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[A]s a rule, scribes reproduced the MSS that were available to them, with greater or lesser care, whether they contained the Koine or an older form of the text.

—B. Aland and K. Wachtel

The scribe who copied the text of a Byzantine gospel book and the painter who illustrated it were normally not the same individual. Every scribe used an older manuscript as his textual exemplar. In those cases where the painter modeled his efforts on an older illustrated manuscript, it would be interesting to know whether his model was the same manuscript as the scribe’s exemplar. In other words, do gospel texts and their figural and non-figural decoration travel together when they are copied by scribes and painters? Thus, if art historians have linked certain illustrated gospel books on the basis of their ornament and/or figural illustrations, what is the likelihood that New Testament text critics will have determined that their texts are also related?


3 For example, two seemingly closely related illustrated gospel books from the early Palaiologan period (Athos, Iviron 5 and Paris gr. 54) are based on different textual exemplars. See K. Maxwell, Between Constantinople and Rome: An Illuminated Byzantine Gospel Book (Paris gr. 54) and the Union of Churches (Farnham, Surrey, 2014), 51–81. A study reviewing the New Testament textual critics’ data for the large group of gospel books of the “decorative” style arrived at different conclusions for the early and middle subgroups of decorative style manuscripts (as defined by Annemarie Weyl Carr, in Byzantine Illumination, 1150–1250: The Study of a Provincial Tradition [Chicago, 1987]) versus the late subgroups. In the latter, manuscripts that are closely related in their decoration may also be closely related in their texts. See K. Maxwell, “The Afterlife of Texts: Decorative Style Manuscripts and New Testament Textual Criticism,” in Byzantine Images and Their Afterlives: Essays in Honor of Annemarie Weyl Carr, ed. L. Jones (Farnham, Surrey, 2014), 11–18. See also W. Langford, “From Text to Art and Back Again: Verifying A. Weyl Carr’s Manuscript Groupings Through Textual Analysis” (PhD diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009). I thank Ulrich Schmid for alerting me to this study.
Byzantine art historians have long scrutinized the scholarship of New Testament text critics in the hope of gaining insight into the production of illustrated Greek New Testament manuscripts.\(^4\) The data amassed by the latter are now significantly easier to access thanks to a commitment to web-based technology. As noted in the previous chapter, the T&T Mss. Clusters tool available on the website of the University of Münster’s Institute for New Testament Research (INTF) displays the closest extant textual relatives of Greek gospel books.\(^5\) These data are based on selective textual comparative studies, or collations, of Greek texts of the Gospels and shed light on the production of some of the most esteemed illuminated Byzantine gospel books of the sixth through thirteenth centuries.\(^6\)

The evidence, albeit preliminary, indicates that during particularly illustrious periods of Byzantine manuscript production, scribes had access to the texts of exemplary older illustrated manuscripts (or access to texts copied from these older manuscripts) and used them as their textual models.\(^7\) The implication is that the texts of these older deluxe manuscripts were valued by later generations of scribes and their patrons as much as their decoration and illustrations were. In fact, the consistency of the textual profiles generated by the Clusters tool for a significant number of deluxe Byzantine gospel books encourages one to speculate on the composition of prestigious manuscript collections in Constantinople and their accessibility to scribes.

Below is an analysis of the Clusters data for deluxe or otherwise significant manuscripts containing the Gospels from the sixth to the late thirteenth centuries. Recourse will be made to the Gregory-Aland (GA) numbering system.\(^8\)

**Theodore Hagiopetrites**

While most of the manuscripts included in this chronological study were probably produced in Constantinople, it will be useful, if somewhat counterintuitive, to introduce the Clusters tool using the manuscripts of the Byzantine scribe and illuminator, Theodore Hagiopetrites (Fig. 3.1), who is believed to have worked in Thessalonike and was active from 1277/78 to 1307/8.\(^9\) He signed and dated ten manuscripts containing the Gospels. Another five gospel manuscripts have been attributed to him while four additional ones described by Robert Nelson as being related to him (appendix, Table 3.1).\(^10\) Theodore is also distinctive in that he apparently created most of the non-figural decoration in his manuscripts. While some of his manuscripts are relatively


\(^5\) These data are based on selective textual comparative studies, or collations, of Greek texts of the Gospels and shed light on the production of some of the most esteemed illuminated Byzantine gospel books of the sixth through thirteenth centuries.\(^6\)

\(^6\) The data were originally published in K. Aland and B. Aland, eds., *Text and Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, vols. 4, 5 (Berlin, 1998–99, 2005), and derive from collations of over 2,200 continuous text manuscripts of the Gospels. Approximately 2,900 New Testament manuscripts (or fragments thereof) are known (in addition, there are approximately 2,500 lectionary manuscripts). For the most up-to-date list of New Testament texts, access http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste (accessed 26 January 2016).


\(^8\) See chap. 2 n. 11 above; for a thorough description, see D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (New York, 2008), 46–46.\(^9\)


\(^10\) Ibid., 114–17.
FIG. 3.1.
Theodore Hagiopetrites, University of Chicago MS 46 (Haskell Gospels), fol. 12r: The beginning of the Gospel of Matthew (photo courtesy Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library)
Kathleen Maxwell

modest, with ornament executed only in pen drawings, others are quite beautiful and worthy of being classified as deluxe. Thus, we have at our disposal a large group of manuscripts written and decorated by one scribe and exhibiting a range of quality. Theodore’s extensive record of gospel manuscripts provides an unusually well-documented environment in which to evaluate the data generated by the Clusters tool, and, based as the data are upon relative terra firma, their analysis will provide an informed perspective from which to launch our subsequent survey of deluxe Byzantine gospel books.

The Clusters tool provided a list of manuscripts that are textually related to each of Theodore’s books. A review of the data for the synoptic gospels for each of the ten manuscripts signed and dated by Theodore indicated that seven are closely related. They are: Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibl., GKS 1322 (GA 234); Athos, Vatopedi 962 (GA 1594); Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 20 (GA 74); London, BL, Burney 21 (GA 484); Amsterdam, Univ. Bibl., Remonstr. 145 (186) (GA 90); Williamstown, MA, Williams College, Chapin Lib., Cod. De Ricci 1 (GA 485); and Meteora, Monastery of the Transfiguration, cod. 545 (GA 2707).

Each of these seven manuscripts is textually related to a minimum of four signed and dated manuscripts by Theodore. In fact, data from two of the seven list six signed and dated Theodore manuscripts, and the data for two other manuscripts list five signed and dated manuscripts. Moreover, the data for all seven manuscripts record the same four of the five manuscripts attributed to Theodore by Nelson, as well as the same two manuscripts (of a possible four) described by him as related to Theodore. These are London, BL, Add. 19387 and Chicago MS 727. In order to better visualize this information, we will examine the data for one of these seven manuscripts, the relatively modest Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 20.

As can be seen in Table 3.2, a total of twenty-three lines of data were generated. Most lines list single manuscripts, but four manuscripts, beginning on line 15, are paired with manuscripts to which they are more closely related textually than they are to Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 20. Eleven of the first sixteen manuscripts are manuscripts found in Table 3.1. In other words, they are manuscripts signed and dated by, attributed to, or related to Theodore as classified by Nelson. Four manuscripts attributed to Theodore (lines 2, 6, 7, and 8) are closer textually to his signed and dated Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 20 than are all but one of the other six manuscripts that he signed and dated.

Line 1, however, is occupied by Panteleimon 771, which has not been associated previously with Theodore and is therefore classified here as “unaffiliated.” Other unaffiliated manuscripts are found on lines 4, 5, 9, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23. A partial explanation for these unaffiliated manuscripts is that Oxford, Christ Church gr. 20 (GA 74) has a 97.7 percent agreement with the majority text in the synoptic gospels. Greek gospel books tend to have a high level of uniformity; most do not differ more than ten

11 Ibid., 1:38.
12 The nineteen gospel manuscripts signed by, attributed to, or related to Theodore are listed by category in Table 3.1 (I have taken these categories from ibid., 1:16–17).
13 Manuscripts were searched using their GA number; textual relatives are also listed by GA numbers. The library shelf number is accessed by moving the cursor over the GA number.
14 To duplicate these results, use the default setting on the Clusters tool to generate data for the synoptic gospels for each of Theodore’s signed and dated gospel books.
15 Nelson, Theodore Hagiopetrites, 1: chap. 5 and p. 98. The fifth manuscript now in San Marino is never cited. This is logical because it was written and decorated in the eleventh century. Theodore only added the canon tables and supplemental texts.
16 Ibid., 2: plks. 9, 10.
17 That is, a total of twenty-three manuscripts correspond to gr. 20 better than does the majority text. The closer a manuscript is to the MT, the fewer the results from the Clusters tool. For more on the concept of the MT see chapter 2 above.
18 For further details on the textual relationships of manuscripts, see http://intf.uni-muenster.de/TT_PP/TT_Guide.html (accessed 15 January 2016). In a Clusters page for a manuscript x, a line of data with paired manuscripts y and z may occur, if the option “Show Further Relations” has been chosen. Such relations offer multiple interpretations. In most cases, a paired manuscript line should be taken as a warning, to pay attention to the relationship y–z and perhaps ignore the relationship x–y. But it may also be taken as an alert to take into account a possible relationship of x to another cluster. In this essay I adopt the latter view.
19 This conformity with the majority text increases in Greek gospel books produced in the thirteenth through fifteenth centuries, as will be shown below.
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percent from the majority text. The higher the percentage of agreement with the majority text, the closer the relationship with the Byzantine text. Long ago, Hermann von Soden recognized that Theodore used the dominant version of the Greek New Testament (that is, the Byzantine text), which helps to explain how a manuscript unaffiliated with Theodore can still be so closely related to his manuscripts. The unaffiliated Panteleimon 771 agrees with the Oxford gr. 20 at 99.6 percent. Panteleimon 771 has been assigned to the fifteenth century by INTF; thus, it could be a direct copy of the Oxford manuscript, which would explain the high level of agreement.

Four unaffiliated manuscripts (lines 1, 4, 5, and 9) are closer textually to Theodore’s Oxford manuscript than all but one (line 3) of the six signed and dated manuscripts by Theodore. Furthermore, these and eight other gospel manuscripts unaffiliated with Theodore appear on the list before London, BL, Add. 19387 (line 21), which is classified as related to Theodore. These unaffiliated manuscripts (and others) are found with great regularity in the Clusters data for the seven manuscripts signed and dated by Theodore that are closely related to each other. In fact, four of Theodore’s manuscripts (GA 234, 1594, 89, and 2749—the first two signed and dated by Theodore and the last two attributed to him) list the same seventeen unaffiliated manuscripts.

Only in the Gospel of John do fewer than 90 percent of gospel manuscripts differ more than ten percent from the majority text. For further information, see Aland and Aland, Text und Textwert, vol. 4, Das Markus evangelium, 1:18*–28*(in English).

The percentage agreement between Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 20 and its textual relatives is given for each manuscript. It should be reiterated that the data were based on the test passages and not on the entire text, so even if the two manuscripts were to agree at 100%, this would not mean that one manuscript is a copy of the other. For more on Panteleimon 771, see n. 25 below.

These seventeen are: Athos, Pantokrator 51/Princeton Y 1956–148 (GA 1187); Athos, Lavra W’ 127 (GA 1615); Athos, Panteleimon 771 (GA 1679); Athens, Lavra H’ 114a (GA 2541); Florence, Conv. Soppr. 55 (GA 567); Athos, Vatopedi 954 (GA 1586); Samos, Mitropoli, 16, 171 (GA 2782); Moscow, RSL, F. 181.13 (Gr. 13) (GA 5519); Vienna, Osterr. Nat. Bibl., Suppl. gr. 52 (GA 3); Milan, Bibl. Ambros. B.70 sup. (GA 351); Andros, Hagias 53 (GA 1562); London, BL, Add. 35030 (GA 2099); Paris, BnF, gr. 191 (GA 253); Harvard, Univ. Libr. MS gr. 21 (GA 2607); Athos, Vatopedi 933 (GA 1567); London, Lambeth Palace, 1175 (GA 470); and Grottaferrata, Bibl. della Badia, A.2.1 (GA 814).

A fifth manuscript—GA 390, attributed to Theodore—lists sixteen of the same seventeen unaffiliated manuscripts. One or more of these unaffiliated manuscripts likely had some tangible relationship to Theodore or to scribes and manuscripts associated with him. It is certainly feasible that one or more of these affiliated manuscripts served as Theodore’s textual exemplar or used Theodore’s texts as an exemplar. It would take significantly more research to make these determinations. These unaffiliated manuscripts are comparable to the role of what I call Group B manuscripts in my analysis below.

Finally, art historians will be intrigued by the presence of Stauronikita 43, a celebrated tenth-century deluxe manuscript (on which, more below), in the paired position on line 17.

Three manuscripts signed and dated by Theodore feature textual profiles that differ from the seven discussed above. They are Vat. gr. 644; Athos, Pantokrator 47; and Venice, Marc. gr. 1, 19. The first is a gospel manuscript with Theophylact’s commentary. Its profile differs in that it does not include in its listing of forty-nine manuscripts any of Theodore’s other gospel texts. Vat. gr. 644 also has a lower agreement of 92.8 percent with the majority text (see below) compared with an average of about 97 percent for the nine other gospels signed and dated by Theodore. Clearly, a different textual exemplar was utilized.

Athos, Pantokrator 47 and Venice, Marc. gr. 1, 19—the two latest signed gospel manuscripts of Theodore, both dating to 1300/1—also differ

Other unaffiliates that occur less consistently are: Vatopedi 965 (GA 1596) and 895 (GA 2455); Lavra L’ 119 (GA 1659); Athens, Hist. Ethn. Gest., 255 (GA 1451); Munich gr. 568 (GA 84); Stauronikita 43 (GA 1110); Vienna, Theol. gr. 300 (GA 76); Athens, Benaki, 69 [formerly vitr. 54/4] (GA 1503); Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 24 (GA 509); and Athens, Spyrr. Loverdu 63 (GA 2677).

Harvard gr. 22 does not appear in GA 390’s data.

For example, Panteleimon 771 and Lavra W’ 127 are assigned to the fifteenth century by text critics so they conceivably could have been copied from one of Theodore’s texts. (One of the unaffiliates, Lavra L’ 119, has been assigned to the seventeenth century by INTF.) The data for Panteleimon 771 itself generated a list of twenty-three manuscripts of which three are further paired. Ten manuscripts of the first seventeen listed are associated with Theodore in one of the three categories given in Table 3.1. Another five are unaffiliated manuscripts regularly found in the data for Theodore’s manuscripts (as in n. 23 above).

See p. 31.
from Theodore’s other signed and dated gospel books, as well as from Vat. gr. 644. The data for both manuscripts are brief; only four paired manuscripts were listed for Pantokrator 47 and just two manuscripts with pairs for Venice, Marc. gr. I, 19. David Parker has noted that they are very close to each other in Luke’s and John’s Gospels, but quite different in both Matthew and Mark.

Both manuscripts are also highly differentiated in that their textual profiles list no other gospel books of Theodore. Nevertheless, they, too, include several of the same unaffiliated manuscripts that we have already encountered above.

Of the five manuscripts attributed to Theodore, one (San Marino, Huntington Library, MS HM 1081) has already been dismissed because it was written in the eleventh century and only added to by Theodore. Two others—Göttingen, cod. Theol. 28 and St. Petersburg, no. 10/667—are virtually identical in their textual profiles to each other and to Copenhagen, GKS 1322, the earliest signed and dated manuscript by Theodore. Vat. Ottob. gr. 381, attributed to Theodore, is also extremely close to the Göttingen, St. Petersburg, Copenhagen, and Vatopedi manuscripts.

Chicago 46, on the other hand, despite its relatively high 97.2% agreement with the majority text, generated the largest amount of data for any of the manuscripts associated with Theodore, 134 lines. The first 20 lines resemble the data discussed above, viz., nine manuscripts associated with Theodore and at least seven of the now familiar unaffiliates.

For the manuscripts categorized as related to Theodore, the first, Venice, Marc. gr. I, 20 (dated 1302), does not include any other manuscripts associated with Theodore. But several of the unaffiliates are seen in the five paired manuscripts listed. The most distinctive profile of the manuscripts in this category is that presented by Iviron 30, which cites only three manuscripts, none associated with Theodore or among the familiar unaffiliates. Moreover, Nelson noted that Iviron 30 does not include Theodore’s usual gospel prefaces or canon table design. He also had serious reservations about the scribal hand being that of Theodore.

On the other hand, Chicago MS 727 is closest in its profile to the seven core manuscripts signed and dated by Theodore and their three close relatives in the manuscripts attributed to Theodore. Eight manuscripts signed and dated by Theodore (or attributed to him) are included, along with numerous familiar unaffiliates. Finally in this category, London, Add. 19387 also lists nine Theodore manuscripts in the primary position. Many now familiar unaffiliates also populate this data.

This survey of Theodore’s manuscripts introduced us to the complex data generated by the Clusters tool for a large group of manuscripts associated with one scribe. Seven of the ten gospel manuscripts signed and dated by Theodore, four of the five manuscripts attributed to him, and two of the manuscripts related to him are textually related. The tendency of unknown (or relatively unknown) and often unpublished manuscripts (the so-called unaffiliates) to be


Parker (Textual Scholarship, 72) had already noted that the Copenhagen and Vatopedi manuscripts were very close in Mark and John.

For Chicago 46, see Nelson, Theodore Hagiopetrites, 1:143; Maxwell, “The Afterlife of Texts,” 34–35.


31 Of related interest is the case of Athens, Benaki, 69 [form. vitr. 34/4] (GA 1305), hitherto unaffiliated with Theodore. Its textual profile for the synoptic gospels indicates that its text is closely related to those of Theodore. Of the twenty-three manuscripts given for Benaki 69 (most of which are paired for a total listing of forty-two manuscripts, including duplicates, in the paired position), five manuscripts are signed and dated by Theodore (two in the secondary position); four manuscripts are attributed to him; and one is related to him. Eleven other manuscripts belong to the unaffiliated category listed in n. 23 above. Benaki 69 is one of a two-volume New Testament set (with GA 1311; Ann Arbor, University of Michigan 14) that once belonged to Antonios Malakes, archbishop of Veroia. Five manuscripts (most of which are of deluxe status) have been associated with this individual by Nelson, including Göttingen, cod. Theol. 28, which has been attributed to Theodore. While Benaki 69 does not appear in Table 3.1, Nelson did note (Theodore Hagiopetrites, 1:45–46) that it shares the unusual selection of prose prefaces found only in Theodore’s last two signed gospel books. For more on this manuscript, see below, p. 69. See also R. S. Nelson, “The Manuscripts of Antonios Malakes and the Collecting and Appreciation of Illuminated Books in the Early Palaeologan Period,” JÖB 36 (1986): 229–54; N. Kavrus-Hoffmann’s chapter in this volume.
close textual relatives can be disconcerting. Based upon the dates supplied by INTF, some unaffiliates may be later copies of Theodore’s manuscripts or copies of manuscripts that he himself used as textual exemplars.

What is the relationship between the text data and the artistic quality of the manuscripts produced by Theodore? As noted, Theodore produced manuscripts that range from those with only relatively modest pen and ink ornament to deluxe products with gold and polychrome headpieces and initials and full-page evangelist portraits.32 Of his five gospel manuscripts that appear to be most closely related to each other textually, Copenhagen, GKS 1322 (dated 1277/78) and Vatopedi 962 (dated 1283/84) are both early signed works by Theodore with pen and ink decoration only. Var. Ottob. gr. 381 (1281/82), another early manuscript, and the later Göttingen manuscript (1289/90), both attributed to Theodore, have painted decoration.33 Thus, for Theodore’s works, there is no compelling relationship between textual affinities and decoration.34 He must have had access to the same textual exemplar for a significant portion of his career, but the quality of the decoration seems to have been dependent upon the resources available to those who commissioned manuscripts from him.

The data behind the Clusters tool says nothing about aesthetics; it shows only textual relations through comparisons of select test passages in each Gospel. Nevertheless, in the following survey of deluxe Byzantine manuscripts, the generated data reveal that high-quality illustrated Byzantine gospel books often have textual profiles that align them with other high-quality gospel books. My argument is not that deluxe gospel books have only textual relatives; rather, some deluxe gospel books generate textual profiles that often feature a similar selection of manuscripts, including both deluxe and rather ordinary manuscripts. These deluxe manuscripts often feature widely divergent types of figural and non-figural illumination.35 Manuscripts playing a comparable role to the unaffiliates in our discussion of Theodore’s gospel books will also be found in the data in the survey of deluxe Byzantine manuscripts. Some of these manuscripts (but by no means all) may be judged as modest products by art historians, especially in their current condition.

The Sixth Century

The Sinope Gospels

Our chronological overview begins with the Sinope Gospels (Paris, BnF, Suppl. gr. 1286) (GA 023).36 This sixth-century purple parchment manuscript is associated with the highest levels of Byzantine patronage and may have been produced for an imperial patron in Constantinople.37 The text is fragmentary; only forty-four folios from the Gospel of Matthew survive. Table 3.3 displays the data generated for the Gospel of Matthew.

The degree of agreement between the Sinope Gospels’ text of Matthew and the majority text is 94.1 percent. Although not identical, the twelve manuscripts in Table 3.3 agree 100 percent with the Sinope Gospels’ text of Matthew.

First on the list is the Rossano Gospels (Rossano Cathedral, Diocesan Museum) (GA 042), another purple parchment majuscule text. Art historians once assigned the Sinope and Rossano Gospels to widely disparate locations, but stylistic associations between the two manuscripts have

32 These portraits were executed by a miniaturist; see Nelson, Theodore Hagiopetrites, 1:101–5; see p. 38 for the distinction between an illuminator and a miniaturist.
33 For illustrations, see ibid., vol. 2, color plate I and pls. 1–3, 7–8, 40–44, and 51–59. I have not seen photographs of the fifth manuscript, St. Petersburg 10/667.
34 After having studied Theodore’s ornament in detail, Nelson divides its development into two distinct periods (ibid., 1:41). He notes that Theodore’s ornament is similar from 1277 until the early 1290s, when a significant change can be detected in the ornament of Burney 21 (dated 1291–92) and subsequent manuscripts. Four of the five manuscripts most closely related textually fall within the first stage of Theodore’s development.
35 See p. 49 below.
36 A GA number beginning with “0” indicates a text written in majuscule script.
37 Jeffrey Spier believes that it was produced either in Antioch or Constantinople and notes that it is stylistically related to two other purple codices: the Rossano Gospels and the Vienna Genesis. For catalog entry and bibliography, see Picturing the Bible: The Earliest Christian Art, ed. J. Spier (New Haven, 2007), 271. John Lowden (“Rossano Gospels,” Grove Art Online, accessed 4 August 2014) notes that these purple manuscripts are usually attributed to Syria or Palestine on slight evidence and cautions that “[a] possible origin in Constantinople ought not to be overlooked.”
be recognized recently. The textual evidence, limited though it is, supports this trend. The Rossano Gospels are better preserved than the Sinope Gospels and contain the Gospels of both Matthew and Mark. I will review the data for the Gospel of Matthew first and then for both the Gospels of Matthew and Mark.

The Clusters tool called up 165 manuscripts for the Gospel of Matthew, but Table 3.4 includes only selections from the first forty lines of data. Most of the 165 manuscripts are paired with other manuscripts that are even closer relatives to the initial 165 manuscripts than the initial manuscripts are to the Rossano Gospels itself. The first manuscript on the list—Mr. Athos, Lavra A’ 27 (GA 1459), attributed to the twelfth century by INTF—has no more than 94.3 percent agreement with the Rossano text of Matthew. I was unable to locate any reproductions, but the Clusters tool indicated that it has a closer textual relationship in Matthew with another manuscript identified as GA 047, which is paired with Lavra A’ 27 on line 1. This latter manuscript is an important tenth-century text better known as Princeton, University Library, Garrett MS 1. It is the only extant gospel book in majuscule script whose entire contents are formatted in the shape of a cross. Many of the manuscripts on the data list for Matthew are not well known to art historians. There are some notable exceptions, but even they are not particularly close relatives given their position on the list and their percentage of agreement with the Rossano Gospel of Matthew. Line 21 is London, BL, Burney 19 (GA 481), the text of which is datable to the second half of the tenth century while its evangelist portraits are later twelfth-century additions of the famous Kokkinobaphos Master type. Several other distinguished manuscripts come into play at lines 23, 24, 29, and 39, respectively Oxford, Bodleian, Auct. T. inf. 2.6 (GA 707); Athos, Lavra A’ 15 (GA 1080); Baltimore, Walters W 527 (GA 2368); and Paris gr. 70 (GA 14). These will be encountered again below.

With the search parameters expanded to include both the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, the results change (Table 3.5). First, the degree of agreement with the majority text drops to 85.3 percent and no manuscript demonstrates more than an 89.6 percent agreement with the manuscript’s level of agreement with the manuscript for which the data are being generated, which means that the level of agreement between GA 047 and the Rossano Gospels’ text of Matthew cannot be determined without further manipulations of the Clusters tool.

38 Compare “[t]he illustrations, on purple parchment, of the Vienna Genesis, the Rossano Purple Codex and the Sinope Codex [...] all lack unity of style, and some scholars ascribe them respectively to three major artistic centres, Constantinople, Antioch or Jerusalem, and Alexandria” (M. Chatzidakis, in idem and A. Grabar, Byzantine and Early Medieval Painting, trans. S. W. Taylor [New York, 1965], 12) with Herbert Kessler’s remark fourteen years later that the two manuscripts were "related in style, paleography, and text" (H. L. Kessler, "Codex Sinopensis," in Age of Spirituality: Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century; Catalogue of the Exhibition at The Metropolitan Museum of Art, November 19, 1977 through February 12, 1978, ed. K. Weitzmann [New York, 1979], 491).

39 It must be noted, however, that the Sinope Gospels does not play a significant role in Table 3.4, which lists the closest textual relatives for the Rossano Gospels. This is surely due to the relatively small number of text passages surviving for the Gospel of Matthew of the Sinope Gospels.

40 The Gospel of Matthew is complete while Mark is missing only the last leaf. See G. Cavallo, J. Gribomont, and W. C. Loewe, Codex Purpuræus Rossanensis: Commentarium (Rome 1987). Wachtel ("Byzantine Text of the Gospels") linked the Rossano Gospels to another purple parchment majuscule manuscript written in silver ink known as “N” or GA 022. Most of GA 022 is in the National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg (Codex Petropolitanus Purpuræus). Thirty-three folios are in Patmos and various folios are found in seven other collections. According to Wachtel, both the Rossano Gospels and GA 022 were probably written in Constantinople and probably copied from the same exemplar.

41 That is, GA 047 is closer to GA 1459, with a relationship of 100%, than GA 1459 is to the Rossano Gospels (with a relationship of 94.5%). The Clusters tool does not divulge a secondary
texts of Matthew and Mark of the Rossano Gospels. The first dozen or so manuscripts listed are either unknown or modest products such as GA 84 and GA 135 (on line 1). These will be identified and discussed more fully below. Lower on the list are manuscripts of art-historical significance, including Oxford, Bodleian Library, E.D. Clarke 10 (GA 112 at line 14); Baltimore, Walters W 525 (GA 2374 at line 17); Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 257 (GA 510 at line 28); and Athos, Philotheou 33 (GA 1120 at line 31). None shows more than 86.9 percent agreement with the Rossano Gospels texts of Matthew and Mark, however. Thus, realistically, there are no extant close textual relatives for the Rossano Gospels.

The Ninth Century

The Uspenskii Gospels (GA 461)
The disruptions of the Iconoclasm controversy are responsible for the dearth of manuscripts (illuminated and otherwise) datable to the eighth and ninth centuries. There are approximately sixty-six extant manuscripts from the ninth century containing one or more books of the New Testament. Fifty-three of these are written in majuscule script and thirty are minuscules. The earliest dated minuscule text is that of St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, gr. 219, otherwise known as the Uspenskii Gospels. This manuscript contains no figural decoration and little that would even qualify as ornament (Fig. 3.2). It is rarely mentioned by art historians. Nevertheless, its later textual relatives as presented by the Clusters tool for the synoptic gospels are noteworthy. Forty-one manuscripts are listed. Unlike either the Sinope or the Rossano Gospels, the Uspenskii Gospels text demonstrates close agreement (97.1%) with the majority text.

Many of these forty-one manuscripts are further paired with manuscripts that are textually closer to them than the original forty-one manuscripts are to the Uspenskii Gospels. Line 2 of Table 3.6 lists two illustrious Byzantine gospel books: Paris gr. 70 (GA 14) (Fig. 3.3) and Paris, BnF, Coislin gr. 195 (GA 34) from the tenth and eleventh centuries, respectively. Paris gr. 70 is closer in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke to the Uspenskii Gospels than any other extant Greek gospel book except for a tiny, eleventh-century text in the Vatican (GA 376, line 1). Both Paris gr. 70 and Coislin 195 have long been associated with the Macedonian renaissance, which coincided with the Macedonian dynamic rule (862–1056). Their textual affinity is of interest because their evangelist portraits differ markedly. While both sets are of high quality, Paris gr. 70 features rarer standing portraits of the evangelists.

46 Walters W 525 is an original member of the Atelier of the Palaiologina. See H. Buchthal and H. Belting, Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople: An Atelier of Late Byzantine Book Illumination and Calligraphy, DOS 16 (Washington, DC, 1978). Additional manuscripts have been associated with the group; see R. S. Nelson and J. Lowden, “The Palaiologina Group: Additional Manuscripts and New Questions,” DOP 45 (1991): 59–68. For color images of Walters W 525, visit the website given in n. 44 above.

47 Buchthal and Belting, Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople, 71–73 and pls. 81–85.

48 Most of these manuscripts will be discussed below.

49 Aland and Aland, Text of the New Testament (n. 7 above), 81.

50 St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, gr. 219 (dated 7 May 835). For a detailed analysis of the Uspenskii Gospels and related bibliography, see chap. 5 below.


52 Nelson is an exception. He has noted that the Uspenskii Gospels manuscript is also the earliest dated text to feature gospel prologues. See R. S. Nelson, The Iconography of Preface and Miniature in the Byzantine Gospel Book (New York, 1980), 96–99, 103, 105, esp. 97.

53 For color images of Paris gr. 70, see n. 4.4 above. For black-and-white reproductions of Paris gr. 70, see Weitzmann, Byzantinische Buchmalerei, figs. 78–84, 87–88; for Paris, Coislin gr. 195, see ibid., figs. 57–60. For color images of the evangelists Matthew, Mark, and Luke, access the BnF website (n. 44 above).

54 Vat. gr. 1539 is dated to the eleventh century on INTF’s Kurzgefasste Liste, where it is described as measuring 10.9 × 7.8 cm. I have not located reproductions of this manuscript. Paris gr. 70 agrees with the Uspenskii Gospels at 98.4%, while Paris, Coislin gr. 195 agrees with Paris gr. 70 at 98.7%.

Fig. 3.2.
The Uspenskii Gospels, St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, gr. 219, fol. 100r: Mark 1:1-6 (photo courtesy Department of Manuscripts of the Russian National Library)
FIG. 3.3.
Paris, BnF, cod. gr. 70, fol. 4v: Evangelist Matthew (photo courtesy Bibliothèque nationale de France)
The next item on the list for the Uspenskii Gospels is GA 3 (line 3). This is Suppl. gr. 52 from the Austrian National Library in Vienna and it is attributed to the twelfth century (Fig. 3.4). Its evangelist portraits are distinctive, but its illustration of the Holy Trinity is almost unprecedented. Line 5 of Table 3.6 features Auct. T. inf. 2.6 of the Bodleian Library (GA 707), which was mentioned briefly in connection with the Rossano Gospels. This handsome mid-tenth-century manuscript from Oxford was marred by the addition of mediocre evangelist portraits in the early fourteenth century. Lines 6 and 13 for the Uspenskii Gospels feature two beautiful manuscripts from Athos: Lavra A’ 19 (dated 992) (GA 1452) and Lavra A’ 15 (GA 1080), which is assigned to the fourteenth century. On line 16 is Princeton, University Library, Garrett MS 2 (GA 1530) from the late eleventh or early twelfth century, a manuscript famous for its extraordinary canon tables.

This remarkable list of the textual relations of the Uspenskii Gospels continues on line 20 with the illustrated New Testament manuscript London, BL, Add. 28815 (GA 699) in the second position; one scholar has described this manuscript as “arguably the most beautiful New Testament manuscript possessed by the British Library.” Also in the second position at line 21 is Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Barocci 51 (GA 45) (Fig. 3.5) from the last quarter of the thirteenth century, another member of the elite early Palaiologan group of manuscripts known as the Atelier of the Palaiologina. Lines 27, 28, and 34 feature in the primary position the illustrious manuscripts of the Codex Ebnerianus (GA 105) (Fig. 3.6); Vienna, Austrian National Library, Theol. gr. 2.40 (GA 123) (Fig. 3.7); and Athos, Philotheou 33 (GA 1120). Codex Ebnerianus is a rare example of an illustrated New Testament text; it is associated with the highest levels of Constantinopolitan imperial patronage in the second quarter of the twelfth century and is one of the most important examples of figural illustration by the so-called Kokkinobaphos Master. Works produced in his style are considered among the finest products of the twelfth century. Vienna, Theol. gr. 2.40 and Philotheou 33 are tenth-century products of very high caliber. Finally, the last entry (line 41) corresponds to Athens, National Library, cod. 93 (GA 777), a twelfth-century illustrated gospel manuscript famous for its numerous framed narrative scenes.

This prestigious list of manuscripts began with the Uspenskii Gospels. While the manuscript dates to the early ninth century, it is textually related in the synoptic gospels to high-caliber manuscripts from the tenth through

56 It agrees with the Uspenskii Gospels at 98%. See I. Spatharakis, “A Dove Whispers in the Ear of the Evangelist,” JOB 49 (1999): 267–88. I thank one of the outside reviewers for bringing this article to my attention. For color illustrations of the Vienna manuscript, see the Gabriel Millet Collection, online under “Resources” at http://ica.princeton.edu/millet (accessed 15 January 2016).


58 Hutter, Corpus der byzantinischen Miniaturenhand- schriften, vol. 1, cat. no. 4.

59 For Lavra A’ 19, see Pelekanidis et al., Οἱ Θρησκευτικοὶ τῶν Αὐτοκεφαλῶν Χριστιανῶν Χρόνων 1100, 3; figs. 18–23. Pelekanidis indicated that the text is dated to 991. Nadezhda Kavrus-Hoffmann informed me that it was executed by the renowned calligrapher monk, Ioannes of Lavra, who copied at least seven manuscripts. Jean Irigoin noted that its ruling pattern is the same as in Ephraim’s Vatopedi 949 and that Lavra had close ties with Constantinopolitan monasteries. See further J. Irigoin, “Pour une étude des centres de copie byzantins,” Scriptorium 15, no. 2 (1959): 177–209, esp. 195–200. I thank Nadezhda Kavrus-Hoffmann for this information and the related reference. For Lavra A’ 15, see Pelekanidis et al., Οἱ Θρησκευτικοὶ τῶν Αὐτοκεφαλῶν Χρόνων 1100, 3; figs. 14–17. INTF once dated Lavra A’ 15 as early as the ninth century, but the online version now dates it to the fourteenth century. These two manuscripts agree with the Uspenskii Gospels at 98% and 97.7%, respectively.

60 For color reproductions, see Kotzabassi and Ševčenko, Greek Manuscripts at Princeton, figs. 10–12.
Fig. 3.4.
Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek
Cod. Suppl. gr. 52,
fol. 13v: Evangelist Matthew (photo courtesy Österreichische Nationalbibliothek)
FIG. 3.5.
Bodleian Library,
University of Oxford,
MS. Barocci 31, fol. 6v:
Evangelist Matthew
Fig. 3.6.
**FIG. 3.7.**
Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Theol. gr. 240, fol. 97v: Evangelist Mark (photo courtesy Österreichische Nationalbibliothek)
The textual affiliation of deluxe Byzantine gospel books is a particularly rich example of the type of data generated for a number of deluxe Greek gospel books. Of interest is the fact that the gospel texts of these manuscripts are related but the manuscripts themselves were copied over a period of four centuries. Their decoration, figural and non-figural, is extraordinary, but hardly uniform: it takes on a wide variety of forms and styles. Indeed, with the diversity displayed in the decoration of these manuscripts, one forgets that Byzantine art is often described as repetitive and somewhat short on innovation.

As noted, the manuscript of the Uspenskii Gospels is of little interest artistically, featuring neither figural decoration nor much that qualifies as ornament (Fig. 3.2). Textually, it is also not regarded as particularly important. It is one of many representations of the Byzantine text that identifies closely with the majority text (97.1%). The manuscript’s stature stems from the fact that it is dated 835 and is thus considered a landmark in Greek paleography studies. Furthermore, it is signed by the scribe Nicholas who later became the superior (hegoumenos) of the Stoudios monastery in Constantinople. Nicholas was the devoted assistant of Theodore, the first hegoumenos of the same monastery and a particularly astute administrator. As a leading iconophile and reformer, Theodore spent significant periods in exile, but his monastic and liturgical reforms were especially influential between the ninth and eleventh centuries. The typikon of the Stoudios monastery reflects the rigor of these reforms, particularly Theodore’s interest in reviving the cenobitic monasticism of late antiquity. More relevant for our purposes is the role of the monastery as an intellectual center with an active scriptorium in the ninth century.

New Testament text critics have recognized that the Byzantine text-type, of which the Uspenskii Gospels is a member, became dominant only after the change of script (μεταχειρίσμος), that is, the radical transformation from majuscule to minuscule script that took place in the ninth century. As summarized by Klaus Wachtel,

This mainstream has its headwaters in pre-Byzantine times, in fact in the very first phase of our manuscript tradition, and it underwent a long process of development and standardization. The final phase began with the introduction of the minuscule script in the 9th century and ended up in a largely uniform text characterized by readings attested by the majority of all Greek manuscripts from the 13th–15th centuries counted by hundreds and thousands.

66 Aland and Aland, Text of the New Testament, pl. 40: “[I]t is not significant for its [Byzantine Majority] text but for its age as the earliest dated minuscule….” Noteworthy, too, is the fact that no majuscule manuscripts appear on the synoptic gospels’ data generated by the Clusters tool, which has to do with the Uspenskii Gospels having a high level of agreement with the MT and most majuscules being too fragmentary to be listed by the clustering tool. I thank Klaus Wachtel for this personal communication.

67 Enrica Follieri noted that there is no absolute proof that the Nicholas who wrote the Uspenskii Gospels is the same individual who became abbot at the Stoudite monastery; see her (orig. publ. 1974) “Tommaso di Damasco e l’antica minuscola libraria greca,” in Byzantina et Italograeca: Studi di filologia e di paleografia, ed. A. A. Longo, L. Perria, and A. Luzzi, Storia e letteratura, vol. 195 (Rome, 1997), 181 n. 61; and A. Diller pointed out (“A Companion to the Uspenskii Gospels,” BZ 49, no. 2 [1956]: 312–15; esp. 333) that the Stoudite monks could not have actually rehbabited the monastery until after the restoration of orthodoxy by Empress Theodora in 842–43, which means that the Uspenskii Gospels manuscript, while strongly associated with Stoudite leadership, was not actually written in the Stoudite monastery. For a detailed analysis of Nicholas and manuscripts of the Stoudite monastic tradition, see Kavrus-Hoffmann’s chapter in this volume.

68 See BMFD 1:86–87: “Another enduring feature of Theodore’s reform, though one not much discussed in his work, was his importation of the office of the St. Sabas monastery near Jerusalem into the Stoudios monastery, displacing the continuous 24-hour service that was the trademark of the ‘sleepless’ monks previously resident there since the middle of the fifth century. In time this would merge with the office of the cathedral church of Hagia Sophia to produce a hybrid Studite office.”

69 See BMFD 1:84–137. Theodore emphasized manual labor and also banned slaves and female animals (p. 86). Reading alternated with manual labor. See ibid., 108, §26 where a daily check-out ritual for books is noted and 112, §53 where “copyists” are referenced and exempted from the recitation of the psalter.


71 Aland and Wachtel, “Greek Minuscule Manuscripts” (n. 1 above), 44. The process was hardly straightforward; see Wachtel, “Byzantine Text of the Gospels.”

72 Wachtel, “Byzantine Text of the Gospels,” 1; see also p. 7: “The Byzantine text is by no means a fixed and stable entity that remained more or less the same from the times of Codex Alexandrinus through the middle ages.”

The Textual Affiliation of Deluxe Byzantine Gospel Books

49
In fact, the dominance of the Byzantine text by the second half of the ninth century has been called into question for more than fifty years. J. Neville Birdsall has argued that the reception of the Byzantine text may not have been as early or as uniform as some scholars concluded. He noted that Photios’s text of the New Testament “had a close affinity with the gospel material which earlier theoreticians called the ‘Caesarean Text’ . . . [and] this is all the more significant because of the intellectual stature and position of Photius, and because of the centrality and importance of his ecclesiastical office.”

Recent research by Nadezhda Kavrus-Hoffmann has confirmed that gospel texts other than the Byzantine text were circulating in mid- and late ninth-century Constantinople. She recently assigned Chicago, Lutheran School of Theology, Gruber 152 (GA 1424), whose script has much in common with that of Nicholas of the Uspenskii Gospels manuscript, to the Stoudios monastery. The textual profile for Gruber 152 created by the Clusters tool describes only a 75.3 percent agreement with the majority text, which contrasts with the distinctly Byzantine character of the text of the Uspenskii Gospels (97.1%).

Of the hundreds of manuscripts found in Gruber 152’s textual profile, none shows closer than a 90.4 percent agreement and all but four manuscripts agree with it at levels below 79 percent.

Regardless, the Uspenskii Gospels manuscript’s association with the Stoudios monastery may account for its many textual relatives with later deluxe gospel texts such as those listed in Table 3.6. As an early dated minuscule gospel text affiliated with an esteemed metropolitan monastery, it may have been sought out as a textual exemplar by later Byzantine patrons and scribes. One cannot argue that the text of the Uspenskii Gospels itself is particularly relevant for the development of the Byzantine text-type. The manuscript is singular because of its very early minuscule script and because of its colophon and the affiliations revealed therein. It is a product of what Cyril Mango has referred to as the “iconophile intelligentsia,” a movement that must include Theodore Stoudite and his associates.

One can safely assume, however, that the prestige of the Uspenskii Gospels would have almost certainly grown throughout the ninth century, especially after the end of Iconoclasm in 843.

Before leaving the Uspenskii Gospels it is important to acknowledge the significant number of unknown or relatively unknown gospel manuscripts that are its close textual relatives but were not included in Table 3.6. Table 3.7 lists some of these manuscripts. With few exceptions they do not appear to have been published, and they are not usually mentioned in the art-historical literature.

Most of these manuscripts are relatively modest products. Harvard gr. 22, in the paired position on line 6, contains only forty-seven folios and an unattractive thirteenth-century script.

Lavra Γ, 54, on line 8, is missing the beginning of Matthew, but its three remaining headpieces and initials are quite competently drawn, if not large

---


75 Another very important late ninth- or early tenth-century manuscript is the now fragmentary Messina F. V. 18, which was dedicated to an otherwise unknown Dionysios. It features unusual and striking canon tables and headpieces, and its one surviving evangelist portrait is iconographically related to those of Stauronikita 43. It agrees with the majority text at 91.7%. See further A. Iacobini and L. Perria, Il vangelo di Dionisio: Un manoscritto bizantino da Costantinopoli a Messina (Rome, 1998).


77 See nn. 50–52 above.

in scale. Other manuscripts are fragmentary and difficult to assess.\textsuperscript{79} Istanbul, Serail 125 is basically complete. Its remaining headpieces (that of Mark is missing) are simple pen and ink, but it has several lovely pages of text formatted in the shape of a cross at the end of Mark’s Gospel. Siderides \textsuperscript{1} is a tiny and worn manuscript with headpieces of indeterminate quality.\textsuperscript{80} John Rylands 7, in the paired position, comprises 204 folios, many of which appear to be damaged by worms, but a large headpiece for Luke shows ambition if not expert execution. Although Vat. gr. 365 appears to have lost most of the pigment in its evangelist portraits, it must have been more appealing at one time (Fig. 3.8).\textsuperscript{81} One of the manuscripts listed in Table 3.7, Patmos 84 (Fig. 3.9), is striking, however, and it comes as a surprise that it is not better known to art historians.\textsuperscript{82} Its \textit{Blütenblattstil} headpieces and its initials are lovely, and it features the much less common and more formal two-column format of the famous Stauronikita 43 Gospels.\textsuperscript{83}

Tables 3.6 and 3.7 remind us that Byzantine gospel books typically have both deluxe and modest textual relatives and that the modest relatives usually far outnumber the deluxe ones. It is important to bear in mind as well that the Clusters tool ranks manuscripts only in terms of textual relations. Aesthetic concerns are irrelevant. The data for the Uspenskii Gospels are representative of the kind of results generated for a number of deluxe Greek manuscripts. I have divided the manuscripts listed into three groups:

Group A: Deluxe or high-quality Greek gospel books of various dates featuring diverse types of illustration and ornament.

Group B: Mostly unpublished Greek gospel books that appear fairly consistently in the Clusters data for deluxe manuscripts; many of these manuscripts are modest, but several warrant promotion to Group A (e.g., Patmos 84 and, as will be seen below, Manchester, John Rylands Library, MS 1).\textsuperscript{84}

Group C: Unknown and usually unpublished Greek gospel books that appear much less consistently in the Clusters data for deluxe manuscripts discussed here.

My focus will be on Group A and Group B manuscripts as they are found more consistently in the data generated for the deluxe manuscripts under discussion. While Group C manuscripts may comprise fifty percent or more of the data for a given manuscript, they will play almost no role in this study. The role of Group B manuscripts is akin to that of the so-called unaffiliated manuscripts discussed above in the text data of Theodore Hagiopetrites.

In sum, deluxe gospel books generate textual profiles that often feature a similar selection of manuscripts from Group A and Group B. We have already seen in the manuscripts of Theodore Hagiopetrites that a scribe/illuminator could create books with similar texts that may or may not be classified as deluxe. Not all patrons had the desire or the resources to commission a beautifully illuminated manuscript. Modest (Group B)

\textsuperscript{79} Munich, BSB, gr. 468 does not appear to have ever had decoration; Moscow, E.181.13 (Gr. 15) contains only 100 folios and within that only the headpiece to Luke survives. The Syracuse fragment appears to have been modestly decorated, but it may have had at least one evangelist portrait.

\textsuperscript{80} My images are derived from a black-and-white microfilm.

\textsuperscript{81} Black-and-white microfilm images of all of Vat. gr. 365 are available in the Virtual Manuscript Room (under GA 155) on INTF’s website (accessed 28 August 2013). Three evangelist portraits survive (Mark, Luke, and John), although much of their pigment has disappeared. Four unpainted headpieces to the gospels are also intact.

\textsuperscript{82} Patmos 84 is unpublished, but has been photographed by Daniel Wallace of CSNTM. It appears no fewer than six times in the paired position in the textual profile for the Uspenskii Gospels.

\textsuperscript{83} Giancarlo Prato noted that gospel texts dated to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries feature one column of text in 90% of all cases (“La presentazione del testo nei manoscritti tardo bizantini,” in idem, \textit{Studi di paleografia greca}, Collectanea, vol. 4 [Spoleto, 1994], 113–49, esp. 116: orig. publ. 1982). If one looks at all manuscripts (dated and undated) from the ninth to the fourteenth centuries, 88% feature a single-column format. The inverse is true for lectionary texts: of 1,500 lectionaries from the ninth to fourteenth centuries, 75% feature two-columned formats. Secular manuscripts are nearly always single columned as well, according to Prato. For the Stauronikita 43 Gospels, see C. Mavropoulou-Tsoumi and G. Galavaris, \textit{Holy Stauroniketa Monastery: Illustrated Manuscripts from the 10th to 17th Century}, 2 vols. (Mt. Athos, 2007–8), 2: figs. 4–55.

\textsuperscript{84} I have not succeeded in locating reproductions of all manuscripts assigned to Group B; John Rylands 7 was probably once Group A quality.
FIG. 3.8. Vatican Apostolic Library, Vat. gr. 365, fol. 44v: Evangelist Mark (with the permission of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, all rights reserved)
Fig. 3.9. Patmos, Monastery of St. John, Ms. 84, fol. 3r: The beginning of the Gospel of Matthew (photo courtesy Monastery of St. John, Patmos)
manuscripts were generally created by the same scribes who wrote deluxe (Group A) manuscripts.

The foundation has now been laid for a more expedient analysis of additional deluxe Greek gospel books.

**Macedonian Renaissance**

For the period associated with the “Macedonian renaissance” of the tenth and early eleventh centuries, I shall examine the evidence of four manuscripts: Vienna, Theol. gr. 240, Paris gr. 70, Stauronikita 43, and Vatopedi 949.

**Vienna, Austrian National Library, Theol. gr. 240 (GA 123)**

Vienna, Theol. gr. 240 (Fig. 3.7) is usually dated to ca. 1000 and is considered a high-quality representative of the “Macedonian renaissance.”85 It was mentioned briefly above in conjunction with the Uspenskii Gospels where it appeared on line 28 (Table 3.6) for the Clusters data for that manuscript. The Clusters data for Vienna, Theol. gr. 240 reveal textual relationships with numerous deluxe illustrated manuscripts.

Like the Uspenskii Gospels, Vienna, Theol. gr. 240 agrees with the majority text at 97.1 percent. The Clusters tool generated seventy-three lines of data and many of these manuscripts are paired. Table 3.8 lists some of the most illustrious manuscripts; all but two are in the primary position.86 Of the sixteen manuscripts assigned to Group A in Table 3.8, ten were also cited in conjunction with the Uspenskii Gospels. The five additional manuscripts are: Patmos 72; Vat. Pal. gr. 220; Harvard gr. 1; Walters W 527; and Vat. gr. 354.87 Four of these are datable to the tenth century, but Harvard gr. 1 is a late thirteenth-century work related in its script to the elite Atelier of the Palaiologina group. Vat. gr. 354, written in majuscule script, is dated to 949. Walters W 527 is an early example of the Perlschrift and features an unusual evangelist portrait of Mark executed in a medium that creates a similar impact to watercolor (Fig. 3.10).88 All sixteen manuscripts are worthy of much greater attention than can be provided here. I will only point out that like Vienna, Theol. gr. 240, Paris gr. 70 features standing evangelist portraits.89

Like the Uspenskii Gospels, Vienna, Theol. gr. 240 includes a number of manuscripts that can be classified under Group B (Table 3.9). Of the fourteen manuscripts listed, nine appeared in Table 3.7 on the Group B list of the Uspenskii Gospels. The newcomers include the Louisville, KY fragment; Manchester, John Rylands 1; Vatican Libr., Vat. Chis. R IV 6 (gr. 6); and Patmos 100. The Louisville fragment is about the same size as the Uspenskii Gospels and its ornament is almost as restrained.90 Usually dated to ca. 1000...

---


86 All manuscripts in Table 3.8 agree with the Vienna manuscript at 97.4% or above, except possibly Walters W 527 and Vat. gr. 354, which are in the paired position on lines 56 and 56. The Clusters tool does not divulge a secondary manuscript’s level of agreement with the manuscript for which the data are being generated. This means that the level of agreement between Walters W 527 and Vienna, Theol. gr. 240, and Vat. gr. 354 and Vienna, Theol. gr. 240 is not readily available from the clustering tool.

87 For Patmos 72, see A. D. Kominis, ed., *Patmos: Treasures of the Monastery*, trans. D. A. Hardy (Athens, 1988). 284–89 and figs. 15–16. Both Vatican manuscripts are illustrated in color in *L’evangelio dei popoli: La parola e l’immagine del Cristo nelle culture e nella storia*, ed. F. D’Aiuto, G. Morello, and A. M. Piazzoni (Vatican City, 2000), cat. nos. 33, 37. Harvard gr. 1’s script was executed by the same group of scribes who did the gospels and lectionaries of the Atelier of the Palaiologina manuscripts, according to Buchthal and Belting, *Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople*, 93 and pl. 89; for full bibliography, see http://hcl.harvard.edu/libraries/houghton/collections/early_manuscripts/bibliographies/Gt/Gro01.html. For Walters W 527, see n. 44 above.

88 It is a bit reminiscient of Athos, Philotheou 55 in this respect.

89 Note, however, that Paris gr. 70 appears on line 17 of the Clusters data for Vienna, Theol. gr. 140.

90 Of its original decoration, only the headpieces to Luke and John in the Louisville gospel manuscript survive and they are small, delicate, braided designs executed in ink. For ornament that is quite reminiscent of the Uspenskii Gospels, see figs. 751 and 145r. The manuscript on csntm.org can be viewed only by special permission. The data for the Louisville Gospel fragment comprise sixty-two lines with many of the manuscripts paired and present what I describe as a classic deluxe manuscript textual profile with many representatives from both Group A and B, among which the highly ranked Manchester, John Rylands 1;
Fig. 3.11. Manchester, The John Rylands Library, Greek, Ms. 1, fol. 193v: Evangelist John (© The University of Manchester)
the eleventh or twelfth century, its minute script, generous margins, and ornament suggest a much earlier date. Patmos 100 is more modest. Space was reserved for headpieces at the beginning of the Gospels of Luke and John, but neither was executed. There is no evidence in the reproductions available to me of any ornament except some enlarged initials. Vatican Library, Chis. R IV 6 (gr. 6) has three remaining pen and ink small headpieces. Matthew’s headpiece is missing and the headpiece for the beginning of Luke is only outlined in its exterior frame. John Rylands 1 differs from the other three manuscripts. The portrait of the Evangelist John, the only folio published in color, signals a deluxe manuscript with his blue and white garments offset by a lush golden background. John Rylands 1 is promoted to Group A status on this basis (Fig. 3.11).92

Paris gr. 70 (GA 14)

One of the finest manuscripts of the period, Paris gr. 70 is well known for its imposing standing evangelist portraits, the beautiful ornament of its canon tables, and its golden, ciborium-type kephalaia headpieces (Fig. 3.3). A later inscription dates the manuscript to 964. The Clusters tool indicates a 98 percent agreement with the majority text and displays thirty-nine primary manuscripts, of which nineteen are further paired with other manuscripts. Table 3.10 lists its illustrious relatives (Group A), most of which are familiar to us from analysis of the Uspenskii Gospels and Vienna, Theol. gr. 140. The surprise here is the appearance of Münster gr. 10, a decorative style manuscript (line 22).93 Noteworthy, too, is Lavra A’ 19 (line 4; dated 992), which Weitzmann has linked in its canon table ornament to that of Paris gr. 70.94 The Uspenskii Gospels manuscript (line 29) also appears with a 98.4 percent agreement with Paris gr. 70.

Table 3.11 displays the manuscripts assigned to Group B, that is, those that appear fairly constantly in the Clusters data generated for high-caliber illustrated manuscripts. All agree with Paris gr. 70 at 98 percent or above, and all but two manuscripts appeared in the Group B list for Vienna, Theol. gr. 240: Patmos 275 and Athens, Nat. Libr., cod. 158. Patmos 275 is dated to 1282.95 It features exuberant, but crudely executed headpieces for both its prologues and gospel texts. The ornament of its canon tables also suggests a provincial origin. Athens, Nat. Libr., cod. 158, also of the thirteenth century, features higher-quality ornament than Patmos 275, but it also uses ornamental motifs and hues atypical of deluxe metropolitan manuscripts.96

Athos, Stauronikita 43 (GA 1110)

For Byzantine art historians, no gospel book is more intimately linked with the Macedonian renaissance than Stauronikita 43. Generations of scholars have appreciated its stately evangelist portraits, but more recent publications have extended that appreciation to its canon tables and headpieces as well.97 In 2000 Lidia Perria assigned Stauronikita 43 to Ephraim, the discriminating and highly regarded Constantinopolitan scribe.98 Ephraim was educated at what appears to have been an elite secondary school in Constantinople where he was exposed to exacting standards in the copying of texts.99 A passage from a letter “to

91 The Louisville Gospel fragment and John Rylands 1 have similar textual profiles, with an impressive selection of Group A and Group B manuscripts.
93 For decorative style manuscripts, see n. 3 above.
94 Weitzmann, Byzantinische Buchmalerei, 35–46.
97 Mavropoulou-Tsioni and Galavaris, Holy Stauroniketa Monastery, 31–42 and figs. 4–35.
98 L. Perria and A. Iacobini, “Un vangelo della rinascenza macedone al Monte Athos: Nuove ipotesi sullo Stavronikita 43 e il suo scribe,” KSEMN s.17 (2000): 75–98. I thank Nadezhda Kavrus-Hoffmann and one of the anonymous readers for bringing this article to my attention. For more on Ephraim, see Kavrus-Hoffmann’s chapter in this volume.
the patriarch” written by an individual generally identified as Ephraim’s teacher offers extraordinary insight into contemporary standards for the best educated scholar-scribes:

You will easily be able to collect a sufficient number of manuscripts. Comparison is often laborious, as manuscripts have many variant readings. When I actually saw the book, with its many marginal notes, I was amazed at the corrector, and wondered if there could possibly be anything left for me to correct, apart from indicating briefly redundancy or omission. To copy it out again because of trivial variations of text or punctuation seems needless. And how am I to judge between variants? I shall bow to the opinions of my superiors. In cases of doubt, sense, style, and doctrinal consistency shall be my guides. You must either be content with that, or pass it to another for further revision. I am too busy to waste effort in vain.100

Ephraim evidently disappointed his teacher by becoming a monk, but his reputation as a careful copyist rests on important religious and secular texts.101 Amy Anderson compared Ephraim’s script style to that of the earlier Nicholas of the Uspenskii Gospels. However, there are enough differences between Ephraim’s lineation and quire signatures to indicate that he was likely not a scribe of the Studios monastery.102 While the identity of Ephraim’s monastery remains unknown, scholars have associated more than fifty manuscripts with its scriptorium based upon codicological evidence.103 The Clusters tool generates, however, only one line of data for Stauronikita 43’s synoptic gospels (Table 3.12).

How does one explain that the consummate gospel book from the Macedonian renaissance has only two rather modest relatives in the synoptic gospels? Both textual relatives belong to the Group B category and the contrast in quality with Stauronikita 43 is stark. A closer look reveals that both are incomplete texts. Munich, BSB, gr. 568 comprises only sixty-six folios and just one headpiece (that of Luke).104 Its fragmentary condition may well have skewed the data. Vat gr. 365 has 181 folios surviving, but it, too, is incomplete (Fig. 3.8). It is in fact due to Stauronikita 43’s very high degree of conformity with the majority text in the synoptic gospels (99.3%) that so few manuscripts appear in the Clusters data. According to Wachtel, Stauronikita 43 “represents the very mainstream and is thus textually related to all other manuscripts that differ only rarely from the majority text.”105

**Athos, Vatopedi 949 (GA 1582)**

Another tenth-century gospel book associated with the scribe Ephraim is Athos, Vatopedi 949 (dated 948).106 Its evangelist portraits were executed later and added to the manuscript in a rebinding that may date to the twelfth century.107 On the other hand, its headpieces are original and feature deluxe Blättenblattstil motifs not unlike

---

100 For the modest character of the Munich fragment and Vat. gr. 365, see the discussion of Group B manuscripts beginning on p. 51 above.

101 Personal communication of June 25, 2014. I thank Klaus Wachtel for contextualizing this data for me.


103 Anderson (*Textual Tradition*, 14) proposes that the portraits themselves may actually date from the tenth century, even if intended for another manuscript originally. Kavrus-Hoffmann (chap. 5 below) compares the frames of Vatopedi 949’s evangelist portraits to those of Dumbarton Oaks, MS 5 and related manuscripts from the second half of the eleventh century.
those seen in Staurnikita 43.\textsuperscript{108} Vatopedi 949 plays a significant role in New Testament text criticism and appears to be one of the most important (and earliest) representatives of a distinctive textual group of gospel manuscripts called Family 1.\textsuperscript{109} While Staurnikita 43 had a 99.3 percent agreement with the majority text, Vatopedi 949 agrees with it by only 59.4 percent.\textsuperscript{110} Not surprisingly, the Clusters data reveal a very different profile for Vatopedi 949. While it generated 563 manuscripts as textual relatives (and most of these are further paired with other manuscripts), only two of the manuscripts agree with Vatopedi 949 at more than 90 percent (Table 3.13).\textsuperscript{111}

The strongly dichotomous textual exemplars used by Ephraim suggest that even more than one hundred years after the Uspenskii Gospels some patrons were interested in commissioning gospel manuscripts whose texts diverged strongly from the Byzantine type. In fact, the evidence seems to support Georgi Parpulov’s recent statement that “the authorities in Constantinople did not seek to promulgate an ‘official’ scriptural text.”\textsuperscript{112} The unusually well-documented environment related to the scribe Ephraim provides a welcome antidote to the traditional view of scribes correcting their copies to conform to the Byzantine text. Ephraim demonstrated a more scholarly perspective toward his textual exemplars and an acute recognition of the need to preserve such evidence in his own copies.\textsuperscript{113}

The textual choices apparently available to Ephraim or his patrons may bolster the significance of the Uspenskii Gospels’ text, for the fact that so many later deluxe manuscripts of varying dates and decoration are textually related to the Uspenskii Gospels is less likely to be purely coincidental in this environment.

The Eleventh Century

The eleventh century offers a number of deluxe manuscripts to examine with the Clusters tool. Some generate data that conform closely to the results already seen (e.g., Patmos 84); the textual profiles of others yield fewer parallels with those examined earlier (Paris gr. 74 and Florence, Plut. VI, 23).

Patmos 84 (GA 1168)

Patmos 84 (Fig. 5.9) is the virtually unknown deluxe manuscript introduced above in the analysis of the Group B manuscripts associated with the Uspenskii Gospels.\textsuperscript{114} With its stately two-column format and its beautifully executed Blütenblattstil headpieces, it is a manuscript that could have served as a prototype for the decoration of some of the much later lectionary manuscripts of the Atelier of the Palaiologina.\textsuperscript{115} The Clusters tool lists twenty manuscripts for Patmos 84 and eight of these manuscripts are further paired with manuscripts that are their closest textual relatives. All twenty manuscripts in the primary position agree with Patmos 84 at levels of 98.8 percent or higher. Group A representatives include Codex Ebnerianus; Manchester, John Rylands 1; Walters W 527; Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52; Princeton, Garrett 2; Lavra A’ 19; and London, BL, Add. 28815.\textsuperscript{116} They are found on lines 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, and 15, respectively. Group B manuscripts

\textsuperscript{108} Anderson, Textual Tradition, 14–15 and pl. I. Vatopedi 949 is a single-columned codex unlike the less common two-column format of Staurnikita 43.

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., passim. See now A. Welsby, A Textual Study of Family 1 in the Gospel of John, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 45 (Berlin, 2013).

\textsuperscript{110} This is an extremely low level of agreement by New Testament text critics’ standards. The vast majority of Greek gospel books feature a high degree of agreement with the Byzantine text. For an analysis of Vatopedi 949’s text, see ibid., chap. 5. Parpulov (“Bibles of the Christian East,” 312) offers several examples in which gospel texts copied by the same scribe are clearly based on different exemplars.

\textsuperscript{111} Family 1 is named after the GA number of the first manuscript listed in Table 3.13 (Basel, Univ. Libr. AN IV 2). For more information on these texts and some reproductions, see Anderson, Textual Tradition, 108–9 (GA 1), 116–19 (GA 209) and pls. XXIX–XXXI.

\textsuperscript{112} Parpulov, “Bibles of the Christian East,” 311. See Barbara Crostini (“The point at which it [the Byzantine text] later became the universal textus receptus has yet to be established”), in New Cambridge History of the Bible, 2:41–55, at 49.

\textsuperscript{113} Anderson, Textual Tradition, 46.

\textsuperscript{114} See n. 82 above.

\textsuperscript{115} For example, Sinai, St. Catherine’s Monastery, gr. 228. See Buchthal and Belting, Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople, pl. 32a.

\textsuperscript{116} Princeton, Garrett 2 and London, BL, Add. 28815 occupy the paired (or secondary) position on lines 7 and 15, respectively.
are Moscow, F. 181.13 (Gr. 13); Athens, Siderides 1; Manchester, John Rylands 7; Harvard gr. 22; Athens, Benaki, TA 14.2; and Vat. Chis. R IV 6 (gr. 6) on lines 1, 5, 11, 12, 15, and 17. Thus, Patmos 84's textual profile conforms to that which we have come to expect from high-quality, deluxe metropolitan manuscripts with familiar representatives from both Group A and Group B manuscripts.

**Princeton, University Library, Scheide M 70 (GA 1357)**

Princeton, Scheide M 70 is assigned to the eleventh century by Kotzabassi and Ševčenko and is famous for its stunning canon tables, headpieces, and initials. The Clusters tool generated thirty-two manuscripts for its synoptic gospels and almost all were paired with other manuscripts (Table 3.14). Two manuscripts in the secondary position (lines 3 and 5) are affiliated with the Atelier of the Palaiologina; Oxford, Barocci 31 (Fig. 3.5) is a full-fledged member and Florence, Plut. VI. 28 is related to the Atelier only through its evangelist portraits. Other deluxe manuscripts are Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52 (line 16), and Paris gr. 49 and Patmos 84 (paired on line 17).

Paris gr. 49 (Fig. 3.12; n. 136 below) is an eleventh-century text that can be described as exquisite, if not technically deluxe. It was written with great care in pale brown ink. Its scribe executed the headpieces in red ink only, but again with extraordinary precision. Moreover, its format is reminiscent of that of Patmos 84 (see Figs. 3.9, 3.12) with its two-column text and generous margins. Might a manuscript like this have been created for use in a monastic setting? It is striking in its simplicity, but there is every indication that it was created for a discerning patron of superior taste who insisted on restraint. I propose that it was made for a member of the aristocracy for personal use upon retirement to a metropolitan monastery. Paris gr. 49's textual relatives seem to reaffirm its status. Its Group B list is also extensive and includes many of the manuscripts listed for Princeton, Scheide 70.

Other deluxe manuscripts associated with Scheide 70 are Codex Ebnerianus and Patmos 84, paired on line 18. Codex Ebnerianus is followed by Escorial X. IV. 17 (line 19). Nelson noted long ago that these two manuscripts were written by the same scribe. The Escorial manuscript has also been linked with the Atelier of the Palaiologina. According to Buchthal and Belting, its paired standing portraits of the authors of Acts are the only known painted prototypes for those found in the Atelier manuscript Vat. gr. 1208. Additional Group A manuscripts are Lavra A' 19 (dated 992) (line 23) and, in the secondary position (lines 28 and 31), Oxford. Bodl. Libr. Auct. T. inf. 2.6 and Manchester, John Rylands 1. The ornament of Princeton, Scheide M 70, on the other hand, has been linked with those of Vat. gr. 358, Dionysiou 588m, Ivon 2, and Princeton, Garrett 2, none of which appears in the data generated for the synoptic gospels, however.

The Group B textual relatives for Scheide M 70 comprise almost all of the manuscripts mentioned earlier, viz., Harvard gr. 22; Moscow, Princeton, University Library, Scheide M 70 (GA 1357)


117 Group B manuscripts listed above occupy both primary and secondary positions in the Clusters tool data.


119 Buchthal and Belting, Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople, 5, who note that the script and ornament differ from the Atelier group.


121 Buchthal and Belting, Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople, 32. For illustrations of the Escorial manuscript, see ibid., pls. 68a, 68b, 69a.

122 Kotzabassi and Ševčenko, Greek Manuscripts at Princeton, 215. Dionysiou 588m will be addressed in more detail below.
Fig. 3.12. Paris, BnF, gr. 49, fol. 18r: The beginning of the Gospel of Matthew (photo courtesy Bibliothèque nationale de France)
Florence, Laur, Libr., Plut. VI. 23 (GA 187)
Florence, Plut. VI. 23, the other famous frieze gospel, agrees with the majority text at 96.1 percent. Seven manuscripts in the primary position are generated by the Clusters tool, four of which are paired for a total of eleven manuscripts. All primary manuscripts agree with Florence, Plut. VI. 23 at 96.2 to 97.4 percent. The only Group A manuscript is Walters W 527 (Fig. 3.10) on line 4. Line 3 contains two stalwarts from Group B: Munich, BSB, gr. 568 and Vat. gr. 365 (Fig. 3.8). Also found in the corresponding data for Paris gr. 74 are Athens, Nat. Libr. 109, a fourteenth-century manuscript on paper, and Vatopedi 933, a thirteenth-century manuscript not reproduced by S. M. Pelekanidis; they are paired on lines 5 and 3, respectively, in Paris gr. 74’s data.

Noteworthy in Florence, Plut. VI, 23’s data is the appearance of four manuscripts discussed earlier in conjunction with Theodore Hagiopetrites. London, BL, Add 19387, categorized by Nelson as related to Theodore Hagiopetrites, is in the paired position on line 6. Three other manuscripts—Samos, Mitropolis 16, 171; Vatopedi 933; and Athens, Hist. Ethn Gest. 255—were dubbed unaffiliates in the data generated for manuscripts associated with Theodore. In fact, the manuscripts from Samos and Vatopedi were two of the seventeen regularly appearing “unaffiliated” manuscripts. 129

Athos, Dionysiou 588 (GA 2458)
Dionysiou 588, with its dazzling canon tables and evangelist portraits, generated skimpy results in the synoptic gospels with the Clusters tool—only three manuscripts. 130 On line 1, with 98.1 percent agreement, is Vienna, Theol. gr. 154, a beautiful eleventh-century gospel book with evangelist portraits, headpieces, initials, and eight highly ornate canon tables, in addition to an unusual series of marginal miniatures. 131 Both are deluxe

126 These Group A manuscripts are found on lines 7 to 28 and all relate at 94.3% to 94.7% to Vat. gr. 1229.
128 A digital facsimile of Florence, Plut. VI. 28, is available by searching on http://teca.bmlonline.it.
When the Escorial manuscript is entered into the Clusters tool, however, Codex Ebnerianus appears on line 7 with 98.1 percent agreement in the synoptic gospels. The Group B candidates for Codex Ebnerianus are familiar by now. The first three manuscripts of Table 3.16 agree at 99.6 percent or higher with Codex Ebnerianus. In fact, none of the manuscripts in the primary position from Table 3.15 or 3.16 falls below 99.1 percent agreement with Codex Ebnerianus.

When the Escorial manuscript is entered into the Clusters tool, however, Codex Ebnerianus appears on line 7 with 98.1 percent agreement in the synoptic gospels. The Group B candidates for Codex Ebnerianus are familiar by now. The first three manuscripts of Table 3.16 agree at 99.6 percent or higher with Codex Ebnerianus. In fact, none of the manuscripts in the primary position from Table 3.15 or 3.16 falls below 99.1 percent agreement with Codex Ebnerianus.

138 Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52 and Paris gr. 49 appear on lines 5 and 6. Group B manuscripts include Moscow, F.181.13 (Gr. 15) (paired with Lavra Α’ 54; line 1) and Harvard gr. 22 (line 2), among others.


140 Nelson (“Theoktistos and Associates,” 63) has already noted that both Parma 5 and Codex Ebnerianus share the relatively unusual nine-page canon table series.

The Twelfth Century

Codex Ebnerianus (GA 105)

Cecelia Meredith identified some seventeen gospel and New Testament manuscripts from the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries featuring evangelist portraits linked with a narrative scene from their gospel. The most prominent representative is the eponymous Codex Ebnerianus from the Bodleian Library in Oxford (Fig. 3.6). It is one of the most famous New Testament manuscripts from Byzantium and has been persistently present in the Group A lists for many of the deluxe manuscripts discussed above. The Clusters tool generated a relatively short list of eleven manuscripts for Codex Ebnerianus in the synoptic gospels (Table 3.15); only lines 8 and 11 are further paired. The illustrious relatives are of interest. Line 2 is the elegant Patmos 84 (Fig. 3.9) which, as noted above, is unpublished. Line 5 features Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52 of the twelfth century. There are two tenth-century manuscripts: Lavra Α’ 19 and Walters W 527 (Fig. 3.10). They have had a significant presence in Group A lists above. Also noteworthy is Paris, BnF, gr. 49 (Fig. 3.12), discussed above in conjunction with Patmos 84 (Fig. 3.9).

It is of some interest that Escorial X-IV-17 does not appear in the data for Codex Ebnerianus. This manuscript was written, as noted above, by the same scribe who wrote Codex Ebnerianus.

132 Meredith, “Illustration of Codex Ebnerianus” (n. 63 above).


134 See n. 82 above.

135 Iohannis Spatharakis (“Dove Whispers,” 283) has noted stylistic connections between the evangelist portraits of Codex Ebnerianus and Vienna, Vindob. Suppl. gr. 52, which he assigns to the mid-twelfth century.

136 Paris gr. 49 is available on Gallica, at http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8470447s.

137 See n. 122 above.
The Textual Affiliation of Deluxe Byzantine Gospel Books

Vienna Suppl. gr. 52 and Princeton, Garrett 2 from the late eleventh or early twelfth century.\textsuperscript{141} The Group B manuscripts in Table 3.18 are by now exceedingly familiar from the many preceding Group B lists for high-quality Byzantine manuscripts that have been examined.

\textbf{Other Members of the Codex Ebnerianus Group}

Many manuscripts of Meredith’s Codex Ebnerianus group display textual affinities with other members of the group. Walters W 522, a diminutive gospel book measuring only 10 × 6.5 cm, features a 99% agreement with the majority text and has only four manuscripts on its Clusters list for the synoptic gospels. Line 1 is Vat. gr. 189, another tiny gospel book (11.6 × 8.7 cm) of the Codex Ebnerianus group with an agreement of 99.7 percent. Line 3 is Athens, Nat. Libr., cod. 57, one of the most important manuscripts of its era. It was dated to the third quarter of the eleventh century by Anna Marava-Chatzinicolaou and Christina Toufexi-Paschou.\textsuperscript{142} Venice, Marc. MS gr. Z 540, another member of the group, is related to Melbourne 710/5, one of the better-known members.\textsuperscript{143} It is not listed as a textual relative in the data generated for the Melbourne manuscript, however.\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{141} Paris gr. 49, Princeton, Garrett 2, and John Rylands 1 are in the paired position on lines 2, 5, and 10, respectively.

\textsuperscript{142} Catalogue, 1: cat. no. 26 and figs. 216–31. The data for Dumbarton Oaks, MS 5 (datable to 1084) are of interest in relation to the Codex Ebnerianus group. They present just six lines of data, but line 1 features Vat., Pal. gr. 189, line 3 is Athens 57, and line 5 is Walters W 522. All three manuscripts relate at 98.7 percent or higher to Dumbarton Oaks, MS 5.

\textsuperscript{143} Melbourne 710/5 appears on line 2 in the secondary position. Nelson (Theodore Hagiopetrites, 67) believes that the Melbourne manuscript and Venice gr. Z 540 are by the same scribe and their canon tables are related and that this scribe (Nelson, “Theoktistos and Associates,” 65) also penned Theoktistos’s Letter of Eusebius in Malibu, Getty, II 4, another deluxe illustrated manuscript dated to 1155; according to Nelson, all three manuscripts share ornamental similarities in their canon tables, but he does not think that they are all painted by the same artist, rather they are contemporary products of the same milieu. Line 1 of the Clusters data for Venice, Marc. MS gr. Z 540 lists two unaffiliated manuscripts regularly seen in the data for Theodore Hagiopetrites’s manuscripts: Samos, Mitrop. 16, 171 and Athens, Hist. Mus. Ethn. Ges. 255.

\textsuperscript{144} Chicago 46, a manuscript attributed to Theodore Hagiopetrites, and three regularly occurring “unaffiliates” in the data of the Theodore manuscripts do appear as textual relatives to Vat. Urb. gr. 2, on the other hand, displays only 85.7 percent agreement with the majority text, a relatively low level of agreement for a Byzantine manuscript. The Clusters tool generated a list of 170 textual relatives for the synoptic gospels and virtually all of them have been paired. Yet no manuscript totals higher than a 94.8 percent agreement with Urb. gr. 2. There are a number of manuscripts from Group B, but generally the data suggest a rather different profile from other deluxe manuscripts that I have examined.\textsuperscript{145}

At 94.1 percent agreement with the majority text, Patmos 274 generated only sixteen manuscripts for the synoptic gospels, most with pairs. Only one, Stauronikita 43, is of the Group A category,\textsuperscript{146} but three are from Group B, including Munich gr. 568, Vat. gr. 365, and Harvard gr. 22.

Megaspelaion 1 is often placed with the Codex Ebnerianus group because of its later evangelist portraits of that type. As noted above, its text dates from the tenth century and the Clusters tool for its synoptic gospels included almost all of the Group B manuscripts seen in the above tables. It is also related to a number of important Group A manuscripts, including Lavra A’ 19; Paris gr. 70; Oxford, Bodl. Auct. inf. 2.6; Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52; Princeton, Garrett 2; Patmos 84; and Florence, Plut. VI. 28, a member of the Atelier of the Palaiologina. Noteworthy, too, is that Megaspelaion 1 is related to the later Codex Ebnerianus itself (which has a 98 percent agreement with the Megaspelaion manuscript [line 14]).

Burney 19’s text dates from the second half of the tenth century, but features later evangelist portraits of the style of the Kokkinobaphos Master.\textsuperscript{147} It is not a member of the Codex Ebnerianus group, but its textual relatives are of interest. The Clusters tool generated only eleven manuscripts and they are all paired. Five are from the Group B lists that are generated consistently in the tables above and include Istanbul, Seraf

---

\textsuperscript{145} Messina F.V. 18 is found on line 18 but with an unimpressive agreement of 89.8% with Vat. Urb. gr. 2.

\textsuperscript{146} Stauronikita 43 is on line 7 with a 94.8% agreement with Patmos 274.

\textsuperscript{147} See n. 43 above.

\textsuperscript{144} Chicago 46, a manuscript attributed to Theodore Hagiopetrites, and three regularly occurring “unaffiliates” in the data of the Theodore manuscripts do appear as textual relatives to
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Spatharakis’s Twelfth-Century Group
(The “Dove Whisperers”)

Iohannis Spatharakis has described another group of manuscripts from twelfth-century Constantinople featuring a peculiar iconographic characteristic: a dove at the ear of an evangelist, usually Mark.\(^\text{149}\) The core manuscripts of the group—Paris gr. 51 (GA 260); Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 378 (GA 2383); Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 26 (GA 73); Athos, Vatopedi 953 (GA 1585); and Paris, Suppl. gr. 1258 (GA 1296)—share similarities in ornament, stylistic and iconographic aspects of their evangelist portraits, and script. Two additional manuscripts differ iconographically in that their John portraits include Prochoros. They are Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52 (with which we are very familiar as a manuscript from Group A) and Sinai gr. 157 (GA 1194). The Vienna evangelist portraits also differ stylistically in that their garments are inscribed with gold lines in a manner that recalls enamel work. Spatharakis refers to the first five manuscripts as subgroup one and to the last two as subgroup two.\(^\text{150}\)

The Clusters data for the synoptic gospels of these manuscripts largely support Spatharakis’s assignments. Four out of the five manuscripts of subgroup one are closely related textually. Paris gr. 51 has a 98.7 percent agreement with the majority text and lists only three relations. Line 1 is Paris, Suppl. gr. 1258 at 99.4 percent and line 3 is Athos, Vatopedi 953 at 99 percent. Both are members of Spatharakis’s first subgroup.\(^\text{151}\)

Oxford, Christ Church, MS 26 relates to the majority text at 95.8 percent and features fifteen lines of textual relatives, most of which are further paired. Manuscripts of Spatharakis’s first subgroup are found on line 2 (Paris gr. 51 in the paired position) and line 5 (Paris, Suppl. gr. 1258 in the primary position and paired with Paris gr. 51).\(^\text{152}\) Moreover, there is one manuscript signed and dated by Theodore Hagiopetrites (Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 20 on line 14 in the paired position) and one manuscript “related to” Theodore (London, BL, Add. 19387 on line 12 with 96.1 percent agreement with Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 26). Also four manuscripts “unaffiliated” with Theodore Hagiopetrites and at least five Group B manuscripts are included.

The data for Vatopedi 953 (98.7% agreement with the majority text) displayed five manuscripts (none paired). Manuscripts of Spatharakis’s first subgroup occupy lines 1 (Paris, Suppl. gr. 1258), 3 (Paris gr. 51), and 5 (Morgan M 378), and all are at 99 percent agreement or above. A Theodore Hagiopetrites “unaffiliated” appears on line 2 (Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 24).

The Clusters tool lists three manuscripts for Paris, Suppl. gr. 1258, which features a 99.3 percent agreement with the majority text. Lines 2 and 3 are occupied by members of Spatharakis’s first subgroup, viz., Paris gr. 51 and Vatopedi 953. Both agree with Paris, Suppl. gr. 1258 at 99.4 percent.\(^\text{153}\) The last member of the first subgroup to be addressed is Pierpont Morgan M 378. It agrees with the majority text at 99 percent and only one manuscript is listed by the Clusters tool: Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 30, which is not included by Spatharakis in either of his subgroups.

The data were quite different for Spatharakis’s smaller, second subgroup. Vienna, Vind. Suppl. gr. 52, a Group A manuscript encountered many times above, features thirteen manuscripts (only line 12 is paired). Group A manuscripts occupy lines 3 (Princeton, Garrett 2), 6 (Codex Ebnerianus), 10 (Philiotheou 33), and 12 (Lavra A’ Athos, Stauronikita 43 is found in the primary position on line 4 with a 96.4% agreement with Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 26. Spatharakis compared some aspects of the decoration of the “Dove Whisperer” manuscripts to Macedonian renaissance products such as Stauronikita 43. The data generated for Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 26 feature many Group B manuscripts, four manuscripts that are unaffiliates of manuscripts associated with Theodore Hagiopetrites, and a member of the Atelier of the Palaiologina: Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Barocci 31.

\(^{152}\) Athos, Stauronikita 43 is found in the primary position on line 4 with a 96.4% agreement with Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 26. Spatharakis compared some aspects of the decoration of the “Dove Whisperer” manuscripts to Macedonian renaissance products such as Stauronikita 43. The data generated for Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 26 feature many Group B manuscripts, four manuscripts that are unaffiliates of manuscripts associated with Theodore Hagiopetrites, and a member of the Atelier of the Palaiologina: Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Barocci 31.

\(^{153}\) The third manuscript is once again the unaffiliated manuscript Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 24 on line 1 with 100% agreement; see n. 23 above.

125; Harvard gr. 22; London, Lambeth Palace 1175; Munich gr. 568; and Vat. gr. 365. Burney 19 is also related to Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52 and to Lavra A’ 61, a very beautiful manuscript dated to 1098.\(^\text{148}\)

For Lavra A’ 61, see Pelekanidis et al., *Oi Θησαυροὶ τοῦ Άγιου Ὅρους*, 3: figs. 41–42.


Ibid., 283.

The third manuscript is Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 24, which appeared several times on the data generated for manuscripts associated with Theodore Hagiopetrites.
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Group B manuscripts appear on lines 1 and 2 (Moscow, F. 181.13 (Gr. 13) and Lavra Γ’ 54), 5 (Athens, Siderides 1), 8 (the Syracuse fragment), and 12 in the paired position (Harvard gr. 22). There are no manuscripts from Spatharakis’s first subgroup here or in the Clusters data for the second manuscript, Sinai gr. 157, of his second subgroup. This manuscript agrees with the majority text only at 91.5 percent (compared to Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52’s 99%) and has a somewhat different textual profile.\(^{154}\) It includes at least three manuscripts either signed and dated by or attributed to Theodore Hagiopetrites (Göttingen, cod. Theol. 28; Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 20; Chicago 46), but all of them agree with Sinai gr. 157 only at levels below 93 percent. Three manuscripts also appear that were dubbed “unaffiliated” of Theodore Hagiopetrites above (Samos, Mitrop. 16, 171; Panteleimon 771; and Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 24).

To conclude, four out of five manuscripts of Spatharakis’s first subgroup display significant textual relations with other manuscripts of the same subgroup. Close textual relations, confirmed by the Clusters tool, underscore compelling artistic and paleographical relationships. Noteworthy, too, is the fact that in three members of the first subgroup and in one member of the second subgroup there are present manuscripts that either are directly associated with Theodore Hagiopetrites or played significant roles as so-called unaffiliates in the Clusters data for Theodore’s manuscripts.

**The Thirteenth Century**

**Atelier of the Palaiologina**

A complete list of the gospel books and the one New Testament associated with the Atelier of the Palaiologina is given in Table 3.19.\(^{155}\) In addition, several other gospel manuscripts are related to the Atelier in their script or for other reasons. They are Harvard College Library, gr. 1 (GA 666), Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 356 (GA 128), and Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 361 (GA 132).

The data generated for the manuscripts in Table 3.19 can be confounding. For Dionysiou 5, which agrees at 99 percent with the Byzantine text, no manuscripts are generated in the synoptic gospels and only twelve are cited for the Gospel of John (four of which are further paired). Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Cromwell 16, a deluxe manuscript from the mid-tenth century, appears on line 6 and Codex Ebnerianus on line 11 as a pair to another manuscript.\(^{156}\) Several other manuscripts that are found on one or more of the other Atelier manuscripts’ genealogies appear, but they are not published.\(^{157}\)

For Vat. gr. 1158 only Dionysiou 5 is listed for the synoptic gospels. It agrees with Vat. gr. 1158 at 98.7 percent. This is curious since both are very different manuscripts. Buchthal and Belting imply that Dionysiou 5 is a very poor relation to Vat. gr. 1158.\(^{158}\) Dionysiou 5 shares the script style of the Atelier, but only one of its five headpieces aligns with the Atelier manuscripts. It contains no evangelist portraits.

For the Gospel of John of Vat. gr. 1158, the Clusters tool generated twenty-nine manuscripts (six of which have pairs). Manuscripts on the first seven lines exhibit 100 percent agreement with Vat. gr. 1158 in John. Paris gr. 70 is on line 1.\(^{159}\) Buchthal and Belting noted

---

\(^{154}\) Still, a familiar Harvard gr. 22 (a Group B manuscript) occupies line 5 at 93.5% agreement with Sinai gr. 157. There are others known to us, but they relate at less than 95%.

\(^{155}\) Buchthal and Belting, *Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople*, passim. Some manuscripts have been added to the Atelier of the Palaiologina since Buchthal’s and Belting’s original publication, but to my knowledge none is a gospel book or New Testament manuscript. See Nelson and Lowden, “Palaiologina Group,” 59–68. More recent additions to the group include another lectionary; see I. Pérez Martín, “Manuscritos iluminados,” in *Bizancio en España: De la Antigüedad tardía a El Greco*, ed. M. Cortés Arrese (Madrid, 2005), 180–204, at 198, cat. no 116: Madrid, Bibl. Nac. de España, Vitr. 16–4 (gr. 348 [formerly N-162]).

\(^{156}\) For Cromwell 16, see Buckton, *Byzantium*, 139–40, cat. no. 149. Buckton reproduces the only surviving evangelist portrait, Matthew, in color and the beginning of his Gospel in black and white.

\(^{157}\) For example, Athos, Koutloumousiou 76 (GA 1055) appears on the listings for the Gospel of John of Lavra Α’; Venice, gr. 541; Florence, Plut. VI. 28; Vat. gr. 1158; and Walters W 525. It is not reproduced in Pelekanidis et al., *Διὸ Θησαυροὶ τοῦ Άγιο Όρους*, vol. 1.

\(^{158}\) Buchthal and Belting, *Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople*, 10; Dionysiou 5 “deserves only a passing mention.”

\(^{159}\) Lines 2 through 7 include Venice, Marc. gr. I, 10 (GA 405); Koutloumousiou 76 (GA 1055); Jerusalem, Saba 412 (GA 1143); Megaspelaion 1 (GA 1224); NY, Morgan 378 (GA 238); and Athens, Byz. Mus. 161 (GA 1521). For Morgan 378, see above discussion; Spatharakis, “Dove Whispers,” 272–74.
another link between these two manuscripts—
their canon tables feature an unusual seven-
page sequence. These links indicate that later
patrons and scribes might have had direct access
to manuscripts of the tenth and eleventh centu-
ries and not just intermediary texts copied from
that elite group. Additional Group A manu-
scripts include Megaspelaion 1 (line 5 at 100%);
Vienna Theol. gr. 2.40 (line 8 at 99.4%); Lavra Aʹ
15 (line 13 at 99.4%); and Paris, Coislin 21 (line 29
as a pair to Patmos 90).161

For Lavra Aʹ 2, data for the synoptic gos-
pels list thirty-nine primary manuscripts with
twenty-five of these further paired.162 Another
Atelier manuscript—Florence, Plut. VI, 28—
appears on line 15 with a 96.4 percent agree-
ment. Other Group A manuscripts include Paris
gr. 64 (line 3 at 98.4% agreement); Dionysiou 38
(line 9); Patmos 84 (line 10 in the paired posi-
tion); Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52 (line 21); Codex
Ebnerianus (line 22); and Escorial X. IV. 17
(line 23). Stauronikita 43 appears on line 2.4 in
the paired position and Philotheou 33 on line 29.
Lavra Aʹ 19, Lavra Aʹ 61, and Walters W 530 (in
the paired position) follow on lines 30 through
32, respectively. Group B manuscripts are also
plentiful and include Moscow, F.181.13 (Gr. 13);
Athens, Siderides 1; Lavra Γʹ 54; Munich gr.
568; London, Lambeth 1175; and Harvard gr. 22.
Thus, Lavra Aʹ 2's textual profile falls well within
the parameters of some of the aforementioned
deluxe manuscripts that date prior to 1204.

Next is Florence, Laur. Libr., Plut. VI. 28,
whose script and ornament are not related to the
Atelier manuscripts; only its inserted evangelist
portraits are. For the synoptic gospels seventeen
manuscripts are listed (nine manuscripts, eight of
which are paired). At the top of the list is a very
familiar Group B manuscript: Moscow, F.181.13
(Gr. 13). It is paired with the elegant Patmos 84.

Other Group B manuscripts are also prominent:
Harvard gr. 22 (line 3), Lavra Γʹ 54 and Athens
158 (paired on line 4), and Lavra Aʹ 28 (line 7,
paired position). Group A manuscripts include
Vienna, Suppl gr. 52 and Princeton, Garrett 2
(paired on line 5), Codex Ebnerianus (line 6), and
Lavra Aʹ 19 (line 7). Based on this information,
one can argue that the Florence Gospels' textual
profile is in keeping with many deluxe manu-
scripts reviewed above even though it is linked to
the Atelier only through its miniatures.

Like the Florence Gospels, Venice, Marc.
gr. 541 differs in its script and ornament from
the Atelier, having only inserted evangelist por-
traits of the Atelier type. Thirty-eight manu-
scripts, most of which are also paired, appear in
the Clusters data for the synoptic gospels. Oxford,
Barocci 31 (Fig. 3.5), another Atelier manuscript,
is found paired to St. Petersburg gr. 97 on line 29.
Numerous other Group A manuscripts are
found in lines 6 through 38. These include Paris
gr. 70 (Fig. 3.3) (at 97%) and Athens 93 (paired
on line 6); Parma, Pal. 5 and E. D. Clarke 10
(Fig. 3.13) (paired on line 13); Patmos 84 (Fig. 3.9)
and Manchester, John Rylands 1 (Fig. 3.11) (on
lines 14 and 15); Lavra Aʹ 15 (line 19, paired posi-
tion); Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52 (Fig. 3.4) (line 23);
Codex Ebnerianus (Fig. 3.6) (at 96.4% on
line 24); Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Auct. T. inf. 2.6 and
Athens 93 (paired on line 30); and Stauronikita 43
(paired position), Lavra Aʹ 19, and London, Add.
28815 (paired position) on lines 31, 33, and 38,
respectively. Noteworthy, too, is the appearance
of the Uspenskii Gospels on line 12 as a pair to
Vat. gr. 1539. In addition, at least ten Group B
manuscripts are listed. This certainly conforms to
the deluxe metropolitan manuscript profile with
many representatives from Group A and Group B.

Oxford, Barocci 31 is a full-fledged member of
the Atelier in its script, evangelist portraits,
and ornament (Fig. 3.5). Only twelve manu-
scripts are listed, but ten of these are paired for
a total of twenty manuscripts. The data for
the synoptic gospels have many parallels
with Florence, Plut. VI. 28 even though the lat-
ter's script and ornament do not conform to
the Atelier. Both have Moscow, F.181.13 (Gr. 13)
and Patmos 84 paired on line 1. Lavra Γʹ 54 from
Group B appears here on line 3 and on line 4 in
the Florence Gospels. Both the Florence Gospels

160 Buchthal and Belting, Patronage in Thirteenth-Century
Constantinople, 81.
161 For color reproductions of some of Paris, BnF, Coislin
21's canons tables and evangelist portraits, see http://ica.
princeton.edu/millet (enter for country, France, and for site,
Paris: Bibliothèque National, currently at pages 18 and 21,
respectively).
162 According to Buchthal and Belting (Patronage in
Thirteenth-Century Constantinople, 4), Lavra Aʹ 2 has one evan-
gelist portrait that does not belong to the Atelier.
and Barocci 31 pair Vienna, Suppl. gr 52 and Princeton, Garrett 2 (on lines 5 and 6, respectively) and Codex Ebnerianus (on lines 6 and line 7). In addition, Barocci 31 includes London, BL, Add. 28815 (as a pair on line 4) and Walters W 527 (as a pair on line 10).

Walters W 525 was compared by Buchthal and Belting unfavorably to the other manuscripts of the Atelier.\(^{163}\) Its ornament is of "the lowest point of artistic endeavor found throughout the entire group of manuscripts."\(^{164}\) They proposed that its scribe also wrote Lavra A’ 2, observing that the script in both is written in minute scale, underlying the utilitarian character of both manuscripts. It is therefore somewhat surprising to see that the Clusters data for W 525’s synoptic gospels were entirely different than for Lavra A’ 2 and that the texts of the two manuscripts do not appear to share any common relatives, as seen in Table 3.20.

Only eight manuscripts are listed and all of them are paired. Vat. Ottob. gr. 381 (dated 1281/2) is assigned the paired position in five of these eight lines. Nelson attributed this manuscript to the well-known scribe who is believed to have lived and worked in Thessalonike and with whom we began this lengthy study: Theodore Hagiopetrites. The first manuscript on the list is Göttingen, cod. Theol. 28 Cim. (dated 1289/90), which was attributed to Theodore by Nelson. It bears a 97.4 percent agreement with Walters W 525. Nelson frequently compared Theodore’s manuscripts to those of the Atelier of the Palaiologina;\(^{165}\) it is thus certainly of interest that a close textual connection between an Atelier manuscript and Theodore’s texts exists. In fact, a total of seven manuscripts signed by or attributed to Theodore Hagiopetrites appear in the data for Walters W 525.\(^{166}\) They are (1) Göttingen cod. Theol. 28 (dated 1289/90), (2) Vatican Library, Ottob. gr. 381 (dated 1281–82), (3) Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibl. GKS 1322 (dated 1277/78), (4) Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 20 (dated 1291/92), (5) Meteora, Metamorphosis cod. 545 (dated 1296/97), (6) St. Petersburg, Russian Academy of Science, Hist. Inst., no. 10/667, and (7) Chicago, University of Chicago, MS 46 (Fig. 3.1).\(^{167}\)

Is it possible that Walters W 525 was commissioned by a patron of Theodore Hagiopetrites, who requested that one of Theodore’s gospel books be used as an exemplar for the text given what Buchthal and Belting described as its “utility” character?\(^{168}\) Moreover, might this patron be Antonios Malakes, the archbishop of Veroia, who traveled between Constantinople and Thessalonike? Malakes owned a manuscript attributed to Theodore (Göttingen, cod. Theol. 28 [GA 89]) that the Clusters data positioned as the closest extant manuscript to Walters W 525, but we cannot know whether Malakes commissioned the Göttingen manuscript from Theodore directly or if he purchased it from another individual. The Göttingen manuscript features ornament that, according to Nelson, aspires to that of the Atelier of the Palaiologina but does not meet those standards.\(^{169}\)

Of related interest is a second manuscript owned by Malakes (Athens, Benaki, 69 (formerly vitr. 34/4) (GA 1305). This manuscript’s textual profile is strikingly similar to those of Theodore Hagiopetrites discussed at the beginning of this chapter. Nelson already noted that it shares the unusual prose prologues seen only in Theodore’s last two signed gospel books. Moreover, Nelson observed that its painted decoration is not influenced by that of the Atelier of the Palaiologina and he wondered if the painter of the Benaki manuscript might have lived in Thessalonike, as he has maintained for Theodore.\(^{170}\) Interestingly, only one of Theodore’s gospel books’ text data

---

164 Ibid., 12.
165 Nelson, *Theodore Hagiopetrites*, e.g., 33, 51, 67, 104.
166 Textual connections among gospel books attributed to Theodore Hagiopetrites have been recognized by New Testament textual critics at least since H. von Soden. For a summary of the scholarship through 1990, see Nelson, *Theodore Hagiopetrites*, 143–46. See also Robinson, *New Testament Textual Criticism* (n. 7 above), §54. See also Parker, *Textual Scholarship*, 70–72.
169 For this reference and for the patron of the Göttinngen manuscript by Theodore Hagiopetrites, see Nelson, "Manuscripts of Antonios Malakes," 256.
170 See n. 31 above for more information and related bibliography.
The results for seven of the original eight Atelier manuscripts containing the Gospels for which we have data indicate that five manuscripts have textual profiles either in the synoptic gospels or in John that include significant representatives from both Group A and Group B. These are Florence, Plut. VI, 28; Lavra A’ 2; Venice, Bibl. Marc gr. 541; Oxford, Barocci 31; and Vat. gr. 1158. Walters W 525 is differentiated from all of the other Atelier manuscripts in its strong textual ties to manuscripts written by Theodore Hagiopetrites; this distinctive text profile is somewhat unexpected given that it was assigned to the same scribe as Lavra A’ 2 by Buchthal and Belting.

Conclusion

The foregoing analysis of the textual affiliation of deluxe manuscripts ultimately reveals as much about ordinary manuscripts as it does about those categorized as deluxe. This can be the case only because the same scribes created both types of manuscripts. The consistency with which certain deluxe manuscripts (Group A) and modest manuscripts (Group B) appear in the T&T Mss. Clusters data for deluxe manuscripts is at first surprising. In fact, the textual profiles of a significant number of deluxe and modest manuscripts are similar. This was noted in the gospel manuscripts of Theodore Hagiopetrites, where one individual produced a very significant range of manuscripts from the ordinary to the deluxe. Typically, neither text nor script determines whether a manuscript is classified as deluxe or ordinary, as long as the scribe is competent in his craft. Instead, it is a manuscript’s figural and non-figural ornament that usually determine its standing. A deluxe manuscript generally required the expertise of a high-caliber illuminator or miniaturist, who used expensive materials to create deluxe effects. The role of the scribe is essential to our understanding of the curious mix of Group A and B manuscripts in the textual profiles of many deluxe manuscripts. Above I concentrated on the textual profiles generated for

171 Buchthal and Belting, Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople, 33–34.
172 Vat. gr. 189 is found on line 7 with a 95.7% agreement with Vat. gr. 361.
173 Of the eight gospel or New Testament manuscripts associated with the Atelier, one has no data available (Getty MS 65) and another has no data for the synoptic gospels (Dionysiou 5). A third manuscript, Vat. gr. 1158, lists only one manuscript in the data generated for the synoptic gospels.
I used the T&T Mss. Clusters tool to generate textual profiles for a number of deluxe manuscripts of diverse dates (and diverse figural and non-figural decoration), which revealed certain patterns. These included the presence of manuscripts from what I have termed Group A and Group B. The relatively consistent presence of representatives from both groups in the text profiles leads to the assumption that there must have been some common repository of manuscripts in Constantinople that would account for these relationships. This repository might have been the patriarchal or imperial library, or important monastic scriptoria. The monastic option holds particular appeal. An important metropolitan monastic scriptorium might have had two types of patrons. Group A manuscripts would have been commissioned by aristocrats fulfilling their desire for deluxe manuscripts. Group B manuscripts—more utilitarian in tone, but executed by scribes using the same textual exemplars as for Group A manuscripts—may have been destined for internal monastic use. In fact, the patrons of Group B manuscripts may well have been the same aristocratic elites who commissioned Group A manuscripts, but who had at this point retired to a monastery.

As scribes copied manuscripts, a prestigious scriptorium could also be trusted to use appropriate textual exemplars, for example, the Uspenskii Gospels of 835. Associated with one of the leaders of what Mango dubbed the “iconophile intelligentsia,” the Uspenskii Gospels with its minuscule script, its complete set of gospel prologues, and its important colophon linking it to an iconophile stronghold, would have held enormous prestige with later scribes and their patrons. Might not these factors go a long way toward explaining the manuscript’s impressive pedigree (Tables 3.6 and 3.7)? The fact that later textual heirs of this oldest dated minuscule text display similar patterns of Group A and Group B manuscripts that can be traced in numerous deluxe manuscripts for the next four and a half centuries is surely significant.

Examples of Group B manuscripts with textual profiles akin to those of deluxe manuscripts are the Louisville fragment; Southern Baptist Theol. Sem. (GA 2538); Syracuse University, NY MS 270.048 G (GA 668); Athens, Akademie, Siderides 1 (GA 14.42); Istanbul, Bibli. du Seraill, 125 (GA 1562); and Athos, Lavra Γ’ 3.4 (GA 1514).

See Kavrus-Hoffmann’s chapter below, for interactions between scribes and illuminators in Constantinople. See n. 120 above.
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**Appendix**

**Table 3.1.**
The Gospel Manuscripts of Theodore Hagiopetrites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gospel Manuscripts Signed and Dated by Theodore Hagiopetrites</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibl., GKS 1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856</td>
<td>Rome, Bibl. Vat., gr. 644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Athos, Vatopedi 962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>London, BL, Burney 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Univ. Bibl., Remonstr. 145 (186)(^\text{a})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>Williamstown, MA, Williams College, Chapin Lib., cod. De Ricci 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2707</td>
<td>Meteora, Monastery of the Transfiguration, cod. 545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394</td>
<td>Athos, Pantokrator 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Venice, Bibl. Marc., gr. I, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscripts Attributed to Theodore Hagiopetrites</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Rome, Bibl. Vat., Ottob. gr. 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290</td>
<td>Chicago, University of Chicago, MS 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>San Marino, Huntington Library, MS HM 1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Göttingen, Universitätsbibl., cod. Theol. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2749</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Historical Institute of the Academy of Science, no. 10/667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscripts Related to Theodore Hagiopetrites</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Venice, Bibl. Marc., gr. I, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>London, BL, Add. 19387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>998</td>
<td>Athos, Iviron 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2266</td>
<td>Chicago, University of Chicago, MS 727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{\text{a}}\) The Amsterdam manuscript was not written by Theodore, but is apparently a much later copy of a manuscript signed and dated by him. Nelson, *Theodore Hagiopetrites*, 1:132.
**Table 3.2.**
T&T Mss. Clusters Data for Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 20 for the Synoptic Gospels (GA 74)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA no. (Primary and Paired)</th>
<th>Date (as Assigned by INTF)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
<th>Relationship with Theodore Hagiopetrites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Athos, Panteleimon 771</td>
<td>unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Göttingen, cod. Theol. 28</td>
<td>attributed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Copenhagen, GKS 1322</td>
<td>signed and dated by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Athos, Pantokrator 52/Princeton Y1956–118</td>
<td>unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra W’ 127</td>
<td>unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2749</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Hist. Inst., no. 10/667</td>
<td>attributed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Chicago, University of Chicago, MS 46</td>
<td>attributed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Var. Ottob. gr. 381</td>
<td>attributed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra H’ 114A</td>
<td>unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Williamstown, De Ricci 1</td>
<td>signed and dated by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Athos, Vatopedi 962</td>
<td>signed and dated by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2266</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Chicago, University of Chicago, MS 727</td>
<td>related to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2707</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Meteora, Transfiguration 545</td>
<td>signed and dated by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>London, Burney 21</td>
<td>signed and dated by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>561 and 2389</td>
<td>XVIII and XI/XII</td>
<td>Glasgow, Hunter 476 and Gruber MS 119, 120, 54, Lutheran School of Theology</td>
<td>both unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Remonstr. 145</td>
<td>later copy of a ms signed and dated by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>351 and 1110</td>
<td>XII and X</td>
<td>Milan, Ambros. B.70 sup. and Stauronikita 43</td>
<td>both unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>London, BL, Harley 5540</td>
<td>unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1586 and 2782</td>
<td>XIII and XI</td>
<td>Athos, Vatopedi 954 and Samos, 16, 171</td>
<td>unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Harvard gr. 22</td>
<td>unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>502 and 1639</td>
<td>XII and XVII</td>
<td>London, BL, Add. 19387 and Athens, Lavra L’ 119</td>
<td>related to; unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2455</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Athos, Vatopedi 895</td>
<td>unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2529 and 3</td>
<td>XII/XIII and XVII</td>
<td>Moscow, RSL, F.181.13 (Gr. 13) and Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52</td>
<td>both unaffiliated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.3.
The Textual Affiliation of Deluxe Byzantine Gospel Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>042</td>
<td>Rossano Gospels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>London, BL, Harley 3540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. Libr., Plut. VIII, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Paris, BnF, gr. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>Venice, Marc., gr. I, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>London, Lambeth Palace, 1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>Parma, Pal. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>Athos, Dionysiou 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Barocci 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td>Montreal, McGill MS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2517</td>
<td>Athens, Ch. G. Sarros, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2727</td>
<td>Zavorda, Nikanoros, 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.4.
The Textual Affiliation of Deluxe Byzantine Gospel Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra A 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>London, BL, Burney 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Auct. T.Inf. 2, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra A 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2368</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>Baltimore, Walters W 527/dochiarion 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>Paris gr. 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>047</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Princeton, Garrett 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>Dimitsana, Greece, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>Dimitsana, Greece, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>Dimitsana, Greece, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Iviron 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.5.
T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for the Rossano Gospels for the Gospels of Matthew and Mark (GA 042)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA. No.</th>
<th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
<th>GA. No.</th>
<th>Agreement with Primary MS (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>Munich, BSB, gr. 568</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Vat. gr. 565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2727</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Zavorda, Nikanoros 27</td>
<td>2529</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>Moscow, RSL, F.181.13 (Gr. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>Oxford, E. D. Clarke 10</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>Jerusalem, Stavrou 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>Jerusalem, Taphou 28</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>Paris gr. 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>Baltimore, Walters W 525</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Modena G.9, a.U.2.3 (II A 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>Philotheou 33</td>
<td>2529</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>Moscow, RSL, F.181.13 (Gr. 13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.6.
T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for the Synoptic Gospels of the Uspenskii Gospels (GA 461)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA. No.</th>
<th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
<th>GA. No.</th>
<th>Agreement with Primary MS (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Vat. gr. 1539</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>Paris gr. 70</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>Paris, Coislin, gr. 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Oxford, Auct. T. inf. 2. 6</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>Athens, NL, 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra A’ 19</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>Harvard gr. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra A’ 15</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>Chicago, Univ. Libr., MS 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Princeton, Garrett 2</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>Chicago, Univ. Libr., MS 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Athens, Benaki TA 142</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>London, BL, Add. 28815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, NLR, gr. 97</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Barocci 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Codex Ebnerianus</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Patmos, St. John’s 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Vienna, Theol. gr. 24.0</td>
<td>2176</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, NLR, gr. 538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Philotheou 33</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>London, BL, Add. 39593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>Athens, NL, 93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>Munich, BSB, gr. 568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.7.
T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for the Synoptic Gospels of the Uspenskii Gospels (GA 461): Other Relatives (Group B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>GA. NO.</th>
<th>AGREEMENT WITH MT (%)</th>
<th>LIBRARY SHELF NO.</th>
<th>GA. NO.</th>
<th>AGREEMENT WITH PRIMARY MS (%)</th>
<th>LIBRARY SHELF NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra A’ 19</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>Harvard University, gr. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra Γ’ 54</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Patmos, St. John’s 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2329</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>Moscow, RSL, F.181.13 (Gr. 13)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Venice, Marc., gr. Z 9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>Munich, BSB, gr. 568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Istanbul, Bibl. du Serail, 125</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>Athens, Akademie, Siderides 1</td>
<td>2282</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>Manchester, John Rylands 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Syracuse University, NY MS 116.048 G</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 365</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Manuscript data available, but suppressed for clarity of argument.*
Table 3.8.
T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for Vienna, Theol. gr. 240 (GA 123) for the Synoptic Gospels: Illustrious Relatives (Group A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA. No.</th>
<th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
<th>GA. No.</th>
<th>Agreement with Primary MS (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>London, BL., Add.</td>
<td>18815</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra A’15</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2297</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>Patmos, St. John’s, cod. 72</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>Vienna, Austr. Nat. Libr., Suppl. gr. 52</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>Codex Ebnerianus (Oxford, Bodl. Libr. MS Auct. T. infra. 1.10)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>Vatican Library, Vat. Pal. gr. 220</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>Harvard University Library, gr. 1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra A’19</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Athos, Philotheou 33</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>Baltimore, Walters W 527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Paris, BnF, gr. 70</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Venice, Marc. gr. I, 18</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Patmos, St. John’s, 84</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Princeton, Garrett 2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>028</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Vatican Library, Vat., gr. 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Barocci 31</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Manuscript data available, but suppressed for clarity of argument.*
<table>
  <thead>
    <tr>
      <th>Line</th>
      <th>GA. No.</th>
      <th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
      <th>Library Shelf No.</th>
      <th>GA. No.</th>
      <th>Agreement with primary MS (%)</th>
      <th>Library Shelf No.</th>
    </tr>
  </thead>
  <tbody>
    <tr>
      <td>5</td>
      <td>2358</td>
      <td>98.7</td>
      <td>Louisville, KY, Theol. Seminary fragment</td>
      <td>–</td>
      <td>–</td>
      <td>–</td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td>6</td>
      <td>2519</td>
      <td>98.7</td>
      <td>Moscow, F.181.13 (Gr. 13)</td>
      <td>2607</td>
      <td>100</td>
      <td>Harvard gr. 22 (repeated five times on list)</td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td>7</td>
      <td>1514</td>
      <td>98.6</td>
      <td>Athos, Lavra Γ’ 54</td>
      <td>–</td>
      <td>–</td>
      <td>–</td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td>8</td>
      <td>a</td>
      <td>a</td>
      <td>Syracuse University fragment MS 226.048 G</td>
      <td>2607</td>
      <td>b</td>
      <td>Harvard gr. 22</td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td>10</td>
      <td>668</td>
      <td>98.4</td>
      <td>Istanbul, Serail 125</td>
      <td>–</td>
      <td>–</td>
      <td>–</td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td>16</td>
      <td>2281</td>
      <td>98.4</td>
      <td>Manchester, John Rylands 1</td>
      <td>–</td>
      <td>–</td>
      <td>–</td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td>26</td>
      <td>2362</td>
      <td>98.1</td>
      <td>Vatican Library, Vat. Chis. R IV 6 (gr. 6)</td>
      <td>a</td>
      <td>a</td>
      <td>a</td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td>35</td>
      <td>2442</td>
      <td>97.9</td>
      <td>Athens, Siderides 1</td>
      <td>2282</td>
      <td>99.3</td>
      <td>Manchester, John Rylands 7</td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td>38</td>
      <td>a</td>
      <td>a</td>
      <td>Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 365</td>
      <td>135</td>
      <td>b</td>
      <td>Munich, BSB, gr. 568</td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td>45</td>
      <td>a</td>
      <td>a</td>
      <td>Patmos, St. John’s, cod. 100</td>
      <td>84</td>
      <td>b</td>
      <td>Patmos, St. John’s, cod. 100</td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td>59</td>
      <td>a</td>
      <td>a</td>
      <td>Patmos, St. John’s, cod. 100</td>
      <td>1176</td>
      <td>b</td>
      <td>Patmos, St. John’s, cod. 100</td>
    </tr>
  </tbody>
</table>

*<sup>a</sup> Manuscript data available, but suppressed for clarity of argument.<br/><sup>b</sup> The percentage rate of agreement between a manuscript in the secondary position in the data output and the manuscript being analyzed is not readily available from the Clusters tool.*
### Table 3.10.

T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for Paris gr. 70 (GA 14) for the Synoptic Gospels: Illustrious Relatives (Group A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Agreement with Primary MS (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Auct. T. inf. 2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra A’19</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>Athens, Nat. Libr. 93</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>Paris, BnF, Coislin 195</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra A’15</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>Münster, Bibelmuseum 10</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>Vienna, Austrian Nat. Libr., Suppl. gr. 52</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>Codex Ebnerianus</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>Uspenskii Gospels</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2368</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>Baltimore, Walters W 527</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>London, Add. 18815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Manuscript data available, but suppressed for clarity of argument.
### Table 3.11.
T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for Paris gr. 70 (GA 14) for the Synoptic Gospels: Other Relatives (Group B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>GA. no.</th>
<th>AGREEMENT WITH MT (%)</th>
<th>LIBRARY SHELF NO.</th>
<th>GA. no.</th>
<th>AGREEMENT WITH PRIMARY MS (%)</th>
<th>LIBRARY SHELF NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 165</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2529</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>Moscow, F.181.13 (Gr. 11)</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Harvard gr. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 26, 27</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Athens, Siderides Akad., 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2282</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Manchester, John Rylands 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Patmos, St. John’s 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra Γ’ 54</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Athens, Nat. Libr. 158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Manuscript data available, but suppressed for clarity of argument.

*b* The percentage rate of agreement between a manuscript in the secondary position in the data output and the manuscript being analyzed is not readily available from the Clusters tool.

### Table 3.12.
T&T Mss. Clusters Data for Stauronikita 43 (GA 1110) for the Synoptic Gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>GA. no.</th>
<th>AGREEMENT WITH MT (%)</th>
<th>LIBRARY SHELF NO.</th>
<th>GA. no.</th>
<th>AGREEMENT WITH PRIMARY MS (%)</th>
<th>LIBRARY SHELF NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>Munich, BSB, gr. 568</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.13.
T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for Athos, Vatopedi 949 (GA 1582) for the Synoptic Gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>GA. no.</th>
<th>AGREEMENT WITH MT (%)</th>
<th>LIBRARY SHELF NO.</th>
<th>GA. no.</th>
<th>AGREEMENT WITH PRIMARY MS (%)</th>
<th>LIBRARY SHELF NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Basel, Univ. Libr. AN IV 2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>Venice, Marc., gr. Z 10 (394)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>Venice, Marc., gr. Z 5 (410)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2193</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>Athos, Iviron, 247*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Auct. D. inf. 2.17</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>Paris, BnF, gr. 72</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.14.
T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for Princeton, Scheide M 70 (GA 1357) for the Synoptic Gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Agreement with Primary MS (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>Harvard gr. 22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2529</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>Moscow, F.181.13 (Gr. 15)</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Patmos 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>Var., Chis. R. IV 6 (gr. 6)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Barocci 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Dionysiou 35</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>Florence, Pet. VI, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>Lutheran School of Theology, Gruber MS 122</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Munich, BSB, gr. 568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>London, Lambeth Palace 1175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra Γ’ 54</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Athens, Nat. Libr. 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>Sinai, gr. 175</td>
<td>2282</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Manchester, John Rylands 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>Athens, Siderides 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>Paris gr. 49</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Patmos 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>Codex Ebranius</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Patmos 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>Escorial, Real Bibl., X. IV 17</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>Escorial, Real Bibl., X. XIII 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>Jerusalem, Taphou 41</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>Athens, Siderides Akad., 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>Lavra A’ 19 and</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>Istanbul, Serafil 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>Athos, Panteleimon 29</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>Var. gr. 363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>Var. gr. 365</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Auct. T. inf. 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2358</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>Kentucky, Theol. Seminary fragment</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>Manchester, John Rylands 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.15.
T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for Codex Ebnerianus (GA 105): Illustrious Relatives (Group A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA. no.</th>
<th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
<th>GA. no.</th>
<th>Agreement with Primary MS (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Patmos 84</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>Paris gr. 49</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra A’19</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2368</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>Walters W 527</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manuscript data available, but suppressed for clarity of argument.

### Table 3.16.
T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for Codex Ebnerianus (GA 105): Other Relatives (Group B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA. no.</th>
<th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
<th>GA. no.</th>
<th>Agreement with Primary MS (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2529</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Moscow, F.181.13 (Gr. 13)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra Γ’ 54</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>Athens, Siderides Akad. 1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>Harvard gr. 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manuscript data available, but suppressed for clarity of argument.
### Table 3.17.
T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for Parma, Pal. 5 (GA 583): Illustrious Relatives (Group A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Agreement with Primary MS (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Libr., E. D. Clarke 10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Codex Eberianus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>Paris gr. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Athos, Dionysiou 34</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Vienna, Suppl. gr. 52</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Princeton, Garrett 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Paris gr. 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Stauronikita 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Patmos 84</td>
<td>2181</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>Manchester, John Rylands 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Lavra A’ 19</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a Manuscript data available, but suppressed for clarity of argument

b The percentage rate of agreement between a manuscript in the secondary position in the data output and the manuscript being analyzed is not readily available from the Clusters tool.

### Table 3.18.
T&T Mss. Clusters (Partial) Data for Parma, Pal. 5 (GA 583): Other Relatives (Group B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Agreement with MT (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
<th>GA No.</th>
<th>Agreement with Primary MS (%)</th>
<th>Library Shelf No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Patmos 275 and</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Harvard gr. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Munich, BSB, gr. 568</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Vat. gr. 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2182</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>Manchester, John Rylands 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>Harvard gr. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>Istanbul, Serail 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2529</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Moscow F.181.13 (Gr. 13)</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Harvard gr. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Harvard gr. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra Γ’ 54</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Athens, Nat. Libr. 158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a Manuscript data available, but suppressed for clarity of argument
### Table 3.19.
List of Gospel Manuscripts Associated with the Atelier of the Palaiologina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GA NO.</th>
<th>LIBRARY SHELF NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>Athos, Dionysiou 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Florence, Plut. VI. 28&lt;br&gt;a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1439</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra A’ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Venice, Biblioteca Marciana gr. 541&lt;br&gt;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Barocci 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Vat. gr. 1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2894</td>
<td>Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum, MS 65&lt;br&gt;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2374</td>
<td>Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, W 525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Inserted miniatures of these manuscripts belong to the Atelier, but their script and ornament differ.

*b* Referred to as Ms "X" by Buchthal and Belting, *Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople*, 5.

As of 9 March 2016, the Clusters tool does not include data for Getty 65.

### Table 3.20.
Complete T&T Mss. Clusters Data for the Synoptic Gospels for Walters W 525 (GA 2374)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>GA. NO.</th>
<th>AGREEMENT WITH MT (%)</th>
<th>LIBRARY SHELF NO.</th>
<th>GA. NO.</th>
<th>AGREEMENT WITH PRIMARY MS (%)</th>
<th>LIBRARY SHELF NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Göttingen, cod. Theol. 28</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Vat. Ottob. gr. 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Copenhagen, Kongelige 1322</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Vat. Ottob. gr. 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Modena, Bibl. Estense G. 9, a.U.2.3 (TTA 9)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Vienna, Theol. gr. 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Athos, Lavra Β’ 127</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>Oxford, Christ Church, gr. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2215</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Larnaka, Mitropolis, s.n.</td>
<td>2099</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>London, Br. Libr. Add. 35030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2707</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Meteora, Metamorphosis cod. 545</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>Vat. Ottob. gr. 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2749</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, no. 10/667</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>Vat. Ottob. gr. 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>Chicago, ms. 46</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>Vat. Ottob. gr. 381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>