

Kathleen Maxwell, *Between Constantinople and Rome: An Illuminated Byzantine Gospel Book (Paris gr. 54) and the Union of Churches*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2014. Pp. xvii + 307 + 64 pages of plates. ISBN 9781409457442, £70.

- [1] The late thirteenth-century bi-lingual (Greek-Latin) gospel codex, Paris gr. 54, housed at the BnF is known to New Testament textual critics by the Gregory number 16. It is a de luxe production, of generous proportions in fine grade parchment and, rarely for a manuscript of its probable provenance, namely Constantinople, and date is illustrated with portraits and an illuminated cycle of pictures. Plate XXVII shows the beauty of the archaizing Greek and indeed the Latin script. Its Greek text is a standard Byzantine type and, as a consequence, is seldom referred to in the *apparatus* of critical editions. It is not included in NA28 or UBS5 for example, although readings from 16 appear in the IGNTP's edition of Luke (1984, 1987).
- [2] Kathleen Maxwell, however, justifiably studied this codex for a university thesis and subsequently has lavished much well-merited time and energy pursuing its many unique and important features. The book, the first published study of this ms., is the fruit of her labours. Prof. Maxwell is an art-historian, and many of the chapters examine in detail the illustrations in the codex. After a worthwhile analysis of the *modus operandi* of the scribes (one or two for the Greek script; more for the Latin column) and the artists, she explains the distinctive and characteristic features of each of the three illuminators.
- [3] One unique feature of this manuscript is that it is a rare example where one can identify with certainty the main manuscript that influenced its artwork. The inspiration for many of its illustrations has been known to scholars for some time – several art historians have recognised the link between Iveron 5 (990) and Paris 54 (16). What could have been particularly telling would have been if plates of *all* the parallel illustrations in these two manuscripts were shown, ideally on facing pages. Minuscule 16 has space for 52 illuminations; 990 has only 29, all of which are represented in 16, albeit sometimes differently distributed. The details of the illustrations in common and the additional illuminations in 16 are carefully described in Maxwell's longest chapter (of over 40 pages in length). Sometimes comparison of the artwork was obscured by the poor reproductions of Iveron 5 in the plates in Pelikanidis *et al.*, *Treasures of Mount Athos* (and Maxwell is duly critical of some of the editing in those albums); she was able to study Iveron 5 for herself when the ms. was on display in Thessaloniki.
- [4] Another distinctive aspect of the manuscript is its use of polychrome text, with four colours used for differing purposes, bright red for narrative text, with crimson, blue or brown for distinctive categories of speaker. This is a more sophisticated version of what is found in some recent children's Bibles where Jesus' words are picked out in red (despite publishers' quandaries about what to do with John 3: 31-36). As this book began life as an academic thesis, it is not surprising that Maxwell thoroughly investigated the consistency of the scribal efforts to maintain the correct use of the four inks in the right places throughout the Greek and then the Latin columns. In general, despite her having spotted some inconsistencies and slips, Maxwell gives the scribes high grades for this work!
- [5] Among other unique features is this ms.' incompleteness. The Latin peters out in Mark, resumes briefly in Luke then reappears again for a few folios in John.

Also the folio containing the end of Mark has been evulsed half way through the disputed longer ending; was that deletion intentional, given the problems with those verses? More significant are the blank boxes allocated for and clearly intended for illuminations. Only 22 of the intended 52 pictures were completed. Five were started but not finished, which means 25 (possibly 24 if one of the spaces allocated was reserved in error) were, to use Maxwell's preferred word, 'uninitiated', although on p. 112 she coins the neologism 'unexecuted'! Chapter 7 compares Paris 54 with examples from some twenty other contemporary mss. (viz A.D.1260-1320); some merit inclusion among the plates. Others are listed but not discussed, being deemed 'irrelevant'.

[6] Just as the ms. responsible for much of the artwork in 16 has been located, cursive 16 is a rarity among Biblical mss. as the exemplar behind its Greek text is identifiable too. Only the nine *Abschriften* in Aland's *Liste* betray their exemplars, e.g. 9^{abs}, 30^{abs}. (The renumbering of these *Abschriften* as 2883-2891 seems particularly unnecessary as it obscures the intimate relationship of these later mss. with the mss. originally standing in the *Liste* with the same number.) No other mss. listed betray their exemplars. The text in Iveron 5 differs too frequently for it and 16 to be intimately related. The ms. closest to the text in 16 is Garrett 3 (= Gregory 1528) in Princeton. According to the recently published book by Sofia Kotzabassi and Nancy Patterson Ševčenko, *Greek Manuscripts in Princeton, Sixth to Nineteenth Century*, Garrett 3 came to Princeton in 1942. When Gregory examined it in 1902 it was on Mount Athos, but it had been written at St Sabas in 1135/36. That date is thus earlier than 16. (Kotzabassi and Ševčenko's book contains eight plates of Garrett 3, none the same as plates from that ms. reproduced by Maxwell.) Maxwell declares herself an ingénue to NT textual criticism, but she has learned quickly, as she disarmingly reveals, and shows (at some length) how she examined studies by von Soden, Colwell and by Wisse, and then the Claremont Profiling Method, the Alands' *Teststellen* and their *TuT* volumes, tracing the close allies, families and groupings of 16; she identified 1528 as its closest ally. On p. 76 she shows in her Table 4.10 how these two mss. share some peculiar features, especially two identical omissions from Mt 24. Those and some comparable evidence strike me as entirely convincing that 16 copied from 1528. Appendix C shows how Maxwell's collations in Matthew reveal differences between Iveron 5, Garrett 3, Paris 54 and Nestle27. The two mss. 16 and 1528 are not completely identical and Maxwell, quite rightly, tells us that Paris 54 was never intended to be a 'mere' slavish copy of any manuscript. The scribe's aim was to surpass any antecedent in this de luxe commissioned codex. Maxwell is unnecessarily modest and cautious over her discovery of the ancestor of the text in this ms.

[7] And yet another exciting and innovative discovery by her is that nineteen extant strange red crosses found on pages of Garrett 3 (and evidence of erasures of some red crosses elsewhere in the ms.) are relevant to her investigations. She deduces with great perception that these crosses were added by the architect of 16 to identify the very positions in the text where space for a picture to be inserted was to be left by the scribe/artist planning and directing the new ms. A good colour photograph of a red cross is to be seen in Plate XXXIII, but pictures relevant to the crosses appear in the monochrome plates 28, 29 and 30. Readers of Garrett 3 have puzzled over the reason for the existence of these red crosses (and the later attempts to remove some 23-28 such inexplicable and distracting insertions); Maxwell has finally solved the problem.

- [8] We may even describe a Greek-Latin New Testament ms. itself as a rarity. Only twenty of our stock of some 5,000 Greek New Testament mss. are bilingual Greek-Latin. (Not all are gospel mss.) More (c.50) are Greek-Coptic; 16 are Greek-Arabic. The dates of the Greek-Latin bilinguals run from the 5th to the 17th century, with D 05 being one of the earliest and most important. Quite why mss. were needed in these languages requires our looking for and identifying Christian communities reading both, mediaeval Southern Italy being one obvious location. But, as far as 16 is concerned, Maxwell's narrative of the ms.' (hi)story, carefully set out in chapter 8 "Art and Diplomacy in Late Thirteenth Century Constantinople", gives the provenance as Constantinopolitan. The Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus, who had recaptured Byzantium from the Latins in 1261, was subsequently fearful of reprisals. His plan to encourage a reconciliation of the church, East and West, then involved *inter alia* the preparation of this de luxe gospel book (a text obviously commonly accepted by both churches) which was to be presented to the Pope to avert such incursions. Part of her evidence is that minuscule 16 planned for seven scenes involving Peter, none of which is in Iveron 5. One likely motive is that it would have been tactful in a book to be presented to Peter's successor if the favourite disciple of Orthodoxy was prominently represented. Michael VIII commissioned the ms. and was its patron. However, the fact that Paris 54 (16), was unfinished requires Maxwell's story to say that the enterprise was abandoned because of changed political circumstances and the ongoing bitter hostility of the Byzantines to the Latins. The Emperor's death in 1282 put paid to such an initiative.
- [9] The existence of ms. 16 in a catalogue of Cardinal Ridolfi's library in Rome in the 1530s encourages Maxwell to postulate that 'her' ms. eventually did fulfil its original intended destiny to reach Italy in an attempt to cement closer links between the Catholic and Orthodox communities by its being among the gifts bestowed during the Council of Florence-Ferrara in 1438-39. Then a rare Greek-Latin Biblical manuscript may well have been especially welcomed by Renaissance humanists. (She shows how the ms. eventually reached Paris through Catherine de Medici.) One is reminded of T. C. Skeat's explanation in his article "The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century" (reprinted in J.K. Elliott (ed.), *The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat* and see there p. 131) that the famous bilingual Codex Vaticanus (B 03) similarly reached Italy at the same time and for a similar purpose. In a short newspaper review of Maxwell's book I concluded that she is a cautious investigative reporter; her readership is the jury assessing the plausibility of the evidence about this manuscript's history. She has certainly convinced this reviewer to declare in her favour.
- [10] The whole volume has been handsomely prepared and produced. Maxwell provides helpful signposting, careful introductions and generous summaries. Her full footnoting reveals years of meticulous research. The Bibliography is impressive. A few typos caught my eye. Dr. R. McKitterick is given two, different, Christian names on p. 17 note 24 and on p. 279. The correct one is Rosamond. Note also the misspelling of Devreesse on p. 17 n. 27 and p. 271. On p. 76 we are told of eight places in Matthew where variants are described as scribal errors: the correct figure should be ten. Why does Maxwell write 'the widow of Naim' (pp. viii, 111, 231) following the unique orthography of fam.1? References in bold type in the Index relate to the pages of plates and yet no page numbers occur on these sixty-four pages – one just has to count them, starting

after page 307! On p. 110 the exorcism in Matthew is wrongly given as that of the Gadarene demoniac (singular!). On pp. 76, 243 re vv. 29-30 the Greek is faulty. In any case 16 adds only του εν τοις ουρανοις. On p. 273 read Österreichische.

J.K. Elliott
The University of Leeds

© Copyright TC: *A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*, 2014