



Gregory-Aland 1412
(National Library of Greece, Athens: 98)

***Kurzgefasste Liste* description:**

GA Number: 1412
Contents: ePK: MtJ
Date: X (No exact date)
Material: parchment
Leaves: 224
Columns: 1
Lines per page: 33
Dimensions: 31 H x 21 W
Shelf Number: 98

Corrections to K-Liste description: dimensions, date

***CSNTM* description:**

GA Number: GA 1412
Contents: ePK: MtJ†
Date: X/XI¹ (No exact date)
Material: parchment
Leaves: 224
Columns: 1
Lines per page: 33
Dimensions: 20.3–21.5 W x 29.0–31.3 H x 5.4–5.5 D
Shelf Number: 98

Images:

Text (448) + Additional matter (22) + Spine & Color Chart (7) = 477 total images

Foliation corrections: none

Quires²: —

Additional matter: 22 images

Front cover: 4 additional leaves + cover b = 9 images

Back cover: 6 additional (paper) leaves + cover a = 13 images

¹ Text is supralinear through 79, infralinear from 80 to the end; both square and rounded breathings are used. Few majuscule letters. Could be as late as XI. 80ff. seem to be XI.

² Strings are generally not visible and the quires are not numbered.

Spine, Cover, and Color Chart: 7 images (color chart on 1a)

Text: 224 leaves (448 images)

UV (MS pages, not ours): none

Specific Details:

NLG catalog (1892) says that the commentaries for Matt and John are those by Chrysostom; for Luke there is the commentary by Titus the bishop of Bostra “and some others.”

NLG also notes that “the leaves [are] lacking in the beginning and the end.”

Embossed leather covers wood boards; both parts of clasp still largely intact.

Commentary seems to be interwoven with the text with the only indication that scripture is in view via the marginal carats. There are also marginal notes in much smaller script on several pages.

1a: text and commentary, beginning with John 5.19.

2a: text and commentary, John 5.24

3b: text and commentary for Matt 3.17ff.

33b: text and commentary on John 11 (raising of Lazarus)

43a: John 13.29—scripture is noted apparently by the symbols ση ωρ with an enlarged lunar *sigma* and *eta* inside of it, an enlarged *omega* with the *rho* above it. But elsewhere this is not biblical text (e.g. 70b).

53a: John 16.21 is marked out by marginal carats (>) on the left of the text, but elsewhere this is not biblical text

63a: commentary by Hesychius (του αγιου ησυχιου περι ιεροσολυμων).

79a: κβ in margin below ωρ; Matt 5.1 quoted.

80a–: second hand, much more elegant, darker ink, through the rest of the codex.

81b: capital letter, ekthesis indicates quotation from Matt 5.9: κληθησονται κτλ. In majuscule script, too.

96b: Matt 6.31 is marked out by marginal carats (>) on the left of the text.

112b: Matt 10.35 is marked out by marginal carats (>) on the left of the text.

119b: Matt 12.29 is marked out by marginal carats (>) on the left of the text.

133a: Matt 14.35 is marked out by marginal carats (>) on the left of the text, but commentary is mixed in with it.

133a: word (line) break in quotation of Matt 14.35: ἐπιγνόντες.

140b: Matt 17.1 is marked out by marginal carats (>) on the left of the text.

151a: Matt 19.12 is marked out by marginal carats (>) on the left of the text.

173b: Matt 23.34 is marked out by capital letter, ekthesis, that introduces the text much like an incipit for a lection.

203b: conclusion to Chrysostom's commentary on Matthew: + επληρωθη του
χρυσοστομου η εις το κατα ματθαιον ευαγγελιον ερμηνεια :-
203b: next is “ : ευσεβιου του παμφιλου : ”
208a: “ + του αγιου ιωαννου χρυσοστομου :- ”
216b: Titus of Bostra “and others” now mentioned as the commentators on the Gospel of
Luke.
217b: Luke 1.5 is marked out by marginal carats (>) on the left of the text.
220b: Luke 1.55 is marked out by marginal carats (>) on the left of the text.
224b: page concludes with + του χρυσοστομου +

Distinguishing text from commentary in this MS is particularly difficult. The way in which scripture is marked out is by majuscule script, large letter ekthesis, letters in the outer margin, *or* left-margin carats. Yet all of these same approaches are used when the commentary is in view—and it happens so frequently that one cannot just assume lack of care on the part of the scribe. There seemed to be no real effort at distinguishing scripture from commentary throughout the MS.

The MS is the product of two different scribes. The second scribe seems to be at least a few decades later.

2 Mar 2015: dbw
Digitized by: ab/ds