

Marginalized Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament in Vienna

Tommy Wasserman, Ansgar University College, Kristiansand

Abstract: According to the current version of the official register (*Kurzgefasste Liste*), there are currently ninety-eight Greek New Testament manuscripts housed in the National Library of Austria in Vienna. Resulting from work on this article, three of these manuscripts have been registered and assigned a Gregory-Aland number: two lectionaries (GA L2530, L2531) and one minuscule (GA 3010). A fourth item, one leaf from a commentary manuscript glued into MS Theologicus gr. 164, has not yet been registered in the *Liste*. Finally, a fifth item, MS Theol. gr. 209, a miscellaneous manuscript, contains a lectionary (GA L155) and a commentary on Matthew that was registered as GA 2988 quite recently (fols. 56r–143v). In my opinion, the first part of this fifth codex, copied from another exemplar with a different commentary on Matthew (fols. 1–55v), also qualifies for inclusion in the *Liste* as part of GA 2988. In this first commentary, the text from Matthew has been abbreviated at times—an example of how the biblical text has been decentralized in a commentary manuscript (a feature that is not uncommon). In fact, in all these manuscripts, the New Testament text has been marginalized in favor of other textual or codicological features, which has arguably worked against their registration in the *Liste*.

1. Introduction to the Manuscripts in the National Library of Austria

The National Library of Austria in Vienna (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek), formerly the Imperial Library (Hofbibliothek), has a long history originating in the imperial library of the Middle Ages, when the Austrian Archduke Albrecht III (1349–1395) organized a library. Albrecht was a connoisseur of art who founded a royal workshop for illustrating manuscripts. In fact, one of the earliest books on record in the library is the splendidly decorated Evangelary of Johannes von Troppau, which was made in 1368 for the duke himself.¹

Hugo Blotius is the name of the first known librarian, a Dutch scholar who was appointed in 1575 by Maximilian II. By that time, the whole collection included some 7,400 manuscripts and rare books.² In the seventeenth century, the manuscript collection became an independent unit of the imperial library. Sebastian Tegnagel, a great philologist and orientalist, was librarian between 1608 and 1636.³ He divided the Greek manuscript collection into five parts: *codices theologici, iurisconsulti, medici, historici, and humaniores et miscellanei*.⁴ Tegnagel apparently

¹ <https://www.onb.ac.at/en/about-us/650th-anniversary/timeline/1368-foundation-codex-and-medieval-treasure>.

² <https://www.onb.ac.at/en/about-us/650th-anniversary/timeline/1575-hugo-blotius-first-imperial-librarian>.

³ Hülya Çelik and Chiara Petrolini, “Establishing an ‘Orientalium linguarum Bibliotheca’ in Seventeenth-Century Vienna: Sebastian Tegnagel and the Trajectories of His Manuscripts,” *Bibliothecae.it* 10 (2021): 175–231.

⁴ Christian Gastgeber, “Ästhetik versus Thematik,” *Biblos* 60 (2011): 20.

read most of the seven hundred Greek manuscripts in the collection, which can be deduced from his many notes in the margins of the manuscripts.⁵

In the same century, Peter Lambeck, librarian between 1663 and 1680, published the first printed catalog of the collection in which he, more or less, retained Tengnagel's division.⁶ Lambeck described over six hundred Greek manuscripts in detail. Subsequently, an additional category, the *supplementum graecum*, was formed for manuscripts that had been acquired later.⁷ Up to the twentieth century, various catalogs were produced, but all of them were based on Lambeck's descriptions or were otherwise merely inventories without any information of the contents of the codices. However, this situation has now changed. First, Josef Bick produced a catalog of the scribes of the Greek manuscripts in Vienna in 1920.⁸ When Bick became director of the library, he assigned Herbert Hunger the task of producing a comprehensive catalog, the work on which Hunger began in 1947 and completed together with various coworkers nearly half a century later in 1994.⁹ The extensive catalog in four volumes, published between 1957 and 1994, contains fresh descriptions of over 1,000 Greek codices and has become a model for subsequent manuscript catalogs.¹⁰

In addition to this collection, the library has the world's largest collection of papyri (180,000 objects), traceable back to the great private collection of the Austrian Archduke Rainer, who gave it to Emperor Franz Joseph I as a birthday present in 1899, requesting that it be made a special collection in the library.¹¹

In the regular collection of Greek manuscripts, there are majuscules, minuscules, and lectionaries written on parchment or paper. In the papyrus collection, there are standard New Testament documents, that is, papyri, lectionaries written on papyrus, and also majuscules written on parchment. Of the ninety-eight registered Greek New Testament manuscripts in the *Liste*, fifty-one belong to the papyrus collection (fourteen papyri, thirty majuscules, and four lectionaries).¹² Hence there is an overlap regarding the latter category of majuscules, because both collections hold this particular type of manuscript. This kind of overlap is also symptomatic of the discipline of papyrological studies, since the term *papyrus* often refers to any ephemeral writing surface, whether made of papyrus reed or other substances such as animal skins.¹³

⁵ Herbert Hunger, *Codices Historici, Codices Philosophici et Philologici*, vol. 1 of *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* (Vienna: Prachner, 1960), xiii.

⁶ Gastgeber, "Ästhetik," 21 (theologici, iuridici, medici, historici, philosophici, and philologici). Peter Lambeck, *Commentariorum de Augustissima Bibliotheca Caesarea Vindobonensis*, 8 vols. (Vienna, 1665–1679).

⁷ Gastgeber, "Ästhetik," 25–26.

⁸ Josef Bick, *Die Schreiber der Wiener Griechischen Handschriften* (Vienna: Ed. Strache, 1920).

⁹ See Marian Harman, review of Herbert Hunger, *Katalog*, vol. 1, *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 31.4 (1961): 406–8.

¹⁰ Herbert Hunger et al., *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, 4 vols. (Vienna: Hollinek, 1961–1994). The first edition of vol. 4 (*Supplementum Graecum*) was published already in 1957.

¹¹ See <https://www.onb.ac.at/bibliothek/sammlungen/papyri> and <https://www.onb.ac.at/bibliothek/sammlungen/papyri/die-papyrussammlung>.

¹² Note that some manuscripts registered with different library shelf-marks are parts of one and the same Greek New Testament manuscript (e.g., the Greek-Coptic GA 070, which has five different library shelf-marks: 15, 2699, 2700, 9007, 9031).

¹³ Cf. Thomas Kraus, "'Pergament oder Papyrus?': Anmerkungen zur Signifikanz des Beschreibstoffes bei der Behandlung von Manuskripten," *NTS* 49 (2003): 430: "Die Forderung, 'The fragment should no longer be called *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus* 840', ist dann sehr wohl angemessen, wenn

2. Marginalized Greek New Testament Manuscripts

At the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Vienna in 2007, I presented on five Greek New Testament manuscripts in the regular collection that had not yet been registered in the *Kurzgefaßte Liste* for various reasons: MS Hist. Gr. 88, MS. Hist. gr. 91, MS Theol. gr. 158, MS Theol. gr. 164, and MS Theol. gr. 209.¹⁴ I identified these five manuscripts by going through Hunger's manuscript catalogs in detail and by ordering copies of the manuscripts on microfilm or paper in order to examine them. I had planned to write a study of these items soon afterward but did not take up work until I was invited to present at the workshop "Decentralising the Biblical Text in Manuscript Formation" hosted by the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing (ITSEE) in Birmingham in March 2022. As I was preparing that paper, I noted that part of one of the items, Theol. gr. 209, fols. 56–143, had been registered as minuscule GA 2988 in the previous year as a result of Georgi Parpulov's work in Birmingham on catena manuscripts.¹⁵ The other manuscripts were then still unregistered, and I will discuss them here, except for MS Hist. gr. 91, a miscellaneous codex that contains a few excerpts from Mark, Luke, John, and Hebrews but clearly does not qualify as a Greek New Testament manuscript.¹⁶

2.1. MS Historicus gr. 88 (GA 3010)

The first item is MS Historicus gr. 88.¹⁷ This codex, written on paper, was acquired by Augerius von Busbeck in Constantinople most probably sometime between 1555 and 1562, when von Busbeck was the ambassador of Emperor Ferdinand I in the court of Sultan Suleiman II. The codex has been dated to the first half of the fifteenth century. It is written on paper, contains 258 folios, and measures 220 x 140/145 mm. According to the catalog, this is a "Sammelhandschrift," which we can define as a composite codex that contains works of different genres and by various authors but without sharing a common theme.¹⁸

etwa in einem fortlaufenden Text auf das Fragment Bezug genommen wird, kann jedoch keineswegs die traditionelle wie konventionelle Abkürzung P.Oxy. V 840 ersetzen. Denn diese rührt einerseits von den Anfängen der Papyrologie als zuständiger Disziplin, andererseits von den jeweiligen Katalogisierungsgebräuchen der Papyrussammlungen wie den durch die Praxis selbst entstandenen Abkürzungskonventionen für die Editionen und Reihen (in Form der im Internet und stets aktualisiert verfügbaren *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*) her."

¹⁴ Tommy Wasserman, "Some New Greek New Testament Manuscripts in Vienna" (paper presented at the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Vienna, 24 July 2007).

¹⁵ Georgi R. Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament: A Catalogue*, TS 3/25 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2021).

¹⁶ MS Hist. gr. 91 contains lessons from Mark 9:17–31; 10:32–39; 10:32–45; Luke 15:11–32; John 10:24–40; 11:1–45; 12:1–16; Heb 6:13–20; Heb 9:11–14. All of these passages were read during Lent, and the excerpts in this part of the codex (fols. 27r–66r) are interspersed with various homilies and other works. There is also another excerpt from Luke 7:2–16 (fol. 22r) among other works, a part concerned with the theme of resurrection from the dead. In all of the excerpts from the New Testament that I have examined, there are some singular or subsingular textual variants, but on the whole the text is to be characterized as Byzantine.

¹⁷ Online description at <http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AC14010788>.

¹⁸ The composite codex would be distinguished from the *miscellany*, in which several texts of different authors, but more or less homogenous (e.g., sharing a common theme), would be organized in a single container. For definitions and discussion of the composite and miscellaneous book,

The greatest part of the codex is comprised of a commentary to the different synodical canons, and this is likely the reason why the manuscript belongs to the *historici graeci*. Nevertheless, one of the works is the Gospel of Matthew, and this section forms an independent part of the codex, which is now registered as GA 3010.¹⁹ The gospel text was copied onto separate sheets of paper before it was bound into this codex and paginated. It also has a distinct layout. In most of the codex there are twenty-eight written lines per page, whereas this section has twenty-two lines per page. Only seven folios are extant, fols. 245r–251v, and they are presently in disorder, so that the extant text beginning in Matt 1:12 μετοι]κεσίαν Βαβυλῶνος is now on fol. 250r. The correct order of the folios is 250, 246, 245, 248, 247, 249, 251.

The text ends in Matt 5:7 with ἐλεηθήσονται. It is very likely that another, now-lost folio formed a quaternion with the seven preserved folios, that is, four folded leaves. Then the first folio of this quaternion would hold the missing first twelve verses in Matt 1. This is consistent with the number of verses per page. This means that the last page of the quaternion would end somewhere around verse 19 in chapter 5. We do not know how many other quaternions are lost. In fact, this whole section may come from a separate *tetraevangelion*, although the whole codex seems to have been copied by the same scribe on pages of roughly the same page format. I have suggested that this is a composite codex, and I can think of no rationale as to why these leaves were included in the codex, apart from being a way to preserve them perhaps with other pages from works copied by the same scribe.

I have collated the Greek New Testament portion against the Byzantine text (Robinson-Pierpont edition) and found the following deviations:²⁰

- 1:15 Ματθαν Μαθθαν δε εγεννησεν] omit (unique)
- 2:2 προσκυνησαι] add αυτον (so Γ Δ 157)
- 2:6 γαρ] add μοι (so C K Γ 28 157 579)
- 2:7 προσκυνησω αυτω] προσκυνησω αυτον (unique)
- 3:5 Ιεροσολυμα και πασα η Ιουδαια] πασα Ιεροσολυμα και Ιουδαια (unique)
- 3:8 καρπον αξιον] καρπους αξιους (so L U 2 28 33)
- 3:12 σιτον αυτου εις την αποθηκην] σιτον εις την αποθηκην αυτου (so E L U 157 1424)
- 3:15 ουτως] ουτω (so 8* B S W 28 118 124 788 1071 1346)
- 4:3 προσελθων αυτω] προσελθων (so 8 B W 1 1582* f³ 33 157 209 700 788)
- 4:16 καθημενος εν χωρα] καθημενος εν σκοτει (unique)
- 5:5 μακαριοι οι πραεις οτι αυτοι κληρονομησουσιν την γην] omit (unique)

see Armando Petrucci, *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture* (New Haven: Yale University, 1995), 1–2; Eva Nyström, *Containing Multitudes: Codex Upsaliensis Graecus 8 in Perspective*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 11 (Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, 2009), 38–48. Recently, Marlena Maniaci has argued that “the two attributes ‘miscellaneous’ and ‘composite’ are mistakenly perceived of as opposites,” which has resulted in confusion. Instead, Maniaci distinguishes between “organised multi-textual, multi-block codices” and “random multi-textual, multi-block codices.” See Marlena Maniaci, “The ‘Non-unitary’ Greek Codex: Typologies and Terminology,” in *Trends in Statistical Codicology*, ed. Marlena Maniaci, Studies in Manuscript Cultures 19 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2022), 349–51.

¹⁹ *Kurzgefaßte Liste* online: <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste?docID=33010>.

²⁰ The textual evidence in this apparatus has been compiled from Swanson and Tischendorf. The *Text und Textwert* volume of Matthew includes 3:12 and 5:5, showing that 207 witnesses attest to σιτον εις την αποθηκην αυτου (3:12) and that merely three witnesses attest to the omission of μακαριοι οι πραεις οτι αυτοι κληρονομησουσιν την γην (Matt 5:5): 365* 783* 1666. This is very likely a coincidental agreement in error due to haplography. None of these three witnesses attests to the unique omission of 3010 in Matt 1:15.

2.2. MS Theologicus gr. 158 (GA L2530)

The second item is MS Theologicus gr. 158.²¹ The miscellaneous codex contains various commentaries on Gregory of Nazianzus's orations. Two leaves of this manuscript (fols. 204 and 210) are palimpsested, the undertext of which is from an uncial gospel lectionary from the tenth century. These leaves are now registered as GA L2530.²² The original writing is not visible on the microfilm copy that I have accessed, although some uncial letters in two columns are visible on the parchment strip. According to the catalog, the lesson is for the first hour of Good Friday, and it contains Matt 27:19–20, 22–23, 25–26, 28–29, 41, 45–46, 48–49, 52–53, but not many of the words are visible.

2.3. MS Theologicus gr. 164 (GA L2531)

The third codex, MS Theologicus gr. 164, is a composite codex that contains various works, for example, by John of Damascus and Gregory of Nyssa.²³ According to a note in the codex (fol. 33r), it was bought from Italy by Johannes Sambucus (1531–1584) for four golden ducats.²⁴

Many leaves are in disorder, and virtually all of them are palimpsested. The undertext of two leaves (fols 105 and 107) comes from an uncial gospel lectionary from the twelfth century, now registered as GA L2531.²⁵ I could not see any text on the microfilm copy, but according to the catalog, the text contains readings from Matt 3:14–4:14 and John 20:3–21:13. I could not find this particular combination of passages in the relatively fixed Synaxarion, so this part is probably from the Menologion.

Interestingly, some pages of another format have been glued into the original codex. One parchment leaf of this section (fol. IVr–v) contains Theophylact's commentary on Luke 15:17–21, followed by a citation of 15:22–24 (v. 23 is lacunose) on the recto followed by commentary again on the verso.²⁶ This manuscript, also from the twelfth century, should, in my opinion, also be assigned a GA number.

2.4. MS Theol. gr. 209 (GA 2988, GA L155)

The fourth codex is MS Theol. gr. 209.²⁷ This is yet another palimpsest; the underwriting of fols. 1r–127v and 136r–143v is an uncial gospel lectionary from the ninth or tenth century, registered as GA L155, with weekday readings from Easter to Pentecost and Saturday/Sunday for other weeks.²⁸ The upper writing dates from the twelfth century and contains an incomplete catena commentary by Theophylact of Ohrid on the Gospel of Matthew (fols. 56r–143v), which

²¹ Online description at <http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AC15089539>.

²² *Kurzgefaßte Liste* online: <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste?docID=42530>.

²³ Online description at <http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AC15089611>.

²⁴ Sambucus was an artist and philologist from Tyrnau in today's Slovakia, who studied in Vienna and came to serve in the court of Maximilian II during the sixteenth century. During his lifetime he produced numerous translations and commentaries of Roman and Greek works.

²⁵ *Kurzgefaßte Liste* online: <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste?docID=42531>.

²⁶ This manuscript has been added to the Catena Catalogue (maintained by the ITSEE in Birmingham) at <https://itsee-wce.birmingham.ac.uk/catenacatalogue/4836/>.

²⁷ Online description at <http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AC14452235>. See also Herbert Hunger and Wolfgang Lackner, *Codices theologici 201–337*, vol. 3.3. of *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* (Vienna: Hollinek, 1992), 33–44.

²⁸ *Kurzgefaßte Liste* online: <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste?docID=40155>. For some reason, the shelf number is indicated as “Theol. gr. 209, fol. 1–55,” whereas the lectionary actually takes up

has recently been registered as GA 2988, due to the work on catena manuscripts by Georgi Parpulov.²⁹ This part of MS Theol. gr. 209 starts with commentary on Matt 9:32–34 and ends with a citation of Matt 25:41–46.

However, the first part of the codex (fols. 1r–55v) contains another commentary on Matthew that has been falsely attributed to Peter of Laodicea (C111).³⁰ As Panagiotis Manafis and Georgi Parpulov have shown, this commentary is a paraphrase drawn by a compiler from various sources.³¹ This part of MS Theol. gr. 209 with Pseudo-Peter's commentary is included in Parpulov's catalog of catenae manuscripts (type e.2.ii.a with full-page commentary; New Testament text abridged), but for some reason it has not been assigned a GA number as some other manuscripts of this type (GA 2480, GA 2481).³² The reason for this is either an oversight or perhaps because the biblical text (typically Byzantine with very few deviations) is abbreviated in one part of the commentary—an example of the decentralization of the biblical text. This phenomenon, however, is present in many other commentary manuscripts in the *Liste*, for example, the recently registered GA 2937. In the following, we will look more closely at the relationship between the two commentaries.

The first leaf of the first part is lacunose (the extant part was originally fols. 2r–56v), so that fol. 1r begins with Pseudo-Peter's commentary on Matt 1:8–11. The gospel text is fully cited from Matt 1:12 up to Matt 5:11 on fol. 21v (not 5:16, as the catalog suggests). The lemma is normally introduced with the abbreviated κείμενον (“text”), and the first letter of the text is stylized. The beginning of the commentary is often marked with the abbreviated ἐρ(μηνεία) (“interpretation”).

On fol. 22r, eleven words (χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς from Matt 5:12a) are missing so that the text begins with οὕτως γὰρ (5:12b). This may be due to a scribal error, since Pseudo-Peter's commentary reads ὅτι μισθὸς ἔσται αὐτοῖς πολὺς ἐν οὐρανοῖς παρὰ κυρίου (which is very similar to 5:12a), so the scribe might have omitted the biblical text by accident here occasioned by the commentary. From fol. 23v and to fol. 31v, however, the biblical text is abbreviated so that often just the beginning and the end of a passage is cited with ἕως, “up to,” in between. Thus Matt 5:21–22 is cited as: Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις· οὐ φονεύσεις ἕως [ca. forty Greek words are omitted] εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός. There is no kind of shift at this point in the commentary.

These abbreviations of the lemma continue up to fol. 32r, where the text is fully cited again from Matt 6:22 until the end of this first part of the codex. On the final page of this part (fol. 55v, originally fol. 56v), Matt 9:32–34 is cited (without the genitive absolute, αὐτῶν δὲ ἐξερχομένων). However, on the next page Theophylact's commentary on these verses follows (Ἄκρας μωρίας ...). This second part of the codex runs up to 143v (the commentary is interrupted by a *sticheronkathisma* on fols. 128r–135v, which is a different codicological unit) and ends with a complete citation of Matt 25:41–46; the rest of the commentary is lacunose.

fols. 1r–127v and 136r–143v of this codex. Hunger dated it to the ninth century, whereas the INTF indicates the tenth century.

²⁹ Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts*, 211–12. Parpulov agrees with Hunger's dating of this part to the twelfth century. The *Liste*, however, indicates fourteenth–fifteenth century.

³⁰ Josef Sickenberger, “Über die dem Petrus von Laodicea zugeschriebenen Evangelienkommentare,” *TQ* 86 (1904): 10–19; Joseph Reuss, *Matthäus-, Markus- und Johannes-Katenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht*, NTAbh 18.4–5 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1941), 72–78; Greek text edited by C. F. G. Heinrici, *Des Petrus von Laodicea Erklärung des Matthäusevangeliums*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung des Neuen Testaments 5 (Leipzig: Dürr, 1908).

³¹ Panagiotis Manafis and Georgi Parpulov, “A Chapter from the History of Catenae: CPG C111–C112, and Their Previously Unknown Ancestor,” *Parekbolai* 11 (2021): 159–70.

³² Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts*, 40 [71876].

The two parts were originally two distinct codicological units, but both, apart from the *sticherokathisma*, are written on the same palimpsest (L155), the leaves of which are now in disorder. There are Greek numerals marking the gatherings of the respective units, some of which have been trimmed away. Thus, in the top right corner on fol. 55v is the number 8 (H) marking the eighth gathering of the first codicological unit. Similarly, on fol. 72r in the second part of the codex one can see a number 3 (Γ) marking the third gathering, which means that the first gathering (A) began on fol. 56r—right where there is a shift from Pseudo-Peter’s commentary to Theophylact’s commentary.

According to Hunger and Lackner, two scribes were at work in the first part of the codex (a shift is clearly apparent on fol. 47r), and a third scribe copied the second part (fol. 56r–143v), but a fourth scribe added ornamental letters in lemma and commentary in both these parts.³³ It is unclear why the two parts were combined, but they were clearly copied on the reused parchment of an uncial lectionary but from different exemplars of two distinct commentaries—perhaps one exemplar was incomplete³⁴—and then combined as seamlessly as possible at Matt 9:32–34, and another scribe then worked on the ornamentation. Since both parts derive from the same composition project—both reuse the same manuscript (L155) and their texts join partway through—the GA number 2988 should, in my opinion, apply to the whole.³⁵

3. Conclusion

Peter Head at Wycliffe Hall (University of Oxford) has pointed out that “the best place to look for ancient manuscripts is *in a library*.”³⁶ I would like to supplement this with the observation that a good manuscript catalog is the best help to find such manuscripts. In this article I have discussed some new Greek New Testament manuscripts housed in the National Library of Austria in Vienna. The research that led to these discoveries would not have been possible without the excellent manuscript catalogs produced by Herbert Hunger and his coauthors. These catalogs have been crucial not only for the first step of identifying the New Testament texts, but also for gaining a better understanding of these complex manuscripts that all reflect

³³ Hunger and Lackner, *Codices theologici*, 43.

³⁴ In this connection, it is notable that on fol. 115v, Matt 21:10–11 is cited (ll. 2–5) followed by commentary, but then the next citation is from Matt 21:15–16 (ll. 13–18), an indication of a missing leaf in the exemplar (so Hunger and Lackner, *Codices theologici*, 34).

³⁵ Andrew Patton has informed me in private correspondence of two other manuscripts that in various ways relate to the situation in MS Theol. gr. 209. First is Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Gr. 189 (=GA 19), a catena manuscript with the *Vollkatene* (C140.4) on John 1:1–7:12 (fols. 1–37v) followed by the commentary attributed to Peter of Laodicea (fols. 38–387v). Patton thinks the manuscript was copied from an exemplar with the same order (John–Matthew–Luke–Mark), but because this exemplar had lacunae in John, the scribe used a different catena manuscript to fill out what was missing. The second manuscript, Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, S.A. Valle 100, contains three catena types of Luke—first C133 (fols. 1r–118r) up to Luke 12:32, then C135 (fols. 119r–350v) up to Luke 24:51, and, finally, in a different codicological unit, C130 (fols. 457r–486v). For a detailed study of this latter manuscript, see Domenico Surace, “Copisti greci in tre codici sconosciuti della Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Roma (S. A. Valle 100, 102–103),” *Νέα Πρωμη Rivista di ricerche bizantinistiche* 8 (2011): 219–303. I want to thank Patton for kindly sharing information from his forthcoming doctoral dissertation.

³⁶ Peter Williams, “Uncovering the Hidden Lives of Manuscripts,” Tyndale House (website article), 7 September 2021, <https://tyndalehouse.com/explore/articles/uncovering-the-hidden-lives-of-manuscripts>.

discontinuity in codicological structure, hand, content and so on to a greater or lesser degree.³⁷ Of course, my study has then proceeded with an examination of each manuscript itself on microfilm or digital images.

There are several likely reasons why these manuscripts were not registered in the official list of Greek New Testament manuscripts, the *Liste*, until very recently. In general, they are all unlike the regular New Testament manuscripts and therefore marginalized; that is, some are part of composite or miscellaneous codices containing other texts as well, some are palimpsests, and some are catena manuscripts with more or less consistently cited biblical text, and in several cases these categories overlap.

The first item, a few leaves with text from Matthew likely drawn from a now-lost *tetraevangelion*, was bound in disorder into a composite codex that was classified, not as a *codex theologicus*, but as a *codex historicus graecus* already by Tengenagel in the seventeenth century, based, no doubt, on the majority of its content. It is, of course, unexpected to find a Greek New Testament manuscript among the *codices historici graeci* in the collection—in fact, there is no other example.³⁸

The next two items, the miscellaneous codex MS Theol. gr. 158 and the composite codex MS Theol. gr. 164, both contain palimpsested leaves from two distinct uncial gospel lectionaries, which have been scraped off and reused. Thus, in both cases, the Greek New Testament text has been marginalized by codicological factors.

The latter codex, MS Theol. gr. 164, also preserves a single leaf (fol. IV) from a catena manuscript bound into the codex, which has escaped notice until now. In my experience, there has been some reluctance on the part of the INTF, at least in the past, to register single leaves of manuscripts that are not early papyri or uncials because they have been regarded as too insignificant.³⁹ In addition, this is a leaf from a Greek New Testament commentary manuscript, which is a category on its own. Commentary manuscripts, even when they are not part of composite or miscellaneous codices, are often separated from the regular biblical manuscripts in manuscript catalogs, and the biblical text can be omitted, abridged, and thus, decentralized

³⁷ On the relevance or importance of identifying and studying discontinuities in codices, see Patrick Andrist, Paul Canart and Marilena Maniaci, *La syntaxe du codex: Essai de codicologie structurale*, *Bibliologia* 34 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013).

³⁸ However, there are two Greek New Testament manuscripts among the *codices iuridici graeci* (six folios of MS Iur. gr. 5 are registered as L45; eight folios of MS Iur. gr. 18 are registered as L2201), and there is one among the *codices philosophici graeci* (two folios of MS Phil. gr. 100 are registered as L2202).

³⁹ In 2006 I sent in a number of new manuscripts to the INTF in Münster for registration. See Tommy Wasserman, "Some Bibliographic Notes on Greek New Testament Manuscripts," *NovT* 49 (2007): 291–95. One of these was Plimpton MS 14 in Columbia University, Rare Book and Manuscript Library. The actual New Testament part of the manuscript (Luke 24:43–50) is a fragment of a single parchment folio from a lectionary dated to the eleventh century that has been reused in the binding of a later miscellaneous codex. It was not given a GA number at the time because it was regarded as too insignificant, as Michael Welte of the INTF explained in private correspondence on 17 May 2006: "Fragmente von der Art des Lukas-Textes gibt es ja unzählige. Texte so geringen Umfangs haben bis dato nur eine Nummern erhalten, wenn es sich um Papyri oder alte Pergamente handelte oder aber trotz geringen Umfangs eine bemerkenswerte Variante bieten." Some years later, however, staff from the INTF contacted me about this and other items, and the manuscript was eventually registered as L2463.

in various ways. Thus, many of these manuscripts demand a good deal of analysis to see if they qualify for inclusion in the *Liste*.⁴⁰

In the course of work on this article, I sent in documentation of the manuscripts to the INTF, proposing that they be included in the *Liste* and assigned a GA number. Significantly, the three regular Greek New Testament manuscripts were registered without any hesitation: MS Hist. gr. 88 (3010), seven folios from a *tetraevangelion*; MS Theol. gr. 158 (L2530) and MS Theol. gr. 164 (L2531), each containing two leaves from gospel lectionaries. However, the two catena manuscripts—the single leaf of MS Theol. gr. 164 from a twelfth-century catena manuscript with one citation from Luke 15:22–23; and the first part of MS Theol. gr. 209 (fols. 1–55) with some of its text from Matthew abbreviated—have apparently required much more time and have been the topic of many conversations at the INTF, and they still have not been included in the *Liste*.⁴¹

The two catena manuscripts are particularly good examples of how the decentralization of the biblical text in these codices have ultimately led to their marginalization in the study of the Greek New Testament text. Ironically, recent computer-aided research on the text suggests that commentary manuscripts have likely been underestimated by text critics. Thus Gerd Mink, who developed the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method that is now being used to produce the *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior*, states regarding a diagram showing the “predominant textual flow” through witnesses to the book of James:

Incidentally, it is striking that nodes with many edges emanating from them often display numbers belonging to commentary manuscripts.... Commentary manuscripts contain, apart from the commentaries, the continuous New Testament text. It is unlikely that these commentary manuscripts served as exemplars for manuscripts containing the continuous text. But it is very plausible that that text form was chosen as the basis for a commentary which was the most highly esteemed at that particular time and place. Accordingly, it would also have been used as an exemplar in the scriptoria.⁴²

⁴⁰ For a discussion of some of the problems of classifications that these commentary manuscripts pose, see H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker, “An Introduction to Greek New Testament Commentaries with a Preliminary Checklist of New Testament Catena Manuscripts,” in *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition: Papers from the Ninth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, in Association with the COMPAUL project*, ed. H. A. G. Houghton, TS 3/13 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2016), 2–4. Houghton and Parker also provided a preliminary checklist of catena manuscripts that has now been surpassed by an online searchable Catena Catalogue where new items are being added continuously (including Theol. gr. 164 fol. IV and Theol. gr. 209, fols. 1–55) at: <https://itsee-wce.birmingham.ac.uk/catenacatalogue/>. Currently, the Catena Catalogue contains 708 entries.

⁴¹ So I have been told in private correspondence with Greg Paulson of the INTF on 14 March 2023.

⁴² Gerd Mink, “Problems of a Highly Contaminated Tradition: The New Testament. Stemmata of Variants as a Source of a Genealogy for Witnesses,” in *Studies in Stemmata II*, ed. Pieter van Reenen, August den Hollander, and Margot van Mulken (Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2004), 49.