

The catena manuscripts on Acts

Scieri, Emanuele

DOI:

[10.1163/15700720-bja10042](https://doi.org/10.1163/15700720-bja10042)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution (CC BY)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Scieri, E 2021, 'The catena manuscripts on Acts: a revised classification', *Vigiliae Christianae*.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/15700720-bja10042>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

The Catena Manuscripts on Acts: A Revised Classification

Emanuele Scieri

Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing,
University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
exs922@student.bham.ac.uk

Abstract

Earlier scholarship faced a number of limitations in classifying catena manuscripts on the Acts of the Apostles. This study makes a comparison of exegetical scholia in selected text passages (Acts 2:1–16, 8:9–25, 28:19–31) in order to determine the different types of catena and how they relate to each other. This survey reveals the diversity of the tradition: some manuscripts are merely copies, which repeat the same text with only small variations, but others are unique and cannot be directly identified with a particular catena type. It is therefore necessary to expand the classification of catenae on Acts in the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* so as to mark subdivisions within the individual types.

Keywords

catena – manuscript – Acts of the Apostles – *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* – scholia – Andreas the Presbyter

1 Introduction: An Overview of the Previous Research

Recent years have seen a significant increase in the study of patristic exegesis of the New Testament, especially with regard to biblical catenae.¹ Detailed research on the catenae on the Acts of the Apostles, however, is yet to be

¹ For an overview and individual studies, see H.A.G. Houghton, ed., *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition* (Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2016). <https://doi.org/10.31826/9781463236908>.

undertaken. At present, there is no critical edition and it is necessary to rely on the printed editions of a few individual Acts catena manuscripts.²

In 1532, Donatus of Verona published a selection of material on Acts, the Pauline epistles, the Catholic epistles, and the book of Revelation, apparently based on Paris, BnF, Gr. 219 (GA 91).³ A Latin translation was then published by John Henten in 1547. A subsequent printed edition containing both the Greek text by Donatus and the Latin translation by Henten was produced in 1631 by Frédéric Morel.⁴ This edition eventually found its way into Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, where the compilation was attributed to Oecumenius (sixth century).⁵ Migne also reprinted the edition by Finettus (1755) of three different catenae on Acts attributed to Theophylact, an eleventh-century Bishop of Bulgaria.⁶ The first catena, from Vienna, ÖNB, Theol. Gr. 150 (GA 1524), had been previously published by Sifanius (1557). The other two texts were based on Vatican, BAV, Vat. Gr. 652 (GA 1842) and Florence, BML, Plutei IV.5 (GA 455), respectively. In 1838, John Cramer published a catena on the Acts of the Apostles as the third of his eight volumes of New Testament catenae.⁷ This was based

2 A summary of the editorial history is given in R. Devreesse, "Chaînes exégétiques grecques," *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément I* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1928) 1084–1233; 1205–1209, and most recently in W.R.S Lamb, "Conservation and Conversation: New Testament Catenae in Byzantium", in D. Krueger and R. Nelson, eds., *The New Testament in Byzantium* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2016) 277–299; 290–291.

3 B. Donatus, Ἐξηγήσεις παλαιαὶ καὶ λίαν ὠφέλιμοι βραχυλογίαν τε καὶ σαφένειαν τοῦ λόγου ἔχουσαι θαυμαστὴν ἐκ διαφορῶν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὑπομνημάτων ὑπὸ Οἰκουμενίου καὶ Ἀρέθα συλλεχθεῖσαι εἰς τὰς τῆς νέας διαθήκης πραγματείας τάσδε· τοῦ μὲν Οἰκουμενίου εἰς τὰς πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων εἰς τὰς καθολικὰς λεγόμενας ἐπιστολάς εἰς τὰς Παύλου πάσας, τοῦ δὲ Ἀρέθα εἰς τὴν Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψιν, (Verona: Sabii, 1532) 1–110. The argument that GA 91 contains the base text for Donatus' edition was strongly defended by K. Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht*, (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1926) 151–153. However, sporadic cases of disagreement between the printed text and the catena in the manuscript render this doubtful.

4 F. Morel, ed., J. Henten, transl., *Oecumenii Commentaria in hosce Novi Testamenti tractatus. In Acta Apostolorum. In omnes Pauli Epistolas. In Epistolas catholicas omnes. Accesserunt Arethae Caesareae Cappadociae episcopi Explanationes in Apocalypsin* (2 vols; Paris: Claudius Sonnius, 1631).

5 Oecumenii Triccae in Thessalia Episcopi, *Opera omnia*, PG 118 (Paris: Garnier, 1893) 29–308. See section 4 below. The Oecumenius catena on Acts was also published by Theoklitos Farmakidis in 1842: Θ. Φαρμακίδης, Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη μετὰ ὑπομνημάτων ἀρχαίων, v. 3 Περιέχων τὰς Πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολὴν, Αθήνα: Νικόλαος Ἀγγελίδης, 1842.

6 Theophylactus Bulgariae, *Expositiones in Acta apostolorum concise ac breviter collectae a beatissimo Theophylacto Bulgariae archiepiscopo*, in *Theophylacti Bulgariae archiepiscopi opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*, PG 125 (Paris: Garnier, 1864) 495–1132.

7 J.A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum* (8 vols; Oxford: OUP, 1838–1844) 3. An online version of this work in XML format is available at <http://open.greekandlatin.github.io/catenae-dev/>.

on a twelfth-century manuscript, Oxford, New College, 58 (GA 2818), with an appendix containing variants from Paris, BnF, Coislin gr. 25 (GA 307): in this manuscript the compilation is attributed to “Andreas”, perhaps to be identified with Andreas the Presbyter (seventh century), compiler of a catena on Isaiah.⁸ A selection of scholia from GA 2818 had already been published by Johann Christoph Wolf in 1723.⁹ Finally, selected scholia on Acts were also published by Matthaei in volume 5 of his edition of the New Testament (1782).¹⁰ These were taken from four different catena manuscripts: Dresden, SLUB, A 104 (GA 101), Moscow, Hist. Mus., S. 347 (V. 096) (GA 103), Moscow, Hist. Mus., S. 346 (V. 024) (GA 462) and Moscow, Hist. Mus., S. 192 (V. 095) (GA 463).

The extensive *Catalogue of Greek Catenae* published by Georg Karo and Hans Lietzmann in 1902 records basic information about the contents of the Andreas catena, building on Cramer’s edition: it includes a brief description of each of the witnesses known to the authors, which are divided into two types: (a) *catena integra*, and (b) *catena ex opere maiore excerpta*.¹¹ In addition, the *incipit* and *explicit* of the catena edited by Cramer are given along with the first and last words of twenty-one scholia to Acts 8:9–25; finally, a list of the Church Fathers named as sources for the extracts is reported.¹² Some information pertaining to Acts is found in Karl Staab’s article about the catenae on the Catholic Epistles (1924), soon after expanded with minor additions by James Hardy Ropes (1926).¹³ Again, some of the manuscripts in Staab’s major work on the catenae on the Pauline Epistles (1926) also contain catenae on Acts, although he pays little attention to these.¹⁴

The first to attempt a thorough analysis and a classification of catena manuscripts on Acts was Hermann von Soden. In the first volume of his edition of

8 See section 3 below.

9 J.C. Wolf, *Anecdota Graeca Sacra Et Profana* (4 vols; Hamburg: Felginer, 1722–1724) 3, 92–194; 4, 1–57.

10 C.F. von Matthaei, ed., *Novum Testamentum XII. Tomis Distinctum Graece Et Latine* (12 vols; Riga: Hartknoch, 1782–1788) 5, *S. Lucae Actus apostolorum Graece et Latine* (1782), 301–347 (*Scholia ad Acta Apostolorum*).

11 G. Karo and J. Lietzmann, *Catenarum graecarum catalogus* (Gottingen: Lüder Horstmann, 1902) 592–595. Such a classification has been recently adopted by Lamb, “Conservation and Conversation”, 291.

12 Karo and Lietzmann, *Catenarum graecarum catalogus*, 592, which basically summarises the *index scriptorum* in Cramer, *Catenae*, 3:452–456.

13 K. Staab, “Die griechischen Katenenkommentare zu den katholischen Briefe,” *Biblica* 5 (1924) 296–353; J.H. Ropes, “The Greek Catena to the Catholic Epistles,” *Harvard Theological Review* 19 (1926) 383–8. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816000007823>.

14 Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*. In a third work, K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben* (NTAbh 15; Münster: Aschendorff, 1933), he provides a detailed description of twenty-three additional manuscripts, some of which contain Acts.

the Greek New Testament,¹⁵ von Soden provides a list of witnesses (*Textzeugen*) which features various catenae on Acts, Pauline Epistles and Catholic Epistles (collectively designed as *Kommentarcodd zum Praxapostolos*). With regard to Acts, a distinction is made between manuscripts containing Oecumenius' compilation (*Kommentar des Ökumenius*) and codices with Andreas' "special commentary" (*Spezialkommentar zu AK von Andreas*). The first cluster is further divided into five groups, each indicated by an abbreviation: Oecumenius manuscripts on Acts, the Catholic and the Pauline Epistles (*O*); manuscripts on Acts and Catholic Epistles (*O^{pe}*) – distinguished from those with only the Pauline Epistles (*O^p*); codices preserving Oecumenius' commentary on Acts and the Catholic Epistles together with the commentary on the Pauline Epistles by Theodoret (*OΘδ*) or Theophylact (*OΘ*); commentaries on Acts and both Catholic and Pauline Epistles whose authorship cannot be determined (*E^α*). In a second section towards the end of the book, von Soden makes an examination and a brief comparison of the different catenae. He revises the classification in Karo and Lietzmann's *Catalogue* by separating the manuscripts with Andreas' catena (*Der Kommentar des Andreas*) – both in the full and reworked recensions – from those transmitting catenae drawn from the major compilation (*Auszüge aus dem Andreas-Kommentar*). The second group includes the catenae attributed to Oecumenius and Theophylact, which in the editor's view bear the character of an edition, unlike other excerpted catenae more resembling collections for private use.¹⁶

The standard classification of Catenae on Acts is currently that of Maurits Geerard in the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (CPG).¹⁷ This divides the diverse texts into just three types: *Catena Andreae* (C150), *Commentarii Ps.-Oecumenii* (C151) and *Commentarii Ps.-Theophylacti* (C152). Unlike the other books of the New Testament, however, there are no further subdivisions nor the identification of *codices singuli* with an otherwise unattested catena type. In addition, no list of manuscripts is provided in the CPG. The present article fulfils this *desideratum* by examining the witnesses to Acts in a new catalogue of catena manuscripts

15 H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902–1913) 1:270–279, 682–692.

16 Von Soden, *Die Schriften*, 1:687.

17 M. Geerard, ed., *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (6 vols; Turnhout: Brepols, 1974–2003) 4:249–250. A second, updated edition has been recently published as M. Geerard and J. Noret, eds., *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*. Vol. 4: *Concilia. Catenae*. Editio aucta (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018) 380–382. However, there are no differences between the two editions of vol. 4 in Acts, apart from the additions of two categories in other languages: *Catena arabica* (C153) and *Catena(e) palaeo-slavica(e)* (C154). Further updates are available on the Brepols Open Access Clavis Clavium online platform.

prepared by Georgi Parpulov for the CATENA project at the University of Birmingham.¹⁸ In so doing, it reveals for the first time the diversity of the Acts catena tradition, offering a new account of the relationship of the different types and shedding light on their transmission.

2 Classification

One common method of identifying and describing a work in a manuscript is to consider its *incipit* and *explicit*. On this basis, Parpulov assigned sixty-one Acts witnesses to one of the CPG types.¹⁹ Due to the complexity of catena tradition, however, Karo and Lietzmann sampled witnesses in a selected passage in order to determine their affiliation. This has been adopted in the present study. In addition to the passage used by Karo and Lietzmann, Acts 8:9–25, two additional passages have been selected so as to include fragments and incomplete copies: these are Acts 2:1–16 and 28:19–31.

Table 1 provides a list of the manuscripts considered in this survey with details of the revised classification offered by this study (and described further below).²⁰ The three types of the CPG have been retained, with further divisions and subdivisions marked with numerals and letters (e.g. C150.1a, C150.2a). The division into subtypes has been applied even where these consist of only one manuscript: while this may simply be a result of editorial revision of that one witness, it may also represent a broader tradition which has not survived. It should be remembered that this study considers all the evidence known at present. In addition, a new category, C155, has been introduced for the *codices singuli*. The Gregory-Aland number, although technically descriptive of the biblical text, has also been included here and in the discussion below for ease of reference.

18 G. Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament: A Catalogue* (Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2021). The online database of the catalogue is available at <https://purl.org/itsee/catena-catalogue>. Cf. also H.A.G. Houghton and D. Parker, "An Introduction to Greek New Testament Commentaries with a Preliminary Checklist of New Testament Catena Manuscripts", in Houghton, *Commentaries*, 1–36: 28–35.

19 Thirteen of these preserve brief glosses or isolated scholia rather than a full catena: GA 203, 302, 457, 462, 617, 627, 1162, 1277, 1764, 1780, 1845, 1859 and 1980.

20 The glosses mentioned in the previous note have not been included, and the microfilms of GA 101 and 2733 are illegible. On the other hand, GA 1371 has been added as a representative of C151.1a, although the manuscript is fragmentary (see section 4 below).

TABLE 1 List of catena manuscripts on acts and type identification

Catena type	Shelfmark	GA	Acts folios	Century
C150				
C150.1a	Paris, BnF, Coislin Gr. 25	307	5r-190r	10th
	Vatican, BAV, Barb. Gr. 582	453	4r-230r	14th
	Paris, BnF, Gr. 221	610	3r-143v	11th
	Athos, Pantokratoros, 770	1678	153v-192v	14th
	Oxford, Bodleian, New College, MS 58	2818	1r-177r	12th/1
C150.1b	Jerusalem, Gr. Orth. Patr. Stavrou 25	1895	3r-283v (i.m.)	10th/1
C150.2a	Paris, BnF, Coislin 202bis	94	30r-117r	12th
C150.2b	Moscow, Hist. Mus., S 347 (V. 096)	103	9r-75r	13th ex.
	Paris, BnF, Gr. 217	606	2r-48r	11th
	London, BL, Add. 22734	641	2r-67r	11th
	Florence, BML, Plutei IV.5	455	1r-40r	13th/2
	Paris, BnF, Gr. 218	607	2r-66v	11th
	Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, F 104 sup.	2576	1r-69r	13th
C150.2c	Drama, Kosinitza Monastery, 3 (3P)	1424	164v-206r	9th-10th / 12th (comm.)
C150.2d	Paris, BnF, Gr. 237	82	10r-61r	10th
C150.2e	Paris, BnF, Gr. 220	608	1r-61v	14th
C150.2f	Vatican, BAV, Reg. Gr. 6	886	189v-205v (catena two)	14th
C151				
C151.1a	Paris, BnF, Gr. 219	91	5r-28v	11th
	Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Phill. 1422	1371	207r-209r (f.m.)	16th
	Paris, BnF, Paris. Gr. 223	1933	202r-231v	11th
C151.1b	Escorial, Real Biblioteca, X.III.03	916	1r-32v (f.m.)	11th
C151.2	Paris, BnF, Coislin Gr. 26	056	2v-56r	11th
	Munich, BSB, Gr. 375	0142	1r-55r	11th
	Athos, Koutloumousiou, 16	1066	1r-98v (f.m.)	11th
C151.3a	Oxford, Bodleian, Barocci 3	314	10r-27r (i.m.)	10th
	Uppsala, Univ., Gr. 1	441	1r-28r	13th
	Florence, BML, Plutei IV.1	454	1r-46r	11th
	Moscow, Hist. Mus., S. 192 (V. 095)	463	4r-32v	14th/1
	London, BL, Add. 39599	911	2r-60v	11th
	Athens, EBE, 207	1360	1r-88v (i.m.)	11th

TABLE 1 List of catena manuscripts on acts and type identification (*cont.*)

Catena type	Shelfmark	GA	Acts folios	Century
C151.3b	Athos, Hagiou Pavlou, 2	1862	23r–98r (i.m.)	10th/2
	Jerusalem, Gr. Orth. Patr., Taphou 38	1888	3r–72r (i.m.)	11th
	Paris, BnF, Suppl. Gr. 1299	2242	11r–151v	12th
	Florence, BML, Plutei VIII.19	–	1r–41v	13th
	Paris, BnF, Coislin Gr. 224	250	28r–111r	11th
	Vienna, ÖNB, Theol. Gr. 302	424	17v–101r	11th
C151.3c	Vatican, BAV, Vat. Gr. 652	1842	16r–75v	13th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. Gr. 1270	621	6r–54r	13th
C151.3d	Oxford, Bodleian, New College, MS 59	327	1r–70r	12th/1
C152				
C152.1a	Vatican, BAV, Vat. Gr. 760	437	2v–178r (catena one)	11th
C152.1b	Istanbul, Ecum. Patr., Panaghia 33	1871	1r–5r (i.m.)	10th / 13th (comm.)
C152.1c	Vienna, ÖNB, Theol. Gr. 150	1524	3r–56r	14th
C152.2	Athens, EBE, 490	254	5r–157r	14th
C155				
C155.1	Paris, BnF, Gr. 216	605	3r–85v	10th
C155.2	Escorial, Real Biblioteca, Ψ. III. 18	920	1r–44v	11th
C155.3	Patmos, Ioannou, 263	–	1r–10r (i.m.)	10th
C155.4	Vatican, BAV, Vat. Gr. 760	437	181r–246v (catena two)	11th
C155.5	Vatican, BAV, Reg. Gr. 6	886	185r–189v (catena one)	13th/2
C155.6	Messina, San Salvatore, 40	1839	1r–25v (i.m.)	12th

3 C150: The “Andreas” Catena

Unlike the CPG, Karo and Lietzmann differentiate between the two types of Andreas catena. The full catena (*catena integra*) is here identified as C150.1 and the abbreviated or reworked versions (*catena ex opere maiore excerpta*) as

C150.2. To the first type belong six witnesses to what appears to be the principal and perhaps the oldest catena on Acts, as it is the primary source of most later compilations. Their texts have the same beginning (Ἀντιοχεὺς ὑπάρχων τὸ γένος ὁ Λουκάς, ἱατρὸς τὴν ἐπιστήμην, ...) and ending (Μαρτυρολόγιον Παύλου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου' ... μηνὶ Ἰουνίῳ καθ' ἡμέραν) and share approximately the same number of scholia (50 for Acts 2:1–6, 21 for Acts 8:9–25, 25 for Acts 28:19–31).²¹ However, GA 1895 features some additional comments and lacks others.²² Although further research is required to determine whether this preserves an early stage of the Andreas catena (as suggested by the early date of the codex: first half of the 10th century) or a later expansion, the additional material in each group, shown in Table 2, is used to identify two subtypes: C150.1a, the main tradition (GA 307, 2818, 610, 453, 1678), and C150.1b, the version of GA 1895.

Most of the scholia in the Andreas catena are given a name or a title: in the three passages examined, more than eighty comments are attributed to Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Ammonius, Severus of Antioch, Theophilus, Didymus, Athanasius, Severian of Gabala, Isidore, Cyril, Gregory of Nazianzus, Irenaeus, Eusebius; two have the heading (ἐξ) ἀνεπιγράφου and three are simply marked as σχόλιον.²³ It is possible that the original basis of the compilation was mostly or even completely made of excerpts from Chrysostom's *Homilies On the Acts of the Apostles* and *On the Beginning of Acts* (which are also the only commentaries on the subject transmitted in their entirety), and subsequently expanded with extracts from other exegetes.²⁴ Support for this may be offered by the title of the Andreas catena, which in all witnesses reads: Ἑρμηνεία τῶν Πράξεων τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου καὶ ἐτέρων διαφόρων ('Exegesis of Acts by Chrysostom and other different [commentators]'). On the other hand, Chrysostom might have been emphasised in the title because he is the most frequently cited author throughout the catena.

21 The partial mutilation of GA 2818 and 610 does not allow us to ascertain whether these witnesses had the same number of scholia to Acts 2:3–4 and 8:9–24, respectively.

22 Here, as well as in the tables below, the source indication has been provided in brackets where it was detectable. This has not been applied where the scholia have resulted from multiple sources, which the compiler has freely combined, paraphrased and readapted (see Table 5, Table 6 [scholia on Acts 8:9–25], Table 8 [scholia from GA 1524], Table 9 [scholia 1–3 from GA 886]).

23 For the list of Church Fathers named in the full catena see Cramer, *Catena*, 3:452–456; Geerard and Noret, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, 249.

24 Cf. Devreesse, "Chaînes exégétiques grecques," 1205–1206, with regard to GA 453: "Le Barb. 582, que nous avons examiné avec quelque détail, nous apparaît comme une chaîne dont Chrysostome fait la base. Sur ce fonds chrysostomien, viennent se greffer quelques lemmes plus ou moins nombreux".

TABLE 2 Additional scholia in “Andreas” manuscripts

Scholia	GA 1895	GA 307	GA 2818	GA 610	GA 453	GA 1678
Acts 2:2–3						
1	Σευηριανοῦ Γαβάλων· Ἐν τοίνυν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ἐδόθη νόμος ... καὶ τότε ἐνομοθέτησε, καὶ νῦν νομοθετεῖ. (CPG 4218)					
2	Ἐδόθη μὲν νόμος ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ ... οὐ ᾗσαν καταμένοντες. (unidentified work)	–				
3	τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου· Διατί μὴ χωρὶς αἰσθητῶν ... Καὶ τὸ αἰφνίδιον δὲ διανέστη- σεν αὐτούς. (Hom. in Ac. 4.1 [PG 60.42.50–55]; CPG 4426)	–				
4	Σευηριανοῦ· Καλῶς τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τότε ἡ πρώτη φωνή ... δείξῃ αὐτὸν Θεὸν καὶ τότε νῦν ἐπιφοιτήσαντα. (cf. C155.2, schol. 4; CPG 4218) ^a	–				
5	Οὐκ ᾗν αὐτὴ ἡ πνοή ... ὁ φόβος ᾗν ἀγνός. (unidentified work)	–				
6	Καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ γενόμενον ... παραστήσωσιν οἱ νομοθετούμενοι τῷ νομοθέτῃ. (unidentified work)	–				
7	Σευήρου ἐπισκόπου ἀπὸ λόγου μῆ· Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μὲν, ἵνα παραστήσῃ ... ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τὸ τῆς Τριάδος μυστήριον. (cf. PO 165; CPG 7035)					
Acts 8:25						
1	–					Τοῦ αὐτοῦ (scil. Χρυσοστόμου)· Διατί πάλιν ἀπίασιν ἐκεῖ ... μέρος καταλαμβάνουσιν. (Hom. in Ac. 18.4 [PG 60.146.12–16])
Acts 28:22						
1	–					Εὐσεβίου· Πρὶν ἐπιδημήσαι τὸν Παῦλον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ... ὧν ἐδήλωσεν Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἀποστόλων. (Is. 1.73.45–74; CPG 3468)

a See Table 9 below.

The name of Andreas is placed as a *subscriptio* at the end of GA 307, along with an extract from the biography of Andreas the Presbyter found in three witnesses to the catena on Isaiah. There, this figure is credited with three books of the catena on Isaiah, but there is no mention of a catena on Acts.²⁵ Staab and Ropes have reasonably cast doubt on this attribution, absent from the other five catena manuscripts on Acts.²⁶

Karo and Lietzmann identified seven manuscripts as abridged forms of the Andreas catena, which we designate as C150.2.²⁷ To these should be added GA 455 and 2576, which both Finettus and von Soden observed had been erroneously attributed to Theophylact.²⁸ The degree of similarity is so high that von Soden dubbed the text from GA 455 as “die Andreas-Catene ohne Text”.²⁹ In the abbreviated versions of the Andreas catena, the compilers chose a small number of scholia from the fuller catena type. The name of each author is retained before some of the scholia, but in most cases it is omitted. The selected comments are either copied in full or slightly abridged; expansions are rare. Occasionally, scholia from different sources are joined together in a single extract as if they were written by the same author; conversely, a single-author scholium might be split into two comments, with the second sometimes marked as coming from another source (ἄλλος).

GA 94 features a different selection of scholia and has thus been identified as an individual subtype of abbreviated catena, C150.2a. Six witnesses (GA 606, 641, 103, 607, 2576 and 455) have the same abridged version of the Andreas catena, and shall therefore be marked as C150.2b. Nevertheless, a few additions shared by three manuscripts allow us to split the cluster in two groups, the

25 Cf. Staab “Die griechischen Katenenkommentare,” 348–349; for the abbreviated text see Cramer, *Catena*, 3:v (and also Karo and Lietzmann, *Catenarum Graecarum Catalogus*, 593). The manuscripts are: Vatican, BAV, Ottob. Gr. 7 (1453), Oxford, Bodleian, New College MS 41 (13th cent.) and Vienna, ÖNB, Theol. Gr. 24 (12th–13th cent.)

26 Ropes, “The Greek Catena,” 387: “The name ‘Andreas’ for the catenist must disappear from use, since Staab skilfully shows that the note in Coislin 25, in which it is found, is probably due to the false inference of a scribe, and that the name has its proper place only in a well-known catena on Isaiah where it is fully attested.”

27 GA 94, 103, 605, 606, 607, 641 and 886: cf. Karo and Lietzmann, *Catenarum Graecarum Catalogus*, 593–595. GA 605 has been moved to C155 (see section 6).

28 GA 455 was attributed to Theophylact by Montfaucon, whereas in GA 2576 the author's name is found in the title (f. 1r: Ἐξηγήσεις ... εἰς πράξεις ... ἀπὸ Θεοφυλάκτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου). However, Finettus, who printed the text from GA 455 as part of the edition of Theophylact's *opera omnia* (= PG 125, *textus tertius*), rejected the attribution, as there is no trace of Theophylact's name in the *inscriptio*; cf. PG 125, 471–472.

29 Von Soden, *Die Schriften*, 1:687.

second of which seems to be an expansion of the first. The evidence is shown in Table 3.

Another single instance of an abbreviated catena is GA 1424 (C150.2c), which is absent from Karo-Lietzmann’s catalogue and not mentioned by von Soden. A few scholia were copied in the margins by the same hand responsible for the biblical text (9th–10th cent.), whereas the majority of comments was added by a later scribe (12th cent.). Unlike the prologue (Ἀντισχεὺς ὑπάρχων τὸ γένος ὁ Λουκάς, ἱατρὸς τὴν ἐπιστήμην, ...), the *incipit* and *explicit* of the scholia differ from the mainstream tradition, simply because these have been abridged. Most comments have been created by reducing the exegetical material in C150.1, and the names of authors are retained. Nonetheless, the diversity of content in certain scholia suggests that the compiler may have employed

TABLE 3 Differences within C150.2b

Scholia	GA 606	GA 641	GA 103	GA 607	GA 2576	GA 455
Acts 8:9–17						
1	Πῶς αὐτὸν οὖν οὐκ ἀνείλον ... διδόναι Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 18.2 [PG 60.144.12–15, 32–33] + Epiph. <i>Haer.</i> 21.1.4; CPG 7820)					
2	–	Οὐχ ὁ ἐν τοῖς δώδεκα ἔστιν οὗτος ὁ Φίλιππος ... οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι διεσπάρησαν, πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων. (Isid. <i>Pel. Ep.</i> 1.447.20–25; CPG 5557)				
3	Καὶ ἐπληροῦτο τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰρημένον ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδαπόστολοι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 18.4 [PG 60.145.50–52])					
4	–	Τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀφέσεως ἔλαβον Πνεῦμα, οὕπω δὲ τὸ τῶν σημείων. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 18.2 [PG 60.143.54–55])				
5	Σημειωτέον ὅτι οὐ δεῖ πλησιάζειν ... ὥστε μὴ συνίεναι τὰ γινόμενα. (Ἀμμωνίου in the margins of GA 606 and 641; CPG 5504)					
6	–	Ὅτι οὐκ ἀργυρίου οὐδὲ ὑποκριταῖς, ἀλλ’ ἀγίοις διὰ πίστεως ἢ μετοχῇ τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος δίδοται. (ΚΕΦ. ΙΑ.) ^a				
7	Διατί οὐκ ἦσαν οὗτοι λαβόντες ... οὐκ ἄλλους πέμπουσιν, ἀλλὰ Πέτρον. (Χρυσοστόμου in the margins of GA 606 and 641; <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 18.3 [PG 60.19–33])					

a The scribe has mistaken the chapter heading for a scholium.

additional sources. A similar situation can be observed in the catena from GA 82 (C150.2d), which also features two layers of scholia. However, unlike in GA 1424, the comments are anonymous and indicated by symbols.

A curious abridgment from Andreas is GA 608 (C150.2e), which seems to contain a mixed catena, partly related to C150.2b but also apparently dependent on C151.3, one of the Oecumenius subtypes.³⁰ The connection with the other abbreviated subtype of Andreas was detected by Staab, who observed that the commentary from this manuscript agrees with that in PG 125 derived from GA 455 (*Expositionis in Acta textus tertius*).³¹ There are notes by three librarians in the front matter that mention Andreas as the author of the catena (in Italian, Greek and Latin). Moreover, the *incipit* of the first scholium from GA 608 (Ὁ μακάριος Λουκᾶς Ἀντιοχεὺς ὑπάρχων τὸ γένος, ἱατρὸς ...) and the beginning of the prologue from C150.2b (Ἀντιοχεὺς ὑπάρχων τὸ γένος ὁ Λουκᾶς, ἱατρὸς ...) are almost identical. Nevertheless, the Latin attribution explicitly suggests a possible influence from the Oecumenius catena (C151.3): «*Cod. Membr. 13 saec. scriptus quo continentur Andreae Cretensis commentaria in acta apostolorum, epistolas Pauli et epistolas septem catholicas. Videndum num haec commentaria Oecumenium auctorem habeant*». The alternation in this manuscript between scholia from C150.2b and others presumably extracted from C151.3 may be observed in Table 4. These are untitled and normally joined into a single continuous text.

Finally, another abbreviated subtype is preserved in the second catena from GA 886 (C150.2f). This manuscript contains two fragmentary catenae on Acts, copied by different hands (13th and 14th cent., respectively). As noted by Karo-Lietzmann and Staab,³² the second compilation (on Acts 2:14–7:59) is an abridgment of the Andreas catena with a particular preference for comments from Chrysostom: all the scholia in this catena are found in C150.1, which contains others not present in this manuscript. Nevertheless, Devreesse believed that this shorter text might instead reflect an early stage of the Andreas catena, when this was mostly made of extracts from Chrysostom's *Homilies*.³³

30 See Section 4 below.

31 The erroneous attribution of this catena to Theophylact has already been noted above. However, Staab claimed that the title, despite the faded red ink, disclosed τω βουλ ... Θεοφυλακτω (Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 223–224). Nevertheless, von Soden states that „Der erste Abschnitt ist unleserlich“ (*Die Schriften*, 1:688) and nothing can be made out on our microfilm.

32 Cf. Karo and Lietzmann, *Catenarum Graecarum Catalogus*, 595; Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 219–220.

33 Cf. Devreesse, “Châînes exégétiques grecques,” 1205–1206.

TABLE 4 Scholia in GA 6o8 partly shared with C15o.2b, partly with C151.3

Scholia	GA 6o8	C15o.2b (Andreas subtype)	C151.3 (Oecumenius subtype)
Acts 28:19–31			
1	Εἰδὼς ὁ Παῦλος ὅτι ἄτοπον ... ἦλθον, οὐχ ἑτέροις διδοὺς κακά. (slightly different <i>explicit</i> in C151.3: ... Καίσαρα' οὐχ ὡς ἑτέροις διδοὺς κακά, ἀλλ' ὡς αὐτὸς φεύγων κακά; Ammonius (CPG 2561) + Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 55.2 [PG 6o.38o.58–6o, 381.1–4])		
2	Εἶτα καὶ ἐκεῖνοι οὕτως ... ἀπολογήσασθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν συγγενῶν. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 55.1 [PG 6o.379.53–55])		–
3	Αἵρεσιν καλοῦσιν Ἰουδαῖοι ... ἀλλὰ ἀντιλέγουσί τινες. (Ammonius, CPG 2561)		–
4	Πρὶν δὲ ἐπιδημήσαι τὸν Παῦλον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ... τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν ἐπικομιζομένους. (Eus. <i>Is.</i> 1.73.45–69)	–	Πρὶν ἐπιδημήσαι τὸν Παῦλον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ... τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν ἐπικομιζομένους.
5	–	Τὸ γὰρ εἰπεῖν ὅτι <i>Εἶπε</i> τὸ Πνεῦμα ... ἀλλ' ἄνωθεν τοῦτο προήδει ὁ Θεός. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 55.2 [PG 6o.381.31–39])	–
6	Τοῖς ὑπουργὸν λέγουσι τοῦ Πατρὸς ... ἴσης ἐξουσίας μετέχει. (Ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου in C15o.1)		
7	Καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ρητόν τὸν προφήτην ... τῶν προφητευομένων ἀναφοράν. (additional line in C15o.2b2: καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸ εὐλογον τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίσεως ἀναφαίνεται; Bas. <i>Is.</i> 6.189.13–18; CPG 2911)		
8	Σκόπει δὲ τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀκρίβειαν, οὐκ εἶπε ... ὅτι ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψωσιν ἰάσεται αὐτούς. (slightly different <i>incipit</i> in C15o.2b: Εἶδες καὶ τὸν προφήτην μετὰ τοσαύτης ἀκριβείας κατηγοροῦντα. Οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸς εἶπεν ...; Chrys. <i>Hom. in Mt.</i> 45.1–2 [PG 58.473.1–1o]; CPG 4424)		
9	Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι μέχρι τοῦτο ... ξίφει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθεῖς. (Ἐκ τοῦ Προλόγου ... Παύλου προτασσομένου in C15o.1)	–	Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι μέχρι τοῦτο ... ξίφει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθεῖς.

4 C151: The “Oecumenius” Catena

Oecumenius was once identified with a tenth-century Bishop of Trikke, but more recently has been considered as a commentator active in Asia Minor in the sixth century.³⁴ Nevertheless, the name of Oecumenius is not found in any catena manuscripts.³⁵ Devreesse suspected that the attribution was Morel's invention,³⁶ whereas Staab and von Soden blamed the manuscript tradition for misleading the editors: in many witnesses, catenae on Acts are placed right before the catena on the Pauline Epistles which is attributed to Oecumenius.³⁷ Although the Commentary on Revelation is now accepted as the work of Oecumenius, the authorship of the catenae on Acts and the Pauline Epistles must be left open.³⁸

A preliminary survey of the manuscripts of this type identifies three main subtypes. C151.1 may be further divided into C151.1a (GA 91, 1371, 1933) and C151.1b (GA 916). GA 1371 is a fragmentary copy of GA 91 in Acts 1:1–16 (but not in the other New Testament extracts), as indicated by the gaps left where this codex is damaged. On the other hand, two of the three representatives of C151.2 (GA 056, 0142, 1066) are “sister manuscripts”: GA 056 and 0142 share the same the layout, marginal notes, number of pages, script and even paratextual features.³⁹ Both subtypes exhibit a similar *incipit* (C151.1: Λόγον πρῶτον εἶπεν καὶ οὐκ εὐαγγέλιον, C151.2: Πρῶτον λόγον εἶπεν καὶ οὐκ εὐαγγέλιον) and share nearly all the comments on Acts 2:1–16 and 28:19–31. However, the scholia to Acts 8:9–25 and the conclusion are notably different, as shown in Table 5.

The third subtype, C151.3, is found in the overwhelming majority of catena manuscripts on Acts. The best known representative is GA 1842, which was first edited by Finettus (*Expositionis in Acta textus alter*).⁴⁰ Despite his insistence on the attribution to Theophylact (based on the *inscriptio*, which reads: Ἀπὸ φωνῆς τοῦ ἁγιοτάτου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Βουλγαρίας Θεοφυλάκτου ἑρμηνεία), Finettus could not deny the striking resemblance to the Oecumenius

34 Houghton and Parker, “An Introduction,” 19.

35 Cramer, *Catenae*, 3:iii: “*Dubitarunt autem Viri docti an Oecumenio hoc opus rite assignari deberet ... nam in nullo quem vidi Codice, eius nomen Commentario in Acta Apostolorum prefigitur*”. Cf. also Devreesse, “Chaînes exégétiques grecques”, 1206.

36 Devreesse, “Chaînes exégétiques grecques”, 1206.

37 Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 162; von Soden, *Die Schriften*, 1:692.

38 C. Kannengiesser, ed., *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2006) 937.

39 On these manuscripts cf. Theodora Panella, “Resurrection appearances in the Pauline Catenae”, in Houghton, *Commentaries*, 121–122. <https://doi.org/10.31826/9781463236908-009>.

40 PG 125, 849–1060.

TABLE 5 Differences within C151

Scholia	GA 91	GA 916	GA 1933	GA 056	GA 0142	GA 1066
	C151.1			C151.2		
	Acts 8:9–25					
1	Σημειωτέον ὅτι οὐ δεῖ πλησιάζειν ... καὶ προσήλθε τοῦτο αἰτῶν. (abbreviated in GA 916)			Οὕτως ἦσαν ταῖς μαγείαις αὐτοῦ ... πρὸς διόρθωσιν τὸ ἐλέγξει.		
2	Πρόδηλον ὅτι οἱ ὑπὸ Φιλίππου ... ἐπιθέσεως δοῦναι Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. (absent from GA 916)			Ἄλλως τε᾽ Ἐπειδὴ ἐκείνῳ πρὸς φρονισμόν ... ἦν οὐκ ἐπιτροφῆς.		
3	Ὁ μιὰρὸς οὗτος Σίμων, οὐ πίστεως ... τὸ ἅγιον ἡγησάμενος.			Ἴσως διὰ τὸν Σίμωνα ... ὡς οὐ φθάνοντος ἐκεῖ τοῦ ἀποστόλου.		
4	Οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα ἀρωμένου ... διαθέσεως ἐλέγετο.			—		
Explicit	... ξίφει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθεῖς (absent from GA 916).			... ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους τριάκοντα καὶ ἔξ (f.m. in GA 1066)		

catena, especially from the middle of Acts 7 onwards.⁴¹ The latter may explain why the work was recorded in the Vatican Library’s catalogue with the title of Οἰκουμενίου εἰς τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ εἰς τὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς; the credit given to Theophylact might therefore be simply a later addition.⁴² More convincing evidence against the attribution of this compilation to the eleventh-century Archbishop of Bulgaria comes from the earliest extant witness to this catena type, GA 1862, which was copied in the tenth century. The hypothesis of a further subtype of the Oecumenius catena cannot be entirely ruled out: in the vast majority of manuscripts assigned to this cluster the catena ends with the section on the martyrdom of St. Paul found in the commentary attributed to Oecumenius/C151.1 (*expl.*: ... ξίφει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθεῖς;

41 PG 125, 410–416 (and cf. von Soden, *Die Schriften*, 1:692). The editor was aware that the brevity of the catena, however compatible with Theophylact’s writing style, is a weak argument to determine the authorship of works of this kind, predominantly resulted from words and sentences assembled from different authors.

42 Cf. Staab, *Die griechischen Katenenkommentare*, 332; of the same view is von Soden, *Die Schriften*, 1:689.

but GA 1842: ὅτι ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψωσιν ἰάσεται αὐτούς).⁴³ Most importantly, the two types share a consistent number of scholia arranged in the same order, none of which is given a title.

Further divergences between the witnesses of C151.3 enable us to divide them into four sub-branches: C151.3a (GA 314, 441, 454, 463, 911, 1360, 1862, 1888, 2242, Plutei VIII.19), C151.3b (GA 250, 424),⁴⁴ C151.3c (GA 1842, 621),⁴⁵ C151.3d (GA 327). Table 6 provides the evidence for this subdivision and for the relationship with C151.1.

Oecumenius' compilation is generally regarded as a reworking and abbreviation of the Andreas catena, with the greatest difference being the absence of author's names.⁴⁶ A preliminary comparison with the Andreas catena, however, reveals a fair degree of independence from the mainstream tradition and a different compilation practice. In commenting on Acts 8:9–15 the compiler of C151.1 draws on different sources, not necessarily related to the Andreas catena. He usually selects the extracts most appropriate for the exegesis and arranges these in long comments. At the same time, he paraphrases sentences, introduces linking words or phrases of variable length and adds something of his own, following a technique of compilation known as *résumé*.⁴⁷ This consists of rewriting the sources *ex novo*, retaining only a few words and sentences in their original form. The result is that we have scholia unique in appearance, whose original sources are not easily detectable. Nevertheless, in other sections (such as Acts 28:19–31), the compiler employs the same technique used by "Andreas", consisting of a more faithful reproduction of the original patristic extracts, either in full or abbreviated. Gilles Dorival has suggested that compilations of this kind, based on catenae but lacking source indications, are better labelled as commentaries.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, given their origins in catena

43 The *incipit* is different: Ἀναμνησκει τὸν Θεόφιλον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ὥστε τὴν οἰκίαν ἀκριβείαν ἐνδείξασθαι κατλ.

44 These two manuscripts are likely to be genetically related: not only the layout, but also the content is almost identical, line by line.

45 In GA 621 the order of some scholia is reversed. This is likely to be a development from scribal errors rather than deliberate editing.

46 Cramer, *Catenae*, 3: iii: "Oecumenii enim opus nihil aliud est nisi Catenae nostrae epitome, in qua omnium auctorum nomina tacentur, et eorum excerpta in unum quasi corpus rediguntur"; and cf. Devreesse, "Chaînes exégétiques grecques," 1206.

47 Cf. C. Curti, "La tradizione catenaria e il recupero dei commenti greci alla Bibbia: validità e limiti", in C. Curti, ed., *Eusebiana I. Commentarii in Psalmos* (Catania: Centro di Studi sull'Antico Cristianesimo, 1989) 280.

48 G. Dorival, "Biblical Catenae: Between Philology and History", in Houghton, *Commentaries*, 65–81, <https://doi.org/10.31826/9781463236908-006> in particular 67: "Oecumenius, Peter of Laodicea, Procopius of Gaza, Theophylact and others are not authors of catenae, but of commentaries totally or partially made from catenae".

TABLE 6 Sub-branches of C151.3 and comparison with C151.1

Scholias	C151.1	C151.3a	C151.3b	C151.3c	C151.3d
Acts 8:9–25					
1	Σημειωτέον ὅτι οὐ δεῖ πλησιάζειν ... καὶ προσῆλθε τοῦτο αἰτῶν.				
2	Πρόδηλον ὅτι οἱ ὑπὸ Φιλίππου ... ἐπιθέσεως δοῦναι Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. —				
3	—	—	Σημείων μεγάλων γινομέ- νων ... καὶ τεράτων Πνεύμα οὕτω ἐλάβομεν. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 18.2 [PG 60.143.54–55], reworked)	—	—
4	Ὁ μιὰρὸς οὗτος Σίμων, οὐ πίστεως ... τὸ ἅγιον ἡγησάμενος.				
5	Οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα ἄρωμένου ... μετὰ τῆς προαιρέσεως. (in conjunction with scholium 6 in C151.1a)				
6	Οὐ κολάζει νῦν τὸν Σίμωνα ... διαθέσεως ἐλέγετο. — (in conjunction with scholium 5 in C151.1a)				
Acts 28:19–31					
1	Εἰδὼς ὁ Παῦλος ὅτι ... ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς φεύγων κακά. (Ammonius — [CPG 2561] + Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 55.2 [PG 60.380.58–60, 381.1–4])				
2	Πρὶν ἐπιδημῆσαι Παῦλον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ... ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν — ἐπικομιζομένοις. (repetition after scholium 3 in C151.3b; Eus. <i>Is.</i> 1.73.45–69)				
3	Τοῖς ὑπουργὸν λέγουσι τοῦ Πατρὸς ... ὅτι ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψωσιν — ιάσεται αὐτούς. (in conjunction with schol. 4 in C151.1a; Ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου in C150.1 + Bas. <i>Is.</i> 6.189.13–18 + Chrys. <i>Hom.</i> <i>in Mt.</i> 45.1–2 [PG 58.473.1–10])				
4	Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι μέχρι τοῦτο ... τὴν κεφαλὴν — — ἀποτμηθέντα. (in conjunction with schol. 3 and 5 in C151.1a) (Ἐκ τοῦ Προλόγου τοῦ ἐν τῷ Βίβλῳ Τῶν Ἐπιστολῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου προτασσομένου in C150.1)				
5	Ἦστί τοίνυν ἀπὸ τοῦ ... τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθεῖς. — Ἦστί τοίνυν (Ἐκ τοῦ Προλόγου ... in C150.1) ἀπὸ τοῦ ... τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθεῖς.				

tradition, no proposal has yet been made to change the traditional classification. One could rather suggest that these works are representatives of an alternative type of catena.

5 C152: The “Theophylact” Catena

Five manuscripts transmit a catena on Acts under the name of Theophylact (GA 254, 455, 1524, 1842, 2576) and Finettus edited three recensions based on as many exemplars.⁴⁹ However, as seen above, three of these seem to be witnesses to different catena types. Therefore, only the texts from 254 and 1524 are potentially related to the Archbishop of Bulgaria, and yet scholars have failed to reach consensus on the attribution. In Finettus’ opinion, the catena from GA 1524 lacks the *ratio commentandi* characteristic of Theophylact as it emerges in the commentaries on the Gospels and Pauline Epistles.⁵⁰ His doubts were shared by von Soden, who suggested that the author indication before the prologue might be a subsequent addition by a later scribe trying to make up for the omission of a commentary on Acts among Theophylact’s exegetical works.⁵¹ The authorship therefore remains to be ascertained.

The text of GA 1524 contains a significant proportion of similarities to the first of the two catenae on Acts preserved in GA 437 (ff. 1r–180r), which in turn seems to be partially connected to GA 1871, at least with regard to the extant passages from this incomplete witness (only Acts 25:9–28:31). Table 7 makes it apparent that GA 1871 and 437 are closely related, as they both split scholium 1 into three segments and lack scholia 2 and 10. On the other hand, GA 1871 includes additional comments (5, 7) and shares scholium 6 with GA 1524 but not with GA 437. This latter concludes the exegesis with a scholium (11) absent from GA 1871 and 1524. Moreover, all three have different endings: ... ἐν ᾗ κατέμην ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ (GA 1524); ... μέχρι τῆς τελειώσεως, λέ’ (GA 437, first catena); ... ἐπιστρέψωσιν, ἰάσεται αὐτούς (GA 1871). Although the genealogical relationship between the catenae of these codices is yet to be traced in detail, the data suggests that the three manuscripts might preserve different stages of the same catena type (C152.1). For these reasons, we shall mark them as C152.1a (GA 437, catena one), C152.1b (GA 1871), C152.1c (GA 1524).

49 PG 125, 495–848 (Finettus’ edition of GA 1524), 849–1060 (*textus alter* from GA 1842), 1061–1132 (*textus tertius* from GA 455).

50 Cf. PG 125, 407–408.

51 Von Soden, *Die Schriften*, 1:689.

TABLE 7 Comparison between the representatives of C152.1

Scholia	GA 1524	GA 437 (catena one)	GA 1871
Acts 28:19–31			
1	Εἰδὼς ὁ Παῦλος ὅτι ἄτοπον ... τὴν κατάσκασιν τῶν δεσμῶν.	Εἰδὼς ὁ Παῦλος ... ἀντιλεγόντων τῶν Ἰουδαίων. (Ammonius, CPG 2561) Τί οὖν; ἵνα αὐτῶν κατηγορήσης, ... διαφυγεῖν τὸν κίνδυνον. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 55.1 [PG 60.379.45–50]) Μία ἦν ἐλπίς, φησί, σωτηρίας ... τὴν κατάστασιν τῶν δεσμῶν. (Ammonius, CPG 2561)	
2	Πρὶν ἐπιδημῆσαι τὸν Παῦλον ... ἐδήλωσεν Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἀποστόλων. (Eus. <i>Is.</i> 1.73.45–74)	–	–
3	Αἴρεσιν καλοῦσιν Ἰουδαῖοι ... ἢ καὶ Ἑλλήνες. (Ammonius, CPG 2561)		
4	Ὅρα πῶς οὐ ράπτουσιν ... ἐπετέτραπτο λοιπὸν τὰ κατ’ αὐτόν. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 55.2 [PG 60.381.15–16] + 54.2 [PG 60.376.36–37])		
5	–	–	Τουτέστι, μὴ πιστεύοντες ἀνεχώρουν ... ἔτι μᾶλλον στηρίζαι. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 55.2 [PG 60.381.14] + 55.1 [PG 60.380.35–37])
6	Τοῖς ὑπουργὸν λέγουσι τοῦ Πατρὸς ... Ἰσης ἐξουσίας μετέχει. (Ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου in C150.1)	–	Τοῖς ὑπουργὸν λέγουσι τοῦ Πατρὸς ... Ἰσης ἐξουσίας μετέχει.
7	–	–	Τὸν τρόπον τοῦ μὴ ἑωρακέναι δεικνύς, τοὺς ... συμβέβηκεν μυσάντων τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς. (Proc. <i>G. Is.</i> [PG 87.1945. 10–20]; CPG 7434)

TABLE 7 Comparison between the representatives of C152.1 (*cont.*)

Scholia	GA 1524	GA 437 (catena one)	GA 1871
8	Ἐποίησαν τοῦτο, φησί, τὰ ὦτα ... ἐπιστρέψωσιν, ἰάσεται αὐτούς. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Mt.</i> 45.1–2 [PG 58.473.3–10])		Οὐχ ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ ... ἀναχαιτίζοντα τῆς κακίας αὐτόν. (inversion of 9)
9	Ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου Ὁὐχ ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ ... ἀναχαιτίζοντα τῆς κακίας αὐτόν. (Severus; CPG 7080.15)		Ἐποίησαν τοῦτο, φησί, τὰ ὦτα ... ἐπιστρέψωσιν, ἰάσεται αὐτούς. (inversion of 8)
10	Οὐ καθάπερ ὁ Σινωπεὺς ... κατέμενεν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in 1 Cor.</i> 35.4 [PG 61.302.9–24]; CPG 4428)	—	—
11	—	Ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ὁ Παῦλος διετίαν ὄλην ... μέχρι τῆς τελειώσεως, λέ'. (Ἐκ τοῦ Προλόγου ... in C150.1)	—

The other catena attributed to Theophylact is found in GA 254 (C152.2). The title of the work reads: Ἐκ τῶν ἐξηγητικῶν τοῦ ἁγ(ίου) Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρ(υσοστόμου) καὶ τινων ἐκ τῶν πατέρων <ἐξηγήσεις> εἰς τὰς Πράξεις καὶ εἰς τὰς Καθολικὰς κατὰ συντομίαν συλλεγ(εῖσαι) παρὰ τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Θεοφυλάκτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Βουλγαρίας. Nonetheless, Staab rejected Theophylact’s authorship and deemed this commentary as a low-quality excerpt from the Andreas catena, formed by cuts and extensions.⁵²

While the influence of the major compilation is undeniable, equally striking is the proximity of GA 254 to GA 1524, as observed by von Soden.⁵³ This is apparent in the verbatim repetition of some fairly long exegetical passages from GA 1524: the two catenae have the same reworked scholium from Chrysostom’s *Homily on Acts* 4, as illustrated in Table 8. However, the selection and sequence of scholia is visibly different. Rather than a direct relationship, we can assume

52 Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, x.
53 Von Soden, *Die Schriften*, 1:688.

TABLE 8 Comparison between GA 254 and 1524

Scholia	GA 254	GA 1524
	Acts 2:3–16	
1	Διδύμου' Αναλαμβανόμενος ἀπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν ... ἦσαν δοθέντος τοῦ Πνεύματος. (CPG 2561)	Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ... ἔχρῃν, ὥσει πυρός.
2	Χρυσοστόμου' Πολλὴν τὴν ῥύμην τοῦ Πνεύματος ... εἰ μὴ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι μετέσχον. (<i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 4.1 [PG 60. 1–42], abbreviated and reworked)	Ἐκάθισέ τε ἐφ' ἓνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν. Τουτέστι, παρέμεινεν ... ἐπὶ Χριστῷ μαρτύρια.
3	Τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου' (no name in GA 1524) Καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ κατοικεῖν ἐκεῖ καταλιπόντας πατρίδας, εὐλαβείας ἦν σημεῖον, μάλιστα τὰ ἐκ διαφορῶν ἐθνῶν ἀπάραντες καὶ ἀφέντας οἰκίας καὶ συγγενεῖς, ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ κατοικεῖν. Τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐθνῶν· τὸ γὰρ παντὸς ἐπὶ πολλῶν ἐκλαμβάνει ἡ γραφὴ ὑπερβολικῶς χρωμένη. Οὕτως εἴρηται καὶ τὸ ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ τὸ οἱ πάντες τὰ ἐαυτῶν ζητοῦσιν, οὐ τὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὸ οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς, ἀπὸ τοῦ καθόλου τοὺς πολλοὺς σημαίνουσα. Εἴτα γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης, συνήλθε τὸ πλῆθος καὶ συνεχύθη, ἡγουν ἐταράχθη, ἐθαύμασεν· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν οἰκίᾳ ἐγένετο τὸ γερόμενον, εἰκότως ἔξωθεν συνέδραμε, ὅτι ἤκουον εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ. Ἦδειςαν γὰρ ὅτι Γαλιλαῖοι ὄντες, καὶ μάλιστα οἱ Ἀπόστολοι· πρὸς γὰρ ἐκείνους μᾶλλον ἐώρων· τὰς μυρίας ἐκείνας ἐλάλουν γλώσσας. Συνεχύθη δὲ τὸ πλῆθος, εἰκότως· ἐνόμιζον γὰρ αὐτοῖς παρέχειν πράγματα διὰ τὴν δυομένην τόλμαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· καὶ τὸ συνειδὸς κατέσειεν αὐτῶν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐν χερσίν οὖν οὔσης ἔτι τῆς σφαγῆς· καὶ πάντα αὐτοὺς ἐπτόει. Τοῦτο δὲ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐνέουρο, ὅτι καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀκρατῶν ἐμάνθανον τοῦ θαύματος τὴν χάριν· ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ἦν τυχὸν Παρθιστὶ, αὐτοὶ οὐκ ᾔδειςαν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ ἐκείνων ἐμάνθανον. Ἐθνῶν δὲ μέμνηται πολεμίων αὐτοῖς, Κρητῶν, Ἀράβων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων· καὶ τοῦτο σύμβολον ἦν ὅτι πάντων κρατήσουσιν. Ἐκεῖ δὲ ἐν αἰχμαλωσίᾳ ἦσαν πολλοί. Πάντοθεν τοῖνον ἡ μαρτυρία, παρὰ πολιτῶν, παρὰ ξένων, παρὰ προσηλύτων. (<i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 4.1 [PG 60.43.50–59] + 4.2 [PG 60.45.37–41], reworked).	
4	Διδύμου' Τὸ ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους ἀπλούστερον ἐκληπτέον ... δεῖξασθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα διδοσθαι αὐτὸ ῥητέον. (CPG 2561)	Πανταχοῦ μετὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς ... ἵνα ἡ χλεύη πολλοὺς συναγάγῃ.
5	Σευηριανοῦ' Διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν ... διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς μετανοίας. (CPG 4218) ^a	Εἶδες ἐκεῖ κηδεμονίαν ... μετὰ τοσαύτης διαλέγεται παρρησίας.

a In the Andreas catena (C150.1) this scholium is entitled τοῦ αὐτοῦ and comes after a comment from Chrysostom. However, since there is no trace of this text in Chrysostom's works, the attribution to Severian of Gabala is probably correct.

the use of a common type as a source. Another departure from GA 1524 is the indication of authorship in the margins of GA 254, next to the first words of each comment, which is mostly absent from the representatives of C152.1. The most relevant discrepancy, though, seems to be in the compilation practice: while the compiler of GA 254 generally separates individual authors' extracts, the catenist of GA 1524 tends to combine multiple sources in a single scholium. Unlike the Oecumenius catena (C151), however, he does not 'rewrite' the mixed comments: in most cases, these are merely abbreviated and assembled while preserving the author's style. This could be defined as a "cut and paste" technique.⁵⁴

6 C155: *Codices singuli*

This category has been introduced as the next available number in the Acts catena sequence in CPG for manuscripts whose catena does not correspond to any of the types so far illustrated. Three manuscripts have already been assigned a number in the *Clavis Clavium* based on Parpulov's catalogue: GA 605 (C155.1); GA 920 (C155.2); Patmos, Ioannou, 263 (C155.3).⁵⁵ The next manuscripts to be included are: GA 437, catena two (C155.4); GA 886, catena one (C155.5); GA 1839 (C.155.6). Further detailed research is required to determine the nature of these compilations, but there is already sufficient evidence to exclude any close relationship between the individual witnesses: each presents a different selection and arrangement of scholia, as displayed in Table 9.

7 Conclusion

To some extent, the present survey may appear to have confirmed Charles Kannengiesser's opinion that the study of the genealogy of catenae is a "a bewildering task".⁵⁶ Nevertheless, this attempt to classify the manuscript tradition in greater detail than has hitherto been the case has brought a degree of order to the confusion which may arise both when approaching individual manuscripts and in understanding the existing printed texts. The forty-six catena manuscripts on Acts considered in this study disclose great diversity: not only are there discrepancies between the selection and transmission of

54 Cf. Curti, "La tradizione catenaria", 280.

55 <https://clavis.brepols.net/clacla/OA/Link.aspx?clavis=CPG&number=C155>.

56 Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, 978.

TABLE 9 Sequence of comments in C155

Scholia	GA 437 (catena two)	GA 605	GA 886 (catena one)
Acts 2:1–14			
1	Σευήρου· Παθών Χριστὸς ὁ Θεὸς σαρκί ... ἐν Πνεύματι καὶ ἀλη- θείᾳ, δεῖ προσκυνεῖν. (unidentified work)	Τουτέστι πρὸ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, περὶ αὐτήν, ὡς εἶπεν ... καὶ ὡσεὶ πνοὴ οὐ γὰρ ἄνεμος ἦν. (Chrys. <i>Hom.</i> <i>in Ac.</i> 4.1 [PG 60.42.45–56, 43.1–6])	Ἀναλαμβάνόμενος ἀπὸ τῶν μαθη- τῶν ... τῆς ἐκκλησίας πληρῶματι.
2	Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησις ... ἀπαρχὴν τῷ Θεῷ προσαγομένων. (Severian of Gabala, unidentified work)	Τουτέστι παρέμεινεν ἐπα- νεπαύσατο ... εἰκότως, ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐδέξαντο τὰς γλώσσας. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 4.1 [PG 60.43.12–13] + unidenti- fied source)	Ὅν τρόπον τὰ τοῦ νόμου ... ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.
3	Πάντες τινες· οἱ Ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς μαθηταίς. (unidentified work)	Τούτου χάριν πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων χαρισμάτων ... ἡδύναντο λαλεῖν ἀθρώως φωναίς. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in 1 Cor.</i> 35.1 [PG 61.296.39–48])	Ἐκέλευεν ὁ νόμος ... πλήρεις ἐγένοντο.
4	Σευηριανοῦ· Καλῶς τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ· Ἐπειδὴ καὶ τότε ἡ πρώτη φωνὴ ... τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσεως. (unidentified work; cf. GA 1895, schol. 4) ^a	Δεικνύς, ὅτι πολλάκις ὁ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις τίμιος ... πάντα προωρίσθαι. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 3.3 [PG 61.38.28–37])	Χρυσοστόμου· Ὅτι οὐ μεθύουσιν, εὐθέως ... πάντας φθέγγεσθαι. ^b (<i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 4.3 [PG 60.46.20–48])
5	Σευήρου· Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μὲν· ἵνα παραστήσῃ σαφῶς ... τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. (ἀπὸ λόγου μὴ in C150.1; CPG 7035)	Ἰστέον ὅτι τούτου ἐκλεγέ- ντος ... οὐχ ἅπαξ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 3.4 [PG 60.38.46–50])	Οὓς ξένους εἶπεν ἀνωτέρω ... τὸ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις οἰκεῖν. (<i>Hom. in</i> <i>Ac.</i> 5.1 [PG 60.49.27–32])

TABLE 9 Sequence of comments in C155 (*cont.*)

Scholia	GA 920	GA 1839	Patmos, Ioannou, 263
		Acts 28:19–31	
1	Ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔνεκεν ὑμῶν τὴν ἄλυσιν.... ὅθεν τοῦτο δηλῶν ἐπάγει· (Chrys. <i>Hom.</i> <i>in Ac.</i> 55.1 [PG 60.379.50–55])	Εὐσεβίου· Πρὶν ἐπιδημήσαι τὸν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ... ὧν ἐδήλωσεν Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἀποστόλων. (<i>Is.</i> 1.73.45–74; no source indication in GA 1839)	
2	᾿Ωσεὶ ἔλεγον· Οὐτε διὰ γραμμάτων, ... κατηγορίας ἑαυτοὺς ἀπολύοντες. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 55.1 [PG 60.379. 60–61, 380.10–15])	Καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ῥητὸν προφήτην ὡς Θεόθεν ἀποφθέγγομεν ... οἱ δὲ ἀφείθησαν ἐν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις. (Bas. <i>Is.</i> 6.189.13–36)	Τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου· Δείκνυσιν ὁ Παῦλος διὰ τούτου, ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα ἦν ὁ ὁ προφητῆς Ἑσαίας τεθέατο. (unidentified work)
3	Ὅτε ἀνεχώρουν ἀντιτασσομένων αὐτῶν ... γινῶναι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 55.1 [PG 60.380.35–43])	–	–
4	Τουτέστι, μὴ πιστεύ- οντες ἀνεχώρουν. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 55.2 [PG 60.381.14])	–	–
5	Ἐνταῦθα δείκνυσιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἐλευθερίαν ... καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπὶ β' ἔτη διδασκῶν ἐκεῖ. (Chrys. <i>Hom. in Ac.</i> 55.1 [PG 60.380.55–57])	–	–

a See Table 2 above.

b A different hand is responsible for this and the following comments: these are excerpted from C150.1 (see section 3 above).

scholia, but even within groups it is rare that two copies are exactly the same. Determining the boundaries between one type of catena and another is a challenge, because during the process of compilation, existing collections were reduced, extended or mixed with others, quotations by Christian exegetes were expanded or abbreviated, and often simply removed. It is apparent that the Andreas catena (C150) exerted a consistent influence on all the other types, yet there is sufficient evidence to adduce a certain degree of flexibility in following the main model and the utilisation of multiple sources (this is the case in C150.2e, C151, C152.2, and most likely some *codices singuli*). As observed by William Lamb, “the rather chaotic manuscript tradition characteristic of catenae suggests that a catena is an ‘open book’. Material was added and amended with the production of each new copy.”⁵⁷

In the light of these considerations, the deployment of specific categories of identification (type, subtype, group), albeit flexible, will permit scholarship to gain a better idea of the diversified tradition of catenae on Acts. This account provides a point of reference for future research and lays the groundwork for specific exploration of matters yet to be addressed, such as reconstructing the stages in the development of the recognised catena types and identifying the manuscripts which merit close examination (such as the *codices singuli*). Only by proceeding in this carefully defined way will it become possible to reach a fuller appreciation of the nature and value of the catena tradition on the Acts of the Apostles.

Acknowledgement

This article is written as part of the CATENA project, which has been funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme (grant agreement no. 770816).

⁵⁷ Lamb, “Conservation and Conversation”, 280.