

A Unique Commentary Manuscript: GA457 and the Pauline Catena Tradition

Panella, Theodora

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Panella, T 2020, A Unique Commentary Manuscript: GA457 and the Pauline Catena Tradition. in HAG Houghton, ML Davies & M Vinzent (eds), *Studia Patristica Vol. C: Including Papers Presented at the Sixth British Patristics Conference, Birmingham, 5-7 September 2016*. . vol. 100, Peeters Publishers and Booksellers, Leuven, Leuven, pp. 315-322.

[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.

A Unique Commentary Manuscript: GA 457 and the Pauline Catena Tradition

Theodora PANELLA, University of Birmingham, UK¹

ABSTRACT

Biblical commentaries seem to have played an important role in theological and exegetical discussions in the East and West from the fourth century onwards. Most of the material in catenae remains unpublished, with little in the way of critical texts. Regarding the catenae on the Pauline epistles there is no thorough examination of the manuscript tradition and the patristic material that is preserved in them. Most, but not all, catenae manuscripts have been listed by scholars over the last century. However, Gregory-Aland 457, not identified as a commentary in the *Kurzgefasste Liste*, is a catena manuscript of Paul with a unique type of commentary which may help to illuminate the history of the genre. This article investigates the sources from which the commentary has been taken. It pays particular attention to unidentified scholia and any scholia found in the wrong place. It also looks at the affiliation of the biblical text to determine whether it was copied from another catena manuscript or is a new composition. More general comments about Pauline catena tradition will be offered on the basis of this manuscript.

Among biblical catena manuscripts are Greek manuscripts of the Pauline Epistles, which combine the scriptural text with a commentary drawn from early Christian Church Fathers, such as Origen, Chrysostom and Theodoret of Cyr. Four catenists are known to have compiled catenae on the Pauline Epistles during the Byzantine era. The earliest is Oecumenius, now believed to have lived at the end of the sixth century.² He is followed some 600 years later by Theophylact, Archbishop of Ohrid or Bulgaria in the eleventh or twelfth century and Nicetas of Heraclea or of Serrae in the eleventh century. Finally comes Euthymius Zigabenus, a monk who flourished in the twelfth century.

¹ The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement no. 283302 (COMPAUL: 'The Earliest Commentaries on Paul in Greek and Latin as Sources for the Biblical Text'). This work is also supported by an Arts and Humanities Research Council Midlands3Cities Doctoral Training Partnership award.

² F. Diekamp, 'Mittheilungen über den neu aufgefundenen Commentar des Oekumenius zur Apokalypse', *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (Phil.-hist. Klasse)* 43 (1901), 1046-56.

The earliest surviving catena manuscript is Codex Zacynthius, a palimpsest whose underwriting, probably dating from the early eighth century, is a catena on Luke.³ For Pauline catenae, the earliest known surviving catena manuscripts were copied in the ninth century, probably three centuries after the compilation was first made. Most manuscripts date from the tenth to twelfth centuries and are listed in the *Kurzgefasste Liste* of New Testament manuscripts.⁴ There has been no edition of the Pauline catenae since Cramer's widely-criticised edition of 1844.⁵ However, subsequent scholars such as Staab⁶ and von Soden⁷ have worked on identifying different types of Pauline catena, characterising them according to the place that they were found (Vaticanus, Parisinus, Monacensis), the name of their author (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Nicetas, Zigabenus) and even further subdivisions, as in the five catenae identified as Pseudo-Oecumenius a, b, c, d and e.⁸ Lamb's recent work on the *Catena in Marcum* has suggested that all the catenae for Mark's Gospel are in fact interrelated, based on one early compilation, which was subsequently enlarged or reduced by later editors according to their interests.⁹ My research so far suggests this is also the case for Paul.

This paper concerns a manuscript housed at the Laurentian Library in Florence, with the classmark Plut. IV. 29. Palaeographically it was assigned by Montfaucon to the tenth century or even the last quarter of the ninth century, but not earlier.¹⁰ The codex consists of 294 parchment leaves (26cm by 19.6cm) and contains the text of the Acts of the Apostles, of the Catholic Letters and the Pauline epistles with a marginal commentary. Montfaucon described it as: 'Membr. Acta Apostolorum cum Epistolis Catholicis, et D. Pauli cum argumentis et scholiis antiquis, et interlineari Latina versione in Epistolis'. The current binding of the codex is not original but matches the other 3000 codices that formed the basis of the newly founded Mediceo-Laurenziana Library in 1571.

³ Cambridge, University Library ms Add. 10062. Parker and Birdsall dated it to around 700: see J. Neville Birdsall and David C. Parker, 'The Date of the Codex Zacynthius (Ξ): A New Proposal', *JTS* NS 55 (2004), 121.

⁴ Kurt Aland, Michael Welte, Beate Köster, Klaus Junack, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neues Testaments* (Berlin, New York, 1994).

⁵ John A. Cramer, *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, v. 4 (Oxford, 1844).

⁶ Karl Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht* (Rome, 1926).

⁷ Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments. I. Teil: Untersuchungen. I. Abteilung: Die Textzeugen* (Göttingen, 1911), 249-89.

⁸ K. Staab, *Pauluskatenen* (1926), 93-182.

⁹ William Lamb, *The Catena in Marcum: A Byzantine Anthology of Early Commentary on Mark*, Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 6 (Leiden, 2012), 57.

¹⁰ According to Antonio Maria Biscionio, *Bibliothecae Mediceo-Laurentianae Catalogus*, t. 1, Codices orientales complectens (Florence, 1752), 70. But Montfaucon in his work *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum* gives only this information about Plut. IV. 29 'Membr. Acta Apostolorum cum Epistolis Catholicis, et D. Pauli cum argumentis et scholiis antiquis, et interlineari Latina versione in Epistolis', see Bernard de Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova*, t. 1 (Paris, 1739), 253.

The quires have been wrongly ordered in the extant binding, with ff. 233-240 (*Col.* 1:23 and *1Thes.* 1:1) placed after 241-248 (*1Thes.* 2:14 – *2Thes.* 3:14).

The manuscript is written in one column with nineteen lines per page.¹¹ A considerable amount of space was left in the margins in order to be used for comments on the biblical text. Leroy identifies Plut. IV. 29 as ruling pattern 44C1q and groups it with four more manuscripts with the same ruling dated between the tenth and eleventh centuries.¹² The scribe copied the codex in two different styles, one for the biblical text and another one for the commentary, the titles of the chapters, the ὑποθέσεις and the indexes of chapters placed before the beginning of the biblical books. This manuscript is included in the *Kurzgefasste Liste* as minuscule 457.¹³ It was also used by von Soden [α67]¹⁴ and by Tischendorf [87^a and 97^p].¹⁵ However, surprisingly, it is not identified in the *Liste* as a commentary manuscript despite the presence of marginal comments in all three sections of the Bible apparently written by the original copyist.

The manuscript arrived in Florence between 1396 and 1492.¹⁶ In 1396, Manuel Chrysoloras received a letter inviting him to buy the books necessary for his future work teaching Greek in Florence, the first period that he spent there being from 1397 until 1399.¹⁷ Since the manuscript has an interlinear word-for-word Latin translation of most of the text and also single words in margins, and since we know that Chrysoloras used this method to teach Greek to his pupils,¹⁸ we may assume that he acquired and used Plut. IV. 29 for this purpose. It seems that the Catholic Epistles and Pauline Epistles held the greatest interest for his students or their teacher, since there is no Latin translation of Acts (ff. 1r-80r). The Latin interlinear text is only on ff. 80v-253v, covering the Catholic Letters and Pauline Epistles up to *1Tim.* 4:3, where the translation stops. There are several hands for the Latin interlinear text, which strengthens

¹¹ K. Aland et al., *Kurzgefasste Liste* (1994), 74.

¹² Julien Leroy, *Répertoire de réglures dans les manuscrits grecs sur parchemin*, *Bibliologia* 13 (Turnhout, 1995), 207. The four manuscripts are: a) Ambros. gr. 0385 (G 016 Sup.), b) Vat. Reginensis gr. Pii II 50, c) Marc. gr. app. I. 011 (coll. 1275), d) Vat. Gr. 0458.

¹³ K. Aland et al., *Kurzgefasste Liste* (1994), 74.

¹⁴ H.F. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, I.1: Die Textzeugen* (1911), 218.

¹⁵ K. Aland et al., *Kurzgefasste Liste* (1994), 380.

¹⁶ See Jerry H. Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance* (Princeton, 1983), 15-6 and Giovanni Mercati, *Se la versione dall'Ebraico del Codice veneto-graeco VII sia di Simone Atumani arcivescovo di Tebe: Ricerca storica con notizie e documenti sulla vita dell'Atumano* (Roma, 1916), 40-1.

¹⁷ Lydia Thorn-Wickert, *Manuel Chrysoloras (ca. 1350-1415)* (Frankfurt am Main, 2006), 41, 45; Coluccio Salutati, *Epistolario*, v. 3, a cura di Francesco Novati (Roma, 1896), lib. IX, Nr. 14, 119-25. See also Deno Jean Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice: Studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to Western Europe* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1962).

¹⁸ Paul Botley, 'Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396-1529: Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series* 100.2 (2010), 86.

the argument that the codex was used for teaching purposes.¹⁹ Chrysoloras might have used the manuscript before it entered the Medici Collection, some time between 1417 and 1492. The former date is when Cosimo the Elder acquired the first 63 books of the collection, while the latter refers to the second visit to Greece by Janus Lascaris, Greek scholar and librarian of this library, who brought back about two hundred manuscripts from Mount Athos.²⁰

In Antonio Maria Biscionio's library catalogue of 1752, some comments in the commentary on Acts are ascribed to Oecumenius,²¹ although in Cramer's edition they are described as of the catena Andreae.²² Regarding the commentary on the Catholic Epistles, this is identified as excerpts from a catena in two other manuscripts in the same library (Plut. IV. 1 and Plut. VIII. 19, dated to the tenth and twelfth centuries): '*Scholia sunt rarissima, ac brevia, excerpta ex catena in Epistolas Catholicas, de qua Pl. IV. Cod. I., & rursum Pl. VIII. Cod. 19*'.²³ According to Staab, these both belong to Pseudo-Oecumenius type a (Normal-typus).²⁴ Remarkably, however, no information is given about the commentary on the Pauline epistles. I therefore transcribed both the biblical text and the commentary, so as to collate the biblical text and identify the excerpts of the commentary with the help of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG), and some printed editions.²⁵ Despite the brevity of some extracts, precluding any further study, my conclusion is that the biblical text in this manuscript represents the Majority Text and that this is a Pauline catena made of excerpts of several Church Fathers.

Some of the names of the sources are clearly written in this manuscript, e.g. Basil of Caesarea, Maximus Confessor and Cyril of Alexandria. The vast majority of the excerpts are from John Chrysostom. Some are found in other catenae (e.g. Vaticanus, Parisinus, Monacensis, Pseudo-Oecumenius), while others are not. The excerpts found in other catenae all belong under the general title of Pseudo-Oecumenian tradition.²⁶ All the extracts thus far encountered in the Pauline catena which might belong to John of Damascus are identical to Chrysostom: this probably means that Damascus used Chrysostom. It is preferable to attribute these extracts to Chrysostom, because he is more ancient. However, in one case, 1Cor. 11:19, οὐ τὰς τῶν δογμάτων, ἀλλὰ τὰς τῶν σχισμάτων

¹⁹ A.M. Biscionio, *Bibliothecae Mediceo-Laurentianae Catalogus* (1752), 67-8.

²⁰ Κωνσταντίνος Ν. Σάθας, *Βιογραφίαι τῶν ἐν γράμμασι διαλαμψάντων Ἑλλήνων, Ἀπὸ τῆς καταλύσεως τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Αὐτοκρατορίας μέχρι τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐθνεγερσίας (1453-1821)*, Νεοελληνικὴ Φιλολογία (Αθήνα, 1868), 113-4.

²¹ A.M. Biscionio, *Bibliothecae Mediceo-Laurentianae Catalogus* (1752), 67.

²² J.A. Cramer, *Catenae*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1838), 1-424.

²³ A.M. Biscionio, *Bibliothecae Mediceo-Laurentianae Catalogus* (1752), 67.

²⁴ K. Staab, *Pauluskatenen* (1926), 108, 111.

²⁵ The TLG was accessed at <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/> in December 2014. It was supplemented by printed texts from J.P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* (Paris).

²⁶ Maurice Geerard, 'Concilia Catenae', *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* IV (Turnhout, 1980).

τούτων λέγει, the excerpt is closer to John of Damascus, because Chrysostom uses a different word order. A similar example occurs at *2Cor.* 11:25 on the word βυθῶ:

Οἱ μὲν ὅτι φασιν, ὅτι ἐν μέσῳ πελάγει φησὶν πλέων· οἱ δέ, ὅτι νηρόμενος ἐμεσο-
πελάγει, ἔνθα οὐ γῆν, οὐκ ὄρος ἦν ἰδεῖν, ὅπερ καὶ ἀληθέστερον. Ἐπεὶ ἐκεῖνό γε
τὸ πρῶτον οὐδὲ θαύματος ἄξιον, οὐδ' ἂν μετὰ τὰ ναύαγια αὐτὸ τέθεικεν, ὥς τῶν
ναυαγίων μεῖζον ὄν. Εἰπὼν γὰρ τρεῖς ἐναυάγησα, ἐπήγαγε. Νυχθημερόν ἐν τῷ βυθῷ
πεποίηκα.

This comment is for a few words closer to John of Damascus²⁷ than to John Chrysostom,²⁸ who himself took the idea from Athanasius.²⁹

Works from which I have identified extracts in this catena are as follows: Chrysostom *Homiliae*, Basil of Caesarea *Asceticon*, Theodoret *Interpretatio in XIV epistulas sancti Pauli*, Cyril of Jerusalem *Catecheses ad illuminandos*, *Index apostolorum discipulorumque Domini* (textus Pseudo-Dorothei), Maximus Confessor *Quaestiones et dubia*, Isidore of Pelusium *Epistulae*, Cyril of Alexandria *Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali trinitate*, Gregory Nazianzen *De moderatione in disputando*, Eusebius of Caesarea *Commentarius in Isaiam*, Didymus Caecus *Commentarii in Psalmos*, John of Damascus *Commentarii in epistulas Pauli*. Other authors cited include Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, Eusebius, Severianus and Oecumenius. It was possible to identify one excerpt on *Titus* 1:12, *Ἐπιμενίδου Κρητὸς μάντεως χρησμός* which, according to Staab's edition, comes from Oecumenius.³⁰ It is interesting that two excerpts from lexicographers are found: a single excerpt on *Col.* 2:8 from Hesychius³¹ (συλλαγωγῶν: ὁ ἀπογυμνῶν) and one on *Phil.* 4:10 (ἡκαιρεῖσθε: ἐκωλύεσθε. Καίρὸν οὐκ εἴχετε) that could be attributed to Photius or an anonymous lexicographer of the eighth or ninth centuries.³²

Another interesting feature is the fact that two extracts from other catenae on Romans are applied to different Epistles in GA 457. The first is Severianus' comment on the word περιτομή in *Gal.* 2:7. This can be found as a comment on *Rom.* 4:11 (καὶ σημειῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς) in a sixteenth-century manuscript from which Cramer edited his *Typus Vaticanus*,³³ and also in other manuscripts

²⁷ John of Damascus, *Ἐκ τῆς καθόλου ἐρμηνείας Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου ἐκλογαὶ ἐκλεγείσαι* (*Exposition in Epistolas Pauli*), PG 95, 765.

²⁸ John Chrysostom, *ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὴν πρὸς Κορινθίους δευτέραν ἐπιστολὴν*, PG 61, 571.

²⁹ Athanasius, *Quaestiones in Scripturam Sacram [Spuria]*, PG 28, 761.

³⁰ K. Staab, *Pauluskommentar* (1933), 461.

³¹ Mauricius Schmidt, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, vols. 3-4 (Halle, 3:1861; 4:1862), 3:251-439; 4:1-336; Peter A. Hansen, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, Vol. III, Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker (SGLG) 11/3 (Berlin, New York, 2005), 3-404.

³² Christos Theodoridis, *Photii patriarchae lexicon* (E-M), vol. 2 (Berlin, New York, 1998), 3-592; I.C. Cunningham, *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων*, Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker (SGLG) 10 (Berlin, New York, 2003), 73-523.

³³ J.A. Cramer, *Catena*, vol. 4 (Oxford, 1844), 1-162.

edited by Staab.³⁴ The same excerpt can be found also as a definition in the Suda lexicon composed in the tenth century (contemporary with the copying of Plut. IV. 29).³⁵ Therefore, given that the provenance of Plut. IV. 29 is unclear, as is the speed of the expansion and influence of the lexicon, it could be suggested that this passage was written by Severianus and later influenced the lexicographer. The second is a comment on *2Tim* 3:17 in Plut. IV. 29 on the word ἄρτιος, matching a comment on *Rom.* 14:22 in other catenae: Σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις; Κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. For this second excerpt, TLG gave two results: the first from John of Damascus and the second from the *Catena in epistolam ad Romanos* (Typus Monacensis, as edited by Cramer), where it is preceded by the name of Chrysostom but cannot be located in his works.

Comments in *2Timothy* on the names of the apostles and disciples in this manuscript are worthy of special mention. There are three works from which these could have been taken: a) Pseudo-Dorotheus' *Index apostolorum discipulorumque Domini*; b) Epiphanius' *Index apostolorum discipulorumque Domini*; c) the tenth-century *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopoleos*.³⁶ The relationship between these is currently not fully understood: they differ in the order that the apostles are listed, in grammar and in syntax, but the content of all three is almost the same. The last work may be discounted as a source for Plut. IV. 29: not only is the *Synaxarium* quite late in date, but it differs textually from this manuscript. The following names are discussed: Φύγελος and Ἑρμογένης (*2Tim.* 1:15, fol. 259v; Φύγελλος ἐπίσκοπος Ἐφέσου καὶ Ἑρμογένης ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος κατέστη ἐν Μεγάροις καὶ ἑτεροδοξήσαντες, ἀντέστησαν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τοῦ ἀποστόλου), Ὀνησιφόρος (*2Tim.* 1:16, fol. 259v; ἐπίσκοπος Κορονίας γέγονεν), Δημᾶς (*2Tim.* 4:10, fol. 262v; ἐπορεύθη εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην κάκεϊ ἱερεὺς εἰδώλων ἐγένετο) and Τρόφιμος (*2Tim.* 4:20, fol. 263v; Τρόφιμος, Ἀρίστραχος καὶ Πούδης οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἐν τοῖς διωγμοῖς τῷ ἀποστόλῳ συγκακοπαθήσαντες. Τέλος σὺν αὐτῷ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀπετμήθησαν). These comments cannot be found in any of the edited catenae. However, Schermann in his edition of Epiphanius' *Index apostolorum discipulorumque* gives a catalogue of witnesses that attribute this index to Epiphanius. One is characterised as *Textus inter Oecumenii Commentaria*, without giving more details about its sources. But the study of these texts in relationship with the extracts in Plut. IV. 29 shows that this is not the case here, since the word κατέστη at *2Tim.* 1:15 and the phrase Θεσσαλονίκην κάκεϊ ἱερεὺς εἰδώλων ἐγένετο (*2Tim.* 4:10) do not exist in Epiphanius: instead, they

³⁴ K. Staab, *Pauluskommentar* (1933), XLVIII, 213-25.

³⁵ Ada Adler, *Suidae lexicon*, 4 vols., Lexicographi Graeci 1.1-1.4 (Leipzig, 1928-1935).

³⁶ Theodorus Schermann, *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae, Indices apostolorum discipulorumque Domini, Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto aliisque vindicate* (Leipzig, 1907), 132-60; T. Schermann, *Indices apostolorum discipulorumque* (Leipzig, 1907), 118-26; Hippolytus Delehaye, *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, Acta Sanctorum 62 (Brussels, 1902, repr. Wetteren, 1985).

are present in the tradition attributed to Pseudo-Dorotheus. Again, the verb γέγονεν at 2Tim. 1:16 is frequently repeated in Pseudo-Dorotheus, but not encountered so often in Epiphanius. So, the source of these comments on Jesus' disciples appears to be the Pseudo-Dorotheus *Index apostolorum discipulorumque Domini*.

This manuscript also includes the Euthalian apparatus.³⁷ This comprises: a) the ὑποθέσεις of the Epistles, b) the indexes of κεφάλαια – τίτλοι (chapters), c) the stichometric notations and d) the πρόλογοι, the three general prologues, to the Pauline Epistles, Acts and Catholic Letters. All except the prologues were copied as part of the original production of Plut. IV. 29. Sometimes the chapter titles can be found just before the beginning of the Epistle, but even if this initial list is absent, the titles are still included as headings above the biblical text, or even below it or in the outer margins. Almost all the titles are present in GA 457, although there are a few minor differences from the standard verse references.³⁸ The ὑποθέσεις are present for all Pauline epistles but absent from 1John. and Acts, while κεφάλαια are only found between James and 2Peter and between Romans and Colossians. According to Blomkvist the question of authorship of these apparatus' ὑποθέσεις is complicated since the ὑποθέσεις are present in three different works: in Euthalius, in the pseudo-Athanasian *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae*³⁹ and, most importantly for us, in the Commentary of Oecumenius (PG 118-9).⁴⁰

In addition to this indication of a connection between this catena manuscript and (Pseudo-)Oecumenian tradition, Antonio Maria Biscionio in his catalogue indicated that Plut. IV. 29 (GA 457) was related to Plut. IV. 01 (GA 454), another catena manuscript from the tenth century, which is attributed to Oecumenius. This same catalogue describes the catena of Acts in GA 457 as that of Oecumenius. Most importantly, most of the excerpts found in GA 457 are from the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena. For all these reasons I think that Plut. IV. 29 should be listed as a catena manuscript in the *Liste* and should also be cited as a witness to the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena tradition. It is not possible to attribute this catena to Oecumenius himself, because some of the extracts were taken from Maximus the Confessor and some others, as it seems from John of Damascus, who both lived in the seventh century after the time of Oecumenius.⁴¹

³⁷ For a brief summary of this, see David C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge, 2008), 268-70.

³⁸ For example, chapter E' begins in 2Tim 2:14 in GA 457 rather than in 2Tim 2:22: see Vermund Blomkvist, *Euthalian Traditions: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Berlin, Boston, 2012), 56.

³⁹ PG 28, 282-438.

⁴⁰ V. Blomkvist, *Euthalian Traditions* (2012), 147.

⁴¹ 'Es sei hier beider seit 4 Jahrhunderten traditionelle Name beibehalten, wenn auch vor das Wort „Oecumenius-Typ“ im Geiste immer ein „Pseudo“ zu setzen ist.' See K. Staab, *Paulus-kommentare* (1933), 99.

This catena gives us a little information about the Pseudo-Oecumenian tradition. First of all, it shows that catenae were open books to which more modern authors could be added. Secondly, catenae existed not only in longer but also shorter formats. One could also ask why the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena was here shortened so drastically. Given that this is a beautiful decorated book with considerable space between the lines and large, clear letters, it could have been a book for liturgical use. If we also take into consideration that only small excerpts or phrases can be found in the margins, then it can be assumed that the user had a good knowledge of the works of the Church Fathers and needed only few words to refresh his memory so as to interpret the Pauline Epistles to a congregation. Supporting evidence for this argument that the manuscript continued to be used for liturgical purposes are the lection identifiers that sporadically can be found in the manuscript.⁴² These were added later, probably in the fifteenth century, by a non-professional scribe. This hand has ‘an almost child-like clarity’, as Barbour characterises this style used by early humanists.⁴³ Also, βαβαί as found in Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Philippians*⁴⁴ is used here at the beginning of the comment on σύμμορφον (*Phil.* 3:21): βαβαί! ἐκεῖνῳ τῷ καθημένῳ ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρός, σύμμορφον τούτῳ γίνεται, ἐκεῖνῳ τῷ προσκυνουμένῳ ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων. ἐκεῖνῳ ᾧ παρεστήκασιν αἱ ἀσώματοι δυνάμεις, ἐκεῖνῳ σύμμορφον γίνεται. This appears to give an emphasis to the oral presentation.

The examination of this catena manuscript raises questions for an editor of the catenae. Are there more manuscripts not currently identified as catenae? Who is their compiler? Are they part of an existing tradition? Do they relate to each other? What is the purpose of their compilation? These cannot be answered without further research on the subject of Pauline catena manuscripts.

⁴² A good and clear extended example for this is ε’ ἡ παραμονὴ τῶν ἁγίων Θεοφανίων on f. 165v. In this lection identifier we can observe also some ignorance of the use of accents and breathings.

⁴³ See Ruth Barbour, *Greek Literary Hands A.D. 400–1600* (Oxford, 1981), xxiii, 29 image 106.

⁴⁴ PG 62, 279.