

The Inner Cohesion between the Bible and the Fathers in Byzantine Tradition

Towards a codico-liturgical approach to the Byzantine biblical and patristic manuscripts

S.M. ROYÉ



The Inner Cohesion between the Bible and the Fathers in Byzantine Tradition

**Towards a codico-liturgical approach to
the Byzantine biblical and patristic manuscripts**

S.M. ROYÉ



ORTHODOX LOGOS PUBLISHING

The Inner Cohesion between the Bible and the Fathers in Byzantine Tradition
Towards a codico-liturgical approach to the Byzantine biblical and patristic manuscript

by S.M. Royé

Front cover Illustration

The front cover illustration is taken from A. Džurova, *Byzantinische Miniaturen. Schätze der Buchmalerei vom 4. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert*, Regensburg, 2002.

Plate No 67: Johannes Chrysostomos, *Homilien*, Katharinenkloster, Berg Sinai, Ms. 364, Pergament, 33 x 25 cm, 1042-1050; f: 2 der Evangelist Matthäus und der hl. Johannes Chrysostomos.

Printed with kind permission of Professor A. Džurova.

© 2007, S.M. Royé

© 2008, Orthodox Logos Publishing, The Netherlands

www.orthodoxlogos.com

ISBN: 978-90-811555-3-3

This book is in copyright. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher, nor be otherwise circulated in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published without a similar condition, including this condition, being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.



**Distinguish, o man, what thou art
reading! Can these things be known
from ink? Or can the taste of honey
be spread over the palate of the
reader, from written documents?**

**Isaac the Syrian, *Mystic Treatises by Isaac of
Nineveh* (trans. A.J. Wensinck, I, 41)**

Acknowledgement

The dissertation at hand* is the result of a twelve year period of study which I have conducted in the area of biblical science and Byzantine patrology, in cooperation with my supervisor Professor Dr. C. Houtman, Professor emeritus of Old Testament Studies at the Protestant Theological University of Kampen. The result of this period of critical and honest exchange of opinion, developed, surprisingly for us both, in the direction of catalogue and manuscript studies. I would sincerely like to thank professor Houtman for his longstanding patience and ever supportive advice.

I am grateful to my second supervisor Professor Dr. R. Roukema, Professor of New Testament Studies and Patristics at the same university, for being a critical reader and for his help in correcting the text.

This dissertation was defended in Kampen on 19th October 2007 at the Protestant Theological University of Utrecht – Kampen – Leiden.

I must certainly also thank Dr. M. Welte for the hospitality he showed when I visited the Hs. Kartei during my working visit to the *Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung* (Münster), with regard to my research of the 'lectionary equipment' in the NT codices.

An orientation visit I paid to the *Patriarchal Institute of Patristic Studies* in Thessaloniki, where the Athos codices are collected on microfilm) shows how great the ignorance of the Western academic world still is (in the first place of this PhD student) with regard to a Greek Orthodox evaluation of the Byzantine Greek manuscripts, as well as of later Greek editions and secondary New Greek specialised literature. Deeper acquaintance and better academic communication with the above is of the greatest necessity for further research in this area.

Very inspirational were my two year long monthly weekend working visits to the *Institute of Orthodox Christian Studies* in Cambridge (UK), not only because of the possibility to learn about the international academic Orthodox world from within, but also because of the possibility to make use of the excellent resources of Cambridge University Library.

I must also thank H. Weeda for her help, not only for her expertise in editing the text of this dissertation, but also for her personal and longstanding support of the work. I also wish to thank Dr. L. Weeda for assisting me in the correction of the Greek text, for helping me in Münster (INTF), and for providing feedback on numerous aspects of this work. Naturally, the responsibility for any language or other errors remains entirely mine.

My friend C. Tsekrekos should be mentioned for the many lively discussions on the themes at hand, his close ties to modern Greek Orthodoxy and all the books he brought me from Athens. I wish also to recall the contributions of young student T. Huyts for his stimulating and kind help in the pioneering period of developing the framework for the *Catalogue of Byzantine Liturgical Codices*.

* Further research has led to corrections having been made in this publication, as compared to the earlier unpublished dissertation (which was printed in 50 copies only). Especially the references in the Tables in Chapter 3.4 have now been checked against the actual texts of the lessons in the Greek original of the Greek Orthodox editions of the liturgical books.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgement	5
Table of Contents	6
Introduction	9
1. The Byzantine Manuscripts and the Western Cataloguing Tradition	21
1.1 Preliminary Remarks to Codicological Study of the Byzantine Manuscripts	
1.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of Specialised Catalogues	
1.3 Existing Paradigms of Manuscript Classification	
1.4 Examples of Codicological Research of the Byzantine Manuscripts	
1.5 Recapitulation	
2. The Byzantine Liturgy and the Biblical and Patristic Manuscripts	53
2.1 The Byzantine Ecclesiastical, Liturgical Manuscripts	
2.2 Scripture in the Byzantine Liturgical Manuscripts	
2.3 The Liturgical Impact of the Biblical Commentary Manuscripts	
2.4 The Byzantine Calendar and the Liturgical Lessons	
2.5 The Typikon: The Ruling Principle of the Byzantine Liturgical Calendar	
2.6 The Scriptural Foundation of Byzantine Hymnography	
2.7 Conclusions	
3. The Byzantine Lection System – a Patristic, Liturgical Hermeneutics of Scripture	87
3.1 The Purpose of the Byzantine Lection System	
3.2 Sources of the Byzantine Liturgical Lessons	
3.3 The Cycle of the Eleven Resurrection Evangelia	
3.4 The Movable and Immovable Cycles of Lessons of the Byzantine Calendar	
3.5 The Byzantine Cycle of Psalmody	
3.6 The Nine (Biblical) Odes of the Byzantine Psalterion	
3.7 Concluding remarks	
4. The Eastern Libraries and the Catalogues of Byzantine Manuscripts	121
4.1 The Value of the Eastern Libraries and their Manuscript Holdings	
4.2 The Present State of Byzantine Manuscript Holdings in East and West	
4.3 The Greek Libraries, their Catalogues and Manuscripts	
4.4 The Slavic, Romanian and Georgian Libraries, their Catalogues and Manuscripts	
4.5 Conclusion	
5. The Contours of a Codico-Liturgical Model of Classification	153
5.1 The Setting up of a <i>Catalogue of Byzantine Manuscripts</i>	
5.2 The Proposed Classification of the Byzantine Manuscripts	
5.3 The Contours of a Typology of the Codification of the Byzantine Manuscripts	
5.4 Concluding remarks	

6. The <i>Catalogue of Byzantine Manuscripts</i>	167
6.1 The Tabular Specimens	
6.2 Group I. Byzantine Biblical Codices (NT)	
6.3 Group II. Byzantine Biblical Codices (OT)	
6.4 Group III. Byzantine Composite Codices (OT/NT)	
6.5 Group IV. Byzantine Composite Codices (Biblical/Liturgical)	
Final Conclusion and Perspective	183
Annexes	185
I. Glossary of terms	187
II. Bibliography	193
III. Indices of the Byzantine Anagnosmata	219

Introduction

Contemporary research of the Scriptures and the fathers is characterised by pluriformity. Throughout the rich history of Bible research and patrology, a palet of different traditions has always existed. One of these, which is based on an abundant manuscript tradition of biblical and patristic interpretation, is the tradition of the Eastern Orthodox Church. It is to this tradition that this study is dedicated.

1. Main objective

In this dissertation I defend an approach to the Byzantine biblical and patristic manuscripts, which could adequately be called a *liturgico-codicological* approach, and which is closely related to modern manuscript studies and especially to codicology. This approach offers, in my view, a key to understanding the position of and opinion concerning the biblical and patristic writings in the Eastern Orthodox churches. It stems from what I call a ‘liturgical hypothesis’, which I will explain in more detail further in this introduction, and implies the necessity of a thorough reclassification of the extant manuscripts.

Before I present the liturgico-codicological approach and the liturgical hypothesis in more detail however, I will provide a short impression of how the Eastern Orthodox churches look upon the biblical and patristic manuscripts.

2. The hermeneutical context of Eastern Orthodox Bible interpretation

Characteristic of the Orthodox vision are: 1) the anchoring of the biblical writings in the liturgy of the church; and 2) the close connection between the Scriptures and the interpretative framework of the fathers. This first point will be discussed in depth in chapter 2: *The Byzantine Liturgy and the Biblical and Patristic Manuscripts*. The second point is treated succinctly in this introduction, in three short paragraphs about Bible interpretation from an Eastern Orthodox perspective.

It is a given that the overwhelming majority of Byzantine and later Eastern Orthodox church fathers, as well as modern Orthodox scholars keenly advocate that biblical research should not be separated from the interpretative framework of the fathers of the church. I do not intend to dwell on this subject. There is a whole body of literature of scholars from Greece, Russia and other Orthodox countries, as well as those living in the West who have identified and written on this issue in depth¹. And also in Western scholarship is attention paid to the subject². Here we will provide only a couple of examples of Eastern Orthodox opinion, to remind us of what we could call the “patristic” point of departure. The Russian scholar Alexander Schmemmann, for example, describes how the isolated position of Scripture in modern biblical science, is something that has not rooted in Orthodox theology: ‘Unchallenged by the Reformation with its emphasis on *Sola Scriptura*, Orthodox theology implicitly rather than explicitly rejects the isolation of Scripture into a closed and self-sufficient field of study...’³; and the Greek biblical scholar Theodore Stylianopoulos refers to the ‘gradual fading away of the Orthodox awareness that the Fathers must function as an intermediary screen between the student and the Bible’⁴.

¹ T. Athanasopoulos, *Ἐκκλησία: ὁ αὐθεντικός φύλακας καὶ ἐρμηνεύτης τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς*, Athens, 1998; P.K. Chrestou, *Ἑλληνικὴ Πατρολογία*, T. I-V, Thessaloniki, 1976-1992, Idem, *Greek Orthodox Patrology. An Introduction to the Study of the Church Fathers*, Vol. I, Ed. and Trans: G.D. Dragas, Rollinsford, New Hampshire, 2005; H. Alfeyev, *St. Symeon the New Theologian and Orthodox Tradition*, Oxford, 2000; H. Alfeyev, *The Spiritual World of Isaac the Syrian*, Kalamazoo, Mich., 2000; T.G. Stylianopoulos, *The New Testament. An Orthodox Perspective, Volume One: Scripture, Tradition, Hermeneutics*, Brookline, Mass., 1999; G.V. Florovsky, *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*, Belmont, 1972; G.V. Florovsky, *The Eastern Fathers of the IVth Century*, Vaduz, 1987; Idem, *The Byzantine Fathers of the Vth Century*, Belmont, 1987; Idem, *The Byzantine Fathers of the VIth – VIIIth Centuries*, Belmont, Mass., 1987; Idem, *The Byzantine Ascetic and Spiritual Fathers*, Belmont, MA, 1987, translated and extended revisions of *Византийские Отцы V-VIII* [The Byzantine Fathers of the Vth–VIIIth Centuries], Paris, 1933 and *Восточные Отцы IV-го Вѣка* [The Eastern Fathers of the IVth Century], Paris, 1931; V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, Cambridge & London, 1973.

² E.g. C. Kannengieser (Ed.), *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, 2 Vols., Leiden / Boston, 2004; P.M. Blowers, (Ed. and Trans.), *The Bible in Greek Christian Antiquity*, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1997.

³ A. Schmemmann, *Russian Theology 1920-1965. A Bibliographical Survey*, Crestwood, NY, 1969, 8-9.

⁴ T.G. Stylianopoulos, “Historical Studies and Orthodox Theology or the Problem of History for Orthodoxy”, in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 12.3 (1967), 406. Cf. Idem, *The New Testament: An Orthodox Perspective* (Vol. 1: Scripture, Tradition, Hermeneutics), Brookline, Mass., 1999, and J. Panagopoulos, *Ἡ ἐρμηνεία τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς τῆν Ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν Πατέρων* [The interpretation of Holy Scripture in the Church of the Fathers], t. I (Athens, 1991).

Three recent conferences held in the last decennium: the first, the *West-östlichen Neutestamentler/innen-Symposiums von Neamț (Auslegung der Bibel in orthodoxer und westlicher Perspektive)* in Romania in 1998⁵; the second, *Zweiter Europäischer Orthodox-Westliche Exegetenkonferenz (Das Alte Testament als Christliche Bibel in Orthodoxer und Westlicher Sicht)* in Rila, Bulgaria in 2001⁶; and the *Third East-Western Symposium of European NT Scholars (Unity and Diversity in NT Ecclesiology)* in St. Petersburg by the newly founded Biblical Institute of the Philological Faculty of St. Petersburg State University in 2005⁷, show very clearly how the topic of the place that the fathers and tradition in general receive in Eastern Orthodox theology is still very high on the agenda of biblical scholarship. We need only to look at the conference agenda of the Neamț conference to confirm this: 1) the meaning of the church fathers for the interpretation of the Bible; 2) the authority of the Church and the interpretation of the Bible; 3) Western scientific methods of Bible exegesis and their reception through Orthodoxy; 4) the inspiration of the Bible and its interpretation.

3. Different approaches to the interpretation of the Bible

In his concluding resumé to the conference held in Rila, Bulgaria in 2001, K.W. Niebuhr suggested that: ‘... there is hardly any difference between Orthodox and non-Orthodox exegesis when it comes to the valuation and application of philological and historical methods, whilst the differences between the theological interpretations of exegetical findings continue to be considerable’⁸ [trans: Ed.]. Niebuhr does not enter into the whole area of philological and historical research in more depth to explain his statement, but we feel that this should be nuanced somewhat. If one takes into account those aspects of biblical and patristic studies, such as palaeography & codicology⁹, textual criticism & criticism of the canon¹⁰, linguistic & literary research, then one can only but conclude that the differences in the practice and application of different approaches to the interpretation of the Bible in East and West are not to be neglected¹¹. One is confronted with a complex phenomenon, which can be traced back to the differences in philological methodology and style that are closely linked to the theology and hermeneutics of the different backgrounds to which they belong. In the field of Western philology of the Bible¹², which was deeply influenced by classical philology since the Renaissance¹³, research has led to a major focus on the biblical text, separated from patristic and liturgical frameworks, and the production of critical editions of the Bible¹⁴. In the East, where Byzantine philology persistently dominated the field of biblical studies, one generally speaking finds an adherence to ecclesiastical practices in the transmission of biblical and patristic texts, reflected

⁵ J.D.G. Dunn et al. (Eds.), *Auslegung der Bibel in orthodoxer und westlicher Perspektive, (Akten des west-östlichen Neutestamentler/innen-Symposiums von Neamț vom 4.-11. September 1998)* (Tübingen, 2000).

⁶ I.Z. Dimitrov et al. (Eds.), *Das Alte Testament als christliche Bibel in orthodoxer und westlicher Sicht: Zweite europäische orthodox-westliche Exegetenkonferenz, im Rilakloster vom 8-15 September 2001* (Tübingen, 2004).

⁷ www.bibliothecabilica.unibe.ch/Petersburgspecial.htm (seen 1 June 2007).

⁸ K.W. Niebuhr, ‘Zu den Ergebnissen des Rila-Symposiums’, in I. Dimitrov (Ed. et al.), *Op. Cit.* (Tübingen, 2004), 365.

⁹ E.E. Granstrom, ‘Zur byzantinischen Minuskel’, in *Griechische Kodikologie und Textüberlieferung*, D. Harlfinger (Ed.) (Darmstadt, 1980), 77-78: ‘Die Mehrzahl der angeführten Gelehrten (mit Ausnahme von B. de Montfaucon, V.K. Ernstedt, E.M. Thompson und G.F. Cereteli) betrachteten die Paläographie lediglich als Summe von Kenntnissen, die für das Lesen und die richtige Datierung von Texten notwendig sind. Viele Paläographen beschäftigten sich mit den paläographischen Gegebenheiten inhaltlich verwandter Texte, was eine Sichtung und den Vergleich der verschiedenen Schrifttypen miteinander, wie sie (...), beim Kopieren von Handschriften unterschiedlicher Bestimmung und verschiedenen Inhalts gebraucht wurden, ausschloß’; idem, ‘Greek Palaeography in Russia’, in *Bulletin no 17 of the Institute of Classical Studies*, University of London (1970), 126-127.

¹⁰ See § 4 and § 7 of this Introduction.

¹¹ A Greek introduction to Byzantine Philology can be found in N.B. Tomadakis, *Κλείς τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Φιλολογίας* (Thessaloniki, 1993); for the Slavonic philological tradition one can consult, A.A. Alexeev, *Текстология Славянской Библии* (St. Petersburg, 1999).

¹² For a general picture, see J.J. Pelikan, *The Reformation of the Bible. The Bible of the Reformation, Catalogue of the Exhibition by V. Hotchkiss and D. Price* (New Haven and London, 1996); J.C. Trebelle Barrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible. An Introduction to the History of the Bible* (Leiden/New York/ Köln and Grand Rapids/ Cambridge, U.K., 1998); B.M. Metzger and B.D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament. Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration* (New York/Oxford, 2005); J.H. Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ. New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance* (Princeton, 1983).

¹³ E.E. Granstrom, ‘Greek Palaeography in Russia’, in *Bulletin no 17 of the Institute of Classical Studies* (1970), 124-135, esp. 126: ‘The foundations of the nineteenth-century study of Greek palaeography in Russia were quite other than those on which the discipline rested in Western Europe. There – and especially in Latin countries – the revival of interest in Greek manuscripts was above all connected with the activities of the humanists who studied the works of classical authors and of the printers who published them, i.e. with the rise of classical philology’.

¹⁴ T.H. Darlow and H.F. Moule (Eds.), *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, vol. II: Polyglots and Languages Other Than English (New York, reprint, 1963): ‘Ancient Greek’.

not only in the continuing manuscript tradition¹⁵, but also in the forms of the printed editions based on these manuscripts¹⁶.

4. Contemporary Orthodox position on philology of the Bible

Elucidating the contemporary Orthodox position on philology of the Bible is not easy. Conservative forces in Greece¹⁷ and Russia¹⁸ can be very strong, precisely in the areas of manuscript studies of Scripture, Bible edition or translation.¹⁹ Eastern Orthodox biblical scholarship, both in Greece²⁰ as well as in Russia (in Russia palaeography and philology of the Bible²¹ was occupied primarily with textual research of the Slavonic Bible and interest in the Byzantine text - the Greek manuscripts since the 9th century - in so far as the Slavonic translation was based on that text)²² has only participated “moderately” in the critical branch of textual research, in so far as we are able to discern²³. There has been a concentration first and foremost on exploration of the codices and their holdings and the cataloguing of these manuscripts (see chapter 4). It should be noted that critical editions of the Bible have not been produced by Eastern Orthodox themselves²⁴. A well-organised editorial committee of Russian philologists was in an advanced stage of producing a critical edition of the Slavonic Bible at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, until the Russian Revolution interrupted

¹⁵ Descriptions of Byzantine manuscripts since the 16th - 19th centuries have selectively been adopted in the catalogues of Aland, Rahlfs, Ehrhard and more completely in the catalogues at location of the individual libraries in East and West. This considerable group of later manuscripts have been less studied. Cf. D. Holton et al. (Eds.), *Κωδικογράφοι, συλλέκτες, διασκευαστές, και εκδότες. Χειρόγραφα και εκδόσεις της ύψιμης βυζαντινής και πρώιμης νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Copyists, collectors, redactors and editors: manuscripts and editions of late Byzantine and early modern Greek literature* (Heraklaion, 2005).

¹⁶ Basic bio-bibliographical entries to these publications are: N.B. Tomadakis, *Κλείς της Βυζαντινής Φιλολογίας*, (Thessaloniki, 1993); E.N. Fragkiskos, *La Bibliothèque de Patmos. Catalogue d'imprimés (XVe-XIXe s.): introduction, description des imprimés, annexes, index* (Athens, 1995-1996); P. Meyer, *Die Theologische Literatur der griechischen Kirche im sechzehnten Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1899); E. Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique ou Description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs aux dix-septième siècle*, 5 vols., (Paris, 1894-1903, repr. Paris, 1975); A. Papadopoulos-Vretos, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία* (Athens, 1854-1857).

¹⁷ A. Delicostopoulos, ‘Major Greek Translations of the Bible’, in *The Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia*, Ed. J. Krašovec (Sheffield, 1998), 304: ‘The Greek State, however, in conjunction with the Church of Greece, exercise a certain degree of control. Our state constitution (Article 3 § 3) mentions: “The text of the Holy Scriptures is kept unaltered (Αναλλοίωτον). Any rendering in any other official linguistic form of the Greek language is forbidden without the approval of the Church of Greece and the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople”’; E.G. Pantelakis, “Les Livres ecclésiastiques de l’Orthodoxie. Étude Historique”, in *Irénikon*, 13.5 (1936), 537; cf. N. Milasch, *Das Kirchenrecht der morgenländischen Kirche. Nach den allgemeinen Kirchenrechtsquellen und nach den in den autokephalen Kirchen geltenden Spezial-Gesetzen* (Mostar, 1905).

¹⁸ A. Ivanov, “К вопросу о восстановлении первоначального греческого текста нового завета” [Towards the Question about the Restoration of the Original Greek Text of the New Testament], in *Журнал Московской Патриархии*, 3 (1954), 38-50; cf. R.P. Casey, “A Russian Orthodox View of New Testament Textual Criticism”, in *Theology*, 60.439 (1957), 51 [Ivanov is quoted in Casey’s report]: ‘In textual questions, as in other matters, the Orthodox theologian must be guided by the dictum: nihil aliud probamus nisi quod Ecclesia’.

¹⁹ E. Bryner, “Bible Translations in Russia”, in *The Bible Translator*, 25.3 (1974), 327 [in referring to one of the basic criteria for a translation of the Scriptures]: ‘The translation, which is intended for Russian Orthodox readers, must be published with the blessing and under the direct control and supervision of the Russian Orthodox Church’.

²⁰ A. Delicostopoulos, ‘Major Greek Translations of the Bible’, in *Op. Cit.* (Sheffield, 1998), 297-316; J.D. Karavidopoulos, ‘Ελληνική βιβλική βιβλιογραφία του 2000ού αιώνα (1900-1995) [Greek biblical bibliography of the 20th century (1900-1995)]’, Thessaloniki, 1997.

²¹ E.E. Granstrem, “Greek Palaeography in Russia”, in *Bulletin no 17 of the Institute of Classical Studies*, University of London (1970), 124-135.

²² R.K. Tsurkan, *Славянский перевод Библии: Происхождение, история текста и важнейшие издания* [The Slavonic Version of the Bible. Introduction to the history of the text and the most important editions] (St. Petersburg, 2001); M. Garzaniti, *Die altslavische Version der Evangelien: Forschungsgeschichte und zeitgenössische Forschung* (Köln-Weimar-Wien, 2001); A.A. Alexeev, *Текстология Славянской Библии* (St. Petersburg, 1999); F.J. Thomson, ‘The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament’, in *The Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia*, by J. Krašovec (Ed.) (Sheffield, 1998), 605-920; cf. the articles by Logachev & Ivanov below.

²³ Russian criticism is articulated by, for instance: K.I. Logachev, ‘Greek Lectionaries and Problems in the Oldest Slavonic Gospel Translations’, in *New Testament Textual Criticism. Its Significance for Exegesis, (Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger)*, Ed. E.J. Epp and G.D. Fee (Oxford, 1981), 345-348; Idem, “The Problem of the Relationship of the Greek Text of the Bible to the Church Slavonic and Russian Text”, in *The Bible Translator* 25, 3 (July, 1974), 313-318; Idem, “Русский перевод Нового Завета (к 150-летию изданию)” [The Russian Translation of the NT], in *Журнал Московской Патриархии*, 11 (1969), 61-68; Idem, “Критические издания текстов Священного Писания” [Critical editions of the text of Holy Scripture], in *Журнал Московской Патриархии*, 6 (1971), I, 78ff; 2 (1972), II, 79ff; 9 (1972), III, 76-80 [discussed are: the edition of Rahlfs, 8th Ed. 1956; Kittel’s *Biblia Hebraica*, 14th Ed., 1966; Nestle’s *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 25th Ed., 1963; the Greek New Testament, Eds. Aland, Black, Martini, Metzger and Wigren, 2nd Ed., 1968]. And: A. Ivanov, “К вопросу о восстановлении первоначального греческого текста нового завет□” [Towards the Question about the Restoration of the Original Greek Text of the New Testament], in *Журнал Московской Патриархии*, 3 (1954), 38-50; Idem, “Новое критическое издание Греческого текста Нового Завета” [A New Critical Edition of the Greek text of the New Testament], in *Журнал Московской Патриархии*, 3 (1956), I-III, 49-58; 4 (1956), IV-VII, 49-58; 5 (1956), VIII-X, 43-52.

²⁴ This fact has been recently confirmed by the Greek NT scholar J. Karavidopoulos in a communication with us, in November 2006.

the endeavour²⁵. It would be an interesting exercise indeed to retrace their principles and procedures, but this is beyond the scope of the present thesis. Critical textual research is remarkably also a lesser explored field by Orthodox scholarship in the West. Yet this area of biblical studies deserves major attention by Orthodox academia, especially where it Byzantine (and Church Slavonic) codicology and manuscript studies concerns.

5. The liturgical hypothesis as the basis of a liturgico-codicological approach

In the above two inferences were made to the position of and opinion concerning the biblical and patristic writings in the Eastern Orthodox churches, namely: 1) the anchoring of the biblical writings in the liturgy of the church; and 2) the close connection between the Scriptures and the interpretative framework of the fathers. These are two closely interrelated conclusions, two sides of one and the same coin. This becomes apparent when we revisit the primary sources; i.e. the extant Byzantine manuscripts and the Byzantine / Eastern Orthodox editions based thereon. Here we find evidence of an inherent cohesion between the Scriptures and the interpretative framework of the fathers, and we can ascertain that this is rooted in the Byzantine liturgy. In this dissertation we therefore advocate a new, namely a *liturgical*-codicological approach which can make this cohesion visible. Manuscript research of the biblical and patristic codices to date that is represented in the manuscript catalogues, provides us of course with a wealth of information, but does not provide a complete insight into the actual content and codex formation of the extant manuscripts. Thus, special attention will be paid to setting out a path of codicological research that could redirect study of the Byzantine codices to a system that allows for a more complete and inclusive picture of the original biotope in which the manuscripts were created and evolved. Once inside this biotope, the reasons for and choices behind the content and codex formation of the biblical and patristic manuscripts become apparent. Consequently, this leads to a suggested reclassification of the Byzantine manuscripts, in light of the above²⁶.

As already mentioned, the Byzantine manuscripts and the printed editions based thereon bear witness to the close cohesion between the Bible and the fathers as well as to their anchoring in the liturgy. This assumption forms the basis of what I call the liturgical hypothesis and leads to the liturgico-codicological approach - the revisiting of the codices themselves, as well as their places of origin, namely the Byzantine liturgy on the one hand which was responsible for their codicological forms (chapter 2) and the monasteries and libraries and holdings on the other, in which they were manufactured, stored and kept (chapter 4). The leading idea of this hypothesis is that the codex forms of the extant manuscript materials are the direct result of the liturgical needs of the Church, and that they have been generated in the course of an age-long liturgico-codicological process of evolution (indeed very gradually), in which the preservation and transmission of the most valued books of the Church was always assumed to be a task of primary importance²⁷. The liturgical function of the Scriptures required a codification of a particular (with regard to the content) and practical (with regard to form) character and this led to the formation of a whole variety of basic codex forms or codicological patterns (see chapter 5). Once developed, such codicological patterns persisted for centuries, and they were even maintained in later printed editions. The lectionary manuscripts - the ecclesiastical reading books, to which much less philological attention has been paid than to the biblical text manuscripts, contain texts that are based on a very cautious and long established tradition of delivery²⁸. And beside lectionary manuscripts, many text and commentary codices also have a liturgical imprint. A reassessment of the codicological status quo of these manuscripts, keeping this liturgical imprint in mind, could throw a new light on manuscript research. In the long term, detailed manuscript study is required, on the basis of large-scale autopsy along the lines set out in this thesis, to make the liturgical hypothesis binding. What we offer here, in anticipation of an intended reclassification of the extant codices, is some evidence to show that a thorough reassessment of manuscript research in the areas discussed previously is desirable.

²⁵ F.J. Thomson, 'The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament', in *The Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia*, by J. Krašovec (Ed.) (Sheffield, 1998), 619-631.

²⁶ J. Karayannopoulos remarks in 'Bericht über Paläographie, Kodikologie und Diplomatik im Rahmen der Byzantinistik', in *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines*, by M. Berza and E. Stănescu (Eds.) (Bucharest, 1976), III, 16: 'Hauptaufgabe der Kodikologie ist die Katalogisierung von Hss., ein höchst wichtiges ... Unterfangen. Wie H. Hunger bemerkt, ist sie "die schwierigste und zeitraubendste, aber wichtigste kodikologische Unternehmung".'

²⁷ The critical opinion of Photius concerning 'textual exactness' is quoted in N.G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London, 1983), 117 [*Amphilochia* 1, PG 101, 84ff.].

²⁸ B.M. Metzger and B.D. Ehrman, *Op. Cit.* (New York/Oxford, 2005), 47; C.D. Osburn, 'The Greek Lectionaries of the New Testament', in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research. Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, Ed. B.D. Ehrman and M.W. Holmes (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1995), 61; B.M. Metzger, 'Greek lectionaries and a critical edition of the Greek New Testament', in *Die alten Übersetzungen*, by K. Aland (Ed.) (Berlin/New York, 1972), 479; A. Wigren, "Chicago Studies in the Greek lectionary of the New Testament", in *Biblical and Patristic Studies, (in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey)*, Ed. J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thomson (Freiburg-Basel-Barcelona-New York-Roma-São Paulo-Wien, 1963), 121; C.R. Gregory, 'Griechische Liturgische Bücher', in *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes* (Leipzig, 1900), I, 328-329.

In the following paragraphs of this introduction I will summarise the content and aims of the chapters that follow, provide information on the sources and the literature I have consulted and used and present some terminological clarifications.

6. Structure and content of the thesis

Chapter 1 is dedicated to the Byzantine manuscripts and the editions based upon these manuscripts, the underlying notion being that the manuscripts themselves express the implicit and explicit patristic hermeneutics of the biblical books: implicit, in so far as the biblical codices that do not possess commentaries, *do* show the clear choices made behind the selection of content and codex formation (for a great deal liturgically motivated); and highly explicit, in those codices that contain commentary texts. In chapter 1 I provide a critical analysis of the manner in which the manuscripts have been catalogued, described and presented to date and I make a plea for setting up a new categorisation, based on the manuscripts' codicological character and original environment.

Merely embarking on codicological research leads to my conclusion that the biblical and patristic manuscripts are anchored in the Byzantine liturgy, and that the liturgy is the domain that can well display the unity between the biblical and the patristic books. In *chapter 2* I lead the reader to the liturgy of the Orthodox Church and present the lectionary cycles and reading schemes which rule the manuscripts' use and function. I illustrate the way that the liturgical scriptures are 'used' in the data (the Byzantine lection system) that I provide in *chapter 3*. This data has the added function of also showing the hermeneutics that lies implicit in the manuscripts and that was responsible for their codex and textual forms. It is precisely this that makes codicology so important.

Codicological research implies the study of the manuscripts themselves and this brings us analogously to the places where they are housed and kept, in particular the Eastern libraries of the Middle East, Greece and Russia etc, where authentic collections can still be found that display the unity between biblical and patristic manuscripts. *Chapter 4* presents these locations and holdings, preparing the way for a re-evaluation of the state of affairs where the manuscripts are concerned.

Chapter 5 sets out the contours of the proposed codico-liturgical model of classification and *chapter 6* introduces the *Catalogue of Byzantine Manuscripts*. Detailed specimens are provided to give a flavour of the cataloguing system I advocate. This endeavour can be linked to other current manuscript research as well as the existing specialised catalogues. At the end of this dissertation, in the *Final conclusion and perspective*, I reflect on the sense and use of a new catalogue.

A chronological index of lessons (of the Movable and Immovable Cycles) - the *Indices of the Byzantine Anagnosmata*-, as presented in Chapter 3, completes the work.

7. Some preliminary clarifications

7.1 Editions of biblical books used in this thesis

Considering the aim of this thesis, I have opted to use side by side the Greek Orthodox editions of the text of Scripture, e.g. the Evangelion (Θεῖον καὶ Ἱερὸν Ἐυαγγέλιον)²⁹, the Apostolos (Ἀπόστολος)³⁰, the Psalterion (Ψαλτήριον)³¹ and the Prophetologion (Προφητολόγιον)³², the latter today being spread over different liturgical books, i.e. the Triodion, the Pentekostarion and the Menaia, the writings of the Byzantine and later Greek fathers and the Byzantine liturgical books on the one hand, and the scientific editions of the Bible (Rahlfs / Hanhart, 2006³³; Aland / Aland, 2006³⁴), the Greek fathers and the Western editions of the Byzantine liturgical books on the other.

²⁹ Θεῖον καὶ Ἱερὸν Εὐαγγέλιον, κατὰ τὸ κείμενον τὸ ἐγκεκριμένον ὑπὸ τῆς Μεγάλῃς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας, Ed. A. Androuses (Athens, second edition 1992) [1st edition 1982; on the basis of the "Patriarchal Edition" of 1904].

³⁰ Ἀπόστολος, Πράξεις καὶ Ἐπιστολαὶ τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων, αἱ καθ' ὅλον τὸ ἔτος ἐπ' Ἐκκλησιαίαις ἀναγιγνωσκόμεναι καθὼς καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τελετῶν, 5th ed. (Athens, 2002).

³¹ Ψαλτήριον τοῦ προφήτου καὶ βασιλέως Δαυὶδ, μετὰ τῶν ἐννέα ᾠδῶν καὶ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ὅπως δεῖ στιχολογεῖσθαι τὸ Ψαλτήριον ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ ἔνιαυτῷ, 9th edition (Athens, 2002).

³² There is a Prophetologion edition edited by the *Institute of Byzantine Musical Studies* in Copenhagen: C. Høeg, G. Zuntz, G. Engberg (Eds.), *Prophetologium I-II* (Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae. Lectionaria. Vol. I) (Copenhagen, 1939-1981).

³³ A new reprint edition by R. Hanhart is, *Septuaginta. It est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta lxx interpretes edidit Alfred Rahlfs, Editio altera quam recognovit et emendavit Robert Hanhart*, (Duo volumina in uno) (Stuttgart, 2006).

The edition of the complete Greek Bible (OT and NT)³⁵ we have consulted is 'Η Ἀγία Γραφή - Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη καὶ ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη, by P.I. Bratsiotis (Ed.), Athens, 1999 [15th edition]³⁶. In Byzantine tradition the OT used is the Septuagint (i.e. 'Ἐβδομήκοντα' or LXX = the 70 interpreters). In Eastern Orthodox academic opinion³⁷, the Septuagint represents the basic primary source of the Greek NT writings³⁸.

This was the Bible of the Undivided Church of the first eight centuries, sanctified through the use of the apostles, the fathers of the church and the local and ecumenical synods, and remained, either completely or partially, as the basis of all other ancient ecclesiastical versions, and it is still the official *Bible of the Eastern Orthodox Church*.

P. Bratsiotis (Ed.), 'Η Ἀγία Γραφή - Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη καὶ ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη (Athens, 1999), 5³⁹

It appears, quite remarkably, that, as far as we know, Orthodox scholarship never made a scientific (critical) edition of the Bible (not of the Greek OT, nor of the Greek NT)⁴⁰. Besides the stream of practical, liturgical editions of Scripture (Venice, Constantinople, Athens), only re-editions of scientific publications produced in the West have been made; for instance, the 'Moscow edition' (1821) of the Greek Bible (OT and NT) was an adoption of the Oxford-Grabe edition of the LXX text, later re-edited by the Greeks (Athens, 1850). The same applies in the case of the Greek Bible edition of 1924, where very slight justification is given for the procedures used and textual decisions made, including only the short prefatory remark that the edition of Tischendorf was consulted⁴¹. This edition was reissued in 1950 with a short preface by Bratsiotis⁴², who, in his turn consulted Rahlfs (1935). The 'Patriarchal edition' of the NT, 'Η Καινὴ Διαθήκη ἐγκρίσει τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας, by B. Antoniadis [et al. Eds], Athens 2004 (first edition, Constantinople, 1904)⁴³, although

³⁴ A corrected reprint edition was recently published, *Novum Testamentum Graeca, post Eberhard et Erwin Nestle editione vicesima septima revisa, Apparatum criticum novis curis elaboraverunt Barbara et Kurt Aland una cum Instituto Studiorum Textus Novi Testamenti Monasterii Westphaliae*, Ed. K. and B. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, B. M. Metzger, 27th revised edition (9. corrected printing) (Stuttgart, 2006).

³⁵ In anticipation of later discussions on the basic codex forms found in Byzantine manuscript tradition, it should be said that complete editions of the Greek Bible and separate editions of the Greek OT and NT, which are so characteristic for the Western printed edition-tradition, are uncommon for Byzantine and later Greek publications of the Scriptures, although 'whole' Bible codices do exist.

³⁶ The 1st edition appeared in Athens in 1928. The basis of the Greek OT is the edition of Tischendorf-Nestle, Vols. I-II (7th ed. 1887) (cf. A. Delicostopoulos, 'Major Greek Translations of the Bible', in *The Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia*, Ed. J. Krašovec (Sheffield, 1998), 309 [text of Σ and Α]); the text of the Greek NT is based on the Patriarchal edition of Constantinople (1904) (cf. Preliminary to the NT part, 867).

³⁷ Philaret Drozdov (Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow), "О догматическом достоинстве и охранительном употреблении греческого семидесяти толковников и славянского переводов священного писания 1845 год" [On the dogmatic merit and conservative function of the Greek Septuagint commentators and the Slavonic translation of Holy Scripture], in *Прибавления к изданию творения Святых Отцов Церкви в русском переводе* [Supplements to the Editions of the Works of the Holy Fathers of the Church in Russian Translation], 17 (Moscow, 1858), 452-484. [Reprint in Metropolitan Philaret, *Избранные Творения* (Moscow, 2004), 355-373]; K. Oikonomos, *Περὶ τῶν Ὁ Ἑρμηνευτῶν τῆς παλαιᾶς θείας Γραφῆς* (Athens, 1849).

³⁸ According to A. Delicostopoulos in 'Major Greek Translations of the Bible', in *Op. Cit.* (Sheffield, 1998), 307: 'we must emphasize the fact that in the New Testament we have 350 verses from the Old Testament, of which 300 at least agree with the LXX. During the centuries of the undivided Church in the East and West the LXX was used in all liturgical forms'.

³⁹ See the Prologue to the second edition of this edition, 5: 'αὕτη ὑπῆρξεν ἡ Βίβλος τῆς ἀδιαίρετου ἐκκλησίας τῶν ὀκτῶ πρώτων αἰώνων, καθηγιασθῆ διὰ τῆς χρήσεως αὐτῆς ὑπὸ τε τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πατέρων καὶ τῶν τοπικῶν καὶ οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων, διετελέσεν, εἴτε ἐν ὅλῳ εἴτε ἐν μέρει, ἡ βᾶσις πασῶν τῶν ἄλλων παλαιῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν μεταφράσεων καὶ ἐξακολουθεῖ νὰ εἶναι ἐπίσημος Βίβλος τῆς Ὁθοδόξου ἀνατολικῆς ἐκκλησίας'.

⁴⁰ A hint to the possible reasons for this is provided in a study of the Slavonic Bible/NT, H.P.S. Bakker, 'Historical Text and Text History', in *Towards a Critical Edition of the Old Slavic New Testament. A Transparent and Heuristic Approach* (Amsterdam, 1996), 9: 'It is understandable that most Palaeoslavists refuse to or refrain from making a construct the base text of a critical edition. Such an eclectic and normalised, 'Lachmannian' text never existed as such and is therefore ahistorical'.

⁴¹ Πρόλογος Α'. The editor(s) wrote: 'But in the case of each difference of 'written text' (orthography), or 'lines' or 'numbering of chapters and verses' we preferred the text of the critical edition of Tischendorf, since this edition is exact and much-elaborated'. It appears to be the 8th ed. rev. by E. Nestle (1887), which was a revision of the 'Sixtine edition' of the Septuagint (with the Codex Vaticanus as most prominent manuscript used). See A. Delicostopoulos, *art. cit.* (Sheffield, 1998), 309.

⁴² Πρόλογος Β'. It becomes clear that the Byzantine ecclesiastical/liturgical text was used, but what remains an open question is which OT Byzantine (lectionary?) text was provided, on what manuscript(s) and/or printed edition(s) it was based, and how the text was constituted. Only in general terms, it is said, were liturgical books consulted, both manuscripts (of Athenian libraries) as well as printed editions (those of Venice).

⁴³ Greek reviews: Gennadios of Heliopolis, "Πῶς οἱ Ἀμερικανοὶ Θεολογοὶ ἐκφράζονται περὶ τῆς Πατριαρχικῆς ἐκδόσεως τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης", in *Ὁρθοδοξία*, 13 (1938), 74-76; D. Chatzedaniel, "Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη (ἐγκρίσει τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας)", in *Ἐκκλησία*, KE/29 (1905), 458-461.

interesting in many aspects⁴⁴, can neither be qualified as a scientific ‘critical’ text in the strict sense, since the procedure of selecting manuscripts and the choice of variants⁴⁵ are not made explicit and cannot be verified⁴⁶.

7.2 Editions of Byzantine patristic literature used

J.P. Migne’s *Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca*, vols. 1-161 (Paris, 1857-1866) is the main source of works of the Greek and Byzantine fathers we have consulted⁴⁷ (Migne is also available in a Greek reprint edition⁴⁸); together with the *Corpus Christianorum*, Series Graeca (Turnhout-Leuven, 1977-); *Die Griechischen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Berlin, 1887-), *Sources Chrétiennes* (Paris, 1941-); E.D. Moutsoula and K.G. Papachristopoulos (Eds.), Βιβλιοθήκη Ἑλλήνων Πατέρων καὶ Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν Συγγραφέων, t. 1-82 (Athens, 1955-); and P.K. Chrestou and others (Eds.), Ἑλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας (Gr.-NGr., Thessaloniki, 1953-).

7.3 Editions of Byzantine liturgical books used

The Byzantine Greek liturgical books are the official books of the Orthodox church, used throughout the ages, without discontinuation and in use to the present day. They are of primary importance for this thesis, from a codicological and textual point of view and are discussed in chapters 2 and 3.

The many editions of liturgical books produced by the Propaganda Press in Rome under the auspices of the Vatican (for use in the Uniate Churches) are easier to consult in Western libraries and are generally used in scholarship in the West. Greek and Slavic editions are more difficult to acquire. Yet, for our purpose we have opted for the latter, even if the Roman editions are deemed better⁴⁹. The reason for this is that, although both Roman and Greek editions were based on the Venetian editions, the Roman underwent certain changes⁵⁰, whilst the Greek editions continued to transmit the liturgical texts in line with Greek Orthodox tradition.⁵¹

7.4 Concerning the ‘Byzantine manuscripts’ and the ‘Byzantine text’

Eastern scholars often understand the terms ‘Byzantine manuscripts’ or ‘Greek manuscripts’ in a broad scope, incorporating in its remit manuscripts from the 4/5th century onwards, including the period in which the uncials (the great codices A, B and S/σ among others) were dominant (until the 9th century) and continuing into and including the period in which the minuscules⁵² evolved (since the 9th century).⁵³ Moreover the term ‘Byzantine text’ is regarded as a family of related texts⁵⁴, rather than the ‘one’, standard Byzantine text (‘Einheitstext’). The

⁴⁴ See the introduction, γ’- η’ [Eng. J.M. Rife, ‘The Antonides Greek New Testament’, in *Prolegomena to the Study of the Lectionary Text of the Gospels*, Ed. E.C. Colwell and D.W. Riddle (Chicago, Illinois, 1933), 57-62]. D.W. Riddle, ‘The use of Lectionaries in critical editions and studies of the New Testament text’, in *Op. Cit.* (Chicago, Illinois, 1933), 73: ‘it will be remarked here merely that the Introduction not only stated the principles of the edition, but made penetrating remarks about the nature of the text of lectionary MSS.’

⁴⁵ The consulted manuscripts (116 Byzantine codices, 9th-16th c.) are enumerated in the short preface (γ’-η’). See reviews of R.D. Dedman, ‘Why the ‘Patriarchal’ Text of Greek New Testament?’ (Web-site, Athos manuscripts, April 2005); J. Karavidopoulos, ‘L’Édition Patriarcale du Nouveau Testament (1904). Problèmes de Texte et de Traduction dans le monde Orthodoxe’, in *Kleronomia*, 20 (1988), 197; J.M. Rife, ‘The Antonides Greek New Testament’, in *Op. Cit.*, (Chicago, Illinois, 1933), 57-66.

⁴⁶ B. Antoniadis (Ed.), Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη ἐγκρίσει τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας, (Athens, 2004), ζ’, Transl: J.M. Rife: ‘Such was the critical procedure, however, that, except in punctuation and orthography, no criticism was made of the authority of the text of the MSS. There was no transposition, substitution, addition, or excision, except in rare cases, and these with sufficient testimony elsewhere’.

⁴⁷ Entries to PG of Migne are: F. Cavallera, *Patrologiae cursus completus accurante J.P. Migne, Series graeca, Indices* (Paris, 1912); Dorotheos Scholarios, *Κλεῖς Πατρολογίας καὶ Βυζαντινῶν συγγραφέων* (Athens, 1879) (= Migne, PG, T. 162).

⁴⁸ Reprinted by the Center of Patristic Studies, Athens, 1987ff., with critical introductions and new biblical indices (cf. G.D. Dragas, *Op. Cit.*, (Rollinsford, NH, 2005, 209)).

⁴⁹ G. Pantelakis, ‘Les Livres ecclésiastiques de l’Orthodoxie. Étude Historique’, in *Irenikon*, 13.5 (1936), 550: ‘Dans son ensemble, l’édition de Rome est meilleure que celle de Venise’.

⁵⁰ G. Pantelakis, *Art. Cit.* (1936), 550: ‘La base de travail choisie fut l’édition de Venise, dont furent éliminés les synaxaires et certains offices, par exemple celui de Grégoire Palamas’.

⁵¹ Cf. K. Krumbacher (Ed.), *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches [527-1453]* (München, 1897), 658: ‘In neuerer Zeit sind auch einzelne Ausgaben in Athen, Konstantinopel und Jerusalem erschienen. – Neben diesen offiziellen griechischen Ausgaben sind natürlich die von katholischer oder protestantischer Seite veranstalteten Drucke nur mit Vorsicht zu benutzen. Das gilt selbst von der bedeutendsten abendländischen Leistung, dem *Εὐχολόγιον* sive *Rituale Graecorum* etc. opera Jacobi Goar, Paris 1647, Editio II. Expurgata et accuratior, Venedig 1730.’ This remark is still valid.

⁵² E.E. Granstrem, ‘Zur byzantinischen Minuskel’, in D. Harlfinger (Ed.), *Griechische Kodikologie und Textüberlieferung* (Darmstadt, 1980), 76; B.L. Fonkič, ‘Griechische Kodikologie’, in *Op. Cit.*, (Darmstadt, 1980), 14-21.

⁵³ Catalogues: E.E. Granstrem, ‘Каталог греческих рукописей ленинградских хранилищ’ [Catalogue of Greek manuscripts in Leningrad holdings], in *Византийский временник* (1959 - 1971), who discusses manuscripts from the 4th to the 15th centuries; A.I. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη (St. Petersburg, 1891-1915) [Repr., Bruxelles, 1963], who discusses manuscripts from the 7th to the 19th centuries; B.L. Fonkič, ‘Griechische Kodikologie’, in *Op. Cit.*, (Darmstadt, 1980), 16: ‘Bis in unserer Zeit haben sich ca. 55 000 griechische Handschriften vom 4.-19. Jh. erhalten’.

⁵⁴ A. Delicostopoulos, ‘Major Greek Translations of the Bible’, in *Op. Cit.* (Sheffield, 1998), 305-306: ‘For those studying the tradition of the Greek New Testament text there is much to be done in discovering and establishing the various groups of manuscripts that

study of the Byzantine text is still in an early stage of development. It includes different categories: a) Byzantine lectionary manuscripts; b) Byzantine text manuscripts; c) Byzantine commentary manuscripts.⁵⁵ In this dissertation I advocate codicological research of the manuscripts which could throw new light on the status of the Byzantine textual forms.

Another issue that requires clarification is the denotation ‘koine edition’ (ἡ κοινὴ ἔκδοσις⁵⁶) or simply ‘koine’ (ἡ κοινὴ). The term ‘koine edition’ came into use among the early Byzantine fathers (Origen, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianz, Jerome), was used for later Byzantine editions of the Scriptures (resulting in the text form of Constantinople - Κωνσταντινουπολικόν at the end of the 15th and in the 16th centuries), was used for the printed editions of Scripture in Venice since the 16th century and later in Constantinople, and finally for recently published ‘koine editions’ by the Great Church of Constantinople and the Church of Greece. Although these different editions display the developments in textual history, and the diversity of underlying Byzantine text forms, the persistent use of the term ‘koine edition’ indicates an ‘ecclesiastical (liturgical) consensus’ of what was considered a common standard of scriptural text (‘κατὰ πάντα σύμφωνον πρὸς τὸ παραδεδομένον ὑπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἀρχέτυπον κείμενον’⁵⁷). This implied both the text of the Greek OT books, as well as the Greek NT books, authorised by liturgical use and an age-long practice of reading and homiletic interpretation. Other denotations also came into being: the ‘ecclesiastical’ edition (ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἔκδοσις⁵⁸), the ‘Constantinopolitan’ edition, the ‘Lucianic’ edition (the latter especially with regard to the LXX), or the ‘liturgical’ edition⁵⁹. This last denotation is especially interesting for our thesis. One of my overriding conclusions in studying the Eastern Orthodox tradition is that it does not presuppose the absolute maintenance by the Church of “one”, “original”, “uniform” Byzantine text/edition⁶⁰. Since there were many different variations of the sacred texts⁶¹, the corruption of manuscripts (the phenomenon of textual variants) since early stages in the textual history of the Greek Scriptures was regarded as a textual *reality*: ὅποιος γράφει παραγράφει (‘he who writes miswrites’)⁶². The notion of a completely “pure” and “authentic” text is unrealistic for textual reconstruction⁶³, both from a practical as well as from a scientific point of view⁶⁴. This said, however, it was the ‘common edition’ (κοινὴ ἔκδοσις) of the Bible that was transmitted by the Church throughout its history (taking into account the difference between the transmission of Greek OT⁶⁵ and NT⁶⁶ corpora), basically unaltered and unmodified, in

constitute the “K” text (Κωνσταντινουπολικόν). Furthermore, they need to know better the history of the text of our Church, and also to find out the influence of the Byzantine text on the other texts’.

⁵⁵ B.M. Metzger and B.D. Ehrman, ‘The Byzantine Text’, in *Op. Cit.* (New York / Oxford, 2005), 279-280.

⁵⁶ E. Nestle, ‘Septuagint: Printed Editions’, in *A Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 (1906), 437-454: ‘A frequent designation among the old Greek writers was also ἡ κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, or merely ἡ κοινὴ, ‘the common, the Vulgate edition’, in contradistinction to the Hebrew text and the later Greek versions; cf. for instance Basil, i. 447d, on Is. 2²², 438.

⁵⁷ According to the Synod of the Church of Greece, in their word of recommendation to the Greek edition of Holy Scripture, Athens, 1928 (Prologos A), the edition was approved by the Holy Synod as being ‘in agreement with the transmitted Archetype Text by the Church’.

⁵⁸ E. Nestle, *art. cit.* (1906), 438: Gregory of Nyssa, *In Psalm 8*.

⁵⁹ I.D. Karavidopoulos, ‘L’Édition Patriarcale du Nouveau Testament (1904). Problèmes de Texte et de Traduction dans le monde Orthodoxe’, in *Kleronomia*, 20 (1988), 198: ‘Si, en fin de compte, nous préférons la désignation du texte comme “ecclésiastique” ou “liturgique”, c’est qu’elle s’approche d’avantage de la réalité’.

⁶⁰ K.I. Logachev, ‘The Problem of the Relationship of the Greek Text of the Bible to the Church Slavonic and Russian Text’, in *The Bible Translator*, 25.3 (1974), 313-318, esp. 316-317: ‘Today, Russian biblical scholarship takes a position which accepts, on the level of the whole church, all Greek forms of the biblical text, excluding of course only those which were the result of a known activity of heretics. Thus it questions the individual importance of any one form at national church level. This excludes a one-sided preference either for the late Greek forms or for the oldest forms of the biblical text. The concept of a “later corruption of the original text” is likewise excluded’.

⁶¹ R. Devreesse, *Introduction à l’Étude des Manuscrits Grecs* (Paris, 1954), 85-86: ‘Il n’existe probablement pas de manuscrits sans corrections, et l’on peut retenir que la très grande majorité ont été relus et amendés. Certaines portent mention expresse de collation-révision (Δ = διώρθωσεν)’. Cf. B.D. Ehrman, ‘The Text of Mark in the Hands of the Orthodox’, in *Lutheran Quarterly*, 5.1 (1991), 143: ‘while we have literally thousands of biblical manuscripts, none of them is an autograph and all of them contain mistakes’; A.A. Alexeev, ‘Holy Scripture and its Translation’, in *The Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia*, by J. Krašovec (Ed.), (Sheffield, 1998), 1394: ‘The text of the Scripture is not yet fixed in its final form. In fact there are more than 5,000 Greek witnesses of the NT from the 2nd to 16th centuries that differ more or less’.

⁶² An ancient scribe’s proverb, quoted in I. Ševčenko, I. Chernukhin, and N. Cherkas’ka, *Грецькі рукописи у зібраннях Києва. Каталог* (Greek Manuscripts in the Collections of Kiev. Catalogue) (Kiev-Washington, 2000), 382.

⁶³ H.P.S. Bakker, ‘Corruption is Rife in Old Slavic Manuscripts’, in *Towards a Critical Edition of the Old Slavic New Testament. A Transparent and Heuristic Approach* (Amsterdam, 1996), 6: ‘Corruption of the transmitted text occurs inevitably and is attested in other traditions as well’; and the reference in n. 3 on page 9: ‘The anti-Lachmann schools therefore claim that a text comprising words taken now from one partly corrupt manuscript, now from another - i.e. a composite critical text - is in fact merely an example of composite corruption’.

⁶⁴ B.M. Metzger and B.D. Ehrman, *Op. Cit.* (New York/Oxford, 2005), Ch. 8 ‘Complications in Establishing the Original Text’, 272-274, and especially the complication remarked upon with regard to the collection of Paul’s writings, 274 n. 5.

⁶⁵ Exact and concise information on this issue can be found in E. Nestle, ‘Early History of the Septuagint’, in *A Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 (1906), 442. With regard to the LXX is said: ‘This variety of texts, strange as it may appear, is not difficult to account for. (1) ☉ was liable to all the dangers connected with transmission to which literary works were exposed in the days before the invention of the printing-press. (2) These dangers were increased in the case of works which were frequently copied and used not only privately but also in public service. (3) ☉ is not an original text, but a translation, or rather a series of translations, and therefore much more exposed to alterations than an original text; for every reader possessed of some knowledge of Hebrew, or of a different exegetical tradition from that embodied in ☉, might change his text (cf. the changes introduced in many MSS of the OT from the quotations in the NT, e.g. in Ps 13³ from

other words, “uncorrupted”. If the original text is a problematic issue⁶⁷, then the origin and measure of “corruption” (either heterodox or orthodox) is problematic too.

This Eastern Orthodox concept of ‘koine text’ can not immediately be equated with the *textus receptus* (NT), which was based, as is well-known, on a limited group of Byzantine manuscripts (reflected in editions of Erasmus, Stephanus, Elzevir) adopted in the West as the original text until far into the 19th and even the 20th century (*‘textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum: in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus’*⁶⁸). The *textus receptus* did not evolve from a common ecclesiastical practice, as the ‘koine text’ used in the Greek Orthodox churches did⁶⁹, but from a printed text tradition⁷⁰. One could say that the concept of a ‘critical edition’ evolved during the making of the *textus receptus*, in striving for an original textual form, which could be reconstructed by conjectural emendation and other philological aids.⁷¹ The many editions produced since the 16th century (*‘No one knows exactly how many separate editions of the Greek Testament have come from the press since 1514...’*)⁷² are sufficient evidence indeed to re-evaluate the search for the original text. In my conviction, the evaluation of the Byzantine ‘koine text’ of Scripture is a task that should be set up afresh, in the context of codicological research of the manuscripts.

7.5 The Eastern Orthodox Canon of Holy Scripture

In Eastern Orthodoxy, the Scriptures are divided into three groups: the books known as canonical books (κανονιζόμενα), the books that are recommended by the Church ‘to be read’ (ἀναγινωσκόμενα) and the apocrypha (ἀπόκρυφα)⁷³. The New Testament comprises only canonical books. The ἀναγινωσκόμενα (non-canonical – in the strict sense of the word) of the OT⁷⁴, i.e. *1 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, 1-3 Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus/Sirach, Baruch, the Letter of Jeremias*, additional parts to *Daniel [The Story of Susanna, The Song of the Three Children, The Idol Bel and the Dragon]*, and such texts as the *Prayer of Manasse* and other smaller variations), were acknowledged for reasons of elementary catechetical teaching and private study since the early days of Christianity and have been maintained in Orthodox tradition.⁷⁵ These books have a high status in Orthodox patristic tradition which comes close to that of canonical.⁷⁶ The inclusion of this

Ro 3¹⁰⁻¹⁸). (4) If the situation was bad enough before, it became worse when other Greek versions of the OT, especially those of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, appeared and began to influence Ⓔ.’

⁶⁶ E. Nestle, ‘Early History of the Septuagint’, *Ibid.*, 442: ‘Even the *New Testament*, with its great number of quotations, does not permit of any very definite statements, except that it proves again that textual corruption had already found its way into the copies used by the writers of the NT (cf. He 3⁹ ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ, 12⁵ ἐνοχλή). Cf. Origen, ‘A Letter from Origen to Africanus’, in *The Writings of Origen*, Trans: F. Crombie, Vol 1 (Edinburgh, 1868); M. Harl and N. de Lange (Eds.), *Origène: Philocalie, 1-20 sur les écritures, introd., texte, trad. [du grec] et notes. La lettre à Africanus sur l’histoire de Suzanne, introd., texte, trad. [du grec] et notes* (Paris, 1983).

⁶⁷ E.J. Epp, ‘The multivalence of the term “original text” in New Testament textual criticism’, in *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism. Collected Essays, 1962-2004* (Leiden / Boston, 2005), 551-593.

⁶⁸ That is: ‘[the reader has] the text which is now received by all, in which we give nothing changed or corrupted’, quoted in B.M. Metzger and B.D. Ehrman, *Op. Cit.*, (New York/Oxford, 2005), 152. These words come from the Preface to the second Elzevir edition of the NT (1633), cf. n.36 on p. 152.

⁶⁹ Textual differences are indicated in the preface to the The “Patriarchal edition” of the NT, ‘Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη ἐγκρίσει τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας’, by B. Antoniadis [et al. Eds] (Athens, 2004, first edition, Constantinople, 1904), ζ’: ‘The text of the present edition, prepared and printed as above described, differs from the *Textus Receptus* distributed by the Bible societies in about 2000 readings and 1400 passages, specifically: Mt. 150, Mk. 175, Lk. 260, Jn. 100, Acts 125, Pauline Epistles 165, Catholic Epistles 65, and the remainder in the *Apocalypse*’ [Transl. Rife].

⁷⁰ E.g. the recent edition by the Trinitarian Bible Society, ‘Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη. *The New Testament, the Greek Text underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611* (London, 1991), which is a reprint edition of Beza (1598) and Scrivener (1894 and 1902).

⁷¹ E.J. Epp, ‘The Multivalence of the Term ‘Original Text’ in New Testament Textual Criticism”, in *Harvard Theological Review*, 42 (1999), 245-281.

⁷² B.M. Metzger and B.D. Ehrman, *Op. Cit.*, (New York/Oxford, 2005), 194.

⁷³ Nicodemus’ Handbook of Orthodox Canon Law, the Πηδάλιον, Ed. by Agapios the Peloponnesian and Nicodemus the Hagiorite (Leipzig, 1800), 585 for this threefold division (with regard to Athanasius the Great, Festival Letter 39): ‘Εἰς τρία διαίρει ὁ Ἅγιος τὰ Βιβλία ἐν τῇ Ἐπιστολῇ ταύτῃ, εἰς ἀπόκρυφα, εἰς κανονιζόμενα καὶ εἰς ἀναγινωσκόμενα’.

⁷⁴ See Cyril of Jerusalem and Athanasius, plus the later synodal decisions of the Councils of Jassy (1642) and Jerusalem under Patriarch Dositheus (1672), where the books were declared to be ‘genuine parts of Scripture’. The denotation ‘apocrypha’ with regard to this particular category, stems from the Latin Church father Jerome (‘inter apocrypha esse ponendum’, in the *prologus galeatus* to the Books of Samuel [MPL 28, 601ff.]) and *praef. in Iudith* (‘apud Hebraeos liber Iudith inter apocrypha legitur’).

⁷⁵ Cf. E. Oikonomos, ‘Die Bedeutung der deuterokanonischen Schriften in der orthodoxen Kirche’, in *Die Apokryphen-Frage im ökumenischen Horizont*, Ed. S. Meurer (Stuttgart, 1989), 26-40; H.B. Swete and R.R. Ottley, ‘Books not Included in the Hebrew Canon’, in *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Peabody, Mass., 1989), Ch. III, 265-288, but consult also Ch. II, ‘Books of the Hebrew Canon’, 231-264, for differences of titles, arrangement and contents between the Hebrew Massoretic Bible and the Greek Version of the Seventy (O’).

⁷⁶ See with regard to the question of the canonical status of the ‘anaginoskomena’ in Eastern Orthodoxy, H.P. Scanlin, ‘The Old Testament Canon in the Orthodox Churches’, in *New Perspectives on Historical Theology: Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff*, Ed. B. Nassif (Grand Rapids, 1996), 300-312; E. Oikonomos, ‘Die Bedeutung der deuterokanonischen Schriften in der orthodoxen Kirche’, in *Op. Cit.* (Stuttgart, 1989), 26-40; T. Mitrevski, ‘Die kanonische Geltung der deuteronomische Bücher. Der heilige Schrift in der orthodoxen Kirche nach den Konzilsentscheidungen”, in *Kyrios*, 13 (1973), 49-77.

category of Scriptures as books of the Church is clearly demonstrated in the Byzantine Greek manuscript tradition of the Old Testament.⁷⁷

The apocrypha comprise a group of books that was clearly determined non-canonical and that is generally known as the pseudepigraphical books of the Old Testament.

7.6 Eastern Orthodox patristic literature

The Eastern Orthodox concept of the patristic period does not end with John of Damascus⁷⁸, nor with the Fall of Constantinople⁷⁹, but runs into the present day⁸⁰. The Greek patrologist Panagiotes Chrestou formulates this sharply in his five volume work on Greek patrology⁸¹. A special role in the Eastern Orthodox approach to patrology is fulfilled by the so-called startsi (elders), such as Elders of Optina (Staretz Leonid, Staretz Makarij, Staretz Ambrosij), Ignatius Brianchaninov, Theophan the Recluse, Serafim of Sarov⁸² and of the 20th century, Silouan the Athonite, Archimandrite Ioann (Krestjankin), Nikolai Gurjanov, Kirill Pavlov, Serafim Tjapochkin, and Samson Sivers in Russian tradition; Hadji-Georgis the Athonite, Nikephorus of Chios, Arsenios of Paros, Nectarios of Aegina, Savvas the New, Philotheos Zervakos, Philaretos of the Holy Mountain, Gabriel Dyonysiatis, Iakovos of Epiros, Joseph the Hesychast, Paisios the Athonite, Amphilochius of Patmos, Epiphanius of Athens, Porphyrius of Kavsokalyvia, George of Drama in Greek tradition.⁸³

7.7 Concerning the primary language of the Eastern Orthodox Church

Greek (κοινή) is, of course, the “first language” of the Christian Church and in Greece this language has been maintained until this present day for official use in the Church (the liturgy). For Eastern Orthodox, Greek is the original language of the Scriptures, of the Old (Septuagint) and New Testament⁸⁴. Greek was also the language for ecclesiastical documents, such as synodal decisions, acts and letters and the whole Byzantine patristic literature⁸⁵. This linguistic continuity is an important factor for textual transmission and codex formation⁸⁶ (Byzantine codicology⁸⁷). But it should be added that translations (ἐρμηνείαι)⁸⁸ belong intrinsically to the

⁷⁷ A. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments für das Septuaginta Unternehmen*, in *Nachrichten der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch Historische Klasse*, (Beiheft) (Berlin, 1914), 1-443, *passim*.

⁷⁸ C. Kannengieser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis* (Leiden / Boston, 2004); M. Geerard and J. Noret (Eds.), *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (Turnhout, 1974-1998); R. Drobner, *Lehrbuch der Patrologie* (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna, 1994); B. Altaner and A. Stuiber, *Patrologie. Leben, Schriften und Lehre der Kirchenväter* (Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1980); J. Quasten, *Patrology* (Utrecht, 1962-1986); O. Stählin, ‘Christliche Schriftsteller’ in *Wilhelm von Christs Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur* (München, 1924).

⁷⁹ A. Ehrhard, ‘Theologie’, in *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527-1453)*, Ed. K. Krumbacher (München, 1897), 37-218; H.G. Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, (München, 1959).

⁸⁰ H. Alfeyev, *St. Symeon the New Theologian and Orthodox Tradition* (Oxford, 2000), 278-279: ‘Symeon became one of the most widely read Byzantine authors in Russia. In contrast to the situation in late Byzantium (cf. Palamas), in Russia they did not distinguish between ancient and later church Fathers, and Symeon was for them as authoritative a writer as the great Fathers of the first Christian centuries and enjoyed the same popularity’. C. Karakolis, ‘Erwägungen zur Exegese des Alten Testaments bei den griechischen Krichenvätern’, in I.Z. Dimitrov et al. (Eds), *Das Alte Testament als christliche Bibel in orthodoxer und westlicher Sicht: Zweite europäische orthodox-westliche Exegetenkonferenz, im Rilakloster vom 8-15 September 2001* (Tübingen, 2004), 21 n.1: ‘Nach orthodoxen Verständnis gibt es im Gegensatz zum westlichen Kriterium der *antiquitas* keine zeitliche Begrenzung für die “Periode der Kirchenväter”. Ein *Kirchenvater* ist eine kirchliche Persönlichkeit, deren Orthodoxie und Heiligkeit durch die Kirche anerkannt wurde. Dieses Kriterium gilt zweifellos auch für Gestalten der neueren Zeit, wie z.B. für die heiligen Nektarios von Pentapolis (1847-1920) und Silouan vom Berg Athos (1866-1938)’. Cf. G. Florovsky, *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View* (Belmont, 1972), 110-113.

⁸¹ P.K. Chrestou, ‘Ελληνική Πατρολογία (t. I-V, Thessaloniki, 1976-1992), t. I (Tr. G.D. Dragas, *Greek Orthodox Patrology. An Introduction to the Study of the Church Fathers*, Rollinsford, NH, 2005, 15-16): ‘The Church has never excluded the appearance of renowned teachers in her bosom, who are outstanding bearers of the divine grace of the divine spirit, and she has never restricted this appearance to any particular period of her history. Orthodox ecclesiastical conciousness, which attributes the title of father in every epoch to elect vessels of grace that lived in previous epochs, has already pushed the patristic period to the end of the Byzantine era and is pushing forward it more and more’.

⁸² I. Smolitsch, *Leben und Lehre der Starzen* (Wien, 1936).

⁸³ G. Mantzaridis, ‘Universality and Monasticism’, in *Precious Vessels of the Holy Spirit. The Lives and Counsels of Contemporary Elders of Greece*, Ed. H.A. Middleton (Thessalonica & Asheville, NC, 2004), 25-36; T. Ware (Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia), ‘The Spiritual Guide in Orthodox Christianity’, in *The Inner Kingdom* (Crestwood, New York, 2004), 127-151 [see Lit. in n. 1]; Idem, ‘The Spiritual Father in Saint John Climacus and Saint Symeon the New Theologian’, in I. Hausherr, *Spiritual Direction in the Early Christian East* (Kalamazoo, MI., 1990), vii-xxxiii (Foreword).

⁸⁴ A. Delicostopoulos, ‘Major Greek Translations of the Bible’, in *The Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia*, Ed. J. Krašovec (Sheffield, 1998), 297: ‘The Greek nation has the rare privilege of having as its mother tongue the language of the New Testament as well as of the Septuagint (LXX). The validity of the Septuagint was verified by the Lord and the Apostles and the ‘consensus ecclesiae’ through the official use throughout the centuries’.

⁸⁵ P.K. Chrestou, ‘Ελληνική Πατρολογία, Vol. I-V (Thessaloniki, 1976-1992), v. I., B’. Η Γλώσσα, 77-90.

⁸⁶ P.K. Chrestou, *Op. Cit.*, ‘Χειρόγραφος Παράδοσις’, 249-301.

⁸⁷ We will use the expression ‘Byzantine Codicology’ analogously to ‘Byzantine Palaeography’. Cf. E.E. Granstrom, ‘Zur byzantinischen Minuskel’, in *Griechische Kodikologie und Textüberlieferung*, D. Harlfinger (Ed.) (Darmstadt, 1980), 76, esp. note 4.

⁸⁸ With regard to the ancient as well as modern translations represented in printed editions, see T.H. Darlow and H.F. Moule (Eds.), *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, in 2 volumes,

phenomenon of the Bible's manifestation and distribution⁸⁹. Indeed, the *Translation of the Seventy* itself (ἡ τῶν Ὁ' ἑρμηνεία) is the best example to demonstrate this given. In this dissertation the Slavic manuscript and edition tradition, which developed from the late Byzantine manuscript tradition, will also receive due attention⁹⁰.

8. Use of quotations in this thesis

All quotations in this thesis are in English. Bible quotations are taken from *The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments and the Books called Apocrypha, Appointed to be read in churches, Authorised King James Version*, edited with an introduction and notes by Robert Carroll and Stephen Prickett (Oxford University Press, 1997). Quotations from the fathers and Orthodox theologians of later days are taken from available translations. On rare occasions, when there was no English translation known, some quotations in the text have been translated into English by the writer of this dissertation.

9. Technical terminology

With regard to the Byzantine Greek terminology used in biblical, patristic and other ecclesiastical books (manuscripts as well as printed), as well as in later Greek interpretative literature, we follow the Greek and Slavic/Russian practices as consistently as possible. A *Glossary of Terms* is provided at the end of the thesis.

Vol. II: Polyglots and Languages Other Than English (New York, reprint, 1963). [1st ed. London, 1903-1911], Introduction, ix ('Thus the whole Catalogue comprises editions in a total number of 628 languages and dialects').

⁸⁹ A.A. Alexeev, 'Holy Scripture and Its Translation', in *The Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia*, Ed. J. Krašovec (Sheffield, 1998), 1389: 'The languages that were the mother-languages for the Scripture are not the mother-languages for Christian peoples today. However, even now the original Bible texts keep their importance as primary sources for theology; besides, being the base of new translations, they exist as an integral part of religious life, more as a symbol than as a real agent. Today Bible translations are more popular among Christians than the original texts. Thus a paradoxical need arises to distinguish Holy Scripture from its translations. Indeed in Christian communities there are some tendencies towards removing distinctions of principle that divide the former from the latter'.

⁹⁰ A.A. Alexeev, 'Holy Scripture and Its Translation', in *Op. Cit.* (Sheffield, 1998), 1396: 'Thus we come to the next distinction of principle between Holy Scripture and its translation. Holy Scripture is by its very nature an omni-confessional text. It means that every Christian denomination can find and does find support for its teaching in the existing text without recourse to text criticism devices and strained interpretation. Plurality of meanings is an immanent characteristic of Holy Scripture. As for translation, a direct dependence on a given Christian community is among the primary conditions of its existence, and a uni-confessional text is a typical form of translation. Confessional orientation of translation may manifest itself in the choice of a base text (...). Thus, the natural omni-confessionalism of Holy Scripture is opposed to the practical uni-confessionalism of translation'.

Throughout the rich history of Bible research and patrology, a palet of different traditions has always existed. One of these, which is based on an abundant manuscript tradition of biblical and patristic interpretation, is the tradition of the Eastern Orthodox Church. In this book a liturgico codicological approach to the Byzantine biblical and patristic manuscripts is set out. This approach offers a key to understanding the position of the biblical and patristic writings in the Eastern Orthodox Churches. It stems from what is termed a 'liturgical hypothesis' and implies the necessity of a thorough reclassification of the extant manuscripts.

Characteristic of the Orthodox approach are the anchoring of the biblical writings in the liturgy of the Church, and the close connection between the Scriptures and the interpretative framework of the fathers. Special attention is paid to setting out a path of codicological research that could redirect study of the Byzantine codices to a system that allows for a more inclusive picture of the original biotope in which the manuscripts were created and evolved. Once inside this biotope, the reasons for and choices behind the content and codex formation of the biblical and patristic manuscripts become apparent.

