

REINHART CEULEMANS – BARBARA CROSTINI (eds), *Receptions of the Bible in Byzantium. Texts, Manuscripts, and their Readers* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. *Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia* 20). Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet 2021. XX, 534 pp. – ISBN: 978-91-513-1017-6.

• FELIX ALBRECHT, Niedersächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (Felix.Albrecht@uni-goettingen.de)

Over the past decade, the interest in the Bible in Byzantium has grown notably. In addition to ROBERT NELSON’s two collective volumes on the Old Testament (2010, edited together with PAUL MAGDALINO) and on the New Testament (2016, edited together with DEREK KRUEGER), CLAUDIA RAPP and ANDREAS KÜLZER presented “The Bible in Byzantium” (2018), and NICHOLAS DE LANGE published an important monograph on the Bible in Byzantine Judaism (2015), as well as a collective volume on the same topic, edited together with JULIA KRIVORUCHKO and CAMERON BOYD-TAYLOR (2015) [the latter volume is not mentioned in the volume under review, as far as I can see].<sup>1</sup>

An introduction by the two editors, “Why the Bible in Byzantium Matters” (pp. 1–37), outlines the general purpose of this volume. One might point out two small points of ambiguity:

First, the affirmation that Byzantine minuscule manuscripts have only now become the focus of critical edition projects in Münster and Göttingen is not correct. Cf. p. 3: “[...] while Byzantine minuscule manuscripts, once neglected by textual critics, have now entered the limelight in editions of the Greek Bible in Münster (INTF) and in Göttingen (Septuaginta-Unternehmen) [...].” Historically, it is not in the least correct to say that the

1. PAUL MAGDALINO – ROBERT NELSON (eds), *The Old Testament in Byzantium* (Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Symposia and Colloquia). Washington D.C. 2010; DEREK KRUEGER – ROBERT NELSON (eds), *The New Testament in Byzantium* (Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Symposia and Colloquia). Washington D.C. 2016; CLAUDIA RAPP – ANDREAS KÜLZER (eds), *The Bible in Byzantium. Appropriation, Adaptation, Interpretation* (Journal of Ancient Judaism. Supplements 25). Göttingen 2018; NICHOLAS DE LANGE, *Japheth in the Tents of Shem. Greek Bible Translations in Byzantine Judaism* (Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism 30). Tübingen 2015; NICHOLAS DE LANGE – JULIA KRIVORUCHKO – CAMERON BOYD-TAYLOR (eds), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions. Studies in Their Use in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism 23). Tübingen 2015.

minuscule manuscripts have been neglected in the case of the New Testament: In the New Testament, the Byzantine *textus receptus* had an immensely powerful effect, so that it was only with Tischendorf that scholarship became aware that the old majuscule manuscripts have a much higher significance than had been generally recognised. The current edition of the NESTLE – ALAND is still under the influence of the *textus receptus*; whether this may be advantageous, because it gives the Byzantine tradition greater significance, remains to be seen. In any case, a turning away from the Byzantine tradition is decisive for New Testament textual criticism, while in the case of the Greek Old Testament, both the Byzantine manuscripts and the majuscule tradition have been taken into consideration. In Septuagint research, the focus from the very beginning was on the majuscule manuscripts: first of all, *Codex Vaticanus*, and later also *Codex Alexandrinus*. The dependence on *Codex Vaticanus*, which is typical of Septuagint research, was therefore once very aptly described by PETER GENTRY as a disease that can be called ‘Vaticanitis’.<sup>2</sup>

Secondly, the reference to the fact that Psalms and parts of the New Testament are often transmitted together must be qualified. Cf. p. 6: “[... ] the frequent combination of the Psalms and (parts of) the New Testament.” Apart from the few late antique pandects, only between 1 and 2% of Psalter manuscripts contain the New Testament.<sup>3</sup>

The total of 20 contributions (three-quarters English, one-quarter French) are thematically structured, “and are arranged in five sections according to a typology of reception of the Bible. Within each section, the papers are ordered overall chronologically” (p. 18). The editors provide introductory summaries of the individual contributions (pp. 18–30); the summary of MARIACHIARA FINCATI’s contribution (p. 29) is misleading:

---

2. PETER J. GENTRY, The Göttingen Edition of Ecclesiastes. In: FELIX ALBRECHT – FRANK FEDER (eds), *Editing the Septuagint. The Unfinished Task. Papers Presented at the 50th Anniversary of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Denver 2018 (De Septuaginta Investigationes 16)*. Göttingen 2022, pp. 95–112, here: p. 100.

3. Cf. FELIX ALBRECHT, *New Testament and Psalter Manuscripts*. Göttinger Septuaginta, January 24, 2023. PATRICK ANDRIST’s study of the pandects, mentioned as “in preparation” (p. 6, n. 29) has been published: PATRICK ANDRIST, *Au croisement des contenus et de la matière: l’architecture des sept pandectes bibliques grecques du premier millénaire. Étude comparative sur les structures des contenus et de la matérialité des codex Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Ephraemi rescriptus, Basilianus, «Pariathonensis» et de la Biblia Leonis*. *Scrineum Rivista* 17/2 (2020) pp. 3–106; published under CC BY-NC-ND, and available under the following [link](#).

“Mariachiara Fincati suggests that the exegetical marginalia of *Codex Marchalianus* of the Prophets (possibly late seventh or early eighth century) might have been introduced by John Kamateros (d. 1206)”. First, FINCATI dates the *Codex Marchalianus*, whose dating is palaeographically disputed, to a wider time window: “between the end of the sixth and the beginning of the eighth century” (p. 465). Secondly, she comes to a less clear conclusion about the authorship of the marginalia: “It has been suggested that the glosses in all of those manuscripts are from their owner, the rhetorician John Kamateros, later patriarch of Constantinople. My research has not adduced elements in favour of this identification [...]” (p. 489). The identification with Kamateros was proposed by CARLO MARIA MAZZUCCHI in 2010.<sup>4</sup> While FINCATI quotes her doctoral supervisor, MAZZUCCHI (pp. 466–70), she distances herself at the same time: “However, as in my opinion further evidence is needed in order to accept the proposed reading and the likeness of the handwriting, I will keep this hypothesis as provisional and refrain from naming Kamateros as the annotator” (p. 470). Indeed, FINCATI does not provide any palaeographical analysis in her article and instead focuses on the compilation of the catena, based on two ‘case studies’: First, the book of Jeremiah (pp. 474–81), and second, the book of Hosea (pp. 482–86). Hers is an excellent study.

Under the heading “Politics of Interpretation” (pp. 39–106) there are four contributions by GÁBOR BUZÁSI, PAUL M. BLOWERS, SYSSÉ GUDRUN ENGBERG and MEREDITH L.D. RIEDEL. Under the heading “Quotations” (pp. 107–83) there are likewise four contributions, by SÉBASTIEN MORLET, ALEXANDRU IONIȚĂ, EMMANUEL VAN ELVERDINGHE and PANAGIOTIS CH. ATHANASOPOULOS. Three authors contributed to the “Rewritten Bible” section (pp. 185–275): FRANCESCA PROMETEA BARONE, GUILLAUME BADY and RACHELE RICCERI.

The remaining contributions are divided between the two sections “Visual Exegesis” (pp. 277–384) and “Technical Exegesis” (pp. 385–491). Five

---

4. CARLO MARIA MAZZUCCHI, Per la storia medievale dei codici biblici B e Q, del Demostene Par. Gr. 2934, del Dione Cassio Vat. Gr. 1288 e dell’*Ilias picta* Ambrosiana. In: ANTONIO BRAVO GARCÍA – INMACULADA PÉREZ MARTÍN (eds), *The Legacy of Bernard de Montfaucon. Three Hundred Years of Studies on Greek Handwriting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Colloquium of Greek Palaeography* (Madrid – Salamanca, 15–20 September 2008) (Bibliologia 31 A–B). Turnhout 2010, pp. 133–41; 746–49. FINCATI also refers to PIETRO VERSACE’s article on the marginalia in *Codex Vaticanus*; here a reference to his monograph should also be provided: PIETRO VERSACE, *I Marginalia del Codex Vaticanus* (Studi e Testi 528). Città del Vaticano 2018.

art-historical articles are entitled “visual” exegesis: These articles are written by ANNE-CATHERINE BAUDOIN, KATHLEEN MAXWELL, ÉLISABETH YOTA, ENGELINA SMIRNOVA, and MASSIMO BERNABÒ. “Technical” exegesis is the title of four philological articles dealing with various types of catenae (the article by Fincati has already been dealt with, see above): THEODORA PANELLA proposes a new categorisation of the catena type CPG C 165 for the Pauline Epistle to the Galatians, previously studied by KARL STAAB (1892–1974):<sup>5</sup> “In this paper, I supplement STAAB’s study by examining the Ps.-Oikoumenian catena tradition on Galatians” (p. 388). Laurence Vianès examines in her article the type of catena on the Major Prophets attributed to John Droungarios and argues for an earlier dating in the second half of the sixth century, specifically in an anti-Chalcedonian milieu. John Droungarios is “un auteur fantomatique” (p. 410); accordingly, Vianès speaks of the “chaîne du Ps.-Droungarios” (p. 411). For the New Testament catenae, GEORGI PARPULOV’s catalogue, published in 2021, needs to be taken into account in all future work (cf. also the online [catalogue](#)).<sup>6</sup> LEONTIEN VANDERSCHULDEN examines the so-called ‘Paris Psalter’ (*Cod. Paris. gr. 139*, Rahlfs MS 1133) and offers an excellent overview of the genesis of the Palestinian Psalter catenae (see p. 429). In her article (pp. 442–463), she provides the edition of the catena of the Paris Psalter to Psalm 11 (Greek text and English translation).

The book ends with four indices (Names, Biblical Passages, Ancient Writings and Manuscripts). The index to the manuscripts provides Pinakes’ Diktyon number. From the perspective of biblical philology, it would have been good if the RAHLFS and GREGORY – ALAND numbers had also been given.

Overall, the volume covers a broad spectrum of the Byzantine cultural sphere: although it focuses on the Greek, other cultural and linguistic areas are considered in individual contributions: Armenian (VAN ELVERDINGHE),<sup>7</sup> Greek/Latin (ATHANASOPOULOS), Slavonic (SMIRNOVA), and Arabic (BERNABÒ). Syriac, Coptic and Georgian, on the other hand, are not dealt with. Thematically, the focus is predominantly on the Old Testa-

---

5. KARL STAAB, *Die Pauluskatenen. Nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht* (Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici). Rome 1926, pp. 93–99.

6. GEORGI PARPULOV, *Catena Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. A Catalogue* (Texts and Studies 25). Piscataway 2021; published under CC BY-NC-ND, and available under the following [link](#).

7. In VAN ELVERDINGHE’s article, all Armenian quotations are written in Armenian script plus transliteration; in the bibliography, however, only a transliteration is provided.

ment, but the New Testament is also treated in four contributions: Middle Byzantine Gospel Books (MAXWELL), Le tétraévangile byzantin (YOTA), the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy in the Laurentian Library (BERNABÒ), Catenae on Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (PANELLA). Many contributions are illustrated with colour illustrations or plates. Altogether, an extremely interesting volume, carefully edited by REINHART CEULEMANS and BARBARA CROSTINI, which should not be missing in any library. It should also be emphasised that the volume is freely available as an e-book.

**Keywords**

Bible; manuscript studies; reception studies