

8. EXEGETICAL FRAGMENTS: OBSERVATIONS ON THE CATENAE ON ACTS IN VATICAN, BAV, REG. GR. 6 (GA 886)

EMANUELE SCIERI*

INTRODUCTION

The Vatican Library manuscript Reg. gr. 6 (hereafter GA 886) is a codex containing the text of the Greek New Testament, except the Catholic Epistles, with a commentary.¹ However, the section on the Acts of the Apostles (fols. 185r–205v) is incomplete: both biblical text and commentary stop at Acts 7:59 (fol. 205v); equally, only a small extract from Revelation is present (fol. 336r: Rev. 22:1–2 with scholia). The fragmentary nature of the text of Acts is further exacerbated by the fact that the commentary consists of two individual types of catena, copied in minuscule script by a thirteenth- and fourteenth-century hand respectively, yet bound together to complement one another: the first catena

* This chapter was written as part of the CATENA project, which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement no. 770816). All transcriptions and translations are mine, unless indicated otherwise.

¹ Digitized microfilm images are available on the NTVMR (<https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/manuscript-workspace?docID=30886>).

comments on Acts 1–2:13, while the second continues on Acts 2:14–7:59.

This double compilation has received little attention from twentieth-century scholarship on New Testament catena manuscripts. While Henry Stevenson and Joseph Reuss barely mention the section on Acts, focussing on the text and authorship of the other commentaries preserved by GA 886,² Georg Karo, Johannes Lietzmann, Hermann von Soden and Robert Devreesse identify this manuscript as a witness to the Andreas catena (CPG C150), based on the analysis of the second commentary which seems to reproduce an abridged text of the principal compilation on the Acts of the Apostles.³ The same observation is provided in Karl Staab's study on the Pauline catenae, where a short remark is added about the disorganised structure of the first catena on Acts 1–2:13, which in his opinion resembles a formless mass.⁴ Finally, in his recent catalogue of New Testament catena manuscripts, Georgi Parpulov has included this witness in an appendix of manuscripts with single author commentaries, although no author is identified for the commentary on Acts.⁵

² Henry M. Stevenson, *Codices manuscripti graeci Reginae Svecorum et Pii PP. II Bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome: Vatican, 1888), pp. 4–6; Joseph Reuss, *Matthäus-, Markus-, und Johannes-Katenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht*, *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen* 18.4–5 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1941), pp. 224–226. These works provide the most exhaustive description of the manuscript features.

³ Georg Karo and Johannes H. Lietzmann, *Catenarum graecarum catalogus* (Göttingen: Lüder Horstmann, 1902), p. 595. GA 886 is classified as *catena ex opere maiore excerpta* (b), as opposed to *catena integra* (a) which includes the manuscripts with a full catena; Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, 4 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911–1913), pp. 1:682–686. GA 886 is identified as *A^{ap}50*, Robert Devreesse, 'Chaînes exégétiques grecques', in *Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément*, ed. By L. Pirot and A. Robert, vol. 1 (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1928), pp. 1205–1206.

⁴ Karl Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1926), pp. 219–220.

⁵ Georgi Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament: A Catalogue*, TS (III) 25 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2021), p. 214. GA 886 is classified as a.An2.

Following a more detailed analysis of the section on Acts, the present study aims to fill the gaps of past research and provide fresh insights into the nature of the two fragmentary catenae from GA 886 and their relationship with the manuscript tradition of the Andreas catena.

CONTENT OF GA 886 AND ATTRIBUTION OF THE COMMENTARIES

GA 886 comprises 336 paper leaves (346 x 245 mm).⁶ It features the text and the commentary of Matthew (fols. 2r–75v), Mark (fols. 75v–93r), Luke (fols. 94r–134r), John (fols. 134v–182r), Acts (fols. 185r–205v), Pauline Epistles (fols. 208r–336v), and Revelation (fol. 336v); however, as mentioned above, the sections on Acts and Revelation are incomplete. According to Kurt and Barbara Aland, the biblical text of all books is a representative of the Byzantine text-type (Category V).⁷ Nevertheless, the manuscript was selected for inclusion in the ECM of Acts, where GA 886 is listed among the *Codices Byzantini*:⁸ its seven extant chapters have an agreement with the Byzantine text of about 91%.⁹ Additional contents include: two scholia from Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Eusebius of Caesarea, respectively (fols. 1r–v); a list of *κεφάλαια* for Matthew (fol. 1v), and four epigrams (fols. 1r–v, 2r, 134r, 208r), one of which was transcribed by Ioannes Chortasmenos, Bishop of Selybria, who acquired the manuscript

⁶ In addition to the descriptions mentioned in note 3 above, see also the short entries in Frederick H.A. Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 4th ed., ed. Edward Miller, 2 vols. (London: George Bell & Sons, 1894), p. 1:267, and Caspar R. Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1900–1909), pp. 1:229–230.

⁷ Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament. An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, 2nd ed., trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989), p. 134.

⁸ Holger Strutwolf, Georg Gäbel, Annette Hüffmeier, Gerd Mink, and Klaus Wachtel, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior. III. Die Apostelgeschichte/The Acts of the Apostles*, 4 vols. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), p. 2:8.

⁹ <https://ntg.uni-muenster.de/acts/ph4/comparison#ms1=886&ms2=35>.

during the 14th/15th century and left a colophon just underneath the poem.¹⁰

With the exclusion of the Theodore extract, added by an unknown hand, and the epigram written by Chortasmenos, the rest of the supplementary content was transcribed by the same hand responsible for the biblical text and the commentary of all books, while the section on Acts 2:14–7:59 (fols. 189v–205v) was copied by a different hand. However, the *Kurzgefasste Liste*, based on Gregory, does not record different dates for the individual scripts and mistakenly assigns this manuscript to the year 1454.¹¹ This may have been inferred from the ownership note in Greek on fol. 205v:¹² following the Byzantine practice of dating manuscripts from the creation (5508 BCE), the date given in the manuscript is 6954 (ϞϠϣδ'), which equates to the year 1446 CE (6954–5508).¹³ The INTF date may simply be a misreading of the year based on the last two digits (54). In any case, the date has no bearing on the manuscript's date of production, but indicates the time when the manuscript was acquired by Ioannes Chortasmenos; he then gave it to Makarios, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Marina in the fifteenth century, who soon afterwards passed it to Demetrios Lascaris Leontari, the author of the

¹⁰ The text of the epigrams is available on the Database of Byzantine Book Epigrams (<https://dbbe.ugent.be>), occurrences 18108, 24486, 18110, 18809. The last is transcribed by Chortasmenos on fol. 1v: on this epigram see Christian Gastgeber, 'Aus der Bibliothek des Ioannes Chortasmenos: Ailios Aristeides, ÖNB, Cod. Phil. gr. 96', in *Alethes Philia. Studi in onore di Giancarlo Prato*, ed. Marco D'Agostino, Collectanea 23 (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 2010), pp. 409–434: 419, n. 23. On Ioannes Chortasmenos see *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600*, ed. Ernst Gamillscheg, Dieter Harlfinger, et al., 3 vols., Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik 3 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981–1997), p. 3:315.

¹¹ *Liste*, p. 99; Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, p. 229.

¹² The transcription of the note is in Stevenson, *Codices manuscripti Graeci*, p. 6, and Florentia Evangelatou-Notara, *Χρηγγοί, κηγγορες, δωρηγες σε σημειωματα κωδικων. Παλαιολογειοι χρονοι*, Parartema 49 (Athens: Parousia, 2000), p. 269.

¹³ On the Byzantine practice see Lidia Perria, *Γραφίς. Per una storia della scrittura greca libraria (secoli IV a.C.–XVI d.C.)*, Quaderni di Νέα Ψώμη, (Rome: Università degli studi di Roma 'Tor Vergata', 2011), pp. 175–185.

subscription.¹⁴ Based on the palaeographical evidence, Parpulov suggests that the hand responsible for the largest part of the manuscript content could be dated as early as the second half of the thirteenth century, while the supplementary scribe of fols. 189v–205r should be assigned to the fourteenth century.¹⁵

The commentary on the Gospels is attributed to Nicetas of Naupactus, an unknown writer who is not to be confused with Nicetas of Heraclea.¹⁶ The name of the author is specified in a librarian's note on the front page (fol. 1r): *Niceta episcopus Naupacti liber in evangelia*. This is probably based on the inscription that precedes the text and commentary on Matthew (fol. 2r), where it is stated that Nicetas' commentary was drawn mainly from the works of Chrysostom and other commentators:

Νικήτα ἐπισκόπου τῆς μητροπόλεως τοῦ Ναυπάκτου σύνταγμα εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ἅγιον Εὐαγγέλιον, συντεθὲν μάλιστα μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἐξηγήσεων τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου εἶτα καὶ ἀπὸ ἐτέρων διαφόρων.

Treatise by Nicetas bishop of the Metropolis of Naupactus on the holy Gospel of Matthew, composed especially from the

¹⁴ See Evangelatou-Notara, *Χορηγοί, κτήτορες, δωρητές*, p. 29. On the three possessors see the entries in the *Prosopographisches Lexikon Der Palaiologenzeit*, ed. Erich Trapp et al. (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1976–1986), nn. 16174, 14676, 30897. The names of the owners are also repeated in a Latin note on fol. 206r (transcription in Stevenson, *Codices manuscripti Graeci*, p. 6), while fol. 1r also contains an ownership note by Christian Raue (17th century).

¹⁵ Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts*, p. 214, n. 1.

¹⁶ This confusion led Michael Clark (who relies on Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, p. 229) to include GA 886 in his dissertation on the catena of Nicetas of Heraclea and the text of John, which in fact, following the results of the research, is considered by the author as a witness to a different catena: see Michael A. Clark, *The Catena of Nicetas of Heraclea and its Johannine Text* (unpubl. diss., University of Birmingham, 2016), especially pp. 14, 24 (<https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/6424/>), and Michael A. Clark, 'Nicetas of Heraclea's Catena on John's Gospel: How Many Manuscripts are There?', in *Authoritative Texts and Reception History: Aspects and Approaches*, ed. Dan Batovici and Kristin de Troyer, Biblical Interpretation 151 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2017), pp. 222–224.

expositions of Saint John Chrysostom and after that from different others.

The attribution seems to be reinforced by a marginal note, linked by a symbol to the name Nicetas, which ascribes to this author other exegetical works, including one on the Acts of the Apostles:¹⁷

οὗτος δὲ καὶ τὸ ψαλτήριον ἐξηγήσατο καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολάς τοῦ ἁγίου Παύλου καὶ τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τὰς καθολικάς. Εἰ δὲ καὶ τινὰ ἕτερα οὐ γινώσκω· ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ μόνα ἦλθον εἰς χεῖρας ἐμὰς.

This one also produced an exegesis on the Psalter, the Pauline Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Catholic Epistles. I have no idea whether there are others. In fact, only these came into my hands.

The same authorship is claimed for the commentary on the Pauline Epistles in the inscription before Romans (fol. 208r):

Ἐν ἐτέρᾳ βίβλῳ εἰς ὄνομα τοῦ Βουλγαρίας ἐπιγεγραμμένην εὔρον τὴν παροῦσαν ἐξήγησιν τοῦ κυρίου δηλονότι Θεοφυλάκτου. Ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ βίβλῳ ἀπαραλλάκτως ἔχουσα πρὸς τὴν ἐνταῦθα, καὶ μᾶλλον κατὰ τὰς ἀρχάς, προβαίνουσα δὲ διήλαττεν. Ὅθεν καὶ πέπεισμαι τῷ Ναυπάκτου ταύτην προσκεκληρῶσθαι δανεισαμένῳ (cod. δεινασάμενος) τὰ πλείω παρὰ τοῦ Βουλγαρίας ἥτοι τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὕστερος τῷ χρόνῳ τοῦ Βουλγαρίας ὁ Ναυπάκτου.

In another book I found the present exposition ascribed to the name of the Bulgarian, clearly the master Theophylact. The exegesis in that book was indistinguishable from the present one, especially towards the beginning, but changed as it went on. Hence, I am convinced that this should also be assigned to the author from Naupactus, who borrowed most of the content from the Bulgarian and from Chrysostom, since the author from Naupactus is later in time than the Bulgarian.

This note explains that, although another manuscript preserves a very similar version attributed to the eleventh-century Theophylact of Bulgaria, significant differences throughout the text suggest that the commentary should rather be assigned to Nicetas, who draws

¹⁷ This remark is erroneously referred to Theophylact by Stevenson, *Codices manuscripti graeci Reginae Svecorum*, p. 5.

the largest part of the exegetical material from Theophylact and Chrysostom.

In a complementary note on fol. 2r, just before the title, the quality of Nicetas' commentary is praised as far superior to the work of Theophylact:

ἀξιολογώτατον βιβλίον καὶ δυσεύρετον· ἐξήγησις θαυμασιωτάτη καὶ πλουσία καὶ κρείττων ἢ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Βουλγαρίας· ἔστι δὲ τὸ βιβλίον πάνυ ὀρθώτατον.

A very remarkable book and difficult to find. The exegesis is excellent and rich, and superior to that of the Bulgarian; and the book is altogether very correct.

Despite the inscriptions, the attribution is disputed by modern scholarship. While Reuss does not rule out that Nicetas could be responsible for the section on Matthew, but not for the other three gospel commentaries, which in his opinion are genuine works by Theophylact, von Soden extends the authorship of the Archbishop of Bulgaria to the commentaries on all four Gospels and the Pauline Epistles.¹⁸ On the other hand, Stevenson claims the authorship of Theophylact only for the commentary on the Pauline Epistles, while accepting Nicetas' attribution for the commentaries on the Gospels and Acts;¹⁹ this is restricted to the Gospels by Scrivener and Gregory, who indicate Theophylact only as the author of the commentaries on Acts and Pauline Epistles.²⁰ By contrast, Albert Ehrhard assigns all the commentaries to the Bishop of Naupactus.²¹ Finally, on more solid ground, Parpulov confirms von Soden's claim that Theophylact is the author of all

¹⁸ Reuss, *Matthäus-, Markus- und Johannes-Katenen*, p. 226; von Soden, *Die Schriften*, pp. 269, 283 (where the manuscript is given the sigla Θ⁵⁶ and Θ^{π56} to indicate Theophylact's commentary on the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles, respectively), 630, 637. Von Soden's opinion is also supported by Clark, *The Catena of Nicetas of Heraclea*, p. 24.

¹⁹ Stevenson, *Codices manuscripti graeci Reginae Svecorum*, p. 4.

²⁰ Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction*, p. 267, Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, pp. 229–230.

²¹ Albert Ehrhard, *Theologie. B. Exegese*, in *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)*, ed. Karl Krumbacher, *Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft* 9/1 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1897), pp. 136–137.

the commentaries from the manuscript except the fragments on Acts and Revelation: by comparing the incipit and explicit of each section, the commentaries on the Gospels have been identified with the text printed in PG 123.143–1348 and PG 124.9–317, while the section on the Pauline Epistles corresponds to catena C167, which is published in PG 124.336–1357 and PG 125.9–404.²²

In any case, no author is indicated in the codex for the commentaries on Acts and Revelation. Although fols. 183r–184v are blank, it is curious that on fol. 185r the commentary on Acts has no title, unlike the other commentaries, and begins directly with a reworked sentence from the beginning of Chrysostom's Homily 1 on Acts, Οὐκ ἔλαττον τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ θείων Εὐαγγελίων ἡ παροῦσα βίβλος τοὺς πιστοὺς ὠφελεῖν δύναται (cf. PG 60.13, 16–17).²³ A short title (Πράξεις) is supplied in the top-right margin by a later hand, which also transcribes a second full title (Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων) in the space between the first and the second commentary passage, before the biblical text of Acts 1–3. This suggests that those commentary parts were meant to serve as a prologue. No obvious cues, however, allow us to determine whether the author of the commentary on Acts 1–2:13 is Nicetas, given the lack of other witnesses to this text as well as of commentary manuscripts on Acts bearing this name. Conversely, we are aware of at least five catena manuscripts on Acts attributed to Theophylact, each containing a different type of catena, but none of which corresponds to the compilation preserved in GA 886.²⁴

²² Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts*, pp. 211–212, where the two works are marked as e.Θφ and p.Θφ. The Pinakes database also records the commentary on Paul as Theophylact's catena C167 (<https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/66176/>).

²³ See Stevenson, *Codices manuscripti graeci Reginae Svecorum*, p. 5: 'integrum commentarium sequuntur folia 182v–184 sine scriptura'; for this reason, these pages have not been digitized on the INTF.

²⁴ These are GA 254, 455, 1524, 1842, 2576. The texts of GA 455, 1524 and 1842 are printed in PG 125, 495–1132. However, GA 455, 2576 seem to derive from C150 (Andreas), while GA 1842 appears to be a sub-type of C151 (Ps.-Oecumenius), as I have recently argued in Emanuele Scieri, 'The Catena Manuscripts on Acts: A Revised Classification', VC 76.3 (2022), pp. 290, 294–296.

Parpulov has recently suggested that this unknown commentary might provide a section missing from another anonymous fragmentary commentary on Acts, Messina, Biblioteca Regionale Universitaria, S. Salv. 40 (GA 1839), although he admits that this assumption is 'not readily demonstrable'.²⁵ Von Soden, on the other hand, included GA 1839 among the independent excerpts from the Andreas catena (C150).²⁶ In a recent reclassification of catena manuscripts on Acts, I have marked GA 1839 as a *codex singulus* (C155.6), while referring the study of its relationship with GA 886 and C150 for further scrutiny.²⁷

THE CATENA ON ACTS 1–2:13

The first catena on Acts (fols. 185r–189v) displays a very distinctive profile. It is written as an alternating catena, where biblical *lemmata* are immediately followed by commentary sections of variable length.²⁸ The biblical text is distinguished by some of the same means as the *lemmata* in single-author commentaries.²⁹ These consist of a blank space left within a line, rubrication, and punctuation through a double-dot (dicolon) followed by a horizontal line. The same punctuation is employed to mark the end of the commentary sections: these are more extensive than those of the second catena, on Acts 2:14–7:59.

The most striking difference between the first and second commentary involves the structure of the compilation. The first commentary is not made of attributed scholia following one another and clearly separated by ending marks as in most catenae: at first sight, it resembles a single-author commentary. Neverthe-

²⁵ Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts*, p. 214 (acp.An1).

²⁶ von Soden, *Die Schriften*, p. 685 (O³⁷).

²⁷ Scieri, 'The Catena Manuscripts', p. 302.

²⁸ On the layout of catenae see Hans Lietzmann, Hermann Usener, *Catenen. Mitteilungen über ihre Geschichte und handschriftliche Überlieferung* (Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1897), pp. 9–11; see also H.A.G. Houghton and D.C. Parker, 'An Introduction to Greek New Testament Commentaries with a Preliminary Checklist of New Testament Catena Manuscripts', in *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition*, ed. H.A.G. Houghton, TS (III) 13 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2016), p. 10.

²⁹ See Houghton and Parker, 'An introduction', pp. 10–11.

less, a thorough analysis of the text reveals that this is a patchwork of scholia, or rather of fragments from multiple patristic sources. More precisely, the compiler seems to have made a selection of extracts in order to create a running commentary, and comments from different Fathers are blended in such a way that the whole work appears rather muddled. The size of the exegetical material ranges from minimal text units, such as short phrases, to more extensive blocks including clauses and sentences. The names of the sources are almost never indicated: only Chrysostom and Gregory of Nazianzus are mentioned in a limited number of occasions (three and two times, respectively) mostly through a periphrasis and always in the form of indirect quotations.³⁰ In four cases, these are attributed vaguely to anonymous sources through indefinite pronouns:³¹ it is unclear whether the lack of name represents the compiler's choice not to mention the author(s), or rather the absence of an attribution for these fragments in the exemplar.

However, this kind of compilation is not unusual in catena tradition, and regarding the book of Acts it finds a parallel in the catenae by Ps.-Oecumenius (CPG C151) and Ps.-Theophylact (CPG C152).³² More importantly, it seems to have a literary precursor in Procopius of Gaza's *Epitome of the Octateuch* (CPG C3). Conventionally regarded as the initiator of the catena tradition, at the beginning of the sixth century, Procopius in the prologue of his *Epitome* describes two different stages involved in his work.³³ While he originally created a catena from patristic commentaries and other exegetical works, which has not been preserved by the manuscript tradition, in a second stage, due to

³⁰ Τῷ δὲ Χρυσολόγῳ δοκεῖ ... ὡς ἐνταῦθα γέγραπται ὁ χρυσοῦς τὴν γλῶτταν (fol. 187r); ἡ δὲ χρυσὴ γλῶττα φησὶν ὡς (188v); ὁ Θεόλογος Γρηγόριος φησὶν ... Τούτῳ γὰρ ἀρέσκειται καὶ ὁ πολὺς ἐν θεολογίᾳ Γρηγόριος (fol. 189r).

³¹ Καὶ εἰρήνασι τινες (fol. 187r); οἱ μὲν γὰρ εἶπον ὡς ... οἱ δὲ, ὅτι (fol. 188v); εἶπε δὲ τις ὡς (fol. 189r). Similar instances in the Theophylact's catena on the Pauline Epistles are discussed by Theodora Panella, 'Resurrection Appearances in the Pauline Catenae', in Houghton, *Commentaries*, p. 127.

³² PG 118.29–308; 125.495–1132. On these types see Scieri, 'The Catena Manuscripts on Acts', pp. 294–302.

³³ Karin Metzler, ed., *Prokop von Gaza, Eclogarum in libros historicos Veteris Testamenti epitome, Teil 1: Der Genesiskommentar*, GCS, NF 22 (Berlin/Munich/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015), p. 1.1–12; cf. PG 87, 21–24.

the vast amount of the material, Procopius embarked on a considerably reduced compilation (ἐκλογῶν ἐπιτομή, 'Epitome of Extracts') where the *lemmata auctoris* are not present and the different interpretations are assembled in a combined whole as if they were written by a single author.³⁴ Although in Gilles Dorival's opinion compilations of this kind, which are based on catenae but lack author indications, would be better regarded as commentaries, no proposal has yet been made to change their traditional classification as catenae in the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*.³⁵ On this basis, in my recent survey of the catena manuscripts on Acts, the first fragmentary compilation in GA 886 has been included in the group of catenae preserved by *codices singuli* and assigned the number C155.5.³⁶

Indeed, despite its unique character and the difficulty in detecting the individual patristic sources, there is sufficient evidence that a significant number of fragments are adopted from the Andreas catena (C150), the principal catena on Acts and the main source for later compilations.³⁷ The first sentence in GA 886 commenting on Acts 1:3 (inc. Ἀντιοχεὺς ὑπάρχων τὸ γένος ὁ θεῖος Λουκᾶς, ἱατρός τε τὴν ἐπιστήμην) reproduces the beginning of C150 (cf. Cramer p. 1.4–7). More importantly, embedded in the commentary are several fragments which are also found in C150,

³⁴ Procopius' prologue and the origins of catena are discussed in Gilles Dorival, 'Biblical Catenae: Between Philology and History', in Houghton, *Commentaries*, pp. 72–76; among others, see François Petit, ed., *Catenae Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum*, 2 vols, CCSG 2, 15 (Turnhout-Leuven: Brepols, 1977–1896), pp. 2:xx, xcvi n. 2; and more recently Maria Antonietta Barbàra Valenti, *Estratti catenari esegetici greci. Ricerche sul Cantico dei cantici e altro*, Testi e studi di cultura classica 76 (Pisa: ETS, 2019), pp. 22–24.

³⁵ Dorival, 'Biblical Catenae', pp. 72–76.

³⁶ Scieri, 'The Catena Manuscripts', p. 302.

³⁷ This catena was published by John A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, 8 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1838–1844), 3. In *Acta SS. Apostolorum*. The printed edition is based on Oxford, Bodleian, New College, MS 58 (GA 2818, 12th cent.) and contains an appendix of variants from Paris, BnF, Coislin Gr. 25 (GA 307, 10th cent.). On this catena and its tradition see Scieri, 'The Catena Manuscripts on Acts', pp. 287–293.

where they are attributed to the following sources: *anepigraphos*, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Chrysostom, Cyril, Didymus, Severus of Antioch, Severian of Gabala.³⁸

Remarkably, as can be observed in Table 1, GA 886 also contains reworked fragments from fifteen of the thirty-one additional scholia on Acts 1–2:13 transmitted by the ninth- or tenth-century manuscript Jerusalem, Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, Stavrou 25 (GA 1895).³⁹ I have identified this codex as subtype C150.1b, differentiating it from five representatives of the full catena (C150.1a).⁴⁰ In GA 886 some of these extracts are even placed as close to each other as in GA 1895, although the compiler rearranges the original sequence presented by the latter; this suggests that the catenae in the two manuscripts might be closely related. On the other hand, other fragments in GA 886 are present neither in GA 1895 nor in the representatives of C150.1a, but are attested in the direct tradition of patristic works (when this has been preserved), such as Chrysostom's Homilies.⁴¹ For this reason, it can be inferred that the compiler employed multiple sources. Equally, the sources of a few sections of the commentary remain undetected, raising the suspicion that they may contain the compiler's own exegesis.

³⁸ The full list of patristic sources cited in C150 is in Maurits Geerard and Jacques Noret, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum, IV. Concilia. Catenae*, rev. ed., CCSG 4 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), pp. 380–381.

³⁹ The ninth century is the date provided in the *Liste*, while Parpulov pushes the date forward to the first half of the tenth century (see Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts*, p. 140).

⁴⁰ Apart from GA 2818 and GA 307, the other manuscripts are Vatican, BAV, Barb. Gr. 582 (GA 453, 14th cent.), Paris, BnF, Gr. 221 (GA 610, 11th cent.) and Athos, Pantokratoros, 770 (GA 1678, 14th cent.); see Scieri, 'The Catena Manuscripts on Acts', p. 288.

⁴¹ The evidence includes Athanasius' *Orationes tres contra Arianos* (PG 26); Chrysostom's *Homiliae in Acta Apostolorum* 1–4 (PG 60), *Homiliae in principium Actorum* 2 (PG 51), *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 77 (PG 58), *Homiliae in Joannem* 87 (PG 59), *Homiliae de sancta pentecoste* 2 (PG 50), *Homiliae in epistulam 1 ad Corinthios* 30 (PG 61), *Expositiones in Psalmos* (PG 55), *Fragmenta in Jeremiam* (PG 64); Gregory of Nazianzus' *Orat. 41 in Pentecosten* (PG 36), *Epistulae theologiae* 101 (SC 208); Isidore of Pelusium's *Epistulae de interpretatione divinae scripturae* 499–500 (PG 78).

GA 1895 (C150.1b)	GA 886
Ammonius (fol. 8r)	fol. 186r
<i>scholium</i> (fol. 8r)	fol. 186r
<i>anepigraphos</i> (fol. 8v)	fol. 186v
<i>anepigraphos</i> (fol. 13v)	fol. 186v
Chrysostom (fol. 14r)	fol. 187r
the same (fols. 14r–v)	fol. 187r
Didymus (fols. 16v–17r)	fol. 186v
<i>scholium</i> (fols. 20v–21r)	fol. 187r
Didymus (fols. 21r–22r)	fol. 187v
Apollinaris (fol. 22v)	fol. 187v
untitled (fols. 24r–v)	fol. 188r
Chrysostom (fols. 24v–25r)	fol. 188r
Severian of Gabala (fol. 25r)	fol. 188r
untitled (fol. 25r)	fol. 188r
untitled (fols. 25r–v)	fol. 188r

Table 1. List of extra scholia from GA 1895 found in GA 886

Although the scholia are occasionally reproduced in their entirety, in most cases the compilation practice of GA 886 seems to follow the so-called technique ‘by cutting’, which is the most typical method of abbreviating the exegetical material in catenae.⁴² This consists of extracting small pieces of text from the source, while omitting other portions (perhaps considered unnecessary for the exegesis), as well as introducing linking words and grammatical adjustments to make up for the omissions. Overall, this kind of intervention abbreviates the source, yet preserves its original style. Less frequently, the ‘résumé’ technique is also employed, which involves paraphrasing and reworking the source, while retaining only a few words or clauses. In all cases, the selected passages from an author are sometimes reproduced

⁴² See Carmelo Curti and Maria Antonietta Barbàra, ‘Greek Exegetical Catenae’, in *Patrology: The Eastern Fathers from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to John of Damascus (750)*, ed. Angelo Di Berardino, trans. Adrian Walford, 1st ed. repr., Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2008), p. 611; see also Carmelo Curti, ‘La tradizione catenaria e il recupero dei commenti greci alla Bibbia: validità e limiti’, in *Eusebiana I. Commentarii in Psalmos*, ed. Carmelo Curti, Saggi e testi classici, cristiani e medievali (Catania: Centro di studi sull'antico cristianesimo, 1989), p. 280.

individually as they appear in the source, but more often are fragmented and mixed with elements from other authors in such a way as to form a single block of text, and in an order which does not necessarily reflect that of the original source. An example of this can be observed in Table 2.

GA 886 (fol. 188v) on Acts 2:2–3
“Οτε μὲν οὖν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ γνωσθῆναι ἔδει τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἐν εἶδει περιστερᾶς κάτεισιν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ὅτε δὲ πλῆθος ὅλον ἐπιστραφῆναι κατήλθεν ἐν εἶδει πυρίνων γλωσσῶν. Τί δήποτε; Ἐκεῖ μὲν τὸ πρᾶον τοῦ δεσπότου δηλοῦται, ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ τὸ τιμωρητικὸν τῶν ἀποστόλων παραγυμνοῦται, καὶ τὸ τῆς μελλούσης κρίσεως διακριτικόν. “Οτε μὲν γὰρ ἁμαρτήματα συγχωρῆσαι ἔδει, πολλῆς ἔδει τῆς πραότητος· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐτύχομεν δωρεᾶς, λοιπὸν καὶ κρίσεως καιρὸς καὶ ἐξετάσεως. “Ωσπερ τὸ πῦρ ἔχει τὴν φωτιστικὴν καὶ καυστικὴν δύναμιν, οὕτως ὁ λόγος τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ ἐφώτιζε τοὺς πιστεύοντας, καὶ ἀνῆλiske τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας. Τοιαύτην εἶχε γλώσσαν πυρὸς ὁ Παῦλος· ἡ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ τὸν ἀνθύπατον ἐφώτισεν καὶ τὸν Ἑλύμαν τὸν μάγον ἐτύφλωσεν· τῇ αὐτῇ δυνάμει κακέϊνον φωτίσας, καὶ τοῦτον τυφλώσας. ᾠφθῆσαν οὖν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις γλῶσσαι ὥσει πυρὸς. Οὐκ εἶπε μεριζόμεναι, ἀλλὰ διαμεριζόμεναι. Καλῶς· ἐκ μιᾶς γὰρ ἦσαν ῥίζης· ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι ἐνέργειά ἐστιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Παρακλήτου πεμφθεῖσα· οὐκ ἐφάνησαν εὐθέως γλῶσσαι, ἀλλὰ πῦρ πολὺ· εἴτα ὥσπερ κατεμένετο τὸ πῦρ καὶ διεμερίζετο εἰς γλῶσσαν. Τίνος μερίζοντος; Τίνος μεριζομένου; οὐχ ἡ φύσις τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐμερίζετο, ἀλλ’ ἦν τὸ μερίζον τὸ Πνεῦμα, τὸ δὲ μεριζόμενον ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος· τὸ γὰρ Πνεῦμα οὐ διαίρεται, ἀλλὰ διαίρεϊ.
C150.1
<i>τοῦ αὐτοῦ.</i> (on Acts 1:5) [Δείκνυσι λοιπὸν τὸ μέσον αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰωάννου φανερώς· ...] Τί δήποτε; Ἐκεῖ μὲν τὸ πρᾶον δελῶν, ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ τὸ τιμωρητικόν. Καὶ τῆς κρίσεως δὲ εὐκαιρῶς ἀναμινῆσκει. “Οτε μὲν γὰρ ἁμαρτήματα συγχωρῆσαι ἔδει, πολλῆς ἔδει τῆς πραότητος· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐτύχομεν τῆς δωρεᾶς, λοιπὸν καὶ κρίσεως καὶ ἐξετάσεως καιρὸς. Cramer pp. 6.27–7.16 (cf. Chrysostom, Homily 1 on Acts, in PG 60:21, 28–33) <i>τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου.</i> (on Acts 2:3) [“Ὡσεὶ πυρὸς”, φησι· καλῶς ὥς, ἵνα μηδὲν αἰσθητὸν ...] “Οτε μὲν γὰρ Ἰωάννῃ ἔδει γνωσθῆναι τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὥς ἐν εἶδει περιστερᾶς ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἦλθε τοῦ Χριστοῦ· νῦν δὲ ὅτε πλῆθος ὅλον ἐπιστραφῆναι ἐχρῆν, ὥσει πυρὸς. Cramer pp. 17.31–18.3 (cf. Chrysostom, Homily 4 on Acts, in PG 60:43, 8–11)

τοῦ αὐτοῦ (on Acts 2:3)

Καὶ καλῶς εἶπε, Διαμεριζόμεναι. Ἐκ μιᾶς γὰρ ἦν ῥίζης· ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι ἐνέργειά ἐστιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Παρακλήτου πεμφθεῖσα. [᾽Ὅρα δὲ καὶ ἐκείνους πρῶτους δειχθέντας ἀξιούς ... οὕτω δὴ καὶ οὗτοι πάντα εἶασαν τὰ ἑαυτῶν.]

Cramer p. 18.4–13 (cf. Chrysostom, Homily 4 on Acts, in PG 60:43, 45–47)

Σευήρου (but *Σευηριανοῦ* in GA 307, 453, 610, 1678, 1895). (on Acts 2:3)

[Οὐκ εἶπε πυρὸς, ἀλλ' ὥσει πυρὸς, οὐ γὰρ ἦν πῦρ τὸ φαινόμενον· ... οὐκ ἐφάνησαν εὐθέως γλῶσσαι, ἀλλὰ πῦρ πολὺ· εἴτα ὥσπερ κατεμένετο τὸ πῦρ καὶ διεμερίζετο εἰς γλῶσσας. τίνος μερίζοντος; τίνος μεριζομένου; οὐχ ἡ φύσις τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐμερίζετο, ἀλλ' ἦν τὸ μερίζον τὸ Πνεῦμα, τὸ δὲ μεριζόμενον ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος· τὸ γὰρ Πνεῦμα οὐ διαιρεῖται, ἀλλὰ διαιρεῖ. **᾽ὤφθησαν διαμεριζόμεναι ὥσει πυρὸς** [· διατὶ γλῶσσαι; ...] **καὶ** ὥσπερ τὸ πῦρ ἔχει τὴν φωτιστικὴν καὶ καυστικὴν δύναμιν, οὕτως ὁ λόγος τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ ἐφώτιζε τοὺς πιστεύοντας καὶ ἀνῆλπισκε τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας. Τοιαύτην εἶχεν γλῶσσαν πυρὸς Παῦλος· ἥ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ τὸν ἀνθύπατον ἐφώτισεν καὶ Ἐλύμαν τὸν μάγον ἐτύφλωσεν· τῇ αὐτῇ δυνάμει κάκεινον φωτίσας, καὶ τοῦτον τυφλώσας.

Cramer p. 20.4–32

Table 2. Compilation practice in GA 886

In the section commenting on Acts 2:2–3, the catenist of GA 886 combines phrases, sentences, and blocks of text of variable length from different scholia which in C150.1a are quite distant from one another.⁴³ The first scholium from Chrysostom comments on Acts 1:5, whereas the second and third extract from the same author and the scholium from Severus of Antioch (or Severian of Gabala?) explain Acts 2:3.⁴⁴ The selected fragments are reproduced verbatim, with only minor variations in the vocabulary (the synonyms *κάτεισιν* for *ἦλθε*, and *οὖν* for *γάρ*) and grammar (the indicative *δηλοῦται* instead of the participle *δηλῶν*; the third plural *ἦσαν* instead of the third singular *ἦν*), as well as very few additions (*τῶν ἀποστόλων*; *τὸ ... μελλούσης ... διακριτικὸν*), omissions (*νῦν*, *εὐκαίρως*, *καί*, *εἶπε*) and substitutions (*κατῆλθεν ἐν*

⁴³ The portions of text from C150.1a which are omitted in GA 886 are inserted within square brackets; the text in bold indicates additions in either group.

⁴⁴ The heading *Σευήρου* is only transmitted by GA 2818 (Cramer's base manuscript); the other representatives of C150.1a have *Σευηριανοῦ*.

εἶδει πυρίνων γλωσσῶν instead of ἐχρῆν ὥσει πυρός; παραγυμνοῦται instead of ἀναμιμνήσκει). However, the original order from C150.1 is dramatically altered:⁴⁵ not only are the textual portions of the first two scholia from Chrysostom reversed, but the third extract from the author is inserted between two fragments from Severus' scholium, which are also reversed. The result is an example of genuine mixture where explanations originally attributed to individual writers are blended as if they were expressed by one and the same writer, similarly to what Procopius did in his epitome.

THE CATENA ON ACTS 2:14–7:59

The second catena is a representative of the standard type, which in GA 886 is given an alternating layout as in the first fragmentary catena. The biblical text is rubricated and separated from the scholia by a double dot (which may or may not be followed by a horizontal line), which is also employed to mark the end of a scholium. The author of each comment is normally identified by his full name (for example: Διδύμου) or through an abbreviation or monogram (for example: χρ for Χρυσοστόμου, τυ αυ for τοῦ αὐτοῦ). This is positioned either within the text, in the blank space left for this purpose between two scholia, or in the margin, near the beginning of the scholium; in both cases, it is rubricated for ease of identification.

As already mentioned above, Karo and Lietzmann, von Soden, and Staab identified this catena as an abridgment of C150. I have recently supported this opinion by classifying the second catena in GA 886 as C150.2f.⁴⁶ However, it is uncertain whether this is indeed a later abridgment of the full catena or, as suggested by Devreesse, the shorter content reflects an earlier stage of

⁴⁵ The portion of text οὐκ εἶπε μεριζόμεναι, ἀλλὰ is not an addition by GA 886, but an omission from GA 2818, since it is present in the other witnesses to C150.1. Equally, the omission or addition of articles are likely to be scribal interventions.

⁴⁶ Scieri, 'The Catena Manuscripts on Acts', p. 292.

C150.⁴⁷ Indeed, among the several types abbreviated from the Andreas catena, GA 886 is the only version in which the selected scholia are copied in full; the other catenae usually reduce or even rework the original material. Only three scholia (fols. 192r–v, 195v–196r, 196v) present a shorter text than C150.1 (Cramer pp. 55.19–56.16, 75.15–23, 80.12–20), as they do not contain the text preceded by the phrase *καὶ μετ’ ὀλίγα* (‘and a little later’). Since this heading is generally added when two extracts from the same author or the same work follow in sequence, the missing portions might have been added by the C150.1 representatives rather than omitted by GA 886. Equally, given the presence of the formula in several other extracts, the few omissions in GA 886 might be simply explained as an abbreviation of the full scholia.

The suspicion that this manuscript contains an abridgment comes from observing fol. 194r: here a scholium which in C150.1 is attributed to Didymus (Cramer pp. 66.19–67.2) is stripped of a large portion of text and the name of the author is erased.⁴⁸ However, the omission might be due to scribal eyeskip: as can be seen in Table 3, the beginning of this scholium shares similar words with the beginning and ending of the scholium before (titled *σχόλιον* in C150.1, but anonymous in GA 886). It is therefore possible that the scribe, after copying the previous scholium and the name *Διδύμου* before the adjacent scholium, erroneously mistook the beginning of this for the incipit or the explicit of the scholium already copied. As a result, the copyist erased Didymus’ attribution, believing that the text yet to be transcribed (inc. *ἡγητέον ὡς Χριστὸς ἀναληφθεὶς*) was a continuation of the previous scholium; indeed, in the full catena from GA 1895 (fols. 59v–60r) this portion is separated from the rest of the comment by a line break.

⁴⁷ Devreesse, ‘Chaînes exégétiques grecques’, p. 1205: ‘A notre avis, nous avons là, recopiée par un scribe d’âge postérieur, une première étape de la chaîne’.

⁴⁸ Despite the erasure, it is still possible to see the curve at the top of *δ*, the *υ* with the acute accent on it, and the lower stroke of *μ*.

GA 886 (fol. 194r)	C150.1 (Cramer pp. 66.19–67.2)
untitled. Τὸ ἄχρι καὶ τὸ ἕως παρὰ τῇ θειᾷ γραφῇ οὐ χρόνων ἐστὶ σημαντικόν. ... καὶ δόξης θεοπρεποῦς κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. <i>Διδύμου.</i> ἡγητέον ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀναληφθεὶς εἰς οὐρανούς μένει ἐκεῖ ... τέλος ἐπιτίθησι τῷ εἶναι ἐν οὐρανῷ.	<i>σχόλιον.</i> Τὸ ἄχρι καὶ τὸ ἕως παρὰ τῇ θειᾷ γραφῇ οὐ χρόνων ἐστὶ σημαντικόν. ... καὶ δόξης θεοπρεποῦς κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. <i>Διδύμου.</i> Ἐπόμενος τίς τῇ συνηθείᾳ τῆς γραφῆς, τὸ καὶ τὸ ἕως ἐκλήψεται οὐ πάντως χρονικᾶς περιγραφᾶς σημαίνοντα. ... ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς· ἡγητέον ὡς Χριστὸς ἀναληφθεὶς εἰς οὐρανούς μένει ἐκεῖ ... τέλος ἐπιτίθησι τὸ εἶναι ἐν οὐρανῷ.

Table 3. Hints of scribal mistake in GA 886

While further research is necessary to establish the development of the Andreas catena, there are sufficient hints that also the second catena from GA 886 might be closely related to GA 1895 (C150.1b) and that both contain a different stage of catena than the representatives of C150.1a. First, it is noteworthy that, although GA 886 contains fewer scholia than all the C150.1 witnesses, it shares all the eighteen omissions in GA 1895 of scholia on Acts 2:14–7:59 which are present in the five representatives of C150.1a. In contrast, the two manuscripts share three extra scholia which are absent from the majority of C150.1a exemplars: these are titled ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου (fol. 192v), τοῦ αὐτοῦ (fol. 198v), Ἀμμωνίου (fol. 201v). While the first and third of these are only shared with GA 1895 (fols. 53r, 92v), the second also appears as a supplement in GA 307 (fol. 46r) and GA 453 (fol. 57r).⁴⁹

⁴⁹ In both manuscripts the additional scholium is signaled by a symbol (÷) and placed in the margins. In GA 307 this is titled Ἰωάννου.

GA 886 (fol. 192v)	GA 1895 / C150.1b (fol. 53r)	C150.1a
ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου. 'Ο συνεργῶν Κύριος τοῖς προαιρουμένοις τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοὺς σπουδάζοντας συγκαταριθμηθῆναι, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐνωθῆναι τοῖς προλαβοῦσι, τὴν πίστιν προσσετίθει καθ' ἐκάστην τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ. <u>Διδύμου.</u> 'Ο συνεργῶν Κύριος τοῖς προαιρουμένοις τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοὺς ἐκτὸς φημι σπεύδοντας συγκαταριθμηθῆναι, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐνωθῆναι τοῖς προλαβοῦσι, τὴν πίστιν προτίθησιν αὐτοὺς καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ. Νοήσεις δὲ τὸ λεγόμενον ... ἡ φύσις αὐτῶν προσσιθεῖ αὐτοὺς τοῖς πιστοῖς, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ Κύριος.	ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου. 'Ο συνεργῶν Κύριος τοῖς προαιρουμένοις τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοὺς σπουδάζοντας συγκαταριθμηθῆναι, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐνωθῆναι τοῖς προλαβοῦσι, τὴν πίστιν προσσετίθει καθ' ἐκάστην τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ. <u>Διδύμου.</u> 'Ο συνεργῶν Κύριος τοῖς προαιρουμένοις τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοὺς ἐκτὸς φημι σπεύδοντας συγκαταριθμηθῆναι, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐνωθῆναι τοῖς προλαβοῦσι, τὴν πίστιν προτίθησιν αὐτοὺς καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ. νοήσεις δὲ τὸ λεγόμενον ... ἡ φύσις αὐτῶν προσσιθεῖ αὐτοὺς τοῖς πιστοῖς, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ Κύριος.	ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου. 'Ο συνεργῶν Κύριος τοῖς προαιρουμένοις τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοὺς σπουδάζοντας συγκαταριθμηθῆναι, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐνωθῆναι τοῖς προλαβοῦσι, τὴν πίστιν προσσετίθει καθ' ἐκάστην τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ· νοήσεις δὲ τὸ λεγόμενον ... ἡ φύσις αὐτῶν προστίθησιν αὐτοὺς τοῖς πιστοῖς, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ Κύριος.

Table 4. Extra scholium in GA 886 and GA 1895

Further confirmation comes from observing that both manuscripts have several scholia which are either arranged in reverse order or placed further down or up in comparison with representatives of C150.1a, and whose titles occasionally change to reflect the different arrangement, as displayed in Table 5.⁵⁰ If one looks at the section on Acts 5:41–42, scholium 3, entitled Χρυσοστόμου in C150.1a, appears as scholium 2 in both GA 1895 and 886: the name of the source is omitted and replaced by τοῦ αὐτοῦ because,

⁵⁰ Apart from GA 2818 (Cramer's base manuscript), the manuscripts in the table are ordered according to the catena type and GA number.

following the inversion, this scholium is presented after another comment from the same author (τοῦ αὐτοῦ in GA 1895 and GA 886). In contrast, in C150.1a this scholium is positioned after one entitled Ἀμμωνίου; therefore, the name Chrysostom needs to be specified to prevent the passage from being mistaken for another extract from Ammonius. The same situation can be observed in the section on Acts 7:30–32, where a scholium from Eusebius of Emesa, located as number 6 in C150.1a, is brought forward as number 2 in GA 886 and 1895. Its position right after another scholium from the same author makes the name redundant; this instead has to be spelled out in the C150.1a witnesses, where the scholium follows one by Cyril. Similarly, in the section on Acts 7:42–43, scholium 6 in C150.1a is moved up to scholium 2 in GA 886 and 1895. In this case the substitution of Χρυσοστόμου with τοῦ αὐτοῦ could not be applied to the reversed scholium, this being preceded by an extract from Didymus; instead, it could be introduced for the subsequent comment also extracted from Chrysostom.

A more diversified arrangement of scholia can be observed in Acts 7:59. Despite its absence from GA 610, scholium 1 is present in the majority of C150 witnesses considered here. However, in GA 1895 and 886 this is placed as scholium 3 in the sequence and attributed to Ammonius, while in GA 2818 and GA 1678 it is anonymous and maintained in the given sequence.⁵¹ On the other hand, in GA 307 and GA 453 this is not included in the text of the catena but supplemented in the margins where it is linked by a symbol to the lemma πνεῦμα μου.⁵²

⁵¹ However, in Cramer p. 130.27 this scholium is printed after scholium 4.

⁵² In Table 5 the marginal position of the scholium is marked by an asterisk attached to the number (*).

Scholium	C150.1a					C150.1b	C150.2f
	GA 2818	307	453	610	1678	1895	886
Acts 2:24							
1	1 ἐξ ἀνεπι- γράφου	1	1	1	1	3 Χρυσο- στόμου	3 Χρυσο- στόμου
2	2 Σευήρου ...	2	2	2	2	4 τοῦ αὐτοῦ	4 τοῦ αὐτοῦ
3	3 untitled	3	3	3	3	1	1
4	4 untitled	4	4	4	4	2	2
Acts 5:32							
1	1 τοῦ αὐτοῦ	1	1	1	1	2	2
2	2 untitled	2	2	2	2	1	1
Acts 5:41–42							
1	1 τοῦ Χρυσο- στόμου	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2 Ἀμμωνίου ...	2	2	2	2	3 τοῦ αὐτοῦ	3 τοῦ αὐτοῦ
3	3 τοῦ Χρυσο- στόμου	3	3	3	3	2	2
Acts 7:21–23							
1	1 Ἀμμωνίου	1	1	1	1	2	2
2	2 Διδύμου	2	2	2	2	1	1
Acts 7:30–32							
1	1 Εὐσεβίου	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2 τοῦ ἁγίου Κυρίλλου	2	2	2	2	6 τοῦ αὐτοῦ	6 τοῦ αὐτοῦ
3	3 τοῦ Χρυσο- στόμου	3	3	3	3	2	2
4	4 τοῦ αὐτοῦ	4	4	4	4	3	3
5	5 Κυρίλλου	5	5	5	5	4	4

6	6 Εὐσεβίου ἐπισκόπου Ἑμίσης	6	6	6	6	5	5
Acts 7:42–43							
1	1 Διδύμου	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2 τοῦ Χρυσο- στόμου	2	2	2	2	6	6
3	3 τοῦ αὐτοῦ	3	3	3	3	2 τοῦ αὐτοῦ	2 τοῦ αὐτοῦ
4	4 τοῦ ἁγίου Κυρίλλου ...	4	4	4	4	3	3
5	5 τοῦ ἁγίου Κυρίλλου ...	5	5	5	5	4	4
6	6 τοῦ Χρυσο- στόμου	6	6	6	6	—	—
Acts 7:59							
1	1 untitled	5*	5*	—	1	3 Ἀμμωνίου	3 Ἀμμωνίου
2	2 untitled	1	1	1	2	1	1
3	3 Ἀθανασίου	2	2	2	3	—	—
4	4 untitled	3 Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσο- στόμου	3 τοῦ Χρυσο- στόμου	3	3	2 τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου	2 Χρυσο- στόμου
5	5 τοῦ ἁγίου Κυρίλλου ...	4	4	4	5	4	4

Table 5. Sequence and attribution of scholia

Table 5 also shows that, besides sharing the same variation in the titles and sequence of scholia, GA 886 and 1895 give attributions to scholia which in C150.1a are anonymous, although it is not always possible to ascertain their correctness. In the section on Acts 2:24 scholia 3 and 4, which in C150.1a are preceded by a

scholium from Severus of Antioch, are titled Χρυσόστομου and τοῦ αὐτοῦ, respectively. The latter scholium is indeed an extract from Chrysostom's Homily 6 on Acts (cf. PG 60.58, 44–45), while the source of the former scholium is undetected outside of the catena. The same is true for the section on Acts 7:59: scholium 3, which as seen above is anonymous in C150.1a but in both GA 886 and GA 1895 is attributed to Ammonius. On the other hand, GA 886 and GA 1895 share with GA 307 and GA 453 the attribution of scholium 4 to Chrysostom, which in C150.1a is preceded by a comment from Athanasius. Although in the latter case the extracts have not been detected outside this catena, these instances also suggest that the lack of title in a scholium does not necessarily mean that the source is the same as the scholium before.⁵³

On the other hand, some attributions in GA 886 are incorrect, and the genuine identification is supplied by the representatives of C150.1 (including GA 1895) as confirmed by the direct tradition. On fol. 198v, the title τοῦ αὐτοῦ introduces a scholium which in C150.1 is attributed to Chrysostom (Cramer pp. 94.30–95.3) and follows an extract from Didymus; the scholium is indeed from Chrysostom's Homily 13 on Acts (cf. PG 60.108, 60–109, 3). Similarly, on fol. 204v the same title is repeated for two consecutive scholia, which in C150.1 are attributed to Chrysostom and Origen, respectively (Cramer pp. 126.29–34, 127.12–17), and separated by a scholium from Severus (Cramer p. 127.1–10). In the first case the heading is correct, since the extract is from Homily 17 on Acts (cf. PG 60.137, 52–59) as well as the scholium before (cf. PG 60.138, 48–55); in contrast, the second τοῦ αὐτοῦ is incorrect since the scholium is an extract from Origen's Letter to Africanus (cf. PG 11.72, 5e–11). These circumstances also show that the title τοῦ αὐτοῦ in catenae manuscripts is not always trustworthy.⁵⁴

⁵³ See Curti and Barbàra, 'Greek Exegetical Catenaes', pp. 609–610; see also Sandro Leanza, 'Problemi di ecdotica catenaria', in *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità. Atti del Primo Convegno dell'Associazione di Studi Tardoantichi*, ed. Antonio Garzya, Associazione di studi tardoantichi 1 (Naples: M. D'Auria Editore, 1989) pp. 257–258.

⁵⁴ See Curti, Barbàra, 'Greek Exegetical Catenaes', p. 609; see also Leanza, 'Problemi di ecdotica catenaria', pp. 258–259.

In a third instance (fol. 202r), the heading *καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα* introduces a comment which in the C150.1 manuscripts is attributed to Eusebius of Emesa (Cramer pp. 111.16–112.6) and comes after a scholium from Chrysostom: while the lack of attestation of this scholium outside the catena makes it difficult to confirm the attribution to Eusebius, its absence from Chrysostom's direct tradition may indeed indicate that *καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα* here is incorrect. Equally, on fol. 193r a scribal oversight involving *καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα* determines the combination of two scholia originally separate and ascribed to individual authors: due to *saut du même au même*, the scribe copies the first part of a scholium from Chrysostom up to *καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα* (Cramer p. 59.4–16) and then jumps to the same formula introducing the second part of the next scholium attributed to Severus of Antioch (Cramer p. 59.17–31), thereby removing an extensive portion of both comments and ascribing the resulting mixture only to the first author.

CONCLUSION

Despite their fragmentary nature, the two exegetical texts on Acts in GA 886 display distinctive profiles, and yet disclose two different faces of the same genre of commentary, the catena. While the second catena (on Acts 2:14–7:59) contains a shorter form of the Andreas catena (C150), the first catena (on Acts 1–2:13) is more peculiar, as it appears to be a running text created by mixing unattributed pieces of scholia from patristic sources. The evidence suggests that these may have also been extracted from the Andreas catena.

There are further hints that both catenae, despite being different types of compilation, relate to the version of the Andreas catena preserved in GA 1895 (C150.1b). For the first catena this is demonstrated by the reworking of a considerable number of extra scholia from GA 1895, which are absent from the other witnesses to the Andreas catena (C150.1a). Similarly, the second catena shares with GA 1895 three extra scholia. Interestingly, one scholium is only partly found in C150.1a, where it seems to derive from a combination of two individual, yet very similar extracts in GA 886 and GA 1895, due to eyeskip. This suggests that the two manuscripts represent an earlier stage of the Andreas catena,

where the two scholia had not yet been mixed. What is more, a significant number of scholia are arranged in the same distinctive sequence found in GA 1895, and in both manuscripts they are given titles which are either missing or different in the representatives of C150.1a. Further examination is required to establish the chronological relationship between the catenae in GA 886 and GA 1895: more precisely, it remains to be ascertained whether the first represents an abbreviation of the second, or the second is an expansion of the first.

As for the author of the first catena, it is difficult to determine whether it was the same Nicetas of Naupactus to whom is ascribed the section on Matthew, or Theophylact of Bulgaria, as suggested by some scholars. Even more complicated, and likely to remain a mystery, is the reason for the incompleteness of the texts. In particular, future research should investigate the criteria behind the compilation practice and the impact of this on the exegetical profile of the commentary. It should also ascertain whether the sections which do not find a parallel in the Andreas catena contain original exegesis by the compiler or betray the influence of sources hitherto undetected. This work could be assisted by comparison with the catenae on Acts by Ps.-Oecumenius (C151) and Ps.-Theophylact (C152), which feature similar techniques of compilation, as well as with other catena types, including those from previously unknown *codices singuli* (C155).

In conclusion, even though it is not possible to fill the missing gaps of these fragmentary catenae, attempts can be made to address the questions rising from what is extant, in order ultimately to evaluate the weight of these exegetical fragments in the reception of the Acts of the Apostles throughout the Byzantine World and the Middle Ages.

