

# The Catena in Marcum



A Byzantine Anthology of  
Early Commentary on Mark

TEXTS AND EDITIONS FOR NEW TESTAMENT STUDY (TENT) [6]

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY

*William R. S. Lamb*

BRILL

## The *Catena in Marcum*

# Text and Editions for New Testament Study

*Edited by*

Stanley E. Porter and Wendy J. Porter

VOLUME 6

*The titles published in this series are listed at [brill.nl/tent](http://brill.nl/tent)*

# The *Catena in Marcum*

A Byzantine Anthology of Early Commentary on Mark

*Edited and translated by*

William R.S. Lamb



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2012

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Catena in Marcum. English.

The catena in Marcum : a Byzantine anthology of early commentary on Mark / edited and translated by William R.S. Lamb.

p. cm. – (Texts and editions for New Testament study, ISSN 1574-7085 ; v. 6)

"Commonly attributed to Victor of Antioch"–Introd.

Includes bibliographical references (p. ) and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-22431-5 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Bible. N.T. Mark–Commentaries–Early works to 1800. 2. Bible. N.T. Mark–Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Lamb, William R. S. II. Victor, of Antioch. III. Title.

BS2585.53.C3813 2012

226.3'0709–dc23

2012005157

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see [www.brill.nl/brill-typeface](http://www.brill.nl/brill-typeface).

ISSN 1574-7085

ISBN 978 90 04 22431 5 (hardback)

ISBN 978 90 04 22833 7 (e-book)

Copyright 2012 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

## CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	IX
List of Abbreviations.....	XI

### PART I

#### INTRODUCTION

1. Patristic Exegesis and the Theological Interpretation of Scripture... 3	
a. Patristic Exegesis in Recent Scholarship..... 8	
b. The Theological Interpretation of Scripture..... 11	
c. The Present Study..... 19	
2. The <i>Catena in Marcum</i> ..... 27	
a. The 'Genealogy' of the <i>Catena in Marcum</i> ..... 32	
i. John Cramer (1840)..... 33	
ii. John Burgon (1871)..... 36	
iii. Harold Smith (1918)..... 40	
iv. Robert Devreesse (1928)..... 47	
v. Joseph Reuss (1941)..... 51	
b. The Open Book..... 58	
c. The Sources of the <i>Catena in Marcum</i> ..... 65	
d. Date and Provenance..... 71	
3. Commentary, Anthology, and the Scholastic Tradition..... 75	
a. Patterns of <i>Paideia</i> in the Byzantine World..... 80	
i. The Scholastic Handbook and 'the Open Book'..... 91	
ii. Literary <i>Scholia</i> and <i>Marginalia</i> ..... 94	
iii. The Compilation of Anthologies..... 98	
b. Procopius of Gaza and the Scholastic Tradition..... 103	
c. A 'Progressive Sterility'?..... 108	
4. Let the Reader Understand..... 111	
a. The Obscurity of Texts..... 113	
i. Allegorical Reading..... 118	
ii. Figural Reading..... 128	
b. The Legacy of the Grammarian..... 133	
c. The Literary Trajectory..... 138	

5. The Discrepancies between the Gospels .....	141
a. The Eusebian Canons .....	145
b. Discrepancies and their Explanation in the <i>Catena in Marcum</i> .....	149
c. The Historical Trajectory .....	157
6. Who Do You Say that I am? .....	163
a. The Chalcedonian Settlement .....	168
b. Cyril of Alexandria and the <i>Catena in Marcum</i> .....	173
c. The Puzzle of <i>Christus Nesciens</i> .....	179
d. Making Sense of Mark's Christology .....	184
e. The Dogmatic Trajectory .....	190
7. Conclusion .....	199

## PART II

## THE CATENA IN MARCUM

Chapter Headings for the Gospel According to Mark .....	213
The Hypothesis: Saint Cyril of Alexandria, <i>On the Gospel According to Saint Mark</i> .....	215

## THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

Chapter 1 .....	221
1. On the demoniac .....	232
2. On Peter's mother-in-law .....	234
3. On the healing of various diseases .....	236
4. On the leper .....	239
Chapter 2 .....	243
5. On the paralytic .....	243
6. On Levi the tax collector .....	247
Chapter 3 .....	255
7. On the man with a withered hand .....	255
8. On the choosing of the apostles .....	258
Chapter 4 .....	265
9. On the parable of the sower .....	265
10. On the calming of the waters .....	277
Chapter 5 .....	281
11. On Legion .....	281
12. On the leader of the synagogue's daughter .....	286
13. On the woman with a haemorrhage .....	287

Chapter 6 .....	291
14. On the commissioning of the apostles .....	292
15. On John and Herod .....	294
16. On the five loaves and the two fishes .....	296
17. On the walking on the sea .....	299
Chapter 7 .....	305
18. On the transgression of the commands of God .....	305
19. On the Phoenician woman .....	308
20. On the deaf and dumb man .....	310
Chapter 8 .....	313
21. On the seven loaves .....	313
22. On the leaven of the Pharisees .....	316
23. On the blind man .....	317
24. On the questioning in Caesarea .....	318
Chapter 9 .....	327
25. On the transfiguration of Jesus .....	327
26. On the epileptic .....	336
27. On the quarrels about who is the greatest .....	341
Chapter 10 .....	351
28. On the Pharisees who asked questions .....	351
29. On the rich man who questioned Jesus .....	357
30. On the sons of Zebedee .....	367
31. On Bartimaeus .....	371
Chapter 11 .....	373
32. On the colt .....	373
33. On the withered fig tree .....	375
34. On the capacity for forgiveness .....	381
35. On the chief priests and scribes who questioned the Lord .....	381
Chapter 12 .....	385
36. On the vineyard .....	385
37. On those sent to ask about the poll tax .....	388
38. On the Sadducees .....	389
39. On the scribe .....	391
40. On questioning from the Lord .....	393
41. On the two coins .....	396
Chapter 13 .....	397
42. On the end .....	397
43. On that day and that hour .....	407



Chapter 14 .....	413
44. On the woman who anointed the Lord with sweet perfume ....	413
45. On the Passover .....	417
46. On the prophecy of betrayal .....	420
47. On Peter's denial .....	430
Chapter 15 .....	437
48. On the request for the body of the Lord .....	452
Chapter 16 .....	455
Appendix. The Sources of the <i>Catena in Marcum</i> .....	461
Bibliography .....	479
Index of Biblical References .....	493
Index of Modern Authors .....	503
Index of Subjects .....	506

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present volume is an adaptation of my doctoral research in the Department of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield. I am extremely grateful to the University of Sheffield for the bursary, which funded this research, and for the company of fellow students and staff who made it such an enjoyable and stimulating place to work and to study. Professor Loveday Alexander, my supervisor, provided me with wise advice and gentle encouragement, particularly when other commitments at the University of Sheffield and Sheffield Cathedral threatened to delay the completion of this project. I am very grateful to the Rt Revd Jack Nicholls for granting some sabbatical leave to allow me to complete this project.

I also want to record my thanks to the following for their wisdom, insight and encouragement: Dr Will Adam, Professor Philip Alexander, Fr Peter Allan CR, the Very Revd Peter Bradley, the Revd Gillian Cooper, Professor James Crossley, Canon Simon Cowling, Professor Philip Davies, Dr Andrew Davison, Dr Diana Edelman, Professor J. Keith Elliott, Professor Sarah Foot, Canon James Garrard, Canon Joanne Grenfell, Professor William Horbury, Dr Christine Joynes, Dr Linda Kirk, Dr Suilin Lavelle, Dr John Lyons, Dr Barry Matlock, Dr Andrew Mein, Professor Jorunn Økland, Professor Hugh Pyper, Dr Vicky Raymer, Professor John Rogerson, Professor Chris Rowland, Canon Martin Seeley, Dr Steve Shakespeare and Dr Lionel Wickham. I would also like to thank the staff of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, for helping me to locate many of the original manuscripts of the *Catena in Marcum*. I wish to thank also Professor Stanley Porter and the publishers at Brill for their helpful advice and support.

This project arose in part out of a conversation with my sister, Charlotte, about a rather obscure text which she subsequently tracked down in the Bodleian Library. This was a copy of John Cramer's edition of the *Catena in Marcum*. She may be surprised to see it reappearing here in a rather more accessible form. Nevertheless, for this I owe Charlotte a considerable debt.



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Cat. Ioh.* *Catena in Iohannem* (catena integra) (e codd. Paris. Coislin. gr. 23 + Oxon. Bodl. Auct. T.I.4) in J.A. Cramer, *Catena graecorum Patrum in N.T.*, II, (Oxford: e Typographeo Academico, 1841), pp. 175–413, 431–450.
- Cat. Luc.* *Catena in Lucam* (Typus B) (e codd. Paris. Coislin. gr. 23 + Oxon. Bodl. Misc. 182 + Oxon. Bodl. Laud. 33) in J.A. Cramer, *Catena graecorum Patrum in N.T.*, II, (Oxford: e Typographeo Academico, 1841), pp. 3–174, 415–430.
- Cat. Marc.* *Catena in Marcum* (recensio ii) (e codd. Oxon. Bodl. Laud. 33 + Paris. Coislin. gr. 23 + Paris. gr. 178) in J.A. Cramer, *Catena in Evangelia S Matthaei et S Marci* (Oxford: e Typographeo Academico, 1840), pp. 261–447.
- Cat. Matt.* *Catena in Matthaeum* (catena integra) (e codd. Paris. Coislin. gr. 23 + Oxon. Bodl. Auct. T.I.4) in J.A. Cramer, *Catena graecorum Patrum in N.T.*, I, (Oxford: e Typographeo Academico, 1840), pp. 1–257, 449–496.
- CPG M. Geerards, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, vols. I–IV (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974).
- BAGD W. Bauer, W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, and F.W. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Third Edition. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).
- DCB W. Smith and H. Wace, *A Dictionary of Christian Biography* 4 vols. (London: John Murray, 1877).
- Lampe* G. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961).
- Liddell and Scott* H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H.S. Jones, R. McKenzie *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Ninth Edition. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).
- NRSV New Revised Standard Version
- NA<sup>27</sup> *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Edited by E. and E. Nestle, B. and K. Aland, et al. Twenty Seventh Edition. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993. 9th corrected printing, 2006).
- PG J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus (series Graeca)* (Paris: Migne, 1857–1866).
- PL J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus (series Latina)* (Paris: Migne, 1844–1865).
- RSV Revised Standard Version
- OCD S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- SC *Sources Chrétiennes*
- TLG *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*

UBS

*The Greek New Testament*. Edited by B. and K. Aland, et al. Fourth Revised Edition. (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 2001. 15th printing, 2009).

*The discipline of reading, the very idea of close commentary and interpretation, textual criticism as we know it, derive from the study of Holy Scripture or, more accurately, from the incorporation and development in that study of older practices of Hellenistic grammar, recension and rhetoric. Our grammars, our explications, our criticisms of texts, our endeavours to pass from letter to spirit, are the immediate heirs to the textualities of western Judaeo-Christian theology and biblical-patristic exegetics. What we have done since the masked scepticism of Spinoza, since the critiques of rationalist Enlightenment and since the positivism of the nineteenth century, is to borrow vital currency, vital investments and contracts of trust from the bank or treasure-house of theology. It is from there that we have borrowed our theories of the symbol, our use of the iconic, our idiom of poetic creation and aura .... We have borrowed, traded upon, made small change of the reserves of transcendent authority. Very few of us have made any return deposit. At its key points of discourse and inference, hermeneutics and aesthetics in our secular, agnostic civilization are a more or less conscious, a more or less embarrassed act of larceny.*

George Steiner\*

---

\* George Steiner, *No Passion Spent* (London: Faber and Faber, 1996), 36.



PART I

INTRODUCTION





## CHAPTER ONE

### PATRISTIC EXEGESIS AND THE THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE

In the Romanesque basilica of St. Mary Magdalene in Vézelay, one of the pillars in the south aisle of the nave has a particularly fine carved capital. It is called *le Moulin Mystique*. The capital depicts a miller holding a bag of wheat over the “mystical mill,” while another gathers the flour underneath. It is an image which intrigues pilgrims and tourists. Like any image or symbolic representation, it carries a range of different meanings. For some, the image is interpreted in supersessionist terms—the raw material of the Torah is refined into the spiritual food of the Gospel through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. For others, the image of the mill provides a suggestive parable for the complex interactions at work in the interpretation of scripture. The mill marks that point where the germs of wheat are ground, sifted, and refined—in other words, the point at which the ancient words of scripture are translated, interpreted and transformed.<sup>1</sup> The flour suggests a metaphor for the many different ways in which the text has been actualised in subsequent contexts and cultures, for different times and seasons. And yet, while this perspective might provide a suitable starting point for discussion about the use of the Bible in the modern world, it perhaps also provides a telling commentary on the history of biblical interpretation in the modern era. Biblical scholars have often been more interested in the provenance of the wheat than the quality of the flour.

In recent years, scholars have begun to redress this imbalance. There has been a growing interest in the “reception history” of the Bible, a phenomenon which perhaps demands some attention and explanation. A

---

<sup>1</sup> This analogy is described by Henri de Lubac in Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis: the Four Senses of Scripture*, trans. E.M. Macierowski, Volume 2. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1959 (ET 2000)), 225–226. De Lubac suggests that the miller is St Paul. By way of comparison, note the rabbinic teaching recorded by Yvonne Sherwood: “when God gave humankind Torah he gave it in the form of wheat for us to make flour from it, and flax for us to make a garment from it: Torah is the raw material, to be ground, woven, and spun (out).” (Yvonne Sherwood, *A Biblical Text and its Afterlives: The Survival of Jonah in Western Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1).

distinctive approach within the field of biblical studies, “reception history”<sup>2</sup> begins from the conviction that what the biblical text “has been interpreted to mean” through the centuries is as significant an area of intellectual inquiry as what the text “originally meant.” And yet while the project of *Wirkungsgeschichte* has been embraced with enthusiasm in some quarters, recent publications reveal that there is some confusion and disagreement about why this approach might be significant or interesting. For some commentators, “reception history” offers resources for a more “ecclesial” emphasis in reading scripture, while for others, it offers a way of exploring the way in which the Bible has animated Western culture through the centuries.

One of the most significant examples of this approach in New Testament studies is the three volume *Hermeneia* commentary on St. Matthew’s gospel by Ulrich Luz.<sup>3</sup> Luz was something of a pioneer in adapting the insights of Hans-Georg Gadamer to promote a new method for reading biblical literature. Luz defines *Wirkungsgeschichte* as follows:

By ‘history of interpretation,’ I mean the history of the interpretations of a text in commentaries and other theological writings. Under ‘history of influence’ (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) I understand the history, reception, and actualizing of a text in media other than the commentary, thus, e.g. in sermons, canonical law, hymnody, art, and in the actions and sufferings of the church. The history of influence and the history of interpretations are related to each other like two concentric circles so that ‘history of influence’ is inclusive of ‘history of interpretation.’<sup>4</sup>

Luz’ innovative approach to biblical commentary has led since to an avalanche of publications. Almost a decade ago, Heikki Räisänen noted that there had been few specific studies on the influence of the Bible, even though the introduction of the term *Wirkungsgeschichte* by Hans-Georg Gadamer<sup>5</sup> had met with some striking and rather “sweeping general statements on the effects of the Bible”<sup>6</sup> among biblical scholars and theologians. However, Luz’ original definition of *Wirkungsgeschichte* is problematic for

---

<sup>2</sup> A rather inadequate translation of the terms ‘Wirkungsgeschichte’ or ‘Rezeptionsgeschichte’ in German scholarship.

<sup>3</sup> Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, trans. Wilhelm Linss, vol. 1 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, trans. Wilhelm Linss, vol. 2 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, trans. Wilhelm Linss, vol. 3 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005).

<sup>4</sup> Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 95.

<sup>5</sup> Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*. Second Edition. (New York: Continuum, 2003).

<sup>6</sup> Heikki Räisänen, ‘The “Effective History” of the Bible: A Challenge to Biblical Scholarship?’, in *Challenges to Biblical Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 264.

two reasons: first, Luz' distinction between "history of interpretation" and "history of influence" is unsustainable when one considers the fact that early commentaries and *catenae* were made up, in large part, of homiletic material. Secondly, the distinction ultimately proves arbitrary in that it fails to take seriously the phenomenological presuppositions of the principal architects of *Wirkungsgeschichte*, namely Hans-Georg Gadamer and Paul Ricoeur.<sup>7</sup>

It is remarkable that there has been very little published research identifying or resolving the confusion and disagreement surrounding the definition of *Wirkungsgeschichte*.<sup>8</sup> In some respects, the exception in this regard is Räsänen himself. In an essay on "The 'Effective History' of the Bible: a Challenge to Biblical Scholarship?", Räsänen acknowledged the importance of the influence of the Bible on civilization, but questioned the way in which biblical scholars and theologians have used the notion of *Wirkungsgeschichte* in their research. Because of its association with the thought of Gadamer and his notion of "tradition," Räsänen was wary of the way in which biblical scholars and theologians (and those who profess to be both biblical scholars and theologians) have used *Wirkungsgeschichte* as a

---

<sup>7</sup> Part of the difficulty is that there was some ambiguity about Gadamer's use of the term *Wirkungsgeschichte* in the first edition of *Truth and Method*, a point readily conceded in the 'Foreword to the Second Edition': "(T)here is a certain legitimate ambiguity in the concept of historically effected consciousness (*wirkungsgeschichtliches Bewußtsein*), as I have employed it. This ambiguity is that it is used to mean at once the consciousness effected in the course of history and determined by history, and the very consciousness of being thus effected and determined. Obviously, the burden of my argument is that effective history still determines modern historical and scientific consciousness; and it does so beyond any possible knowledge of this domination" (Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, xxxiv). The distinction might at first appear rather subtle, but if illustrated with reference to the new perspective on Paul, Gadamer is describing the difference between Paul's 'effect' on the consciousness of Martin Luther, and our awareness of the 'effect' of Luther's reading of Paul on our own consciousness.

<sup>8</sup> Räsänen notes that "the actual 'effective history' of the Bible (which is not identical with the history of its exegetical interpretation) has not yet been the subject of systematic study; here a vast area of research awaits workers" (Räsänen, 'The 'Effective History' of the Bible: A Challenge to Biblical Scholarship?', 247). Perhaps these words should be read as a prelude to the task undertaken in the Blackwell Bible Commentaries—significantly, Räsänen also suggests that "an unbiased 'effective history' of the Bible, coupled with ideological criticism, could function as a realistic prelude to a reflective use of the Bible in theology" (Räsänen, 'The 'Effective History' of the Bible: A Challenge to Biblical Scholarship?', 247). This positive affirmation of the way in which *Wirkungsgeschichte* might contribute to a critical and reflective theological discourse contrasts with Anthony Thiselton's negative characterisation of Räsänen's argument in Anthony C. Thiselton, 'Biblical Interpretation,' in *The Modern Theologians*, ed. David Ford (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 302–303.

way of presenting their particular vision of biblical study as *normative*. For Räsänen, “effective history” must be distinguished from the formation of “authoritative tradition”—i.e. “the great confessional traditions in the churches.”<sup>9</sup> While he admitted that the Bible has shared in the formation of these confessional positions, he pointed out that those who lost the arguments in the making of “orthodoxy”—Arians, Pelagians and Socinians—also appealed to scripture to defend their theological positions. Consequently, biblical scholars should resist accepting such “tradition-bound exegesis” as a self-imposed limit on the horizon of their interpretation of the text. Those engaged in the research of “effective history” have not always been sufficiently attentive to the conflict and dissent inherent in much biblical interpretation. Moreover, the discourse of “reception history” with its particular focus on a specific artefact, namely the Bible, neglects the fact that most of these traditions were also influenced by factors quite independent of the Bible.

The challenge to develop a clearer understanding of *Wirkungsgeschichte* has been taken up by Paul Ricoeur. One of the reasons for the confusion is that Gadamer wanted to avoid creating a new “method” for reading and interpretation. He was simply aiming to observe and describe the way in which “understanding envelops the entire process of interpretation.”<sup>10</sup> By contrast, Ricoeur sought to create a little more clarity by drawing out questions of method. He argued that if the interpreter is to acquire a *critical* understanding of the text, then some reflection on methods and explanatory procedures is inevitable. Method is not the enemy of understanding. The promise of *Wirkungsgeschichte* lies in the fact that it helps the critic to identify the way in which the text is transformed by subsequent readings. Ricoeur’s fascination with scripture is a direct consequence of his interest

---

<sup>9</sup> Räsänen, ‘The ‘Effective History’ of the Bible: A Challenge to Biblical Scholarship?’, 265. Räsänen’s anxieties may be well-founded: for example, Charles Kannengiesser notes the potential of the ‘history of reception’ for restoring an ecclesial emphasis in reading scripture: “As the hermeneutical criteria of ‘history of tradition’ and ‘history of reception’ were introduced into the study of Scripture, the link between writings and the community of readers was increasingly identified as part of the canonical value and the vital relevance of the writings. Such a renewed community awareness turned the attention of biblical scholars to the Church community itself, in which the Bible enjoys an innate familiarity with the traditions of its unique homeland” (Charles Kannengiesser, ‘A Key for the Future of Patristics,’ in *In Dominico Eloquio—In Lordly Eloquence*, ed. Paul M. Blowers et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 96).

<sup>10</sup> Robert M. Grant with David Tracy, *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 164.

in the way in which human beings use texts to think with. Ricoeur's initial reflections upon the phenomenology of reading and interpreting texts lead him to assert the autonomy of the text, to distance the text from the intentions of the author and to emphasise that texts contain a reservoir of meaning that can be tapped again and again. Meaning cannot simply be determined with reference to the author's intention. But this reference to a "surplus of meaning" does not mean that Ricoeur embraces the fruitless indeterminacy of meaning characteristic of some readings of French post-structuralism: "If it is true that there is always more than one way of construing a text, it is not true that all interpretations are equal and may be assimilated to so-called "rules of thumb." The text is a limited field of possible constructions ..."<sup>11</sup> While it is axiomatic that "a text means everything that it can mean,"<sup>12</sup> Ricoeur does not suggest that it can mean just about anything.

The delicate balance between the author's intention, the autonomy of the text and the "surplus of meaning" is borne out in the subsequent development of Ricoeur's thought. In *Thinking Biblically*, André LaCocque and Paul Ricoeur note that while they recognise that "investigations having to do with the author or the date and place of production of a text"<sup>13</sup> will enable the reader to make sense of a text, such knowledge does not exhaust the capacity of the text to generate meaning. LaCocque and Ricoeur insist that the interpreter also needs to be aware of "the different expectations of a series of communities of reading and interpretation that the presumed authors of the text under consideration could not have anticipated."<sup>14</sup> Indeed, both are fascinated by the way in which a particular text or narrative can be translated, repeated, refigured and rewritten in different communities of reading and interpretation. LaCocque and Ricoeur assess this history of interpretation and the phenomenon of reception with reference to a number of "trajectories."<sup>15</sup> The identification of these trajectories in biblical interpretation amounts to much more than a rather antiquarian interest in historical

---

<sup>11</sup> Paul Ricoeur, 'Metaphor and the Central Problem of Hermeneutics,' in *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, ed. John Thompson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 175.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 176.

<sup>13</sup> André LaCocque and Paul Ricoeur, *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), xi.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> This term is central to the argument of *Thinking Biblically*: 'Indeed, at one point we even considered using *Trajectories* as the title for this volume' (*Ibid.*, xii).

theology. According to Ricoeur, these trajectories are significant because they continue to shape and form the consciousness of those engaged in the enterprise of interpretation. A greater awareness of these trajectories may serve to expose the assumptions and presuppositions, as well as the prejudices and tactical definitions, at work in contemporary debates about biblical criticism.

#### a. *Patristic Exegesis in Recent Scholarship*

In *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*, John Barton argues that the traditional description of the origins of biblical criticism with reference to the Reformation and the Enlightenment neglects its more ancient antecedents in the Renaissance and Late Antiquity.<sup>16</sup> While he concedes that strains of thought derived from the Reformation and the Enlightenment can clearly be detected in modern biblical criticism, he also recognises a number of features in patristic exegesis, which “modern scholars have long regarded as anticipations of biblical criticism.”<sup>17</sup> But Barton suggests that rather than dismissing these elements as “unusual precursors of biblical criticism,” modern scholars may need to acknowledge that the antecedents of modern biblical criticism find their roots in the “remote past.”<sup>18</sup> In other words, the “trajectories of interpretation” associated with modern biblical criticism do not necessarily begin with the Reformation or the Enlightenment. Their starting point may in fact lie in the world of late antiquity.

Barton’s comments alert us to the fact that there has been considerable interest in patterns of patristic exegesis in recent years. This contrasts with the profound lack of interest in patristic exegesis that has characterised biblical scholarship over the last two centuries. The reasons for this revival are manifold. During the twentieth century, Jean Daniélou and Henri de Lubac became the principal advocates of a French Roman Catholic

---

<sup>16</sup> The argument outlined by Andrew Louth in *Discerning the Mystery* provides an example of this traditional description. Louth sees the antecedents of modern biblical criticism in the Reformers’ devotion to the principle of *sola scriptura* and the Enlightenment’s promotion of the historical-critical method. With a heavy hint of irony, Louth commented that such an alliance between the Reformation and the Enlightenment was “not something that inspires confidence” (Andrew Louth, *Discerning the Mystery: An essay on the nature of theology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 101).

<sup>17</sup> John Barton, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 131.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 132.

theological movement, often described—initially, rather dismissively—in terms of *Nouvelle Theologie*. Both of these Jesuit thinkers sought to reinvigorate and re-imagine Roman Catholic theology through a self-conscious re-engagement with the theology and exegesis of the early church. Their work had a significant impact on the Second Vatican Council. They argued that the analysis of patristic and medieval interpretation of the Bible was central to the enterprise of *ressourcement*. They sought to recover the sources of the Christian tradition in order to animate and resource the task of contemporary theology. Thus their research was motivated by more than an antiquarian interest. Not only did they make early patristic texts more readily available through *Sources Chrétiennes* but both presented major studies on early Christian exegesis.<sup>19</sup> They believed that by reflecting on the way in which Christian theologians had engaged with the biblical text in the past, they might retrieve patterns of biblical exegesis for the contemporary church.

At the same time, developments in the field of literary theory led to a renewed interest among literary critics in the way in which texts generate multiple meanings. Some of these developments inevitably reflected the “postmodern turn.”<sup>20</sup> Interest in literary approaches also stimulated further explorations of more ancient forms of literary criticism. Biblical scholars were drawn particularly to developments within the field of rhetorical

---

<sup>19</sup> For instance, Jean Daniélou’s work on Origen in Jean Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (London: Burns & Oates, 1960) and Henri de Lubac’s major work on medieval exegesis in Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis: the Four Senses of Scripture* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998–2000). The original work was published in French between 1959–1964 in four volumes.

<sup>20</sup> For example, in *The Genesis of Secrecy*, Frank Kermode provided a commentary on the work of commentators—a book “about interpretation, an interpretation of interpretation” (Frank Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979), 2.) Not only was he drawn by the ‘enigmatic quality’ of Mark’s gospel, but he was fascinated by the way in which the Christian writers of late antiquity saw in the parables a range of hidden meanings. It appeared that “the Holy Ghost does not give details merely to please or reassure; in all his works every word and every figure is charged with sense” (Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy*, 35). Kermode wrote out of a conviction that the gospels needed “to be talked about by critics of a quite unecclesiastical formation” (Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy*, ix). His recognition and acknowledgement of the density of multiple meanings in Mark, as well as his reflections on the ‘interminability of interpretation,’ need to be placed in the context of some of the significant developments in critical literary theory during the late twentieth century. For further reflections, see Stephen Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: the Theoretical Challenge* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989),



criticism and the growth of “the new rhetoric.”<sup>21</sup> The work of George Kennedy on the principles of “rhetorical criticism”<sup>22</sup> and Margaret Mitchell’s rhetorical analysis of John Chrysostom’s Pauline commentaries<sup>23</sup> have illuminated our understanding of the way the rules and techniques of rhetoric were employed in the New Testament. One of the perceived difficulties with the earlier work of the pioneers of rhetorical criticism is that they compared New Testament texts with ancient rhetorical handbooks without considering whether the New Testament writers and their immediate successors would have had the level of education to apply these rhetorical techniques and strategies. Reference to patristic writers provided a way of testing many of these theories. Engaging with the writings of those who were trained in ancient rhetoric and naturally picked up the use of rhetorical devices offered “a critical perspective on modern rhetorical analyses.”<sup>24</sup>

The interest of biblical scholars in the biblical interpretation of the early church was also accompanied by a similar interest among specialists in the literature of late antiquity. Partly as a consequence of a more sustained engagement with developments in contemporary historiography,<sup>25</sup> historians of Christianity in the Graeco-Roman world began to turn their attention from philosophical treatises to biblical commentaries. Rather than describing doctrinal development in terms of the culmination of Christianity’s “hellenization,” with “a philosophically articulated doctrinal system only distantly related to the words of Scripture,”<sup>26</sup> more recent scholarship has begun to emphasise the vitality and significance of the contemplation of scripture for early Christian writers.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, scholars within this field

---

<sup>21</sup> See Chapter 4 ‘Rhetorical Criticism’ in The Bible and Culture Collective, ed., *The Postmodern Bible* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 149–186.

<sup>22</sup> George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), George A. Kennedy, *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald, *Writings from the Greco-Roman World* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005).

<sup>23</sup> Margaret M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002).

<sup>24</sup> Lauri Thurén, ‘John Chrysostom as a Rhetorical Critic: The Hermeneutics of an Early Father,’ *Biblical Interpretation* 9, no. 2 (2001): 181.

<sup>25</sup> For an overview of these developments, see Elizabeth A. Clark, *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004).

<sup>26</sup> Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 31.

<sup>27</sup> These revisionary accounts include Pier Cesare Bori, *L’interpretation infinie: l’herme-*

have become increasingly conscious of the way in which their historical study is oriented towards the study and analysis of texts. Elizabeth Clark has argued that early Christian studies need “to attend to the textuality of early Christian writings.”<sup>28</sup> She traces the development of her discipline from a specifically theological interest through a more robust engagement with social-science methodologies to a more self-conscious attention to questions of historiography. Her own study of asceticism and scripture in early Christianity demonstrates the way in which these perspectives can be fused to show how early Christian exegesis was informed by “the moral, religious and social values” of the interpreters concerned.<sup>29</sup> Her work is emblematic of a significant shift in recent scholarship. Revisionary scholarship has tended to emphasise the way in which “exegetical concerns”<sup>30</sup> and the interpretation of scripture were at the heart of Christian intellectual culture in late antiquity.

### b. *The Theological Interpretation of Scripture*

This description of recent interest in patristic exegesis only presents part of the story. In the course of the twentieth century a number of theologians began to profess dissatisfaction with the perceived limits of the historical-critical method in the field of biblical studies. They speculated whether patristic exegesis might offer contemporary theologians patterns of interpretation and exegesis which would enable them to articulate their theological outlook more clearly and authentically. One of the key figures in the story of the reaction against modern historicism in biblical studies is the

---

*nutique chretienne ancienne et ses transformations*, trans. Francois Vial (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1991), Elizabeth Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), John David Dawson, *Allegorical readers and cultural revision in ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1992), John David Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California, 2002), Manlio Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, trans. John A. Hughes (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), Robert L. Wilken, ‘In Defense of Allegory,’ *Modern Theology* 14 (1998), and Frances Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). They constitute a reaction against the negative judgements of a previous generation of scholars: for instance, Richard Hanson had characterised the exegesis of the fourth century as “incompetent and ill-prepared to expound” the scriptures (Richard Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381 AD* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 848).

<sup>28</sup> Clark, *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn*, 160–161.

<sup>29</sup> Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity*, 13.

<sup>30</sup> Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*, 31.

theologian, Hans Frei. In *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, Frei presented a detailed survey of some of the developments in eighteenth and nineteenth century hermeneutics. He argued that premodern readers of biblical narratives would normally have assumed that these narratives described real historical events. In the thought of the Reformers, “the world truly rendered by combining biblical narratives into one was indeed the one and only real world, it must in principle embrace the experience of any present age and reader.”<sup>31</sup> Biblical interpretation therefore aimed at “incorporating extra-biblical thought, experience, and reality into the one real world detailed and made accessible by the biblical story—not the reverse.”<sup>32</sup> In other words, the world described in scripture was the world inhabited by the reader. This same world was also the realm of God’s historical activity. But, according to Frei, something happened in the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. The established pattern of biblical interpretation was reversed. With the rise of scientific discovery and developments in natural philosophy, a world had come into being apart from that which the biblical texts described. Those texts had to accommodate themselves to the new world as best they could.

What did Frei mean? To use a simple analogy, Frei was arguing about “maps.” For the Reformers, the Bible was the basic map of reality, of the real world. It was not a completely detailed map, but it gave you roughly the right directions. Everything human beings apprehended in the real world could be drawn into the map in greater detail to fill in the gaps. And yet with the rise of Deism, historical criticism and the natural sciences in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, this map-making exercise was reversed. People discovered other ways of mapping out reality. Thus the character of biblical interpretation changed. Biblical exegesis became a matter of trying to fit the rather inconvenient contours of biblical narrative onto a reality which had been explored and mapped out in a different way. This reversal was accentuated by the romantic and idealist revolution at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It gave rise to a historical consciousness which accentuated the gap between the present and the past. Rather than assuming a basic continuity between the past and the present, the past became a far and distant country. For the texts of the past to speak to the present, the reader had to learn to listen to the distinctive and alien voice of

---

<sup>31</sup> Hans Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 3.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

the author. This meant that when it came to reading texts, historians sought to reclaim the authentic voice of the past by privileging the intention of the author.

Frei argued that the uncritical acceptance of these developments would only serve to distort biblical narrative. In response, Frei sought to recover the “Precritical Interpretation of Biblical Narrative” with reference to the writings of the Protestant Reformers, particularly Martin Luther and John Calvin. In his study of their exegesis, Frei noted that both Luther and Calvin had a particular concern to elucidate the *sensus literalis* or the “grammatical sense”<sup>33</sup> of the text. In referring to the “grammatical sense,” Frei was referring to a realistic regard for the scriptural narrative, which pointed the reader to the Bible’s narrative world as God’s story about the reader’s own life. It invited the reader to accept this world as the proper setting for understanding that life and the lives of others.

At the same time, Frei was particularly intrigued by Calvin’s use of the Old Testament. While Luther tended to accentuate the contrast between the Old and the New, between the Law and the Gospel, Calvin emphasized the unity of the biblical canon and the assertion that “the meaning of all of it is salvation in Jesus Christ.”<sup>34</sup> Drawing on the writings of Erich Auerbach,<sup>35</sup> Frei explored the importance of “figural” or “typological” reading in Calvin’s use of the Bible. He noted the way in which Calvin used the juxtaposition of types and anti-types to enrich his reading of scripture. Calvin emphasised the way in which the biblical canon constituted a unitary whole which bore witness to the divine economy. Frei distinguished “figural reading” from “allegory” because it was not enough simply to set forth “the unity of the canon as a single cumulative and complex pattern of meaning.”<sup>36</sup> Figural interpretation also involved an historical reference. It demanded “the effective rendering of reality with the pattern of meaning that is dependent upon it.”<sup>37</sup> So, for example, it was not enough to read a series of Old

---

<sup>33</sup> The *sensus literalis* is sometimes translated as the ‘literal sense,’ but the association of this phrase with the literalism of contemporary fundamentalism renders such a translation rather misleading.

<sup>34</sup> Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*, 27.

<sup>35</sup> Erich Auerbach, ‘Figura,’ in *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature*, ed. Wlad Godzich and Jochen Schulte-Sasse (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984 (originally published 1944)).

<sup>36</sup> Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*, 33.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 36.

Testament passages as allegories of the Christian drama of salvation. If the story of Exodus was a *type* or *figure* of the drama of Easter, the Christian Passover, then the pattern and shape of the story pointed to the unfolding of God's revelation and providence in history. Thus "figural interpretation" was to be clearly distinguished from "an arbitrary allegorizing of texts in the service of preconceived dogma."<sup>38</sup>

Frei's comments about the differences between figural reading and allegory have generated considerable debate. But the crucial point is that Frei suggested that something authentic had been lost in the world of biblical studies. His instinct was that "precritical interpretation" would offer some insight and inspiration in restoring the vitality and purpose of biblical interpretation. A similar move (involving some very different judgments about the place of allegory in this scheme of retrieval and recovery) can be discerned in the writings of David Steinmetz and Andrew Louth.

In "The Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis,"<sup>39</sup> David Steinmetz took biblical scholars to task for their obsession with recovering "the original intention of the author" and their disdain for the "pre-critical exegetical tradition" which they regarded as "an obstacle to the proper understanding of the true meaning of that text."<sup>40</sup> Steinmetz argued that the assertion that "the most primitive meaning of the text is its only valid meaning, and the historical-critical method is the only key which can unlock it" was "demonstrably false."<sup>41</sup> He sought to support his argument with reference to developments in the field of literary criticism<sup>42</sup> and the history of biblical interpretation. For Steinmetz, the theory of a "single meaning" was of fairly recent provenance. Similarly, in *Discerning the Mystery*,<sup>43</sup> Andrew Louth presented a suggestive essay in which, again drawing on the insights of literary critics (this time the "new criticism" of T.S. Eliot and the hermeneutics of H.G. Gadamer), he argued for a "Return to Allegory" to recover "a sense of the depth and richness of Scripture, a richness derived from the mystery to which it is the introduction, of which it is the unfolding."<sup>44</sup> Like Frei, both

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 37.

<sup>39</sup> David C. Steinmetz, 'The Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis,' in *The Theological Interpretation of Scripture: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, ed. Stephen E. Fowl (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997).

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 27.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Steinmetz quotes H. Northrop Frye and Eric D. Hirsch, both leading North American literary critics in the twentieth century.

<sup>43</sup> Louth, *Discerning the Mystery: An essay on the nature of theology*.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 110.

Steinmetz and Louth hoped that theologians and biblical scholars might adopt a more avowedly *theological* reading of scripture and thereby discover the truer, deeper and more spiritual meaning of the scriptures.

Rowan Williams notes that the renewed interest in the *theological* interpretation of scripture has been accompanied by “a good deal of interest in reclaiming the insights of ‘pre-critical’ exegesis, and in challenging what has been seen as the unproductive dominance of scholarly concern with original forms of a scriptural text.”<sup>45</sup> And yet it is something of a paradox that, in professing an interest in the benefits of recovering insights from the history of biblical interpretation, Frei, Steinmetz and Louth express some serious reservations about the benefits of employing historical criticism in the exegesis of scripture itself. Indeed, this ambivalence about the benefits of the historical-critical method has become one of the hallmarks of those who advocate the need for a more distinctively *theological* interpretation of scripture. *Prefaces* and *Introductions* seem to be littered with the most revealing comments: for example, Markus Bockmuehl describes the recent proliferation of biblical scholarship engaged in *theological interpretation*. Bockmuehl presents this as a “scholarly movement,” and although it is not clear who its leading players are or what the shared values of this movement might be, he remarks that “it undoubtedly expresses a long-overdue reaction against the modernist critical excesses of twentieth century professional guilds: poking and dissecting the biblical text on ‘educational’ or ‘scientific’ pretexts before publishing the carcass of ‘assured results’ ...”<sup>46</sup>

In an *Introduction* to the *Journal of Theological Interpretation*, Joel Green betrays almost a sense of embarrassment about the state of play in contemporary biblical scholarship when he asks “How do we read these texts as Christian Scripture so as to hear God’s address? The methods of choice have generally focused elsewhere: the voice of the reconstructed historical Jesus, the voice of the redactor of the Gospels, or the voice of the ‘community’ behind the text.”<sup>47</sup> Defiantly asserting the need for a greater emphasis on doctrinal questions in biblical interpretation, Russell Reno, one of the editors of the *Brazos Theological Commentary* series, asserts that “doctrine ...

---

<sup>45</sup> Rowan Williams, ‘The Discipline of Scripture,’ in *On Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 44.

<sup>46</sup> Markus Bockmuehl, ‘Introduction,’ in Markus Bockmuehl and Alan J. Torrance, ed., *Scripture’s Doctrine and Theology’s Bible: How the New Testament Shapes Christian Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2008), 7.

<sup>47</sup> Joel B. Green, ‘Introduction,’ *Journal of Theological Interpretation*, Sample Issue (2007): i.

is not a moldering scrim of antique prejudice obscuring the meaning of the Bible.”<sup>48</sup> It is far too important to play second fiddle to the historical-critical method. Indeed, expertise in such “a crucial aspect of the divine pedagogy” is far more important than “historical or philological expertise.”<sup>49</sup> This judgement has informed the editors’ choice of contributors to the series. He states brashly that “it is the conceit of this series of biblical commentaries that theological training in the Nicene tradition prepares one for biblical interpretation, and thus it is to theologians and not biblical scholars that we have turned.”<sup>50</sup>

In the *Series Preface*, Reno also notes that contributors will draw on “classical typological and allegorical readings from the premodern tradition.”<sup>51</sup> Indeed, Jaroslav Pelikan’s volume on *Acts* contains extensive insights from patristic commentators. Ephraim Radner’s volume on *Leviticus* is replete with “figural readings.”<sup>52</sup> Similarly, Mark Edwards’ commentary on *John*<sup>53</sup> in the *Blackwell Bible Commentary* series draws extensively on the insights of patristic writers. Contributors to this series are invited to draw on the reception history of the Bible in “patristic, rabbinic, and medieval exegesis, interpretation from the Reformation and early modern period, as well as insights from various types of modern criticism ...”<sup>54</sup> At the same time, two other series focus particularly on patristic exegesis. According to the General Editor, the *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture* series seeks to revitalise “Christian teaching based on classical Christian exegesis” and explicitly resists the temptation to “fixate endlessly upon contemporary criticism.”<sup>55</sup> The compilers of these commentaries seek to illuminate the biblical text with an anthology of patristic comments and thereby respond to the need for “a deeper grounding beyond the scope of the historical-critical

---

<sup>48</sup> Jaroslav Pelikan, *Acts, Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2005), 12.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>52</sup> For Radner’s specific comments about ‘figuralism,’ see Ephraim Radner, *Leviticus*, ed. R.R. Reno et al., *Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2008), 22–25 and 90–91.

<sup>53</sup> Mark Edwards, *John*, ed. John Sawyer, Judith Kovacs, Christopher Rowland, *Blackwell Bible Commentaries* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).

<sup>54</sup> Judith Kovacs, David Gunn, Christopher Rowland and John Sawyer (editors), *Guidelines for Authors* (Blackwell, 2007 [cited 13th January 2009]); available from <http://www.bbibcomm.net/reference/guidelines.html>.

<sup>55</sup> Thomas C. Oden and Christopher A. Hall, *Mark*, ed. Thomas C. Oden, *Ancient Christian Commentary Series* (Downers Grove Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1998), xi.

orientations that have governed biblical studies in our day."<sup>56</sup> Similarly, *The Church's Bible* offers an anthology of insights from those who interpreted the Bible during the first millennium of Christian history. Robert Wilken's reasons for doing this are rather more nuanced than those of some other editors. Perhaps alluding to the work of rhetorical critics and aware of the increased interest of patristic scholars in the way the contemplation of scripture influenced the theological imagination of these early writers, he says:

Anyone who reads the ancient commentaries realizes at once that they are deeply spiritual, insightful, edifying, and, shall we say, 'biblical.' Early Christian thinkers moved in the world of the Bible, understood its idiom, loved its teaching, and were filled with awe before its mysteries. They believed in the maxim, 'Scripture interprets Scripture.' They knew something that has largely been forgotten by biblical scholars, and their commentaries are an untapped resource for understanding the Bible as a book about Christ.<sup>57</sup>

Wilken suggests that the Christological emphasis of ancient commentary has been largely forgotten in contemporary biblical scholarship. In his commentary on *Isaiah*, he seeks to recover this emphasis by providing examples from the writings of the Church fathers.<sup>58</sup>

These new series of biblical commentaries have been matched by a number of other publications which argue for the renewal of the *theological* interpretation of scripture: for example, the *Series Preface* in a new series of "Studies in Theological Interpretation" describes "the constructive theological contribution made by Scripture when it is read in its canonical richness."<sup>59</sup> Clearly, some of these developments reflect the increased interest in and influence of the "canonical approach,"<sup>60</sup> but others argue that the renewal and revitalization of theological hermeneutics will only come

---

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, xi–xii.

<sup>57</sup> Robert L. Wilken, *Isaiah: Interpreted by Early Christian and Medieval Commentators* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), x–xi.

<sup>58</sup> This emphasis is also reflected in recent developments in Continental scholarship. For example, there is the recently established series, *Novum Testamentum Patristicum*, published by Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, and edited by Andreas Merkt, Tobias Nicklas, and Joseph Verheyden.

<sup>59</sup> Joel Green in Markus Bockmuehl, *Seeing the Word: Refocusing New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2006), 7.

<sup>60</sup> Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus* (London: SCM Press, 1974), James A. Sanders, *Torah and Canon* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), James A. Sanders, *Canon and Community: A guide to Canonical Criticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).



from a renewed engagement with early Christian interpretation. This is the central argument of *Sanctified Vision* by John O’Keefe and Russell Reno. The *Preface* describes the writers’ frustration with “contemporary theology and its hopeless modernisms.”<sup>61</sup> For Reno, engagement with the fathers’ interpretive practices “came at the end of a long pilgrimage through the wreckage of modern theology.”<sup>62</sup> Displaying a debt to Hans Frei, they acknowledge that the recovery of patristic exegesis has enriched their theological understanding. They have come to realize that “reading the text to find out what really happened or to gain access to theological principles”<sup>63</sup> betrayed peculiarly modern concerns. For early Christian interpreters, the purpose of reading scripture was not to focus one’s attention on questions of historicity or extrapolate timeless theological truths. The meaning of the Bible was to be located in the biblical text itself.

O’Keefe and Reno suggest that “premodern” exegetes might equally be described as “precritical.”<sup>64</sup> In making this suggestion, they are not attributing a certain naïveté to patristic writers in presuming the historical accuracy of scripture, nor are they judging them unfairly in comparison with the various techniques of critical analysis that characterize modern study of the Bible. They are suggesting that “precritical” commentators presumed “that the meaning of scripture is in the words and not behind them.”<sup>65</sup> According to O’Keefe and Reno, this willingness to explore the density of meaning within the biblical text offers a more promising way of retrieving resources suppressed by modern habits of thought.<sup>66</sup> However, I will argue

---

<sup>61</sup> John J. O’Keefe and R.R. Reno, *Sanctified Vision: An Introduction to Early Christian Interpretation of the Bible* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press 2005), ix.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, x.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>66</sup> The enterprise of ‘precritical’ exegesis seems to hint at remarkable similarities with the ‘postcritical’ theology associated with the *Radical Traditions* series, edited by Stanley Hauerwas and Peter Ochs. This series seeks to cut “new lines of inquiry across a confused array of debates concerning the place of theology in modernity and, more generally, the status and role of scriptural faith in contemporary life. Charged with a rejuvenated confidence, spawned in part by the rediscovery of reason as inescapably tradition constituted, a new generation of theologians and religious scholars is returning to scriptural traditions with the hope of retrieving resources long ignored, depreciated, and in many cases ideologically suppressed by modern habits of thought.” (From the *Preface* by Stanley Hauerwas and Peter Ochs in Peter Ochs and Nancy Levene, ed., *Textual Reasonings: Jewish Philosophy and Text Study at the end of the Twentieth Century, Radical Traditions: Theology in a Post-Critical Key* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002)). See also Peter Ochs, ‘Returning to Scripture: Trends in Postcritical Inter-

that the designation “precritical” is deeply misleading. Such a designation only serves to conceal the way in which the biblical exegesis of late antiquity drew upon the insights of ancient literary criticism and historiography. It also reinforces the sense that those who advocate a more avowedly *theological* approach to the interpretation of scripture can afford to eschew the insights of historical and literary criticism.

### c. *The Present Study*

Given the interest of both biblical scholars and theologians in the biblical exegesis of late antiquity, these ancient writings may provide a valuable resource for bringing both constituencies into a more effective dialogue. Advocates of a more explicitly *theological* interpretation of scripture have drawn predictable responses from those who argue that confessional loyalties should not be allowed to determine the critical scrutiny of the Bible in the academy.<sup>67</sup> And yet, in listening to the rhetoric which is used to promote “premodern” or “precritical” exegesis, it is striking that the *theological* interpretation of scripture is often portrayed as a viable alternative to established patterns of *literary* and *historical* criticism in the field of biblical studies. But can premodern forms of exegesis be used to substantiate and justify this rhetoric?

In my view, the use of the term “precritical” in relation to premodern forms of exegesis is misplaced.<sup>68</sup> Using the insights of *Wirkungsgeschichte* and the concept of “trajectories of interpretation” advanced by Paul Ricoeur and André LaCocque,<sup>69</sup> I will argue that the *theological* exegesis of late antiquity clearly drew on a combination of three distinct trajectories of interpretation:

- 1) *The Literary Trajectory*. The form and content of ancient Christian commentary relied heavily on the conventions of ancient literary

---

pretation,’ *Cross Currents* 44, no. 4 (1994/1995). In each case, advocates of ‘postcritical’ exegesis draw on the insights of Hans Frei and other proponents of postliberal theology to promote an overtly theological reading of scripture untrammelled by the perceived constraints of historical criticism.

<sup>67</sup> Jacques Berlinerblau, *The Secular Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), Philip Davies, *Whose Bible is it Anyway?* (London: T & T Clark, 2004), Heikki Räisänen, *Beyond New Testament Theology: A Story and a Programme*, 2nd Edition (London: SCM Press, 2000).

<sup>68</sup> In forming this opinion, I have found John Barton’s analysis of the origins of biblical criticism very stimulating (Barton, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*, 130–135).

<sup>69</sup> Ricoeur, *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies*, xii.

criticism. The compilation of commentaries drew on established forms of *paideia* in the ancient world. Moreover, the use of allegory (including figural readings), the close grammatical analysis, the awareness of textual issues, the attention to the λέξις or “wording” of the text, provides an abundance of evidence that early Christian commentators drew on the established conventions of literary analysis.

- 2) *The Historical Trajectory*. The desire to demonstrate the authenticity of the canonical gospels and the need to respond to pagan critics who cast doubts on their accuracy and truth made patristic writers alert to questions of what actually happened and the need to subject the foundational documents of the Christian faith to proper enquiry. While there are dangers in overstating the case (and it would be foolish to suggest that the fathers embraced historical criticism in a way which would be instantly familiar to contemporary exegetes), issues about the integrity of the biblical narrative and questions of ἱστορία were not unknown in the early church.
- 3) *The Dogmatic Trajectory*. The exegesis of scripture generated considerable doctrinal debate within the life of the church. In particular, questions about Christology often centred around the exegesis of passages that were perceived as “difficult” or inconsistent with the prevailing consensus. It was not that theologians arrived at independent conclusions which were then imposed on the biblical witness as if its writings were to be squeezed into a doctrinal straitjacket. Dogmatic questions were hammered out with reference to the scriptures. Doctrinal development was characterised by a process of iteration in which the interpretation of scripture played a vital part.

This combination of literary, historical and dogmatic interests provides a much more satisfying description of patristic exegesis than is sometimes allowed by the polemic and partiality associated with recent investigations of early Christian interpretation. *If* some of the currents of “premodern” exegesis flow into modern and contemporary forms of biblical exegesis, then a “theological interpretation of scripture,” divorced from literary and historical perspectives, begins to look like a peculiarly modern construct. As an exercise in *ressourcement*, the undertaking is only partially complete. *If* contemporary theologians insist on looking to the early church for inspiration in their interpretation of scripture, then they will need to recognize that, for the church fathers at least, all three trajectories—the *literary*, the *historical* and the *dogmatic*—played a vital part in the theological interpretation of scripture. Moreover, given that the emergence of commentary in

the ancient world was directly associated with a pedagogical task, the identification of these three trajectories as a consistent and constant presence in the life of the church should also invite further reflection about the pedagogy of the Bible.

Of course, such a thesis can only be defended and demonstrated with reference to relevant and appropriate evidence. One of the difficulties with discussions about patristic exegesis is that modern scholarship often speaks of patristic exegesis as if it were a body of opinion that betrayed little variance. Moreover, one might select a letter, treatise or comment from one particular theologian in the fourth century without having any idea as to whether the perspective contained therein was representative or unusual. In its own context, the observation might have governed widespread consensus. It may have been rejected with vehemence. It may have been an isolated comment about which most people were pretty much oblivious. That said, the observation may have had a very different reception in subsequent centuries. Seeking to demonstrate a series of general axioms about premodern exegesis with sole reference to a line from Gregory of Nyssa's *Homilies on the Song of Songs* or a line from Theodore of Mopsuestia's *Commentary on Galatians* is hardly adequate.<sup>70</sup> The only option appears to be to produce the exhaustive surveys of the writings of different commentators through the centuries.<sup>71</sup> But there may be an alternative approach.

In this book, I shall develop this thesis by evaluating and assessing the claims made about premodern exegesis with reference to a single *catena* on Mark's gospel, the *Catena in Marcum*, commonly attributed to Victor of Antioch. *Catena*e emerged at the beginning of the sixth century. They were compiled from a variety of different sources and so they provide not only some insight into the commentaries that were *written* in late antiquity but, more significantly, an indication of the commentaries which were actually *read*. *Catena*e were usually compiled by inscribing extracts in the margins

---

<sup>70</sup> Robert Wilken notes the perils of citing convenient authorities in his discussion of Theodore of Mopsuestia's reception in the twentieth century: "If Theodore had won the day, wrote Kendrick Grobel in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* at the end of the 1950s, historical exegesis, which Grobel curiously identified with the Reformation, 'might have emerged a thousand years earlier than it did.'" (Robert L. Wilken, 'In Defense of Allegory,' *Modern Theology* 14 (2002): 197).

<sup>71</sup> For example, Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis: the Four Senses of Scripture* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998–2000), Charles Kannengiesser, ed., *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), and Claudio Moreschini and Enrico Norelli, *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell, 2 vols., (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005).

of the page around a portion of the biblical text. The *Catena in Marcum* can be found in a large number of medieval copies of the Book of the Gospels which were often used for teaching and preaching as well as private study. Thus we can say with some confidence that the material contained within the *Catena in Marcum* was fairly mainstream. This is confirmed by the fact that it appears to have influenced a number of subsequent commentators.<sup>72</sup>

Thus the core task at the heart of this research project is to present a detailed critical translation of John Cramer's edition of the *Catena in Marcum* published in 1840.<sup>73</sup> Even though the *Catena in Marcum* has exercised some considerable influence in the course of the history of the interpretation of Mark, no full translation of this work exists in the English language.<sup>74</sup> The notes to the translation in Section II also present a detailed analysis of the sources of the *catena*.<sup>75</sup> But more importantly, the *Catena in Marcum* provides a selection of material from a variety of sources, which can be used profitably to explore and evaluate some of the assertions and claims that have been made in recent years about the importance and significance of patristic exegesis and to substantiate the claim that the theological exegesis of late antiquity drew on a combination of literary, historical and dogmatic perspectives.

---

<sup>72</sup> Sean Kealy, *Mark's Gospel: A History of its Interpretation from the beginning until 1979* (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), 28–29.

<sup>73</sup> *Catena in Marcum* (recensio ii) (e codd. Oxon. Bodl. Laud 33 + Paris. Coislin. 23 + Paris. Gr. 178) in John A. Cramer, *Catena in Evangelia S Matthaei et S Marci* (Oxford: e Typographeo Academico, 1840), 261–447. Although this edition contains a number of clearly identifiable errors, it still represents the most comprehensive and reliable account of the manuscript tradition.

<sup>74</sup> A number of brief extracts have been translated. These include Sean Kealy's sample of a passage from the *Catena in Marcum* on Mark 7.31–37 (Kealy, *Mark's Gospel: A History of its Interpretation from the beginning until 1979*, 28). William Farmer also includes John Burgon's translation of the final scholium from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 (*Cat. Marc.* 447.11–18) in William R. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, ed. Matthew Black, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 24–25. William Lane quotes from the description of the Cursing of the Fig Tree in the *Catena in Marcum* (William L. Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark, New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 400). Adela Yarbro Collins quotes Kurt Aland's reconstruction of this passage in his article, 'Der Schluss des Markusevangelium' in Maurits Sabbe, ed., *L'Évangile selon Marc: tradition et redaction* (Leuven: Peeters, 1988), 435–470 (Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 805). None of these extracts give the reader an accurate picture of the *catena* as a whole. Moreover, all of these scholars attribute the authorship of this work to 'Victor of Antioch.'

<sup>75</sup> A summary of these sources also provided in Appendix 1.

In *Chapters 2 and 3*, I will consider in more detail some of the methodological issues which arise in the study of *catenae*. In *Chapter 2*, I will offer a closer assessment of the manuscript tradition of the *Catena in Marcum* and I will describe the shortcomings of a number of hypotheses about its supposed authorship. I will argue that the attempt to establish the origins of the *Catena in Marcum* by exploring the question of authorship is basically a blind alley. I will suggest that a careful analysis of the sources of the *Catena in Marcum* and consideration of its overall impact point to its emergence at some point in the early decades of the sixth century. Rather than attributing the work to one specific author, the textual inconsistencies between the different manuscripts suggest that the *Catena* was an “open” book which emerged in the context of the scholastic tradition.

In *Chapter 3*, I will consider the origins of *catenae* in the context of the scholastic tradition in the Byzantine world. I will argue that the reproduction of texts and the production of commentaries were central to the development of this tradition. This was a direct development of the established patterns of *paideia* in the ancient world. Moreover, the exposition of texts was often accompanied by the compilation of anthologies and miscellanies. This insight is important because it begins to explain the origins of *catenae*. It also helps to expand the horizons of the debate beyond a rather simplistic association of their origins with the name of Procopius of Gaza. Consideration of these broader questions reinforces the hypothesis that the emergence of the *Catena in Marcum* should be placed in the context of common pedagogical practices in the ancient world. This pedagogical context alerts us instantly to the influence and impact of ancient forms of literary criticism and historiography on biblical interpretation.

*Chapter 4* provides a detailed analysis of the *literary* trajectory in early Christian exegesis. The extracts contained within the *Catena in Marcum* show that early Christian exegetes adopted established patterns of literary criticism and grammatical analysis in their interpretation of the text. These techniques enabled patristic exegetes to address some of the perceived obscurities and difficulties within the biblical text. Although “allegory” is often conceived as a peculiarly theological enterprise, I will argue that comparisons with other contemporary literature suggest that allegorical readings are viewed more properly in the context of ancient literary criticism. The evidence will illustrate the way in which both the form and content of early Christian commentary were shaped by the conventions of literary criticism in the ancient world.

*Chapter 5* confirms the importance of the *historical* trajectory in patristic exegesis. In the third, fourth and fifth centuries, Christians sought to

demonstrate the reliability of the gospels against a number of pagan detractors. Arguments centred particularly on the discrepancies between the gospels. Although their apologetic was not always convincing, early Christian commentators advanced a range of arguments to explain the contradictions and inconsistencies between the gospel accounts. This often meant that they needed to give some explanation of what happened and why the accounts might have differed. While they would not have recognised the historical “distance” between the ancient world and the contemporary commentator in a way which the conventions of modern historical criticism demand, the evidence suggests that the biblical interpretation of late antiquity betrays a significant debt to the insights of ancient historiography. It is not enough to dismiss patristic exegesis as naïve about these questions.<sup>76</sup> Such a judgement itself betrays a lack of historical “distance” in refusing to assess and evaluate patristic exegesis in the context and environment of late antiquity.

In an extended discussion of patristic understandings of Mark’s Christology in *Chapter 6*, I explore the *dogmatic* orientation of patristic exegesis. The evidence suggests that patristic readers of the gospel did not simply interpret the text through “Chalcedonian-tinted spectacles.”<sup>77</sup> Controversy over the reception of Chalcedon and the legacy of Cyril of Alexandria meant that theologians continued to wrestle with questions of Christology in the light of the scriptures. The *dogmatic* orientation of Chalcedon offered a “discipline of reading” which sought to do justice to the tensions and complexity of the biblical corpus. They did not simply use the text as a body of evidence to substantiate a series of theological propositions, nor should their exegesis be characterised simply in terms of the imposition of a series of arbitrary and anachronistic statements on the text. Indeed, there is a curious absence of the more controversial technical vocabulary associated with Chalcedon from the *Catena in Marcum*. While the evidence suggests a “dogmatic concern,” it also suggests that there was a complex interplay between their dogmatic questions and their attentiveness to the text. Thus *Chapter 6* presents evidence of the *dogmatic* trajectory in patristic exegesis.

---

<sup>76</sup> Lewis Ayres offers similar observations in his discussion of ‘Theology and the Reading of Scripture’ (Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*, 33).

<sup>77</sup> The image is suggested by Morna Hooker in ‘Chalcedon and the New Testament,’ in *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine*, ed. Sarah Coakley and David Pailin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 90.

In *Chapter 7*, I conclude that this analysis shows that patristic exegesis cannot simply be reduced to the “figural” or the “allegorical.” A more thorough analysis of patristic exegesis demonstrates that it embraces three distinct trajectories of interpretation: the *literary*, the *historical* and the *dogmatic*. For Christian exegetes of late antiquity, these three elements were integral to the theological interpretation of scripture. Thus contemporary attempts to recover the insights of patristic exegesis need to embrace all three elements.





## CHAPTER TWO

### THE CATENA IN MARCUM

In this chapter, I will offer an assessment of the manuscript tradition of the *Catena in Marcum* with particular reference to the edition published by John Cramer in 1840.<sup>1</sup> Although the listing in *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* refers to three manuscripts,<sup>2</sup> John Cramer in fact used six manuscripts in compiling his edition of the *Catena in Marcum*. The majority are medieval copies of the Book of the Gospels dating from the eleventh century. Four of these manuscripts are in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris while the other two are in the Bodleian Library in Oxford. The manuscripts used by Cramer consisted of the following:

MSS	Date	Library and Catalogue Reference	Attribution
20	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 188	Cyril of Alexandria
24	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178	Anon.
39	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23	Victor of Antioch
50	XI	Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud Gr. 33	Cyril of Alexandria
300	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 186	Cyril of Alexandria
—	1345	Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Barocc. Gr. 156	N/A

These manuscripts represent a relatively small sample of the extant copies of the *Catena in Marcum*. It is important to emphasise that Cramer's edition was by no means the first. In 1580, a Latin translation had been published in Ingolstadt by Theodore Peltanus.<sup>3</sup> In 1673, Peter Possinus, the French Jesuit scholar, published a Greek edition in Rome.<sup>4</sup> Christian Matthaei published another Greek edition in Moscow in 1775.<sup>5</sup> The variations between

<sup>1</sup> *Catena in Marcum* (recensio ii) (e codd. Oxon. Bodl. Laud 33 + Paris. Coislin. 23 + Paris. Gr. 178) in John A. Cramer, *Catenae in Evangelia S Matthaei et S Marci* (Oxford: e Typographeo Academico, 1840), 261–447.

<sup>2</sup> CPG 4.236.

<sup>3</sup> Theodor Peltanus, *Victoris Antiocheni in Marcum, et Titi Bostrorum episcopi in Evangelium Lucae commentarii* (Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1580).

<sup>4</sup> Peter Possinus, *Catena Graecorum patrum in Evangelium secundum Marcum* (Rome: Typis Barberinis, 1673).

<sup>5</sup> Christian F. Matthaei, Βίκτωρος πρεσβυτέρου Ἀντιοχείας καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἐξηγησις εἰς τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ἄγιον εὐαγγέλιον *ex codibus Mosquensibus* (Moscow, 1775).

these different editions are considerable. Joseph Reuss has identified sixty-eight manuscripts in total.<sup>6</sup> And yet each of these editions used only a small selection of the available manuscripts. In this regard, Cramer was no exception.

Given the magnitude of the task, I have not attempted a new critical edition based on all these manuscripts. In my view, only a synoptic analysis or *variorum* edition<sup>7</sup> would offer a clearer picture of the omissions, variations and discrepancies which characterise the manuscript tradition. In this regard, further work remains to be done. Nevertheless, Cramer's work at least offers us a working edition with a comprehensive summary of the fragments and extracts incorporated within a number of copies of the *Catena in Marcum*. As Michael Cahill pointed out in his survey of the history of the interpretation of Mark, Cramer's edition is "regarded as the most extensive and inclusive in regard to text. Other editions used manuscripts in which the *catena* is found in an epitomized form."<sup>8</sup> Although Cramer's edition is now out of print, it is available on the internet.<sup>9</sup> It is often cited in modern scholarship<sup>10</sup> and referenced in the manuscript descriptions of library catalogues.<sup>11</sup> Consequently, I have translated and annotated this edition while at the same time acknowledging its limitations.

The contents of the codices used by Cramer vary considerably. Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 186 contains the following documents: the Eusebian Canons

---

<sup>6</sup> Joseph Reuss, *Matthäus, Markus, und Johannes-Katenen: nach den handschriften Quellen* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1941), 118–141.

<sup>7</sup> Recent developments within humanities research may provide more effective ways of studying *catenae*: for instance, the computer assisted synoptic compilation of manuscripts used in the production of *Foxe's Book of Martyrs Variorum Edition Online* ([cited 17th January 2008]; available from <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/johnfoxe/index.html>) or the technology being pioneered by David Parker and others to produce critical electronic editions of New Testament manuscripts (Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*, 216–224) may offer avenues for further study and research.

<sup>8</sup> Michael Cahill, 'The Identification of the First Markan Commentary,' *Revue Biblique* 101, no. 2 (1994): 265.

<sup>9</sup> [http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=BoINAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=cramer+catenae&ei=\\_ExNSJbKBYfstgPWq8zmDQ#PPA265,M1](http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=BoINAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=cramer+catenae&ei=_ExNSJbKBYfstgPWq8zmDQ#PPA265,M1) [Accessed: 25th April 2009]. The *Catena in Marcum* is also published online in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* [TLG 4102.002].

<sup>10</sup> For example, David C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 329–330; Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, 107 and 805; Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark*, 3; W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, *International Critical Commentary* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), xxv.

<sup>11</sup> For example, see the reference to Cramer's edition in the description of Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23 in Robert Devreesse, *Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs. II, le Fonds Coislin* (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 1945), 19.

and Eusebius' letter to Carpanianus;<sup>12</sup> a *Catena in Matthaëum* attributed to John Chrysostom;<sup>13</sup> a *Catena in Marcum* attributed to Cyril of Alexandria;<sup>14</sup> and a *Catena in Iohannem* attributed to Titus of Bostra.<sup>15</sup> Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 188 is a more substantial volume containing: a *Catena in Matthaëum* attributed to John Chrysostom;<sup>16</sup> fragments of the *Hippolyti chronico*;<sup>17</sup> a *Catena in Marcum* attributed to Cyril of Alexandria;<sup>18</sup> a *Catena in Lucam* attributed to Titus of Bostra;<sup>19</sup> a *Catena in Iohannem* attributed to John Chrysostom;<sup>20</sup> and a Synaxarium.<sup>21</sup> Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 178 contains the four canonical gospels with *catenae*, all of which are unattributed. (The copy of the *Catena in Marcum* in this manuscript begins only at Mark 4.22). Paris, Bibl. Nat. Coislin Gr. 23 contains: a *Catena in Matthaëum*;<sup>22</sup> a few brief scholia; a *Catena in Marcum* attributed to Victor of Antioch: the letter from Dionysius of Alexandria to Basilides on the question of when one should break the fast at Easter; a *Catena in Lucam*; and a *Catena in Iohannem*. Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Laud Gr. 33 contains: a *Catena in Matthaëum* beginning at Matthew 9.35;<sup>23</sup> a few brief scholia;<sup>24</sup> a *Catena in Marcum* attributed to Cyril of Alexandria;<sup>25</sup> a *Catena in Lucam* attributed to Titus of Bostra;<sup>26</sup> and a

<sup>12</sup> ff. 1–8.

<sup>13</sup> ff. 9–93.

<sup>14</sup> ff. 94–147.

<sup>15</sup> ff. 148–209.

<sup>16</sup> ff. 1–83.

<sup>17</sup> ff. 84–86. The *Chronicle* of Hippolytus of Rome dates from the third century CE. Like most of his writing, this document exists only in the form of fragments.

<sup>18</sup> ff. 87–140.

<sup>19</sup> ff. 141–202.

<sup>20</sup> ff. 203–272 recto.

<sup>21</sup> f. 272 verso. This Synaxarium (συναξάριον) is a list containing the portions of scripture to be read in the course of the liturgical year.

<sup>22</sup> In the catalogue, Devreesse notes that 'at the end, in red letters, is written: ἐρμηνεία τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαίου εὐαγγελίου ἐν ἐπιτομῇ· ἐγγραφή δὲ εὐαγγέλιον ἐκεῖνο εἰς τὸ πατριαρχεῖον ἐπὶ Σεργίου τοῦ πατριάρχου; after which come a few brief scholia' (Robert Devreesse et al., *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs. II, le fonds Coislin* (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 1945), 19–20). Devreesse also notes that the manuscript 'belonged at one time to the Great Lavra,' the oldest monastery on Mount Athos.

<sup>23</sup> ff. 1–78.

<sup>24</sup> ff. 79–83.

<sup>25</sup> ff. 85–145 (The manuscript is written in the same hand until Mark 14.39 and then the hand changes at f. 141. Part of the original text appears to be missing and a later scribe has simply inserted Mark 14.40–16.20).

<sup>26</sup> ff. 146–214. There is no superscription, but at the end of the *Catena in Lucam* (folio 214) the text reads: ἡ ἐρμηνεία τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν ἁγίου εὐαγγελίου ἐρμηνευθεῖσα παρα τοῦ ἁγίου Τίτου ἐπισκοποῦ Βόστρων.

*Catena in Iohannem*.<sup>27</sup> Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Barocc. Gr. 156 is the first volume of a three-volume commentary on the gospel according to Matthew. This *catena* was compiled by Macarius Chrysocephalus, the fourteenth century Archbishop of Philadelphia. Macarius was a great compiler of *florilegia* and *catenae*. He earned the sobriquet *Chrysocephalus* from the way he compiled the writings of the fathers under χρῶσα κεφάλαια or “golden headings.” This manuscript is used only once by Cramer as a source for a passage incorporated in the *Hypothesis*.<sup>28</sup> Clearly, the contents of these manuscripts vary dramatically. It is worth noting that the copies of the *Catena in Marcum* are characterised not only by the obvious inconsistency of attribution but also by a whole range of internal inconsistencies and variants. While the text in Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 188 and Gr. 186 is broadly similar, no two copies of the *Catena in Marcum* are the same.

These internal inconsistencies presented Cramer with a serious challenge when he came to produce his edition. Following the text-critical conventions of his day, he sought to produce a critical edition of the text by reconciling the differences and inconsistencies between the different manuscripts. He listed these variants in the apparatus of the text. The main assumption underpinning his work was that there must have been a single *Urtext* which had given rise to these textual variants. In this chapter, I will suggest that this basic assumption warrants further scrutiny. However, one particular editorial decision needs to be acknowledged from the very beginning. In preparing the text for publication, Cramer substantially altered the way in which the commentary was presented.

Most of the original manuscripts follow the established conventions of *catenae marginales*.<sup>29</sup> The origins of these anthologies of patristic commentary will be discussed in the following chapter. However, at this point it is worth commenting on the terminology employed. The term “catena” is associated supremely with the *Catena aurea* or the “Golden Chain” of Thomas Aquinas. There is no equivalent term in English, nor for that matter in Greek. In the East, a collection of scholia and extracts from patristic homilies were more often described literally as a “collection of exegetical extracts”—συναγωγή τῶν ἐξηγητικῶν ἐκλογῶν.<sup>30</sup> Both in the East and the

<sup>27</sup> This *Catena* is also incomplete. The attribution is unclear.

<sup>28</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 264.24–265.21.

<sup>29</sup> There are one of two exceptions (including Paris, Bibl. Nat. Coislin Gr. 24 and London, Brit. Mus. Add. 315.516) where only the commentary is supplied. The text of the gospel is not included.

<sup>30</sup> Kannengiesser, ed., *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, 978.

West, *catenae marginales* shared a similar format. The geography of the page can be illustrated by a detailed description of the pages of Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Laud Gr. 33. This manuscript, which belonged at one stage to the library of Archbishop Laud, dates from the eleventh century. It contains 241 folios, of which ff. 83–147 are devoted to the *Catena in Marcum*. Made from vellum, the page measures 272 mm × 205 mm. The scribe marked each page with a stylus to create 41 lines (5 mm apart). These lines were then subdivided into two columns. The column closest to the margin of the page is approximately 70 mm wide while the column closest to the spine is approximately 90 mm wide. The space between the columns is approximately 15 mm wide. The biblical text is written in the two 90 mm wide columns closest to the spine. The scribe usually begins writing the text in large letters<sup>31</sup> between lines 6–22. The space above and below the biblical text, as well as the column closer to the margin, is filled with a “chain” of comments, glosses and scholia written in a dense<sup>32</sup> and often abbreviated form. Occasionally, where the number of comments available is limited, the scribe has used the whole of the column closest to the spine to reproduce the text of the gospel.<sup>33</sup> The scribe has usually left margins of 24 mm at the top of the page and 43 mm at the bottom of the page. Because the margins are marked with a stylus, the scribe follows exactly the same markings on the verso.

Following the precedent set in earlier printed editions, Cramer rearranged the text so that it followed the more familiar conventions of a *lemmatic* commentary: he presents the *lemma* using the chapter and verse references of the biblical text familiar to modern readers. In contrast to the original manuscript, he does not include the whole of the biblical text. After the *lemma*, he adds the related comments, expanding their abbreviated form. Cramer’s rearrangement of the *catena* into a *lemmatic* form was not completely arbitrary. First, there is some evidence that a number of manuscripts were intended to be read alongside another volume containing the biblical text. This means that the text of the commentary is printed in continuous form without the text of the gospel.<sup>34</sup> Secondly, Cramer incorporates the 48 Chapter headings or κεφάλαια used to subdivide

<sup>31</sup> The size of the text is roughly equivalent to Times New Roman 14 pt.

<sup>32</sup> The size of the text is roughly equivalent to Times New Roman 10 pt.

<sup>33</sup> For example, Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Laud Gr. 33 ff. 105 verso–112.

<sup>34</sup> For example, Paris, Bibl. Nat. Coislin Gr. 24 and London, Brit. Mus. Add. 3115.5116 both provide the commentary of the *Catena in Marcum* without the Gospel text. Although Cramer did not use these particular texts in compiling his own edition, his extensive work on other manuscripts suggests that he was probably familiar with this phenomenon.

Mark's text in many of the original manuscripts. These headings follow the pattern in Codex Alexandrinus (A), although an older system of capitulation can be found in Codex Vaticanus (B) which lists 62 headings. Thirdly, Cramer is guided by the simple marginal numbering system in the original manuscripts.<sup>35</sup> The β' marked by the Marcan text related directly to the β' at the beginning of the comments in the margins. These numbers provided the necessary links in the chain or *catena* and they were used by Cramer to relate the commentary to the appropriate *lemma*. However, occasionally the arrangement of the material is more haphazard than a neat system of numbering might suggest. There are some additional marginal notes, glosses and superscriptions which are unnumbered and which occasionally appear in a different hand.

#### a. *The 'Genealogy' of the Catena in Marcum*

Charles Kannengiesser has suggested that the study of *catenae* has become "a bewildering task."<sup>36</sup> This is partly to do with the fact that the manuscript tradition of any *catena* is often characterised by all sorts of divergences, contradictions, and discrepancies. Faced with the chaotic literary life of a *catena*, the contemporary commentator might well be tempted to give up the task of establishing its genealogy, origin and provenance. Since the publication of Cramer's edition of the *Catena in Marcum*, a number of different theories about its origins have emerged. Given the combination of the superscriptions provided in different manuscripts and the absence of internal attribution, it is not surprising that discussions about the origins of the *Catena in Marcum* have tended to focus on the question of authorship. Moreover, the *lemmatic* form adopted by Cramer reinforces the view that this text is like any other commentary. When an experienced New Testament scholar picked Cramer's edition off the shelf and turned to the opening page of the *Catena in Marcum*, he said, "This says that it is a commentary on Mark by Cyril of Alexandria." Indeed, the superscription states: εἰς τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ἅγιόν εὐαγγέλιον ἐκ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν ἐρμηνείας τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας.<sup>37</sup> The reason why this superscription appears in Cramer's edition

<sup>35</sup> In Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Laud Gr. 33, the scribes have marked a series of sequential numbers next to passages within the gospel text. These relate directly to the numbering of the marginalia. These marginal marks are also visible in Figure 1.

<sup>36</sup> Kannengiesser, ed., *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, 978.

<sup>37</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 263.2–3.

is simple. Of the five manuscripts of the *Catena in Marcum* employed by Cramer, three attributed the work to Cyril of Alexandria. Cramer chose to believe them.

In the course of the nineteenth century, Cramer's conclusions about the question of authorship came under considerable scrutiny. Since that time, a number of hypotheses about the origins of the *Catena in Marcum* have been presented. As well as the hypothesis suggested by John Cramer, different assessments are associated with the names of John Burgon, Harold Smith, Robert Devreesse, and Joseph Reuss. In this section, I will describe these hypotheses chronologically and assess each of them in the light of the manuscript evidence and what we can glean from the internal evidence of the *Catena in Marcum* about its sources and origins.

Most of the hypotheses about the origins of the *Catena* focus on the question of authorship: the *Catena in Marcum* has been associated with Cyril of Alexandria, Victor of Antioch and even Pseudo-Victor of Antioch. Moreover, regardless of the different opinions surrounding the question of authorship, there has been a surprising consensus with regard to the question of its date. Cramer, Burgon, and Smith all date the *Catena in Marcum* at some point in the fifth century CE. However, I will argue that the attempt to establish the origins of the *Catena in Marcum* by exploring the question of authorship is basically a blind alley and that the evidence of the manuscript tradition points to a very different conclusion. The textual inconsistencies between the different manuscripts suggest that the *Catena* was an "open" book, which emerged in the context of the scholastic tradition. Its compilation was not the work of one author. Moreover, a careful analysis of the sources of the *Catena in Marcum* points to its emergence at some point in the early decades of the sixth century.

#### i. John Cramer (1840)

By the standards of the time, John Cramer's research constituted a considerable achievement.<sup>38</sup> He recovered a huge amount of material from the marginalia of a number of different manuscripts. He published *catenae* not only on the Gospel of Mark, but also on the other gospels and other texts of the New Testament. The influence of his research can be seen in the nineteenth-century translation of the *Catena aurea* of Thomas Aquinas,

---

<sup>38</sup> A classicist by training, John Cramer was the Principal of New Inn Hall in the University of Oxford, where he eventually became the Regius Professor of Modern History in 1842. Appointed Dean of Carlisle in 1844, he died in 1848.



which was sponsored by the leading light of the Oxford Movement, John Henry Newman.<sup>39</sup> In Newman's edition of the *Catena aurea*, the *Catena in Marcum* is often suggested as Aquinas' source.

Undoubtedly, by the standards of modern critical scholarship, there are a number of weaknesses about Cramer's edition.<sup>40</sup> The text is littered with typographical errors.<sup>41</sup> Towards the end of the commentary, large portions of material are repeated. Evidently, Cramer made little attempt to edit or reconcile these repetitions. His inclusion of a scholium from Macarius Chrysocephalus' commentary on Matthew is curious to say the least. This material simply does not appear in the manuscripts of the *Catena in Marcum*. Even in the nineteenth century, while John Burgon allowed that Cramer's edition was "by far the fullest and most satisfactory exhibition of the Commentary of Victor of Antioch that has hitherto appeared,"<sup>42</sup> he went on to lament the fact that a "work should have been suffered to come abroad disfigured in every page with errors so gross as to be even scandalous, and with traces of slovenly editorship which are simply unintelligible."<sup>43</sup> In the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, Maurits Geerard provides a rather bald description of Cramer's efforts. He simply described Cramer's edition of the *Catena* as "editio inepta."<sup>44</sup>

Cramer assumed that there was a single *Urtext* which could be reconstructed from the variants and discrepancies of the manuscript tradition. Cramer used six manuscripts and attempted to reconstruct a coherent pattern of exegesis from them. His manuscripts included Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 186 and Gr. 188, which were very similar and dated from the eleventh century. Alongside these manuscripts, he noted a number of variants from the following eleventh century manuscripts: Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 which contains a partial copy of the *Catena in Marcum*, which is referred to in the apparatus as *Cod. 178*; Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23, which is referred to in the apparatus as 'P'; and Oxford, Bod. Libr., Laud Gr. 33 indicated by the

---

<sup>39</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Catena Aurea: Commentary on the Four Gospels* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841–1845).

<sup>40</sup> Indeed, Adela Yarbro Collins notes Reuss' observation that Matthaei's is the better edition: 'the edition by J.A. Cramer (1840; reprinted 1967) is the most extensive, but also the worst' (Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, 107).

<sup>41</sup> For example, *Cat. Marc.* 264.27, 267.21, 268.19, 268.20, 269.6, 284.24. A detailed analysis is provided in Part II. To be fair to Cramer, some of these typographical errors occur in the original manuscripts (for example, *Cat. Marc.* 285,6).

<sup>42</sup> John W. Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Lafayette: Sovereign Grace, 2000 (original edition 1871); reprint, 2000), 351.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> CPG 4.236.

letter 'L.' Occasionally, he also noted some of the variants in Possinus' edition, which are indicated by the abbreviation 'Poss.' With the exception of Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23, which attributes the *Catena in Marcum* to Victor of Antioch and Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 178, in which the work is anonymous, each of the three other manuscripts attribute the *Catena* to Cyril of Alexandria. This was the attribution adopted by John Cramer.

In Chapter 6, I will argue that the overall Christology presented within the *Catena in Marcum* is largely consistent with the Christological insights of Cyril of Alexandria. *Cat. Marc.* 272.3–4 also includes an anonymous scholium containing a specific reference to the Nestorian controversy. The combination of the superscription in the manuscripts, the Christological perspective of the *Catena* and its anti-Nestorian tone enable us to see why Cramer came to the conclusion that the *Catena in Marcum* was written by Cyril of Alexandria, even though he was almost certainly wrong. Indeed, the error was quickly recognized by a number of his contemporaries. In the second volume of the English translation of the *Catena Aurea*, published in 1842, Newman corrected the error.<sup>45</sup> He attributed the *Catena in Marcum* to Victor of Antioch. John Burgon simply dismissed the idea that Cyril of Alexandria was the author of the *Catena in Marcum* by stating that it was “undeserving of serious attention.”<sup>46</sup> There are two reasons why Cyril cannot be the author. First, there is no external evidence to suggest that Cyril of Alexandria compiled *catenae*. While Cyril was known to be a meticulous compiler of *florilegia* or “anthologies” in defending his doctrinal orthodoxy by appealing to earlier authorities,<sup>47</sup> there is no evidence to suggest that he compiled *catenae*. Moreover, the origins of *catenae* are often associated with Procopius of Gaza who lived between c. 465 and 528 CE. There is no suggestion that Cyril of Alexandria was the initiator of this literary form. Secondly, there is the internal evidence of the *Catena in Marcum*, which shows that the text incorporates a broad range of sources. The idea that Cyril would happily incorporate so little of his own writing within the *Catena in Marcum* to make room for the insights of some of the great exponents of the Antiochene

---

<sup>45</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Catena Aurea: Commentary on the Four Gospels*. Volume 2. (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842). See especially the apparatus on the following pages: 8, 13, 15, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 38, 40, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 60, 64, 65, 67, 69, 75, 76, 81, 82, 91, 92, 93, 97, 98, 99, 101, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 125, 126, 128, 132, 133, 135, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 153, 154, 157, 159, 162, 165, 170, 171, 175, 176, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 187, 190, 191, 194, 197, 199, 208, 215.

<sup>46</sup> Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, 351.

<sup>47</sup> For example, see John McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy*. Second Edition. (New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004), 85–86.

tradition, particularly those who were the guides and mentors of Nestorius, is hardly convincing. Subsequent scholarship has provided some rather more persuasive explanations for the origins of the *Catena in Marcum*.

ii. *John Burgon (1871)*

Clearly, John Burgon<sup>48</sup> was not impressed by Cramer's slovenly editing of the manuscripts used to compile his edition of the *Catena in Marcum*. Nevertheless, when he decided to revisit the original manuscripts to establish a more reliable and accurate copy of the commentary to help him in his research on *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, he wrote "Never I think in my life have I been more hopelessly confused than in the *Bibliothèque*, while attempting to collate certain copies of Victor of Antioch."<sup>49</sup> Burgon had considerable difficulty making sense of the manuscripts. He was confounded by the "strange licentiousness on the part of Victor's ancient transcribers."<sup>50</sup> He recognized that there were considerable differences and inconsistencies in the manuscript tradition. While Burgon recognized that the *Catena in Marcum* was made up of comments from different sources, he argued that Victor of Antioch should be regarded as the author of this commentary on Mark. Even though he conceded that a *Catena* was a compilation, he insisted that "the Author of a compilation is an Author still."<sup>51</sup>

In the course of the nineteenth century, Burgon had become a vigorous spokesman of the conservative opposition to Westcott, Lightfoot and Hort. Burgon sought to uphold the integrity of the *textus receptus* against the advances of textual critics. An impulsive and provocative controversialist, in the words of *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, "he was an old-fashioned High Churchman who was famous for his support of a long series of lost causes."<sup>52</sup> Burgon claimed, against Westcott, Lightfoot and Hort, that the last twelve verses of Mark were part of the original gospel. He was drawn to the *Catena in Marcum* because, in his mind, it provided an early and authoritative witness to the authenticity of Mark 16.9–20. In the final lines of the *Catena in Marcum*, the catenist writes:

---

<sup>48</sup> Like Cramer, John Burgon was an Oxford academic who held ecclesiastical office. He was a passionate critic of the Revised Version and campaigned vehemently against the proposal of a new lectionary for the Church of England.

<sup>49</sup> Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, 354.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 353.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 349.

<sup>52</sup> 'John William Burgon (1813–88),' in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

But even if the words which follow ‘*after he rose early*’ (Mark 16.9) do not come in the present gospel in most copies so that some consider them to be spurious, nevertheless, finding these things in most of the carefully edited copies in accordance with the Palestinian Gospel of Mark, as the truth demands, we have included this passage and the resurrection of the Lord recounted in it, which follows after ‘*for they were afraid*’ (Mark 16.8), that is to say, from ‘*After he rose early on the first day of the week*’ and so on (Mark 16.9) until ‘*through the signs that accompanied it*’ (Mark 16.20).<sup>53</sup>

From Burgon’s point of view, the use of the first person suggested that the voice of the author was evident in these comments. This passage provided the vital evidence he needed to demonstrate that the tradition associated with Eusebius, which had cast doubt on the authenticity of Mark 16.9–20 and which is quoted indirectly in the final section of the *Catena*,<sup>54</sup> was in fact mistaken.

It follows that Burgon’s desire to identify Victor of Antioch as the author of this commentary on Mark was motivated by a corresponding need to demonstrate that this passage was of the earliest possible provenance. Even so, Burgon was cautious in his judgements. He recognized that Cramer’s conclusion that the author was Cyril of Alexandria would command little scholarly consensus. Given his familiarity with the manuscripts of the New Testament, he sought to collate as many copies of the *Catena in Marcum* as possible and to establish from the superscriptions the precise authorship of the work. Burgon identified a number of manuscripts and listed them, along with a few notes and comments, in an Appendix to *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*.<sup>55</sup> The manuscripts included the following:<sup>56</sup>

MSS	Date	Library and Catalogue Reference	Attribution
—	1307	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 206	Victor of Antioch
—	XII	Paris, Bib. Nat., Gr. 256	Victor of Antioch
—	XII	Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Gr. 99	Victor of Antioch
12	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 230	Victor of Antioch
19	XII	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 189	Victor of Antioch
20	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 188	Cyril of Alexandria

<sup>53</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 447.11–18. Note that this passage is also quoted in Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, 24–26 and Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, 805. The *Catena in Marcum* is still cited in discussion of the Longer (Additional) Ending of Mark.

<sup>54</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 446.15–447.10 is made up of quotations, albeit indirect and heavily corrupted, from Eusebius, *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum* (PG 22.937–957).

<sup>55</sup> Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, 349–367.

<sup>56</sup> I have modified Burgon’s list for ease of reference.

MSS	Date	Library and Catalogue Reference	Attribution
24	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178	Anon.
25	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 191	Anon.
34	X	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 195	Victor of Antioch
36	X	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 20	Anon.
37	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 21	Victor of Antioch
39	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23	Victor of Antioch
40	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 22	Anon.
41	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 24	Victor of Antioch
50	XI	Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud Gr. 33	Cyril of Alexandria
77	XI	Vienna, Nat. Bibl., Theol. Gr. 154	Anon.
92	X	Basel, Univ. Bibl., o. II. 27	Victor of Antioch
108	XI	Naples, Bibl. Naz., Cod. Vien. 3	Unclear
129	XII	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 358	Victor of Antioch
137	XI	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 756	Anon.
138	XII	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 757	Peter of Laodicea
143	XI	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1229	Anon.
146	XII	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Pal. Gr. 5	Unclear
181	XI	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Reg. Gr. 179	Anon.
186	XI	Florence, Bibl., Laur. VI. 18	Anon.
194	XI	Florence, Bibl., Laur. VI. 33	Victor of Antioch
195	XI	Florence, Bibl., Laur. VI. 34	Anon.
197	XI	Florence, Bibl., Laur. VIII. 14	Anon.
210	XI	Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marc., 341	Anon.
215	XI	Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marc., 544	Anon.
221	X	Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Can. Gr. 110	Anon.
222	XIV	Vienna, Nat. Bibl., Theol. Gr. 180	Anon.
233	XIII	Escorial, Y. II. 8	Unclear
237	X	Moscow, Hist. Mus., V. 85, S. 41	Anon.
238	XI	Moscow, Hist. Mus., V. 91, S. 47	Anon.
253	XI	olim: Moscow, Erzbisch. Nikephorus	Anon.
259	XI	Moscow, Hist. Mus., V. 86, S. 44	Anon.
299	X	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 177	Anon.
300	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 186	Cyril of Alexandria
301	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 187	Victor of Antioch
304	XII	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 194	Anon.
309	XIII	Cambridge, Univ. Libr., Dd. XI.90	Victor of Antioch
329	XII	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 19	Anon.
332	XII	Turin, Bibl. Naz., C. II. 4	Anon.
353	XII	Milan, Bibl. Ambros., M. 93 sup.	Anon.
373	XV	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1423	Anon.
374	XII	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1445	Peter of Laodicea
379	XV	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1769	Unclear
427	XIII	Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Gr. 465	Unclear
428	XIII	Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Gr. 381	Cyril of Alexandria

MSS	Date	Library and Catalogue Reference	Attribution
556	XII	Geneva, Bibl. Bodmer, Phillipps 13975	Anon.
569	1061	S. Petersburg, Russ. Nat. Bibl. Gr. 72	Anon.
599	XV	Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marc., Gr. Z. 495 (1048)	Victor of Antioch
703	XI	San Marino, Huntington Libr., HM. 1081	Origen

Although the majority of these manuscripts offer no guidance at all about the question of the authorship of the *Catena in Marcum*, Burgon noted that fifteen manuscripts attributed authorship to Victor of Antioch, while only four attributed authorship to Cyril of Alexandria. He also noted the following superscription from a manuscript in the Vatican Library: ἑρμηνεία Πέτρου Λαοδικείας εἰς τοὺς Δ' ἁγίους εὐαγγελιστάς.<sup>57</sup> In his view, the association with Peter of Laodicea merited little further consideration: "This is simply a mistake. No such work exists."<sup>58</sup> On the evidence of the number of attributions and the witness of the earliest available manuscripts, Burgon concluded that Victor of Antioch was the most likely author of the *Catena in Marcum*.

Of Victor of Antioch, Burgon conceded that there is "scarcely a Commentator of antiquity about whom less is certainly known."<sup>59</sup> He is described simply as "a presbyter of Antioch." Burgon recognized that crediting Victor of Antioch with the creation of the *Catena in Marcum* actually tells us very little about its origins. In fact, all it achieves is that it suggests that the *Catena in Marcum* dates from the fifth century. But then, that was exactly what Burgon was seeking to do:

It only remains to point out, that since Chrysostom (whom Victor speaks of as ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις [p. 408] and ὁ μακάριος [p. 442]) died in AD 407, it *cannot* be right to quote '401' as the date of Victor's work. Rather would AD 450 be a more reasonable suggestion: seeing that extracts from Cyril, who lived on till AD 444, are found here and there in Victor's pages. We shall not perhaps materially err if we assign AD 430–450 as Victor of Antioch's approximate date.<sup>60</sup>

This conclusion comes at the very end of Burgon's discussion of the *Catena in Marcum*. His vigorous defence of Victor of Antioch as the author of the *Catena in Marcum* meant that by the end of the nineteenth century

<sup>57</sup> Rome, Bibl. Vatic. Gr. 1445.

<sup>58</sup> Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, 366.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 137.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 358.

the established opinion was that the *Catena in Marcum* was compiled by Victor of Antioch in the fifth century.<sup>61</sup> Burgon's justification for this date rests principally on the fact that the text incorporates extracts from Cyril of Alexandria. That said, he offered no real analysis of the sources of the *Catena in Marcum*. He did not ask *why* or *how* they were selected. He was content to restrict his analysis to the question 'When?'

### iii. Harold Smith (1918)

Like Burgon, Harold Smith was not convinced by the suggestion that Cyril of Alexandria was the author of the *Catena*.<sup>62</sup> He suggested that Cyril's name "seems to have become attached to it because of the considerable use made in its earlier and later chapters of his commentaries on (Matthew) and Luke."<sup>63</sup> Struck by the fact that the *Catena in Marcum* contained a number of extracts from "Theodore and perhaps of Theodoret, the representatives of the opposite school to Cyril,"<sup>64</sup> Smith remarked at the extraordinary way in which extracts from Cyril and Theodore were often tied together almost seamlessly, so that "a comment introduced by ἄλλος φησὶν consists of about two lines of Theodore running on to a long comment by Cyril."<sup>65</sup> However, he did not speculate whether this was a consequence of the editorial efforts of the catenist, a result of subsequent scribal attempts at abridgement, or an indication that the *Catena in Marcum* was compiled from existing *catenae* on Matthew and Luke.

Smith noted that "of Victor all that is known apart from this commentary is that *catenae* on Luke have a number of quotations from a commentary by him on that Gospel."<sup>66</sup> Three passages in Cramer's edition of the *Catena in Lucam* are ascribed to "Victor the presbyter,"<sup>67</sup> although rather frustratingly none of these passages are reproduced in the *Catena in Marcum*. He also noted that Victor is quoted three times in Corderius' *Catena in Lucam*,<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> For example, H.B. Swete, *The Gospel according to Mark* (New York: Macmillan, 1898), cvi.

<sup>62</sup> Harold Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1918): 351.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*: 352.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.* Smith is referring to the passage in *Cat. Marc.* 423,6–29.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>67</sup> Luke 8.16–17, Luke 8.18 and Luke 8.39.

<sup>68</sup> Balthasar Corderius, *Catena Sexaginta Quinque Graecorum Patrum in S. Lucam* (Antwerp: ex Officina Plantiniana, 1628).

which is an abridgement of Nicetas' *Catena in Lucam*.<sup>69</sup> Nicetas includes twenty-four passages attributed to "Victor the presbyter," while Corderius quotes Victor of Antioch on Luke 1.35, 8.34, and 10.30f. All these passages are peculiar to Luke. In other words, there are no Marcan parallels. Only one quotation (on Luke 4.42) is reproduced in the *Catena in Marcum*.<sup>70</sup> However, before one suggests that this rather slender evidence enables us to establish the identity of the catenist, it is important to note that Smith accepts that an alternative hypothesis was possible:

that Victor actually commented only on Luke, and that his name became attached to the compilation on Mark in the same way as that of Cyril did—and that of Titus to the compilation on Luke—because of the extensive use of his work in it.<sup>71</sup>

Nevertheless, Smith was not persuaded by this. He suggested that the ascriptions to Victor of Antioch contained within the *catenae* on Luke might equally be mistaken, and pointed out that Nicetas' *Catena in Lucam* "ascribes to Cyril a passage really from Isidore"<sup>72</sup> of Pelusium. Ultimately, the internal evidence is inconclusive.

Smith concluded that the author of the *catena* was Victor of Antioch on the slender evidence that he was the author cited. Nevertheless, his hypothesis was accompanied by three additional observations: first, relatively little is known about Victor of Antioch; secondly, Victor was "not a *catenist* in the ordinary sense"<sup>73</sup> of the word, in that only occasionally did he mention his sources by name; and thirdly, Smith suggested that Victor also exercised a certain freedom in relation to these sources, and included some material of his own: the compiler of the *Catena in Marcum* used "many sources; more than ten can be identified; but he works up his material, and probably adds a good deal of his own, especially in his frequent comparisons of the various Gospels."<sup>74</sup> While attempts to establish the identity of

---

<sup>69</sup> Nicetas of Heraclea, *Catena in Lucam* (XII century).

<sup>70</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 280.3–17.

<sup>71</sup> Smith, "The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark," 352.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*: 353.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.* Michael Cahill's contention that Victor of Antioch should not be credited "with the title of first commentator on Mark" should be viewed with caution. Cahill claimed that because Victor of Antioch's work is a *catena* rather than a *commentary*, such an epithet should be bestowed upon the author of Pseudo-Jerome, a commentary which he dates to the 7th century: "Victor cannot be said to have authored a commentary on Mark, in the normal sense of the term, i.e. a formal full-length continuous commentary by the same author."



the catenist had proved fruitless, Smith suggested that the identification of the sources of the *Catena in Marcum* was of some value for three reasons:

- 1) It adds to our none too great MS tradition in the case of the bulk of these sources, e.g. Origen, Eusebius, Titus, Apollinaris, Theodore, Cyril.
- 2) In the case of Cyril and Theodore it supplies the Greek of some passages preserved otherwise only in Syriac.
- 3) It probably enlarges some of our fragments of e.g. Titus, Apollinaris, and Theodore.<sup>75</sup>

In other words, he was suggesting that it was possible to use the *Catena in Marcum* as a kind of treasure-trove which would offer a few more pearls of wisdom from the commentators of late antiquity. However, this proposal should be viewed with caution. The fact that the catenist and subsequent scribes have exercised some considerable freedom in abridging and transposing these fragments means that any attempt to reconstruct material from the *Catena* may prove to be a challenge.

Roughly a third of all the material contained within the *Catena in Marcum* comes from John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaеum*, although much of this material is concentrated in comments on Mark 8–15.<sup>76</sup> The following comparison in Figure 1 shows an extract taken from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaеum* 75.1 alongside the extract reproduced in *Catena in Marcum* 407.26–408.5. A comparison between the two reveals that much of the material in the *Catena in Marcum* has been heavily abridged.

---

(Cahill, 'The Identification of the First Markan Commentary,' 259). And yet, the standards and conventions of biblical commentary in the 20th century, and even the 7th century, should not be used to judge the standards and conventions of earlier periods. Indeed, by Cahill's own admission, one can identify in the writing of Pseudo-Jerome the use of a variety of sources, including Origen, Eusebius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great. Thus, there is a sense in which the distinction between writing a commentary and the redaction, editing and transmission of ancient sources are more a matter of degree than a matter of principle.

<sup>75</sup> Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 353.

<sup>76</sup> Smith calculates that Chrysostom provides 43 per cent of the material within these chapters (*ibid.*: 354).

Figure 1

Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 75.1	Cramer, <i>Catena in Marcum</i> 407.26–408.5
1. <u>Διὰ τοῦτο κατ' ἴδιαν προσῆλθον, ἅτε ὑπὲρ τοιούτων πεισόμενοι. Καὶ γὰρ ὠδινον μαθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὸ σφόδρα ἐπιθυμεῖν τὴν δόξαν ἐκείνην ἰδεῖν τὴν μυρίων οὖσαν ἀγαθῶν αἰτίαν.</u>	<u>καὶ πάλιν ὁ Μάρκος οὐ πάντας αὐτὸν φησιν ἐρωτῆσαι περὶ τῆς συντέλειαι τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων,</u> ἀλλὰ μόνους τοὺς προγεγραμμένους.
2. <u>Καὶ δύο ταῦτα ἐρωτῶσιν αὐτόν· Πότε ταῦτα ἔσται; τουτέστιν, ἡ τοῦ ναοῦ κατασκαφή· καὶ, Τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας;</u>	<u>καὶ ὁ Λουκάς ἐν ἔφησεν εἶναι τὸ ἐρώτημα περὶ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων, ἅτε νομιζόντων αὐτῶν τότε καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ εἶναι.</u>
3. <u>Ὁ δὲ Λουκάς ἐν φησιν εἶναι τὸ ἐρώτημα, τὸ περὶ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων, ἅτε νομιζόντων αὐτῶν τότε καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ εἶναι.</u>	ὁ δὲ Ματθαῖος δύο, περὶ τε τῆς καθαιρέσεως τοῦ ναοῦ, καὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.
4. <u>Ὁ δὲ Μάρκος οὐδὲ πάντας αὐτοὺς φησιν ἐρωτῆσαι περὶ τῆς συντελείας τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων, ἀλλὰ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην,</u>	<u>ἅτε πλείονα παρρησίαν ἔχοντες.</u>
5. <u>ἅτε πλείονα παρρησίαν ἔχοντας.</u>	<u>διὰ τοῦτο κατ' ἴδιαν προσῆλθον, ἅτε ὑπὲρ τοιούτων πεισόμενοι.</u>
1. <u>This is why they came to him privately, as they were seeking to learn about such things.</u> For they were puzzled to know the day of his coming, because of their eager desire to see his glory, which is the cause of countless blessings.	<u>And again Mark says that not all of them asked him about the end of Jerusalem, but only those mentioned.</u>
2. <u>And they asked him two things:</u> “When will these things happen?” (meaning the destruction of the temple); and “What will be the sign of your appearing?”	<u>And Luke says [that they asked] a single question about Jerusalem, given that they supposed that his coming was also then.</u>
3. <u>And Luke says that they asked a single question about Jerusalem, given that they supposed that his coming was also then.</u>	<u>But Matthew says [that they asked] two [questions], one about the destruction of the temple, and another about the end of the age, given that they were more bold.</u>
4. <u>And Mark says that not all of them asked him about the end of Jerusalem, but only Peter and John,</u>	<u>This is why they came to him privately, as they were seeking to learn about such things.</u>
5. <u>given that they were more bold.</u>	

Admittedly, this is a particularly striking example, but (as can be clearly seen from the numbering in the margins) this passage has been rewritten and reshaped. The order of Chrysostom's sentences has been almost completely reversed. Given that Chrysostom was originally commenting on a passage from Matthew, we would expect Matthew to be more prominent. Thus "Matthew says ... but Luke says ... and Mark says ... etc." Unsurprisingly, in the *Catena in Marcum*, the words of Mark are made more prominent. Mark's account is cited first, and comparison with the other synoptic accounts follows. And yet the words ὁ δὲ Ματθαῖος δύο, περί τε τῆς καθαιρέσεως τοῦ ναοῦ, καὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος also provides evidence of abridgement. In the first clause, the text is heavily condensed and the verb as well as the object need to be supplied. In the following clauses, Chrysostom's direct questions are abbreviated. The *Catena* provides the bare skeleton of Chrysostom's original comments. Moreover, there is clear evidence in this passage of a drastic redaction of the original source. Consequently, we should be cautious about using the *Catena* as a farm for sources, particularly those which are either lost or fragmentary.<sup>77</sup> It would perhaps be more profitable to identify the existing sources of the *Catena* and then look at the way in which those sources were edited and transposed.

Smith himself noted that "in sections clearly taken from Chrysostom he not only greatly abridges and sometimes transposes Chrysostom's sentences, but may, perhaps in the middle of a sentence, go off into the use of some other source, or into a remark of his own."<sup>78</sup> As a result, Smith restricts most of his efforts to his first stated objective, namely, the identification of sources cited in other manuscripts. The principal sources identified by Smith include:

John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem*  
 Origen, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis*  
 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum*  
 Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam*  
 Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Matthaem*  
 Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam*

In addition, Smith identified small extracts from Theodore of Heraclea, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrhus,

---

<sup>77</sup> Similar methodological questions are raised in Ronald E. Heine, 'Can the Catena Fragments of Origen's *Commentary on John* be trusted?', *Vigiliae Christianae* 40, no. 2 (1986): 118–134.

<sup>78</sup> Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 353.

Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and Isidore of Pelusium. However, given that the internal evidence of the *Catena* suggests that the compilers used Theodore of Mopsuestia as a source and given that most of his original writings have been lost, he also attempted to identify additional material from Theodore.

Smith put forward the theory that Isho'dad's *Commentarius in Matthaеum*,<sup>79</sup> written in Syriac, probably preserves many fragments from Theodore, and that the coincidences between material in the *Catena in Marcum* and Isho'dad's commentary "preserve a line of Theodore omitted in direct transmission."<sup>80</sup> Smith concluded that "we are probably justified in provisionally assuming all passages common to Victor and Isho'dad have *Theodore* as their common source."<sup>81</sup> He noted that it was also possible that these coincidences owed as much to Theodoret of Cyrrhus as Theodore of Mopsuestia, for although Isho'dad nowhere mentions Theodoret in his writings, other passages suggested that he used him freely. To sustain his assertion that Theodore was most probably the source, Smith made two suggestions:

- 1) it was possible that Theodoret and Isho'dad both follow Theodore closely; and
- 2) the writings of Theodore and Theodoret were often confused. Thus even if the catenist was reading a comment of Theodoret, he thought he was incorporating an extract from Theodore.<sup>82</sup>

Certainly, the evidence of *Cat. Marc.* 408.10 and 418.9, where Theodore is mentioned explicitly in the text, indicates that the writings of Theodore were an important source for the catenist and later compilers. However, Smith's method of sourcing material through Isho'dad is not entirely convincing: for instance, he attributes *Cat. Marc.* 398.23–28 to Theodore of Mopsuestia on the grounds that the passage coincides with Isho'dad, *Commentarius in Matthaеum* 85. A search of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* suggests that in fact this passage comes from Apollinaris.<sup>83</sup> Similarly, *Cat. Marc.* 299.19–300.19 contains a lengthy passage from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in*

---

<sup>79</sup> Margaret Dunlop Gibson and James Rendel Harris, *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv, Bishop of Hadatha (c. 850 A.D.), in Syriac and English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911).

<sup>80</sup> Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 358.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*: 359.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>83</sup> Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaеum* Fr. 110 (J. Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche [Texte und Untersuchungen* 61. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957]: 37).

*Matthaeum* Fr. 73,<sup>84</sup> even though parts of this passage coincide with Isho'dad and are mistakenly attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia by Smith.<sup>85</sup>

Undoubtedly, Smith's work in identifying the sources of the *Catena in Marcum*, without the benefit of modern search engines, presents a singular achievement, but by the end of his study, he is forced to admit, that "much ... of Victor remains unidentified."<sup>86</sup> Many of the passages which he did identify displayed evidence of considerable adaptation and amendment. This made it difficult to argue that the *Catena in Marcum* would enable scholars to identify further examples of the writings of Origen, Eusebius, Cyril and Theodore. The method which he adopted to identify additional material from Theodore of Mopsuestia also proved to be rather unreliable.

Smith's article on "The Sources of Victor of Antioch" has perhaps left scope for further inquiry. Admittedly, his survey was primarily quantitative in character. He did not really explore whether a more qualitative approach would present greater dividends. Little has been made of the way in which the sources were edited, abbreviated and transposed. As I have suggested, these editorial changes may sometimes have been the consequence of adjusting a comment about Matthew or Luke to fit the contours of Mark's narrative. But there is little reference to the theological outlook reflected within the sources. For instance, he recognises that Theodore of Mopsuestia is a source, but he does not refer to the fact that the catenist has not chosen material in which Theodore made a distinction between the two natures of Christ to explain different incidents in the life of Christ. Nor does Smith explore whether there is any evidence of a consistent point of view within the *Catena*. Given the fact that the *Catena in Marcum* includes extracts from Cyril of Alexandria as well as Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose respective Christological insights fuelled the fire of the Nestorian controversy, it is surprising that he does not explore whether the selection of these extracts betrays any kind of coherent or consistent understanding of the identity of Christ. But perhaps the greatest flaw in Smith's approach is that his article makes no reference to the scholastic environment which may have provided the context for the production of the *Catena in Marcum*. He assumes that Cramer's edition of the *Catena in Marcum* reflects the work of a single author at a given point in time. Smith was cautious about ascribing

---

<sup>84</sup> J. Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche [Texte und Untersuchungen 61]*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957]: 37.

<sup>85</sup> Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 368.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*: 364. Smith calculated that 32% of the sources contained within the *Catena in Marcum* can be traced back to Chrysostom (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 354).

this role to Victor of Antioch. Nevertheless, the idea that Victor of Antioch was the originator of the *Catena in Marcum* is still very much in the frame. The overall picture that emerges is that the catenist, most probably Victor of Antioch, scoured the pages of a variety of different sources. These included the homilies of John Chrysostom, the commentaries of Cyril of Alexandria, the writings of Apollinaris of Laodicea and the homilies of Titus of Bostra. From these varied sources, Victor compiled the *Catena in Marcum*. However, subsequent scholarship went on to suggest that the inconsistencies and contradictions within the manuscript tradition pointed to a rather different way of describing the origins of the *Catena in Marcum*.

iv. *Robert Devreesse (1928)*

In an extended article on “Chaines Exégetiques Grècques” in the Supplement of the *Dictionnaire de la Bible*,<sup>87</sup> Robert Devreesse took issue with what had become the dominant approach in the study of *catenae*. He was particularly critical of those who sought to describe the origins of a *catena* as if it were simply the work of an author. *Catenae* were an important and significant source of the writings of the Greek fathers. Indeed, he went so far as to claim that the *catenae* offered some of the best insights into the principles of patristic exegesis: “it is in the *catenae* that the most significant and, we admit, the best part of Greek exegesis has been preserved.”<sup>88</sup> Some of these extracts were not simply scattered fragments or sayings of the fathers—“they are sometimes, even often, texts of which the size more or less equals that of entire commentaries.”<sup>89</sup> He noted in particular that the exegetical work of Theodore of Mopsuestia could be partly reconstituted from *catenae*. The same was true of Apollinaris and others who had been deemed suspect or heterodox in the course of subsequent history. But he was also aware that the use of *catenae* simply to compile the fragments of lost patristic commentaries could be problematic. Many of the extracts had been epitomised, inverted, and amended. The study of *catenae* was a challenge because the manuscripts did not always present a thoroughly reliable guide to the original sources. Instead, he suggested that “one should study a collection for what it *is*, without worrying about what it *could* yield ...”<sup>90</sup>

<sup>87</sup> Robert Devreesse, ‘Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,’ in *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplement*. (1928), 1084–1233.

<sup>88</sup> Devreesse, ‘Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,’ 1098.

<sup>89</sup> Devreesse, ‘Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,’ 1098.

<sup>90</sup> Devreesse, ‘Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,’ 1098.

In his discussion of the *Catena in Marcum*, Devreesse attempted an analysis of the manuscript tradition. He noted the influence of the edition published by Possinus in 1673, as well as its sources, but he recognized that Cramer's later edition drew principally on Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud Gr. 33 and Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23. These manuscripts were supplemented by additional material from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 and a scholium from Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Barocc. Gr. 156. He noted the fact that most of the material was unattributed, but he conceded that one name stood out in the manuscript tradition: Victor of Antioch.<sup>91</sup>

Devreesse's analysis of the manuscript tradition extended beyond a discussion of Cramer's edition to offer an assessment of earlier editions. He was at pains to point out the significant discrepancies between Possinus' edition and Peltanus' translation. Possinus had criticized Peltanus for following a faulty manuscript. Devreesse suggests that Possinus was being too kind:

This was actually a euphemism, for Peltanus had done much more: his translation distorted the text of the manuscript. Moreover, he had not totally hidden this fraud since he warned at the start of his work that he had allowed himself to rectify and correct the rambling text in order to better adapt it to the inspired words.<sup>92</sup>

The sloppiness of Peltanus' work alarmed Devreesse. It caused him to question Peltanus' attribution of the *Catena in Marcum* to Victor of Antioch. He noted the discrepancies in the manuscript tradition. He was aware that other manuscripts attributed the work to Origen and Cyril of Alexandria. He also suggested that the reason why both Possinus and Peltanus attributed the work to Victor of Antioch was because both shared one particular manuscript in common: Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Gr. 99. Devreesse asserted that "in reality, the work belonged to none of the three authors cited."<sup>93</sup> As a *catena*, the text consisted of a variety of extracts from a number of different authors.

Struck by the inconsistencies in the manuscript tradition, Devreesse suggested that the textual evidence pointed towards a more complex development. He put forward the following hypothesis: the textual tradition probably started with a group of anonymous notes, some of which may have been associated with Victor of Antioch. Over a period of time, the manuscript tradition developed, with an extended adaptation of John Chrysostom's *Homiliae in Matthaëum*, as well as a series of extracts from "Origen, Athanasius(?),

<sup>91</sup> Devreesse, 'Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,' 1176.

<sup>92</sup> Devreesse, 'Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,' 1176.

<sup>93</sup> Devreesse, 'Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,' 1177.

Eusebius, Apollinaris, Cyril, Josephus(?), Chrysostom, Basil, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Victor of Antioch.<sup>94</sup> He conceded that the original scholia may have been compiled by Victor of Antioch, but he observed that the only justification for attributing the *Catena* to Victor of Antioch was “the fact that he is cited.”<sup>95</sup> Given the lack of internal evidence, Devreesse cautiously suggested that once one removed from Cramer’s edition a few scattered fragments, it might be more appropriate to describe the *Catena in Marcum* as the work of Pseudo-Victor of Antioch.<sup>96</sup>

Crucially, Devreesse went on to suggest that this material had been subjected to extensive revisions and amendments:

We think that around this first group were inserted, in certain manuscripts, little by little, isolated quotations that were subsequently added to the original source. Furthermore, they were few; some of them even only summarized passages found, in their entirety, a few lines away.<sup>97</sup>

The merit of Devreesse’s hypothesis was that it accounted for the curious inconsistencies in the manuscript tradition. It explained why John Cramer included muddled repetitions of material in his edition and why John Burgon was so confused in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Underlying Devreesse’s hypothesis is the implicit assertion that the *Catena in Marcum* was an “open” book. Moreover, he suggested that from this original work of Pseudo-Victor stemmed another *catena* on Mark, which came to be associated (again pseudonymously) with Peter of Laodicea. This is the work which was dismissed so aggressively by John Burgon. Devreesse illustrates his point with reference to a passage taken from a manuscript in the Vatican library,<sup>98</sup> edited by Cardinal Mai, and published by Migne under the name of Peter of Laodicea.<sup>99</sup> Devreesse noted that exactly the same passage could be found in Possinus’ edition,<sup>100</sup> Cramer’s edition,<sup>101</sup> and in Matthaei’s edition.<sup>102</sup>

In summary, Devreesse identified four stages in the development of the *Catena in Marcum*. In the beginning, there was a selection of mostly

<sup>94</sup> Devreesse, ‘Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,’ 1177.

<sup>95</sup> Devreesse, ‘Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,’ 1177.

<sup>96</sup> Devreesse, ‘Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,’ 1177.

<sup>97</sup> Devreesse, ‘Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,’ 1177.

<sup>98</sup> Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1445 (Gregory-Aland 374, XII century).

<sup>99</sup> PG 86.3325C–3328B. The extract is drawn from Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1445.

<sup>100</sup> Peter Possinus, *Catena Graecorum patrum in Evangelium secundum Marcum* (Rome: Typis Barberinis, 1673), 313–314.

<sup>101</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 422.22–423.27.

<sup>102</sup> Christian F. Matthaei, Βίκτωρος πρεσβυτέρου Ἀντιοχείας καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἐξήγησις εἰς τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ἅγιον εὐαγγέλιον *ex codibus Mosquensibus* (Moscow: Moscow University Press, 1775), 78–80.



anonymous scholia compiled by Pseudo-Victor of Antioch. Devreesse suggested that Possinus' edition rendered a more adequate account of this stage of the *Catena's* development. Subsequently, a few additional extracts were added to this source, a stage of transmission reflected in Cramer's edition. Later, Peter of Laodicea developed the textual tradition further by adding other material to the original source. Some of this material overlapped with the material added at an earlier stage.

And yet there were further developments in the manuscript tradition. Devreesse identified two other collections of scholia in Vatican, Libr. Vat., Vat. 1692 and Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 194. The first of these manuscripts dates from the thirteenth century. Extracts from this manuscript were incorporated by Possinus in his edition of 1673 under the heading Ἄνωρύμου Βατικιάνου. This manuscript betrayed some Western influence, containing explicit citations of the work of Ambrose, Athanasius, Augustine, Clement of Alexandria, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Josephus, Gregory of Nazianzus, and John Chrysostom. The second of these manuscripts also appears in Possinus' edition under the heading Ἄνωρύμου Τολωῶς. This contained a number of explicit citations from Photius, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodore of Heraclea, Origen, Severus of Antioch, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinaris, Athanasius, and Gregory of Nyssa. Both manuscripts displayed evidence of further recensions of the *Catena in Marcum*.

Devreesse concluded that the original scholia were assembled by Pseudo-Victor of Antioch. This claim has been reinforced recently by Markus Bockmuehl who asserts that the *Catena in Marcum* was compiled by "Ps.-Victor of Antioch, writing ca. AD 500."<sup>103</sup> And yet such a conclusion is puzzling. Devreesse offers little justification for his suggestion that there was an historical figure in the sixth century who adopted the title of Victor of Antioch pseudonymously. Indeed, on the face of it, it seems odd that anyone would adopt the title of such a relatively obscure figure. By contrast, the idea

---

<sup>103</sup> Markus Bockmuehl, 'The Making of Gospel Commentaries,' in *The Written Gospel*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl and Donald Hagner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 289. The footnote refers the reader to the rather unsatisfactory discussion of the *Catena in Marcum* in Hall, *Mark*. Oden and Hall state: "There is a manuscript by one Victor, presbyter of Antioch (c. A.D. 500) who is wrongly identified as the author of a brief commentary on Mark, but this 'commentary' is itself an early catena whose main sources are the homilies on Matthew by Chrysostom, Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Titus of Bostra and Theodore of Heraclea." (Hall, *Mark*, xxxi). No reference is offered, although the fact that extracts from the *Catena in Marcum* are subsequently attributed to Pseudo-Victor of Antioch suggests a rather partial awareness of the thesis put forward by Robert Devreesse.

that the *Catena in Marcum* was attributed by scribes to Cyril of Alexandria pseudonymously would be much more plausible. Cyril was a well-known figure and a major player in the theological controversies of the fifth century. About Victor of Antioch, we know almost nothing.<sup>104</sup> If a presbyter of Antioch, called Victor, was involved in an early stage of the development of the *Catena in Marcum*, we can only substantiate such an hypothesis on the grounds that he is cited in fifteen manuscripts. There is no external evidence to confirm or deny this. All that Devreesse's suggestion achieves is that it underlines the fact that the identity of the original catenist remains uncertain.

The strength of Devreesse's analysis of the *Catena in Marcum* is that, rather than problematizing the inconsistencies in the manuscript tradition, there is an implicit acknowledgement that the *Catena in Marcum* was an "open" book. In other words, in the course of its history, the *Catena* had been subject to a series of further amendments, additions and adaptations, which created a varied and divergent manuscript tradition. Devreesse's insight was important. It provided the starting point for a re-evaluation of the evidence. Rather than attempting to determine the origins of the *Catena in Marcum* by establishing the identity of its author, subsequent scholarship sought to explain the origins of the *Catena* by exploring the inconsistencies in the manuscript tradition and identifying a number of different recensions. The chief proponent of this approach was Joseph Reuss.

#### v. *Joseph Reuss (1941)*

In suggesting that one should study a *catena* for what it *is*, rather than what it might *yield*, Robert Devreesse was dissenting from a well-established tradition in continental scholarship, a tradition which had become particularly influential in Germany: "The Berlin Academy, when it decided to restore the corpus of works of the Greek Fathers of the first three centuries, recognised clearly that going through the *catenae* was an essential preliminary task."<sup>105</sup> The work of Joseph Reuss follows very much in this tradition. His research was focussed principally on the *catenae* on the gospels. He

---

<sup>104</sup> In *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, Maurits Geerard provides a detailed analysis of those passages in *catenae* which are attributed to Victor of Antioch. The extracts on Jeremiah are extensive, but fragments include exegetical extracts on the Octateuch (CPG 6529), Jeremiah (CPG 6530), the Lamentations of Jeremiah (CPG 6531), Daniel (CPG 6532), and Luke (CPG 6534). Geerard also notes the material in Matthaei's edition (CPG 6533).

<sup>105</sup> Devreesse, 'Chaines Exégetiques Grécques,' 1099.

published a slim volume describing the manuscript tradition of the *catenae* on Matthew, Mark and Luke.<sup>106</sup> He also published more substantial volumes reconstituting the 'lost' commentaries of Apollinaris of Laodicea, Theodore of Heraclea, Cyril of Alexandria, Eusebius, Origen, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret of Cyrrhus. He published these fragments in separate volumes on Matthew,<sup>107</sup> Luke,<sup>108</sup> and John.<sup>109</sup> Sadly, he did not offer a parallel volume on Mark.

In his discussion of the *Catena in Marcum*, Reuss presented a careful analysis of the manuscript tradition. The fact that the manuscripts were so well-distributed indicated the importance of the commentary. Reuss drew on the insights of Hermann Freiherr von Soden who had noticed the curious variations and inconsistencies between the different manuscript copies. Von Soden also recognized that the *Catena* must have been in some sense an open book, but he identified a number of family resemblances between the manuscripts. In his *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, von Soden distinguished between three different recensions of the *Catena in Marcum*: A<sup>a</sup>, A<sup>b</sup>, A<sup>c</sup>. In this classification A<sup>a</sup> was the earlier form and A<sup>b</sup> and A<sup>c</sup> were later revisions or epitomes of it. He identified the later A<sup>c</sup> form with the work of Matthaei and the earlier A<sup>a</sup> form with the work of John Cramer.<sup>110</sup>

Reuss provided a simpler analysis than von Soden. He reduced the number of recensions to two, while conceding that within these two textual families there were further variations. He presented his analysis in some considerable detail, and illustrated his argument with reference to the published editions of the *Catena in Marcum*.<sup>111</sup> He suggested that the edition published in Moscow by Christian F. Matthaei in two volumes in 1775 reflected the first recension most closely,<sup>112</sup> although he regarded it as the best of a bad job. Matthaei's edition was based on a number of manuscripts in the Patri-

<sup>106</sup> Reuss, *Matthäus, Markus, und Johannes-Katenen: nach den handschriften Quellen*.

<sup>107</sup> Joseph Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche. Aus Katenenhandschriften gessammelt und herausgegeben* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957).

<sup>108</sup> Joseph Reuss, *Lukas-Kommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche. Aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1984).

<sup>109</sup> Joseph Reuss, *Johannes-Kommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche. Aus Katenenhandschriften gessammelt und herausgegeben* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1966).

<sup>110</sup> Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin: Alexander Duncker, 1902–1913), § 65–79, 156–164.

<sup>111</sup> Reuss, *Matthäus, Markus, und Johannes-Katenen: nach den handschriften Quellen*, 118–141.

<sup>112</sup> Christian F. Matthaei, Βίβλιος πρεσβυτέρου Ἀντιοχείας καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἐξήγησις εἰς τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ἅγιον εὐαγγέλιον *ex codibus Mosquensibus* (Moscow, 1775).

archal Library in Moscow dating from the eleventh century.<sup>113</sup> A subsequent edition of this recension was published by Samuel Markfi in 1860 with notes in Latin and Hungarian.<sup>114</sup>

According to Reuss, there were three basic differences between the two recensions of the *Catena in Marcum*. First, one recension was much shorter than the other. The first recension consisted of 114 sections, while the second recension was made up of 160 sections. Secondly, even though the majority of scholia were identical, they were in a different order. Thirdly, while the second recension contained some evidence of attribution, no names were given in the first recension.

Reuss identified forty five manuscripts which closely matched this first recension:

MSS	Date	Library and Catalogue Reference	Attribution
—	X	Vienna, Nat. Bibl., Theol. 117	Anon.
—	1553	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 384	Origen
—		Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Ottob. Gr. 113	Origen
—		Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1741	Anon.
—	XVI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 939	Origen
—	XVII	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Gr. 40	Origen
12	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 230	Victor of Antioch
19	XII	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 189	Victor of Antioch
24	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178	Anon.
25	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 191	Anon.
36	X	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 20	Anon.
37	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 21	Victor of Antioch
40	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 22	Anon.
41	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 24	Victor of Antioch
77	XI	Vienna, Nat. Bibl., Theol. 154	Anon.
100	X	Budapest, Univ. Bibl., Cod. Gr. 1	Anon.
129	XII	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 358	Victor of Antioch
137	XI	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 756	Anon.
138	XII	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 757	Anon.
143	XI	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1229	Anon.
146	XII	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Pal. Ms. Gr. 5	Anon.

<sup>113</sup> These manuscripts included:

MSS	Date	Library and Catalogue Reference	Attribution
253	XI	olim: Moscow, Erzbisch. Nikephorus	Anon.
259	XI	Moscow, Hist. Mus., V. 86, S. 44	Anon.

<sup>114</sup> Samuel Markfi, *Codex graecus quatuor Euangeliorum: e Bibliotheca Universitatis Pestinensis / cum interpretatione hungarica* (Pestini: Emich, 1860), 125–201.

MSS	Date	Library and Catalogue Reference	Attribution
186	XI	Florence, Bibl. Laur., VI. 18	Anon.
195	XI	Florence, Bibl. Laur., VI. 34	Anon.
197	XI	Florence, Bibl. Laur., VIII. 14	Anon.
210	XI	Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marc., Gr. Z. 27 (341)	Anon.
222	XIV	Vienna, Nat. Bibl., Theol. Gr. 180	Anon.
299	X	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 177	Anon.
329	XII	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 19	Anon.
353	XII	Milan, Bibl. Ambros., M 93 sup.	Anon.
374	XII	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1445	Anon.
377	XV	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1618	Anon.
391	XI	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Ottob. Gr. 432	Anon.
703	XI	San Marino, Huntington Libr., HM. 1081	Origen
746	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Gr. 611	Anon.
747	1164	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Gr. 612	Anon.
754	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Gr. 1076	Anon.
847	XII	Rome, Bibl. Angel. 36 (B I 5)	Victor of Antioch
861	XVI	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1090	Anon.
885	XV	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Reg. Gr. 5	Anon.
1266	X/XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 206	Anon.
1814	XV	Milan, Bibl. Naz. di Brera, AF.XIV.15	Anon.
2481	XVI	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 2350	Anon.
2482	XIV	Bologna, Bibl. A 3	Anon.
2579	XVI	Milan, Bibl. Ambros. D 161 u. 466 inf	Anon.
2583	XVII	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 2275	Anon.

By contrast, the second recension accounted for only fifteen manuscripts. These included:

MSS	Date	Library and Catalogue Reference	Attribution
—	XI	Rome, Bibl. Angel. 67 (B I 7)	Victor of Antioch
—	XII	Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marc. I, 34 (1070)	Anon.
—	XII	Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Gr. 99	Victor of Antioch
—	1307	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 206	Victor of Antioch
—	XVIII	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Gr. 94	Anon.
20	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 188	Cyril/Victor
34	X	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 195	Victor of Antioch
39	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23	Victor of Antioch
055	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 201	Victor of Antioch
194	XI	Florence, Bibl. Laur., VI. 33	Victor of Antioch
215	XI	Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marc., Gr. Z. 544 (591)	Cyril of Alexandria
300	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 186	Cyril of Alexandria
301	XI	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 187	Victor of Antioch
373	XV	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1423	Anon.
599	XV	Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marc., Gr. Z. 495 (1048)	Victor of Antioch

Thus the manuscripts of the second recension make up just a quarter of the overall number of manuscripts identified by Reuss. In his analysis, the majority of the manuscripts used by Cramer in compiling his edition belonged to the second recension. Thus, if Matthaei's edition reflected the first recension, Cramer's edition represented the second recension.

Reuss was highly critical of Cramer's work. He argued that it was of poor quality because it succeeded in combining a manuscript of the first recension (Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178) with manuscripts of the second recension. This meant that Cramer's manuscript was characterised by some considerable editorial confusion. However, one of the difficulties with these discussions is that neither Burgon, Devreesse nor Reuss provide an exhaustive list of manuscripts. Even though Reuss is critical of Cramer, he offers no discussion or analysis of Oxford, Bod. Libr., Laud Gr. 33. A careful comparison between Cramer's text and Oxford, Bod. Libr., Laud Gr. 33 suggests that this was the principal text employed by Cramer. His edition provides a surprisingly faithful transcript of the marginalia in this manuscript. Moreover, it is striking that Cramer's editorial confusion, with its repetition of material and its occasional incoherence, becomes most prominent at exactly the point at which the marginalia in Oxford, Bod. Libr., Laud Gr. 33 come to an end. After this point, Cramer was dependent upon Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23, which he supplemented with the aid of Peter Possinus' edition<sup>115</sup> and a transcript of Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178.<sup>116</sup>

Reuss suggested that Possinus' version was marginally better than Cramer's and that this was possibly a better exemplar of the second recension. Like Devreesse, Reuss notes that Possinus had compiled his own *Catena in Marcum* from three different manuscripts.<sup>117</sup> This means that the passages from Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Gr. 99 are clearly delineated and attributed to Victor of Antioch. And yet, although Reuss suggests that Possinus provides a more adequate example of the second recension, it is worth noting that Possinus has drawn on only one of the manuscripts belonging to Reuss'

<sup>115</sup> Peter Possinus, *Catena Graecorum partum in Evangelium secundum Marcum* (Rome: Bibliotheca Barberina, 1673).

<sup>116</sup> See footnote "q" in Cramer's text at the bottom of page 428.

<sup>117</sup> According to CPG 4.236, these included:

MSS	Date	Library and Catalogue Reference	Attribution
304	XII	Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 194	Anon.
—	XII	Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Gr. 99	Victor of Antioch
—	X/XIII	Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1692	Anon.

second recension. His conclusions were based principally on the striking quality of Possinus' transcript of Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Gr. 99. And yet the difficulty is that Reuss' conclusions are informed by a rather partial evaluation of the evidence.<sup>118</sup> He questions the reliability of Cramer's edition but he does not appear to base this judgement on a careful assessment and evaluation of the principal manuscript used by Cramer. Oxford, Bod. Libr., Laud 33 (XI century) and Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Gr. 99 (XII century) clearly diverge at a number of significant points, but Reuss does not provide any clear rationale to demonstrate why the latter is to be preferred.

With regard to the question of authorship, Reuss noted that in the case of the first recension, seven manuscripts<sup>119</sup> were attributed to Victor of Antioch and five to Origen. In the case of the second recension, ten were attributed to Victor of Antioch and three to Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>120</sup> His survey of the manuscripts indicated that Victor of Antioch was both the earliest and the most frequent attribution. Nevertheless, in Reuss' view, the identification of the author was not the way to establish the provenance of the text. Reuss offered a very different explanation for the inconsistencies in the manuscript tradition.

Reuss was struck by the use of sources in the compilation of the *Catena in Marcum*. He argued that the use of one particular source, John Chrysostom's *Homiliae in Matthaeum*, suggested that the compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* may have depended not on an original source but on material from the basic form of the *Catena in Matthaeum*. In his analysis of the *Catena in Matthaeum*, Reuss had identified 4 distinct recensions, which he categorised as Types A–D. Categorising each of the manuscripts under these headings, he noted that copies of the first recension of the *Catena in Marcum* were more likely to appear alongside Type B of the *Catena in Matthaeum*.<sup>121</sup> The second recension of the *Catena in Marcum* appeared alongside Type A of the *Catena in Matthaeum*. However, in categorising the manuscripts in this way, Reuss made a curious discovery. He recognized that about a third of the *Catena in Marcum* was made up of John Chrysostom's *Homiliae in Matthaeum*. And yet this material had been heavily abbreviated and in

---

<sup>118</sup> Undoubtedly, the Second World War appears to have some impact on Reuss' research. He does not appear to have seen the material in the Bodleian Library.

<sup>119</sup> Reuss, *Matthäus, Markus, und Johannes-Katenen: nach den handschriften Quellen*, 134. However, one should note that his list of manuscripts between pages 118–129 only cites six instances.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, 134–135.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 134. I am grateful to Professor John Rogerson for help with the translation of these passages.

some places completely rewritten. When Reuss compared the material in the *Catena in Marcum* with the material in the Type A manuscripts of the *Catena in Matthaeum*, he realized that the compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* had used this secondary source: "When we note that the Chrysostom excerpts from the *Homilies on Matthew* in the original form of our Type A comprise more than a third of the commentary, we can rightly hypothesise that the compiler knew and used this original form."<sup>122</sup> So Reuss concluded that the compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* had not in fact been guided by original sources as previous scholars had been willing to believe. A large proportion of the material used by the compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* consisted of extracts already summarized by the compilers of the *Catena in Matthaeum*.

In summary, Reuss described the origins of the *Catena in Marcum* in the following way. First, a basic form of the *Catena in Marcum* had been compiled using extracts from an earlier *Catena in Matthaeum*. The second recension provides the closest guide to this basic form. Secondly, this basic form was enlarged at a number of subsequent stages. The material from writers like Photius and Severus of Antioch, incorporated in Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 194, or from Ambrose and Augustine in Vatican, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1692, provides some evidence that the manuscript tradition developed in a number of different directions at subsequent stages. Thirdly, while some scribes were expanding the *Catena*, others were abbreviating it. The manuscript tradition also suggests that the basic form of the *Catena in Marcum* was subsequently epitomised and shortened. This accounts for the variants in the first recension.

This summary of five different accounts of the origins of the *Catena in Marcum* perhaps serves to confirm Kannengiesser's observation about the study of *catenae*. There is a bewildering array of different descriptions. Some of the analysis associated with these descriptions is highly questionable. With regard to the question of authorship, Cramer, Burgon and Smith were guided principally by the superscriptions in the manuscripts which they had used. Moreover, they took the words at the beginning of the *Hypothesis* at face value. They assumed that a single compiler had drawn "together the fragmented and scattered sayings of the teachers of the Church and create a concise commentary."<sup>123</sup> They differed in that Cramer suggested that

---

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 140–141.

<sup>123</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 263.9–10.



the compiler was Cyril of Alexandria, Burgon confidently asserted that the compiler was Victor of Antioch, while Smith was rather more hesitant in suggesting that the *Catena in Marcum* had been compiled by Victor of Antioch. Devreesse was similarly diffident in allowing that Victor of Antioch may have been associated with the initial stages of the compilation of the *Catena in Marcum*, but cautiously attributed the *Catena* to “Pseudo-Victor of Antioch.” Devreesse was struck more by the variants in the manuscripts. He was persuaded that the inconsistencies in the manuscript tradition suggested later editorial activity. Reuss complicated the question of later editorial activity further. His careful analysis of a number of different manuscripts suggested that there were two recensions of the *Catena in Marcum*. He also argued that the basic form of the *Catena in Marcum* betrayed evidence of interaction with an early recension of the *Catena in Matthaeum*. Thus the date and provenance of the text could not simply be determined by the question of authorship. Although Smith and Burgon dated the *Catena* in the fifth century, the manuscript tradition suggested a more complex development. Consequently, the question of the date and provenance of the *Catena in Marcum* has become ever more elusive.

#### b. *The Open Book*

In the first volume of his three-volume study of the *catenae* on the psalms, Gilles Dorival provides a helpful introduction, entitled, ‘How to write the history of *catenae*.’<sup>124</sup> Dorival provides a detailed survey of the work of the earliest catenists of Palestine. Beginning with Procopius of Gaza, he traces the development and production of *catenae* through the period of the Arab conquest to the work of later catenists in Constantinople in the eighth and ninth centuries. His work is without doubt one of the most authoritative contemporary guides to the study of *catenae*.

Dorival is alert to the fact that when one studies the manuscript tradition, there are considerable discrepancies and variations between the *catenae* on the psalms. Scholars have attempted to explain these discrepancies and variations by delineating their textual development and the relationships between different manuscripts. He points out that, by convention, there have been five elements in the “traditional methodology” associated with

---

<sup>124</sup> ‘Comment écrire l’histoire des chaînes’, in G. Dorival, *Les chaînes exégétiques grecques sur les Psaumes: contribution à l’étude d’une forme littéraire* Vol. 1, published in *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense* 43 (1986), 1–98.

the study of the history of *catenae* (although he admits that these five elements have not always been adopted by contemporary scholars in an entirely systematic way):

- 1) Critics have identified the different manuscripts containing *catenae* on a particular biblical text.
- 2) They have identified the sources within the *catena*. Some *catenae* may be relatively *simple*, containing two sources. Others may be *complex*, containing multiple sources. The catenists may have reproduced the original sources in pristine condition. At other points, the sources may be abridged, and, in some cases, completely rewritten.
- 3) Given the inconsistencies within the manuscript tradition, critics have sought to establish the 'genealogy' of the *catenae* by attempting to demonstrate the order in which they were compiled. Thus a *complex catena*, with multiple sources, might demonstrate dependence upon a *simple catena*, with only two or three sources.
- 4) They have attempted to date these compilations.
- 5) They have made proposals about the probable provenance of the *catenae*.

One of the significant points about this summary of a "traditional methodology" is that at no point does Dorival suggest that the date and provenance of *catenae* can be determined by establishing the identity of the compiler or the catenist. Thus the central focus of debates that have raged over the previous two centuries regarding the origins of the *Catena in Marcum*, namely the identity of Victor of Antioch, is a question which is largely irrelevant to the study of most *catenae*. That said, when we consider other aspects of the arguments surrounding the origin of the *Catena in Marcum*, we can see a number of elements which would serve to illustrate the methods described by Dorival. First, Burgon, Devreesse and Reuss invested much time and energy in identifying different manuscripts. Inevitably, a comparison reveals that the strikingly varied judgements reached by each of these scholars is largely due to the fact that each had access to a slightly different range of manuscripts. Moreover, each were able to demonstrate that the edition produced by John Cramer differed in a number of significant respects from some of the manuscripts at their disposal. Secondly, Smith, Devreesse and others have attempted to identify the sources within the *Catena in Marcum*. Thirdly, in noting the inconsistencies within the manuscript tradition, Devreesse and Reuss sought to describe the "genealogy" of the *Catena in Marcum*. Their work marked a crucial development in the history of research and methodology. Both recognized that the *Catena in*

*Marcum* was essentially an “open” book. Reuss brought this insight into particular focus in asserting that the manuscript tradition could be described with reference to two different recensions, and in arguing that the “genealogy” of the *Catena in Marcum* was mixed up with the early development of the *Catena in Matthaëum*.

However, with regard to Dorival’s observations about date and provenance, surprisingly little is said by either Devreesse or Reuss. There is some cursory discussion about the association of the *Catena in Marcum* with Victor of Antioch, but the attribution of the *Catena* to Pseudo-Victor of Antioch would appear to offer little guidance about the questions of date and provenance. The element which is lacking in the analysis of both Devreesse and Reuss is any real engagement with the internal evidence of the catena. By contrast, Dorival sought to explain the origins of *catenae* by tracing their development through a number of different stages. He did this not simply by identifying different manuscripts but by engaging in a careful analysis and evaluation of the internal evidence. For instance, the preference for particular writings, the way extracts are selected and edited, the repetition of particular exegetical *topoi*, even the discrepancies between different manuscripts, all tell us something about the genealogy of a *catena*. In other words, Dorival suggests that rather than simply using *catenae* as a farm for sources in order to reconstruct a series of lost commentaries, we also need to attend to the voices from the margins, namely the scribes, compilers and annotators of the extracts and scholia contained there.

Of course, there is a difficulty here. The evidence of the manuscript tradition confirms that the *Catena in Marcum* was an open book. In other words, it was a text that grew and developed over a period of time. This phenomenon was not unusual in the ancient world. Indeed, in the following chapter, I will explore in greater detail the way in which this phenomenon was shaped by the scholastic tradition. But at this stage it is important to emphasise that the inconsistencies of the manuscript tradition demonstrate that the origin and genealogy of the *Catena in Marcum* cannot simply be determined with reference to the question of authorship, nor for that matter with reference to a reconstructed *Urtext*. Over a period of time, a number of different scribes added material, as well as amending, abbreviating and omitting a number of different extracts. The unevenness of the text is confirmed by the synoptic analysis of the manuscript evidence in Figures 2 and 3.

Figure 2

Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23 f. 146  
(This passage is incorporated by Cramer at  
Cat. Marc. 441.32–442.14. It can also be  
found in Possinus pp. 354–355).

Ἐλαττον ἦν φοβερόν ταῖς γυναίξιν, ἤπερ τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις τὸ πρᾶγμα· καὶ παραμένουσιν Μαρία ἢ Μαγδαληνῆ, καὶ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τοῦ Ἰωσὴ μήτηρ, διὸ καὶ Ἰωάννης ἔφη παρεῖναι τῷ σταυρῷ τὴν μητέρα. ἡ δὲ διακονία τῶν γυναικῶν τῶν ἐπομένων τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν χρημάτων ἀναλώματα. ἀναγκαῖα δὲ καὶ κατὰ θεὰν ἢ παραμονὴ τῶν γυναικῶν εἰς τὸ γνῶναι ποῦ τίθεται, ἵνα αὐτῶ ἀπαντήσωσι, καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῖς μαθηταῖς κομίσωσι. τὸ γὰρ γένος τὸ κατακριθὲν, τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ ἀπολαύειν τῆς τῶν ἀγαθῶν θεωρίας προτιμότερον. τὴν δὲ μητέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ὑπονοητέον λέγειν Ματθαῖόν τε καὶ Μάρκον μητέρα Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσὴ, ὡς φησιν ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης. Ἀπολιναρίος δὲ μὴδὲ μνήμην αὐτῆς πεποιηκένα φησὶ Ματθαῖον καὶ Μάρκον· τὴν δὲ Σαλώμην ἴσως ὑπονοητέον λέγειν τὸν Μάρκον τὴν μητέρα τῶν υἰῶν Ζεβεδαίου, ἥσπερ καὶ ὁ Ματθαῖος ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀνωλύμως. τούτων γὰρ ὡς ἐπὶ σεμνοτέρων δι' ἀρετὴν μνημονεῦσαι καλῶς ἐδοκίμασαν.

Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 ff. 103–104  
(This passage is incorporated by Cramer at  
Cat. Marc. 442.16–443.4).

Ἄναγκαῖα καὶ κατὰ Θεὸν ἢ παραμονὴ τῶν γυναικῶν εἰς τὸ γνῶναι ποῦ τίθεται, ἵνα ἀπαντήσωσι, καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν κομίσωσι τοῖς μαθηταῖς· τὸ γὰρ γένος τὸ μάλιστα κατακριθὲν τοῦτο πρῶτον ἀπολαύει τῆς τῶν ἀγαθῶν θεωρίας· οὐχ οὕτω γὰρ φοβερόν ἦν τὸ παραμεῖναι καὶ ταῦτα θεωρῆσαι ταῖς γυναίξιν, ἤπερ τοῖς μαθηταῖς. Παραμένουσι δὲ Μαρία ἢ Μαγδαληνῆ, καὶ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν υἰῶν Ζεβεδαίου. φησὶ γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης παρεῖναι τῷ σταυρῷ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου μητέρα, ἦν τινα Ματθαῖός τε καὶ Μάρκος μητέρα Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσὴ λέγουσι, τινὲς δὲ τῶν ἐξηγητῶν μὴδὲ μνήμην αὐτῆς πεποιηκένα φησὶ Ματθαῖόν τε καὶ Μάρκον, τὴν τε Σαλώμην ὑπονοητέον λέγειν τὴν μητέρα τῶν υἰῶν Ζεβεδαίου, ἥσπερ καὶ ὁ Ματθαῖος ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀνωλύμως· τούτων γὰρ ὡς ἐπισημοτέρων δι' ἀρετὴν ἐμνημόνευσεν. ἡ δὲ διακονία τῶν ἐπομένων γυναικῶν τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν χρημάτων ἀναλώματα ἦν. πολλῶν δὲ οὐσῶν καὶ ἄλλων γυναικῶν, κατ' ἐξοχὴν αὐταὶ ὠνομάσθησαν, αἱ μᾶλλον θεωροῦσαι καὶ διακονοῦσαι καὶ κρείττων (sic) ἀκολουθοῦσαι· ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγαλισμοῦ Μαρία, Μάγδαλα γὰρ μεγαλισμός, καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐπωνύμων τῶν πατριαρχῶν μήτηρ τοῦ πτερνίσαντος τὸν ἀδελφόν, καὶ ἐφ' ᾧ γεννηθέντι λέγει ἡ μήτηρ, “προσθέτω μοι ὁ Θεὸς υἰὸν ἕτερον.” καὶ ἡ τῶν υἰῶν τῆς βροντῆς μήτηρ ὀνομαζομένη Σαλώμη ἐστὶν εἰρημένη.

Figure 3

<p>Burgon's Reconstruction (based largely on Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin. Gr. 20)</p>	<p>Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 f. 105 (This passage is incorporated by Cramer at <i>Cat. Marc.</i> 447.11–18.)</p>	<p>Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 20 f. 219</p>	<p>Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 230 f. 291 (The text is heavily stylised with a cruciform shape in the centre of the column.)</p>
<p>ει δὲ τὸ, “ἀναστάς δὲ πρῶτῳ” μετὰ τὸ ἐπιφερόμενα ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρίας τῆ Μαγδαληνῆς, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς ἐπιφερόμενα, ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίῳ παραπλήριστος ἀντιγράφος οὐ κείνται, ὡς νόθα γὰρ ἐνόμισαν αὐτὰ τινες εἶναι· ἀλλ’ ἡμεῖς ἐξ ἀκριβῶν ἀντιγράφων, ὡς ἐν πλείστοις εὐρόντες αὐτὰ, κατὰ τὸ παλαιστιναῖον εὐαγγέλιον, ὡς ἔχει ἡ ἀλήθεια Μάρκου, συντεθείκαμεν, καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπιφερομένην δεσποτικὴν ἀνάστασιν, μετὰ τὸ “ἐφοβόνητο γάρ”, τούτῳ ἐπιφρομένην ἀνάστασιν, μετὰ τὸ “ἀναστάς δὲ πρῶτῳ σαββάτου” καὶ καθ’ ἕξῃ, μέχρι τοῦ “διὰ τῶν ἐπακολούθουντων σημείων. Ἄμην.”</p>	<p>τὸ δε “ἀναστάς δὲ πρῶτῳ σαββάτου ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρία τῆ Μαγδαληνῆς” καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, ἐπιφερόμενα ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίῳ, παραπλήριστος ἀντιγράφος οὐ [...] ἐνόμισαν αὐτὰ τινες εἶναι. ἡμεῖς δὲ (sic.) ἐξ ἀκριβῶν ἀντιγράφων, ὡς ἐν πλείστοις ἀντιγράφοις εὐαγγέλιον, κατὰ τὸ παλαιστιναῖον εὐαγγέλιον ... καί τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπιφερομένην δεσποτικὴν ἀνάστασιν, μετὰ τὸ “ἐφοβόνητο γάρ.”</p>	<p><i>This MSS finishes at Mark 14.39. It was without doubt Cramer's principal source.</i></p>	

Figure 2 alerts us to some of the divergences between the manuscripts employed by Cramer. A comparison between Cramer, *Catena in Marcum* 441.32–442.14 and Cramer, *Catena in Marcum* 442.16–443.4 presents passages which have been incorporated from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23<sup>125</sup> and Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178. A comparison between these two passages enables us to make the following observations: first, the order of the material is different in both manuscripts. Secondly, Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 also incorporates an extended passage from Origen,<sup>126</sup> which does not appear in Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23. Thirdly, there are a number of variants: *κατὰ Θεόν* in Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 is a clear corruption of *κατὰ θεάν* which makes much more sense in this context. The commentator's purpose is to demonstrate the value of the women as eyewitnesses. The "mother of Joses" is replaced by "the mother of the sons of Zebedee," although this is perhaps a consequence of the fact that some elements have been compressed in Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 178. Finally, the name of the commentator, Apollinaris, has been anonymised in Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 178 so that it reads "some of the interpreters say ...." Given the association of Apollinaris with the Christological heresy of Apollinarianism, the desire to conceal his identity is fairly simple and straightforward to explain. In each case, the comparison with other manuscripts suggests that Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 is more likely to represent the later recension.

The evidence provides a partial vindication of Reuss' hypothesis about the manuscript tradition. Reuss argued that there was a basic form of the *Catena*. This basic form was subsequently amended in two different ways: in some manuscripts, the basic form was subsequently extended, while in others, the basic form was subsequently abbreviated and shortened. The fact that this passage from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 presents an epitomised form of the passage from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23 appears to vindicate this theory. But note that the final lines of this passage from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 have also been extended to incorporate a passage from Origen. This section appears both to extend and to abbreviate the basic form of the *Catena* at the same time. A more satisfying description of the evidence would suggest the following hypothesis: there was a basic form (Reuss' second recension) and an epitome of the basic form (Reuss' first recension).

<sup>125</sup> This was Cramer's default manuscript once Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud Gr. 33 had been exhausted. He described this manuscript as 'P.' (Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, 361).

<sup>126</sup> Origen, *Commentariorum series in evangelium Matthaei* 293.30–294.30.

Both were subject to later additions and amendments. This would suggest a more adequate account of the differences and divergences among the manuscripts.

Figure 3 demonstrates why John Burgon was so confused in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The manuscripts betray a bewildering array of textual variants. The text from Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud Gr. 33 has been lost. The word order in Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 appears to have been corrupted: the reference to *κατὰ τὸ Παλαιστιναῖον Εὐαγγέλιον, ὡς ἔχει ἢ ἀλήθεια Μάρκου* is puzzling and does not really make sense. The lemma is omitted in Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 230 and the final clauses of the sentence have been changed into a doxology. All of this indicates just how fluid the text of the *Catena* can be. Indeed, both Figure 2 and Figure 3 demonstrate the degree to which different compilers have not only anthologised their sources around the narrative of Mark's Gospel, they have also amended the material in a number of ways: they have abbreviated, epitomized, transposed and paraphrased their sources. In some places, they have made amendments which substantially altered the meaning of the original text. Charles Kannengiesser points out that *catenae* often present the following characteristics: they offer conclusions without premises; they extract striking phrases from a commentary or homily which are then separated from the context which defines their meaning; comments are transposed from sometimes radically different contexts, and as a consequence their meaning is modified. Moreover, the compilers of *catenae* often abridged longer extracts so that they could be incorporated within the text.<sup>127</sup> Similar phenomena can be observed in Figures 2 and 3. The literary life of the *Catena in Marcum* was characterised by a process of further amendment, abbreviation and transposition, which followed the compilation of the original material. The fact that the *Catena in Marcum* was an open book is significant for the simple reason that a stemmatic theory of recension depends "for its successful operation ... on the tradition being 'closed'."<sup>128</sup> The fluidity of the manuscript tradition suggests that attempts to establish an original *Urtext* (like Burgon) or to identify two clear recensions (like Reuss) run the risk of oversimplifying the transmission of the *Catena in Marcum*. The positing of an "open" book provides a more satisfying account of the manuscript evidence.

<sup>127</sup> Kannengiesser, ed., *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, 978.

<sup>128</sup> L.D. Reynolds and N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*. Third Edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 211.

c. *The Sources of the Catena in Marcum*

In the *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, Charles Kannengiesser offers the following description of *catenae marginales*:

Borrowed from a limited number of commentaries, literal quotations of ancient Christian writers were linked one to another, with the specific identification of the cited authors. These patristic quotations, placed side by side with the scriptural verses (*lemmata*) quoted in their natural order, were placed either on the left side or in the middle of the pages.<sup>129</sup>

Curiously, the *Catena in Marcum* does not follow these established conventions. While it was the convention to preface an extract within a *catena* by placing the name of the source in the genitive case at the beginning, this happens very rarely within the *Catena in Marcum*. Indeed, where it does occur in Cramer's text, it is sometimes a consequence of later editing.<sup>130</sup> Instead, the *Hypothesis* provides an acknowledgement that the text is made up of material which comes from a range of different sources. At the beginning of the *Catena*, contrasting the lack of exegetical interest in Mark with the extended commentaries on the other canonical gospels, the writer says:

I have determined to draw together the fragmented and scattered sayings of the teachers of the Church and create a concise commentary so that Mark should not appear alone to be neglected among the writings of the New Testament.<sup>131</sup>

Very little indication is given of the sources used by the compiler of the *Catena in Marcum*. Sources are occasionally identified in Cramer's text, although their attestation is rather uneven in the manuscripts themselves. More frequently, extracts merge seamlessly into each other. When a different source is cited in the *catena*, this is indicated by the inclusion of the common editorial phrase ἄλλως δὲ φησὶν<sup>132</sup> or ἄλλος δὲ φησὶν.<sup>133</sup>

There are two points within the *Catena* where clear editorial remarks give the reader some indication that a number of sources are being used. Both passages refer to exegetical questions in the gospel which achieved little consensus among early commentators. The first instance refers to the vexed question of "the end" referred to in Mark 13.7. The catenist notes:

<sup>129</sup> Kannengiesser, ed., *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, 978.

<sup>130</sup> Note *Cat. Marc.* 414.29, where the attribution of an extract to Theodore of Mopsuestia is itself attributed to the edition produced by Possinus in 1673.

<sup>131</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 263.8–11.

<sup>132</sup> This phrase can be found in *Cat. Marc.* 301.5; 316.4; 355.7; 355.25; 392.6; 423.6.

<sup>133</sup> This phrase can be found in *Cat. Marc.* 269.2; 393.32; 414.29; 422.18; 427.28; 433.12; 447.3.



But a number of interpreters have taken these things in different ways. Some understand these things to have been said about the end of the age, while others understand these things to have been said about the destruction of Jerusalem: and of the first opinion are Apollinaris and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and of the second opinion are Titus and John, the bishop of the Royal city of Constantinople, who is among the saints. Therefore since Mark says the disciples asked the question about this when they were on their own, it is necessary also for us in this instance mainly to follow the second opinion.<sup>134</sup>

It is clear that the catenist has consulted the work of Apollinaris of Laodicea, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Titus of Bostra and John Chrysostom.<sup>135</sup> But it is also clear that the catenist offers his own point of view. He chooses to follow Titus and John, although his rationale for doing so is not immediately clear.

The second instance refers to the identity of the woman who anointed Jesus with oil in the house of Simon the leper, which is described in Mark 14.3–9. Early commentators appear to have struggled with the apparent discrepancies between the gospels:

This woman seems to be one and the same according to all the Evangelists: but she was not: although according to the three Evangelists, she seems to me to be one and the same, according to John, she is no longer the same, but another woman, the sister of Lazarus. And John, the bishop of the Royal city of Constantinople, says these things. But again Origen says that, according to Matthew and Mark, it was one woman, who poured out the ointment on his head in the house of Simon the leper: and a different woman, described by Luke—the sinner who pours the oil on his feet in the house of the Pharisee. And Apollinaris and Theodore say that she is one and the same according to all the Evangelists, but John is more precise in handing on the account. But Matthew and Mark and John seem to be talking about the same woman: for they say that it came to pass in ‘Bethany’: and this is a village. But Luke is speaking about a different woman: ‘for behold,’ he says, ‘in the city, there was a woman who was a sinner, and when she discovered that he was staying in the house of the Pharisee’ and so on. (Luke 7.37) And whereas this woman was described as ‘a sinner’ and the event took place ‘in the city,’ the other woman was not described as ‘a sinner’ and the event took place in the village of Bethany.<sup>136</sup>

In this passage, the catenist notes three conflicting points of view. John Chrysostom, Apollinaris of Laodicea and Theodore of Mopsuestia, are struck by the differences between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic

<sup>134</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 408.7–14.

<sup>135</sup> Note that John did not earn the sobriquet ‘Chrysostom’ until the seventh century. The description of John as ‘bishop of the Royal city’ is possibly further evidence of an earlier provenance.

<sup>136</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 417.30–418.17.

Gospels. Chrysostom suggests that John and the Synoptics are describing different women, while Apollinaris and Theodore attempt to reconcile the accounts by suggesting that John is being more precise in providing the name of the woman. The third view is put forward by Origen, who notes not the discrepancies between John and the Synoptics, but the discrepancies between Luke and the other three gospels: Luke describes a “sinner” who pours oil on his feet in the “house of a Pharisee.”<sup>137</sup> The catenist sides with Origen in this debate.

These two passages are extremely significant. In the *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, Charles Kannengiesser suggests that one of the principal characteristics of *catenae* was the fact that these texts were made up simply of patristic quotations: “No additional comments, *glossae*, were introduced by compilers of the *catenae* as the quoted patristic authorities supposedly confirmed and clarified each other’s statements.”<sup>138</sup> And yet these two passages from the *Catena in Marcum* suggest a different story. Not only does the evidence directly contradict Kannengiesser’s observation,<sup>139</sup> but it also demonstrates that the compilers of the *catenae* were aware that some of the exegetical problems within Mark’s text threw up a range of different interpretations among their established authorities. These different points of view do not simply “confirm” and “clarify” each other. The compiler of the *Catena in Marcum* offers a judgement about these differences. He expresses a preference.

These passages also suggest that the catenist referred principally to the writings of Origen, John Chrysostom, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Titus of Bostra. It is significant that these sources are frequently referred to in *catenae* on both Matthew and Luke. Indeed, there are intriguing parallels between material in the *Catena in Marcum* and the *Catena in Matthaeum*: for example, in commenting on Mark 12.28, the *Catena in Marcum* provides an extract from Chrysostom’s *Homiliae in Matthaeum* and a fragment from Apollinaris. Exactly the same passages are quoted in the discussion of the parallel passage in the *Catena in Matthaeum*.<sup>140</sup>

<sup>137</sup> Luke 7.37.

<sup>138</sup> Kannengiesser, ed., *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, 978.

<sup>139</sup> Indeed, one should be cautious about Kannengiesser’s discussion of *catenae* for a number of reasons. Note especially the following comment: “If some books of the OT did not enter the programme of ancient ‘catenists’ it was because appropriate Commentaries or *scholia* were lacking, as was the case of historical books after Esdras, or for Wisdom and Sirach; the same counts for the Gospel of Mark in the NT” (Ibid., 980–981).

<sup>140</sup> *Cat. Matt.* 182.6–183.13.

A more detailed analysis suggests a much wider selection of sources. Using the search engine of the web-based version of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, it has been possible to source over 50% of the material contained within the *Catena in Marcum*. The sources of the *Catena in Marcum* include extracts from the homilies, commentaries and letters of the following writers:<sup>141</sup>

John Chrysostom	34.4 %
Cyril of Alexandria	4.19 %
Apollinaris of Laodicea	3.28 %
Origen	2.88 %
Theodore of Mopsuestia	2.22 %
Titus of Bostra	1.78 %
Eusebius of Caesarea	0.93 %
Theodore of Heraclea	0.39 %
Basil of Caesarea	0.29 %
Gregory of Nyssa	0.10 %
Isidore of Pelusium	0.10 %
Theodoret of Cyrrhus	0.06 %

Most of the material incorporated within the *Catena in Marcum* came originally from commentaries and homilies on the gospels of Matthew and Luke. There is some evidence to suggest that much of that material was already collated in existing *catenae*. But there are three further points which emerge from this analysis. First, none of the material identified is later than Cyril of Alexandria. This means that other than editorial remarks by the catenist himself, the material identified is no later than 444 CE, the year when Cyril died. Secondly, while the *Catena in Marcum* is heavily dependent upon John Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew, the selection of sources in itself does not betray any clear ideological bias on the part of the catenist. While contemporary commentators have often suggested that patristic exegesis can be distinguished in terms of an "Alexandrian" or "Antiochene" provenance, such a simplistic analysis will not do justice to the material contained within the *Catena in Marcum*. Thirdly, the way in which these passages are so easily compared and the fact that quotations from different sources appear at various points to merge seamlessly into each other suggest that the compiler of the *Catena in Marcum* may have adapted and epitomized material from existing *catenae* on Matthew and Luke.

But there are some additional reasons for the confusions and inconsistencies within the *Catena in Marcum*: first, while the evidence suggests that

<sup>141</sup> A detailed analysis of these sources is listed in Appendix 1.

the compiler of the *Catena in Marcum* used earlier commentaries and *catenae* on Matthew, it appears that this material also needed to be adjusted and modified. Secondly, the combination of a number of sources from different writers occasionally generated internal inconsistencies. For example, to illustrate the first point, we need to recognise that many of the comments gleaned from the sources began life as exegetical remarks or homilies on the Gospel of Matthew. The compilers of the *Catena* have had to make some careful adjustments to ensure that the comments follow the contours of Mark's narrative, transposing a comment about Matthew which makes a comparison with Mark, so that it becomes a comment about Mark which makes a comparison with Matthew. In other places, there are occasional editorial oversights. For instance, in his comments on the passage from Mark 4.34 "secretly he explained everything to his disciples," the catenist incorporates another comment from John Chrysostom,<sup>142</sup> suggesting that "everything" refers to the things "which they sought to learn from him about the parable of the sower and the parable of the tares."<sup>143</sup> While the parable of the sower is recorded in Mark and Matthew, the parable of the tares is only to be found in Matthew.<sup>144</sup> Thus the passage clearly reflects its earlier application to Matthew.

With regard to the second point, and the inconsistencies generated by the use of a variety of different sources, we can see a clear instance of this phenomenon in the comments on the phrase οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ in Mark 3.21. The initial comment suggests that the commentator is struck by the ambiguity of these words, an ambiguity made perhaps more apparent if the words are translated quite literally as "those from beside him":

'And when they heard, those from beside him went out to restrain him, for they were saying that he had gone out of his mind.' (Mark 3.21) Who heard, or from where they went out, he has not described clearly. Therefore, believing that the Evangelist is speaking about the Pharisees and the Scribes, that having heard about him and the crowd around him, being filled by malign influences with Bacchic frenzy in anger, they ran over to restrain him .... From this point he goes on to describe them clearly, when he says, "The scribes ..." and so on.<sup>145</sup>

By contrast, in commenting on Mark 3.31–34, the compilers of the *catena* include an extract from Apollinaris, which suggests that this phrase refers not to the Pharisees and the Scribes, but to members of Jesus' own family:

<sup>142</sup> Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 47.1 (TLG 2062.152).

<sup>143</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 311.26–27.

<sup>144</sup> Matthew 13.24–29.

<sup>145</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 297.23–298.2.

Alternatively, it says that his brothers had not yet believed in him, as we learn from John. And that, according to Mark, they tried to detain him since he was out of his mind.<sup>146</sup>

Certainly, Apollinaris' interpretation has governed the consensus about the meaning of this particular phrase, and the discrepancy between these two readings alerts us to the fact that there were phrases and *lacunae* within the text which taxed early commentators. However, it also alerts us to the fact that the extracts selected by the catenist do not always succeed in presenting a consistent point of view. All the evidence suggests that the *Catena in Marcum* was an "open" book.

If this is the case, then there is no earthly reason why we should privilege the earliest possible form of the text. We can offer a range of hypotheses about its genealogy, but we cannot identify a pure and uncorrupted form of the *Catena in Marcum* and say, "This is it." Only a synoptic account would do justice to the complexities of the manuscript tradition. Nevertheless, this survey demonstrates some of the pitfalls and dangers in studying the history of *catenae*. It also raises some uncomfortable questions about the reliability of Cramer's edition of the *Catena in Marcum*. While there are clear weaknesses, a comparison of Cramer's edition with Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud Gr. 33 shows that this manuscript was undoubtedly his principal guide. It follows the text faithfully. When it deviates from this text, it indicates the divergence within the apparatus. Moreover, there is one striking piece of evidence which confirms his reliance on this manuscript. The fact that this manuscript finishes abruptly at Mark 14.39 presented Cramer with a serious problem. He had to supplement Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud Gr. 33 with reference to a number of other sources at this point.<sup>147</sup> Using transcripts of Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 and Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 23, Cramer sought to reconstruct the final two chapters of the *Catena in Marcum*. He was only partially successful. The fact that the quality of the editing deteriorates towards the end of the *Catena* also enables us to see why Cramer's poor editing was such a source of frustration to Burgon. The evidence suggests that Cramer does present a fairly reliable guide to the contents of Oxford,

<sup>146</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 301.5–7.

<sup>147</sup> As I noted earlier, it is striking that most of the repetitions and editorial inconsistencies within Cramer's edition occur after Mark 14.39. Note the number of repetitions in the comments on Mark 15.1–43: *Cat. Marc.* 434.10–13 repeats 434.5–7, 435.3–4–16 repeats 434.22–32, 436.25–29 repeats 436.5–10, 437.1–3 repeats 436.18–20, 440.19–22 repeats 440.9–12, 441.12–15 repeats 440.25–29, 441.16–19 repeats 440.29–32, 442.18–19 repeats 442.7–8, 442.19–23 repeats 441.32–442.3, 442.23–28 repeats 442.11–14, and 442.28–39 repeats 442.3–4.

Bodl. Libr., Laud Gr. 33. It might be more apt to treat Cramer's edition of the *Catena in Marcum* not as an 'Old Master' lovingly restored but simply as a 'snapshot' of a particular stage in the development of the *Catena in Marcum*. Even so, it is important to concede that there are a few blurred edges. In particular, the material after Mark 14.39 in Cramer's edition should be viewed with caution.

#### d. *Date and Provenance*

Inevitably, given the vagaries of textual transmission and the development of an "open" book, some caution needs to be exercised in making judgements about the date and provenance of the *Catena in Marcum*. While the association with Victor of Antioch tells us little about the origin and genealogy of the *Catena in Marcum*, the internal evidence, particularly the Christological perspective and its pronounced anti-Nestorian tone, provides some evidence to substantiate the hypothesis that the compilation of this text began in the early part of the sixth century.

The transition from the fifth to the sixth centuries was characterised by considerable ecclesiastical instability. Although the issues brought to a head by the conflict between Cyril and Nestorius appeared to Christians in the West to have been resolved by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 CE, the Church in the East continued to be overwhelmed by controversy. The conflict rumbled on until the Emperor Zeno's publication of the *Henoticon* or *Act of Unity* in 482 CE. This document sought to resolve the disputes between Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Christians by reinstating elements of Cyril of Alexandria's teaching which had been overlooked by Chalcedon and avoiding elements of Chalcedonian vocabulary that were problematic to anti-Chalcedonian Christians. The *Henoticon* was by no means perfect but it did at least achieve an uneasy truce in the East which lasted for about 40 years.

The impact of these events can be illustrated with particular reference to the succession of the Bishops of Antioch during this period. When the *Henoticon* was promulgated, the bishop of Antioch, a staunch Chalcedonian, was deposed and replaced by the anti-Chalcedonian, Peter the Fuller. He was succeeded by two Chalcedonian bishops who accepted the carefully crafted compromise between Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians articulated in the *Henoticon*. They in turn were succeeded by the leading anti-Chalcedonian, Severus of Antioch. When Justin became the Byzantine emperor in 518 CE, imperial policy changed. At the behest of Justinian

his nephew, Justin imposed a more rigorous Chalcedonian position on the imperial state church. Anti-Chalcedonian bishops in the eastern empire found themselves in a rather exposed position. Severus was deposed and exiled to Egypt. Justin appointed a new Patriarch, but many still chose to recognize Severus. Schism ensued.

This description of the theological restlessness in Antioch during the fifth and sixth centuries helps to illuminate some of the internal evidence of the *Catena in Marcum* itself. In spite of the fact that the *Catena* includes a variety of different sources, the Christology articulated is surprisingly consistent.<sup>148</sup> It follows closely the perspective offered by Cyril of Alexandria. Indeed, his influence is so pronounced that one can understand how Cramer was led to the conclusion that the *Catena in Marcum* was the work of Cyril himself. The *Catena* contains an explicit condemnation of Nestorius' position. Commenting on the Baptism of Christ and Mark's description of the voice from heaven which says, "You are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased," the commentator says "If 'one is in the other' according to the words of Nestorius, one would have to say, 'In you is my son the beloved in whom I am well pleased'."<sup>149</sup> This passage is rather revealing. The phrase "one is in the other" is a reference to the 8th Anathema in the Twelve Chapters appended to Cyril's third letter to Nestorius. These Twelve Chapters had not been adopted by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 CE. This had become a major bone of contention among members of the anti-Chalcedonian party. Thus its inclusion in the *Catena in Marcum* suggests either the influence of the anti-Chalcedonian party or of Zeno's *Henoticon*.<sup>150</sup> Moreover, just as the *Henoticon* avoided the more controversial technical vocabulary adopted at Chalcedon, the technical vocabulary of Chalcedon is also absent from the *Catena in Marcum*. The internal evidence of the *Catena* is surprisingly consistent with the "doctrinal stasis" articulated in the *Henoticon*. This perspective is reinforced by two additional pieces of evidence: first, the comments on Mark 13.32 bear little awareness or acknowledgement of the Agnoetic Controversy which emerged later in the sixth century; secondly, the inclusion of extended extracts from Theodore of Mopsuestia also suggests that the material began to be compiled at some

<sup>148</sup> Chapter 6 provides a more detailed analysis of the *Catena's* Christology.

<sup>149</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 272.3–4.

<sup>150</sup> It may possibly reflect the rehabilitation of the Twelve Chapters following the Second Council of Constantinople in 553. However, if this later date were to be convincing, one would also need to explain why the *Catena* does not include material from writers later than Cyril of Alexandria and why it includes material from writers explicitly condemned at that Council.

point before the Second Council of Constantinople in 553 CE. For it was then that the theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia was condemned in no uncertain terms.<sup>151</sup>

While Cramer, Burgon and Smith attempted to fix the date and provenance of the *Catena in Marcum* by establishing the question of authorship, Devreesse and Reuss sought to identify the origins of the *Catena in Marcum* by assessing the genealogy of the manuscript tradition. Curiously, none of these scholars have offered any judgement about the origins of the *Catena in Marcum* by referring to the contents of the text itself. In the following chapters, I will argue that the internal evidence suggests that the compilation of the *Catena in Marcum* began at some point between 490 and 553 CE. We do not know whether Victor of Antioch had a hand in its compilation. The only evidence we have is the fact that he is cited. However, the question of authorship does little to advance our knowledge of the origin and genealogy of the *Catena in Marcum*. The material contained within the *Catena* and the editorial comments within the document suggest that the *Catena* emerged at the beginning of the sixth century. That said, the significant discrepancies in the manuscript tradition underline the fact that the *Catena in Marcum* was an “open” book. The openness and fluidity of the text appears to have been one of the distinctive features of *catenae marginales*. The reasons for this are the subject of the following chapter.

---

<sup>151</sup> Adam Becker notes that the influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia persisted after the Second Council of Constantinople: “At the same time that Theodore’s works and person were condemned at the fifth ecumenical council of 553, they were emulated by writers in Latin, Greek and Syriac; this ‘Theodorism’ illustrates how wide open the intellectual *oikoumene* was in the sixth century, with intellectuals visiting Constantinople and Alexandria from the far west and east” (Adam H. Becker, ‘The Dynamic Reception of Theodore of Mopsuestia in the Sixth Century: Greek, Syriac, and Latin,’ in *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism*, ed. Scott Fitzgerald Johnson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 29). Becker’s analysis depends principally on the argument that Junillus Africanus’ *Instituta Regularia Divinae Legis* betrays evidence of the influence of the School of Nisibis and some dependence on Theodore of Mopsuestia. However, it is important to note that this interpretation is contested, particularly by Michael Maas (Michael Maas, *Exegesis and Empire in the Early Byzantine Mediterranean* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 15–16). Becker argues that Maas was too dependent upon the judgements of Robert Devreesse. He suggests that Junillus Africanus articulates a robust apology for the Chalcedonian position: “For example, the ‘distinct characteristics’ (*inconfusas proprietates*) of the divine and human natures is reminiscent of the Chalcedonian definition and its usage of the adverb ‘distinctly’ (*inconfuse*). Such phrasing was reiterated in 553” (Becker, ‘The Dynamic Reception of Theodore of Mopsuestia in the Sixth Century: Greek, Syriac, and Latin,’ 37). It is not necessary to rehearse all these arguments here, but the absence of this kind of language from the *Catena in Marcum* only serves to underline the thesis that Theodore’s writings are employed sparingly and edited carefully. Moreover, the absence of this kind of language is consistent with a desire to appeal to the Miaphysite party.





## CHAPTER THREE

### COMMENTARY, ANTHOLOGY, AND THE SCHOLASTIC TRADITION

The Greeks of Constantinople held in their lifeless hands the riches of the fathers, without inheriting the spirit which had created and improved that sacred patrimony: In the revolution of ten centuries, not a single discovery was made to exalt the dignity or promote the happiness of mankind. Not a single idea has been added to the speculative systems of antiquity; and a succession of patient disciples became in their turn the dogmatic teachers of the next servile generation. Not a single composition of history, philosophy or literature has been saved from oblivion by the intrinsic beauties of style or sentiment, of original fancy, and even of successful imitation .... The leaders of the Greek church were humbly content to admire and copy the oracles of antiquity, nor did the schools or pulpit produce any rivals of the fame of Athanasius and Chrysostom.<sup>1</sup>

Gibbon was being rather unkind. But beneath the invective there does lie an element of truth. The pattern of teaching and learning within the Byzantine world drew heavily on the interpretation of texts and the appropriation of earlier authorities. But Gibbon conceals the fact that this same pattern of teaching and learning had been firmly established in the course of antiquity. Indeed, the act of interpreting and commenting upon a written text was integral to the whole enterprise of teaching and learning across the Mediterranean world. Moreover, the respect and regard that students showed to the writings of their forebears was matched by their regard for their teachers, whose writings were imbued with an almost canonical authority.<sup>2</sup> Reading

---

<sup>1</sup> Edward Gibbon, *The history of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire*. Third Edition. Vol. 5 (London: Methuen, 1908), 529.

<sup>2</sup> Indeed, while the term *canon* is often used in the field of biblical studies to describe the books which make up the Old and New Testaments of the Christian Bible, the term was used more widely in the ancient world. Although the Greek word *κανών* originally referred to a carpenter's measuring tape or rule, the word was adapted as a metaphor for a rule or standard of excellence in a number of different walks of life. Because these standards of excellence were often set out in the form of a list, the term came to apply by extension to the list itself. In the ancient world, numerous *canons* were produced. The compilation of these lists in ancient literary scholarship is described in Eric G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 100–112. It is worth adding that

and interpreting these writings was not simply about affecting a particular devotion to the writers of the past. To construct a “canon” was to construct an educational curriculum.<sup>3</sup> In other words, the interpretation of texts and the production of commentaries were central to the whole enterprise of learning.<sup>4</sup> The development of the scholastic tradition within the Byzantine world was a direct continuation of patterns of *paideia* which had been firmly established in the ancient world.<sup>5</sup> This means that an emphasis on

---

the notion of a *canon* is not prominent in rabbinic discussion of the books of the Hebrew Bible. While one can recognise a process of canonization, the production of a list of books is more the consequence than the purpose of such a process. For a further exploration of this view, see Philip Davies, ‘How to Get Into the Canon and Stay There. Or: The Philosophy of an Acquisitive Society,’ in *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. P.S. Alexander and J.-D. Kaestli (Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2007). Given that a *canon* eventually became a list, the significance of the insight for Christian theology is explored in William J. Abraham, *Canon and Criterion in Christian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 1–26 and in Harry Y. Gamble, *The New Testament Canon: Its Meaning and Making* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 17–18.

<sup>3</sup> The educational emphasis of a *canon* in the ancient world should not be underestimated. Thus, when George Steiner draws a distinction between ‘syllabus’ and ‘canon’ with reference to contemporary literature, this contradicts the fact that in the ancient world a canon was hardly “a profoundly personal construct” but represented precisely the “cultural, social, pedagogic choices” which he reserves for his definition of a ‘syllabus’ (George Steiner, *Real Presences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 184). For further discussion, see Henri-Irénée Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (New York: New American Library, 1964), 225. Teresa Morgan points out that literary canons varied in the ancient world. She suggests that these variations were often the consequence of assumed cultural status and resistance to social mobility (Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds, Cambridge Classical Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 50–89). Nevertheless, her comments do not alter the fundamental insight that a ‘canon’ was formulated for educational purposes.

<sup>4</sup> As Pierre Hadot suggests, in the ancient world, one of the most pervasive and influential ways of establishing these lists was by demonstrating the antiquity of the writings contained within them: “There was a constant effort to return to the origins of tradition: from Plato to Pythagoras; from Pythagoras to Orpheus. In addition to these revelations, we must also take into consideration the oracles of the gods, proclaimed in various ways in various sanctuaries .... The older a philosophical or religious doctrine was, the more true and venerable it was. Historical tradition was thus the norm for truth; truth and tradition, reason and authority were identified with each other” (Pierre Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, trans. Michael Chase (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), 152–153).

<sup>5</sup> As Robert Robins notes, “[t]he Byzantines took over responsibility for grammatical studies from the Ancient World, and this cannot be overemphasized. How far they developed original ideas and original methods and ideas in the description and teaching of grammar is a matter of controversy” (Robert H. Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), 25). Robins argues that the way in which Byzantine grammarians defended this inheritance and preserved the culture of Antiquity was shaped by a corresponding desire to maintain Constantinople’s claim to be the legitimate continuation of the old Empire.

“commentary” was not unique to Judaism and Christianity. Biblical commentary reflected practices of reading and interpretation which had been widespread in the Hellenistic world and continued throughout the Byzantine period. Many theologians of late antiquity had benefited from a classical education, and in their reading of scripture they employed to the full the skills they had learned in the schoolroom.

In this chapter, I will argue that this scholastic tradition provides the proper context for the emergence of *catenae marginales*. However, it is intriguing to note the echo of Gibbon’s words in many recent evaluations of the emergence of *catenae*. For example, in his study of patristic exegesis, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*, Manlio Simonetti notes that *catenae* emerged at the end of the fifth century CE. He argues that the practice of compiling *catenae* was symptomatic of the intellectual decline of the church during this period.<sup>6</sup> He suggested that there was a corresponding caution about saying anything remotely controversial in the light of the Christological controversies of the fourth century. The climate of intolerance and insecurity wrought by a series of controversies led biblical exegetes to become rather pedestrian in their interpretation of the biblical text. The growing significance of *catenae* during this period was symptomatic of the increasing tendency to refer back to the exegetes of the past, rather than write new commentaries.

Simonetti speaks of a “progressive sterility”<sup>7</sup> which characterised exegetical literature from the fifth and sixth centuries. In his analysis, there were a number of factors which account for this decline: first, he argued that the “progressive emergence of the autochthonous (Coptic) element following the Monophysite controversy was the decisive blow”<sup>8</sup> to the school of Alexandria; and secondly, the accusations levelled at Theodoret of Cyrillus, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus, seriously undermined the proponents of Antiochene exegesis:

Thus, albeit for very different reasons, in the middle of the 5th century Christian learning was seriously in decline both in Alexandria and at Antioch: and

---

<sup>6</sup> Indeed, Simonetti is rather dismissive of some later Christian commentary. Describing the brevity of Theodoret, he says “perhaps this is symptomatic of a certain weariness among the Christian community for exegetical works of large dimensions—a foretaste of that demand for anthologies and easily readable manuals which is characteristic of literary and cultural decline in general.” (Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, 76).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 111.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 110.

the appearance of lesser centres of learning (Edessa, Nisibis and Gaza) could not recover much of this heritage.<sup>9</sup>

Simonetti suggests that the climate of intolerance and insecurity generated by Christological controversies made theologians cautious about engaging in the kind of exegetical activity, pioneered by Origen, Diodore and Theodore: “the prevailing tendency was to refer back to the exegetes of the past.”<sup>10</sup> Indeed, Simonetti’s view is reinforced by Moreschini and Norelli who are even more stinging in their criticism when they say, “the rise of the *catena*, a new literary genre, testifies to the exhaustion of original exegesis. Such works were meant to be as useful as possible to students of the scriptures. But they maximised the deficiencies of the earlier texts, for their ‘commentary’ was nothing but a compilation.”<sup>11</sup> Their common literary characteristic was the fact that they lacked “originality.”<sup>12</sup>

Like Gibbon, these scholars lament the inherent conservatism within this tradition of interpretation. And yet, one wonders whether such judgements are fair. For instance, Simonetti’s judgements about the merit of *catenae* is informed by parallels drawn between *catenae* and the commentaries of Origen and Cyril of Alexandria. In this chapter, I will demonstrate that these judgements are questionable for the following reasons: first, the evidence suggests that the practice of compiling *catenae* was informed by the standard pedagogical techniques of the ancient world. Both the use of marginalia and the compilation of anthologies played their part in the development of the scholastic tradition in the Byzantine world. In other words, the practice of compiling *catenae* reflects the pattern of compiling textbooks. Thus drawing a comparison between one of Cyril of Alexandria’s commentaries and a *catena* would be like drawing a comparison between Karl Barth’s *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*<sup>13</sup> and N.T. Wright’s *Paul for Everyone: Romans*.<sup>14</sup> These volumes are designed for different audiences. Their authors write with different purposes in mind. Secondly, while it is fair to say that the material in *catenae* is largely derivative, these texts amount to much more than the casually washed-up detritus of the past. The selection of sources and the judgements exercised by the compilers betray a range of ideological

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 110–111.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 111.

<sup>11</sup> Claudio Moreschini and Enrico Norelli, ed., *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History*, 2 vols. (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005), 2.709.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968).

<sup>14</sup> N.T. Wright, *Paul for Everyone: Romans*. Volumes 1 and 2 (London: SPCK, 2006).

interests. Michael Maas has argued persuasively that from the beginning of the sixth century, biblical exegesis became increasingly a matter of imperial interest. Explaining why the Quaestor of the Sacred Palace and the senior legal officer of the Emperor Justinian, Junillus Africanus, should take time to write the *Instituta Regularia* or 'Handbook of the Basic Principles of Divine Law,' Maas suggests that:

In the theological hothouse of Justinian's Mediterranean, biblical exegesis carried significant political force. The explication of biblical texts lay at the heart of conciliar debates in which bishops wrangled over points of doctrine. The consequences of differing interpretations of sacred Scripture were enormous because the formation of church doctrine depended upon them.<sup>15</sup>

Maas shares with Manlio Simonetti the sense that the enterprise of biblical interpretation had become more pedestrian during the sixth century in the light of the Christological controversies of late antiquity. Where they differ is that while Simonetti seems to imply that this was a consequence of intellectual indolence, Maas argues that the Emperor Justinian attempted to impose his own limits and constraints on those engaged in the interpretation of sacred Scripture. He achieved this in a number of ways: first, by defining the limits of orthodoxy; secondly, by ensuring that the officials of his court conformed with the emperor's definition of faith; and thirdly, by initiating a number of reforms of the education system and placing restrictions on those who were allowed to teach. The "doctrinal neutrality" characteristic of *catenae* may in fact be a consequence of repeated attempts to establish and impose "orthodoxy" on the imperial state church. Indeed, as Pierre Hadot argues, establishing a "school orthodoxy" was one of the significant effects of a "scholastic tradition."<sup>16</sup>

Our understanding of the emergence of the *Catena in Marcum* will be enormously enriched by these insights. They enable us to understand the way in which the compilers of *catenae* drew on established authorities to interpret the text. More importantly, these insights help to illuminate the rather bewildering development of the manuscript tradition. The numerous "corruptions" within the manuscript tradition are no longer simply the occasion for scholarly frustration or ever more complex hypotheses about their possible development. By placing *catenae* within the scholastic tradition, we begin to see the discrepancies between manuscripts in a new light. The recensions associated with the *Catena in Marcum* and described

<sup>15</sup> Maas, *Exegesis and Empire in the Early Byzantine Mediterranean*, 112.

<sup>16</sup> Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, 149.

in the previous chapter are not simply the consequence of scribal error and incompetence. They are the result of a consistent and coherent approach to teaching and learning that we would recognize in a wide range of academic disciplines in our own day—for example, when an economics student looks for the most authoritative text-book, she will look not for the first edition but for the most recent. By contrast, in the humanities, scholars are sometimes so wedded to the authority of the first edition that we assume that an *Urtext* can be the only authoritative and authentic guide. If such a presupposition is allowed to dominate the study of *catenae*, then ultimately it will prove debilitating. It will ensure that the study of *catenae* will remain “a bewildering task.”<sup>17</sup>

#### a. *Patterns of Paideia in the Byzantine World*

In *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*, Averil Cameron describes the ambiguous relationship between Christians of late antiquity and the prevailing classical culture.<sup>18</sup> Negative judgements about pagan rhetoric and pagan philosophy abound in the writings of the fathers. As Henri-Irénée Marrou notes, in *Quid Athenae Hierosolymis*, Tertullian had written withering attacks on the old culture for its perceived hostility to the Christian gospel, and the number of passages among patristic writers who continue in much the same vein is “embarrassingly large.”<sup>19</sup> In the third century, the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, a document which “for a long time had considerable influence in the East ..., ... says bluntly, ‘Have nothing to do with pagan books,’ and gives some rather surprising grounds for this injunction.”<sup>20</sup> These writings are often presented as evidence of a determination by the Christian Church to make a clear break with the pagan world, and

<sup>17</sup> Kannengiesser, ed., *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, 978.

<sup>18</sup> Note also the studies of Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, H. Gregory Snyder, *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World* (London: Routledge, 2000), Anthony Grafton and Megan Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006). The recent work of Karl Olav Sandnes provides an illuminating discussion of the interaction between Hellenistic patterns of *paideia* and early Christianity. He is particularly critical of the work of Marrou (Karl Olav Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer: School, Pagan Poets and Early Christianity* (London: T & T Clark, 2009), 26–28).

<sup>19</sup> Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 320.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

to suggest that Christians sought to preserve the distinctiveness of the gospel against the corrupting influence of paganism. Indeed, the relationship between 'Athens' and 'Jerusalem,' between 'Classicism' and 'Christianity,' is increasingly problematized in contemporary scholarship.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, while the sources are unanimous in their condemnation of paganism, the evidence suggests that Christians came to enjoy a much more complex relationship with their intellectual and cultural environment. As Cameron remarks, it "remained convenient to be able to decry classical rhetoric even while drawing heavily upon it."<sup>22</sup> In a similar vein, Sara Rappe argues that Christian apologetics in late antiquity demanded that Christian authors should be "concerned to identify themselves as members of an intellectual elite."<sup>23</sup> In spite of Tertullian's protestations, the irony is that his own writings demonstrate his skill in rhetoric and literary composition. Rappe notes that Tertullian "perhaps single handedly created a renaissance in the field of old-fashioned Latin rhetoric."<sup>24</sup> Indeed, such was the influence of Christian teachers and philosophers in the higher echelons of the educational system that, by 362 CE, the Emperor Julian had become so concerned about their presence that he published an amendment to the Theodosian code forbidding them to teach.

Marrou maintained that, in spite of the determination of Christians to break with the pagan world, during the first three centuries of the common

---

<sup>21</sup> The contribution of Guy Stroumsa and his analogy of a 'double helix' to describe the relationship between Christianity and pagan philosophy and education is particularly important (Guy Stroumsa, *Barbarian Philosophy: the Religious revolution of Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999)). Troels Engberg-Pedersen notes the way in which the distinction between religion and philosophy in modern scholarship has skewed the way in which the interaction between Jews, Christians and their Graeco-Roman context is often presented in the field of biblical studies: 'Due to deep prejudices in the Western consciousness concerning a set of intrinsic contrasts between religion and philosophy, religion and humanism, religion and secularism, an endemic tendency (at least at the present time) exists among New Testament scholars to think something like this: Christianity both is and was a religion. Philosophy, humanism, and even secularism have their roots in ancient Greece. Hence, for the elucidation of early Christianity, it is a priori likely that there is most to be gained by bringing in material that is Jewish. Only secondarily and somewhat peripherally may one then consider material that has no explicit connection with Judaism' (Troels Engberg-Pedersen, ed., *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 11).

<sup>22</sup> Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire* (London: University of California Press, 1991), 85.

<sup>23</sup> Sara Rappe, 'The New Math: how to add and to subtract pagan elements in Christian education,' in *Education in Greek and Latin Antiquity*, ed. Yun Lee Too (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 409.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*



era, they made no effort “to develop their own religious type of school as something quite separate from the classical pagan school.”<sup>25</sup> He suggested that this was all the more remarkable, given the fact that a religious education, with the Bible at its centre, was emerging in a highly organised and coherent way throughout the Empire—in the rabbinical schools. He could find little evidence that Christians sought to follow the example of the Jews, who from the time of the Dispersion and particularly after the destruction of the Temple, sought to preserve and sustain their cultural and religious identity through the establishment of schools: “the ‘house of instruction’—*bêt hamidrâsch*—or the ‘house of the book’—*bêt séfer*—existed side by side with the synagogue, the house of prayer—*προσευχή*; together they were the soul of any Jewish community.”<sup>26</sup> In Marrou’s view, one of the principal reasons for this was the fact that the reading of the Christian scriptures did not involve a sacred language. Both the Septuagint and the New Testament

---

<sup>25</sup> Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 316. Marrou’s distinction between ‘church’ and ‘school’ perhaps imposes a very narrow definition of the word ‘school,’ which has in some ways served to skew the evidence. As Gregory Snyder suggests, when the term ‘school’ is used, “[n]o institution should be presumed. A school may be comprised of one teacher and one student. It may perish with its teacher, or it may survive under a successor” (Snyder, *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World*, 8). While it may be true that Christians did not set up their own special schools in the sense that they did not establish major institutions, with buildings and facilities, to provide a comprehensive education, there is extensive evidence of learning and teaching within early Christian communities. The evidence can be found not only in the form of catechesis and homiletic, but also in the widespread production of texts. Snyder demonstrates that the production of books was central to the enterprise of learning and teaching during the first century BCE to the beginning of the third century CE, and the appropriation of texts in the ancient world invariably “involved some type of mediation by a trained specialist” (Snyder, *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World*, 11). Thus a ‘school’ can refer to a large ‘academy’ or a small ‘disciple-circle.’ Its distinguishing feature in the ancient world is the study of texts.

<sup>26</sup> Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 317. While Marrou is surely correct that the establishment of a school was one of the factors which helped to preserve Jewish culture and identity, the institutional framework was perhaps not as solid or as rigid as his description suggests. Indeed, Philip Alexander describes the rabbinic school as “a highly elusive institution” (Philip Alexander, ‘In Search of the Rabbinic Beit Midrash in Late Antiquity,’ (2008)). Catherine Hezser’s detailed study of Jewish literacy in this period suggests that there was little evidence of a formal institutional framework and the most prevalent form of Jewish higher education was “the study with a rabbi and the attendance of the so-called study houses” (Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, ed. Martin Hengel and Peter Schafer, *Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 95). Moreover, Marrou’s words might lead one to assume that the existence of rabbinic schools impeded Jewish interaction with pagans and Christians. Such an assumption would be mistaken, as the research of Nicholas de Lange amply testifies (Nicholas de Lange, *Origen and the Jews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976)).

were available in the *lingua franca* of the Empire, and there was no principle or convention which either insisted that these texts must be read in their original languages or prevented the translation of the Christian scriptures into each and every language. Thus the Christian church did not share the impulse of the synagogue to organise and maintain its own educational infrastructure. According to Marrou, the existence of Christian scriptures in the vernacular meant that Christians did not need to set up their own special schools during the earliest centuries of the Christian Church.<sup>27</sup> Christians continued to enjoy the delights of a classical education. After all, they still needed to teach their children Greek and that was easily done in an established school: “they simply added their own specifically religious kind of training—which ... came from the Church and the family—on to the classical teaching that they received along with their non-Christian fellows in the established schools.”<sup>28</sup> As a result, an enduring connection between ‘Classicism’ and ‘Christianity’ was established.

Arguably the most important figure in the development of biblical interpretation in the early church is Origen (c. 184–254). Partly because of allergic reactions among twentieth century Protestant theologians to his use of allegory,<sup>29</sup> Origen is often credited with contaminating biblical theology with

---

<sup>27</sup> The only exception identified by Marrou, where schools with a distinctively Christian ethos emerged, was where the Church was established in “a barbarian land, i.e. one that had not assimilated classical culture.” Because there was no sacred language to learn, this meant that the Scriptures were translated into every language. This act of translation had a remarkable effect: “in countries which had previously had no written culture, Christianity gave birth to a national culture, a national literature, and above all a national script, all for its own purposes. It was primarily so that he could translate the Bible, the source of Christian life, that Frumentius—or his earliest associates—in the fourth to the fifth centuries raised Ethiopian to the level of a written language. Mesrob is traditionally supposed to have done the same for Armenian and Georgian, Qardutsat of Arran probably for Hunnish, Ulfilas, as we know, for the Germanic, and much later, in the ninth century, Cyril and Methodius for the Slav languages. In each case the education was essentially religious from the very beginning” (Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 317). It is intriguing to note that one of the earliest examples of a dedicated Christian school is the School of Nisibis, established at the beginning of the fourth century and associated with Ephrem the Syrian. The School of Nisibis was located on the edge of the Byzantine Empire on the Syrian border with Persia, and became a major centre of Christian learning (see Adam H. Becker, *Fear of God and the Beginning of Wisdom: The School of Nisibis and the Development of Scholastic Culture in Late Antique Mesopotamia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006)).

<sup>28</sup> Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 317.

<sup>29</sup> For example, see Richard P.C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: a study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1959) and Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*, 29. For a compelling reassessment of these issues, see Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity*, 186–206.

pagan philosophy. And yet the studies of both Mark Edwards<sup>30</sup> and David Dawson<sup>31</sup> have raised a number of questions about the accuracy of this portrayal. In spite of the polemical tone<sup>32</sup> of much of his writing, Edwards challenges the view that Origen was a Platonist. Edwards argues that, at key points, Origen's theological vision is clearly distinguishable from that of Plato.<sup>33</sup> Nevertheless, at the same time, Edwards concedes that Origen was thoroughly immersed in the intellectual culture and arguments of his day:

No one denies that Origen wrote of God, the human person and the world in terms that might have seemed profane to the apostles; but too many have forgotten that the use of a common language is as much the precondition of controversy as of intellectual friendship. Origen must be measured by, not merely assimilated to, the standards of his time.<sup>34</sup>

This description of Origen's relationship with the prevailing culture perhaps adds credence to Marrou's contention that "adopting the classical system of education did not mean accepting the culture it subserved."<sup>35</sup> This is a compelling way of assessing the somewhat ambiguous evidence. In spite of the rhetoric of early Christian theologians, who clearly sought to resist what they perceived as the corrupting influence of paganism, the evidence suggests that they were also heavily immersed in the culture and civilisation of their day. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the fact that Christians continued to receive training in the practices of Hellenistic grammar and rhetoric. These practices in turn came to exert greater influence over the reading and interpretation of scripture. Given the significance of the role played by scripture in the formation of Christian identity, the practices associated specifically with the appropriation of texts in the Hellenistic Schools were of singular importance. Perhaps this provides further evidence of the fact that the relation between the Christian Church and the prevailing culture of the ancient world was "not entirely symmetrical."<sup>36</sup> It is perhaps

---

<sup>30</sup> Mark Edwards, *Origen Against Plato* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

<sup>31</sup> Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity*. Dawson's arguments are considered in more detail in the following chapter.

<sup>32</sup> Maurice Wiles was particularly critical of Edwards' 'confrontational style and voice' in his review of *Origen against Plato* (Maurice Wiles, 'Review: Origen against Plato. By Mark Julian Edwards,' *Journal of Theological Studies* 55, no. 1 (2004): 344).

<sup>33</sup> See particularly Chapter 2 'The God of Origen and the Gods of Plato' in Edwards, *Origen Against Plato*.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>35</sup> Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 320.

<sup>36</sup> As Robert Jenson has suggested, "since the gospel is intrinsically a missionary message, and since Mediterranean antiquity was there before it was invaded by the gospel, Christianity

remarkable that at every level of the education system within the Byzantine world, the study of the classical tradition survived alongside the reading of the biblical corpus. Christian theologians and commentators were not uncritical of this intellectual inheritance—even those like Origen who were suspected of being far too accommodating by their critics.

The evidence used in Marrou's analysis describes two contrasting attitudes towards the relationship between the Christian church and its pagan environment: the first reflects a strategy of *rejection*, while the second is characterised by a process of *accommodation*. Marrou suggests that there was a real tension between these two different attitudes. Indeed, Marrou's description of this tension between *rejection* and *accommodation* can be illustrated with reference to a writer who had mixed views about the benefits of a classical education. In the third book of his treatise *Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae*,<sup>37</sup> which he wrote as a young man, John Chrysostom despaired at the corrupting influence of the prevailing educational system. In his view, this was the single most significant factor in shaping social decline. He proposed that parents should entrust their children to monasteries so that through the instruction and example of monks, they might find true happiness and health. In spite of the fact that Chrysostom himself owed a tremendous debt to the literary training of Libanius,<sup>38</sup> he concluded that a liberal education, and particularly the study of rhetoric, could do more harm than good: "True wisdom and true education consist only in the fear of God."<sup>39</sup> He recommended the monastic schools as institutions which offered an alternative pattern of education.

By the time he came to write *De inani gloria et de educandis liberis*<sup>40</sup> ten years later, Chrysostom had begun to moderate his views. J.N.D. Kelly

---

is the intruder even in the civilisation it co-created. Within the West, it is therefore possible to be a disciple of Socrates and not of the prophets or apostles, though it is not possible to be unaffected by them. So there will be 'philosophers' who are not Christian theologians. But within Western civilization, and so within the theological enterprise located there, it is not possible to be a disciple of the apostles and not a disciple also of Socrates." (Robert W. Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 163).

<sup>37</sup> TLG 2062.003.

<sup>38</sup> Libanius lived between 314 and 393. For a more detailed description of his relationship with Chrysostom, see J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: the Story of John Chrysostom, Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 6–13, Robert L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2004), 5–7, and R. Cribiore, *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

<sup>39</sup> Chrysostom, *Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae* 3.12 (PG 47.368).

<sup>40</sup> Chrysostom, *De inani gloria et de educandis liberis* (A.-M. Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome. Sur la vaine gloire et l'éducation des enfants*, SC 188 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1972)).

describes this treatise as “the earliest surviving manual setting out a comprehensive programme for the moral and spiritual formation of young Christians at home, in addition to the education they received at school.”<sup>41</sup> In this treatise, Chrysostom suggested to parents that “thorough moral and spiritual training calls for at least as much care as having them taught liberal arts at school.”<sup>42</sup> Chrysostom conceded that this was the responsibility of parents in the home, rather than the monk in the hermitage, and so he outlined a detailed programme based on scripture and the exempla of the saints for them to adopt. It is assumed that children would benefit from a classical education, with the proviso that such learning might be complemented by instruction within the home. Chrysostom could not find a way of resolving the tension of living between the church and the world so he advised parents to teach their children simply to live with it.

Inevitably, this meant that Christians were exposed to both pagan and Christian literature in the course of their education. Such exposure provoked comparisons and further reflections. Basil of Caesarea’s *De legendis gentilium libris*<sup>43</sup> suggests that a much more nuanced understanding of the relationship between the Christian religion and classical culture had emerged by the middle of the fourth century CE. While Basil emphasised the superiority of the Christian scriptures over pagan literature, he suggested that the reading of scripture required a spiritual maturity, which was sometimes lacking in those who were young and immature:

Teaching us through divine words, the Holy Scriptures lead us into eternal life. But while our immaturity prevents us from understanding their deep thought, we exercise our spiritual perceptions upon profane writings, which are not altogether different, and in which we perceive the truth as it were in shadows and in mirrors. So we imitate those who perform the exercises of military practice, for they acquire skill in gymnastics and dancing, and then in battle reap the reward of their training. We must believe that the greatest of all battles lies before us ...<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Kelly, *Golden Mouth: the Story of John Chrysostom, Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*, 86.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>43</sup> Basil of Caesarea, *De legendis gentilium libris* (Bouleuger, *Saint Basile. Aux jeunes gens sur la manière de tirer profit des lettres Helléniques* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1935 (repr. 1965): 41–61)) is sometimes referred to as *Ad adulescentes*. There is also an English translation in N.G. Wilson, *Saint Basil on the value of Greek literature* (London: Duckworth, 1975). Rousseau notes that this work is extremely difficult to date, but suggests it reflects a more mature stage in Basil’s writing (Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (London: University of California Press, 1994), 49).

<sup>44</sup> Basil of Caesarea, *De legendis gentilium libris* 2.26–35.

Basil argued that the learning offered by a classical education was a preparation for true wisdom. Students who read pagan literature would be following in the footsteps of Moses who learned the letters of the Egyptians and David who studied Chaldean philosophy.<sup>45</sup> Basil indicated that reading pagan literature offered not only an opportunity to reflect on the “silhouette of virtue”<sup>46</sup> in the writings of pagans, but also to gain two important and basic skills: the ability to read, and the ability to interpret a text. In acquiring such skills, young people would then be prepared to tackle the “divine words” of Holy Scripture. Implicit in these words is the idea that, while the corrupting influence of paganism should be kept at bay, the basic patterns of reading, commentary and exegesis would inevitably inform the interpretation of Holy Scripture.

Marrou observes that “Byzantine education was a direct continuation of classical education.”<sup>47</sup> However, this observation is potentially misleading if we imagine in consequence that patterns of pedagogy remained static and unchanging. Pierre Hadot notes that patterns of pedagogy at the more elite levels of education had changed and become more text-based during the Hellenistic age. There was an increased emphasis on the appropriation and criticism of texts,<sup>48</sup> and this pattern continued during the Byzantine period. Moreover, while access to education remained extremely limited, Robins points out that a consensus has grown in recent years to suggest that “while no writers or teachers at the level of Abelard and Thomas Aquinas are found [in the east], the general level of education was very much higher than in the west.”<sup>49</sup> Even so, this view should not be over-stated. The learning

---

<sup>45</sup> Basil of Caesarea, *De legendis gentilium libris* 3.12–16.

<sup>46</sup> Basil of Caesarea, *De legendis gentilium libris* 10.2–3.

<sup>47</sup> Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 340.

<sup>48</sup> Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, 148–149.

<sup>49</sup> Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*, 125–126. Robins cites the following scholars to substantiate his point: Georgina Buckler, *Anna Comnena: A study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929); Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 340; Steven Runciman, *Byzantine civilisation* (London: Arnold, 1933), Chapter 9; Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 44–78. However, Robins' reference to this debate about access to education in the Byzantine world might benefit from comparison with similar debates about what Pierre Hadot rather controversially describes as a kind of ‘democratization’ which took place during the Hellenistic period (Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, 41). More recent studies would suggest that the use of the term ‘democratization’ needs to be treated with caution. As Teresa Morgan and Raffaella Cribiore demonstrate, education remained the preserve of a social elite within the ancient world. Indeed, as Morgan points out, while access to a ‘core curriculum’ may have increased, the evidence suggests that the “differentiating functions of education” were extended during this

of the basic principles of grammar took place just beyond the elementary level. Anything beyond that remained the preserve of a social elite.

Luc Brisson observes that we have “little knowledge of the lower grades of education”<sup>50</sup> during the Byzantine period. However, the extensive analysis of papyri provided by Raffaella Cribiore and Teresa Morgan means that we now have a much more detailed picture of elementary education during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Several accounts indicate that “Homer remained the main author studied,”<sup>51</sup> and students would invest a significant amount of time in learning the *Iliad* by rote. Marrou notes that “an exercise-book kept by a young Christian schoolboy in fourth-century Egypt ... has nothing to distinguish it from a Hellenistic book six or seven centuries older—the same lists of mythological names, the same maxims and anecdotes (both moral and the opposite).”<sup>52</sup> Cribiore’s study, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, reinforces this insight and provides a considerable amount of evidence from Egyptian papyri and ostraca from the Roman period. Moreover, she notes that the practices reflected in these papyri and ostraca continued up to the early Middle Ages.<sup>53</sup>

Robert Kaster argues that the role of the grammarian was central to the enterprise of teaching and learning in late antiquity. Indeed, the pre-eminence of the grammarian continued throughout the Byzantine period. Robins suggests that “although [Kaster] is mainly concerned with western grammars of Latin, much of what he says ... would be equally applicable to the Byzantine context.”<sup>54</sup> Both Kaster and Robins note that the teaching and learning offered by the grammarian hardly compares with the heady ideals of a liberal education. Their scholarship was often “fragmented,” “pedestrian,” “lacking in imagination,” and over-burdened by a narrow pedantry. The grammarian prized above all things a working knowledge of correct speech and this meant that he focussed on questions of grammar and syntax. The riches of classical literature were often effectively dismembered to provide working examples of individual parts of speech. Likewise, Robins

---

period (see Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, 74–89). Both Morgan and Cribiore’s judgements are informed by the analysis in William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).

<sup>50</sup> Luc Brisson, *How Philosophers Saved Myths: Allegorical Interpretation and Classical Mythology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 108.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 325.

<sup>53</sup> Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, 171.

<sup>54</sup> Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*, 20.

admits that the writings of the grammarians could be “austere and arid,”<sup>55</sup> but insists that they never forgot that they were principally “teachers” who “kept alive the systematic teaching and learning of Greek in their own generations, and in the end provided the teachers and the resources for the teaching of Greek in Renaissance Italy.”<sup>56</sup> And yet, if the grammarian’s profession served to extend and preserve this tradition of learning, Kaster’s study suggests that the role of the grammarian could also serve to limit and restrict social mobility. The grammarian was “fundamentally a man of distinctions” but his art also had social consequences:

Grammar defines and separates: *grammatica dividit*. As a distillation of the grammarian’s expertise the phrase could not be bettered, and the definition applies both to the effects of grammar on the language and to its social consequences, distinguishing the educated man from the masses.<sup>57</sup>

Kaster’s study suggests that education was inextricably bound up with economic status. Of the relatively select few who would have advanced to secondary education and benefited from the guidance of a grammarian, only a tiny elite would have then had access to the teaching of rhetoric. A more substantial number would have had access to some basic elementary instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic.<sup>58</sup> The study of literature preceded the study of other disciplines such as rhetoric, philosophy and medicine, but it remained very much the preserve of the children of the elite.<sup>59</sup> Exposure to the rules of grammar was marginally more widespread. Moreover, Robins’ research demonstrates that the *scholia*, which developed around grammatical textbooks, offer an important perspective on the patterns of *paideia* in the Byzantine World. He shows that commentary played an important and significant pedagogical function. If the grammarian was a “guardian of grammar” then the commentary was the principal vehicle by which the grammarian secured his legacy and preserved the oracles of antiquity.

---

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> Robert A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (London: University of California Press, 1988), 19.

<sup>58</sup> For a discussion of levels of literacy in late antiquity, see Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 36–47.

<sup>59</sup> The studies of social scientists and educationalists such as Pierre Bourdieu and Paolo Freire have made modern scholars much more alert to the ways in which education can be used by governing elites as a means of social conservation (Paolo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. Myra Bergman Ramos (London: Penguin, 1970), and Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*, trans. Richard Nice (London: SAGE, 1977)).



In spite of the anxieties about pagan influence articulated by early Christian writers, the compilation of commentaries, which were employed in the study of literature and other disciplines, presents a number of striking parallels with the development of biblical commentary and the emergence of *catenae*. According to Pierre Hadot, commentary played a central role in the transmission of a scholastic tradition.<sup>60</sup> This phenomenon can be observed in the ancient commentators on Aristotle, as well as the medical commentaries associated with Apollonius and Galen. Richard Sorabji points out that ancient commentary on Aristotle did not simply involve the slavish repetition of earlier authorities. It was often accompanied by a surprising degree of flexibility and innovation. Although the commentaries of the Neoplatonist and Aristotelian schools often contain fragments of Aristotle's writing, which have since been lost, the commentaries are worth studying themselves because they demonstrate how Aristotle's thought was "transformed"<sup>61</sup> in subsequent generations. An awareness of the significance of these commentaries is essential for any adequate account of the history of philosophy, simply because, the writing of commentaries "was one of the ways of doing philosophy."<sup>62</sup> Indeed, "without knowledge of the commentaries, we cannot understand the Aristotle of the later Middle Ages."<sup>63</sup>

Similarly, medical commentaries betrayed an enormous debt to the legacy of Hippocrates. But this is not to suggest that these commentaries were motivated by a quaint historical interest. The disciples of Hippocrates do not simply advocate the repetition of his medical practices (nor would we expect the doctors and medics of today, however much they may be guided and inspired by the "Hippocratic oath"). The text of Hippocrates was part of a "living tradition,"<sup>64</sup> which was worthy of respect but which was not beyond criticism:

Galen's writings are full of energetic and acrimonious debates with the teaching tradition .... The discussion is not about whether one should read Hippocrates, but how. Galen's writings illustrate richly the complex relationships between medical practice and tradition .... The interpretative tradition has to be accorded a reasonable amount of respect: Galen can be defensive about his

---

<sup>60</sup> Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, 148–153.

<sup>61</sup> Richard Sorabji, ed., *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence* (London: Duckworth, 1990), 24.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>64</sup> Loveday Alexander, 'Canon and Exegesis in the Medical Schools of Antiquity,' in *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. J.-D. Kaestli and P.S. Alexander (Lausanne: Edition du Zebre, 2006), 10.

frequent failure to cite the interpretations of his predecessors, and he obviously incurred some criticism for his cavalier attitude to the accumulated wisdom of tradition. But equally it is not a body of doctrine to be accepted without question; contentious from its very roots, it is a minefield to be negotiated with critical acumen.<sup>65</sup>

Galen recognized that medical practice in the second century CE had moved on since the time of Hippocrates. His commentaries show a debt to the past but they also display a critical engagement with a living tradition.

This extended account of patterns of *paideia* in the ancient world serves to demonstrate two points: first, it shows that in “the era of the commentator,”<sup>66</sup> teaching and learning primarily involved commentary and exegesis: “... [C]lasses were ... devoted primarily to the reading and exegesis of texts.”<sup>67</sup> This means that commentaries were designed to serve a pedagogical purpose, but at the same time they were characterised by an element of adaptation and change. Secondly, the pattern of education which took shape in the Hellenistic world continued almost unchanged through the Byzantine age. Christian theologians may have been vigorous in expressing their aversion to the corrupting influence of pagan culture, but the evidence suggests that some considerable effort and energy was invested first, in *adopting*, and then, in *adapting*, the classical system of education. Attempts at adaptation, such as the displacement of the stories of Greek mythology by extracts from the scriptures, met with varying degrees of success. However, a range of other practices was simply adopted without much variation. Three conventions of the Hellenistic school room in particular shaped the emergence of *catenae marginales*: the first relates to the use and development of school handbooks; the second relates to the use of *scholia* and *marginalia*; and the third relates to the compilation of anthologies:

#### i. *The Scholastic Handbook and ‘the Open Book’*

Raffaella Cribiore’s description of the teaching of grammar in the ancient world is heavily reliant on the little textbook of Dionysius Thrax.<sup>68</sup> Described by Marrou as “one of the shining lights of the schools in Rhodes,” Dionysius Thrax is reputed to have written a little treatise around 100 BCE, called

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 23–24.

<sup>66</sup> Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, 148.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 150.

<sup>68</sup> Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, 185–215.

the *Technē Grammatikē*. This treatise described ‘The Art of Grammar’ and it codified the principles of grammar under six headings: first, accurate reading; second, explanation of the literary devices; third, the provision of notes on phraseology and subject matter; fourth, the discovery of etymology; fifth, the working out of analogical regularities; and sixth, the critical study of literature.<sup>69</sup> This little treatise encapsulates the basic pedagogic principles of the ancient grammarians. It became one of the basic textbooks. Although the question of its original authorship is contested, from the first century BCE onwards, it was continually revised and furnished with appendices, glosses, and commentaries “not only throughout Roman times but for long into the Byzantine period.”<sup>70</sup> The persistence of this little grammatical handbook in edition after edition is significant—first, because it provides further evidence of the continuity between Hellenistic and Byzantine forms of *paideia*, and secondly, because the amendments and additions to this text demonstrate that school handbooks were, like the textbooks of today, open to a process of revision in the ancient world. The question of its original authorship does not shed much light on its subsequent development. A similar phenomenon can be observed in relation to Libanius’ *Progymnasmata*. As a leading rhetorician, Libanius provided a series of exercises in prose composition for his students. After his death in 393 CE, it appears that a number of additions, which imitated his style, were incorporated within the collection. In his recent translation, Craig Gibson notes that the authenticity of a number of exercises is contested. While some of the additions can be clearly distinguished, others provoke greater uncertainty. Gibson observes that his edition probably includes model exercises from the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries “by Libanius, a student of Libanius (Severus of

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 185.

<sup>70</sup> Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 170. The authenticity of the text attributed to Dionysius Thrax is hotly contested. Criore is inclined to view the body of the *Technē* as a product of late antiquity. (See Criore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, 185). Similarly, Robert Robins notes the doubts about authorship and suggests that we should view “the version we have of the *Technē* as the final and canonical ‘edition’ of an original textbook written by Dionysius which had passed through various alterations in the light of theoretical and technical revisions” (Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*, 43–44). Indeed, he contrasts the fourteen and a half printed papers attributed in Bekker’s 1816 edition to Dionysius with the 326 pages of the writings of the scholiasts on the *Technē* (Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*, 41). However, Nigel Wilson warns against the temptation to over-emphasise the significance of this textbook. There were “other textbooks ... used in addition to Dionysius” (N.G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*. Revised Edition. (London: Duckworth, 2003), 24).

Alexandria), an imitator of Libanius (Pseudo-Nicolaus), and other unknown authors."<sup>71</sup> Intriguingly, Gibson's collection includes not simply the original authenticated writings of Libanius, but also the tradition which they generated.

The textual transmission of these handbooks suggests that they were subject to a process of development. They were effectively "open" books. This phenomenon is not unusual in early manuscripts. In his study of medieval Hebrew texts, Israel Ta-Shma has noted the phenomenon of the "open" book. In reading a medieval text, the effects of additions and amendments can often be confusing and perplexing. At times, the author appears "confusingly hesitant, undecided, sometimes even self-contradictory, with regard to central issues in his work."<sup>72</sup> The reader may yearn for an original text, unadulterated by the additions of subsequent editors, but Ta-Shma suggests that our obsession with discovering an original *Urtext* should itself invite further critical scrutiny. On the basis of "a long and intensive review of the medieval Hebrew book," Ta-Shma suggests that "quite often books were not meant by their authors to serve as final statements, but rather as presentations of an interim state of knowledge or opinion, somewhat like our computerized databases, which are constantly updated and which give the user a summary of the data known at the time of the latest updating."<sup>73</sup> This meant that an author would revise and amend his original text in the light of a renewed understanding of a given topic or greater personal maturity. The need for this flexibility and openness was particularly acute when a text formed part of a recurrent academic curriculum or related to the interpretation of legal (*halakhic*) texts. Ta-Shma suggests that:

A classic type would be Maimonides' *Commentary on the Mishnah*, finished—and made public—at the early age of thirty, and emended regularly throughout the rest of his life, three more-or-less distinct versions actually being published and still in existence.<sup>74</sup>

But Ta-Shma also notes that there is evidence of a different phenomenon, the book which appears to be "open," but which was not intended as such:

---

<sup>71</sup> Craig A. Gibson, *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), xxv. See also Criboire's recent study of Libanius (Raffaella Criboire, *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007)).

<sup>72</sup> Israel M. Ta-Shma, 'The 'Open' Book in Medieval Hebrew Literature: The Problem of Authorized Editions,' *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 75, no. 3 (1993): 17.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*: 21.

“it has actually been ‘opened up’ by its readers, not by the author himself.”<sup>75</sup> Ta-Shma suggests that these changes were often the consequence of philological and critical considerations. These amendments often served an apologetic purpose in the light of criticisms from “literary opponents.” Inevitably, this phenomenon has given rise to a number of questions about the authorship and finality of a given text or work. These questions have been faced in a particularly acute way in the field of textual criticism.<sup>76</sup> However, stimulated in part by recent theories of literature and the acknowledgement of the more active role of the reader in determining the meaning of a text,<sup>77</sup> recent scholarship has begun to take “much more seriously the shifts of meaning introduced into earlier works by later copyists.”<sup>78</sup> The transmission of texts offers some insight into the history of their reception, and those responsible for their transmission are also increasingly recognized as readers and interpreters in their own right. Thus even “the activity of *copying and re-copying* an earlier work creates a record of the activity of *reading and interpreting* that work.”<sup>79</sup> Ta-Shma, Alexander and Samely are describing the transmission of Jewish medieval texts, but their insights might well apply to the scholastic handbooks of the Byzantine era. The evidence of numerous recensions and editions in the transmission of these handbooks suggests that they were effectively “open” books.

## ii. *Literary Scholia and Marginalia*

Procopius of Gaza (c. 460–c. 530) is supposed to have invented a form of literature that bears some resemblance to scholia, namely the catena, a running commentary on a book of the Bible which puts together the opinions of several previous interpreters, normally with verbatim quotations of their arguments. This invention marked a new stage of biblical studies; but whether the

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.: 18.

<sup>76</sup> For example, David Parker is particularly alert to these challenges in relation to the textual criticism of the New Testament when he responds to the familiar objection, “But surely we have more or less what the author wrote: we can tell his style; there may be a few problems of detail, but what of that?”: “The answer is that what is available is not an authorial text, but the product of a more complicated process in which the author’s writings have been preserved but also to some degree changed, for better or for worse, by his readers” (Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*, 184).

<sup>77</sup> The contribution of Umberto Eco and his analysis of ‘The Poetics of the Open Work’ has been particularly influential (Umberto Eco, *The Open Work*, trans. Anna Cancogni (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), 1–21).

<sup>78</sup> Philip S. Alexander and Alexander Samely, ‘Introduction: Artefact and Text,’ *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 75, no. 3 (1993): 6.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.: 7.

catena is to be regarded as a forerunner of classical scholia or as an imitation of them is a question that has not yet been answered.<sup>80</sup>

The question of how and when collections of marginal notes in the form of *scholia* emerged has been the subject of some disagreement.<sup>81</sup> *Scholia* (from the Greek σχολίον ‘comment’) are grammatical, critical or explanatory comments, some of which have been dated as early as the fourth century BCE.<sup>82</sup> Although they are sometimes “regarded as the *disiecta membra* of lost commentaries,”<sup>83</sup> a good number of *scholia* may well have originated as marginal comments rather than as passages embodied in a larger commentary. Whatever their origin, these comments were included to help the reader to understand difficulties or ambiguities within the text. The earliest examples are associated with the interpretation of Homer, who was probably the most widely read author in the ancient world.

Recent scholarship has revised nineteenth and early twentieth century judgements about the value of these *scholia*. With reference to a number of examples, Eric Turner has illustrated how the insights of scholiasts can often illuminate difficulties encountered by contemporary interpreters in reading ancient classical literature.<sup>84</sup> In early Greek papyri, occasional marginal *scholia* were more usually complemented by marginal notation and signs associated with a more extended commentary contained in a parallel volume. Readers were able to navigate the text by reference to *lemmata* but occasionally the marginal signs sufficed. Turner notes that only the “papyri of the Roman and Byzantine age show the gradual progress from separate, though related, text and *hypomnēma* to a single volume with marginal

---

<sup>80</sup> Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 53.

<sup>81</sup> For a description of the contours of this debate, see N.G. Wilson, ‘A Chapter in the History of Scholia,’ *Classical Quarterly* 17, no. 2 (1967).

<sup>82</sup> As Eleanor Dickey points out, the word *scholia* can have different meanings when used by different groups of scholars. The current convention is that “it means ‘commentary or notes written in the margins of a text’ as opposed to ‘hypomnema’, which refers to an ancient self-standing commentary, and to ‘gloss,’ which generally refers to a short definition found between the lines of a literary text” (Eleanor Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 11, footnote 25). She also notes that the term can also refer to short notes on specific passages rather than continuous exegesis. For the sake of clarity, I have used the terms *scholia* and *marginalia*. ‘Scholia’ refers to short notes, regardless of location, while ‘marginalia’ refers to short notes and abbreviated comments written in the margins of a text.

<sup>83</sup> OCD, s.v. ‘Scholia,’ 961. See also the discussion in Robert Devreesse, ‘Chaines Exégétiques Grecques,’ in *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplement*. (1928).

<sup>84</sup> Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*, 99–100.

notes.”<sup>85</sup> He suggests that this development was largely a matter of convenience. Earlier *scholia* tend to be restricted to small jottings “recording a variant observed when the copy was collated with another exemplar, or querying a word, occasionally explaining it.”<sup>86</sup> But in the second century, these notes become more extended, so that “(b)y the sixth century it is possible to point to well-developed systems of marginal annotation to which it would be fair to attach the name ‘scholia’.”<sup>87</sup>

Turner suggests that the introduction of more extended marginalia was a direct consequence of the development of the codex form. Unlike a roll, the columns of writing were more clearly demarcated and the outside margins of a page invited annotation. But as well as these practical considerations, there was also a greater need for commentary to negotiate the widening gulf between the literary conventions of an earlier generation and what Turner describes as “the language of everyday speech.”<sup>88</sup> In this respect, they betrayed a clear pedagogical purpose. Turner argues that many of the early *hypomnēmata* originated in the lecture room. They often developed out of the “lecture notes of the scholar concerned.”<sup>89</sup>

Recent research on the history and emergence of *scholia* suggests that extended *marginalia* emerged in the context of teaching and learning. This is particularly evident in the context of legal instruction.<sup>90</sup> Kathleen McNamee notes that, from the fourth century CE onwards, legal papyri appear with extended margins for the inclusion of commentary and annotations alongside the original text.<sup>91</sup> These papyri, associated with Beirut, the major centre of legal instruction in antiquity, are significant for two reasons: first, their format bears a strong resemblance to that of *catenae*; secondly, their comparatively early date settles an argument about the emergence and development of *scholia*.

---

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 122.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.* Teresa Morgan notes that Homeric Greek would have presented challenges even to native speakers, for whom it “would have been all but a foreign language which would have to be learnt” (Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, 166).

<sup>89</sup> Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*, 113.

<sup>90</sup> For a discussion of the role of commentary in medicine, see Alexander, ‘Canon and Exegesis in the Medical Schools of Antiquity,’ 115–153 and Loveday Alexander, ‘Paul and the Hellenistic Schools: The Evidence of Galen,’ in *Paul in his Hellenistic Context*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 60–83.

<sup>91</sup> For a more detailed discussion of this debate, see Kathleen McNamee, ‘Another Chapter in the History of Scholia,’ *Classical Quarterly* 48, no. (i) (1998), 269–288.

In contradiction to the view put forward by Turner, Günther Zuntz claimed that “*scholia* on ancient Greek literature were a by-product of the literary renaissance of the Byzantine nine and tenth centuries, an innovation of ‘humanistically minded ecclesiastics on the model of the theological *catenae marginales* with which they were familiar’.”<sup>92</sup> For Zuntz, the emergence of collections of extended *scholia* was dependent upon the established use of *catenae*.<sup>93</sup> Kathleen McNamee concurs with Zuntz in suggesting that the practice of including marginal notes and comments, alongside the text, derived from school handbooks,<sup>94</sup> but she challenges his contention that collections of extended *scholia* only emerged in the ninth century.

There are three elements to her argument: first, McNamee points out that literary evidence would suggest an earlier date. She presents a range of evidence which includes the Oxyrhynchus Callimachus.<sup>95</sup> This document dates from either the sixth or seventh centuries and contains extensive marginalia. McNamee also notes Nigel Wilson’s observation of the occurrence of the Latin word *aliter* in Philargyrius’ commentary on Vergil’s *Ecloques*. According to Wilson,<sup>96</sup> this usage, which dates from the fifth century, provides an exact parallel to the use, in Greek *scholia* and *catenae*, of the word ἀλλως. Wilson surmises that Philargyrius did not invent this device, but copied this convention from existing *scholia*. Secondly, McNamee notes the tradition “that claims that *catenae* were invented by Procopius who lived in Gaza in the late fifth and early sixth centuries.”<sup>97</sup> Thirdly, she presents the evidence of *scholia* from the law schools of the Levant, dating from the fourth and fifth centuries. McNamee deduces that the literary and documentary evidence points to the following conclusion: “Cumulatively, the evidence suggests strongly that we should set back by at least four centuries, from the ninth to the fifth, Zuntz’s date for the ‘invention’ of *scholia*.”<sup>98</sup> Obviously,

---

<sup>92</sup> Ibid.: 284. See also Günther Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 272–275.

<sup>93</sup> Intriguingly, he does not appear to advance the argument that the inclusion of extended marginalia was partly a consequence of the increasing popularity of minuscule script during the ninth century.

<sup>94</sup> For a more detailed discussion of this question, see Criboire, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, 142–143.

<sup>95</sup> Callimachus POxy 2258 is an early codex containing the writings of the poet, Callimachus. The codex is remarkable ‘because of the density of its marginalia and its huge format.’ (McNamee, ‘Another Chapter in the History of Scholia,’ 277).

<sup>96</sup> Wilson, ‘A Chapter in the History of Scholia,’ 254.

<sup>97</sup> McNamee, ‘Another Chapter in the History of Scholia,’ 285.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid.



McNamee is not talking about the earlier individual scholia described by Turner, but the more systematic use of marginal annotation which Turner himself dates to the sixth century. The significance of McNamee's research is that she has adduced evidence which places this phenomenon squarely in the fifth century.

More significantly, McNamee notes that many of the comments contained in the margins of these *scholia* are pedagogical in nature. For instance, in the *Scholia Sinaitica*, she remarks on an "oral quality to the text, as if it were the lecture notes of a teacher: the second person addressed to a student is used freely .... The 'learn this,' 'skip that,' and 'important' leave no doubt that these commentaries served an educational purpose."<sup>99</sup> McNamee suggests that the writing, compilation and inclusion of comments in the margins of texts was common practice in the classrooms of the Graeco-Roman world—it was a phenomenon which encompassed ecclesiastical, literary and legal training. Although she speculates that this innovation belonged to the lawyers of Beirut and inspired the compilation of Biblical *catenae* and literary *scholia*, she concedes that it is impossible to come to any certain conclusions. Moreover, it is difficult to make hard and fast distinctions between the worlds of biblical commentary and legal studies during this period. Interaction between these disciplines is confirmed by the fact that the rhetorician Procopius of Gaza, himself a "commentator on scripture and 'inventor' of the *catena*, sent students the relatively short distance from Gaza to study law at Beirut."<sup>100</sup> While McNamee's argument relies on an element of conjecture, the evidence is sufficiently compelling to dismiss Zuntz's contention that extended *scholia* emerged fairly late in the ninth century, and to confirm Turner's observation that they emerged towards the end of the Roman period and the beginning of the Byzantine age. The evidence suggests that the convention of compiling *marginalia* and *scholia* in Byzantine literature was also adopted in the compilation of *catenae*.<sup>101</sup>

### iii. *The Compilation of Anthologies*

The third convention in ancient pedagogical practice, which influenced the development of *catenae*, was the compilation of anthologies. In the *Preface*

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.: 274.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.: 286.

<sup>101</sup> Indeed, a study of the parallels between *catenae* and copies of the *Talmud* suggests that this convention influenced both Christian and Jewish commentators in their compilation of texts.

to his *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius of Caesarea suggests that the compilation of an anthology of scattered records “culled from spiritual meadows”<sup>102</sup> to create an extended history of the Christian church, marked, for him at least, a new departure. Rather than simply providing his own account of the events surrounding the emergence of these communities with their troubled tales of persecution and conflict, Eusebius suggested that he was the first to make extensive use of the testimony of earlier chroniclers. Inevitably, much of what is written presents a rather romanticized view of the period and a rather unseemly adulation of the Emperor Constantine. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the writings of Eusebius provide a remarkably intense bricolage of different sources and records from the first centuries of the Christian Church.

Arnaldo Momigliano has suggested that Eusebius’ emphasis on documentary evidence served to transform the practice of historiography as it emerged in the Graeco-Roman world. Indeed, Eusebius’ approach to historiography is the subject of considerable debate.<sup>103</sup> However, his contribution should not be overstated. Eusebius’ distinctive contribution lies not in compiling an anthology but in using this technique in the service of historiography. There is extensive evidence that the practice of compiling an anthology had a much earlier provenance. The practice is well-attested in the ancient world. In his *Laws*, Plato describes what appears to be a common convention in the Hellenistic schools, when he says:

There are others who compile select summaries of all the poets, and piece together whole passages, telling us that a boy must commit these to memory and learn them off by heart if we are to have him turn out good and wise as a result of a wide and varied range of instruction.<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 1.1.3–4 (G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 1. SC 31. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952), 4).

<sup>103</sup> Arnaldo Momigliano, ‘Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.’, in Arnaldo Momigliano, ed., *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), 79–99. Momigliano perhaps overstates the case (after all, our perspective is inevitably shaped by the limited range of sources at our disposal). However, he is right to note that this emphasis is a general characteristic of Eusebius’ writing. Eusebius’ capacity to collate different sources and quote from different authors becomes, in the words of Aryeh Kofsky, “a systematic structural technique, which he applies with unprecedented skill” (Aryeh Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea against the Pagans* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 81). Referring to the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Kofsky points out that “statistically, quotations account for approximately 71 percent of the work, so that only about 29 percent is actually written by Eusebius” (Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea against the Pagans*, 81).

<sup>104</sup> Plato, *Leg.* 811A (R.G. Bury, *Plato, Laws*, vol. 1, *Loeb Classical Library* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926), 76–77).

Documents discovered at Qumran, as well as a number of early Christian texts, give strength to the argument that the business of compiling anthologies, particularly of citations from the Hebrew Bible, was already widespread by the time of Eusebius.<sup>105</sup>

Both Manlio Simonetti<sup>106</sup> and Frances Young<sup>107</sup> have argued that the development of Christian commentary in antiquity was heavily influenced by Greek conventions of literary and philosophical exegesis. And yet, given that training in rhetoric was only available to a tiny elite within the ancient world, it is sometimes difficult to assess just how pervasive these conventions were. Teresa Morgan suggests that the anthology was a genre which transcended the literature of high and popular culture. Although commentators developed large multi-volume anthologies of Greek poetry, there is considerable evidence that anthologies of ‘gobbets’ were used by grammarians in the scholastic tradition. Many of these handbooks were geared towards instruction in the school-room. Students were given a number of poetic epigrams, maxims and quotations, which provided exemplars of good literary style or grammatical construction. They were expected to learn them by rote. Teresa Morgan notes that “an enormous number of manuscripts of gnomic sayings and manuscripts survive to us. They were copied and circulated throughout the Greek speaking world up to the end of the Byzantine period.”<sup>108</sup> Many of them appear to have been written by students. They “display the full range of schoolhands and appear to have been used at every stage of *enkyklios paideia*.”<sup>109</sup> These moralizing statements (*gnomai*) and exemplary stories (*chreiai*) provide enormous insight into the moral landscape of the Greek speaking world.<sup>110</sup> Indeed, there is an allusion to the use of a scholastic anthology, *lit.* “a garland of flowers,” in the following exhortation from Basil of Caesarea:

We shall take ... those passages in which [Greek authors] have praised virtue or condemned vice. As others’ pleasure in flowers is limited to their scent and colour, while bees can extract honey from them too, so it is possible for those

---

<sup>105</sup> For a detailed exposition of this argument, see Snyder, *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World*, 148–151, 209–212.

<sup>106</sup> Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, 4.

<sup>107</sup> Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 169–176.

<sup>108</sup> Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, 122.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>110</sup> Teresa Morgan provides an extended analysis of these sayings and stories in Teresa Morgan, *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 5–190.

who do not read these writings just for their sweetness and charm, to extract from them something useful for the spirit.<sup>111</sup>

But the use of anthologies could be a mixed blessing. Kaster points out that the compilation of anthologies carried with it inherent pedagogical weaknesses:

Far from understanding his culture, the man emerging from the schools of grammar and rhetoric would have no overall view of history, only a memory of disjointed but edifying vignettes; no systematic knowledge of philosophy or of any philosophic school, but a collection of ethical commonplaces; no organic sense even of the language he had so painstakingly acquired, but rules and categories, divided and subdivided, or rare lexical tidbits to display like precious jewels.<sup>112</sup>

The sense of fragmentation that accompanied the compilation of anthologies could sometimes be debilitating. But whatever the value and purpose of these collections may have been, it is clear from the writings of Eusebius and Basil that Christian commentators were familiar with the convention of compiling anthologies. It is also clear from their widespread use that anthologies were an important means of dissemination. That they were used as a means of dissemination should also perhaps alert us to the fact that they also had an ideological purpose. In other words, the compilation of an anthology was a very effective and practical mechanism for promoting a school orthodoxy.

The influence of these three conventions of the Byzantine school room is evident in the emergence of *catenae* in general and the *Catena in Marcum* in particular. The confusion of the manuscript tradition of the *Catena in Marcum* begins to look less bewildering when parallels are drawn with the varied editions of school handbooks. Again, the use of marginalia and

---

<sup>111</sup> Basil of Caesarea, *De legendis gentiliū libris* 4.7. The passage is quoted in Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, 263.

<sup>112</sup> Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, 12. In his classic travel book *Eothen*, Alexander Kinglake offers a similar perspective on the perils of a fragmented, narrow schooling in his lament over his own schooldays: "thin meagre Latin (the same for everybody), with small shreds, and patches of Greek, is thrown like a pauper's pall over all your early lore; instead of sweet knowledge, vile, monkish, doggrell grammars, and graduses, Dictionaries, and Lexicons, and horrible odds and ends of dead languages are given you for your portion, and down you fall, from Roman story to a three inch scrap of 'Scriptores Romani,'—from Greek poetry, down, down to the cold rations of 'Poetae Graeci,' cut up by commentators, and served out by schoolmasters!" (Alexander W. Kinglake, *Eothen*, first published in 1896 (London: Century, 1982), 31).

the systematic compilation of *scholia* is illuminated by comparison with legal *scholia*. Finally, the compilation of *anthologies* appears to have been widespread in teaching and learning in the Byzantine world. While this pedagogical practice had its weaknesses, these *anthologies* were an effective means of dissemination. It is perhaps no accident that there are so many manuscripts of the *Catena in Marcum*. All the evidence confirms that the pedagogical conventions of the Byzantine world exerted considerable influence over the emergence of *catenae*.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> These observations may serve to revise the influential view of Richard Hanson, “The exegesis of the primitive Christian Church was a direct and unselfconscious continuation of the type of exegesis practised by ancient Judaism in its later period” (R.P.C. Hanson, ‘Biblical Exegesis in the early Church,’ in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 412). The emphasis on the distinctiveness of Jewish and Christian forms of interpretation has had a telling influence on recent debate. For example, in *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, Michael Fishbane argues that the resources for rabbinic exegesis of scripture evolved from ‘native ... cultural forms’ (Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 67). Thus rabbinic exegesis was not dependent upon interaction with the world of pagan *paideia*. On the other hand, William Horbury argues that rabbinic methods of interpretation are often derived from Hellenistic rhetoric (William Horbury, ‘Jews and Christians on the Bible: Demarcation and Convergence 325–451 C.E.,’ in *Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon*, ed. J. van Oort and U. Wickert (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992)), a view supported by Philip Alexander (Philip Alexander, ‘Quid Athenis et Hierosolymis? Rabbinic Midrash and Hermeneutics in the Graeco-Roman World,’ in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*, ed. Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990)). For evidence of Jewish interaction with the world of pagan *paideia* during the first century CE, one might look no further than Philo, *De congressu quaerendae eruditionis gratia* (F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo: Volume IV*. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932), 458–552). In this work ‘On Preliminary Studies,’ Philo attests to his own general education in Alexandria in the course of his youth. In allegorizing the relationship between Sarah and Hagar described in Genesis 16.1–6, he describes a general education, ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία, as the necessary preparation for Wisdom and philosophy: “When Abraham failed at first to have a child by Sarah (philosophy), he took the maid Hagar (general studies) in her place” (Peder Borgen, ‘Philo of Alexandria,’ in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 255). For Philo, ‘the handmaiden of wisdom is the culture gained by the primary learning of general studies’ which include ‘grammar, geometry, astronomy, rhetoric, music and all the other branches of intellectual study’ (Philo, *De congressu* 3.9–11). Philo also comments on the relationship between Hagar and ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία in *De cherubim* 1.6 (F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo: Volume II*. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929), 10–11). Maren Niehoff has argued recently that there is some evidence that Philo adapted text-critical methods of Homeric scholarship to the Hebrew Bible (Maren R. Niehoff, ‘Homeric Scholarship and Bible Exegesis in Ancient Alexandria: Evidence from Philo’s ‘Quarrelsome’ Colleagues,’ *Classical Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2007): 166–182 and Maren R. Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)).

b. *Procopius of Gaza and the Scholastic Tradition*

This emphasis on the significance of the scholastic tradition challenges some of the received wisdom about the emergence of *catenae*. During the twentieth century, a number of hypotheses were offered to account for their emergence. For instance, there was some speculation about the striking similarities between *catenae* and copies of the Talmud in terms of the geography of the page.<sup>114</sup> However, in spite of these similarities, there is little evidence to support the argument that the development of *catenae* drew upon rabbinic approaches to scriptural exegesis. For example, in his comparison of rabbinic and patristic commentary on Ecclesiastes, Marc Hirshman notes evidence of interaction between some early rabbinic and Christian sources, but such evidence is absent from the *catenae* of Procopius of Gaza.<sup>115</sup> The absence of a demonstrable degree of dependence between these traditions lends weight to the argument that the compilation of anthologies within these distinctive religious traditions is a reflection of their interaction with common pedagogical and hermeneutical conventions within the ancient world.

In 1936, René Cadiou suggested that the emergence of *catenae*, particularly those on the psalter, developed from the scholarly *marginalia* and *scholia* of Origen and Eusebius preserved in the library at Caesarea. Although he conceded that Origen and Eusebius were in no way the authors of *catenae*, he suggested that the accumulation of so many texts within their library “rendered *catenae* possible” and prepared the way.<sup>116</sup> Indeed, this

---

<sup>114</sup> There is an argument attributed to G. Zuntz by N.G. Wilson that Procopius of Gaza took the Talmud as his model for *catenae* (Wilson, ‘A Chapter in the History of Scholia’). However, in a subsequent issue of the *Classical Quarterly*, Wilson concedes that Zuntz “regarded the Talmud simply as providing an argument from analogy. My own opinion is that the relations between Jewish and Greek literature require further exploration. It may not be very likely that Procopius knew and learned from Jewish literature, but I should not like to see the hypothesis excluded at this stage” (N.G. Wilson, ‘A Chapter in the History of Scholia: A Postscript,’ *Classical Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (1968): 277).

<sup>115</sup> While Hirshman accepts that the *Midrash Rabbah Ecclesiastes* contains resonances with the writings of Gregory of Nyssa and Didymus the Blind, and suggests that Gregory and Didymus demonstrated some awareness of rabbinic exegesis, such resonances are absent from the catena: “Procopius shows no apparent interest in making different avenues of exegesis available to the reader. He is interested in creating a line of exegesis which draws eclectically from various modes without trying to arrive at a disciplined articulation of the exegetical possibilities” (Marc Hirshman, ‘The Greek Fathers and the Aggada on Ecclesiastes: Formats of Exegesis in Late Antiquity,’ *Hebrew Union College Annual* 59 (1988): 155).

<sup>116</sup> René Cadiou, ‘La Bibliothèque de Césarée et la Formation des Chaines,’ *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 16, no. 4 (1936): 483.

observation would in some ways reinforce the observation of Momigliano and Kofsky that Eusebius' accumulation of documentary evidence in the library at Caesarea exercised a major influence over his own literary output and subsequent historiography. The view that the earlier *catenae* on the psalms emerged in Palestine is confirmed by the major study of Gilles Dorival. He argues that the use of *catenae* spread throughout the Levant. Following the Arab Conquest of Palestine, most of the scribal activity travelled north to Byzantium itself, but before then, most of the literary activity around the compilation of *catenae* appears to have been concentrated in and around Palestine.<sup>117</sup>

However, it is not only the library at Caesarea that has caused scholars to locate the compilation of *catenae* in Palestine. The origins of *catenae* are often associated with Procopius of Gaza, who is often credited as the person who invented the genre.<sup>118</sup> Procopius was a teacher of rhetoric who was born in Gaza and studied in Alexandria before returning to his home town where he became one of the central figures in the School of Gaza towards the end of the fifth century.<sup>119</sup> Gaza also provided a stimulating environment for interaction between Christian and pagan forms of *paideia*. Over the years, Gaza had gained a considerable reputation for its literary activity. In the fourth century, its rhetorical school had gained the respect and admiration of Libanius, one of the leading rhetoricians of the day. Having become a teacher of rhetoric at an early age, Procopius eventually became the head of the school and a prominent man of letters. A number of his writings are extant, including 163 of his letters, a panegyric of the emperor Anastasius (who reigned between 491–518 CE), and a couple of standard rhetorical exercises (*προορμησματα*), including a description (*ἔκφρασις*) of two pictures of pagan mythological scenes.<sup>120</sup> Bas ter Haar Romeny has

<sup>117</sup> G. Dorival, *Les chaînes exégétique grecques sur les Psaumes: contribution à l'étude d'une forme littéraire* vol. 43–45, *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense* (Louvain: 1986), 29.

<sup>118</sup> According to Moreschini and Norelli, Procopius of Gaza "lived between 465/475 and 528/538." He produced *catenae* on the Octateuch, the Song of Songs, Proverbs, Qohelet, and Isaiah (Claudio Moreschini and Enrico Norelli, *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell, 2 vols. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005), 2.710) For the classic discussion of the role of Procopius in the creation of *catenae*, see R. Devreesse, 'Chaines exégétiques grecques,' in *Dictionnaire de la Bible* (Paris: 1928).

<sup>119</sup> For a description of the reputation and importance of the School of Gaza, see Glanville Downey, 'The Christian Schools of Palestine: A Chapter in Literary History,' *Harvard Literary Bulletin* 12 (1958): 307–319.

<sup>120</sup> For a description of Procopius' gifts as an art critic and interpreter, see Rina Talgam, 'The *Ekphrasis Eikonos* of Procopius of Gaza: The Depiction of Mythological Themes in

commented on the way in which Procopius appeared to straddle the divide between Christian commitment and classical culture.<sup>121</sup> Indeed, the non-theological writings of Procopius and his successor, Choricius, have caused some confusion. As Bas ter Haar Romeny notes:

The conservative, Atticist position with regard to the language, the genres of literature chosen, and the frequent references to Zeus and other members of the Greek Pantheon in their works all contribute to this confusion—to such an extent that now and then scholars even suggest a conversion at the end of Procopius' life, or even the existence of two completely unrelated individuals, who had the same name.<sup>122</sup>

Haar Romeny notes that Procopius' *Panegyric on the Emperor Anastasius* is full of allusions to figures in classical literature. And yet no one would doubt the Christian commitment of the emperor. Analysis of Procopius' profane works suggests that Christians in Gaza were content to follow a traditional curriculum. There was an innate conservatism about this strongly Hellenized city, and Christians did not want to rock the boat: "Christianity had to be expressed in forms and words people were used to, in order to win their (rather conservative) hearts."<sup>123</sup>

As "a pious Christian,"<sup>124</sup> Procopius also composed a number of theological treatises and exegetical works. Moreschini and Norelli assert that he produced *catenae* on the Octateuch, the Song of Songs, Proverbs, Qohelet, and Isaiah.<sup>125</sup> The ninth century chronicler, Photius, notes that his commentary was remarkable for the fact that the exegete was 'prolific' and 'prolix': "he does not spend time on superfluous and irrelevant digressions but more on recording differences of opinion on the same subject."<sup>126</sup> However, the *Catena on the Octateuch* attributed to Procopius appears in two different recensions. Indeed, there are some curious parallels with some of the difficulties in describing the precise relationship between the two recensions of the *Catena in Marcum* identified by Joseph Reuss.

---

Palestine and Arabia during the Fifth and Sixth Centuries,' in *Christian Gaza in Late Antiquity*, ed. Brouria Bitton-Ashkelony and Aryeh Kofsky (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 216–219.

<sup>121</sup> Bas ter Haar Romeny, 'Procopius of Gaza and his Library,' in *From Rome to Constantinople*, ed. Hagit Amirav & Bas ter Haar Romeny (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 175.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>124</sup> Downey, 'The Christian Schools of Palestine: A Chapter in Literary History,' 310.

<sup>125</sup> Moreschini and Norelli, eds., *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History*, 2.710.

<sup>126</sup> Photius, *Bibliotheca* 206 (Photius, *The Bibliotheca: a selection translated with notes by N.G. Wilson* (London: Duckworth, 1994), 185).



The established scholarly consensus is that Procopius prepared an extended edition of his *catena*, which he then summarised in a second recension or *epitome*.<sup>127</sup> In spite of Photius' assurance that Procopius took care to cite his sources, the citations are completely absent from the *epitome*. Norelli and Moreschini tell us that Procopius' principal sources were the commentaries of Cyril of Alexandria, Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodore of Heraclea, Gregory of Nyssa, Origen, Basil, Evagrius Ponticus, and Nilus of Ancyra.<sup>128</sup> With such a broad range of sources, there has been considerable speculation about the location of this scholarly endeavour. Given the size and scale of Origen's library in Caesarea, scholars since René Cadiou have speculated that the compilers of *catenae* were regular visitors to Caesarea.<sup>129</sup>

In a recent article, Bas ter Haar Romeny has described the way in which the consensus regarding the central role of Procopius in the development of *catenae* has been challenged in recent years. One of the things that puzzled scholars is the fact that there were some significant discrepancies between the *Catena on the Octateuch* attributed to Procopius and the later *Epitome*. It is difficult to reconcile the contents of the *Epitome* with the extracts contained within the *Catena* (some of these discrepancies had been noted in earlier studies by Robert Devreesse).<sup>130</sup> Devreesse argued that the discrepancies could only be explained by positing the hypothesis that there was an earlier *catena* which constituted the common source of the two recensions. Nevertheless, he still regarded Procopius as the "fondateur des chaînes."<sup>131</sup> Gilles Dorival concurred with this view: "there was nothing to cast doubt on Procopius' affirmation concerning his initial project."<sup>132</sup> However, this view has been challenged by Françoise Petit first in her major study of the *Catenae Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum*.<sup>133</sup> and then in a subsequent article published in 1996.<sup>134</sup> Petit argued that the idea that Procopius com-

<sup>127</sup> Procopius, *Epitome or Commentary on the Octateuch* (CPG 7430).

<sup>128</sup> Moreschini and Norelli, eds., *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History*, 2.711.

<sup>129</sup> Cadiou, 'La Bibliothèque de Césarée et la Formation des Chaines,' 483.

<sup>130</sup> Devreesse, 'Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,' 1087–1090.

<sup>131</sup> Devreesse, 'Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,' 1094.

<sup>132</sup> Haar Romeny, 'Procopius of Gaza and his Library,' 181. G. Dorival, *Les chaînes exégétique grecques sur les Psaumes: contribution à l'étude d'une forme littéraire* vol. 43, *Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense* (Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 105–106.

<sup>133</sup> Françoise Petit, *Catenae Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum: 1. Catena Sinaitica* (Leuven: Peeters, 1977), xx–xxi.

<sup>134</sup> Françoise Petit, 'La Chaîne grecque sur la Genèse, miroir de l'exégèse ancienne,' in *Sti-*

pleted an enormous collection of texts which he then précised involved a volume of work and a scale of literary activity which made the suggestion rather unconvincing. Secondly, Petit's research indicated that the extracts attributed to Severus of Antioch within the *Catena* must have been added at a later date. This meant that the sources common to Procopius' *Epitome* and the *Catena* all came from before the middle of the fifth century. Petit argued that the only satisfactory explanation was that Procopius used an original *catena*, which was already in existence. Thus the point that he was making in the introduction to his *epitome* was not that he was creating a new genre, but that he was attempting to find a better way of presenting an existing compilation of extracts.

Haar Romeny finds this explanation of the genealogy of Procopius' *Epitome* compelling, although he concedes that the fact that the later work occasionally includes more extensive quotations from the sources cited in the *Catena* requires some explanation: "Petit's view that Procopius went back to the original sources might not seem very obvious at first sight, but I would argue it is very possible."<sup>135</sup> Like Cadiou, Petit argued that the *Catena* and the subsequent work of Procopius required access to an extensive library and she speculated, like Cadiou, that Caesarea was a likely candidate. Haar Romeny's only deviation from the hypothesis presented by Petit is that he imagines that Procopius may well have used a library in Gaza. Whatever the truth of the matter, both views are speculative. Even so, the speculation is revealing because it shows that one of the principal motivations behind these studies is the desire to determine the origin and source of these works.

Petit's question raises sufficient doubt about the contention that Procopius was the "fondateur de chaînes" that the established scholarly consensus now needs to be revised. However, it may be illuminating to review these arguments in the light of parallel debates about the development of *scholia* and *marginalia*. For instance, although McNamee refers to Procopius of Gaza and his role in the emergence of *catenae*,<sup>136</sup> it is striking that there is no attempt to establish the identity of the 'fondateur' of legal *scholia*. It is sufficient simply to acknowledge that legal *scholia* emerged in the context of a scholastic tradition. This underlines the fact that the attempts to establish the origin of the *Catena in Marcum* by establishing the identity of its author

---

*mulī, Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann.* ed. G. Schöllgen and C. Scholten (Münster: Aschendorff, 1996).

<sup>135</sup> Haar Romeny, 'Procopius of Gaza and his Library,' 182.

<sup>136</sup> McNamee, 'Another Chapter in the History of Scholia,' 285.

are of little consequence. It is sufficient simply to establish the conventions within the scholastic tradition which shaped the emergence of *catenae*.

c. *A 'Progressive Sterility'?*

There is an ideological dimension to the development of a scholastic tradition which is not always immediately apparent. In his study of Procopius of Gaza, Haar Romeny notes that the choice of sources and the comparison between the full commentaries and the fragments chosen offer some insight into “the kind of exegesis Procopius and his predecessors were interested in.”<sup>137</sup> He asserts that Procopius’ choice of ‘Antiochene’ exegetes alongside ‘Alexandrians’ suggests that “the different schools of exegesis were treated equally, and that doctrinal issues played no role.”<sup>138</sup> Indeed, this approach to the selection of sources is common in the study of *catenae*. There is often an assumption of “doctrinal neutrality”<sup>139</sup> in the compilation of these anthologies. Haar Romeny reinforces this view when he makes the following comment:

The catenists and Procopius were mostly interested in the solution of problems and questions posed by the text: they wanted to present an *instrument d'étude* that would serve a grammatical and historical explanation of the text. There is hardly room for the philosophical, spiritual, and doctrinal here. As Petit remarks, on the basis of the *Catena on the Octateuch* one would not suspect that the majority of the exegetes quoted were involved in the Trinitarian and Christological debates of their era. This does not mean that Procopius and the catenists were not interested in doctrine, or against allegorical interpretations by way of principle. We should rather make the connection with Procopius’ profane works: he was a sophist and wrote books that could be used as examples in the classroom.<sup>140</sup>

Haar Romeny suggests that Procopius had little interest in doctrinal questions. Literary and historical interests are more evident and reflect his standing as a ‘sophist’ and a grammarian.

The question of the dogmatic interests of *catenae* has provoked an extraordinary array of different responses. Over a century ago, the German scholar Theodor Zahn argued that the role of a catenist was basically conservative and reactionary. The catenists sought simply to conserve and

---

<sup>137</sup> Haar Romeny, ‘Procopius of Gaza and his Library,’ 189.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>139</sup> A phrase of Dr. Lionel Wickham.

<sup>140</sup> Romeny, ‘Procopius of Gaza and his Library,’ 189.

consolidate Christian orthodoxy by assembling a compendium of authoritative exegesis in the face of a series of heretical threats.<sup>141</sup> The view that biblical interpretation was directly related to the ideological interests of the imperial state church has found recent expression in the work of Michael Maas.<sup>142</sup> Given the way in which doctrinal questions had provoked considerable controversy in the course of the fifth and sixth centuries, it is not surprising that a succession of Emperors began to take a keen interest in the interpretation of scripture. Maas' particular area of interest is the *Instituta regularia* of Junillus Africanus, the principal legal adviser to the Emperor Justinian. But his research suggests that the reason why *catenae* often achieved a kind of "doctrinal neutrality" may not be accidental. Pierre Hadot notes that one of the consequences of the emphasis on textual study within the scholastic tradition was the fact that "the teaching of a school orthodoxy became essential. Freedom of discussion had always existed, but it became much more restricted."<sup>143</sup> Concern with the maintenance of a tradition meant that there was considerable nervousness around any perceived novelty: "Above all, the truth was now conceived as faithfulness to a tradition, which originated in 'authorities'."<sup>144</sup>

These observations perhaps bring us full circle to the original comments of Edward Gibbon, and the associated comments of Simonetti, Moreschini and Norelli. Some of their criticisms are perhaps overstated. While Simonetti suggested that *catenae* were characterised by a "progressive sterility" in terms of biblical exegesis, it appears that they served a more pedagogical function. They were geared more to the dissemination of ideas than original research. But the comparison drawn between anthologies and *catenae* has already alerted us to the idea that *catenae* may share not only a pedagogical function but also an ideological interest. Haar Romeny may be correct in his contention that literary and historical questions were more significant in the exegetical writings of Procopius and other catenists, but in subsequent chapters I will show that alongside literary and historical interests, the *Catena in Marcum* was often shaped by the "dogmatic horizon" of Christological and Trinitarian debates in the life of the church.

---

<sup>141</sup> T. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte der neutestamentliche Kanons und der altkirchliches Literatur* (1893) cited in Hirshman, 'The Greek Fathers and the Aggada on Ecclesiastes: Formats of Exegesis in Late Antiquity,' 152.

<sup>142</sup> Maas, *Exegesis and Empire in the Early Byzantine Mediterranean*.

<sup>143</sup> Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, 149.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*

Gibbon, and to a certain extent Simonetti, express the view that the dead weight of tradition conspired to diminish the “sacred patrimony of the past” and to restrain the intellectual curiosity of future generations of scholars. In the view of Pierre Hadot, the compilation of commentaries served to establish and reinforce a “school orthodoxy.” All the evidence suggests that *catenae* emerged in the context of the scholastic tradition. But that tradition was not always “univocal.” Indeed, the little phrase ἄλλως δὲ φησὶν suggests that the compilers of *catenae* were well aware of the fact that established authorities did not always speak with one voice. There were occasions when the interpretation of a text generated conflict and sometimes lively disagreement. Moreover, as the rather tortuous textual transmission of the manuscripts of the *Catena in Marcum* suggests, its compilers did not simply *conserve* their material, they also *adapted* it.

The idea that the emergence of *catenae* was shaped by the scholastic tradition of the Byzantine world helps to explain a number of issues. First, comparisons with school handbooks explain the vagaries of the manuscript tradition. Secondly, a number of the pedagogical conventions of the Byzantine schoolroom clearly shaped the emergence of *catenae*. Thirdly, this scholastic context demonstrates the way in which the Christian exegesis of scripture continued to be shaped by the pedagogical conventions of antiquity. This observation provides a frame for subsequent exploration of the way in which the conventions of ancient literary criticism and historiography continued to shape biblical interpretation in the Byzantine world. Finally, the suggestion that a *catena* betrays a series of dogmatic interests means that the *Catena in Marcum* may have something to tell us about the way in which early commentators responded to some of the *lacunae* and problems within the text: what were the techniques and methods used by commentators to figure them out? How did they account for the inconsistencies arising from what we would describe as the synoptic problem? How did they make sense of the gospel in the light of the Christological controversies which had dominated earlier centuries? These questions provide the focus for the following chapters.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### LET THE READER UNDERSTAND

The coded reference to the “reader” in Mark 13.14 has fascinated modern commentators. As Vincent Taylor says, “the parenthesis reads more like a dark hint, a clue to Christian eyes but an enigma to others ....”<sup>1</sup> Morna Hooker suggests that this parenthetical comment alerts Mark’s readers “to the fact that his somewhat enigmatic language needs to be decoded.”<sup>2</sup> The words invite close attention not only because they come in a passage which has been the focus of a number of influential hypotheses about the provenance and date of Mark’s gospel, but also because they raise a question about the role and identity of the reader. Adela Yarbro Collins suggests that the reader, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων, “in the phrase ‘Let the reader understand’ is the one who actually reads the text to the audience, rather than the individual member of the audience.”<sup>3</sup> These words in parenthesis suggest that the reader was to interpret and explain these words with care. This in itself is testimony to a pattern of private reading and study which was “most likely rooted in an oral context of teaching and handing on the tradition.”<sup>4</sup> Eugene Boring notes that “the interjected command points out that the meaning of the text is not on the surface, but calls for reflection and insight.”<sup>5</sup> He suggests that the phrase accentuates the apocalyptic language of Chapter 13.<sup>6</sup> That which is to be revealed lies hidden below the surface: “the revelatory dimension is accentuated by including a bit of planned obscurity.”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1952), 511–512.

<sup>2</sup> Morna Hooker, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, ed. Henry Chadwick, *Black’s New Testament Commentaries* (London: A&C Black, 1991), 314.

<sup>3</sup> Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, 598. Collins also notes that she is not persuaded by Ernest Best’s ‘ingenious’ argument that this parenthetical comment drew the reader’s attention to the peculiar grammar of the preceding phrase “standing where he (*sic.*) should not”; see Ernest Best, ‘The Gospel of Mark: Who was the Reader?’ *Irish Biblical Studies* 11 (1989), 124–132.

<sup>4</sup> Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, 598.

<sup>5</sup> M. Eugene Boring, *Mark: A Commentary*, ed. C. Clifton Black and John T. Carroll, *The New Testament Library* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 366–367.

<sup>6</sup> Similarly, William Lane suggests that this parenthetical note underlines the sense that Jesus’ words are uttered “in the context of an eschatological mystery” (Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark*, 467).

<sup>7</sup> Boring, *Mark: A Commentary*, 367.

My purpose here is not to evaluate contemporary debates about Mark's meaning at this point, nor is it to establish the identity the reader, nor is it to describe the horizon, apocalyptic or otherwise, which might have shaped Mark's theological imagination. Instead, I want to focus on the language used by these contemporary commentators to describe this passage: 'hint,' 'enigma,' 'mystery,' 'clue,' and 'obscurity.' While it is possible that this language may be evidence of the influence exercised by Frank Kermode in *A Genesis of Secrecy* on recent commentators,<sup>8</sup> it is also the case that these words would have been instantly familiar to the pioneers of ancient literary criticism. From the third century onwards, biblical scholars like Origen developed a highly sophisticated pattern of exegesis which was informed by the literary criticism of the ancient world. In this chapter, I will argue that the sources used in the *Catena in Marcum* betray evidence of a sustained engagement with the art of the grammarian. Christian commentators of late antiquity were familiar with the 'obscurity' of texts. They employed many of the strategies developed by ancient literary critics in order that they might draw out the density of meaning within the scriptures. Of course, one of these strategies was allegorical interpretation. And yet, it is curious that negative judgements about allegory in modern biblical scholarship have led to the neglect of the way in which Christian commentators of the first five centuries used a whole range of reading methods which would have been familiar in ancient scholarship. From the perspective of modern biblical criticism, allegory smacked of *eisegesis* rather than *exegesis*. Far from helping the reader to understand the original meaning and intention of

---

<sup>8</sup> Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative*. This publication did much to reinvigorate a literary approach in Gospel criticism (or a detailed examination of Kermode's significance, see Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: the Theoretical Challenge*, 109–111). Dennis Nineham contended that Mark presents "the greatest of all literary mysteries" (Dennis Nineham, *St. Mark* (London: SCM, 1969), 439) and this perspective has shaped a good number of research projects over the last forty years. Janice Capel Anderson and Stephen Moore have suggested that Mark has "long been a favourite testing-ground for new methodologies in New Testament studies" on account of its brevity, priority and artistry (Janice Capel Anderson and Stephen D. Moore, *Mark and Method*. Second Edition. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), ix). Writing twenty years ago, William Telford spoke of "a literary explosion ... in the field of Marcan study" (William R. Telford, ed., *The Interpretation of Mark* (London: SPCK, 1985), 1). Indeed, interest in a more literary approach to Marcan studies has given rise to an avalanche of publications, including Ernest Best, *Mark: The Gospel as Story* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1983), James Camery-Hoggatt, *Irony in Mark's Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), Elizabeth Struthers Mallon, *In the Company of Jesus: Characters in Mark's Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), David Rhoads & Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: an Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), Vernon Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

the author, allegory was a painful distraction which enabled people to confirm all their prejudices without really engaging properly with the text. As a result, ancient biblical interpretation was perceived as intellectually dishonest, “irrelevant, arbitrary,”<sup>9</sup> “unethical,”<sup>10</sup> above all as “pre-critical.” However, I will argue that biblical commentary reflected practices of reading and interpretation which were widespread in the Hellenistic world. Many theologians of late antiquity had benefited from a classical education and they employed to the full the skills which they had learned. The evidence of the *Catena in Marcum* demonstrates that early commentators were familiar with the insights of ancient literary criticism. These insights shaped a close grammatical reading of the text. The use of technical grammatical language and syntax, as well as a close and intensive reading of the text, betrays a clear debt to the scholastic tradition. A broader and more sympathetic description of the influence of ancient literary criticism on patristic exegesis will reinforce the observation that, while these interpretations are undoubtedly “pre-modern,” it is somewhat misleading to dismiss them as “pre-critical.” Ancient commentators, like their modern successors, were able to identify the obscurities and ambiguities in the text. Obviously, they may have come to rather different conclusions about their meaning. But this should not lead us to view patristic exegesis simply as “a deficient form”<sup>11</sup> of contemporary biblical criticism. Rather it means that Christian exegetes of late antiquity recognised the importance of engaging with and learning from the established conventions of literary criticism.

#### a. *The Obscurity of Texts*

Early biblical commentators were well aware that there were some obscure and difficult passages within the scriptures. The meaning of biblical texts was not always clear or immediately apparent. They were also aware that such challenges were not unique to the interpretation of Christian texts. Many of the texts which populated the canon of classical literature, particularly those used at a more advanced level in the philosophical schools, could appear to be rather obscure. Indeed, the writings of Homer in particular

<sup>9</sup> Louth, *Discerning the Mystery: An essay on the nature of theology*, 97.

<sup>10</sup> Frances Young, ‘Allegory and the Ethics of Reading,’ in *The Open Text*, ed. Francis Watson (London: SCM Press, 1993), 103.

<sup>11</sup> This phrase belongs to Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*, 31.



were a puzzle to many later interpreters.<sup>12</sup> Granted the importance enjoyed by these texts, and given their capacity to excite within the reader a capacity for virtue, ancient commentators sought to find ways of overcoming this perplexing problem. Indeed, from earliest times, the obscurity of these texts was one of the chief factors in stimulating the rise of commentary, both in oral and written form.<sup>13</sup> According to Pierre Hadot, the discipline of philosophy was conceived in general terms, as the pursuit of wisdom and a life of virtue. Even so, it was essentially an exegetical enterprise:

It is important to realize that, for almost two thousand years—from the mid-fourth century BC to the end of the sixteenth century AD—philosophy was conceived of, above all, as the exegesis of a small number of texts deriving from “authorities”, chief among whom were Plato and Aristotle.<sup>14</sup>

Hadot argues that the whole enterprise of exegetical philosophy was linked to the foundation and continued “existence of philosophical schools, in which the thought, life-style, and writings of a master were religiously preserved.”<sup>15</sup> Thus commentary arose specifically within a pedagogical context.

This phenomenon can be observed clearly in the way in which the writings of Plato and Aristotle were handled in antiquity. Commentary on the writings of Plato was extensive in the ancient world: the commentaries which are extant include “two separate sets of scholia, a lexicon of Platonic words, a large number of Neoplatonic commentaries and some shorter Neoplatonic and Middle Platonic writings.”<sup>16</sup> This tradition of pagan commentary and reflection continued until the closure of Plato’s Academy by the Emperor Justinian in 529 CE. Commentaries on the writings of Aris-

---

<sup>12</sup> For an extended discussion of the challenges of interpreting Homer in late antiquity, see Robert Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989). His description of Porphyry’s response to the ‘enigmatic’ quality of Homer’s writings is particularly helpful (Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*, 108–133).

<sup>13</sup> Dirk Obbink notes that “Exegesis and commentary in the Greek tradition existed in an oral form early on: the rhapsodic performative tradition included the notion of explaining or expounding upon the texts performed.” (Dirk Obbink, ‘Allegory and Exegesis in the Derveni Papyrus: The Origin of Greek Scholarship,’ in *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition*, ed. G.R. Boys-Stones (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 178). Obbink argues that the oldest extant exegetical commentary in the Greek tradition dates from the end of the fifth century BCE, a commentary on an Orphic theogony from Derveni in Thessaloniki.

<sup>14</sup> Pierre Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, ed. Arnold I. Davison, trans. Michael Chase (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 71.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship*, 46–49.

total appear from the first century BCE, and this pattern of commentary writing was firmly established in the Byzantine world. In the perspective of ancient philosophy, the search for truth was indistinguishable from the search for meaning in these authoritative texts: "Truth was contained *within these texts*; it was the property of their authors, as it was also the property of those groups who recognized the authority of these authors, and who were consequently the 'heirs' of this original truth."<sup>17</sup> The pursuit of wisdom was conceived in exegetical terms, and the obscurity of philosophical texts was not simply a problem to be overcome:

On the contrary: their obscurity, it was thought, was only the result of a technique used by a master, who wished to hint at a great many things at once, and therefore enclosed the 'truth' in its formulations. Any potential meaning, as long as it was coherent with what was considered to be the master's doctrine, was consequently held to be true.<sup>18</sup>

It was axiomatic that the authoritative source of a philosophical tradition could not be mistaken, inconsistent or poorly argued. As Robert Lamberton suggests, a "prestigious author" was "incapable of an incoherent or otherwise unacceptable statement." For early commentators, "an offensive surface was a hint that a secondary meaning lurks beyond."<sup>19</sup> Thus the source might well be *enigmatic*: the words *ἀνύγμια* and *ἀνίττομα* had been used from the time of Plato and before "to designate the secondary meanings of texts and myths."<sup>20</sup> The task of the exegete was to explain the sense of the narrative and to elucidate unfamiliar vocabulary, but there was also the opportunity to uncover, within the *hints* and *allusions* of the writer, the truths which were also hidden beneath the surface of the text. The obscurity of these texts only served as the occasion to demonstrate their depth of meaning. The role of the commentator was to be attentive to the mysteries inherent within the text and to tease out their meaning. The text demanded a close and intensive reading, employing all the technical skill at the interpreter's disposal.

Commentators within the *Catena in Marcum* occasionally refer to the obscurity of the text by alerting the reader to the hints and allusions within the text. The term *ἀνύγμια* and its cognates is used on a number of occasions to alert the reader to the deeper meaning contained within the text. This

---

<sup>17</sup> Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 73.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*, 20.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 48.

was not simply a consequence of idle speculation. Hadot spoke of the way in which ancient interpreters assumed that the obscurity of a saying or text pointed to the pedagogical strategy of the teacher. At a number of points within the *Catena in Marcum*, a similar strategy is directly attributed to Jesus.<sup>21</sup> In his discussion of the Parable of the Sower,<sup>22</sup> John Chrysostom says that Jesus “places this parable first because it makes the hearer more attentive. For since he was about to speak mysteriously (ἀνιγμᾶτωδῶς) on account of the scribes and Pharisees being mixed up with the multitude, first through the parable he stimulates the minds of those who are listening; and in addition to this, in order that he might make his discourse more emphatic, he speaks loudly and clearly in parables so that he might fix it more in their memory ....”<sup>23</sup>

A similar emphasis can be found in the exegesis of Mark 7.16: “He who has ears to hear, let him hear.”<sup>24</sup> The commentator notes that Jesus does not say explicitly “what comes out of the heart,” so the disciples thought that the saying hinted (ἀνίττεται) at something else which was more profound, and when he came home from the crowd, “they asked him about the parable.”<sup>25</sup> This emphasis on the mysteriousness of the teaching of Christ is reinforced later in the same chapter when the catenist writes: “He speaks in riddles (ἀνιττόμενος) to those who boast in their knowledge of the Mosaic Law, and who plug their ears so as not to hear the teaching of the Lord.”<sup>26</sup>

But there is also evidence that the enigmatic quality of Mark’s Gospel was not only perceived as a consequence of the pedagogical strategy of Jesus. Early exegetes were also able to identify passages where Mark himself appeared to engage in what Eugene Boring might describe as “a bit of planned obscurity”:<sup>27</sup> for example, in the discussion of the reactions to Jesus and the account of his reputation reaching the ears of Herod Antipas in Mark 6.14–29, the extract from Eusebius addresses the secrecy motif in Mark more directly when he says: “But, when he says that ‘some say that he was a prophet like one of the prophets,’ Mark seems to me to hint (ἀνιττεσθαί)

<sup>21</sup> This strategy is one of the ways in which ancient interpreters made sense of those passages which modern interpreters would associate with ‘the Messianic Secret’ (See Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: a critical study of its progress from Reimarus to Wrede* (London: A & C Black, 1954 [1906]), 328–395).

<sup>22</sup> Mark 4.3–8.

<sup>23</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 302.27–32.

<sup>24</sup> This verse is omitted in NA<sup>27</sup>, UBS and modern translations.

<sup>25</sup> Mark 7.17: *Cat. Marc.* 335.29–30.

<sup>26</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 308.22–23.

<sup>27</sup> Boring, *Mark: A Commentary*, 367.

that they are speaking of the one of whom Moses spoke, 'The Lord your God will raise up a prophet for you like me.' For perhaps they feared to say openly that he was indeed the Christ: and they used the saying of Moses to conceal their assumptions for fear of their leaders."<sup>28</sup>

John Chrysostom, in particular, was alert to some of the more enigmatic qualities of the text. Describing the way in which Jesus was "led up" into the wilderness to be tempted by Satan,<sup>29</sup> he notes that these words hint (ἀνιρτόμενος) "that it is not necessary for those baptized to rush to martyrdom, but when they are dragged to it, they should be courageous."<sup>30</sup> In interpreting the words of Mark 10.31 "Many that are first will be last, and the last first," the commentator suggests that Jesus "seems to me to be hinting (ἀνιρτεσθαί) at the Pharisees."<sup>31</sup> In the Garden of Gethsemane, an obvious *aporia* emerges, given that the disciples could not know what Jesus was praying about if they were all asleep. Chrysostom suggests that the disciples were able to speculate about his prayers from his words to Peter and to them: "All were asleep, and hinting at the things he had expressed in prayer, he rebuked Peter. And in the words which follow, he hints at this. For he says, 'Watch and pray: in order that you may not enter into the time of trial.'"<sup>32</sup> In each case, the commentator betrays a desire to lay bare the obscurities in the text and to clarify its meaning. In commenting on Mark, this often meant suggesting that the enigmatic quality of the text was directly related to the pedagogical intentions of Jesus and, in some cases, the evangelist.

This pattern of exegesis reflects a series of assumptions about the authority of ancient texts which were common in antiquity. While contemporary scholars might characterise the *obscurity* of texts as the unforeseen consequence of reading from the perspective of an alien culture (accommodation) or development within a culture (revision),<sup>33</sup> early commentators believed that the *enigmatic* quality of these writings pointed to the subtlety

<sup>28</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 325.16–20.

<sup>29</sup> Chrysostom is commenting at this point on Matthew 4.1.

<sup>30</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 272.24–25.

<sup>31</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 381.19–20.

<sup>32</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 426.28–29.

<sup>33</sup> For instance, the following studies consider ancient rhetorical techniques in terms of cultural accommodation or revision: Luc Brisson, *How Philosophers Saved Myths: Allegorical Interpretation and Classical Mythology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), John David Dawson, *Allegorical readers and cultural revision in ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), John David Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*.

of the writer's thought. Influential writers and philosophers who hinted at many different things at once only served to present a greater challenge to the interpreter, who sought to discover the whole truth enclosed in their formulations. In this context, allegory and allegorical interpretation emerged as a sympathetic way of exploring, even exploiting, the *enigmatic* quality of ancient texts. Given that Mark 4.1–20 presents an allegorical interpretation of the Parable of the Sower, we should not be surprised that the *Catena in Marcum* is littered with allegorical interpretations of a number of different passages. The *Catena in Marcum* provides a wealth of evidence to suggest that allegory was a vital element of patristic exegesis. The evidence suggests that early Christian commentators engaged in allegorical readings not only to make sense of a number of obscurities in the text, but also because they interpreted the parables of Jesus as allegories. The use of such allegorical readings betrayed a considerable debt to the conventions of ancient literary criticism.

#### i. *Allegorical Reading*

Allegory was and is not a uniform phenomenon. Allegorical reading<sup>34</sup> in Christian exegesis was related directly to established patterns of textual interpretation in the ancient world. This phenomenon can be observed particularly in relation to the study of Homer and the development of Homeric scholarship. In the minds of many pagan readers, one of the difficulties with the writings of Homer was the fact that they betrayed a “disrespect for the divine”:<sup>35</sup> for example, when Homer suggests that the gods attempted to bind Zeus in chains, Heraclitus writes: “For these lines, Homer deserves to be banished not just from Plato’s Republic but, as they say, beyond the furthest pillars of Heracles and the inaccessible sea of Ocean.”<sup>36</sup> For Heraclitus, these comments were problematic precisely because Homer exerted such a powerful influence over Greek literature and culture. Heraclitus attempted to rescue Homer from these accusations by suggesting that difficult or obscure comments were intended to be read allegorically. Indeed, allegorical interpretations of his writing were not simply to defend his piety or to protect the

---

<sup>34</sup> The term *allegory* refers principally to a literary trope or figure of speech: “the trope which says one thing but signifies something other than what it says” (Heraclitus, *Quaestiones Homericae* 5.2 (Donald A. Russell and David Konstan, *Heraclitus: Homeric Problems* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 9)).

<sup>35</sup> Heraclitus, *Quaestiones Homericae* 1.1 (ibid., 3).

<sup>36</sup> Heraclitus, *Quaestiones Homericae* 21.3 (ibid., 39).

reputation of the gods. Allegorical interpretations could also be employed to legitimate philosophical insights.<sup>37</sup> Homer's choice of vocabulary also caused some perplexity, particularly words which were archaic or names which had a certain resonance. This led to further speculation about their etymology or attempts to illuminate their meaning by suggesting sometimes imaginative forms of metonymy: so, according to Heraclitus, Athena is "wisdom in perfection"<sup>38</sup> and Ares "simply stands for war."<sup>39</sup>

In his major study *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique*, Jon Whitman describes the history of the term "allegory."<sup>40</sup> He notes that the word was used in two different ways in antiquity. It referred both to "allegorical composition" (in which the author composed an allegorical text, which said something other than what was meant) and "allegorical interpretation" (in which the emphasis was on an interpretative technique, used to identify the meaning of a text already written.) While the term "allegory" was used from the third century BCE to describe "allegorical composition," it was not until the first century BCE that it was used to describe "allegorical interpretation." But Whitman argues that the actual practice of allegorical interpretation can be traced much earlier—to the philosophical interpretation of Homer: "Until the first century BC, the word ὑπονοία, "under-sense," was used to designate that which was meant (the philosophic meaning), as opposed to that which was said (the literal meaning)."<sup>41</sup> It is important to recognise that the use of allegory and allegorical interpretation was not without its detractors in the pagan world.<sup>42</sup> In *How Philosophers*

<sup>37</sup> For a detailed account of this phenomenon, see Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*, 10–43.

<sup>38</sup> Heraclitus, *Quaestiones Homericae* 20.1 (Konstan, *Heraclitus: Homeric Problems*, 37).

<sup>39</sup> Heraclitus, *Quaestiones Homericae* 31.1 (*ibid.*, 57).

<sup>40</sup> Jon Whitman, *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987). Frances Young also points out that it is important to draw a distinction between 'compositional allegory,' where a deeper meaning is suggested by the author, and 'allegorical interpretation,' where the reader or interpreter suggests a deeper meaning (Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 177). She is guided by Whitman in offering this judgement.

<sup>41</sup> Whitman, *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique*, 265.

<sup>42</sup> For instance, Luc Brisson notes Plutarch's criticisms of allegorical interpretation. He suggests that Plutarch was the 'critical witness' in observing the evolution and development of allegorical readings: "Some commentators forcibly distorted these stories through what used to be termed "deeper meanings" (ταῖς πάλαι μὲν ὑπονοίαις), but are nowadays called "allegorical interpretations" (ἀλληγορίαις δὲ νῦν λεγομέναις)." (Plutarch, *De audiendis poetis* 4, *Moralia* 19e (translated and quoted by Brisson, *How Philosophers Saved Myths: Allegorical Interpretation and Classical Mythology*, 58)).

*Saved Myths*, Luc Brisson argues that, in spite of such arguments, these literary conventions were crucial in enabling philosophers and critics to interpret myth and poetry in antiquity.

The writings of Philo of Alexandria display a particular debt to these literary conventions.<sup>43</sup> Manlio Simonetti points out that Philo was not interested in drawing out comparisons between the biblical text and pagan mythology, but he did embrace “the allegorical interpretation of the sacred text according to the norms which governed the interpretation of the Homeric poems.”<sup>44</sup> This phenomenon was reflected in the development of early Christian literature, including the New Testament itself.<sup>45</sup> And yet the greatest biblical exegete of the early church was, arguably, Origen of Alexandria. In any account of the use of allegory and allegorical interpretation, his name comes to the fore. However, this is not because he was the first to read the Christian scriptures allegorically. As Simonetti points out, “if they are taken one by one, almost all the characteristics of Origen’s exegesis ... can be found in exegetes who preceded him.”<sup>46</sup> Origen’s contribution is significant for two reasons. First, critics like Porphyry asserted that Origen’s use of allegory stemmed from his familiarity with the allegorical works of the Stoics, Cornutus and Chaeremon, and the Neo-Pythagorean and middle-Platonist, Numenius. In other words, his use of allegory was clearly dependent on established patterns of textual interpretation in the ancient world.<sup>47</sup> Secondly, Origen systematised these exegetical conventions. He is arguably the first Christian biblical exegete to offer an extended *theological* account of biblical hermeneutics, the *De principiis* or ‘On First Principles.’<sup>48</sup> It is impor-

---

<sup>43</sup> For discussion of Philo’s approach to the allegorical reading of scripture, see Maren Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), V. Nikiprowetsky, *Le commentaire de l’Écriture chez Philon d’Alexandrie, son caractère et sa portée* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), Samuel Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), Borgen, ‘Philo of Alexandria,’ 233–282, and Dawson, *Allegorical readers and cultural revision in ancient Alexandria*, 73–126.

<sup>44</sup> Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, 7.

<sup>45</sup> Galatians 4.24 provides the only instance of the use of the term ἀλληγορούμενα. However, the interpretation of the Parable of the Sower offered in Mark 4.1–20 is clearly allegorical.

<sup>46</sup> Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, 39.

<sup>47</sup> Ilaria Ramelli offers a detailed analysis of this fragment from the third book of Porphyry’s *Contra Christianos* in Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.19.8 (Ilaria Ramelli, ‘Origen and the Stoic Allegorical Tradition: Continuity and Innovation,’ in *SBL Annual Meeting* (Atlanta: 2004)).

<sup>48</sup> Origen, *De principiis* (H. Crouzel and M. Simonetti, *Origène. Traité des Principes*. Volumes 1–3. SC 252, 253, 268. (Paris: Éditions de Cerf, 1: 1978, 2: 1978, 3: 1980)).

tant to note that although Origen's name has become "a byword for the use of allegory,"<sup>49</sup> he gave as much weight to the literal sense. Indeed, in *De principiis* 4 where Origen describes the "spiritual" interpretation of the biblical text, there is only one reference to allegory and that in a quotation from Galatians 4.24. The passage suggests that he was much more interested in exploring the types and shadows of the new covenant in the old covenant to demonstrate the over-arching consistency of God's providence. But Origen is interested in establishing the "elevated" sense of scripture. He often prefers the term ἀναγωγή to talk about allegory. Origen's subsequent commentaries show that he was capable of making exactly the same kind of hermeneutical moves as pagan philosophers wrestling with the writings of Homer. In Simonetti's view, Origen "employs all the typical procedures of the Alexandrian tradition, not only numbers and etymologies of Hebrew names, but a thousand details of the sacred text (names of animals, plants, etc.) become opportunities for allegory."<sup>50</sup> And yet Origen was aware of the attendant dangers. He recognized that allegory could become arbitrary and subjective, which is why he emphasised that the allegorical meaning should be restrained by attentiveness to the literal sense.<sup>51</sup> *De principiis* is significant because it provided a *theological* justification for the use of allegory by appealing to a theology of providence. Ever since, allegory has been inextricably linked with a *theological* interpretation of scripture and has been associated with the different exegetical concerns of the schools of Antioch and Alexandria which emerged in the fourth century CE.

Margaret Mitchell notes that "the standard textbook diagram of early Christian exegesis as characterized by a basic dichotomy between Alexandrine allegory and Antiochene literalism has eroded considerably in the past decades."<sup>52</sup> Frances Young has suggested that the distinction between the 'literal,' 'typological'<sup>53</sup> and 'allegorical' is often unhelpful in securing a thorough analysis and comparison of sources associated with Antioch and Alexandria: for example, if Origen represents the Alexandrian school,

---

<sup>49</sup> Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, 44.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 45–46.

<sup>51</sup> Origen, *De principiis* 4.2.9 (H. Crouzel and M. Simonetti, *Origène. Traité des Principes*. Vol. 3. SC 268. (Paris: Éditions de Cerf, 1980), 334–341).

<sup>52</sup> Margaret M. Mitchell, 'Patristic Rhetoric on Allegory: Origen and Eustathius put 1 Kingdoms 28 on Trial,' in *The "Belly-Myther" of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church*, ed. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (Atlanta: SBL, 2007), lxxxv.

<sup>53</sup> Young points out that 'typology' is a modern construct. Ancient exegetes did not distinguish between typology and allegory. The word does not appear in English until 1844 (Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 193). Nevertheless, the distinction is



his commentaries display a consistent regard for the literal sense of the text, while representatives of the Antiochene school frequently make use of allegory in their interpretative exercises. As Young notes, Theodoret was just as capable of an allegorical reading of the Song of Songs as Origen.<sup>54</sup> Instead, Young argues that the differences in theological temperament and in the handling of the scriptural texts owe more to the pattern of education associated with Alexandria and Antioch. Alexandrian exegesis was influenced by the philosophical schools, where a more speculative approach was encouraged. Antiochene exegesis was influenced by the predominance of rhetorical schools within Antioch, which was accustomed to a more forensic approach to the analysis and interpretation of texts.<sup>55</sup>

Young argues that “the principal Antiochene exegetes undoubtedly had a rhetorical education,”<sup>56</sup> and that this influence made them particularly alert to the integrity of the narrative, its consistency and coherence as well as its accuracy. Of course, this does not mean that Antiochene exegesis should be characterised as an incipient form of modern historical criticism. Young rejects the tendency in recent scholarship to assume that Antiochene literalism meant something like modern historicism.<sup>57</sup> Rather, Antiochenes employed “the standard literary techniques of the rhetorical schools to protest against esoteric philosophical deductions being made in what they regarded as an arbitrary way.”<sup>58</sup> In this way, Young provides an elegant solution to the fact that there were clearly different styles of exegesis emerging from Antioch and Alexandria, and that it was not always possible to differentiate between the two in terms of the ‘literal’ and the ‘allegorical.’

---

popularized by Daniélou and Hanson in their work on Origen (Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* and Hanson, *Allegory and Event: a study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*).

<sup>54</sup> Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 297.

<sup>55</sup> Young expands and extends the argument proposed by H.N. Bate in 1923: ‘It should be remembered that the tradition of Antiochene learning was from the earliest times connected with Aristotle and the rhetoricians, just as the tradition of Alexandria was Platonic. Origen was an Alexandrian and an exact scholar; the tradition which he left in his native place was substantially the same as that which he inherited there. The Antiochenes on their side took over from Origen just as much of his method as was congenial to their own established traditions: they inherited from him an ideal of scholarship, but retained their own technical equipment as students of rhetorical science.’ (H.N. Bate, ‘Some Technical Terms of Greek Exegesis,’ *Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1923): 59).

<sup>56</sup> Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 171.

<sup>57</sup> She is extremely critical of the arguments put forward by Richard Hanson in Hanson, *Allegory and Event: a study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*.

<sup>58</sup> Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 182.

So neither literalism as such, nor an interest in historicity as such, stimulated the Antiochene reaction against Origenist allegory, but rather a different approach to finding meaning in literature which had its background in the educational system of the Graeco-Roman world. Perhaps we could say that it was not 'allegory' as such that they objected to; for allegory was a standard figure of speech, and, if the text carried some indication of its presence, even allegory could be allowed. What they resisted was the type of allegory that destroyed textual coherence.<sup>59</sup>

Nevertheless, while Young is right to question the way in which modern commentators have characterised the historical consciousness of Antiochene exegetes, and have placed too much weight on the exegetical controversies surrounding the use of allegory, she perhaps places too much emphasis on the role of rhetoric in shaping patristic exegesis.

A more nuanced position is articulated by Margaret Mitchell. She places much more emphasis on the way in which Christian interpreters of late antiquity employed the standard techniques of literary criticism in their reading of the biblical text. In her reading of Eustathius' treatise *De engastrimutho contra Origenem*<sup>60</sup> and Origen's fifth homily on 1 Samuel 28 *De engastrimutho*,<sup>61</sup> Mitchell notes that both Eustathius and Origen employ standard exegetical techniques in their analysis of the text. Both display more than a passing familiarity with the conventions of literary criticism. And yet in adopting the idea of a courtroom drama, both employed rhetoric to discredit the opposing point of view. She argues that the rhetoric about 'literal' and 'allegorical' readings served as a device to highlight the different positions adopted by these exegetes: both "articulate the exegetical stakes as absolute: true or false, right or wrong, literal or allegorical, with (theoretically and rhetorically) no grey area."<sup>62</sup> In much the same way that contemporary Christians will characterise their opponents as 'liberal' or 'conservative,' these labels were often subject to tactical definition in exegetical arguments.

Before succumbing to the temptation to trace the ebb and flow of these arguments in the margins of the *Catena in Marcum*, we should simply note

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 176.

<sup>60</sup> A critical edition of this text has appeared in *La maga di Endor: Origene, Eustazio, Gregorio di Nissa*, Manlio Simonetti, ed. (Florence: Nardini, Centro Internazionale del Libro, 1989), 94–206.

<sup>61</sup> Origen, *De engastrimutho* in *La maga di Endor: Origene, Eustazio, Gregorio di Nissa*, Manlio Simonetti, ed. (Florence: Nardini, Centro Internazionale del Libro, 1989), 44–74.

<sup>62</sup> Mitchell, 'Patristic Rhetoric on Allegory: Origen and Eustathius put 1 Kingdoms 28 on Trial,' cxxi.

that allegorical readings can be observed in a number of places.<sup>63</sup> For the purposes of illustration, I will offer two particular instances: the Cursing of the Fig Tree (Mark 11.12–14) offers a particular example of the use of the term ὑπονοία, while the Parable of the Wicked Tenants (Mark 12.1–8) offers an example of the allegorical reading of one of Jesus' parables.

The Cursing of the Fig Tree is possibly one of the more obscure passages in Mark's gospel.<sup>64</sup> In this passage, Jesus appears to engage rather inexplicably in the wanton destruction of a tree.<sup>65</sup> The passage presents something of a puzzle to the interpreter. It provokes all sorts of exegetical questions: why was Jesus hungry so early in the morning? What did the destruction of the tree signify? To answer the questions, the catenist drew on material from a number of sources, including John Chrysostom's *Homiliae in Matthaeum* and possibly the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia.<sup>66</sup> The divergences between Matthew and Mark are noted, but the passage from Chrysostom notes the challenges presented by this particular text and concludes that "it is clear that it was for their deeper understanding. For indeed [the Evangelists] record the things which had deeper meaning for the disciples."<sup>67</sup> Two points emerge from this exegetical strategy: first, Chrysostom's use of the term ὑπονοία enables him effectively to allegorise the passage, without employing the term allegory; secondly, the description of "the deeper understandings of the disciples" suggests an element of intention embedded within the text. This interpretation is not simply a consequence of the reader's speculation. Chrysostom is suggesting that the text reveals that Jesus did not approach the fig tree simply because he was hun-

<sup>63</sup> One might also note the allegorical interpretation of the Parable of the Sower in Mark 4.1–20 (*Cat. Marc.* 302.26–304.24) or the allegorical interpretation of the 'watches of the night' in Mark 5.48: 'And perhaps the first watch according to the logic of the anagogical sense if from Adam until the Flood; the second from the Flood until Moses; the third from Moses until the coming [of Christ]; and the fourth is the one in which the Saviour comes to appear early to those who become disciples to him' (*Cat. Marc.* 330.7–11). Note that this passage comes from Paris, *Bibl. Nat.*, Gr. 178.

<sup>64</sup> Mark 11.12–14.

<sup>65</sup> Along with the story of the Gadarene swine, this incident caused Bertrand Russell to suggest that "I cannot myself feel that either in the matter of wisdom or in the matter of virtue Christ stands quite as high as some other people known to history." (Bertrand Russell, *Why I am not a Christian*, ed. Simon Blackburn, *Routledge Classics* (London: Routledge, 1957; reprint, 2004), 15). It is interesting to note that ancient pagan critics of Christianity often adopted similar arguments. See John Granger Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 36–39.

<sup>66</sup> Smith argues that material which is common to Victor of Antioch and Isho'dad's Syriac commentary on Matthew probably had Theodore as a common source (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 358).

<sup>67</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 391.6–8.

gry. His hunger served as a pretext to communicate some kind of hidden meaning to the disciples. The meaning was understood by them and handed on.

It is important to note that Chrysostom is suggesting that this interpretation is intrinsic to the testimony of the gospel. In his view at least, his analysis of the “deeper meaning” of the text is not arbitrary or subjective. As Frances Young argues, “allegory was to be admitted only as a figure of speech and only where the text indicated that this figure of speech was in play.”<sup>68</sup> As Chrysostom notes elsewhere “everywhere in scripture there is this law, that when it allegorises, it also gives the explanation of the allegory.”<sup>69</sup> Chrysostom adopts a similar strategy in this context. He attempts to guard against an arbitrary form of allegory. At the same time, he enhances his own reading of the “deeper meaning” of this passage by giving it the *imprimatur* of apostolic authority. The story is given the character of both a kind of compositional allegory and, more directly, an eyewitness reminiscence. For Chrysostom, the “deeper meaning” of this passage is no arbitrary construct of the reader. The discovery of a “deeper meaning” is not a latter-day distortion of the writer’s words, but a latent sense waiting to be disclosed. It is, in the words of Mark Edwards, a “real presence” waiting to be deciphered.<sup>70</sup>

So what in Chrysostom’s view is the “deeper meaning” of this passage? Chrysostom reads this passage as a kind of exhortation addressed to the disciples, but it is an exhortation marked by a sustained attack on Israel’s rejection of the Messiah. The “fig tree” is read metonymically as a reference to “the Jews.” Since Jesus neither hurt nor chastised anyone during his ministry, he cursed the fig tree as a “demonstration of his power of punishment” so that the disciples might learn “that he was one who had the power to wither the Jews.” Because of his innate goodness, Jesus was not willing to demonstrate this power on human beings, so he used a plant instead. The commentator has no patience with those who might question the moral sensibility of one who visited such destruction on a plant. He notes with a sense of weariness the similar arguments which rage over the story of the Gadarene demoniac and the sorry fate of the pigs thrown into the sea. With the kind of rhetorical flourish one would expect of an accomplished preacher like Chrysostom, he concludes: “Let us not be too precise about

<sup>68</sup> Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 297.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 165. Quoted from Chrysostom *In Isaiam* 5.3.46–49 (PG 56.60 and J. Dumortier, *Jean Chrysostome. Commentaire sur Isaïe. SC* 304. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1983): 222–224).

<sup>70</sup> Edwards, *Origen Against Plato*, 125. Note the allusion to Steiner, *Real Presences*.

the rights and wrongs, but let us simply contemplate the miracle.<sup>71</sup> There is no point in listening to such objections—“For pigs are without sense, just as that plant was without a soul.”<sup>72</sup> The important point for Chrysostom is that “the motive for the curse, as I said, was for the deeper understanding (ὕπονοιάς) of the disciples, even though he does not hint (αὐνίττεται) at any of these things.”<sup>73</sup> In this context, Chrysostom employs an established literary trope to expose the deeper meaning and significance of Jesus’ actions.<sup>74</sup> At the same time he seeks to avoid the subjectivity associated with allegorical interpretations by insisting that these meanings are intrinsic to the text itself.

In the *Catena in Marcum*, the reading of the parable of the wicked tenants in Mark 12.1–8 offers a familiar allegorical reading. The comments, which probably come from Apollinaris of Laodicea, identify the metonymic elements within the story so that the allegory can be understood:

This is why, quite reasonably, he reveals the rejection (of Israel) in advance to those who will be believers, describing the vineyard, that is ‘Israel,’ of the owner, that is ‘of God,’ and the hedge thrown up around it for security, which comes from God.<sup>75</sup>

When it comes to describing a couple of the architectural features, the commentator offers some reflections which may not be instantly familiar. So when Mark 12.1 says that the owner “dug a pit for the wine press and built a tower,” the commentator suggests that the temple is being described: the ‘pit’ refers to the pit under the altar where the blood from the sacrifices was collected, while the ‘tower’ refers to the inmost shrine of the temple itself. The tenants are ‘the chief priests’ and ‘the teachers.’ The writer recognises that the parable is full of allusions to the prophecy of Isaiah,<sup>76</sup> because he goes on to refer to this text to explain why the owner withdraws. When the owner sends slaves to the tenants, the catenist explains that the first slave refers to Elijah and the other prophets of his day, the second slave refers to Isaiah and Hosea and Amos, while the third slave refers to the prophets from the time of Ezekiel and Daniel. Then in the fourth year, the son is killed.

<sup>71</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 391.15–16.

<sup>72</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 391.18–19.

<sup>73</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 391.20–22.

<sup>74</sup> Similarly, the catenist refers to the ‘deeper meaning’ suggested by Jesus’ actions: “For not even the Lord took his stand solely on these teachings, even though he drew all of them from the sacred scriptures, but also he imparts their deeper meaning by a miracle” (*Cat. Marc.* 293.28–294.1).

<sup>75</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 398.18–21.

<sup>76</sup> Isaiah 5.1–7.

And although the sequence of the argument suggests that the Son could not be present when the owner arrives, the writer suggests that he must have been (principally, because the dogmatic horizon of his Trinitarian theology would not allow him to say otherwise). The punishment meted out to the tenants at the end of the story is then equated with the calamity that befell the Jews at the hands of the Romans. The vineyard is leased “to other tenants, that is, the apostles and teachers from among the gentiles.”<sup>77</sup>

It is intriguing to compare this allegorical reading of the parable with more recent scholarship. Charles H. Dodd,<sup>78</sup> like Joachim Jeremias,<sup>79</sup> insisted on the riddle-like quality of the parables. The allegorical interpretations characteristic of patristic exegesis served to create a degree of “mystification” which must appear “quite perverse” to the ordinary person of intelligence.<sup>80</sup> While Jeremias conceded that Mark 12.1–8 “is evidently pure allegory,”<sup>81</sup> Dodd refused to accept that this parable was an allegory. While he conceded that the story may have “suffered a certain amount of expansion,” he asserted that “the story in its main lines is natural and realistic in every way.”<sup>82</sup> Dodd asserts that the parable is a “dramatic story” shaped by Isaiah’s Song of the Vineyard (Isaiah 5.1–2), and its application “is clear enough without any allegorizing of the details.”<sup>83</sup> By contrast, John Drury describes this parable as “the real nemesis” of the approach articulated by Dodd and Jeremias. As far as Drury is concerned, the parable is an allegory. And yet this is a view which is resisted by a number of New Testament scholars. The problem is that a strict allegorical reading raises questions about the historicity of the passage. This point is conceded by Drury: “it is very difficult to accept as a parable of Jesus an historical allegory whose historical vantage point is quite clearly later than Jesus, whose death, as son and heir to the vineyard, forms the climax and turning-point of the story.”<sup>84</sup> Such an observation only serves to exacerbate the anxieties in the minds of some scholars about allegory. N.T. Wright attempts to transcend the parameters of the debate by suggesting that “we must give up the false distinction between allegory and parable.” He appears to read the story in almost exactly the same way as the catenist:

---

<sup>77</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 399.26–28.

<sup>78</sup> Charles H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Whitefriars, 1935).

<sup>79</sup> Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, trans. S.H. Hooke (London: SCM, 1963).

<sup>80</sup> Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 13.

<sup>81</sup> Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 70.

<sup>82</sup> Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 125.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 130.

<sup>84</sup> John Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1985), 64.

In the parable of the wicked tenants, Israel is the vineyard, her rulers the vineyard-keepers; the prophets are the messengers, Jesus is the son; Israel's god, the creator, is himself the owner and father.<sup>85</sup>

By the standards of ancient literary criticism, there is little ambiguity about the fact that Wright is reading the parable as an allegory. From the perspective of early commentators, the sustained use of metonymy in its interpretation and the sense that the story is speaking of something other than itself serve to legitimate and give licence to an allegorical interpretation of the parable. Thus, the use of allegorical interpretation in the *Catena in Marcum* is far from arbitrary. In each case, the interpreter is not simply seeking to impose something alien on the text. Rather the language suggests that he is attempting to elucidate something hidden or obscure which needs to be disclosed.

## ii. *Figural Reading*

Identifying "Israel" as the vineyard suggests that one of the real difficulties with allegorical interpretations is that they can all too easily provide a platform for supersessionism. To the modern reader, this can sometimes appear to be little more than a thinly-veiled anti-semitism. This is one of the main charges presented by Daniel Boyarin in his discussion of allegory in *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*.<sup>86</sup> Some of the controversies in Mark's gospel contain some sharp words about the scribes and Pharisees, and it is fair to say that some of the rhetoric employed in the *Catena in Marcum* would only serve to provide Boyarin with further evidence to sustain his argument. In addition to the negative judgements about the Jews contained in comments on Mark 11.12–14 and Mark 12.1–8, there is a discussion on the tradition of the elders in Mark 7.1–23, in which the catenist says:

This is why he shows in advance that the casting out of the former, the Jews, actually brings about the reception of the latter, the Gentiles. Therefore, since they had not yet laid hands on him, he maintained his goodwill towards them and did not transfer his grace to those outside. He calls the gentiles 'dogs,' the very thing which later came round to Israel, at the time when Israel was deprived of divine nourishment, as it says in the Psalms, "They starve like dogs which return in the evening".<sup>87</sup>

<sup>85</sup> N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996), 178.

<sup>86</sup> Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 13–38.

<sup>87</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 337:31–338.6.

In the same chapter, the catenist goes on to comment on Jesus' demand that those who witnessed the healing of the deaf and dumb man should tell no one "in order that he may not seem to inflame and arouse the murderousness (*μικαιφονίαν*) of the Jews against him prematurely."<sup>88</sup> When Jesus describes this "faithless generation" in Mark 9.19, Chrysostom notes that Jesus defends the disciples who have failed to heal the epileptic:

But Jesus acquitted [the disciples] of the accusation in front of the people, and he reckons the greater [fault] is the man's, saying 'O faithless and perverse generation, how long will I be with you?' in order that he might not only bring shame upon the man, whose lack of faith was being exposed, but also on all the Jews.<sup>89</sup>

He goes on to suggest that the crucifixion will be less of a trial to Jesus than having to be with them. Indeed, the Passion narrative only serves to accentuate these negative comments. In commenting on Mark 11.18 where the scribes and chief priest hear of the cleansing of the temple and seek "a way to destroy him," Chrysostom notes that their "love of power completely consumed them and made them ready for murderous cruelty."<sup>90</sup>

Although these passages are not strictly allegorical, they speak of a set of attitudes which only serves to underline the supersessionist character of much of the material in the *Catena in Marcum*. David Dawson has attempted to address some of these criticisms in *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity*.<sup>91</sup> In this volume, Dawson offers a thorough presentation of Origen's allegorical interpretation of the Bible as a means of testing the interpretative claims of three prominent twentieth century thinkers: Daniel Boyarin, Erich Auerbach and Hans Frei. Each is critical of the way in which Christians have engaged in the allegorical interpretation of scripture—and Origen is often the object of their criticisms. And yet while they share an antipathy towards allegory, they offer radically different reasons for their hostility towards it. Boyarin argues that allegorical readings are inherently supersessionist. In his view, Christian allegory undermines the distinctive integrity of Jewish identity and history. Auerbach is critical of allegorical readings because, in his view, they vitiate the historical emphasis of the narrative. Auerbach introduces an important distinction between allegorical and figural readings of the Old Testament. Although

<sup>88</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 339.28–30.

<sup>89</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 360.12–16.

<sup>90</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 394.23–24.

<sup>91</sup> Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity*. See also the article John David Dawson, 'Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Christian Identity in Boyarin, Auerbach and Frei,' *Modern Theology* 14, no. 2 (1998).



figural readings were a form of allegorical reading, he suggests that they were distinct because they were consonant with the preservation of historical reality.<sup>92</sup> This view exercised considerable influence over the arguments advanced by Hans Frei. For Frei, as for Auerbach, allegorical speculation detracts from the historical emphasis of the narrative. Frei believed that allegorical readings destroy the literal sense, arguing that “Christian figural reading of the Bible narratively extends rather than effaces the Bible’s realistic, literal sense.”<sup>93</sup> As a theologian, Frei departed from Auerbach, the literary critic, in asserting that Christian figural reading was evidence not simply of human intuition but of divine intention. Figural reading lays bare the pattern of divine providence.

Dawson offers a series of criticisms of the various positions outlined by Boyarin, Auerbach and Frei. He is particularly critical of the way in which Origen has emerged as a foil for those who reject allegorical readings of scripture and who seek to impose greater methodological clarity in their portrayal of Christian interpretation of the Bible. Dawson emerges as a confident advocate and apologist for Origen. He argues that the interpretative practice of Origen was in fact largely consonant with the kind of literal and figural reading described and promoted by Auerbach and Frei. Indeed, Origen “shares far more with Frei than the latter was willing to admit.”<sup>94</sup> They are similar because they share a profound interest in questions of narrative and identity as well as a devotion to the literal sense. Where they differ is in Origen’s willingness to move beyond the literal and the figural to embrace a more allegorical style of reading. But Dawson attempts to redefine the contours of the debate between Origen and Frei. Even though Frei was suspicious of Origen, Dawson maintains that the principal difference between Origen and Frei is the fact that Origen’s theological imagination was not constrained in the same way as Frei’s theological outlook. Frei insisted that the purpose of reading scripture was simply to render the identity of Jesus Christ. In Dawson’s view, this suggests that the main focus of disagreement is not about biblical interpretation *per se*, but about Christology:

Frei’s Christology preserves a gap or distance between God and human beings, while Origen’s emphasizes God’s transformative power and presence directly in human lives .... Frei’s impulse was, we might say, distinctively Athanasian: only a Jesus who remains who *he alone* really is can save us as we alone really are. Hence, every effort must be made to ensure that Jesus’

---

<sup>92</sup> Auerbach, ‘Figura,’ 29.

<sup>93</sup> Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity*, 141.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

identity is never confused with our own—and for Frei that required the repudiation of allegory, the defense of the literal sense, and the marginalization of Origen. By contrast, Origen's concern was, we might say, more Arian (following the recovery of the soteriological aims of Arius and his followers): only a Jesus who himself undergoes spiritual transformation can be a fitting means of our own divine transformation. Hence every effort must be made to show our similarity to Jesus. For Origen, that demanded allegorical reading as a mode of the reader's own spiritual transformation—a transformation in which the literal sense, and hence who and what the reader presently is, must change.<sup>95</sup>

A key element in Dawson's argument emphasises the similarities between Frei and Origen and alerts the reader to their shared commitment to a "figural" reading of scripture. Dawson follows the principle, enunciated by Auerbach, Frei and Hanson, that the distinguishing feature of figural, as opposed to allegorical, reading is its capacity to preserve the history of biblical persons and events "or at least the details of their textual representation, while allegorical readings are said to subvert or efface them."<sup>96</sup> This argument is then used to reject Boyarin's claim that all Christian interpretation of the Hebrew Bible is inherently supersessionist because it is allegorical.<sup>97</sup> If a figural reading preserves the history of biblical persons and events, then a figural approach should respect their autonomy and independence.

We can see a couple of examples of figural or typological reading in the *Catena in Marcum*. In commenting on some of the discrepancies between John and the synoptic tradition about the timing of the Passion in relation to

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 207.

<sup>97</sup> Boyarin's description of Christian exegesis as allegorical is not entirely convincing. It gives considerable prominence to Paul's use of the term ἀλληγορούμενα in Galatians 4.24. Boyarin describes 'allegory' in terms of 'the letter' and 'the spirit' and draws a parallel with the dualism of 'flesh' and 'spirit' characteristic of Platonism. He concludes that Christianity is shaped irreducibly by this commitment and attachment to Platonist dualism and he contrasts this with the 'Hebraic' mindset. And yet such a distinction between 'Jewish' and 'Hellenistic' strategies of reading throws up a series of fascinating questions about the identity of Paul. At times, Boyarin presents Paul as a 'Hebrew of the Hebrews' in dialogue and conversation with other Jews of the period. At other times, Paul is characterised as a marginal figure, whose teaching represents the alien philosophy of the Graeco-Roman world. Boyarin re-writes this distinction in terms of a tension between 'midrash' and 'allegory.' Paul's hermeneutic stands in opposition to midrash but 'in another way he is very much within a midrashic tradition' (Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*, 118). One might make a similar observation about Philo of Alexandria—an observation which leaves us grappling with the question: does the use of allegory make either Paul or Philo less Jewish? Nevertheless, the idea that Christians and Jews betrayed the influence of Hellenistic practices of grammar and rhetoric to varying degrees offers a much more promising way of describing the evidence.

the Passover, Apollinaris suggests that “John shows according to the day and the hour of the Passion that the Passover had not yet been eaten by the Jews, since, as he said, it was necessary for both the typological (τυπικόν) and the real Passover to be completed on the same day.”<sup>98</sup> In a subsequent *scholium* on the Last Supper, the commentator writes: “But why did he accomplish this mystery at the time of the Passover? So that you may learn from all sides that he is also the law giver of the Old [Covenant], and the things [in the New Covenant] are foreshadowed in the Old. Thus through this, the use of the type (τύπος) adds [to the] truth.”<sup>99</sup> However, there is little in the way of the kind of figural reading described by Dawson in the writings of Origen. What we do see is a pronounced emphasis on the idea of οἰκονομία, a term used nineteen times in the course of the *Catena in Marcum*.<sup>100</sup> Kathy Eden has suggested that this term had a literary resonance,<sup>101</sup> but it was also the way in which early commentators described the unfolding of divine revelation in the Old and New Testaments. The notion of οἰκονομία provided the theological underpinning for the figural reading of scripture. It enabled readers to understand the scriptures as a continuous narrative so that two distinct events, each in their concrete reality and particularity, might reflect a single divine intention: “Discerning that intention in oddly congruent literary narratives, the figural reader makes explicit the similarities by which otherwise separate events are related to one another as moments in a single, divine utterance.”<sup>102</sup>

The evidence of the *Catena in Marcum* provides an intriguing perspective on contemporary debates about the impact of allegorical and figural readings in the Christian exegesis of late antiquity. First, recent attempts by scholars to emphasise the importance of figural readings over and above allegorical readings begin to look less than convincing. There is little evidence of figural reading in the *Catena in Marcum*. Admittedly, such readings are bound to be more prevalent in commentaries and *catenae* on books of the Old Testament. But the paucity of evidence in this *Catena* makes it difficult to sustain

<sup>98</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 421.6–9.

<sup>99</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 424.13–16.

<sup>100</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 272.24, 273.29, 280.15, 286.25, 294.32, 303.4, 308.26, 337.10, 346.4, 346.22, 347.2, 351.13, 356.28, 392.24, 394.22, 417.1, 427.13, 427.19, 427.26.

<sup>101</sup> Kathy Eden, *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the Ancient Legacy and Its Humanist Reception* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 42–45. (Cf. Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*, 36).

<sup>102</sup> Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity*, 85.

the claim that figural reading captures the essential character of patristic exegesis. By contrast, there is rather more evidence of allegorical interpretation, some of which is used to reinforce a supersessionist understanding of the relationship between Jews and Christians. This suggests that the precise relationship between figural and allegorical readings in patristic exegesis demands further reflection. The evidence suggests that Dawson's attempt to mediate between the positions of Origen, Auerbach, Boyarin and Frei is vulnerable to further challenge. The figural reading described by Dawson does not provide a sufficiently comprehensive description of patristic exegesis. Such a conclusion begs a profoundly difficult question about the degree to which "patristic exegesis" is recoverable in the context of contemporary Jewish-Christian relations. Secondly, the fact that there are a number of examples of allegorical interpretation in the *Catena in Marcum* serves to substantiate the argument that the exegetical imagination of early Christian commentators was shaped by the conventions of ancient literary criticism. The use of technical terms such as ὑπονοία and αἰνιγμα (as well as its cognates) suggests a profound debt to the insights of the grammarian.

#### b. *The Legacy of the Grammarian*

Eric Turner has noted that "the higher criticism of the nineteenth century underrated the value of ancient learning, and therefore at times took a cavalier attitude towards the statements of ancient scholars."<sup>103</sup> Such has been the dominance of these judgements about ancient scholarship that, until relatively recently, it has been sorely neglected. However, in recent years this pattern has been reversed. The work of Eric Turner, Teresa Morgan and Raffaella Cribiore on schoolroom papyri from the Hellenistic and Roman worlds,<sup>104</sup> and the studies by Nigel Wilson and Robert Robins on early Byzantine scholarship,<sup>105</sup> now present a rich and illuminating analysis of the practices and conventions associated with ancient literary criticism. They also describe the ways in which these practices were handed on to subsequent generations.

<sup>103</sup> Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*, 99.

<sup>104</sup> Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*.

<sup>105</sup> Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*, Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*.

Frances Young and Manlio Simonetti both argue persuasively that early Christian interpretation was heavily influenced by the literary conventions of the scholastic tradition.<sup>106</sup> Indeed, we know that two of the commentators quoted in the *Catena in Marcum*, John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea, were taught by Libanius, the great pagan rhetor and sophist in Antioch.<sup>107</sup> But the significance of this should not be over-stated. While Libanius offered his students training and education to a fairly advanced level, much of the material within the *Catena in Marcum* would have been familiar to readers with a much more modest education. Although there has been considerable discussion in recent years about the influence of the study of philosophy and rhetoric on the interpretation of scripture,<sup>108</sup> the Christian exegesis of late antiquity reflects a set of literary conventions which would have been accessible to those with even a fairly rudimentary grasp of grammar. The influence of the grammarian in learning and teaching was significant (a point laboured in the previous chapter). We can see this influence in the emphasis given to grammatical construction, syntax and figures of speech in the sixth century treatise, *Isagoge ad scripturas sacras*, by Hadrian the monk.<sup>109</sup> Like the grammatical textbooks discussed in the previous chapter, this little manual provides a grammatical analysis of the language and imagery of the Bible. Hadrian distinguishes between *διανοία*, *λέξις*, and *συνθέσις*, between ‘meaning,’ ‘wording’ and ‘composition.’ After an extended discussion of the inevitable anthropomorphisms in the biblical description of God, he goes on to survey a whole range of different tropes and figures of speech, giving in each case some examples from scripture. Hadrian lists examples of ‘metaphor,’ ‘simile’ (*παρὰβολή*), ‘comparison’ (*σύγκρισις*), ‘synecdoche,’ ‘example’ (*ὑποδείγμα*), ‘metonymy,’ ‘antiphrasis,’ ‘periphrasis,’ ‘recapitulation’ and ‘repetition’ (*ἐπανάληψις*), ‘misuse’ (*ἀπόχρησις*), ‘prosopopoeia,’ ‘schematismus’ (*σχηματισμός*),<sup>110</sup> ‘allegory,’ ‘hyperbole,’ ‘mockery’ (*ἐπιτωθασμός*), ‘irony,’ ‘sarcasm,’ ‘hint’ (*αἰνίγμα*),<sup>111</sup> ‘threat,’ ‘negation’ (*ἀπόφασις*),

<sup>106</sup> Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 76–96 and Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, 4–6.

<sup>107</sup> For a detailed description of the life and work of this fourth century teacher, see Criboire, *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*.

<sup>108</sup> Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 169–173.

<sup>109</sup> Hadrian, *Isagoge ad scripturas sacras* (PG 98.1273A–1312B).

<sup>110</sup> This rhetorical device is a figure of speech which enables the intended meaning to be understated or left unspoken. Hadrian gives Job 1.7, Psalm 45.9, Psalm 98.8, and Ezekiel 16.7 as examples.

<sup>111</sup> Hadrian gives the following examples: Isaiah 1.22, Ezekiel 39.17, Joel 3.13 and Luke 3.9.

‘understatement’ (ἀποσιώπησις),<sup>112</sup> and ‘paraenesis.’<sup>113</sup> While this does not present the most scintillating analysis, this basic introduction to the interpretation of scripture demonstrates that biblical exegetes were encouraged to engage with scripture in the light of a reasonable knowledge of basic grammar and syntax.

In the world of late antiquity, accurate reading involved an ability to decipher blocks of text containing almost no punctuation. The text was read aloud. The words were not separated, and the absence of punctuation made reading rather challenging. The teacher guided the student in matters of diction, phrasing and parsing. It was essential for the student to gain some competence in these matters, and students would most often learn to read by listening to their teacher’s lessons. The reading was accompanied by oral commentary, in which the teacher would explain the meaning of particular words, teach the rules which determined their use, and explain their grammatical form with reference to case, number, mood or tense. The ‘core’ curriculum included the poetry of Homer, although the periphery of the syllabus appears to have been more varied.<sup>114</sup> Nevertheless, whatever the precise canon or syllabus, the exegesis of these texts involved the identification of specific tropes and figures of speech, the explanation of the narrative (including historical and geographical elements, such as persons, places, times and events), and the elucidation of unfamiliar vocabulary. It is worth noting that many of these pedagogical conventions are reflected in Hadrian’s little treatise. More importantly, these conventions are also evident in the *Catena in Marcum*.

The intensive reading of the text promoted by the grammarians of late antiquity and their successors, involved a particular attention to its λέξις or ‘wording.’ As Eleanor Dickey points out, in ancient Greek scholarship, the term λέξις might refer to a single word or a phrase, a question of diction or style.<sup>115</sup> In the *Catena in Marcum*, the reader’s attention is drawn to the ‘wording’ on a number of occasions: for example, in the account of John the Baptist in Mark 1.3–4, the passage from Eusebius’ *Commentarius in Isaiam* 2.16.104–118 notes that the prophecy about John the Baptist was fulfilled “to the letter”: ἐπληροῦτο πρὸς ἱστορίαν καὶ λέξιν.<sup>116</sup> When comparing Luke 14.34–35 with Mark 9.49–50, the anonymous source suggests that Luke’s “wording

<sup>112</sup> Liddell and Scott, s.v. “2. a rhetorical figure, when for emphasis, modesty, etc., the sentence is abruptly broken off.” Hadrian gives Joel 11.17 and John 3.5 as examples.

<sup>113</sup> Hadrian, *Isagoge ad scripturas sacras* (PG 98.1301D–1308D).

<sup>114</sup> See Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, 71–73.

<sup>115</sup> Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship*, 245.

<sup>116</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 268.2.

is ambiguous”: διόπερ ἀμφίβολος αὐτοῦ ἡ λέξις ἐστίν.<sup>117</sup> In commenting on Mark 10.14, another anonymous source remarks that the wording is quite precise: διὸ καὶ ἀκριβῆς ἡ λέξις.<sup>118</sup> Later, in commenting on Mark 12.18–27 about the argument with the Sadducees over the resurrection of the body, the extract from Origen’s comments on Luke<sup>119</sup> notes that Valentinus and Marcion object to the “wording” in this passage on the grounds that Jesus must have been referring to the “soul” rather than the “body”: ἴσμεν δὲ ὅτι καὶ πρὸς τὴν λέξιν ταύτην οἱ ἀπο τοῦ Οὐαλεντίνου καὶ Μαρκίωνος ἔτι διαμάχονται, ἐπι ψυχᾶς ἀνάγοντες τὸν λόγον.<sup>120</sup> In a passage from Titus of Bostra’s *Homiliae in Lucam* 22.22,<sup>121</sup> the catenist incorporates a comment about the word ὑπάγει in Mark 14.21, where it says that “the Son of man goes” to his Passion. According to Titus, “the wording” reinforces the voluntary nature of the act: καὶ τὸ ἐκούσιον ἡ λέξις ἐρμηνεύει.<sup>122</sup>

In the *Catena in Marcum*, this attentiveness to the wording of the text is matched by an intensive reading which demonstrates a familiarity with the technical language of Hellenistic grammar. For instance, *Cat. Marc.* 444.19–31 contains a number of comments about the perceived inconsistencies between the evangelists in describing the resurrection. The passage is peppered with grammatical terms:

However, in some of the copies of the Gospel according to Mark, ‘Now after he rose again early on the first day of the week, he appeared to Mary Magdalene’ etc. is added.<sup>123</sup> And this appears to contradict what was said by Matthew. We will say that one could say that the ending carried in some [copies] has been corrupted in the [copying] from Mark. However, in order that we might not seem to have taken refuge in a convenient reading, we will read it like this: inserting a comma after ‘after he rose again,’<sup>124</sup> we go on, ‘and he appeared to Mary Magdalene on the first day of the week,’<sup>125</sup> in order that on the one hand we might relate the [phrase] ‘after he rose again’<sup>126</sup> to the [phrase] from Matthew ‘the end of the Sabbath’<sup>127</sup> (for that is when we believe him to have been raised), while on the other hand we might combine the rest, which is

<sup>117</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 369.21.

<sup>118</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 375.4.

<sup>119</sup> Origen, *Fragmenta in Lucam* 242.

<sup>120</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 402.22.

<sup>121</sup> Joseph Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901), 243.

<sup>122</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 421.30.

<sup>123</sup> Mark 16.9.

<sup>124</sup> Mark 16.9.

<sup>125</sup> Mark 16.9.

<sup>126</sup> Mark 16.9.

<sup>127</sup> Matthew 28.4.

incomplete, with what follows. For Mark tells us that the one who according to Matthew was raised 'at the end of the sabbath' is the one whom Mary Magdalene saw 'early in the morning':<sup>128</sup>

Eleanor Dickey's study of ancient scholarship helps us to identify a number of technical terms within this passage:

444.19	ἀντιγράφων	copy, manuscript
444.19	προσκειταιί	it is added
444.22	διαφωνεῖν	differ, contradict
444.23	νερόθευται	corrupt, spurious
444.25	ἀναγνωσόμεθα	we will read
444.25	ὑποστήξαντες	inserting a comma
444.27	ἀναπέμψωμεν	relate, refer back
444.29	παραστατικόν	incomplete
444.29	συνάψωμεν	connect

The passage suggests a close attention to the grammatical form of the gospel, as well as an assured competence in technical grammatical language. This passage is not unique. At other points in the *Catena in Marcum*, not only does the catenist refer to difficulties of punctuation (for example, suggesting that Mark's comments about the traditions of the elders should be read in parenthesis),<sup>129</sup> but also offers observations about instances where Mark's vocabulary is unusual. When the term ἐκεφαλῶσαν occurs in Mark 12.4, the *Catena in Marcum* includes a scholium which offers a number of interpretations of a term which is the earliest instance of this particular use of the word. The scholiast suggests that it means either "they brought a deadly blow against his head" or "they exacted the penalty of death."<sup>130</sup>

This technical vocabulary demonstrates the dependence of patristic commentators on the conventions of Hellenistic rhetoric and grammar. Observation of this kind of close grammatical reading should make us wary of categorising patristic readings of scripture as 'pre-critical.' In Chapter 1, I noted John Barton's suggestion that the designation 'pre-critical' should be used with some care. The Christian exegesis of late antiquity is not 'non-critical' or 'uncritical,' although in some cases such a description might be entirely appropriate.<sup>131</sup> Barton notes that biblical criticism is often presented

<sup>128</sup> Mark 16.2.

<sup>129</sup> δια μέσου: *Cat. Marc.* 333.25.

<sup>130</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 400.13–17: *Liddell and Scott*, s.v. 'κεφάλαιον,' 945.

<sup>131</sup> Barton asserts that 'critical reasoning is clearly present' in the writings of Julius Africanus and Jerome. In a letter to Origen (See Origen, *La lettre à Africanus sur l'histoire de Suzanne*. SC 302. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1983), 469–578), which includes an analysis of the



as “partly the product of the Enlightenment emphasis on reason in the study of texts.”<sup>132</sup> But he also notes that biblical criticism finds its antecedents in the “return to the sources,” which characterised the Renaissance, and the Reformation emphasis on freedom in reading Scripture without bothering too much with ecclesiastical tradition. In suggesting that the roots of biblical criticism might be traced back even further to clear anticipations in patristic and medieval exegesis, he writes:

The contrast between critical and precritical interpretation is flawed in suggesting that the difference can be plotted on a timeline; it would be better to speak of critical and noncritical approaches, recognizing that the latter are still very common and that the former did occur before ‘modernity,’ even if to a limited extent.<sup>133</sup>

The *Catena in Marcum* betrays critical and uncritical elements in the writings of ancient commentators. In this respect, it encompasses some of the strands in contemporary biblical interpretation. However, the important point is that the sometimes detailed exegesis of the text indicates that early biblical commentators were informed by common cultural modes of critical reasoning, as well as the way in which they approached obscure and difficult passages within the text. The ‘comma’ and the ‘parenthesis’ were hardly unique to the Christian tradition. It should come as no surprise that their exegetical concerns were shaped by the legacy of the grammarian.

### c. *The Literary Trajectory*

In this chapter, I have been seeking to demonstrate that early Christian exegesis was shaped and influenced by the exegetical tradition of the scholastic tradition.<sup>134</sup> The use of technical grammatical language demonstrates that the exegesis and interpretation of late antiquity was shaped by the established conventions of ancient literary criticism. Early commentators

---

relationship between the Books of Susanna and Daniel, Africanus furnishes the reader with a mixture of literary and historical arguments: “All are just the kinds of argument employed by modern biblical critics.” (Barton, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*, 131).

<sup>132</sup> Ibid., 6.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid.

<sup>134</sup> For further discussion, see Loveday Alexander, ‘Hellenistic Schools,’ in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), Alexander, ‘Quid Athenis et Hierosolymis? Rabbinic Midrash and Hermeneutics in the Graeco-Roman World,’ and Horbury, ‘Jews and Christians on the Bible: Demarcation and Convergence 325–451 C.E.,” in *Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon*, ed. J. van Oort and U. Wickert (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992).

were alert to the *enigmatic* quality of the text. They recognised the ways in which Mark's narrative was filled with 'hints' and 'obscurities.' These words betrayed a density of meaning within the text that required the reader to look beyond the superficial and to identify its deeper meaning. In doing this, they appealed again to the established conventions of ancient literary criticism. The use of the term ὑπονόα in the analysis of Mark 11 and the allegorical interpretation of the parables of the Sower (Mark 4) and the Tenants in the Vineyard (Mark 12) serves to substantiate this view. This evidence sits uneasily with recent attempts to define patristic exegesis in terms of literal and figural readings. While the debt to ancient literary criticism reflects a real concern with the letter and wording of the text, the recent emphasis given to figural reading appears to be overplayed. Nevertheless, the fact that early Christian commentators drew on the conventions of ancient literary criticism reinforces John Barton's contention that we can distinguish between modern and patristic commentary in terms of 'critical' and 'precritical.' We can trace a 'literary trajectory' in the interpretation of Mark from some of the sources recorded in the *Catena in Marcum*. Their attentiveness to the literary character of Mark's gospel was shaped by the legacy of the grammarian. Even the earliest commentators on the gospel of Mark were occasionally attentive to the Evangelist's plea, "Let the reader understand."



## CHAPTER FIVE

### THE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE GOSPELS

Mark is the shortest of our four gospels, and almost the whole of it is closely paralleled in either Matthew or Luke, often in both. The relationship between the three gospels is so close as to suggest that two of the evangelists must have copied this parallel material. The first to consider this problem was Augustine, who examined the relationship between the gospels in his *De Consensu Evangelistarum* (c. 400). He regarded Mark's gospel as an abbreviation of Matthew's and apparently saw no conflict between this explanation of their relationship and the patristic tradition that Mark had been the interpreter of Peter.<sup>1</sup>

The idea that Augustine is the first person who tried to resolve some of the difficulties presented by the synoptic problem has become a commonplace in recent New Testament scholarship. The assumption is that prior to Augustine there was little interest in such questions. Indeed, Markus Bockmuehl suggests that Augustine's *De consensu evangelistarum* was "a notable exception" in addressing the discrepancies between the gospels.<sup>2</sup> He contends that "gospel commentaries tended to draw heavily on cognate or parallel passages in the other gospels—thus producing expositions that were rather less preoccupied with synoptic differences than has been the norm in modern critical scholarship."<sup>3</sup> To Augustine's credit, he chose to address the differences.

In addressing the synoptic problem, Augustine is often presented as the earliest advocate of Matthaean priority. While Augustine accepted the association of Mark with Peter, he played down its significance, simply stating that, "Mark follows [Matthew] closely and looks as if he was his attendant (*pedisequs*) and epitomist (*breviator*)."<sup>4</sup> The basic assumption is that Augustine believed that Mark had access to Matthew, and Luke to Mark.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 8–9.

<sup>2</sup> Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner, ed., *The Written Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 285.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> 'Marcus eum subsecutus tamquam pedisequs et breviator eius videtur.' (Augustine, *De consensu Evangelistarum* 1.2.4 (PL 34.1041–1230)).

This has been described as the ‘Augustinian’ hypothesis. However, Henk Jan de Jonge has argued that Augustine’s observations are perhaps more nuanced than the references of modern commentators to his testimony sometimes allow:

[I]t is doubtful whether Augustine assumed any literary interdependence between the Gospels at all. For the way in which he speaks about the relationships between the Gospels elsewhere in his *De consensu evangelistarum* contradicts the literary-critical theory just mentioned so often that Augustine can hardly be supposed to have held it.<sup>5</sup>

The statement in *De consensu evangelistarum* 1.2.4 needs to be placed alongside some of Augustine’s other observations: that Matthew has left out material occurring in Mark<sup>6</sup> and Luke,<sup>7</sup> that Matthew and Luke are said to skip certain matters occurring in Luke,<sup>8</sup> that Matthew has inserted statements attributed to Jesus which are not reported by Mark or Luke,<sup>9</sup> and that although Mark follows Matthew for the most part, he also appears to be closer to Luke in a number of other passages.<sup>10</sup> Augustine accounts for these differences by suggesting that the divergences were a symptom of the divergent recollections of individual Evangelists and their own particular interests and observations in recording their respective gospels.<sup>11</sup> If Augustine believed that “Matthew has omitted what Mark has related,”<sup>12</sup> then the evidence suggests that Augustine did not assume that Mark was dependent upon Matthew. Mark ‘followed’ Matthew in the sense that his independent testimony served to confirm Matthew’s eyewitness account. In Augustine’s mind, the resemblance did not necessarily indicate a close literary relationship. However, it is quite misleading to suggest that the publication of *De consensu evangelistarum* means that Augustine was a notable exception in addressing the discrepancies between the gospels.

Debates about the discrepancies between the gospels were not unknown before the time of Augustine. John Chrysostom, writing at roughly the same time as Augustine and drawing on a tradition which appears to have

---

<sup>5</sup> Henk Jan de Jonge, ‘Augustine on the Interrelations of the Gospels,’ in *The Four Gospels*, ed. F. van Segbroeck et al. (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 3.2410.

<sup>6</sup> Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* 2.27.61 (PL 34.1041–1230).

<sup>7</sup> Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* 2.12.26 (PL 34.1041–1230).

<sup>8</sup> Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* 2.66.127 (PL 34.1041–1230).

<sup>9</sup> Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* 2.80.157 (PL 34.1041–1230).

<sup>10</sup> Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* 4.10.11 (PL 34.1041–1230).

<sup>11</sup> Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* 2.12.26 (PL 34.1041–1230).

<sup>12</sup> Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* 2.27.61 and 2.68.131 (PL 34.1041–1230).

originated in the writings of Eusebius,<sup>13</sup> suggests that Matthew wrote first and that Mark came after him, accounting for his brevity on the grounds that he was “putting his hand to what had already been spoken and made manifest.”<sup>14</sup> It is curious that the writings of Eusebius have been neglected in relation to these questions. The contribution of Eusebius of Caesarea is significant not only for the corpus of apologetic works but also for the detailed analysis of gospel parallels in the Eusebian Canons. In one of the sources of the *Catena in Marcum*, the *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum*, Eusebius attempts to explain a range of inconsistencies in the testimony of the first witnesses of the resurrection.

These inconsistencies had all been picked up by pagan critics of the Christian religion.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, they were a source of considerable contention between Christian commentators and their pagan critics, who exploited many of the inconsistencies within and among the gospel narratives. Celsus had noticed some of the inconsistencies between the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, suggesting that there were also other discrepancies within the gospels—sometimes (e.g. Matthew 3.17) the identity of Jesus was clearly disclosed while at other times his identity was hidden from view.<sup>16</sup> The criticisms of Celsus met with a fairly robust response from Origen, who was able to exploit the fact that Celsus had not read the gospel narratives very closely.<sup>17</sup> Porphyry, on the other hand, was a much more challenging adversary, and it was left to Eusebius to take up the challenge. Although only extracts of his writings survive, it is clear from what remains extant that Porphyry was skilled in the forensic analysis of texts: for instance, we know that Porphyry was aware of the discrepancies between the genealogies;<sup>18</sup> he objected to Mark’s conflation of Malachi 3.1 and Isaiah

---

<sup>13</sup> Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.16.1 (G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 1, SC 31 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952, 71)).

<sup>14</sup> John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 4.1.7 (PG 57.39.48–50).

<sup>15</sup> For discussion of these issues, see Loveday Alexander, ‘The Four among Pagans,’ in *The Written Gospel*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl and Donald Hagner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 222–237 and Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*.

<sup>16</sup> Origen, *Contra Celsum* 2.32.6 and 2.72.4. (TLG 2042.001 and M. Borret, *Origène. Contre Celse*, vol. 1, SC (Paris: Éditions du Cerf), 364–365 and 456–459).

<sup>17</sup> Celsus’ ‘reading of the gospels was not close and accurate in the Porphyrian sense.’ (Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*, 28).

<sup>18</sup> Porphyry, *Contra Christianos* Fr. 11 (A. von Harnack, *Porphyrius. Gegen die Christen* [Berlin: Reimer, 1916]). Many of these fragments have been translated in R. Joseph Hoffman, *Porphyry’s Against the Christians: The Literary Remains* (New York: Prometheus Books, 1994).

40.3<sup>19</sup> and Matthew's attribution of a passage from the Psalms to Isaiah;<sup>20</sup> among others, he noted the inconsistencies between Matthew's and Luke's accounts of the Messiah's birth;<sup>21</sup> in the account of the Gadarene demoniac, he noted that Mark included details which were not found in Matthew's version;<sup>22</sup> he had discovered contradictory versions of the circumstances surrounding the death of Judas Iscariot in the Acts of the Apostles and in Matthew;<sup>23</sup> and he almost certainly questioned the fact that Mark records that Jesus was crucified at the third hour, while John records that it was the sixth hour.<sup>24</sup> Moreover, only John<sup>25</sup> had recorded that Jesus was stabbed in the side by a Roman soldier.<sup>26</sup> Commenting on Fragment 15 of Porphyry's *Contra Christianos*, Aryeh Kofsky notes his extensive knowledge of the Christian scriptures in general and his close reading of the Passion narratives in particular:

Porphyry points out that each Gospel gives a different version of the Passion (πάθος) of Jesus. For example, Mark writes that someone offered Jesus a sponge dipped in vinegar (15.36). Matthew states that he was given 'wine mingled with gall' (27.34), while John mentions 'a sponge full of the vinegar on hyssop' (19.29). Matthew relates that on the cross, Jesus cried out: 'Eli, Eli lama sabachthani? That is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' (27.46). Luke, on the other hand, writes that Jesus cried out: 'Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit' (23.48). In light of the banal and highly contradictory story, says Porphyry, perhaps several were crucified and not just one man. If the authors of the Gospels could not present a single version of the death of Jesus, then nothing they wrote was worth believing.<sup>27</sup>

Confronted with such a sustained attack on the reliability of the gospels, Christian apologists such as Eusebius responded energetically to this assault on their foundational documents.

---

<sup>19</sup> Porphyry, *Contra Christianos* Fr. 9 (A. von Harnack, *Porphyrius. Gegen die Christen* [Berlin: Reimer, 1916]).

<sup>20</sup> Porphyry, *Contra Christianos* Fr. 10 (A. von Harnack, *Porphyrius. Gegen die Christen* [Berlin: Reimer, 1916]).

<sup>21</sup> Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*, 137.

<sup>22</sup> Porphyry, *Contra Christianos* Fr. 49 (A. von Harnack, *Porphyrius. Gegen die Christen* [Berlin: Reimer, 1916]).

<sup>23</sup> Porphyry, *Contra Christianos* Fr. 17 (A. von Harnack, *Porphyrius. Gegen die Christen* [Berlin: Reimer, 1916]).

<sup>24</sup> Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*, 147.

<sup>25</sup> John 19.34.

<sup>26</sup> Porphyry, *Contra Christianos* Fr. 16 (A. von Harnack, *Porphyrius. Gegen die Christen* [Berlin: Reimer, 1916]).

<sup>27</sup> Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea against the Pagans*, 27.

Aryeh Kofsky argues that the apologetic work of Eusebius has been seriously underestimated in recent scholarship. Indeed, the fact that Eusebius' contribution is ignored by contemporary biblical scholarship only serves to underline his thesis. Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* is often used as a farm for different sources, but there has been little engagement with some of his other works. Kofsky suggests that Porphyry's *Contra Christianos* may have been "a decisive factor in motivating Eusebius' apologetic-polemical writing."<sup>28</sup> Both the *Praeparatio evangelica* and *Demonstratio evangelica* mention Porphyry's writing explicitly, and in these as well as a number of other writings (including *De theophania*<sup>29</sup> and *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum*,<sup>30</sup> quoted in the *Catena in Marcum*), Eusebius seeks to address and refute Porphyry's arguments. Given Porphyry's detailed analysis of the inconsistencies between the gospels, Eusebius seeks to address his criticisms directly. Undoubtedly, the expertise offered by Eusebius in this task was informed by the creation of the Eusebian Canons.

#### a. *The Eusebian Canons*

In the opening pages of a number of the medieval manuscripts containing the *Catena in Marcum*, one can often find a frontispiece made up of ten ornate tables with decorative colonnades. To the uninitiated, their purpose can appear somewhat mysterious. The tables present a series of numerals side by side in different columns. The numerals relate to numbered passages in the gospels. They were designed by Eusebius of Caesarea to aid the exegetical study of the gospels. The story of the compilation of the Eusebian canons can be gleaned from Eusebius' letter to Carpianus, which follows the Eusebian canons in Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 186 as well as a number of other manuscripts.<sup>31</sup> Eusebius begins by lamenting prior attempts to compile a harmonized account of the four gospels. Ammonius the Alexandrian had attempted to do this by placing the corresponding sections of the other gospels alongside the gospel according to Matthew. Eusebius observes that this had "the inevitable result that the coherent sequence of

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 250.

<sup>29</sup> This particular work is also quoted in *Cat. Marc.* 264.31–265.21.

<sup>30</sup> See *Cat. Marc.* 266.9–12 and some allusions in *Cat. Marc.* 444.9–445.32.

<sup>31</sup> Eusebius, *Epistula ad Carpianum ad canones evangeliorum praemissa* (TLG 2018.013). The translation is taken from Harold H. Oliver, 'The Epistle of Eusebius to Carpianus: Textual Tradition and Translation,' *Novum Testamentum* 3, no. 1/2 Jan. (1959), 138–145.



the three was destroyed inasmuch as regards the pattern of the readings.”<sup>32</sup> Instead Eusebius uses the raw data provided by Ammonius to assign consecutive reference numbers to each pericope in each of the four gospels. Parallel pericopae are then set out in a total of ten tables: first, passages that occur in Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; second, passages in Matthew, Mark and Luke; third, Matthew, Luke and John; fourth, Matthew, Mark and John; fifth, passages common to Matthew and Luke; sixth, passages common to Matthew and Mark; seventh, passages common to Matthew and John; eighth, passages common to Mark and Luke; ninth, passages common to Luke and John; and finally material which is unique to each gospel. Curiously, the ten canons do not exhaust the potential parallels possible. There is no reference to the passages common to Mark, Luke and John, nor to the twofold agreement between Mark and John. Carl Nordenfalk suggests an intriguing reason for this oversight:

The hidden reason for his limiting the *Canones* to ten must have been the particular significance attached in ancient numerology to that figure. Just as according to St. Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 3.11) there had to be four Gospels, neither more nor less, because the number four conformed to the cardinal points of the Universe, so the Canon Tables attained a similar degree of perfection by being ten. Since Pythagoras, the numbers “four” and “ten” had been considered mutually connected by mathematical laws. Eusebius himself refers to it in his *Oration in Praise of Constantine*, delivered in 335 at the occasion of the Emperor’s *Tricennalia*: ‘... the number four produces the number ten. For the aggregate of one, and two, and three, and four, is ten.’ Later in the same speech he elaborates further: ‘... the number ten, which contains the end of all numbers, and terminates them in itself, may truly be called a full and perfect number, as comprehending every species and every measure of numbers, proportions, concords, and harmonies.’ The restriction of the Canon Tables to ten thus made them particularly well suited to be a ‘harmony’ of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ.<sup>33</sup>

Putting to one side the distractions of the curious mathematics, it is probable that the tabular presentation of information was an approach which Eusebius had learned from the documents assembled by Origen and Pamphilus in the library in Caesarea. Origen had used a tabular format to good effect in the *Hexapla*, and Eusebius adopts a similar method in his analysis of the gospels. Perhaps Eusebius’ ingenuity lay in establishing a system of numerical cues that could be used alongside an existing book of the

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 144.

<sup>33</sup> Carl Nordenfalk, ‘Canon Tables on Papyrus,’ *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 36 (1982): 29–30.

gospels. As long as the passages were numbered consistently, commentators could retrieve information and make comparisons between different passages relatively easily. Indeed, Eusebius appears to have been particularly adept at maximising the technological potential of the codex. As Anthony Grafton and Megan Williams point out, Eusebius “enabled readers not simply to rely on memory or to use rearranged texts of the Bible, but to turn the four Gospels into a single web of cross-commentary ...”<sup>34</sup> Armed with such a resource, Christian commentators were alert to the discrepancies between the gospels. In his *Homiliae in Matthaeum*, John Chrysostom seems to have been particularly attentive to these issues, drawing frequent parallels between Matthew, Mark and Luke. The comments of Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinaris of Laodicea, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria and others demonstrate not only an awareness of these exegetical issues but also a desire to refute pagan critics of the gospels.

Of course, these commentators were not the only ones to use the Eusebian canons. The evidence suggests that the compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* also used the Eusebian canons to search existing *catenae* and commentaries on Matthew and Luke so that they could find the relevant extracts for the equivalent passages in Mark. One of the consequences of this was that the compilers of the *Catena* became aware of the inconsistencies between Mark and the other evangelists in a particularly acute way. The *Catena in Marcum* contains over eighty instances in which discrepancies between Mark and the other evangelists are cited. In noting these discrepancies, it was inevitable that some explanation would be required. In some cases, the compilers drew on an existing explanation.

How can we tell whether the compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* were using the Eusebian canons? There are two separate pieces of evidence. The first relates to the fact that the *Catena in Marcum* is largely made up of extracts from *catenae* and commentaries on Matthew and Luke. The compilers of the *Catena* would have required some means of navigating their way around these existing commentaries to find the relevant passages. The tables provided by Eusebius would have provided the simplest means available. The Eusebian canons were the closest thing to a search engine that ancient commentators could find. The second piece of evidence is more complex, but it is important in that it serves to tip the balance of probability. It relates again to the comments on the woman who anointed

---

<sup>34</sup> Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*, 199.

Jesus with oil in Mark 14.<sup>35</sup> The catenist notes that John Chrysostom, Origen, Apollinaris and Theodore of Mopsuestia all comment on this passage but they disagree about the identity of the woman. Chrysostom notes the inconsistency between the three synoptic gospels and John, while Origen notes the inconsistency between Luke and the two other synoptic gospels, Matthew and Mark. Apollinaris and Theodore play down the inconsistency, by suggesting simply that “John is more precise in handing on the account.”<sup>36</sup> That the compiler quotes these different commentators at length alerts us to the fact that the interpretation of this passage is particularly problematic. One of the reasons why it is so problematic is that it is the subject of a curious inconsistency within the Eusebian canons.<sup>37</sup> John 98<sup>38</sup> features in both *Canon I Of Four Gospels* and *Canon IV Of Three Gospels*. The fact that John 98 appears in Canon I suggests that Eusebius regarded this episode to be the same in all four gospels. Consequently, John 98 is placed alongside Matthew 276,<sup>39</sup> Mark 158,<sup>40</sup> and Luke 74.<sup>41</sup> However, John 98 is also placed alongside Matthew 277,<sup>42</sup> and Mark 159<sup>43</sup> in Canon IV. Luke is omitted.

These differences are reflected in the different judgements of the commentators quoted by the catenist. Apollinaris and Theodore accept Eusebius’ judgement that this episode belongs in Canon I. They may not agree exactly on the details, but it is a pericope which is common to all four evangelists. Origen is more sceptical, insisting that the differences with Luke are more significant. Only Chrysostom goes for a more radical solution, disregarding the Eusebian canons and suggesting that John’s testimony differs from the other three. Chrysostom’s position is clearly at variance with the Eusebian canons. This solution is perhaps a little too radical for the catenist, who proceeds to give a detailed analysis of the differences between Luke’s account and that of the others. In other words, the catenist upholds Origen’s view that this passage really does belong in Canon IV. The views of the others are not considered in any detail. The fact that the catenist moves

---

<sup>35</sup> Note that this passage has also been discussed in Chapter 2.

<sup>36</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 418.10–11.

<sup>37</sup> See C. Nordenfalk, ‘The Eusebian Canon Tables: Some Textual Problems,’ *Journal of Theological Studies* 35, no. 1 (1984).

<sup>38</sup> John 12.2–8.

<sup>39</sup> Matthew 26.6–11.

<sup>40</sup> Mark 14.3–7.

<sup>41</sup> Luke 7.36–50.

<sup>42</sup> Matthew 26.12–13.

<sup>43</sup> Mark 14.8–9.

so quickly to consider the inconsistencies with Luke in the comments that follow suggests that he is wrestling with the problem presented by the Eusebian canons. Moreover, the evidence also suggests that the catenist was not willing to stray too far from the guidance of Eusebius.

This passage is significant, not only because it suggests that compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* were guided by the Eusebian canons, but also because this material demonstrates that the compilers of the *Catena* were aware of the fact that different commentators often came up with different, and sometimes conflicting, explanations for the discrepancies.

#### b. *Discrepancies and their Explanation in the Catena in Marcum*

The fact that the compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* consulted material on the gospels of Matthew, Luke and John, perhaps made them peculiarly aware of the similarities and the discrepancies between the gospels. Sometimes discrepancies are picked up, simply by virtue of the fact that the catenist is reading a commentary on another gospel. For instance, in a comment on Mark 3.13, the extract states “He went up onto the mountain, as Luke says, to pray.”<sup>44</sup> No reason is given for this reference to Luke, although it is repeated again a little later.<sup>45</sup> The implication of this passage is that Luke is providing a more detailed account of the incident. Mark is often presented in the *Catena* as the evangelist who provides a brief account. So with regard to John the Baptist in Mark 1.4, “The story that Matthew set out at a greater length, the present Evangelist expounds in a concise form.”<sup>46</sup> Explaining the inconsistency between Mark’s reference<sup>47</sup> to the arrest of John the Baptist before the beginning of Jesus’ public ministry, and Matthew’s description of his arrest at a later point within his narrative,<sup>48</sup> the commentator simply asserts that “Mark narrates most things in conformity with Matthew in an abbreviated form.”<sup>49</sup>

Further evidence of the more detailed description provided by Matthew is furnished by a comparison of the different accounts of the commissioning of the twelve:<sup>50</sup> “And Mark tells us simply the number of those he selected.

<sup>44</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 296.20.

<sup>45</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 297.4.

<sup>46</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 268.11–12.

<sup>47</sup> Mark 1.14.

<sup>48</sup> Matthew 4.12.

<sup>49</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 274.15–16.

<sup>50</sup> The parallels are Mark 6.7–11, Matthew 10.1–16, and Luke 9.1–5.

But Matthew also adds who they were, and he also describes the manner in which they were sent out in twos. For while Mark puts this simply, Matthew says ‘it was him and it was him,’ and also describes their arrangement, pointing out who was the first and who was the second.<sup>51</sup> And yet while the compilers of the *catena* were aware of the standard apologetic that Mark had produced an *epitome* of Matthew, they were also aware of the connection between Mark and Peter. Thus when it comes to describing Peter’s confession of the Messiah at Caesarea Philippi in Mark 8, the catenist notes that Matthew provides a fuller description of the episode, which is curious given the tradition that Mark had access to Peter’s own account of the incident. Some explanation was required: “And the present Evangelist has passed over the more detailed narrative that Matthew gives, for he, as in an abridgement, has omitted the precise details of the story, in order that he might not seem to Peter to court favour with his teacher.”<sup>52</sup>

We should be wary of assuming that when patristic writers observe that Mark presents a briefer account, they are suggesting some kind of literary dependence upon Matthew. Such an assumption neglects their observations that Mark provides a more abbreviated version than Luke. For example, when Mark describes Jesus casting out demons,<sup>53</sup> the catenist adds:

Now saying this is not contrary to what was said by Saint Luke, for the same says ‘demons came out from him, screaming and saying, ‘You are the Christ, the Son of God.’ But he rebuked them and would not allow them to speak, because they knew that he was the Christ.’ Mark disregards the latter in so far as many things in his exposition are abbreviated.<sup>54</sup>

At other points, the discrepancies between Mark and Luke are explained not by the argument that Mark has provided a brief description, but by the argument that Luke has provided additional material. Thus, in the prediction of the Passion in Mark 10.32–34, the catenist incorporates an extract from John Chrysostom in which he says that “Luke recounted in addition that it was necessary also from the prophets when he says ‘everything that is written about the Son of Man by the prophets will be accomplished,’”<sup>55</sup> and again another extract from Chrysostom suggests that Luke’s descrip-

---

<sup>51</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 322.27–29.

<sup>52</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 346.11–14.

<sup>53</sup> Mark 1.34.

<sup>54</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 278.28–279.3.

<sup>55</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 383. 25–27.

tion of the two thieves at Calvary<sup>56</sup> is a consequence of Luke's desire to set out "a more detailed account."<sup>57</sup>

Indeed, patristic commentators noted that Mark himself occasionally provided a fuller account. For example, in Mark 8.15, there is a discrepancy with Matthew 16.6 and Luke 12.1. While Matthew speaks of the leaven "of the Pharisees and the Sadducees" and Luke speaks of the leaven "of the Pharisees," Mark speaks of the leaven "of the Pharisees and Herodians." The catenist is quick to say that "there is no disagreement" for "the three Evangelists say 'the Pharisees' in the first place. But two Evangelists assign a part to second parties, while neither of the two says only one. For the likelihood was that since Matthew omitted the Herodians, Mark added them to provide a fuller description."<sup>58</sup> Similarly, when the women approach the tomb in the account of the resurrection, the catenist notes the fact that Matthew says that an angel sat on top of the stone, while Mark describes a young man seated on the right wearing a white robe. However, again "there is no disagreement."<sup>59</sup> Matthew does not describe the form in which the angel appeared: "Therefore what was omitted by Matthew was filled in by Mark."<sup>60</sup>

Some of the divergences between the gospels demand explanations of their own. Many of these relate to minor details of factual information: for instance, while Mark 1.37 says that the disciples were looking for Jesus, Luke 4.42 says that the crowd were searching for him. Again "they are not contradicting each other. For it is possible that the crowd was also following after the Apostles."<sup>61</sup> Indeed, Mark 1.36 speaks of "Simon and those who were with him," leaving room for the kind of explanation provided in the *Catena in Marcum*. Similarly, there is the reference to the calling of Levi, son of Alphaeus in Mark 2.14. The problem with this passage is that it agrees with Luke 5.27, but disagrees with Matthew 9.9, where "Levi" is replaced by "Matthew." The comment incorporates a fragment from Origen's commentary on Luke:

And so he goes out and finds a tax collector, called Levi, sitting down. And this is Matthew the Evangelist. And Blessed Mark and Blessed Luke both conceal the name with the more old-fashioned name; but, in his gospel, Levi,

---

<sup>56</sup> Luke 23.39–43.

<sup>57</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 438.28–29.

<sup>58</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 343.20–24.

<sup>59</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 445.16–17.

<sup>60</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 445.22–23.

<sup>61</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 280.8–9.

plainly announcing what concerns himself says, 'And he saw Matthew a tax collector,' exposing his own shame in order that you may marvel at the skill of the healer.<sup>62</sup>

In other words, Mark and Luke conceal Matthew's identity to spare his blushes. Similarly, there is a minor discrepancy between Mark's account of the Gerasene demoniac in Mark 5.1–13 and Matthew's description of two demoniacs in Matthew 8.28. Chrysostom protests that there is no discrepancy—a discrepancy would only arise if Mark had insisted that there was *only* one demoniac. But if that is not sufficiently persuasive, he goes on to suggest that Mark was singling out the demoniac who was more difficult to handle. He asserts that Luke adopts a similar approach in describing the condition of the demoniac "in more tragic terms."<sup>63</sup> There is a similar problem with the description of the healing of Bartimaeus in Mark 10. 46–52. The parallel in Matthew refers to the healing of two blind men. Again "this does not make the narrative inconsistent. For it is possible that both Mark and Luke make mention of more important details, just as Mark here has disclosed his name saying, 'Bartimaeus, son of Timaeus, a blind man' as someone who was well-known at the time."<sup>64</sup>

There are further disagreements between Mark 9.2 and Luke 9.28. Mark prefaces the story of the transfiguration by saying "after six days," while Luke says "after eight days." Chrysostom again tells us to disregard this discrepancy "for the one expressed both the day on which he spoke, and the day on which he led them up (the mountain). But the other described only the interval between the days."<sup>65</sup> By comparison, the discrepancy between Mark 9.33 and Matthew 18.1 (where the disciples ask a direct question of Jesus "Who is the greatest?" without Mark's reference to Jesus' question to them, "What were you arguing about on the way?") is resolved when one simply concludes that "Matthew does not begin at the beginning of the narrative."<sup>66</sup>

In Mark 10.35–45, "James and John, the sons of Zebedee" ask Jesus if they may be granted the seats of honour in the Kingdom of God, but in Matthew 20.20, their mother asks the question on their behalf. Chrysostom suggests that "both these things came to pass"<sup>67</sup> and he also reasons that

<sup>62</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 288.5–9.

<sup>63</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 315.4–5.

<sup>64</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 388.28–31.

<sup>65</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 352.18–20.

<sup>66</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 363.26.

<sup>67</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 384.8–9.

they took their mother along to be their advocate because she appears to have been rather formidable. In accounting for the discrepancy between John and the synoptic gospels in their descriptions of the timing of cleansing of the temple, the compilers of the *Catena* furnish the reader with not just one explanation, but three: first, they quote Chrysostom who suggests that Jesus drove out the money-changers and traders on more than one occasion and so the evangelists are describing two different occasions;<sup>68</sup> secondly, an extract from Apollinaris says that, while John presents the “more precise” account, the date “was not really a matter of any significance” to Matthew, Mark and Luke, who were only concerned about telling the story;<sup>69</sup> thirdly, an anonymous passage suggests that the sequence of historical events is often subject to alteration in biblical narrative. Quoting Psalm 78.19–20, the commentator suggests that the Psalmist had altered the sequence of events described in the Book of Exodus. For the Book of Exodus describes the giving of the manna before Moses struck the rock in Exodus 17.<sup>70</sup>

These comments about the Psalmist alert us to the fact that ancient commentators would sometimes put forward more overtly theological explanations for the divergences between the gospels: for instance, in Mark 10.1, the evangelist says that when the crowds gathered, “he taught them,” but the parallel passage in Matthew 19.2 says that “he healed them.” Chrysostom suggests that this divergence can be explained when one considers that Christ brought healing “in two ways: first, for the soul (for such was the teaching) and secondly, for the body. For the healing of their sickness came to pass not only for them, but also became for others an intimation of the knowledge of God ...”<sup>71</sup> Later in Chapter 10, the compilers include another extract from Apollinaris. Commenting on Mark 10.29, Apollinaris notes that by contrast Luke refers not simply to leaving one’s house, brothers, sisters, mother, father and children, but also one’s “wife.”<sup>72</sup> He explains this with reference to Paul’s instructions in 1 Timothy 5.1–3 “to honour older women as mothers and younger women as sisters in all purity”:

For just as he gives brothers who are not brothers, and parents who are not parents, and children who are not children, so also he gives a wife who is not a wife; and, in a slightly different spiritual fashion, it is a good thing to leave behind one’s kin according to the flesh on account of the spiritual life, in the

---

<sup>68</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 393.15–25.

<sup>69</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 393.32–394.6.

<sup>70</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 394.6–14.

<sup>71</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 371.17–21.

<sup>72</sup> Luke 18.29.



same way that Moses said long ago concerning the tribe of Levi, ‘the one who says to his father and his mother ‘I have not seen you,’ and to his brothers ‘I do not recognise you,’ and to his sons ‘I renounce you,’ observes your word and keeps your covenant. They will teach Jacob your ordinances, and Israel your law. They will offer incense on your altar on account of everything.’<sup>73</sup>

Again, in Mark 1.34, the evangelist says that Jesus healed “many” of the people who were sick, while the parallel in Matthew 8.16 refers to Jesus healing “all” of them. The commentator attempts to resolve this inconsistency by referring to Romans 5.18–19: “Just as one man’s trespass led to condemnation for all, so one man’s act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all. For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by one man’s obedience many will be made righteous.” The commentator observes that in the first sentence Paul speaks of “all” and in the following verse, he speaks of “many.” This leads the commentator to conclude that these words are used interchangeably in scripture. Consequently, there is no real inconsistency between Mark and Matthew.<sup>74</sup>

Although the logic of these arguments is not always easy to follow, it is perhaps significant that time and again commentators use other passages from scripture to explain a *lacuna* or to clarify the interpretative options in reading a particular passage. In this respect, Bockmuehl is entirely right when he suggests that ancient “gospel commentaries tended to draw heavily on cognate or parallel passages in the other gospels.”<sup>75</sup> Thus the differences between the gospel narratives are not necessarily problematic. Instead, they are used to the commentators’ advantage. They serve to add clarity or to fill in detail where there is a perceived ambiguity in the text. For instance, Mark 1.38 speaks simply of Jesus “preaching,” while Luke 4.43 speaks of Jesus ‘proclaiming the gospel.’ The commentator thinks that this is significant because “it indicates that Christ himself is the Kingdom of God,”<sup>76</sup> and a lengthy excursus follows explaining what it means to identify the Kingdom with the presence of Christ. The feeding of the 4,000 (Mark 8.1–10) may appear to be a simple repetition of the feeding of the 5,000 in Mark 6.35–44. In the mind of the commentator, these passages are not simply indications of Christ’s power to respond repeatedly to material needs. They serve a more spiritual purpose. In his view, they are illuminated by John 6.26–27:

---

<sup>73</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 382.14–23.

<sup>74</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 278.17–25.

<sup>75</sup> Bockmuehl and Hagner, ed., *The Written Gospel*, 285.

<sup>76</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 280.17.

'You do not seek me because you saw signs and wonders, but because you ate from the bread, and were satisfied.' Then urging them on to search for something greater, he encourages faith in himself and the benefit which comes from it which is eternal: comparing it with more immediate sustenance, he says, 'Do not work for the food which perishes, but for the food which endures for eternal life.'<sup>77</sup>

In his description of the arrest of Jesus, Mark recounts the story in which one of Jesus' followers strikes the servant of the high priest and cuts off his ear. Mark's narrative moves on quickly, but the compilers of the *Catena* are quick to draw the attention of the reader to the parallel passage in Luke where Jesus heals the one who endured the blow. As the extract from Cyril of Alexandria indicates, this only serves to prove the truth of the incarnation.<sup>78</sup> But it is important to note the way in which a gospel parallel is used to fill in a detail within Mark's narrative and to explain a *lacuna* within the text.

The explanations for these inconsistencies are not always terribly convincing, and there is a defensiveness about their tone, which suggests that the shadow of Celsus and Porphyry is never far away. At other points, rather than attempting to explain the divergence, the significance of the differences between the accounts is minimised. At a number of points, the commentator simply asserts that the accounts are similar, and the differences are of no real significance.<sup>79</sup> Elsewhere, the catenist is happy to concede that the evangelists have not been too precise about the details.<sup>80</sup> The inference is that it really is not all that important.

The evidence of the *Catena in Marcum* suggests that ancient commentators were accustomed to a close reading of the text. Nevertheless, there were occasional oversights: for example, in commenting on the passage from Mark 4.34 "secretly he explained everything to his disciples," the compilers of the *Catena* incorporate an extract from John Chrysostom, which says that "everything" means that "which they sought to learn from him about

<sup>77</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 340.19–24.

<sup>78</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 429.2–4.

<sup>79</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 268.29–30, 280.8, 284.6, 324.4, 324.27.

<sup>80</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 284.11, 315.9, 391.15, 432.6 Robert Grant quotes the first two incidents of the term ἀκριβολογία and its cognates in the *Catena in Marcum*. He identifies the catenist as a follower of Antiochene exegesis, and he associates the catenist's use of the term with Theodore of Mopsuestia's antipathy towards scholarship. He thought it was evidence of "a certain anticritical feeling in the school of Antioch" (Robert M. Grant, 'Historical Criticism in the Ancient Church,' *The Journal of Religion* 25, no. 3 (1945): 196). However, Grant's assumption that the *Catena in Marcum* stands in the Antiochene tradition is mistaken. It embraces representatives of both the Antiochene and Alexandrian schools.

the parable of the sower and the parable of the tares.<sup>81</sup> The problem is that while the parable of the sower is recorded in Mark and Matthew, the parable of the tares is only to be found in Matthew. Thus the passage clearly reflects its earlier application to the Gospel according to Matthew. Part of the difficulty is that the compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* are having to adapt material which applies more directly to Matthew or Luke. One of the unforeseen consequences of this process of adaptation is that this inevitably reinforces the way in which Mark's gospel is read in the light of Matthew and Luke. Marcan priority is not entertained as a possibility, but then these commentators are not interested in providing literary solutions to the 'synoptic problem.'

Early commentators were not willing to ignore the challenges of interpreting the discrepancies between the gospels. Their pagan critics would not so easily let them off the hook. Discrepancies between John and the synoptic tradition, as well as Matthew and Mark, Mark and Luke, Luke and Matthew, as well as Mark against Matthew and Luke, Matthew against Mark and Luke, and Luke against Mark and Matthew, are all identified within the *Catena in Marcum*. Considerable ingenuity is invested in explaining some of these contradictions, although some explanations are less convincing than others.

The evidence of *Catena in Marcum* 346.11–14 suggests that ancient commentators were content to speak of Mark as an *epitome* of Matthew, while at the same time insisting that Mark was a disciple of Peter. The fact that Mark is also portrayed as presenting an abbreviated version of a passage in Luke suggests that an *epitome* did not imply any kind of literary dependence. A similar issue can be detected in Augustine's *De consensu evangelistarum*. That Augustine saw no conflict between Mark as the epitomist (*breviator*) of Matthew, and Mark's dependence on Peter, suggests that he saw no literary dependence between Matthew and Mark. There are two points to be learned from this: first, the assertions contained within *De consensu evangelistarum* are attested in other writings of the period, many of which are either contemporaneous with or earlier than Augustine's treatise. Augustine was by no means unique in giving his attention to the discrepancies between the gospels. The Eusebian canons show that early commentators were alert to these problems. Moreover, the criticisms of Celsus and Porphyry made this an essential task of Christian apologetic. Secondly, the

---

<sup>81</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 311.25–27 The passage in question comes from Chrysostom's comment on Matthew 13.41–43.

assumption that Augustine proposed a literary solution to the synoptic problem suggests that there has been a tendency among modern scholars to project their own literary solutions onto the testimony of Christian writers of late antiquity. The recent disavowal of literary solutions to the synoptic problem and the recognition of the importance and vitality of the oral transmission of testimony about Jesus may reduce the temptation of projecting literary solutions onto patristic writers and allow a further reappraisal of the way in which early Christian writers understood the relationships between the four canonical gospels.<sup>82</sup>

### *c. The Historical Trajectory*

In this chapter, I have explored the way in which early commentators attempted to explain the discrepancies between the gospels. Their comments betray a clear apologetic interest for the simple reason that these divergences had been the subject of vigorous criticism by pagan thinkers, such as Celsus and Porphyry. It is significant that Christian commentators emphasised the significance of eyewitness testimony in their defence. The clear inference of their arguments at every stage is that the gospels could be trusted as reliable and authentic accounts of the events which they described. While it would be anachronistic to attribute a modern historical consciousness to these writers, it is clear that early commentators were not content simply to read the biblical text as a self-contained world. Although postliberal theologians have used patristic and medieval emphasis on the *sensus literalis* to alert contemporary theologians to the importance of the biblical narrative and to challenge the hegemony of historical criticism, it is clear that early commentators took the biblical narratives to refer to real historical events.

Many years ago, Robert Grant argued that while “historical criticism was infrequent in the early church,” the fact that “it was employed at all suggests that it is not something alien to the Christian tradition.”<sup>83</sup> He went on to argue that this interest in historical questions was a direct consequence of the insistence that Christianity was “a historical religion, basing

---

<sup>82</sup> See in particular, Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: the Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006) and Samuel Byrskog, *Story as history—history as story: the gospel tradition in the context of ancient oral history*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

<sup>83</sup> Grant, ‘Historical Criticism in the Ancient Church,’ 196.

its claims on events and interpretations of events which have actually taken place within history.”<sup>84</sup>

Grant’s view may have been overstated. It is not always clear that Grant successfully manages to avoid the risk of projecting the values and assumptions of modern historicism onto the world of the early church. Part of the difficulty lies in establishing what exactly ancient commentators meant by the term ἱστορία. The subtlety of this term has often been lost in debates about patristic exegesis.<sup>85</sup> Although Pierre Hadot notes that the term suggests “inquiry” or “intellectual undertaking,”<sup>86</sup> the etymology of the word ‘history’ should not lead us to confuse ἱστορία with the conventions of modern historical scholarship.<sup>87</sup> The term does not always reflect a desire to reconstruct historical events. When commentators refer to questions of ἱστορία, they are concerned with the writer’s attention to detail and the accuracy of the description. For example, at the beginning of Mark’s gospel, the catenist notes that Mark 1.2–3 consists of a conflation of texts from Malachi and Isaiah. The extract from Origen’s *Commentary on John* identifies the passage from Mark 1.3 “the voice crying in the wilderness” as a passage from Isaiah<sup>88</sup> which follows the “account” of the reign of Hezekiah.<sup>89</sup> Again, when commenting on Mark 2.25–26, the catenist includes a comment from Eusebius’ *Commentary on the Psalms* to explain the perceived discrepancy between the account in Mark, where Jesus says that Abiathar was high priest at the time when David ate the bread of the presence, and the confusion over the identity of the high priest in 1 Samuel 21–22. Eusebius suggests two possible ways of explaining the *aporia*: either Abiathar’s second name was Abimelech and they were one and the same person, or the confusion is caused by the fact that while Abimelech was a priest, Abiathar was in fact the high priest at the time. Thus, when 1 Samuel 22.11 says that Abimelech replies to Saul, he is not *described* as “the high priest.”<sup>90</sup> In

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> For a more extended discussion of this question, see Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 86–87.

<sup>86</sup> Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, 10.

<sup>87</sup> Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 79.

<sup>88</sup> Isaiah 40.3.

<sup>89</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 268.22 Origen is referring to Isaiah 37–39. Robert Berchman has noted that this textual error had been picked up by Porphyry, whose views are recounted by Jerome (Robert M. Berchman, ‘In the Shadow of Origen: Porphyry and the Patristic Origins of New Testament Criticism,’ in *Origenia Sexta: Origen and the Bible*, ed. Gilles Dorival and Alain le Boulluc (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995), 662).

<sup>90</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 293.11–15.

Mark 3.8, an anonymous source refers to the crowds desire to see Jesus “at first hand,” i.e. to get their own “description.”<sup>91</sup> In his interpretation of the healing of the blind man (Mark 10.46–52), the catenist notes the discrepancy with the “two blind men” in Matthew 20.30. He argues that “this does not make the description inconsistent.”<sup>92</sup> By contrast, the comments in the *Catena in Marcum* suggest that Mark is “more accurate in his description” in relating the story of the withering of the fig tree.<sup>93</sup> In Mark 13, the commentator comments on the curious eschatological language by saying that “it is customary in scripture to use this sort of description.”<sup>94</sup> Note that in each case, the compilers of the *catena* are using the term ἱστορία not simply to reconstruct a series of historical events, but to alert the readers to some of the problems with the biblical narrative and to encourage readers to engage in a close and intensive reading of the text.

But discussions about patristic historiography should not be restricted to the use of the term ἱστορία. The wider evidence of the *Catena in Marcum* suggests that early commentators were concerned about the testimony of the gospels and the quality of the evangelists’ description of the events which they contained. But the evidence also suggests that this interest arose not simply because of some principled commitment to the idea of “a historical religion” as Grant asserts. During the third and fourth centuries, pagan philosophers such as Celsus and Porphyry had subjected the Christian faith to sustained attack. In constructing their arguments against this new religion, one of their targets was the question of the reliability of Christianity’s foundational documents. Critics like Porphyry argued that the followers of Jesus “misquoted sources, offered conflicting interpretations of his teachings, and exhibited a pitiful lack of comprehension of what Jesus was about.”<sup>95</sup> As Robert Berchman suggests, “Porphyry’s searing critique of the Bible forced Christian biblical scholars to defend their scriptures on historical and literary grounds.”<sup>96</sup> While Berchman argues that this historical interest is more pronounced in the writings of Augustine of Hippo, particularly *De consensu evangelistarum*, the evidence of the *Catena in Marcum*

---

<sup>91</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 296.3.

<sup>92</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 388.28.

<sup>93</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 394.28 There are similar comments about Mark’s description of events in comparison with the other synoptic accounts at *Cat. Marc.* 418.10 and 430.9.

<sup>94</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 412.18.

<sup>95</sup> Berchman, ‘In the Shadow of Origen: Porphyry and the Patristic Origins of New Testament Criticism,’ 661.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, 669.

demonstrates that earlier exegetes also sought to provide compelling arguments to explain the discrepancies between the gospels. These arguments often betrayed a clear historical interest. Once again, the evidence serves to confirm the thesis outlined by John Barton in *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*. Patristic exegesis embraced insights which were by modern standards both critical and noncritical. The antecedents of the 'historical trajectory' in biblical criticism are not simply to be revealed in the context of the Enlightenment or as a consequence of the Renaissance.<sup>97</sup> The arguments about the historicity of the gospel accounts may have become more marked since the rise of modern biblical criticism, but a commitment to discover whether the gospels presented accurate and credible testimony about Jesus was also an important characteristic of early patristic commentary and exegesis.

By contrast, in their description of patristic commentary and exegesis, O'Keefe and Reno suggest that 'premodern' exegetes might equally be described as 'precritical'.<sup>98</sup> And yet, in my view, their analysis is potentially rather misleading. While the description of the Christian exegesis of late antiquity as 'precritical' may provide a useful rhetorical device for drawing parallels between patristic exegesis and more recent attempts by 'postliberal' or 'postcritical' theologians to define an approach to the theological interpretation of scripture that is freed from the legacy of the Enlightenment and the shackles of historical criticism, such a view may actually serve to distort some of the principal characteristics of patristic exegesis. The contention "that the meaning of scripture is in the words and not behind them"<sup>99</sup> does not do justice to the fact that interpreters of Mark were concerned to address the perceived inconsistencies between the gospels and to alert the reader to the value of the Evangelist's testimony in bearing witness to the events described. The fact that these commentators would occasionally draw on the witness of external sources, such as Josephus, to draw attention to particular questions of historical detail only serves to reinforce the point.<sup>100</sup> The evidence presented by the *Catena in Marcum* perhaps only serves to confirm that O'Keefe and Reno are overstating the case. While the

---

<sup>97</sup> Note the comment of Robert Grant: 'It is often assumed by defenders as well as by opponents of historical and literary criticism of the Bible that the method came into existence at the time of the Renaissance and reached its height in the nineteenth century. Such is not the case. Among the primary interests of the great schools of the Hellenistic age was criticism' (Grant, 'Historical Criticism in the Ancient Church,' 183).

<sup>98</sup> Reno, *Sanctified Vision: An Introduction to Early Christian Interpretation of the Bible*, 12.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>100</sup> Commentators refer to the writings of Josephus at a number of points in the course of the *Catena in Marcum* (cf. *Cat. Marc.* 325.1, 408.25, 411.6, 411.32).

arguments employed to explain the discrepancies between the gospels in the *Catena in Marcum* display a close and intensive reading of the text, they are attentive to questions of consistency and coherence in Mark's description of events. They were concerned to defend the gospels as depositories of authentic and accurate eyewitness testimony against the sometimes aggressive inquisition of pagan critics. While it would be anachronistic to equate this 'historical trajectory' with the rigours of modern historical criticism, the evidence nevertheless demonstrates a willingness on the part of the Christian commentators of late antiquity to engage with the rudimentary principles of ancient historiography.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> For further discussion, see Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.' in Momigliano, ed., *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, 79–99 and Arnaldo Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (London: University of California Press, 1990). Momigliano recognises the debt of modern historiography to the great historians of Greek literature, Herodotus and Thucydides, but he also emphasises the influence of Eusebius and the way in which he sought to amass appropriate evidence to defend his arguments: 'Having started to collect his materials during Diocletian's persecutions, Eusebius never forgot his original purpose which was to produce factual evidence about the past and about the character of the persecuted Church. He piled up his evidence of quotations from reputable authorities and records in the form that was natural to any ancient controversialist' (Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.,' 90).





## CHAPTER SIX

### WHO DO YOU SAY THAT I AM?

The question of the identity of Jesus lies at the heart of Mark's gospel. If the question posed by Pontius Pilate, "What is truth?"<sup>1</sup> is the "most celebrated question in the whole of the New Testament"<sup>2</sup> then "Who do you say that I am?"<sup>3</sup> has a particular hold over the exegetical imagination in the interpretation of Mark. The question posed in Mark 8.29 throws into sharp relief the evangelist's interest in the identity of Jesus Christ. In the words of one commentator, there can be no "Christology-free zones"<sup>4</sup> in Mark.

It is a truism that since the publication of William Wrede's groundbreaking *The Messianic Secret*,<sup>5</sup> questions about Christology have dominated the field in Marcan studies. Wrede sought to understand Mark as a theologian. That his book set the agenda for Gospel criticism during this period is almost indisputable. He has been described as "the harbinger of twentieth-century Gospel criticism."<sup>6</sup> His chief contribution to biblical studies lies in the fact that he anticipated much in the critical approach to the text that later advocates of redaction criticism would espouse. Wrede viewed Mark as an author,<sup>7</sup> and he argued that the narrative of Mark's gospel, far from being an accurate historical record of the events surrounding the life of Jesus, betrayed a strong doctrinal and theological interest. While he conceded that the gospel contained a number of historical ideas, he asserted that "the real texture of the presentation becomes apparent only when to the warp of these general historical ideas is added a strong thread of thoughts that are dogmatic in quality."<sup>8</sup> More specifically, he challenged the popular

---

<sup>1</sup> John 18.38.

<sup>2</sup> Rowan Williams, *Christ on Trial: How the Gospel Unsettles our Judgement* (London: Fount, 2000), 76.

<sup>3</sup> Mark 8.29.

<sup>4</sup> Martin Hengel, 'The Messianic Secret in Mark,' in *Recognising the Margins: Developments in Biblical and Theological Studies*, ed. Werner G. Jeanrond and Andrew D.H. Mayes (Dublin: The Columba Press, 2006), 42.

<sup>5</sup> William Wrede, *The Messianic Secret*, trans. J.C.G. Greig (London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd, 1971 ET (first published in German in 1901)).

<sup>6</sup> Robert Morgan, *Biblical Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 107.

<sup>7</sup> Wrede, *The Messianic Secret*, 129.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 130.

explanations of these passages which suggested that Jesus was attempting to proclaim a spiritual understanding of messiahship in contradiction to the prevailing misconceptions about the identity of the Messiah. Wrede argued that this explanation did not pay sufficient attention to the evidence. He was particularly interested in the cryptic language in the following passages: Mark 1.25, 1.34, 1.43–45, 3.12, 4.10–12, 5.43, 7.24, 7.36, 8.26, 8.30, 9.9, 10.47. He discerned a consistent thread in these passages. He noted Mark's references to "silence," the cryptic comments which suggested concealment, and the explicit reference to the "secret" of the kingdom of God in Mark 4.10–12. He posited that the repeated exhortations to conceal the identity of Jesus suggested a "messianic secret."

In Wrede's view, the purpose of this literary motif was to conceal the fact that there was a huge gulf between the Jesus of history and the Christ described in the formularies of the Christian Church, between what the Christian Church had come to think about Jesus and how Jesus was acknowledged and understood in the course of his life. There was also a significant gap between Mark's understanding of the person of Christ and subsequent Christological development in the course of the first six centuries of the emerging church. Wrede's thesis still has a significant hold on the imagination of contemporary scholars. The "thoroughgoing scepticism" which he espoused may have been subject to a variety of criticisms, but the influence of his thought can still be seen in contemporary scholarship. For instance, in her recent commentary on Mark, Adela Yarbro Collins offers a description of Mark's Christology. She suggests that it might be more appropriate to think in terms of the "interpretation of Jesus" in Mark, rather than "Christology" simply "because systematic, philosophical reflection on the nature of Christ had not yet begun in the movement carried on by the followers of Jesus."<sup>9</sup> While Collins is absolutely right to emphasise that some of the dogmatic considerations which characterised subsequent Christological reflection are not present in Mark's text, Collins perhaps shares with many other scholars in the field "a basically evolutionary"<sup>10</sup> understanding of Christological development.

In recent years, this evolutionary view has been challenged by scholars such as Richard Bauckham, Larry Hurtado and Simon Gathercole.<sup>11</sup> De-

<sup>9</sup> Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, 44.

<sup>10</sup> Frances Watson, *Text, Church and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 257.

<sup>11</sup> Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel: 'God crucified' and other studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), Larry

scribed by Martin Hengel as the pioneers of a “new History of Religions School,” these scholars “reject an evolutionary or conventionally developmental approach to Christology and tend toward the view of George Caird that ‘the highest Christology of the NT is also its earliest’.”<sup>12</sup> The debate has tended to focus on questions about the pre-existence of Christ. Scholars such as Dunn and Kuschel have tended to play down the presence of such language in the writings of Paul and within the synoptic gospels. In the words of Dunn, the first time we encounter “the understanding of Jesus’ divine sonship in terms of the personal pre-existence of a divine being who was sent into the world and whose ascension was simply the continuation of an intimate relationship with the Father which neither incarnation nor crucifixion interrupted or disturbed”<sup>13</sup> is in the Johannine writings. In Dunn’s view, there is no hint of pre-existence in the synoptic tradition.

In New Testament studies, there are currently two radically different and mutually exclusive accounts of Marcan Christology: one can be characterised as essentially ‘minimalist,’ while the other might be described as basically ‘maximalist.’ The ‘minimalist’ position tends to emphasise the evolutionary character of doctrinal development, while the ‘maximalist’ position gives greater emphasis and priority to the language within the synoptic tradition which speaks of the exaltation of the Son of Man. My purpose in referring to this debate is not simply to rehearse all the arguments (which are extensive). Nor is it my desire to suggest that the arguments presented by the ‘maximalists’ open up a world which is much closer to that of the horizon encompassed within the *Catena in Marcum*. Nor is it to suggest that these arguments would find their resolution if only scholars were to return to the insights of patristic exegesis. (Indeed, despairing of what he perceives to be the more corrosive effects of the modern quest for the historical Jesus, Pope Benedict XVI appears to embrace precisely this possibility in his recent two volume study, *Jesus of Nazareth*).<sup>14</sup> My purpose is much more modest and

---

W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (London: SCM Press, 1988) and Simon J. Gathercole, *The Pre-existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark and Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).

<sup>12</sup> Gathercole, *The Pre-existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark and Luke*, 14.

<sup>13</sup> James D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM Press, 1980), 59, cf. Karl-Josef Kuschel, *Born Before All Time? The Dispute Over Christ’s Origin*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1992), 243.

<sup>14</sup> Joseph Ratzinger/Pope Benedict XVI, *Jesus of Nazareth: From the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration*, trans. Adrian J. Walker (London: Bloomsbury, 2007). David Lincicum suggests that the Pope’s book will be of particular interest to those committed to “recovering patristic biblical interpretation as a resource for contemporary exegesis.” (David Lincicum,

more historiographical in character. My starting point is the fact that both 'minimalist' and 'maximalist' accounts of Mark's Christology often betray a number of assumptions and prejudices about patristic interpretation. For instance, a 'minimalist' like Dunn warns of the danger of using the terminology of later Christological formulations in New Testament exegesis:

... (T)erms whose current technical meaning owes most to later developments and clarifications can be too readily superimposed upon the first-century material and hinder rather than help us in trying to understand the meaning intended by these writings. This danger, of *confusing* rather than *clarifying* the historical analysis, is present in a too ready use of terms like 'incarnation,' 'myth,' 'hypostasis' and 'adoptionist' in exegeting the NT.<sup>15</sup>

It is clear that, in Dunn's view, the task of the exegete is to remove the accumulated crust of subsequent layers of interpretation which only serve to obscure and occlude the original text. Consequently, members of the scholarly guild are given licence to ignore them.<sup>16</sup>

That Mark was a theologian with a particular interest in and concern with questions of Christology is an observation that has governed scholarly consensus since the writings of William Wrede. Far more controversial is the influence of subsequent Christological discourse. For 'minimalists,' the language of *ousia*, *hypostasis*, *physis*, *homoousios*, *prosopon* and *henosis* only serves to distort the witness of the New Testament. On the other hand, 'maximalists' suggest that the insights of subsequent Christological debates, which often arose in the context of biblical interpretation in the life of the early church, may well illuminate our interpretation of the gospels.

---

'Benedict's Jesus and the Rehabilitation of Christian Figural Reading,' *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 2, no. 2 (2008): 291). He notes the importance of figural reading in the Pope's exegesis and also, intriguingly, his debt to the canonical approach often associated with Brevard Childs.

<sup>15</sup> Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 9.

<sup>16</sup> Similarly, in his survey of previous research, Simon Gathercole asserts: "In the opinion of pre-modern, pre-critical interpreters of the Gospels, it was widely held that pre-existence could be found in all four gospels" (Gathercole, *The Pre-existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark and Luke*, 2). This view is held to be sufficiently self-evident that the assertion need not be furnished with a scrap of evidence to substantiate the claim. But the observation serves to add a degree of legitimacy and credibility to his point of view, even though (or perhaps precisely because) his position does not govern a consensus in contemporary scholarship. It is intriguing to note the way in which observations about patristic exegesis often serve to shape the rhetoric of academic discourse. However, is it not curious that the debate often proceeds without any serious reference to the actual history of interpretation?

However, it is curious that, with one or two significant exceptions,<sup>17</sup> modern scholarship has largely been content to ignore the history of Mark's interpretation during the first six centuries of the Christian church. Indeed, many contemporary scholars would regard this material as being of little relevance to the real task of interpretation. They would regard it as more of a hindrance than a help. Others would concede rather grudgingly that earlier interpretations might be of some antiquarian interest.

In recent years, a number of advocates of the 'theological interpretation of scripture' have suggested that the recovery of patristic approaches to biblical interpretation offers theologians and biblical scholars vital insights and patterns of exegesis in reading the scriptures theologically. Obviously, the 'theological interpretation of scripture' is a world apart from Wrede's simple observation that Mark the evangelist was a theologian. Few would dispute the value of taking Mark seriously as a theologian or of attempting to evaluate the way in which his theological outlook was shaped by and responded to his historical context. Indeed, the previous chapters have indicated that the literary and historical questions characteristic of modern biblical criticism find their antecedents and origins in patristic exegesis. And yet patristic approaches to biblical interpretation also betrayed a more overt dogmatic concern. In this chapter, I will continue to assess the characteristics of patristic approaches to biblical interpretation by evaluating the way in which doctrinal concerns have shaped the reading and exegesis of Mark's gospel. While biblical scholars might bristle at the prospect of returning to "the dead hand of dogma," I want to consider the way in which patristic writers approached the interpretation of Mark in the light of the dogmatic formulations of the Council of Chalcedon for two reasons: first, does the material in the *Catena in Marcum* help to illuminate the maximalist / minimalist debate about Mark's Christology? Is the evidence consistent with a linear "evolutionary scheme of Christological development"<sup>18</sup> or does contemporary scholarship need to embrace a different approach? Secondly, what does the evidence tell us about the precise relationship between exegesis and dogma? Do the dogmatic concerns contained within these exegetical extracts relate to the text itself, or do they relate to a series of doctrinal presuppositions arrived at by another route? Do they serve to distort or illuminate the interpretation of Mark?

---

<sup>17</sup> For example, Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

<sup>18</sup> Watson, *Text, Church and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective*, 257.

### a. *The Chalcedonian Settlement*

When Cyril, the bishop of Alexandria of celebrated memory, took issue with these things through private communications, Nestorius in turn resisted these, was not persuaded by the writings of Cyril nor by those of the bishop of elder Rome, Celestine, and poured forth his own vomit on the whole Church, without consideration for anything.<sup>19</sup>

In this ancient account of the Nestorian controversy, the colourful language perhaps alerts the reader to the profound animosity and antagonism which had been generated over questions of Christology in the course of the fifth century. In the analysis of John McGuckin, there were three key issues at the heart of the Nestorian controversy: “firstly the concept of personal identity in Christ, in terms of the active subject referent of the deeds of the incarnate one as described by scripture; secondly the problem of the manner of the relationship between the divine and the human in Christ (the ‘how’ of the Christological union); and thirdly the need to settle on an agreed terminology with which to discuss and define the issues in question.”<sup>20</sup> The controversy took shape in a series of heated exchanges between Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, and Nestorius, the patriarch of Constantinople. Cyril had written to Nestorius to seek clarity about Nestorius’ Christology, and when neither his ‘second’ nor his ‘third’ letter (accompanied by the demand to assent to Cyril’s Twelve Anathemas) received a response to Cyril’s satisfaction, a Council was called to settle the matter. Nestorius felt confident that he would be vindicated. He suspected that the Twelve Anathemas provided by Cyril presented compelling evidence of Apollinarian tendencies. However, Nestorius seriously underestimated his opponent and fatally misjudged the significance of meeting in Ephesus, a city dedicated to the Virgin Mary, to discuss the merits of describing Mary as *Christotokos* rather than *Theotokos*. The Third Ecumenical Council of Ephesus in 431 led to a forthright condemnation of Nestorius’ teaching. Nestorius was deposed, excommunicated, and exiled to the Egyptian desert where he wrote increasingly confused and garbled expositions of his theological position.

Sadly, the canons promulgated by the bishops at Ephesus did not bring the kind of resolution that they desired. There was a suspicion that Cyril of Alexandria had not done enough to distinguish his Christology from Apollinarianism. As John McGuckin points out, the teachings of Cyril of Alexan-

---

<sup>19</sup> Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.3 (tr. Michael Whitby, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), 11).

<sup>20</sup> McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy*, 194.

dria were not always clear to his opponents, particularly when his more discursive approach was reduced to a compendium of Christological jargon: "Cyril's language and preferred formulas were ... sometimes responsible for causing more confusion than illumination in the camps of his opponents."<sup>21</sup> The same might also be said of some of his followers.

One of Cyril of Alexandria's disciples was the archimandrite Eutyches. He had been one of the original dissidents in Constantinople, who had objected vehemently to the teachings of Nestorius back in 428. Eutyches was accused of compromising Cyril's delicately balanced distinction between the divine and human natures, by suggesting that there was a single nature after the incarnation. Eutyches' detractors objected, and in 448 he was tried and censured. Eutyches appealed to the Emperor Theodosius, and after an abortive attempt to address the issue at the Second Council of Ephesus (which Pope Leo, the Bishop of Rome, subsequently described as "a den of thieves," and which ever since has been known as the *Latrocinium* or 'Robber Synod'), the Fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon was called in 451.

Initially, the bishops resisted imperial demands for a definitive statement of faith. However, at their fifth session, the emperor Marcian insisted that a simple and short definition should be published by the council. When the bishops eventually acceded to the demand but failed to agree a text, Marcian threatened to dissolve the council and convene a new council in Italy. Before the council, Pope Leo had been invited to attend by the emperor but had declined the invitation, sending a delegation and a statement or 'Tome' which he anticipated would resolve the issues and be accepted by the bishops who were present. The problem was that Leo missed some of the subtlety of what was actually at issue. Fearful that "an Italian council would simply rubber-stamp Leo's Tome and its dogmatic profession wholesale,"<sup>22</sup> the bishops set about drafting a statement with renewed vigour. At its simplest level, the purpose of the exercise was to find a *via media* between the twin errors of 'Nestorian duality' and 'Apollinarist fusion.' At the same time, the bishops needed to respond diplomatically to Pope Leo, and safeguard the legacy of Cyril of Alexandria. The result was that the fathers of Chalcedon affirmed that Cyril's Second and Third Letters to Nestorius (although they did not include the Twelve Chapters) and Leo's Tome were definitive standards of orthodoxy. The agreed statement continued:

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 226.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 236.



In agreement, therefore, with the holy fathers, we all unanimously teach that we should confess that Our Lord Jesus Christ is one and the same Son, the same perfect in Godhead, and the same perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man, the same of a rational soul and body, *homoousios* with the Father in Godhead, and the same *homoousios* with us in manhood, that is like us in all things but sin; begotten from the Father before the ages as regards his Godhead, and in these last days, the same one begotten from the virgin Mary, the *Theotokos*, as regards his manhood, for our sake and for the sake of our salvation; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only Begotten, who is made known in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the difference of natures being by no means removed because of the union, but the property of each nature being preserved and concurring in one *prosopon* and one *hypostasis*, not parted or divided into two *prosopa*, but one and the same Son, Only Begotten, Divine Word, the Lord Jesus Christ, as the prophets of old and Jesus Christ himself have taught us about him, and the creed of our fathers has handed down.<sup>23</sup>

And yet, although in the West the Chalcedonian definition was presented as a vindication of Leo's *Tome*, in the East there was a widespread perception that the Chalcedonian settlement did not really settle anything. In parts of Egypt and Syria, there were many who thought that the language of Chalcedon had given too much ground to the Antiochene position associated with Nestorius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrillus and Diodore of Tarsus. There was considerable resentment that the clumsy exactness of Leo's *Tome* failed to capture the nuances of debate in the East. In their view, Chalcedon represented a betrayal of Cyril of Alexandria's theology. Thus while they shared in the rejection of the teachings of Eutyches, they chose to hang on to Cyril's language of the *μία φύσις* and *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*. In the East, a clear body of 'anti-Chalcedonian' thought emerged, and Christological formulations continued to be the subject of division and dissent. Clearly, for Evagrius Scholasticus who wrote his *History* towards the end of the sixth century, the controversies generated first by Nestorius and then by Eutyches still touched a raw nerve. Arguments about the legacy of Cyril of Alexandria and the decisions of Chalcedon continued to rage. The monks of Gaza, led by Peter the Iberian and Severus of Antioch, were particularly vociferous in their criticisms of Chalcedon.<sup>24</sup>

The years following Chalcedon were also characterised by political instability. A succession of shortlived reigns in the East, incursions by the Goths, and the usurpation of the Western empire by the Ostrogoth Theodoric

<sup>23</sup> Edward Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* 2.1.2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 129.

<sup>24</sup> Brouria Bitton-Ashkelony and Aryeh Kofsky, *The Monastic School of Gaza* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 22–36.

inclined the ruling elite to regard passionate divisions about doctrinal questions with alarm.<sup>25</sup> Such arguments, they believed, would only serve to create further instability. Consequently, in July 482, the emperor Zeno published an edict, an instrument of union popularly called the *Henoticon*. It had been drafted by Acacius, the patriarch of Constantinople, with the specific aim of overcoming division and restoring unity. Its text is cited by Evagrius Scholasticus.<sup>26</sup>

It is perhaps instructive that it begins with the comment that “the irresistible shield of our empire is the sole correct and truthful faith” and goes on to assert that “the enemy nations will be utterly destroyed and annihilated” and peace will come with its attendant blessings, good weather and good harvests.<sup>27</sup> But the edict goes on to note that the emperor has received numerous entreaties from archimandrites, hermits and others, for the unity of the Church to be restored. To that end the *Henoticon* reaffirmed the teachings of the first council of Nicaea in 325 and the first council of Constantinople in 381. It refers explicitly to Mary as the *Theotokos* and then goes on to note that the Council of Ephesus in 431 also upheld the teaching of Nicaea and Constantinople. The document then anathematizes both Nestorius and Eutyches and accepts “the Twelve Chapters which were pronounced by Cyril of pious memory, Archbishop of the holy and universal church of the Alexandrians.” This was a significant concession to the anti-Chalcedonian party.

The edict then provides a summary of the church’s teaching about the nature of Christ. It is a masterpiece in studied ambiguity. Acacius cleverly avoids the kind of technical vocabulary which might give rise to controversy (so words such as *ousia* or *hypostasis* are absent), while at the same time

---

<sup>25</sup> For a detailed examination of the influence of exegetical and theological questions on the political scene, see Maas, *Exegesis and Empire in the Early Byzantine Mediterranean*. Maas has argued that from the beginning of the sixth century, biblical exegesis became increasingly a matter of imperial interest: “In the theological hothouse of Justinian’s Mediterranean, biblical exegesis carried significant political force. The explication of biblical texts lay at the heart of conciliar debates in which bishops wrangled over points of doctrine. The consequences of differing interpretations of sacred Scripture were enormous because the formation of church doctrine depended upon them. In Justinian’s day, as indeed throughout late antiquity, the tensions between followers of different Christological positions were very high” (Maas, *Exegesis and Empire in the Early Byzantine Mediterranean*, 112).

<sup>26</sup> Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.14 (tr. Michael Whitby, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), 147–149).

<sup>27</sup> Henry Chadwick notes that when the crops failed during the reign of Leo, the Monophysites took this to be a sign of heaven’s displeasure at his Chalcedonian policy (Henry Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great*, *Oxford History of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 595).

using the accepted vocabulary of Nicaea (for example, *homoousios*) and allaying the fears and anxieties of those who had objected to an infelicitous phrase in Leo's Tome,—the *Henoticon* declared “to be of one being both the miracles and the sufferings which he endured voluntarily in the flesh.” In other words, there could be no division or separation. Thus the passage, which deals directly with areas of Christological controversy, seeks to hold together the rather fractious parties in the dispute by seeking to uncover the areas of underlying agreement:

And we confess as one and not two the only-begotten Son of God, even God, our Lord Jesus Christ who in truth was made man, consubstantial with the Father in divinity and the same consubstantial with us in humanity, Who came down and was made flesh from the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin and Mother of God. For we declare to be of one being both the miracles and the sufferings which He endured voluntarily in the flesh. For those who divide or confound or introduce an illusion we utterly refuse to receive, since indeed the sinless incarnation, that was in truth from the Mother of God, did not create an additional entity of the Son. For the Trinity has remained a Trinity even after one of the Trinity, God the Word, was made flesh.<sup>28</sup>

It is followed by one simple editorial remark. Evagrius states that, “When this was read, all those in the city of Alexander were united with the holy universal and apostolic Church.”<sup>29</sup> Indeed, while it did not satisfy some of the more extreme Monophysites, anti-Chalcedonians such as Severus were happy to affirm the *Henoticon* as “an orthodox confession of the faith” (even though Severus could not resist explicitly anathematizing Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo in the address he gave when he was enthroned as Patriarch of Antioch in 512).<sup>30</sup> The *Henoticon* became the standard of orthodoxy for thirty six years until 518 when the emperor Justin pursued a more aggressively Chalcedonian stance under the influence of his nephew Justinian.

Henry Chadwick notes that as disagreements over the legacy of Chalcedon rumbled on, both sides sought to demonstrate that their convictions were entirely in accordance with the unchanging orthodox tradition. They did this by compiling *florilegia* or anthologies “of carefully selected excerpts from orthodox fathers.”<sup>31</sup> It is intriguing to note that *catenae* also emerged at roughly the same time, and also that the writings of Procopius of Gaza,

---

<sup>28</sup> Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.14 (tr. Michael Whitby, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), 149).

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 149.

<sup>30</sup> Iain R. Torrance, *Christology after Chalcedon* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1988), 5.

<sup>31</sup> Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church* (London: Pelican, 1967), 207.

who lived through the troubled century following the Council of Chalcedon, are often regarded as ‘doctrinally neutral.’ Given that the *Catena in Marcum* probably emerged during this period, we might well ask whether it also reflects the ‘stasis’ established by the *Henoticon*.

### b. *Cyril of Alexandria and the Catena in Marcum*

John Cramer argued that the *Catena in Marcum* had been originally compiled by Cyril of Alexandria. He was mistaken. His conclusions were informed not only by the minority manuscript evidence, which attributed the text to Cyril in a couple of superscriptions, but also by the internal evidence of its consistency with Cyril’s Christology and its anti-Nestorian tone. For instance, in commenting on the words, “You are my beloved Son: with you I am well-pleased,”<sup>32</sup> the catenist includes an anonymous scholium referring directly to the Nestorian controversy: “If ‘one is in the other’ according to the words of Nestorius, one would have to say, ‘In you is my son the beloved in whom I am well pleased’.”<sup>33</sup> These words alert us to one of the key points of contention between Cyril and Nestorius. Indeed, the phrase “one in the other” is used by Cyril in the 8th Anathema or Chapter appended to his third letter to Nestorius.<sup>34</sup> According to Cyril, the incarnation was not a mere indwelling (ἐνοικήσις) of God in Humanity, one in the other, but an actual and abiding union of the divine and human natures in one personal life.

The catenist is referring to the fact that Nestorius had taught that Christ possessed two natures—φύσεις—distinct in union, using the term *προσώπων* to describe the unity of the figure of Christ. In maintaining the absolute integrity of the divine and human natures, Nestorius could not attribute the frailties associated with human life to the second Person of the Trinity. For Nestorius, the doctrine of divine impassibility meant that the two natures had to be distinct and discernible or “apparent to the external observer in their respective prosopa.”<sup>35</sup> There could be no confusion between the two,

<sup>32</sup> Mark 1.11.

<sup>33</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 272.3–4.

<sup>34</sup> Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistula* 17 (PG 77.105–122) The Twelve Anathemas appended to this letter were a source of contention between Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian Christians. While the Third Letter was recognized as a statement of orthodoxy by the bishops at Chalcedon, the Twelve Chapters were not. It was only with the introduction of Zeno’s *Henoticon* that they began to gain official recognition. It was not until the Fifth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 553 that they were accepted as an orthodox statement of faith.

<sup>35</sup> McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy*, 151.

and the fact that there was no confusion could be illustrated with reference to the scriptural witness. Thus as John McGuckin describes the Christology of Nestorius:

One can look at the historical figure of Christ in the Gospels and see the clear signs of the two prosopa, divine and human. The fact that Jesus is a man with the human parentage of Mary, grows and advances as a human child should (Lk. 2.49), shows true human emotions such as grief (Jn. 11.35) and anxiety (Mk. 14.34), all contribute to present us with a body of evidence that here before our eyes and sense are all the prosopic marks of a human physis. The prosopic reality of this human physis is known as Jesus, the man from Nazareth. On the other hand, this same historical figure of the Christ gives the observer another body of evidence that signals there is not simply a human prosopon here but another prosopon of a fundamentally different kind, the prosopon of a divine ousia. The latter body of evidence transcends the scope of a human prosopon and amounts to claims of pre-existence that human beings cannot rightly make (Jn. 8.58), claims for absolute status (Jn. 6.54; 8.12), and signs of awesome power such as raising the dead (Mk. 5.35f.) and walking on the sea (Mk. 6.45f.) There are all things beyond the range of a human prosopon and they signal to the observer the existence of another kind of prosopon, one that manifests a divine physis behind it. This hold and powerful prosopon is recognised by faith as the divine Logos. An accurate scrutiny of the external visible signs and evidence concerning Christ, therefore, clearly tells the observer that there are two separate levels of reality in this figure; two prosopa (or prosopic sets of evidence) signalling to the intelligent exegete the fact that two different natures co-exist in this being.<sup>36</sup>

Cyril of Alexandria had attacked the teaching of Nestorius, while allowing that the difference between the divine and human natures in Christ was not abolished by their union; yet in union they constitute a single entity (ὑπόστασις). It followed that theologians could say legitimately that “God was born at Bethlehem” and that “the eternal Word suffered and died.” Cyril asserted that the Christology of Nestorius led to the division of the words and acts of Christ between his divine and human natures. This had an inevitable effect on the exegesis of the gospel narrative. As Frances Young points out, Antiochene exegetes such as Theodore of Mopsuestia tended to distinguish between the two natures of Christ.<sup>37</sup> In this regard, they followed the pattern of much earlier exegetes.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 151–152.

<sup>37</sup> Frances Young, ‘The ‘Mind’ of Scripture: Theological Readings of the Bible in the Fathers,’ *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 7, no. 2 (2005): 135. In an earlier work, Young had suggested that Cyril’s Christology was more problematic: ‘Cyril is incapable of doing real justice to the humanity of Christ, and his rejection of Apollinarianism

The evidence of the *Catena in Marcum* suggests that its compilers not only follow the teaching of Cyril of Alexandria, but attempt to demonstrate that the words of the gospel serve to lend substance to this teaching. At no point does the catenist attribute an action, emotion or passion of Christ to his humanity rather than his divinity. Cyril's emphasis on the unity of the divine and human natures is elucidated in the following passages: at the baptism of Jesus by John, John's words "After me comes one who is mightier than I, the thong of whose sandals I am not worthy to stoop down and untie" provoke the observation that John says this not simply on account of the greatness of the honour, but because Christ's "divinity was self-evident."<sup>38</sup> In describing the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, the catenist includes a passage (which is anonymous although it might well come from Cyril) which speaks of Jesus performing the miracle and demonstrating the "indivisible union"<sup>39</sup> of his divinity and humanity. In Mark's account of the healing of the paralytic,<sup>40</sup> the catenist includes a fragment from one of Cyril's *Commentarii in Matthaëum*, in which he speaks of "the indivisible union" of his human and divine natures and paraphrases the words of Jesus to make the claim to divinity more apparent:

'For even though,' he says 'I have become a human being, being in reality the divine word, and through the incarnation both live out my life and dwell on the earth, nevertheless I accomplish miracles which issue from my word, even granting the forgiveness of sins: for my becoming Son of Man unchangeably and truly on the earth according to flesh did not take away any of the properties of divinity, nor diminish me.'<sup>41</sup>

In describing the healing of the man who was deaf and dumb at the end of Mark 7, the physical actions of Jesus, placing his fingers in the man's ears, spitting and touching his tongue, all serve to show "how even the body inexpressibly united to him, abounds in the energy of divine power; inasmuch as it was clearly animated by a soul possessed both of reason and thought."<sup>42</sup> Not only do these words present a clear affirmation of the unity of the two natures, but the final clause also rejects any hint of Apollinarianism.

---

is merely superficial' (Frances Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to its Literature and Background* (London: SCM Press, 1983), 260).

<sup>38</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 269.28.

<sup>39</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 277.26.

<sup>40</sup> Mark 2.1–12.

<sup>41</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 286.24–29.

<sup>42</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 338.32–339.2.

Mark's Passion narrative provides the opportunity for the most detailed exposition of Cyril's Christology and the most intensive quotation of the commentaries of Cyril himself.<sup>43</sup> Thus, in commenting on the account of the Last Supper in Mark 14, another fragment from Cyril's *Commentarii in Matthaëum* is cited: "For the life-giving Word of God, having united himself to his own flesh in a way which he only knows, declares the flesh to be 'life-giving'."<sup>44</sup> In the description of Gethsemane, Cyril draws a veil over any hint of fear or desperation, when he addresses the following insight to the Saviour himself: "Throughout the whole earth, you will raise the sign of victory against every opposing power: and you will be worshipped as God and as the Creator of all that exists."<sup>45</sup> When Jesus is scourged by the Roman soldiers, Cyril comments on the futility of the blindfold:

The Lord of heaven and earth, who is the origin and Creator of all, suffers dishonour from us as one of us, and being beaten he endures to the end, and he endures the laughter of the ungodly, offering himself to us as an example of patient endurance. And those who beat him said, 'Prophesy!' But the one who examines the affections and motives, the giver of all prophecy, how would he not know who was the one who struck him?<sup>46</sup>

Again and again, the unity of the divine and human natures is affirmed in the course of the *Catena in Marcum*. Any temptation to distinguish between Christ's human and divine natures is resisted. Cyril's Christology is vindicated. The claims and counterclaims of the Nestorian controversy appear to have been settled in the commentator's mind by exegetical argument. The distinction of the two natures associated with Theodore of Mopsuestia will not be countenanced. The single subjectivity of Christ is consistently upheld.

In *Chapter 3*, I discussed the fact that a number of scholars including Manlio Simonetti, Lionel Wickham, and Charles Kannengiesser have commented on the 'doctrinal neutrality' of *catenae*. This perspective is informed by the fact that *catenae* often draw on material from writers who would have adopted very different positions on a range of doctrinal questions. Thus in the *Catena in Marcum*, material from Cyril of Alexandria sits alongside extracts from Apollinaris of Laodicea and Theodore of Mopsuestia. However, we should not infer 'doctrinal neutrality' from the inclusion of these

---

<sup>43</sup> Indeed, Harold Smith noted that Cyril "is repeatedly used throughout the Passion narratives, supplying 17 per cent. On cc. xiv–xv (Chrysostom has nearly 37 per cent.)" (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 356).

<sup>44</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 423.8–10.

<sup>45</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 427.29–428.2.

<sup>46</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 431.21–26.

writers. Ancient commentators were perfectly capable of discrimination and discernment. For example, in a letter to Tranquillinus written towards the end of the fourth century, Jerome responds to his correspondent's concerns about reading the writings of Origen and those whose orthodoxy had become suspect:

You ask me, insignificant though I am, for an opinion as to the advisability of reading Origen's works. Are we, you say, to reject him altogether with our brother Faustinus, or are we, as others tell us, to read him in part? My opinion is that we should sometimes read him for his learning just as we read Tertullian, Novatus, Arnobius, Apollinarius and some other church writers both Greek and Latin, and that we should select what is good and avoid what is bad in their writings according to the words of the Apostle, 'Prove all things: hold fast that which is good.'<sup>47</sup>

Indeed, Jerome had been taught in Antioch by Apollinaris and commends his scholarship, his "diligent study of grammar" and his "innumerable volumes on the holy scriptures" in *De viris illustribus* 104.<sup>48</sup> But Jerome was clearly able to distinguish Apollinaris' broad expertise in exegesis from his speculation about the nature of Christ.

This evidence adds weight to the argument, based on a more careful reading of the *Catena in Marcum*, that it would be misleading to conclude that the *Catena* is 'doctrinally neutral.' It presents a clear and coherent reading of Mark which is informed by Cyril's Christology and the ongoing doctrinal debates of the fifth and sixth centuries. The extracts suggest a close affinity with and sympathy for the theological outlook of Cyril of Alexandria, who is justifiably regarded as "the father of Orthodox Christology par excellence."<sup>49</sup> Cyril governed the affections and loyalties of many Christians in the East, whether they regarded themselves as 'Chalcedonian' or even 'anti-Chalcedonian.' Undoubtedly, this common regard for Cyril often proved to be the starting point for imperial attempts to resolve the differences between Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian. One can certainly see its influence on Acacius and the emperor Zeno in drafting the *Henoticon*. In some ways, the 'stasis' established by the *Henoticon* is mirrored in the *Catena in Marcum*: first, it shares a deep appreciation for the legacy of Cyril of Alexandria and a deep-seated antipathy towards Nestorius; secondly, it avoids the use of technical vocabulary (so the words *ousia* and *hypostasis*

<sup>47</sup> Jerome, *Epistula* 62.2 (W.H. Fremantle, G. Lewis and W.G. Martley, *Jerome*. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. 6. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. New Edition (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1980), 133–134).

<sup>48</sup> Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 104 (PL 23.701B–702B).

<sup>49</sup> McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy*, 1.



are completely absent from its Christological formulations); and finally, it succeeds in evading any hint or suggestion that the exegesis of the gospel might enable the exegete to adduce different portions of text as evidence of the divinity and humanity of Christ.

It follows that when the compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* wrestle with the question “Who do you say that I am?”,<sup>50</sup> they do not simply produce a digest of a variety of different Christological formulations and invite the reader to take their pick. Rather, in drawing on the work of earlier writers, they seek to demonstrate the coherence and consistency of a particular doctrinal position. The incorporation of Cyril’s *Commentarii* on Luke and Matthew within the *Catena* only serves to underline a Christological position which was reasserted with some qualifications in the *Henoticon* and ultimately vindicated at the Fifth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 553 under the Emperor Justinian. McGuckin points out that this council is often neglected in western scholarship because of the tendency to read Christological debates through “the somewhat narrow lens of the Tome of Leo.”<sup>51</sup> However, it was only then that the limitations of the Antiochene school were finally acknowledged and the teachings of Theodoret, Ibas of Edessa and Theodore of Mopsuestia were formally anathematised. It was there that the Twelve Chapters of Cyril of Alexandria were finally accepted as an orthodox statement of faith. Thus the story of the aftermath of Chalcedon provides the necessary backdrop for the compilation of the *Catena in Marcum*. The manuscript tradition suggests that it was an ‘open book’ which was subject to a number of recensions and amendments. Nevertheless, its contents display a surprising consistency and coherence with the doctrinal apparatus of the imperial state church. This dogmatic perspective provided the horizon for the interpretation of Mark. It performed an important and significant hermeneutical function.

Inevitably, this dogmatic approach to exegesis sits rather uneasily with the claims of modern biblical criticism. Patristic commentators may have been content to assume that their doctrinal concerns corresponded with Mark’s intentions, but contemporary commentators might well be suspicious of such anachronism. However, Francis Watson argues that theological hermeneutics cannot simply be reduced to a discussion of the “appropriate principles of textual interpretation.”<sup>52</sup> Simply expressing a preference for the final ‘canonical’ form of the text is not enough. According to Wat-

---

<sup>50</sup> Mark 8.29.

<sup>51</sup> McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy*, 242.

<sup>52</sup> Watson, *Text, Church and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective*, 241.

son, theological hermeneutics must also “include the themes of Christian theology, which guide and shape the form and content of the exegesis no less clearly than distinctively hermeneutical concepts ...”<sup>53</sup> Watson’s observations appear to be consistent with the evidence of the *Catena*. Ecclesial formulations are employed to illuminate the interpretation of the text. And yet at the same time, these formulations cannot simply be imposed on the text in a cavalier fashion. There are a few passages in Mark which present real difficulties and problems. In Mark’s account of the Passion, the compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* must use the bluster and rhetoric of Cyril to skate over the anxiety of Jesus described in the garden of Gethsemane at Mark 14.34.<sup>54</sup> At times patristic commentators are uncomfortably aware that their doctrinal concerns do not always clearly correspond with Mark’s intentions. Sometimes these doctrinal concerns made the task of interpretation more difficult and challenging. Indeed, this observation can perhaps be best illustrated with reference to the puzzle of *Christus Nesciens*.

### c. *The Puzzle of Christus Nesciens*

The interpretation of Mark 13.32 was the source of some controversy in the development of pro-Nicene orthodoxy. Indeed, such is the significance of Mark 13.32 in the exegetical imagination of pre-modern commentators that this section is given its own superscription or τίτλος: *On that day and that hour*. The reason why this passage was so important is that the assertion that “the Father knows but the Son does not know” appeared to be inconsistent with the central tenets of Nicene orthodoxy. It suggested not only that the Son might be subordinate to the Father, but also that the attribution of ignorance to the Son might compromise the perfection of his divinity. This text was one of the problematic passages at the heart of the issues which led to the First Council of Nicaea in 325. It is one of the texts which features in Athanasius’ *Orationes tres contra Arianos*.<sup>55</sup> According to Athanasius, his opponents<sup>56</sup> took any intimation of the Son’s ‘ignorance’ as evidence of the

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 427.28–428.17.

<sup>55</sup> PG 26.12–468.

<sup>56</sup> One needs to exercise a degree of caution these days about identifying the opponents of Athanasius. The inference that they were Arians or that there was a distinct ‘Arian party’ in the middle of the fourth century is considered suspect by most scholars of the period. In his assessment of recent scholarship, Rowan Williams notes that “there is a growing sense that ‘Arianism’ is a very unhelpful term to use in relation to fourth-century controversy. There was no single ‘Arian’ agenda, no tradition of loyalty to a single authoritative teacher. Theologians

truth of the doctrine that the Son was subordinate to the Father. In response, Athanasius declared that Christ's ignorance was only apparent.<sup>57</sup> In an element of apologetic which will be taken up by Chrysostom later, he notes that the "Lord of heaven and earth, through whom all things were made"<sup>58</sup> would hardly need to offer a judgement about the day and the hour. But Athanasius' subsequent arguments are more problematic. Athanasius suggests that the reason why Jesus professes ignorance about the day and hour is because he made this statement, alongside other comments "as a human being, according to the flesh": διὰ τὴν σάρκα ὡς ἄνθρωπος.<sup>59</sup> Athanasius suggests that the ignorance of Jesus is proper to his humanity, while at the same time he shows that he knew everything by virtue of his divinity. In case anyone is willing to countenance the possibility that human beings are not ignorant, Athanasius then furnishes his readers with a number of instances from scripture in which human beings make their ignorance abundantly evident.

When viewed in the light of the Nestorian controversy, these arguments are problematic because they rely on a clear distinction and division between the humanity and divinity of Christ. The distinction Athanasius makes between the humanity and divinity of Christ in interpreting the scriptural witness is precisely the kind of deductive move that Cyril of Alexandria so roundly condemned. It is curious to note that for those wrestling with the legacy of Chalcedon, the arguments put forward by the champion of Nicene orthodoxy are found wanting. It is precisely because of subsequent doctrinal developments that the *Catena in Marcum* draws on the later writings of John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria in selecting extracts to illuminate the interpretation of this passage.

The compilers of the *Catena* draw on two distinct sources: the *Homiliae in Matthaem* of John Chrysostom and an extract which bears some resemblance to one of the letters of Cyril of Alexandria. In his comments on this passage, Chrysostom begins by asserting that the purpose of Jesus' comments was to restrain the curiosity of his disciples. Chrysostom points out that this passage is entirely consistent with Acts 1.6–8, where in his

---

who criticized the Creed of Nicaea had very diverse attitudes to Arius himself, and part of the continuing difficulty of identifying the main lines of Arius' theology arises from this fact" (Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. Second Edition. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 247).

<sup>57</sup> Athanasius, *Orationes tres contra Arianos* 3 (PG 26.412.12–26.429.15).

<sup>58</sup> Athanasius, *Orationes tres contra Arianos* 3 (PG 26.412.20–21).

<sup>59</sup> Athanasius, *Orationes tres contra Arianos* 3 (PG 26.413.17).

response to the question, “Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom of Israel?”<sup>60</sup> Jesus says, “It is not for you to know times or seasons.”<sup>61</sup> Athanasius also referred to this passage,<sup>62</sup> although Chrysostom does not go on to adopt Athanasius’ argument that there is no reference in Acts to the “Son not knowing” because in this resurrection appearance, the risen Lord has cast off his mortality and was now free to teach in a divine manner. By contrast, Chrysostom goes on to provide further ammunition to support his argument through a series of rhetorical questions: first, he quotes John 1.3 to suggest that by virtue of his involvement in creation, he could not be ignorant of that which he had made. Secondly, rather than being himself ignorant of the day, he suggests that Christ deliberately sets out to keep silent and not to reveal it. According to Kevin Madigan, both these arguments are employed by Jerome, while the latter is also adopted by Augustine of Hippo.<sup>63</sup> For Augustine, the point of Mark 13.32 is not that the Son does not know, but that he causes human beings not to know. For Jerome, the economy of salvation requires that human beings remain ignorant of the day: “for if we knew that the day of judgment would not arrive for two thousand years, we would be ‘more negligent’ (*neglegentiores*) than if we remained in a state of pious ignorance.”<sup>64</sup>

The passage which follows is anonymous, although Lionel Wickham has suggested that its content is consistent with the position espoused by Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>65</sup> The passage in the *Catena in Marcum* states:

It is also possible to say, according to Mark, that ‘neither does the Son know, if the Father does not, but if the Father does not know, neither does the Son.’ But if the Father knows, then obviously the Son does also because he is the Father’s Wisdom, containing everything from the Father except being the Father itself.<sup>66</sup>

The attempt to reconfigure the sense of the passage in the first sentence reflects the attempts by commentators to reduce the impact of this phrase by noting the absence of the phrase οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς in Matthew 24.36 in a number

---

<sup>60</sup> Acts 1.6.

<sup>61</sup> Acts 1.7.

<sup>62</sup> Athanasius, *Orationes tres contra Arianos* 3 (PG 26.425.23–25).

<sup>63</sup> Kevin Madigan, ‘Christus Nesciens? Was Christ Ignorant of the Day of Judgment? Arian and Orthodox Interpretation of Mark 13.32 in the Ancient Latin West,’ *Harvard Theological Review* 96, no. 3 (2003): 267–274.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*: 270.

<sup>65</sup> Personal communication.

<sup>66</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 416.5–9.

of manuscripts.<sup>67</sup> However, it is the following comment which is redolent of the writings of Cyril of Alexandria. In one of his letters, Cyril responds to Tiberius the Deacon, who along with a number of others had asked about those who assert that the Son did not know the final day. Cyril says:

Even more anomalously for them, the Son is called God the Father's Wisdom and Counsel. For Paul said of him 'Who was made Wisdom for us by God' and again 'In whom are hidden all the treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge.' Inspired David hymns the heavenly God and Father in the words 'Thou hast guided me with thy counsel,' meaning by God's 'counsel' the Son springing from him. In that case must it not be absurd to suppose that the Father's Wisdom and Counsel could be ignorant of any feature of him?<sup>68</sup>

The reference to the Son as the Father's Wisdom is repeated in the extract in the *Catena in Marcum*. While the scholium does not appear to be a direct quotation from Cyril himself, we can see some resemblance with Cyril's interpretation of Mark 13.32. As far as Cyril is concerned, the thesis that God's Wisdom is incarnate in Jesus Christ is the starting point for resolving the problem presented in the text. Cyril's reading of Mark 13.32 is determined by a prior theological presupposition, which is informed by other passages within the canon of scripture.

The evidence provided by the *Catena in Marcum* warrants two further observations. First, it is surprising that the *Catena* betrays little evidence of interaction with the *Agnoetai*. Around the year 536 (following the deposition of Theodosius, the patriarch of Alexandria), a group of disciples of Severus of Antioch, led by Themistius, a deacon of Alexandria, taught that "the human soul (not the divine nature) of Christ was like us in all things, even in the limitation of knowledge, and was ignorant of many things, especially the day of judgment, which the Father alone knew (Mark xiii. 32)."<sup>69</sup> None of Themistius' writings survive in their entirety, but there are Greek and Syriac fragments preserved in various *acta* of councils, as well as a number of *anti-Agnoetic* and Chalcedonian writings.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> In commenting on Ambrose's adoption of this approach, Madigan notes that this argument would prove popular in the West (Madigan, 'Christus Nesciens? Was Christ Ignorant of the Day of Judgment? Arian and Orthodox Interpretation of Mark 13.32 in the Ancient Latin West,' 264).

<sup>68</sup> Lionel R. Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria's Select Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 151.

<sup>69</sup> DCB I.62.

<sup>70</sup> These have been translated and published in Albert van Roey and Pauline Allen, *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* (Leuven: Peeters, 1994). For a more extended discussion of these texts, see also Cyril Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom: Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

The teachings of the *Agrnoetai* emerged in the light of a dispute between Severus of Antioch and Julian of Halicarnassus. Standing within the anti-Chalcedonian tradition, Julian taught that the relationship between Christ's human and divine natures were such that Christ's body was "incorruptible" (ἄφθαρτος) from the very beginning. He suggested that this view was a perfectly natural development of the teachings<sup>71</sup> of his ally and mentor, Severus of Antioch. This became a source of considerable irritation to Severus, who felt that he had become guilty by association with a position that was regarded by critics as little more than a form of Docetism and a revised version of Apollinarianism. The followers of Julian were dubbed *Aphthartodocetae* and Severus sought to dissociate himself from Julian in a number of polemical writings. In his response, Severus conceded that he had used the word "incorruptible" without qualification in his *Philolethes* but he went on to qualify his meaning. He suggested that Christ could only legitimately be described as "incorruptible" when the word meant "without sin," that Christ is "corruptible" in experiencing "the blameless passions" (πάθη ἀδιάβλητα), which included things like hunger, thirst, tiredness, the scourging, crucifixion and death, and that absolute incorruptibility took place only after the resurrection.

A detailed analysis of the row between Julian and Severus need not detain us here.<sup>72</sup> The crucial point is that Severus' reference to "the blameless passions" initiated a lengthy discussion among his disciples regarding the question of whether "ignorance" was to be numbered among them. Themistius became the leading proponent of the view that this was so. He asserted that Christ shared in human ignorance. According to one Byzantine chronicler,<sup>73</sup> Themistius advanced a number of arguments (ἐπιχειρήματα) to prove the ignorance of Christ. His arguments centred on three principal New Testament texts: there were intimations of ignorance when he asked of his friend Lazarus, "Where have you laid him?,"<sup>74</sup> in his comment about the fact that the Son did not know the day and the hour in Mark 13.32, and in Luke's observation that Jesus "increased in wisdom and in stature."<sup>75</sup> Themistius argued

<sup>71</sup> Julian refers explicitly to the *Philolethes* of Severus of Antioch.

<sup>72</sup> For a detailed discussion, see Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Council of Chalcedon 451 to Gregory the Great 590–604*, trans. Pauline Allen, vol. 2.2 (London: Mowbray, 1995), 82–94.

<sup>73</sup> Photius, *Bibliotheca* cod. 108 (Nigel Wilson, *The Bibliotheca by Photius* (London: Duckworth, 1994)). Photius was the patriarch of Constantinople in the latter part of the ninth century. He compiled an extended bibliography summarising many of the books that he had either read or come across.

<sup>74</sup> John 11.34.

<sup>75</sup> Luke 2.52.

that the ignorance attributed to Christ in these passages was not simply apparent but real, and he suggested that this ignorance was directly related to the humanity of Christ. At this point in his argument, Themistius appears to be flirting with a more pronounced 'two natures' Christology. However, he insists that there is one nature. Themistius clearly rules out such a possibility.

The *Agnoetic* controversy is significant for two reasons: first, it demonstrates that anti-Chalcedonians and adherents of the one-nature Christology were still struggling in the course of the sixth and seventh centuries to do justice to the humanity of Christ. The contours of the debate highlight "a shortcoming of the one-nature Christology, since precisely by attempting to do justice to Christ's humanity, Themistius and his followers end up looking like dyophysites, if not Nestorians."<sup>76</sup> That Themistius flirts with a more pronounced 'two natures' Christology also accounts for the ferocity of the subsequent debate. It also explains "the sustained reaction not only from the followers of the one-nature Christology, but also from the Chalcedonian side."<sup>77</sup> Secondly, Themistius takes up the dogmatic proposals inherited from Cyril of Alexandria and Severus of Antioch and discovers that when he reads the gospels in the light of his dogmatic assertions, he is confronted with a number of difficult and problematic texts: John 11.34, Mark 13.32 and Luke 2.52. This brings me to the second observation: Mark 13.32 is by no means the only problematic text within the *Catena in Marcum*. Although the description of a *Christus Nesciens* was puzzling for those struggling to articulate the identity of Christ within the parameters laid down by Cyril of Alexandria, there were other passages which required careful handling if the interpreter was to demonstrate that the divine Word permeated the humanity of Christ.

#### d. *Making Sense of Mark's Christology*

Although the aftermath of the Council of Chalcedon was characterised by vigorous Christological debate, both Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian Christians sought to defend the legacy of Cyril of Alexandria. Cyril's central insight was that the language Christians used about the identity of Jesus Christ needed to demonstrate that the divine Word permeated the humanity of Christ. And yet, Mark's narrative presents a number of exegetical dif-

---

<sup>76</sup> Allen, *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, 15.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*

ficulties. Some statements within the gospel appeared to refer to Christ's humanity without qualification. Others appeared to lessen the status of his divinity. How did the catenist draw on the writings of people like Cyril of Alexandria, Apollinaris, Origen and John Chrysostom reconcile these difficult texts with the demands of orthodoxy?

At a number of points in the Byzantine text of Mark's narrative, Jesus appears to be described in the text as a human being without qualification. For example, when Jesus suggests that "The kingdom of God is as if a man should scatter seed upon the ground,"<sup>78</sup> the anonymous extract identifies the 'man' with Jesus himself and goes on to observe:

And indeed he is 'a man,' and who will know him? For being God and Son of God before the beginning of the ages, he has become immutably man for us, and he sows the land and illuminates the whole world with the word of the knowledge of God.<sup>79</sup>

The commentator uses this opportunity to underline the humanity of Christ and remove any suggestion of Docetism. At the same time, his words suggest that the humanity of Christ is permeated with the divine Word. Similarly, at Mark 13.34, when Jesus tells another parable about the man who goes on a journey and leaves his house in the charge of his servants, the commentator identifies the 'man' with Jesus himself. An anonymous note simply adds that "he calls himself 'a man' by virtue of the incarnation."<sup>80</sup> When Jesus calms the Sea of Galilee before the eyes of the disciples, Mark 4.41 (in a textual variant that may have been influenced by Matthew 8.27) reads "They were amazed and said, 'What manner of man is this that even the sea and the wind obey him?'" Chrysostom notes that "Christ did not rebuke them for calling him 'a man'.<sup>81</sup> Rather Jesus' ministry is characterised by patience, for "he waited to teach them by his signs that their opinion was mistaken." In other words, the words reflect not the true identity of Jesus but the misunderstanding of his disciples: "For while sleep and his appearance showed that he was a man, the sea and the calm declared that he was God."<sup>82</sup>

At the same time, there are passages in Mark which appear to lessen the status of Christ's divinity. The key passages are Mark 3.28 and Mark 10.18. In Mark 3.28, Jesus says that people will be forgiven for their sins and the blasphemies they utter with one exception: "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit."

<sup>78</sup> Mark 4.26.

<sup>79</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 308.28–309.1.

<sup>80</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 417.1.

<sup>81</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 313.20–21 The extract comes from Chrysostom Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 28.1–2 (TLG 2062.152).

<sup>82</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 313.26–27.



The extract from Apollinaris suggests that he was much exercised by this passage. The logic of his argument is as follows: Jesus states that blasphemy against God is unpardonable in the name of the Spirit. He then identifies the activity of the Holy Spirit with the Kingdom of God, so it follows that blasphemy against the Spirit is the same as blasphemy against God. But then Apollinaris goes on to suggest that “blasphemy against the Son in comparison with blasphemy against the Spirit does have pardon” on the grounds that the one who blasphemes might not recognise his true identity and see him simply as a man “of low estate and of a race easily despised.”<sup>83</sup> The passage illustrates that Mark 3.28 begs a number of questions about the precise relationship between the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. According to Apollinaris, it appears that “blasphemy against him, as one who was thought to be just a human being, is deemed to be less important than blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.”<sup>84</sup> Clearly, Apollinaris’ comments depend on a series of inferences from the text, but the challenges presented by Mark 10.18 are more explicit. The question posed by the rich young man in Mark 10.17 is accompanied by an extended extract from John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 63.1–2.<sup>85</sup>

Why does Jesus challenge the rich young man for calling him “good,” saying “No-one is good except God alone?”<sup>86</sup> Chrysostom responds to this question by asserting that Jesus’ participation in this conversation is shaped by the perceptions and assumptions of his conversation-partner. The rich young man approaches him, assuming that he is a human being and just like any other Jewish teacher. To dispel any doubt about the divine nature of Christ, he then suggests a couple of instances in which Jesus betrays his divine insight by discerning the inner thoughts of those who approach him. He then goes on to suggest that his reticence is driven by a pedagogical desire to teach the rich young man about the virtue of humility:

Therefore when he said, ‘No one is good,’ he meant, ‘No one among human beings is good.’ But he says this not to deprive human beings of goodness, but to make it different from the goodness of God. This is why he also added, ‘except God alone.’ And he did not say, ‘except my Father,’ so that you may learn that he did not reveal himself to the young man. Why on earth did he reply to him in this way? He wishes to lead him on by a step at a time and to

---

<sup>83</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 299.28–30 The extract comes from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* Fr. 73 (Joseph Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche. Aus Kettenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben.* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 21).

<sup>84</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 300.16–19.

<sup>85</sup> Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365.

<sup>86</sup> Mark 10.18.

teach him to avoid all flattery, and to drive him on towards God, and to know the one who is truly good, who is also the root and fountain of all things, and to render honour to Him: because also when he says, 'Call no one upon earth 'Teacher!,' he says this to make a distinction from himself so that they might learn what is the ruling principle over all things.<sup>87</sup>

The argument that Jesus' concealment of his true identity is motivated by a pedagogical interest is repeated at a number of points within the *Catena in Marcum*: for instance, at Mark 11.18, when Mark describes the response of the crowds to the preaching of Jesus, Chrysostom suggests that Christ "did not want to do anything beyond the capacity of a human being, so that the Incarnation might be believed."<sup>88</sup> The emphasis given to the humanity of Christ and the ignorance of his divinity is a consequence of the misunderstanding of the disciples and those whom Jesus taught. So when Chrysostom comments on the responses of the disciples to the question, "Who do you say that I am?,"<sup>89</sup> he asserts that "they were compelled to consider him human on account of what they saw—even in attributing the resurrection of the dead to him, they thought he was John, or Jeremiah, or one of the prophets."<sup>90</sup> According to Cyril of Alexandria, it was the same lack of discernment which led ultimately to the treachery of Judas: "For he gave to them a sign, saying, '*the one whom I will kiss is the man*': and he forgot completely the glory of Christ."<sup>91</sup>

At other points in his exegesis, Chrysostom alerts the reader to the fact that the true identity of Christ is more explicit in Mark's narrative: for example, in commenting on Mark's description of the healing of the Gerasene demoniac, he notes the irony that "while the crowds acknowledged him as a man, the demons came to proclaim his divinity."<sup>92</sup> Although many commentators have noted that Chrysostom stands within the established tradition of 'Antiochene exegesis,'<sup>93</sup> Chrysostom's understanding of Christology should not be closely aligned with that of Theodore of Mopsuestia or Nestorius.

<sup>87</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 376.15–32.

<sup>88</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 394.21–22. The extract can be found in Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 68.2 (PG 58.642.53–643.6).

<sup>89</sup> Mark 8.29.

<sup>90</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 345.25–26. The extract can be found in Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 54.1–2 (PG 58.532.56–533.41).

<sup>91</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 428.13–14.

<sup>92</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 315.15–16. The extract can be found in Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 28.2–3 (PG 57.352.33–353.19).

<sup>93</sup> Indeed Thomas McKibbens stated a number of years ago that the study of Chrysostom's exegesis was worthwhile because it was "an excellent example of the Antiochene school of biblical study." (Thomas R. McKibbens, 'The Exegesis of John Chrysostom: Homilies on the Gospels,' *The Expository Times* 93, no. 9 (1982): 264–265).

While Chrysostom refers to the two natures of Christ in the course of his writings, his use of the term ‘condescension’ or *συγκατάβασις* adds a degree of subtlety to his understanding of Christology. The term is used extensively by Chrysostom in his Pauline commentaries<sup>94</sup> and is central to his understanding of the doctrine of the incarnation. The idea of ‘condescension’ suggests that God is made manifest not so much as he is, but rather as one is able to see him. In other words, in the revelation of God in Christ, there is an accommodation to human limitations. Chrysostom is not referring to Christ’s limitations as a human being so much as the limitations of those around him.

One can see this clearly in the two passages in the *Catena in Marcum* where the term appears. In Mark 10, when James and John, the sons of Zebedee, ask Jesus whether they can sit one on his left and the other on his right, in the places of honour, Jesus responds by saying first that the disciples “do not know” what they are asking,<sup>95</sup> and intimates that “to sit at my right hand or at my left is not mine to grant.”<sup>96</sup> Chrysostom suggests that this passage presents two puzzles: first, is there a seat at his right hand and has it been prepared for anyone? Secondly, was the Lord of all “not sufficiently Lord to provide for those for whom it was not prepared.”<sup>97</sup> The second point is significant for these words suggest that Jesus is in some way constrained. His choices are limited. His omnipotence is restricted and so he is not truly “Lord of all.” Chrysostom argues that Jesus said these things to condescend “to their understanding.”<sup>98</sup> Intuitively, he perceives the underlying agenda. James and John want to enjoy some kind of pre-eminence in terms of status and honour above the other apostles, but they did not understand what they were saying. Chrysostom then paraphrases the response of Jesus in the following way:

You shall die on account of me and you will share with me in the Passion: but this is not sufficient to enable you to secure the first rank. For if anyone else should be more accomplished than you in every other kind of virtue and should arrive by virtue of their martyrdom, I will not give you the first honours simply because at this moment I love you and prefer you to the others.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Margaret Mitchell, ‘Pauline Accommodation and “Condescension”’: 1Cor 9.19–23 and the History of Influence,’ in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed., Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 197–214.

<sup>95</sup> Mark 10.38.

<sup>96</sup> Mark 10.40.

<sup>97</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 385.22–23.

<sup>98</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 386.1.

<sup>99</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 386.6–11.

Chrysostom suggests that Christ's purpose is primarily pedagogical. In 'condescending' to their level of understanding, he challenges them to demonstrate their virtue in order that they might have not only the hope of salvation (which is assured) but also possess a reputation for a life of virtue. Similarly, when the woman anoints Jesus with oil in Mark 14.1–3, Jesus "condescends to this and he permits the oil to be poured on his head."<sup>100</sup> The reason why Chrysostom speaks of 'condescension' at this point is that he notes that Jesus does not dismiss the objection of Judas and the other disciples that such wanton profligacy should be restrained. Chrysostom infers that Jesus concedes that it would have been better to distribute the money spent on the perfume among the poor. Moreover, he had said himself, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice."<sup>101</sup> Instead, he recognises the generous intention of the woman. His act of 'condescension' or 'accommodation' lies in accepting her gift graciously rather than censuring her profligacy.

This last example perhaps illustrates the way in which 'condescension' refers to the perspective of the onlooker rather than any innate quality of Christ. However, the story of James and John, and their request for the seats of honour, is more closely related to the question of Christology. Chrysostom wants to indicate clearly to his listeners that the words of Jesus do not suggest that he is less than "the Lord of all." Rather these words suggest Jesus' willingness to speak within the frame of reference dictated by the limited horizons and awareness of his conversation-partners. Such language is consistent with the numerous references to "divine economy" within the *Catena in Marcum*.<sup>102</sup> The term was widely used within patristic literature to demonstrate how the divine Word permeated the humanity of Christ given the constraints and limitations of time and space. Attention to such language is important because these words bring into clear focus the dogmatic presuppositions and assumptions which inform the exegesis and interpretation contained within the extensive array of extracts assembled within the *Catena in Marcum*. The compilers of the *Catena* were keen to demonstrate that the discourse of Mark's gospel was entirely consistent with the formularies of Nicaea and the legacy of Cyril of Alexandria. However, this enterprise was not as straightforward as some may have been led to believe. Commentators recognized that the gospel narrative did not simply confirm their assumptions and presuppositions. When the scriptures were read in

<sup>100</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 419.8.

<sup>101</sup> Matthew 9.13 and Matthew 12.7, quoting Hosea 6.6.

<sup>102</sup> See the discussion of the term *οικονομία* in Chapter 4.

the light of these dogmatic assertions, certain passages became difficult and problematic to the reader. But these dogmatic assertions were not sufficient to trump anything that was contained within the text. When considered in the light of the scriptures, these dogmatic assertions also became difficult, even strange.

#### e. *The Dogmatic Trajectory*

According to Albert Schweitzer, the quest of the historical Jesus which began in the nineteenth century “loosed the bands by which he had been riveted for centuries to the stony rocks of ecclesiastical doctrine, and rejoiced to see life and movement coming into the figure once more.”<sup>103</sup> In *Text, Church and World*, Francis Watson notes Schweitzer’s antipathy towards “the immobility and unreality of a Jesus interpreted in the light of the church doctrines of trinity and incarnation,”<sup>104</sup> but takes him to task for his own lack of self-awareness and historical consciousness. Although Schweitzer was alert to the way in which the lives of Jesus published in the course of the nineteenth century tended to produce mirror images of the authors themselves, Watson suggests that Schweitzer’s own apocalyptic prophet who fought “against history and lost” is not far from “the late-romantic, post-Nietzschean but still idealist ethos that Schweitzer himself inhabited.”<sup>105</sup> Watson goes on to observe that most reconstructions of the historical Jesus since Schweitzer have tended towards the ‘thoroughgoing scepticism’ of Wrede than the ‘thoroughgoing eschatology’ of Schweitzer (although more recent scholarship may well have redressed the balance).<sup>106</sup> From Watson’s perspective, recent scholarship is so circumspect and uncertain in its judgments that when, “after much labour, a ‘historical Jesus’ emerges, he often proves to be a relatively uninteresting figure.”<sup>107</sup> His proposal is suggestive:

---

<sup>103</sup> Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: a critical study of its progress from Reimarus to Wrede*, 397.

<sup>104</sup> Watson, *Text, Church and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective*, 256.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>106</sup> Scholars associated with the ‘third quest,’ including Ed Sanders, Anthony Harvey, James Dunn, Tom Wright and Dale Allison, place a much greater emphasis on the impact of Jewish ‘restoration eschatology’ on the language and teaching of the historical Jesus. See Dale C. Allison, *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1998), James D.G. Dunn, *A New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed* (London: SPCK, 2005), Anthony Harvey, *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (London: Duckworth, 1982), E.P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. Second Edition. (London: Penguin, 1995), Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996).

<sup>107</sup> Watson, *Text, Church and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective*, 256.

The quest continues out of its own self-generating momentum, but it has become entirely unclear why it might matter and what benefits are to be expected from it. Despite an awareness that theological or at least religious significance ought to be available somewhere in the vicinity of Jesus, there has been little serious attempt among biblical scholars to enquire whether the rejected 'ecclesiastical doctrine' might have something worthwhile to say on the subject. Perhaps Jesus has been riveted for centuries to the stony rocks of historical-critical scholarship, and perhaps ecclesial doctrine is needed to restore him to life and movement?<sup>108</sup>

Watson concedes that his proposal is unlikely to gain widespread acceptance within the scholarly guild, given the widespread perception that the dogmatic assertions of the early church only serve to distort the New Testament witness.<sup>109</sup> In his analysis of the arguments presented in the work of 'minimalists' like Karl-Josef Kuschel<sup>110</sup> and James Dunn,<sup>111</sup> there is a problem with "the dominance of a basically evolutionary scheme of Christological development" which reaches its logical conclusions in the Councils of Nicaea and Chalcedon.<sup>112</sup> The problem is that this perspective is based on four questionable assumptions: first, that the original meaning of Christological titles is determined by the constraints of history; secondly, that the process of Christological development is basically *linear*; thirdly, that the truth can only be found at the moment of origin and "is corrupted by whatever is late";<sup>113</sup> and finally, the perspective of church history and ecclesiastical doctrine imposes a concept of unitary history on the historical fragments of the New Testament which cannot be sustained.

Watson challenges these four assumptions in a preliminary analysis with reference to an extended discussion of the writings of Reimarus. However, given that he is describing a process which begins with the writings of the New Testament and culminates in the Councils of Nicaea and Chalcedon,

---

<sup>108</sup> Ibid.

<sup>109</sup> Morna Hooker puts forward this view in typically forthright terms: "The question which concerns me here is the extent to which the influence of Chalcedon is still a positive hindrance to our understanding of what the New Testament authors were trying to say about Jesus in their own very different time and circumstances. The Fathers of the Church held that the Son, being 'of one substance with the Father ... became incarnate.' This may have been a natural way for them to interpret the Fourth Gospel in their own time, but it was not ... what the fourth evangelist himself said." (Morna Hooker, 'Chalcedon and the New Testament,' in *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine*, ed. Sarah Coakley and David Pailin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 74).

<sup>110</sup> Kuschel, *Born Before All Time?: The Dispute Over Christ's Origin*.

<sup>111</sup> Dunn, *Christology in the Making*.

<sup>112</sup> Watson, *Text, Church and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective*, 257.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid.

it is strange that he does not assess these assumptions in the light of the Christological debates of the first five centuries. By contrast, my view is that the evidence of the *Catena in Marcum* and the Christological debates provoked by the text of Mark serves to illustrate precisely the kind of approach that Watson is advocating. And yet, one of the difficulties with ‘minimalist’ and ‘maximalist’ accounts of the Christological developments of the early church is that they are *both* essentially ‘linear’ in character. Put crudely, the ‘minimalists’ begin with a Jesus viewed simply as a human being who in no way compromised Jewish monotheism. The documents of the New Testament and the early church provide evidence of a process of evolution which reaches its apotheosis in the complex formulae of the Chalcedonian definition. By contrast, the ‘maximalists’ seek to identify the earliest possible references or allusions to the ‘pre-existence’ of Christ. They then demonstrate the consistency of this perspective with the opinion of “pre-modern, pre-critical interpreters.”<sup>114</sup> Curiously, although the approaches of ‘minimalists’ and ‘maximalists’ appear to be diametrically opposed, they share one simple underlying presupposition. They both suppose that the trajectory of interpretation is essentially ‘linear’ in character.

The evidence of the *Catena in Marcum* suggests that this is not so. Watson’s instincts, which lead him to question the ‘linear model’ proposed by Reimarus and the “basically evolutionary scheme of Christological development,” turn out to be well-founded. The evidence suggests a *circularity* about the exchange between dogmatic assertion and biblical exegesis in the life of the early church which is far more complex: for example, while debates about Mark 13.32 in the context of the Arian controversy may have led Athanasius to make a number of proposals about its interpretation in the light of Nicene orthodoxy, by the time of the Nestorian controversy, his comments about the humanity and divinity of Christ were beginning to look rather suspect. Moreover, as the *Agnoetic* controversy of the sixth century demonstrates, Cyril of Alexandria’s disciples still struggled to reconcile his subtle reflections on the precise relationship between the divinity and humanity of Christ with the intimations of Christ’s ignorance in John 11.34, Mark 13.32 and Luke 2.52. Reference to the judgments of Nicaea and Chalcedon was not always sufficient to settle the question.

Perhaps a more ‘iterative’ approach to Christological development needs to be explored. Not only would this have the merit of providing a more satisfying account of the Christological controversies which dominated the

---

<sup>114</sup> Gathercole, *The Pre-existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark and Luke*, 2.

first five centuries of the common era, but it would also enable us to assess more recent explorations of the precise relationship between exegesis and dogma. In a helpful essay on the status and meaning of the Chalcedonian Definition,<sup>115</sup> Sarah Coakley surveys three recent assessments of the language of Chalcedon: first, Chalcedon as *linguistic* regulation, articulated by Richard Norris<sup>116</sup> and clearly betraying the influence of a 'postliberal' agenda and George Lindbeck's interest in linguistic rules of predication;<sup>117</sup> secondly, John Hick's contention that Chalcedon's meaning is rightly to be interpreted today as 'metaphorical';<sup>118</sup> and thirdly, reassertions of the 'literal' truth of the incarnation<sup>119</sup> in reaction to John Hick's earlier embrace of metaphor in *The Myth of God Incarnate*.<sup>120</sup> In Coakley's view, each of these approaches betrays strengths and weaknesses.<sup>121</sup> In the light of her assessment, she advances the argument that theologians will only effectively develop the insights of these three approaches and avoid their pitfalls if they attend to the word *ῥοπος*, which describes the document which emerged from Chalcedon and which is often translated 'Definition.' She notes that Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon* suggests a broader range of meanings, including 'boundary,' 'horizon,' 'limit,' 'standard,' 'pattern' and 'monastic rule,' as well as 'liturgical or dogmatic decisions' and 'decrees.'<sup>122</sup> Coakley suggests that

---

<sup>115</sup> Sarah Coakley, 'What Does Chalcedon Solve and What Does it Not? Some Reflections on the Status and Meaning of the Chalcedonian 'Definition', in *The Incarnation*, ed. Stephen T. David, Daniel Kendall and Gerald O'Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 144–163.

<sup>116</sup> Richard Norris, 'Chalcedon Revisited: A Historical and Theological Reflection,' in *New Perspectives on Historical Theology*, ed. Bradley Nassif (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996).

<sup>117</sup> George Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1984), 16–19.

<sup>118</sup> John Hick, *The Metaphor of God Incarnate: Christology in a Pluralistic Age* (London: SCM Press, 1993), 99–111.

<sup>119</sup> Coakley provides references from a range of writers, including: Thomas V. Morris, *The Logic of God Incarnate* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986), 17–18; David Brown, *The Divine Trinity* (London: Duckworth, 1985), 102–103; and William Alston, *Divine Nature and Human Language* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), 17–38.

<sup>120</sup> John Hick, ed., *The Myth of God Incarnate* (London: SCM Press, 1977), 175.

<sup>121</sup> There is a helpful discussion of Coakley's criticisms of John Hick in Oliver D. Crisp, *Divinity and Humanity: The Incarnation Reconsidered* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 168–170.

<sup>122</sup> Sarah Coakley, 'What Does Chalcedon Solve and What Does it Not? Some Reflections on the Status and Meaning of the Chalcedonian 'Definition', in *The Incarnation*, ed. Gerald O'Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 160. It is worth noting that Lampe offers all these definitions, with the exception of Coakley's preferred 'horizon.' However, her quotation from Plotinus, *Enneads* 5.5[32].8 offers a more convincing justification for asserting that 'horizon' is consistent with the semantic potential of *ῥοπος* and giving the reader a sense of what 'boundary' or 'limit' might mean.



the term ‘horizon,’ rather than ‘definition,’ offers a more promising way of describing what exactly the bishops assembled at Chalcedon were attempting to do:

Taking this semantic background into account, and remembering again that the assembled bishops at Chalcedon resisted at one point the Emperor’s demand for greater ‘precision,’ we may perhaps begin to see the true intentions of the document. It does not, that is, intend to provide a full systematic account of Christology, and even less a complete and precise metaphysics of Christ’s makeup. Rather it sets a ‘boundary’ on what can, and cannot, be said, by first ruling out three aberrant interpretations of Christ (Apollinarianism, Eutychianism, and extreme Nestorianism), second, providing an abstract rule of language (*physis* and *hypostasis*) for distinguishing duality and unity in Christ, and, third, presenting a ‘riddle’ of negatives by means of which a greater (though undefined) reality may be intimated.<sup>123</sup>

Coakley suggests that the statement produced by the bishops at Chalcedon was designed to be “normative” and “regulatory.” (After all, the Emperor put considerable pressure on the bishops to produce one for precisely this purpose). But it was also more modest in scope than systematic theologians have often allowed. The “riddle of negatives” towards the end of the statement gave it an apophatic quality, which meant that the statement neither explained nor grasped “the reality towards which it points.”<sup>124</sup> At the same time, it did not address a whole raft of different issues, such as the more immediate question about the number of Christ’s wills, or the more contemporary question of “whether the risen Christ is male.”<sup>125</sup> Chalcedon provided an horizon “to which we constantly return, but with equally constant forays backwards and forwards.”<sup>126</sup> This movement perhaps encapsulates precisely the kind of ‘iteration’ which this chapter so far has described. While the Chalcedonian Definition was intended to be regulatory and established certain limits of actualisation, these protocols continued to be contested between Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian Christians in the course of the sixth century. The controversy which it provoked also precipitated a host of questions which it did not directly address.

Many of these questions came into focus as theologians continued to wrestle with *difficult* passages in scripture. The ‘dogmatic horizon’ agreed by the bishops at Chalcedon was intended to inform the interpretation of scripture. Indeed, as Morna Hooker points out, “when more than 500

---

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 161.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, 163.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, 162.

bishops gathered together in the Church of St Euphemia at Chalcedon in October AD 451, a copy of the scriptures was placed in the centre of the Council as a symbol of the fact that their deliberations began from scripture, and that they believed themselves to be expounding scripture.<sup>127</sup> There is an element of circularity or iteration in this argument, which should be immediately apparent. Indeed, in a recent article, Peter Scott has noted that there is something “uncomfortably circular” about the argument put forward by Sarah Coakley. He summarises it rather crudely in the following way:

Does Scripture present us with an incarnate God? Well, no, the matter of the identity of the second person of the Trinity and Jesus can only be read out of Scripture anachronistically—but please see the Chalcedonian definition that offers a decision over terminology and an interpretative horizon that is informed by scripture and is an aid in reading Scripture. Well then, does Scripture present us with an incarnate God? Well, no ... And so forth.<sup>128</sup>

Scott’s criticisms appear to rest on the presupposition that patristic doctrine is made up of a series of static categories and concepts which can only be adequately authorised or proved with reference to the scriptures.<sup>129</sup> And yet it is questionable whether the church fathers would have shared this kind of epistemological anxiety. While the records suggest that the bishops began with scripture and believed themselves to be expounding scripture, it does not follow that they were using scripture as a way of authorising a series of theological assertions or statements which had been independently established by other means. Indeed, the resistance to the kind of Antiochene exegesis, which distinguished between the two natures of Christ, also reflected an established antipathy towards the reading of scripture simply as evidence.<sup>130</sup> For critics of the Antiochene position, the suggestion that the tears of Jesus at John 11.35 demonstrated his humanity, while his walking on water

<sup>127</sup> Hooker, ‘Chalcedon and the New Testament,’ 73.

<sup>128</sup> Peter Manley Scott, ‘Seasons of Grace? Christ’s Cursing of a Fig Tree,’ in *Christology and Scripture: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Andrew T. Lincoln and Angus Paddison (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 200–201.

<sup>129</sup> A similar hesitation is expressed by David Yeago in his assessment of James Dunn’s *Christology in the Making* (David S. Yeago, ‘The New Testament and the Nicene Dogma: A Contribution to the Recovery of Theological Exegesis,’ in *The Theological Interpretation of Scripture: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, ed. Stephen E. Fowl (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), 93–97).

<sup>130</sup> For an extended discussion of some of the weaknesses of Antiochene exegesis, see John J. O’Keefe, ‘“A Letter that Killeth”; Toward a reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms,’ *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8, no. 1 (2000) and John J. O’Keefe, ‘Kenosis or Impassibility: Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrrhus on the Problem of Divine Pathos,’ *Studia Patristica XXXIII* (1997), 358–365. O’Keefe makes

at Mark 6.45–52 confirmed his divinity, was not a satisfactory way of articulating the identity of Jesus Christ. Such a profound misconception led those same critics to discover not a series of doctrinal statements that would be authorised with reference to scripture, but to articulate a basic orientation and discipline of reading which would enable them to encounter the mystery of Christ when they interpreted the scriptures.

The idea of ‘a discipline of reading’ perhaps encapsulates what the ‘dogmatic horizon’ of Chalcedon was seeking to achieve. Articulating the identity of Christ did not depend on demonstrating a capacity to parrot complex philosophical propositions, nor did it rely on some sort of innate quality of the text itself, nor did it consist in the adoption of a particular interpretative technique or method. First, the evidence of the arguments over Mark 13.32 suggest that Christological statements articulated after Nicaea and Chalcedon were not static. They were renewed and refined as theologians continued to wrestle with difficult texts in the scriptures. Secondly, those who sought to engage with questions of Christology in the aftermath of Chalcedon knew that there was no oracle within the scriptures which rendered a comprehensive and unambiguous description of the identity of Jesus Christ. Pre-modern exegetes shared with modern interpreters an awareness that the text was not “undialectically transparent to God’s self-imparted meaning.”<sup>131</sup> If it had been, then presumably there would have been nothing to argue about. Thirdly, the varied and extensive evidence suggests that patristic exegesis cannot simply be reduced to a particular interpretative technique or method.

Thus the dogmatic horizon of Chalcedon sought to promote a particular discipline of reading. The interaction between exegesis and dogma was inherently dynamic and iterative in character. It was open to correction. It resisted closure. A similar observation is made by Rowan Williams in his theological *Postscript* on Arius:

Scripture and tradition require to be read in a way that brings out their strangeness, their non-obvious and non-contemporary qualities, in order that they may be read both freshly and truthfully from one generation to another. They need to be made more *difficult* before we can accurately grasp their sim-

---

the point that the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia was not simply a consequence of Christological concerns, but also reflected concerns about his exegetical methods. He suggests that there was a tendency in Antiochene exegesis to interpret the text in the light of philosophy, while Cyril of Alexandria sought to fashion his philosophical concepts in conformity with the text.

<sup>131</sup> Rowan Williams, ‘Historical Criticism and Sacred Text,’ in *Reading Texts, Seeking Wisdom*, ed. David Ford and Graham Stanton (London: SCM Press, 2003), 226.

plicities. Otherwise, we read with eyes not our own and think them through with minds not our own; the ‘deposit of faith’ does not really come into contact with *ourselves*. And this ‘making difficult,’ this confession that what the gospel says in Scripture and tradition does not instantly and effortlessly make sense, is perhaps one of the most fundamental tasks for theology.<sup>132</sup>

This admission that the dialectical relationship between scripture and tradition often appears *difficult*—and should be *difficult*—perhaps invites further reflection about the relationship between exegesis and dogma. Biblical scholars often imagine that any engagement with the Christological formulations of Nicaea, Chalcedon and their aftermath, involves the artificial and arbitrary imposition of alien and anachronistic material on the text. Indeed, Morna Hooker questions the temptation of theologians to read the New Testament through a pair of “Chalcedonian-tinted spectacles”:

If we want to do justice to the ways in which the first Christians were trying to express their faith we must not suppose that when they speak of Jesus as ‘Son of God’ they meant the second person of the Trinity, or thought of him as being ‘of one substance with the Father’; they were aware only that in Jesus of Nazareth God had spoken to them in a way which led them ever more confidently to identify the revealer with the revealed.<sup>133</sup>

Hooker’s words are challenging because they raise a serious question about “the unity presupposed between generations of hearers.”<sup>134</sup> If the first Christians were aware that God had spoken to them in Jesus so that they were led “to identify the revealer with the revealed,” does the language of Chalcedon contradict or subvert this insight? The evidence suggests that a more sympathetic understanding of the complex interactions between exegesis and dogma is necessary if biblical scholars are to engage with the theological orientation of the New Testament. Moreover, the evidence suggests that the dogmatic concerns contained within these exegetical extracts were not simply determined by the text itself, nor were they shaped by a single pattern of exegesis. Nor is it always clear that the exegesis of Mark was determined by the imposition of a series of extraneous doctrinal presuppositions, in spite of the fact that occasionally a discreet veil is drawn over some of the exegetical difficulties.

Like Mark, later exegetes wrestled with the question, “Who do you say that I am?,” but they did not provide an exhaustive response. The insights contained within the Chalcedonian *ὄρος* encouraged a *discipline* of reading,

---

<sup>132</sup> Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, 236.

<sup>133</sup> Hooker, ‘Chalcedon and the New Testament,’ 90–91.

<sup>134</sup> Williams, ‘Historical Criticism and Sacred Text,’ 227.

which, while normative, was resistant to closure. In embracing a “riddle of negatives,” it encouraged theologians to continue wrestling with the real and perceived difficulties within the biblical text. Obviously, this does not mean that bishops and emperors were immune from the temptation to use these insights coercively. But as Justinian discovered, coercion was not sufficient to restore the unity of Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian Christians. Both bishops and emperors in the East recognized that elements of the Chalcedonian definition required further elucidation and refinement. Thus patristic interpretation was not simply *cumulative*. It did not involve adding more and more comments. There was also a tendency to simplify and iron out inconsistencies which were often the consequence of earlier theological debate. Some of these tensions were never resolved, but it is no accident that the main areas of controversy which led to the Fifth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 553 were about the interpretation of scripture.

This emphasis on a *discipline of reading* enables us to recognise that Christology after Nicaea and Chalcedon was not characterised by a linear process of evolution, but by a sequence of iterative developments. It also brings us back to a constant theme of these chapters,—namely, the importance of *paideia*. Frances Young notes that “doctrine was only doctrine because it was educative.”<sup>135</sup> We may associate dogma with being ‘dogmatic,’ but in the ancient world, ‘dogmata’ were simply teachings: “that teaching involved a whole process of education, a *paideta*, ascetic training in a spiritual way of life which involved both moral and intellectual progress.”<sup>136</sup> It was for precisely this reason that guidance in the discipline of reading was sought. One of the ways in which this guidance was offered was through the compilation of a *catena*.

---

<sup>135</sup> Frances Young, ‘*Paideia* and the Myth of Static Dogma,’ in *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine*, ed. Sarah Coakley and David Pailin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 282.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, 266.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### CONCLUSION

The *Catena in Marcum* exercised considerable influence over the interpretation of Mark in the church during the Byzantine era. This influence extended beyond the fall of Byzantium in 1453. In his history of Marcan exegesis, Sean Kealy points out that the evidence suggests that the *Catena* influenced in turn Pope Gregory the Great<sup>1</sup> in the sixth century, the Venerable Bede<sup>2</sup> in the seventh century, Archbishop Theophylact<sup>3</sup> in the eleventh century and Euthymius Zygabenus<sup>4</sup> in the twelfth century.<sup>5</sup> Copies of the *Catena* are still to be found in the catalogues of monastic and Episcopal libraries in the East. Inevitably, the fact that books are kept in a library gives us little indication of whether they are in fact read. However, we can say that many of the patterns of exegesis identified within the *Catena in Marcum* persist in the churches of the East to this day.

The question of the influence of the *Catena in Marcum* in the West is more difficult to evaluate. The *Catena aurea* of Thomas Aquinas betrays some evidence of its precursors in the section on Mark, particularly in its selection of passages from John Chrysostom.<sup>6</sup> However, any influence on the *Glossa ordinaria* is probably indirect. In the *Glossa ordinaria*, the commentary on Mark is clearly dependent upon Bede.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, the production of the *Glossa ordinaria* and the *Catena aurea* bears witness to the continued vitality of this form of commentary. By the Middle Ages the biblical

---

<sup>1</sup> Gregory, *Homiliarum in evangelia* I–II (PL 76.1075A–1311B).

<sup>2</sup> Bede, *In Marci evangelium expositio* I–IV (PL 92.131D–302C).

<sup>3</sup> Theophylact, *Enarratio in evangelium Marci* (PG 123.437B–682C).

<sup>4</sup> Euthymius Zygabenus, *Commentarius in Marcum* (PG 129.765C–852C).

<sup>5</sup> Kealy, *Mark's Gospel: A History of its Interpretation from the beginning until 1979*, 28. Michael Cahill notes that elements of the *Catena in Marcum* were added to the Antwerp edition of the *Glossa ordinaria* in 1634. However, these passages are absent from the first printed editions of the *Glossa*: “Victor of Antioch was not known in the West in the early Middle Ages” (Cahill, “The Identification of the First Marcan Commentary,” 267).

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Catena Aurea: The Gospel of St Mark*, trans. John Henry Newman, originally published in 1845 (New York: Cosimo, 2007).

<sup>7</sup> E. Ann Matter, “The Church Fathers and the *Glossa ordinaria*,” in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, ed. Irena Dorota Backus (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 105.

text was “effectively embedded in the history of its interpretation.”<sup>8</sup> Readers were used to seeing the *scholia* and glosses written in the margins alongside the biblical text. These voices from the margins served to illuminate and enable the interpretation of the reader. And yet Gerald Bruns argues that at the time of the Reformation a major symbolic moment of transition between “ancient and modern” hermeneutics took place. In the winter of 1513–1514, Martin Luther was preparing his first lectures as a professor at the University of Wittenberg. Luther was preparing a course on the psalms and he decided to commission a new text book for his class. He instructed the University printer, Johann Grüenberg, “to produce an edition of the Psalter with wide margins and lots of space between the lines. The students would reproduce Luther’s own glosses and commentary. In a stroke, Luther wiped the Sacred Page clean.”<sup>9</sup> This story is significant for a number of reasons: first, the story underlines the fact that the writing of glosses and *marginalia* was thoroughly established in Luther’s pedagogical approach. The story reinforces a point made repeatedly in this study: documents with extended *marginalia* emerged in the context of the school room. Whatever the changes in theological outlook or ideological perspective, this pedagogical approach appears to have remained surprisingly consistent. Secondly, *sola scriptura*, one of the banner cries of the Reformation, did not simply reflect a doctrine about the theological interpretation of scripture. It also described quite literally the geography of the page in the textbooks of Luther’s students.

It is tempting to assume that from this moment onwards texts like the *Catena in Marcum* were—no pun intended—marginalized. Their influence over the history of interpretation became rather limited. And yet this temptation should be resisted. *Catena*e continue to exert some influence. Anthony Harvey points out that biblical scholars have continued to consult these ancient texts, not only because they offer some insight over questions of the transmission of the text of the New Testament, but also because the *scholia* and glosses contained within them often helped to illuminate difficult or puzzling passages:

The first catena of patristic comments on biblical texts was made before 500 CE and set a precedent that was followed many times in later centuries. When J.J. Wettstein published his great two volume commentary on the New Testament in 1752–1753, he included not only explanatory material from the

---

<sup>8</sup> Gerald L. Bruns, *Hermeneutics Ancient and Modern* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 139.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 140.

ancient world (and his work is still an invaluable resource for scholars seeking precedents in classical literature for biblical expressions and ideas), but also a rich selection of patristic and medieval comment, not for its own sake, but in the interest of bringing as much light as possible on difficulties in the text ...<sup>10</sup>

Harvey's observation is confirmed by the fact that there are a number of references to the *Catena in Marcum* in contemporary commentaries: for example, Cranfield uses insights in the *Catena in Marcum* to address the puzzle presented by the Cursing of the Fig Tree in Mark 11.12–14<sup>11</sup> and Collins refers to the catenist's attestation to the authenticity of the longer ending of Mark in Mark 16.9–20.<sup>12</sup>

Harvey's allusion to the need of modern interpreters to refer to the work of ancient commentators should make us more attentive to questions about the origins and provenance of *catenae*, and particularly the *Catena in Marcum*. This study has demonstrated that questions of provenance can rarely be established simply by reference to the question of authorship. While the association with Victor of Antioch may account for some of the original material, the discrepancies and inconsistencies within the manuscript tradition demonstrate that the *Catena in Marcum* was an 'open book,' shaped by the conventions of the scholastic tradition within the Byzantine world. These conventions were a direct continuation of the common practices of late antiquity. But Harvey's comments should also alert us to the fact that it is misleading to describe the *Catena in Marcum*, along with other *catenae*, as 'pre-critical.' It is more accurate to say that the *Catena* contains a combination of critical and uncritical comments. Indeed, this detailed study of the fragments and extracts contained within the *Catena in Marcum* has enabled us to identify three distinct trajectories of interpretation within patristic exegesis. First, early Christian commentators drew on the insights of ancient literary criticism in their reading of the biblical text. The *form* of a *catena* reflects the established pedagogical practices of the scholastic tradition, while the *content* with its use of allegory and technical grammatical vocabulary displays an enormous debt to the established conventions of literary criticism. Christian commentators of late antiquity sought to alert the reader to the density of meaning within the text. Their exegesis reflects the

<sup>10</sup> Anthony Harvey, "Gospel Truths" *The Times Literary Supplement*, August 13th 2004.

<sup>11</sup> C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, ed. C.F.D. Moule, *The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 356–357.

<sup>12</sup> Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, 805. This passage also features in William Farmer's study of Mark 16.9–20 (Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, 24–26).



world of the grammarian of late antiquity. Its contents are consistent with the practice of close attention to texts and the kind of reading which was characteristic of the scholastic tradition.

Secondly, pagan critics used these same literary techniques to raise questions about the authenticity and accuracy of the gospels. Although Celsus' lack of familiarity with the gospel accounts enabled Origen to counter his arguments with relative ease, Porphyry, who may have been a Christian in his youth, demonstrated a close and detailed knowledge of the Christian scriptures. He proved to be a much more formidable adversary. The numerous references to inconsistencies, perceived or otherwise, between the gospels are the subject of considerable analysis and description. These comments, drawn in particular from the writings of Eusebius of Caesarea, John Chrysostom and others, betray a concern with the historical events described within the gospel itself. The repeated insistence on the reliability of the apostolic witness displays an apologetic concern. It represents a concerted effort to dismiss and contradict the accusations of Porphyry and pagan critics. These arguments speak of a more historical concern. Momigliano is right to emphasise the significance of Eusebius and others for early Christian historiography.<sup>13</sup> While it would be anachronistic to attribute a modern historical sensibility to the commentators of the first five centuries of the common era, it is clear that the antecedents of historical criticism in biblical scholarship are not simply to be located in the Renaissance or the Enlightenment. We can discern the antecedents of the historical trajectory in patristic exegesis.

Thirdly, patristic exegesis was marked by a clear and distinct concern with the subject matter of Christian theology. It was shaped by a 'dogmatic' horizon, which encouraged a particular discipline of reading. The dogmatic horizon of the early church was formed in the crucible of the Christological controversies of the early church. And yet this dogmatic horizon did not give rise to biblical exegesis which was either wooden or static. The Chalcedonian definition generated further debates about Christology in the sixth century, some of which are reflected in the pages of the *Catena in Marcum*. Early commentators came to realise that scripture could not always be so easily domesticated. There was a dialectical relationship between scripture and the tradition which was often resistant to closure. The contours of the scriptural narrative sometimes eluded simple definition. Appeals to

---

<sup>13</sup> Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.' in Momigliano, ed., *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, 79–99.

scripture did not always serve to settle doctrinal debates, even when driven by political expediency or imperial coercion. This 'dogmatic' horizon is an essential component of patristic patterns of exegesis.

The identification of these three trajectories of interpretation in the *Catena in Marcum* suggests that in the first five centuries of the common era, the theological interpretation of scripture was shaped by literary, historical and dogmatic concerns. All played a vital part in the Church's reflection and engagement with the Bible as scripture. In his study of biblical interpretation in the Orthodox Church, John Breck notes that in the course of the last fifty years, a number of theologians and biblical scholars

have signalled the demise of the historical-critical method .... They express dismay at the rationalizing tendencies of biblical specialists today and want to return to what they understand to be a more traditional interpretation of the sacred Scriptures. Many of them seem to be labouring under the impression that historical and text-critical method was first developed in the wake of the Enlightenment.<sup>14</sup>

Breck makes two observations in this passage, one about contemporary scholarship and another about patristic exegesis. This study has provided extensive evidence to confirm Breck's insight that early Christian commentary betrayed a commitment to literary, historical and dogmatic questions. However, developments within current scholarship since his words were written suggest that this observation has gone unheeded. The identification of 'patristic exegesis' with the 'figural' or the 'canonical' reflects an impoverished understanding of the biblical interpretation of the fathers. The fact that 'theological' interpretations of scripture are being produced in commentary series such as the *Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible* by editors who appear willing to impart an attitude of studied oblivion with regard to the most recent advances in textual study and historical scholarship should be a cause for concern among those who value biblical scholarship. If pre-modern exegesis provides an inspiration and guide for the theological interpretation of the Bible, then a more comprehensive description of what it actually entailed may prove instructive.

This study has demonstrated that patristic exegesis cannot be defined simply in terms of placing an emphasis on dogmatic questions, recognising the priority of the 'literal sense,' appealing to the 'mind of scripture,' or adopting a 'figural' reading of the Old Testament. While patristic exegesis is littered with examples of each of these things, the danger is that each of

---

<sup>14</sup> John Breck, *Scripture in Tradition: The Bible and its Interpretation in the Orthodox Church* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 2.

them can be used to suggest that somehow patristic exegesis is *sui generis*, a special case distinct from established patterns of intellectual discourse. Such descriptions are often void of context, without due regard for the complex interaction between the earliest Christian communities and the dominant prevailing culture. By contrast, this study has sought to relate the literary techniques adopted by ancient Christian commentators to established forms of literary criticism, to describe historical concerns in the context of anti-pagan polemic, and to describe the dogmatic horizon of patristic interpretation in relation to continuing doctrinal debate. The combination of all these approaches enabled the reader to discover the depth and range of the Christian scriptures.

The question of pedagogy has occupied centre-stage in the course of this study. Biblical commentary arose out of established patterns of *paideia* in the ancient world. In commenting on biblical passages, early commentators employed the patterns of exegesis and textual criticism which they had inherited from the scholastic tradition. This view is reinforced by the evidence of extended discussions among the fathers about the value of inherited forms of *paideia*, as well as the use of technical grammatical vocabulary which would have been familiar in a pedagogical context. In his recent book *Pedagogy of the Bible*, Dale Martin suggests that by paying attention to how Christians in premodern times thought about and interpreted Scripture, “premodern biblical interpretation may be used to nurture and shape new imaginations for ourselves in scriptural interpretation.”<sup>15</sup> Martin presents a series of proposals about the teaching of the Bible in theological education. In his survey of ten seminaries in North America, he notes the pre-eminence given to historical criticism in biblical interpretation, but he also laments the lack of awareness of more recent developments in the fields of hermeneutics and literary theory. Moreover, in his visits to interview faculty and students, he discerned a poor grasp of theological hermeneutics,<sup>16</sup> an inability to make connections between biblical knowledge and theological argument, and a failure to integrate biblical studies with other areas of the curriculum. He concluded, “The modern theological school, in far too many cases, is not doing a good job of teaching church leaders to interpret the Bible in creative, imaginative, and theologically sophisticated ways.”<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Dale B. Martin, *Pedagogy of the Bible* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 45.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 28.

<sup>17</sup> Similar observations were made by Stanley Hauerwas a number of years ago. His analysis is similar, although his proposals are rather different: “I believe that one of the most promising ways to reclaim the integrity of theological language as a working language for a congregation’s life is for seminaries to make liturgy the focus of their life. I do not mean

Martin proposes that scripture should be at the heart of a seminary's curriculum. He notes Jean Leclercq's insistence that the centrality of Scripture was not invented at the end of the middle ages—the principal task of the patristic tradition “was to transmit and explain the Bible.”<sup>18</sup> In his view, a renewed emphasis on the centrality of scripture in theological education “would better connect us to the longer history and tradition of the church.”<sup>19</sup> For Martin, the attractiveness in premodern interpretation lies in the fact that it engages the imagination.<sup>20</sup> The suggestion that students might be introduced to the practice of *Lectio divina* before “encountering the more technical method of historical criticism or other critical approaches to the Bible” would serve to enable seminarians to imagine Scripture differently and “to imagine Christian ways of reading and interpreting Scripture that move beyond modernist methods.”<sup>21</sup> Many of his suggestions about a revised curriculum, including a continued emphasis on historical criticism,<sup>22</sup> the need for an understanding of literary theory and philosophies of interpretation and intertextuality, and a recommendation that students learn some “theological thinking and interpretation” before learning about methods of biblical interpretation, reflect the historical, literary and dogmatic concerns of premodern exegesis.

Martin's arguments indicate that those responsible for the curriculum in seminary education may learn much from the insights of patristic exegesis. The difficulty is that often the insights gleaned give a partial and incomplete account of the different elements which make up patristic exegesis. Martin

---

simply that seminaries should have more worship services, though if done well that might be helpful. Rather, I mean that the curriculum of the seminary should be determined by and reflect the liturgical life of the church. For example, why should seminaries continue to teach courses in ‘Old Testament’ and ‘New Testament’ as if those were intelligible theological subjects? Liturgically the Scripture functions not as text but canon. Yet in our classes we treat the Scripture primarily as text, and then as those responsible for the training of ministers we are puzzled why Scripture plays so little part in the life of most Protestant congregations. Is it not the case that we must admit, in the classical words of Pogo, that ‘We have met the enemy and he is us?’ (Stanley M. Hauerwas, *Christian Existence Today: Essays on Church, World and Living in Between* (Grand Rapids: Labyrinth Press, 1988), 124). By contrast, Dale Martin insists on the continued relevance of historical criticism and the need for seminarians to be familiar with modern techniques of exegesis. However, he shares with Hauerwas a concern to develop the capacity of seminarians to engage with scripture in a *theologically* sophisticated way.

<sup>18</sup> Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1961), 71.

<sup>19</sup> Martin, *Pedagogy of the Bible*, 98.

<sup>20</sup> Although we might add that this is also true of many modern literary studies of the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament.

<sup>21</sup> Martin, *Pedagogy of the Bible*, 101.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

insists on the continued relevance of historical criticism and the need for seminarians to be familiar with modern techniques of exegesis. Intriguingly, he sees the value of historical criticism in challenging students who arrive at seminary with an approach to biblical interpretation which is self-serving:

Churches often tame Scripture or ideologically construe its meaning so that it affirms rather than challenges their beliefs, prejudices, and even complicity with oppressive powers. In less ominous cases, students simply read Scripture so that it teaches rather innocuous but uninteresting platitudes and easy pieties. The interpretations furnished by historical criticism, as many professors will attest, may serve as leverage to dislodge harmful or simply boring appropriations of Scripture, hasty accommodations of the text to our own culture.<sup>23</sup>

And yet one of the difficulties with his discourse is that it supposes that ‘criticism’ is the preserve of the biblical critic while Christian theology will benefit from a greater use of the ‘imagination’ in appropriating scripture. There is an underlying assumption about the relationship between biblical criticism and theology which demands further scrutiny. In distinguishing between ‘historical criticism’ and ‘confessional piety,’ he may in fact be reinforcing a sense of dislocation between the church and the academy.

If the patterns of reading and interpretation which characterised late antiquity embraced literary, historical and dogmatic elements, then a more promising way of overcoming the dislocation of historical criticism and a more overt theological interest in biblical interpretation in seminary education might be to approach the question with some of the insights offered by Pierre Hadot. One of the central themes of Hadot’s thought is that modern commentators have a tendency to project modern constructions of the discipline of philosophy on their reading of ancient philosophical texts. It is easy to assume that philosophy is something akin to Western analytical philosophy, which rarely gets past questions of logic and epistemology. Drawing in particular on the writings of Philo of Alexandria, Hadot argued that ancient philosophy had a much broader canvas in view. Philosophy in the ancient world was not a “theoretical” or “abstract” construct. It was a “method for training people to live and to look at the world in a new way.”<sup>24</sup> Philosophy was “a way of life.”<sup>25</sup> Like Martin, he quotes the writings of Jean Leclercq: “As much as in antiquity, *philosophia* in the monastic Middle Ages designates not a theory or a way of knowing, but a lived wisdom, a way of

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 107.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 264.

living according to reason.”<sup>26</sup> The pursuit of wisdom not only offered peace of mind and a particular way of addressing questions of moral conduct, but it enabled the student to discover “the art of living.”<sup>27</sup> It offered the student the possibility of personal transformation, and the student discovered the art of living in a series of “spiritual exercises.”

Hadot’s use of the term “spiritual exercises” aroused some controversy.<sup>28</sup> But his rationale for using this particular phrase was precisely that it embraced not only the intellect but also the imagination. Hadot noted that Philo offered two different lists of these spiritual exercises in two different works: *Who is the Heir of Divine Things* and *Allegorical Interpretations*.<sup>29</sup> In *Who is the Heir*, Philo describes the following forms of *ascetic practices* or *spiritual exercises*: inquiry (ζήτησις), examination (σκέψις), reading (ἀνάγνωσις), listening (ἀκρόασις), attentiveness (προσοχή), self-mastery (ἐγρᾶτεια), and indifference to indifferent things (ἡ ἐξαδιοφóρησις τῶν ἀδι-αφόρων). The other list includes reading, meditation, therapies of the passions, remembrance of past things, self-mastery, and devotion to duty. Inevitably, the lists reflect Philo’s debt to Stoic philosophy, but two things emerge clearly from Hadot’s analysis: first, these practices engage both the intellect and the imagination; secondly, *reading* is an essential element of both lists. The close and intensive reading of the foundational texts of a philosophical school was supposed to embrace all the intellectual, analytical and imaginative gifts at the reader’s disposal.

Hadot recognises that there are striking parallels between these practices in the philosophical schools and the patterns of ecclesial life in late antiquity. For Christians of late antiquity, Christianity was a form of philosophy. The distinction between philosophy and theology emerged much later in the course of the middle ages.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, Hadot argues that the cultivation

<sup>26</sup> Jean Leclercq, ‘Pour l’histoire de l’expression ‘philosophie chrétienne’, *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 9 (1952), 221.

<sup>27</sup> Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 83.

<sup>28</sup> Hadot notes his influence on Michel Foucault who rather than speaking of “spiritual exercises” translates the ancient Stoic references to *askesis* in terms of “practices of the self.” Hadot is unconvinced. He takes the view that Foucault is “focused far too much on the ‘self,’ or at least on a specific conception of the self” (*ibid.*, 207).

<sup>29</sup> Philo Judaeus, *Quis rerum divinarum heres* 253 (F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo*. Vol. 4. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932), 412–413) and *Legum allegoriarum libri* 3.18 (H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo*. Vol. 1. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929), 312–313).

<sup>30</sup> Peter Brown, in his influential biography of Augustine of Hippo, underlines the philosophical overtones of the Christianity of late antiquity when he says: “Above all, the Christianity of the fourth century would have been presented to such a boy as a form of ‘True Wisdom.’ The Christ of the popular imagination was not a suffering Saviour. There are no

of “spiritual exercises” in the Hellenistic schools was the direct antecedent of the “spiritual exercises” of Ignatius Loyola.<sup>31</sup> And yet, modern accounts of the spiritual exercises of Ignatius Loyola would place them alongside something like *lectio divina* rather than “a critical approach” to biblical interpretation. Premodern accounts of these spiritual exercises would not have recognised such a distinction. In fact, for ancient commentators, a commitment to the practice of *askesis* would have embraced the kind of resistance to “uninteresting platitudes and easy pieties” which Martin reserves for a more critical approach. When Christian commentators of late antiquity used the tools of ancient literary criticism, they did not self-consciously decide that they were no longer thinking *theologically*. In the minds of premodern commentators, theological interpretation involved a sustained engagement with literary, historical and dogmatic questions. While Martin is right to be concerned about the quality of teaching and learning in seminary education, perhaps “the expansion of the Christian imagination,” which he seeks, will only advance when seminarians discover that the use of the techniques of historical criticism to “dislodge harmful or simply boring appropriations of Scripture” is also one of the vital ways in which they will develop “the habits and skills appropriate for the Christian interpretation of Scripture.”<sup>32</sup>

But our appreciation of the continuities in biblical interpretation and hermeneutics should not be characterised by naïveté. Martin presents a bold vision for the pedagogy of the Bible, and his proposals will no doubt continue to stimulate considerable debate. But there is a problem. In the *Introduction*, I began with a description of a carved capital in Vézelay, *le Moulin mystique*. I pointed out that this image could be interpreted in a number of different ways. One of those interpretations is clearly supersessionist: “the raw material of the Torah is refined into the spiritual food of the Gospel through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.” This raises some uncomfortable questions about the way the Jews are often portrayed in patristic literature. In Chapter 4, I suggested that a number of references

---

crucifixes in the fourth century. He was, rather, ‘the Great Word of God, the Wisdom of God.’ On the sarcophagi of the age, He is always shown as a Teacher, teaching His Wisdom to a coterie of budding philosophers. For a cultivated man, the essence of Christianity consisted in just this. Christ, as the ‘Wisdom of God,’ had established a monopoly in Wisdom: the clear Christian revelation had trumped and replaced the conflicting opinions of the pagan philosophers; ‘Here, here is that for which all philosophers have sought throughout their life, but never once been able to tract down, to embrace, to hold firm ... he who would be a wise man, a complete man, let him hear the voice of God’ (Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London: Faber & Faber, 1967), 41–42).

<sup>31</sup> Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 126–140.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 108.

to Israel and the Jewish people in the *Catena in Marcum* rendered some of the material simply irretrievable. The use of terms like *χριστοκτονία*<sup>33</sup> and *χριστοφονία*<sup>34</sup> should alert us to the fact that patristic exegesis carries within it a series of prejudices that should disabuse any modern commentator of the temptation to read patristic exegesis uncritically. While patristic exegesis may offer the modern commentator a wealth of insights into the way in which early commentators wrestled with the biblical text in their own context, considerable discretion is required with regard to what can and cannot be recovered. This shadow side of patristic exegesis is rarely acknowledged in the pages of recent commentaries which seek to recover the insights of 'premodern' exegesis. It is to David Dawson's great credit that he has responded to the criticisms of Daniel Boyarin and made the issue of supersessionism so prominent in discussions of patristic exegesis. Appeals to the patterns of patristic exegesis can offer contemporary theologians a wealth of insights about how earlier exegetes thought about scripture and how they interpreted it, but such appeals can never simply take the form of slavish repetition. Thus there is something slightly disingenuous about *The Ancient Christian Commentary Series* and *The Church's Bible* commentaries. The selection of a few choice purple passages from the fathers does not always alert the reader to the fact that reading patristic texts demands considerable discretion and discernment.

This study has identified three trajectories of interpretation which are integral to premodern exegesis: the literary, the historical and the dogmatic. The recognition and acknowledgement of 'trajectories of interpretation' is a constant theme of Paul Ricoeur. As a critic of Hans-Georg Gadamer, whose pioneering work on *Wirkungsgeschichte* has done much to stimulate further reflection on the significance of reception history for biblical studies, Ricoeur saw that the promise of *Wirkungsgeschichte* might in fact lie in enabling the critic to identify the ways in which a text is transformed in reading after reading, as well as the way in which a number of trajectories of interpretation continue to shape the consciousness of the reader. Interpretation does not stand still. The flour continues to be ground, sifted and refined. In terms of tracing the reception history of Mark's Gospel, much remains to be done. But perhaps the identification of these three trajectories of interpretation will enable scholars to provide a more satisfying description of the complex interactions at the heart of the *mystical mill*.

---

<sup>33</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 387.33, 415.1, 422.20.

<sup>34</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 295.18.





PART II

THE *CATENA IN MARCUM*



1. On the demoniac
2. On Peter's mother-in-law
3. On the healing of various diseases
4. On the leper
5. On the paralytic
6. On Levi the tax collector
7. On the man with a withered hand
8. On the choosing of the apostles
9. On the parable of the sower
10. On the calming of the waters
11. On Legion
12. On the leader of the synagogue's daughter
13. On the woman with a haemorrhage
14. On the commissioning of the apostles
15. On John and Herod
16. On the five loaves and the two fishes
17. On the walking on the sea
18. On the transgression of the commands of God
19. On the Phoenician woman
20. On the deaf and dumb man
21. On the seven loaves
22. On the leaven of the Pharisees
23. On the blind man
24. On the questioning in Caesarea
25. On the transfiguration of Jesus
26. On the epileptic
27. On the quarrels about who is greater
28. On the Pharisees who asked questions
29. On the rich man who questioned Jesus
30. On the sons of Zebedee |
31. On Bartimaeus
32. On the colt

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers in square brackets refer to the page numbers in J.A. Cramer, *Catena in Evangelia S Matthaei et S Marci* (Oxford: e Typographeo Academico, 1840).

33. On the withered fig tree
34. On the capacity for forgiveness
35. On the chief priests and scribes who questioned the Lord
36. On the vineyard
37. On those sent to ask about the poll-tax
38. On the Sadducees
39. On the scribe
40. On questioning from the Lord
41. On the two coins
42. On the end
43. On that day and that hour
44. On the woman who anointed the Lord with sweet perfume
45. On the Passover
46. On the prophecy of betrayal
47. On Peter's denial
48. On the request for the body of the Lord

SAINT CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA,  
*ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO SAINT MARK*<sup>2</sup>

Since many people have composed commentaries on the Gospel according to Matthew and on the Gospel according to John, the son of Thunder, and since a few people [have done so] on the Gospel of Luke, whereas no one at all, so far as I am aware, has interpreted the Gospel according to Mark (given that I have heard of none until now, even though I have inquired from those who have made it their business to gather together the books of more ancient writers), I have determined to draw together the fragmented and scattered sayings of the teachers of the Church and create a concise commentary so that [Mark] should not appear alone to be neglected among the writings of the New Testament, or as though it did not need any attention, or as though it were possible<sup>3</sup> from the interpretation of the others to work out the meaning of this [gospel] as well.<sup>4</sup> But no-one should undertake this writing with reckless haste or over-confidence. Rather they<sup>5</sup> should labour with prayers to achieve an end worthy of the task.

---

<sup>1</sup> This entire section has been compiled from a number of different manuscript sources. The hypothesis (ὑπόθεσις) is a technical term describing the subject-matter of a book. By convention, it supplies the reader with basic details “concerning the author, content, and the circumstances of composition of the particular book” (Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. Fourth Edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 39). The writer follows these literary conventions, beginning with a causal clause, the author’s decision and numerous dependent clauses. The hypothesis begins with a highly stylised Preface, which clearly follows the structure outlined in Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke’s Gospel: Literary convention and social context in Luke 1.1–4 and Acts 1.1* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 213–216.

<sup>2</sup> In many manuscripts, the authorship is anonymous, but in three of the manuscripts used by John Cramer, the commentary is ascribed to Cyril of Alexandria. This is the reading he adopts.

<sup>3</sup> *Lit.* “or as if we were able.”

<sup>4</sup> The irony is that in the sustained use of commentaries on Matthew and Luke throughout the *Catena*, this is precisely the strategy adopted by the catenist.

<sup>5</sup> The verb is singular at this point, but wherever possible inclusive language will be employed in the course of this translation.

After Matthew, Mark the Evangelist composed a text. He was<sup>6</sup> also called “John.” And this was the son of Mary, who offered hospitality to the apostles in Jerusalem in her house, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, in the episode about Peter being released from prison through the intervention of an angel. “For as soon as [Peter] realized this,” it says, “he went to the house of the mother of John, whose other name was Mark, where many had gathered.”<sup>7</sup> And at the beginning he followed Barnabas, who was his cousin, and then Paul, as again the Acts of the Apostles records. And Paul, [264] in his letter to the Colossians, | mentions him, saying, “Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, greets you.”<sup>8</sup> And in the Second Letter to Timothy, “Get Mark and bring him with you, for he is useful to me in ministry.”<sup>9</sup> After these things, he was in Rome together with Peter, just as he says, writing in his first Epistle to those in the Diaspora, “The church in Babylon, chosen together with you, sends you greetings; and so does my son Mark.”<sup>10</sup> Therefore, he was instructed in holy teaching of the divine proclamation from the disciples of the Saviour and with them, he was instructed in this [teaching] and set it out fully in Rome. And with all kinds of exhortation, they begged him there, so they say, to set out for them a written version of the account of the saving proclamation. This was the cause of the writing of the so-called Gospel according to Mark. And they say that the Apostle discovered what had been done when the Spirit revealed it to him, and he was overwhelmed by their enthusiasm and authorised the text for reading in the churches.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Historic present.

<sup>7</sup> Acts 12.12 Note the careless omission of the name of “his mother,” τῆς Μαρίας, mentioned earlier in the paragraph. Textual variants will be noted in further footnotes.

<sup>8</sup> From Colossians 4.10. Again the catenist omits the reference to “Aristarchus, my fellow prisoner,” thus placing additional emphasis on the role of Mark.

<sup>9</sup> 2 Timothy 4.11 Note the variant ἀγαγέ which, according to NA<sup>27</sup> is attested in A, 104. 365. (188r\*).

<sup>10</sup> 1 Peter 5.13 Note the insertion of ἡ Ἐκκλησία.

<sup>11</sup> This tradition is recorded by Clement *Hypotyposeis* 6. These annotations on the Gospels have not survived. Our knowledge of this text is dependent upon the elements found in Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.15.1–2 (G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 1 SC 31. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952), 70–71). Note that the *Hypothesis* ceases here in Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Laud Gr. 33 (ff. 83–84).

[FROM IRENAEUS]<sup>12</sup> ♦ After<sup>13</sup> the publication of the Gospel according to Matthew, Mark the disciple and interpreter of Peter, handed on Peter's public preaching to us in writing. The Gospel according to Mark was written by Mark after ten years from the Ascension of Christ. This man heard the Gospel from Peter the Apostle and he wrote it down, being a disciple of Peter.

♦<sup>14</sup> [FROM JUSTIN]<sup>15</sup> Since therefore it was necessary for those caught by the apostles to die from their first life in sin, when they came to the light of

---

<sup>12</sup> This passage (*Cat. Marc.* 264.17–23) comes from a scholium written in a different hand at the top of folio 86 in Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Laud Gr. 33. Such headings, with the source identified in the Genitive case, are common in catenae. However, they are not common in the *Catena in Marcum*. Given his tendency to use the phrase ἄλλως δὲ φησὶν, it is possible that these headings were added at a later date by scribes. Nevertheless, it is worth commenting on the fact that the catenist has amended the source from Irenaeus in one significant way. In *Adversus Haereses* 3.1.1 (L. Doutreleau and A. Rousseau, *Irénee de Lyon. Contre les hérésies, livre 3*, vol. 2. SC 211. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974), 20–25), Irenaeus begins by describing Matthew's composition of his gospel for the Hebrews "in their own language," while Peter and Paul proclaimed the gospel in Rome. He then writes: μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον Μάρκος .... Instead the catenist writes: μετὰ τὴν τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαίου Εὐαγγελίου ἔκδοσιν, Μάρκος .... The catenist simply asserts Matthaean priority, omitting the reference to Peter and Paul, and erasing the difficulty caused by Irenaeus in terms of chronology (for ἔξοδον is commonly taken to refer to the death of Peter and Paul, thus placing the date of the Gospel in the late 60s. Such a date would contradict the statement that Mark wrote "ten years after the Ascension"). For further discussion of the issues surrounding the date of Mark's Gospel, see James G. Crossley, *The date of Mark's gospel* (London: T & T Clark International, 2004), 6–18 and Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 13–14.

<sup>13</sup> This passage is included in the margin at the beginning of the gospel in Cod. Bodl. Laud. Gr. 33, an 11th century manuscript. It is worth noting that this is the only passage that occurs there by way of an hypothesis. Intriguingly, there is no heading or reference to Irenaeus. Devreesse notes that this passage is also recorded in the edition published by Possinus in 1673 (Robert Devreesse, 'Chaines Exégetiques Grècques,' in *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément*. (1928), 1178). The origins of this tradition are the subject of some debate. The tradition is recorded by Theophylact (11th Century) in the Prologue to his Commentary on the Gospels (PG 123.492: τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον, μετὰ ἔτη τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναλήψεως συνεγράφη ἐν Πρώμῃ), a fact noted by Hengel (Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1985), 121). Hengel suggests that this tradition reflects the tradition recorded in *Chronicon Hieronymi* to the effect that Peter came to Rome in the second year of Claudius (either AD 42 or AD 43). In the third year of Claudius, Mark wrote the Gospel: 'The calculation is relatively simple. Starting from the synchronism in Luke 3.1 dating the emergence of John the Baptist in the fifteenth year of the emperor Tiberius (AD 28/29) and on the presupposition that according to the Fourth Gospel the ministry of Jesus lasted for three years, the *Chronicon Hieronymi* puts the Passion of Jesus in the eighteenth year of the emperor (AD 32/33–Passover of 33). The second year of Claudius (accession 24.1.41) is 'about' ten years later.' (Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 5).

<sup>14</sup> The symbol ♦ denotes the beginning and the end of a selected passage from an identified source.

<sup>15</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 264.17–265.21 is taken from a catena, which is contained in the fourteenth



the knowledge of God and the breath of the Creator of all, the life-giving and all-holy Spirit, so the Lord likened the catching of people to the catching of fish<sup>16</sup> and chose the apostles from fishermen and promised to make them fishers of people. And he added the word 'hunting'<sup>17</sup> according to Luke, adding what was missing from the illustration for the one who expounds it. ♦ These things<sup>18</sup> the Saviour predicted by divine power. These things he himself | proved to be true and reliable by his deeds. For it is not possible to grasp in number how many myriads of people, instead of fish, that that caster of nets, the fisherman, the Syrian, entangled in his nets of mysterious words. These phenomena are a visible manifestation of what is unclear to sight, [phenomena] which the lengthy period of life before the appearance of the Saviour did not bring to birth, [phenomena] which neither Moses the lawgiver of the Hebrews, nor those prophets of God after Moses, even though they laboured much through every night before his appearance to achieve that which no-one has been able (to achieve), these things the Galilean, the poor man, the barbarian in speech, the man himself, Peter, achieved.

And the proof of the things then brought to completion by Peter is supplied by the churches which continue to shine to this day, filled (much

---

century manuscript, Oxford, Barocc. Gr. 156 (ff. 131b line 25–132 line 20). Although the passage is attributed to Justin, the passage combines an extract from Diodore of Tarsus and Eusebius. A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* confirms that *Cat. Marc.* 264.24–31 is an extract from Pseudo-Justin Martyr, *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos* (J.C.T. Otto, *Corpus apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi*, vol. 5, 3rd Edition. Jena: Mauke, 1881 (repr. 1969): 402.C.1–7). In 1901, Adolf von Harnack argued that Pseudo-Justin Martyr was in fact Diodore of Tarsus, although an early manuscript discovered in 1895 attributed this text to Theodoret of Cyrillus (Francis Christie, 'Diodorus von Tarsus. Vier Pseudojustinische Schriften als Eigentum Diodors nachgewiesen by Adolf Harnack,' *The American Journal of Theology* 6, no. 3 (1902)). As far as Justin Martyr is concerned, the only tradition, from which it might be inferred that there was a connection between Mark and Peter, can be found in Justin's *Dialogue cum Tryphone* 106.2–3 (Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and Arthur Cleveland Coxe, *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Originally published in 1885 (New York: Cosimo, 2007), 252) with its echo of Papias' description of Peter's "Memoirs": "... and when it says that he (Christ) had given the name Peter to one of his apostles, and when it is also written in his Memoirs that it happened after he had given to two other apostles, the sons of Zebedee, the name Boanerges, that is Sons of Thunder."

<sup>16</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 264.27: there appear to be two subjects in the Nominative case—τη ἄγρᾱ makes more sense and is confirmed by Bobichon, *Justin Martyr, Dialogue avec Tryphon*, 62.

<sup>17</sup> Luke 5.10: the Greek word ζῶγρῶν is distinctive and unusual at this point.

<sup>18</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 264.31–265.21 is an extract from Eusebius, *De theophania* 6.76–97 (H. Gressmann, *Eusebius Werke, Band 3.2: Die Theophanie* [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 11.2. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904]: 18–21).

more than those boats) with “spiritual fish”:<sup>19</sup> as it happens at Caesarea in Palestine; like [the church] in Antioch in Syria;<sup>20</sup> like [the church] in the city of the Romans itself. For Peter himself is recorded<sup>21</sup> as having founded these churches as well as all those around them; and he himself again is recorded as having established the ones in Egypt and in Alexandria itself—of course, not in person, but through Mark who had been apprenticed to him. For Peter himself devoted his time around Italy and all the nations surrounding it. But he appointed his own pupil Mark as a teacher and fisherman of people in Egypt.<sup>22</sup> ♦

<sup>19</sup> The precise meaning of λογικῶν ἰχθύων is unclear. λογικῶν may refer to the distinctive mark of human beings (as opposed to other creatures) in their capacity for reason (i.e. ‘rational’). Kofsky offers the following translation: ‘intelligent fish’ (Aryeh Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea against the Pagans* (Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2002), 298). However, the adopted translation (i.e. “spiritual”) is more likely: according to Lampe, this translation is attested in Eusebius, Chrysostom and Theodoret, as well as Paul (Romans 12.1).

<sup>20</sup> *Lit.* “in respect of Syria.” Presumably, the commentator is distinguishing Antioch-on-the-Orontes in Syria from Antioch in Pisidia.

<sup>21</sup> Peter’s association with Caesarea is recorded in Acts 9.31–10.48, where he baptized and received into the Church the first non-Jewish Christians, the centurion Cornelius and his household. Peter is associated with Antioch at Galatians 2.1–10. According to Origen and Eusebius, Peter was the first bishop of Antioch (Origen, *Homiliae in Lucam* 6.34.25 (M. Rauer, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 9, 2nd edn. [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 49 (35)]. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959): 34) and Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*. 3.36.2 (G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 1. SC 31. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952), 147). The earliest record of Peter having founded the church in Rome can be found in Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 3.3.2 (L. Doutreleau and A. Rousseau, *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies, livre 3*, vol. 2. SC 211. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974), 32–33). Of Mark, Irenaeus records the following: ‘Now Matthew composed his Gospel among the Hebrews in their own language, while Peter and Paul proclaimed the Gospel in Rome and founded the community. After their death Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, transmitted his preaching to us in written form.’ (Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 3.1.1 (L. Doutreleau and A. Rousseau, *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies, livre 3*, vol. 2. SC 211. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974)), 22–23). It is worth noting that Irenaeus does not explicitly place the writing of the Gospel in Rome.

<sup>22</sup> The association of Mark with Alexandria appears to have originated in the writings of Eusebius (*Historia ecclesiastica* 2.16.1 (G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, 3 vols. SC 31. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952), 71)) and *De theophania* 6.94–96 (H. Gressmann, *Eusebius Werke, Band 3.2: Die Theophanie* [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 11.2. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904]: 21). The Monarchian Gospel Prologue states that Mark was the son by baptism of Peter and wrote his Gospel in Italy. He had come from priestly stock in Israel, had dismembered his thumb after his baptism to ensure that he was unfit for the priesthood, and he eventually became the Bishop of Alexandria. This tradition is embellished in John Chrysostom’s *Homiliae in Matthaem* 1.7 (PG 57.22.5–56), where the composition of Mark’s Gospel is located in Alexandria. Commenting on the tradition from Eusebius, Mark Edwards notes “the absence of firm evidence for an episcopate in Alexandria up to the time of Clement” (Mark Edwards, *Origen Against Plato* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 26).



# THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

## CHAPTER 1

(1) The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. As it [266] is written in the prophets,<sup>1</sup> (2) Behold, I<sup>2</sup> am sending my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way before you.<sup>3</sup>

And so Mark states that John, the last of the prophets, marks<sup>4</sup> the beginning of the Gospel, adding “as it is written in the prophets “Behold I am sending my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way.”<sup>5</sup> ♦ This<sup>6</sup> is a prophetic saying of Malachi, and not of Isaiah. Moreover, it may be a scribal error, as Eusebius of Caesarea says in his book dedicated to Marinus concerning the apparent discrepancy in the Gospels about the resurrection. ♦ But

---

<sup>1</sup> The compilers of the *Catena in Marcum* succeed in recording two textual variants within the text. The passage at this point reads ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, which is attributed in NA<sup>27</sup> to a variety of sources, including “A W<sup>f13</sup> 91 vg<sup>ms</sup> sy<sup>h</sup> (bo<sup>ms</sup>); Ir<sup>lat</sup>”. Later (line 15) the text says ἐν Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ, which NA<sup>27</sup> attributes to “D Θ f<sup>1</sup> 700. l 844. l 2211 pc; Ir Or<sup>pt</sup> Epiph.” The third edition of UBS attributed this reading to “Victor of Antioch.” However, a more detailed analysis of the *Catena* shows that it is Origen who is quoted at this point. This inconsistency is perhaps a demonstration of the difficulties of using the *Catena in Marcum* as a source for textual criticism. The *Catena* contains internal inconsistencies, and itself reflects the varied attestations of earlier commentators. That said, the plural form τοῖς προφήταις has possibly been adopted to provide a more consistent reading of the text in the light of the conflation of Malachi 3.1, Exodus 3.20, and Isaiah 40.3. This conflation is acknowledged in the comments which follow. Wherever the text of the *Catena* departs from recent critical editions of the New Testament, this will be noted in the footnotes.

<sup>2</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐγώ.

<sup>3</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐμπροσθέν σου. This variant reading comes from Matthew 11.10 and is not to be found in the LXX (although Davies and Allison suggest that its insertion follows the MT more faithfully (W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 3 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 1.249)). According to NA<sup>27</sup>, this insertion can also be found in a number of manuscripts.

<sup>4</sup> Lit. ‘is.’

<sup>5</sup> Mark 1.1–2.

<sup>6</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 266.9–12 is a reference to Eusebius, *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum* (Harold Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1918): 367). Eusebius refers to ‘scribal error’ once in *Quaestiones evangelicae* (PG 22.948.15) to explain a discrepancy in the resurrection narrative.

Origen,<sup>7</sup> in the sixth book of his commentary on the Gospel according to John says, “He has combined two prophecies spoken in different places by two prophets into one, ‘just as it is written in Isaiah the prophet, ‘Behold I am sending my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way; a voice crying in the wilderness, Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight’’.<sup>8</sup> For the “*voice crying in the wilderness*”<sup>9</sup> is recorded after the narrative about Hezekiah.<sup>10</sup> But “*Behold I am sending my messenger before your face*” is [said] by Malachi. And so, because he is abridging, the Evangelist placed two oracles side by side attributing them both to [267] Isaiah. | And he has made the same kind of abridgement in “*Behold I am sending my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way,*”<sup>11</sup> passing over in silence the [words], “*before you,*” set out in the text. And in other respects, not only [Mark] but the rest of the Evangelists do this, creating an epitome of the prophetic words. And Matthew also introduced this oracle as if spoken by the Saviour himself concerning the Baptist to the crowds, at the time when the disciples of John had gone away after asking their question. For having said, “Why did you come to see a prophet? Yes, I tell you, and more than a prophet,”<sup>12</sup> he says: “For this is the one about whom it is written, ‘Behold, I am sending my messenger before your face’” and so on.<sup>13</sup> ♦ For<sup>14</sup> having earlier set out the testimony of the Jews, then he adapts the [testimony] to the prophet.

<sup>7</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 266.12–267.8 is an extract from Origen, *Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis* 6.24.128–129 (C. Blanc, *Origène. Commentaire sur saint Jean*, vol. 2. SC 157. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 228–229). Origen provides a detailed comparison of the statements of the four evangelists.

<sup>8</sup> Malachi 3.1a and Exodus 3.20.

<sup>9</sup> Mark 1.3.

<sup>10</sup> Isaiah 40.3 Inevitably, there is no recognition of the break between Isaiah of Jerusalem and Deutero-Isaiah. Although questions about the unity of the Book of Isaiah were raised in the twelfth century by the Jewish commentator, Ibn Ezra, it was not until 1789 that J.C. Döderlein put forward the thesis that Isaiah 40–66 was an independent work. Thus for the catenist, Isaiah 40 is read simply as a continuation of the narrative from the preceding Chapter’s description of the days of Hezekiah (Isaiah 37–39).

<sup>11</sup> Mark 1.2.

<sup>12</sup> Origen is referring to the passage at Matthew 11.9f, which the catenist is relating to Mark 1.2. It is not surprising that the textual tradition reflects this link between Mark and Matthew (note the inclusion of ἐγώ from Matthew 11.10 in Mark 1.2).

<sup>13</sup> Matthew 11.10.

<sup>14</sup> According to Harold Smith, the extract from Origen merges here almost seamlessly into a passage from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum*. *Cat. Marc.* 267.9–17 is an abbreviated extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 37.1–2 (Smith, “The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,” 365).

“before your face” for just as with kings, people who ride close to the [king’s] chariot hold a more honourable position than the others, in the same way John also appears going ahead close to the presence [of the Lord].

◆ And<sup>15</sup> he has put it this way, abridging this, even though it was not so in the prophet, but [says] “the paths of our God.”<sup>16</sup> And who was the one crying out these things to those sent to John by the chief priests and teachers of the people, inquiring<sup>17</sup> who he was and asking whether he was the Christ, or Elijah, or the Prophet? He said he was none of these; but when they persisted and said, “So tell us who you are, so that we may give an answer to those who sent us: What do you say about yourself?” This is the answer he gave, “*I am the voice of one crying out in the wilderness*” and so on.<sup>18</sup> Now he taught that this was being fulfilled in himself, presenting himself as “*the one crying out in the wilderness*” and showing that the wilderness was different from Moses’ wilderness, in which he fashioned his way of life.<sup>19</sup> ◆

(3) The voice of one crying out in the wilderness, Prepare the way of the Lord, make straight his paths.

◆ He<sup>20</sup> shows that the salvation of God is already present “*at the very gates.*”<sup>21</sup> The prophecy sets forth plainly that the things prophesied will not take place in Jerusalem, | but in the wilderness, and this was fulfilled to the letter<sup>22</sup> [268]

<sup>15</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 267.8–29 is a ‘a free and indirect’ paraphrase of Origen, *Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis* 6.24.129–130 (C. Blanc, *Origène. Commentaire sur saint Jean*, vol. 2. SC 157. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 228–231).

<sup>16</sup> Isaiah 40.3.

<sup>17</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 267.21: τοις ... πυνθανόμενοις The use of the dative is confirmed by reference to Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Laud. Gr. 33, where the sigma is very faint.

<sup>18</sup> Mark 1.3.

<sup>19</sup> Note the allusion to Mark 1.3 at this point. There is a wordplay on the words τὰς τριβύδας (Mark 1.3) and τὰς διατριβὰς.

<sup>20</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 267.32–268.8 is an extract from Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam* 2.16.104–118 (J. Ziegler, *Eusebius Werke, Band 9: Der Jesajakommentar [Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller]*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975]: 250). The first line is perhaps an allusion to Isaiah 60.18.

<sup>21</sup> Mark 13.29.

<sup>22</sup> πρὸς ἱστορίαν καὶ λέξις: the phrase is difficult to translate into English—‘historically and literally’ would seem rather misleading. Robert C. Hill notes that these terms are prominent characteristics in patristic exegesis (See his *Introduction* in Diodore of Tarsus, ‘Commentary on Psalms 1–51,’ (Atlanta, Georgia: SBL, 2005), xxv). However, the subtlety of these terms in ancient Greek literary criticism is not always appreciated. Far from referring to the kind of literalism associated with fundamentalist movements in late modernity, these terms are

with regard to John the Baptist, when he proclaimed the salvific epiphany in the wilderness by the Jordan, where the glory of Christ was also made known to all (when after his baptism, the heavens were opened and the Holy Spirit, in the form of a dove descending, rested upon him). And the voice of the Father was carried to the Son in testimony, “*This is my Son, the Beloved, listen to him.*”<sup>23</sup> ♦ And, with foreknowledge in the Spirit, his father, the Blessed Zechariah, prophesied this, saying, “And you child shall be called ‘prophet of the Most High’, for you will go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways.”<sup>24</sup> The story that Matthew set out at greater length, the present Evangelist expounds in a concise form: “*John came baptizing in the wilderness*” and so on.<sup>25</sup>

(4) John came baptizing in the wilderness, and proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.

And as for the voice of one crying in the wilderness, the Blessed Baptist spoke to those sent by the chief priests and teachers of the people. For when they were inquiring and asking persistently “Who are you? So that we may give an answer”<sup>26</sup> and so on,<sup>27</sup> he replied, “*The voice of one crying in the wilderness,*”<sup>28</sup> just as also the following quotation makes clear, “*proclaiming*

---

intended to promote an intensive reading of the text. The term *ιστορία* refers to the narrative: i.e. the story or the writer’s description of an event or a piece of information. Thus, it might “refer to an ancient literary genre not totally dissimilar to what we mean by history,” but it might also include local myths, and information “we would regard not as historical but rather as geographical or cultural.” (Frances Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 79). As Pierre Hadot points out, the word is associated with the notion of “inquiry” (Pierre Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, trans. Michael Chase (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), 16). On the other hand, the term *λέξις* refers to the ‘wording’ itself: i.e. a word, phrase, speech, diction, style or a peculiar word. For a more detailed description of these terms, see Eleanor Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

<sup>23</sup> The commentator has confused the divine epiphanies of the Baptism and the Transfiguration of Jesus. Matthew 3.17 reads οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, while Mark 1.11 has σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. The text of the *Catena in Marcum* follows Mark 9.7: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

<sup>24</sup> Luke 1.76.

<sup>25</sup> Mark 1.4.

<sup>26</sup> John 1.19–20.

<sup>27</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 268.19: insert a comma and remove the full stop.

<sup>28</sup> Mark 1.3 quoting Isaiah 40.3: cf. Matthew 3.3, Luke 3.4 and John 1.23.

a baptism of repentance,” and so on.<sup>29</sup> ♦ And<sup>30</sup> you can see how he was proclaiming, for it is quite clear that he came simply preparing the way beforehand and getting things ready, not freely bestowing the gift, namely, forgiveness, but preparing beforehand the souls of those about to receive the God of all things. ♦ For the baptism of John purified through repentance as a preparation for holiness, but (the baptism) of Christ, through grace, brought holiness to fruition.

(6) And John<sup>31</sup> was clothed with camel's hair.

Matthew says the same thing more distinctly, that “his garment was from camel's hair.” | ♦ This figure of speech<sup>32</sup> is a symbol of penitence and the Kingdom: ♦ or as someone else says,<sup>33</sup> the garment of John was a symbol for mourning, and the leather belt was a symbol of the mortification of the people; for this is what the Saviour meant in saying “We played the flute for you, and you did not dance; we wailed, and you did not mourn, for John came neither eating nor drinking and you said ‘He has a demon’,”<sup>34</sup> with [the words] “we wailed” referring [to John], and “we played the flute” referring to himself—“the Son of Man came eating” and so on.<sup>35</sup> [269]

But his food was,<sup>36</sup> as I believe, a symbol of the spiritual food of the people then, for he did not eat any of the pure birds of the air.<sup>37</sup> But he was nourished by what seems to be a word<sup>38</sup> which hovers in the air and yet which does not range above the birds and is not able to rise up above the earth, and is not able to reach its heights. So also “wild honey” was the teaching which

<sup>29</sup> Mark 1.4: Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 268.20: insert quotation marks around the phrase from Mark 1.4.

<sup>30</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 268.21–25 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 10.3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 364). This passage can be found in PG 57.187.20–25.

<sup>31</sup> Note the textual variant: ἦν δὲ Ἰωάννης.

<sup>32</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 269.1 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 10.4 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 364). This passage can be found in PG 57.188.42–44.

<sup>33</sup> The source at this point is unclear.

<sup>34</sup> Matthew 11.17–18. Note also the necessity for a correction to *Cat. Marc.* 269.6: after ἔχει insert a comma and remove the full stop. Ἀποδοῦς is masculine singular and must be in agreement with ὁ Σωτήρ.

<sup>35</sup> Matthew 11.18.

<sup>36</sup> Matthew 3.4.

<sup>37</sup> Acts 10.12.

<sup>38</sup> The commentator employs an allegorical reading of the ‘locusts’ consumed by John.



came from the prophets, whose minds like bees were not cultivated or domesticated through the harmony of understanding and inquiry.<sup>39</sup>

(7) And he proclaimed saying, “The one who is more powerful than me is coming after me, of whom I am not worthy to stoop down and untie the strap of his sandals.”

♦ Matthew<sup>40</sup> says something different—“to carry the sandals.” And it is different from “*stooping to untie the strap of the sandals*.”<sup>41</sup> And indeed, it follows, as none of the Evangelists is mistaken,<sup>42</sup> that the Baptist said both things at different times with a different meaning. For although it occurs roughly in the same ways, as some commentators think, these [traditions] were passed on differently, and they did not hold precisely in the memory each of the things which were said or done. ♦

The strap, he says, is the thong of the sandal. And given the greatness of the honour, and having full regard for the fact that his divinity was self-evident, he says, “Not even in the rank of a servant am I to be counted worthy”; for the nature of man is all reckoned as “a drop of water from a bucket, or like spittle, | and its righteousness as a dirty rag.”<sup>43</sup>

(9) And it happened in those days, Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee, and was baptized by John in the Jordan.

---

<sup>39</sup> The rather dense metaphor used here is unclear. *Lit.* “So also ‘wild honey’ came from the mental bees of the prophets, and it was not farmed or tamed through the harmony of understanding and investigation.”

<sup>40</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 269.20–26 is based on Origen, *Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis* 6.34 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). The original text from Book 6.34 reads as follows: “And it follows, since believers cannot think that either of the Evangelists made any mistake or misrepresentation, that the Baptist must have made these two utterances at different times and have meant them to express different things. It is not the case, as some suppose, that the reports refer to the same incident and turned out differently because of a looseness of memory as to some of the facts or words.” (Origen, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 6.34.171 (C. Blanc, *Origène. Commentaire sur saint Jean*, vol. 2. SC 157. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 258–259)). The second sentence in the *Catena in Marcum* appears to be badly corrupted. Origen dismisses this possibility, while the catenist simply appears to note it. Thus the catenist appears to have altered Origen’s original meaning.

<sup>41</sup> Mark 1.7.

<sup>42</sup> Note this hermeneutical principle. It is axiomatic that the Evangelists cannot be mistaken. Consequently, the differences between their accounts must be explained by a variety of different strategies.

<sup>43</sup> This quotation combines elements from Isaiah 40.15 and Isaiah 64.6.

Since the Holy Spirit has not yet been given, he talks about baptizing in water, and he foretells that he, that is to say the Christ, will baptize in the Holy Spirit: a gift which, after the ascension to the heavens, the holy disciples were the first to encounter, according to the promise of the Saviour, when he said to the disciples, “You will be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many (days from now).”<sup>44</sup>

Therefore, by way of anticipation, John said, “*There comes after me one who is greater than me, the strap of whose sandal I am not worthy stooping down to untie. And he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit*” and so on.<sup>45</sup> ♦ So<sup>46</sup> whenever you see him coming to be baptized with servants, do not be troubled; for among these (people) far lowlier than him, his eminence shines forth; ♦ for<sup>47</sup> something different came from the baptism of John, which was less perfect than ours,<sup>48</sup> but far more sublime than the Jewish [baptism] (being somehow in between the two), that you may learn from the nature of the baptism itself that he was not baptized on account of sin; for he himself was the one who takes away the sin of the world “who did not sin” “nor guile was found” and so on.<sup>49</sup> Nor did he need the bestowal of the Spirit, for that baptism was barren of both these things; but neither [was this] even<sup>50</sup> for the repentance for which those others came. For he is much greater than the Baptist, and he is incomparably more pure. So for whose sake did he get baptized? It was so that he might be made known to the masses, and, as Paul says, that they might believe.<sup>51</sup>

This is why the descent of the Spirit happened at that time, not that it was the first time of its visitation (for he was not | barren of it) but this served to show what was being proclaimed, just as by (pointing) with a finger one might make the way known to all. And again it was to fulfil all righteousness, which is the fulfilment of the commandments, that he was baptized. And it was also a commandment to obey the baptizing prophet, and that it was the will of God for all to be baptized, listen to what he says: “The one who [271]

<sup>44</sup> Acts 1.5.

<sup>45</sup> Mark 1.8.

<sup>46</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 270.16–17 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 12.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 364). This passage can be found in PG 57.201.50–53.

<sup>47</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 270.17–271.19 is a rough paraphrase of an extract from Chrysostom, *De Baptismo Christi* 3–4 (PG 49.366–372). Note that *Cat. Marc.* 270.17–19 is repeated at *Cat. Marc.* 271.27–29.

<sup>48</sup> *Lit.* ‘more uninitiated.’

<sup>49</sup> Cf. 1John 3.9, Psalm 31.2 and Rev. 14.5.

<sup>50</sup> *Lit.* ‘even by far more.’

<sup>51</sup> This is perhaps an allusion to Romans 16.26.

sent me to baptize with water.”<sup>52</sup> And again Christ (says), “Tax-gatherers and prostitutes acknowledged the justice of God having been baptized with the baptism of John, but the Pharisees and the Scribes disdained the will of God, not having been baptized by him.”<sup>53</sup> Therefore, if obeying God is righteousness, and if God sent John to baptize the people, along with all the other provisions of the Law, Christ fulfilled this commandment too. And even if you were to say that he was baptized for us to sanctify the waters,<sup>54</sup> you would not go far wrong. And therefore the Spirit came sweeping down in the form of a dove. For wherever there is the reconciliation of God, there is a dove (just as on Noah’s ark<sup>55</sup>): and now, the Spirit<sup>56</sup> comes in the form of a dove, not in the body [of a dove],<sup>57</sup> announcing the reconciling mercy of God to the world, and at the same time making it known that the spiritual person must be gentle, simple, without vice or guile. ♦

(10) And immediately coming up from<sup>58</sup> the water, he saw the heavens torn apart, and the Spirit descending upon him as a dove.

“*The heavens were torn apart*,”<sup>59</sup> or according to Matthew “they opened,” so that sanctification might be bestowed on humanity from heaven and

<sup>52</sup> John 1.33.

<sup>53</sup> A paraphrase of Luke 7.29–30.

<sup>54</sup> In this section, Chrysostom deals with some of the common theological problems raised by the baptism of Christ: first, why was the baptism of Christ necessary, and secondly, why was it necessary for the Spirit to descend upon the Son? The argument outlined is simple: Christ was baptized so that his true identity would be revealed and so that he would fulfil all righteousness. Righteousness meant obeying God’s commandments. God commanded John to baptize. Therefore Christ had to be baptized.

<sup>55</sup> Just like the passage from the Gospel itself, the *Catena* is filled with allusions to the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>56</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 271.17–19 should be attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia on the basis of the “scanty catena fragments” in the Syriac commentary of *Isho’dad* (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 368). Note that there is a similar list of virtues in Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* 15.35 (B. Pruche, *Basile de Césarée. Sur le Saint-Esprit*, 2nd edn. SC 17 bis. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968), 366–367): “The Lord describes in the Gospel the pattern of life we must be trained to follow after the (baptismal) resurrection: gentleness, endurance, freedom from the defiling love of pleasure, and from covetousness. We must be determined to acquire in this life all the qualities of the life to come.” However, Smith is mistaken. The source is clearly Chrysostom, *De Baptismo Christi* 3–4 (PG 49.366.46–372.25).

<sup>57</sup> There is an allusion here to Luke’s Gospel, which refers to the Holy Spirit descending “upon him in bodily form like a dove” (Luke 3.21).

<sup>58</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀπό τοῦ ὕδατος.

<sup>59</sup> Mark 1.10.

heavenly things might be united with earthly things. But the voice which was conveyed was either something angelic or something else from the presence of the Father.<sup>60</sup>

◆ Here<sup>61</sup> the Saviour bestows something different, when he comes to the baptism of John; for this was much less perfect than ours but superior to Jewish baptism. For he came for this purpose, that he might show through the nature of baptism that he was baptized not on account of sin, nor as if he needed the bestowing of the Spirit. And | he was even without sin and the Spirit was always in him essentially. ◆ [272]

If “one is in the other”<sup>62</sup> according to the words of Nestorius, one would have to say, “In you is my Son the beloved in whom I am well pleased.”

(12) And immediately the Spirit drove him out into the desert. (13) And he was there in the desert<sup>63</sup> for forty days, tested by Satan.<sup>64</sup>

◆ Since<sup>65</sup> he both acted and experienced all things with a view to our instruction, he is content also to be led up to that place and to wrestle with the devil in order that each of those who are baptized (even though after baptism one has to endure great temptations) should not be troubled as if the matter happened contrary to expectation, but should continue to endure all things nobly. Indeed, for this reason God does not prevent temptations as they come by: first, in order that you may learn that you have become much stronger; then in order that that you may remain temperate and not

<sup>60</sup> *Lit.* ‘from the face of the Father’—a common device in Hebrew for describing the presence of the Lord (cf. Genesis 3.8, 4.16; 1 Samuel 1.22; Psalm 114.7; Lamentations 2.19; Jonah 1.3, 1.10).

<sup>61</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 271.27–272.2 is another extract from Chrysostom, *De Baptismo Christi* 3–4 (PG 49.366.46–372.25). This passage repeats the material in *Cat. Marc.* 270.17–19. Such repetitions are common in the *Catena*, and suggest that material has been conflated and amended at different points in the course of its literary life.

<sup>62</sup> This phrase indicates that the incarnation is not a mere indwelling (ἐνοίκησης) of God in Humanity, the “one in the other,” but an actual and abiding union of the divine and human natures in one personal life. The phrase is used by Cyril in the 8th Anathema appended to his third letter to Nestorius (Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistula* 17). This text can be found in Lionel R. Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria’s Select Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 12–33. For further discussion of this passage, see Chapter 6.

<sup>63</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

<sup>64</sup> Note the omission of καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων, “and he was with the wild beasts.”

<sup>65</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 272.8–273.2 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Mattheum* 13.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in PG 57.208.57–209.34.

over-excited by the greatness of (your) gifts,<sup>66</sup> for temptations have the power to humble you; then in order that the evil one, by inquiring through the torture of temptations, might be satisfied that you have completely forsaken him; fourthly, in order that you might become stronger and hard as steel; fifthly, in order that you might through this receive a clear proof of the treasures entrusted to you. For the devil would not come upon you if he did not see you brought to greater honour.

For this reason he does not show you Jesus simply going up but 'led up'<sup>67</sup> for the sake of the [divine] economy; suggesting<sup>68</sup> by these words that it is not necessary for those baptized to rush [to martyrdom], but when they are dragged to it, they should be courageous.

[273] [The Spirit] drags him into the desert, since he wanted to draw the devil there; and he gave occasion to him not only on account of his hunger but also on account of the place: for then most especially does [the devil] attack, when | he sees people isolated and by themselves. To this degree surely also the wilderness was deserted, in as much as it was also full of wild animals. ♦

(13) And the angels ministered to him.

And the angels, effecting the salvation of human beings, ministered to him throughout the temptation and the victory over the devil, according to what has been said: "Are they not all ministering spirits sent for the service of those destined to inherit salvation?"<sup>69</sup> And this means to me that on every single occasion when temptation is brought to an end, angels come ministering to the one who has conquered.

The present Evangelist follows Matthew's description.<sup>70</sup> For the latter also when he says, "angels came and ministered to him," continues "and Jesus hearing that John had been arrested, withdrew into Galilee"<sup>71</sup> and a bit later, "from that time Jesus began to preach and say, 'Repent: for the Kingdom of heaven has come near'. "<sup>72</sup>

And it is necessary to pay attention to the fact that John preaches in the wilderness of Judaea, saying, "Repent" before "The Kingdom of heaven has

<sup>66</sup> Cf. 1 Corinthians 12.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Matthew 4.1.

<sup>68</sup> ἀνιττόμενος *Lit.* "speaking in riddles."

<sup>69</sup> Hebrews 1.14.

<sup>70</sup> Note that the catenist assumes the priority of Matthew.

<sup>71</sup> Matthew 4.12.

<sup>72</sup> Matthew 4.17.

come near.” ♦ And, as Matthew says, our Saviour<sup>73</sup> withdrawing into Galilee and leaving Nazareth, “went and made his home in Capernaum by the sea.”<sup>74</sup> And “from that time he began to preach, and say, not ‘Repent’ but only ‘the Kingdom of heaven has come near’.”<sup>75</sup> For it was necessary for “Repent” to be said by John beforehand since he was preparing the way of the Lord. Therefore, according to Mark, our Lord said, “*The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God has come near.*”<sup>76</sup> And according to the text the fulfilment of the time was necessary: “when the fullness of time came, God sent his Son.”<sup>77</sup> This was to bring the economy of salvation to perfection through the prophets. Wherefore in the course of the temptation and the angels coming to minister to Jesus, Jesus hears that John has been arrested. ♦

“*Repent and believe in the Gospel.*”<sup>78</sup> See if | it is possible to say, that the [274] “Repent” of John might have summoned those hearing to run away from the sins in life, but the “Repent” of Jesus urges them forward to turn away from the written law to the life giving Spirit revealed in the Gospel. This is why Jesus joins together “Repent” and “believe in the Gospel.”

After the arrest of John, he goes into Galilee, teaching us not to withdraw [to the desert] in similar fashion nor to strive for the mettle of monks. But, instead, he devotes himself to his teachings, in order that you might carry them out fully, and to the miraculous healings before the Passion, which he has made known beforehand and predetermined, for this he humbled himself and became “obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.”<sup>79</sup>

He withdrew there not waiting to be persecuted, but he withdrew admitting persecution as a future possibility after the arrest of John. And it is proper to see this, as Mark narrates most things in conformity with Matthew in abbreviated form. And after the choosing of the apostles, he adds “*and they came to Capernaum.*”<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 273.19–31 is a free and indirect summary of Origen, *Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis* 10.2.5–9 (C. Blanc, *Origène. Commentaire sur saint Jean*, vol. 2. SC 157. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 384–387).

<sup>74</sup> Matthew 4.13.

<sup>75</sup> The description of this discrepancy in Matthew 4.17 is noted in earlier editions of NA. In NA<sup>27</sup>, the editors note the omission of μετανοείτε in the work of Justin, Clement, Origen, and Eusebius.

<sup>76</sup> Mark 1.15.

<sup>77</sup> Galatians 4.4. Note the exegetical arguments at work in this passage. For Origen, all these texts serve to point towards the economy of salvation.

<sup>78</sup> Mark 1.14.

<sup>79</sup> Philippians 2.8.

<sup>80</sup> Mark 1.21 Note the omission of Mark 1.16–20.

1. *On the demoniac*<sup>81</sup>

(21) And they came to Capernaum.

Luke also sets things out in a similar fashion: and from where did they come to Capernaum? From Nazareth—as Luke says, “and he was teaching them on the Sabbath.”<sup>82</sup>

(21) And immediately on the Sabbath, he entered the synagogue and began to teach.

[275] For then they used to gather together (but only through the necessity of idleness and not through fondness for listening to the law, given that the Law imposed this necessity of the Sabbath on them).<sup>83</sup> Therefore he began to teach | on the Sabbath, wishing to seek out the souls of those listening to godliness.

(22) And they were astounded at his teaching; for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.

“*And they were astounded at his teaching*” because<sup>84</sup> he did not present his words to solicit favours, nor flattery, nor to seek the praise of his listeners: but his word came with authority, an exhortation<sup>85</sup> urging them towards salvation and threatening retribution upon those who fail to heed the call.

---

<sup>81</sup> There are 48 Chapter headings or κεφάλαια in the *Catena in Marcum*, following the pattern found in Codex Alexandrinus (A). This codex dates from the fifth century. (An older system of capitulation can be found in Codex Vaticanus (B) from the fourth century, which lists 62 headings). The titles, or τῖτλοι, of the headings also follow the pattern in Codex Alexandrinus. For further discussion of the significance of these headings, see Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 34f.

<sup>82</sup> Luke 4.31.

<sup>83</sup> Anti-Jewish polemic surrounding the observance of the Sabbath can be found as early as Ignatius of Antioch, *Letter to the Magnesians* 9.1 (Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, *Loeb Classical Library* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 249). A later recension of this letter makes a specific accusation about the Sabbath as an excuse for “rejoicing in idleness” (For further discussion and debate see Heather McKay, *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 179–185).

<sup>84</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 275.6–10 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)* (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in PG 72.545.39–41.

<sup>85</sup> *Lit.* “a protreptic” (For a more detailed description of this particular style of exhortation in ancient rhetoric, see Anthony Guerra, *Romans and the apologetic tradition: the purpose, genre and audience of Paul’s letter* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 3–21).

(23) And<sup>86</sup> there was in their synagogue, a man with an unclean spirit.

Through the addition of “unclean,” he distinguishes the identity of the spirit: for the air is also spirit, and the soul, and then there are the ministering spirits,<sup>87</sup> as they are called, and the Holy Spirit; therefore, in order that we might not fall into the error of uncertainty in matters of faith through ambiguity or vagueness, he says “a spirit of an unclean demon”—“unclean” on account of the impiety of withdrawing from God and rejoicing over every kind of defiling and wicked act.

“And he cried out in a loud voice saying: What do you want with us? Have you come out of season?” and so on.<sup>88</sup> “I am guessing at your appearing,” he says, “I have a sneaking suspicion about your coming.” For he had no certain or firm knowledge of his coming: but even if he appears to know this, he proclaims these words hypocritically.

♦ Why<sup>89</sup> does he say, “*You have come to destroy us*”?<sup>90</sup> For you no longer give us any space. Taking away impiety, driving away error, you instil knowledge of God in the souls of human beings: “*I know who you are, the Holy One of God.*”<sup>91</sup> Each of the prophets was holy, and yet he did not indicate one of them, ♦ but he proclaims the [Holy] One. | For through the definite article, [276] he indicates “the One” chosen from among the others. And he recognises the Lord of all because he is afraid.<sup>92</sup> ♦ Moreover,<sup>93</sup> he brought this about upon their Sabbath, and he was teaching on the Sabbath, wishing to seek out the souls of those who were listening for Godliness. But Jesus rebuked him; for neither did the truth have need of recommendation by wicked demons, nor of being magnified by the witness of his opponents: which is why it says,

(25) He rebuked him saying, Be silent and come out of him.

<sup>86</sup> Note the textual variant: εὐθύς.

<sup>87</sup> Hebrews 1.14.

<sup>88</sup> Mark 1.23–24. Note the textual variant: φωνῆ μεγάλης.

<sup>89</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 275.26–29 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)* (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in PG 72.548.54–56.

<sup>90</sup> Mark 1.24.

<sup>91</sup> Mark 1.24.

<sup>92</sup> *Lit.* ‘through fear.’

<sup>93</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 276.3–5 repeats *Cat. Marc.* 274.28–275.2.



◆ And<sup>94</sup> immediately, he uttered a commandment for our salvation, so that we should not be completely persuaded by demons, not even if they claimed to be speaking the truth. “And he came out of him, and the demon threw him about” and so on.<sup>95</sup> And since he spoke soberly and he communicated as one in a calm state, those present thought that these words were uttered not from the demon but from the heart. ◆

(26) And the unclean spirit convulsing him, and crying<sup>96</sup> with a great shout, came out of him. (27) And they were all amazed:<sup>97</sup> so that they kept on asking one another, “What is this? Is this a new teaching? For with authority,<sup>98</sup> he commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him.”

◆ This<sup>99</sup> is why the demon persisted in throwing him about, so that it might become manifest that it was the demon speaking and not the man who was making the sound. For “*I know who you are*”<sup>100</sup> was the saying of someone in a sound mind. And he came out from him without having to harm him. For not even when he exorcised him did the man show any sign of hurt. But the Lord persisted on account of those who were present, and he did not allow him to come to any harm. This was so that the authority of the one imposing the commands might be seen.<sup>101</sup> ◆ |

## 2. On Peter's mother-in-law

(29) And immediately on their exit from the synagogue, they came to the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John.

<sup>94</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 276.10–15 is an extract from a comment on Luke 4.35 in *Cat. Luc.* 39.20–25 which is attributed to Titus of Bostra (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367).

<sup>95</sup> Luke 4.35; cf. Mark 1.25–26.

<sup>96</sup> Note the textual variant: *κράξαν*.

<sup>97</sup> Note the textual variant: *ἐθαμβήσαν*.

<sup>98</sup> Note the textual variant: *τί ἐστι τοῦτο; τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἢ καινὴ αὐτῆ; ὅτι κατ’ ἐξουσίαν*.

<sup>99</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 276.22–26 is a further extract from *Cat. Luc.* 39.20–25 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). The passage is attributed to Titus of Bostra.

<sup>100</sup> Mark 1.24.

<sup>101</sup> This is a standard motif of attempts by early Christian theologians to defend the practice of exorcism. In the New Testament, exorcism “displays the exorcist’s divine authority and contributes to the apocalyptic, eschatological, and broadly soteriological aspects of the gospel message.” (Eric Sorenson, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 168).

For the things they saw provided clear proof and the sight of the things that happened presented evidence. It was not simply hearsay, which resulted in their confusion<sup>102</sup> between belief and doubt.<sup>103</sup> This is why they asked questions among themselves, “What is this word? And what is the miracle that has happened? Rather he lays down the law in his teaching; and he even commands the evil demons, and confounded, they are put in their place. Prophets have come and gone, but they asserted, ‘The Lord said these things,’ but this man says, ‘I say to you’.”<sup>104</sup> This is a “*new teaching*”<sup>105</sup> and, so it seems, a new covenant. Prophets did wonders too, but they called upon God, while this man says with authority, “*Be silent and come out from him.*”<sup>106</sup> It is, so it seems, the Lord of all, and thus the miracle was talked about in all “*the surrounding countryside.*”<sup>107</sup>

(30) Now Simon’s mother-in-law lay in bed with a fever; and immediately they told him about her. He came and lifted her up, taking her by the hand:<sup>108</sup> and immediately<sup>109</sup> the fever left her, and she served them.

After these things, “*coming out of the synagogue*” and so on,<sup>110</sup> they went back, as it was the Sabbath, for dinner at the disciple’s house, and the one who was to serve them had gone down with a fever; “*and immediately*” the disciples “*told him about her,*”<sup>111</sup> already having experience of his power. And “*he came,*”<sup>112</sup> and the Word, stretching out his physical hand, raised up the woman with a fever, demonstrating the indivisible union [of his divinity and humanity] in his own body,<sup>113</sup> through which he worked as in the case of all miracles: and the woman, who had been freed from the fever and who had been strengthened by contact with the divine body, gave service to them

<sup>102</sup> *Lit.* “dividing the mind.”

<sup>103</sup> The passage perhaps suggests a resonance with Hebrew 11.1–2.

<sup>104</sup> This phrase occurs repeatedly in Matthew (cf. Matthew 5.18, 5.22, 5.26, 5.28, 5.32, 5.34, 5.39, 5.44).

<sup>105</sup> Mark 1.27.

<sup>106</sup> Mark 1.25.

<sup>107</sup> Mark 1.28.

<sup>108</sup> Note the textual variant: τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς.

<sup>109</sup> Note the textual variant: εὐθέως.

<sup>110</sup> Mark 1.29.

<sup>111</sup> Mark 1.30.

<sup>112</sup> Mark 1.31.

<sup>113</sup> Note the Cyrilline emphasis of this passage. The writer affirms the unity of the divine and human natures, rejecting any hint of division.

in return (teaching us that one does not seek after healings from God for no purpose, but having obtained (healing), one is to obey his commands [278] completely and to minister to the saints). |

### 3. *On the healing of various diseases*

(32) That evening, at sundown, they brought to him many who were sick or possessed with demons. (33) And the whole city<sup>114</sup> was gathered around the door. (34) And he healed many who were sick with various diseases.

When the sun had set, the whole city gathered around the doors and “*they brought to him all those who were sick or possessed with demons*”:<sup>115</sup> and “*he healed many who were sick with various diseases*.”<sup>116</sup> “When the sun came down”<sup>117</sup> is not redundant,<sup>118</sup> but given that they thought that nobody would go out to heal on the Sabbath, they waited for the end of the Sabbath. Of course, the leaders of the Jews used to accuse him of healing on the Sabbath, and the disciples, having been helped already, did not wait for the evening but prevailed upon him to heal Peter’s mother-in-law.

And the present Evangelist says he healed “*many*”<sup>119</sup> of those who were sick. It says “*many*,”<sup>120</sup> or (it might equally say) “*all*,”<sup>121</sup> given the all too frequent habit in scripture of confusing the two, having consulted in the text the saying by Paul, “just as on account of the (trespass) of one man *many* were made sinners, so through one man, *many* will be made righteous.”<sup>122</sup> Or he says “*many*,” meaning “the ones who believed in him,” and whose faith brought about healing. But Luke gives us the former sense when he says that laying his hands *on each one of them*, he healed them.<sup>123</sup>

<sup>114</sup> Note the textual variant: *καὶ ἡ πόλις ὅλη ἐπισυνηγμένη.*

<sup>115</sup> Mark 1.32.

<sup>116</sup> Mark 1.34.

<sup>117</sup> Luke 4.40.

<sup>118</sup> *Lit.* “added for no purpose.”

<sup>119</sup> Mark 1.34.

<sup>120</sup> Mark 1.34.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Matthew 8.16.

<sup>122</sup> Romans 5.18–19: In the previous verse, Paul has “all” instead of “many.” The association of the two words in Paul means that from the catenist’s point of view the confusion between Mark and Matthew is of little consequence.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. Luke 4.40.

(34) And he cast out many demons, and he would not allow them<sup>124</sup> to speak, because they knew him.

Now saying this is not contrary to what was said by Saint Luke, for the same says “demons came out from many, screaming and saying ‘You are the Christ, the Son | of God.’ But he rebuked them and would not allow them to speak because they knew that he was the Christ.”<sup>125</sup> Mark disregards the latter in so far as many things in his exposition are abbreviated. [279]

And the demons knew that he was the Christ because they received experience of his power, both from the preceding miracles, and from the sign with authority.

“And he did not allow them to speak,”<sup>126</sup> because he did not wish us to accept their description of it, but to shake off their words with every fibre of our being:<sup>127</sup> an example the apostles also followed when the woman, who had a spirit of divination, used to follow them, crying out: “These people are the servants of the Most High God, who are proclaiming to us the way of salvation’ .... Paul was annoyed and turned upon the spirit and said, ‘I command you, come out of her in the name of Jesus Christ’.”<sup>128</sup>

(35) And in the morning, while it was still very dark, Jesus got up and went out and went away into a deserted place, and there he prayed. (36) And Simon and those with him pursued<sup>129</sup> him. (37) And finding<sup>130</sup> him, they said to him, “All are looking for you.” (38) And he said to them, “Let us go<sup>131</sup> to the neighbouring towns, so that I may proclaim the message there also: for this is why I came here.” (39) And he was<sup>132</sup> proclaiming the message in<sup>133</sup> their synagogues throughout Galilee and casting out demons.

Luke selects words almost resembling these when he says: “At daybreak, he departed to a deserted place, and the crowds were looking for him, and

<sup>124</sup> Note the textual variant: τὰ δαιμόνια.

<sup>125</sup> Luke 4.41.

<sup>126</sup> Luke 4.41.

<sup>127</sup> *Lit.* ‘with all power.’

<sup>128</sup> Acts 16.17–18.

<sup>129</sup> Note the textual variant: κατεδιώξαν.

<sup>130</sup> Note the textual variant: εὐρόντες.

<sup>131</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀλλαχοῦ.

<sup>132</sup> Note the textual variant: ἦν (rather than ἦλθεν).

<sup>133</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐν.

when they reached him, they wanted to prevent him from leaving them. And he said to them, 'It is necessary for me to proclaim the Kingdom of God to the other cities also: for I was sent for this purpose'.<sup>134</sup> ♦ The Lord withdrew for a little while to a deserted place, so that, being absent, the people might miss him. But this is a figure (or type) to commend the best kind of discipline to us: not to seek out miracles for the praises of people and to associate with them, but to humble oneself and to withdraw by oneself to offer instead thanksgiving to God and to sing the praises of the Giver of all good things, and | to say, "Every good gift and every last gift is from above 'coming down from the Father of Lights'."<sup>135</sup>

Look<sup>136</sup> how Jesus withdraws into the wilderness to pray: not that he needed to do this himself, for he himself was the one who accepted prayers from all spiritual people, but he does this for the sake of the (divine) economy, and he was also being for us, as we said, an example<sup>137</sup> to show us how to behave.<sup>138</sup>

But Mark says that the apostles sought him out and said, "*Everyone is looking for you.*"<sup>139</sup> They are not contradicting each other.<sup>140</sup> For it is possible that the crowd was also following after the apostles with a view to overtaking them. And the Lord, restraining himself, gave a greeting (but he decided to send them away, so that others might also receive his teaching, given that the duration of his visit was not going to be very long).

And Mark goes on to say, "*this is why I came here,*"<sup>141</sup> indicating the authenticity of his divine nature and the voluntary nature of his self-emptying.<sup>142</sup> But Luke says, "This is why I have been sent,"<sup>143</sup> thus demonstrating the econ-

<sup>134</sup> Cf. Luke 4.42–44. Note that there are a number of textual variants in this passage.

<sup>135</sup> James 1.17a.

<sup>136</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 280.2–17 is attributed to 'Victor of Antioch' in the *Catena in Lucam* (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 367).

<sup>137</sup> *Lit.* 'a type.'

<sup>138</sup> Harold Smith attributes these lines to "Victor of Antioch"—indeed they are attributed to "Victor" in the *Catena in Lucam*—but note that the phrase *τύπος ἡμῶν* also occurs in the unattributed passage on the previous page (*Cat. Marc.* 279.28–29). Given that the commentator is reinforcing this assertion by referring to the previous allusion, one might reasonably assume that the previous passage belongs to Victor also. Therefore, if *Cat. Marc.* 280.2–17 is attributed to Victor of Antioch in the *Catena in Lucam*, it follows that *Cat. Marc.* 279.27–280.17 may be attributed to Victor of Antioch.

<sup>139</sup> Mark 1.37.

<sup>140</sup> The commentator is referring to the conflict with Luke 4.42, where Luke says that the people, rather than the disciples, were seeking him out.

<sup>141</sup> Mark 1.38.

<sup>142</sup> An allusion to Philippians 2.7.

<sup>143</sup> Luke 4.43.

omy of salvation and describing the grace of the Father in terms of “sending” him. ♦ One [evangelist] says simply “*in order that I might preach the message.*”<sup>144</sup> But in proclaiming “the Kingdom of God,”<sup>145</sup> the other [evangelist] indicates that [Christ] himself is the Kingdom of God, for John [the Baptist] also said, “Repent: he has drawn near,”<sup>146</sup> speaking about the Christ, who is also the Kingdom of God, which happens to be among those taught by him, for as it says “the Kingdom of God is among you.”<sup>147</sup> This is why it is said to those having it within themselves, “Do not say in your heart, ‘Who will ascend into heaven?’ (that is, to bring Christ down) or ‘Who will descend into the abyss?’ (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). But what does the scripture say? The word is very near to you, on your lips and in your heart.”<sup>148</sup> And Christ is the Kingdom of heaven, when each of them accepts in their hearts that heaven exists, and that it is neither passing away nor destroyed. “*And he proclaimed the message in the synagogues,*”<sup>149</sup> in order that he might combine both the old and the new covenants in a single doctrine, and in order that he might show that the God of the old covenant is not different from the God of the new, against those ungodly heretics.<sup>150</sup> And it is the same God, who provides the Law, who passes from the letter of the | Law to the spirit, from shadows to the truth, and who frees people from the tyranny of demons; and everywhere having made his teaching trustworthy, and making it acceptable to those who heard it, he supplies wonders in addition to the things which he said. [281]

#### 4. *On the leper*

(40) And a leper came to him begging him, and kneeling before him and saying<sup>151</sup> to him, “If you choose, you can make me clean.”

The one who cleansed the world of leprosy (that is to say, of impiety) now restores one leprous in body but pure in mind to his natural state through faith and hope. For the Lord was coming into one of the cities, and the leper,

<sup>144</sup> Mark 1.38.

<sup>145</sup> Luke 4.43.

<sup>146</sup> Matthew 3.2.

<sup>147</sup> Luke 17.21 Note the emphasis given by the catenist to Luke’s more “realized” eschatology. The sense in the following sentence is not entirely clear.

<sup>148</sup> Romans 10.6–8.

<sup>149</sup> Mark 1.39.

<sup>150</sup> This is probably a reference to Marcion and Valentinus and their followers.

<sup>151</sup> Note the textual variant: *καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν, καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ.*

understanding that the disease was incurable, was seeking salvation from his suffering: therefore “*he came to*”<sup>152</sup> the Saviour, and prostrated himself before him and said of the leprosy, “*If you wish, you can make me clean, for I know that you can do all things.*”<sup>153</sup> For often what is lacking is the will, and nothing prevents someone who has formed a desire from acting. The soul of the leper was in good health: and his heart was clean. “I know,” he says, “that you can, but I am not always worthy; for I know that I suffer what I suffer by a judgement of God: if you do not will it, I am not going to argue, nor am I going to press [you] for the gift.”

(41) And Jesus,<sup>154</sup> moved with pity, stretched out his hand and touched him,<sup>155</sup> and said to him, “I do wish it. Be made clean.” (42) And when he had spoken,<sup>156</sup> immediately the leprosy left him, and he was made clean.

◆ And<sup>157</sup> the Saviour, moved with pity, having stretched out his hand, touches the leper. But why did he touch the leper, and why did he not effect the healing with a word? Moses has made known in the law that the one who touches a leper is unclean; and one is bound to remain unclean for the whole day—neither may one come into the temple of God, nor do anything else, but in the evening one will be set free to be clean. Therefore, the Saviour [282] (did this), | in order that he might show that uncleanness does not touch the Saviour in his nature, and that the Law was not over him but over ordinary people, because he is Lord of his own law: ◆ and<sup>158</sup> he heals not as a servant but as Lord. For Elisha, being strict in observing the law, could not even bear to look at Naaman, but he sent him to the Jordan to bathe. But Jesus touches the leper deliberately, not that he needed the contact for the effectiveness of the healing, but in order that he might teach them that it is necessary to take care of the soul, and that leaving aside the external rituals of purification, to

<sup>152</sup> Mark 1.40: for the sake of consistency, I have assumed the historic present in translating verbs in this sentence.

<sup>153</sup> Mark 1.40.

<sup>154</sup> Note the textual variant: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς.

<sup>155</sup> Note the textual variant: ἥψατο αὐτοῦ.

<sup>156</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ.

<sup>157</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 281.25–282.3 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 5.12 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367).

<sup>158</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 282.3–9 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 25.2 (ibid.: 364). This passage can be found in PG 57.329.14–28.

wipe [the soul] clean: ♦ and he says: “*I do wish it. Be made clean.*”<sup>159</sup> And at once he banishes the disease by his word, not refusing to do this by his will. For the very thing which the leper said by word, he showed by deed. ♦ For<sup>160</sup> not only did he eliminate speculation, he even gave greater proof, repeating the remarkable words and saying, “*I do wish it. Be made clean.*” He said this in order that he might confirm his teaching. ♦

(43) And after sternly warning him, immediately he sent him away.

(44) And he said to him, “See that you tell no-one.”<sup>161</sup>

♦ Through<sup>162</sup> these things, he teaches us also the disinterested and modest and careful characteristics of these actions. And yet he knew that he would not obey. And [the leper] broadcast [the identity of] his benefactor: nevertheless, he did this by himself: ♦ and in addition to this [Jesus] almost cries out, “It is not the right time for the action to be proclaimed. Do not say anything! I do not need you to proclaim it: for with my Passion proclaiming me, this cleansing will count for nothing.”

(44) “But go, show yourself to the priest, and offer for your cleansing what Moses commanded, as a testimony to them.”

“But go,” he says, “to the priest: for I do not bring dishonour to the law which I have given” for (the Law) says through him, “If anyone is a leper, let him remain outside the camp as one unclean.”<sup>163</sup> “And if he is healed without visible cause (which happens when God wills it), in order that he may not be cast outside, let him show himself, therefore, (to indicate) that he has been cleansed by the will of God”: this is why | the Saviour sends the one, [283] who was a leper for a long time, to the priest for an examination of the healing, in order that he may no longer be excluded from the temple, but may come into the place of prayer, being numbered among the people; for if

<sup>159</sup> Mark 1.41.

<sup>160</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 282.13–15 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 25.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 364). This passage can be found in PG 57.334.30–35.

<sup>161</sup> Note the textual variant: ὅρα μηδενὶ εἰπῆς.

<sup>162</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 282.18–21 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 25.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 364). This passage can be found in PG 57.329.44–46.

<sup>163</sup> Lev. 13.46.



the priest did not say that the leper was cleansed, he would remain still with the unclean outside the camp. *“Therefore, show yourself to the priest, and offer for your cleansing what Moses commanded, as a testimony to them.”*<sup>164</sup>

◆ He<sup>165</sup> guided him by the law, stopping the insolent speech of the Jews. He also made the work complete. But he permitted them to perform the examination and he made them sit down as judges of his own miracles.

*“As a testimony for them.”*<sup>166</sup> That is to say, for the accusation of their wilful misunderstanding, so that he says “whenever they persecute me as a deceiver and impostor, or as an adversary of God and a transgressor of the Law, you may bear witness about me,—that you were healed by me, and you were guided by the Law even to the satisfaction of priests.” ◆

(45) But he went out and began to proclaim it freely and to spread the word, so that he was no longer able to go into a town openly. But he stayed outside in<sup>167</sup> desert places, and people came to him from every quarter.

And in gratitude, the leper proclaimed the good deed everywhere and spread the word—that is to say the thing that happened with power, when he said *“I do wish it. Be made clean”*<sup>168</sup>—with the result that he turned and moved everyone to the contemplation of and belief in the healer. On account of this, the Saviour was not able to make a habit of visiting the cities but he continued in deserted places. And so they came to him from all over the place. For their zeal outweighed the exertion.

---

<sup>164</sup> Mark 1.44.

<sup>165</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 283.7–15 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 25.3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 364). This passage can be found in PG 57.330.6–39.

<sup>166</sup> Note the textual variant: Εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτῶν (with the use of the genitive rather than the dative).

<sup>167</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐν.

<sup>168</sup> Mark 1.41.

## CHAPTER 2

### 5. *On the paralytic*

(1) And again he went to Capernaum after some days: and it was reported that he was at home. (2) And immediately, so many | gathered around that there was no longer room for them, not even at the door. (3) And he was speaking the word to them. And they came, bearing a paralytic, carried by four men. [284]

And Luke presents something similar, although he says nothing about the town in which the sign took place. Matthew is silent about the removal of the roof, but describes the same kind of thing,<sup>1</sup> saying that the wonder came to pass in the town of Jesus. And Nazareth was held by him to be the town of Jesus, and not Capernaum: unless one were to say that his town was Capernaum on account of the many times he stayed and made himself at home there and that many signs took place there: or to say that, given the proximity of the places, the Evangelists were not precise about the details,<sup>2</sup> hurrying only to describe the sign. On that, they agree completely, even though they differ in their words.

(4) And since they could not get close to him through the crowd, they removed the roof where he was, and having dug through it, they lowered the mat on which the paralytic lay.

And so some people went to meet him, carrying a paralytic; and finding the door blocked by the multitude, they were not able to enter by it, for neither did those inside yield to those outside, nor did they give way so that they

---

<sup>1</sup> *Lit.* “but comes through the same words.”

<sup>2</sup> The term ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι (*Cat. Marc.* 284.11) and its cognates are used elsewhere in the *Catena in Marcum* (315.9 and 391.15). Robert Grant suggests that the use of this term here, and in the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, is evidence of “a certain anticritical feeling in the school of Antioch” (Robert M. Grant, ‘Historical Criticism in the Ancient Church,’ *The Journal of Religion* 25, no. 3 (1945): 196). While he is perhaps too quick to associate the *Catena in Marcum* with the “school of Antioch,” he argues that there may be a “deprecatory” or “contemptuous tone” here. Certainly, the term serves to short-circuit any further discussion.

might make an entrance. Therefore, those who were carrying the man and hastening to effect his healing raised him up onto the roof, and this action came to pass by means of a hoist,<sup>3</sup> since the prospect of healing gave rise to an unexpected innovation. For hauling the couch up with its load, and removing the roof, they lowered the man on the couch and brought him before the presence of the Saviour. And look<sup>4</sup> with me at the patience of Jesus, at how he simply carries on while these things happen, understanding [285] what is to happen a little later. |

(5) And when Jesus saw their faith, he said to the paralytic, “Child, your sins are forgiven.”<sup>5</sup>

♦ “And<sup>6</sup> when the Lord,” it says, “saw their faith, he said to the paralytic, ‘Child, your sins are forgiven.’” It was not the faith of the one who was disabled, but of those who carried him. For there are occasions when one is healed through the faith of others, and the holy scripture of the Gospels is full of this<sup>7</sup> kind of thing. ♦ Therefore, seeing<sup>8</sup> their faith, he revealed that their toil was not in vain, but he said, “*Child* (or as Luke says, ‘Man’),<sup>9</sup> *your sins are forgiven.*”<sup>10</sup> And the word “child” was either a reference to him also having believed, or a reference to his role in creation.<sup>11</sup> ♦ And what kind of “sins,” as he says, were they? “I look for one thing, but he grants something else. Those people led me here so that I might walk, but you heal something else. For you know the offences I have committed.” “I know,” he says, “what they do not see. The soul falls ill before the body. Accordingly, I heal the cause of the disease and, at the same time, the suffering is taken away.”

<sup>3</sup> *Lit.* “a mechanical device.”

<sup>4</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 284.26: ὄρα for ὄρα.

<sup>5</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀφέωνται.

<sup>6</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 285.3–6 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam*, 5.27 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367).

<sup>7</sup> The sense demands a correction to *Cat. Marc.* 285.6: τουτου for τουτο even though Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Laud Gr. 33 also has τουτο.

<sup>8</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 285.6–10 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Matthaeum* Fr. 102 (Joseph Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche. Aus Kettenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben.* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 185–186).

<sup>9</sup> Luke 5.20.

<sup>10</sup> *Lit.* “they are forgiven you and so on.”

<sup>11</sup> κατὰ τῆς δημιουργίας i.e. “his Sonship.”

(9) “Which is easier, to say to the paralytic, ‘Your sins are forgiven’<sup>12</sup> or to say, ‘Get up and walk’?”

And the Pharisees and the scribes happened to be around at the time and they suspected that what he said was a blasphemy: and they questioned in their hearts “Why does this man speak blasphemies like this? For only the Judge of all has authority to forgive or not.” But the Saviour, penetrating their thoughts by virtue of his divinity,<sup>13</sup> and knowing the thoughts of men, exposed their misgivings. Confident of the fact that he discerns hidden thoughts, he also grants the forgiveness of sins; but again they remained ignorant and they did not give to the one who announced their own inner thoughts the capacity to heal sins. And so Jesus said to them “*Which is easier?*” and so on.<sup>14</sup> For forgiving sins is more difficult than saying, “*Get up.*” And as the refutation is not obvious (for if someone says, “*Your sins are forgiven,*” it is uncertain whether it is effective), for the action is not self-evident in order that the healer might be subjected to scrutiny, he says, “Which is easier, to say or to do? |—clearly ‘to say,’ given that the thing which comes to pass is not obvious. Therefore, since you disbelieve my word, I bring an action to provide proof of what is invisible.” For if the Lord had first healed the paralytic externally and then forgiven him his sins, they would have thought that in the first respect, he had been healed, but in the second respect, it was dubious. But he brings in the more dubious and unbelievable first so that they might be refuted as not believing and arguing in their hearts. Then he adds the action. [286]

(10) “But so that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on<sup>15</sup> the earth to forgive sins,” he said to the paralytic, (11) “I say to you, get up, take your mat, and go to your home.”

“I say to you,” he says, “ignore them; for they are unbelievers, and they ponder evil things in their hearts. I say to you, since your sins are forgiven, you have also become worthy to be a hearer of our words and to receive

<sup>12</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀφέωνται.

<sup>13</sup> *Lit.* “as God.”

<sup>14</sup> Mark 2.9.

<sup>15</sup> This appears to be an error: ἐστι has replaced ἐπι.

healing.” ♦ “*Get up,<sup>16</sup> take your mat, and go to your home.*”<sup>17</sup> The word came out and the miracle followed. The power of the body returned and the whole body was rediscovered. The paralytic felt the healing, and he stood up (for he gave to him the sensation of healing), he stretched out his legs, he moved his joints, and he walked as a healthy man. And why does he want “to forgive sins on the earth”? For what reason did he say that the Son of Man forgives sins in the accomplishment of a miracle? In order that he might show that he brought down into his human nature the power of divinity, by virtue of their indivisible union.<sup>18</sup> “For even though,” he says, “I have become a human being, while being in reality the divine Word, and through the incarnation both live out my life and dwell on the earth, nevertheless I accomplish miracles which issue from my word, even granting the forgiveness of sins: for my becoming Son of Man unchangeably and truly on the earth according to flesh did not take away any of the properties of divinity, nor diminish me.” ♦ Therefore having been healed both in soul and body and having become whole, taking up his mat, he went out in front of them all. |

(12) And immediately<sup>19</sup> he got up, and took the mat and went out in front of them all: so that they were all amazed and glorified God, saying, “We have never seen anything like this.”

And he allowed him to go out. Seeing him get up and putting the mat over his shoulders, they all stood aside and glorified God “*saying, ‘We have never seen anything like this.’*”<sup>20</sup> Nothing was more likely. And ignoring the greater deed, namely the forgiveness of sins, they were amazed at that which was visible: they should have said, “We no longer wonder so much that the paralytic has been raised up, as we now believe in the light of this that his soul has also received healing, having been set free from sin.”

---

<sup>16</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 286.15–29 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Matthaeum* Fr. 103 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). The emphasis on the indivisible union of the divine and human betrays the marks of the Nestorian controversy.

<sup>17</sup> Mark 2.11.

<sup>18</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 286.23: ἔνωσιν for ἔνωσιν.

<sup>19</sup> Note the textual variant: Καὶ εὐθέως ἤγγεθη, καὶ ἄρας τὸν κράββατον.

<sup>20</sup> Mark 2.12.

6. *On Levi the tax collector*

(13) And he went out again beside the sea; and the whole crowd gathered around him, and he taught them.

And again after the miracle, he set out his teaching. “*For he went out,*” it says, “*beside the sea: and the whole crowd gathered around him, and he taught them*”:<sup>21</sup> urging his hearers towards an unshakeable faith (not the scribes and the Pharisees and the like, who were well-disposed to none of the things that happened or were said, but those freed of all doubt<sup>22</sup> and who had obtained a clear judgement). ♦ And notice<sup>23</sup> the Saviour’s lack of boastfulness and lack of ambition—that when a great crowd assembles, he does not stay to loiter in the city or in the middle of the market-place but he makes haste for the desert and the mountain, teaching us to do nothing for show, especially when it may be necessary to reflect and to speak about essential matters. ♦

(14) As he was walking along, he saw Levi son of Alphaeus sitting at the tax-booth, and he said to him, “Follow me.” And he got up and followed him.

He does not learn about the character of the disciples through experience | in human fashion, but as one who understands their hearts. He chooses [288] those who are worthy and even when he sees a pearl lying in the filth, he picks it up and he brings to light the purity of its soul. ♦ And so<sup>24</sup> he goes out and finds a tax collector, called Levi, “sitting down.” And this is Matthew the Evangelist. And Blessed Mark and Blessed Luke both conceal the name with the more old-fashioned name;<sup>25</sup> but in his gospel, Levi himself, plainly describing what concerns himself says, “And he saw Matthew a

<sup>21</sup> Mark 2.13.

<sup>22</sup> πασῆς διπλότης Lampe s.v. ‘1. doublemindedness, inclination to go two ways; 2. ambiguity; 3. duplicity; 4. twofold character.’

<sup>23</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 287.22–26 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 15.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 364). This passage can be found in PG 57.223.8–16.

<sup>24</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 288.4–9 is an extract from Origen, *Fragmenta in Lucam* Fr. 108 (M. Rauer, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 9, 2nd edn. [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 49 (35)]. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959]: 271–272).

<sup>25</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 288.6: add iota subscript to ἀρχαιοτέρα.

tax collector”,<sup>26</sup> exposing his own shame in order that you may marvel at the skill of the healer. ♦ Nevertheless<sup>27</sup> he saw the tax collector sitting down and settling the accounts of his ill-gotten gains, and he was not too fastidious about his way of life but said to him, “Follow me.” And Levi, without waiting a moment and leaving everything behind, followed him. ♦ By the intensity<sup>28</sup> of his faith, he brought glory to being chosen, and he did not vex the one who called (him) by any delay. ♦ For leaving everything and despising public revenues, not even noticing them, and reckoning the risk as nothing, he committed himself completely to the one who called [him], reckoning his own salvation as more precious than anything else.

(15) And it came to pass that<sup>29</sup> as he sat at dinner at Levi’s house, many tax collectors and sinners were also sitting with Jesus and his disciples—for there were many who followed him.

And in giving thanks for his call, he held a great party in his home, and he invited everyone with whom he was acquainted, even the Saviour himself, in order that he might not be the only one to receive this benefaction, but also all those who had been invited. ♦ And<sup>30</sup> without cause for shame, Jesus called a tax collector to discipleship and he also came into his house: in which there was no other good thing than the repentance of the master of the house. ♦

[289] (16) And the Scribes and Pharisees,<sup>31</sup> seeing him | eating with tax collectors and sinners, said to his disciples, “Why is he eating and drinking with tax-collectors and sinners?”

<sup>26</sup> Matthew 9.9.

<sup>27</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 288.10–12 is an extract from the writings of Cyril of Alexandria (attributed in *Cat. Luc.* 46.22–27).

<sup>28</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 288.13–14 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 5.28 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in Joseph Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901), 160.

<sup>29</sup> Note the textual variant: Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακείσθαι.

<sup>30</sup> A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* reveals that *Cat. Marc.* 288.26–28 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Matthaeum* Fr. 104 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 186).

<sup>31</sup> Note the textual variant: Καὶ οἱ Γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.

♦ And<sup>32</sup> there was a big crowd of tax collectors sitting with Jesus, and the Saviour was not displeased, nor did he take what was happening as an insult to himself. But he attended the feast as a master of his human nature, and he both ate and drank, demonstrating the reality of his body, and blessing the appropriate use of food. And there were also present Pharisees and scribes (not that they were involved with what was going on), and they saw the tax collectors sitting at table with him, and they called the disciples and asked them what was going on. ♦

(17) And when he heard, Jesus said to them, “Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick; for I have come not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.”<sup>33</sup>

Jesus heard and said to them, “*Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.*”<sup>34</sup>

♦ “And you,”<sup>35</sup> he said, “do need a physician. For if you were not sick, you would not censure the love for humanity<sup>36</sup> of a physician. For do I not know already that they are tax collectors? And am I ignorant of the sicknesses of their souls? I know that they are sick. For this reason, I have come to stand by them, in order that I might heal their sick souls.” Why do the Pharisees object to the Saviour eating with sinners? It is because there was a Law to differentiate between the holy and the profane. And they did not realise that Christ provides generous<sup>37</sup> grace over and above the usage of the Law. For the one<sup>38</sup> excludes, whereas the other<sup>39</sup> transforms, sin. Therefore he showed that he came not as a judge, but as a physician. ♦ And<sup>40</sup> he devoted himself<sup>41</sup> to the art of healing and he mixed with the sick and those in need of healing. ♦

<sup>32</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 289.4–11 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Matthaem* Fr. 104 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 186).

<sup>33</sup> Note the textual variant: εἰς μετάνοιαν (cf. Luke 5.32).

<sup>34</sup> Mark 2.17.

<sup>35</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 289.16–28 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Matthaem* Fr. 104 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 186).

<sup>36</sup> τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν—*lit.* “love for humanity.”

<sup>37</sup> φιλόανθρωπον—*lit.* “loving humanity, benevolent.”

<sup>38</sup> I.e. “the Law.”

<sup>39</sup> I.e. “grace.”

<sup>40</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 289.29 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam* (*in catenis*) (PG 72.572.15).

<sup>41</sup> το ἐπιβάλλον ποιεῖ—*lit.* “he makes it his business.”



[290] (18) Now John's disciples and those of the Pharisees were fasting; and they came and said to him, "Why do John's disciples and those of the Pharisees fast, but your disciples do not fast?" (19) And Jesus said to them, "The wedding guests cannot fast while the bridegroom is with them, can they? For as long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast. (20) The days will come, when the bridegroom is taken from them, and then they will fast in those days."<sup>42</sup>

◆ Since<sup>43</sup> they received an answer<sup>44</sup> to the first, they added another question: "Why do the disciples of John and those of the Pharisees fast?"<sup>45</sup> They wanted to take advantage of him and to discover something to his discredit. There is a time for the calling of brides, and a time for teaching, through which the children are educated, when those who have been called are fed.<sup>46</sup> This is not the right time for fasting: "The wedding guests cannot fast while the bridegroom is with them, can they? And the days will come, when the bridegroom is taken from them, and then they will fast on that day."<sup>47</sup> Why does it say, "the bridegroom is taken from them"? This means "he is taken up." ◆ What sort of bridegroom is he? He is the one who is to marry the Church.<sup>48</sup> He says "the bridegroom," in order that he may reveal the one who is married to him: for a new marriage is taking place. What is this marriage? It is the betrothal gift,<sup>49</sup> that is to say, the grace of the Holy Spirit,<sup>50</sup> through which the world believed, and through which fishermen won over and transformed the world. "The friends of the bridegroom cannot fast for as long as they have the bridegroom with him." He is saying that spending time with him is like a remedy against all pain. For the one who suffers is the one who does not have a present good. Because of the deprivation of the good, one grieves, longing for its enjoyment. And the one who enjoys

<sup>42</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις (cf. Luke 5.35).

<sup>43</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 290.10–20 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam* (*in catenis*). This passage can be found in PG 72.572.15–73.36.

<sup>44</sup> τῆν λύσιν—*lit.* "release, loosing." Lampe *s.v.* "6. *solution*; hence *remedy* for difficulty or trouble.."

<sup>45</sup> Mark 2.18.

<sup>46</sup> γαλουχοῦνται οἱ κεκλημένοι—*lit.* "those who are called are suckled at the breast."

<sup>47</sup> Mark 2.19–20.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Revelation 18.23; perhaps there is also an allusion to Ephesians 5.23–25.

<sup>49</sup> The ambiguity of the word ἀρραβώνος provides a bridge between the language of the "bridegroom" and Paul's description of the grace of the Holy Spirit in 2Cor. 1.22 and 5.5. According to Lampe, the word means "down-payment, pledge, token." It also suggests "betrothal." (G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961)).

<sup>50</sup> 2 Corinthians 1.22 and 5.5.

a present good naturally rejoices and does not suffer. The bridegroom of human nature is the Word, which is the ruler of human nature, giving the seed of life. Therefore, “when he is taken from them,”<sup>51</sup> they will fast, yearning | for his presence: and so that they may be with him according to the Spirit, they will purify themselves from bodily pleasures. And the reason he said this was probably to restrain their boasting, and show that he was not leading his own disciples in the direction of luxury and licentiousness, but that there was a time in the future when they would demonstrate their courage and endurance in testing situations.<sup>52</sup> [291]

(21) “No one sews a piece of unshrunk cloth onto an old cloak: otherwise, the patch pulls away from it, the new from the old, and a worse tear is made. (22) And no one puts new wine into old wineskins. Otherwise, the new wine will burst the skins, and the wine is poured out, and the skins are lost; but one must put<sup>53</sup> new wine into new wineskins.”

◆ And he goes on<sup>54</sup> to show the difference of the disciples from them, that they do not fast from the same necessity as them, and he says “No-one (sews) a piece” and so on.<sup>55</sup> ◆ “Just as,”<sup>56</sup> he says, “if an unshrunk rag is patched onto an old cloak, it tears it apart by its own firmness, and if new wine is put into old wineskins, it bursts it open by its own heat, so it is in this matter.”<sup>57</sup> For since the apostles happen to be heralds of the new covenant it is not possible for them to be subject to the provisions of the ancient laws. It is only to be expected that you who follow the ancient customs keep the Mosaic fasts. But these men, as they are about to hand on wonderful new laws to people, are in no way compelled to keep these things. But at the right time with their remaining virtue, they will also demonstrate a fast, of course not

<sup>51</sup> Mark 2.20.

<sup>52</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the way in which early Christian writers engaged with problematic texts to maintain the ascetic project, see Elizabeth Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).

<sup>53</sup> Note textual variants: καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχέεται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται. ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσχοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον (cf. Luke 5,38).

<sup>54</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 291.14–16 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragments in Matthaeum* Fr. 48.4 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 112).

<sup>55</sup> Mark 2.21.

<sup>56</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 291.16–292.2 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragments in Matthaeum* Fr. 47.1–15 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 112).

<sup>57</sup> I.e. fasting.

from necessity, and not by those provisions of the Law and ancient customs (as you keep them), but willingly, as they decide out of virtue, intending to fast. For the fast of those subject to the law is different in this way from those who fast in grace: because [the Jews] have fasts, which are required and which they have to observe (even when they do not wish to), while [the disciples]<sup>58</sup> fast voluntarily, according to what seems right to them, [292] approaching the fast by choice out of virtue. And if also | the time of Lent seems to be required, it is to remind the apathetic; but by contrast we pursue that fast willingly. ♦

(23) And it came to pass that he was going through the fields on the Sabbath, and his disciples began to make a path by plucking heads of grain. (24) And the Pharisees said to him, “Look, why are they doing what is not lawful on the Sabbath?”

The disciples, following the truth, are free with regard to the outward form (of the Law); for thus indeed they had become accustomed in the presence of the Lord to disparage the outward form of the Sabbath rest, even though God’s eternal rest from creation had been revealed. And (the disciples) freely made use of the ears of corn for nourishment, because they had brought nothing edible (with them). And those who yield to the outward form (of the Law) and who are unacquainted with the truth quarrel and say, “It is not permitted,” to the one who has all authority and who is providing for his own, not knowing that the Law did not prevail over the Law-giver, nor is there a single thing that is not allowed to a king. And the Lord makes a gentle defence, not with an inflated authority, but by (drawing on) the example of the saints from long ago, who themselves were thinking of higher things than bodily rest and such physical needs.

(25) And he said to them, “Have you never read what David did, when he was in need (of food), and he and those with him were hungry? (26) How he came into the house of God, when Abiathar was High Priest, and he ate the bread of the Presence, which it is not permitted for anyone but the priests to eat, and he gave (it) also to those who were with him?”

---

<sup>58</sup> *Lit.* “these men.”

He quite properly mentions David, who himself appeared not to have been educated according to the Law, when he partook of the priestly food and gave it to those who were with him, in order that respect for him might restrain the vexatious accusation of the apostles. “For if a prophet has power over the Law, going about in want and following his need, | and yet being under the Law, if you see my disciples do not have any bread, furnishing themselves with a supply of seeds instead of a table, are you going to complain and lay down<sup>59</sup> the Law? Or do you not know that David was a servant of the Law? And that I, the Son of Man, am Lord of the Sabbath?” [293]

♦ For<sup>60</sup> what reason does he call himself specifically Son of Man? Since being Son of God, it is indeed strange that he deigns to be called “Son of Man.” ♦ And<sup>61</sup> although he mentions Abiathar as the one who was the high priest at the time when David did this, the Book of Kings says “Abimelech”:<sup>62</sup> some might say that his second name was Abimelech as his (name) was also Abiathar, or the description mentions Abimelech as a priest, but the Saviour says that Abiathar happened to be the high priest at the time. And the Book of Kings appears to say that “Abimelech and the priests of God replied to Saul”<sup>63</sup> but does not appear to describe the high priest as the one who replied. ♦

<sup>59</sup> *Lit.* “decide the Law.”

<sup>60</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 293.5–7 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 6.5 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 369). This passage can be found in Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien*, 161.

<sup>61</sup> Smith attributes the final lines of this section to Eusebius of Caesarea (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 369). A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* reveals that *Cat. Marc.* 293.7–15 is an extract from Eusebius of Caesarea, *Commentaria in Psalmos* 33 (PG 23.292.43–293.4).

<sup>62</sup> Some MSS record Ἀχιμελεχ instead of Ἀβιμελεχ. In 1 Samuel 21, the priest is ‘Ahimelech’ and ‘Abiathar’ is his son. 1 Samuel 22.20, together with 2 Samuel 8.17 and 1 Chronicles 18.16 and 24.6 suggest some confusion of these two figures.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. 1 Samuel 22.11–23.



## CHAPTER 3

### 7. *On the man with a withered hand*

(1) And again he went into the synagogue, and a man who had a withered hand was there. (2) And they watched him to see if he would heal him on the Sabbath, so that they might accuse him.

And Luke adds that he came to teach in the synagogue and that the one who was healed<sup>1</sup> had a withered right-hand. And Matthew says, “Jesus said to them, ‘Which person among you, who if they have one sheep, and it falls into a pit on the Sabbath, does not lay hold of it and lift it out? How great, therefore, is the difference between a human being and a sheep?’”<sup>2</sup> All these things come together in a continuous sequence to relax the things relating to the earthly Sabbath.<sup>3</sup> For not even the Lord took his stand solely on these teachings, even though he drew all of them from the divine | scriptures, but [294] also he imparts their deeper meaning<sup>4</sup> by a miracle.

(3) And he said to the man who had a withered hand,<sup>5</sup> “Get up into the middle.” (4) And he said to them, “Is one allowed to do good on the Sabbath or to do harm? To save a life or to kill?” And they were silent.

♦ Looking around<sup>6</sup> in order that he might attract their attention with his eye, he asked the Pharisees, “Is one allowed to heal on the Sabbath, to save a life or to destroy?”<sup>7</sup> And they were silent. For they knew that he would

---

<sup>1</sup> Timeless Aorist.

<sup>2</sup> Matthew 12.11f.

<sup>3</sup> The commentator is referring to the thematic resonance of this and the previous pericope in relating stories about controversies surrounding the Sabbath.

<sup>4</sup> τὴν ὑπόνοιαν—“the undersense,” i.e. “the true meaning that lies at the bottom of something.”

<sup>5</sup> Note the textual variant: τῷ ἐξηραμμένῳ ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα.

<sup>6</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 294.7–14 is an extract from John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 40.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 57.439.7–12.

<sup>7</sup> Note that the text contains a resonance with Luke 6.9 at this point: ἀπολέσαι.

heal him anyway. And so he stood him in the middle, that he might place him in full view,<sup>8</sup> that confounded by the spectacle they might repudiate their wickedness, and taking pity on the man, they might cease from their brutality. And [Mark] says that “he asked,” just like Luke. But Matthew says that “he was asked.”<sup>9</sup> And it is likely that both happened. ♦ And Jesus combines the miracle with a word, saying to the man, “*Stretch out your hand.*”<sup>10</sup> And he stretched it out on the spot, having become healthy simply by the speech of Jesus. And having provided an explanation of all these things for the sake of the disciples, at the same time he also showed that his way of life was much higher than the Law. ♦ But<sup>11</sup> on account of this miracle, they added to their wickedness; and they increased in evil; and they discussed among themselves what they might do to Jesus, having voluntarily hardened their hearts: ♦ for, strangely, what they considered to be permissible<sup>12</sup> for a sheep, they would deny to a human being, for the sake of whose healing one should [be willing to] forfeit the Sabbath rest even more given that a human being is more precious. Therefore envy brought hardness of heart to them. For the real Law of God is in no way for the prevention of good, even though it prescribes the Sabbath rest symbolically.

(5) And looking round at them with anger, grieved by their hardness of heart, he said to the man, “Stretch out your hand”; and he stretched it out, and his hand was restored as healthy as the other.<sup>13</sup>

[295] And the fact that Jesus was distressed at their hardness of heart is consistent with the incarnation which he accepted willingly on our behalf. |

(7) And Jesus withdrew with his disciples across the sea. And a great multitude from Galilee followed him. (8) And having heard<sup>14</sup> everything that he was doing, a great multitude came to him from Judea, and Jerusalem, and Idumea, and beyond the Jordan, from around Tyre

<sup>8</sup> *Lit.* “in their sight.”

<sup>9</sup> Matthew 12.10.

<sup>10</sup> Mark 3.5.

<sup>11</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 294.19–21 are to be attributed to Titus of Bostra, *Commentary on Luke* 6.13 (Smith, “The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,” 369). This passage can be found in Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien*, 161.

<sup>12</sup> *Lit.* “to be conceded.”

<sup>13</sup> Note the textual variant: ὑγιής ὡς ἡ ἄλλη (cf. Matthew 12.13).

<sup>14</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀκούσαντες.

and Sidon. (9) And he told his disciples to have a boat ready for him on account of the crowd, so that they might not crush him: (10) for he healed many so that all who had diseases pressed upon him that they might touch him. (11) And whenever the unclean spirits saw him, they fell down before him and shouted, saying “You are the Son of God.” (12) And he sternly ordered them not to make him known.

*“And Jesus withdrew with his disciples”*<sup>15</sup> in order not to force the issue,<sup>16</sup> which was possible while he was with his enemies, so as not to suffer at their hands. At the same time he grants them a favour, in so far as it was possible, in order that they should not fall prey to the charge of the murder of Christ too quickly. Meanwhile the Evangelist says, *“A great multitude from Galilee followed him, and having heard about him, a great multitude came to him from Judea and Jerusalem, from Idumea, and from beyond the Jordan and around Tyre and Sidon. And he told his disciples to have a boat ready for him on account of the crowd, so that they might not crush him: for he healed many, so that all who had diseases pressed upon him that they might touch him”* and so on.<sup>17</sup> The Evangelist has said these things wanting to make everything more comprehensible. For they do not make up the words for love of honour, or inflate<sup>18</sup> these events in the details of their individual narratives. On the contrary, they restrain their words on account of the weakness of the hearers. For if they attempted to hand on all these things in writing, which would be quite unmanageable, “I suppose that the world itself could not contain the books that would be written,”<sup>19</sup> in the words<sup>20</sup> of | John the theologian. Except that the things about Jesus became [296] widely known in all these countries, and a great crowd ran together to get sight of the things which were happening and to see Jesus at first hand, and also to bring those who suffered various diseases in order that they might gain healing. And when Jesus saw them, he rejoiced at their zeal, and he rewarded their troubles, having healed all of those who were sick. And when the unclean spirits were crying out “You are the Son of God,” and recognising their master by worshipping him, he rebuked them in order that

<sup>15</sup> Mark 3.7.

<sup>16</sup> *Lit.* “the nature of the matter.”

<sup>17</sup> Mark 3.7–11.

<sup>18</sup> *Lit.* “elevate to a height.”

<sup>19</sup> John 21.25.

<sup>20</sup> *Lit.* “according to the expression.”



they might not make him known and in doing so arouse even further the madness of the Scribes and Pharisees and inflame their anger and jealousy.<sup>21</sup> He controlled the timing of the Passion.<sup>22</sup>

### 8. *On the choosing of the apostles*

(13) And he went up onto the mountain, and called to him those whom he wanted: and they came to him. (14) And he appointed twelve in order that they might be with him, and in order that he might send them out to preach.<sup>23</sup>

He went up onto the mountain, as Luke says, to pray. For everywhere as in all things he adds prayer to his miracles, not so as to exercise a virtue but in order that we might learn to pass the night in prayer to God, and whenever good things happen through us, we should acknowledge him as the cause and the creator and the helper, and we should sing hymns in praise of the giver of good things. And perhaps he directs something else and teaches the leaders of the church that before the laying on of hands, they are to pass the night in prayer in order that their ordination might not come to nothing. For he himself, with divine understanding of the hearts of all, and knowing exactly what was about to happen, performed [297] the ordination of his own apostles in this way.<sup>24</sup> And if he chose Judas | willingly, it was in order that he might show that the apostles attain or lose salvation not by nature, but by each one proving himself worthy of either salvation or destruction. For the gospels teach that he knew that Judas was to be a betrayer. Therefore when day came, according to Luke, he called to him those whom he wanted, and having chosen twelve from among them (for there were more present), he called them “apostles,” both equipping them for the task in hand and also for the work which was destined to be accomplished by them, giving them power (that is “authority”) to heal diseases and to drive away demons. Then he says their names in order that you might not be mistaken about their identity, in case any person should claim to have become an Apostle. And he says that he gave Simon the name “Peter” in order that the description might anticipate his work

<sup>21</sup> Note this rather distinctive take on the Messianic Secret. The purpose of this secrecy is to save the Scribes and Pharisees from themselves.

<sup>22</sup> *Lit.* “He set the Passion according to the hour determined by him.”

<sup>23</sup> Note the omission of Mark 3.15–19.

<sup>24</sup> I.e. by spending the night beforehand in prayer.

prophetically. For he has called him “Peter” because he was going to build on a rock [and] because his word was unbroken and his faith was unshaken. And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, he named “Boanerges,” which is “Sons of Thunder,” on account of the great, even deafening, doctrines of theology which would resound throughout the world, and so on, and so on ... in order that you may learn the identity of the twelve.

(20) And they<sup>25</sup> came home, and again the crowd came together, so that it was not<sup>26</sup> even possible for them to eat any bread. (21) And when they heard, those from beside him<sup>27</sup> went out to restrain him, for they were saying that he had gone out of his mind.

Therefore, when he has chosen them, he comes home, and again a crowd gathers, so that they are not able to eat any bread. “*And when they heard, those from beside him went out to restrain him, for they were saying that he had gone out of his mind.*”<sup>28</sup> Who heard, or from where they went out, he has not described clearly. Therefore, believing that the Evangelist is speaking about the Pharisees and the Scribes, that having heard about him and the crowd around him, being filled by malign influences with Bacchic frenzy in anger, they ran over to restrain him, supposing him to suffer what they themselves suffered. For to suppose that the performer of such wonders, the benefactor of souls, and the teacher of divine wisdom | had been driven out of his mind is clear madness and distraction of mind. From this point he goes on to describe them clearly, when he says, “*The scribes*” and so on.<sup>29</sup> [298]

(22) And the scribes who had come down from Jerusalem said, “He has Beelzebul, and by the ruler of demons, he casts out demons.”

Since they could not contradict what was happening, they attempted to bring him into discredit in another way, saying that he cast out demons by Beelzebul the ruler of demons; as the multitude were more well-disposed than the rulers. For the rulers were prevented by their concern for honour

<sup>25</sup> Note the textual variant: ἔρχονται.

<sup>26</sup> Note the textual variant: μήτε.

<sup>27</sup> Although οἱ παρ’αὐτοῦ is usually taken to refer to the family of Jesus, at one point the catenist adopts a different reading. Consequently, the translation demands a literal approach because the catenist’s interpretation turns on the ambiguity of this phrase.

<sup>28</sup> Mark 3.21.

<sup>29</sup> Mark 3.22.

from making a righteous judgement, but the mind of the multitude was not darkened by this. Where the mind is not darkened, it sees more keenly, and they were lead on towards the recognition of the Lord. But the teachers of the Law are making a false accusation, when they suppose the deliverance to have been by evil, a fact totally opposed to divine instruction.

(23) And calling them to him, he spoke to them in parables, “How can Satan cast out Satan? (24) And if a kingdom is divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand, (25) and if a house is divided against itself, that house cannot stand,<sup>30</sup> (26) and if Satan has risen up against himself, he is divided and cannot stand, but his end has come.”

By these examples, he presented a very strong refutation of the fact that this is not even possible: for of necessity, when a divided kingdom is torn apart by internal enemies, is either completely destroyed or greatly diminished: and it is possible to see the same thing also happening in a similar way in the home and in the city. Surely then the kingdom of Satan, if it is divided against itself (and Satan drives Satan away from people), then it seems that the abolition of the demons is close at hand for their strength is in their rule over people. If they take this away from themselves, it is no different [299] from saying that their kingdom is undone. But if | the kingdom of evil stands united, and rules over people still, it is clear that it is not divided against itself.

(27) “No one<sup>31</sup> can enter a strong man’s house and plunder his possessions, without first binding the strong man, and then he will plunder his house.”

Surely then since people have become the possessions of demons and stand under their power because of their vices, ♦ it was<sup>32</sup> impossible for the demons to be deprived of their own property, without first being defeated

<sup>30</sup> Note the textual variant: οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι ἡ οἰκία ἐκείνη.

<sup>31</sup> Note the textual variant: οὐδεὶς δύναται τὰ σκεύη τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ.

<sup>32</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 299.7 and 299.9–12 are extracts from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragments on the Gospel of Matthew* Fr. 68 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 119). Harold Smith attributed these passages to Theodore of Mopsuestia on the grounds that all passages common to the *catena* and Isho’dad of Merv have Theodore as their common source. (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 358). However, a more systematic search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* suggests that Isho’dad shared both the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Apollinaris of Laodicea with the catenist.

and tied up with chains, so as to make it impossible for them to fight again for their own possessions. This would never come to pass at the hands of the demons, since it was not possible for them to rob themselves of their power with respect to human beings. ♦

(28) Truly I say to you, All the sins will be forgiven to people,<sup>33</sup> even the blasphemies which they utter. But whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit has no forgiveness ever, but is bound by an everlasting judgement<sup>34</sup>—for they were saying, “He has an unclean spirit.”

♦ Just<sup>35</sup> as here the forgiveness of sins is not mentioned without a possibility of repentance, so also blasphemy against the Spirit will not hold repentance totally unacceptable: for it is hard for this to be totally unconscious: given also the generosity of the fact that all people are progressing toward salvation.

He states that blasphemy against God is unpardonable in the name of the Spirit: for just as the activity of the Spirit is the Kingdom of God, so also blasphemy against the Spirit becomes blasphemy against God. The rejection of God is unforgivable, as in such rejection, there is no possibility of pardon. For blasphemy against the Son in comparison with blasphemy against the Spirit does have pardon, according to what he was considered to be then, and he was seen as a man, coming in low estate and of a race which was easily despised: and “not being forgiven in the present age nor in the age to come”<sup>36</sup> | refers to both judgement according to the Law and future judgement. For given that the Law requires God, being accused, to be condemned to death, and given that the Lord upholds the Law, he does not give pardon to such a person. Forgiveness through baptism gets passed over in silence in this discussion,<sup>37</sup> since it was not yet time to argue with the Jews about this. For somehow this forgiveness is found between the judgement in this age and that in the world to come, because everyone who is baptized leaves this age and is tested somehow between the present and

[300]

<sup>33</sup> *Lit.* “the sons of men.”

<sup>34</sup> Note the textual variant:  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ .

<sup>35</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 299.19–300.19 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* Fr. 73 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 21). In Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Laud. Gr. 33 (folio 96), *Cat. Marc.* 299.19–23 is placed at the bottom of the page in the shape of a trapezoid. This appears to give this passage added emphasis.

<sup>36</sup> Matthew 12.31.

<sup>37</sup> I.e. the discussion in vv. 28–29.

the future life. And so he is able to obtain release from the judgement of the Law because as Paul says, “It is God who justifies—who will condemn?”<sup>38</sup> Therefore to describe as things of the demon the miracles and the release from demons, which are only for the Spirit to do, leaves to you no defence or pardon for blasphemy. But he has made these things known not to dismiss blasphemy against himself completely, nor to allow the opportunity of repentance to those who blaspheme against the Spirit, even if they were to wish it,—but by way of comparison, to say that blasphemy against him, as one who was thought to be just a human being, is deemed to be less important than blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. ♦

(31) And so his brothers and his mother came,<sup>39</sup> and standing outside,<sup>40</sup> they sent for him and called him.<sup>41</sup> (32) A crowd was sitting around him, and they said<sup>42</sup> to him, “Look, your mother and your brothers and sisters are outside looking for you.” (33) And he replied to them saying,<sup>43</sup> “Who are my mother and my brothers?” (34) And looking around at those seated around him in a circle, he said, “Here are my mother and my brothers. (35) For whoever does the will of God is my brother and my sister and my mother.”

♦ He shows<sup>44</sup> that he prefers those who are of the household of faith, in comparison with any family connexion; and he says these things not [301] rejecting his mother and brothers at all, but he shows that he prefers | the relationship of the soul in comparison with any relationship of nature: this is why these things get expressed<sup>45</sup> even though he cares about his family. For to the one who thinks that he should describe the company of his relatives in a better way, it was also necessary for him to say this for the instruction of

<sup>38</sup> Romans 8.33.

<sup>39</sup> Note the textual variant: ἔρχονται οὖν.

<sup>40</sup> Note the textual variant: ἑστῶτες.

<sup>41</sup> Note the textual variant: φωνοῦντες.

<sup>42</sup> Note the textual variant: εἶπον.

<sup>43</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων.

<sup>44</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 300.29–301.4 is an extract attributed by Smith to Theodore of Mopsuestia. (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 369). Reference to *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* confirms that this passage is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragments on the Gospel of Matthew* Fr. 71.1–4 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 119–120).

<sup>45</sup> The syntax is not clear at this point. There is an inconsistency in the number of the subject, governing the participle and the verb.

those present. ♦ Alternatively,<sup>46</sup> it says that his brothers had not yet believed in him, as we learn from John.<sup>47</sup> And that, according to Mark, they tried to detain him since he was out of his mind.<sup>48</sup> And since they were of this mind, the Lord was not mindful of them as relatives: ♦ but we learn that we stand as relatives of Christ, established according to the Spirit.

---

<sup>46</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 301.5–8 is an extract from Apollinaris. (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 369). A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* reveals that this passage is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaem* Fr. 75.1–4 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 22).

<sup>47</sup> John 7.5.

<sup>48</sup> Mark 3.21 There is a clear point of conflict within the *Catena* between this reading of Mark (attributed to Apollinaris) and the earlier passage which does not identify οἱ παρ'αὐτοῦ with the relatives of Jesus.



## CHAPTER 4

### 9. *On the Parable of the Sower*

(1) And again he began to teach beside the sea: and such a large crowd gathered around him so that he embarked and sat on a small boat on the sea: and the whole crowd was beside the sea on the land. (2) And he taught them many things in parables, and in his' teaching he said to them.

He sits besides the sea in the middle of crowds and begins his discourse; and because there is not enough open space due to the over-crowding of the multitude, he gets onto a boat. Actions come about constructively when there is a need. Therefore, from the sea he teaches those standing on the land; on a boat (in the usual way), and not by going on the sea itself (even though he was able to do this), in order that he might not drive out what was heard from their minds on account of their amazement nor appear more like a miracle-worker than a teacher. For a marvel that is excessive and does not happen out of compassion, he held to be an untimely miracle. Since he had performed many signs, he now grants them the benefit of his teaching. ♦ And he sits<sup>2</sup> on the boat, fishing and entangling those on the land in his net. And this is how he sat. For the Evangelist has not put this in simple terms, in order that he might describe the scene in detail. | He indicates that from the wide expanse of the sea, he left no-one behind his back and he kept everyone face to face. And sitting there, he spoke loudly and clearly in parables: ♦ and all the parables, which he places here one after another, are a foretelling of either what is the case without the proclamation of the gospel, or what will be in the case of the proclamation of the gospel. And he says these things for many other reasons as well, thinking that the proclamation of these things is necessary for him, in particular, so that he would not seem, like the rest of those beginning teaching, to be proclaiming the Gospel in ignorance of what will be. Therefore, he foretells both the growth of the proclamation [302]

---

<sup>1</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 301.18: ἀὐτοῦ not αὐτοῦ.

<sup>2</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 301.28–302.2 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 44.3 (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 367). This passage can be found in PG 57.466.62–467.9.



and the worthlessness of the disobedient, or the vanity of those who go forward in the Gospel without a proper disposition. But truly he makes use of their zeal in his teaching, so that it becomes completely clear to those who are listening that he knows perfectly well what kind of thing will happen concerning the gospel: he makes all these points for the sake of the zealous.

(3) “Listen. See, a sower went out to sow. (4) And as he sowed, some seed fell beside the path, and the birds of the sky came and ate it up; (5) other seed fell on rocky ground, where it did not have much soil, and immediately it sprang up, because it had no depth of soil: (6) and when the sun rose, it was scorched, and since it had no root, it withered away. (7) And other seed fell among thorns, and the thorns grew up and choked it, and it gave no fruit. (8) And other<sup>3</sup> seed fell on good soil, and it gave fruit, and growing up and increasing, it yielded thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and one hundredfold.”

◆ He<sup>4</sup> places this parable first because it makes the hearer more attentive. For since he was about to give an address mysteriously on account of the scribes and Pharisees being mixed up with the multitude, first through the parable he stimulates the minds of those who are listening; and in addition to this, in order that he might make his discourse more emphatic, he speaks loudly and clearly in parables so that he might fix it more in their memory, and bring the matters before their sight. And the prophets | did this also: [303] therefore “he opens his mouth in parables,”<sup>5</sup> as the psalmist puts it, and he says, “*A sower went out to sow.*”<sup>6</sup> From where did the one who is present everywhere, who fills all things, go out? This refers not to a place, but to his nature and his incarnation, coming closer to us by dwelling in the flesh. For since we were not able to go in, our sins walling up the entrance, he had to come out to us. Therefore he came to sow the word of godliness; for by seed here he means his teaching, and by arable land he means the souls of human beings. “*And some seed fell beside the path.*”<sup>7</sup> And he does not say that he

<sup>3</sup> Note the textual variant: ἄλλο. NA<sup>27</sup> prefers ἕλλα.

<sup>4</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 302.26–304.24 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 44.3–4 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in PG 57.467.16–469.34.

<sup>5</sup> Psalm 78.2 (77.2 LXX): ἀνοιξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου—“I will open my mouth in parables.”

<sup>6</sup> Mark 1.3.

<sup>7</sup> Mark 1.4.

threw the seeds, but that they fell. And some fell on rock, and some among thorns, and some fell on good soil. So a quarter was saved; and not even this bears fruit equally. But even here there is a great difference. And he said these things, showing that he told all these things without any resentment, for just as the sower makes no distinction in the land underfoot, simply and indiscriminately throwing his seed, so also he tells everybody, fulfilling his part while knowing already what will be, in order that he might say, "What should I have done, that I have not done?"<sup>8</sup> And the prophets speak to the people as if about a vine, but he speaks about seeds, showing that obedience for everybody now will be quick and easier, and will immediately give fruit. But whenever you hear, "*The sower went out to sow*,"<sup>9</sup> do not imagine it a needless repetition; for the sower goes out often, and for different kinds of business, either to plough, or to cut up evil weeds, or to attend to something else; but he went out to sow. Therefore why was the greater part of the seed lost? This was not because of the sower, but because of the soil which received it, that is, the soul which heard [it]. And why, do you suppose, did he not say this directly? This is because he does not want to rebuke them severely, in case he should cast them into despair, but he leaves the reproach to the one who understands among his hearers, and he tells this parable to prepare<sup>10</sup> and to teach his disciples, that even though the lost may be more in number than those who receive the word, | they are not to be discouraged. For this happened also to your Master, and he, who saw everything beforehand, knowing that these things would be, did not refrain from sowing. For the farmer would reasonably be held to account for where he scatters the seed, but the teacher would have great praise. And the farmer would reasonably be held to account for doing this: for it is not possible for the rock to become soil, or for the path not to be the path, or for there to be no thorns: but in spiritual things, it is not so. For it is possible for the rock to be transformed and to become rich land, and for the path no longer to be trampled on or to lie open to all that pass by, but to become as ploughed land, and for the thorns to disappear, and for the seeds to have plenty of space. For if it were not possible, he would not have sowed in this way. And you mark my words, that there is not only one way to destruction,<sup>11</sup> but there are several. For the ones like the path are the careless and the scornful, those like the rock are the weaker ones, with the teaching wasting away even when

[304]

---

<sup>8</sup> Isaiah 5.4.

<sup>9</sup> Mark 1.3.

<sup>10</sup> *Lit.* "to anoint with oil" as in gymnastic training.

<sup>11</sup> *Lit.* "of destruction."

nobody abuses it, even more so when there are tribulations at hand. And the ones among the thorns are even more inexcusable than these. And finally he mentions the good soil, not abandoning us to despair, but giving us the hope of repentance, that it is possible to change from the things which have been said into this. But even though the soil is good and the sower is one and the seeds are the same,<sup>12</sup> why is there a hundredfold and sixtyfold and thirtyfold? Here again the difference is because of the nature of the soil, which is to say, because of free will. Great is the generosity of the farmer, because he receives the first, and he does not cast out the second, and he gives space to the third. ♦

(9) And he said, “Let him, who has<sup>13</sup> ears to hear, listen.” (10) And when he was alone, those who were around him along with the twelve asked him about the parable. (11) And he said to them, “To you has been given to know the mystery of the Kingdom of God, but to those outside, everything comes in parables.”

[305] ♦ When<sup>14</sup> the Evangelist says “*and he said to them*”<sup>15</sup> about his teaching, he shows that his word is his own and not another’s. For it is not | the teaching of Peter or Paul, but of the Saviour: “for,” he said, “a sower went out to sow his seed.” And the Saviour also said, “Do not call anyone ‘Teacher’ on earth, for you have one teacher who is in heaven,”<sup>16</sup> and the only true teacher is the one who speaks without learning. ♦ The Saviour<sup>17</sup> said these things and gave the interpretation: “*And when he was alone, those around him with the twelve asked him*” and so on.<sup>18</sup> “In order that he might say that since you are worthy to learn everything of the proclamation which pertains towards teaching, you will also learn the exposition of the parables. Whereas for these others,

<sup>12</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 204.20–21: διὰ τὸ marks the beginning of the apodosis, following the conditional εἰ in the previous sentence. Running the last sentence of the previous paragraph and the first sentence of the next paragraph creates much more sense: if the conditions are the same, why are there such differences in the yield?.

<sup>13</sup> Note the textual variant: ὁ ἔχων.

<sup>14</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 304.30–305.5 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 8.5 (Smith, “The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,” 367). This passage can be found in Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien*, 173.

<sup>15</sup> Mark 1.11.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Matthew 23.7.

<sup>17</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 305.6–12 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Mattheum* 72.7–8 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 120).

<sup>18</sup> Mark 4.10.

I have used parables in teaching, since they are not worthy to learn, given the vice of their way of life.” ♦ For the Lord came to them, neither ignoring the Jews who disbelieved nor moving them completely towards faith, but he confounded them with signs, which were perfectly adequate for even the hardened and the stupid to be persuaded, so that through these things they would be without excuse concerning their unbelief: and he did not give them any advantage in terms of knowledge, because not submitting themselves to obedience to his Law (which they accepted), and judging that to share in the new word was not righteous, they were deprived of both. For the old is also in the new, but where the new is not, neither is the old still able to have space. Therefore he shows by the example of the obedience of disciples that on account of their denial, their descendants<sup>19</sup> are unworthy of clear teaching. And, in general, speaking in parables, rather than being completely silent, indicates to those, who do not go near the good, that even if the good were to appear by itself, then it appears obscurely rather than clearly; just as the shape of a body is not discerned clearly by those standing from afar. “Nor do you want,” he says, “to provide the unfolding of wisdom to those who are completely disobedient”; for whenever someone cultivates a pious disposition and orthodox opinion, they<sup>20</sup> will receive the revelation of hidden secrets with great abundance; but whenever someone does not have a sound understanding, they<sup>21</sup> will not be worthy to accept listening to what is readily available to many people.

(12) “In order that seeing they might see, and not perceive; and | [306]  
hearing they might hear, and not understand: so that they may not  
turn again and their sins<sup>22</sup> be forgiven.”

And then by the addition of the prophetic voice, he proves their wickedness as it had been preached long ago. “For seeing, they will not see. And they will not perceive. And they will hear and they will not understand,”<sup>23</sup> for they will not want to inherit his grace. Wherefore he says, “Behold, you were sold in your sins: and because of your iniquity, I put your mother away. Why was no one there when I came? Why did no one listen when I called?”<sup>24</sup> ♦ And

<sup>19</sup> I.e. the Jews.

<sup>20</sup> *Lit.* “he.”

<sup>21</sup> *Lit.* “he.”

<sup>22</sup> Note the textual variant in *Cat. Marc* 306.2: τὰ ἀμαρτήματα.

<sup>23</sup> Isaiah 6.9–10.

<sup>24</sup> Isaiah 50.1–2.

so<sup>25</sup> they were able “to see” through the grace of the one who was seen; but they did not “perceive” because they closed their eyes and they pretended not to see. And in the same way, they did not “hear” because they did not want to “understand” what was said and they were contemptuous of what was said. ♦ And thus it will come to pass that they will not be delivered from their own sins, and they will be hostile towards their own salvation.

(21) And he said to them, “Does a light come so that it may be placed under the bushel basket, or under the bed? And does it not come in order that it may be placed on the lamp stand?”

♦ The one,<sup>26</sup> who wants to apply the lamp even to the most perfect of the disciples of Jesus, will put us to shame by what has been said according to John: that he was the light, which was kindled and shone.<sup>27</sup> But also the saying, “The light of the body is the eye,”<sup>28</sup> if we apply its meaning to each person, will be applicable to all people. But the saying “Be dressed for action, and let your lamps be kindled,”<sup>29</sup> is about all the disciples of Jesus. Therefore someone will say that what is said refers to this present life, that the spiritual person should not hide the lamp which is revealed in the soul, but put it on a lamp stand: as a symbol of which Moses placed a lamp stand in the tent of witness.<sup>30</sup>

[307] Therefore the lamp must not be “under the bushel”<sup>31</sup> of the measure of corn: for by a bushel let the fellow slaves be rationed by the trustworthy and prudent steward, and let | all in the house of the Church see the rays of the lamp standing on the lamp stand and disclosing the word. And neither do they put the lamp “under the bed,”<sup>32</sup> where one may take rest, nor under any other object. For the one, who does this, does not think beforehand

<sup>25</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 306.9–14 is an extract from Eusebius of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Isaiam* 1.42.49–55 (J. Ziegler, *Eusebius Werke, Band 9: Der Jesajakommentar [Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller]*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975]: 42).

<sup>26</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 306.20–307.16 is an extract from Origen, *Fragmenta in Lucam* 121a, 121b, 121c, 121d, 121e (M. Rauer, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 9, 2nd edn. [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 49 (35)]. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959]: 275–276).

<sup>27</sup> John 1.8.

<sup>28</sup> Matthew 6.22 and Luke 11.34.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Luke 12.35 *Lit.* “Let your loins be girded, and let your lamps be kindled.”

<sup>30</sup> An allegorical reading of Exodus 26.35.

<sup>31</sup> Mark 4.21.

<sup>32</sup> Mark 4.21.

about those, who come into the house and for whom it is necessary to set up a lamp stand, for they are the ones who bring light to the natural mind by the true light and the radiant word and the rays of wisdom: which is precisely why the Creator provided it, because a lamp stands in need of kindling by the word and wisdom and the truth of the true light. And one must consider that the command “Let your lamps be kindled”<sup>33</sup> is fulfilled by those who have taken thought beforehand to have the most clear-sighted mind, which also participates in the one who said, “I am the light which has come into the world.”<sup>34</sup> For those who kindle the lamp and place it on the lamp stand in order that it may give light to all in the house, will persuade those in the house who see the brightness of the lamp, even themselves to kindle their own lamp stand. ♦ Therefore it says with some force, “I kindled<sup>35</sup> the light, but for it to remain burning, let it be through your zeal, and not on your account only, but also for those who are about to profit from its ray and to be guided towards the truth. For if you live your life with discipline, your detractors will not be able to obscure your lamps with shadows.”

(22) For there is nothing hidden, that will not be made known; and there is nothing secret, that will not be disclosed.

♦ And again<sup>36</sup> by these words he leads them to a discipline of life, and he teaches them to be like those taking part in a contest, as set before the eyes of all, and contending for a prize in the middle of the theatre of the whole world. For, “what is more,” he says, “do not imagine that we are now sitting here, and we are in a small part of a corner of the earth. For in this way you will be conspicuous to all, as a lamp shining on a lamp stand in a house.” Where now are those who disbelieve in the power of Christ? Let them hear these things, and amazed at the power of his prophecy, let them adore his strength. For by this he also makes them more attentive, when he adds: ♦ | [308]

(23) “Let the one,<sup>37</sup> who has ears to hear, listen.”

<sup>33</sup> Luke 12.35.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. John 1.9, 8.12, 9.5.

<sup>35</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 307.17: ἡψα.

<sup>36</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 307.24–308.5 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 15.11. (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 57.232.29–43.

<sup>37</sup> Note the textual variant: ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούέτω.

♦ For<sup>38</sup> consider how great were the things which he promised to those who were not even well-known in their own country: that land and sea should know them, and that they should be distinguished to the ends of the world not by fame alone, but also by their work of benevolence. ♦

(24) And he said to them, “Pay attention to what you hear. By the measure you measure, it will be measured to you, and it will be repeated for those of you who hear.”<sup>39</sup> (25) For whoever has, [more] will be given to him, and whoever does not have anything, even what he has will be taken away from him.”

He adds, “*Pay attention to what you hear.*”<sup>40</sup> Be sober on account of the measure of obedience, and knowledge will be given, and as much wisdom as anyone would wish for will be obtained by zeal, receiving in turn a measure over and above what one gives: for the good or bad in human beings is not without measure. This is according to the following proportion—“for the measure we give will be the measure we get back, that is, a good measure, which has been shaken together, pressed down, overflows, and which is delivered into our lap.”<sup>41</sup>

For whoever has a desire and zeal for hearing and asking, more will be given to them.<sup>42</sup> But whoever does not have passion for divine instruction because of their presumption, even if they thought they had something of the written Law, it will be taken away from them,<sup>43</sup> just as it says “the Kingdom of heaven will be taken from you, and will be given to a people that produces the fruit of the Kingdom.”<sup>44</sup> He speaks in riddles to those who boast in their knowledge of the Mosaic Law, and who plug their ears so as not to hear the teaching of the Lord.

He calls “the Kingdom of God” faith in himself, and he speaks of his appearance in flesh in keeping with the (divine) economy, which is consistent with “the Kingdom of heaven is at hand”<sup>45</sup> and “the Kingdom of God

---

<sup>38</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 308.2–5 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 15.11. (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 57.232.43–47.

<sup>39</sup> Note the textual variant: τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.

<sup>40</sup> Mark 4.24.

<sup>41</sup> A paraphrase of Luke 6.38.

<sup>42</sup> *Lit.* “him.”

<sup>43</sup> *Lit.* “him.”

<sup>44</sup> Matthew 21.43.

<sup>45</sup> Matthew 4.17.

is within you,”<sup>46</sup> which he says to the disciples. Therefore the Kingdom is like “*when a man scatters seed on the ground.*”<sup>47</sup> And indeed he is “*a man,*” and who will know him? For, he, being God and Son of God before the beginning of the ages,<sup>48</sup> has become immutably man for us, and he sows | the land and illuminates the whole world with the word of the knowl- [309] edge of God; and he is taken up into heaven, as though “*he sleeps,*”<sup>49</sup> or as it says somewhere else, “*went to another country,*”<sup>50</sup> and he waits through patience and forbearance for those who received it to bear fruit, as well as those who continue to receive the seed and the saving word. By night and by day “*he is awake,*”<sup>51</sup> which is consistent with the saying, “*Wake up! Why do you sleep, O Lord? Rise and do not reject us for ever.*”<sup>52</sup> With the words of prophecy, he stirs us up to bear fruit, with “*the weapons of righteousness for the right hand,*”<sup>53</sup> which are more auspicious (for “*the day*” stands for the radiant gleam of goodness), and with [the weapons of righteousness] “*for the left hand,*”<sup>54</sup> which are less promising (for “*the night*” stands for enduring the trials of both persecution and discipline). For because of these things, “*the seed sprouts and grows.*”<sup>55</sup> ♦ But<sup>56</sup> he says “*how he does not know*”<sup>57</sup> in order to say that he entrusts the action to the autonomous free will of those who receive the word, and he does not control everything himself: [this] is in order that our goodness may not be an involuntary action for us. This is why this saying follows, “*For the land bears fruit of itself,*”<sup>58</sup> not by force constraining its free will, nor by the course of the stars, nor by fortune or destiny (as the rash and foolish would say), but by the faculty of free choice

---

<sup>46</sup> Luke 17.21.

<sup>47</sup> Mark 4.26 Note that this passage is without parallels in the Synoptic tradition.

<sup>48</sup> Note the anti-Arian emphasis of this construction.

<sup>49</sup> Mark 4.27.

<sup>50</sup> Matthew 21.33. It is possible that the phrase suggests a similar allegorical reading of the Parable of the Wicked Tenants.

<sup>51</sup> Mark 4.27.

<sup>52</sup> Psalm 44.23 (LXX 43.26).

<sup>53</sup> 2 Corinthians 6.7. According to Victor Furnish, this reference to bearing the weapons of righteousness on the right hand and the left suggests being *fully armed*, with a sword in one hand and a shield in the other. (Victor Furnish, *2 Corinthians, The Anchor Bible Series* (New York: Doubleday, 1984), 346). Here, the commentator seems to suggest that the left-hand has a more sinister connotation.

<sup>54</sup> 2 Corinthians 6.7.

<sup>55</sup> Mark 4.27.

<sup>56</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 309.12–19 is attributed by Harold Smith to Theodore of Mopsuestia (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 368).

<sup>57</sup> Mark 4.27.

<sup>58</sup> Mark 4.28.



sent forth for this purpose. And the earth “*bears fruit, first the stalk*”<sup>59</sup> by the law of nature, and little by little it sends forth shoots to perfection. ♦ And since those who have only just received the word are given milk to drink like infants, they fall back on the stalks, as those who are weak eat vegetables and avail themselves of the food which is incommensurable with the bread made of barley. Then it bears also “*the ear*,”<sup>60</sup> which is brought to the altar of the Lord and becomes a sheaf for those who “come in fervent joy and carrying their sheaves.”<sup>61</sup> And “*whenever the fruit comes*,”<sup>62</sup> and the fields are ripe for harvesting,<sup>63</sup> the good farmer will stretch out his sickle so that he may gather the grain into the stores. For to gain salvation, it is not enough for us to germinate simply like a green shoot, through obedience. We also need courage, so that we may stand like a full-grown stalk of corn and despise the winds which blow (or the trials), and stretch the majesty of the soul to its full height; and we need an enduring patience, in order that like an ear of corn [310] we may finally bring forth fruit | and we may make him perfectly known by the complete accomplishment of virtue, filling the hand of the harvester and kept safe for the blessing of the Lord. And “*the harvest*”<sup>64</sup> would be the time of the End. “*The sickle*”<sup>65</sup> is “the word of the Lord living and active and sharper than any double-edged sword, and penetrates as far as the separation of the soul and of the spirit, of the joints and of the marrow, and is able to discern the thoughts and reflections of the heart.”<sup>66</sup> This is the one who has everything “exposed and laid open to his eyes.”<sup>67</sup> For here “*the sickle*” does not reveal *punishment* and *curse*, as in the prophet Zechariah,<sup>68</sup> since it does not prevail against those bearing fruit, “For the axe is laid to the root of those who do not produce fruit and they are thrown into the fire.”<sup>69</sup> And this sickle lies in the hand of the harvester, in order that none of the grain may be lost. He says this to indicate that for this kind of fruit, he “*sends forth the sickle*”<sup>70</sup> himself: whereas, in the parable of the tares, “he sends his angels to gather from out of his Kingdom all the snares and the evil-doers; in order

---

<sup>59</sup> Mark 4.28.

<sup>60</sup> Mark 4.28.

<sup>61</sup> An allusion to Psalm 126.6 (LXX 125.6).

<sup>62</sup> Mark 4.29.

<sup>63</sup> An allusion to John 4.35.

<sup>64</sup> Mark 4.29.

<sup>65</sup> Mark 4.29.

<sup>66</sup> Hebrews 4.12.

<sup>67</sup> Hebrews 4.13.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Zechariah 5.

<sup>69</sup> This passage appears to be a conflation of Matthew 7.19 and Luke 3.9.

<sup>70</sup> Mark 4.29.

that they may throw them into the furnace of fire.”<sup>71</sup> For they are not worthy of the right hand of the Most High. Therefore this parable is told concerning the righteous alone. And the first parable puts people in four categories, three which perish in a variety of ways, and one which is saved according to the proportion of faith and works. And of the latter, he has described in terms of three different kinds.<sup>72</sup> But here, he has described one kind (drawing the three kinds into one single category), for all bear grain, even if not equally to each other.

(30) And he said, “To what<sup>73</sup> shall we liken the Kingdom of God? Or with what kind of parable shall we compare it? (31) It is like a seed of mustard, which, when sown in the earth, is smaller than all the seeds which are in the earth. (32) Yet when it is sown, it grows and becomes larger than all the shrubs, and it puts forth large branches so that the birds of the air can make nests in its shade.” (33) And with many such parables he spoke the word to them, | as they were able to hear. (34) [311] And he did not speak to them except in parables; but he explained everything privately to his disciples.

◆ The word of faith<sup>74</sup> is brief in the preaching to the world, and whatever is taught among human beings at large, this is proclaimed in the briefest words: but the wisdom spoken among the perfect expands and increases the word, inasmuch as it can only be expanded and increased in truth. For nothing is greater than truth. ◆

Then those, who are flighty in mind and exalted by their own words, long for the “*shade*”<sup>75</sup> under the true word and they take refuge under it.

<sup>71</sup> Matthew 13.41–42.

<sup>72</sup> I.e. “the thirty, sixty and a hundredfold.”

<sup>73</sup> Note the numerous textual variants in this passage.

<sup>74</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 311.4–8 is an extract from Isidore of Pelusium, *Epistulae* 6.76. (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 368). Isidore of Pelusium (ca. 355–ca. 435) trained in rhetoric in Pelusium (in the Nile Delta) before living for some time in Alexandria. Around the year 413, he joined a monastery near Pelusium, where he dedicated his life to prayer and biblical studies. He was a great devotee of John Chrysostom and had a profound influence on Cyril of Alexandria. He did not write commentaries as such, but his exegesis can be found in his letters, of which over 2000 survive. A selection of letters has recently been published in a new critical edition in P. Évieux, ed., *Isidore de Peluse. Lettres 1 and 2*, SC 422 and 454 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 422: 1997 and 454: 2000).

<sup>75</sup> Mark 4.32.

Then this blessed Evangelist, rejoicing in brevity<sup>76</sup> and indicating the form of the parables, adds “*And with many such parables he spoke to them*” and so on.<sup>77</sup> It is the best of teachers who make their words match the condition of their hearers, and who do not cast pearls before swine,<sup>78</sup> and who do not expose such great things to contempt by expressing themselves clearly.<sup>79</sup> ♦ And Matthew<sup>80</sup> points out that he is not being innovative in such a form of words, and he introduces the Prophet<sup>81</sup> stating first the manner of his teaching. And teaching us the purpose of Christ, that he gave instruction so that they might not be ignorant, but that he might lead them to ask questions, he adds “*And he spoke to them in many parables*”:<sup>82</sup> and yet, no one asked him questions even though they often asked the prophets: but these people did no such thing. “*And privately he explained everything to his disciples*,”<sup>83</sup> we may presume, means “*everything*,” which they sought to learn from him about the parable of the sower and the parable of the tares.<sup>84</sup> ♦ For he leaves the rest uninterpreted, saying to them “‘Have you

---

<sup>76</sup> Note the connection with the previous paragraph: the form of the Evangelist’s writing reinforces the claim made by Isidore.

<sup>77</sup> Mark 4:33.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Matthew 7:6.

<sup>79</sup> In the fourth century, it was a commonplace that the central rites and doctrines of the Christian Church should be hidden from those who did not belong to it. This ‘doctrine of reserve’ or the *disciplina arcana* found scriptural warrant in Matthew 7:6: “Do not give what is holy to the dogs, or throw your pearls before swine.” Consequently, it was common practice to dismiss those who were not baptized and those who were catechumens before the Eucharistic rite in the liturgy. However, the practice of catechesis varied from place to place: for instance, in Jerusalem, it was Cyril’s practice to teach the creed to the catechumens only a few days before baptism and to teach the newly baptized the mysteries of the faith after baptism, while John Chrysostom simply instructed the candidates in advance. (For a more extensive discussion, see Edward Yarnold, *Cyril of Jerusalem, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2000), 49–55). It is interesting to note that preaching in parables is also presented by the catenist as a scriptural warrant for this “doctrine of reserve.”

<sup>80</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 311.17–25 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 47.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.481.26–46.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Matthew 13:34–35: Matthew draws upon this passage and upon Psalm 78:2 “I will open my mouth in a parable,” which he describes as *prophetic*, to explain Jesus’ use of parables. According to Davies and Allison, Matthew “probably understood the psalms to be largely prophetic.” (Davies and Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 2.425).

<sup>82</sup> Mark 4:33.

<sup>83</sup> Mark 4:34.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Matthew 13:24–30 and 13:36–43: clearly, the absence of the Parable of the Tares from Mark’s text (and the inclusion of the reference to Chrysostom’s discussion of it in this catena)

understood all these things?' And they said, 'Yes, Lord'.<sup>85</sup> For what the Lord was seeking in his hearers was understanding. For a lesson is learnt when it is understood, and on the whole what has not been understood is lost. This he has already | foretold in the parable. This is why he had to ask [312] whether they had mastered the divine seed through understanding; and the question is not out of ignorance, but for the awakening of the attention of his hearers, and for their own training; and parables are things which are spoken and need clarification; but they, from what was said and intended earlier, understand these things as well; and this is why it says "*he explained everything*"<sup>86</sup> to them.

#### 10. *On the calming of the waters*

(35) And on that day, when evening came, he said to them, "Let us go across to the other side." (36) And leaving the crowd behind, they took him with them in the boat, just as he was. (37) And other boats were with him. And a great storm arose: and the waves beat into the boat, so that it was already being swamped.

◆ And Mark,<sup>87</sup> set free from the strict chronology<sup>88</sup> demanded of him, tells it in this way, and Luke likewise.<sup>89</sup> But Matthew does not do so but maintains the sequence here. For they did not write everything in the same way. And these things are said in order that no-one might suppose the omission to be a disagreement. Therefore, sending the crowds away, or rather sending them ahead, he took the disciples with himself. And he took them neither at random nor without purpose, but with the consequence that he might make them spectators of the miracle which was about to take place: and in order that they might not think too highly of themselves (given that while

---

should not be simply read as an unfortunate error or oversight. It perhaps demonstrates the way in which the catenist reads Mark in the light of Matthew (and not vice versa); hence the following statement to the effect that Mark leaves the rest uninterpreted.

<sup>85</sup> Matthew 13.51.

<sup>86</sup> Mark 4.34.

<sup>87</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 312.16–313.31 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 28.1–2. (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 365). This passage may be found in PG 57.349.47–352.30.

<sup>88</sup> τῶν ῥημάτων τὴν τάξιν is perhaps an allusion to the tradition from Papias, recorded by Eusebius, H.E. III.39.15: οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα "but not in order of the things said or done by the Lord."

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Luke 8.22–25.

he had sent the others away, he had kept them back), he sent them to be tossed about in the storm; and by this, also directing them to bear persecution nobly. And so, while Matthew says that “he was sleeping,”<sup>90</sup> Mark says also how he was sleeping—“*on a cushion*”<sup>91</sup>—showing his freedom from pride and teaching us a high degree of asceticism<sup>92</sup> in consequence. Therefore when the storm arose, they woke him up, saying, “*Teacher, do you not care that we are perishing?*”<sup>93</sup> And Jesus “*woke up*”<sup>94</sup> and “*rebuked the sea*”<sup>95</sup> [313] and | the disciples showed by this that it is necessary to have confidence, even when great waves are raised up, and that he dispenses everything for our good.<sup>96</sup> For indeed their being “*terrified*”<sup>97</sup> happened for their good, so that the miracle might appear greater, and their remembrance of the event might endure.<sup>98</sup> This is also why “*he was sleeping*.”<sup>99</sup> For if he had been awake, either they would not have been afraid, or they would not have sought him out, or they would never have thought him to have been able to do such a thing. This is why “*he was sleeping*,”<sup>100</sup> giving occasion for their “*fear*”<sup>101</sup> and making their perception of what was happening clearer. Therefore, although they had seen that all had received a blessing while they themselves had not experienced it, they were still unaffected; and they needed to experience this blessing for themselves. He permits the storm, in order that they might receive by their deliverance a clearer perception of the blessing. For this reason, he does not do this when others are present, in order that they might not be condemned for their little faith, but he takes them on their own to direct them. For they did not yet hold the appropriate opinion about him, but while they knew that he was able to calm the waters by a rebuke when he had been woken up, they did not yet know that he was able to do this while he was asleep. This is why they are rebuked several times, just as when he says, “*Do you still not understand?*”<sup>102</sup> Therefore do not be amazed,

---

<sup>90</sup> Matthew 8.25.

<sup>91</sup> Mark 4.38.

<sup>92</sup> *Lit.* “philosophy”—according to Lampe, in later usage, φιλοσοφία referred, in Christian discourse, to the ascetic ideal and the life of virtue.

<sup>93</sup> Mark 4.38.

<sup>94</sup> Mark 4.39.

<sup>95</sup> Mark 4.39.

<sup>96</sup> There is perhaps an allusion here to Hebrew 12.10: συμπερόντως.

<sup>97</sup> Mark 4.41.

<sup>98</sup> *Lit.* “become enduring *or* perpetual.”

<sup>99</sup> Mark 4.38.

<sup>100</sup> Mark 4.38.

<sup>101</sup> Mark 4.41.

<sup>102</sup> Mark 4.41.

given that the disciples were so imperfectly disposed, that the crowds had no sense of his reputation.<sup>103</sup> *“For they were amazed and said ‘What manner of man is this, that even the sea and the wind obey him?’”*<sup>104</sup> But Christ did not rebuke them for calling him “a man,” but he waited to teach them by his signs, that their opinion was mistaken. But why did they think him a man?—perhaps from his appearance, then from his sleeping, and having to use a boat. So on account of this they were cast into perplexity and they said, “What manner of man is this?” For while sleep and his appearance showed that he was a man, the sea and the calm declared that he was God. For by a single command, he dissolved the whole storm immediately. He did not need a prayer, nor a rod (like the one Moses held out), for he is like a master imposing order on a servant girl and like a craftsman imposing order on what he has made. And when he disembarked from the sea, he performed another miracle which was even more awe-inspiring. ♦

---

<sup>103</sup> *Lit.* “no great impression of him.”

<sup>104</sup> Matthew 8.27 and Mark 4.41: ironically, the textual variant ἄνθρωπος which is central to Chrysostom's exegesis at this point is, according to Kurt Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 1988), only attested in Matthew 8.27. Instances of this variant in the manuscript tradition of Mark are limited.



## CHAPTER 5

### 11. *On Legion*

(1) And he went across the sea, to the country of the Gadarenes.<sup>1</sup> [314]

♦ And<sup>2</sup> he came to the country of “the Gerasenes,” or alternatively, “the Gergesenes” and so on. But neither “Gadarenes” nor “Gerasenes” is the correct reading of the manuscripts, but “Gergesenes” is the correct reading. For Gadara is a city of Judaea, in the region of which there are the famous hot springs, and there is nothing like a lake with cliffs near it and nothing like “sea.” And Gerasa is a city of Arabia, with neither a sea nor a lake close by; and the Evangelists would not have said something so clearly and demonstrably false, as they were men who knew the region around Judaea intimately. And so, Gergesa (from which the name “the Gergesenes” is taken) is an old town near what is now called Lake Tiberias, in the region of which is a cliff, from which the pigs could have been driven down by the demons. And Gergesa means “a place of those who have been cast out,” perhaps a prophetic reference to that which they have written about the Saviour, since the citizens of the country begged him to pass outside their borders. And Origen says these things in Book 6 of his Commentary on the Gospel according to John. ♦

(3) And no-one<sup>3</sup> was able to bind him with chains. (4) For he had often been bound with shackles and chains, but the chains he wrenched apart, and the shackles he broke in pieces: and no one was strong enough to subdue him. (5) And through every night and day among the tombs and on the mountains he used to howl and cut himself with stones.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the textual variant: Cramer cites Γαδαρηνῶν, and yet Origen’s commentary, which follows, challenges this reading in favour of Γεργεσηνῶν. NA<sup>27</sup> prefers Γεργεσηνῶν.

<sup>2</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 314.5–21 is an extract from Origen, *Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis* 6.41.208–211 (C. Blanc, *Origène. Commentaire sur saint Jean*, Vol. 2. SC 157. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970): 288–291) (Smith, “The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,” 366). This is duly noted by the catenist at the end of this passage. In this passage, Origen demonstrates a detailed knowledge of textual variants.

<sup>3</sup> Note the textual variants in Mark 5.3.



◆ You<sup>4</sup> should know that Mark and Luke say there was one demoniac, but Matthew says that there are two: and this does not exhibit any discrepancy. [315] | For if they said that there was *only* one, they would seem to be in conflict with Matthew. And if some speak of one, while another speaks of two, what is said is not out of disagreement, but out of a different manner of narration, for it seems to me that they singled out the one that was more difficult to handle. This is why [Luke] describes his misfortune in more tragic terms; specifically, that, breaking his shackles and chains, he used to wander about the wilderness.<sup>5</sup> And Mark says that he used to cut himself with stones.<sup>6</sup> ◆ And<sup>7</sup> both being equally hard to deal with, there is agreement in saying simply that “he was demon-possessed,” although they are not exact about the number,<sup>8</sup> since they did not think to round up the number for the purpose of making the power of the agent greater. ◆

(8) For he had said to him, Come out of the man, you unclean spirit!

◆ Therefore<sup>9</sup> while the crowds acknowledged him as man, the demons came to proclaim his divinity. And those, who had not heard of the sea swelling into a storm and becoming calm again, heard these things from the cries of the demons which the sea by its calm was crying out.<sup>10</sup> Then in case the deed might not seem to be a matter of flattery, given their perception of the facts, they cry out, saying, “Are you come here to torment us before the time?”<sup>11</sup> Because of the earlier act, their hostility is acknowledged, yet their plea should be suspect. For they were also invisibly being tormented and inflamed and suffering intolerable things by virtue of his presence.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 314.28–315.7 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 28.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365).

<sup>5</sup> A paraphrase of Luke 8.29.

<sup>6</sup> A paraphrase of Mark 5.5.

<sup>7</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 315.7–12 may be attributed indirectly to Theodoret of Mopsuestia, through Isho’dad of Merv’s *Syriac Commentary on Matthew* 43. However, Smith notes that there is ‘some doubt’ about such attribution, particularly given some parallels with passages attributed to Theodoret of Cyrrhus. (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 358–359).

<sup>8</sup> See the discussion of this phrase in Grant, ‘Historical Criticism in the Ancient Church,’ 196.

<sup>9</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 315.15–316.4 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 28.2–3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 57.352.51–353.2.

<sup>10</sup> Note the oxymoron—a deliberate rhetorical flourish.

<sup>11</sup> Note that this passage does not occur in Mark. It belongs to Matthew 8.29.

<sup>12</sup> *Lit.* “that presence.”

And they supposed that their punishment was already upon them, and they were afraid, as even now they were about to be subjected to vengeance. Therefore, they think it proper not to suffer punishment before the due time. For since he caught them perpetrating those violent and terrible things, and they were distorting and punishing in every way the creature which he had created, they supposed that he, on account of the excess of what had happened, would not wait for the time of punishment, which is why “they begged”<sup>13</sup> and pleaded with him. And those, who would not be held with iron bands, came bound, and those who were running about the mountains, came down to the plains.

Why then do the demons hang around the tombs? They want to suggest [316] to the multitude a pernicious teaching (that the souls of those who have died become demons), which is something we should never entertain in our thinking. ♦ Alternatively,<sup>14</sup> it says that even if the demons are very wicked, they know that in every way punishment awaits them at the last, on account of their wickedness. But that the time of their punishment was not at hand, they could easily know from the fact that they are not handed over to punishment now, although he compels them to withdraw from them.<sup>15</sup> For the Saviour had said, “*Come out from the man, you unclean spirit.*”<sup>16</sup> Therefore as they have opportunity in the meantime to do what they want to the men,<sup>17</sup> they cried out in this way against the Lord, as if he was seeking in vain to overpower them before the proper time for punishment. ♦

(9) And he asked him, “What is your name?” And he replied, saying, “Legion is my name, because we are many.”

And<sup>18</sup> he asked him, “*What is your name?*” For although the Lord knew the multitude of demons inhabiting him (while those who were watching saw one man, and they heard him speak with one voice), he says, “Tell me, what is your name?” in order that he himself might not say that there were many,

<sup>13</sup> Matthew 8.31: cf. Mark 5.12.

<sup>14</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 316.4–13 may be indirectly attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia (cf. Isho’dad’s *Syriac Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew*). (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 360).

<sup>15</sup> Note the plural form. Like the previous passage, it is clear that this section was originally a reflection on Matthew’s account rather than Mark’s.

<sup>16</sup> Mark 5.8.

<sup>17</sup> I.e. “the demoniacs.”

<sup>18</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 316.16–20 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)* (PG 72.636.7–12).

but so that they themselves might confess that there happened to be many of them: ♦ “*and he replied, saying, ‘My name is Legion.’*”<sup>19</sup> And he did not say how many, but simply revealed the multitude. For scrupulous accuracy<sup>20</sup> is of no benefit in matters of knowledge.

(10) And he begged him earnestly<sup>21</sup> not to send them out of the country.

[317] “*And he begged him earnestly not to send them out of the country,*”<sup>22</sup> or “to go away into the abyss,”<sup>23</sup> as Luke says. For the abyss is a means of retreat from this world. Therefore, the demons determine not to be sent outside the earth, where there is no human being, into “the outer darkness,”<sup>24</sup> “prepared for the devil and his angels,”<sup>25</sup> with<sup>26</sup> the consequence that, while the Lord was unable to submit to their demands, he agreed that they should be in that country; and so it is the same with the | devil, lest by the absence of the adversary, humanity should be deprived the victor’s crown.

(11) And there was on the mountainside a great herd of pigs grazing.

He permitted them to go into the pigs. And all of them were driven by the demons, and throwing themselves down the cliff, they cast themselves into the sea, so that those who were tending [their herds] at the same time were both afraid and amazed at what had happened, and going into the city, they told those in the city everything that had happened, at which, they, being quite reasonably panic-stricken by these [events], came out to Jesus: and they found the man, from whom the demons had come out, clothed and in his right mind, sitting down at the feet of Jesus and recognising his benefactor. And they were astonished at this happening: ♦ and rendering<sup>27</sup> him due honour in their encounter with him, they begged him to go away

---

<sup>19</sup> Mark 5.9.

<sup>20</sup> *Lit.* “precision.”

<sup>21</sup> *Lit.* “much.”

<sup>22</sup> Mark 5.10.

<sup>23</sup> Luke 8.31.

<sup>24</sup> An allusion to Matthew 8.12.

<sup>25</sup> An allusion to Matthew 25.41.

<sup>26</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 316.30–317.2 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 8.31 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien*, 177.

<sup>27</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 317.14–17 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Mattha-*

into other places, as they were not worthy to have such a good man in their own country, fearing lest they should suffer something even greater from the power of his presence because of their own wickedness.

♦ And so,<sup>28</sup> getting on a boat, he returned; and the one who had suffered did not withdraw from the Saviour, but requested that he might be with him; thus he demonstrated both that he recognised him as the Saviour and that he was afraid that the demons might come back to him again. ♦

(20) And he went away and began to proclaim in the Decapolis the things which Jesus had done for him: and all were amazed.

♦ And<sup>29</sup> the Lord in order that he might not appear only to guard him by virtue of his presence, lets him go: “Don’t be afraid of anything,” he says, “For presence lessens the miracle, but absence reveals divine power even more. ‘Go back to your home,’<sup>30</sup> having from me the pledge of salvation, and ‘tell’<sup>31</sup> others about the miracle so that you may firmly establish the grace.” This is exactly what he did. ♦ It is asked why the Lord instructs the demons to go into the pigs when they beg him in this way. The demons expose people to very great evil. | Consequently, many, quite reasonably, were exploring and examining this question with one another,—why does God restrain himself with those who do these things? [318]

♦ Therefore,<sup>32</sup> the Lord wants to show to everyone both how much anger the demons have towards humanity and also that they do much less than they could or would like, being prevented from working wicked things in the lives of human beings by the power of God: although he did not demonstrate

---

*eum* Fragment 44.1–4 (Cf. Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 368). This passage can be found in Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 111.

<sup>28</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 317.18–21 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 8.38 (Ibid.: 367). This passage can be found in Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien*, 178–179.

<sup>29</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 317.24–25 and 317.28–29 are extracts from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 8.38 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). *Cat. Marc.* 317.24–29 is attributed to Titus of Bostra in *Cat. Luc.* 70.10–13.

<sup>30</sup> Luke 8.39.

<sup>31</sup> Luke 8.39.

<sup>32</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 318.2–12 may be attributed indirectly to Theodore of Mopsuestia (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 368). Smith’s attribution was based on a “hunch” in his reading of the Syriac commentary of Isho’dad, which, he argued, was heavily reliant on the writing of Theodore. A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* demonstrates that *Cat. Marc.* 317.29–318.12 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Matthaemum* Fragment 43.1–12 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 110–111).

this on<sup>33</sup> human beings, he allowed them to enter the pigs, so that from the pigs the anger of the demons should be made plain and they should know his power, and that those who made so many pigs disappear in a flash were not unable to do the same thing to human beings, so that through all these things the power of God is manifest, since he prevents them from dealing with human beings as they wished. ♦

12. *On the leader of the synagogue's daughter*

(21) And when Jesus had crossed again in the boat<sup>34</sup> to the other side, a great crowd assembled around him, and he was beside the sea. (22) And look,<sup>35</sup> there came one of the leaders of the synagogue, called Jairus, and seeing him, he fell at his feet. (23) And he begged him a great deal, saying, "My little daughter is at the point of death. Come and lay your hands on her, so that she may be healed and live." (24) And he went with him, and a great crowd followed him and pressed in on him.

♦ Again<sup>36</sup> another miracle follows. For the leader of the synagogue comes out to meet the Lord, and he was not predisposed to accept the faith with goodwill, but was compelled to do so by the illness of his daughter. His name was Jairus. ♦ The name occurs on account of the Jews who know what happened, so that the name might become proof of the miracle. And he begged Jesus on account of his own daughter, who was dead according to Matthew,<sup>37</sup> while Mark says that she was terribly unwell at this point, but [319] that subsequently | someone comes from the household of the leader of the synagogue (because the Lord happened to be far away) to announce that she was already dead, and that it was no longer necessary for him to trouble the teacher. For since they supposed he was invited as a teacher, and that he might come to pray for the child, they supposed that it was no longer

<sup>33</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 318.7: ἐπ' ἐκείνων instead of ἀπ' ἐκείνων provides a clearer contrast with ἐπὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπων in 318.6.

<sup>34</sup> Note the textual variant: τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ.

<sup>35</sup> Note the textual variant: ἰδοῦ. The variant perhaps reflects the influence of Matthew and Luke.

<sup>36</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 318.24–27 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 8.41 (Smith, "The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark," 369). The extract can also be found in *Cat. Luc.* 70.10–13.

<sup>37</sup> Matthew 9.18.

necessary for him to come, given her death. And they did not realise that he had the power even to raise the dead girl. Therefore he put it in this way, while Matthew said that only this final action happened, so that each of them is indicating like the other that he indeed raised a dead girl. (Matthew) said in summary that she was dead, passing over the exact detail. The Lord promises to go with him and to raise his child for him. And the disciples followed him.

13. *On the woman with a haemorrhage*

(25) And there was a woman who had had a haemorrhage for twelve years.

And Matthew, even though it came to pass in one particular way,<sup>38</sup> in speaking of the miracle, has abandoned the detail. For Mark adds that the Lord turned round to interrogate the one who had touched him. And she out of fear declared herself, and this is why he said to her, “*Your faith has saved you.*”<sup>39</sup> The one who believes in the Saviour touches him; but the one who does not believe presses against him and hurts him. But the one who has touched him draws him and induces him to an act of compassion. And they all denied touching him, for they did not believe, but they pressed in on him. And he taught that his clothes did not save her, saying, “*Your faith has saved you.*”<sup>40</sup> Thus it is neither a place, nor a word, nor anything outside which saves, but one’s faith. And the one who is healed from the flow of blood physically and cleansed from her suffering bears the title “*daughter*”<sup>41</sup> of Jesus. And afterwards he comes to the house of the leader of the synagogue, and he sees a great deal of lament and convention that they perform for the departed. Therefore he bids the multitude not to do these things, as the child is not dead, but asleep:<sup>42</sup> for he was showing that when he wished, he could awaken those who had died as easily as another person would awaken those who were asleep. | At the same time he avoids boasting by saying that the one who had died was asleep, and by not immediately announcing that

[320]

<sup>38</sup> The general sense is clear at this point, although the text may be corrupt.

<sup>39</sup> Mark 5:34: although many modern translations (including the NRSV) suggest ‘Your faith has healed you’ for ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε, the subsequent passage suggests that σέσωκε is taken to refer to “salvation.”

<sup>40</sup> Mark 5:34.

<sup>41</sup> Mark 5:34.

<sup>42</sup> A paraphrase of Mark 5:39.

he was going to raise her up. Therefore, he makes it his business to do the thing modestly, even though the exceptional nature of the action makes him prominent. For casting out the multitude, he took the little girl by the hand and immediately “*she got up*”;<sup>43</sup> and the wonder from all these things was great, and the news was spread abroad throughout the whole surrounding countryside; since everyone, as you would expect, was quick to proclaim this kind of thing.

But it is necessary to say in addition why the Saviour says “*Who touched me?*”<sup>44</sup> about the woman with a haemorrhage. This was in order that you may perceive that she received salvation from him willingly and not involuntarily. For he knew that the woman had touched him. And he asked in order that he might identify<sup>45</sup> the woman who came forward, and that he might publicise her faith, and that the power which had been worked might not escape notice. “Who touched me?” not by the hand but with faith. Therefore immediately Peter<sup>46</sup> said, “There is such a crowd pressing about you and you are saying, ‘Who touched me?’ For he did not know what had happened. But the Lord interpreted for him, saying, ‘I know that power has gone out from me.’”<sup>47</sup> Powers of the Saviour, which go out from him, are transmitted to others not in a physical or bodily sense as if they leave him. But being disembodied, they also enter into others and are imparted to others and they are not separated from him, just as the intellectual disciplines are both from the teacher and are given to those who learn.<sup>48</sup> In this way the powers are given to those who touch him by faith by both his will and his judgement. And he did not simply say, “I sensed” but “I knew,” for those powers are not perceived by the senses but are disembodied. “Somebody touched me,” he says, “somebody interacted with me on a spiritual level, and communicated with me by faith, having approached me gently and little by little received healing from me. And those who crowd around did not touch me, for they do not engage me on a spiritual level. Therefore the one who touched me will acknowledge the divine healing, in order that she might be helped more and, when she leaves, might understand that she has not only been healed but that she has not escaped notice as she intended.” Therefore the woman, sensing that she had not escaped notice, fell at his feet and confessed, not

---

<sup>43</sup> Mark 5.41.

<sup>44</sup> Mark 5.40.

<sup>45</sup> *Lit.* “prove by questioning.”

<sup>46</sup> Note the reference to Luke 8.45. In Mark, Jesus addresses the disciples generally; in Luke, it is Peter who responds.

<sup>47</sup> A paraphrase of Luke 8.46.

<sup>48</sup> In other words, the knowledge of the teacher is not diminished by teaching.

to the one who knew but to those who were ignorant: for she confessed in front of all the people, that she was healed on the spot. And he said to her, | “*Daughter*.”<sup>49</sup> ♦ He<sup>50</sup> calls the woman who had been healed “*Daughter*” on account of her faith: for her faith was better than healing and she was granted adoption as a daughter. For he says, “*Your faith has saved you*.”<sup>51</sup> ♦ Since then you learnt that faith was the cause of salvation, may the seed grow. For each one bears as much fruit as they have faith. “*Go in peace and be healed of your disease*.”<sup>52</sup> Having healed her body, he benefited her soul as well, sending her to a good end in the peace in which God is said to dwell, in accordance with what scripture says, “His dwelling place is in holy peace.”<sup>53</sup> And he teaches her a third thing which is necessary in order that she may know that her body is not only healed, but also delivered from a scourge, that is to say, from the causes of bodily sufferings, which are sins.

(43) And he gave them many instructions, in order that no one should know this, and he told them to give her something to eat.

ANOTHER SCHOLIUM FROM SOMEONE ELSE. As a proof that she has truly been raised, and not by some kind of appearance and fantasy, he commands that something<sup>54</sup> should be given to her to eat: for when he himself rose from the dead, he did this also to provide evidence of the reality of the Resurrection.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Mark 5:34.

<sup>50</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 321.1–3 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 8.48 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien*, 182.

<sup>51</sup> Mark 5:34.

<sup>52</sup> Mark 5:34.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Psalm 76.2 (LXX 75.3).

<sup>54</sup> The meaning of *διὰ πάντας* is unclear.

<sup>55</sup> *Lit.* “the full reality.”





## CHAPTER 6

(1) And he left there and came<sup>1</sup> to his home town, and his disciples followed him.

He sets foot in his home town, and he is not ignorant [of the fact] that they look down upon him on account of their familiarity, but he exposes their ignorant contempt. And they were astounded by the extraordinariness of his words and the incredible nature of his works, but they did not honour him on account of these things and they disparaged him on account of their familiarity with his earthly family. Consequently, what happened to them, as the saying goes, was the common experience of those who have no faith. So the Lord does not lead people like that into accurate knowledge of himself, and just as he did then in his home town, he refuses to do any more miracles because of their unbelief. For upon those who receive him the first time he lavishes even more the second time, just as he did upon his genuine disciples, displaying ever greater and more wondrous powers. But upon those who persist in ignorance of the first gift, he refused to make any addition of the second: he knew that for people like this, | making [322] any additions was useless and futile and not fitting for the revelation of himself. And it says “*he was not able to do any miracle there*”<sup>2</sup> on account of the unbelief of those who received him. ♦ For since<sup>3</sup> two things are necessary for healing, both the faith on the part of those being healed, and the power of the one doing the healing, the second was not possible because its counterpart<sup>4</sup> was missing. ♦ And I do not know if one should not add that this too was with good reason. For it is not reasonable to heal those who hesitate out of unbelief. “*And he went about around the villages*

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἦλθεν.

<sup>2</sup> Mark 6.5.

<sup>3</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 322.3–6 is an extract from Gregory Nazianzen, *De Filio* 30.10–11 (J. Barbel, *Gregor von Nazianz. Die fünf theologischen Reden*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963: 203). The origin of this statement is missed by Oden and Hall, who mysteriously attribute this passage to ‘Pseudo-Victor of Antioch.’ (Thomas C. Oden and Christopher A. Hall, *Mark*, ed. Thomas C. Oden, *Ancient Christian Commentary Series* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 81).

<sup>4</sup> *Lit.* “yoke.”

teaching, and he called the twelve”<sup>5</sup> and so on. Jesus went around all the towns and the villages, so that all those who welcomed him received the opportunity for faith, while those who were not persuaded had no excuse for their disobedience.

#### 14. On the commissioning<sup>6</sup> of the apostles

(7) And he called the twelve towards him, and began to send them out two by two, and he gave them authority over unclean spirits.

And he called his twelve disciples, and he sent them two by two, having given them also power to accomplish all sorts of wonders: so that they might cross through the middle of Judaea proclaiming the teachings of piety, and be generous in granting, to those who needed it, the healing of their bodies. By their hand he relieved the multitude from pain, no longer going around and about by himself (in spite of the fact that all were compelling him), but through the disciples being sent out from Christ, they were able to be present all over the place. And Mark tells us simply the number of those he selected. But Matthew also adds who they were, and he also describes the manner in which they were sent out in twos. For while Mark puts this simply, Matthew says “it was him and it was him,” and also describes their arrangement, pointing out who was the first and who was the second.<sup>7</sup> And Jesus gave orders that they were to take nothing. The Saviour says to the [323] apostles, “I do not want you to accept any money | for this endeavour, not even for travelling expenses (which seems to be absolutely necessary to most people) and I do not want you to accept anything from those with whom you are staying. Therefore do not carry ‘gold or silver or copper’<sup>8</sup> for the expenses of the journey, and I do not want you to have ‘a purse,’<sup>9</sup> so that you may show everyone by this gesture how far you are from the desire for riches.” And Matthew says, and Luke also, that on the journey “you are not to take sandals or clothes or staves” (which seems to be even more self-denying). But Mark seems to permit them to take a staff and to wear sandals. But the saying about the staff is perhaps what someone would say by way of

<sup>5</sup> Mark 6.6–7.

<sup>6</sup> *Lit.* “drill”—διατάγη is a military term, used to describe “arranging soldiers in order” or “drawing up an army.”

<sup>7</sup> Matthew 10.1 and 10.7–11.

<sup>8</sup> Matthew 10.9.

<sup>9</sup> Mark 6.8; note also the Synoptic parallels (Matthew 10.10 and Luke 9.3).

a concession, in that he adds “*except a staff*.”<sup>10</sup> “For,” he says, “I do not want you to carry anything except a staff: no bag, no bread, no money in your belt, and not even to wear sandals and not to put on two tunics.” For in common with Matthew and Luke, it is necessary to suppose that he said “not [to wear sandals]” to them for this agrees with the things said just before the Passion according to Luke: for he says to the disciples, “When I sent you out without a purse and a bag and sandals, did any of you come to grief?”<sup>11</sup> For at that point he keeps silent about the staff, agreeing in some respects with Mark. And we know that whatever the apparent disagreement at this point, it is not important.<sup>12</sup>

(10) And he said to them, “Wherever you enter a house, stay there until you leave the place.”

◆ And<sup>13</sup> he also ordered them to stay in one house and not move about, so that they might not gain a reputation for easily led or careless judgement among those who live in the town. ◆ And<sup>14</sup> he ordered them, when people did not obey them and did not entertain them, to shake the dust from their feet, which is a symbol of the journey, which they had endured on their behalf, ◆ or possibly, so<sup>15</sup> that the dust of their sins might return to them again. ◆ |

[324]

(12) And they went out and proclaimed that they might repent. (13) And they cast out many demons, and they anointed many who were sick with oil, and healed them.

<sup>10</sup> Mark 6.8.

<sup>11</sup> Luke 22.35.

<sup>12</sup> Lampe s.v. *καίριος* “important, crucial.” A note by Cramer reads at this point that “there is a huge gap here in Codex L which I have supplemented from Cod. Paris 178, which is hardly adequate.” The text is certainly sketchy, but the sense suggests that the catenist is arguing, intriguingly, that a deliberate alteration of the text at this point is justified given the contradictions with the other synoptic gospels. The argument perhaps serves to illustrate the thesis presented in Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

<sup>13</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 323.24–26 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* Fr. 51 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 51).

<sup>14</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 323.26–28 is an extract from Theodoret of Cyrillus. This passage is attributed to Theodoret in *Cat. Matt.* 76.22–25.

<sup>15</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 323.29 is possibly an extract from Origen, *Fragmenta in Lucam* Fragment 160.1. This passage can be found in M. Rauer, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 9, 2nd edn. [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 49 (35)]. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959]: 291.

In roughly these words, Luke also sets out [the account]: but only Mark says “they anointed with oil,” and James also says the same thing as this in the Catholic Epistle, “Is any among you sick? Let him call the presbyters of the Church, and let them pray over him and anoint him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith will heal the sick, and the Lord will raise him up.”<sup>16</sup> And the oil also heals pain and is a cause of light and a source of cheerfulness. Therefore, the oil used in anointing indicates also the mercy that comes from God, and the healing of disease, and the illumination of the heart, for it is manifest to anyone anywhere that prayer brings about everything;<sup>17</sup> and the oil, so I suppose, is a symbol of these things.

### 15. *On John and Herod*

(14) And King Herod heard of it, for his name had become known. And he said,<sup>18</sup> “John the Baptist has been raised<sup>19</sup> from the dead, and this is why these powers are at work in him.”

This Herod was the son of Herod I, during whose reign Joseph took Jesus and his mother away into Egypt, having been warned by an angel. And Matthew and Luke call this one “a Tetrarch,” as one who rules the fourth part of the realm of the father. For the Romans divided it into four parts, and after the death of the first [Herod], they entrusted the son with the rule of a fourth part. And Mark and some others still call him a King, without making a distinction, either because it was customary for the father or because they [325] were using this form of address carelessly. And Josephus narrates | these things more clearly. Hearing now of the miracles of the Lord, and knowing full well that he had killed John, who was a righteous man, needlessly, he assumed that having been raised from the dead [John] was doing these things. But Luke<sup>20</sup> says that he heard that others assumed these things, and he was made even more perplexed, and he wanted to see him, so as to know whether this was the same man.

<sup>16</sup> James 5.14.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. 1 Corinthians 12.6.

<sup>18</sup> Note the textual variant: ἔλεγεν.

<sup>19</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐκ νεκρῶν ἠγέρθη.

<sup>20</sup> Luke 9.7.

(15) And others said, “It is Elijah”: but others said, “It is a prophet,” or “It is like one of the prophets.”<sup>21</sup>

◆ When<sup>22</sup> the apostles were asked the question by him, “Who do people say that I, the Son of Man, am?”<sup>23</sup> they replied saying, “Some say John the Baptist, others Elijah, others Jeremiah, or another of the prophets,”<sup>24</sup> ◆ for there were all these fallible assumptions about him among the people,<sup>25</sup> such as one might expect of a very great man who was admirable in his way of life.<sup>26</sup> But when he says that “some say that he was a prophet like one of the prophets,”<sup>27</sup> Mark seems to me to hint that they are speaking of the one of whom Moses spoke, “The Lord your God will raise up a prophet for you like me.”<sup>28</sup> For perhaps they feared to say openly that he was indeed the Christ: and they used the saying of Moses to conceal their assumptions for fear of their leaders.

(16) And when Herod heard, he said, “This man is John, the one whom I beheaded: he has been raised from the dead.”<sup>29</sup> (17) For Herod himself had sent people who arrested John and bound him in prison, on account of Herodias, the wife of his brother Philip, because [Herod] had married her.

The Evangelist describes the way in which [Herod] killed him and the reason for it (not that he is saying that the event happened at this point but he inserts this in his narrative).<sup>30</sup> For he says that Herod, when he heard these things about the Lord, thought that John had been raised since he had been

<sup>21</sup> Note the textual variant: ὅτι προφήτης ἐστίν, ἢ ὡς εἰς τῶν προφητῶν.

<sup>22</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 325.9–12 is an extract from Eusebius, *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Stephanum*. This passage can be found in PG 22.885.49–51.

<sup>23</sup> This appears to be a conflation of Matthew 16.13 and Mark 8.27.

<sup>24</sup> Matthew 16.14.

<sup>25</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 325.13: insert a comma and remove the full stop.

<sup>26</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 325.14: τον βίον.

<sup>27</sup> Note the omission of ἢ in contrast to the text in 325.16.

<sup>28</sup> Deuteronomy 18.15 (cf. Acts 3.22).

<sup>29</sup> Note the textual variant: Ὅτι ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτός ἐστιν· αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν.

<sup>30</sup> τῆς οἰκείας διηγήσεως—in the Eusebian Canon Tables, Mark 6.16 (Mark 58) is mistakenly presented as unique to Mark (being placed in Canon X). This appears to be the strength of the term οἰκείας at this point. However, note the parallels with Matthew 14.1–2 (Matthew 143) and Luke 9.7 (Luke 90). For further exploration of this question, see C. Nordenfalk, ‘The Eusebian Canon Tables: Some Textual Problems,’ *Journal of Theological Studies* 35, no. 1 (1984): 103.

[326] done away with. The pretext for the murder was | that when Herod took the wife of his own brother Philip, while he was still alive, having a daughter by her and living with her, John did not tolerate the abomination and he rebuked [Herod] for his wrongdoing; and while [Herod] did not tolerate the rebuke, he was afraid of the crowd because they held a very high opinion regarding John, and he did not dare to kill him, even though he very much wanted to on account of Herodias. He knew that he was a righteous and holy man, and Herod used to follow his advice to considerable advantage. He shut him up in prison and ordered a guard to be kept. And Herod was celebrating his own birthday with no expense spared. And the daughter of Herodias danced during the drinking and revelry. And since Herod was pleased by her dancing, he swore an oath to give her whatever she asked of him. And she asked for the head of John, as her mother had instructed her. And Herod fulfilled his own wish, but found a pretext in the constraint of the oath because of those present; though he himself was grieved at what had happened. And we are taught from this that adultery and dancing and oaths took the head of the Baptist, and these things are to be rejected by those who have good understanding; if for no other reason than this—that we may not be associated with those who are guilty of the murder of the fore-runner.

(29) And when his disciples heard, they came and took his body, and they placed it in the tomb.<sup>31</sup>

He says these things in order that he may show their affection, which they maintained towards their teacher even after his death: and he continues with these words,

16. *On the five loaves and the two fishes*

(34) And as he went ashore, Jesus<sup>32</sup> saw a large crowd, and he had compassion for them<sup>33</sup> because they were like sheep without a shepherd; and he began to teach them many things. (35) And because the hour [327] was late, | his disciples coming to him, say,<sup>34</sup> “This is a deserted place, and the hour is late.”

<sup>31</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐν τῷ σημείῳ.

<sup>32</sup> Note the textual variant: ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

<sup>33</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς.

<sup>34</sup> Note the textual variant: προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγουσιν.

When the apostles came to Jesus and when they told him what they had done and what they had taught by his power and by the energy of the Holy Spirit, he called them on their own to a deserted place to rest, for they were weary by then: for so many were pestering them on account of the healings that were increasing in number that there was no opportunity to eat. Therefore Jesus took them in a boat with him to withdraw a little on their own to a desert place in order that they might find rest, and there was following him, as you might expect, a great crowd, mostly because of the miracles and because of his words, all of them prepared to abandon their homes and follow him. And so he saw them weary from walking, as if they were sheep without a shepherd; for indeed these people were in such a state that nobody was able<sup>35</sup> to teach them anything beneficial for the soul. It was for this reason in particular that they were forced to follow after the Lord, as if he alone were the only one capable of leading them to better things: and, delighted at their zeal, he had pity upon them, and he gave them the benefit of his teaching, offering to them a spiritual dining-table and a generous banquet which is everlasting. And since “the hour was late,”<sup>36</sup> the disciples asked for the crowd to be dismissed, principally because of the desertedness of the place and the scarcity of provisions. “They do not have anything to eat,” they said. But he, being rich and full of love for humanity, encouraged his disciples to set a literal table<sup>37</sup> for them, all but saying, “I am here as the one who provides a great abundance for all.” And they did not understand, and they were confused (as though they had heard some impossible command); “How many loaves do you have?”<sup>38</sup> And they went and found out and said, “Five, and two fish.”

(41) And taking the five loaves and the two fish, he looked up to heaven, and he blessed and broke the loaves, and he gave them to his<sup>39</sup> disciples to set before the people: and he divided the two fish among them all. |

[328]

<sup>35</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 327.16: insert δυνάμενον in place of δυνάμενος.

<sup>36</sup> Mark 6.35.

<sup>37</sup> The σωματικὴν τράπεζαν “a literal or bodily table” here contrasts with the πνευματικὴν “a spiritual table” referred to in lines 19–20.

<sup>38</sup> The syntax is confused at this point.

<sup>39</sup> Note the textual variant: αὐτοῦ.



◆ Now,<sup>40</sup> quite appropriately, in looking up to heaven, he showed that he was entrusting what was happening to the Father. For when God supplied manna for them in the desert, the Israelites dared to speak against him, “Is he not able to give [us] bread?”<sup>41</sup> In order that he himself might not seem to fall prey to this by making himself greater than God, especially as the Jews were attempting to lay many traps for him, before he did this, he offered what was happening to the Father. ◆

(42) And all ate, and they were filled; (43) and they took up twelve baskets full of broken pieces, and of the fish. (44) And those who ate the bread numbered five thousand men.

◆ And so<sup>42</sup> all were satisfied, even though there were five thousand men, apart from women and children.<sup>43</sup> He provided such an abundance from the scraps, so as to fill twelve baskets, so that as each took it up onto their shoulders, they would receive a greater impression of what was happening.<sup>44</sup> ◆ For the present Evangelist shows plainly that the disciples were still very much uncertain about what was happening, given that it was so extraordinary,<sup>45</sup> when he says, “*for they did not understand about the bread; for their hearts were hardened.*”<sup>46</sup> And there is another reason why he made the abundance to happen so as to make apparent the abundance in the demonstration of his power, not for the sake of the material needs of others, as Moses gave the manna, but for the sake of this need alone.<sup>47</sup> For the residue, when they had gathered it was no use to them. Then they obtained the fruit of the earth, and the manna was no longer brought down.<sup>48</sup> In the same way, Elijah did not then make the wheat-meal to be more than enough for the widow, and

---

<sup>40</sup> Harold Smith suggests that *Cat. Marc.* 328.1–8 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia. This claim is based on his assertion that passages common to the *Catena* and Isho'dad's *Syriac Commentary on Matthew* have Theodore as their common source. (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 368).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Exodus 16.3.

<sup>42</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 328.13–16 is an extract from Theodore of Heraclea according to Harold Smith. This claim is based on the evidence of an attribution in Possinus, *Catena in Matthaëum* (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 367).

<sup>43</sup> The reference to “women and children” suggests that the commentator is referring to Matthew 14.21 at this point.

<sup>44</sup> The number 12 is here understood as a reference to the 12 apostles.

<sup>45</sup> *Lit.* “on account of it being excessively strange.”

<sup>46</sup> Mark 6.52: Cf. Mark 8.17.

<sup>47</sup> In other words, his sole purpose in creating such an abundance was to demonstrate the scale of his power. There was no other reason.

<sup>48</sup> Joshua 5.12.

indeed the olive oil as well.<sup>49</sup> As soon as the rain came, the gift ceased. Therefore in order that the difference might be plain, he made a great abundance, so that the multitude marvelled at being overwhelmed by left-overs.<sup>50</sup> So then | what happened was wonderful, as was the demonstration of creative power, but no less wonderful was the fact of not always using his power for the provision of food. For while he performs signs for the sake of human beings, he also opens the way to the recognition of his power for salvation through faith for those who come afterwards, and he makes use of material things in the way which is proper to his humanity, at the same time benefiting those who provide render assistance in the exercise of his power.<sup>51</sup> To provide anything for the Lord is a great act of benevolence. This indeed is why he hands on to the disciples in turn [the tradition] that they make use of the resources provided by those being taught. [329]

17. *On the walking on the sea*

(45) And immediately he made his disciples get into the boat, and go on ahead to the other side, to Bethsaida, while he himself dismissed<sup>52</sup> the crowd.

Before first dismissing the multitude, he made them [get into the boat], as they did not want to go away. This was, first, because of their disposition, and secondly, because they were also puzzled as to how he would come to them: this was precisely why the Lord ordered them to go away in order that seeing him walking on the waters, they might learn more about the greatness of the one who was among them.<sup>53</sup> Therefore, dismissing the crowds of those who came to be blessed, as it would appear, and those who came for healing, he went up onto the mountain to pray—as a human being would do and simultaneously teaching us to hold fast to the task of prayer. And since it was already late in the evening, “he himself was alone there,”<sup>54</sup> and the boat

<sup>49</sup> 1 Kings 17.12–16.

<sup>50</sup> Cramer adds a footnote at this point, alerting the reader to the following variant from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178: “Then there was such an abundance of scraps when they had eaten their fill that twelve baskets were filled with scraps, so that each of the 12 disciples carrying a basket on their shoulder might receive an indication of what had happened, and so that in making a shortage into a surplus he might demonstrate his power.”

<sup>51</sup> *Lit.* “for this purpose.”

<sup>52</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀπολύσθη.

<sup>53</sup> *Lit.* “the one who was present.”

<sup>54</sup> A paraphrase of Mark 6.47.

of the disciples was already in the middle of the sea, prevented from going further by the winds blowing against it. And he planned it this way for the greater revelation of the miracle. For although the winds were blowing in the wrong direction and the waves rose up against the wind, he remained [330] walking on the waters hindered by nothing at all.<sup>55</sup> |

(48) And<sup>56</sup> around the fourth watch of the night he came to them, walking on the sea, and he intended to pass by them.

♦ He<sup>57</sup> means the fourth watch after the 9th hour, which is to say, the 10th: or the one after that. For in four watches the divine scripture divides the time of the night, saying that each watch of the night is three hours long. ♦ And perhaps the first watch according to the logic of the anagogical<sup>58</sup> sense is from Adam until the Flood; the second from the Flood until Moses: the third from Moses until the coming [of Christ]; and the fourth is the one in which the Saviour comes to appear early to those who become disciples to him.<sup>59</sup>

♦ And<sup>60</sup> the divine scripture says that there are four watches of the night, each one divided into three hours. ♦ Therefore he calls the fourth [watch] the one after the ninth hour, the tenth or the hour after that, just as we would call it. Therefore towards that hour, he says, he was seen by them walking on the sea and coming towards them. And since they were completely panic-stricken by the sight, so as to imagine, by virtue of its unusualness, that the thing that appeared was a phantom, and since they cried out in great fear, the Lord spoke to them, saying “*Take heart. It is me. Do not be afraid.*”<sup>61</sup>

<sup>55</sup> *Lit.* “no other thing.”

<sup>56</sup> An element of Mark 6.48 has been omitted from the lemma.

<sup>57</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 330.4–7 is possibly an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* 78.1 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 124). Note that this section is taken from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178. Note also the repetitions in the following paragraph.

<sup>58</sup> According to Henri de Lubac, the origins of the “anagogical sense” belong to Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus and Jerome. (Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis: the Four Senses of Scripture*, trans. Mark Sebanc, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1959 (ET 1998)), 2.180).

<sup>59</sup> Cramer notes that this paragraph comes from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178. Given that the following paragraph begins in roughly the same manner, it appears that the comments on this passage have developed in slightly different ways.

<sup>60</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 330.12–13 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* 78.1 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 124).

<sup>61</sup> Mark 6.50.

(49) And seeing him walking around on the sea, they thought him to be a phantom<sup>62</sup> and they cried out.

And so the anxiety was resolved for them by the sound of his voice, but the unusualness of the thing that appeared still caused them to be uncertain, so that Peter, in order to make sure that what appeared was not a phantom and, in his hot-headed passion,<sup>63</sup> in order to share in the same experience, said to Jesus, “Lord, if it is you, order me to come towards you on the waters.”<sup>64</sup> He commanded him to do this. And Peter, getting out of the boat, at first walked on the waters safely, but the Lord, wishing to teach him that he was really only able to do this by His power, and that he really needed to trust without proof, allowed him after a little while to be swallowed up in the waters: then, | when he came into difficulty and shouted, “Lord, save me,” [the Lord], stretching out his hand, took hold of him and stood him up on the waters, reproaching him for his lack of faith. For the struggle of sinking made all the greater the experience of the grace of the one who saved him. Finally, Jesus got into the boat, taking Peter on board as well. Then the wind stopped, showing that the disturbance [of the sea] had come about for this purpose: so as to amplify the magnitude of the miracle. And the disciples went up to him on the boat and worshipped him, confessing him to be truly the Son of God:<sup>65</sup> showing that before this, they had an imperfect knowledge of him. For why did they need to confess this after the miracle, if they had known? Understanding this beforehand, they would not have had so much uncertainty about what appeared, whereas now they understand with perfect knowledge.

[331]

◆ Therefore<sup>66</sup> we learn through these things, that solitude and being alone is good, whenever it is necessary to pray to God. For the desert is the mother of silence, delivering us from every kind of distress.<sup>67</sup> And in addition to these things we learn also to bear everything nobly: for even now in the

<sup>62</sup> Note the textual variant: ἕδοξαν φάντασμα εἶναι.

<sup>63</sup> *Lit.* “wishing to participate in the same things out of much recklessness.”

<sup>64</sup> Matthew 14.28. This tradition is recorded in Matthew 14.28–33 and the comment clearly relates to the Matthaean passage. There is no reference to Peter at this point in Mark’s narrative.

<sup>65</sup> Matthew 14.33.

<sup>66</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 331.15–332.29 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 50.1–2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.503.51–507.17.

<sup>67</sup> *Lit.* “all turmoils.”

process of leading his disciples to a greater degree of endurance, he makes himself absent and allows the storm to arise in the middle of the sea, and he lets them be buffeted by the waves for the whole night, to awaken, as the Evangelist says, their “*hardened heart*”;<sup>68</sup> and after their contrition, he threw them into a greater longing for and a more persistent memory of him. And, indeed, this is why he did not present himself to them immediately, teaching them not to seek hastily to be set free from the dangers which constrain them, but to bear what happens nobly: and whenever the dangers are about to end, to expect other things which are even more difficult. For in this way even they cried out in alarm at the spectacle: for together with the storm, the sight terrified them. This is why he left them in the dark<sup>69</sup> and did not make himself visible straightaway, teaching them to persevere through dangers. For since it is not in one’s power to be tested for a long time and to an excessive degree, whenever the righteous are about to get out of their trials, [332] wishing | to profit them more, he prolongs their physical trials. But Christ did not disclose himself to the disciples until they cried out. For in this way they were even more glad of his coming. And since they cried out, he released them from fear, saying: “*Take heart. It is me. Do not be afraid.*”<sup>70</sup> For they would not recognise him because of the unexpectedness of the walking on the sea nor because of the time of the night, but through his voice he made himself known. “If it is you,” says Peter, “command me to come towards you.”<sup>71</sup> And he sought this only for love, and not to show off. For no one loved Jesus so much. And he showed his faith in addition to his love, [believing that] he gives an example to others as well. So what did Christ [do]? He commanded it. And when he gets out of the boat, he is buffeted by the waves and is frightened, since a gale excites fear. And why did the Saviour not command the winds to cease, but seized him himself? This was because his faith was wanting. For whenever our part is inadequate, God’s part stands firm. Demonstrating, therefore, that it was not the assault of the wind, but his lack of faith which caused his downfall, he says, “Why did you doubt, you of little faith?” For if he had not disbelieved, he would have stood easily even against the wind. This is why he seizes him and allows the wind to blow, showing that the wind<sup>72</sup> causes no damage when faith is firm. And when

---

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Mark 6.52.

<sup>69</sup> *Lit.* “he did not undo the darkness.”

<sup>70</sup> Mark 6.50. Note the parallel passage: Matthew 14.27.

<sup>71</sup> Matthew 14.28.

<sup>72</sup> *Lit.* “it.”

they got onto the boat, then the wind ceased. And on an earlier occasion, they said, “What sort of man is this? That even the winds ...” and so on,<sup>73</sup> but now they say “Truly you are God’s Son.”<sup>74</sup> For it was not for show that the walking on the waters by the Saviour came to pass, but for the benefit of the disciples. “For from the extraordinary thing [that has come to pass], they have changed their opinion completely. For they did not understand about the loaves: for their hearts were hardened.”<sup>75</sup> Therefore having been helped, they confessed him to be “Son of God,” and he did not rebuke them when they said this. On the contrary, God<sup>76</sup> confirmed everything which had been said, healing those who approached him with greater authority, and not as before.<sup>77</sup> ♦

(53) And when they had crossed over, they came<sup>78</sup> to the land of Gennesaret, and they moored the boat. (54) And when they got out of | the boat, people recognised him immediately,<sup>79</sup> (55) and rushed [333] about that whole region,<sup>80</sup> and began to bring the sick on mats to wherever they heard he was.<sup>81</sup>

♦ The Evangelist,<sup>82</sup> showing from this that he had visited many times, says that ‘the men of the place recognised him, and rushed about the whole region, and began to bring the sick on mats.’<sup>83</sup> For they did not approach him as before, dragging him into their homes and seeking a touch of his hand, as well as directions from him in words, but with a higher regard and a greater longing for wisdom and with a greater abundance of faith, they

<sup>73</sup> Matthew 8.27: cf. Mark 4.41.

<sup>74</sup> Matthew 14.33.

<sup>75</sup> Mark 6.51–52: This is a direct quotation, but note that Chrysostom is reading this passage in a markedly different way. In Chrysostom’s view, Mark is not simply registering that they were “astonished,” but that they had completely changed their point of view.

<sup>76</sup> The catenist strengthens the assertion here. Chrysostom says simply “He confirmed everything which had been said ...”

<sup>77</sup> Chrysostom is attempting to demonstrate why the crowds respond to Jesus in a remarkably different fashion in the following passage.

<sup>78</sup> Note the textual variant: ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

<sup>79</sup> Note the textual variant: εὐθέως.

<sup>80</sup> Note the textual variant: τὴν περίχωρον (cf. Matthew 14.35).

<sup>81</sup> Note the textual variant: ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἔστι.

<sup>82</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 333.5–14 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 50.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found at PG 58.507.24–35.

<sup>83</sup> This passage constitutes a curious conflation of Matthew 14.35 and Mark 6.55.

came in pursuit of healing. For the woman who had the haemorrhage taught them all to seek after wisdom. And the intervening time did not abolish their faith, but made it even stronger, and preserved its vigour. ♦ For it was not unreasonable even as time went on and his fame was magnified by the things which came to pass, that the faith in him became greater among people.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> Chrysostom is suggesting that, following the walking on the water, there is a greater intensity of activity around Jesus. This reflects a close narrative reading of the text, particularly Mark 6.54–56.

## CHAPTER 7

### 18. *On the transgression of the commands of God*

(1) And the Pharisees, and some of the scribes who had come from Jerusalem, gathered around him. (2) And seeing that some of his disciples were eating bread<sup>1</sup> with defiled hands, that is, without washing them, they reproached them.<sup>2</sup>

The Evangelist, wanting to talk about the accusation against the disciples, which the Scribes and the Pharisees made when they came to the Saviour, teaches in parenthesis what the tradition of the elders was, and he describes it in this way.

(5) So<sup>3</sup> the Pharisees and the scribes asked him, “Why do your disciples not live according to the tradition of the elders, but eat with defiled hands?”<sup>4</sup>

Not that the disciples were totally committed to not washing. ♦ But<sup>5</sup> | [334] because the Lord had taught them to perform everything which pertained to bodily needs, as required, and only to have a care for virtue, the Pharisees noticed that they did not pay attention to washing when the time came to eat, as was their custom, and this was what the Pharisees made the basis of their accusation. ♦ What therefore does the Lord say about this?

Since the charge they were bringing against the disciples was not a transgression of the law but a transgression of a tradition of the elders, he reproaches them with something more weighty, inasmuch as they were observing something absurd in an outward show of piety, and he quotes a saying of the prophet Isaiah, as something which was said about them. For, he

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐσθίοντες.

<sup>2</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐμέμψαντο.

<sup>3</sup> Note the textual variant: ἔπειτα.

<sup>4</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀνίπτοις χερσίν.

<sup>5</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 333,31–334,5 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* 79,1–12 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 124).



says, they are just like those people described in the saying, honouring God with their lips while being far from him in their hearts:<sup>6</sup> in vain they speak of rendering worship to God, while they give priority to human teachings: in the same way, while doing the same kind of thing, you transgress the law of God, and while adorning the outer person, you leave the inner person unadorned, and you, who pursue outward show, reproach those who practise the truth. Therefore in order to refute those who rely on the tradition of the elders [and reveal them] as those who do not observe piety, he exposes the disobedience which follows from the tradition of the elders, contrasting divine writing with the unwritten tradition of human beings.

(9) Then he said to them, “You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God, in order that you may keep<sup>7</sup> your tradition. (10) For Moses said, ‘Honour your father and your mother’; and ‘He who speaks evil of his father or mother must surely die.’ (11) But you say that if a man says to his father or his mother, ‘Whatever support you might have had from me is Corban (which is an offering [to God])’.”

[335] From these two laws he demands the honour due to parents according to the will of God. While one commands us to do so, the other exacts punishment for doing the opposite. For in this way he also demonstrates that the necessity of the command is very great. Since such is ordained by law and there is so great a threat upon its transgression, it is an easy and obvious thing to say, “You transgress the divine command, following the | traditions of your teachers. So that if anyone in dishonouring his parents were to promise a sacrifice, saying that he was to make gifts and sacrifices for God, which he should offer to his father, by this you say that honouring your father is no longer legitimate: which is a cancelling of the law on account of the tradition.” It would be quite proper to rebuke the insolence of a young man, and to reject as an abomination such a sacrifice, for God does not rejoice at being honoured out of the dishonour of one’s parents: because of all this, he shows that the rebuke,

<sup>6</sup> Note the paraphrase of Isaiah 29.13: *διανοία* has displaced *καρδιά*. The standard LXX translation appears to demand further explanation.

<sup>7</sup> Note the textual variant: *τηρήσητε*.

which came from God in the time of the prophet in relation to what happened then, is no less true of those who think in the same way as they did.

(14) Then he called the whole crowd<sup>8</sup> and he said to them, “Listen to me, all of you, and understand. There is nothing from outside a person, which by going into one can defile one: but the things that come out from him, these are the things which defile the person.”

Here begins the new law, which is according to the Spirit, and which no longer looks for bodily cleansings, nor difference of foods, but for virtue of spirit. Let us not be surprised if, whereas the law knows about bodily uncleanness and forbids it, the Lord appears to introduce the opposite, as if there is no kind of bodily uncleanness in the human person: for the things of the Law are concerned with the outer person, but the things of the Lord are concerned with the inner person; inasmuch as the time is already present, when the Cross will bring an end to bodily things, so that those who believe should act as those who have already laid aside the body, and have become naked spirit. Therefore he says that bodily defilement causes no damage to the inner person, but the evil things that come from out of the heart are the things which defile. And he adds, “*He who has ears to hear, let him hear,*”<sup>9</sup> without saying plainly what comes out of the heart. And the disciples thought that the saying hinted at something else which was more profound, and when he came home from the crowd, “*they asked him about the parable.*”<sup>10</sup> So they described the unclear saying as a parable. |

[336]

(21) “For it is from within, from the hearts of human beings, that evil intentions come: adultery, fornication, murder, theft.”

And he says to them, “*Do you not understand that everything that goes into a person from outside ...*” and so on,<sup>11</sup> that is to say, nothing which goes in makes people unclean, but only the evil which issues from within, and the passions which are generated by it.

---

<sup>8</sup> Note the textual variant: *πάντα*.

<sup>9</sup> Mark 7.16 is omitted in NA<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> Mark 7.17.

<sup>11</sup> Mark 7.18.

19. *On the Phoenician woman*

(24) And setting out from there,<sup>12</sup> he went away to the region of Tyre and Sidon.<sup>13</sup> And he entered the house and he wanted nobody to know that he was there, and he was not able to escape notice. (25) For a woman,<sup>14</sup> whose daughter<sup>15</sup> had an unclean spirit, heard about him and came to him and prostrated herself at his feet.

When the Lord crossed into the regions of Canaan (since both Tyre and Sidon happened to be there), a certain woman, a foreigner from among the inhabitants, whose daughter was painfully troubled by a demon, learnt that the Lord had come to stay in those places, and she came to him to ask for healing for her daughter, and she shouted out to him:<sup>16</sup> but why did she call to him? These things at any rate are basically what Matthew says. ♦ And the Lord,<sup>17</sup> although he saw the faith of the woman, apparently put off the healing because she was an outsider, “*a Gentile, a Syrophenician by birth*”;<sup>18</sup> showing to the Jews that healing was not granted on equal terms to them and to outsiders, and simultaneously, by making the faith of the woman manifest to all, showing how much more by comparison was the Jews’ lack of faith. ♦ And the Lord said to her, “*Let the children be fed first.*”<sup>19</sup> He said this because the time for doing good to outsiders had not yet come because Israel had not brought to completion her refusal of the good. Therefore he came not as to his own people, but to those to whom there was nothing in common with the fathers, to whom the promise has been made. | Yet he has not made his appearance manifest to Tyrians and Sidonians. But, on the contrary, he tries hard to escape notice, in order that he might not appear to be visiting the Gentiles prematurely, nor to be inviting them to faith through performing acts of gracious generosity through his goodwill and power. For this belonged to the time after the Cross and the rejection by Israel, as explained above. But in fact he was not able to escape notice, that is to say, it was not really possible to escape the notice of

[337]

<sup>12</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστὰς.

<sup>13</sup> Note the textual variant: τὰ μεθόρια Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος (cf. Matthew 15.21).

<sup>14</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀκούσασα γὰρ γυνή.

<sup>15</sup> Note the omission of αὐτῆς.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Matthew 15.22 where ἔκραυγάζεν is used in some manuscripts.

<sup>17</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 336.21–26 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Mattheum* 82.1–4 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 126).

<sup>18</sup> Mark 7.26.

<sup>19</sup> Mark 7.27.

those who outstripped Israel in faith. And in order that the disciples might know that he also opened the door of salvation to the Gentiles, he delays the disciples for a while on purpose on account of the economy of salvation.<sup>20</sup> Therefore knowing beforehand that he would be recognised, he gives the woman the opportunity to approach him and to seek healing. So he allowed her to prostrate herself, nor did he allow anything to happen outside his foreknowledge: in addition to this, when he replied very harshly, she was so far from taking it badly that she voiced a reply, which displayed a lot of faith and a lot of piety and wit. ♦ For<sup>21</sup> to grasp that she was reckoned by the Lord to have the status of a dog was a mark of piety; and to suppose that the tiniest amount of his power (which she called “crumbs”) was enough to supply healing for her daughter was a mark of faith exceeding all bounds; and to snatch affection from his abuse and to make such a wonderful reply was sure evidence of wit. ♦ For what does she say? “I take it as a favour even to have the status of a dog.” For to that extent, she is not an outsider, but a member of his own household, eating from the table of the Lord—if not some of the bread then at least some of the crumbs. “So great is the wealth of the Lord’s<sup>22</sup> table that even a crumb suffices for me to enjoy the things which I seek.” Therefore she says that the Jews are “children” and the Gentiles are “dogs,” bread “the benefits of miracles,” and crumbs “the tiniest amount of his power.” Therefore he gave to her the saying, not because his power was going to be wanting, even if he were to show kindness to her (for his power is unceasing and is sufficient for all who need it), but because both Hebrews and Gentiles are divided and they do not share fellowship. This is why he shows in advance that the casting out of the former, the Jews, actually brings about the reception of the latter, | the Gentiles. Therefore, since they had not yet laid hands on him, he maintained his goodwill towards them and did not transfer his grace to those outside. He calls the gentiles “dogs,” the very thing which later came round to Israel, at the time when Israel was deprived of divine nourishment, as it says in the Psalms, “They starve like dogs which

[338]

<sup>20</sup> Note the reference to Mt. 15.24 and Mt. 10.6. Jesus responds that he was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, just as the disciples are sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. It is only at the end of the gospel that the disciples are sent out to make disciples of all nations (Mt. 28.19).

<sup>21</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 337.15–25 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* 82.5–14 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 126).

<sup>22</sup> Cramer notes that the text of Possinus suggests δέ σου “your” at this point. This reading is also found in the parallel fragment from Theodore of Mopsuestia (Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* 82.13 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 124)).

return in the evening.”<sup>23</sup> And she did not bear the name badly, according to the story. But even with the same status as a dog, she continued to seek the act of gracious generosity, to partake of a share of the rich gift in Israel. And she received a share in the crumbs, which fall from the hands of children, just like dogs. Then he said to her, “For saying that, you may go”: note that Matthew says it indicates her faith, “Woman, great is your faith! Let it come to pass for you, as you wish!” but Mark indicates the virtue of her saying, when he says, “*Because of that saying, you may go,—the demon has left your daughter.*”<sup>24</sup>

*20. On the deaf and dumb man*

(31) And setting out again from the territories of Tyre and Sidon,<sup>25</sup> he came to<sup>26</sup> the sea of Galilee, in the territory of the<sup>27</sup> Decapolis. (32) And they brought to him a deaf (and)<sup>28</sup> dumb man, and they begged him to lay his hand [on him].

◆ The Lord<sup>29</sup> does not look out for his own honour so much as for our salvation, nor does he regard how he might make a great pronouncement, but how he might say something which could draw us to himself. This is why an abundance of things, which are insignificant and unremarkable, surround things which are of importance.<sup>30</sup> ◆ This is why he takes hold of the deaf and the dumb man, and takes him away privately, as far as possible to separate him from the crowd in order that he might not seem to command

<sup>23</sup> Psalm 59.7 “They howl like dogs which return at evening and prowl around a town” (LXX 58.7).

<sup>24</sup> Mark 7.29.

<sup>25</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐκ τῶν ὀρίων Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος.

<sup>26</sup> Note the textual variant: πρὸς.

<sup>27</sup> Note the textual variant: τῆς.

<sup>28</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ.

<sup>29</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 338.22–25 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Iohannem* 64.1. This passage can be found in PG 59:353.46–49.

<sup>30</sup> The meaning of the Greek is not immediately clear at this point. Lampe suggests that the meaning of περιρρεῖ in this context means “make to flow around.” The original passage in Chrysostom’s *Homilia in Iohannem* 64.1 states: Διὰ τοῦτο τὰ μὲν ἠψηλά καὶ μεγάλα, ὀλίγα, καὶ αἰτὰ δε κεκρυμμένα: τὰ δὲ ταπεινά καὶ εὐτελεῖ, πολλὰ περιρρεῖ τοῖς αὐτοῦ λόγοις: ‘For this reason, his sublime and impressive sayings are few as well as hidden, but those which are humble and lowly are many, and abound through his discourses’ (PG 59.353). Nevertheless, the passage suggests that the writer appears to be addressing two questions: why has Jesus not noticed the deaf and dumb man? Moreover, why do the people have to beg him to heal the deaf and dumb man?

the miracles to show off, and he teaches us to practise not being arrogant and boastful. For no-one does miracles adorned with such humility and pursuing such moderation of character.

(33) And he put his fingers in his ears.

Despite being able to accomplish the miracle with a word. Showing how even the body, | inexpressibly united to him, abounds in the energy of divine power; inasmuch as it was clearly animated by a soul possessed both of reason and thought. [339]

(33) And he spat and touched his tongue.

Which same thing John also recounts him to have done in the episode of the man born blind. For since after the transgression in Adam many sufferings came upon human nature, including occasionally disability, revealing into what kind of sickness human nature has fallen through sin, Christ came and exhibiting in himself this same human nature in perfect form (in the form that he had himself created from the beginning), through this same human nature, he cures the diseases of those who share the same nature as him:<sup>31</sup> through his human nature, with his fingers, he opened the ears of the deaf and dumb man, and, with his spittle, he restored the power of speech to his tongue. This he did also to the man born blind.<sup>32</sup>

(34) And looking up to heaven, he sighed.

And looking up to heaven, he sighed, both at the same time attributing the responsibility for everything done by him to the Father, and having pity on human nature, seeing into what depths, the devil, hating the good, had led it, and the want of attention of those first-formed.<sup>33</sup>

(34) And he said to him, "Ephphatha," which is, "Be opened."

And at the same time, by his word, the miracle comes into actuality: he both hears and speaks properly.

---

<sup>31</sup> *Lit.* "as it" i.e. his human nature.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. John 9.6.

<sup>33</sup> I.e. Adam etc.

(36) And Jesus ordered them to tell no one: but the more he ordered them, the more zealously they proclaimed it. (37) And they were astounded beyond measure, saying, "He has done all things well: he even makes the deaf to hear and the mute to speak."

Again he teaches us moderation here, and he recommends to those who have been shown kindness to conceal the miracle, in order that he may not seem to inflame and arouse the murderousness of the Jews against him prematurely.<sup>34</sup> Even if most certainly he knew that they would not keep silent, but would proclaim the miracle.

---

<sup>34</sup> *Lit.* "before time."

## CHAPTER 8

### 21. *On the seven loaves*

(1) In those days when there was a great<sup>1</sup> crowd without anything to eat, Jesus<sup>2</sup> called his disciples and said to them, (2) “I have compassion for the crowd, because they have been with me now for three days, and they have nothing to eat. (3) If I send them away hungry to their homes, they will faint on the way—for some of them have come a great distance.” [340]

The Lord having already earlier created provisions, once again wishes to perform the same sign, moving the crowd to faith. And then as now he makes use of propitious conditions. And these were the constancy of the crowds, which had endured already for three days, and the impending danger of harm to those who were hungry, because there was no food. And yet these were not the reasons, for the Lord did not altogether want to provide such a great exercise of power so that the multitudes would not follow him for the sake of bodily sustenance. Therefore, as they were thinking in this way and following him for this reason, he said to them: “You do not seek me because your saw signs and wonders, but because you ate from the bread, and were satisfied.”<sup>3</sup> Then urging them on to search for something greater, he encourages faith in himself and the benefit which comes from it which is eternal: comparing it with more immediate sustenance, he says, “Do not work for the food which perishes, but for the food which endures for eternal life.”<sup>4</sup>

(4) And his disciples replied to him, “How can one feed these people with bread here in the desert?”

So when the Saviour said to the disciples, “*I have compassion on the crowd, because they have been with me now for three days, and they have nothing to eat, and if I send them away hungry to their homes, they will faint on the*

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the textual variant: *παμπόλλου*.

<sup>2</sup> Note the textual variant: *ὁ Ἰησοῦς*.

<sup>3</sup> John 6.26.

<sup>4</sup> John 6.27.



way, for some of them have come a great distance"<sup>5</sup>—the disciples, again not yet understanding the working of a feeding miracle, ♦ which<sup>6</sup> for the sake [341] of their faith the Lord wanted to provide, | said, “How can one feed these people with bread here in the desert?”<sup>7</sup> revealing the impossibility of the act in conformity with human thinking. ♦

(5) And he asked<sup>8</sup> them, “How many loaves do you have?”

So why does the Saviour ask,<sup>9</sup> “How many loaves do you have”? He does not ask out of ignorance, but in order to lead the disciples on to the perception of his power. Then when they said, “Seven,” and when he heard that there was sufficient for the preparation of the meal, the multitude sat down for the supply of provisions.

(6) And they said, “Seven.” Then he ordered the crowd to sit down on the ground. And he took the seven loaves, and after giving thanks, he broke them and gave them to his disciples in order that they might distribute them: and they distributed them to the crowd. (7) And they had a few small fish; and after blessing them, he told them that these also should be distributed.

Such was the readiness of his power! A thanksgiving to God characteristic of a human being! An action with regard to what had to be done characteristic of God! For with him this divine power was not imparted from outside as it is with the saints. For the Evangelist showed this when he says, “Power came out from him and he healed them all.”<sup>10</sup> ♦ What is seemly<sup>11</sup> for the Lord is preserved by making use of the ministry of the disciples, for whom such public service is an appropriate characteristic of discipleship. “And they had a few small fish, and after blessing them, he said that they should be distributed.”<sup>12</sup> ♦

<sup>5</sup> Mark 8.2–3.

<sup>6</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 340.31–32 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragments in Mattheum* 86.1–2 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 127).

<sup>7</sup> Mark 8.4.

<sup>8</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ ἐπηρώτα.

<sup>9</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 341.4: alter punctuation to omit first question mark.

<sup>10</sup> Luke 6.19.

<sup>11</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 341.18–21 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragments in Mattheum* 87.2–3 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 128).

<sup>12</sup> Mark 8.7.

(8) They ate<sup>13</sup> and they were satisfied. And they took up the broken pieces left over, seven baskets full. (9) And those who ate<sup>14</sup> were about four thousand in number: and he sent them away.

And having eaten, they were satisfied, but there was also left over seven baskets of scraps from those who ate. The action is evident from every perspective: from the fact that those who had feasted were full, from the quantity of what was left over, and from the number of those who were satisfied. The sharing of the bounty was consistent with their need, and it was not as if they could make any gain having received it, despite the fact that there were many leftovers. And this also is a good symbol for measuring the benefit by the need, and not being led on beyond the need to greed.

(10) And immediately, getting into the boat with his disciples, he went [342] to the region of Dalmanutha.

Therefore the Saviour got into the boat with his disciples, despite not embarking with them in the earlier story. Therefore let us learn from this not to take upon ourselves trials and conflicts. But let us learn that frequently we are led to trial and testing through taking rest, for just as when he is absent, he makes hard work for us by his absence, so generally he gives us rest whenever he is present.<sup>15</sup>

(11) And the Pharisees came, and they began to argue with him, asking him for a sign from heaven to test him.

*“To test him”* puts it beautifully. Since in making their request they pretended that they would believe if he were to provide a sign, but in truth they made the request deceitfully because they would only accept a test of his power, reckoning his word to be nothing worth believing. ♦ But<sup>16</sup> what is the sign from heaven? Either that he should make the sun to stand, or stop the moon, or bring down thunder-bolts, or work a change in the air, or do

<sup>13</sup> Note the textual variant: ἔφαγον δέ.

<sup>14</sup> Note the textual variant: οἱ φαγόντες.

<sup>15</sup> The meaning of this passage is rather obscure. The writer appears to be suggesting that, in the previous story, when the disciples departed without Jesus, they quickly found that a storm arose (in his absence); his presence provides security and safety.

<sup>16</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 342.15–25 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 53.3. (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365) This passage can be found in PG 58.528.28–50.

some other such thing. “This present time of my coming,” he says, “is different from that which is to come. Now there is need of these signs on the earth, but those for the future are stored up in heaven. Now I come as a physician, then I shall be here as a judge. For this reason do I come hidden: but then I will come making everything manifest, turning Heaven upside down, hiding the sun, and not allowing the moon to give any light. Then even the powers of the Heavens will be shaken.<sup>17</sup> But now is not the time for these signs.” ♦ This is why “*no sign will be given to this generation.*”<sup>18</sup> From those who withdraw from communion with God, God also withdraws: his departure is a symbol of this.<sup>19</sup> Therefore reasonably he also sighed deeply in his spirit and said these things, wondering why he had come to do these things, namely to die on their behalf, and to suffer the last things: why do they provoke him against | themselves passing their lives in wickedness? “*And getting into the boat again, he went across to the other side.*”<sup>20</sup>

[343]

## 22. On the leaven of the Pharisees

(14) And they had forgotten to take any bread: and they had nothing except one loaf with them in the boat. (15) And he cautioned them, saying, “Watch out! Beware the leaven of the Pharisees, and the leaven of Herod!” (16) And they argued among themselves, saying,<sup>21</sup> “It is because we have<sup>22</sup> no bread.”

The Lord simultaneously reproaches them for their unbelief, and he makes plain what is said on their part. He says, “Had you remembered what already happened, you would not be at a loss for bread if you do not have it nor would you be thinking that I was talking to you about this. For it was not difficult for me in the same way as before to make bread appear out of nothing in your midst and to meet your need. How is it that you do not yet understand?<sup>23</sup> Are your hearts still hardened?” He says these things briefly guiding the disciples to both perception and faith. And if Matthew

---

<sup>17</sup> Matthew 24.29.

<sup>18</sup> Mark 8.12.

<sup>19</sup> Mark 8.13 “He left them, and getting into the boat again, he went across to the other side.”

<sup>20</sup> Mark 8.13.

<sup>21</sup> Note the textual variant: λέγοντες.

<sup>22</sup> Note the textual variant: ἔχομεν.

<sup>23</sup> The text follows Matthew 16.11 at this point.

says to beware the leaven of “the Pharisees and the Sadducees,”<sup>24</sup> Mark “of the Pharisees and the Herodians,”<sup>25</sup> and Luke only “of the Pharisees,”<sup>26</sup> there is no disagreement in these things. For the three Evangelists say “the Pharisees” in the first place. But two Evangelists assign a part to second parties, while neither of the two says only one. For the likelihood was that since Matthew omitted the Herodians, Mark added them to provide a fuller narrative. And the one who knows that the teaching is “bread” apprehends and understands the things concerning “bread”: while sound teaching is healthy, false teaching is hurtful, and so anyone who seeks all the “bread” written down in the scriptures at each place fits the writings onto the things concerning the doctrines and the teaching.

### 23. *On the blind man*

(22) And he comes<sup>27</sup> to Bethsaida, and they bring to him a blind man, and they beg him to touch him. And | he took the hand of the blind man and he led<sup>28</sup> him out of the village. [344]

Christ comes to faithless Bethsaida, and they bring to him a blind man, and they beg him to touch him. The faith of those who brought him was not genuine, nor were they worthy to be spectators of the miracle. This is why he took him by the hand and led him out of the village, and spat into his eyes.

And when he had spat on his eyes and laid his hands on him, he asked him whether he could see<sup>29</sup> anything. (24) And looking up, he said, “I can see people, but they look like trees, walking.”<sup>30</sup>

And he spits and places his hands on him, wanting to show that a divine word and an action according with the word accomplished the miracles. For his hand is a symbol of the action and the spit which came out of his mouth is a symbol of the word. And he asked him if he could see, which he

<sup>24</sup> Matthew 16.6.

<sup>25</sup> Mark 8.15.

<sup>26</sup> Luke 12.1.

<sup>27</sup> Note the textual variant: ἔρχεται.

<sup>28</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐξήγαγεν.

<sup>29</sup> Note the textual variant: βλέπει.

<sup>30</sup> Note the textual variant: ὡς δένδρα περιπατοῦντας.

did not do to the others—signalling that the faith of those who brought him was as defective as the eyes of the man who was blind. And he said hardly anything else for this reason, not even “according to your faith let it come to pass for you,” since he exposed the imperfection of his faith: for he said vaguely that he saw the people, but they looked like trees, walking.

(25) Then again he laid his hands on his eyes and he made him look up. And he was restored, and he saw everything clearly.<sup>31</sup>

Again he places his hands on his eyes, leading him out of his prior perception to the added gift of faith, and in this way he made him see perfectly. But the addition proves what I said. For after saying “he made him to see,” he adds, “and he was restored, and he saw everything clearly,” that is to say, with the eye of the soul.<sup>32</sup> For the Lord healed him physically and spiritually. And he [345] saw clearly and with | the eyes of the mind. Therefore we are compelled to say to the Saviour like the holy disciples, “Increase our faith.”<sup>33</sup> “*Then he sent him away to his home,*”<sup>34</sup> and he gave an order to him that he was not to say anything to anyone in the village.<sup>35</sup>

“You were saved,” he says, “and you have come out of Sodom. Be saved on the mountain of the Church. For this is your home. But Bethsaida is a village of fishermen<sup>36</sup> (understand what I say) and people who are unworthy of both the sight and the sound of miracles. Therefore do not go there in case you are made captive to their will.”

#### 24. *On the questioning in Caesarea*

(27) And Jesus went with his disciples to the villages of Caesarea Philippi. And on the way he asked his disciples, saying to them “Who

<sup>31</sup> Note the textual variants in the previous verse.

<sup>32</sup> Metonymy.

<sup>33</sup> Luke 17.5.

<sup>34</sup> Mark 8.26.

<sup>35</sup> Note the textual variant at this point: μηδέ ειπεῖν τινα των εν τη κωμη. Some manuscripts suggest that Jesus instructs the man not even to enter the village: μηδε εις την κωμην εισελθης (This latter reading is the reading preferred in NA<sup>27</sup>).

<sup>36</sup> Lampe quotes this passage in the *Catena in Marcum* in his entry for θηρατής. He goes on to note that Severianus Gabalensis uses the term as a metaphor for ‘heretics.’ The context here might also suggest this metaphor, particularly given the heavy hint added in parenthesis.

do men say that I am?" (28) And they replied,<sup>37</sup> "[Some say] John the Baptist, others Elijah, and others one<sup>38</sup> of the prophets." (29) And he said to them,<sup>39</sup> "But who do you say that I am?" And in reply<sup>40</sup> Peter said to him, "You are the Christ."

He asks already knowing, setting up their advantage from the reply, and making the disciples form an opinion about him which is better than the opinions of others. For Peter he confirms that he has formed the right opinion, and for the others he inspires faith by Peter's testimony. The miraculous nature of Christ made an impression on everyone, even if they had not quite attained faith. They were compelled to consider him human on account of what they saw—even attributing the resurrection of the dead to him, they thought he was John, or Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. ♦ But<sup>41</sup> why did he not ask for their own opinion straightaway, rather than that of the people? This was in order that when they had stated the people's opinion, they might then be asked, "But who do you say that I am?" By the manner of his questioning they should be led to a greater opinion, understanding implicitly that they should not be reduced to the same level as the others. | This is why he does not ask them at the beginning of his preaching, but when he has done many signs, and had taught them about many lofty things, and about his divinity. And showing how earnestly he wants his Incarnation to be confessed, he says "the Son of Man." Then since they stated the mistaken opinion of many, he added, "But who do you say that I am?" all but calling them through the second question to a greater imagination concerning him, and not to concur with the many. What therefore does the leader of the disciples, the spokesperson<sup>42</sup> of the apostles, say? When all are asked, he alone answers and says "*You are the Christ.*"<sup>43</sup> ♦ And the present Evangelist has passed over the more detailed narrative that Matthew gives,<sup>44</sup> for he, as in an abridgement, has omitted the precise details in order that he might not seem to Peter to court favour with his teacher.

[346]

<sup>37</sup> Note the textual variant: οἱ δὲ ἀπεκρίθησαν.

<sup>38</sup> Note the textual variant: ἕνα.

<sup>39</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει αὐτοῖς.

<sup>40</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ.

<sup>41</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 345.27–346.10 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 54.1–2 (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.532.56–533.41.

<sup>42</sup> *Lit.* "the mouth."

<sup>43</sup> Mark 8.29.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Matthew 16.16–20.

(30) And he ordered them not to say anything about him.

“And he ordered them,” says Jesus,<sup>45</sup> “not to say anything,”<sup>46</sup> or “he sternly ordered” as Matthew says. ♦ For<sup>47</sup> he still wanted their opinion about him to be kept secret, so that when they were caught up in the midst of the scandal of the Cross and Passion, faith would be engraved securely on their minds. Perhaps<sup>48</sup> also he ordered the disciples for another reason at that time to tell nobody that he was Jesus the Christ. For the issue was that after bringing the economy of salvation to perfection, he would say, just before the Ascension, “Go and make disciples of all the nations,”<sup>49</sup> thus entrusting to them [the task of] proclaiming him. And even though earlier he sent out the same twelve, that is, “everyone who confesses me,”<sup>50</sup> having given them other instructions, we can say that at that point Jesus had not yet been identified as the Christ, and the heavenly Father had not yet revealed to Peter that the Christ was the Son of the living God.

But Matthew says “and he began to reveal”;<sup>51</sup> for he did not simply teach, but it is as if he reveals the explanation at one time to the catechumens,<sup>52</sup> and then to those who have progressed to full initiation. The reason for his [347] instruction | to them not to say just yet that Jesus is the Christ is revealed: for he says the things that are about to happen for the economy of salvation, should be proclaimed finally after Jesus Christ has been crucified by those who are able to bear witness. ♦ And when<sup>53</sup> he establishes the doctrine [of who he is], he then leads them into the teaching about the Passion. But even so they do not understand what he says. “For what he said was,” it says,

<sup>45</sup> This reference to “Jesus” appears to be a scribal error. The point that the writer is making is that two totally different verbs are used in Mark and Matthew (a point that is not immediately apparent from the English translation).

<sup>46</sup> Mark 8.30.

<sup>47</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 346.16–347.4 contains echoes of Origen, *Commentarium in Matthaeum* 12.18–19 (E. Klostermann, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 10.1 [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 40.1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1935]: 109–113), which are “not verbally close” and “perhaps indirect” (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366).

<sup>48</sup> Cramer notes that at this point Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 departs from the other manuscripts. He has included the extract, which continues until “... after Jesus Christ has been crucified by those who are able to bear witness” (*Cat. Marc.* 347.4).

<sup>49</sup> Note the combination of the accounts in Matthew 28.19 and Luke 24.50–53.

<sup>50</sup> An allusion to Matthew 10.32.

<sup>51</sup> Matthew 16.21.

<sup>52</sup> Lampe notes that οἱ ἀρχομένοι is often used of catechumens.

<sup>53</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 347.4–10 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 54.5 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.536.8–19.

“hidden from them.”<sup>54</sup> They did not understand that it was necessary for him to rise again, and they were afraid to ask him not about his having to die, but “How?” and “In what manner?” And they did not know what rising from the dead might be, but they supposed it was much better for him not to die. ♦

(32) And Peter took him aside and began to rebuke him. (33) But turning and looking at his disciples, he rebuked Peter,<sup>55</sup> saying,<sup>56</sup> “Get behind me, Satan, because you do not set your mind on divine things, but on human things.”

♦ When<sup>57</sup> the others were bewildered and puzzled, once again Peter, being hot-headed, tries to argue about this—not openly, but taking him away privately, he began to rebuke him. Or as Matthew says, “God forbid that this should ever happen to you.”<sup>58</sup> What on earth is going on? The one who received a revelation, the one who was so blessed, has he so quickly fallen away and stumbled? And would it not be surprising if someone who had not received a revelation should suffer this? For he had learnt that Christ is the Son of God, but the question of what the mystery of the Cross and of the resurrection might be had not yet been revealed to him. “For the saying,” he says, “was hidden from them.”<sup>59</sup> However, to demonstrate that he is far from coming unwillingly to his Passion, he simultaneously rebuked Peter and called him “Satan,” not saying, “Satan spoke through you,” but “*Get behind me Satan, because you do not set your mind on divine things, but on human things.*”<sup>60</sup> For indeed it was the Adversary’s desire that Christ should not suffer. This is why he rebuked him with such severity. “For you,” he says, “suppose that the Passion is unworthy of me, but I tell you that not suffering would be unworthy of me.” By these statements, he dismisses Peter’s | anxiety. ♦ And somebody else<sup>61</sup> says that when Satan tests Jesus himself, he is not told “Get behind me, Satan,” but “Away with you, Satan, [348]

<sup>54</sup> A paraphrase of Luke 18.34.

<sup>55</sup> Note the textual variant: τῷ Πέτρῳ.

<sup>56</sup> Note the textual variant: λέγων.

<sup>57</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 347.16–348.1 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 54.5–6 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.536.19–537.4.

<sup>58</sup> Matthew 16.22.

<sup>59</sup> Luke 18.34.

<sup>60</sup> Mark 8.33.

<sup>61</sup> This source is anonymous.



for it is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God' and so on.<sup>62</sup> But since Peter still sins, and, consequently, is not yet behind Jesus, he is told, "Get behind me, Satan, you are a stumbling block to me." Therefore, unless the saint is behind Jesus, the rebel misunderstands the words of God and casts Jesus behind himself. And for this reason Peter hears him say, "Get behind me," which means, "Follow me, and do not resist my willing acceptance of suffering, tossing my word behind you,"<sup>63</sup> (as it says in the forty ninth psalm addressed to the sinner). ♦ "For you<sup>64</sup> are reproaching me for being willing to suffer: but I say to you, it is hurtful and damaging for you not only to hinder me but also to be horrified at my Passion, for it will be impossible for you to be saved if you are not ready to die yourself. This is why he does not only advance the saying about himself but also about Peter."<sup>65</sup> ♦

(34) And he called the crowd with his disciples, and he said to them, "Whoever<sup>66</sup> wants to follow behind me, let him renounce himself and take up his cross and follow me."

♦ For<sup>67</sup> so great is the profit from this action, that so far as regards yourselves, he says, not dying is a grievous thing, but dying is a good thing. And he did not say, "Even if you are not willing, it is necessary for you to suffer this." But why did he say, "*If anyone wants to follow after me*"?<sup>68</sup> "For I am calling you to good things, and not to evil and burdensome things; and not so that I should have to compel." By saying these things, he attracted them even more. For the one who uses force turns people away, but the one who leaves the hearer to be the Lord's, attracts people even more. For nurture is mightier than force.

Let us learn at length what it is "*to deny oneself*."<sup>69</sup> And we will grasp this if we understand what it is to deny one's companion. He who denies a companion or a brother or a servant or whoever it might be, even if

<sup>62</sup> Matthew 4.10.

<sup>63</sup> Psalm 50.17.

<sup>64</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 348.11–16 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 54.6 (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.539.62–541.4.

<sup>65</sup> *Lit.* "that man."

<sup>66</sup> Note the textual variant: ὁσπις.

<sup>67</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 348.21–349.17 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 55.1–2 (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.541.4–542.41.

<sup>68</sup> Mark 8.34.

<sup>69</sup> Mark 8.34.

he is being beaten | or bound or arrested or suffering some other kind of [349] misfortune, is the one who does not stand by him and fails to help him and does not suffer anything for his friend once he is estranged from him. So this is how he wants us to disregard our own bodies, in order that, even if they beat us or whatever they do, we should not spare ourselves. For this is what it means—to be sparing. For since fathers are being sparing to their children when they hand them over to their teachers and order them not to spare them, so also Christ does not say, “Let him not spare himself,” but he says vehemently, “*Let him renounce himself*,”<sup>70</sup> that is, let him have nothing in common with himself, but let him give himself to dangers and to conflicts, and let him feel that someone else suffers these things.<sup>71</sup> And when he says, “*let him take up his cross*,”<sup>72</sup> this demonstrates the greatness of the hyperbole, for this is even greater than that: denying oneself is necessary even to this extent: as far as death, even the most shameful death. And not once, nor twice, but through the whole of life, one must do this. “*And let him follow me*.”<sup>73</sup> For since it is possible even as a sufferer not to follow, when one suffers something not because of him, in order that you should not consider that the nature of the dangers is sufficient, he adds also the principle that in doing this, you should also follow him. ♦

(35) “For whoever wants to save his life will lose it: and whoever may lose<sup>74</sup> his life for my sake and the sake of the gospel will save it.”

♦ And<sup>75</sup> what he says is like this: “Not being unsparing of you, but rather very much sparing you, I command these things. For the one who spares his child, ruins it: but the one who does not spare his child, saves it.” Then he said, “*He who wants to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses*” and so on.<sup>76</sup> In order that you may not suppose destruction and salvation to be equal, and in order that you may learn how great is the difference

<sup>70</sup> Mark 8.34.

<sup>71</sup> In other words, let him disregard his own suffering to such a degree that it would be as if someone else were suffering it.

<sup>72</sup> Mark 8.34.

<sup>73</sup> Mark 8.34.

<sup>74</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀπολέσῃ.

<sup>75</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 349.21–350.4 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 55.3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.543.57–544.24.

<sup>76</sup> Mark 8.35.

between destruction and salvation, he brings in this statement to furnish this argument.<sup>77</sup> Therefore you must stand prepared against everlasting death; for even now a difficult battle is about to be kindled; therefore do not sit inside, but go out and fight; even if you fall in the line of duty, you will then be saved; for if in real battles, somebody stands ready in battle for slaughter, this person is more highly regarded than the others and is more invincible and more formidable to the enemy, even though after death the King, on whose behalf he took up arms, is not strong enough to raise him up again; how much more in these wars, | when there are such hopes of resurrection, will the one, who exposes his life<sup>78</sup> to death, find it. ♦

(36) “For what will it profit<sup>79</sup> you,<sup>80</sup> if you will gain the whole world and lose your life? Indeed what will you give in exchange for your life?”

♦ See<sup>81</sup> how the salvation of one’s life, beyond what is right or proper, is worse and more unbearable than losing it altogether because there is nothing left to redeem it. For “do not tell me this,” he says, “that the one who has saved his life has escaped such dangers: but with his life add the whole world, and what does he gain from that when his life is destroyed? For you do not have another life to give in place of your life. For you can exchange money or house or slaves, but if you lose your life you will have no other life to give. And why is it surprising if this happens to one’s life? For in fact anyone might see that this comes to pass with regard to the body. For even if, wearing ten thousand diadems, you have a body which is sickly by nature and incurable, you will not be able to give your whole kingdom to redeem it.” ♦

(38) “For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him the Son of Man will also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with his holy angels.”

<sup>77</sup> *Lit.* “these thing.”

<sup>78</sup> The word ψυχή can be translated ‘life’ or ‘soul.’

<sup>79</sup> Note the textual variant: ὠφελήσει.

<sup>80</sup> *Lit.* “a man” For the sake of more idiomatic English, as well as inclusive language, I have used the second person.

<sup>81</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 350.8–20 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeeum* 55.4 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.543.57–544.24.

♦ He<sup>82</sup> is not satisfied with faith in the mind, but he also demands confession from the mouth, preparing us for bold speech and for the greater display of love, and making us more devout. And this is why he speaks with everybody: to make them devout. For the one who learns this will not only teach with boldness but will also persuade with enthusiasm, confessing him without shame. “For even in matters of discipline,” he says, | “the greater the punishment, the greater the rewards in good things.” ♦ And “the adulteress” [351] refers to a woman who goes with another man: and a soul, which has abandoned God the true bridegroom and is not following through his teaching, but has made her bed with others and has accepted the seeds of ungodliness, clearly takes and bears the title of an “adulteress” and a “sinner.” “Therefore the one, who denies for such reasons my Lordship and is ashamed at the word of the Gospel, will pay the appropriate penalty for ungodliness, hearing in the second and fearful coming, “Truly truly I say to you: I do not know you.”<sup>83</sup> For this reason, even if you do something good, and you do not receive the reward for it in this material world, do not be troubled. Even if you do something evil and do not receive punishment, do not think that you have got away with it. For the retribution will be waiting for you there; for the one who is now despised by you and called ‘Son of Man’ on account of the incarnation will come with great glory, no longer exhibiting the humility of flesh but the power of his own Father, and attended by his angels.” For God has a father, even though he is without a mother: and he is the Son of Man according to the flesh even if he is without a father: therefore, hinting at the complete unity of the Son of Man, he calls God his own father.

---

<sup>82</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 350.26–351.2 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 34.3 (PG 57.402.5–17).

<sup>83</sup> Matthew 25.12.



## CHAPTER 9

### 25. *On the transfiguration of Jesus*

(1) And he said to them. “Truly I say to you, that there are some standing here,<sup>1</sup> who will not taste death, until they see the Kingdom of God come with power.”

◆ Since<sup>2</sup> he had spoken much of dangers and death—of his own Passion and of the death of the disciples—he imposed these rigorous demands: and these things were in the present life and were approaching, but good things were in the future and were a source of hope. Wanting also to satisfy them fully by the vision, and to teach them what kind of glory it was with which he was going to return (as far as it was possible for them to learn in their present life), | he shows them and reveals this in order that they might not suffer loss [352] either at their own death or at the death of their Lord: and especially Peter in his grief. And notice what he does when he has spoken about Gehenna and the Kingdom: he shows the Kingdom in a vision, but he does not yet show Gehenna. For since they were already of good repute and considerate, he exhorts them with reference to<sup>3</sup> greater things. Not only does he pass over that subject, but there are some places where he brings the realities of hell before our eyes, as when he introduces the picture of Lazarus,<sup>4</sup> and mentions the man who demanded back the one hundred denarii,<sup>5</sup> and the man clothed in filthy garments,<sup>6</sup> and many others. ◆

(2) And after six days, Jesus took Peter and James and John, and led them up a high mountain privately on their own: and he was

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the textual variants: according to NA<sup>27</sup>, the different word order is attested in a number of manuscripts.

<sup>2</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 351.26–352.10 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaewum* 56.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.549.10–38.

<sup>3</sup> *Lit.* “by sight of.”

<sup>4</sup> Luke 16.19–31: the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus.

<sup>5</sup> Luke 16.1–16: the Parable of the Unjust Steward.

<sup>6</sup> Matthew 22.11–14: the Parable of the Wedding Garment.

transfigured before them, (3) and his clothes became white as snow, such as no fuller on earth could bleach them.

◆ Now<sup>7</sup> Luke says “after eight days,” not disagreeing with this evangelist, but agreeing with him in every way. For the one expressed both the day on which he spoke, and the day on which he led them up. But the other described only the interval between the days. Therefore having taken the leaders, “*he led them up a high mountain privately on his own*” and so on.<sup>8</sup> Why does he take these? Because these were superior to the others. And Peter showed his superiority in loving him exceedingly: but John by being loved exceedingly by him; and James by the answer which he gave with his brother when he said, “We are able to drink the cup”:<sup>9</sup> but not by this answer alone, but also by his works, especially those in which he fulfilled what he said. For (James) was so irritating and difficult to the Jews, that Herod thought he might do the Jews a favour if he were to have him killed.<sup>10</sup>

But why does he not lead them up immediately? In order that the remaining disciples should not suffer any human weakness: this is why he does not mention the names of those who are left behind. Why then does he foretell [353] it at all? In order that | they might be readier to learn about spiritual contemplation<sup>11</sup> from what he foretold, and being filled with a more earnest desire in the course of those days, they might be present with a mind which is awake and alert. ◆ Therefore while it was possible for him to display his glory in his own dwelling place because he also holds the summit of the mountain to be a suitable dwelling place (which is understood entirely as a consequence of the height of his glory), he led them up on to a high mountain. And he says that he did this “*privately*,”<sup>12</sup> signifying the secret mystery of the reality since the Lord was unwilling to make it public. And the transfiguration was so-called because of its brightness, in that his face shone like the sun and his clothing became “white like lightning,”<sup>13</sup> as Luke says. But Matthew says his clothes became “as white as the light.”<sup>14</sup> Now one should not expect a change

---

<sup>7</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 352.17–353.3 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 56.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.549.40–550.26.

<sup>8</sup> Mark 9.2.

<sup>9</sup> Matthew 20.22.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Acts 12.1–2.

<sup>11</sup> *Theoria*.

<sup>12</sup> Mark 9.2.

<sup>13</sup> Luke 9.29 *Lit.* “flashing as with lightning.”

<sup>14</sup> Matthew 17.2.

of character in the Kingdom, neither of the Saviour himself nor of those who have become like him, but one should expect the addition of a very bright light, and this is the change of which Paul speaks.<sup>15</sup> The Evangelists call it “the transfiguration.”<sup>16</sup> ♦ As<sup>17</sup> to the reason why he brings Moses and Elijah centre-stage, one might mention many reasons but let us say these things: first, that since the crowds said, some that he was Elijah, others that he was Jeremiah, and others that he was one of the prophets, he presents the principal characters in order that they might see the difference between the servants and the Lord, and that Peter was rightly commended for confessing him Son of God. And since they were continually accusing him of transgressing the Law and they supposed him to be a blasphemer, appropriating to himself a glory which belonged not to him but to the Father, they also said, “This man is not from God because he does not keep the Sabbath”<sup>18</sup> and other similar things. Therefore in order that he might be shown to be innocent of these things, and that there is no transgression of the Law, and that calling himself equal to the Father is not an appropriation of glory, which is not his own, he presents those who have shone with respect to each:<sup>19</sup> for Moses gave the Law, and they were able to reflect that he would not have overlooked it being trampled on, as the Jews supposed, nor would he honour a man who transgressed it and was an enemy of the one who established it. And Elijah was zealous for the glory of God. And if anyone would be a rival to God, and call himself a God | equal to the Father, while he was not what he said, Elijah was not the person to stand by and listen to him. [354] And again, in order that they might see that he has authority over death and life, and has power over those above and those below,<sup>20</sup> he presents a man who has died<sup>21</sup> and a man who never suffered death.<sup>22</sup> And the Evangelist

<sup>15</sup> Possibly a reference to 1 Corinthians 15.52.

<sup>16</sup> The commentator is at pains to explain what the Evangelists mean by μεταμόρφωσις and to avoid any potential misunderstanding. While the word implies “change” and “transformation,” the writer is at pains to insist that μεταμόρφωσις means that Christ’s nature was simply revealed and not changed. Thus any attempt to promote an “adoptionist” Christology is firmly resisted.

<sup>17</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 353.16–354.8 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 56.1–2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.550.27–551.6.

<sup>18</sup> John 9.16.

<sup>19</sup> In other words, with respect to “the observance of the Law” (Moses) and with respect to “the glory of God” (Elijah).

<sup>20</sup> I.e. the living and the dead.

<sup>21</sup> I.e. Moses.

<sup>22</sup> I.e. Elijah. 2 Kings 2.



himself has revealed the fifth reason in that he wished to show the glory of the Cross and to console Peter and those others who were afraid of the Passion and to raise their spirits. ♦ And again, Moses and Elijah are shown standing beside him in his present glory, and they are shown in their future role as signs of the preparatory instruction<sup>23</sup> of the Law and the Prophets, which leads to Christ, so that attaching themselves to and standing either side of the one endowed with perfect grace are the preparatory instruction of the Law and the prior announcement of the prophets: of whom Elijah was the first flowering and first fruits, ordained a prophet for the recalling of Israel, in accordance with the words, “Behold, I am sending for you Elijah the Tishbite, and when he comes he will restore the hearts of the fathers towards their sons, and the heart of the sons towards their fathers.”<sup>24</sup> And he shows also the connection between the Old Covenant and the New, because at the resurrection the apostles will be united with the prophets and there will be one communion in the assembly of the Kingdom. ♦ But<sup>25</sup> also both of them, in losing their life, found it.<sup>26</sup> And both of them spoke out against tyrants: one against the Egyptians,<sup>27</sup> and the other against Ahab,<sup>28</sup> both on behalf of heartless and disobedient people, and on behalf of those who were saved by them and yet by whom they were brought into extreme danger; and both of them wanted to avoid idolatry; and both of them were uneducated (for one was slow of tongue and slow of speech,<sup>29</sup> while the other had the manners of a boorish peasant). And there are many other things to say. Training them for all these things therefore, he presents those who excelled under the Old Covenant.

“*And those who were speaking to him.*”<sup>30</sup> While the present Evangelist does not specify, the others add, “they were speaking about the glory which he was to fulfil in Jerusalem,”<sup>31</sup> that is to say, the Passion and the Cross: for so

---

<sup>23</sup> *παιδαγωγία* refers to elementary or preparatory training. This perspective on the Law is reflected in Clement of Alexandria’s *Paedagogus* 1.5 (PG 8.268B), which in turn draws on Galatians 3.24.

<sup>24</sup> Malachi 4.5–6.

<sup>25</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 354.20–355.2 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 56.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.551.16–552.12.

<sup>26</sup> Matthew 10.39 and 16.25; Mark 8.35; Luke 9.24 and 17.33; John 12.25.

<sup>27</sup> Exodus 5–10.

<sup>28</sup> 1 Kings 18–21.

<sup>29</sup> Exodus 4.10.

<sup>30</sup> Mark 9.4.

<sup>31</sup> Luke 9.31.

they always | call it. What therefore does the hot-headed Peter say? *"It is good for us to be here."*<sup>32</sup> And he is talking like someone about to come into conflict, longing to take a rest before the contest. ♦ [355]

But on the other hand, he also compared servants to their master, even the one who sustains the universe with his word. There was no need to compare the incomparable, nor with three tents to count things which cannot be numbered together.

*"For he did not know what to say, for they were afraid."*<sup>33</sup> Another source says that Peter related this from memory, as alarm had possessed him, as his disciple Mark says, *"he did not know what he was saying, for they were afraid."*<sup>34</sup> And that fear acted as an opportunity to raise his more ordinary understanding to a better state of mind: and what that better state of mind might be, Moses and Elijah make plain. And the soul is led on towards the desire for God by the impulse which comes from these men, and it seeks eagerly to be transported from the human state, so that both as a result of the blessed vision which he was beholding and as a result of the spiritual impulse which arose within him, Peter imagines and says that being removed from human affairs is good. And as if they are going to be with him for longer, he suggests making the three tents, not considering in that momentary instant that the Lord had caused the transfiguration for the indication of his coming glory (just as he said before<sup>35</sup>), nor that Moses was there as a soul, and not in body,<sup>36</sup> nor that Christ did all these things for the sake of the teaching and healing of human beings. And he was not able to abandon many people and to dwell on the mountain. Such are the impulses of human beings—in comparison, they are like little children as far as God is concerned, even if someone were an adult and greater than other people. ♦ Alternatively,<sup>37</sup> it says that because he had heard that it was necessary for them to go up to Jerusalem, he was still afraid, and trembling with fear on his behalf, and after his rebuke he does not dare to come to him again and to say to him, "Be it far from you." But from that fear, he hints at these things

<sup>32</sup> Mark 9.5.

<sup>33</sup> Mark 9.6.

<sup>34</sup> Mark 9.6 The commentator refers explicitly to Mark at this point for the simple reason that this passage does not occur in the Synoptic parallels.

<sup>35</sup> I.e. Mark 9.1.

<sup>36</sup> But note that while this observation applies to Moses, it does not apply to Elijah.

<sup>37</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 355.25–356.22 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 56.2–3 (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.552.13–554.2. Note also the use of the standard catenal form—*ἄλλως δὲ πάλιν φησι*.

[356] through other words. For since he saw a mountain and so much solitude, he thought that it had much safety. “For if this were to come to pass,” he says, “let us not go up to Jerusalem, and he will not die. Moses who went into the darkness<sup>38</sup> and spoke with God, stands by, | and Elijah, who brought down fire on the mountain, and no one will know that we are here.” And he said these things, trembling not so much on his own account, but as one who was burning with zeal on behalf of Christ.

Why therefore does he himself make no pronouncement (neither Moses, nor Elijah), while the Father who is greater than all and more worthy of faith, emits a voice from the cloud? God always appears in this way: “for a cloud and darkness are all around him”<sup>39</sup> and “he sits on a swift cloud”<sup>40</sup> and again “because he makes a cloud his chariot.”<sup>41</sup> “And a cloud received him out of their sight.”<sup>42</sup> Therefore in order that they might believe that the voice proceeds from God, there comes from the cloud a voice, saying, “*This is my Son, the beloved in whom I am well-pleased. Listen to him.*”<sup>43</sup> For if God is powerful, as certainly he is, it is quite clear that the Son is likewise. Then do not be afraid of these fearful things: but if you do not yet admit the truth of this, then consider this, that he is also loved: and if he is loved, do not be afraid: for no one gives up one whom he loves: nor do you love him as much as the one who has begotten him.

“*In whom I am well-pleased*”<sup>44</sup> for he loves him not only because he has begotten him, but because he is also equal to him in all respects and is of one mind with him. But what does “*in whom I am well-pleased*” mean? It is as if he said, “in whom I am refreshed, in whom I delight” because in every way he is equal with him in the exact sense of the word, and there is one will in him and the Father, and while he remains a Son, in every way he is one with the one who has begotten him.<sup>45</sup> ♦

“*Listen to him.*”<sup>46</sup> ♦ Even<sup>47</sup> if he is resolved to be crucified, do not oppose him: for this is the one of whom these men speak, of whom Moses prophe-

---

<sup>38</sup> Exodus 20.21.

<sup>39</sup> Psalm 97.2.

<sup>40</sup> Isaiah 19.1.

<sup>41</sup> Psalm 104.3.

<sup>42</sup> Acts 1.9.

<sup>43</sup> Mark 9.7.

<sup>44</sup> Mark 9.7.

<sup>45</sup> Note the anti-Arian emphases within this passage. The writer rejects any sense that the Son might be subordinate to the Father.

<sup>46</sup> Mark 9.7.

<sup>47</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 35.6.23–29 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 9.33 (Smith,

sied, and of whom Elijah prefigured as a type.<sup>48</sup> “You should see these men as slaves attending to<sup>49</sup> my only-begotten [Son], and you should listen to him: because it is necessary that he should suffer. It is necessary that he should share with humanity in death. It is necessary that he should be raised. It is necessary that he should bring the (divine) economy to completion. It is necessary also for you yourselves to be tempted and to suffer with him, in order that you may also share in his glory.” ♦

(9) And<sup>50</sup> as they were coming from<sup>51</sup> the mountain, he ordered them to tell no-one about what they had seen, until the Son of Man had risen from the dead.

♦ For<sup>52</sup> the greater his reputation,<sup>53</sup> the more difficult | it was then for the crowd to accept these things, and the more accentuated was the offence of the Cross. Consequently, for this reason he tells them to be silent, and not simply that, but again he reminds them of the Passion, and all but tells them the reason why he tells them to be silent. For he did not altogether forbid them never to tell any one, but only “*until he was raised from the dead*.”<sup>54</sup> And he is silent about the unpleasant part, but expresses the good part only.<sup>55</sup> ♦ But they, failing to understand the mystery around his resurrection, simply “*kept the saying to themselves, and they began to dispute among themselves what this ‘being raised from the dead’ might be*.”<sup>56</sup> As the Evangelist says, “they did not yet understand that it was necessary for him to be raised from the dead,”<sup>57</sup> even after the promise came to fulfilment. ♦ And<sup>58</sup> if we wish, let [357]

---

‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien*, 182.

<sup>48</sup> Note the typological emphasis within this passage.

<sup>49</sup> The use of this verb to describe Moses and Elijah can also be found in a fragment on Luke’s Gospel by Eusebius (PG. 24.549A). Note that this passage is attributed by Sickenberger to Titus of Bostra.

<sup>50</sup> Note the textual variant: καταβαινόντων δέ.

<sup>51</sup> Note the textual variant: ὄπι.

<sup>52</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 356.31–357.6 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 56.4 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.554.24–31.

<sup>53</sup> *Lit.* “the things spoken about him.”

<sup>54</sup> Mark 9.9.

<sup>55</sup> In other words, he omits reference to the cross but speaks simply of the resurrection.

<sup>56</sup> Mark 9.10.

<sup>57</sup> John 20.9—i.e. the resurrection narrative.

<sup>58</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 357.11–13 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 56.4 (Smith,

us also see Christ, not in the way then when he was on the mountain, but brighter by far; ♦ and not after six days, but after this world: for the “six days” are a symbol of the “present age,” and then Jesus will make you go up onto a high mountain, as if you were Peter or James or John. For it is possible for this kind of thing to happen even to you, and he will not come like this the next time. ♦ For then<sup>59</sup> sparing his disciples, he revealed only such of his brightness that they were able to bear. But the next time he will come in the glory of the Father itself, and not only with Moses and Elijah, but with countless hosts of angels: not with a cloud over his head, but even with the veil of heaven removed. ♦

(11) And they asked<sup>60</sup> him, “Why<sup>61</sup> do the scribes say ...?” and so on.

♦ Now<sup>62</sup> they did not know this from the scriptures, but they<sup>63</sup> used to explain it in this way to them, and this saying was repeated to countless people as being also about the Christ: and this is not rightly interpreted by them. For the scriptures speak of two advents of Christ, both the one that has happened and the one to come: nevertheless they say that Elijah will be the forerunner for the second [coming]: for the first [coming] came John, whom Christ called Elijah, not because he was Elijah, but because he fulfilled the ministry of Elijah. For just as that man will be a forerunner for the second coming, | so this man came for the first [coming]. But the scribes, confusing these things, and leading the people astray, only comment on the second coming: and it is for this reason that the disciples say, “How<sup>64</sup> is it that the scribes say that it is necessary for Elijah to come first?” What then does Christ say about these things? That Elijah is coming before my second coming. And now Elijah has come, describing John in this way. But if you would look for the Tishbite, he is coming and he will restore everything according to the prophecy of Malachi. “For he will restore,” it says, “the heart of the father towards his son, lest in coming I destroy the

---

‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.554.24–44.

<sup>59</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 357.17–22 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 56.4 (ibid.). This passage can be found in PG 58.554.45–52.

<sup>60</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐπιρωτήσαν (cf. Matthew 17.10).

<sup>61</sup> Note the textual variant: τί (cf. Matthew 17.10).

<sup>62</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 357.25–358.26 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 57.1–2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.557.46–560.37.

<sup>63</sup> I.e. “the scribes.”

<sup>64</sup> Note the variant text: πῶς.

earth completely.”<sup>65</sup> For since Christ called John “Elijah,” on account of their fellowship of service, in order that you might not suppose this to be said also by the prophet, he has added now his country also, calling Elijah “the Tishbite.”<sup>66</sup> For John was not a Tishbite. And so “lest in coming, I destroy the earth completely”<sup>67</sup> points to the second coming. For at the first [coming] he did not come to destroy the earth: “For I came,” he says, “not to judge the world, but to save the world.”<sup>68</sup> Therefore he has said this to show that the Tishbite comes before the coming associated with<sup>69</sup> the judgement: and he will put right the unbelief of the Jews who are found at that time.

He again reminds them in a timely fashion of the Passion, also relying on the witness of the scriptures. But he says that they did whatever they wanted to John whom he also called Elijah. For they even threw him into prison, and they abused him, and they killed him, and carried his head on a platter: and so also the Son of Man was about to suffer at their hands. And by the remembrance of the death of John, he provides much encouragement to them. ♦

(13) “But I say to you that Elijah has come, and they did to him whatever they wanted,<sup>70</sup> as it is written about him.”

Therefore having understood the things which have been said, let us contemplate the connection between these words, given that the disciples began on the mountain, and they saw his transfiguration, and they received a taste of his Kingdom;<sup>71</sup> they asked him about something said by the scribes; he confirmed the prediction of the prophet, saying that he would come and restore everything. Again his disciples learnt how it was written | that the Son of Man should suffer. Then he says in addition, “I say to you that just as John came in the likeness of Elijah, and these terrible things happened to him: so just as it has been written, it is necessary for the Son of Man to suffer.”

[359]

<sup>65</sup> Malachi 4.6.

<sup>66</sup> The commentator’s argument at this point rests on the evidence of the passage in the LXX (Malachi 3.22: *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμῖν Ἴηλιαν τὸν Θεσβίτην πρὶν ἔλθειν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ*). The reference to “the Tishbite” is not attested in the Hebrew text. The commentator is asserting that because John was not a “Tishbite,” this prophecy refers more properly to the Second Coming of Christ.

<sup>67</sup> Malachi 4.6.

<sup>68</sup> John 12.47.

<sup>69</sup> *Lit.* “which has.”

<sup>70</sup> Note the textual variant: *ἠθέλησαν*.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Mark 9.1.

(14) When he came back<sup>72</sup> to the disciples, he saw a great crowd around them, and scribes arguing with them. (15) And immediately the whole crowd saw<sup>73</sup> him, and they were overcome<sup>74</sup> with awe, and running towards him, they greeted him. (16) And he asked the scribes,<sup>75</sup> “What are you arguing about with them?”

In order that he might speak,<sup>76</sup> they made the inquiry of the nine who did not go up with him onto the mountain. For the scribes, having seized on the absence of the Saviour, came upon the disciples to catch them unawares. But seeing him unexpectedly, although not [the scribes] (for they were not worthy to contemplate the Saviour), the whole crowd were filled with awe, for the sight amazed them.<sup>77</sup> And charging towards him, you see, they greeted him (that is to say, those from the crowd who had been set free from all suffering) and clinging to him, they longed to be with him through everything.

### 26. *On the epileptic*<sup>78</sup>

(25) When Jesus saw a great crowd running after him, he commanded the unclean spirit, saying to it, “Deaf and dumb spirit, I command you,<sup>79</sup> come out of him and never enter him again.”

A SCHOLIUM<sup>80</sup> And when they did not reply, someone else from the crowd spoke.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>72</sup> Note the textual variants: *καὶ ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς, εἶδεν.*

<sup>73</sup> Note the textual variant: *ἰδὼν.*

<sup>74</sup> Note the textual variant: *ἐξεθαμβήθη.*

<sup>75</sup> Note the textual variant: *τοὺς γραμματεῖς.*

<sup>76</sup> According to Cramer’s footnotes, the text appears to be corrupt here. This phrase is omitted completely by Possinus. The sense is uncertain.

<sup>77</sup> *Lit.* “led them to consternation.”

<sup>78</sup> Note the use of the title *τοῦ Σεληνιαζομένου*. This title is not used within the text. It is the product of later interpretative reflection.

<sup>79</sup> Note the textual variant: the word order is slightly different.

<sup>80</sup> This passage is anonymous.

<sup>81</sup> This passage illustrates one of the weaknesses of Cramer’s editorial strategy. This comment is clearly a marginal gloss. However, given the omission of Mark 9.17–24, the context for this comment is removed and its meaning becomes less clear for the simple reason that the continuity of the narrative has been disrupted. This comment is a description of the narrative. The point that is being made is that the scribes have been effectively silenced by Jesus. It is then that the boy’s father speaks.

♦ The Scripture<sup>82</sup> shows that this man is very weak in terms of faith: and this is evident in many ways: both from the fact that Christ says, “*O faithless generation,*”<sup>83</sup> and again, “*all things are possible for the one who believes,*”<sup>84</sup> and from the fact that the man who approached him says, “*Help my unbelief,*”<sup>85</sup> | and from the fact that he orders the demons not to enter him [again], and again from the fact that Christ says, “*If you are able to believe.*”<sup>86</sup> If his lack of faith was the cause of the demon not being driven out, as it says, why does he blame the disciples? He shows that it was possible for them to heal in many places even without people coming with faith. For just as often the faith of the person who brings [someone for healing] is sufficient for receiving a cure, even from lesser people, in the same way frequently the power of the performers [of the miracles] is sufficient even when those who come do not have faith in working miracles. And note the ignorance of this man also in another respect, in that he pleads to Jesus against his disciples in front of the crowds, saying, “I brought him to your disciples, and they did not have the strength to cure him.”<sup>87</sup> But Jesus acquitted [the disciples]<sup>88</sup> of the accusation in front of the people, and he reckons the greater [fault] is the man’s, saying “O faithless and perverse generation, how long will I be with you?”<sup>89</sup> in order that he might not only bring shame upon the man, whose lack of faith was being exposed, but also on all the Jews.<sup>90</sup> For it is likely that many of those present were offended, and entertained inappropriate thoughts about the disciples. But when he said, “*How long will I be with you?*”<sup>91</sup> he indicates again that death is welcome to him, and that it was not being crucified but being with them that was hard to bear. And in fact he does not baulk at the accusations, but what does he say? “Bring him here to me”:<sup>92</sup> and he allows him to be convulsed, not for show (since when a crowd

---

<sup>82</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 359.27–361.16 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 57.3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in PG 58.561.10–562.13.

<sup>83</sup> Mark 9.19; Matthew 17.17; Luke 9.41.

<sup>84</sup> Mark 9.23.

<sup>85</sup> Mark 9.24.

<sup>86</sup> Mark 9.23—note the textual variant: εἰ δύνασαι πιστεῦσαι.

<sup>87</sup> A paraphrase of Mark 9.18.

<sup>88</sup> *Lit.* “them.”

<sup>89</sup> Matthew 17.17 and Luke 9.41.

<sup>90</sup> The exegetical problem is that Mark uses the plural, but, while this indicates that Mark has a broader constituency in mind, the commentator is at pains to spare the embarrassment of the disciples.

<sup>91</sup> Mark 9.19.

<sup>92</sup> Matthew 17.17.



gathered, he rebuked it), but this was for the sake of the father himself, in order that when he should see the demon disturbed simply by being called, he might even be led to faith in the coming miracle. And because that man said, “*From childhood*”<sup>93</sup> and because he said “*if you are able to help me,*”<sup>94</sup> Jesus says, “*All things are possible for the one who believes.*”<sup>95</sup>

Again overturning the accusation against him, note how he corrects it, as it is not said as it ought to be: what does he say? “*If you are able to believe, all things are possible for the one who believes.*”<sup>96</sup> And what he says is like this: [361] “Such abundance of power is with me, as even to make others work these miracles. So that if you believe as you should, even | you would be able to heal him yourself, even this man and many others”: and saying these things, he set free the demoniac. ♦

(28) And when he had entered the house, his disciples asked him privately, “Why could we not cast it out?”

♦ They seem to me<sup>97</sup> in anguish and afraid that they might no longer have the grace with which they had been entrusted. For they had received authority over unclean demons: which is the reason why they ask, and so as not to be put to shame, they come to him in private. What therefore does Christ say?

The entire species of demons, he says, is cured<sup>98</sup> through these things. Note how still he introduces the idea of “fasting.”<sup>99</sup> And do not tell me on the basis of unusual cases that some people have cast them out even without fasting. For although you might to say this about those who rebuke demons in one or two cases, it is nevertheless impossible ever to rid the sufferer of this madness if he enjoys luxury. For it is essential for him to fast from such things for this purpose. ♦ For Mark does not say that the demon withdrew immediately, but that at once it was gripped by fear, and convulsing the child, it remained torturing him. And this was happening on account of the unbelief of those who had approached him.

<sup>93</sup> Mark 9.21.

<sup>94</sup> Mark 9.22.

<sup>95</sup> Mark 9.23.

<sup>96</sup> Mark 9.23.

<sup>97</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 361.6–16 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 57.3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.562.36–563.17.

<sup>98</sup> Note the confusion of the language at this point: surely it is the boy who is cured, not the demon.

<sup>99</sup> This comment relates to a textual variant in Mark 9.29: *προσευχή* καὶ νηστεία.

And the Saviour asked, "How long has he been possessed by the demon?"<sup>100</sup> *"From childhood,"*<sup>101</sup> he said, and he explained that the demon was in danger of destroying him completely, and he uttered his unbelieving speech in front of them, saying, *"If you are able to do anything, help us."*<sup>102</sup> The display of power came from the Saviour with appropriate gentleness, when he said, *"If you believe, all things are possible to the one who believes."*<sup>103</sup> For he did not say, "All things are possible for me," and yet this shows that faith in him makes all things possible. And he, yet more convicted about his own lack of faith, said, *"I believe. Help my unbelief."*<sup>104</sup> But if he believed, when he said *"I believe,"* why does he then say, *"Help my unbelief."* There are different kinds of faith. One is initiatory, the other is perfected. Therefore, the one | [362] who is at the beginning in faith needs the Saviour to provide what is lacking through his power. This is why the disciples said to the Saviour, *"Increase our faith."*<sup>105</sup> And then, the crowd ran towards him and, as the Evangelist says, the Saviour, seeing the crowd, rebuked the unclean spirit. And at this point a plausible reason for the healing is disclosed, namely the recognition of the Lord among those who were running towards him. He is sparing in showing himself, to the degree that it falls to each one to know him. And so the command reveals his authority: *"Deaf and dumb spirit, I command you, come out of him and never go into him again."*<sup>106</sup> The phrase *"I command"* demonstrates<sup>107</sup> his divine authority, even without human faith.<sup>108</sup> *"Come out."* And then he says not only *"Come out,"* but also *"never enter again,"*<sup>109</sup> so that the one who was not secure in his faith should also be protected from a second attack, which the command of the Lord barred from happening. And this is why the deliverance from the demon which cried out and convulsed him was so horrible, and in the end he lay like a corpse, so that they thought he was dead. *"But Jesus,"* it says, *"took him by the hand and lifted him up, and*

---

<sup>100</sup> A paraphrase of Mark 9.21.

<sup>101</sup> Mark 9.21.

<sup>102</sup> Mark 9.22.

<sup>103</sup> Mark 9.23.

<sup>104</sup> Mark 9.24.

<sup>105</sup> Luke 17.5.

<sup>106</sup> Mark 9.25.

<sup>107</sup> Cramer suggests the insertion of *δεικνυσι* in this passage, following the Latin translation of Possinus. Without this insertion, the passage is unclear.

<sup>108</sup> This latter clause acknowledges that the commentator's argument has moved on from the original question about the power of faith to perform miracles. The argument is now about Christ's claim to divine authority. In some respects, this detracts from the strength of the earlier argument.

<sup>109</sup> Mark 9.25.

he was able to stand.”<sup>110</sup> For the demon did not have the power to throw the boy down into death because of the presence of life: and the demon came out without being able to retain the power of returning. And indeed Matthew indicates this, saying that the boy was healed at that very hour.<sup>111</sup>

(30) And they went on from there<sup>112</sup> and passed through Galilee, and he did not want anyone to know: (31) for he taught his disciples, and he told them that the Son of Man is to be handed over into the hands of men, and they will kill him, and having been killed, he will be raised on the third day.<sup>113</sup>

◆ As<sup>114</sup> soon as he talks about his Passion, he performs wonders, both after his words and before these words. And it is possible for the one who pays attention to find this in many places. At least then “he began,” it says, “to show that it was necessary for him to go up to Jerusalem and to be killed,” and then “to suffer many things.”<sup>115</sup> When? When he was confessed as Christ and Son of | God.<sup>116</sup> Again on the mountain when he showed them the marvellous sight and the prophets spoke about his glory, he reminded them of his Passion.<sup>117</sup> And when he tells the story about John, he adds, “for in this way the Son of Man is about to suffer at their hands.”<sup>118</sup> And again a little later, when he drove out the demon, which the disciples were not strong enough to cast out, he adds this. And he did this, limiting the excess of their grief by the magnitude of his miracles. ◆

(32) But they did not understand his words, and they were afraid to ask him.

<sup>110</sup> Mark 9.27.

<sup>111</sup> Matthew 17.18.

<sup>112</sup> Note the textual variant: *καὶ ἐκεῖθεν*.

<sup>113</sup> Note the textual variant: *τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*.

<sup>114</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 362.27–363.8 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 57.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.560.15–34.

<sup>115</sup> Note that this is a reference to Matthew 16.21 rather than Mark 8.31.

<sup>116</sup> The commentator refers back to Caesarea Philippi (Matthew 16.13–20; cf. Mark 8.27–30).

<sup>117</sup> The commentator refers back to Jesus’ teaching following the Transfiguration (Matthew 16.21–23; cf. Mark 8.31).

<sup>118</sup> This passage comes from Matthew 17.12. Immediately after this passage, Matthew adds: τότε συνήκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

◆ When<sup>119</sup> they heard these things, they did not ask him, either because they were weighed down by feelings of dismay at the Passion, or because they were afraid. For in many places whenever they see him not wanting to speak plainly, they keep silent. And Luke also [says]: that “its meaning was concealed from them,” and “they were afraid to ask him about this saying.”<sup>120</sup> ◆

27. *On the quarrels about who is the greatest*

(33) And he came<sup>121</sup> to Capernaum: and when he came to the house, he asked them, “What were you arguing about among yourselves<sup>122</sup> on the way?” (34) But they were silent: for they were discussing among themselves on the way who was the greatest.

‘An argument’ arose ‘among them’<sup>123</sup> concerning these things, as Luke says, and they argued among themselves on the way about who was the greatest, as Mark records:<sup>124</sup> but, according to these Gospels, the Lord, taking his cue from their private conversation, asks the reason for their argument. Yet Matthew does not begin at the beginning of the narrative, but is silent about the Saviour’s knowledge of what was intended and what was said privately:<sup>125</sup> but he begins with the disciples inviting teaching from the Lord and the saying about these things, saying that they ask him about being honoured:<sup>126</sup> and it was because they were privately thinking or speaking these things that they said in his presence what was on their mind, because everything was clear to him, even an internal thought, just as much as what was said and | spoken in his presence. Therefore they longed for honour from the Lord, holding this to be good and praiseworthy. But in addition to this longing was [their desire for] self-aggrandisement. For the degree to which

[364]

<sup>119</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 363.11–15 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 57.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.560.55–62.

<sup>120</sup> Luke 9.45.

<sup>121</sup> Note the textual variant: ἦλθεν.

<sup>122</sup> Note the textual variant: πρὸς ἑαυτούς.

<sup>123</sup> Luke 9.46.

<sup>124</sup> Mark 9.33.

<sup>125</sup> The commentator has studied the Gospel parallels carefully at this point. This section is characterised by a close and conscientious reading of the differences between the gospel narratives.

<sup>126</sup> *Lit.* “about the teaching about being honoured” (cf. Matthew 18.1).

someone is great, to the same degree they reach forward for great honours, and that is why he<sup>127</sup> did not stifle the desire, but introduced the theme of humility: saying that they would achieve their goal if they were not minded to think great things of themselves, but they would achieve this if they were to yearn for the simplicity of children, who think nothing of themselves and are not inclined in any way to have this conceited impression of themselves. Therefore he discloses their consciences, and he responds to their emotions, not just to their words.

(35) And sitting down, he called the twelve and said to them, “If anyone wishes to be first, he will be last of all and servant of all.” (36) And taking a little child and putting it in their midst, and taking it in his arms, he said to them, (37) “Whoever welcomes one such child in my name welcomes me: and whoever welcomes<sup>128</sup> me, welcomes not me but the one who sent me.”

◆ ‘For you,’<sup>129</sup> he says, ‘inquire who is greatest, and contend for first place: but I say that unless he has become least of all, he is unworthy of admission.’ And he describes the illustration well, and not only does he describe it, but he also sets a little child in their midst, and putting them to shame by the sight of the child, he persuades them to be humble and thus unaffected. For the little child is pure from envy and from conceit and from longing for the first place and he is possessed of the greatest virtue, simplicity. “And not only,” he says, “if you become like this will you receive a great reward, but also if you honour others such as this on account of me, even for honour to them will I mark out a Kingdom for you: this is because to me being humble and unaffected is much to be desired.” ◆ For it is not about being as a child in every respect, but in respect of a child’s unaffected humility, for as Paul says, “Brothers, do not become like little children in your minds, but be like a child to evil.”<sup>130</sup> | Therefore the one, who receives such as these because of Christ and not for any other reason, has received Christ, in just the same way as Paul bears witness to the Galatians, that they received him as Christ Jesus.<sup>131</sup>

<sup>127</sup> I.e. Jesus.

<sup>128</sup> Note the textual variant: δέξεται.

<sup>129</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 364.19–30 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 58.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.568.54–569.1.

<sup>130</sup> 1 Corinthians 14.20.

<sup>131</sup> Possibly an allusion to Galatians 2.15–20.

And through Christ, he also brings in the Father: “*For whoever welcomes me, does not welcome me but the one who sent me.*”<sup>132</sup> What could possibly be greater than to welcome the Son and the Father?

(38) And John replied to him, saying,<sup>133</sup> “Teacher, we saw someone casting out demons in your name, who does not follow us: and we stopped him,<sup>134</sup> because he was not following us.” (39) But Jesus said, “Do not stop him. For there is no one who does a deed of power in my name who will be able quickly to speak evil of me. (40) For whoever is not against you<sup>135</sup> is for you.”

The Son of Thunder was not compelled by jealousy when he said this to the Saviour, but he wanted all who called upon the name of Christ also to follow him, and to be one with his disciples. I will describe briefly the kind of person he is talking about. ♦ Many<sup>136</sup> of those who do not believe have received spiritual gifts, like the one who was casting out demons but was not one of his followers:<sup>137</sup> even Judas was like this. For even he, though he was evil, had a spiritual gift. And anyone would find this in many places in the Old Testament<sup>138</sup> where grace dwells in those who are unworthy in order that it might make good things happen for others. For since not all had an aptitude for everything, there were some of pure life, who did not have so much faith, but there were others by contrast whom he encouraged through these words that they might display great zeal and faith, and these he called out through this unutterable gift to become more virtuous. Consequently, he gives grace with much extravagance. ♦ This is why the Saviour also says, “*Do not stop him,*”<sup>139</sup> for it is likely that through these things he will be able to attain the additional gift of virtue. For none of those who accomplish deeds of power in my name “*will be able to speak evil of me lightly.*”<sup>140</sup> The “*lightly*” | is added on account of those who fell into heresy, such as Simon and [366]

<sup>132</sup> Mark 9:37.

<sup>133</sup> Note the textual variant: Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης, λέγων.

<sup>134</sup> Note the textual variant: ὅς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν· καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν.

<sup>135</sup> Note the textual variant: ὑμῶν.

<sup>136</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 365.18–27 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 24.1–2. This passage can be found in PG 57.322.21–32.

<sup>137</sup> *Lit.* “with him.”

<sup>138</sup> Lampe, *s.v.* παλαίος ‘6. of OT writings in general without mention of διαθήκη.’

<sup>139</sup> Mark 9:38.

<sup>140</sup> Mark 9:38.

Menander and Cerinthus: perhaps those men did not do signs in his name, but they seemed to do so by some trickery and deceit. But those men even if they do not follow us, because they do not approach the works by faith, at least they cannot say anything against us easily, because of the way in which they exalt themselves at the wonderful works which they accomplish when they pronounce my name. And the [statement], “*whoever is not against you is for you*”<sup>141</sup> is not in opposition to the [statement], “*whoever is not with me is against me.*”<sup>142</sup> For the latter is said concerning the demons when they are eager to drag everyone away from God, and to disperse what has been gathered together: but the former is said concerning those who believe in him, but who do not follow him on account of their lack of commitment,<sup>143</sup> or on account of the vanity of life, but who still command mighty acts by his name, on account of the faith of those who approach [them] and, also, on account of being urged on to perfect faith. For at the beginning of the Gospel, God allowed even things like this to happen, in order that, as the Apostle says, “Whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed.”<sup>144</sup>

(41) “For truly I tell you, whoever gives you a cup of water in my name, because you are of Christ, will by no means lose their reward.”

“For not only,” he says, “do I order you to prevent those who call on my name from doing mighty acts, but also those who welcome you from simply bringing you a drink of cold water. For while the former comes about through a poverty of mind, this, I say, comes about through those who make an excuse through a lack of means.” So that no one may use poverty as an excuse, he says, ♦ “Even<sup>145</sup> if he were to give a drink of cold water, on which nothing is spent, even for this a reward will be laid up in store. ♦ For I want everyone to be encouraged on account of these things even to achieve more perfect things.”<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Mark 9.40.

<sup>142</sup> This text can be found in Matthew 12.30 and Luke 11.23.

<sup>143</sup> *Lit.* “defective commitment.”

<sup>144</sup> Philippians 1.18.

<sup>145</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 366.25–26 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 35.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 57.408.40–42.

<sup>146</sup> Chrysostom makes the point that the road to perfection is not dependent upon wealth.

(42) “And whoever offends one of the little ones who believe in me,<sup>147</sup> it would be better for him if a great millstone<sup>148</sup> were hung around his neck and he were thrown into the sea.”

♦ He<sup>149</sup> makes his message more emphatic, not by appealing to honour alone, but also by combining it with punishment. | “For just as,” he says, [367] “those who honour you on account of me gain heaven,<sup>150</sup> so those who dishonour you (for this is to offend and trip you up) will pay the highest price.” And he does not go on to define the exact punishment,<sup>151</sup> but from the things familiar to us he indicates its unendurability. For when he wants to communicate directly with them, he uses striking images. And here therefore wanting to show that the punishment they will undergo is great, and [wanting] to attack the arrogance of those who despise them, he brings into their midst a striking form of punishment, that of “*the millstone*”<sup>152</sup> and of drowning. And he did not say, “A millstone *will* be hung around his neck” but that it is better for him to submit to this,<sup>153</sup> showing that another evil, more terrible than this, awaits him. ♦ Therefore “*the little ones who believe in*”<sup>154</sup> him, and those who call upon his name,<sup>155</sup> who nevertheless do not follow him, and those who bring a drink of cold water,<sup>156</sup> without anything greater than this, are the ones whom one must not distress or cause to stumble, for this would hinder calling on his name. Recognising this distinction also, the divine Apostle, writing to the Corinthians, says, “To the Church of God which is in Corinth, to those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus, to those called to be saints, together with all those who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.”<sup>157</sup> For he recognises that the saints are different from those who call upon his name. For although some took up their cross and followed him,

<sup>147</sup> Note the textual variant: τῶν μικρῶν τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ.

<sup>148</sup> Note the textual variant: λίθος μυλικός.

<sup>149</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 366.32–367.12 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 58.3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.569.33–62.

<sup>150</sup> Note the way in which the commentator paraphrases the notion of “not losing his reward.”

<sup>151</sup> *Lit.* “the punishment from the same things.”

<sup>152</sup> Mark 9.42.

<sup>153</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 367.11: omit the full stop and insert a comma before δευκός.

<sup>154</sup> Those described in Mark 9.42.

<sup>155</sup> In other words, those described in Mark 9.38.

<sup>156</sup> In other words, those described in Mark 9.41.

<sup>157</sup> 1 Corinthians 1.2.



others only called upon his name. Even less than these in terms of faith was Enosh “who hoped to call on his name.”<sup>158</sup> For why did he not rather call, but hoped to call?

(43) “And if your hand offends you, cut it off. It is better for you<sup>159</sup> to enter life maimed than to have two hands and to end up in Gehenna, in the unquenchable fire.”

[368] ♦ He<sup>160</sup> does not say these things about members [of the body]—far from it—but he speaks about friends, about relations, whom we hold in the same regard as<sup>161</sup> necessary members [of the body]. For nothing is as harmful as bad company. For whatever | force is able to do, friendship can do more besides both in terms of harm and in terms of profit. This is why, with much hyperbole, he commands us to cut off those who are harming us, but not those who are weak and lacking in faith, ♦ and those no different from babes in arms: for it is necessary to take thought for these and to treat them well so that they should not be disheartened, and not to dishonour them lest they are deterred by the dishonours concerning the faith, in which they stand fast, and they are hurt greatly. Therefore admonishing those who offend, he advises those who are offended to be on their guard, even if it is the closest relative who offends. For even if the separation from them is like the cutting off of limbs, it would be a better choice than the impending destruction. And he adds a prophetic word from Isaiah the prophet,<sup>162</sup> ♦ for I guess<sup>163</sup> that this would be the worst form of punishment—to have a worm eating away inside you for ever. This is how he describes conscience, like a worm eating away those who have realised in penitence that their soul is not good. Therefore each of them will become his own accuser in what has been confessed, calculating, pondering over their actions throughout their mortal life, and pricked by the conscience, and the worm will

<sup>158</sup> Genesis 4.26.

<sup>159</sup> Note the textual variant: *καλὸν σοί*.

<sup>160</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 367.30–368.3 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 59.4 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.578.21–28.

<sup>161</sup> *Lit.* “in the rank of.”

<sup>162</sup> Verse 48 is based on Isaiah 66.24.

<sup>163</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 368.11–22 is an extract from Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam* 2.58.196–208 (J. Ziegler, *Eusebius Werke, Band 9: Der Jesajakommentar* [Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975]: 410–411).

continue in this way for ever. (For indeed these things are not said about a physical worm, not even one that is about to come into existence). And “the fire” will be “unquenchable”<sup>164</sup> for them. For just as fire is said to be “eternal”<sup>165</sup> elsewhere, so also here it is “unquenchable,”<sup>166</sup> ♦ that is, the judgement of their own conscience, which in the manner of an everlasting worm inside them, will destroy and burn them like fire springing forth within them.

(49) “For everyone will be salted with fire, and every sacrifice will be salted with salt.”<sup>167</sup> (50) Salt is good. But if salt loses its saltiness, with what will you season it? Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace with one another.”

The saying “everyone will be salted with fire” is like the saying of the Apostle, “for the fire will test what sort of work each one has done.”<sup>168</sup> Then he introduces the testimony from Leviticus, “All your offerings | of sacrifice will be salted”;<sup>169</sup> let us keep this command according to a spiritual Law, if by “all our offerings of sacrifice,” we find favour before God by “prayer” and by “any other gift to our neighbour”;<sup>170</sup> and sacrificing according to the letter of the sacred writings, let us salt the gift of our sacrifice for God: therefore the work of each in this world will be salted with salt, but in the next world it will be

[369]

<sup>164</sup> Mark 9.43.

<sup>165</sup> Matthew 18.8.

<sup>166</sup> Mark 9.43.

<sup>167</sup> Note the textual variant: *καὶ πάντα θυσία ἀλλὶ ἀλισθήσεται*.

<sup>168</sup> 1 Corinthians 3.13.

<sup>169</sup> A paraphrase of Leviticus 2.13. While this reading is supported by a number of manuscripts, most textual critics agree that this appears to be a later gloss. Nevertheless, the gloss gives some indication of the meaning. As Cranfield points out: “The connection with *v.* 48 is simply the presence of the catchword *πῦρ* ...: the connection with *v.* 50 appears to be similar. So we have to interpret *v.* 49 quite independently. The most probable clue is provided by the reader of copyist who inserted the quotation from Lev. ii.13. The Jewish sacrifices had to be accompanied by salt (Lev. ii.13, Ezek. xliii.24; cf. Exod. xxx.35). So the thought here appears to be that the disciple (*πᾶς* we take to mean ‘every disciple’) is to be a sacrifice to God (cf. Rom. xii.1) and that there is something which is as necessary an accompaniment of this sacrifice as salt was of the Temple sacrifices. This something is referred to as *πῦρ*, which here (unlike *πῦρ* in *v.* 48) probably stands for the fires of trials and persecutions (cf. IPet. i.7, iv.12)” (C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, ed. C.F.D. Moule, *The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 315–316).

<sup>170</sup> Note the use of metonymy in this statement: the “sacrifices” of Leviticus now have a very different meaning.

salted with fire: but even if our sacrifice is salted with divine fire in this world, this would stand in agreement with the words “I came to cast fire on the earth”<sup>171</sup> and “inflamed with the Spirit.”<sup>172</sup>

(50) “Salt is good but if the salt loses its saltiness” and so on.

In as much as salt is useful for human life, why is it necessary to say this as well? At this point, it seems worthwhile to ask what exactly the disciples of Jesus throw away in salt. For it seems that just as salt preserves carcasses from changing into worms from the foul smell, and renders them useable for longer, so they would not last for a while and be good for human consumption without salt: in the same way, the disciples of Jesus preserve everything on the earth around them, and they preserve everything from the foul smell of sin, from both idolatry and immorality. Therefore Matthew seems to me to have described the disciples of Jesus themselves as ‘salt’:<sup>173</sup> Luke does not show this plainly, which is why his wording is ambiguous, but [the text] according to Mark can mean that each of us ought to have salt in ourselves, for he says, “*Therefore have salt in yourselves.*”<sup>174</sup> And perhaps one has as much salt as one has received from the grace of God (as it says, “May grace be multiplied to you”),<sup>175</sup> such as those who found grace in the presence of the Lord God, like Noah and Abraham and Moses, and anyone else who has been recorded to have found grace before the face of God. And Paul brings together grace and salt when he says, “Let your speech be always gracious, seasoned with salt.”<sup>176</sup> Therefore if anyone is made worthy of grace and renders this useless, this would be one in whom the salt has become tasteless.

[370] And the heavenly salt is our Lord Jesus Christ, who was sufficient on his own to preserve the whole earth from being ruined, and he created a great deal of salt on earth, that is, those who are strong enough not to become tasteless and are not lacking in saltiness, who neither perform deeds worthy of being thrown out, nor fall under the feet of those who were ready to trample them.<sup>177</sup>

<sup>171</sup> Luke 12.49.

<sup>172</sup> Romans 12.11.

<sup>173</sup> The commentator is referring to Matthew 5.13: ὑμεῖς ἐστε το ἅλας τῆς γῆς but goes on to make the point that this statement does not appear in Luke (cf. Luke 14.34–35).

<sup>174</sup> Mark 9.50.

<sup>175</sup> 1 Peter 1.2 and 2 Peter 1.2.

<sup>176</sup> Colossians 4.6.

<sup>177</sup> Cf. Matthew 5.13.

Therefore “*salt is good*”<sup>178</sup> and worthy of praise: but if at some time even some of it may become tasteless (for it is possible out of want of attention even for good salt to change to being tasteless), how will it be made fit for consumption? For it is without taste and not suitable for seasoning, nor is it suitable for farming the land, nor for the fertiliser which the vine-dresser needs.<sup>179</sup> This is why it is thrown out, and I think that it follows that the one who has salt in himself is at peace in himself. For in this is the peace of God, which surpasses all knowledge,<sup>180</sup> and, which reflects the same mind and thoughts in Christ Jesus.<sup>181</sup> And such a person is at peace with everyone from this, being of good courage and saying, “Against those who hate peace, I was for peace.”<sup>182</sup>

◆ FROM BASIL,<sup>183</sup> CHAPTER 240 OF THE BOOK ON MONASTIC DISCIPLINE: But what is the salt, which the Lord prescribed, saying, “*Have salt in yourselves and be at peace with one another*”?<sup>184</sup> And the Apostle says, “Let your speech be always gracious, seasoned with salt,”<sup>185</sup> and here through the links in each chapter the meaning is manifest. For in the words of the Lord, no reason is allowed [either] for separation from each another [or] for disagreement. But we teach that it is necessary “to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.”<sup>186</sup> And in the words of the Apostle, recalling someone who said, “Can bread be eaten without salt?”<sup>187</sup> asks if there is any taste “in empty words?”<sup>188</sup> He will be taught to dispense his words for the building up of the faith, in order that he may give grace to those who hear, using both the appropriate time and a graceful disposition to enable those who hear to become more obedient. ◆

---

<sup>178</sup> Mark 9.50.

<sup>179</sup> Note the resonances with Luke 14.35 in this passage.

<sup>180</sup> An allusion to Philippians 4.7.

<sup>181</sup> There is perhaps an indirect allusion to Philippians 2.5 at this point.

<sup>182</sup> Psalm 120.6–7 (LXX Psalm 119.7).

<sup>183</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 370.18–31 is an extract from Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae brevis tractatae* 266 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 362). This passage can be found in PG 31.1264.12–30. The use of Basil’s ascetic writings should not lead the reader to presume a monastic origin for the *Catena in Marcum*. As Philip Rousseau notes, Basil’s ascetic writings sketch the image of the ideal Christian. (For further discussion, see Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (London: University of California Press, 1994), 192–232).

<sup>184</sup> Mark 9.50.

<sup>185</sup> Colossians 4.6.

<sup>186</sup> Ephesians 4.3.

<sup>187</sup> Job 6.6.

<sup>188</sup> Ephesians 5.6.

[371] “Salt is good”<sup>189</sup> and worthy of praise:<sup>190</sup> but if at some time it also becomes tasteless (for it is possible at any time for something good to change for the worse) how it will be seasoned is worthy of investigation. Therefore in answer to this question, one can say that the salt, which has lost its taste, is not suitable for farming the land, nor for fertiliser, which both vine-dressers and gardeners need. This is why it is thrown out, being both unprofitable and useless.

---

<sup>189</sup> Mark 9.50.

<sup>190</sup> Although the source of this passage is anonymous, note the repetition of *Cat. Marc.* 370.6–12 at *Cat. Marc.* 371.1–6.

## CHAPTER 10

### 28. *On the Pharisees who asked questions*

(1) And going up from there he came to the region of Judea through the land beyond<sup>1</sup> the Jordan. And crowds again gathered around him, and, as was his custom, again he taught them.

◆ Having<sup>2</sup> kept out of Judea on account of the envy of those persons, he now visits it, since the Passion was almost at hand. But he does not go up to Jerusalem for a while, but to the surrounding region of Judea. And when he came, they followed him, and “*as was his custom, again he taught them,*”<sup>3</sup> or, as Matthew says, “he healed them,”<sup>4</sup> bringing them healing in two ways: first, for the soul (for such was the teaching) and, secondly, for the body. For the healing of their sickness came to pass not only for them, but also became, for others,<sup>5</sup> an intimation of the knowledge of God—but not for the Pharisees—and indeed, for this very reason, they began to hunt him down. ◆

(7) And he said, “For this reason a man shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his wife. (8) And the two will become one flesh: so that they are no longer two, but one flesh. (9) Therefore<sup>6</sup> what God has joined together, let no one separate.”

◆ O what folly!<sup>7</sup> They thought to silence him by their questions, even though already they had received proof of this power: for, when they argued a

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the textual variant: διὰ τοῦ πέραν.

<sup>2</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 371.13–22 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 62.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.595.36–56.

<sup>3</sup> Mark 10.1.

<sup>4</sup> Matthew 19.2.

<sup>5</sup> I.e. the “readers” and “hearers.”

<sup>6</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 371.26 (οὐκ is not attested in any of the textual variants in Mark 10.9): omit οὐκ and insert δ.

<sup>7</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 371.28–372.6 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 62.1–2

[372] number of times over the Sabbath,<sup>8</sup> when they said, “*He blasphemes,*”<sup>9</sup> | when they said, “He has a demon,”<sup>10</sup> when they rebuked his disciples as they were walking through the corn-fields,<sup>11</sup> when they argued about unwashed hands,<sup>12</sup> again and again, he sewed up their mouths and sent them away. Not even so would they leave him alone: such was there wickedness and envy. So what does he say? For he does not always keep silent, in order that they may not imagine that they escape notice, nor does he always admonish, in order that he may teach us to bear all things with gentleness. ♦

(3) “What did Moses command you?” And they said, “Moses allowed ...” and so on.

♦ On being asked<sup>13</sup> if it is lawful for a man to divorce his wife, he did not say immediately, “It is not lawful,” in order that they might not be troubled and disturbed: but through questioning, he first wanted them to give him an answer about the meaning of the Law, in order that whatever he needed to say to them, they should arrive at first in their reply. And yet, he does not seek to crush them, nor does he say to them, “I am not now bound by this,” but he seeks to satisfy them on this question. For if he had dissociated himself from the old covenant,<sup>14</sup> he would not have defended Moses, nor would he have been eager to show that his own commandments were in agreement with the old ones. And indeed Moses had commanded many other things, both the things about food, and the things about the Sabbath. Therefore why did they not bring Moses forward in an argument anywhere else, as they do here? Perhaps it was also on account of the question of the Saviour, or perhaps also they wanted to enlist a multitude of husbands

---

(Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.597.14–598.17.

<sup>8</sup> Mark 2.23–28 and Mark 3.1–6. Note the parallel passages in Matthew 12.1–8 and Matthew 12.9–14.

<sup>9</sup> Mark 2.7. Note the parallel passage in Matthew 9.3.

<sup>10</sup> An allusion to Mark 3.22, although the passage is more properly a quotation from Matthew 11.18.

<sup>11</sup> Mark 2.23–28. Note the parallel passage in Matthew 12.1–8.

<sup>12</sup> Mark 7.1–23. Note the parallel passage in Matthew 15.1–20.

<sup>13</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 372.9–22 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 62.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.597.14–598.17.

<sup>14</sup> Note the anti-Marcionite emphasis of these words.

against him:<sup>15</sup> for this was a matter of indifference to the Jews, and they all used to do this, as it had been allowed by the Law. ♦ And since,<sup>16</sup> with regard to this question, Malachi the prophet, rebuking those who divorced their wives, says, “Do not abandon the wife of your youth: she is your companion and your wife by covenant,”<sup>17</sup> they present the problem of what the Law decrees concerning this ordinance as being insoluble. ♦ And yet,<sup>18</sup> the Saviour defends these things, saying that Moses “*wrote this commandment for you on account of your hardness of heart.*”<sup>19</sup> Nor does he allow [Moses] to remain open to accusation, given that he himself had given the Law to him, and he delivers him from | the charge, and turns everything completely on its head. Then since what he said was hard to bear and brought disgrace upon them, he goes back to the original Law, saying “*from the beginning of creation, he made them male and female,*”<sup>20</sup> that is, in actual fact, from the beginning God commanded the opposite. So, in order that they might not say, “Where does it show that it was on account of our hardness of heart that Moses said this?” he again renders them speechless with reference to the creation. For if this is the primary Law and for our good, then the other thing would not have been given from the beginning, for God, in creating [the world], would not have created it in this way and he would not have said such things. ♦ And<sup>21</sup> he considers the one who persists

[373]

---

<sup>15</sup> It is perhaps noteworthy that Chrysostom understands the teaching of Jesus at this point as having a particularly negative impact on the lives of men, a point emphasised in recent feminist exegesis of this passage. Elizabeth Schüssler-Fiorenza suggests that the question posed by the Pharisees is totally androcentric and presupposes a patriarchal understanding of marriage: “The first exchange between Jesus and the Pharisees makes it clear that divorce is necessary because of the male’s “hardness of heart,” that is, because of men’s patriarchal mind-set and reality. As long as patriarchy is operative, divorce is *commanded* out of necessity. One is not allowed to abolish it within the structures of patriarchy” (Elizabeth Schüssler-Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM Press, 1983), 143). While Chrysostom is hardly a standard-bearer for feminism, it is intriguing that he sees that these challenging words about divorce might upset a “multitude of husbands” and present a potential threat to the structures of patriarchy. In this respect, Schüssler-Fiorenza’s reading is consistent with Chrysostom’s.

<sup>16</sup> This extract in *Cat. Marc.* 372.22–27 interrupts the extended quotation from Chrysostom. This source remains anonymous.

<sup>17</sup> Malachi 2.14–15.

<sup>18</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 372.28–373.10 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 62.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.598.19–41.

<sup>19</sup> Mark 10.5.

<sup>20</sup> Mark 10.6.

<sup>21</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 373.10–25 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 62.1. This



obstinately in this, not only from the point of view of the creation, but also from the point of view of the commandment, where “one man” is joined together with “one woman.” For if a man wanted to leave his wife and to take another woman, then when God made one man, he would have created many women: and he did not say that he simply made one man and one woman, but that he also commanded this. And now by the manner of God’s giving of the Law, he demonstrated that one man must live with one woman always and never break off from her. For, he says, they came into existence from one source,<sup>22</sup> and they came together into one body. Then making it a fearful thing to deny this, he says not, “Do not break up,” but “*What God has joined together, let no one separate.*”<sup>23</sup> And “if you introduce Moses into the discussion, I speak to you as the Lord of Moses, and in addition to that, I have power over time as well. For this law is more ancient, even if it seems to have been introduced by me now.” For he did not simply bring the woman to the man, but he commanded him to leave his parents and to be united with his wife, demonstrating through the form of his words the indissolubility of the relationship. ♦ “*For the two will be,*” he says, “*one flesh*”:<sup>24</sup> and this is the natural union. Although the Law is not yet able to return humanity to purity, it seeks to mitigate the evil. But the evil is not mitigated to such an extent that humanity is made pure from within. For if the soul were made completely pure both from desires and anger, it would be possible even for those who possess unwavering patience to endure an ugly woman. But as soon as the desires mentioned above became excessive in the soul, many terrible things, which are contrary to common sense, would happen in their living together. | For instance, it would be possible for the man to criticise or misrepresent his wife, and for the husband who hated his wife to bring on the additional charge of adultery, perhaps even to be led to murder through anger. Indeed, the Law provides a check for these things: it grants the renunciation of the wife who is hated, and it does not prevent the man who has actually changed his mind from doing this, so as not to allow men to fall into ways which are contrary to nature.

---

passage is noted by Harold Smith (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365) However, he does not note the fact that the catenist has inverted material in Chrysostom’s homily. This passage can be found in PG 58.597.20–45.

<sup>22</sup> *Lit.* “root.”

<sup>23</sup> Mark 10.9.

<sup>24</sup> Mark 10.8 quoting Genesis 2.24.

(10) And again in the house<sup>25</sup> his<sup>26</sup> disciples asked him about the same.<sup>27</sup> (11) And he said to them, “Whoever divorces his wife and marries another, he commits adultery against her. (12) And if a wife<sup>28</sup> divorces her husband and marries another,<sup>29</sup> she commits adultery.”

Even if by divorce, it says, she is separated from her husband, nevertheless by virtue of the fact that she is joined together from the beginning, she cannot be separated. This is why he called being joined with another woman while the first woman was still alive “adultery.” And for a wife, it is the same: but is it “adultery” to come together with one’s own wife? ♦ But,<sup>30</sup> it says, that one does not come together with one’s own wife, but that having abandoned one’s own wife, one commits adultery with her, that is to say, with the second woman whom he brings in besides the one who lived with him according to the natural law. And in the same way, the woman is not living with her own husband when she leaves her own husband. And the Law prevented self-evident adultery, when a man might seduce the woman who lives with another. But the Saviour also condemned the adultery which is not acknowledged by all or even recognized, but is exposed as a crime against nature. ♦ And Matthew says that the Saviour said these things to the Pharisees: but Mark, to the disciples.<sup>31</sup> And this is not a contradiction. For it is possible for Jesus<sup>32</sup> to say the same things to the former and to the latter. Alternatively, Mark seems also to be referring us to the passage above and reminding us that earlier on the disciples “asked” Jesus “about this”<sup>33</sup> and that he told them these things.

(13) And they brought little children to him, in order that he might touch them. And the disciples rebuked those who were bringing them.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

<sup>26</sup> Note the textual variant: αὐτοῦ.

<sup>27</sup> Note the textual variant: περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ.

<sup>28</sup> Note the textual variant: γυνή.

<sup>29</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ ἐὰν γυνή ἀπολύσῃ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς, καὶ γαμηθῇ ἄλλῳ.

<sup>30</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 374.15–22 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* Fr. 94.1–7 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 30).

<sup>31</sup> Matthew effectively omits the equivalent of Mark 10.10. Consequently, everything is said in the presence of the Pharisees.

<sup>32</sup> *Lit.* “him.”

<sup>33</sup> Note the clear references to Mark 10.10.

<sup>34</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐπετίμων τοῖς προσφέρουσιν.

[375] It is a characteristic of the Creator to rejoice in what he has made and not to prevent their approach towards him, and especially when | there is nothing to prevent it. For it is only the evil and decay of the creation which prevents it approaching the Creator: but the state of lacking wisdom is not a reason to prevent the approach. For they lack wisdom, and an approach serves to correct<sup>35</sup> this. This is why the wording is quite precise: “*for it is to such as these that the Kingdom of heaven belongs.*”<sup>36</sup> For he did not say, “to these,” but “to such as these,” since the state of lacking wisdom applies to children. Warning against this, the Apostle says, “Do not become little children in your thinking.”<sup>37</sup> But the present Evangelist expounded the reason, when he says by way of explanation, “*for it is to such as these that the Kingdom belongs.*”<sup>38</sup>

◆ Why<sup>39</sup> did the disciples fend off the little children? For the sake of dignity. What then does he do? He teaches them to be gentle and to trample worldly affectation underfoot. And he receives the little children and he takes them into his arms, and “*to such as these*”<sup>40</sup> he promises the Kingdom. For the soul of the little child is pure from all the passions, and to those who have upset it, it does not bear malice, but goes to them as a friend as if nothing has happened: and however much it is scolded by his mother, it seeks after her, preferring her to everyone else, and even if you show it the queen with her diadem, it does not prefer her to his mother clothed in rags, but would choose rather to see her with these things than the queen with her finery: and it seeks after nothing more than the necessities of life, but just to be satisfied from the breast, and to fill its belly.<sup>41</sup> It is not grieved by the things which grieve us, such as the loss of money and other such things. And it does not rejoice at these perishable things: and it is not excited by physical beauty. This is why he says, “*it is to such as these that the Kingdom belongs,*”<sup>42</sup> so that we might accomplish by our conscious choice what children have by nature.<sup>43</sup> ◆ And “*lifting them in his arms, he*

<sup>35</sup> *Lit.* “satisfies.”

<sup>36</sup> Mark 10.14.

<sup>37</sup> 1 Corinthians 14.20.

<sup>38</sup> Mark 10.14.

<sup>39</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 375.10–25 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 62.4 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.600.54–601.21.

<sup>40</sup> Mark 10.14.

<sup>41</sup> *Lit.* “to pull back from the nipple.”

<sup>42</sup> Mark 10.14.

<sup>43</sup> Note that there is no real emphasis on “original sin” in this passage. Chrysostom’s

*blessed them*<sup>44</sup> is a beautiful thing. For again the creature who, from the beginning, was separated and had fallen away, is lifted up, as it were, into the arms of its Creator. ♦ And<sup>45</sup> he lays his hands on the children,<sup>46</sup> and the laying on of his hands speaks of the bestowing of divine power, by which its own workmanship is brought to perfection. ♦ And the practice is common, and Christ does this following the custom of the laying on of hands, | but the inner working is not according to custom. Because while being God, he also observed closely the human way of life as he had truly become a human being. [376]

29. *On the rich man who questioned Jesus*

(17) And as he was setting out on a journey, someone<sup>47</sup> ran up and knelt before him, and asked him, “Good teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?”

♦ Some<sup>48</sup> accuse this young man of being someone who was a dissembler and evil, who also came with a test for Jesus. But I, although I would decline to say that he was not fond of money (since Christ also charged him with being such a character), would in no way charge him with being a dissembler, because Mark has placed him above this suspicion. “*For he ran up,*” he says, “*and knelt before him, and asked him: ... and that when he saw him, Jesus loved him.*”<sup>49</sup> So why does Christ reply to him in this way, saying, “*No-one is good except God alone?*”<sup>50</sup> It is because he comes to him as a human being, and as one of many Jewish teachers. This is why he converses with him as a human being. And indeed, frequently he responds to the secret thoughts of those who approach him: for instance, when he says, “We worship what

---

observations of infant behaviour perhaps provide an interesting contrast with those of Augustine.

<sup>44</sup> Mark 10.16.

<sup>45</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 375.27–30 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* Fr. 96.15–16 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 32).

<sup>46</sup> There is a clearer echo of Matthew 19.15 than Mark 10.16 in terms of vocabulary at this point.

<sup>47</sup> Note the textual variant: τῖς, in place of εἷς, is not attested in NA<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 376.9–378.4 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 63.1–2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.603.16–605.43.

<sup>49</sup> Mark 10.17–21.

<sup>50</sup> Mark 10.18.

we know,”<sup>51</sup> and “If I bear witness about myself, my witness is not true.”<sup>52</sup> Therefore when he said, “*No one is good,*”<sup>53</sup> he meant, “No one among human beings is good.” But he says this not to deprive human beings of goodness, but to make it different from the goodness of God. This is why he also added, “*except God alone.*”<sup>54</sup> And he did not say, “except my Father,” so that you may learn that he did not reveal himself to the young man. Why on earth did he reply to him in this way? He wishes to lead him on by a step at a time and to teach him to avoid all flattery, and to direct him towards God, and to know the one who is truly good, who is also the root and fountain of all things, and to render honour to Him: because also when he says, “Call no one upon earth ‘Teacher!’,”<sup>55</sup> he says this to make a distinction from himself so that [377] they might learn what is the ruling principle over all things. | But the young man displays no little eagerness to fall in with such a desire at this time. And when others were testing [Jesus], and coming to him [for healing] from diseases (either their own or those of others), he came to [Jesus] and talked [with him] about eternal life. For indeed the earth was fertile and rich, but the multitude of thorns choked the seed.<sup>56</sup> Look at least at how much he was ready for obedience to the commandments, for he does not say, “How may I enter into life?” but “What must I do?” Thus he was ready to carry out the things, which were going to be told him. But if he had come to him to test him, the Evangelist would have shown this to us also, just as he does with regard to the others. But even if Christ himself had been silent, he would not have allowed him to remain hidden, but would have made his guilt plain, or he would even have hinted at it. If he had come to him to test him, he would not “*have gone away distressed*”<sup>57</sup> at what he heard. So his desire was for life, but he was held by a most dangerous passion.

Therefore when Christ has mentioned the commands of the Law, he says, “*I have kept all these since my youth. And Jesus, looking at him, loved him*” and so on.<sup>58</sup> Then because he was about to set him a great challenge, he sets out the rewards saying, “*You lack one thing: go, sell what you own and give it to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven: then come, follow me.*”<sup>59</sup> See

---

<sup>51</sup> John 4.22.

<sup>52</sup> John 5.31.

<sup>53</sup> Mark 10.18.

<sup>54</sup> Mark 10.18.

<sup>55</sup> A paraphrase of Matthew 23.9.

<sup>56</sup> This is a reference to the Parable of the Sower in Mark 4.1–20.

<sup>57</sup> Mark 10.22.

<sup>58</sup> Mark 10.20–21.

<sup>59</sup> Mark 10.22.

how many prizes and look at how many crowns he sets for this race? And if that man were testing him, the Saviour would not have said this to him. But in fact he says this so as to draw him on, and he shows him that the reward is great: for indeed, in following him, there is a great reward. And rightly, he does not mention life, but treasure—for since the discussion was about money, and he advised him to strip himself bare, he shows that he will not lose his possessions, but will add to what he has even more than he was commanded to give up (so much more since heaven is so much greater than earth). But with a miserable countenance at the discussion, “*he went away distressed, for he was very wealthy.*”<sup>60</sup> Those who have little are not held back in the same way as those drowning<sup>61</sup> in affluence, for the addition of wealth kindles | the flame more, and renders those who have possessions the poorer. Therefore notice also what sort of strength this passion exhibited in this world. When Jesus ordered this man, who came to him with joy and eagerness, to throw away his wealth, it would not allow him to consider life, but rather, made him miserable. ♦

[378]

(24) And Jesus, responding again, said to them “Children, how hard it is for those who trust in riches<sup>62</sup> to enter the Kingdom of God.”

♦ In<sup>63</sup> saying “*how hard it is,*”<sup>64</sup> he does not impugn the riches themselves, but those who are infatuated by them without moderation. What precisely is the point of this for his disciples? What therefore does Christ say? “*How*

<sup>60</sup> Mark 20.22.

<sup>61</sup> Note the allusion to baptism at this point.

<sup>62</sup> Note the textual variant: τοὺς πεποθότας ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν. This variant perhaps demonstrates the fact that this text has caused difficulties for interpreters through the centuries. Crossley notes a variety of attempts to amend the meaning, including the spurious argument that the passage in Mark 10.25 refers to a Needle’s Eye gate in Jerusalem “or the only slightly less unlikely attempt, with the help of Arabic and later Greek, to read the variant *kamilon*, ‘ship’s towline’, ‘cable’, for *kamelon*, ‘camel’.” (James Crossley, ‘The Damned Rich (Mark 10.17–31),’ *The Expository Times* 116 (2005): 399). Crossley notes the textual variant in Mark 10.24 and suggests that there are “numerous attempts” in *modern* scholarship “to downplay Jesus’ condemnation of the rich by arguing, for example, that wealthy people as such are not attacked but abuse of wealth and godless wealth are the problem, echoing the textual variant of Mark 10.24” (Crossley, ‘The Damned Rich (Mark 10.17–31),’ 399). It is intriguing to note that this is exactly the interpretative strategy adopted by the *pre-modern* catenist.

<sup>63</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 378.8–30 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaewum* 63.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.605.43–606.27.

<sup>64</sup> Mark 10.24.

*hard it is for those who have riches*” and so on.<sup>65</sup> To those who are poor and possess nothing he says that a rich man will enter the Kingdom of God only with difficulty. He teaches them not to be ashamed of their poverty, excusing himself to them, as it were, for allowing them to have nothing. He did not simply say that it was “*hard*,” but, with even greater intensity,<sup>66</sup> that it was impossible: and this he showed from the example of the camel and the needle: from this he shows that there is no ordinary reward for those who are rich and who are able to lead an ethical life.<sup>67</sup> This is why he also said that it was a work of God, in order to show that for the one who would achieve this would need plenty of grace. At least, when the disciples were troubled and said, “*Who then can be saved? Jesus looked at them and said*” and so on.<sup>68</sup>

And why are the disciples troubled given that they are poor? They grieve for the salvation of others: this is why “*he looked*”<sup>69</sup> at them before he said these things: for with a soft and gentle look, he calmed their trembling minds, then he also took the pressure off them by his words, introducing God’s power into the discussion, and in this way making them feel confident. How then could this be possible? It was in order that, having considered the greatness of the enterprise, and having leapt at it readily, and having beseeched God to assist you in these honourable ordeals, you would attain everlasting life, and, having separated yourself from evil desires, you would throw away<sup>70</sup> your possessions: as the Apostle says, “let us also lay aside every weight, and sin which clings so closely.”<sup>71</sup> ♦

[379] For the way which leads to life is narrow and hard,<sup>72</sup> and through this a camel will be unable to pass, being the largest in size. ♦ Therefore<sup>73</sup> the preparatory teaching of the Law is a good thing, and Christ does not do away

<sup>65</sup> Note the inconsistency between the Marcan text here and that contained within the lemma. The catenist succeeds in recording both textual variants.

<sup>66</sup> ἐπιτάσις is a technical grammatical term, which means either “intensity” or “intensification” (See Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship*, 238).

<sup>67</sup> The verb φιλοσοφεῖν suggests the philosophical virtues. For further discussion of the significance of philosophy in Christian discourse, see especially Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, 237–252.

<sup>68</sup> Mark 10.27.

<sup>69</sup> ἐμβλέψας—cf. Matthew 19.26 and Mark 10.27.

<sup>70</sup> The text in Cramer’s edition is unclear at this point. A comparison with Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 63.3 (PG 58.606.28–30) suggests that ῥίψης is the most probable reading.

<sup>71</sup> Hebrews 12.1.

<sup>72</sup> Matthew 7.14.

<sup>73</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 379.3–6 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* Fr. 97 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 32).

with it, when he shows that this is the beginning of the way, although not its end: and he bears witness through this that the Law is not against him, for its perfection comes through him: ♦ for setting aside what is superfluous,<sup>74</sup> he says, “Come! Follow me!”<sup>75</sup> For when these obstacles are removed, may your path be clear to follow the one who guides you towards true life. And how it becomes possible and how the impossibility of the example can be resolved, we can learn from the Saviour when he says to the rich, “Make friends for yourselves by means of unrighteous Mammon, in order that when you die,<sup>76</sup> they may receive you into their eternal habitations.”<sup>77</sup>

When it says “*all things are possible for God*,”<sup>78</sup> does the saying concede anything to those who say, “What about bad things”? ♦ For<sup>79</sup> “bad things” are not included in “all things possible for God.” For wherever God is spoken of, goodness follows, and anyone who is sound in mind would not even consider that bad things are possible for God, nor would one say that not doing bad things was a sign of powerlessness. For, on the contrary, the doing of bad things is a weakness: and Paul calls these weaknesses “sins” when he says, “For while we were still weak, Christ died at the right time for the ungodly”<sup>80</sup> and in the words of the Psalmist, “their weaknesses were washed clean”<sup>81</sup> (describing their sins as “weaknesses”). But nor would anyone object to the saying, which refers to “all things being possible for God”: therefore, is it possible for God also to make something that has happened not to have happened? For again such an action would be completely pointless: but the power of God cannot sustain a pointless action.<sup>82</sup> For someone might inquire how it is that he loved him who was not intending to follow him into eternal life: in the first place, the one who keeps the law is worthy of love, and that from his youth, but his deficiency as regards perfection does not allow his first love to become perfect, since he has not received perfection. This is why Paul, when he had at last grasped the total imperfection in the Law, hastened to perfection: ♦ “for whatever gain I had, I counted as loss

<sup>74</sup> I.e. wealth.

<sup>75</sup> Mark 10.21.

<sup>76</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐκλίπητε.

<sup>77</sup> Luke 16.9.

<sup>78</sup> Matthew 19.26 and Mark 10.27.

<sup>79</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 379.15–33 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaicum* Fr. 98.4–20 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 32).

<sup>80</sup> Romans 5.6.

<sup>81</sup> Psalm 15.4 (LXX).

<sup>82</sup> *Lit.* “nothing is conceived as pointless in the case of God’s power.”



[380] in terms of goodness.”<sup>83</sup> Accordingly, if the fulfilment of the Law is a good thing at | a particular time, then the love for this is also right: but the failure to follow him towards perfection deprives the one who does not follow of perfect love. And, in this saying, we find a refutation of the madness of the Marcionites and the Manichees, who say that the Law belongs to someone other than Christ. For Christ would not have loved the one who spoke boldly about this for the fulfilling of someone else’s Law, and also, it is a testimony to his achievement in not stumbling when he said, “*I have kept all these things since my youth.*”<sup>84</sup> For indeed he would have exceeded the measure of humanity, not even being guilty of a single sin; but in witness of the fact that it is possible for a human being to keep the entire Law, the rich young man gave his own testimony, and Christ loved him for his robust keeping of the laws.<sup>85</sup>

(28) And Peter began to say to him, “See, we have left everything and followed<sup>86</sup> you.” (29) And in reply Jesus said,<sup>87</sup> “Truly I say to you, there is no one who has left home, or brothers, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife,<sup>88</sup> or children, or fields, for my sake and for the sake of the Gospel, (30) who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age, homes and brothers and sisters and mothers and children and fields, with persecutions, and in the age to come eternal life.”

◆ What<sup>89</sup> exactly is “*everything*,”<sup>90</sup> O blessed Peter? The fishing-rod, the net, the boat, the trade, are you telling me that these things are “*everything*”? “Yes,” he says. “But not for love of honour, but in order that through this question I may bring in the multitude of the poor.” Since you heard Christ saying, “If you want to be perfect, sell your possessions and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven,”<sup>91</sup> in case you should say, “What if I

---

<sup>83</sup> Philippians 3:7. Note the textual variant: τῶν χρηστῶν is unattested in NA<sup>27</sup>, and may be evidence of a corruption in the manuscript used by Cramer. τὸν Χριστόν is the more familiar reading.

<sup>84</sup> Mark 10:20.

<sup>85</sup> The syntax is obscure in this passage, but the general sense seems clear.

<sup>86</sup> Note the textual variant: ἠκολουθήσαμεν.

<sup>87</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν.

<sup>88</sup> Note the textual variant: ἡ γυναῖκα.

<sup>89</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 380.21–29 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 64.1 (PG 58.609.10–26).

<sup>90</sup> Mark 10:28.

<sup>91</sup> Matthew 19:21.

have no possessions? Am I not able to be perfect?" Peter asks this question in order that you may learn and in receiving the response from Christ, you may feel confident. ♦ For<sup>92</sup> on behalf of the whole world, he put to him this question.<sup>93</sup>

But in order that the rest, hearing the word "you", might not suppose this to be something peculiar to the disciples, Jesus extended the Law and spread the | undertaking of the Law over the whole earth, and from the things [381] present guarantees the things to come also. ♦ So,<sup>94</sup> if someone were to leave a few things, or even many things, for his sake, he will receive everlasting treasure. But when he says "*who has left their wife*,"<sup>95</sup> he does not say this to dissolve marriages, but what he said was concerning one's soul, that the one "who loses his soul for my sake, will find it":<sup>96</sup> and this is not so that we might destroy ourselves, nor is it so that while still here we might separate the soul from the body, but so that we might prefer holy living to all things: and this is what he means by "wife" and "brothers" and the others. But he seems to me here also to give some intimation of the "*persecutions*":<sup>97</sup> for since there were many, both fathers urging their children to unholy living, and wives their husbands, when they command these things, he says, let them remain neither wives or fathers: of this therefore also Paul says, "But even if the unbeliever separates, let him be separated."<sup>98</sup> Therefore having raised the spirits of all, and having also made them feel confident with respect to themselves and with respect to the world, he adds: ♦

(31) "Many that are first will be last, and the last first."

He shows that of those who think they are first, the foremost will be those who believe in him and leave these things of their own. But here it seems to me that he is hinting at the Pharisees—as he also said earlier that "the sons

<sup>92</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 380.29–381.2 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 64.1 (PG 58.610.33–38).

<sup>93</sup> Note the portrayal of Peter in this passage. Far from suggesting that the disciples are slow to understand or slightly dense, the commentator suggests that Peter is possessed of a certain prescience in asking the kind of questions which might help to instruct the faithful.

<sup>94</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 381.2–17 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 64.2 (PG 58.611.26–42).

<sup>95</sup> Note that this comment relates to a textual variant within Mark 10.29. However, the phrase ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ is integral to Luke 18.29.

<sup>96</sup> Matthew 16.25.

<sup>97</sup> I.e. "the persecutions" referred to in Mark 10.30.

<sup>98</sup> 1 Corinthians 7.15.

of the kingdom will be thrown"<sup>99</sup> outside: but others, he says, ask whether salvation is difficult for those who cling to money, and whether there is any hope for those who leave everything behind. And this is clear from the fact that "Who then can be saved?" was spoken about the rich. But they want to know the hope reserved for themselves, not as those who have abandoned some great things, but as those who are detached from what they had. And the Saviour reveals the reward, acknowledging the desire for it and encouraging the love of it. For this also Paul prays on behalf of the churches, "to know what is the hope to which they are called, and what are the riches of the grace of God for those who believe."<sup>100</sup>

(29) "There is no one who has left home or brothers" and so on.

[382] ♦ He<sup>101</sup> places the command not on the apostles alone but | on all who have left family and home for him as well. He says that they will receive "very much more,"<sup>102</sup> and they will inherit "eternal life": this distinction is made by both Mark and Luke, saying that the "very much more" will be "*in this age*":<sup>103</sup> but "*eternal life*"<sup>104</sup> will be "*in the age to come*":<sup>105</sup> ♦ for the enjoyment<sup>106</sup> of this "very much more" is now in terms of fellowship rather than in terms of physical kinship because the Saviour has set aside everything belonging to the brothers for those enlisted in the service of the gospel. And so he also said that there would be many homes and brothers and sisters and mothers and children and fields for those who abandon their own because love is the fulfilment of every relationship for the Jews and every need such as houses

<sup>99</sup> Matthew 8.12. The commentator is referring to the story of the healing of the Centurion's servant, when Jesus says, "I tell you, many will come from east and west and sit at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, while the sons of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness; there men will weep and gnash their teeth" (Matthew 8.11–12).

<sup>100</sup> A corrupt version of Ephesians 1.18. The original reads as follows: "having the eyes of your hearts enlightened, that you may know what is the hope to which he has called you, what are the riches of his glorious inheritance in the saints ...."

<sup>101</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 381.32–382.4 is a paraphrase of Origen, *Commentarium in evangelium Matthaeum* 15.25.13–14 (E. Klostermann, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 10.2 [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 40.2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1937]: 422).

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Luke 18.30.

<sup>103</sup> Mark 10.30 and Luke 18.30.

<sup>104</sup> Mark 10.30.

<sup>105</sup> Mark 10.30.

<sup>106</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 382.4–383.2 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* Fr. 100.1–30 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 33–34).

and fields would supply. And Luke has added also “a wife”:<sup>107</sup> and this was according to Paul’s instructions “to honour older women as mothers and younger women as sisters in all purity.”<sup>108</sup> For just as he gives brothers who are not brothers, and parents who are not parents, and children who are not children, so also he gives a wife who is not a wife: and, in a slightly different spiritual fashion, it is a good thing to leave behind one’s kin according to the flesh on account of the spiritual life, in the same way that Moses said long ago concerning the tribe of Levi, “The one, who says to his father and his mother, ‘I have not seen you,’ and to his brothers, ‘I do not recognise you,’ and to his sons, ‘I renounce you,’ observes your word, and keeps your covenant. They will teach Jacob your ordinances and Israel your law. They will offer incense on your altar on account of everything.”<sup>109</sup> For there the separation from the family is on account of zeal for God, and here it is the same (although it is not as if it is necessary in any other respect to alienate one’s family except in so far as one assigns a higher value to what is more devout and offers no impediment to the service of the gospel). At any rate, the Lord himself also honoured the mother who bore him according to the flesh, and committed her to the beloved disciple (so the word of a Manichee is hostile to the purpose of Christ, and all who upset physical kinship on account of the spiritual have in mind something different from the Saviour).

But there is no real distinction between saying “for the sake of my name”<sup>110</sup> or “*for the sake of the Gospel*”<sup>111</sup> as Mark, or “for the sake of the Kingdom of God”<sup>112</sup> as Luke: for the name of Christ is the power of the Gospel and the Kingdom: and the Gospel depends | upon the name of Christ: and the Kingdom of God is made known through his name, and is made near: ♦ and Mark adds also that even “*with persecutions*”<sup>113</sup> they will have “very much more” now, just as he will find many presenting an altogether more genuine disposition on account of their piety: for all these things come about because of the faithful, and they prevail to such an extent that they enable the perfection of Christianity to prosper.

[383]

---

<sup>107</sup> Note that at this point the commentator acknowledges the inconsistency between Mark and Luke, even though the Marcan lemma carries a textual corruption which incorporates the Lukan reading.

<sup>108</sup> 1 Timothy 5.2.

<sup>109</sup> Deuteronomy 33.9–10.

<sup>110</sup> Matthew 19.29.

<sup>111</sup> Mark 10.29.

<sup>112</sup> Luke 18.29.

<sup>113</sup> Mark 10.30.

(32) They were on the road, going up to Jerusalem: and Jesus was walking ahead of them,<sup>114</sup> and they were amazed, and those who followed were afraid.<sup>115</sup> And he took the twelve aside again, and he began to tell them what was about to happen to him.

◆ He foretold<sup>116</sup> these things to the disciples out of necessity, so that they should know that he had come to the Passion knowingly and not in ignorance, neither unwillingly but willingly. ◆ This is why<sup>117</sup> he also frequently said the same kind of thing as Mark indicates, saying, “He took the twelve aside again and began to tell them what was about to happen to him.”<sup>118</sup> And privately he began to reveal such things to the disciples beforehand. For these were indeed worthy of knowing in advance, and of not being troubled by the sufferings. This is why he spoke separately with them, even when many others travelled with them. And he said what would happen plainly, and he recounted even being spat upon, in order that no detail might be passed over in silence, so that no lack of foreknowledge would trouble those who suddenly saw these things. But the remedy for all these things was that “*on the third day he will be raised*”:<sup>119</sup> and Luke recounted in addition that it was necessary also from the prophets when he says “everything that is written of the Son of Man by the prophets will be accomplished.”<sup>120</sup> ◆ For<sup>121</sup> it was mostly for consolation that the prophets gave warning in advance that the Saviour would suffer these things, so that when these unhappy things came about, they might in consequence also expect the resurrection. For the one who did not conceal the distressing details and the | things which seemed to be shameful, would reasonably be believed with regard to everything else. ◆

[384]

<sup>114</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀπὸ τῶν.

<sup>115</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο.

<sup>116</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 383.13–15 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 65.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.617.42–44.

<sup>117</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 383.15–27 is anonymous.

<sup>118</sup> Mark 10.32.

<sup>119</sup> Mark 10.34.

<sup>120</sup> Luke 18.31.

<sup>121</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 383.27–384.2 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 65.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.617.54–58.

30. *On the sons of Zebedee*

(35) And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, came forward,<sup>122</sup> saying, “Teacher, we want you to do whatever we ask.”<sup>123</sup>

♦ Why<sup>124</sup> does Matthew say that their mother came? It is likely that both these things came to pass. For they took along their mother in order to increase the force of their supplication, seeking by her presence to overawe Christ. And since this was the case, and the request was really their own, feeling ashamed they brought along the woman who bore them, and notice how he directs his saying to them. Let us learn what they ask first, and with what kind of disposition (either theirs or their mother’s), and how it was, that they came to this. They saw themselves honoured above the others and they expected in consequence to attain their request. But what is it that they ask? Listen to another Evangelist<sup>125</sup> making this plain: for “because he was near Jerusalem, and because they supposed that his Kingdom should appear immediately,”<sup>126</sup> they asked these things. For they supposed that after the Kingdom, it would be too late.<sup>127</sup> ♦ For<sup>128</sup> this reason, indeed even at this point, they came to him with their request: from this it is clear that they imagined it was a Kingdom perceptible to the senses. ♦ But<sup>129</sup> let no one lay a charge against the apostles, if they had this rather imperfect state of mind. For there was as yet no Cross, and there was as yet no grace of the Spirit. This is why he reveals their deficiencies, in order that later<sup>130</sup> they might realise what kind of persons they had become by grace. And it was not in ignorance of what they want to ask that the Saviour says, “What do you want?” but it was in order that he might compel them to answer and might teach them in this way. But being ashamed (since they were under the influence of human passion), they took him away from the disciples on their

<sup>122</sup> Note the textual variant: the omission of ἀὐτῶ.

<sup>123</sup> Note the textual variant: the omissions of σε.

<sup>124</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 384.8–19 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 65.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.618.50–619.5.

<sup>125</sup> Chrysostom is referring to Luke.

<sup>126</sup> Luke 19.11.

<sup>127</sup> *Lit.* “they would not obtain their request.”

<sup>128</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 384.19–21 is anonymous.

<sup>129</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 384.21–386.22 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 65.2–3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.619.12–621.38.

<sup>130</sup> *Lit.* “after these things.”

own and asked him: for “they came forward,”<sup>131</sup> it says, so that they might not become observable to the disciples.<sup>132</sup> So what did they say? It is clear that they were asking for nothing spiritual, nor did they really understand [385] | what they were asking for: for they would not have had the courage to ask for so great a thing. He said, “*You do not know what you are asking for yourselves,*<sup>133</sup> how great, and how much surpassing the powers above. *Can you drink the cup which I will drink?*”<sup>134</sup> See how quickly he led them away from their misconception by talking to them of contrary things. “For you,” he says, “discuss ‘honour’ with me, whereas I am discussing conflicts and toils with you. For this is not the time for rewards, but the present is a time for slaughter and war and danger.” And notice how by the form of his question, “*Are you able to drink the cup that I will drink?*”<sup>135</sup> he urges them on in order that they might become more ready for fellowship with him. And again he calls this “*baptism,*”<sup>136</sup> revealing the great act of cleansing from these events, which on the one hand was his cleansing for them, and on the other, the cleansing from the Cross for the whole world. “*They said to him, ‘We are able.’*”<sup>137</sup> They promised immediately, expecting to hear what they had asked for because they said these things. But demonstrating that what they said was no false pretence, he says, “*the cup I drink, you will drink, and the baptism with which I am baptised, you also will be baptised,*”<sup>138</sup> which is to say, “you will be counted worthy of martyrdom, and you will suffer the things which I will suffer.” “But to sit at my right hand and my left is not mine to give, but it shall be given to those for whom it has been prepared by my Father.”<sup>139</sup> See how he excited their souls and made them of a higher character, and ensures that they are unvanquished by sorrow. But whatever does he mean by the saying? For there are two puzzles: one is whether it has been prepared for anyone to sit at his right hand; and the other is whether the Lord of all was not sufficiently Lord to provide for those for whom it was not prepared. Therefore, on the first question, we will say that no one shall sit on his right hand or on his left. For that throne is inaccessible to the whole creation. Indeed, Paul puts this as a special honour of the only-

---

<sup>131</sup> An allusion to Mark 10.35.

<sup>132</sup> *Lit.* “to them.”

<sup>133</sup> Mark 10.38: cf. Matthew 20.22.

<sup>134</sup> Mark 10.38.

<sup>135</sup> Mark 10.38.

<sup>136</sup> Mark 10.38.

<sup>137</sup> Mark 10.39.

<sup>138</sup> Mark 10.39 Note that this passage is not to be found in the parallel passage in Matthew.

<sup>139</sup> Matthew 20.23.

begotten, saying “To which of the angels has he ever said, ‘Sit at my right hand?’ .... And of the angels he says, ‘Who makes his angels spirits ...’, but of the Son he says, ‘Your throne, O God, is for eternity’.”<sup>140</sup> Why then does he say that to sit at my right hand or “*on my left is not mine to give*”<sup>141</sup> as though there are some who should sit there and some who should not? Surely not! He is responding to the underlying question of those who ask, | condescending to their understanding.<sup>142</sup> For they did not know that exalted throne<sup>143</sup> and the seat at the right hand of the Father, but they were seeking one thing: to enjoy the first honours, and to stand before the others. For since they had heard of twelve thrones<sup>144</sup> and were ignorant of what the saying meant, they asked for the best seat. What therefore Christ says is this: “You shall die on account of me and you will share with me in the Passion: but this is not sufficient to enable you to secure the first rank. For if anyone else should be more accomplished than you in every other kind of virtue and should arrive by virtue of their martyrdom, I will not give you the first honours simply because at this moment I love you and prefer you to the others,<sup>145</sup> setting them aside for this reason. Therefore it is prepared for those who are able to become more distinguished by their deeds.” Therefore, given the grace of God, he urges them on in every way to the demonstration of their own virtuous action in order that they might have the hope of salvation *and* of good repute.<sup>146</sup> For the fact that he is Lord of all is manifest from his having all judgement, and he himself will give, as the righteous judge, the crown of righteousness to Paul,<sup>147</sup> and not only him, “but to those who have loved his appearing”,<sup>148</sup> in the words of the Apostle. Therefore having attended to them efficiently, so that they should not worry about the first places in vain, and at the same time not wanting to hurt them, he achieves both aims. ♦

<sup>140</sup> Hebrews 1,5,7,8 Note the attribution of Hebrews by Chrysostom to Paul.

<sup>141</sup> Mark 10.40: cf. Matthew 20.23.

<sup>142</sup> τῶν συγκαταβαίνων τῇ αὐτῶν διανοίᾳ. The idea of ‘condescension’ is a typical feature of Chrysostom’s exegesis. For further discussion, see Margaret Mitchell, ‘Pauline Accommodation and “Condescension”’: 1Cor 9.19–23 and the History of Influence,’ in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 197–214.

<sup>143</sup> I.e. of the Father.

<sup>144</sup> A reference to Matthew 19.28: cf. Luke 22.30.

<sup>145</sup> There is perhaps an allusion at this point to the tradition that John did not die a martyr’s death, but died of old age.

<sup>146</sup> Thus, while salvation and a place in the Kingdom is guaranteed by the grace of God, the order of precedence in the seating arrangements depends chiefly on a life of virtue.

<sup>147</sup> A reference to 2 Timothy 4.8.

<sup>148</sup> 2 Timothy 4.8.



For<sup>149</sup> indeed, a gift such as this is not beyond the capacity of the Son. “For those for whom it is prepared by the Father,”<sup>150</sup> is as if he also said, “by him.” ♦ This<sup>151</sup> is why Mark has not said “by my Father.”<sup>152</sup> But “when,” it says, “*the ten heard this, they began to be angry.*”<sup>153</sup> For in so far as the decision was Christ’s, they were not indignant, and seeing them being honoured, they acquiesced out of respect for their teacher. And when they experienced some human weakness in Peter, they were not angry with him, but simply asked, “Who is the greatest?”<sup>154</sup> But because here the question came from the disciples, “*they began to be angry,*”<sup>155</sup> and not even at this point, but only when Christ rebuked them, and showed that all of them would not receive the seats of honour, and so all of them were less than perfect. But you will see | them rescued from all these passions, even when they have conceded the seats of honour to others. Therefore what does Christ say? “*Calling them to himself,*”<sup>156</sup> it says, he soothes them by placing the calling before his words and by drawing them close to him (for the two had also stood close to him, pleading their own interests). This is why he brings them closer, soothing the strong feelings of both groups. And in showing that the love of first places is a quality of the gentiles, he puts to shame their inflamed souls. “Do not be angry,” he says, “like men who are arrogant, for those who seek the seats of honour rather dishonour themselves: for these things for us are not as they are for those outside. For the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, but with me the one who is last is first. And by means of these things which I do and which I suffer, take note of the demonstration of my sayings. For being King of the powers above, I was willing to become a human being and to be despised and to meet with death, and I gave my life as a ransom.”<sup>157</sup> and on whose behalf? On behalf of my enemies. But you, if you should be

[387]

---

<sup>149</sup> These two sentences (*Cat. Marc.* 386.22–24) have been inserted by the catenist. They do not occur in Chrysostom’s original homily on this passage in Matthew. Note both the anti-Arian emphasis and the careful analysis of Synoptic parallels in these words. The omission by Mark is used as an opportunity for further Christological reflection.

<sup>150</sup> Matthew 20.23.

<sup>151</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 386.24–387.23 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeeum* 65.3–4 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.621.40–623.8.

<sup>152</sup> Mark 10.40.

<sup>153</sup> Mark 10.41.

<sup>154</sup> Matthew 18.1.

<sup>155</sup> Mark 10.41.

<sup>156</sup> Mark 10.42.

<sup>157</sup> Mark 10.45 cf. Exodus 30.12 “a ransom for his soul to the Lord.”

humiliated, it would be on your own part, but for me, it is on your behalf. Therefore do not be afraid, as if your honour had been taken away: for as much as you would humble yourself, you are not able to descend as much as your master.” And yet his descent has become the ascent of every one: and has made his glory to shine forth. For before he became a human being, he was known only among the angels. But when he became a human being and was crucified, not only did he not lessen that glory, but he received in addition another [glory] from the whole world. ♦

### 31. *On Bartimaeus*

(46) And they came to Jericho. And as he was leaving Jericho, with his disciples and a large crowd, Bartimaeus, son of Timaeus, the<sup>158</sup> blind man, was sitting besides the road begging.<sup>159</sup>

That the healing was within his power, he showed when he says, “*What do you want me to do for you?*”<sup>160</sup> And the respect that the multitude had for him is evident in that they told the blind man not to shout (like when a king is present). So, had they not been led to it by their rulers, the people would not have taken part in the slaying of Christ. | But the abusive exercise of power does damage people. And the blind man was calling on the “*Son of David,*” having heard the rumour which was running among the people, and being certain of the prediction by the prophets. And the Lord did not deny the relationship,<sup>161</sup> despite having shown elsewhere that he is above the physical relationship. For surely he would not have provided healing to someone who was mistakenly calling him “Son of David” out of false faith and by a slanderous word, as think those who say that he had come only in appearance,<sup>162</sup> or to have been made flesh from another substance and not from the stuff of David. And why did Jesus ask him, “*What do you want me to do for you?*”<sup>163</sup> This was in order that no one might suppose that when somebody wanted one thing, he gave them something else. And indeed it was his custom everywhere to elicit the desire of those being healed and to

<sup>158</sup> Note the textual variant: ὁ τυφλός.

<sup>159</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐκάθητο παρά τὴν ὁδὸν προσαιτῶν.

<sup>160</sup> Mark 10.51.

<sup>161</sup> I.e. being the Son of David.

<sup>162</sup> Anti-docetic.

<sup>163</sup> Mark 10.51.

reveal that to everybody, and then to bring on the healing: first, in order that he might lead the others to zeal: secondly, in order that he might show that the gift they were enjoying was appropriate.

(51) And the blind man said to him, “Rabbi, that I might see again” and so on.

That he was [receiving the gift] worthily and faithfully is evident both from the fact that “he cried out”<sup>164</sup> and ran towards Jesus with all eagerness, “leaping up,”<sup>165</sup> and that he threw away the cloak that he wore, all but stripping off his tunic,<sup>166</sup> and he committed himself entirely to Jesus, and from the fact that Christ bore witness to his faith and said, “Go, your faith has saved you.”<sup>167</sup> And having obtained healing, he did not depart (as many do), being ungrateful after a kindness is shown to them: and, as he was persistent before the gift, so he was grateful after the gift. For “*he followed*” Jesus “*on the way*.”<sup>168</sup> And the fact that the healing from blindness happened “by the road”<sup>169</sup> agrees with Matthew and Luke: and this gospel and Luke says that there was one blind man,<sup>170</sup> but Matthew says that there were two:<sup>171</sup> but this does not make his description inconsistent. For it is possible that both Mark and Luke have made mention of more important details, just as Mark here has also disclosed his name saying, “Bartimaeus, son of Timaeus, a blind man,” as someone who was well-known at that time.<sup>172</sup>

<sup>164</sup> Mark 10.48 has ἐκράζεν rather than ἐβόησε.

<sup>165</sup> Mark 10.50 has ἀναπηδήσας rather than ἐκπηδήσας.

<sup>166</sup> Note the additional hyperbole.

<sup>167</sup> Mark 10.52.

<sup>168</sup> Mark 10.52.

<sup>169</sup> An allusion to Mark 10.46.

<sup>170</sup> Luke 18.35.

<sup>171</sup> Matthew 20.30.

<sup>172</sup> This observation is remarkably similar to that of Richard Bauckham, who suggests that Bartimaeus is mentioned by name because he was an eyewitness known to Mark's community: “Mark could expect his readers to know of Bartimaeus as a kind of living miracle, who made Jesus' act of healing still, so to speak, visible to all who encountered him as a well-known figure in the churches of Jerusalem and Judea. But after his death and after the fall of Jerusalem, which removed the Jewish Christians of Palestine from the usual purview of Christians outside Palestine, Bartimaeus was presumably no longer a figure of wide repute, and so Matthew and Luke omitted his name” (Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: the Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 54).

## CHAPTER II

### 32. *On the colt*

(1) And when they were coming close to Jerusalem at Bethphage and Bethany near the Mount of Olives, he sent two of his disciples. (2) And he said to them, “Go into the village ahead of you, and immediately<sup>1</sup> as you enter it, you will find tied there a colt, which no one has ridden:<sup>2</sup> untie it and bring it.”<sup>3</sup> [389]

◆ And<sup>4</sup> yet he had often entered Jerusalem before, but never with such prominence. For these were just the preliminary stages, and he was not known to them, nor was the time of his Passion near. This is why he mixed with them more unobtrusively, almost hiding himself. For he would not have been viewed with such high regard had he appeared in this way, and he would have excited them to greater anger. But because he had given them sufficient experience of his power, and the Cross was at the very gates, he finally made himself more conspicuous, and did everything, which was likely to inflame them, with greater prominence. But observe with me how many miracles are done and how many prophecies are fulfilled. He said, “You will find an ass.”<sup>5</sup> He foretold that no one would hinder them: and do not suppose that what happened was insignificant. For who persuaded the farmers, who were probably poor, not to protest when their property was taken from them, their animals dragged off, even when they did not see Jesus himself, but only his disciples? By these things he teaches them that he could have thwarted the Jews who were about to arrest him and rendered them speechless: but he did not want to do this. ◆ And<sup>6</sup> this incident was a

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the textual variant: εὐθέως.

<sup>2</sup> Note the textual variant: κεκάθικε.

<sup>3</sup> Note the textual variant: λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε.

<sup>4</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 389.9–25 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 66.1–2 (Harold Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1918): 369). This passage can be found in PG 58.627.11–42.

<sup>5</sup> Matthew 21.2.

<sup>6</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 389.25–32 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* Fr. 104.1–7 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 369). This passage can be found in Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 35.

sign: for there was no necessity for the Lord to sit on an ass, going from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem. He had passed through the whole of Galilee and Judea on foot, but to be seen mounted upon the colt shows that he presides over a new people as the heavenly ruler and King of Jerusalem.<sup>7</sup> For the colt showed the newness of this calling, and that those who are now being called were not clean under the old dispensation. For an ass is not clean according to the Law. ♦

[390] (4) They went away and found the colt tied up, and so on.

♦ But<sup>8</sup> he does not sit on the bare colt, but on the apostles' cloaks. When he took the colt, then they gave up everything. And note the obedience of the colt,—how being unbroken and unused to the bridle, it carried him in an orderly manner. And this was a prophecy of the future, showing the obedience of the Gentiles and their complete conversion to good order. ♦

(8) And many people spread their garments on the road, and so on.

For as long as the simple are not led astray by the wicked, they follow the truth. And the crowds recognized the Lord from his signs, and they rendered worship to him, and they believed him to be the Son of David and the Christ, and they sang aloud in the words of the Psalm, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord." For "Hosanna" refers to<sup>9</sup> a hymn.

"*Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David in the name of the Lord*"<sup>10</sup> is well said. For in many places the prophets describe the coming Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ under the name of "*David*,"<sup>11</sup> naming Christ "*David*," on account of their acknowledgement that he was "from David" in terms of physical descent. Therefore they ascribe glory to the one who comes in the name of the Lord. And they bless his "*Kingdom*,"<sup>12</sup> and in everything they ascribe the tribute of praise to God "in the highest,"<sup>13</sup> as far as they were able to understand.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Zechariah 9.9.

<sup>8</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 390.2–7 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 66.2 (Smith, "The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark," 369). This passage can be found at PG 58.629.3–11.

<sup>9</sup> *Lit.* "is interpreted as."

<sup>10</sup> A conflation of Mark 11.9–10.

<sup>11</sup> Mark 11.10.

<sup>12</sup> Mark 11.9.

<sup>13</sup> There is perhaps a closer parallel with Luke 19.38 at this point.

(11) And Jesus went into Jerusalem, and into the temple, and so on.

◆ His<sup>14</sup> “leaving”<sup>15</sup> presents his departure as though it was from those who are unworthy. ◆ And he does not go<sup>16</sup> far from Jerusalem, in order that he might return again in the morning:<sup>17</sup> for he came for the Passion and he was not about to depart before his Passion was completed.

### 33. *On the withered fig tree*

(12) The next day, as they were coming out of Bethany, he was hungry.

(13) And seeing a fig tree from afar covered in leaves, | he went to see [391] if there was anything on it. And going to it, he found nothing except leaves; for it was not the time for figs.<sup>18</sup>

◆ “*The next day*,”<sup>19</sup> it says, “*as they were coming out of Bethany, he was hungry*.”<sup>20</sup> Matthew places this “early”<sup>21</sup> in the day. But why is he hungry in the morning? He made this concession to the flesh. But another [Evangelist]<sup>22</sup> says that “*he went to see if there was any fruit on it*.”<sup>23</sup> Therefore it is clear that it was of deeper significance for them.<sup>24</sup> For indeed [the Evangelists] record

<sup>14</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 390.26 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* Fr. 108.1 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 36).

<sup>15</sup> Matthew 21.17.

<sup>16</sup> *Lit.* “he is not separated to a great extent.”

<sup>17</sup> *Lit.* “after the night.”

<sup>18</sup> Note the textual variant: οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων.

<sup>19</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 391.3–24 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 67.1–2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 369). This passage can be found in PG 58.633.36–634.17.

<sup>20</sup> Mark 11.12.

<sup>21</sup> Matthew 21.18.

<sup>22</sup> I.e. Mark.

<sup>23</sup> Mark 11.13.

<sup>24</sup> The story of the Cursing of the Fig Tree has been the source of considerable controversy among commentators. Many have observed the parallels with Luke 13.6–9. Morna Hooker notes the description of the passage as an “acted parable,” an observation developed by David Brown (Morna Hooker, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, ed. Henry Chadwick, *Black’s New Testament Commentaries* (London: A&C Black, 1991), 261, but compare David Brown, *Tradition and Imagination: Revelation and Change* (Oxford: Oxford, 1999), 56). Some of the interpretive issues are also explored in Peter Manley Scott, ‘Seasons of Grace? Christ’s Cursing of a Fig Tree,’ in *Christology and Scripture: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Andrew T. Lincoln and Angus Paddison (London: T & T Clark, 2007).

the things which have a deeper meaning<sup>25</sup> for the disciples. That is why there is the recognition that (the tree) is accursed. So why is it accursed? For the sake of the disciples, that they might be encouraged. For because everywhere he brings relief, while not punishing anyone, and because it was also necessary to supply a demonstration of his power of punishment, so that they might learn that he was one who had the power to destroy<sup>26</sup> the Jews, he relented willingly and he did not wither them. He did not want to demonstrate this on people, and he provided this demonstration of his power on the plant. For wherever something out of the ordinary happens, let us not be too precise about the rights and wrongs, but let us contemplate the miracle. For many have said this concerning the pigs thrown into the sea, seeking to work out the principle of justice. But not even here must one make a concession to them. For these pigs are without sense, just as that plant was without a soul.

Therefore why did this act take this particular form? The motive for the curse, as I said, was for the deeper understanding of the disciples, even though he does not hint at any of these things. But if he were saying that it was not the time, even here he shows that he came precisely for this purpose—not on account of hunger, but on account of the disciples. ♦ For<sup>27</sup> who is so silly as to assume that he might have found himself hungry<sup>28</sup> so early in the morning? If indeed he recognised the need to eat then, what hindered him from eating at home? Nor is it possible to say that the sight of the fruit made him hungry. For it was not the time for figs. Being hungry, why did he not seek nourishment from some other source? But from the fig-tree, from which it was not possible to have fruit out of season, what does he reveal to everyone plainly? What kind of irritation was appropriate to a tree which did not have any fruit? It is not at all silly | that one might reasonably conclude that he was not hungry, but the outward show of hunger was to display his power, so that they would not imagine that he endured the Passion as a consequence of a lack of physical strength. For this reason he selected a plant, which even if someone were to cut down, would not have been naturally disposed to dry up<sup>29</sup> readily: he dried up this tree solely through his rebuke.

<sup>25</sup> *Lit.* “the deeper meanings.”

<sup>26</sup> *Lit.* “wither.”

<sup>27</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 391.24–392.5 is possibly an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 368). This claim rests upon Smith’s assumptions about the sources behind Isho’dad’s Syriac Commentary on Matthew.

<sup>28</sup> *Lit.* “he might submit to hunger.”

<sup>29</sup> *Lit.* “set aside its natural moisture.”

♦ Alternatively, it says that he shows on the fig tree the judgement about to befall Jerusalem, just as the parable makes clear as well, the parable which Luke recounted saying, “A certain man had a fig tree planted in his garden, and he came looking for fruit on it and found none. So he said to the gardener, “Look here! For three years I have come looking for fruit on this fig tree and still I find none. Cut it down! Why should it be wasting the soil?” But in reply he said to him, ‘Sir, let it be for one more year, until I dig around it and throw manure on it. If it bears fruit next year, well and good; but if not, you can cut it down.’”<sup>30</sup> Therefore, the thing which he set forth by word, he has displayed also by deed, as he did other symbolic things in the present and through the prophets; because the sight of something rather than the description<sup>31</sup> captures the imagination, it also stays in the memory. The parable reproaches the unfruitfulness of Jerusalem.

Therefore the Lord came to the fig tree seeking fruit from it, just as the parable says, but it had only leaves, given that it was spring; and he appears to have come in need of nourishment. And he enacts what he said symbolically, and his hunger corresponded with the symbolic action, and so both the nature and impulse of his holy body came together for the dispensation and demonstration of these actions. And presumably he would not have been ignorant of the fact that the fig tree would have no fruit for eating at that time of year. But it is manifest from this action that the nourishment of the Lord is the salvation of humanity, and this is what he longs for, just as he also said to the Samaritans when they were about to believe, “I have food to eat, which you do not know about.”<sup>32</sup> Therefore the leafiness of the fig tree showed the glory of Jerusalem given to it by God; but the fruitlessness showed its baseness and disbelief. And the unseasonable time for the fruit then proved the unseasonable time for the salvation of Jerusalem; and it brought this unseasonable time upon itself. Therefore it incurred both a reproach and a curse—not indeed that the Lord was angry at the fig tree for not bearing | fruit out of season—but in that the tree [393] was made an example of the city. And the curse revealed in these actions was fulfilled with regard to the city.<sup>33</sup> For the fact that it no longer bore any fruit does not prevent Jerusalem from renewing its fruit bearing, which the knowledge of Christ, when it is given [to the Jews], will provide—as if by some kind of engrafting, apostolic power will be given to Jerusalem for the

<sup>30</sup> Luke 13.6–9.

<sup>31</sup> *Lit.* “the voice.”

<sup>32</sup> John 4.32.

<sup>33</sup> The writer is here referring to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE.



purpose of bearing fruit. For that fruit will not be from Jerusalem, but from the new and additional knowledge, which if added from outside, even from the church of the gentiles, she will receive.

(15) And they came to Jerusalem: and Jesus<sup>34</sup> went into the temple and began to drive out those who were selling and those who were buying in the temple: and he overturned the tables of the money-changers and the chairs of those who sold doves.

◆ John<sup>35</sup> also says this (although he puts it at the beginning of his gospel).<sup>36</sup> This [Evangelist] puts it towards the end, just like Matthew as well.<sup>37</sup> So it is probable that this happened twice, and on different occasions, and it is evident both from the date and from the response. For there<sup>38</sup> it happened during the Passover, but here just before. And this is a source of greater accusation against the Jews since he did this not just once but twice, and they still continued in their trading: and they said he was an adversary of God, even though they needed to learn from him his respect for the Father and his own power. For they saw his words agreeing with his actions: but even so they were not persuaded,—they were vexed. This is why he also sets us Isaiah<sup>39</sup> against them as an accuser, ◆ quenching their passion, and showing them that he had come from God. And because their love of gain was a form of robbery, he called the traders “robbers,”<sup>40</sup> who, taking the necessity of sacrifices as an excuse for shameful gain, were selling cattle, doves and pigeons, while others were offering small change in exchange for larger coins. ◆ And<sup>41</sup> his action became even more vehement (without the gentleness of a word<sup>42</sup>), when he threw out those who were selling their wares and when he overturned their tables. ◆ Another source<sup>43</sup> | says that

<sup>34</sup> Note the textual variant: ὁ ἱησοῦς.

<sup>35</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 393.15–25 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 67.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 369). This passage can be found in PG 58.631.56–632.60.

<sup>36</sup> John 2.13–17.

<sup>37</sup> Matthew 21.12–13.

<sup>38</sup> I.e. in the gospel according to John.

<sup>39</sup> The commentator is referring to the quotation from Isaiah 56.7 in Mark 11.17.

<sup>40</sup> Mark 11.17: cf. Matthew 21.13 and Luke 19.46.

<sup>41</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 393.30–32 is an extract from Theodore of Heraclea, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* 40.2–3 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 147).

<sup>42</sup> *Lit.* “not in the gentleness of a word.”

<sup>43</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 393.32–394.6 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* Fr. 106.1–5 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 36).

with respect to the date, it was not really a matter of any significance to the three Evangelists in their description of the journey to Jerusalem. For John relating such a thing by way of introduction more precisely, said these things took place on the first visit: and indeed he narrates the Passion as having happened during Passover. Therefore narrating the action is all they care about, and they have made different visits into one visit. ♦ So also in Psalm 70, the things which happened at different times are introduced under one time in the narrative. There it says, “They railed against God and said, ‘Can God prepare a table in the desert? Even though he struck a rock and the waters flowed, and the raging waters overflowed, can he also give bread, or prepare a table for his people?’”<sup>44</sup> For after the giving of water,<sup>45</sup> there was no controversy concerning the manna,<sup>46</sup> but [there was] the [controversy] about meat:<sup>47</sup> and the Psalmist has confused each with the other.

(18) And the scribes and the chief priests<sup>48</sup> heard and sought a way to destroy<sup>49</sup> him.

♦ For<sup>50</sup> then they realised that the things, which he did, were a reproach to them. So sometimes restraining himself, he withdraws from their midst and is not seen, but at other times, he appears and he restrains the source of their desires and affections. And in this instance, he restrained them through their fear of the multitude—for he did not want to do anything beyond the capacity of a human being so that the Incarnation might be believed. For they were not even brought to their senses by the multitude, nor did they respect the witness of the prophets. In this way the love of power completely consumed them, and made them ready for murderous cruelty. ♦

---

<sup>44</sup> Psalm 78.19–20.

<sup>45</sup> Exodus 17.

<sup>46</sup> Exodus 16.

<sup>47</sup> The commentator is possibly referring to Numbers 11 where the Israelites, no longer satisfied with manna, are given meat to eat. And yet the commentator’s attempt to conflate the accounts is not entirely successful. He appears to neglect the fact that the story of Moses striking the rock to yield its water comes in Numbers 20.

<sup>48</sup> Note the textual variant: οἱ δὲ γραμματεῖς καὶ ἀρχιερεῖς.

<sup>49</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀπολέσουσιν which is unattested in NA<sup>27</sup>. It may well be a misprint.

<sup>50</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 394.17–24 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 68.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 370). The passage can be found at PG 58.642.53–643.6.

(19) And when evening came, he went<sup>51</sup> outside the city. (20) And in the morning, when they passed by, they saw the fig tree withered away to its roots.

[395] The present Evangelist gives the more accurate description, saying that on the following day the fig tree was seen by the disciples to have withered away when they were returning again to the city from the suburbs. But Matthew omitted the precise detail of the time, saying that the fig tree “was withered on the spot”<sup>52</sup> and the disciples | had been amazed. But even if he were to say “on the spot,”<sup>53</sup> the action would still be noticed on the following day. And his power was strong, both in quickening the dead (as in the case of those who were brought back to life by the Lord), and in drying up living things (as in the case of the fig tree). And these things are also said in scripture by God: “I will put to death and I will make life”<sup>54</sup> and “I make the green tree dry, and I revive the parched tree.”<sup>55</sup> And there are no words to describe divine activity, unless it takes place with regard to the free choice of human beings, who do not always accept it immediately, nor are they necessarily brought to that point of perfection which divine activity enables. This is why even in the matter of the power of faith, there are few who, in following the Lord, produce actions to match the faith which is provided for them in power—not just drying up a tree in bloom, but even removing “*a mountain*”<sup>56</sup> by a command, so as to achieve anything, whatever one might request.

And<sup>57</sup> it is clear that Christ does not make these promises without a reason, nor for a rather pointless<sup>58</sup> working of wonders, as demand those who deny such things, ordering the most trivial things, as if in refutation of the promise about the mountain: for neither a mountain nor a toothpick would be removed pointlessly by the power of God, since he himself did not wither the fig tree pointlessly,<sup>59</sup> but [did this] rather as a sign of the future unfruitfulness of Israel, and as a demonstration of his own power. And perfect faith is followed by deeds of virtue—either by those things

<sup>51</sup> Note textual variant: ἐξεπορεύετο.

<sup>52</sup> Matthew 21.19.

<sup>53</sup> Matthew 21.19.

<sup>54</sup> Deuteronomy 32.39.

<sup>55</sup> Ezekiel 17.24.

<sup>56</sup> A reference to Mark 11.23.

<sup>57</sup> According to Possinus, part of this scholium is attributed to Cyril of Alexandria. This is noted by Cramer and also by Harold Smith (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367).

<sup>58</sup> *Lit.* “fruitless.”

<sup>59</sup> *Lit.* “fruitlessly.”

which have been achieved in virtue from the beginning, or by those things which have been corrected through repentance. And since the achievement of virtue from the beginning without stumbling is impossible, the Lord provides this through repentance.

34. *On the capacity for forgiveness*

(25) “And whenever you stand praying, forgive, if you have anything against anyone, in order that your Father in heaven may also forgive you your trespasses.”

Not only does he say “*whatever you ask for when you pray, | believe that you are receiving it, and it will be yours,*”<sup>60</sup> but he also says in addition: “*and whenever you stand praying, forgive, if you have anything against anyone, in order that your Father in heaven may also forgive you your trespasses*”:<sup>61</sup> for in this way, he says, the faith in you is real and is capable of anything. [396]

(26) “But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father, who is in heaven, forgive your trespasses.”<sup>62</sup>

If purity by repentance is to be provided for you, you could also attain the forgiveness of sins by giving the signal for forgiveness from God through your forgiveness of other people. Therefore he is preparing his disciples to be of good courage both in faith and in prayer, and not to be afraid. For their amazement was not from faith. Nor was [their amazement] of great import to God. Therefore since they did not clearly recognize his power, he led them away imperceptibly from unbelief and he showed how important the matter of faith is.

35. *On the chief priests and scribes who questioned the Lord*

(27) And they came again into Jerusalem: and while he was walking around in the temple, the chief priests and the scribes<sup>63</sup> came, (28) and

<sup>60</sup> Mark 11.24.

<sup>61</sup> Mark 11.25.

<sup>62</sup> Note the textual variant: the inclusion of verse 26.

<sup>63</sup> Note the textual variant: *καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* is omitted. This variant is unattested in NA<sup>27</sup>.

they said<sup>64</sup> to him, “By what authority do you do these things? And<sup>65</sup> who gave you this authority to do them?”

◆ Since<sup>66</sup> they did not have the means to denounce him for his signs, they reproach him for his chastisement of the traders in the temple. And what they say is like this: ‘Did you receive the chair of the teacher? Have you been ordained a priest, that you should display such authority?’ And yet he did nothing out of arrogance—he was conscious only of the good order of the temple. But nevertheless, having nothing to say [against him], they make this charge. And when he threw them out, they did not dare to say anything, on account of the miracles, which Matthew says he had done in the temple. ◆ But when he appeared again, then they rebuked him. They are all but saying, “Why are you able to prevent those things which we never  
[397] managed to prevent?<sup>67</sup> | You dismiss our authority, and put us to shame for being negligent about what is fitting in the temple.” For these were the inner thoughts of those who accused the Lord for his correction of the things going on in the temple. But they should not have asked questions but rather they should have known this from the prophets of old. And since they did not attain to this because they did not want to, they should at least have brought the testimony of John to mind and recognized that this is the long-expected Saviour of the world, and they should have perceived his authority and not asked questions about him. But since they do not understand, the Lord declines to bear witness about himself directly, owing to the fact that in human terms it is not trustworthy to bear witness about oneself:<sup>68</sup> but he is willing to present John as a witness, and because they were not willing to accept anything,<sup>69</sup> he did not speak about John, but first he asked a question about John, about the honour in which they held him.<sup>70</sup> “*For he said to them,*” it says, “*I will ask you also one question,—answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things: did the baptism of John come from heaven or was it*

<sup>64</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ.

<sup>65</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ.

<sup>66</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 396.23–30 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 67.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 370). This passage can be found at PG 58.634.33–49.

<sup>67</sup> *Lit.* “which we did not prevent in the whole time.”

<sup>68</sup> There is a clear allusion to John 5.31 at this point: “If I bear witness about myself, my testimony is not true.”

<sup>69</sup> The text is confused at this point.

<sup>70</sup> *Lit.* “whose honour they held.”

of human origin?" and so on.<sup>71</sup> For if they were to have accepted him, then it was logical that they should also accept his testimony, and thus they would understand his authority.

He puts the question for these things saying, "I wish to ask one question, and if you tell me, you will learn by what authority I do these things, and if you receive this testimony concerning me, you will know who I am." And he asks a question concerning the grace in John. For this provides testimony about him, who was both honoured and trustworthy. "And tell me," he says, "whether the baptism of John was of God or of human origin?" For in saying "from heaven,"<sup>72</sup> he meant "from God." And they were in difficulty about their answer. On the one hand, if they were to confess the truth about John, they would expose to shame their own earlier lack of faith in him, which logically would become evident from their truthful witness concerning him: on the other hand, if they were to deny that the Baptist was from God, then they were afraid of the crowd. This is why when they declined to answer, they said, "We do not know."<sup>73</sup> And at this the Saviour said in response, "Neither will I tell you by what authority I do these things."<sup>74</sup> For as is clear<sup>75</sup> from this encounter, | they were avoiding the answer, and their failure to answer was not out of genuine ignorance. "Neither will I," he says, "tell you."<sup>76</sup> He did not say, "I do not know," but "I will not tell you," instead of saying, "you did not want to tell [me] the truth: neither will you gain an answer from me." Or we could put it this way, "You are not able to hear about who I am, since you did not accept the witness, who came [to give] testimony, in order that he might bear witness about the light."<sup>77</sup> For if you believed that I am the true light,<sup>78</sup> you would know this—that it is only to be expected that I should dispel darkness from the holy place. For the greed and covetousness, which do not allow one to see the good, is darkness." [398]

<sup>71</sup> Mark 11.29–30.

<sup>72</sup> Mark 11.30 (cf. Matthew 21.25 and Luke 20.4).

<sup>73</sup> Mark 11.33 (cf. Matthew 21.27).

<sup>74</sup> Mark 11.33 (cf. Matthew 21.27).

<sup>75</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 397:33; replace δῆλον with δῖλον. This is the reading suggested by Possinus and noted by Cramer in the apparatus.

<sup>76</sup> Mark 11.33 (cf. Matthew 21.27).

<sup>77</sup> An allusion to John 1.7.

<sup>78</sup> An allusion to John 1.9.



## CHAPTER 12

### 36. *On the vineyard*

(1) And he began to speak<sup>1</sup> to them in parables, “A man planted a vineyard,<sup>2</sup> and put a fence around it, and dug a pit for the wine press, and built a watchtower, and he leased it to tenants, and he went away.”

The parable shows that they were acting out of wanton ignorance not only with regard to John, but also with regard to the Lord himself, starting with the servant and progressing to the master. This is why, quite reasonably, he reveals the rejection in advance to those who will be believers, ♦ describing<sup>3</sup> the vineyard (‘Israel’) of the owner (‘of God’) and the hedge thrown up around it for the security, which comes from God: ♦ which is why when God threatens the destruction of the hedge in the prophet Isaiah,<sup>4</sup> he indicated that their security would be taken from around them. ♦ “*And he dug a pit for the wine press*”:<sup>5</sup> or “a wine-vat,”<sup>6</sup> as another Evangelist<sup>7</sup> says, referring to “the altar,”<sup>8</sup> and the pit underneath, where they collected the blood from the sacrifices. And “the tower” is the inmost shrine of the temple, being

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the textual variant: λέγειν.

<sup>2</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀμπελώνα ἐφύτευσεν ἄνθρωπος.

<sup>3</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 398.20–21 is possibly an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia (Smith, “The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,” 368). This claim is based on Smith’s assertion that Isho’dad’s Syriac Commentary on Matthew is based in part on the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia. However, given that the passage in question is clearly allegorical and given that a search of TLG reveals that *Cat. Marc.* 398.23–28, which were also attributed by Smith to Theodore, in fact come from Apollinaris, it is more likely that Apollinaris is the source of this passage.

<sup>4</sup> The commentator is referring to Isaiah 5.5.

<sup>5</sup> Mark 12.1.

<sup>6</sup> Again, according to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 398.23–28 is possibly an extract from Theodore of Mopsuestia (Smith, “The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,” 368). However, the evidence suggests some striking parallels with Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* Fr. 110 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 37) at this point.

<sup>7</sup> Matthew 21.33.

<sup>8</sup> According to *Liddell and Scott*, λήνος refers to “anything shaped like a tub or a trough.” Such a definition lends itself to the allegorical reading found in this passage.



the most renowned and eminent among human beings. And he said that the vineyard “*had been leased to the tenants*,”<sup>9</sup> that is, “the chief-priests” and “the teachers”: ♦ and that “*he had gone away*,”<sup>10</sup> which is to say that he had allowed time for the purpose of bearing fruit, which as if standing by, he was about to demand back again. These things were said with reference to “the Father” according to the argument of the parable, since the parable [399] introduces | “his own Son,” and the incarnation<sup>11</sup> is characteristic of the Word: truly the saying about the owner does not separate the Son from the Father, since in fact “all things came to be through him.”<sup>12</sup> For example, Isaiah speaks of the vineyard “of the beloved”:<sup>13</sup> and after these things comes the demand for the harvest of fruits, which is to say, a life devoted to the Law, and when the time arrives, he says that the demand came first through a slave: and when he was beaten and killed, again the demand had to come through another slave. And then again a third is sent to them, and eventually for the last time [it came] through the son, making a disproportionate display of his glory in order to put them to greater shame. And it is not that the sender is ignorant of the consequences, but that the action will be worthy of “respect.”<sup>14</sup> And the “first slave” means the prophets from the time of Elijah and Elijah himself, the “second” means Isaiah and Hosea and Amos, and the “third” means the prophets from the time of Ezekiel and Daniel: and indeed, according to this reckoning “for three years I have come seeking fruit from this fig tree, and I find none”<sup>15</sup> would refer to the prophets, in order that the fourth year may be that of the coming of the Lord, and not the third. At least then the parable brings about this reckless action from the Lord, and, as they think him to be the heir, they demonstrate even greater recklessness by killing him in order to take the inheritance. So “*they threw him out*,” it says, “*outside the vineyard*,”<sup>16</sup> that is, outside the city and the temple, and “*they killed him*.”<sup>17</sup> When it says that they killed him, the sequence of the parable’s argument cannot allow him to be the one who would be present

---

<sup>9</sup> Mark 12.1.

<sup>10</sup> Mark 12.1.

<sup>11</sup> Lampe notes that *σάρκωσις* is a “favourite word of Apollinarius” (G.W.H. Lampe, ‘A Patristic Greek Lexicon,’ (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), 1224). Given that this passage is immediately preceded by an extract from Apollinarius, one might speculate that this is simply a continuation of it.

<sup>12</sup> John 1.3.

<sup>13</sup> Isaiah 5.1.

<sup>14</sup> *ἐντροπή* picks up on Mark 12.6: *λέγων ὅτι ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱὸν μου*.

<sup>15</sup> Luke 13.7.

<sup>16</sup> Mark 12.8.

<sup>17</sup> Mark 12.8.

at the punishment of the slaves, but it is obvious that he is. Therefore his coming is already somehow a pretext for the people being handed over to the Romans. And the deed is his and not that of the Romans. And then comes the leasing of the vineyard to other tenants, that is, the apostles and teachers from among the gentiles. ♦ “*Have*<sup>18</sup> *you not read the scripture,*” he says, “*the stone which the builders rejected*” and so on.<sup>19</sup> In all this, he shows that while they were about to be rejected, the gentiles were about to be brought in. And he said rightly, “*this is the Lord’s doing*,”<sup>20</sup> in order that they might learn that none of the things that came to pass were contrary to God. “*And it is marvellous.*”<sup>21</sup> And quite rightly so. He calls himself a “*stone*” | and a “*builder*,”<sup>22</sup> in the same way that he has also just called the teachers of the Jews “*tenants*”:<sup>23</sup> ♦ but he himself, after being rejected by them, is made “*the keystone*,”<sup>24</sup> that is, of the Gentiles and the Jews. And this is a wonder from the Lord to those who understand him, when indeed Christ appears alive after death, being King of heaven and earth. And he makes the gentiles holy and fitting for God’s household. But it is not sufficient for them simply not to believe in him, but they also strive to restrain the one who convicts them of punishment, despite the fact that the reproach was concealed and not obvious. And “*open rebuke is better than hidden love,*”<sup>25</sup> which is [love that is] deceitful and sycophantic, or so it seems to Solomon. Through hastening toward murder, they were held back out of fear of others, and not from fear of God. [400]

A SCHOLIUM “*And they beat him over the head.*”<sup>26</sup> They caused a penalty to be placed on his head—which means either “they exacted the penalty of death” or “they brought a deadly blow against his head.” “*They beat him over the head,*”<sup>27</sup> which is instead of saying “they subjected him to all the penalties meted out by those who judged him earlier,” summing up in this action all their earlier judgements.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 399.28–400.2 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 68.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 370). This passage can be found at PG 58.641.52–642.6.

<sup>19</sup> Mark 12.10.

<sup>20</sup> Mark 12.11.

<sup>21</sup> Mark 12.11.

<sup>22</sup> Mark 12.10.

<sup>23</sup> Mark 12.1–9.

<sup>24</sup> Mark 12.10.

<sup>25</sup> Proverbs 27.5.

<sup>26</sup> Mark 12.4. The word ἐκεφαλῖωσαν is very unusual. According to *Liddell and Scott*, this instance in Mark 12.4 is the earliest usage of the term—hence, the need for a marginal gloss.

<sup>27</sup> Mark 12.4.

37. *On those sent to ask about the poll tax*

(13) And they sent to him some of the Pharisees and the Herodians, in order that they might trap him by a saying.

◆ In<sup>28</sup> this context,<sup>29</sup> the “*Herodians*”<sup>30</sup> were those who said that Herod was “the Christ” (as it is recorded).<sup>31</sup> But others say that the “*Herodians*”<sup>32</sup> are the soldiers of Herod. And as these men set themselves against the true Christ, and as they were around the ruler, they wanted to provide witnesses of their accusation by asking questions from those who were putting him to the test and who wanted to hear from him that he would not pay the tribute. ◆ And this the present Evangelist says plainly, “Should we give or not?” This is why we get the eulogies, and the testimony about him speaking “the truth,”<sup>33</sup> and about his every action being truly correct, and about him asserting with boldness that “this is the way of God,”<sup>34</sup> and about him not  
[401] ingratiating himself with anybody | nor flattering anyone. For they say these things so as to bring him under their power, demonstrating the capacity

<sup>28</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 400.22–27 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* Fr. 112 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 38).

<sup>29</sup> *Lit.* “according to those times.”

<sup>30</sup> Mark 12.13.

<sup>31</sup> The reference to *Herodianoi* at this point is puzzling. John P. Meier suggests that “the most likely meanings of *Herodianoi* would include the household servants or slaves of Herod, his officials or courtiers (high officials sometimes being ex-slaves), and more generally all the supporters of Herod’s regime, whether or not they belonged to an organized group or party.” (John Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus: Companions and Competitors*, vol. 3 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 561). However, William Horbury argues that Herodian rulers encouraged the development of a ruler cult, and that their ideology and language carried theocratic overtones (William Horbury, *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM Press, 1998), 134–140). It is perhaps this language which led Tertullian to claim that the Herodians regarded Herod as the Messiah: “Of the Sadducees I am silent, who, springing from the root of this error, had the audacity to adjoin to this heresy the denial of the resurrection of the flesh. In passing, I should refer to the Pharisees, who were divided from the Jews by their superimposing of certain additions to the Law, a fact which also made them worthy of receiving this very name; and, together with them, the Herodians, who said that Herod was Christ” (Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum* 1.1 (Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, *The Writings of Tertullian. Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3 (New York: Cosimo, 2007 (originally published in 1870)), 259)). Although it is difficult to assess the extent of Tertullian’s influence in the East, the inclusion of this tradition by the catenist suggests that his perception was shared more widely. It appears to have influenced Apollinaris.

<sup>32</sup> Mark 12.13.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Mark 12.14.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Mark 12.14.

to treat their ruler with contempt and to renounce the tributes payable to the emperor. And they knew that Judas the Galilean, having proposed not submitting to the emperor and not making a declaration of one's property,<sup>35</sup> perished: and all who believed in him were scattered. But in the face of such testing, the word of the Saviour first exposes the fact that they are testing him,<sup>36</sup> in order that they might not imagine that they have escaped his notice, but they might see that he knows even what is in their hearts. For this is manifest in the words: "*knowing their hypocrisy.*"<sup>37</sup> Then he orders a small coin payable to the emperor to be brought to him. Not that he does not know the inscription, but he does this in order that he might obtain an answer from the exhibited item itself, and in order that they might hear the consequence of their own answers. Having asked, "*Whose image and inscription is this?*"<sup>38</sup> when they said, "the emperor's," he gave the answer which followed from their own words—that it was necessary to render the things which belong to the emperor to the emperor, and what belongs to God to God: for in adding the business about God, he did not leave them room even for seeming to flatter the emperor with sycophantic remarks (since it seems to be some kind of slavery to pay the tribute of a human being and not of God). As a result of this, they were amazed at the elusiveness of his words, and they went away.

### 38. *On the Sadducees*

(18) And Sadducees, who say that there is no resurrection, came to him: and they asked<sup>39</sup> him saying,

◆ Who<sup>40</sup> are the Sadducees? Another sect of the Jews, saying that "*there is no resurrection, nor angel, nor spirit.*"<sup>41</sup> And here they say nothing to him

---

<sup>35</sup> According to Josephus, "There was one Judas, a Galilean, of a city whose name was Gamala, who, taking with him Zadok, a Pharisee, became zealous to draw them to a revolt. Both said that this taxation was no better than an introduction to slavery, and exhorted the nation to assert their liberty ..." (Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 18.4–6. Loeb Classical Library. Tr. Louis Feldman. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), 4–7).

<sup>36</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 401.7: replace the full stop with a comma.

<sup>37</sup> Mark 12.15.

<sup>38</sup> Mark 12.16.

<sup>39</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐπιρώτησαν.

<sup>40</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 401.26–402.9 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 70.2 (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 370). This passage can be found at PG 58.656.60–658.13.

<sup>41</sup> Acts 23.8.

about resurrection. But they invent a story, and they concoct a situation, which never happened, supposing that this would drive him to confusion, and that this would refute the existence of the resurrection. And why did they not invent two or three, but seven? So that from the excess, they might ridicule the resurrection. This is why they also say, “they all had her.”<sup>42</sup> What [402] therefore does Christ say? He replies in two different ways, | not just the words, but also their underlying meaning, and he proves both that there will be a resurrection, and that the resurrection will not be in the way that, as some say, the Pharisees understand. For what does he say? “You are wrong because you know neither the scriptures nor the power of God.”<sup>43</sup> For since they put forward Moses and the law (as though they knew what they were talking about), he shows them that they are ignorant of the scriptures, and consequently that they are also ignorant of the power of God. And since this was the cause of them not acknowledging the resurrection, imagining that such a state of affairs could come to pass, he cures the cause as well as the symptom. “For in the resurrection,” he says, “they neither marry, nor are married. ♦ Therefore you assume a falsehood, being ignorant of the scripture concerning the resurrection, and ignorant of the power of God, which brought everything into being through his Word: and this same power also brings things which are destroyed to new life. And since human beings will remain like this (while no longer increasing in number), they will be like the angels, as it were: this is why the fellowship of marriage will be taken away”: ♦ for<sup>44</sup> this is the meaning of “*as the angels of God in heaven*.”<sup>45</sup> For just as the angelic number is great, and did not increase from birth, but already existed from [the beginning of] creation, so also is the number which is raised up. And that a resurrection will come to pass, and that this deed is not impossible, he proves by virtue of the promise of God and not by reasoning from nature.<sup>46</sup> For God is not the holy God of that which does not exist, for he does not say “I was,” but “I am the God

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Mark 12.23. The text follows Matthew 22.28.

<sup>43</sup> Matthew 22.29.

<sup>44</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 402.15–22 is an extract from Origen, *Fragmenta in Lucam* Fr. 241 (M. Rauer, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 9, 2nd edn. [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 49 (35)]. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959]: 330).

<sup>45</sup> Mark 12.25. Note the insertion of τοῦ θεοῦ, which is attested in a number of manuscripts.

<sup>46</sup> φυσιολογικός—According to Lampe, this means: “1. *study of natural phenomena*, often in vague sense, of any scientific or physiological studies ...; 2. *nature*, ...; 3. *rationalization*, of myths by relating or referring to natural phenomena” (Lampe, ‘A Patristic Greek Lexicon,’ 1495).

of that which lives and exists.”<sup>47</sup> ♦ We<sup>48</sup> know that those from Valentinus and Marcion still contend against this text, restricting the saying to the soul. For [they say that] these [souls] are living, and concerning these souls the Lord has said that God is the God of these [souls]. And I presume that the explanation to the Sadducees was not about souls, but about bodies: so that the reply was about these [bodies]. And the corpse is said to be raised, when the soul is with the body;—not that the soul is dissolved in the meantime, without the properties of the soul that it has with the body. For both together are one in human beings, and their life is held in common, and it is necessary for each to be raised again from death to life. ♦ |

[403]

### 39. *On the scribe*

(28) And one of the scribes came to him, and heard them disputing with one another, and seeing<sup>49</sup> that he answered them well, he asked him, “Which commandment is the first of all?”

♦ Matthew<sup>50</sup> says that he asked this to test him:<sup>51</sup> but by contrast Mark says, “*For when Jesus saw that he replied sensibly, he said to him, ‘You are not far from the Kingdom of God.’*”<sup>52</sup> And they do not contradict the other, but they agree completely. For he asked to test him at the beginning, but

<sup>47</sup> Perhaps a paraphrase of Mark 12.26, betraying a debt to Matthew 22.32: “He is not the God of the dead, but of the living.”

<sup>48</sup> Harold Smith argued that *Cat. Marc.* 402.22–32 was an extract from Apollinaris (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 370). A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* confirms that this passage comes from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaem* Fr. 113 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 88). However, the search also confirms that *Cat. Marc.* 402.22–32 is an extract from Origen, *Fragmenta in Lucam* Fr. 242 (M. Rauer, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 9, 2nd edn. [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 49 (35)]. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959]: 330). There are two possible solutions to this confusion over the origin of this passage: first, it is possible that Apollinaris adopted some of Origen’s insights in his own writing; and secondly, given the fragmentary evidence, that the passage has been misattributed to either Origen or Apollinaris.

<sup>49</sup> Note the textual variant: εἰδώς.

<sup>50</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 403.6–17 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 71.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found at PG 58.661.31–40.

<sup>51</sup> Matthew 22.34.

<sup>52</sup> Mark 12.34.

when he was helped by his answer, he was commended. For he did not commend him at the beginning, but when he said that loving one's neighbour was greater than burnt-offerings, then he said, "*You are not far from the Kingdom*,"<sup>53</sup> because he took no notice of base things and embraced the first principle of virtue.<sup>54</sup> For all these things are for the sake of this, even the Sabbath and everything else. And he did not frame his commendation in a way which was completely fulsome, but he shows what is still lacking. ♦ For saying "*You are not far from the Kingdom*"<sup>55</sup> shows that he still has some distance to go, in order that he might seek what is lacking. So why did he put forward this question to Jesus to begin with? ♦ He<sup>56</sup> expected some opportunity to present itself so that [Jesus] would have to be corrected on account of making himself God. Therefore what does Christ say? He shows where he is coming from: as a consequence of having no love, as a consequence of being consumed by envy and jealousy, ♦ he says, "You shall love the Lord your God." This is the first and the great commandment. And the second is like it, "And you will love your neighbour as yourself."<sup>57</sup> And why is it "like it"?<sup>58</sup> Because the one prepares the way for the other, and the very fact of our loving the Lord our God hangs upon our loving one another. For in loving each other, we love also the one who made us such as to be in the image of the one who created us. For it is not from loving God that we love one another, but by loving one another, we give thanks to the one who made us and gives graciously such immeasurable things, | repaying him as far as we are able through such love. ♦ "For<sup>59</sup> every one who does evil hates the light, and he does not come towards the light":<sup>60</sup> and again, "The fool has said in his heart, 'There is no God,' and from this they are corrupt and become abominable in their ways of living."<sup>61</sup> "And he who loves me will keep my command-

---

<sup>53</sup> Mark 12.34.

<sup>54</sup> I.e. love.

<sup>55</sup> Mark 12.34.

<sup>56</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 403.19–26 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 71.1 (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 365). This passage can be found at PG 58.661.38–44.

<sup>57</sup> A paraphrase of Matthew 22.37–39 (cf. Mark 12.29–31): cf. Deuteronomy 6.4–5 and Leviticus 19.18.

<sup>58</sup> Matthew 22.39.

<sup>59</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 404.2–7 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 71.1 (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 365). This passage can be found at PG 58.661.45–54.

<sup>60</sup> John 3.20.

<sup>61</sup> Psalm 14.1 (LXX 13.1).

ments”,<sup>62</sup> and the sum of these is “*You shall love your neighbour.*”<sup>63</sup> Therefore having been asked for the first [commandment], he adds also the second, which does not fall short of [the first]: ♦ and the Law “in all the heart, and in all the soul, and in all the mind”<sup>64</sup> abounds by virtue of the repetition of the same action, in order that it may bring love to the height of perfection: he does not allow an exception to any other thing which would diminish love for God. So the Lord, calling this one “great,”<sup>65</sup> adds, “This is also the first,”<sup>66</sup> in order that he may also introduce the second [commandment], which is connected to it and from which it is not possible to separate [the first]. This is why, having been asked about one, he did not keep silent<sup>67</sup> about the one which is inseparable from it. For love for God is not real, when it does not contain love towards the neighbour. ♦ And<sup>68</sup> so when he had replied, he also questioned in turn. ♦

#### 40. *On questioning from the Lord*

(35) And as Jesus was teaching in the temple, he said, “How is it that the scribes say that the Christ is the Son of David?”<sup>69</sup>

♦ But<sup>70</sup> even though he praised the man who said, “*There is one God,*”<sup>71</sup> and in order that they would not say that he performed miracles but was an adversary of the law and an enemy of God, at last<sup>72</sup> he asked this question, secretly leading them on to confess him as God. ♦ For<sup>73</sup> in view of the fact

---

<sup>62</sup> John 14.15 Note that in this summary of different biblical passages, Chrysostom presents a series of biblical quotations, including I Timothy 6.10 “The love of money is the root of all evils ....” This passage is omitted by the catenist.

<sup>63</sup> Mark 12.31.

<sup>64</sup> Matthew 22.37: cf. Mark 12.30.

<sup>65</sup> Matthew 22.38. There is no parallel in Mark. It is omitted.

<sup>66</sup> Matthew 22.38.

<sup>67</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 404.15: remove ἀπεσιώτησε and insert ἀπεσιώπησε.

<sup>68</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 404.16–17 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 71.1 (PG 58.663.4).

<sup>69</sup> Note the textual variant: υἱὸς ἐστὶ Δαβὶδ.

<sup>70</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 404.23–26 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 71.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.663.9–14.

<sup>71</sup> Mark 12.29.

<sup>72</sup> *Lit.* “after so many things.”

<sup>73</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 404.26–405.21 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 71.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.663.19–664.23.



that he was about to go to his Passion, he finally puts forward the prophecy which proclaims his authority—but not plainly or directly, and with good reason! For having dismissed their mistaken opinion, he introduces David who proclaimed his divinity, and the genuineness of his sonship, and his equality | with the Father. And he does not stop there, but in order to strike them with fear, he adds the following, saying, “*until I make your enemies your footstool.*”<sup>74</sup> [He says this] in order that he might even in this way convince them. But first he said, “What do you think? Whose Son is he?” so that by a question he might lead them [to the answer]. Since they said, “of David” (and truly David said these things), [he did not respond with a statement] but again by drawing up a question, [he asked], “How therefore does David by the Spirit [call him Lord]?”<sup>75</sup> in order that he might not attribute words to them. This is why he did not say, “What do you think about me?” but “[What do you think] about the Christ?” And see how in asking them, he overcomes them in argument. Therefore if David calls him Lord, how is he his Son?<sup>76</sup> Not taking away the fact that he is his Son (of course not!), he draws out the underlying sense.

How was he “his Son,” or so as you say, “only a Son,” and not also his Lord? Even after the testimony [of the Psalm], he did not say, “And truly he is his Lord,” though he was to ask of them, “How [is he his Lord]?” even though they did not respond to him.<sup>77</sup> For they did not want to learn any of the things which were necessary. And this is why he carried on, saying that he was his Lord. And he was not so much to be spoken of as Lord of all the Jews, as of David.<sup>78</sup> And consider with me how opportune this is. For when he said, “*The Lord is one,*”<sup>79</sup> then he was also speaking about himself, that he is “Lord” even from prophecy, not simply from his works alone, and he shows him defending him,<sup>80</sup> and that the Father’s mind was at one with his.

♦ For it was not right according to the Jews to say that the son is Lord of the father, but on the contrary, it was just like Solomon’s mother calling him the

<sup>74</sup> Mark 12.36: cf. Psalm 110.1.

<sup>75</sup> Matthew 22.43.

<sup>76</sup> Matthew 22.45: cf. Mark 12.37.

<sup>77</sup> *Lit.* “question him”—The writer is alluding to a standard technique in philosophical debate in the ancient world. In other words, they did not attempt to refute him by asking a question, which would have invited an answer, which in turn would undermine his initial argument.

<sup>78</sup> *Lit.* “And it is not equal to hear ‘Lord of all Jews’ and ‘of David.’”

<sup>79</sup> Mark 12.29.

<sup>80</sup> This phrase picks up on the passage from Psalm 110.1, “I will make your enemies your footstool.” According to Chrysostom, the Father retaliates on behalf of the Son.

servant of his father, when she says, “No! Solomon is your servant.”<sup>81</sup> And for a father to speak about a son as about a Lord is altogether inadmissible and contrary to nature—especially when he speaks under the inspiration of the Spirit. ♦ And<sup>82</sup> he did not say “Lord of the Spirit,” but “of David.”<sup>83</sup> The Spirit is not to be reduced to the status of a servant, just because in speaking in the Spirit he calls Christ “Lord,” as those who blaspheme against the Spirit dare to say. Thus David also says that he is “the son of the handmaid”<sup>84</sup> of God, and this too indeed will not harmonise with the Spirit,<sup>85</sup> but in his own person this was said by him, as well as many other things. ♦ |

[406]

(38) And he said to them<sup>86</sup> in his teaching, “Beware the scribes, who wish to walk about in long robes, and to be greeted with respect in the marketplaces.”

*“And he said to them ...”*<sup>87</sup> To whom? Clearly to those from the people, about whom it said, *“And a great crowd listened to him gladly.”*<sup>88</sup> Therefore guard yourselves, he says, against the scribes. Do not emulate [them], do not congratulate [them], observing the outward show. For they do not expose a Law-observant character for the sake of God, but for the sake of seeming pious to others and acquiring a reputation from others, which is pointless. For all these things are sufficient to indicate for human beings what is exaggerated and unnecessary. For they get houses for themselves, he says, and they acquire the things which ought to be given to inform widows, [and they adopt] a certain kind of unnecessary religious scruple, drawing out their prayers for too long. And the more they are honoured by the people and attract honour to their own detriment, the more will they be condemned. For those who are powerful will be powerfully tested. ♦ And<sup>89</sup> saying these things, he also taught the apostles not to imitate the scribes and

<sup>81</sup> 1 Kings 1.19. The abbreviation of the text is very difficult to follow, but the thrust of the argument appears to be that Solomon’s claim to succeed David as King is secured in part by Bathsheba’s careful emphasis of the fact that Solomon is David’s servant.

<sup>82</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 405.26–31 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* Fr. 114.1–6 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 89).

<sup>83</sup> Mark 12.37.

<sup>84</sup> Psalm 116.16.

<sup>85</sup> The writer is emphasising the fact that David speaks here as a human being.

<sup>86</sup> Note the textual variant: *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*.

<sup>87</sup> Mark 12.38.

<sup>88</sup> Mark 12.37.

<sup>89</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 406.16–20 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 20.46. (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). Smith’s conclusions are

the teachers of the Jews, but to emulate him. For since they are appointed as teachers of the world, he instructs them through these things in the best way of ordering one's life. ♦

41. *On the two coins*

(41) And Jesus<sup>90</sup> sat down opposite the treasury, and he observed how the crowd threw money into the treasury, and many rich people threw in large sums.

He did not measure what was thrown in, but he measured their willingness to give. Therefore he amazed at God's method of judging, as he does not pay attention to the size of the gifts, but to the willingness of one's disposition. "Those others have much," he says, "they have given 'out of their abundance',<sup>91</sup> but she contributed her livelihood." This widow was held in greater honour than the scribes who grew fat. For other women devote themselves to the mere show of their teachers, with their babbling words (talking nonsense), from which there is no advantage for the soul. Even though they lavish things on their homes in vain, this woman secretly handed over her money to God, leaving nothing for her livelihood. She is not taken in by her leaders, but to God she shows her character.

---

based on the reconstruction of this text by Sickenberger. A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* reveals that *Cat. Marc.* 406.18–20 is also found in *Cat. Luc.* 149.4–5, where it is attributed to Titus of Bostra.

<sup>90</sup> Note the textual variant: καθίστας ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

<sup>91</sup> Mark 12.44.

## CHAPTER 13

### 42. *On the end*

(3) And when he was sitting on the Mount of Olives, and so on.

◆ Given that<sup>1</sup> he had prophesied many things concerning the desolation which would happen to the city and to the temple, in [the prophecy] “Your house is left desolate,”<sup>2</sup> his disciples heard these things and given that they were filled with wonder, they came to him and pointed out the beauty of the temple, and they were perplexed that workmanship of such scale and beauty should be destroyed. And the Lord, when he heard this, nonetheless predicted its complete destruction. And if some say that this has not yet happened completely and that a remnant of the buildings still remains, not even in this way does his statement<sup>3</sup> fail: for when he referred to its complete desolation, he meant the end of worship in accordance with the law which happened in that place at that time. For part of it is destroyed as far as the foundations. Or indeed, from what happened one should even take heart from the sight of the wreckage, that these things are completely destroyed. ◆ And someone else<sup>4</sup> says that when the disciples pointed out that the temple was most excellently constructed, and for that reason it should not fall, he gives the saying a more universal meaning, saying, “in [this] saying which was universal, he proclaimed, ‘There will be a time when *everything will be accomplished*’<sup>5</sup> so that *‘not one stone will remain on another’*.”<sup>6</sup> For he said this concerning the end of the universe. ◆ And<sup>7</sup> again Mark says that not all

---

<sup>1</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 407.10–22 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 75.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.685.48–686.45.

<sup>2</sup> Matthew 23.38. There is no direct parallel in Mark.

<sup>3</sup> According to Cramer, some manuscripts give the word ἀπόκρισις ‘reply.’ However, comparison with Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 75.1 (PG 58.685.57) suggests that ἀπόφασις is the more likely reading.

<sup>4</sup> This source is anonymous.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Mark 13.4.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Mark 13.2.

<sup>7</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 407.26–28 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 75.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can

of them asked him about the end of Jerusalem, but only those mentioned.<sup>8</sup> ♦ [408] And<sup>9</sup> Luke says [that | they asked] a single question about Jerusalem, given that they supposed that his coming was also then. ♦ But<sup>10</sup> Matthew says [that they asked] two questions, one about the destruction of the temple, and another about the end of the age, given that they were more bold.<sup>11</sup> ♦ This<sup>12</sup> is why they came to him “*privately*,”<sup>13</sup> as they were seeking to learn about such things. “*And Jesus replied and began to say to them, ‘See that no one deceive you’ ...*” and so on.<sup>14</sup> ♦ But a number of interpreters<sup>15</sup> have taken these things in different ways. Some understand these things to have been said about the end of the age, while others [understand these things to have been said] about the destruction of Jerusalem: and of the first opinion are Apollinaris and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and of the second opinion are Titus and John, the bishop of the royal [city],<sup>16</sup> who is among the saints. Therefore since Mark says the disciples asked the question about this when

---

be found in PG 58.686.58–687.2. However, Smith does not mention that Chrysostom’s original sequence of thought is reproduced in a somewhat garbled form (as subsequent footnotes suggest).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Mark 13:3: “Peter, James, John, and Andrew asked him privately ...”

<sup>9</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 407.28–408.2 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 75.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.686.55–58.

<sup>10</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 408.2–4 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 75.1 (ibid.) This passage can be found in PG 58.686.53–54.

<sup>11</sup> Note that the distinction between the “temple” and the “end,” found in Matthew 24.1 and 24.3, suggests that Matthew was already alert to the aporia in this passage. Ulrich Luz notes that this distinction gave rise to two different interpretations of the language about the “end” in this passage and its parallels. These interpretations can be described broadly as (1) eschatological or (2) historical. The first trajectory of interpretation reads this passage in terms of the end of all time. Luz asserts that this is the “oldest type of interpretation of Matthew 24” (Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, trans. Wilhelm Linss, vol. 3 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 185). It is associated with the writings of the *Didache* 16.3–7, the *Apocalypse of Peter* 1–2, 6, Irenaeus (*Adversus Haereses* 5.25.2), Hippolytus, Hilary of Poitiers and Cyril of Jerusalem. The second trajectory of interpretation understands Mark’s reference to “wars” in terms of the First Jewish Revolt and the siege of Jerusalem. This interpretation is associated principally with “John Chrysostom and the exegetes he influenced” (Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 186).

<sup>12</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 408.4–5 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 75.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 365). This passage can be found in PG 58.686.49–50.

<sup>13</sup> Mark 13:3.

<sup>14</sup> Matthew 24.4: cf. Mark 13.5.

<sup>15</sup> This is a significant passage. In these editorial comments, the catenist identifies a number of his key sources including Apollinaris, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Titus of Bostra and John Chrysostom.

<sup>16</sup> The “royal city” refers to Constantinople. John did not earn the sobriquet “Chrysostom” until the seventh century.

they were on their own, it is necessary also for us in this instance mainly to follow the second [opinion]. Consequently, they ask one thing, and he answers another: they want to learn the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, but he secures their understanding before the destruction of Jerusalem: for he knew that the time would be of no use to them, unless they were secure with regard to the faith. ♦ For<sup>17</sup> the devil, seeking to diminish the significance of the coming of Christ, introduced other deceivers to the disciples: such as Theudas and Judas the Galilean.<sup>18</sup> Therefore when these things were about to happen, and many were usurping the name of Christ, he said to them in the meantime, “See that no one leads you astray, lest you are caught out by the use of the same name: for then you can learn the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, when you become secure in the faith of the one who is with you.” “*When you hear of wars,*”<sup>19</sup> [refers to the wars] which Josephus reports happening before the destruction,<sup>20</sup> when the people rebelled and did not give the usual tribute to the Romans. And when Roman attacks continually take place against the Jews, he says, “*Do not be alarmed!*”<sup>21</sup> for the end of the city has not yet come. ♦ For many times the temporary cessation of war will come about through the mercy of the victors, and many times the Jews will display their folly. ♦ Therefore<sup>22</sup> he does not talk about the wars abroad and everywhere in the world (for why should those [wars] | matter to them?) [409] And what would be new about that?<sup>23</sup> But he is referring to those who come from far away to attack them.

*“For nation will be raised against nation and kingdom against kingdom, and there will be earthquakes in various places, and famines and troubles. These things are the beginnings of the birthpangs.”*<sup>24</sup> Although even his

---

<sup>17</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 408.18–28 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 21.8 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in Joseph Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901), 236.

<sup>18</sup> Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 20.97–98. Loeb Classical Library. Tr. Louis Feldman. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), 441–443 and Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 18.23–25. Loeb Classical Library. Tr. Louis Feldman. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), 20–23.

<sup>19</sup> Mark 13.7.

<sup>20</sup> Josephus, *De bello Judaico* 2.405–456. Loeb Classical Library. Tr. H. St. J. Thackeray. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927), 481–501.

<sup>21</sup> Mark 13.7.

<sup>22</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 408.31–409.13 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaum* 75.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.688.16–24.

<sup>23</sup> The translation of this passage is unclear.

<sup>24</sup> Mark 13.8.

words<sup>25</sup> were sufficient to throw them into confusion, in showing them that he himself will come to their aid and fight with them, he does not only speak of “*battles*,”<sup>26</sup> but also of plagues sent by God, of “*famines*”<sup>27</sup> and “*earthquakes*”:<sup>28</sup> in which he was showing that he himself instigated the “*wars*”<sup>29</sup> as well. For if he had been talking only about everyday occurrences, it would not have been a prediction, and he would not have thrown them into confusion. This is why he does not simply say that these things would “*come*” but that they would come “*with signs*,”<sup>30</sup> in order that it might be known that he was bringing these things upon them. To me at least, it seems that he is speaking of the preludes to the ills of the Jews.<sup>31</sup> And all these things are “*the beginning of the birthpangs*”<sup>32</sup> which will fall to them.<sup>33</sup> ♦

(9) “Look to yourselves; for<sup>34</sup> they will hand you over to councils, and you will be beaten in synagogues, and you will stand before leaders and kings for my sake, as a testimony against<sup>35</sup> them.”

♦ It<sup>36</sup> was opportune that he introduced their misfortunes, receiving some consolation from their churches.<sup>37</sup> And not by this alone, but also by adding “on account of my name,”<sup>38</sup> or rather, “*for my sake*.”<sup>39</sup> ♦ And [he adds] “*as a*

<sup>25</sup> *Lit.* “the things which he said.”

<sup>26</sup> Mark 13.7.

<sup>27</sup> Mark 13.8.

<sup>28</sup> Mark 13.8.

<sup>29</sup> Mark 13.7.

<sup>30</sup> Luke 21.11.

<sup>31</sup> Chrysostom is referring to the Jewish wars and the destruction of Jerusalem.

<sup>32</sup> Mark 13.8.

<sup>33</sup> As Luz points out, rather than reading this passage eschatologically with reference to the interpreter’s future, Chrysostom takes the prediction to refer to an event which is now past, namely the defeat of the Jews: “The “end” that is announced in vv. 13–14 is not the *consummatio orbis* but the *consummatio urbis*—that is, the final destruction of Jerusalem” (Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 186).

<sup>34</sup> Note the textual variant: παραδώσουσι γὰρ ὑμᾶς.

<sup>35</sup> Note that the New Revised Standard Version suggests “a testimony to them” at this point.

<sup>36</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 409.18–20 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 75.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.688.25–28.

<sup>37</sup> The meaning of τῶν κοινῶν is ambiguous here. According to Lampe, the construction το κοινός may suggest “the Christian community” (*A Patristic Greek Lexicon*).

<sup>38</sup> Matthew 24.9.

<sup>39</sup> Mark 13.9.

*testimony against them*,”<sup>40</sup> in order to leave them with no excuse, with you bearing witness against [them] in suffering these things.

(11) “And when<sup>41</sup> they bring you to trial and hand you over, do not worry beforehand about what you will say, and do not rehearse what you will say:<sup>42</sup> but whatever is given to you in that hour, say that: for it is not you speaking, but the Holy Spirit.”

He introduced these things in order that they might not suppose that the things which were said would prevent the proclamation [of the gospel]. ♦ For<sup>43</sup> before the destruction, the gospel was preached. Hear what Paul says, “Their voice has gone out into all the earth”:<sup>44</sup> and it was “*a testimony against them*,”<sup>45</sup> not against it being believed: for it was preached everywhere: this is why he also said, “as a testimony against | those who did not believe,” which [410] is to say, as a “refutation,” as an “accusation.” Consequently, after the gospel had been proclaimed in every part of the world, Jerusalem was destroyed, in order that they might not have a shadow of an excuse for acting ignorantly. For having seen his power shining in every place and captivating the entire world instantly, what excuse would they have for continuing in the same ignorance? For in proof that it was preached everywhere at that time, hear what Paul says, “by the gospel which has been preached to every creature under heaven”:<sup>46</sup> which is also a very great sign of Christ’s power, since in the space of twenty years<sup>47</sup> the word had reached the ends of the earth. For, he says, after the things prophesied will come the end of Jerusalem. “*And when they bring you to trial and hand you over*” and so on.<sup>48</sup> ♦ For before the prophecies came to pass, the blessed disciples were persecuted by them. They became prisoners. They were brought to trial by the leaders. They

<sup>40</sup> Mark 13.9.

<sup>41</sup> Note the textual variant: ὅταν δέ.

<sup>42</sup> Note the textual variant: μηδὲ μελετᾶτε.

<sup>43</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 409.28–410.12 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 75.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.688.55–689.25.

<sup>44</sup> Romans 10.18: thus Paul had indicated that the gospel had been preached everywhere before the destruction of the temple.

<sup>45</sup> Mark 13.9.

<sup>46</sup> Colossians 1.23.

<sup>47</sup> *Lit.* “in twenty whole years.”

<sup>48</sup> Mark 13.11.



were sent before kings. ♦ And<sup>49</sup> he suggests that you should not practice in advance when you are about to make your defence: “for you will receive wisdom from me, against which all those opposing you will not be able to withstand or hold out.”<sup>50</sup> ♦ Then again he predicts what will be the most painful thing of all for them—that they will not have “the consolation of love”<sup>51</sup> since the conflict will happen among their own people, with even the laws of marriage and kinship being trampled underfoot. ♦ Therefore<sup>52</sup> the conflict will come from three sources: from within one’s own household, from deceivers, and from enemies. ♦ But the consolation will be greater—for all these things will come to pass because of his name, which alone is sufficient to relieve every misfortune on account of the hopes of the future.

(14) “But when you see the abomination of desolation, described by Daniel the prophet,<sup>53</sup> set up where it ought not to be (let the reader understand), then let those in Judea flee to the mountains.”

[411] ♦ Some<sup>54</sup> say the “*abomination*” is the soldiers coming into | the temple, while some say [the “*abomination*”] is the statue of the man who captured the city at that time: which seems to me to make more sense. For every idol was called “an abomination.” and every figure in relief: and he said “*of desolation*,” since after the resurrection, the place was then abandoned: and Pilate who also crucified Jesus, brought in and raised up the standards of Caesar by night, and as Josephus says, it became the cause of a great deal of uproar among the Jews:<sup>55</sup> the revolt took its starting-point from that moment, and there was no respite<sup>56</sup> until the time when the temple was burnt down, and the city was left desolate. Therefore, quite reasonably, he

<sup>49</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 410.15–17 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam* (*in catenis*). This passage can be found in PG 72.897.27–30.

<sup>50</sup> Luke 21.15.

<sup>51</sup> Philippians 2.1.

<sup>52</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 410.21–22 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 75.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.687.17–18.

<sup>53</sup> Note the textual variant: τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Δαυιδ.

<sup>54</sup> There are some resonances between *Cat. Marc.* 410.30–411.15 and Theodore of Heraclea, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* Fr. 121–124 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 90–91).

<sup>55</sup> Accounts of this incident can be found in Josephus, *De bello Judaico* 2.169, Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 18.55 and Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.6.4 (G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 1. SC 31. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 11952), 59).

<sup>56</sup> *Lit.* “it did not leave an interval.”

also calls these standards an “*abomination*.”<sup>57</sup> And “*of desolation*”<sup>58</sup> as it also became<sup>59</sup> the starting point of the revolt, which resulted in the desolation of the city.<sup>60</sup> Then in order that they might learn that these things will also happen while some of them are [still] alive, for this reason he said, “*when you see*.”<sup>61</sup> From this, one might marvel particularly at the power of Christ and the courage of those disciples, because they were preaching in such times when the affairs of the Jews were very much engulfed by war.

♦ After<sup>62</sup> these things he mentions again the misfortunes of the Jews, showing that when these [disciples] were radiant teaching the whole world, then [the Jews] were suffering misfortunes. “For whenever,” he says, “these things happen, and the abomination of desolation stands in the holy place, then flee! For there is no hope of salvation left for you. Nor is it for you to suppose that such a great catastrophe will come to pass for you as came to pass previously in the wars, but that a beloved remnant will be saved without even the clothes you stand up in”—showing by this that the evils were inevitable and the misfortune was incalculable.

“*But woe to those who are with child*” and so on.<sup>63</sup> For, as one might expect, the suffering they will bear at that time will be greater among women who are pregnant and who are breast-feeding, for whom the most immediate evil will have come to be unendurable. You see how he speaks concerning the things which will overtake Judea. And he says “*in winter-time*”<sup>64</sup> on account of the lack of food resulting from the time of year. And let no one suppose that what is set down has been over-stated:<sup>65</sup> but studying the writings of Josephus, you can learn how true these sayings are, for [Josephus] shows them incurring an even worse | punishment than what was described.<sup>66</sup> For if, he said, the war of the Romans against the city had prevailed further, all the Jews would have died: for “*all flesh*”<sup>67</sup> means those outside Judea

[412]

---

<sup>57</sup> Mark 13.14.

<sup>58</sup> Mark 13.14.

<sup>59</sup> *Lit.* “it was also made.”

<sup>60</sup> *Lit.* “from which the desolation of the city was completed.”

<sup>61</sup> Mark 13.14.

<sup>62</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 411.16–412.23 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 76.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.693.45–697.8.

<sup>63</sup> Mark 13.17.

<sup>64</sup> Mark 13.18.

<sup>65</sup> *Lit.* “to have been stated hyperbolically.”

<sup>66</sup> Eusebius summarises Josephus’ account in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.6.1–3.7.2 (G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 1. SC 31. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1:1952), 104–110).

<sup>67</sup> Mark 13.20.

and those within. For not only did they wage war against them in Judea, but against those who were dispersed everywhere. But whom does he here mean by “*the elect*”?<sup>68</sup> [He means] the faithful set apart in their midst. For in order that the Jews might not say that because of them and the proclamation [of the gospel] these evil things took place, he shows the opposite—that if it were not for them, all would have been utterly destroyed: but in order that those of them who had become believers might not perish together with the unbelieving Jews, he quickly put down the fighting and made an end of the war.

“*And then if any among you may say, behold here is the Christ*” and so on.<sup>69</sup> Having finished [describing] the things concerning Jerusalem, he goes on next [to describe] his own coming, and he tells them the signs [of it], not for their use only, but for us, and for all those who will be after us. And “*then*”<sup>70</sup> refers not to the sequence of the events which have already been mentioned, but it refers to the period within which these things were about to take place, of which I am about to speak. For it is customary in scripture to use this sort of description.<sup>71</sup> And in the meantime he gives them assurance from [his description of] the occasion, describing the distinguishing marks of his second coming, and [giving] examples of deceivers. For just as in [his] first [coming], when he appeared in Bethlehem, in a little corner of the world, with nobody recognizing him at the beginning, he says that [it will] not be like that then, but that it will be obvious, so that it will not even be necessary to announce these things. ♦

(21) “And if anyone says to you at that time, ‘Look! Here is the Christ!’ or ‘Look! There he is!’ do not believe him. (22) For false messiahs and false prophets will arise and produce signs and wonders, to lead astray, if possible, even the elect.”

He says that “*false prophets will arise*”:<sup>72</sup> therefore those who attempted to deceive in the time of the apostles, deceived the many. And these, just before his coming, will be even more relentless than that. “For,” he says, “in

---

<sup>68</sup> Mark 13.20.

<sup>69</sup> Mark 13.21.

<sup>70</sup> Mark 13.21.

<sup>71</sup> At this point, Chrysostom is referring to the fact that there are significant lapses of time recorded in the scriptures, such as the period of Jesus’ birth and his baptism by John, which are covered by phrases such as “and in those days” and “then.”

<sup>72</sup> Mark 13.22.

...serving a false messiah, they will perform signs, so as to deceive, if possible, even the elect.” | And while there were false prophets in the time of the Jews, [413] there were also false messiahs in the time of the new covenant: and he says that they are the same,<sup>73</sup> and he adds,

(23) “But be alert: see,<sup>74</sup> I have told you everything beforehand.”

◆ Let<sup>75</sup> no one plead ignorance, but let him secure himself against the deception of these people. ◆

(24) “But in those days, after that tribulation, *the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light.*”<sup>76</sup>

◆ The<sup>77</sup> tribulation of the Antichrist and the false prophets will be great at that time when there are so many deceivers. But it is not extended over a length of time. For if the Jewish war was shortened for the sake of the elect, by much more will this trial be shortened for the sake of these same people. Therefore after this tribulation “*the sun will be darkened*”:<sup>78</sup> for all these things will come to pass more or less at the same time, when false messiahs and false prophets will come and will cause confusion: and immediately he himself will appear, the creation itself having been transformed for the future: and “*the sun will be darkened*,”<sup>79</sup> not obscured but overpowered by the light of his presence. “*And the stars will fall [from heaven]*,”<sup>80</sup> for what need shall there be for them, when there is no night? “*And the powers of heaven shall be shaken*,”<sup>81</sup> seeing such a great change coming to pass, and their fellow servants rendering an account, and the whole world standing before a dreadful judgement-seat.

<sup>73</sup> *Lit.* “these and those are the same.”

<sup>74</sup> Note the textual variant: ἰδοὺ.

<sup>75</sup> A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* reveals that *Cat. Marc.* 413.5 displays resonances with Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Hexaemeron* 7.5.12 (S. Giet, *Basile de Césarée. Homélie sur l'hexaéméron*, 2nd edn. SC 26 bis. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968): 414–415).

<sup>76</sup> Isaiah 13.10.

<sup>77</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 413.10–23 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 76.3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.697.46–698.8.

<sup>78</sup> Mark 13.24: cf. Isaiah 13.10.

<sup>79</sup> Mark 13.24: cf. Isaiah 13.10.

<sup>80</sup> Mark 13.25: cf. Isaiah 13.10.

<sup>81</sup> Mark 13.25.

◆ “And<sup>82</sup> then they will see the Son of Man,”<sup>83</sup> that is, coming bodily, just as he was taken up.<sup>84</sup> And when he says that the Son of Man “will send his angels,”<sup>85</sup> he demonstrates that the Son of Man is God. For they are the angels of God, and sending them is a property of God. And “from the ends of the earth to the ends of heaven”<sup>86</sup> teaches us that the ends of the earth and of heaven are the same: so that it is necessary to believe Christ and not to be deceived, as if the smallest particle of the earth, when it is in the midst of heaven, would exceed [the earth] with infinite magnitude. ◆

[414] |

(28) “From the fig-tree learn the parable: as soon as its branch becomes tender and puts forth its leaves, you know that summer is near. (29) So also, when you see<sup>87</sup> these things happening, you know that he is near, at the very gates.”

◆ He<sup>88</sup> inserts the example of the fig tree, [indicating] that the interval is not great, but immediately after the tribulation the coming will also occur: this is why he demonstrated this not only through the parable, saying “you know that he is near, at the very gates.”<sup>89</sup> Here he also prophesies another thing, that there will be for the righteous “a summer”<sup>90</sup> and a calm on that day after winter: but for sinners, there will be the opposite, a winter after summer: [and he says this] in order that even here he might confirm his saying which is thus fulfilled in every way. For just as it is a necessity for the fig tree, so also it is a necessity for the end. ◆

---

<sup>82</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 413.23–31 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum* Fr. 127 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 92).

<sup>83</sup> Mark 13.26: cf. Isaiah 34.4.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Acts 1.11.

<sup>85</sup> Mark 13.27. Note the textual variant: αὐτοῦ. The use of αὐτοῦ at this point is central to the observation which follows.

<sup>86</sup> Mark 13.27.

<sup>87</sup> Note the textual variant: ταῦτα ἴδητε.

<sup>88</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 414.6–14 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 77.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.701.29–43.

<sup>89</sup> Mark 13.29.

<sup>90</sup> Mark 13.29.

43. *On that day and that hour*

(32) “But about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.”

◆ “*Truly*<sup>91</sup> *I say to you that this generation will not pass away,*”<sup>92</sup> means “the [generation] of the faithful,”<sup>93</sup> for he knows not to characterise a generation in terms of time only but also by the manner of their religious worship and practice (like when he says, “This is the generation of those who seek the Lord.”<sup>94</sup>) For “*until all these things come to pass*”<sup>95</sup> means the things about Jerusalem, about wars, and about other related matters, which he has said will occur in the interval before his coming. This is why he also said above that it is necessary for absolutely everything to come to pass, and the generation of the faithful will abide, impeded by none of the things which have been mentioned. ◆

FROM THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA<sup>96</sup> And another source says that he means the “evil generation” (in terms of their character rather than their person), teaching that in the presence | and sight of the impious slayers of [415] Christ, he will show that his glory is from heaven, to fulfil the [statement,] “they will look on him whom they pierced.”<sup>97</sup> ◆

<sup>91</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 414.20–28 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 77.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.701.55–702.31.

<sup>92</sup> Mark 13.30.

<sup>93</sup> The catenist enumerates three different arguments to explain the meaning of the word γενεά. The first argument (from Chrysostom) suggests that Jesus is referring not to the present generation, but to “the generation of the faithful.” In other words, the events described by Jesus are not limited by the span of life allotted to his immediate hearers. The second argument (from Theodore of Mopsuestia) suggests that Jesus is referring to an “evil generation.” The third argument reads the text chronologically. In this reading, Jesus is referring to his contemporaries. The latter reading is probably closest to contemporary interpretations which emphasise the “indefinite imminence” of the Parousia in the Gospel of Mark. (For further discussion see Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 617–619).

<sup>94</sup> Psalm 24.6.

<sup>95</sup> Mark 13.30.

<sup>96</sup> This attribution is found in Possinus’ edition and is noted by Harold Smith (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 368). A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* has not revealed the source.

<sup>97</sup> John 19.37: cf. Zechariah 12.10.

But again another source<sup>98</sup> says that he is talking about the “*generation*”<sup>99</sup> at that time, until it passes away, until the things which have already been described happen to the Jews, confirming through these things his saying about the end. ♦ “*Heaven*<sup>100</sup> and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away,”<sup>101</sup> that is to say, it is easier for these things which are irrevocably fixed and immovable to be obliterated than for any of my words to fail. And anyone who contradicts these things, let them examine what has been said, and from the things which happen in the present, let them believe in what will happen in the future. This is why he also brings the elements into the frame, ♦ resorting to the ancient words (for through Jeremiah he also establishes the unshakeableness of his own statement) and at the same time showing implicitly that he is the creator of all. ♦ Since<sup>102</sup> he was speaking about the end (a thing disbelieved by many), he inserted “*heaven and earth*,”<sup>103</sup> showing that he was the ruler of all with much power.

“*But concerning that day or hour no one knows*” and so on.<sup>104</sup> Therefore by saying “*neither the angels*,”<sup>105</sup> he restrained them from seeking to learn the very thing which [the angels] did not know: and saying “*neither the Son*,”<sup>106</sup> he prevented them not only from learning, but even from asking. For that it was said on account of this, note how after the resurrection, he restrained them to an even greater extent when he saw that they had become overly curious. For at this point he has mentioned many, indeed countless, proofs: but then he says simply, “It is not for you to know times or seasons.”<sup>107</sup> Then in order that they might not say, “We are confused, we are utterly despised, we are not even worthy of this,” he speaks of “those times which the Father has put under his own authority”<sup>108</sup> for he was about to accord them a great honour by not hiding anything from them: this is why he constantly refers

---

<sup>98</sup> This source is anonymous.

<sup>99</sup> Mark 13.30.

<sup>100</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 415.6–11 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 77.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.702.38–47.

<sup>101</sup> Mark 13.31.

<sup>102</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 415.14–416.5 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 77.1–2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.702.50–703.35.

<sup>103</sup> Mark 13.31.

<sup>104</sup> Mark 13.32.

<sup>105</sup> Mark 13.32.

<sup>106</sup> Mark 13.32.

<sup>107</sup> Acts 1.7 (cf. Mark 13.33).

<sup>108</sup> Acts 1.7.

them to the Father, both making it a fearful thing, and excluding the things of which he had spoken from their inquiry. For given that this is so, why do you suppose that as he knows the Father as plainly as the Son, he does not know the day? How if “all things come to be through him, and without him nothing has come to be”<sup>109</sup> | was he ignorant of the day? For it is obvious [416] that the one who created the ages also created the times, and if time, then the day. Why then is he ignorant of that which he made? Indeed, therefore, when he had spoken about all these things, including the times and seasons, and had brought them to the gates (“for,” he says, “it is close at hand, at the very gates”<sup>110</sup>), he keeps silent about the day.<sup>111</sup> ♦

It is also possible to say, according to Mark, that “neither does the Son know, if the Father does not, but if the Father does not know, neither does the Son.”<sup>112</sup> But if the Father knows, then obviously the Son does also because he is the Father’s Wisdom, containing everything from the Father except being the Father itself.<sup>113</sup>

<sup>109</sup> Cf. John 1.3.

<sup>110</sup> Mark 13.29.

<sup>111</sup> Mark 13.32 was the subject of some considerable dispute within the early church. According to Athanasius, certain followers of Arius took any intimation of the Son’s “ignorance” as evidence of the truth of the doctrine that the Son was subordinate to the Father. Athanasius declared that Christ’s ignorance was only apparent (in *Orationes tres contra Arianos* 3 [PG 26.412.12–429.15]). In his comments on this passage, Chrysostom provides further ammunition to support this argument through a series of rhetorical questions: first, he quotes John 1.3 to suggest that by virtue of his involvement of creation, he could not be ignorant of that which he had made. (According to Kevin Madigan, this argument is also employed by Jerome. (Kevin Madigan, ‘Christus Nesciens? Was Christ Ignorant of the Day of Judgment? Arian and Orthodox Interpretation of Mark 13.32 in the Ancient Latin West,’ *Harvard Theological Review* 96, no. 3 (2003): 268)). Secondly, rather than being himself ignorant of the day, he suggests that Christ deliberately sets out to keep silent and not to reveal it. (Again, according to Madigan, this argument is also employed by Augustine and Jerome (Madigan, ‘Christus Nesciens? Was Christ Ignorant of the Day of Judgment? Arian and Orthodox Interpretation of Mark 13.32 in the Ancient Latin West,’ 273)). For Augustine, the point of Mark 13.32 is not that the Son does not know, but that he causes human beings not to know. For Jerome, the economy of salvation requires that human beings remain ignorant of the day: “for if we knew that the day of judgment would not arrive for two thousand years, we would be ‘more negligent’ (*neglegentiores*) than if we remained in a state of pious ignorance” (Madigan, ‘Christus Nesciens? Was Christ Ignorant of the Day of Judgment? Arian and Orthodox Interpretation of Mark 13.32 in the Ancient Latin West,’ 270).

<sup>112</sup> This is a curious paraphrase of the expression in Mark 13.32. It omits the substance of the clause and simply emphasises the end. Thus “about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father” becomes, ‘nor does the Son know, only the Father, only the Father knows, not the Son.’”

<sup>113</sup> This passage is anonymous, although Dr. Lionel Wickham has suggested that the thought is consistent with the position espoused by Cyril of Alexandria. In his response



“*But beware, keep alert!*”<sup>114</sup> and so on. The sequence of the argument shows the reason why he did not make the day clear to them, for in learning the nature of the judgement [there is] much advantage, but in [learning] the time [there is] no longer [an advantage]. For if each person is ignorant of their own day of judgement and know that often the uninitiated will perish, they will contend to be baptized at their final breath, as a result of which they will enter into eternity bereft of good works—saved by faith, but unable to manifest its works. If the end were known, why would they not do this?<sup>115</sup> For this reason he adds (all but saying), “The reason I did not tell you the day is so that, not knowing the day, you might watch and pray and keep awake.” ♦ And<sup>116</sup> he did not say, “I do not know,” but “you do not know,”<sup>117</sup> wanting them to struggle continually, holding that [day] and the end of their lives as a mystery. ♦

(34) “It is like a man going on a journey, when he leaves his house” and so on.

---

to Tiberius the Deacon, who along with a number of others had asked about those who assert that the Son did not know the final day, Cyril says: “Even more anomalously for them, the Son is called God the Father’s Wisdom and Counsel. For Paul said of him ‘*Who was made Wisdom for us by God*’ and again ‘*In whom are hidden all the treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge.*’ Inspired David hymns the heavenly God and Father in the words ‘*Thou hast guided me with thy counsel,*’ meaning by God’s ‘counsel’ the Son springing from him. In that case must it not be absurd to suppose that the Father’s Wisdom and Counsel could be ignorant of any feature of him?” (Lionel R. Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria’s Select Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 151). The reference to the Son as the Father’s Wisdom is picked up in this scholium.

<sup>114</sup> Mark 13.33.

<sup>115</sup> In other words, the consequence of the uncertainty concerning the second coming is that the uninitiated must be baptised as soon as possible, for they would not want to suffer the effects of events beyond their control in the coming judgement. However, if they were to know the day of judgement, they might be tempted to sin boldly so that they could repent at leisure.

<sup>116</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 416.19–21 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaum* 77.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.704.54–57.

<sup>117</sup> In his discussion of Western interpretations of Mark 13.32, Madigan says of Jerome: “Finally, and most originally, Jerome insists that the entire pericope, and particularly the text immediately surrounding the difficult verse, be taken into consideration. In fact, he focuses his attention on the verse immediately after Mark 13.32: ‘Be on guard! Be alert! You do not know when that time will come’ (Mark 13.33). Notice, Jerome says, that Jesus did not say *we* do not know. He said, rather, *you* do not know.” (Madigan, ‘Christus Nesciens? Was Christ Ignorant of the Day of Judgment? Arian and Orthodox Interpretation of Mark 13.32 in the Ancient Latin West,’ 270). Intriguingly, we find exactly the same argument employed here.

♦ This<sup>118</sup> is why he said, “Keep awake!” showing that if people knew when they were to die, all would be virtuous only at that hour. And wanting them always to look forward to this and so that they might be virtuous always, he<sup>119</sup> made the end of the life of each uncertain. Then he openly names himself “*Lord*,”<sup>120</sup> having nowhere spoken plainly in this way. But here he seems to me also to shame those who are indifferent. “For you do not care for your salvation,” he says, “as much as those who think they might be robbed care for their money.” ♦ Therefore the present time is for undertaking [the commandments], and the future time is for judgement. | [417] And he calls himself “*a man*”<sup>121</sup> by virtue of the Incarnation. And he calls the Ascension into heaven “*going on a journey*.”<sup>122</sup> And “*the work of each*”<sup>123</sup> is the work of keeping<sup>124</sup> the commandments, which is made manifest through the watch of “*the door-keeper*.”<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 416.24–29 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 77.2–3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.704.57–705.18.

<sup>119</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 416.27: replace ἐποίησα with ἐποίησε.

<sup>120</sup> Mark 13.35.

<sup>121</sup> Mark 13.34.

<sup>122</sup> Mark 13.34.

<sup>123</sup> Mark 13.34.

<sup>124</sup> There is a complex play on the word τήρησις in this passage. The word encompasses both the sense of “keeping watch” and “keeping the commandments.”

<sup>125</sup> Mark 13.34.



## CHAPTER 14

### 44. *On the woman who anointed the Lord with sweet perfume*

(1) It was two days before the Passover and the feast of Unleavened bread: and the chief priest and the scribes were seeking how they might arrest him deviously and kill him. (2) And they said, “Not during the festival, in case there will be a riot<sup>1</sup> of the people.”

Two days before the Passion, there was this plan. This is why we hold a fast on the fourth day of the week,<sup>2</sup> to mark the beginning of the Passion, which was completed on the sixth day. And they devised a cunning plan because the people were always following and surrounding him. And while they wanted to miss the feast, they did not get agreement, because it was necessary for the prophecy to be fulfilled according to the regulation of the Law, which laid down that the Passover was sacrificed on the fourteenth day in the first month. For it was necessary that in this month and on that day the true Passover must be offered. And in addition it is shown that he surrendered himself willingly, accepting this on our behalf, and although they often wanted to arrest him, they were not strong enough. But just when they were plotting his capture, then against all expectation, by giving himself up, he contrived to bring about what they were ultimately striving for. To these things likewise Matthew the Evangelist attaches what happened “in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper”<sup>3</sup> at the hands of a woman.

(3) And when he was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, when he was reclining at table, a woman came holding an alabaster jar of very costly perfume—pure<sup>4</sup> nard—and<sup>5</sup> she broke the alabaster jar and poured it over<sup>6</sup> his head.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the textual variant: θόρυβος ἔσται.

<sup>2</sup> I.e. Wednesday.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Matthew 26.6.

<sup>4</sup> See note below.

<sup>5</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ συντρίψασα.

<sup>6</sup> Note the textual variant: αὐτοῦ κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς.

[418] ♦ This<sup>7</sup> woman seems to be one and the same according to all | the Evangelists: but she was not: although according to the three [Evangelists], she seems to me to be one and the same, according to John, [she is] no longer [the same], but another woman, the sister of Lazarus. ♦ And John, the bishop of the royal city [of Constantinople], says these things.<sup>8</sup>

♦ But again Origen<sup>9</sup> says that, according to Matthew and Mark, it was one woman who poured out the ointment on his head in the house of Simon the leper: and a different woman, described by Luke—the sinner who pours the oil on his feet in the house of the Pharisee. ♦

And Apollinaris and Theodore<sup>10</sup> say that she is one and the same according to all the Evangelists, but John is more precise in handing on the description. But Matthew and Mark and John seem to be talking about the same woman; for they say that it came to pass in Bethany; and this is a village. But Luke is speaking about a different woman. “For behold,” he says, “in the city, there was a woman who was a sinner, and when she discovered that he was staying in the house of the Pharisee” and so on.<sup>11</sup> And whereas this woman was described as “a sinner”<sup>12</sup> and [the event took place] “in the city,”<sup>13</sup> the other woman was not described as “a sinner,” and [the event took place] in the village of Bethany.<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, the Saviour receives her generosity favourably, and he does not speak in vain when he says that the action of the woman will be told in the whole world with the preaching of the Gospel,

---

<sup>7</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 417.30–418.3 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 80.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.723.35–39.

<sup>8</sup> Note the editorial attribution of the preceding passage to John Chrysostom. The catenist distinguishes between a number of different interpretations at this point because the text is particularly problematic. Carl Nordenfalk notes an inconsistency in the Eusebian canon tables which relates specifically to this passage. John 98 features in both Canon I *Of Four Gospels* and Canon IV *Of Three Gospels*. The fact that John 98 features in Canon I suggests that Eusebius regarded “the episode as being the same in all four gospels.” In Canon I, it is placed alongside Matthew 276, Mark 158 and Luke 74. However, the fact that John 98 is also placed alongside Matthew 277 and Mark 159 (note the omission of Luke) presents something of an exegetical challenge—hence the attempt by commentators to establish the identity of the woman (C. Nordenfalk, ‘The Eusebian Canon Tables: Some Textual Problems,’ *Journal of Theological Studies* 35, no. 1 (1984)).

<sup>9</sup> Note the editorial attribution to Origen.

<sup>10</sup> Note the editorial attributions to Apollinaris and Theodore of Mopsuestia. The subsequent suggestion may be the voice of the catenist himself.

<sup>11</sup> Luke 7.37.

<sup>12</sup> Luke 7.37.

<sup>13</sup> Luke 7.37.

<sup>14</sup> Mark 14.3.

but that it presents a pattern<sup>15</sup> for the Church which brings its faith to Christ and distributes it just like the most fragrant perfume. And they call the nard “*pistikos*”<sup>16</sup> and say that it is “very costly.” And he says that the anointing of the perfume is of service for his burial. He says that she has done what she could. “*For she has anointed my body beforehand for my burial*”:<sup>17</sup> for at his death, that is when he will receive the greatest offering of faith as salvation for the world: and this is an act of the most powerful faith. And this is a sign of the future and [is] in accordance with the will of the Saviour: for an action is more memorable than a word, [and is] in order that we may remember that he knew about the Passion in advance. And as to the fact that those who complained<sup>18</sup> about the pouring out of the perfume being different, John simply mentions Judas the betrayer, Matthew mentions the apostles, and Mark, some but not all. And the Lord does not question the motive of the speaker, though Judas was saying this from base motives | due [419] to his financial greed, but neither does he find fault with the others who were censuring her for sound reasons. For without knowing the reasonableness of what had transpired, they censured the action, ♦ for<sup>19</sup> they had heard the teacher saying, “I desire mercy and not sacrifice,”<sup>20</sup> when he gave much instruction on the mountain regarding almsgiving.<sup>21</sup> And from these things, they calculated by themselves that it was much better for the value of the

<sup>15</sup> *Lit.* ‘type.’

<sup>16</sup> Commentaries abound with intriguing theories about the origins of this word. As Hooker points out, “the meaning of the word translated **genuine** (πιστικός) is uncertain. The most widely accepted view is that it is derived from πίστις meaning ‘faith’ or ‘reliability,’ and hence ‘genuine’; an alternative interpretation links it with an Aramaic word for a nut used in making ointments” (Hooker, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 328). Cranfield suggests that the latter view is more probable, suggesting that the word is “a transliteration of Aramaic *pîstākā*’ which denotes the ben or pistachio nut (cf. πιστάκιον), the oil of which was used as a base for perfumes” (C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, ed. C.F.D. Moule, *The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 415). The difficulty is that, according to *Liddell and Scott*, this is probably the first instance of this word in Greek. BAGD notes that “some derive πιστικός from a name of some kind (Theophylact MPG CXXIII 6445b ...) or from πιστάκια ‘pistachio tree’ (MBlack, *An Aramaic Approach*) ...” (p. 818). In the light of Hooker’s comments about ‘faith,’ it is intriguing to note that the catenist goes on to make a significant link between the words πιστικός and πιστός.

<sup>17</sup> Mark 14.9.

<sup>18</sup> Genitive of Respect.

<sup>19</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 419.3–9 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 80.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.725.1–12.

<sup>20</sup> Hosea 6.6: cf. Matthew 9.13 and 12.7.

<sup>21</sup> Matthew 6.2–4.

perfume to be distributed among the poor. But the Saviour, seeing her intention, allows this (for great was her piety), and there is no saying how great her zeal was: this is exactly why he condescends [to this],<sup>22</sup> and he permits the oil to be poured on his head. ♦ And<sup>23</sup> among the many and varied complaints, the Lord, in full-knowledge of the future, refutes Judas as a lover of money:<sup>24</sup> but he does not censure the disciples, as they had said these things from a simpler intention. ♦ For<sup>25</sup> they remembered [him saying], “I desire mercy and not sacrifice.”<sup>26</sup> And saying that it might have been sold for three hundred denarii, they showed how much this woman had spent on the perfume, and how great was the generosity which she showed. “And,” he says, “*wherever the Gospel may be preached, what this woman has done will also be told.*”<sup>27</sup> On account of this again he declares in advance the mission<sup>28</sup> to the Gentiles, and by this he reassures them about his death: or more accurately, the power after the Cross, as the proclamation was to be “poured out”<sup>29</sup> all over the earth. And the occasion did not require that what had come to pass be set right, but only that it be received favourably.<sup>30</sup> For just as, if anyone were to ask him, he would not have approved before the woman did it, so

---

<sup>22</sup> Again Chrysostom suggests that Jesus “condescends” to submit to this by virtue of the incarnation. The term *συγκατάβασις* is central to Chrysostom’s understanding of the incarnation. The idea of “condescension” suggests that God appears not so much as he is, but rather as one is able to see him. It implies that there is an accommodation to human limitations in the incarnation. Robert Hill has suggested that “consideration” is preferable to “condescension” (Robert C. Hill, *John Chrysostom, Commentary on the Psalms* (Brookline MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2007), 21–41), while Margaret Mitchell speculates that “accommodation” might be preferable: “The exact term, though not terribly common, was apparently at home in the wide-ranging Greco-Roman discussion of rhetorical adaptability, as used by Philodemus, for instance, to mean ‘condescension’ to the level of an audience” (Margaret Mitchell, ‘Pauline Accommodation and “Condescension”: 1 Cor 9.19–23 and the History of Influence,’ in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 205).

<sup>23</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 419.10–13 is anonymous. However, these lines represent a somewhat garbled summary of the ten preceding lines.

<sup>24</sup> This interpretation contradicts the previous section, much of which is repeated but in a different way.

<sup>25</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 419.13–29 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 80.1–2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.725.21–46.

<sup>26</sup> Hosea 6.6: cf. Matthew 9.13 and 12.7.

<sup>27</sup> Mark 14.9.

<sup>28</sup> *Lit.* “the going forth.”

<sup>29</sup> Note the resonance with the pouring out of the perfume.

<sup>30</sup> Chrysostom suggests that whatever the good, however imperfect it may be, it should be received generously, so as to encourage it and advance it.

after the oil had been bought and poured out, criticism was untimely: and this is why he said these things so as not to undermine the intention of the woman. And what he does say, he says for her encouragement.<sup>31</sup> “For,” he says, “I am so far removed from condemning her for having done [something] wrong, or from blaming her for not having acted rightly, that I will not allow what has been done to escape notice. But the world will know what has been done privately and behind doors. For what has come to pass was from a great heart, and was a sure sign of much faith.”<sup>32</sup> ♦ | [420]

#### 45. *On the Passover*

(12) And on the first day of Unleavened Bread, when they sacrificed the Passover [lamb], his disciples said to him, “Where do you want us to go to make the preparations for you to eat the Passover?”

♦ By<sup>33</sup> the first day of Unleavened Bread, he means the day before the festival of Unleavened Bread. For they are accustomed always to reckon the day from the evening. But another [Evangelist]<sup>34</sup> says that it was before the first day of Unleavened Bread, mentioning the day on which, in the evening, the Passover would be sacrificed. So it is clear that both indicated the same day. And on the fifth day of the week<sup>35</sup> they came to him, and while one calls this the [day] before the festival of Unleavened Bread, another calls this [the day] of Unleavened Bread: and each speaks truthfully: for [the

---

<sup>31</sup> Hooker notes the synoptic parallels regarding the identity of the woman who anointed Jesus, parallels which are noted by the catenist. However, she comments: ‘The tradition identifying the woman as Mary Magdalene is not found in any of the gospels and is first recorded in the fourth century.’ (Hooker, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 327). It is perhaps significant that this identification is not made within the *Catena*. If Luz is correct that the identification of the unknown woman with Mary Magdalene had become a commonplace by the early Middle Ages, we might note that this view was much stronger in the Latin West. Thus there is evidence in a sermon from Pope Gregory the Great (dated 591) and in the writings of the Venerable Bede (Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 339). The fact that the catenist does not make this connection suggests that this tradition was not widespread in the East before the sixth century.

<sup>32</sup> Note that Mark 14.10–11, describing the betrayal of Jesus by Judas, is omitted at this point.

<sup>33</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 420.6–19 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 81.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.729.48–730.50.

<sup>34</sup> John 13.1.

<sup>35</sup> I.e. Thursday.



latter] began from the evening: this is why each adds when the Passover used to be sacrificed. And they say, “Where do you want us to go to make the preparations for you to eat the Passover?”<sup>36</sup> So even from this it is manifest that he had no home nor lodging. And I suppose neither had they: for surely they would have invited him to go there, but they had none, having renounced everything by then. And why did he keep the Passover? He shows through all these things until the last day, that he was not opposed to the Law. ♦

(13) So he sent two of his disciples, and said to them, “Go into the city, and a man will meet you” and so on.

♦ So<sup>37</sup> why on earth does he send [them] to a man who knew nothing? Even through all these things, he shows that it was possible for him not to suffer. For what would [Christ], who prevailed upon the mind of this man so that he would welcome them (and that by a mere word), not have done with those who crucified him, if it had been his will not to suffer? For that very reason he gives them a sign (as Mark and Luke record<sup>38</sup>), that he was “carrying a jar.”

[421] ♦ Therefore<sup>39</sup> | neither of them have said, “How will I eat the Passover?” but “Where is my lodging, where I am to eat the Passover with my disciples?” so that it would be sufficient for the preparations. And as that man supposed him to be in hiding,<sup>40</sup> Matthew alone has said, “I will keep the Passover at

<sup>36</sup> Matthew 26.17: cf. Mark 14.12 and Luke 22.9.

<sup>37</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 420.23–28 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 81.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.730.50–731.10.

<sup>38</sup> Mark 14.13 and Luke 22.10.

<sup>39</sup> A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* reveals that *Cat. Marc.* 420.28–421.9 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaicum* Fr. 130.1–7 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 44–45). Note that *Cat. Marc.* 420.28–421.4 is mistakenly attributed by Harold Smith to Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 81 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366).

<sup>40</sup> Richard Bauckham also comments on the surprising element of secrecy which appears to surround these arrangements: “But why does Jesus employ such an elaborate procedure to enable the disciples to find the house? Evidently, he wants the fact that he and his disciples are to be eating the Passover meal in that particular house to remain secret, as readers of Mark realize because by that time Mark has told them of the plot to arrest Jesus” (Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: the Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 188). The element of secrecy is necessary to maintain the integrity of Mark’s narrative. If the venue of the supper was well-known, then it would have been simpler for Jesus’ arrest to take place at the meal.

your house”<sup>41</sup> and it is possible to explain that this indicated the preparation for the Passover, not the eating of it. For John shows according to the day and the hour of the Passion that the Passover had not yet been eaten by the Jews, since, as he said, it was necessary for both the typological<sup>42</sup> and the real Passover to be completed on the same day. ♦ Therefore sending the disciples away, the Saviour told them to depart into the city, and that someone, carrying a jar of water, would meet them: and following him, they should stop at the house which he enters. Then they should say what follows to the master of the house. And these things are omitted by Matthew who says simply that he ordered them to go “to so-and-so,”<sup>43</sup> and say this to him. For anyone will find him simply recording the things of consequence, passing over most of the details,<sup>44</sup> which is why one accepts what he has said most of the time.

---

<sup>41</sup> Matthew 26.18.

<sup>42</sup> Note the use of the term *τύπιον* which is used in the context of a reference to the Passover. Frances Young points out that “typology” is a modern construct. Ancient exegetes did not distinguish between typology and allegory, and the word does not appear in English until 1844 (Frances Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 193). The distinction was popularized by Daniélou and Hanson in their work on Origen (Jean Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (London: Burns & Oates, 1960), Richard P.C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: A study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1959)), but perhaps more significant was the work of Erich Auerbach, who argued that ancient “typology” or “figural reading,” in contrast with the allegorical readings associated with Origen, preserved the historicity of biblical figures and events (Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (New Haven: Yale, 1950), Erich Auerbach, ‘Figura,’ in *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature*, ed. Wlad Godzich and Jochen Schulte-Sasse (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984 (originally published 1944))). However, David Dawson has argued more recently that the distinction posed by Auerbach is drawn too sharply, and that ancient Christian writers, including Origen, presuppose an ongoing historical outworking of “a divine intention to transform humanity over the course of time.” (John David Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California, 2002), 216). The evidence here perhaps adds weight to Dawson’s conclusions. Here the commentator on the Passion narrative draws out the parallels between the “symbolic” and the “real” Passover.

<sup>43</sup> Matthew omits any reference to water jars (cf. Matthew 26.18, “He said, ‘Go into the city to so-and-so, and say to him, ‘The Teacher says, My time is near; I will keep the Passover at your house with my disciples.’”) Bauckham suggests “so and so” is a better translation than the literal “a certain man”: “Jesus names someone but Matthew does not tell us the name, doubtless because he did not know it. In Matthew, therefore, Jesus behaves as we might have expected. Why the more roundabout and clandestine arrangements in Mark? Probably because Jesus already knows that Judas is going to deliver him to the chief priests, but the other members of the Twelve do not know this. In order to keep the place where they will eat the Passover secret from Judas, Jesus must keep it secret from the Twelve” (Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: the Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*, 188–189).

<sup>44</sup> *Lit.* “the things which have happened in between.”

46. *On the prophecy of betrayal*

(17) When evening came, he went with the twelve: (18) and when they had taken their places and were eating, Jesus said, “Truly I say to you, one of you will betray me.”

Therefore when all the disciples were ready, “*when evening came, he went with the twelve*” and so on.<sup>45</sup> Speaking about the Passion, “*just as it has been written concerning him,*”<sup>46</sup> he revealed to the betrayer that he would not prevail: and simultaneously he also revealed the punishment in order that he might not have an excuse.<sup>47</sup> ♦ And<sup>48</sup> the “*going*”<sup>49</sup> indicated a journey rather than death. Just as he said to the Jews, “I am going to the one who sent me,”<sup>50</sup> [this] wording also reinforces the voluntary [nature of the act].

[422] | ♦ And<sup>51</sup> it being “*better not to have been born*”<sup>52</sup> is said as a punishment: for non-existence is more desirable than evil existence. ♦ And they began to be vexed, as you might expect: for once the saying was thrown into their midst, each of them was alarmed lest Jesus should ever have entertained this suspicion about themselves. And they said to him, “Surely it is not me?”

(22) And while they were eating, Jesus<sup>53</sup> took bread, and after blessing it, he broke [it] and gave [it] to them and said, “Take, eat:<sup>54</sup> this is my body.” (23) And taking the<sup>55</sup> cup, and after giving thanks, he gave it

<sup>45</sup> Mark 14.17.

<sup>46</sup> Mark 14.21.

<sup>47</sup> In Mark 14.21, Jesus says: “Woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It would have been better for that man if he had not been born.” As Chrysostom explains in the next few sentences, these words are a punishment in themselves.

<sup>48</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 421.28–30 is an extract from Titus of Bostra, *Homiliae in Lucam* 22.22 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien*, 243.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Mark 14.21 “For the Son of Man goes as it is written of him.”

<sup>50</sup> John 7.33.

<sup>51</sup> A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* reveals that *Cat. Marc.* 422.1–2 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaem* Fr. 132.1–2 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 46).

<sup>52</sup> Mark 14.21.

<sup>53</sup> Note the textual variant: ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

<sup>54</sup> Note the textual variant: φάγετε.

<sup>55</sup> Note the textual variant: το.

to them: and all drank from it: (24) and he said to them, “This is my blood, which is of the new<sup>56</sup> covenant, which is poured out for many.”<sup>57</sup>

◆ Mark<sup>58</sup> says that having partaken of the mysteries, the betrayer was unaffected,<sup>59</sup> and having been admitted to the most holy table, he did not change: as Luke also shows, saying that after this, “Satan entered him,”<sup>60</sup> not suggesting that the body has no effect, but announcing the shamelessness of the betrayer. And Christ did not prevent him, even though he knew everything, in order that you might learn that he leaves untold none of the things which pertain to correction. ◆

And another source<sup>61</sup> says that Judas went out beforehand (as John explained):<sup>62</sup> for the servant of the slaying of Christ would not have received the token<sup>63</sup> of communion for salvation: and indeed the Lord has borne all the other things: but this he would not tolerate. ◆ But because through these things he handed on to the disciples how they should perform the mystery of the new covenant, I suppose no one would say differently. Therefore he also blessed [the bread] and said [the words], giving [it] to them to share the things which were fitting, in order that, through the blessing and the thanksgiving, they might learn that the things which were dispensed through the Passion of Christ are truly great and worthy of every thanksgiving. Indeed, he handed on these tokens to be enacted by them. And in saying, “*This is my body*”<sup>64</sup> and “*This is my blood*,”<sup>65</sup> with regard to the bread set forth, it is fitting for them after the Eucharistic prayer to think that they are sharing in the body [of Christ], and with regard to the cup | it is right for them to consider [that they are partaking] of the blood, about which the Passion came to pass for both the common salvation of all people and for the forgiveness

[423]

<sup>56</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ νῆς.

<sup>57</sup> Note the textual variant: περὶ πολλῶν.

<sup>58</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 422.12–18 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 82.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.737.35–48.

<sup>59</sup> *Lit.* “remained the same.”

<sup>60</sup> Luke 22.3.

<sup>61</sup> A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* reveals that *Cat. Marc.* 422.18–22 is an extract from Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* Fr. 133.1–3 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 46).

<sup>62</sup> John 13.27–30.

<sup>63</sup> *Lit.* “type.”

<sup>64</sup> Mark 14.22.

<sup>65</sup> Mark 14.24.

of their sins. For the faith which rests on these things holds fast to the confession of the things which have been fulfilled, and simultaneously bestows participation in forgiveness on those who believe.

♦ Alternatively,<sup>66</sup> it says that he teaches us not to have in view the physical nature of what is set forth, but through the thanksgiving happening over the [elements], [he teaches us] to believe [that the bread and the wine are his body and blood].<sup>67</sup> ♦ For<sup>68</sup> the life-giving Word of God, having united himself to his own flesh in a way which he only knows, declares the flesh to be “life-giving”: for he himself said, “Truly I say to you, whoever believes in me has eternal life. I am the bread of life: and whoever eats this bread will live for eternity. And the bread that I will give is my flesh, [given] for the life of the world. Truly I say to you, if you do not eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you have no life in yourselves.”<sup>69</sup> Surely then when we do this, we have life in ourselves, having been made one with him and abiding in him: and also having him in ourselves. ♦ For<sup>70</sup> it was necessary for him through the Holy Spirit to be in us divinely, and to be intimately united, as it were, with our bodies through his holy body and through his precious blood: which indeed also we have held [in our hands] in the form of bread and wine as a life-giving blessing: and in order that we may not be struck with fear by seeing both the flesh and the blood set forth on the holy tables of churches, he submits as God to our weaknesses and he sends the power of life into the Eucharistic elements, and he transforms them into the energy of his own body in order that we may hold them for the purpose of participation [in the life of God] which is life-giving, and in order that, like a life-giving seed, the “body of life” might be found in us: and do not doubt that

---

<sup>66</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 423.6–8 is an extract from Theodore of Mopsoestia. This is confirmed by a search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, which reveals that this passage comes from Theodore of Mopsoestia, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* Fr. 106.3–5 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 134).

<sup>67</sup> *Lit.* “to believe that these things are those things.”

<sup>68</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 423.8–29 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria. (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 370). A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* confirms that *Cat. Marc.* 423.8–17 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)*. This passage can be found in PG 73.909.25–39. For details about *Cat. Marc.* 423.17–29, see note 68 below.

<sup>69</sup> John 6.51–53.

<sup>70</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 423.8–29 comes from Cyril of Alexandria. (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 370). A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* confirms that *Cat. Marc.* 423.17–29 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Matthaeum* Fr. 289.12–22 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 255).

this is true, since he says this himself: but rather accept in faith the word of the Saviour, for being truth, he does not deceive. ♦

Saying that the blood is to be shed *“for many”*,<sup>71</sup> he means “for all,” for “all” are “many,” just as Paul said, showing that on account of the one man, many will be made<sup>72</sup> [righteous]: and indeed that is what he is showing here—that one man suffers this *“on behalf of many.”*<sup>73</sup> He goes on:

(25) “Truly I say to you, I will never again | drink of the fruit of the vine, [424]  
until that day when I will drink it anew in the Kingdom of God.”

*“I will not drink of the fruit of the vine”* and so on,<sup>74</sup> or according to Matthew “of [my] Father,”<sup>75</sup> that is, *“anew”*<sup>76</sup> after the resurrection.<sup>77</sup> For he was about to be raised, and in the resurrected state both to eat and to drink with the disciples<sup>78</sup> (so that a greater and truer faith in the resurrection should be engendered in them). And he identified *“the Kingdom of God”*<sup>79</sup> and “of the Father”<sup>80</sup> with the resurrection, the point from which the Kingdom came into existence for him and participation in it came into existence for the rest of humanity. Therefore, the [expression] “I will not drink this from that time until then”<sup>81</sup> shows that it was not only the resurrection, but also the Passion which was near,<sup>82</sup> since<sup>83</sup> he will no longer have time to share food and drink with them. But why on earth did he accomplish this mystery at

<sup>71</sup> Mark 14.24.

<sup>72</sup> κατασταθήσεσθαι, which means literally “to be established,” is an allusion to Romans 5.19: “For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by one man’s obedience many will be made righteous.”

<sup>73</sup> Mark 14.24: Note the inconsistency between the use of περι πολλῶν in the lemma (a reading which follows Matthew 26.28) and the use here of ὑπερ πολλῶν (the reading preferred in NA<sup>27</sup>).

<sup>74</sup> Mark 14.25.

<sup>75</sup> Matthew 26.29: “I tell you I shall not drink again of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom.”

<sup>76</sup> Mark 14.25.

<sup>77</sup> The commentator is making the point that the kingdom of God is inaugurated in the resurrection.

<sup>78</sup> Luke 24.41–43: cf. John 21.15.

<sup>79</sup> Mark 14.25.

<sup>80</sup> Matthew 26.29.

<sup>81</sup> A paraphrase of Mark 14.25.

<sup>82</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 424.11: insert a comma and remove the full stop.

<sup>83</sup> I have followed the variant ἐπειδή at this point, rather than εἴπερ δὴ “if indeed.”

the time of the Passover? So that you may learn from all sides that he is also the law giver of the Old [Covenant], and the things [in the New Covenant] are foreshadowed in the Old.<sup>84</sup> Thus through this, the use of a type<sup>85</sup> adds [to the] truth. And the fact that it was “*evening*”<sup>86</sup> was a sign of the fulfilment of the times, and the events [were a sign] of the impending end. And he gives thanks for the Passion, showing that it was voluntary, and teaching us to bear whatever we might suffer thankfully. ♦ “Until<sup>87</sup> I drink this anew with you,”<sup>88</sup> with you as witnesses: for you will see me raised up. But why “*anew*”?<sup>89</sup> This means “in a strange way,” not having a body that may be perceived, but [a body which is] everlasting and incorruptible, and not in need of food. ♦

(26) And when they had sung the hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives.

♦ They<sup>90</sup> gave thanks before receiving, in order that we also might give thanks: they gave thanks after receiving and they sang a hymn, in order that we might do the same.<sup>91</sup> And why did they go out to the Mount? He made himself noticeable before being arrested, in order that he might not appear to hide himself. For he hurried to go to the place, where he was accustomed [to go], and [which] the betrayer knew for certain. ♦

[425] (27) And Jesus said to them, “You will all desert me in the course of this night;<sup>92</sup> for it is written, | ‘I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep

<sup>84</sup> *Lit.* “through these things.”

<sup>85</sup> *Lit.* “the type.” Note the similar perspective offered in *Cat. Marc.* 421.8, where the word τυπικόν is used. The point being made by the commentator is that the testimony of the New Testament is not sufficient in itself. It needs the warrant and proof of the Old Testament.

<sup>86</sup> Mark 14.17.

<sup>87</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 424.20–23 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 82.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.739.58–740.2.

<sup>88</sup> A paraphrase of Matthew 26.29.

<sup>89</sup> Mark 14.25.

<sup>90</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 424.25–29 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 82.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.740.48–58.

<sup>91</sup> The catenist omits Chrysostom’s exhortation to those who would disappear before the final hymn: “Hear this, as many as wait not again for the last prayer of the mysteries, for this is a symbol of that.” (Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 82.2. This passage can be found in PG 58.740.16–18).

<sup>92</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐν ἡμοῖς τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ.

will be scattered.<sup>93</sup> (28) But after I am raised up, I will go before you to Galilee.”

In order that the accusation might not seem to be too harsh, he told them a prophecy as well, simultaneously prevailing upon them to turn their attention to the scriptures, and showing them that even up to this point, he was the one who was keeping them together. ♦ Not<sup>94</sup> that he was leaving them once more to be among the dejected,<sup>95</sup> but he says, “*I will go before you to Galilee,*”<sup>96</sup> in order that being freed from fear of the Jews, they might believe what he has said. ♦

(29) Peter said to him, “Even if all become deserters, I will not.” (30) And Jesus said to him, “Truly I say to you, today in the course of this night,<sup>97</sup> before the cock crows twice, you will deny me three times.” (31) But he said<sup>98</sup> vehemently,<sup>99</sup> “Even if it is necessary for me to die with you, I will never deny you.”

♦ Although<sup>100</sup> the prophet spoke<sup>101</sup> and Christ endorsed the saying, Peter, it says, would not leave [him] on account of this: and by this, he teaches [us] to obey Christ in all things, and to hold his judgement to be more trustworthy than one’s own conscience. In fact, it is necessary for us to pray and to say, “Help us, so that we be not cut off.” But [Peter] is proud.<sup>102</sup> Therefore Christ, wanting to restrain this [pride], permitted him to deny him.<sup>103</sup> And the more Christ dissuaded him, the more Peter contradicted him. Whence then did this come to him? From much love. For since he had been set free from

<sup>93</sup> Note the textual variant: διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα.

<sup>94</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 425.6–9 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 82.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366) This passage can be found in PG 58.740.18–23.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Matthew 6.16 and Luke 24.17.

<sup>96</sup> Mark 14.28.

<sup>97</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ.

<sup>98</sup> Note the textual variant: ἔλεγε.

<sup>99</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐκ περισσοῦ ... μᾶλλον.

<sup>100</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 425.16–426.2 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 82.3–4 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.741.1–742.51.

<sup>101</sup> A reference to Jeremiah 10.21 quoted in Mark 14.27.

<sup>102</sup> *Lit.* “confident in himself.”

<sup>103</sup> *Lit.* “the denial.”



soul-searching about the betrayal (and it was clear who the betrayer was), he then spoke confidently.<sup>104</sup> And perhaps his behaviour [sprang] from love of honour. Notice then at least how he is affected after his fall. For before [the fall] he attributed everything to himself, but after these things, it was completely the opposite, “Why do you stare at us as though we had made him walk by our own power or holiness?”<sup>105</sup> And from this we learn a great lesson, that the desire of a human being is not enough, unless it has the benefit of influence from above. And again | we shall gain nothing from the influence from above, if there is no desire for it. ♦

(31) And all of them said the same.

As Peter, striving after honour, said that not even if death presented itself to him would he choose to escape the punishment of death by denying Christ, he also inspired the other disciples to use the same words.

(32) And they came to a place, which is called Gethsemane: and he said to his disciples, “Sit here, while I pray.” (33) And He took with him Peter and James and John. And he began to be distressed and sorely troubled.

♦ It<sup>106</sup> was his custom to pray apart from them: and he did this, teaching them and us, to ensure silence for one’s prayers.<sup>107</sup> And why does he not take all [the disciples], but only those who had been spectators of his glory?<sup>108</sup> In order that they might not fall away. Nevertheless, he leaves them too and goes on a little farther and prays. ♦

Nor<sup>109</sup> did they have the strength to share in his grief, but sleep took hold of [them]. And he prayed assiduously, in order that the action might not

---

<sup>104</sup> In other words, Peter thinks that he is in the clear. Judas has been identified as the betrayer. Therefore, Peter feels that he has the licence to protest.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Acts 3.12.

<sup>106</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 426.13–17 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 83.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.745-36–43.

<sup>107</sup> For a discussion of the significance of the hesychast tradition, see Kallistos Ware, ‘Silence in Prayer: The Meaning of *Hesychia*’ in B. Pennington (ed.), *One Yet Two Monastic Traditions East and West*, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), 22–47.

<sup>108</sup> I.e. at the Transfiguration.

<sup>109</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 426.17–20 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 83.1 (Smith,

appear to be an act [for show], for he was laying aside his own body and not that of someone else. ♦ And<sup>110</sup> this is why he prayed. For desiring to die is not exactly in accordance with [being] human. ♦ Therefore<sup>111</sup> by saying, “If it is possible, let it pass,”<sup>112</sup> he shows his humanity. But by saying, “Nevertheless, not as I want, but as you [will],”<sup>113</sup> he showed his valour and his virtue as a philosopher—that when nature weighs us down, it is necessary to follow God.<sup>114</sup> And if words were not enough, actions were also necessary in order that it might be believed that he became a man and died. And so he says to Peter, “*Do you not have the strength to watch with me for one hour?*”<sup>115</sup> All were asleep, and hinting at the things he had expressed in prayer, he rebuked Peter. And in the words which follow, he hints at this. For he says, “Watch and pray: in order that you may not enter into the time of trial.”<sup>116</sup> ♦ (Notice how he said rightly, “This is why I said to them, | ‘You will be scattered’”,<sup>117</sup> [427] in order that they might rise to [the need for] supplication and look to God). ♦ So<sup>118</sup> he eradicates their stubbornness in every way and makes them ready for action. Then in order that he might not appear to reprove them too much, he says, “*The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak.*”<sup>119</sup> For even if you have the will, he says, nothing will [happen] unless God stretches out his hand. For flesh drags you down. And in this way what was powerless through the weakness of the flesh received strength. And again he prayed

---

‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.745.59–61.

<sup>110</sup> These sentences (*Cat. Marc.* 426.20–22) are omitted by Chrysostom. We can assume that this is a later editorial insertion. Note the anti-docetic Christological emphasis in the preceding sentence.

<sup>111</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 426.22–31 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 83.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.746.32–52.

<sup>112</sup> Matthew 26.39.

<sup>113</sup> Matthew 26.39.

<sup>114</sup> These words are a direct challenge to Celsus and pagan critics (Origen, *Contra Celsum* 2.24) who viewed the crucifixion as “unheroic” and submissive. In this regard, Christ provided a poor exemplum of virtue. (For a more detailed discussion of these issues, see Loveday Alexander, ‘The Four among Pagans,’ in *The Written Gospel*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl and Donald Hagner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 227).

<sup>115</sup> This passage is a conflation of Mark 14.37 and Matthew 26.40.

<sup>116</sup> Matthew 26.41.

<sup>117</sup> This may be a reference to John 16.32 although the original context is unclear. There is nevertheless an allusion to Mark 14.27.

<sup>118</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 427.2–16 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 83.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.746.59–747.24.

<sup>119</sup> Mark 14.38.

the same, “*Not what I want, but what you will,*”<sup>120</sup> showing by this that he was in complete agreement with the will of God. And saying the same thing twice or three times in scripture is particularly indicative of truth. For just as Joseph said, “The fact that the dream appeared to you a second time is for the sake of truth, and it is also to convince you that this shall come to pass in its entirety,”<sup>121</sup> and for the sake of making the economy [of salvation] trustworthy. And why a second time? So that he might see them and put them to shame. However, he did not put them to shame, but he stood apart from them a little and he disclosed their unmentionable weakness, in that, having been rebuked, they were not able to endure. For as well as it being the middle of the night, “their eyes were heavy”<sup>122</sup> with faintheartedness. ♦ “*And he came the third time and said to them, sleep on then and take your rest*” and so on.<sup>123</sup> ♦ He<sup>124</sup> shows that it was not because of Judas but because of the economy [of salvation]. And not only this, but also by saying “*into the hands of sinners,*”<sup>125</sup> he raises their spirits. For the deed was the effect of their wickedness, and not of his being guilty of anything. And what follows likewise emphasises this—that he comes voluntarily to the situation: “*Rise, let us be going. See, the one who is betraying me is at hand.*”<sup>126</sup> And through all these things, he taught them that the situation was not from necessity, but from some sort of secret plan. For he knew beforehand that [Judas] was coming; and not only did he not flee, he even went to meet him. ♦

Alternatively,<sup>127</sup> it says, “How have you been grieved and sorely troubled, O Lord? Have you become also ‘*very sorrowful, even to death*’?”<sup>128</sup> By them<sup>129</sup>

<sup>120</sup> Mark 14.39.

<sup>121</sup> A paraphrase of Genesis 41.32.

<sup>122</sup> Matthew 26.43 appears to be the source at this point: cf. Mark 14.40 where βεβαρημένοι is a variant reading in some manuscripts.

<sup>123</sup> Mark 14.41.

<sup>124</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 427.19–27 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 83.1–2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.747.34–43. It is worth noting that Possinus attributes this section to Origen (Peter Possinus, *Catena Graecorum patrum in Evangelium secundum Marcum* (Rome: Typis Barberinis, 1673), 324).

<sup>125</sup> Mark 14.41.

<sup>126</sup> Mark 14.42.

<sup>127</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 427.28: Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud 33 reads ἄλλως rather than ἄλλος. *Cat. Marc.* 427.28–428.5 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam* (*in catenis*) (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in PG 72.920.15–25.

<sup>128</sup> Mark 14.34: cf. Matthew 26.38.

<sup>129</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 427.29: Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud 33 reads τοις rather than τοῦς.

throughout the whole earth, | you will raise the sign of victory<sup>130</sup> against [428] every opposing power: and you will be worshipped as God and as the creator of all that exists. Therefore at what have you been grieved?" "Yes," he says, "I understand the benefits which will come to the world as a consequence of the Passion, but Israel, the firstborn, grieves me, because it is not among my servants." ♦

(43) And immediately, while he was still speaking, Judas, one of the twelve, arrived, and with him there was a great crowd with swords and clubs, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders.

♦ [He adds]<sup>131</sup> "*One of the twelve*" and so on,<sup>132</sup> for the demonstration and accusation of the wickedness of the one who betrayed [him]. For the one who had been honoured as an equal to the apostles had become a pawn of the murderers of Christ. For he gave to them a sign, saying, "*the one whom I will kiss is the man*":<sup>133</sup> and he forgot completely the glory of Christ: and he perhaps expected, having been minded in some degree, that when he offered a kiss as a symbol of love, he would be able to escape notice. And he devised the greeting for the one who would be brought into the snare of death by him. ♦ And<sup>134</sup> the Lord did not turn away from the one who kissed him: but he showed him that he had come not in the manner of friendship, but out of ungodliness. ♦ And<sup>135</sup> [the Lord] gave himself up willingly. And they laid their hands upon him and overpowered him on the very night in which they ate Passover. Such was the extent of their rage and fury. But, all the same, they would not have had the strength, unless he had himself given way. Yet this does not deliver Judas from intolerable punishment, but condemns him even more, because, although he had received so great a proof of his power and of his virtuousness and of his gentleness, he became more dangerous than any wild beast. ♦

<sup>130</sup> I.e. the Cross.

<sup>131</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 428.10–16 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)* (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 367). This passage can be found in PG 72.925.36–38.

<sup>132</sup> Mark 14.43.

<sup>133</sup> Mark 14.44.

<sup>134</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 428.16–18 is an extract from Apollinaris (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 367). This passage can be found in *Catena in Lucam* 2.160.18–19.

<sup>135</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 428.19–25 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 83.2 (ibid.: 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.748.18–26.

(50) And leaving him, they all fled.

[429] The blessed disciples, spurred on by the love of God, drew their swords to repel the attack:<sup>136</sup> but Christ did not let this happen. Note that he does not | want us to make use of the sword, but instead to repudiate one's adversaries generally by using love<sup>137</sup> and prudence. ♦ And<sup>138</sup> in a manner befitting God, "he healed"<sup>139</sup> the one who endured the blow, as another Evangelist says, giving this godly sign to those who had come to seize him. ♦ And<sup>140</sup> he shows that no-one would prevail over him by force, even if they wanted to, saying, "day after day I was teaching in the temple, and you did not arrest [me]."<sup>141</sup> For I was rather controlling the necessity to suffer at the proper time (which is the present [time]) in order that the scriptures might be fulfilled. ♦ He shows that the arrest was not of their own making.<sup>142</sup> Why did they not arrest him in the temple? Because they were afraid of the crowd. This is why he also went out, and by means of the place and the time he gave them freedom from fear. And "leaving him,"<sup>143</sup> the disciples "fled."<sup>144</sup> For it was not possible for the truth to be false nor for the prophets to be mistaken.<sup>145</sup>

#### 47. On Peter's denial

(53) And they took Jesus up to the high-priest: and all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes gathered with him.<sup>146</sup> (54) And Peter

<sup>136</sup> Mark 14.47 and parallels: Matthew 26.51, Luke 22.50, and John 18.10.

<sup>137</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 429.1: replace ἐννοία with εὐνοία.

<sup>138</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 429.2–4 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)*. This passage can be found in PG 72.925.36–38.

<sup>139</sup> Luke 22.51.

<sup>140</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 429.4–8 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)*. This passage can be found in PG 72.925.43–47.

<sup>141</sup> Matthew 26.55; cf. Mark 14.49.

<sup>142</sup> *Lit.* "strength."

<sup>143</sup> Mark 14.50.

<sup>144</sup> Mark 14.50.

<sup>145</sup> Mark 14.49 Note that there is no reference to the "young man" described in Mark 14.51–52. The lacunae surrounding this passage (which appears to have been such a source of fascination to Morton Smith in Morton Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973)) do not appear to have exercised the mind of the catenist. For a discussion of the issues surrounding Morton Smith's "discovery," see Stephen C. Carlson, *The Gospel Hoax: Morton Smith's Invention of Secret Mark* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2005).

<sup>146</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀὐτῷ.

followed him at a distance, right into the courtyard of the High Priest: and he was sitting with the guards and he warmed himself by the fire.

♦ Peter's<sup>147</sup> fervour was considerable: seeing the others flee, he did not flee: but he stood his ground and went in [with the Lord]: and John also, since he was known.<sup>148</sup> And why did they lead him there, where they were all assembled? In order that they might do everything with the consent of the high priests. For that man was then high priest. Therefore all assembled, and it was a council of plagues: and they did not simply question him, but they wanted the appearance of a court of justice to conceal this treachery. For "none of their testimonies were the same," it says.<sup>149</sup> Thus it was a court of pretences and everything was full of confusion and disorder. And false witnesses came and said, "This | man said, 'I will destroy this temple made with human hands, and in three days I will build another not made with human hands'."<sup>150</sup> Through the addition of "made with human hands" they strengthened the vexatiousness of their prosecution: for he did not say "I will destroy," but "Destroy this temple": and he spoke not about ["the temple"], but about his own body. What therefore did the high priest say? He wanted to press him to a defence, in order that from it, he might trap him, and he said, "*Do you not have anything to say? Why therefore do these people bear witness against you? But he was silent.*"<sup>151</sup> For attempts at a defence would come to nothing,<sup>152</sup> since no one was listening. For it had only the appearance of a court of justice, ♦ which Luke's account also demonstrated, when they said, "Are you the Christ? Tell us." He replied, "If I tell you, you will not believe: and if I question you, you will not answer."<sup>153</sup> And again the high priest asked him if he was "the Anointed."<sup>154</sup> And since priests, prophets and kings were called "the Anointed," he adds specifically, "*the Son of the Blessed,*"<sup>155</sup> in order that he might indicate "[the Anointed] of God."

[430]

---

<sup>147</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 429.22–430.9 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaum* 84.2 (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.754.3–36.

<sup>148</sup> Cf. John 18.15.

<sup>149</sup> A paraphrase of Mark 14.59.

<sup>150</sup> Matthew 26.61.

<sup>151</sup> Mark 14.60–61.

<sup>152</sup> *Lit.* "were unprofitable."

<sup>153</sup> Luke 22.67–68.

<sup>154</sup> Alternatively, "the Christ."

<sup>155</sup> Mark 14.61.

The reply, “*I am*,”<sup>156</sup> was to refute him<sup>157</sup> since he was not able to believe. For he also says according to Luke, “but you will not believe.”<sup>158</sup> But [he says this] in order that even this might not be left behind, because they did not hear him plainly when he revealed that he was the Anointed. And Mark says this openly,<sup>159</sup> ♦ but<sup>160</sup> this is after he had indicated that the matter had not escaped their notice completely, given their recognition of signs: for why else would they be asking him whether he was “the Anointed” (which they had not asked about others)? And he brings to bear also the matter of judgement, threatening that they will see him appearing in heavenly glory. ♦ And “*at the right hand of Power*”<sup>161</sup> means the glory which will appear from heaven without bodily form. For the God who is totally invisible cannot be seen, so the seat at his right hand is also described as being seen in bodily form: but anyone who will be seen in the greatest visible glory, he said, will be seen “*at the right hand*”.<sup>162</sup> in as much as this visible glory is the closest approximation and most reverential way of describing that invisible glory.<sup>163</sup> ♦ But<sup>164</sup> all the same, hearing [this], they did not take heed, but they said that his speech was blasphemy, and witnesses were [431] to be sought no longer. Thus the revelations of the mysteries | are not for the benefit of those who will not listen, but for their condemnation. ♦ Therefore<sup>165</sup> when Christ said, “I am,”<sup>166</sup> and that he would be seated at the right hand of the Father, and that he would come again to judge the world (which was a demonstration of the great accord between himself and the Father), “the high priest tore his clothes”<sup>167</sup> and said, “You have heard what

<sup>156</sup> Mark 14.62.

<sup>157</sup> The point being made by the commentator is that the words of Christ were more by way of reproach, than by a desire to convince the High Priest of his identity.

<sup>158</sup> Luke 22.67.

<sup>159</sup> Note again the close study of Synoptic parallels. In Matthew and Luke, Jesus’ response is qualified. In Mark, the response is plain and direct: “I am.”

<sup>160</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 430.19–23 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)*, which can be found in *Cat. Luc.* 162.33–163.2.

<sup>161</sup> Mark 14.62.

<sup>162</sup> Mark 14.62.

<sup>163</sup> In other words, God does not have a right or left hand, but “the right hand” is an indication of the highest possible honour.

<sup>164</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 430.29–431.1 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)*. This passage can be found in *Cat. Luc.* 163.2–5.

<sup>165</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 431.1–16 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 84.3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.755.2–23.

<sup>166</sup> A paraphrase of Mark 14.62 (*lit.* “that it was He”).

<sup>167</sup> Matthew 26.65; cf. Mark 14.63.

has been said: what do you think?"<sup>168</sup> He does not take responsibility for the judgement himself, as in the case of acknowledged transgressions and evident blasphemy, but he asks the others and he anticipates his hearers saying, "You have heard the blasphemy,"<sup>169</sup> all but necessitating and securing a bad outcome, and he rather forced those who were present to deliver a verdict against him for uttering blasphemy and making himself God: and he said, "You have heard the blasphemy. What do you think?"<sup>170</sup> So what did they say? They judged him to be guilty of death: acting themselves as prosecution, judge and everything. Just by the tearing of a little tunic,<sup>171</sup> [the high priest] draws them all on. For it was the custom for them to do this, at the time when they supposed that they heard some blasphemy.

◆

(65) And some began to spit on him, and to blindfold him,<sup>172</sup> and to strike him, and to say to him, "Prophecy!" And the guards struck<sup>173</sup> him with blows.

◆ The<sup>174</sup> Lord of heaven and earth, who is the origin and creator of all things, suffers dishonour from us as one of us, and being beaten he endures to the end, and he endures the laughter of the ungodly, offering himself to us as an extreme example of patient endurance. And those who beat him said, "Prophecy!"<sup>175</sup> But the one who examines the affections and motives,<sup>176</sup> the giver of all prophecy, how would he not know who was the one who struck him?<sup>177</sup> ◆

<sup>168</sup> A paraphrase of Matthew 26.65–66.

<sup>169</sup> Mark 14.64.

<sup>170</sup> Mark 14.64: note that the Matthaean *δοκεῖ* has appeared in place of *φαίνεται*. According to NA<sup>27</sup>, this is attested in some manuscripts of Mark.

<sup>171</sup> Note the diminutive form: τὸν χιτωνίσκον.

<sup>172</sup> Note the textual variant: τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ.

<sup>173</sup> Note the textual variant: ἔβαλλον.

<sup>174</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 431.21–26 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam* (*in catenis*) (Smith, 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' 367). This passage can be found in PG 72.929.4–12.

<sup>175</sup> Mark 14.65.

<sup>176</sup> *Lit.* "the hearts and reins": this reference to "hearts and kidneys" is common in the Old Testament (cf. Psalm 7.9, 16.7, 26.2, 73.21, 139.13; Jeremiah 11.20, 12.2, 17.10, 20.12; Lamentations 3.13) In Hebrew tradition, the kidneys are frequently associated with the most inner stirrings of emotional life.

<sup>177</sup> This is a reference to the fact that Christ has been blindfolded. The commentator suggests that such an action is redundant—attempts at concealment are pointless.



(66) And while Peter was below in the courtyard, one of the servant-girls of the high priest came.

◆ As<sup>178</sup> predicted, blessed Peter was weak and he denied the Lord, the Saviour of the Universe, not once, but three times, and he reinforced the denial with an oath on account of the words spoken by the servant-girl, ◆  
 [432] and in the confusion of the | moment he did not remember the saying of the Lord: “Whoever denies me before human beings, I will deny him before my Father.”<sup>179</sup> For behold, he denied him before everyone, and perhaps it was either before the servant-girl herself, as Mark says, or, as Matthew says, “another woman”<sup>180</sup> who pointed out that he was one of the disciples, for this was not made precise in the memory of those who have written, since it was not essential for the faith which brings salvation: while Luke has it that it was not a servant-girl, but a man who insisted that [Peter] was a follower of Jesus.<sup>181</sup> Indeed, although such things are not terribly important, there is agreement on the matter at issue—that for the second time Peter denied with an oath that he even knew the man. And again since others had come to the same conclusion, he denied it more emphatically on oath. And when in a little while the fear had passed, his reasoning powers revived and recovered the memory which he had lost in the confusion of the moment, and he found that, incredibly, his disgrace had come to pass, as the Lord had said: and at the signal of the cock, ◆ recognising<sup>182</sup> whom he had denied, “he went outside,” it says, “and wept bitterly”<sup>183</sup> when Christ looked at him.<sup>184</sup> therefore, having repented, he has not totally failed in his aim for he has remained what he always was: a genuine disciple. For he remains rich in the hope of forgiveness. ◆ We say that it is only if we learn about the mistakes of the saints through the scriptures that we can become imitators of their repentance.<sup>185</sup> For the compassionate God intended repentance as a remedy

---

<sup>178</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 431.29–31 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)* (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in PG 72.928.27–30.

<sup>179</sup> Matthew 10.33.

<sup>180</sup> Matthew 26.71.

<sup>181</sup> Luke 22.58.

<sup>182</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 432.16–31 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)* (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). *Cat. Marc.* 432.16–19 can be found in PG 72.928.52–57.

<sup>183</sup> Luke 22.62: cf. Matthew 26.75 and Mark 14.72.

<sup>184</sup> Luke 22.61: note that the reference to Christ looking at Peter is not found in Matthew and Mark.

<sup>185</sup> The catenist does not read Mark’s portrayal of Peter in a negative light. Rather he

for salvation, which those who say that they are pure try to do away with, failing to recall that having such a tendency in themselves, [they are] full of every [kind of] filth. For no one is clean from filth, just as it is written.<sup>186</sup> And let them not fail to recognise this too: that before Christ was seized and Peter denied him, he was a partaker of the body of Christ and his most precious blood, and in this state, he stumbled and received forgiveness by virtue of his repentance. Therefore, let them not speak against the mercy of God, mindful of what he said explicitly in scripture, “The wickedness of the wicked will not cause permanent injury, on the day they turn back from their wickedness.”<sup>187</sup> ♦ And<sup>188</sup> | the Evangelist says that when he denied him once, the cock crowed,<sup>189</sup> and when he denied him three times, then [the cock crowed] a second time,<sup>190</sup> for he relates in detail the weakness of the disciple, and that he was completely destroyed by fear. And he learnt these [433]

---

emphasises the way in which the mistakes of the apostles bring encouragement to the faith: repentance and not perfection is the mark of a genuine disciple. The portrayal of the disciples in Mark’s gospel has exercised the minds of contemporary scholars. Theodore Weeden argued that Mark’s depiction of the disciples was overwhelmingly negative, and suggested that their portrayal was the consequence of a Christological dispute raging within the Marcan community (a view has been challenged by C. Clifton Black, among others, who have questioned the capacity of redaction critics to evaluate Mark’s reason for writing). The position adopted by the catenist is closer to that of Elizabeth Malbon, who adopts a more nuanced view of the description of the disciples. Malbon describes the disciples as “fallible followers.” Mark deliberately portrays the disciples as flawed, but not complete failures. They get things wrong and they make mistakes. She suggests that such a description would bring encouragement to Mark’s readers, because they would be able to identify with the disciples precisely because they themselves were less than perfect. (For further details about these debates, see Ernest Best, *Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), C. Clifton Black, *The Disciples according to Mark: Marcan Redaction in Current Debate* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, *In the Company of Jesus: Characters in Mark’s Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), Robert C. Tannehill, ‘The Disciples in Mark: the Function of a Narrative Role,’ *Journal of Religion* 57 (1977), Theodore Weeden, ‘The Heresy that necessitated Mark’s Gospel,’ *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 59 (1968)).

<sup>186</sup> The commentator is possibly alluding to Job 14.4 at this point: “Who can bring a clean thing out of filth? There is no-one.”

<sup>187</sup> A paraphrase of Ezekiel 18.20–21.

<sup>188</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 432.31–433.12 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 85.1–2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in PG 58.758.51–759.11.

<sup>189</sup> Mark 14.68: ὁ δὲ ἠρνῆσατο λέγων: οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι σὺ τί λέγεις. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. The final clause is often omitted from English translations. However, the insertion of this clause causes the commentator a problem. If Peter recalls the cock-crowing the first time round, why did he not remember the words of Jesus as well?

<sup>190</sup> Cf. Mark 14.72.

things from his teacher for he was a pupil of Peter. And these things are agreed by Matthew and Mark, even if they appear to be contradictory. For even though the cock is accustomed to crow even a third and a fourth time on each occasion, Mark shows that the sound did not keep him in check and it did not prompt his memory.<sup>191</sup> So both are true: for before the cock had finished a single sequence, he had denied him a third time: and when he was reminded of his sin by the Lord, he did not dare to weep openly.<sup>192</sup> ♦

And another source<sup>193</sup> says that although Matthew said it was before the cock crowed once (without limit), Mark added what was omitted, saying (as common sense<sup>194</sup> suggests) that the cock-crow is the most dominant sound, just as it make the new<sup>195</sup> day evident to everyone. Therefore, he<sup>196</sup> says that the Evangelist<sup>197</sup> interpreted “before the cock crowed”<sup>198</sup> as meaning “before<sup>199</sup> the second time,” when it was evident to all, and he does not contradict the others. ♦

---

<sup>191</sup> *Lit.* “lead him to remembrance.”

<sup>192</sup> In other words, he “goes outside” (Matthew 26.75 and Luke 22.62).

<sup>193</sup> This source is anonymous.

<sup>194</sup> *Lit.* “as determined according to common usage.”

<sup>195</sup> *Lit.* “clear.”

<sup>196</sup> I.e. Mark.

<sup>197</sup> I.e. Matthew.

<sup>198</sup> Matthew 26.34: Matthew does not refer to the cock crowing twice (unlike Mark). The commentator is attempting to resolve the discrepancy between the two accounts.

<sup>199</sup> Correction to *Cat. Marc.* 433.17: replace ποίαν with πρίν.

## CHAPTER 15

(1) And as soon<sup>1</sup> as it was<sup>2</sup> morning, the high priests called a meeting with the elders and the scribes, and the whole council. And binding Jesus, they led him away and handed him over to Pilate.<sup>3</sup>

◆ They<sup>4</sup> led Jesus to Pilate: and they themselves were handed over to the military power of the Romans,<sup>5</sup> and the things about them, which were announced beforehand by the holy prophets, were fulfilled. For one says, “Woe to the wicked! For the evil inflicted by their own hands will happen to them”:<sup>6</sup> and another, “As you have done, so it shall be done to you, your just deserts will fall | on your own head.”<sup>7</sup> ◆ And Pilate asked, “*Are you the King of the Jews?*”<sup>8</sup> Jesus answered him, “You say [that I am].”<sup>9</sup> Since, according to Luke, they had begun to accuse him saying, “We found this man perverting our nation” and so on,<sup>10</sup> when asked by Pilate, Jesus said, “You say [that I am]” lest he should either, through his silence, confirm their accusation or, through denial, acquire a reputation for cowardice. [434]

The high priests of the Jews led Jesus to Pilate with the elders and scribes, as a rebel who said that he was King of the Jews. And when Pilate asked him if he was the King of the Jews, in order that he might neither, through silence, confirm their vexatious accusation, nor, through denial, acquire a reputation for cowardice, he replied, “You say [that I am].” And he was accused by the chief priests, for according to Luke, they said many things: “We found this man perverting our nation and forbidding us to pay taxes

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the textual variant: εὐθέως.

<sup>2</sup> Note the textual variant: ἐπὶ τὸ πρωί.

<sup>3</sup> Note the textual variant: τῷ Πιλάτῳ.

<sup>4</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 433.23–434.1 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)* (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 368). This passage can be found in PG 72.932.35–41.

<sup>5</sup> The commentator sees in these events an intimation of the fate that awaited the people during the First Jewish Revolt.

<sup>6</sup> Isaiah 3.11: *Lit.* “Woe to the lawless man! For the evil works from his own hands will happen to him.”

<sup>7</sup> Obadiah 1.15: *Lit.* “the recompense will be paid back to you on your head.”

<sup>8</sup> Mark 15.2: cf. Matthew 27.11 and Luke 23.3.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Mark 15.2 and parallels.

<sup>10</sup> Luke 23.2.

to Caesar and saying that he himself is Christ, a king.”<sup>11</sup> “*And Pilate was amazed*”<sup>12</sup> how it could be that this most eloquent teacher, someone who was able (if he would defend himself) to be acquitted as “not guilty,” does not defend himself, but willingly undergoes suffering, despising his accusers as befits a devout nature. This is why he also said to him, “*Do you have nothing to say? Do you see how much they bear witness against you?*”<sup>13</sup> He was inviting him to make a defence, so that he might release him as “not guilty”: ♦ except<sup>14</sup> the Jews were shown up as being more ungodly than an idolatrous man.<sup>15</sup> For on the one hand, Pilate absolved him from every charge, not once, but three times, and, on the other, he reminded them twice<sup>16</sup> that they had the authority to make a request on the feast (according to custom), encouraging them to do this. And they were insistent, saying “*Crucify him!*”<sup>17</sup> and they made a pretext out of the accusations, and they shouted with the entire crowd saying, “*Take him away! Release Barabbas for us!*”<sup>18</sup> This man had been thrown “into prison for murder and sedition”;<sup>19</sup> “*And they denied one who was holy and righteous, and they asked for a murderer to be given to them,*”<sup>20</sup> in order that they might become partners in his faction.<sup>21</sup> ♦ |

[435]

(6) Now at the festival he used to release one prisoner for them, anyone for whom they asked.<sup>22</sup>

♦ For<sup>23</sup> the unholy Jews, there was one aim—to lead down into death the one who raises up into life: only they accused him and they were shown

<sup>11</sup> Luke 23.2.

<sup>12</sup> Mark 15.5.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Mark 15.4; note the paraphrase of the second question.

<sup>14</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 434.22–32 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)* (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 368). This passage can be found in PG 72.933.6–26.

<sup>15</sup> I.e. Pilate.

<sup>16</sup> Note the reference to πάλιν in Mark 15.12.

<sup>17</sup> Mark 15.13.

<sup>18</sup> Luke 23.18.

<sup>19</sup> Luke 23.25.

<sup>20</sup> A paraphrase of Acts 3.14.

<sup>21</sup> I.e. Barabbas. Again, the events unfolding within the Passion narrative are being linked with the events at the heart of the first Jewish Revolt. The protagonists in this tale are described as associates of Barabbas, but note that the commentator places emphasis on the fact that Barabbas had been charged with ‘sedition.’ This was precisely the charge laid at the feet of the leaders of the first Jewish revolt.

<sup>22</sup> Note the textual variant: ὄντερ ἤτοῦντο.

<sup>23</sup> According to Harold Smith, *Cat. Marc.* 435.3–16 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)* (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary

up as more ungodly than an idolatrous man.<sup>24</sup> For Pilate absolved Jesus from every charge, not once, but three times. But they were insistent, saying “*Crucify him!*,”<sup>25</sup> using the accusations as an excuse. And Pilate rebuked those who said these things, saying “*What evil has he done?*”<sup>26</sup> And though the one who was assigned to judge him was striving to free him, they were beseeching him to place the “guide” and “teacher”<sup>27</sup> of all godliness under a penalty of death: and in order that they might endure a more onerous punishment themselves, they shouted with the entire crowd, saying, “Take him away. Release Barabbas for us!”<sup>28</sup> “And they denied one who was holy and righteous,” just as holy Peter says, “and they asked for a murderer to be given to them,”<sup>29</sup> in order that they might become partners in his faction.<sup>30</sup>

◆ Therefore Pilate decided that their request should come to pass, and they have won a victory, which was the mother of destruction, and the Saviour, because he held the whole court to be corrupt, made no reply, but was silent. ◆ Why<sup>31</sup> did Pilate, having scourged him, hand him over to be crucified? Either because he was condemned, or because he wanted to put a smoke-screen around the trial, or because he wanted to show them a favour. ◆

(22) Then they brought Jesus to a place called Golgotha (which means<sup>32</sup> the place of the skull). (23) And they offered him wine mixed with myrrh to drink:<sup>33</sup> but he did not take it.

◆ As<sup>34</sup> if by some signal to the whole company, the devil then took over the stage-directions.<sup>35</sup> For even the soldiers took pleasure in their insults against

---

on Mark,’ 368). This passage can be found in PG 72.933.4–46. Note that this passage repeats *Cat. Marc.* 434.22–32.

<sup>24</sup> I.e. Pilate.

<sup>25</sup> Mark 15.13.

<sup>26</sup> Mark 15.14: cf. Matthew 27.23 and Luke 23.22.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Matthew 23.8–10.

<sup>28</sup> Luke 23.15.

<sup>29</sup> Acts 3.14.

<sup>30</sup> Cyril makes a direct link between the Passion narrative and the subsequent destruction of Jerusalem.

<sup>31</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 435.19–21 is an extract from Theodore of Heraclea, *Fragmenta in Matthaem* Fr. 130.1–2 (inexact) (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 93.

<sup>32</sup> Note the textual variant: μεθερμηνεθόμενος.

<sup>33</sup> Note the textual variant: πιεῖν.

<sup>34</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 435.25–436.3 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 87.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.769.23–39.

<sup>35</sup> The meaning of ἐχόρευσε is difficult to render literally. Although it refers to dancing, it

him (either they were seeking to please the Jews, or they did everything in accordance with their own evil disposition). And their insults were many and varied. For first they beat that divine head, and then they maltreated him with a crown of thorns, and then they struck him with a reed: and they mocked him further by clothing him in a purple robe, and falling to their [436] knees, they worshipped him, and people who were polluted | and unclean spat upon him.<sup>36</sup> Therefore what right will we have to talk when we suffer insults? For what happened to him was worse than any insult.<sup>37</sup> ♦ As one might expect, the disciples are not present, in case, by these very things, they may be made to stumble: ♦ for<sup>38</sup> the things which have come to pass go beyond all rational explanation. For after they had mocked [him], they led him to be crucified, ♦ and,<sup>39</sup> it says, they laid his cross on Simon of Cyrene.<sup>40</sup> And another of the Evangelists also said that Jesus carried the beam himself. And both [accounts]<sup>41</sup> are completely true. For the Saviour carried the cross, but perhaps they encountered the Cyrenean halfway down the road and seized him, and they transferred the beam to him. ♦ And this is why Matthew says: “As they went out, they found a man from Cyrene, called Simon, and they compelled this man to carry his cross.”<sup>42</sup> as Jesus had carried it from the city to this point. And Mark says, “*They led him out in order that they might crucify him, and they compelled someone passing by (Simon of Cyrene, who came from the country and was the father of Alexander and Rufus) to carry the cross*.”<sup>43</sup> for he adds for the sake of a more complete record that he was also the father of certain people, perhaps because some were disputing whether he carried [the cross], or because he was still around and able to describe the events surrounding the Cross of Jesus. But he has probably added this to confirm what has been said by the Evangelists, and not to contradict it.<sup>44</sup>

---

also encompasses the arrangement of the choreography of a dance: hence, the metaphor of “stage direction.”

<sup>36</sup> A loose paraphrase of Mark 15.17–20.

<sup>37</sup> *Lit.* “For what happened was the furthest limit of an insult.”

<sup>38</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 436.4–5 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 87.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.769.47–48.

<sup>39</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 436.5–10 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)* (ibid.: 367). This passage can be found in PG 72.935.53–936.3.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Mark 15.20–21.

<sup>41</sup> *Lit.* “this and that.”

<sup>42</sup> Matthew 27.32.

<sup>43</sup> Mark 15.21.

<sup>44</sup> The clear inference of this passage is that Mark is later, and is aware of what the other Evangelists have said.

After having mocked [him], they lead him to be crucified, and they compel someone passing by, Simon of Cyrene, to carry the cross: ♦ and so<sup>45</sup> they even regarded the beam [of the cross] itself as accursed, and they would not even put out a hand to touch it. ♦ But<sup>46</sup> one of the other Evangelists says that Jesus himself also carried the beam. And [both accounts] are true: for first the Saviour carried the cross, and perhaps when the Cyrenean encountered [them] halfway along the road, they detained him and they transferred the beam to him, and it is manifest that the Lord carried [the cross] from within the city. ♦ This is why Matthew says: “As they went out, they found a man from Cyrene” and so on.<sup>47</sup> And for the sake of a more complete | record, [437] he<sup>48</sup> says that Simon was the father of certain people: perhaps because some were in dispute about who carried the cross, or because he was still around and able to describe the events surrounding the cross of Jesus.<sup>49</sup>

(24) When they crucified him,<sup>50</sup> they divided<sup>51</sup> his clothes, casting lots to decide what each should take.

♦ Consider<sup>52</sup> how the Creator and Lord of all restores the nature of humanity to what it was in the beginning, which is why he offers [himself] to

<sup>45</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 436.24–25 is attributed to John Chrysostom in *Cat. Ioh.* 391.13–14.

<sup>46</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 436.25–29 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)* (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 72.935.53–936.3. (Note that *Cat. Marc.* 436.25–29 repeats 436.5–10).

<sup>47</sup> Matthew 27.32.

<sup>48</sup> Note that *Cat. Marc.* 437.1–3 repeats *Cat. Marc.* 436.18–20.

<sup>49</sup> The inclusion of these obscure figures is the subject of considerable debate in recent scholarship. While both Matthew and Luke mention Simon of Cyrene, only Mark mentions Alexander and Rufus, his sons. Martin Dibelius (Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co Ltd, 1971)) ‘originally’ suggested that Simon of Cyrene was named by Mark as an eyewitness, although this view has not gained common currency. More recently, Richard Bauckham has argued that the names mentioned in the gospels suggest that the Evangelists took seriously the testimony of eyewitnesses. The fact that the immediate circle of Jesus’ disciples are absent from Mark 15.21 onwards means that Mark has to rely on the testimony of others. Thus, Simon’s sons were ‘well-known figures, telling their father’s story of the crucifixion of Jesus.’ (Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: the Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*, 52). It is clear from the words of the catenist that these words were the subject of dispute among ancient commentators. He presents two arguments: first, in the light of the discrepancies between the gospels, he suggests that there may have been some dispute over the identity of the person who carried the cross; secondly, he suggests that the Evangelist may well have been alluding to the testimony of eyewitnesses.

<sup>50</sup> Note the textual variant: *καὶ σταυρώσαντες αὐτόν*.

<sup>51</sup> Note the textual variant: *διεμέριζον*.

<sup>52</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 437.6–12 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Matthaeum* Fr. 308.1–7 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 263.



become like us, and submits to our sufferings for our sake. For when the precious cross was erected, two bandits were hung together with him. And, admittedly, it was intended as an insult by the Jews, except that it recalled the prophecy which says, “and he was counted among the lawless.”<sup>53</sup> But through his sufferings, blessings come quickly to us. For he himself has paid off our debts in full on our behalf: he took our sins himself, and “he suffers pain for our sake.”<sup>54</sup> ♦ And one should note that the one<sup>55</sup> who says that vinegar with gall was offered to Jesus was not misleading, nor does he contradict the one<sup>56</sup> who said that he was offered wine drugged with myrrh, nor the one who only mentions vinegar.<sup>57</sup> For one says that he was offered it before the cross,<sup>58</sup> but the other that he was offered it on the cross,<sup>59</sup> and “taking it”<sup>60</sup> and “rejecting what was tasted”<sup>61</sup> and “not even beginning to taste it”<sup>62</sup> are not the same thing. For Matthew said that what was tasted was wine with gall, which he did not want to drink, and Mark said that he would not even begin to taste the wine mixed with myrrh. And John said that it was vinegar and gall with hyssop,<sup>63</sup> contradicting none of the things left unmentioned. For many things happened to him, and it is possible amid so much confusion when the multitude abused him, that one added this, while another added that, and while yet another added something else. And many things also are omitted: and everything which has been said is true, and comes from witnesses who knew him, and they did not write without clear

---

<sup>53</sup> Some sources add this reference to Isaiah 53.12 at Mark 15.28.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Isaiah 53.4.

<sup>55</sup> Matthew 27.34.

<sup>56</sup> Mark 15.23.

<sup>57</sup> Luke 23.36 (note that this passage is not the immediate parallel to Matthew 27.34 and Mark 15.23).

<sup>58</sup> I.e. Matthew and Mark.

<sup>59</sup> I.e. Luke.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. John 19.29.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Matthew 27.34.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Mark 15.23.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. John 19.29; but note that *μετα ὑσσώπου* is a textual variant. This variant probably arose to address some of the confusion surrounding John’s reference to hyssop at this point. As Raymond Brown notes: “Mark/Matthew speak of a reed, presumably a long, strong stalk. What does John mean by ‘hyssop’? Usually biblical hyssop ... is a small bushy plant that can grow out of cracks in walls, a plant that I Kings iv 33 classifies as the humblest of shrubs ... While the Palestinian variety of hyssop has a relatively large stem, the branches are suitable for sprinkling ... but scarcely for bearing the weight of a wet sponge” (Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John XIII–XXI, The Anchor Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 1970), 909). Brown argues that the mention of hyssop was a piece of theological symbolism, referring to the use of hyssop for sprinkling the blood of the paschal lamb on the doorposts of Israelite homes (Exodus 12.22). The idea that a sponge was placed on the end of a branch would have caused earlier commentators similar difficulties—hence the textual variant.

direction,<sup>64</sup> nor did they write down the incidents just as they happened, and they did not direct their comments at just anyone, but at those who would refute them, if by chance they should dare to write something contrary to the facts. ♦ But<sup>65</sup> neither does the one<sup>66</sup> who says that “when he tasted it, he said, ‘It is finished,’” show that he drank it. For he does not distinguish “simply tasting” from “not drinking,” but he shows one and the same thing. Therefore when those who asked Pilate to remove the accusation (which was the inscription, “The King of the Jews”) did not prevail (for he stood | [438] his ground saying, “What I have written, I have written,” as one of the other Evangelists<sup>67</sup> says), they were attempting by their derision to show that he was not a King. ♦ This [Evangelist]<sup>68</sup> says that Jesus was crucified at the third hour, but Matthew<sup>69</sup> says that darkness fell at the sixth hour: and it is probable that he was crucified from the third hour, while darkness fell from the sixth hour. And the other signs ♦ were<sup>70</sup> sufficient of themselves to convert them, not only by their miraculous magnitude, but also by virtue of the fact that they took place at precisely the right time (for these things came to pass after all of their abuse,<sup>71</sup> when they let go of their anger, ♦ and they ceased from saying and doing all these things). And some say that [Mark],<sup>72</sup> mentioning the rejection of the people, said that Jesus was crucified at that hour by the people: for it was the third hour when the people of the Jews condemned him to be crucified: but the others<sup>73</sup> mentioned [that it was] the sixth [hour], in which having received the judgement from Pilate, he was crucified by the soldiers (with which the rest of the Evangelists are in agreement).<sup>74</sup>

<sup>64</sup> *Lit.* “at random.”

<sup>65</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 437.29–438.3 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 87.1–2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.770.54–771.23.

<sup>66</sup> John 19.30.

<sup>67</sup> John 19.22.

<sup>68</sup> Mark 15.25; a search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* reveals that *Cat. Marc.* 438.3–6 are cited as ‘Anonymous’ in *Cat. Matt.* 236.30–35.

<sup>69</sup> Matthew 27.45; cf. Mark 15.43.

<sup>70</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 438.6–9 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 88.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.775.36–40.

<sup>71</sup> *Lit.* “drunken carousing.”

<sup>72</sup> *Lit.* “this man”: Mark 15.25.

<sup>73</sup> John 19.14: cf. Matthew 27.45 and Luke 23.44.

<sup>74</sup> The discrepancies between Mark and John in terms of the chronology of the Passion are clearly an issue for this commentator. Brown notes a number of attempts to reconcile these discrepancies, including: 1) arguing that John’s sixth hour should be counted from midnight rather than from dawn and so equals 6am; 2) dismissing John’s sixth hour as a

(29) And those who passed by derided him, shaking their heads and saying, “Aha! You would destroy the temple and build it in three days.”<sup>75</sup>

♦ And<sup>76</sup> seeing him impaled on the cross, even those who passed by reproached him: and what was most grievous of all was to suffer the same things at the hands of a rogue and a vagabond.<sup>77</sup> ♦ This<sup>78</sup> is why they said, “Let the Christ, the King of Israel, come down from the cross,”<sup>79</sup> and again, “He saved others, but he cannot save himself.”<sup>80</sup> ♦ And<sup>81</sup> indeed someone might well say to them, “If he saved others, and you suppose that this really took place, how is it that he does not have the strength to remove himself from your hands?” ♦ Hence<sup>82</sup> they even attempt to disparage the earlier signs. Surely then neither the prophets were prophets, nor the righteous [truly] righteous, since God did not snatch them away from dangers. ♦ And<sup>83</sup> Luke sets out a more detailed [account] about the bandits. Matthew and Mark

---

theological statement; 3) making Mark's third hour equivalent to the sixth hour (amending Mark 15.25); 4) arguing that Mark's third hour describes the moment when Pilate decided to crucify Jesus, while John's sixth hour describes the moment of execution (although Brown notes that “actually Pilate's presence and action were concluded by Mark ten verses before he mentioned the third hour” (Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave*, vol. 2 (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994), 959)); 5) arguing that Mark's “third” hour is a mistaken reading for the “sixth”; and 6) arguing that references to “the hour” are eschatological rather than chronological. Brown concludes that none of these explanations are convincing: “Both indications may be theological; one may be chronological and the other theological or liturgical; but both cannot be chronologically exact” (Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave*, 959) The attempt by the catenist to reconcile the discrepancies is also less than convincing.

<sup>75</sup> Note the textual variant: καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις οἰκοδομῶν.

<sup>76</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 438.19–21 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 87.2. This passage can be found in PG 58.771.1–3.

<sup>77</sup> I.e. the two thieves (Luke 23.39–43).

<sup>78</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 438.21–23 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 87.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.771.23–26.

<sup>79</sup> Mark 15.32.

<sup>80</sup> Mark 15.31.

<sup>81</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 438.24–26 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Lucam* (*in catenis*) (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,’ 367). This passage can be found in PG 72.937.15–18.

<sup>82</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 438.26–28 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 87.2 (*ibid.*: 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.771.26–31.

<sup>83</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 438.28–32 is an extract from Origen, *Commentariorum series in evangelium Matthaei* 133 (E. Klostermann, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 11 [Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 38.2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1933]: 270.20–28). Harold Smith attributes this passage to Gregory of Nyssa on the basis of a mistaken attribution of Possinus (*ibid.*: 368).

pass over this and say that those who were crucified with him reproached him. But Luke says that while the [first] derided [him], the [second] rebuked him, and to the [second] was rightly promised a great honour. ♦ And the two were unable to deride him at first, not knowing for what he had been condemned:<sup>84</sup> but when they learnt, one refused to deride | him, while the other, when he learnt the reason, did not abstain [from deriding him] and he was in the grip of incorrigible evil. [439]

(33) When it was the sixth hour, darkness came over the whole earth, until the ninth hour: (34) and at the ninth hour<sup>85</sup> Jesus cried out with a loud voice, saying,<sup>86</sup> “Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani?” which means, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?”<sup>87</sup>

♦ Then<sup>88</sup> when noon came, the very thing, which they had demanded from Jesus, came to pass: a sign from heaven. And this is why he promised to give [them a sign], when he said, “An evil and adulterous generation seeks after a sign, and it will be given no sign except the sign of Jonah”<sup>89</sup> and “when you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will know that I am he.”<sup>90</sup> And so it was much more remarkable that this should come to pass when he was nailed to the cross rather than when he walked on the earth, and that this

---

<sup>84</sup> This reflects a close reading of the gospel. The commentator is attempting to explain why the taunts of the thieves follow the taunts of the crowds. Luke refers to the inscription ‘The King of the Jews,’ which the criminals cannot see. It is only when the bystanders taunt him (Luke 23.35–38) that the thieves begin to taunt Jesus.

<sup>85</sup> Note the textual variant: τῆ ὥρᾳ τῆ ἐννάτῃ.

<sup>86</sup> Note the textual variant: λέγων.

<sup>87</sup> Note the textual variant: εἰς τί με ἐγκατέλιπες.

<sup>88</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 439.8–16 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 88.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.775.2–34.

<sup>89</sup> Matthew 12.39. As Yvonne Sherwood points out, the “sign of Jonah” is associated directly with the cross and resurrection in the minds of many patristic commentators: “Though interpretation splays out in multiple directions, the lines intersect at the (compulsively repeated) point of the cross: X marks the spot ... (I)n Jonah, the resourceful cross and tomb replicate themselves throughout the text, hook themselves onto any loophole, insert themselves audaciously into every gap and every word. Christ’s death and resurrection are inscribed in Jonah’s sleep and waking, in his self-sacrifice and descent overboard, and even, in one interpretation, in the lines of his psalm” (Yvonne Sherwood, *A Biblical Text and its Afterlives: The Survival of Jonah in Western Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge, 2000), 16–17). She notes also the fact that Jonah features “as the ultimate icon of death’s defeat” on early Christian sarcophagi (Sherwood, *A Biblical Text and its Afterlives: The Survival of Jonah in Western Culture*, 18).

<sup>90</sup> John 8.28.

was something which had never happened before (except in Egypt when the Passover was accomplished, for indeed these events were a pattern<sup>91</sup> of those).<sup>92</sup> ♦ And in order that they might not say that what took place was an eclipse, they say that it took place on the fourteenth [day of the month], when an eclipse was impossible.<sup>93</sup> ♦ And<sup>94</sup> [it took place] in the middle of the day, so that all who inhabit the earth might learn about it. ♦ And<sup>95</sup> after this, he speaks in order that they might learn that he was still alive and that he did this himself, and in order that, through this, they might become more moderate. And he says, “*Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani*,”<sup>96</sup> in order that they

<sup>91</sup> *Lit.* “a type.”

<sup>92</sup> Chrysostom is referring to Exodus 10.21–29.

<sup>93</sup> This description is simply a reflection of the fact that the “eclipse of the sun while the moon is full is an astronomical impossibility” (George Caird, *Saint Luke*, ed. Dennis Nineham, *The Pelican New Testament Commentaries* (London: Penguin Books, 1963), 253). This may well have provided “grist to the mill” in an early debate between pagans and Christians about the incidents surrounding the death of Christ. Unlike their pagan interlocutors, Christian commentators wanted to insist that this occurrence was a *miraculous* rather than a *natural* phenomenon. The contours of this debate are preserved in a reference to the writing (now lost) of the first century Greek historian, Thallos, in a fragment of Sextus Julius Africanus (whose work was in turn preserved by the Byzantine historian, Georgius Syncellus). Robert van Voorst goes so far as to argue that this reference to Thallos is “the earliest possible reference to Jesus” (Robert van Voorst, *Jesus outside the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 20). With regard to the solar eclipse recorded by Luke (Luke 23.45), Julius “argues that Thallos was ‘wrong’ (ἀλλογώζ) to argue that this was only a solar eclipse, because at full moon a solar eclipse is impossible, and the Passover always falls at full moon. Julius counters that the eclipse was miraculous, ‘a darkness induced by God’. Thallos could have mentioned the eclipse with no reference to Jesus. But it is more likely that Julius, who had access to the context of this quotation in Thallos and who (to judge from other fragments) was generally a careful user of his sources, was correct in reading it as a hostile reference to Jesus’ death” (Voorst, *Jesus outside the New Testament*, 20–21). The fragment attributed to Julius Africanus states: “On the whole world there pressed a most fearful darkness; and the rocks were broken by an earthquake, and many places in Judea and other districts were thrown down. This darkness, Thallos, in the third book of his History, calls ‘an eclipse of the sun,’ which appears to me to be wrong. For the Hebrews celebrate the Passover on the 14th day according to the moon, and the Passion of our Saviour falls on the day before the Passover; but an eclipse of the sun takes place only when the moon comes under the sun. And it cannot happen at any time other than the interval between the first day of the new moon and the last of the old, that is, at their junction: how then should an eclipse be supposed to happen when the moon is almost diametrically opposite the sun?” (Julius Africanus, *Chronographiae* Fr. 50.5–16 (M.J. Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae*, vol. 2. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1846 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1974): 238–308)).

<sup>94</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 439.18–19 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 88.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.775.34–35.

<sup>95</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 439.19–25 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 88.1 (Ibid.). This passage can be found in PG 58.776.9–18.

<sup>96</sup> Mark 15.34; cf. Psalm 22.2.

might learn that he honours the Father until his very last breath and that he is no adversary of God. This is why he uttered a prophetic cry, so that [God] might become manifest, thereby showing that he was of one mind with the one who had begotten him. ♦

(35) And some of the bystanders heard it, and they said, “Listen,<sup>97</sup> he is calling Elijah.” (36) And one of them<sup>98</sup> ran, and filling a sponge with vinegar, placed it on a reed, and gave it to him to drink, saying, “Wait! Let us see if Elijah will come to take him down.”

♦ But<sup>99</sup> note also their stupidity at this point.<sup>100</sup> For they thought, it says, that Elijah was being called: ♦ and I suppose this was the ignorance of soldiers. Moreover, administering the vinegar with the sponge | was an act of [440] mockery from someone without education or sense. So the Lord submitted to both Jewish and Gentile taunts. And the “Why?”<sup>101</sup> shows that there is no crime in his judgement: and [showing] that he had not been abandoned, he said earlier, “I am not alone, for the Father is with me.”<sup>102</sup> But in himself, he typifies our condition.<sup>103</sup> For I suppose that *we* are the ones who have been abandoned and disregarded, who are then summoned and saved by the sufferings of the one who is impassible.

(37) And Jesus gave a loud cry and breathed his last.

♦ In<sup>104</sup> order that it might be shown that the act came to pass under his authority, what does the present Evangelist say? “*Pilate was amazed that he*

<sup>97</sup> Note the textual variant: ἰδοῦ.

<sup>98</sup> Note the textual variant: εἶς.

<sup>99</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 439.30–31 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 88.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.776.19–21 and TLG 2062.152.

<sup>100</sup> Cramer gives two divergent readings: τὴν διάνοιαν or τὴν ἄνοιαν. From Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 88.1, it is clear that Chrysostom speaks of “wantonness, intemperance, and stupidity.” The text says: Ἄλλ’ ὅρα καὶ ἐντεῦθεν τὴν ἀσελγείαν, καὶ τὴν ἀκολασίαν, καὶ τὴν ἄνοιαν (PG 58.776.19–20). Therefore, τὴν ἄνοιαν is to be preferred.

<sup>101</sup> I.e. “Why have you forsaken me?” (Matthew 27.46: cf. Mark 15.34).

<sup>102</sup> John 16.32.

<sup>103</sup> Lampe (*A Patristic Greek Lexicon*) gives an instance where this statement is quoted by Gregory Nazianzen (*Or.* 30.5, p. 115.6: PG 36.109B).

<sup>104</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 440.9–12 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 88.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.776.33–37.

was already dead”<sup>105</sup> and [the Evangelist says] that the centurion believed most of all for this reason—that he died with authority. ♦ And the cry, as Luke says, was “Father, into your hands I commend my spirit.”<sup>106</sup> ♦ And<sup>107</sup> so, this was brought about in effect through Christ, the Saviour of us all, for our souls—sending [our souls] set free from the body into the hands of the living God. And knowing this, Peter writes, “Let those who suffer in accordance with the will of God commend their souls to a faithful creator.”<sup>108</sup>

♦ He<sup>109</sup> really cried out in order that it might be shown that the act came to pass under his authority. For as the present Evangelist says, “*Pilate was amazed that he had already died*”:<sup>110</sup> and the centurion believed most of all for this reason—that he died with authority, ♦ for he gave “*a great cry*”<sup>111</sup> (in other words, a cry which was evident and bore no sign of death). And, as Luke says, the cry was as follows:<sup>112</sup> “Father, into your hands, I commend my spirit.”<sup>113</sup> ♦ And<sup>114</sup> this cry tore the veil [of the temple], and opened the tombs, and made the house [of God] desolate: and he did not insult the temple, but he declared that they were not worthy to remain in that place. And this was a prophecy of the coming desolation, ♦ as was also<sup>115</sup> that what was foreshadowed in the Law should be brought to completion and that the Holy of Holies should be opened up to those who have been

---

<sup>105</sup> Mark 15.44.

<sup>106</sup> Luke 23.46 Note how the text attempts to reconcile the accounts of Mark and Luke. Mark recalls a great cry, while Luke provides its content.

<sup>107</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 440.13–18 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Matthaicum* Fr. 313.1–9. This passage can be found in Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 265.

<sup>108</sup> 1Peter 4.19.

<sup>109</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 440.19–22 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 88.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.776.33–37. *Cat. Marc.* 440.19–25 repeats much of the material in *Cat. Marc.* 440.9–18. These passages include material from both Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria. Material in *Cat. Marc.* 440.26–32 is also repeated in *Cat. Marc.* 441.10–19. The reason for this is that *Cat. Marc.* 440.19–441.7 is an extended passage from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178, which has been incorporated after the previous section (which relies on the manuscript tradition from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 186 and Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 188). The manuscript tradition is clearly inconsistent at this point.

<sup>110</sup> Mark 15.44.

<sup>111</sup> Mark 15.46.

<sup>112</sup> *Lit.* “like this.”

<sup>113</sup> Luke 23.46.

<sup>114</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 440.25–29 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 88.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.776.37–45.

<sup>115</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 440.29–32 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Matthaicum* Fr. 315.9–13 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 267).

made righteous through faith in Christ, in order that, in future, those of us who believe in Christ might run into the inner sanctuary with no-one preventing us. ♦ Therefore, according to Matthew, the centurion and the soldiers,<sup>116</sup> since they could see | the earthquake and the things which had [441] come to pass (such as the veil and the rocks breaking apart), were extremely afraid, saying, “Truly this was God’s Son.”<sup>117</sup> But according to Luke, these men and the centurion said that Jesus, the Son of God, was “a righteous man,”<sup>118</sup> perhaps not realising that [he was the Son of God], but simply hearing his great cry, and observing, moreover, how quickly he breathed his last, even though his legs were not broken according to the custom.<sup>119</sup>

(38) And the veil of the temple was cut in two from top to bottom.  
 (39) And when the Centurion, who was facing him, saw that he cried out in this way<sup>120</sup> and breathed his last, he said, “Truly this man<sup>121</sup> was God’s Son.”<sup>122</sup>

♦ This<sup>123</sup> cry tore the veil, and opened the tombs, and made the temple desolate. And he did this not to insult the temple, but to declare that they were not worthy of remaining in that place, and it was also a prophecy of the coming desolation, ♦ and<sup>124</sup> [a prophecy] that it was necessary for what was foreshadowed in the Law to be brought to completion, and that the Holy of Holies should be thrown open to those made righteous through faith in Christ, in order that, in future, with no-one shutting us out, those of us who walk in the footsteps of Christ<sup>125</sup> might run into the inner sanctuary. ♦ And how is he not truly “*the Son of God*,”<sup>126</sup> given that he broke apart the stones,

<sup>116</sup> Matthew 27.54 refers to the centurion “and those who were with him.”

<sup>117</sup> Matthew 27.54.

<sup>118</sup> Luke 23.47.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. John 19.33.

<sup>120</sup> Note the textual variant: ὅτι οὕτω κράξας ἐξέπνευσεν.

<sup>121</sup> Note the textual variant: ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος.

<sup>122</sup> Note the textual variant: υἱὸς ἦν Θεοῦ.

<sup>123</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 441.12–15 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 88.1 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.776.37–45.

<sup>124</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 441.16–19 is an extract from Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Matthaeum* Fr. 315.10–14 (Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 267): note the repetition of *Cat. Marc.* 440.29–32.

<sup>125</sup> Note this variant from the previous citation of this passage (*Cat. Marc.* 440.32), which speaks of “those who believe in Christ.”

<sup>126</sup> Mark 15.39.



cast the world in darkness, opened the tombs, ♦ and<sup>127</sup> caused the dead to come to life again (even though they did not come into contact with his body, which was stretched out on the cross, but raising them by his will alone)? And they are not only raised, but the stones are broken apart and the land is shaken [by an earthquake], in order that they might discover that the one who does these things had a much greater power, being able to remove their sight and break them into pieces. ♦

(40) There were also women looking on from a distance: among them were Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the mother of James<sup>128</sup> the younger and of Joses,<sup>129</sup> and Salome. (41) And<sup>130</sup> these women used to follow him and minister to him when he was in Galilee: and there were many other women who had come up with him to Jerusalem.

[442] The matter was less frightening to the women than to the apostles: | and it was Mary Magdalene, and the mother of the Lord, and the mother of Joses, who remained. This is why John also said that the mother [of the Lord] was present at the cross. And the “ministry”<sup>131</sup> of the women who accompanied [him] was the provision of financial support from their personal wealth. And the constant presence of the women as observers<sup>132</sup> was also essential for knowing where he was placed, in order that they might encounter him and convey the proclamation of the resurrection to the disciples. ♦ And<sup>133</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 441.21–25 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 88.2 (Smith, “The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,” 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.776.50–56.

<sup>128</sup> Note the textual variant: ἡ τοῦ.

<sup>129</sup> Note the textual variant: Ἰωσή.

<sup>130</sup> Note the textual variant: αἱ καὶ.

<sup>131</sup> The commentator is explaining the use of the term *διακονία* at this point. Mark was probably using the term in a generic sense of “service,” but by the time that the *Catena* was being compiled, it had perhaps acquired a more specific ecclesiastical meaning to describe the office and work of a Deacon.

<sup>132</sup> *Lit.* “according to sight.” Richard Bauckham notes that in the Synoptic tradition, “the role of the women as eyewitnesses is crucial: they see Jesus die, they see his body being laid in the tomb, they find the tomb empty. The fact that some of the women were at all three events means that they can testify that Jesus was dead when laid in the tomb and that it was the tomb in which he was buried that they subsequently found empty” (Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: the Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*, 48). It is worth noting that the catenist also places some emphasis on the role of the women as observers.

<sup>133</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 442.7–8 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 88.2 (Smith, “The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,” 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.777.51–52.

this greatly despised sex enjoys the greater privilege in their contemplation of these blessings. ♦ And one must suppose that both Matthew and Mark mean that the mother of James the younger and Joses is the mother of the Lord, as blessed John says.<sup>134</sup> But Apollinaris says that Matthew and Mark did not even make mention of her: and equally, one must suppose that Mark means that “*Salome*”<sup>135</sup> is “the mother of the sons of Zebedee,” whom Matthew<sup>136</sup> also mentioned without name. They<sup>137</sup> rightly decided to mention these men as being more notable for their virtue.

And<sup>138</sup> by the grace of God,<sup>139</sup> the constant presence of the women was indispensable for knowing where he was placed, in order that they might encounter him, and convey the proclamation of the resurrection to the disciples: ♦ so<sup>140</sup> this greatly despised sex was the first to enjoy the contemplation of these blessings: ♦ for staying and seeing these things was not as frightening for the women, as it was for the disciples. And it was Mary Magdalene and the mother of the Lord and the mother of the sons of Zebedee who remained. For John says that present at the cross was the mother of the Lord,<sup>141</sup> whom both Matthew and Mark say was the mother of James the younger and Joses, but some of the interpreters say that both Matthew and Mark did not even mention her, and that one should suppose that “*Salome*”<sup>142</sup> means “the mother of the sons of Zebedee,”<sup>143</sup> whom Matthew also mentioned without name: for he mentioned them as being more notable for their virtue. And the “ministry”<sup>144</sup> of the women who accompanied [him] was the provision of financial support from their own

---

<sup>134</sup> John 19.25.

<sup>135</sup> Mark 15.40.

<sup>136</sup> Matthew 27.56.

<sup>137</sup> Note the plural. In fact only Matthew mentions the sons of Zebedee at this point.

<sup>138</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 442.16–29 repeats much of the material in *Cat. Marc.* 442.4–15. Again, this is because Cramer has added the variant from Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178 (*Cat. Marc.* 442.16–443.4). This variant diverges significantly from Cramer’s principle source in including a passage from Origen from *Cat. Marc.* 442.30–443.4.

<sup>139</sup> Note this variant: *Cat. Marc.* 442.4 has *κατὰ θεάν* which makes much more sense given the context and the need to establish eyewitness testimony than *κατὰ θεόν* here at *Cat. Marc.* 442.16.

<sup>140</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 442.18–19 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 88.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.777.51–52. Note that this is a repetition of *Cat. Marc.* 442.7–8.

<sup>141</sup> John 19.25.

<sup>142</sup> Mark 15.40.

<sup>143</sup> Matthew 27.56.

<sup>144</sup> The commentator is explaining the use of the term *διακονία* at this point. Mark was probably using the term in a generic sense of “service,” but by the time that the *Catena* was being compiled, it had perhaps acquired a more specific ecclesiastical meaning.

wealth. ♦ And<sup>145</sup> although there were many other women as well, these women were named as the most prominent, given that they saw much more and they ministered to him and they were better at following him: Mary from a place of great renown<sup>146</sup> (for Magdala means “a place of great [443] renown”); and the mother<sup>147</sup> | of the namesakes of the patriarchs, of [James] who gripped the heel of his brother,<sup>148</sup> and [Joseph] at whose birth his mother said, “May God add to me another son”,<sup>149</sup> and it is said that the mother of the Sons of Thunder was called Salome. ♦

48. *On the request for the body of the Lord*

(42) When evening had come, and since it was the day of preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath, (43) Joseph of Arimathea, a respected councillor, who was also himself waiting expectantly for the Kingdom of God, came<sup>150</sup> and was bold enough to go to Pilate and ask him for the body of Jesus.

And we say that none of this happened by chance: neither the Lord establishing his death on the sixth day (for it was necessary for him who made humanity on the sixth day<sup>151</sup> in the same way to establish his death on their behalf on the sixth day, in order that he might rescue [humanity] from the destruction of death), ♦ nor<sup>152</sup> was this engineered by chance: that Joseph of Arimathea, not only took him and honoured him with funeral rites in a costly way, but also that, according to Matthew, he laid him in his own new

<sup>145</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 442.30–443.4 is an extract from Origen, *Commentariorum series in evangelium Matthaei* 141 (E. Klostermann, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 11 [Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 38.2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1933]: 293.30–294.30).

<sup>146</sup> The word *μεγαλυσμός* is also attested in Origen, *Commentariorum series in evangelium Matthaei* 141 (E. Klostermann, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 11 [Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 38.2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1933]: 293.35–294.6). Its meaning is uncertain. According to BAGD, *μεγαλύνω* means ‘exalt, extol, magnify.’

<sup>147</sup> Cf. Matthew 27.56.

<sup>148</sup> I.e. Jacob: cf. Gen. 25.26.

<sup>149</sup> Gen 30.24: this passage refers to Joseph. The commentator is referring to Matthew 27.56: ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ μητέρα “the mother of James and Joseph.”

<sup>150</sup> Note the textual variant: ἦλθεν Ἰωσήφ.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. Gen. 1.26–31.

<sup>152</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 443.16–444.2 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaem* 88.2–3 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.778.13–26.

tomb, in order that he might not arouse any suspicion that it was not this man but another who rose again.

Even if he was not a follower, at least Joseph was a disciple,<sup>153</sup> who though he had been concealed for a long time, now became very bold after the death of Christ. For he was not an anonymous person or someone<sup>154</sup> who escaped notice, but a very distinguished member of the council, a fact which makes his courage especially significant. For I daresay he exposed his soul to death, taking on the hatred of all, and he showed his zeal for Jesus, not only by taking [him]<sup>155</sup> and burying him in a costly way, but also by placing him in a new tomb: and this was engineered not by chance, but was so that there should not be the faintest suspicion that one had risen instead of another. And the women described beforehand kept watch nearby, not yet knowing anything significant about him. And so they carried gifts, so that if the madness of the Jews should abate, they might go and | attend to [the [444] body], and they showed courage and tender affection and much financial generosity, even unto death. ♦

---

<sup>153</sup> Cf. John 19:38.

<sup>154</sup> *Lit.* "nor among those who."

<sup>155</sup> Note that *Cat. Marc.* 443:25–29 repeats the material in *Cat. Marc.* 443:16–19.



## CHAPTER 16

(1) And when the Sabbath was over, Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices, in order that they might go and anoint Jesus.<sup>1</sup>

◆ After<sup>2</sup> the resurrection, the angel came and took away the stone for the women. For they themselves saw [the angel] in the tomb at that time. And so in order that they might believe that he was raised, by seeing the tomb void of the body, he rolled away the stone. ◆ But<sup>3</sup> Matthew says that it was “at the end of the Sabbath”<sup>4</sup> when they came to the tomb, while Luke says that it was “early at dawn,”<sup>5</sup> and John says that it was “early on the first day of the week, while it was still dark,”<sup>6</sup> since it appears that the night had advanced much and it was almost day. For it is possible for such a time to be called both “the end of the Sabbath” and “early dawn on the first day of the week.” And when Mark says that it was “*very early*,”<sup>7</sup> he explained that it was still the hour of night. For it is clear that those who are saying that it was the first day of the week want to point out that it was the day of resurrection. But when Matthew says that it was “the end of the Sabbath,” he is describing the beginning of the resurrection. For the customary keeping of the Sabbath and every feast begins from the evening.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the textual variant: τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

<sup>2</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 444.6–9 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaicum* 89.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.783.50–55.

<sup>3</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 444.9–445.32 is a “free and perhaps indirect” extract from Eusebius. (Ibid.: 370). A search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* suggests some dependence on Eusebius, *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum* (PG 22.937–944), although it is worth noting that the catenist goes in the subsequent section to challenge Eusebius’ conclusions.

<sup>4</sup> Matthew 28.1.

<sup>5</sup> Luke 24.1.

<sup>6</sup> John 20.1.

<sup>7</sup> Mark 16.2.

<sup>8</sup> In a number of manuscripts (for example, Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 195, ff. 238–239), the text of the commentary is followed by a copy of Dionysius of Alexandria’s *Letter to Basilides* (PG 10.1272–1277). The first section of this letter offers some guidance on the exact time that the faithful should break their fast on the Sundays of Eastertide. Dionysius notes that the question should be determined with reference to the precise time at which Christ rose from the dead for from that moment Christians should not fast but “be filled with festal

However, in some of the copies of the Gospel according to Mark, [these words] are added, “*Now after he rose again early on the first day of the week, he appeared to Mary Magdalene*” and so on.<sup>9</sup> And this appears to contradict what was said by Matthew. We will say that one could say that the ending carried in some [copies] has been corrupted in the [copying] from Mark. However, in order that we might not seem to have taken refuge in a convenient reading, let us read it like this: inserting a comma after “*after he rose again,*”<sup>10</sup> we go on, “*and he appeared to Mary Magdalene on the first day of the week,*”<sup>11</sup> in order that on the one hand we might relate the [phrase] “*after he rose again*”<sup>12</sup> to the [phrase] from Matthew “the end of the Sabbath”<sup>13</sup> (for that is when we believe him to have been raised), while on the other hand we might combine the rest, which is incomplete, with what follows. For Mark tells us that the one who according to Matthew was raised “at the end of the sabbath” is the one whom Mary Magdalene saw “*early in the morning*”:<sup>14</sup> | indeed, John also showed this, bearing witness himself that it was “early on the first day of the week”<sup>15</sup> that he was seen by the Magdalene: so two separate incidents are presented in these words: one is the resurrection, when it was “the end of the Sabbath,”<sup>16</sup> and the other is the appearance of the Saviour, which was “early in the morning.”<sup>17</sup> But not

---

joy.” However, the inconsistencies between the gospels had given rise to a variety of different practices. In Rome, it was the practice to break the fast at cock-crow, but in discovering that the Christians of Alexandria broke their fast at an earlier point, Basilides had written to seek guidance. Dionysius suggests that the practice in Alexandria is consistent with the witness of the gospels. He notes Matthew’s reference to “the end of the Sabbath” and the other evangelists’ emphasis on the events taking place early in the morning. In attempting to harmonise their statements, he asserts that because the resurrection took place before dawn, there should be no need to fast until dawn, although it would be unseemly to break the fast too close to midnight. Clearly, the inclusion of the letter after the *Catena in Marcum* suggests a close affinity between the judgements offered by Dionysius and the interpretations offered within the *Catena*. More importantly, the letter also illustrates the fact that the need to harmonise the inconsistencies between the gospels was not motivated simply by a desire to provide an effective apology to pagan detractors (*pace* John Granger Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000)) but to offer guidance to those who sought to pattern their lives in the light of the witness of the gospels.

<sup>9</sup> Mark 16.9.

<sup>10</sup> Mark 16.9.

<sup>11</sup> Mark 16.9.

<sup>12</sup> Mark 16.9.

<sup>13</sup> Matthew 28.4.

<sup>14</sup> Mark 16.2.

<sup>15</sup> John 20.1.

<sup>16</sup> Matthew 28.1.

<sup>17</sup> Mark 16.2.

even “*looking up and seeing that the stone had been rolled away*”<sup>18</sup> is contrary to what is said by Matthew, which is that when the women came to the tomb, “there was a great earthquake, and an angel of the Lord, descending from heaven, came and rolled back the stone.”<sup>19</sup> For in the time in which, according to Mark, they had been saying to one another, “*Who will roll away the stone for us?*”<sup>20</sup> (given that it had not yet been rolled away), the angel came down and rolled it away: thus, “*looking up*,”<sup>21</sup> the women saw that the stone had been rolled away: but Mark is silent about it being rolled away by the angel, even though Matthew has said this. But if Matthew says that the angel sat on top of the stone,<sup>22</sup> while Mark says that “*after entering the tomb*” the women saw “*a young man seated on the right wearing a white robe*,”<sup>23</sup> even so there is no disagreement. For it is possible that the one whom they saw, according to Matthew, sitting on the stone and having “an appearance like lightning and clothing as white as snow,”<sup>24</sup> was also the one whom they saw “after they had gone into the tomb,”<sup>25</sup> going on ahead of them and “*sitting on the right side*,”<sup>26</sup> whom Mark says was seen in “*the form of a young man*.”<sup>27</sup> For Matthew does not say in what sort of form they saw him.<sup>28</sup> Therefore what was omitted by [Matthew] was filled in by Mark. And I am not unaware that those who study [the text] to reconcile the apparent disagreements say that these visions were different, and that the women in Matthew were different from the women in Mark, since Mary Magdalene followed with much greater haste than everyone else and she saw different visions: and the time of their arrival at the tomb is different for the Evangelists, who say that there were some women and then others, and even the times of the visions are different, while not undermining the things which have been said by others. ♦ |

[446]

(9) Now after Jesus rose early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from<sup>29</sup> whom he had cast out seven demons.

---

<sup>18</sup> Mark 16.4.

<sup>19</sup> Matthew 28.2.

<sup>20</sup> Mark 16.3.

<sup>21</sup> Mark 16.4.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Matthew 28.2.

<sup>23</sup> Mark 16.5.

<sup>24</sup> Matthew 28.3.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Mark 16.5.

<sup>26</sup> Mark 16.5.

<sup>27</sup> Mark 16.5.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Matthew 28.2–3.

<sup>29</sup> Note the textual variant: ἀφ’.



♦ And<sup>30</sup> the young man said to them, “*Do not be alarmed.*”<sup>31</sup> For first it was necessary to deliver them from fear, and then to tell them of the resurrection. Therefore he delivers them from fear. And his clothing was bright, a symbol of resurrection, and he said in these words, “*you are looking for Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified*”:<sup>32</sup> he is not ashamed to call him “*crucified.*” For this is the summit of [all] good things: “*Behold the place where they laid him.*”<sup>33</sup> This is why he had taken away the stone, in order that he might point out the place. “*But go and tell the disciples that you will see him in Galilee,*”<sup>34</sup> freeing them from troubles and dangers, so that fear might not be a hindrance to faith. ♦ And<sup>35</sup> by singling out Peter (to tell him as well), he signals to them that that his denial did not lead to his condemnation, but that his repentance caused him to be admitted again, and he numbered him among the apostles.

“*They went out and fled from the tomb.*”<sup>36</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea says that Mary Magdalene and Mary, the [mother] of James, and Salome, prepared spices: and they were not those who came before the sun had risen, but there were other women, who are unnamed. For there were many women who had gone up with him from Galilee. And the women according to Mark came when the sun had risen, and where they came from<sup>37</sup> is of little consequence: which is why they attended him, not by night, but “*early in the morning*”:<sup>38</sup> and the women, who had heard that they should tell the disciples and Peter, fled, and “*they said nothing to anyone: for they were afraid.*”<sup>39</sup> And the women departed on their own and they were convinced by the truth of the vision, so that they understood it after the rising of the sun, and they were not thought worthy to see “the Saviour,”<sup>40</sup> or “the angel which appeared like

---

<sup>30</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 446.4–15 is an extract from Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaëum* 40.2 (Smith, ‘The Sources of Victor of Antioch’s Commentary on Mark,’ 366). This passage can be found in PG 58.784.1–22.

<sup>31</sup> Mark 16.6.

<sup>32</sup> Mark 16.6.

<sup>33</sup> Mark 16.6.

<sup>34</sup> A paraphrase of Mark 16.7.

<sup>35</sup> *Cat. Marc.* 446.15–447.10 is a “free and indirect” quotation from Eusebius, *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum* (PG 22.937–944). Note the explicit reference to Eusebius in *Cat. Marc.* 446.19. The fact that Eusebius is referred to here is important. The catenist notes the view of Eusebius, but he does not agree with him.

<sup>36</sup> Mark 16.8.

<sup>37</sup> *Lit.* “how they were situated.”

<sup>38</sup> Mark 16.3.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Mark 16.8.

<sup>40</sup> Matthew 28.9–10: cf. John 20.14.

lightning,<sup>41</sup> or the two inside the tomb,<sup>42</sup> or “the two men”<sup>43</sup> according to Luke. And seeing with the vision appropriate to their small minds, they saw just “a young man”<sup>44</sup> dressed in a white robe. Therefore, | [Eusebius] [447] says that Mark records these things about some other women, who are not named. For it was not possible after such great sights when the sun had risen for the Magdalene to be confused or not to know who would roll away the stone.<sup>45</sup> ♦

And another source<sup>46</sup> says that the Evangelists were not present at the things, which came to pass in the resurrection. It is clear from this that each person would have been in such confusion about matters, given that they were beyond all human imagining, and would have heard indirectly about what had happened and written<sup>47</sup> with a greater degree of simplicity: divine grace allowed this, so that it might bring to light their simple acceptance of the miracle of the resurrection, and of the other doctrines which are proclaimed harmoniously by all.<sup>48</sup>

But even if the words which follow “*after he rose early*”<sup>49</sup> do not come in the present gospel in most copies so that some consider them to be spurious, nevertheless, finding these things in most of the carefully edited copies,<sup>50</sup> in accordance with the Palestinian gospel of Mark,<sup>51</sup> as the truth demands, we have included this passage and the resurrection of the Lord recounted in it, which follows after “*for they were afraid*,”<sup>52</sup> that is to say, from “*After he rose*

<sup>41</sup> Matthew 28.3.

<sup>42</sup> John 20.12.

<sup>43</sup> Luke 24.4.

<sup>44</sup> Mark 16.5.

<sup>45</sup> This is a reference to John 20.12 f. The commentator is attempting to reconcile John's story about Mary Magdalene's encounter with the risen Lord with the account recorded here.

<sup>46</sup> This source is anonymous.

<sup>47</sup> *Lit.* “made their exposition.”

<sup>48</sup> Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 195 f. 238 and Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin 23 f. 147 finish at this point. These are both manuscripts identified by Reuss as belonging to the second recension. The scholium that follows can be found in a number of manuscripts belonging to Reuss' “first recension.” Cramer notes that it comes from “Cod. 178.”

<sup>49</sup> Mark 16.9.

<sup>50</sup> *Lit.* “accurate copies.” William Farmer suggests that “carefully edited” is the best way to render ἀκριβῶν at this point. For further discussion, see William R. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, ed. Matthew Black, *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 17–22.

<sup>51</sup> Comparison with other manuscripts suggests that the word Μάρκου has been displaced in Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 178. Although this is the manuscript adopted at this point in Cramer's edition, I have followed the word order in Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin Gr. 20 f. 219 and Gr. 230 f. 291.

<sup>52</sup> Mark 16.8.

*early on the first day of the week*” and so on,<sup>53</sup> until “*through the signs that accompanied it.*”<sup>54</sup> Amen.

The end of the Gospel according to Mark

---

<sup>53</sup> Mark 16.9.

<sup>54</sup> Mark 16.20.

## APPENDIX

THE SOURCES OF THE *CATENA IN MARCUM*

Cramer	Source
263.1–264.7	The catenist
264.7–16	Clement, <i>Hypotyposesis</i> 6
264.17–19	Irenaeus, <i>Adversus haereses</i> 3.1.1
264.20–23	Anon.
264.24–31	Pseudo-Justin Martyr, <i>Responsiones et quaestiones</i> 402.C.1–7
264.31–265.21	Eusebius, <i>De theophania</i> 6.76–97
266.1–5	Lemma: Mark 1.1–2
266.6–9	Anon.
266.9–12	Eusebius, <i>Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marimum</i>
266.13–267.8	Origen, <i>Commentarii in evangelium Joannis</i> 6.24.128–129
267.9–17	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 37.1–2
267.18–29	Origen, <i>Commentarii in evangelium Joannis</i> 6.24.129–130
267.30–31	Lemma: Mark 1.3
267.32–268.8	Eusebius, <i>Commentarius in Isaiam</i> 2.16.104–118
268.8–13	Anon.
268.14–15	Lemma: Mark 1.4
268.16–21	Anon.
268.21–25	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 10.3
268.25–27	Anon.
268.28	Lemma: Mark 1.6
268.29–30	Anon.
269.1	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 10.4 (PG 57.188.42–44)
269.2–16	Anon.
269.17–19	Lemma: Mark 1.7
269.20–26	Origen, <i>Commentarii in evangelium Joannis</i> 6.18
269.27–270.2	Anon.
270.3–5	Lemma: Mark 1.9
270.6–15	Anon.
270.16–17	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 12.1
270.17–271.19	Chrysostom, <i>De baptismo Christi</i> 3–4
271.20–22	Lemma: Mark 1.10
271.23–26	Anon.
271.27–272.2	Chrysostom, <i>De baptismo Christi</i> 3 (Repeating 270.17–19)
272.3–4	Anon.
272.5–7	Lemma; Mark 1.12–13
272.8–273.2	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 13.1
273.3	Lemma: Mark 1.13b

Cramer	Source
273.4-19	Anon.
273.19-31	Origen, <i>Commentarii in evangelium Joannis</i> 10.2
273.32-274.18	Anon.
274.21	Lemma: Mark 1.21
274.22-24	Anon.
274.25-26	Lemma: Mark 1.21
274.27-275.2	Anon.
275.3-5	Lemma: Mark 1.22
275.6-10	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.545.39-41
275.11-12	Lemma: Mark 1.23
275.13-25	Anon.
275.26-28	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.548.54-56
275.29-276.7	Anon. (Note that 276.3-5 repeats 274.28-275.2)
276.8-9	Lemma: Mark 1.25
276.10-15	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i>
276.16-21	Lemma: Mark 1.26-27
276.22-26 (28)	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i>
277.1-5	Lemma: Mark 1.29
277.6-16	Anon.
277.17-20	Lemma: Mark 1.30-31
277.21-31	Anon.
278.1-7	Lemma: Mark 1.32-34
278.8-25	Anon.
278.26-27	Lemma: Mark 1.34
278.28-279.13	Anon.
279.14-21	Lemma: Mark 1.35-38
279.22-280.2	Victor of Antioch
280.3-17	Victor of Antioch
280.18-281.4	Anon.
281.5-9	Lemma: Mark 1.40
281.10-20	Anon.
281.21-24	Lemma: Mark 1.41-42
281.25-282.3	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 5.12 f.
282.3-9	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaem</i> 25.2
282.10-12	Anon.
282.13-15	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaem</i> 25.2
282.16-17	Lemma: Mark 1.43-44
282.18-21	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaem</i> 25.2 (PG 57.329.44-46)
282.21-23	Anon.
282.24-26	Lemma: Mark 1.44
282.27-283.6	Anon.
283.7-15	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaem</i> 25.3
283.16-19	Lemma: Mark 1.45
283.20-26	Anon.

Cramer	Source
283.27–284.3	Lemma: Mark 2.1–3
284.4–13	Anon.
284.14–17	Lemma: Mark 2.4
284.18–28	Anon.
285.1–2	Lemma: Mark 2.5
285.3–6	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 5.27
285.6–10	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Matthaicum</i> Fr. 102
285.11–15	Anon.
285.16–17	Lemma: Mark 2.9
285.28–286.7	Anon.
286.8–11	Lemma: Mark 2.10–11
286.12–15	Anon.
286.16–29	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Matthaicum</i> Fr. 103
286.29–31	Anon.
287.1–3	Lemma: Mark 2.12
287.4–13	Anon.
287.14–15	Lemma: Mark 2.13
287.16–21	Anon.
287.22–26	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaicum</i> 15.1
287.27–29	Lemma: Mark 2.14
287.30–288.3	Anon.
288.4–9	Origen, <i>Fragmenta in Lucam</i> Fr. 108
288.10–12	Cyril of Alexandria (attributed in <i>Cat. Luc.</i> 2.46.22–27)
288.13–14	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 5.28
288.15–18	Anon.
288.19–22	Lemma: Mark 2.15
288.23–25	Anon.
288.26–28	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Matthaicum</i> Fr. 104
288.29–289.3	Lemma: Mark 2.16
289.4–11	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Matthaicum</i> Fr. 104
289.12–15	Lemma: Mark 2.17
289.16–28	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Matthaicum</i> Fr. 104
289.29	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.572.15
290.1–9	Lemma: Mark 2.18–20
290.10–20	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.572.15–73.36
290.21–291.6	Anon.
291.6–13	Lemma: Mark 2.21–22
291.14–16	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaicum</i> Fr. 48.4
291.16–292.2	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaicum</i> Fr. 47.1–15
292.3–6	Lemma: Mark 2.23–24
292.7–19	Anon.
292.20–25	Lemma: Mark 2.5–26
292.26–293.4	Anon.
293.5–7	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 6.5

Cramer	Source
293.7-15	Eusebius, <i>Commentaria in Psalmos</i> 33
293.16-21	Lemma: Mark 3.1-2
293.22-294.2	Anon.
294.3-6	Lemma: Mark 3.3-4
294.7-14	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 40.1
294.14-19	Anon.
294.19-21	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 6.13
294.21-26	Anon.
294.27-30	Lemma: Mark 3.5
294.31-32	Anon.
295.1-13	Lemma: Mark 3.7-12
295.14-18	Anon.
295.19-25	Mark 3.7-10
295.26-29	Anon.
295.30-31	John 21.25
296.1-13	Anon.
296.15-19	Lemma: Mark 3.13-14
296.20-297.17	Anon.
297.18-21	Lemma: Mark 3.20-21
297.22-298.2	Anon.
298.3-5	Lemma: Mark 3.22
298.6-14	Anon.
298.15-21	Lemma: Mark 3.23-26
298.22-299.2	Anon.
299.3-5	Lemma: Mark 3.27
299.7-12	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 68
299.13-18	Lemma: Mark 3.28-30
299.19-300.19	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 73
300.20-28	Lemma: Mark 3.31-35
300.29-301.4	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 71.1-4
301.5-8	Apollinaris. <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 75.1-4
301.8-10	Anon.
301.13-18	Lemma: Mark 4.1-2
301.19-28	Anon.
301.28-302.2	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 44.3
302.3-14	Anon.
302.15-25	Lemma: Mark 4.3-8
302.26-304.24	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 44.3-4
304.25-29	Lemma: Mark 4.9-11
304.30-305.5	Titus of Bostra <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 8.5
305.6-12	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 72.4-6
305.12-31	Anon.
305.32-306.2	Lemma: Mark 4.12
306.3-4	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 72.7-8

Cramer	Source
306.4-5	Isaiah 6.9-10
306.6	Anon.
306.7-9	Isaiah 50.1-2
306.9-14	Eusebius, <i>Commentarius in Isaiam</i> 1.42.49-55
306.14-16	Anon.
306.17-19	Lemma: Mark 4.21
306.20-30	Origen, <i>Fragmenta in Lucam</i> Fr. 121a
306.31-307.2	Origen, <i>Fragmenta in Lucam</i> Fr. 121b
307.2-6	Origen, <i>Fragmenta in Lucam</i> Fr. 121c
307.6-10	Origen, <i>Fragmenta in Lucam</i> Fr. 121d
307.10-16	Origen, <i>Fragmenta in Lucam</i> Fr. 121e
307.16-21	Anon.
307.22-23	Lemma: Mark 4.22
307.24-31	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 15.11
308.1	Lemma: Mark 4.23
308.2-5	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 15.11
308.6-9	Lemma: Mark 4.24-25
308.10-310.23	Anon.
310.24-311.3	Lemma: Mark 4.30-34
311.4-8	Isidore of Pelusium, <i>Epistulae</i> 6.76
311.9-16	Anon.
311.17-25	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 47.1
311.25-312.7	Anon.
312.10-15	Lemma: Mark 4.35-37
312.16-313.31	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 28.1-2
314.1-2	Lemma: Mark 5.1
314.5-21	Origen, <i>Commentarii in evangelium Joannis</i> 6.41
314.22-27	Lemma: Mark 5.4-5
314.28-315.7	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 28.2
315.7-12	Theodore of Mopsuestia
315.13-14	Lemma: Mark 5.8
315.15-316.4	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 28.2-3
316.4-13	Theodore of Mopsuestia
316.14-15	Lemma: Mark 5.9
316.16-20	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.636.7-12
316.20-23	Anon.
316.24-25	Lemma: Mark 5.10
316.26-29	Anon.
316.30-317.2	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 8.31
317.3-4	Lemma: Mark 5.11
316.5-14	Anon.
317.14-17	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 44
317.18-21	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 8.38
317.22-23	Lemma: Mark 5.20



Cramer	Source
317.24–29	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 8.38
317.29–318.12	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 43.1–12
318.13–23	Lemma: Mark 5.21–24
318.24–28	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 8.38
318.28–319.11	Anon.
319.12–14	Lemma: Mark 5.25
319.15–321.1	Anon.
321.1–3	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 8.48
321.3–11	Anon.
321.12–13	Lemma: Mark 5.43
321.14–17	Anon.
321.18–19	Lemma: Mark 6.1
321.20–322.3	Anon.
322.2–322.7	Gregory Nazianzus, <i>De filio</i> (Orat. 30.10.15–20)
322.7–9	Mark 6.6–7
3.22.10–14	Anon.
322.15–17	Lemma: Mark 6.7
322.18–323.21	Anon.
323.22–23	Lemma: Mark 6.10
323.24–26	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> 51
323.26–28	Theodoret, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> (attr. <i>Cat. Matt.</i> 1.76.22–25)
323.29	Origen, <i>Fragmenta in Lucam</i> Fr. 160.1
324.12–13	Lemma: Mark 6.12–13
324.3–14	Anon.
324.15–20	Lemma: Mark 6.14
324.21–325.6	Anon.
325.7–8	Lemma: Mark 6.15
325.9–12	Eusebius, <i>Quaestiones evangelicae ad Stephanum</i>
325.12–20	Anon.
325.21–25	Lemma: Mark 6.16–17
325.26–326.19	Anon.
326.20–21	Lemma: Mark 6.29
326.22–24	Anon.
326.25–327.2	Lemma: Mark 6.34–35
327.3–28	Anon.
327.29–32	Lemma: Mark 6.41
328.1–8	Anon.
328.9–12	Lemma: Mark 6.42–44
328.13–15	Anon.
328.15–20	Anon.
328.21–329.9	Anon.
329.11–14	Lemma: Mark 6.45
329.15–30	Anon.

Cramer	Source
330.1-3	Lemma: Mark 6.48
330.4-7	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> 78.1
330.7-11	Anon.
330.12-13	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> 78.1
330.13-20	Anon.
330.21-22	Lemma: Mark 6.49
330.23-331.14	Anon.
331.15-332.29	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 50.1-2
332.30-333.4	Lemma: Mark 6.53-55
333.5-333.14	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 50.2
333.15-16	Anon.
333.17-21	Lemma: Mark 7.1-2
333.22-25	Anon.
333.27-30	Lemma: Mark 7.5
333.31-334.5	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> 79.1-12
334.6-20	Anon.
334.21-26	Lemma: Mark 7.9-11
334.27-335.10	Anon.
335.11-15	Lemma: Mark 7.14-15
335.16-31	Anon.
336.1-3	Lemma: Mark 7.21
336.4-7	Anon.
336.10-14	Lemma: Mark 7.24-25
336.15-20	Anon.
336.21-26	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> 82.1-4
336.26-337.15	Anon.
337.15-25	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> 82.5-14
337.25-338.14	Anon.
338.16-21	Lemma: Mark 7.31-32
338.22-25	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Joannem</i> 64.1
338.25-30	Anon.
338.31	Lemma: Mark 7.33
338.32-339.2	Anon.
339.3	Lemma: Mark 7.33
339.4-13	Anon.
339.14	Lemma: Mark 7.34
339.15-18	Anon.
339.19	Lemma: Mark 7.34
339.20-21	Anon.
339.22-26	Lemma: Mark 7.36-37
339.27-31	Anon.
340.1-9	Lemma: Mark 8.1-3
340.10-24	Anon.
340.25-26	Lemma: Mark 8.4

Cramer	Source
340.27-30	Mark 8.2-3
340.31-32	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> 86.1-2
341.1-3	Anon.
341.4	Lemma: Mark 8.5
341.5-8	Anon.
341.9-13	Lemma: Mark 8.6-7
341.14-18	Anon.
341.18-21	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> 87.2-3
341.22-24	Lemma: Mark 8.8-9
341.25-32	Anon.
342.1-2	Lemma: Mark 8.10
342.3-8	Anon.
342.9-11	Lemma: Mark 8.11
342.11-14	Anon.
342.15-25	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 53.3
342.25-343.2	Anon.
343.5-9	Lemma: Mark 8.14-16
343.10-28	Anon.
343.31-344.2	Lemma: Mark 8.22-23
344.3-7	Anon.
344.8-11	Lemma: Mark 8.23-24
344.12-20	Anon.
344.21-23	Lemma: Mark 8.25
344.24-345.9	Anon.
345.10-19	Lemma: Mark 8.27-29
345.20-26	Anon.
345.27-346.10	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 54.1-2
346.10-14	Anon.
346.15	Lemma: Mark 8.30
346.16-347.4	Anon.
347.4-10	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 54.5
347.11-15	Lemma: Mark 8.32-33
347.16-348.1	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 54.5-6
348.2-11	Anon.
348.11-15	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 54.6
348.16-20	Lemma: Mark 8.34
348.21-349.17	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 55.1-2
349.18-20	Lemma; Mark 8.35
349.21-350.4	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 55.3
350.5-7	Lemma: Mark 8.35
350.8-20	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 55.4
350.21-25	Lemma: Mark 8.38
350.26-351.2	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 34.3
351.2-19	Anon.

Cramer	Source
351.20-25	Lemma: Mark 9.1
351.26-352.10	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 56.1
352.11-16	Lemma: Mark 9.2-3
352.17-353.3	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 56.1
353.3-353.16	Anon.
353.16-354.8	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 56.1-2
354.8-20	Anon.
354.20-355.2	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 56.2
355.2-25	Anon.
355.25-356.22	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 56.2-3
356.23-29	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 9.33
356.30-33	Lemma: Mark 9.9
356.31-357.6	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 56.4
357.6-11	Anon.
357.11-13	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 56.4
357.13-17	Anon.
357.17-22	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 56.4
357.23-24	Lemma: Mark 9.11
357.25-358.26	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 57.1-2
358.27-28	Lemma: Mark 9.13
358.29-359.4	Anon.
359.5-9	Lemma: Mark 9.14-16
359.10-18	Anon.
359.21-24	Lemma: Mark 9.25
359.25-26	Anon.
359.27-361.2	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 57.3
361.3-5	Lemma: Mark 9.28
361.6-16	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 57.3
361.16-362.21	Anon.
362.22-26	Lemma: Mark 9.30-31
362.27-363.8	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 57.2
363.9-10	Lemma: Mark 9.32
363.11-15	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 57.2
363.18-21	Lemma: Mark 9.33-34
363.22-364.11	Anon.
364.12-18	Lemma: Mark 9.35-37
364.19-30	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 58.2
364.30-365.6	Anon.
365.7-13	Lemma: Mark 9.38-40
365.14-18	Anon.
365.18-27	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 24.1-2
365.28-366.16	Anon.
366.17-19	Lemma: Mark 9.41
366.20-24	Anon.

Cramer	Source
366.25–26	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 35.2
366.26–27	Anon.
366.28–31	Lemma: Mark 9.42
366.32–367.12	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 58.3
367.12–25	Anon.
367.26–29	Lemma: Mark 9.43
367.30–368.3	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 59.4
368.3–11	Anon.
368.11–22	Eusebius, <i>Commentarius in Isaiam</i> 2.58.196–208
368.22–25	Anon.
368.26–29	Lemma: Mark 9.49–50
368.30–369.9	Anon.
369.10	Lemma: Mark 9.50
369.11–370.17	Anon. (comments on Luke 14.34–35)
370.18–31	Basil of Caesarea, <i>Regulae brevius tractatae</i> 266
371.1–6	Anon. (repeating 370.6–12 commenting on Luke 14.34–35)
371.9–12	Lemma: Mark 10.1
371.13–22	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 62.1
371.23–27	Lemma: Mark 10.7–9
371.28–372.6	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 62.1
372.7–8	Lemma: Mark 10.3 (Note the displacement of the lemma)
372.9–372.22	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 62.1–2
372.22–27	Anon.
372.28–373.10	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 62.2
373.10–25	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 62.1
373.26–374.6	Anon.
374.7–11	Lemma: Mark 10.10–12
374.12–14	Anon.
374.15–22	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 94.1–7
374.22–27	Anon.
374.28–29	Lemma: Mark 10.13
374.30–375.9	Anon.
375.10–25	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 62.4
375.26–27	Anon.
375.27–30	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 96.15–16
375.30–376.3	Anon.
376.5–8	Lemma: Mark 10.17
376.9–378.4	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 63.1–2
378.5–7	Lemma: Mark 10.24
378.8–30	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 63.2
378.30–32	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 63.3
379.1–3	Anon.
379.3–6	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 97
379.6–15	Anon.

Cramer	Source
379.15-33	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 98.4-20
379.33-380.11	Anon.
380.12-20	Lemma: Mark 10.28-30
380.21-29	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 64.1
380.29-381.2	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 64.1
381.2-17	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 64.2
381.16-17	Lemma: Mark 10.31
381.18-30	Anon.
381.31	Lemma: Mark 10.31
381.32-382.4	Origen, <i>Commentarium in evangelium Matthaeum</i> 15.25
382.4-383.2	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 100.1-30
383.2-7	Anon.
383.8-12	Lemma: Mark 10.32
383.13-15	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 65.1
383.15-27	Anon.
383.27-384.2	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 65.1
384.5-7	Lemma: Mark 10.35
384.8-19	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 65.2
384.19-21	Anon.
384.21-386.22	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 65.2-3
386.22-24	Anon.
386.24-387.23	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 65.3-4
387.26-29	Lemma: Mark 10.46
387.30-388.15	Anon.
388.16-17	Lemma: Mark 10.51
388.18-31	Anon.
389.3-8	Lemma: Mark 11.1-2
389.9-25	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 66.1-2
389.25-32	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 104.1-7
390.1	Lemma: Mark 11.4
390.2-7	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 66.2
390.8-9	Lemma: Mark 11.8
390.10-23	Anon.
390.24-25	Lemma: Mark 11.11
390.26	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 108.1
390.26-29	Anon.
390.30-391.2	Lemma: Mark 11.12-13
391.3-24	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 67.1-2
391.24-392.5	Anon.
392.6-393.9	Anon.
393.10-14	Lemma: Mark 11.15
393.15-25	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 67.1
393.25-30	Anon.
393.30-32	Theodore of Heraclea, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> 40.2-3

Cramer	Source
393.32–394.6	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> 106.1–5
394.6–14	Anon.
394.15–16	Lemma: Mark 11.18
394.17–24	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 68.2
394.25–27	Lemma: Mark 11.19–20
394.28–395.25	Anon.
395.26–30	Lemma: Mark 11.25
395.31–396.5	Anon.
396.6–7	Lemma: Mark 11.26
396.8–15	Anon.
396.16–22	Lemma: Mark 11.27–28
396.23–30	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 67.2
396.31–398.9	Anon.
398.11–15	Lemma: Mark 12.1
398.16–20	Anon.
398.20–21	Anon.
398.21–23	Anon.
398.23–28	Anon.
398.29–399.28	Anon.
399.28–400.2	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 68.1
400.2–12	Anon.
400.13–17	Anon.
400.20–21	Lemma: Mark 12.13
400.22–27	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 112
400.22–401.20	Anon.
401.23–25	Lemma: Mark 12.18
401.26–402.9	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 70.2
402.10–15	Anon.
402.15–22	Origen, <i>Fragmenta in Lucam</i> Fr. 241
402.22–32	Origen, <i>Fragmenta in Lucam</i> Fr. 242
402.22–32	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 113
403.3–5	Lemma: Mark 12.28
403.6–17	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 71.1
403.17–19	Anon.
403.19–26	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 71.1
403.26–404.2	Anon.
404.2–7	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 71.1
404.7–16	Anon.
404.16–17	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 71.1
404.20–22	Lemma: Mark 12.35
404.23–26	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 71.1
404.26–405.21	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 71.2
405.21–26	Anon.
405.26–31	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 114.1–6

Cramer	Source
406.1-3	Lemma: Mark 12.38
406.4-18	Anon.
406.18-20	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 20.46
406.23-25	Lemma: Mark 12.41
406.26-407.5	Anon.
407.8-9	Lemma: Mark 13.3
407.10-11	Anon.
407.11-22	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 75.1
407.22-26	Anon.
407.26-28	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 75.1
407.28-408.1	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 75.1
408.2-4	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 75.1
408.4-5	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 75.1
408.5-18	Anon.
408.18-28	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 21.8
408.29-31	Anon.
408.31-409.13	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 75.2
409.14-17	Lemma: Mark 13.9
409.18-20	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 75.2
409.20-22	Anon.
409.23-26	Lemma: Mark 13.11
409.27-28	Anon.
409.28-410.12	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 75.2
410.13-15	Anon.
410.15-17	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.897.27-30
410.18-21	Anon.
410.21-22	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 75.2
410.22-25	Anon.
410.26-29	Lemma: Mark 13.14
410.30-411.15	Theodore of Heraclea, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 121-124
411.16-412.23	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 76.1
412.24-28	Lemma: Mark 13.21-22
412.29-413.3	Anon.
413.4	Lemma: Mark 13.23
413.5	Basil of Caesarea, <i>Homiliae in Hexaemeron</i> 7.5.12
413.5-6	Anon.
413.7-9	Lemma: Mark 13.24
413.10-23	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 76.3
413.23-31	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 127
414.1-5	Lemma: Mark 13.28-29
414.6-14	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 77.1
414.17-19	Lemma: Mark 13.32
414.20-28	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 77.1
414.29-415.2	Theodore of Mopsuestia (attributed by Possinus)



Cramer	Source
415.2-6	Anon.
415.6-11	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 77.1
415.12-14	Anon.
415.14-416.5	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 77.1-2
416.6-19	Anon.
416.19-21	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 77.2
416.22-23	Lemma: Mark 13.34
416.24-29	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 77.2-3
416.29-417.3	Anon.
417.6-9	Lemma: Mark 14.1-2
417.10-24	Anon.
417.25-29	Lemma: Mark 14.3
417.30-418.3	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 80.1
418.3-4	Editorial attribution of the previous passage to John Chrysostom.
418.4-6	Editorial attribution of comment to Origen.
418.6-13	Editorial attribution of comments to Apollinaris and Theodore.
418.13-15	Luke 7.37
418.15-419.2	Anon.
419.3-9	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 80.1
419.10-13	Anon.
419.13-29	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 80.1-2
419.29-30	Anon.
420.3-5	Lemma: Mark 14.12
420.6-19	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 81.1
420.20-22	Lemma: Mark 14.13
420.23-28	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 81.1
420.28-421.9	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 130.1-7
421.9-18	Anon.
421.21-23	Lemma: Mark 14.17-18
421.24-28	Anon.
421.28-30	Titus of Bostra, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> 22.22
422.1-2	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 132.1-2
422.2-5	Anon.
422.6-11	Lemma: Mark 14.22-24
422.12-18	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 82.1
422.18-22	Apollinaris, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 133.1-3
422.22-423.5	Anon.
423.6-8	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 106.3-5
423.8-17	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.909.25-39
423.17-29	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 289.12-22
423.30-34	Anon.
423.35-424.2	Lemma: Mark 14.25
424.2-20	Anon.

Cramer	Source
424.20–23	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 82.2
424.24	Lemma: Mark 14.26
424.25–29	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 82.2
424.30–425.3	Lemma: Mark 14.27–28
425.4–6	Anon.
425.6–9	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 82.2
425.10–15	Lemma: Mark 14.29–31
425.16–426.2	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 82.3–4
426.3	Lemma: Mark 14.31
426.4–7	Anon.
426.8–12	Lemma: Mark. 14.32–33
426.13–17	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 83.1
426.17–20	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 83.1
426.20–22	Anon.
426.22–31	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 83.1
426.31–427.2	Anon.
427.2–16	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 83.1
427.16–17	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 83.1
427.17–19	Mark 14.41
427.19–27	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 83.1–2
427.28–428.5	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.920.15–25
428.6–9	Lemma: Mark 14.43
428.10–16	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.924.39–46
428.16–18	Apollinaris (extract attributed in <i>Cat. Luc.</i> 2.160.18–19)
428.19–25	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 83.2
428.26	Lemma: Mark 14.50
428.27–429.2	Anon.
429.2–4	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.925.36–38
429.4–8	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.925.43–47
429.8–13	Anon.
429.1–21	Lemma: Mark 14.53–54
429.22–430.9	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 84.2
430.9–19	Anon.
430.19–23	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> (attributed in <i>Cat. Luc.</i> 2.162.33–163.2)
430.23–29	Anon.
430.29–431.1	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> (attributed in <i>Cat. Luc.</i> 2.163.2–5)
431.1–15	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 84.3
431.15–16	Anon.
431.17–20	Lemma: Mark 14.65
431.21–26	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.929.4–12
431.27–28	Lemma: Mark 14.66
431.29–31	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.928.27–30

Cramer	Source
431.31–432.16	Anon.
432.16–19	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.928.52–57
432.19–31	Anon.
432.31–433.12	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i> 85.1–2
433.12–18	Anon.
433.19–22	Lemma: Mark 15.1
433.23–434.1	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.932.35–41
434.1–22	Anon. (Note that 434.10–13 repeats 434.5–7)
434.22–32	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.933.6–26
435.1–2	Lemma: Mark 15.6
435.3–17	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.933.4–46 (Note that 435.3–4 repeats 434.22–32)
435.17–19	Anon.
435.19–21	Theodore of Heraclea, <i>Fragmenta in Matthaëum</i> Fr. 130.1–2
435.22–24	Lemma: Mark 15.22–23
435.25–436.3	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i> 87.1
436.3–4	Anon.
436.4–5	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i> 87.1
436.5–10	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.935.53–936.3
436.10–21	Anon.
436.22–24	Anon.
436.24–25	Chrysostom (attributed in <i>Cat. Ioh.</i> 2.391.13–14)
436.25–29	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.935.53–936.3 (note that 436.25–29 repeats 436.5–10)
436.29–437.3	Anon. (note that 437.1–3 repeats 436.18–20)
437.4–5	Lemma: Mark 15.24
437.6–12	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Matthaëum</i> Fr. 308.1–7
437.12–29	Anon.
437.29–438.3	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i> 87.1–2
438.3–8(9)	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i> 88.1
438.9–15	Anon.
438.16–18	Lemma: Mark 15.29
438.19–21	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i> 87.2
438.21–23	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i> 87.2
438.24–26	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Lucam</i> 72.937.15–18
438.26–28	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i> 87.2
438.28–32	Origen, <i>Commentariorum series in evangelium Matthaëi</i> 270.20–28 (falsely attributed to Gregory of Nyssa by Possinus)
438.32–439.2	Anon.
439.3–7	Lemma: Mark 15.33–34
439.8–16	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i> 88.1
439.16–18	Anon.
439.18–19	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i> 88.1
439.19–25	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i> 88.1

Cramer	Source
439.26–29	Lemma: Mark 15.35–36
439.30–31	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 88.1
439.31–440.7	Anon.
440.8	Lemma: Mark 15.37
440.9–12	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 88.1
440.13–18	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 313.1–9
440.19–22	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 88.1 (Note repetition of 440.9–12).
440.22–25	Anon.
440.25–29	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 88.1
440.29–32	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 315.9–13
440.32–441.7	Anon.
441.8–11	Lemma: Mark 15.38–39
441.12–15	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 88.1 (Note repetition of 440.25–29).
441.16–19	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentarii in Matthaeum</i> Fr. 315.10–14 (Note repetition of 440.29–32).
441.19–21	Anon.
441.21–25	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 88.2
441.26–31	Lemma: Mark 15.40–41
441.32–442.4	Anon.
442.4–7	Anon.
442.7–8	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 88.2
442.8–10	Anon.
442.10–15	Anon
442.16–18	[Cod. 178] Anon. (note repetition of 442.4–7)
442.18–19	[Cod. 178] Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 88.2 (note repetition of 442.7–8)
442.19–23	[Cod. 178] Anon. (note repetition of 441.32–442.3)
442.23–28	[Cod. 178] Anon. (note repetition of 442.11–14)
442.28–30	[Cod. 178] Anon. (note repetition of 442.3–4)
442.30–443.4	[Cod. 178] Origen, <i>Commentariorum series in evangelium Matthaei</i> 293.30–294.30
443.6–11	Lemma: Mark 15.42–43
443.12–15	Anon.
443.16–444.2	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 88.2–3
444.3–5	Lemma: Mark 16.1
444.6–9	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 89.2
444.9–445.32	The catenist. (Smith attributed this passage to Eusebius, although conceded it was ‘free and indirect’). Some allusions to Eusebius, <i>Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum</i> .
446.1–3	Lemma: Mark 16.9
446.4–15	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i> 40.2

---

Cramer	Source
446.15-447.2	The catenist. (Explicit reference to Eusebius, <i>Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum</i> , but note that the catenist disagrees with Eusebius' conclusions).

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Primary Sources*

- Aland, K., *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* (Stuttgart, 1988).
- Bardy, G., *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, 3 vols. SC 31, 41, 55. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1:1952).
- Blanc, C., *Origène. Commentaire sur saint Jean*, 3 vols. SC 120, 157, 222. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1:1966; 2:1970; 3:1975)
- Bobichon, P., *Justin Martyr, Dialogue avec Tryphon: édition critique* (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003).
- Bury, R.G., *Plato, Laws*, Volume 1. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926).
- Colson, F.H. & Whitaker, G.H., *Philo*: Volumes 1, 2, and 4. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1:1929, 2:1929, 4:1932).
- Cramer, J.A., *Catena in Evangelia S. Matthaei et S. Marci* (Oxford: e Typographeo Academico, 1840).
- Crouzel, H. and Simonetti, M., *Origène. Traité des Principes*. SC 252, 253, 268 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1: 1978, 2: 1978, 3: 1980).
- Doutreleau, L. and Rousseau, A., *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies, livre 3*, vol. 2. SC 211. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974).
- Ehrman, B.D., *The Apostolic Fathers*. Volumes 1–2. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).
- Évieux, P., *Isidore de Peluse. Lettres 1* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997).
- Feldman, L., *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities*. Books 18–19. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965).
- , *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities*. Books 20. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965).
- Gibson, C.A., *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Atlanta: SBL, 2008).
- Giet, S., *Basile de Césarée. Homélie sur l'hexaéméron*, 2nd edn. SC 26 bis. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968).
- Gressmann, H., *Eusebius Werke, Band 3.2: Die Theophanie* [Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 11.2. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904]: 3\*–35\*.
- Harnack, A. von, *Porphyrius. Gegen die Christen* (Berlin: Reimer, 1916).
- Hill, R.C., *John Chrysostom, Commentary on the Psalms* (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2007).
- , *Diodore of Tarsus. Commentary on Psalms 1–51* (Atlanta: SBL, 2005).
- Hoffmann, R.J., *Porphyry's Against the Christians: The Literary Remains* (New York: Prometheus Books, 1994).
- Kennedy, G.A., *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus* (Atlanta: SBL, 2005).
- Klostermann, E., *Origenes Werke*, vol. 10.1–2 [Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 40 Leipzig: Teubner, 10.1:1935; 10.2:1937].

- , *Origenes Werke*, vol. 11 [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 38.2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1933].
- Malingrey, A.-M., *Jean Chrysostome. Sur La Vaine Gloire et l'Éducation des Enfants* (Paris: Cerf, 1972).
- Nautin, P., *Sur la Genèse: texte inédit d'après un papyrus de Toura/Didyme l'Aveugle*. SC 233/244 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976–1978).
- Otto, J.C.T., *Corpus apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi*, vol. 5, 3rd edn. Jena: Mauke, 1881 (repr. 1969): 2–246.
- Pruche, B., *Basile de Césarée. Sur le Saint-Esprit*, 2nd edn. SC 17 bis. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968).
- Rauer, M., *Origenes Werke*, vol. 9, 2nd edn. [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 49 (35). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959].
- Routh, M.J., *Reliquiae sacrae*, vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1846 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1974).
- Schwartz, E., *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984).
- Sickenberger, J., *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukas-homilien*. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901).
- Simonetti, M., *La maga di Endor: Origene, Eustazio, Gregorio di Nissa*, (Florence: Nardini, Centro Internazionale del Libro, 1989), 94–206.
- Thackeray, H. St. J., *Josephus, The Jewish War*. Books 1–2. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927).
- Whitby, M., *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000).
- Wickham, L.R., *Cyril of Alexandria Select Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).
- Wilson, N.G., *The Bibliotheca by Photius* (London: Duckworth, 1994).
- Ziegler, J., *Eusebius Werke, Band 9: Der Jesajakommentar* [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975]: 3–411.

#### Secondary Literature

- Abraham, W.J., *Canon and Criterion in Christian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- Aland, K., *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994).
- Alexander, L., *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1–4 and Acts 1.1* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- , 'Paul and the Hellenistic Schools: The Evidence of Galen,' in T. Engberg-Pedersen ed., *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), pp. 60–83.
- , 'The Four among Pagans,' in M. Bockmuehl and D. Hagner ed., *The Written Gospel*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 222–237.
- , 'Canon and Exegesis in the Medical Schools of Antiquity,' in J.-D. Kaestli and P.S. Alexander ed., *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, (Lausanne: Zèbre, 2006), pp. 115–153.
- , 'Hellenistic Schools,' in D.N. Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 1005–1011.

- Alexander, P.S., 'Quid Athenis et Hierosolymis? Rabbinic Midrash and Hermeneutics in the Graeco-Roman World,' in P.R. Davies and R.T. White ed., *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990).
- , 'In Search of the Rabbinic Beit Midrash in Late Antiquity,' Unpublished Paper, 2008.
- Alexander, P.S. and Samely, A., 'Introduction: Artefact and Text,' *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 75 (1993), pp. 5–16.
- Allen, P. and van Roey, A., *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century* (Leuven: Peeters, 1994).
- Allen, P. and Heyward, C.T.R., *Severus of Antioch* (London: Routledge, 2004).
- Allison, D.C., *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1998).
- Allison, D.C. and Davies, W.D.D., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew. The International Critical Commentary*. 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991).
- Alston, W., *Divine Nature and Human Language* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989).
- Ashkenazi, Y., 'Sophists and Priests in Late Antique Gaza According to Choricus the Rhetor,' in B. Bitton-Ashkelony and A. Kofsky ed., *Christian Gaza in Late Antiquity*, (Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Aubineau, M., 'Les Catenae in Lucam,' *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 80 (1987), pp. 29–47.
- Auerbach, E., 'Figura,' in W. Godzich and J. Schulte-Sasse ed., *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984 (originally published 1944)), pp. 11–76.
- , *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950).
- Ayres, L., *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Barr, J., 'Historical Criticism and the Theological Interpretation of Scripture,' in *Explorations in Theology* 7, (London: SCM, 1980), pp. 30–51.
- , *Holy Scripture: Canon, Authority, Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983).
- Barth, K., *The Epistle to the Romans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968).
- Barton, J., *The Nature of Biblical Criticism* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007).
- Bate, H.N., 'Some Technical Terms of Greek Exegesis,' *Journal of Theological Studies*, 24 (1923), pp. 59–66.
- Baukham, R., *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- , *Jesus and the God of Israel: 'God Crucified' and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- Becker, A.H., *Fear of God and the Beginning of Wisdom: The School of Nisibis and the Development of Scholastic Culture in Late Antique Mesopotamia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).
- , 'The Dynamic Reception of Theodore of Mopsuestia in the Sixth Century: Greek, Syriac, and Latin' in Scott F. Johnson ed., *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).



- Berchman, R.M., 'In the Shadow of Origen: Porphyry and the Patristic Origins of New Testament Criticism,' in G. Dorival and A.L. Bouillic ed., *Origenia Sexta: Origen and the Bible* (Leuven: Peeters, 1995).
- Berlinerblau, J., *The Secular Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Best, E., *Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981).
- , 'The Gospel of Mark: Who was the Reader?,' *Irish Biblical Studies* 11 (1989), 124–132.
- Bible and Culture Collective, ed., *The Postmodern Bible* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
- Black, C.C., *The Disciples According to Mark: Markan Redaction in Current Debate* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).
- , *Mark: Images of an Apostolic Interpreter* (Columbia: University of Columbia Press, 1994).
- Bockmuehl, M., 'The Making of Gospel Commentaries,' in M. Bockmuehl and D. Hagner ed., *The Written Gospel*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- , *Seeing the Word: Refocusing New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006).
- Bockmuehl, M. and Hagner, D. ed., *The Written Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Bockmuehl, M. and Torrance, A.J. ed., *Scripture's Doctrine and Theology's Bible: How the New Testament Shapes Christian Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008).
- Borgen, P., 'Philo of Alexandria,' in M.E. Stone ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
- Bori, P.C., *L'Interpretation Infinie: L'herméneutique Chrétienne Ancienne et ses Transformations* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1991).
- Boring, M.E., *Mark: A Commentary. The New Testament Library* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006).
- Bourdieu P. and Passeron, J.-C., *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (London: Sage, 1977).
- Boyarin, D., *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
- , *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).
- Breck, J., *Scripture in Tradition: The Bible and Its Interpretation in the Orthodox Church* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001).
- Brisson, L., *How Philosophers Saved Myths: Allegorical Interpretation and Classical Mythology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).
- Brown, D., *The Divine Trinity* (London: Duckworth, 1985).
- , *Tradition and Imagination: Revelation and Change* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).
- Brown, R.E., *The Gospel According to John XIII–XXI* (New York: Doubleday, 1970).
- , *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994).
- Bruns, G.L., *Hermeneutics Ancient and Modern* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).
- Buckler, G., *Anna Comnena* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929).

- Burgon, J.W., *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Lafayette: Sovereign Grace, 2000 (original edition 1871)).
- Burton-Christie, D., *The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- Byrskog, S., *Story as History—History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (Tübingen: Möhr Siebeck, 2000).
- Cadiou, R., 'La Bibliothèque de Césarée et la Formation des Chaînes,' *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 16 (1936), pp. 474–483.
- Cahill, M., 'The Identification of the First Markan Commentary,' *Revue Biblique*, 110–112 (1994), pp. 258–268.
- Caird, G., *Saint Luke* (London: Pelican, 1963).
- Cameron, A., *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).
- Camery-Hoggatt, J., *Irony in Mark's Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Carlson, S.C., *The Gospel Hoax: Morton Smith's Invention of Secret Mark* (Waco: Baylor, 2005).
- Chadwick, H., *The Early Church* (London: Pelican, 1967).
- , *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Childs, B.S., *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970).
- , *The Book of Exodus* (London: SCM, 1974).
- Christie, F., 'Diodorus Von Tarsus. Vier Pseudojustinische Schriften Als Eigentum Diodors Nachgewiesen by Adolf Harnack,' *The American Journal of Theology*, 6 (1902), pp. 557–578.
- Clark, E., *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).
- , *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004).
- Coakley, S., 'What Does Chalcedon Solve and What Does It Not? Some Reflections on the Status and Meaning of the Chalcedonian 'Definition',' in G. O'Collins ed., *The Incarnation*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Collins, A.Y., *Mark: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007).
- Cook, J.G., *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Tübingen: Möhr Siebeck, 2000).
- Cooper, S.A., *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Cranfield, C.E.B., *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).
- Criboire, R., *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- , *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).
- Crisp, O.D., *Divinity and Humanity: The Incarnation Reconsidered* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Crossley, J.G., *The Date of Mark's Gospel* (London: Continuum, 2004).
- , 'The Damned Rich (Mark 10.17–31),' *The Expository Times*, 116 (2005).

- Daniélou, J., *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (London: Burns & Oates, 1960).
- Davies, P., *Whose Bible is it Anyway?* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2004).
- , 'How to Get into the Canon and Stay There. Or: The Philosophy of an Acquisitive Society,' in J.-D. Kaestli and P.S. Alexander ed., *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, (Lausanne: Zèbre, 2006), pp. 11–25.
- Dawson, J.D., *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).
- , 'Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Christian Identity in Boyarin, Auerbach and Frei,' *Modern Theology*, 14 (1998), pp. 181–196.
- , *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).
- Devreesse, R., 'Chaînes Exégétiques Grecques,' in *Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément*, 1928, pp. 1084–1233.
- , 'L'édition du commentaire d'Eusèbe de Césarée sur Isaïe: Interpolations et omissions,' *Revue biblique*, 42 (1933), pp. 540–555.
- Dibelius, M., *From Tradition to Gospel* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1971 (original 1934)).
- Dickey, E., *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Dodd, C.H., *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Whitefriars, 1935).
- Donahue, J.R. and Harrington, D.J., *The Gospel of Mark. Sacra Pagina*. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2002).
- Dorival, G., *Les Chaînes Exégétiques Grecques sur les Psaumes: Contribution à l'étude d'une forme littéraire* (Leuven: Peeters, 1986).
- Downey, G., 'The Christian Schools of Palestine: A Chapter in Literary History,' *Harvard Literary Bulletin*, 12 (1958), pp. 297–319.
- Drury, J., *The Parables in the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1985).
- Dunn, J.D.G., *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM, 1980).
- , *A New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed* (London: SPCK, 2005).
- Eco, U., *The Open Work* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).
- Eden, K., *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).
- Edwards, M., *Origen against Plato* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).
- Ehrman, B.D., *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- Elliott, J.K. ed., *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- Engberg-Pedersen, T., *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001).
- Farmer, W.R., *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).
- Fishbane, M., *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).
- Fowl, S.E. ed., *The Theological Interpretation of Scripture: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997).

- , *Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).
- Frei, H., *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).
- , *Types of Christian Theology*, ed. G. Hunsinger and W.C. Placher (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).
- , *Theology and Narrative, Selected Essays*, ed. G. Hunsinger and W.C. Placher (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- Freire, P., *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (London: Penguin, 1970).
- Froehlich, K., *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
- Furnish, V., *2 Corinthians* (New York: Doubleday, 1984).
- Gadamer, H.-G., *Truth and Method* (New York: Continuum, 2003 (Second Revised Edition)).
- Gamble, H.Y., *The New Testament Canon: Its Meaning and Making* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).
- , *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
- Gathercole, S.J., *The Pre-Existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark and Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).
- Gibbon, E., *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (London: Methuen, 1908).
- Grant, R.M., 'Historical Criticism in the Ancient Church,' *The Journal of Religion*, 25 (1945), pp. 183–196.
- Grillmeier, A., *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Council of Chalcedon 451 to Gregory the Great 590–604* (London: Mowbray, 1995).
- Guerra, A., *Romans and the Apologetic Tradition: The Purpose, Genre and Audience of Paul's Letter* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Haar Romeny, B. ter, 'Procopius of Gaza and His Library,' in Hagit Amirav and B. ter Haar Romeny ed., *From Rome to Constantinople*, (Leuven: Peeters, 2007).
- Hadot, P., *Philosophy as a Way of Life* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995).
- , *What Is Ancient Philosophy?* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002).
- Hall, C.A. and Oden, T.C., *Mark*. Ancient Christian Commentary Series. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998).
- Hanson, R.P.C., *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1959).
- , 'Biblical Exegesis in the Early Church,' in P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans ed., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).
- Harvey, A., *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (London: Duckworth, 1982).
- , 'Gospel Truths,' in *The Times Literary Supplement* (London, 2004).
- Hauerwas, S.M., *Christian Existence Today: Essays on Church, World and Living in Between* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988).
- Heine, R.E., 'Can the Catena Fragments of Origen's *Commentary on John* be Trusted?' *Vigiliae Christianae*, 40 (1986), pp. 118–134.
- Hengel, M., *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (London: SCM, 1985).
- , 'The Messianic Secret in Mark,' in W.G. Jeanrond and A.D.H. Mayes ed.,

- Recognising the Margins: Developments in Biblical and Theological Studies* (Dublin: Columba Press, 2006).
- Herrin, J., *Byzantium: The Surprising Life of a Medieval Empire* (London: Penguin, 2007).
- Hezser, C., *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine* (Tübingen: Möhr Siebeck, 2001).
- Hick, J. ed., *The Myth of God Incarnate* (London: SCM, 1977).
- , *The Metaphor of God Incarnate: Christology in a Pluralistic Age* (London: SCM, 1993).
- Hirshman, M., 'The Greek Fathers and the Aggada on Ecclesiastes: Formats of Exegesis in Late Antiquity,' *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 59 (1988), pp. 137–165.
- Hooker, M., *The Message of Mark* (London: Epworth, 1983).
- , *The Gospel According to St. Mark. Black's New Testament Commentaries*. (London: A. & C. Black, 1991).
- , 'Chalcedon and the New Testament,' in S. Coakley and D. Pailin ed., *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- Horbury, W., 'Jews and Christians on the Bible: Demarcation and Convergence 325–451 C.E.' in J. van Oort and U. Wickert ed., *Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon*, (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992).
- , *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM, 1998).
- Hovorun, C., *Will, Action and Freedom: Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).
- Hurtado, L.W., *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (London: SCM, 1988).
- Irvine, M., *The Making of Textual Culture: Grammatica and Literary Theory 350–1100* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Jenson, R.W., *Systematic Theology*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).
- Jeremias, J., *The Parables of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1963).
- Jonge, H.J. de, 'Augustine on the Interrelations of the Gospels,' in F. van Segbroeck et al., *The Four Gospels* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), vol. 3 pp. 2409–2417.
- Kannengiesser, C., 'A Key for the Future of Patristics' in Paul M. Blowers et al., *In Dominico Eloquentia—In Lordly Eloquence* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), pp. 90–106.
- , ed., *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- Kaster, R.A., *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).
- Kealy, S., *Mark's Gospel: A History of Its Interpretation from the Beginning until 1979* (New York: Paulist, 1982).
- Kelly, J.N.D., *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom, Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995).
- Kennedy, G.A., *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984).
- , *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999).
- Kermode, F., *The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979).

- Kloppenborg, J., 'Evocatio Deorum and the Date of Mark,' *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 124 (2005), pp. 419–150.
- Kofsky, A., *Eusebius of Caesarea against the Pagans* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Kofsky, A. and Bitton-Ashkelony, B. ed., *Christian Gaza in Late Antiquity*, (Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- , *The Monastic School of Gaza* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- Kuschel, K.-J., *Born before All Time? The Dispute over Christ's Origin* (London: SCM, 1992).
- Lamberton, R., *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).
- Lane, W.L., *The Gospel According to Mark. The New International Commentary on the New Testament*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974).
- Lange, N. de, *Origen and the Jews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).
- Leclercq, J., 'Pour l'histoire de l'expression 'philosophie chrétienne', *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 9 (1952), pp. 221–226.
- , *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1961).
- Levene, N. and Ochs, P. ed., *Textual Reasonings: Jewish Philosophy and Text Study at the End of the Twentieth Century* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).
- Lincicum, D., 'Benedict's Jesus and the Rehabilitation of Christian Figural Reading,' *Journal of Theological Interpretation*, 2 (2008), pp. 285–292.
- Lindbeck, G., *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
- Louth, A., *Discerning the Mystery: An Essay on the Nature of Theology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).
- Lubac, H. de, *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1959 (ET 1998)).
- Luz, U., *Matthew 1–7* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989).
- , *Matthew 8–20* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001).
- , *Matthew 21–28* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005).
- Maas, M., *Exegesis and Empire in the Early Byzantine Mediterranean* (Tübingen: Möhr Siebeck, 2003).
- MacIntyre, A., *After Virtue* (London: Duckworth, 1981).
- , *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* (London: Duckworth, 1988).
- Madigan, K., 'Christus Nesciens? Was Christ Ignorant of the Day of Judgment? Arian and Orthodox Interpretation of Mark 13,32 in the Ancient Latin West,' *Harvard Theological Review*, 96 (2003), pp. 255–278.
- Malbon, E.S., *In the Company of Jesus: Characters in Mark's Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001).
- Marrou, H.-I., *A History of Education in Antiquity* (New York: New American Library, 1964).
- Martin, D.B., *Pedagogy of the Bible* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008).
- Matter, E.A., 'The Church Fathers and the *Glossa Ordinaria*,' in I.D. Backus ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 83–112.
- McGuckin, J., *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy* (New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004).

- McKay, H., *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- McKibbens, T.R., 'The Exegesis of John Chrysostom: Homilies on the Gospels,' *The Expository Times*, 93 (1982), pp. 264–270.
- McNamee, K., 'Another Chapter in the History of Scholia,' *Classical Quarterly*, 48 (1998), pp. 269–288.
- Meier, J., *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus: Companions and Competitors* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007).
- Metzger, B.M., *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Michie, D. and Rhoads, D., *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).
- Mitchell, M.M., 'Pauline Accommodation and "Condescension": 1 Cor. 9.19–23 and the History of Influence,' in T. Engberg-Pedersen ed., *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), pp. 197–214.
- , *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002).
- , 'Patristic Rhetoric on Allegory: Origen and Eustathius Put 1 Kingdoms 28 on Trial,' in R. Greer and M. Mitchell ed., *The "Belly-Myther" of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church* (Atlanta: SBL, 2007).
- , *Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- Momigliano, A. ed., *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963).
- Moore, S.D., *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
- Moore, S.D., and Anderson, J.C., *Mark and Method* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008).
- Morgan, R. and Barton, J., *Biblical Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).
- Morgan, T., *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- , *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Morris, T.V., *The Logic of God Incarnate* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986).
- Niehoff, M.R., 'Homeric Scholarship and Bible Exegesis in Ancient Alexandria: Evidence from Philo's 'Quarrelsome' Colleagues,' *Classical Quarterly*, 57 (2007), pp. 166–182.
- , *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Nineham, D., *St. Mark* (London: SCM, 1969).
- Nordenfalk, C., 'Canon Tables on Papyrus,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 36 (1982), pp. 29–38.
- , 'The Eusebian Canon Tables: Some Textual Problems,' *Journal of Theological Studies*, 35 (1984), pp. 96–104.
- Norelli, E. and Moreschini, C. ed., *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History*. 2 vols. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005).

- Norris, R., 'Chalcedon Revisited: A Historical and Theological Reflection,' in B. Nasif ed., *New Perspectives on Historical Theology*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), pp. 140–158.
- Norwich, J.J., *Byzantium: The Early Centuries*. Vol. 1 (London: Penguin, 1996).
- , *Byzantium: The Apogee*. Vol. 2 (London: Penguin, 1996).
- , *Byzantium: The Decline and Fall*. Vol. 3 (London: Penguin, 1996).
- Nünlist, R., *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- O'Keefe, J.J., '“A Letter That Killeth”; toward a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms,' *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 8 (2000), pp. 83–104.
- Obbink, D., 'Allegory and Exegesis in the Derveni Papyrus: The Origin of Greek Scholarship,' in G.R. Boys-Stones ed., *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Ochs, P., 'Returning to Scripture: Trends in Postcritical Interpretation,' *Cross Currents*, 44 (1994/1995), pp. 437–452.
- Oliver, H.H., 'The Epistle of Eusebius to Carpianus: Textual Tradition and Translation,' *Novum Testamentum*, 3 (1959), pp. 138–145.
- Parker, D.C., *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- Pelikan, J., *Acts* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005).
- Petit, F., *Catena Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum: 1. Catena Sinaitica* (Leuven: Peeters, 1977).
- , 'La Chaîne grecque sur la Genèse, miroir de l'exégèse ancienne,' in G. Schöllgen and C. Scholten ed., *Stimuli, Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1996).
- Radner, E., *Leviticus* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2008).
- Räsänen, H., *Challenges to Biblical Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- , 'The “Effective History” of the Bible: A Challenge to Biblical Scholarship?' in *Challenges to Biblical Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 263–282.
- Ramelli, I., 'Origen and the Stoic Allegorical Tradition: Continuity and Innovation,' Conference Paper at *SBL Annual Meeting* in Atlanta, 2004.
- Rappe, S., 'The New Math: How to Add and to Subtract Pagan Elements in Christian Education,' in Y.L. Too ed., *Education in Greek and Latin Antiquity*, (Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 405–432.
- Ratzinger, J., *Jesus of Nazareth: From the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration* (London: Bloomsbury, 2007).
- Ratzinger, J., *Jesus of Nazareth: Holy Week: from the entrance into Jerusalem to the Resurrection* (London: Bloomsbury, 2011).
- Reno, R.R. and O'Keefe, J.J., *Sanctified Vision: An Introduction to Early Christian Interpretation of the Bible* (London: John Hopkins University Press, 2005).
- Reuss, J., *Matthäus, Markus, und Johannes-Katene: Nach den Handschriften Quellen* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1941).
- , *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche. Aus Katenehandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957).
- , *Johannes-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche. Aus Katenehandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1966).



- , *Lukas-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche. Aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben.* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984).
- Reynolds, L.D. and Wilson, N.G., *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature.* Third edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
- Ricoeur, P., 'Metaphor and the Central Problem of Hermeneutics,' in J. Thompson ed., *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
- Ricoeur, P. and LaCocque A., *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
- Robbins, V., *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
- Robins, R.H., *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993).
- Rousseau, P., *Basil of Caesarea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
- Runciman, S., *Byzantine Civilisation* (London: Edward Arnold, 1933).
- Russell, B., *Why I Am Not a Christian* (London: Routledge, 2004).
- Sanders, E.P., *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 1995).
- Sanders, J.A., *Torah and Canon* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972).
- , *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
- Sandnes, K.O., *The Challenge of Homer: School, Pagan Poets and Early Christianity* (London: T & T Clark, 2009).
- Schüssler-Fiorenza, E., *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM, 1983).
- Schweitzer, A., *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede* (London: A. & C. Black, 1954 [1906]).
- Scott, P.M., 'Seasons of Grace? Christ's Cursing of a Fig Tree,' in A.T. Lincoln and A. Paddison ed., *Christology and Scripture: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, (London: T. & T. Clark, 2007), pp. 188–206.
- Sherwood, Y., *A Biblical Text and Its Afterlives: The Survival of Jonah in Western Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Simonetti, M., *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994).
- Smith, H., 'The Sources of Victor of Antioch's Commentary on Mark,' *Journal of Theological Studies*, 19 (1918), pp. 350–370.
- Smith, M., *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973).
- Snyder, H.G., *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World* (London: Routledge, 2000).
- Soden, H.F. von, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902–1913).
- Sorabji, R. ed., *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence* (London: Duckworth, 1990).
- Sorenson, E., *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Möhr Siebeck, 2002).
- Stein, R.H., *Mark. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament.* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008).

- Steiner, G., *Real Presences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).
- , *No Passion Spent* (London: Faber & Faber, 1996).
- Steinmetz, D.C., 'The Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis,' in S.E. Fowl ed., *The Theological Interpretation of Scripture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), pp. 26–38.
- Stout, J., *Democracy and Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).
- Stroumsa, G.G., *Barbarian Philosophy: The Religious Revolution of Early Christianity* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).
- Swanson, R., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Mark* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).
- Tannehill, R.C., 'The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role,' *Journal of Religion*, 57 (1977), pp. 368–405.
- Ta-Shma, I.M., 'The 'Open' Book in Medieval Hebrew Literature: The Problem of Authorized Editions,' *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 75 (1993), pp. 17–24.
- Talgam, R., 'The *Ekphrasis Eikonos* of Procopius of Gaza: The Depiction of Mythological Themes in Palestine and Arabia During the Fifth and Sixth Centuries,' in B. Bitton-Ashkelony and A. Kofsky ed., *Christian Gaza in Late Antiquity*, (Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Taylor, V., *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1952).
- Telford, W.R. ed., *The Interpretation of Mark* (London: SPCK, 1985).
- Thiselton, A.C., 'Biblical Interpretation,' in D.F. Ford with R. Muers ed., *The Modern Theologians* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005).
- Thurén, L., 'John Chrysostom as a Rhetorical Critic: The Hermeneutics of an Early Father,' *Biblical Interpretation*, 9 (2001), pp. 180–218.
- Torrance, I.R., *Christology after Chalcedon* (Norwich: Canterbury, 1988).
- Tracy, D., *Plurality and Ambiguity: Hermeneutics, Religion, Hope* (London: SCM, 1987).
- Turner, E.G., *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).
- Voorst, R. van, *Jesus Outside the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
- Watson, F., *Text, Church and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994).
- Weeden, T., 'The Heresy That Necessitated Mark's Gospel,' *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 59 (1968), pp. 145–158.
- Whitman, J., *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).
- Wiles, M., 'Theodore of Mopsuestia as Representative of the Antiochene School,' in P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans ed., *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).
- , 'Review: Origen Against Plato. By Mark Julian Edwards,' *Journal of Theological Studies*, 55 (2004), pp. 340–344.
- Wilken, R.L., *John Chrysostom and the Jews* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).
- , 'In Defense of Allegory,' *Modern Theology*, 14 (1998), pp. 197–212.
- , *Isaiah: Interpreted by Early Christian and Medieval Commentators* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).
- Williams, M. and Grafton, A., *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2006).

- Williams, R., 'The Discipline of Scripture,' in *On Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), pp. 44–60.
- , *Christ on Trial: How the Gospel Unsettles Our Judgement* (London: Fount, 2000).
- , *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).
- , 'Historical Criticism and Sacred Text,' in D. Ford and G. Stanton ed., *Reading Texts, Seeking Wisdom*, (London: SCM, 2003).
- Wilson, N.G., 'A Chapter in the History of Scholia,' *Classical Quarterly*, 17 (1967), pp. 244–256.
- , 'A Chapter in the History of Scholia: A Postscript,' *Classical Quarterly*, 18 (1968), p. 413.
- , *Scholars of Byzantium*. Revised Edition. (London: Duckworth, 1996).
- Wrede, W., *The Messianic Secret* (London: James Clarke, 1971 ET (first published in German in 1901)).
- Wright, N.T., *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996).
- , *Paul for Everyone. Romans*. (London: SPCK, 2006).
- Yarnold, E., *Cyril of Jerusalem* (London: Routledge, 2000).
- Yeago, D.S., 'The New Testament and the Nicene Dogma: A Contribution to the Recovery of Theological Exegesis' in S.E. Fowl ed., *The Theological Interpretation of Scripture: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), pp. 87–101.
- Young, F., *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to Its Literature and Background* (London: SCM, 1983).
- , 'Allegory and the Ethics of Reading,' in F. Watson ed., *The Open Text* (London: SCM, 1993), pp. 103–120.
- , 'Paideia and the Myth of Static Dogma,' in S. Coakley and D. Pailin ed., *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 265–283.
- , *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- , 'The 'Mind' of Scripture: Theological Readings of the Bible in the Fathers,' *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, 7 (2005), pp. 126–141.
- Zuntz, G., *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

## INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

### 1. OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis		Joshua	
1.26-31	452	5.12	298
2.24	354		
3.8	229	1 Samuel	
4.16	229	1.22	229
4.26	346	22.11-23	158, 253
25.26	452	22.20	253
41.32	428	28.3-25	123
Exodus		1 Kings	
3.20	221-222	1.19	395
4.10	330	4.33	442
5-10	330	17.12-16	299
10.21-29	446	18-21	330
12.22	442		
16	379	2 Kings	
16.3	298	2	329
17	153, 379		
20.21	332	1 Chronicles	
26.35	270	18.16	253
30.12	370	24.6	253
30.35	347		
		Job	
Leviticus		1.7	134
2.13	347	6.6	349
13.46	241	14.4	435
19.18	392		
		Psalms	
Numbers		7.9	433
11	379	14.1	392
20	379	15.4	361
		16.7	433
Deuteronomy		22.2	446
6.4-5	392	24.6	407
18.15	295	26.2	433
32.29	380	31.2	227
33.9-10	365	44.23	273
		45.9	134
		50.17	322

Psalms (*cont.*)

59.7	310
73.21	433
76.2	289
78.2	276
78.19–20	153, 379
97.2	332
98.8	134
104.3	332
110.1	394
114.7	229
116.16	395
120.6–7	349
126.6	274
139.13	433

## Proverbs

27.5	387
------	-----

## Isaiah

1.22	134
3.11	437
5.1	386
5.1–7	126–127
5.4	267
5.5	385
6.9–10	269
13.10	405
19.1	332
29.13	306
34.4	406
40.3	144, 158, 221–223
40.15	226
50.1–2	269
53.4	442
53.12	442
56.7	378
64.6	226
66.24	346

## Jeremiah

11.20	433
12.2	433
17.10	433
20.12	433

## Lamentations

2.19	229
3.13	433

## Ezekiel

16.7	134
17.24	380
18.20–21	435
39.17	134
43.24	347

## Hosea

6.6	189, 415–416
-----	--------------

## Joel

3.13	134
11.17	135

## Obadiah

1.15	437
------	-----

## Jonah

1.3	229
1.10	229

## Zechariah

5	274
9.9	374
12.10	407

## Malachi

2.14–15	353
3.1	143, 221–222
4.5–6	330
4.6	335

## 2. NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew		13:51	277
3:2	239	14:1-2	295
3:4	225	14:21	298
3:17	143, 224	14:27	302
4:1	117, 230	14:28-33	300, 302
4:10	322	14:33	303
4:12	149, 230	14:35	303
4:13	231	15:1-20	352
4:17	230-231, 272	15:21	308
5:13	348	15:22	308
5:18-44	235	15:24	309
6:2-4	415	16:6	151
6:16	425	16:11	316-317
6:22	270	16:13	295
7:6	276	16:14	295
7:14	360	16:16-20	319, 340
7:19	274	16:21	320, 340
8:12	284, 364	16:22	321
8:16	153	16:25	330, 363
8:25	278	17:2	328
8:27	185, 279, 303	17:10	334
8:28	152	17:17	337
9:3	352	17:18	340
9:9	151, 248	18:1	152, 341, 370
9:13	189, 415-416	18:8	347
9:18	286	19:2	153, 351
10:1	292	19:15	357
10:1-16	149	19:21	362
10:6	309	19:26	360, 361
10:7-11	292	19:28	369
10:9	292	19:29	365
10:10	292	20:20	152
10:32	320	20:22	328, 368
10:33	434	20:23	368, 369, 370
10:39	330	20:30	159, 372
11:10	222	21:12-13	378
11:17-18	225	21:17-18	375
11:18	352	21:19	380
12:1-8	352	21:33	273, 385
12:7	189, 415-416	21:43	272
12:10	256	22:29	390
12:30	344	22:32	391
12:31	261	22:34	391
12:39	445	22:37-39	392-393
13:41-42	275	22:39	392

Matthew (*cont.*)

22.43-45	394	1.13	230
23.7	268	1.14	149, 231
23.9	358	1.15	231
24.4	398	1.21	231-232
24.9	400	1.22	232
24.36	181	1.23-24	233
25.12	325	1.25	164, 233
25.41	284	1.26-31	234-235
26.6	413	1.32-33	236
26.6-11	148	1.34	150, 154, 164, 237
26.12-13	148	1.35-39	151, 237
26.18	419	1.37	238
26.29	423, 424	1.38	154, 238-239
26.37	418	1.39	239
26.39-41	427	1.41-42	240, 242
26.51	430	1.43-45	164, 241-242
26.61	431	2.1-4	243
26.65	432, 433	2.1-12	175
26.71	434	2.5	244
26.75	434, 435	2.7	352
27.32	440, 441, 442	2.9-11	245
27.34	144, 442	2.11-12	246
27.45	443	2.13-14	247
27.46	144, 447	2.14	151
27.54	449	2.15-16	248
27.56	451, 452	2.17	249
28.1	455, 456	2.18-20	250
28.2-3	457	2.21-22	251
28.3	459	2.23-24	252
28.4	136, 456	2.23-28	352
28.9-10	458	2.25-26	158, 252
28.19	320	3.1-4	255, 352
		3.3	224
		3.5-7	256
		3.8	159, 256
		3.9-11	256
		3.12	164, 256
		3.13	149
		3.13-14	258
		3.20-21	259
		3.21	69, 263
		3.22	259, 352
		3.23-27	260
		3.28	185-186, 261
		3.31-35	69, 262
		4.1-20	118, 124, 139, 358
		4.1-2	265
Mark			
1.1-2	221		
1.2-3	158		
1.3	223, 266, 267		
1.3-4	135		
1.4	149, 224-225, 266		
1.6	225		
1.7	226		
1.8	227		
1.9	226		
1.10	228		
1.11	173, 268		
1.12	229		

4.3-8	266	6.50	300, 302
4.9-11	268	6.52	298, 302
4.10-12	164	6.53-55	303
4.12	269	6.54-56	304
4.21	270	7.1-23	128, 352
4.22-23	271	7.1-5	305
4.24-25	272	7.9-11	306
4.26-27	273	7.14-21	307
4.28	274	7.24	164
4.30-34	275	7.24-27	308
4.33	276	7.31-37	22, 175
4.34	155	7.31-32	310
4.35-37	277	7.33-34	311
4.38-41	278	7.36	164
4.41	185, 279, 303	7.36-37	312
5.1	281	8.1-4	313
5.1-13	152	8.1-10	154
5.2-5	281-282	8.2-7	314
5.8	282	8.8-11	315
5.9	283	8.12-13	316
5.10-11	284	8.14-16	316
5.20	285	8.15	151, 317
5.21-24	286	8.16	236
5.25	287	8.17	298
5.34	287, 289	8.22-24	317
5.39	287	8.25	318
5.40-41	288	8.26	164, 318
5.43	164, 289	8.27	295, 318
5.48	124	8.27-9.1	150, 340
6.1	291	8.28-29	319
6.5	291	8.29	163, 178, 187
6.6-7	292	8.30	164, 320
6.7-11	149, 292	8.31	340
6.8	292, 293	8.32-33	321, 341
6.10-13	293	8.34	322, 341
6.14	294	8.35	323, 330
6.15-17	295	8.36-38	324
6.16	295	9.1	327, 331, 335
6.29	296	9.2	152, 327
6.34-35	296	9.3	328
6.35	297	9.4	330
6.35-44	154	9.5-6	331
6.41	297	9.7	224, 332
6.42-45	298	9.9	164, 333
6.45 f.	174, 196, 299	9.10	333
6.48	300	9.11	334
6.49	301	9.13	335



Mark ( <i>cont.</i> )		10.35	367
9.14-16	336	10.35-45	152
9.19	129, 337	10.38	188, 368
9.21	338, 339	10.40	188, 369, 370
9.22	338, 339	10.41-45	370
9.23	337, 338, 339	10.46	371-372
9.24	337, 339	10.46-52	152, 159
9.25	336, 339	10.47	164
9.27	340	10.48	372
9.28	338	10.51	371-372
9.29	338	11.1-2	373
9.30-32	340	11.4-8	374
9.33	152, 341	11.11	375
9.35-37	342	11.12-14	124, 128, 201, 375
9.37	343	11.15	378
9.38	343	11.18	129, 379
9.38-40	343	11.19-20	380
9.40	344	11.23	380
9.41	344	11.25-27	381
9.42	345	11.29-30	383
9.43	346, 347	11.33	383
9.49-50	135, 347-349	12.1-8	124, 126, 127, 128, 387
9.50	350	12.1-2	385
10.1	351	12.4	137
10.3	352	12.6	386
10.5	353	12.10-11	387
10.6	353	12.13	388
10.7-9	351	12.14	388
10.8	353	12.15-16	389
10.9	353	12.18	389
10.10-13	355	12.18-27	136
10.14	136, 356	12.23	390
10.16	357	12.28	67, 391
10.17	357	12.29	394
10.18	185-186, 358	12.29-31	392
10.20-21	358	12.34	391-392
10.22	358, 359	12.35	393
10.24	359	12.36	394
10.25	359	12.37	394, 395
10.27	360, 361	12.38	395
10.28-30	362	12.41	396
10.29	153, 364, 365	12.44	396
10.30	364	13	159
10.31	117, 363	13.2-4	397
10.32	366	13.5	398
10.32-34	150	13.7-8	399
10.34	366	13.8-9	400

13.11	401	15.17-21	440
13.14	111, 402, 403	15.22-23	439, 442
13.17-18	403	15.24	441
13.20-22	404	15.25	443
13.23-25	405	15.29	444
13.28-29	406	15.31-32	444
13.29	223	15.33-34	445, 446, 447
13.30	407	15.35-37	447
13.31	408	15.36	144
13.32	72, 179 f., 192, 407-409	15.38-39	449
13.34	410, 411	15.40	451
13.35	411	15.40-41	450
14.1-3	189, 413, 414	15.43	443
14.3-9	66, 148	15.44-46	448
14.8-9	148, 415	16.1-2	455
14.9	416	16.2	456
14.12	417-418	16.3	457, 458
14.17	420, 424	16.4-5	457
14.17-25	176	16.6-8	458
14.21	136, 420	16.8	459
14.22-23	420	16.9	136, 456, 459
14.24-25	423	16.9-20	36, 201, 460
14.25-26	424		
14.27-28	424-425	Luke	
14.29-31	425, 426	1.35	41
14.32	426	1.76	224
14.34	174, 179	2.49	174
14.38	427	2.52	183-184, 192
14.39	29, 71, 428	3.4	224
14.43	429	3.9	134, 274
14.44	429	3.21	228
14.47	430	4.31	232
14.50	430	4.35	234
14.53-54	430	4.40	236
14.59	431	4.41	237
14.60-61	431	4.42	41, 151
14.62	432	4.42-44	238
14.63	432	4.43	154, 238-239
14.65	433	5.10	218
14.66	434	5.20	244
14.68	435	5.27	151
14.72	434, 435	6.9	255
15.1-2	437	6.19	314
15.1-43	70	6.38	272
15.4-6	438	7.29-30	228
15.12	438	7.36-50	148
15.13	438	7.37	66, 414

Luke (*cont.*)

8.22-25	277
8.29	282
8.31	284
8.34	41
8.39	285
8.45	288
8.46	288
9.1-5	149
9.3	292
9.7	294, 295
9.24	330
9.28	152
9.29	328
9.31	330
9.41	337
9.45-46	341
10.30 f.	41
11.23	344
11.34	192, 270
12.1	151, 317
12.35	271
12.49	348
13.6-9	377
13.7	386
14.15	393
14.34-35	135, 348-349
16.1-16	327
16.9	361
16.19-31	327
17.5	318, 339
17.21	239, 273
17.33	330
18.29	153, 363, 365
18.30	364
18.31	366
18.34	321
18.35	372
19.11	367
19.46	378
20.4	383
20.14	458
21.11	400
22.3	421
22.10	418
22.30	369
22.35	293

22.50	430
22.51	430
22.58	434
22.61	434
22.62	434, 436
22.67	432
22.67-68	431
23.2	437
23.18	438
23.25	438
23.36	442
23.44	443
23.47	449
23.48	144
24.1	455
24.4	459
24.17	425
24.41-43	423
24.50-53	320

## John

1.3	386, 409
1.7	383
1.8	270
1.9	271, 383
1.19-20	224
1.23	224
1.33	228
2.13-17	378
3.5	135
3.20	392
4.22	358
4.32	377
4.35	274
5.31	358, 382
6.26-27	154, 313
6.51-53	420
7.5	263
7.33	420
8.12	271
8.28	445
9.5	271
9.6	311
9.16	329
11.34	183-184
11.35	174
12.2-8	148

12.25	330		
12.47	335		
13.1	417		
13.27-30	421		
14.15	393		
18.10	430		
18.15	431		
18.38	163		
19.14	443		
19.22	443		
19.25	451		
19.29	144, 442		
19.30	443		
19.33	449		
19.37	407		
19.38	453		
20.1	455, 456		
20.9	333		
20.12	459		
21.15	402, 423		
21.25	257		
Acts of the Apostles			
1.5	227		
1.6-8	180		
1.7	408		
1.9	332		
1.11	406		
3.12	426		
3.14	438-439		
3.22	295		
9.31-10.48	219		
10.12	225		
12.1-2	328		
12.12	216		
16.17-18	237		
23.8	389		
Romans			
5.6	361		
5.18-19	154, 236		
10.6-8	239		
12.1	347		
12.11	348		
16.26	227		
1 Corinthians			
1.2	345		
3.13	347		
7.15	363		
12	230		
12.6	294		
14.20	342, 356		
15.52	329		
2 Corinthians			
1.22	250		
5.5	250		
6.7	273		
Galatians			
2.1-10	219		
2.15-20	342		
3.24	330		
4.4	231		
4.24	120-121, 131		
Ephesians			
1.18	364		
4.3	349		
5.6	349		
5.23-25	250		
Philippians			
1.18	344		
2.1	402		
2.5	349		
2.7	238		
2.8	231		
3.7	362		
4.7	349		
Colossians			
1.23	401		
4.10	216		
4.6	348-349		
1 Timothy			
5.1-3	153		
5.2	365		
6.10	393		

## 2 Timothy

4.8 369  
4.11 216

## Hebrews

1.5,7,8 369  
1.14 230, 233  
4.12 274  
4.13 274  
12.1 360

## James

1.17a 238  
5.14 294

## 1 Peter

1.7 347  
4.12 347  
4.19 448  
5.13 216

## 1 John

3.9 227

## Revelation

14.5 227  
18.23 250

## INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Aland, K., 22, 49, 279  
 Alexander, L.A., 90, 96, 138, 143, 215, 427  
 Alexander, P.S., 76, 82, 94, 102  
 Collins, A.Y., 22, 34, 111, 164, 217, 407  
 Allen, P., 182–184  
 Allison, D.C., 28, 190, 221, 276  
 Alston, W., 193  
 Auerbach, E., 13, 129–131, 133, 419  
 Ayres, L., 10–11, 24, 113, 132
- Barton, J., 8, 19, 137–139, 160  
 Barth, K., 78  
 Bate, H.N., 122  
 Bauckham, R., 157, 164, 372, 418–419, 441  
 Becker, A.H., 73, 83  
 Berchman, R.M., 158–159  
 Berlinerblau, J., 19  
 Black, C.C., 111, 435  
 Bockmuehl, M., 15, 17, 50, 141, 143, 154, 427  
 Bori, P.C., 10  
 Bourdieu, P., 89  
 Boyarin, D., 128–131, 133, 209  
 Breck, J., 203  
 Brisson, L., 88, 117, 119–120  
 Bruns, G.L., 200  
 Buckler, G., 87  
 Burgon, J.W., 22, 33–37, 39–40, 49, 55, 57–59, 62–64, 70, 73  
 Byrskog, S., 157
- Cadiou, R., 103, 106–107  
 Cahill, M., 28, 41–42, 199  
 Caird, G.B., 165, 446  
 Cameron, A., 80–81  
 Camery-Hoggatt, J., 112  
 Carroll, R., 111  
 Chadwick, H., 111, 171–172, 375  
 Childs, B.S., 17, 166
- Christie, F., 218  
 Coakley, S., 24, 191, 193–195, 198  
 Collins, A.Y., 22, 28, 34, 37, 111, 164, 193, 201, 217, 407  
 Cranfield, C.E.B., 201, 347, 415  
 Cribiore, R., 80, 85, 87–88, 91–93, 97, 133–134  
 Crossley, J.G., 217, 359
- Daniélou, J., 8–9, 122, 419  
 Davies, P., 19, 76, 102  
 Davies, W.D., 28, 221, 276  
 Dawson, J.D., 11, 83–84, 117, 120, 129–133, 209, 419  
 Devreesse, R., 28–29, 33, 47–51, 55, 58–60, 73, 95, 104, 106, 217  
 Dibelius, M., 441  
 Dickey, E., 95, 114, 135, 137, 224, 360  
 Dodd, C.H., 127  
 Dorival, G., 58–60, 104, 106, 158  
 Downey, G., 104–105  
 Drury, J., 127  
 Dunn, J.D.G., 165–166, 190–191, 195
- Eco, U., 94  
 Eden, K., 132  
 Edwards, M., 16, 84, 125, 219  
 Ehrman, B.D., 167, 232, 293  
 Engberg-Pedersen, T., 81, 96, 188, 369, 416
- Farmer, W.R., 22, 37, 201  
 Fiorenza, E.S., 353  
 Fishbane, M., 102  
 Frei, H., 12–15, 18–19, 83, 129–131, 133, 160  
 Freire, P., 89  
 Furnish, V., 273
- Gadamer, H.-G., 4–6, 14, 209  
 Gamble, H.Y., 76

- Gathercole, S.J., 164–166, 192  
 Geerard, M., 34, 51  
 Gibbon, E., 75, 77–78, 109–110  
 Grafton, A., 80, 147  
 Grillmeier, A., 183  
 Guerra, A., 232
- Haar Romeny, B. ter, 104–109  
 Hadot, P., 76, 79, 87, 90–91, 109–110,  
 114–116, 158, 206–208, 224, 360  
 Hanson, R.P.C., 11, 83, 102, 122, 131, 419  
 Harvey, A.E., 190, 200–201  
 Hauerwas, S., 18, 204–205  
 Hengel, M., 82, 163, 165, 217  
 Hezser, C., 82  
 Hick, J., 193  
 Hirshman, M., 103, 109  
 Hooker, M., 24, 111, 141, 191, 194–195,  
 197, 375, 415, 417  
 Horbury, W., 102, 138, 388  
 Hovorun, C., 182  
 Hurtado, L.W., 164–165
- Jenson, R.W., 84–85  
 Jeremias, J., 127  
 Jonge, H.J. de, 142
- Kannengiesser, C., 6, 21, 30, 32, 57, 64–  
 65, 67, 80, 176  
 Kaster, R.A., 88–89, 101  
 Kealy, S., 22, 199  
 Kelly, J.N.D., 85–86  
 Kennedy, G.A., 10  
 Kermodé, F., 9, 112  
 Kofsky, A., 99, 104–105, 144–145, 170,  
 219  
 Kuschel, K.-J., 165, 191
- LaCocque, A., 7, 19  
 Lamberton, R., 114–115, 119  
 Lane, W.L., 22, 28, 111  
 Lange, N. de, 82  
 Leclercq, J., 205–207  
 Lincicum, D., 165  
 Lindbeck, G., 193  
 Louth, A., 8, 14–15, 113  
 Lubac, H. de, 3, 8–9, 21, 300
- Luz, U., 4–5, 398, 400, 417
- Maas, M., 73, 79, 109, 171  
 Madigan, K., 181–182, 409–410  
 Malbon, E.S., 112, 435  
 Marrou, H.-I., 76, 80–85, 87–88, 91–92  
 Martin, D.B., 204–206, 208  
 McGuckin, J., 35, 168, 173–174, 177–178  
 McKay, H., 232  
 McKibbens, T.R., 187  
 McNamee, K., 96–98, 107  
 Meier, J., 388  
 Metzger, B.M., 215, 232  
 Michie, D., 112  
 Mitchell, M.M., 10, 121, 123, 188, 369, 416  
 Momigliano, A., 99, 104, 161, 202  
 Moore, S.D., 9, 112  
 Moreschini, C., 21, 78, 104–106, 109  
 Morgan, R., 163  
 Morgan, T., 76, 80, 87–88, 96, 100–101,  
 133, 135  
 Morris, T.V., 193
- Niehoff, M.R., 102, 120  
 Nineham, D., 112, 446  
 Nordenfalk, C., 146, 148, 295, 414  
 Norelli, E., 21, 78, 104–106, 109  
 Norris, R., 193  
 Norwich, J.J., 172
- O'Keefe, J.J., 18, 160–161, 195  
 Obbink, D., 114  
 Ochs, P., 18  
 Oort, J. van, 102, 138
- Paddison, A., 195, 375  
 Parker, D.C., 28, 34–35, 94  
 Pelikan, J., 16
- Radner, E., 16  
 Räsänen, H., 4–6, 19  
 Ramelli, I., 120  
 Rappe, S., 81  
 Ratzinger, J., 165  
 Reno, R.R., 15–16, 18, 160–161  
 Reuss, J., 28, 33–34, 45–46, 51–53,  
 55–60, 62–64, 73, 105, 186, 244,

- 248–249, 251, 260–263, 268, 285,  
 293, 300, 305, 308–309, 314, 355, 357,  
 360–361, 364, 373, 375, 378, 385, 388,  
 391, 395, 402, 406, 418, 420–422, 439,  
 441  
 Reynolds, L.D., 64  
 Rhoads, D., 112  
 Ricoeur, P., 5–8, 19, 209  
 Robbins, V., 112  
 Robins, R.H., 76, 87–89, 92, 133
- Sanders, J.A., 17  
 Sandnes, K.O., 80  
 Schweitzer, A., 116, 190  
 Scott, P.M., 195  
 Sherwood, Y., 3, 445  
 Sickenberger, J., 136, 248, 253, 256,  
 268, 284–285, 289, 333, 396, 399,  
 420  
 Simonetti, M., 11, 77–79, 100, 109–110,  
 120–121, 123, 134, 176  
 Smith, H., 33, 40–42, 44–46, 57–59,  
 73, 124, 176, 186, 221–222, 225–229,  
 232–234, 238, 240–242, 244, 246–  
 248, 253, 255–256, 260, 262–263,  
 265–266, 268, 271–273, 275–277,  
 281–286, 289, 298, 301, 303, 315, 319–  
 324, 327–334, 337–338, 340–342,  
 344–346, 349, 351–354, 356–357,  
 359, 366–367, 370, 373–376, 378–  
 380, 382, 385, 387, 389, 391–393, 395,  
 397–403, 405–408, 410–411, 414–418,  
 420–422, 424–435, 437–441, 443–  
 446
- Smith, M., 430  
 Snyder, H.G., 80, 82, 100  
 Soden, H.F. von, 52  
 Sorabji, R., 90  
 Sorenson, E., 234  
 Steiner, G., 76, 125  
 Steinmetz, D.C., 14–15  
 Stroumsa, G., 81
- Tannehill, R.C., 435  
 Taylor, V., 111  
 Telford, W.R., 112  
 Thiselton, A.C., 5  
 Thurén, L., 10  
 Torrance, I.R., 15, 172  
 Tracy, D., 6  
 Turner, E.G., 75, 95–98, 133
- Voorst, R. van, 446
- Watson, F., 113, 164, 167, 178–179, 190–  
 192  
 Whitman, J., 119  
 Wiles, M., 84  
 Wilken, R.L., 11, 17, 21, 85  
 Williams, M., 80, 147  
 Williams, R., 15, 163, 179–180, 196–197  
 Wilson, N.G., 64, 86–87, 92, 95, 97, 103,  
 105, 133, 183  
 Wrede, W., 116, 163–164, 166–167, 190  
 Wright, N.T., 78, 127–128, 190
- Yarnold, E., 276  
 Yeago, D.S., 195



## INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Abelard, 87  
Acacius, 171, 177  
accommodation, 85, 117, 188–189, 206, 369, 416  
Adam, 73, 83, 124, 300, 311  
adoptionism, 166, 329  
Africanus, Julius 73, 79, 109, 137–138, 446  
Agnoetai, 72, 182–184, 192  
Allegory, 11, 13–14, 16, 20, 23, 25, 83, 88, 108, 112–115, 117–134, 139, 201, 207, 225, 270, 273, 385, 419  
Ambrose, 42, 50, 57, 182  
Ammonius, 145–146  
anagogical, 124, 300  
Anastasius, 104–105  
anthology, 16–17, 23, 30, 35, 64, 75, 77–79, 81, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 93–105, 107, 108–109, 172  
anti-Chalcedonian, 171, 183  
Antiochene, 35, 68, 77, 108, 121–123, 155, 170, 174, 178, 187, 195–196  
Aphthartodocetae, 183  
apocalyptic, 111–112, 190, 234  
Apollinarianism, 63, 168–169, 174–175, 183, 194  
Apollinaris of Laodicea, 42, 44–45, 47, 49, 50, 52, 63, 66–70, 126, 132, 147–148, 153, 176–177, 185–186, 260–261, 263, 293, 355, 357, 360–361, 364, 373, 375, 378, 385–386, 388, 391, 395, 398, 406, 414, 418, 420–421, 429  
Aquinas, 30, 33–35, 87, 199  
Arianism, 6, 11, 131, 179, 179–182, 192, 273, 332, 409–410  
Aristarchus, 216  
Aristotle, 90, 114, 122  
Arius, 131, 180, 196–197, 409  
asceticism, 11, 85–86, 198, 207–208, 251, 278, 349  
Athanasius, 48, 50, 75, 130, 179–181, 192, 409  
Augustine, 42, 50, 57, 141–142, 156–157, 159, 181, 207–208, 357, 409  
Basil of Caesarea, 45, 49, 68, 86–87, 100–101, 106, 134, 228, 349, 405  
Bede, 199, 417  
Caesarea, 44–45, 50, 68, 86–87, 99–101, 103–104, 106–107, 134, 143–147, 150, 202, 213, 219, 221, 253, 270, 318, 340, 349, 405  
Calvin, 13  
*catenae marginales*, 21–24, 27–37, 39–53, 55–60, 63–65, 67–73, 77, 79, 91, 97, 101–102, 105–110, 112–113, 115–116, 118, 123, 126, 128–129, 131–139, 143, 145, 147, 149, 151, 153, 155–156, 159, 161, 165, 167, 173, 175–182, 184, 187–189, 192, 199–203, 209  
Celsus, 143, 155–157, 159, 202, 427  
Cerinthus, 344  
Chalcedon, 24, 71–72, 102, 138, 167, 169–170, 172–173, 175, 178, 180, 183–184, 191–198  
Chalcedonian Definition, 24, 71–73, 168, 170–173, 177, 182, 184, 192–195, 197–198, 202  
*Christus Nesciens*, 179, 181–182, 184, 409–410  
Chrysocephalus, 30, 34  
Chrysostom, John, 10, 29, 39, 42–44, 46–50, 56–57, 66–69, 75, 85–86, 116–117, 124–126, 129, 134, 142–143, 147–148, 150, 152–153, 155–156, 176, 180–181, 185–189, 199, 202  
condescension, 188, 369, 416  
Constantine, 99, 146

- Constantinople, 58, 66, 72–73, 75–76, 105, 168–169, 171, 173, 178, 183, 198, 398, 414
- Corderius, 40–41
- Cramer, 22, 27–28, 30–37, 40, 43, 46, 48–50, 52, 55–57, 59, 61–63, 65, 70–73, 173, 213, 215, 281, 293, 299–300, 309, 320, 336, 339, 360, 362, 380, 383, 397
- Cyril of Alexandria, 24, 27, 29, 32–33, 35, 37–42, 44, 46–52, 54, 56, 58, 68, 71–72, 78, 83, 106, 147, 155, 168–171, 173–182, 184–185, 187, 189, 192, 195–196
- Didache*, 398
- Didascalia Apostolorum*, 80
- Didymus, 103, 300
- Diodore of Tarsus, 77–78, 170, 195, 218, 223
- Dionysius Thrax, 29, 91–92
- Docetism, 183, 185, 371, 427
- Ephrem the Syrian, 83
- Epiphanius, 50
- Eusebian Canons*, 28, 75–76, 143, 145–149, 156, 168, 295, 414
- Eusebius of Caesarea, 29, 37, 42, 44, 46, 49–50, 52, 68, 99–101, 103–104, 106, 116, 120, 135, 143–149, 158, 161, 202
- Eustathius, 121, 123
- Euthymius Zygabenus, 199
- Eutyches, 169–171
- Eutychianism, 194
- Evagrius of Pontus, 106, 168, 170–172
- figural reading, 11, 13–14, 16, 20, 25, 83–84, 117, 128–130, 132–133, 139, 166, 203, 419
- florilegia*, 30, 35, 172
- Galen, 90–91, 96
- Gaza, 23, 35, 58, 78, 94, 97–98, 103–108, 170, 172
- Glossa ordinaria*, 199
- Gregory of Nazianzus, 50
- Gregory of Nyssa, 21, 45, 50, 68, 103, 106
- Hadrian, 134–135
- handbooks, 10, 91–94, 97, 100–101, 110
- Henoticon, 71–72, 171–173, 177–178
- Heraclitus, 118–119
- Herodotus, 161
- Hesychia, 426
- Hexapla, 146
- Hilary of Poitiers, 398
- Hippocrates, 90–91
- Hippolytus, 29, 398
- historia*, 120, 143, 145, 168, 171–172, 216, 219, 402–403
- historiography, 10–11, 19, 23–24, 99, 104, 110, 159, 161, 202
- Homer, 80, 88, 95, 113–115, 118–119, 121, 135
- homoousios, 166, 170, 172
- hypostasis, 166, 170–171, 177, 194
- Ignatius of Antioch, 232
- Ignatius Loyola, 208
- Irenaeus, 146, 217–219, 398
- Isidore of Pelusium, 41, 45, 68, 275–276
- Isho'dad of Merv, 45–46, 124
- Jerome, 41–42, 137, 158, 177, 181
- Josephus, 49–50
- Julian, 81, 84, 183
- Justin Martyr, 71–72, 172
- Justinian, 71, 79, 109, 114, 171–172, 178, 198
- Kenosis, 195
- Latrocinium, 169
- lectio divina*, 205, 208
- Leo, 169–172, 178
- Libanius, 85, 92–93, 104, 134
- literacy, 82, 88–89
- Luther, 5, 13, 200
- Maimonides, 93
- Manichees, 362, 365
- Marcian, 169
- Marcion, 136, 239, 352, 362, 391
- marginalia, 32–33, 55, 78, 91, 94–98, 101, 103, 107, 200

- Monarchian Prologue, 219  
 Monophysites, 73, 77, 171–172, 182, 184
- Neoplatonism, 90, 114–115, 119  
 Nestorianism, 35, 46, 71, 168–169, 173,  
 176, 180, 184, 192, 194  
 Nestorius, 36, 71–72, 168–171, 173–174,  
 177, 187, 229  
 Nicaea, 10–11, 16, 24, 102, 113, 132, 138,  
 171–172, 175, 179–180, 189, 191–192,  
 196–198  
 Nicetas of Heraclea, 41  
 Nisibis, 73, 78, 83
- obscurity, 23, 111–118, 139  
 Origen, 9, 39, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52–54,  
 56, 63, 66–68, 78, 82–85, 103, 106,  
 112, 120–123, 125, 129–133, 136–137,  
 143, 146, 148, 151, 158–159, 177, 185,  
 202
- paideia, 20, 23, 76, 80, 89, 91–92, 100,  
 102, 104, 198, 204  
 pedagogy, 16, 21, 23, 78, 87, 89, 91, 96,  
 98, 101–103, 109–110, 114, 116–117, 135,  
 186–187, 189, 200–201, 204–205, 208  
 Peltanus, 27, 48  
 Philo, 102, 120, 131, 206–207  
 Philodemus, 416  
 Photius, 50, 57, 105–106, 183  
 Plato, 76, 84, 99, 114–115, 118, 125, 219  
 Platonism, 84, 120, 122, 131  
 Plotinus, 193  
 Plutarch, 119  
 Porphyry, 114, 120, 143–145, 155–159,  
 202  
 Possinus, 27, 35, 48–50, 55–56, 61, 65,  
 217, 298, 309, 336, 339, 380, 383, 407,  
 428, 444  
 precritical, 13–14, 18–19, 138–139, 160  
 premodern, 12, 16, 18–21, 160, 204–205,  
 208–209  
*progymnasmata*, 92–93  
 prosopic union, 170, 173–174
- reception history, 3–4, 6–7, 16, 21, 24,  
 94, 128, 209
- Reformation, 8, 12–13, 16, 21, 138, 200  
 Reimarus, 116, 190–192  
*ressourcement*, 9, 20  
 rhetoric, 9–10, 19, 80–81, 84–85, 89,  
 92–93, 100–102, 104, 121–125, 128, 131,  
 134–135, 137, 166, 179, 232, 275
- scholia*, 29–31, 34–35, 48–50, 53, 60, 67,  
 89, 91, 94–98, 102–103, 107, 114, 132,  
 200, 217  
 schools, 75, 82–84, 85, 90–91, 96–97,  
 99, 101, 104–105, 108, 113–114, 121–122,  
 155, 207–208  
*sensus literalis*, 13, 157  
 Severus of Antioch, 50, 57, 71–72, 92,  
 107, 170, 172, 182–184  
 Socrates, 85  
 Spiritual Exercises, 86, 92–93, 104, 122,  
 207–208  
 Stoicism, 120, 207  
 supersessionism, 3, 128–129, 131, 133,  
 208–209  
 Synaxarium, 29  
 Syncellus, 446
- Theodore of Heraclea, 44, 50, 52, 68,  
 106  
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 21, 27, 40, 42,  
 44–47, 49–50, 52, 65–68, 72–73, 77–  
 78, 106, 124, 147–148, 155, 170, 174,  
 176, 178, 187, 195–196  
 Theodoret of Cyrrhus, 40, 44–45, 52,  
 68, 77, 122, 170, 178, 195  
 Theodosius, 169, 182  
 Theophylact, 199, 217, 415  
*theoria*, 328  
 Thucydides, 161  
 Tiberius the Deacon, 182, 410  
 Titus of Bostra, 29, 41–42, 44, 47, 50,  
 66–68, 136, 234, 240, 244, 248, 253,  
 256, 268, 284–286, 289, 332–333,  
 395–396, 398–399, 420  
 trajectories, 7–8, 19–21, 25, 138, 157, 190,  
 201–202, 203, 209  
 Tranquillinus, 177  
 typology, 9, 13, 16, 121–122, 131–132, 333,  
 419

Valentinus, 136, 239, 391

Vergil, 97

Vézelay, 3, 208

Victor of Antioch, 21–22, 27, 29, 33–42,  
44–51, 53–56, 58–60, 71, 73, 124, 176,  
186, 199, 201, 221–222, 225–229

*Wirkungsgeschichte*, 4–6, 19, 209

Wittenberg, 200

Zeno, 71–72, 171, 173, 177

