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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.
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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/10.31826/9781463236938.
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), respecti-
vely. 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–
1232/1205–1209, 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, *Ἔξηγήσεις παλαιαὶ καὶ λίαν ὠφέλιμοι βραχυλογίαν τε καὶ σαφήνειαν τοῦ
λόγου ἔχουσαι θαυμαστὴν ἐκ διαφόρων τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὑπομνημάτων ὑπὸ Οἰκουμενίου καὶ Ἀρέθα
συλλεχθέσαι εἰς τὰς τῆς νέας διαθήκης πραγματείας τάσδε˙ τοῦ μὲν Οἰκουμενίου εἰς τὰς πράξεις
τῶν Ἀποστόλων εἰς τὰς καθολικὰς λεγόμενας ἐπιστολὰς 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 Explanatones in Apocalypsin* (2 vols; Paris:
Claudiust Sonniss, 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, ‘Η Καινὴ Διαθήκη μετὰ ὑπομνημάτων ἄρχαιων,
v. 3 Περιέχων τὰς Πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ρωμαίους 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, *Catena 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/.
The Catena Manuscripts on Acts

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. A selection of scholia from GA 2818 had already been published by Johann Christoph Wolf in 1723. Finally, selected scholia on Acts were also published by Matthaei in volume 5 of his edition of the New Testament (1782). 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. 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. 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). 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.

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, 92–94; 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, Catena, 3:452–456.
13 K. Staab, “Die griechischen Katenenkommentare zu den katholischen Briefe,” Biblica 5 (1924) 296–333; J.H. Ropes, “The Greek Catena to the Catholic Epistles,” Harvard Theological Review 19 (1926) 383–8. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0017868600007823.
14 Staab, Die Pauluskatcenen. In a third work, K. Staab, Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katennahandschriften 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,\textsuperscript{15} von Soden provides a list of witnesses (Textzeugen) which features various catenae on Acts, Pauline Epistles and Catholic Epistles (collectively designed as \textit{Kommentar codd zum Praxapostolos}). With regard to Acts, a distinction is made between manuscripts containing Oecumenius’ compilation (\textit{Kommentar des Ökumenius}) and codices with Andreas’ “special commentary” (\textit{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 (\textit{O}); manuscripts on Acts and Catholic Epistles (\textit{Oπ}); manuscripts on Acts and Catholic Epistles together with the commentary on the Pauline Epistles by Theodoret (\textit{OΘδ}) or Theophylact (\textit{OΘ}); commentaries on Acts and both Catholic and Pauline Epistles whose authorship cannot be determined (\textit{E}). 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 \textit{Catalogue} by separating the manuscripts with Andreas’ catena (\textit{Der Kommentar des Andreas}) – both in the full and reworked recensions – from those transmitting catenae drawn from the major compilation (\textit{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.\textsuperscript{16}

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

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

\textsuperscript{16} Von Soden, \textit{Die Schriften}, 1:687.

\textsuperscript{17} M. Geerard, ed., \textit{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., \textit{Clavis Patrum Graecorum. Vol. 4: Concilia. Catena}. 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: \textit{Catena arabica} (C153) and \textit{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. 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. 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). 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, 517, 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).
| Catena type | Shelfmark                                           | GA  | Acts folios | Century  |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----|-------------|----------|
| C150        |                                                    |     |             |          |
| C150.1a     | Paris, BnF, Coislin Gr. 25                         | 307 | 5r–19or     | 10th     |
|             | Vatican, BAV, Barb. Gr. 582                        | 453 | 4r–23or     | 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., § 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  | 1or–61r     | 10th     |
| C150.2e     | Paris, BnF, Gr. 220                                | 608 | 1r–61v      | 14th     |
| C150.2f     | Vatican, BAV, Reg. Gr. 6                           | 886 | 189v–205v   | 14th     |
|             |                                                   |     |             | (catena two) |
| 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                         | 956 | 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 | 1or–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     |
| Catena type | Shelfmark | GA | Acts folios | Century |
|-------------|-----------|----|-------------|---------|
| C150: The “Andreas” Catena |

3

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 Λουκᾶς, ἰατρὸς τὴν ἐπιστήμην, ...) and ending (Μαρτυρολόγιον Παῦλου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ... μηνὶ Ἰουνίῳ κθ´ ημέρα) 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 ἑτέρων 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, “Châines exégétiques grecques,” 1235–1236, with regard to GA 453: “Le Barb. 582, que nous avons examine 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 | GA | GA | GA | GA |
|---------|--------|----|----|----|----|----|
|         | 397    | 2818 | 610 | 453 | 1678 |    |

Acts 2:2–3

1. Σευρησιανοῦ Γαβάλων Ὁ ἐν τούτων ἠμέρᾳ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ἐδόθη νόμος ... καὶ τότε ἐνομοθέτησε, καὶ νῦν νομοθετεῖ. (CPG 4218)

2. Ἐδόθη μὲν νόμος ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ ... οὐ ἦσαν καταμένοντες. (unidentified work)

3. τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου Διατι μὴ χωρὶς αἰσθητῶν ... Καὶ το αἰφνίδιον δὲ διανέστησεν αὐτούς. (Hom. in Ac. 4.1 [PG 60.42.50–55]; CPG 4426)

4. Σευρησιανοῦ Καλῶς τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τότε η ἡ πρώτη φωνὴ ... δείξῃ αὐτὸν Θεὸν καὶ τότε νῦν ἐπιφοιτήσαντα. (cf. C155.2, schol. 4; CPG 4218) a

5. Ὁ ὥρκη ᾗ αὐτῆ ἡ πνοή ... ὁ φόβος ᾗ ἄγνος. (unidentified work)

6. Καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ γενόμενον παραστήσιον σι νομοθετούμενοι τῷ νομοθέτῃ. (unidentified work)

7. Σευήρου ἐπισκόπου ἀπὸ λόγου μη̣˙ Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μὲν, ἱνα παραστήσῃ ... ὡς ἐν ἠμέρᾳ τοῦ τῆς Τριάδος μυστήριον. (cf. PO 165; CPG 7035)

Acts 8:25

1. Τοῦ αὐτοῦ (scil. Χρυσοστόμου) Διατι πάλιν ἀπίασιν ἐκεῖ ... μέρος καταλαμβάνουσιν. (Hom. in Ac. 18.4 [PG 60.146.12–16])

Acts 28:22

1. Εὐσέβιοι Πρὶν ἐπιδημῆσαι τὸν Παῦλον ἐν τῇ Ρώμῃ ... ὄν ἐδήλωσεν Ἰουδαίων ἄποστλῶν. (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: Ἐξήγησις ... 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, 1687.
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 (Ἄντιοχεὺς υπάρχων τὸ γένος ὁ Λουκᾶς, 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

\[\text{Table 3 Differences within C150.2b}\]

| Scholia | GA 606 | GA 641 | GA 103 | GA 607 | GA 2576 | GA 455 |
|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| **Acts 8:9–17** | | | | | | |
| 1 | Πῶς αὐτὸν οὖν οὐκ ἀνεῖλον ... διδόναι Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 18.2 [PG 60.144.12–15, 32–33] + Epiph. Haer. 21.1.4; CPG 7820) | | | | | |
| 2 | – | Οὐχ ὁ ἐν τοῖς δώδεκα ἔστιν οὗτος ὁ Φίλιππος ... οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι διεσπάρησαν, πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων. (Isid. Pel. Ep. 1.447.20–25; CPG 5557) | | | | |
| 3 | Καὶ ἐπληροῦτο τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰρημένον ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδαπόστολοι ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 18.4 [PG 60.145.50–52]) | | | | | |
| 4 | – | Τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀφέσεως ἔλαβον Πνεῦμα, οὔπω δὲ τὸ τῶν σημείων. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 18.2 [PG 60.143.54–55]) | | | | |
| 5 | Σημειωτέον ὅτι οὐ δεῖ πλησιάζειν ... ἡ μὴ συνεῖνα τὰ γινόμενα. (Ἀμμωνίου in the margins of GA 606 and 641; CPG 5504) | | | | | |
| 6 | – | “Ὅτι οὐκ ἀργυρίου οὐδὲ ὑποκριταῖς, ἀλλὰ ἀγίου διὰ πίστεως ἡ μετοχὴ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος δίδοται. (ΚΕΦ. ΙΑ.1.)” | | | | |
| 7 | Διατί οὐκ ἦσαν οὗτοι λαβόντες ... οὐκ ἄλλους πέμπουσιν, ἀλλὰ Πέτρον. (Χρυσοστόμου in the margins of GA 606 and 641; Hom. in Ac. 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. 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). 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, ἰατρὸς ...) and the beginning of the prologue from C150.2b (Ἀ ντιοχεὺς ὑπάρχων τὸ γένος ὁ Λουκᾶς, ἰατρὸς ...) 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, epistolae Pauli et epistolae septem cattolicas. Videndum nam 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, 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.
### Table 4  Scholia in GA 608 partly shared with C150.2b, partly with C151.3

| Scholia | GA 608 | C150.2b (Andreas subtype) | C151.3 (Oecumenius subtype) |
|---------|--------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Acts 28:19–31 |
| 1 | Εἰδὼς ὁ Παῦλος ὅτι ἄτοπον ... ἦλθον, οὐχ ἐπέρας διδοὺς κακά. (slightly different explicit in C151.3: ... Καίσαρα' οὖχ ὡς ἐπέρας διδοὺς κακά, ἀλλ' ὡς αὐτὸς φεύγων κακά; Ammonius (cpg 2561) + Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 55.2 [PG 60.380.58–60, 381.1–4]) | – | – |
| 2 | Εἶτα καὶ ἐκείνοι ὄντως ... ἀπολογήσασθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν συγγενῶν. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 55.1 [PG 60.379.53–55]) | – | – |
| 3 | Αἵρεσιν καλοῦσιν Ἰουδαῖοι ... ἀλλὰ ἀντιλέγουσι τινες. (Ammonius, cpg 2561) | – | – |
| 4 | Πρὶν δὲ ἐπιδημήσῃ τὸν Παῦλον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ... τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν ἐπικομιζομένους. (Eus. Is. 1.73.45–69) | Τὸ γὰρ εἰπεῖν ὅτι Εἶπε τὸ Πνεῦμα ... ἀλλ' ἄνωθεν τοῦτο προῆξε ὁ Θεός. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 55.2 [PG 60.381.31–39]) | – |
| 5 | – | – | – |
| 6 | Τοῖς ὑπουργῶν λέγουσι τοῦ Πατρὸς ... Ἰησῆς ἐξουσίας μετέχει. (Ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου in C150.1) | Τοῖς ὑπουργῶν λέγουσι τοῦ Πατρὸς ... Ἰησῆς ἐξουσίας μετέχει. (Ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου in C150.1) | – |
| 7 | Καὶ τούτο τὸ ῥητὸν τοῦ ἐπίσκοπον ... τῶν προφητευομένων ἀναφοράν. (additional line in C150.2b2: καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸ εὐλογον τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίσεως ἀναφέρεται; Bas. Is. 6.189.13–18; cpg 2911) | – | – |
| 8 | Σχόπει δὲ τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀκρίβειαν, οὖχ εἶπε ... ὅτι ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψωσιν ἵσταται αὐτοῖς. (slightly different incipit in C150.2b: Ἐβοδ καί τὸν προφητήν μετὰ τοσεἰς ἀκριβείας καθηγοροῦντα. Οὔ δὲ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐπείπα; Chrys. Hom. in Mt. 45.1–2 [PG 58.473.1–10]; cpg 4424) | – | – |
| 9 | Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι μέχρι τοῦτο ... ξίφει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθείς. (Ἐξ τοῦ Προλόγου ... Παύλου προτασσομένου in C150.1) | Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι μέχρι τοῦτο ... ξίφει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθείς. (Ἐξ τοῦ Προλόγου ... Παύλου προτασσομένου in C150.1) | – |
Oecumenius was once identified with a tenth-century Bishop of Trikka, but more recently has been considered as a commentator active in Asia Minor in the sixth century. Nevertheless, the name of Oecumenius is not found in any catena manuscripts. Devreesse suspected that the attribution was Morel's invention, 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. 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.

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 layout, marginal notes, number of pages, script and even para-textual features. Both subtypes exhibit a similar incipit (C151.1: Λόγον πρῶτον εἶπεν καὶ οὐκ εὐαγγελίον, C151.2: Πρῶτον λόγον εἶπεν καὶ οὐκ εὐαγγελίον) 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). Despite his insistence on the attribution to Theophylact (based on the inscriptio, which reads: Ἀπὸ φωνῆς τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Βουλγαρίας Θεοφυλάκτου ἑρμηνεία), Finettus could not deny the striking resemblance to the Oecumenius
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34 Houghton and Parker, “An Introduction,” 19.
35 Cramer, Catenae, 3:iii: “Dubitarunt autem Viri docti an Oecumenio hoc opus rite assignari debaret … 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, 1692.
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.
catena, especially from the middle of Acts 7 onwards. 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 ἐπιστολὰς; the credit given to Theophylact might therefore be simply a later addition. 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 ἀποτμηθείς; ... ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους τριάκοντα καὶ ἕξις (f.m. in GA 1066)).

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 αὐτοὺς). 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), C151.3c (GA 1842, 621), 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. 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. 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. Nevertheless, given their origins in catena
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43 The incipit is different: Ἀναμιμνήσκει τὸν Θεόφιλον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ὥστε τὴν οἰκείαν ἀκριβείαν ἐνδείξασθαι κτλ.
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, “Chânes exégetiques 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

| Scholia | C151.1 | C151.3a | C151.3b | C151.3c | C151.3d |
|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Acts 8:9–25 |
| 1 | Σημειωτέον ὅτι οὐ δεῖ πλησιάζειν ... καὶ προσήλθε τούτο αὐτῶν. | – | – | – | – |
| 2 | Πρόδηλον ὅτι οἱ ὑπὸ Φιλίππου ... ἐπιθέσεως δοῦναι Πνεῦμα ἄγιον. | – | – | – | – |
| 3 | Σημείων μεγάλων γινομένων ... καὶ τεράτων Πνεῦμα οὔπω ἐλάβομεν. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 18.2 [PG 60.143.54–55], reworked) | – | – | – | – |
| 4 | Ὁ μιαρὸς οὗτος Σίμων, οὐ πίστεως ... τὸ ἅγιον ἡγησάμενος. | – | – | – | – |
| 5 | Οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα ἀρωμένου ... μετὰ τῆς προαιρέσεως. (in conjunction with scholium 6 in C151.1a) | – | – | – | – |
| 6 | Οὐ κολάζει νῦν τὸν Σίμωνα ... διαβέβηκε πολλάκις. (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. Hom. in Ac. 55.2 [PG 60.380.58–60, 381.1–4]) | – | – | – | – |
| 2 | Πρὶν ἐπιδημῆσαι Παῦλον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ... ἐπικομιζομένων. (repetition after scholium 3 in C151.3b; Eus. Is. 1.73.45–69) | – | – | – | – |
| 3 | Τοῖς ὑπουργὸν λέγουσι τοῦ Πατρὸς ... ἕτερι ἐπιστρέψωσιν ἑαυτοῦ. (in conjunction with schol. 4 in C151.1a; Ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου in C150.1 + Bas. Is. 6.189.13–18 + Chrys. Hom. in Mt. 45.1–2 [PG 58.473.1–10]) | – | – | – | – |
| 4 | Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι μέχρι τούτο ... τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθέντα. (in conjunction with schol. 3 and 5 in C151.1a) (‘Εκ τοῦ Προλόγου τοῦ ἐν τῷ Βίβλῳ Τῶν Ἐπιστολῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου προτασσομένου in C150.1) | – | – | – | – |
| 5 | Ὁ ἔστι τοῖνυν από τοῦ ... τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθεῖσα. (‘Εκ τοῦ Προλόγου ... in C150.1) | – | – | – | – |

---
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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. 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. 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. 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 κατέμεν 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, 1689.
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 | Εἰδὼς ὁ Παῦλος ... ἄντιλεγόντων τῶν Ἰουδαίων. | Τί οὖν; ἦν αὐτῶν κατηγορήσεις ... διαφυγεῖν τὸν κίνδυνον. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 55.1 [PG 60.379.45–50]) |
| | ... τὴν κατάσκασιν τῶν δεσμῶν. | (Ammonius, CPG 2561) | Μία ἦν ἐλπίς, φησί, σωτηρίας ... τὴν κατάστασιν τῶν δεσμῶν. (Ammonius, CPG 2561) |
| | (Ammonius, CPG 2561) | | |
| 2 | Πρὶν ἐπιδημῆσαι τὸν Παῦλον ... ἐδήλωσεν Ἰουδαικῶν ἀποστόλων. | – | – |
| | – | | |
| 3 | Αἵρεσιν καλοῦσιν Ἰουδαῖοι ... ἣ καὶ Ἕλληνες. (Ammonius, CPG 2561) | – | – |
| 4 | Ὅρα πῶς οὐ ῥάπτουσιν ... ἐπετέτραπτο λοιπὸν τὰ κατ´ αὐτόν. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 55.1 [PG 60.381.15–16] + 54.2 [PG 60.376.36–37]) | – | – |
| 5 | – | – | Τούτους, μὴ πιστεύοντες ἀνεχώρουν ... ἐτι μᾶλλον στηρίξαι. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 55.2 [PG 60.381.14] + 55.1 [PG 60.380.35–37]) |
| 6 | Τοῖς ὑπουργὸν λέγουσι τοῦ Πιστρός ... Ἰσης ἐξουσίας μετέχει. (Ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου in C150.1) | – | Τοῖς ὑπουργὸν λέγουσι τοῦ Πιστρός ... Ἰσης ἐξουσίας μετέχει. (Ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου in C150.1) |
| 7 | – | – | Τὸν τρόπον τοῦ μὴ ἑωρακέναι δεικνύν, τοὺς ... συμβέβηκεν μυστάντων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς. (Proc. G. Is. [PG 87.1945. 10–20]; CPG 7434) |
The other catena attributed to Theophylact is found in GA 254 (C152.2). The title of the work reads: Ἐκ τῶν ἐξηγητικῶν τοῦ ἁγ(ίο)υ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρ(υσοστόμου) καὶ τινων ἐκ τῶν πατέρων ⟨ἐξηγήσεις⟩ εἰς τὰς Πράξεις καὶ εἰς τὰς Καθολικὰς κατὰ συντομίαν συλλεγ(εῖσαι) παρὰ το ῦ 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
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52  Staab, Pauluskomentare, x.
53  Von Soden, Die Schriften, 1688.
Table 8 Comparison between GA 254 and 1524

| Scholia | GA 254 | GA 1524 |
|---------|---------|---------|
| 1       | Διδύμου’ Ἀναλαμβανόμενον ἀπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν ... ἦσαν δοθέντος τοῦ Πνεύματος. (CPG 2561) | Εἴν τῇ ἠμέρᾳ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ... ἔχρην, ὦσει πυρός. |
| 2       | Χρυσοστόμου’ Πολλὴν τὴν ρύμην τοῦ Πνεύματος ... εἰ μὴ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι μετέσχον. (Hom. in Ac. 4.1 [PG 60.1–42], abbreviated and reworked) | 'Εκάθισε τι ἐφ’ ἔνα ἐκαστὸν αὐτῶν. Τούτεστι, παρέμεινεν ... ἐπὶ Χριστῷ μαρτύρια. |
| 3       | Τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου’ (no name in GA 1524) Καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ κατοικεῖν ἐκεῖ καταλιπόντας πατρίδας, εὐλαβείας ἡν σημείον, μάλιστα τε ἐκ διαφόρων ἔθνων ἀπάραντες καὶ ἀφέντας οἰκίας καὶ συγγενεῖς, ἐν ἵππων ὅλων κατοικεῖν. Τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ παλαιόν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ γεγονός, εἴκοστος ἑξάχρονος εἰς τὸν παλαιὸν πάπιον. (Hom. in Ac. 4.1 [PG 60.43.50–59] + 4.2 [PG 60.45.37–41], reworked) | Διδύμου’ Ἀναλαμβανόμενον ἀπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν ... ἦσαν δοθέντος τοῦ Πνεύματος. (CPG 2561) |
| 4       | Σευηριανοῦ’ Διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐνωμένην ... διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς μετανοίας. (CPG 4218) | Πανταχοῦ μετὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας πάντων συναγάγῃ. (CPG 2561) |

---

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 scholi um. 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 “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.
| Scholia | GA 437 (catena two) | GA 605 | GA 886 (catena one) |
|---------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|
| 1       | Σευήρου Παθὼν Χριστὸς θεὸς σαρκὶ ... εν Πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, δεὶ προσκυνεῖν. (unidentified work) | Τουτέστι πρὸ τῆς Πεντεκοστῆς, περὶ αὐτῆς, ὡς εἰπεῖν ... καὶ ὠς ἰπνο ὑ ἀγρ ἁνεμο ᾄ ἴν. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 4.1 [PG 60.42.45–56, 43.1–6]) | Ἄναλαμβανόμενος ἀπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν ... τῆς ἐκκλησίας πληρώματι. |
| 2       | Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ᾣ τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησις ... ἀπαρχὴν τῷ Θεῷ προσαγομένῳ. (Severian of Gabala, unidentified work) | Τουτέστι παρέμειν ἐπανεπαύσατο ... εἰκότως, ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐδέξαντο τὰς γλῶσσας. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 4.1 [PG 60.43.12–13] + unidentified source) | Ὡν τρόπον τά τοῦ νόμου ... ἀλλʼ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος. |
| 3       | Πάντες τινες οἱ Ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοίς μαθηταίς. (unidentified work) | Τοῦτου χάριν πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων χαρισμάτων ... ἡδύναντο λαλεῖν ἀθρώως φωναῖς. (Chrys. Hom. in 1 Cor. 35.1 [PG 61.296.39–48]) | 'Εκέλευν ὁ νόμος ... πλήρεις ἐγένοτο. |
| 4       | Σευηριανοῦ Καλῶς τὸ εξ οὐρανοῦ ἐπειδὴ καὶ τότε ἡ πρώτη φωνὴ ... τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησεως. (unidentified work; cf. GA 1895, schol. 4) | Δεικνύσι, ὁτι πολλάκις ὁ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις τίμιος ... πάντα προωρίζηθαι. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 3.3 [PG 61.38.28–37]) | Χρυσοστόμου ὁτι οὐ μεθύουσιν, εὐθέως ... πάντας φθέγγεσθαι. (Hom. in Ac. 4.3 [PG 60.46.20–48]) |
| 5       | Σευήρου Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μὲν ἵνα παραστήσῃ σαρκὶς ... τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. (ἀπὸ λόγου μὴ in C150.1; CPG 7035) | Ἰστέον ὁτι τοῦτο ἐκλεγέντος ... οὐχ ἀπαξ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλακις. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 3.4 [PG 60.38.46–50]) | Ὡς ξένος εἰπεν ἀνωτέρω τό ἐν Ἰεροσολύμοις οἰκεῖν. (Hom. in Ac. 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 ἕνεκεν ύμων τὴν ἁλυσιν…. ὅθεν τοῦτο δηλών ἐπάγει... (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 55.1 [PG 60.379.50–55]) | Εὐσεβίου’ Πρὶν ἐπιδημήσαι τὸν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ... ὃν ἐδήλωσεν Ἰουδαίων ἀποστόλων. (Is. 1.73.45–74; no source indication in GA 1839) | |
| 2 | Ὡσεὶ ἔλεγον˙ Οὔτε διὰ γραμμάτων, ... κατηγορίας ἑαυτοὺς ἀπολύοντες. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 55.1 [PG 60.379.60–61, 380.10–15]) | Καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ρητὸν προφήτην ὡς Θεόθεν ἀποφθέγγομεν ... οἱ δὲ ἀφείθησαν ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις. (Bas. Is. 6.189.13–36) | Τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου’ Δείκνυσιν ὁ Παῦλος διὰ τοῦτου, ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα ἔν τῷ δια προφητῆς Ἡσαίας τεθέατο. (unidentified work) |
| 3 | Ἄτε ἁνεχὼρουν ἀντιτασσομένων αὐτῶν ... γνῶναι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 55.1 [PG 60.380.35–43]) | – | – |
| 4 | Τούτεστι, μὴ πιστεύσοντες ἁνεχὼρουν. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 55.2 [PG 60.381.14]) | – | – |
| 5 | Ἐνταῦθα δείκνυσι τὴν αὐτοῦ ἐλευθερίαν ... καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπὶ β’ ἐτη διδάσκων ἑκεί. (Chrys. Hom. in Ac. 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 C153.1 (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.”

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.
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