

THE SOURCES OF VICTOR OF ANTIOCH'S COMMENTARY ON MARK.

THE fullest English account of this commentary is by Burgon (*Last Twelve Verses*, Appendix D). He there says that 'It is evident that an Epitome of Chrysostom's Homilies on S. Matthew, together with Victor's compilation on S. Mark, Titus of Bostra on S. Luke, and a work in the main derived from Chrysostom's Homilies on S. John . . . constituted the established commentary of ancient Christendom on the fourfold Gospel'.¹ This commentary, or part of it, is contained in a large number of MSS; Burgon describes over fifty copies of Victor on Mark, while Sickenberger (Titus von Bostra, *TU* xxi) describes or mentions over thirty-five of 'Titus' on Luke; some of these include also commentaries on the other Gospels, the oldest being Codex X of the Gospels, at Munich, cent. ix or x.

The complete commentary is most accessible in Cramer's edition of the catena that is built up round it. The catenist, however, set to work differently on various Gospels. He made no additions to Victor's commentary on Mark. All his additions to the commentary on John were apparently drawn straight from an existing catena, that published by Corderius. This is noticed, as applying at least to Origen, by Preuschen in his edition of Origen's Commentary on St John. In the chapters in which I have compared the two catenae, 'Cramer' simply gives a selection and sometimes an abridgement of the passages in Corderius. The only addition I have observed is that in Cramer the quotations from Severus of Antioch are usually referred to the precise work from which they are taken, as in the catenae on Matthew and Luke; these references do not appear in the printed text of Corderius, which, however, includes all these Severus passages, and others besides. An examination of the MSS of both catenae might elucidate this matter; meanwhile I am inclined to think that the compiler of 'Cramer' had a special interest in Severus. On Matthew and Luke he seems more independent. His chief sources on Luke are Cyril and Titus, who also supply between them the bulk of the commentary on that Gospel round which this catena is built up.

The commentary is indeed compiled variously in the case of each Gospel. I have not examined that on John, and know no special

¹ p. 87.

account of it; it is probably formed on much the same principle as that on Matthew, the main source being Chrysostom's Homilies on John. That on Matthew is examined by Sickenberger.¹ It consists almost entirely of extracts from Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew, nearly always passing over the hortatory part at the end of each homily; it compresses much of the remainder, with many omissions and some transpositions; often only a few sentences run consecutively in the source. It includes one or two passages from Isidore and other writers, but practically everything not otherwise specified, apart from necessary changes and introductions by the compiler, is due to Chrysostom; I have found hardly anything not so traceable, except on ch. xxv. It has never been published separately, except in the Latin translation by Serrarius, 1553; but Sickenberger notes what portions of Cramer's catena represent this commentary.

The commentary on Luke is commonly ascribed to Titus, Bishop of Bostra in the Hauran, who wrote against the Manichaeans and confronted the Emperor Julian. But it can come from him only in an extremely modified sense. It quotes or mentions a number of later writers, including Chrysostom, Isidore of Pelusium, Cyril of Alexandria, and even Dionysius the Areopagite; hence it cannot be earlier than the sixth century. And examination shews its basis to be Cyril's commentary on Luke, preserved in a large number of catenae fragments (ed. Mai,² reprinted in Migne) and in a nearly complete Syriac translation (ed. Payne Smith). On some long passages the commentary is wholly from Cyril. But Cyril is not here used nearly so exclusively as Chrysostom is in the commentary on Matthew; on some chapters (e.g. xv) there is very much from other sources; in particular, Titus of Bostra is often used. As practically our only sources for Titus are the catenae of Nicetas and of Cramer, it is highly probable that a number of unidentified passages also come from this source. Hence the name of 'Titus' has become attached to the whole commentary, in the same way as, according to a current view, the name of Matthew, really belonging only to the most characteristic source of our First Gospel, has been extended to that Gospel itself.

The compiler, if not the same as that of the commentary on Matthew, plainly had that work before him; he constantly refers to it, passing over various sections because already dealt with there. On the commentary see Sickenberger as above; he deals with it as a prelude to treating of the genuine fragments of Titus, which he prints in full.

The commentary on Mark is ascribed in some MSS to Cyril of Alexandria, but in more to 'Victor, presbyter of Antioch'. It is clearly

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 26 f.

² *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* ii.

not by Cyril, whose 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; it makes however considerable use also of Theodore and perhaps of Theodoret, the representatives of the opposite school to Cyril. In one place, a comment introduced by ἄλλος φησὶν consists of about two lines of Theodore running on to a long comment by Cyril (p. 423). 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. (1) Three short passages in Cramer's catena are ascribed to 'Victor the presbyter'—on Lk. viii 16-17, 18, 39. These, though on passages where there is a parallel in Mark, do not recur in the commentary on that Gospel; one of them is ascribed by Nicetas (and Sickenberger) to *Titus*, an extract from whom immediately precedes. (2) In Corderius's catena—an abridgement of Nicetas—Victor is quoted on i 35, viii 34, and at considerable length on x 30 f; the first and last of these are passages peculiar to Luke. (3) Nicetas's catena contains twenty-four¹ quotations from 'Victor the presbyter'; they are published with other matter in Mai's *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio* vol. ix 626. They are found on chapters 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 13-14; five of these chapters obviously have either no parallels in Mark, or very short ones, while in several of the rest there is much not parallel. Nine are on ch. i, and the bulk of the rest are either on passages not in Mark, or of such a character—often very short—that we could hardly expect them to be repeated in Victor's commentary on that Gospel. But there are four quotations about the αἱμορροῦσα, which it is surprising not to find there. One quotation of some length remains, on Lk. iv 42; this is found in the commentary on Mark, p. 280, 3-17, and very probably some of what follows, identifying Christ with the kingdom, may come from the same source. Here, and in some other fragments, we see Victor's interest in comparing the Gospels. But it is clear that Victor's commentary on Luke was more independent and less of a compilation. In the above passage, and probably elsewhere, Victor must have copied from himself. The alternative is 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. This view seems supported by Possinus's catena (or catenae) on Mark ascribing some Victor passages to *Photius*. This would put the compilation later than the time of Photius, which is not forbidden by the dates of our oldest MSS. But there are other alternatives. (1) These ascriptions are mistaken; this catena is none too reliable in such matters. It

¹ Sickenberger *TU* xxii 97 I can find only twenty-one in Mai.

ascribés to Cyril a passage really from Isidore. (2) Photius may simply be following a source of Victor; in one case (Mk. xiv 9) Chrysostom is the real source. (3) These Photian passages may be late additions to the text of Victor. (4) Photius may be following Victor—in one case he is following Victor on *Luke*.

The compiler in any case uses 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. Only occasionally does he quote or mention earlier writers by name; these include Origen, Eusebius, Titus, Apollinaris, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia (Cramer, pp. 266, 408, 418, 442). Basil, Cyril, and Theodore have their names attached to a few notes in some MSS or editions. But the writer is not a catenist in the ordinary sense.

His work has been published in four different forms—by (1) Peltanus, 1580, in a Latin version; (2) Possinus, 1673, combining it with two other commentaries; (3) Matthiae, 1775, based on Moscow MSS; (4) Cramer, 1840, from several Paris and Oxford MSS. These editions differ widely, except that Peltanus's Latin is a free rendering of the text followed by Possinus. Cramer's text is much the fullest. The amount of variation among the MSS is very great; 'not so much in respect of various readings or serious modifications of the text (though the transpositions are very frequent, and often very mischievous), as resulting from the boundless license which every fresh copyist seems to have allowed himself chiefly in *abridging* his author.'¹ Cramer's various codices, however, seem to supplement one another well. In fact he has here and there, especially near the end, duplicate passages; e. g. p 270, 17-24 = 271, 27-31; 274, 28--275, 2 = 276, 3-5; 434, 5-7 = 434, 10-13; 434, 22-32 = 435, 4-16; 436, 6-10 = 436, 25-29; 440, 9-13 = 440, 19-25; 440, 25-32 = 441, 12-19; 441, 32-442, 15 = 442, 16-30.

The identification of Victor's sources is of some value in three ways.

(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. But we have at once to face the fact of Victor's freedom in the use of his sources. 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. Or, again, just one phrase or sentence of Chrysostom may be inserted in the midst of foreign

¹ Burgon, p. 272.

matter. Some sections are very composite. E.g. in that on p. 270, lines 12-29, only lines 15-17 are clearly from Chrysostom. The section p. 281, 25-282, 15 consists of four fragments: (1) Titus, 281, 25-282, 3; (2) Chrysostom, 3-9; (3) unidentified, 9-12; (4) Chrysostom, 12-15. That on p. 428, lines 10-25, consists of three components, (1) Cyril, 10-17; (2) Apollinaris, 17-19; (3) Chrysostom, 19-25.¹ Hence when we find one or two sentences, in the course of a paragraph, clearly coming from a certain writer, we cannot with any great assurance claim the whole paragraph, or even the immediate context, for this writer. On the other hand, there are cases where long sections, or a series of sections, come exclusively from Chrysostom; and it is not impossible that e.g. Titus or Theodore may similarly be the source of a continuous passage. In the case of Theodore at least this seems very probable.

The largest identified source is, as we might expect, *Chrysostom's* Homilies on Matthew. But Victor's use of them varies. They are used in the opening chapters only occasionally and at no great length. From ch. iv onwards there are much longer passages, e.g. on the Parable of the Sower, 302, 26-304, 24; on the Stilling of the Tempest, 312, 16-313, 21; on the Walking on the Sea, 331, 15-333, 14; besides shorter ones. But the amount from Chrysostom is still no great proportion of the whole, except on ch. iv. This proportion increases with ch. viii; there are a series of passages from Chrysostom on the rebuke to Peter and the teaching which follows; and from this point till ch. xv inclusive the proportion from Chrysostom on each chapter is never less than one-third (except on ch. xi), sometimes more than one-half. On cc. 8-15 Chrysostom supplies 43 per cent.; on the whole Gospel, 32 per cent.

Origen is much less used than we might expect. Of course the first part of his commentary on Matthew is lost, except for fragments; but the fact that Victor nowhere coincides with these fragments and hardly ever with the extant portion of the commentary, renders it very doubtful whether he uses it much anywhere. In the case of two or three coincidences on ch. viii, the verbal similarity is not close; Victor may well have used Origen here only indirectly. But his commentary on John is directly quoted on Mk. i 1 (from tome vi 24 p. 126). This is followed by a passage from Chrysostom; then Origen (l. c.) seems used again, but more freely and perhaps indirectly (267, 18 f). Tome vi 41 (p. 141), where Origen prefers 'Gergesenes' to 'Gerasenes' or 'Gadarenes', is quoted 314, 5-19. A long passage on Mark iv 21 (306, 20-307, 16) is ascribed to Origen by Gallandi and Corderius on Luke. They give it in a very corrupt state, so that it is a gain to have

¹ On p. 423—on the Eucharist—a brief passage from *Theodore* passes imperceptibly into one from *Cyril*.

Victor's text. A passage ascribed by Possinus to Origen (p. 428) comes, in the form given by Cramer, directly from Cyril. Origen seems to have been used both by Titus and by Cyril, and Victor's quotations from him may not be direct.

Eusebius's work on the 'Apparent Discrepancies of the Gospels', addressed to Marinus, is quoted on Mk. i 2; Eusebius regards 'Isaiah' as a σφάλμα γραφῆως for Malachi. It is also the main source used by Victor on ch. xvi; and it is possible that it may be used elsewhere in the comparisons of the various Gospels, of which Victor makes a great point. The passage about Abiathar the High-Priest (293, 7-15) is from Eusebius on Psalm xxxiii (xxxiv). I have seen no coincidences with the fragments of Eusebius on Luke, published by Mai.

Titus of Bostra was clearly largely used, and is probably the source of many unidentified passages. But the numerous quotations from him are often quite short. A clear instance of the way in which Victor uses Titus occurs on p. 276, on Mk. i 25-27, compared with Titus on Lk. iv 35 (Sickenberger, p. 187).

Titus.

ἐπειδὴ ἐλάλει ὡς νήφων ὁ ἄνθρωπος
καὶ ἐφθέγγετο ὡς καθεστηκώς . . .
καὶ ἐνόμιζον οἱ παρόντες

ὅτι οὐκ ἐν δαιμονίῳ πονηρῷ ἐφθέγγετο, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐλάλει.

συνεχώρησεν αὐτῷ ρίψαι τὸν ἄνδρα, ἵνα δῆλον γένηται ὅτι τὸ λαλήσαν δαιμόνιον ἐστι καὶ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

ἐξῆλθε δὲ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν· ρίψαι γὰρ μόνον συνεχωρήθη, περαιτέρω δὲ οὐ συνεχωρήθη. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ κατέβαλεν ἤδη ἔτρανμάτισεν.

Victor.

ἐπειδὴ ἐλάλει ὡς νήφων καὶ ὡς καθεστηκώς ἐφθέγγετο, καὶ ἐνόμιζον οἱ παρόντες

οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος ἀλλ' ἐκ καρδίας τοὺς λόγους ἐκφέρεσθαι . . .

διὰ τοῦτο δὲ συνεχώρησεν αὐτὸν ρίψαι τὸ δαιμόνιον, ἵνα δῆλον γένηται ὅτι τὸ δαιμόνιον ἦν ὁ λαλήσας (v. l. τὸ λαλήσαν) καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ὁ φθεγγόμενος. τὸ γὰρ "Οἶδά σε τίς εἶ" σῶφρονος ἦν.

ἐξῆλθε δὲ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ κατέβαλεν, ἤδη τραυματίαν ἀπέφηνεν· ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν συνεχώρησεν ὁ Κύριος διὰ τοὺς παρόντας, βλάβην δὲ γενέσθαι οὐκ εἶασεν· ἵνα τοῦ ἐπιτάξαντος φανερωθῇ ἡ ἰσχὺς.

The differences are accounted for by allowance for compression in each case. It will be seen that Victor has some additional sentences. They may or may not also come from Titus. I have noted more than twelve other passages from Titus, on cc. i, ii, iii, iv, v, ix, xii, xiii, xiv—the majority very short.

Theodore of Heraclea is shewn by the catenae of Cramer and Possinus on Matthew to be the source of at least two passages (1) A few lines

of Victor's comment on Mk. vi 42-44 (p. 328, 16-20 at least); (2) a few lines on the Lord's scourging (435, 19-21).

Apollinaris again probably supplies much more than we can now identify. We have notes from him on 'Who is my mother, or my brethren?'; on adultery and divorce; on the Sadducees; and on the kiss of Judas. A short passage declaring that the Lord's riding into Jerusalem was a sign, as he could well have travelled on foot as usual, is ascribed to *Titus* in Cramer's catena on Luke, as printed; but Nicetas, and two codices of 'Cramer' used by Sickenberger, assign to Titus only the preceding section, attributing *this* to Apollinaris.

Cyril of Alexandria is used less than we might expect, and very unequally. We have, however, only fragments of his commentary on Matthew; the use of this is traceable only on the narrative of the Paralytic (Mk. ii 5, 11). From his commentary (homilies) on Luke come a few passages, some very short and not quite certain, on the first two chapters; then for the bulk of the Gospel nothing is clearly traceable to it till ch. xiv, where the comment on the Institution of the Eucharist comes largely from Cyril. He is repeatedly used throughout the Passion narratives, supplying 17 per cent. on cc. xiv-xv (Chrysostom has nearly 37 per cent.). A few earlier passages are ascribed to Cyril in some MSS or editions. One on the parable of the Mustard Seed (Cramer, 311, 4-8) is thus ascribed by Possinus¹; so another on Mk. xi 24. Another on Mk. vi 10 similarly ascribed by Possinus is assigned to *Theodoret* in Cramer's catena on Matthew, and may possibly come from *Theodore* (see below). A passage on Gethsemane assigned by Possinus to Origen (p. 428) is, in the form it takes in Cramer, exactly represented in *Cyril*.

The great bulk of these passages from Cyril can be identified from the Greek fragments published by Mai, and reprinted by Migne; but a few are otherwise extant only in the Syriac, the Greek original being recoverable only from Victor.

(1) 428, 27 f. οἱ μακάριοι μαθηταὶ τῷ τῆς φιλοθείας νιττόμενοι κέντρῳ, μαχαίρας ἐπανατείνουσιν, ἀποσοβοῦντες τὸν ἔφοδον· οὐκ ἔα δὲ τοῦτο γενέσθαι ὁ Χριστός· οὐ γάρ τοι μαχαίρα ἡμῶς κεχρησθαι βούλεται, ἐννοία (v. l. εἰννοία) μᾶλλον καὶ συνέσει χρωμένους ἀποσεῖσθαι γενικῶς (q. νεανικῶς?) τοὺς ἐναντίους. ἰάσατο² δὲ θεοπρεπῶς τὸν ὑπομείναντα τὴν πληγὴν, . . . τοῖς ἀφιγμένοις εἰς τὸ

Smith, p. 695. And the blessed disciples, pricked with the goading of divine love, drew their swords to repel the attack. But Christ would not permit this to be done . . . for He would not have us use swords wherewith to resist our enemies, but rather employing love and prudence, we so must mightily prevail against those who oppose us. . . . And He healed with divine

¹ But is really due to Isidore iv 76.

² This sentence is in Mai.

συλλαβεῖν αὐτὸν θεοπρεπὲς καὶ τοῦτο διδοὺς σημεῖον. ὅτι δὲ τὴν αὐτοῦ χεῖρα¹ καὶ θέλῃσιν πλεονεκτῆσαι ἐν οὐδεὶς, διαδείκνυσσι λέγων . . .

dignity him who had received the blow, so giving to those who came to seize Him this godlike sign also for their condemnation. But that no one prevailed by force over His power and will, He shews by saying . . .

(2) 432, 19 f. The few lines preceding are also in Mai, who, however, has πεπλουτηκὼς τῆς ἀφέσεως τοῦ πλημμελήματος, against Victor's πεπλούτηκε γὰρ τῆς ἀφέσεως τὴν ἐλπίδα, and the Syriac 'He won also the hope of forgiveness'.

Victor. πλὴν ἐκεῖνό φαμεν ὅτι (καὶ τὰ) τῶν ἁγίων ὀλισθήματα διὰ τῶν γραφῶν μαθάνονται, ἵνα καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν μετανοίας μιμηταὶ γενώμεθα. φάρμακον γὰρ σωτηρίας ἐπενόησεν ὁ φιλοκτιρῶν θεὸς τὴν μετάνοιαν, ἣν ἀναιρεῖν πειρῶνται οἱ καθαροὺς ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι λέγοντες· οὐκ ἐννοήσαντες ὅτι παντός ἐστι ρύπον μεστὸν τὸ τοιαύτην ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὴν διάληψιν· καθὰ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἀπὸ ρύπου, καθὼς γέγραπται. κακῆν δὲ μὴ ἀγνοεῖτωσαν· ὅτι πρὶν συλληφθῆναι Χριστὸν καὶ ἀρνήσασθαι τὸν Πέτρον, μέτοχος ἦν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος, καὶ οὕτως ὠλίσθησε, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς μετανοίας ἄφεσιν ἐκομίζετο. οὐκοῦν μὴ κατηγορεῖτωσαν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ γαληνότητος, μεμνημένοι λέγοντος ἐναργῶς· Ἀνομία ἀνόμου οὐ μὴ κακώσῃ αὐτόν, ἐν ᾗ ἂν ἡμέρα ἀποστρέψῃ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας αὐτοῦ.

Smith, p. 700. And this too we say: that though we are taught the falls of the saints in the sacred Scriptures . . . [Victor has here probably compressed Cyril]

For the merciful God has provided for the inhabitants of earth repentance as the medicine of salvation; and this I know not how men endeavour to dispense with, saying of themselves that they are clean, and in their great madness not understanding, that to entertain such an idea of themselves is full of all impurity. For 'no man is free from defilement', as it is written . . .

And besides this they ought not to forget that before Christ was seized or Peter denied Him, he had been a partaker of the body of Christ and of His precious blood. . . .

He fell into sin, and received forgiveness upon his repentance. Let them not then find fault with the gentleness of God . . . but call to mind Him who plainly says 'The wickedness of the wicked shall not hurt him in the day wherein he turneth away from his iniquity'.

(3) 437, 5-14. This passage is clearly from Cyril's 153rd Homily on Luke (Smith, pp. 718-719). Migne has it as though a fragment

¹ Cramer edits *κἂν θέλῃσιν*!

of the commentary on *Matthew* (col. 464). Each text can correct the other—e.g. Victor has τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσιν for Migne's τὴν αὐτοῦ φύσιν. The Syriac here supports Victor; as again in reading 'the precious cross'. Victor, supported by the Syriac, has a few words not in Migne αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐκτέτικεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὰ ὀφειλήματα: αὐτὸς τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αἶρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾷται.

I have noticed several other cases where Migne publishes passages from catenae on *Matthew*,¹ which are shewn by the Syriac to come from Cyril's work on *Luke*. Most of them are also given by Migne in their right place. The passage at the beginning of p. 99 (Migne, col. 457) is composite; the first part comes from Cyril on *Luke*, Hom. 148; most of it is found also in its right place ὁν p. 426 (Migne, 924), but the Syriac shews that neither quotation is complete. Part occurs also in Victor (428, 13-16), which is closest to the second quotation in Migne, but includes one clause (προσέτιθει δὲ τὸ "χαῖρε" τῷ παγιδευθέντι πρὸς θάνατον δι' αὐτοῦ) which is an adaptation of a sentence only in col. 457 and the Syriac. The latter part of the quotation in col. 457 (beginning προέδωκε τε ἑαυτὸν ἐκῶν) comes in the same passage of Victor, but is not from Cyril, but from Chrysostom on *Matthew*, H. 83 (p. 793 B; Field, 477).

Theodore of Mopsuestia was probably a still more important source, supplying much more than can now be traced. A large proportion of the scanty catena fragments of Theodore recur in Victor; these include some sentences on Mark's unique parable of the Growth of the Seed; possibly Theodore supplies all or the bulk of Victor's long comment here.

But further, Isho'dad's Syriac commentary on *Matthew* (ed. Mrs. R. D. Gibson, *Horae Semiticae* v) probably preserves many fragments from Theodore, *The Interpreter* of the Nestorians, in addition to statements definitely ascribed to him. A clear case of the relation of Victor and Isho'dad to catena fragments of Theodore occurs in a comment by him on Mt. viii 34, given in Cramer's Catena—the Gergesenes παρεκάλεσαν ἐφ' ἑτέροισι μεταβῆναι τόπους, ὡς οὐκ ἄξιοι ὄντες τοσοῦτον ἀγαθὸν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας ἔχειν χώρας, δέισαντες μήπου ἀμαρτημάτων ἕνεκεν. For μήπου Cramer (p. 65) suggests δῆπου. But the whole sentence recurs in Victor with a more complete ending—μήπου τι καὶ μείζον πάθωσιν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ παρόντος δυνάμεως τῶν οἰκείων ἀμαρτημάτων ἕνεκεν. This fuller form is supported by Isho'dad (p. 44)—'they were not worthy, lest also some other harsh thing should happen to them because of their sins, by reason of His greatness'. Clearly Isho'dad and Victor agree in preserving a line of Theodore omitted in direct transmission.

We are probably justified in provisionally assuming all passages common to Victor and Isho'dad to have *Theodore* as their common

¹ E.g. col. 457, ll. 1-10, 26-32; 461, 41-49; 464, 1-9, 24-49.

source. Some doubt is, however, introduced by the fact that in the two or three cases where Victor coincides with passages ascribed in Cramer's catena on Matthew to *Theodoret*—in one case definitely to 'Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus'—there are also coincidences in Isho'dad. I have not been able to trace these passages in Theodoret. There are three possible explanations. (1) Isho'dad, though he nowhere mentions Theodoret, yet used him freely; in this case some other coincidences with Victor may also come from Theodoret. (2) Theodoret and Isho'dad both follow Theodore closely. (3) As often, Theodore and Theodoret are confused. This is perhaps most probable.

The connexion between Victor and Isho'dad appears most clearly in the following cases :—

(1) *Victor* (Cramer, 299, 9-12)

... εἰς τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι αὐθὺς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων διαμάχεσθαι κτημάτων. τοῦτο δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν δαιμόνων οὐκ ἂν ποτε ἐγένετο· ἐπεὶ μηδὲ οἷόν τε ἦν ἐκείνους ἑαυτοὺς ἀφελίσθαι τῆς ἐξουσίας αὐτῶν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.

(2) *Victor* (300, 14-19).

ταῦτα δὲ οὔτε τὴν εἰς ἑαυτὸν βλασφημίαν ἀποφηνάμενος, οὔτε τοῖς βλασφημοῦσι κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος χώραν μετανοίας, εἰ βούλοιντο, ἀφιεῖς οὐδεμίαν· ἀλλ' ἐν παραθέσει τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν βλασφημίαν ὥς εἰς ἀνθρώπον τότε γίνεσθαι δοκοῦσαν, ἔλαττον φασκὼν εἶναι, ὅταν τῇ βλασφημίᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου συγκρίνηται πνεύματος.

(3) *Victor* (337, 14-21).

... ἀπεκρίνατο φωνήν, ἥ πολλὴν μὲν πίστιν, πολλὴν δὲ εὐλάβειαν ἐδείκνυ καὶ σύνεσιν. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐλέσθαι καὶ ἐν κυνὸς τάξει καταλογισθῆναι τῷ κυρίῳ, εὐλαβείας ἦν· τὸ δὲ οἰηθῆναι ὅτι καὶ τὸ βραχύτατον αὐτοῦ τῆς δυνάμεως (τοῦτο γὰρ ψυχία ὀνομάζει) ἱκανὸν τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς παρασχεῖν τὴν ἴασιν, πίστει ὑπερβαλλούσης· τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς λοιδορίας ἀρπάσαι τὴν οἰκείωσιν καὶ ποιήσασθαι ἀπόκρισιν οὕτω θαυμαστήν, συνέσεως εἶχε γνώρισμα.

Isho'dad, 53.

... so that he cannot again contend for his possessions.

This then would never have happened of the devils, that they should have bound themselves and liberated men from their power.

Isho'dad, 53.

This He says, not as if blasphemy against Himself were to be completely forgiven, nor as if to those who blaspheme against the Holy Ghost the door were shut in face of their repentance; but He spoke this to lessen the blasphemy against Himself, when it is compared with the blasphemy against the Spirit, because they had been thinking of Him as of a simple Man.

Isho'dad, 64.

Three virtues are shewn by the return of the answer of the Kanaänite—discretion, faith, and wisdom. That she chose to be considered by our Lord even as a dog, was a sign of her discretion; for that her thought was that even a little of His power (for she calls this *crumbs*) was sufficient to give healing to her daughter, was a great proof of her faith; that she took to herself domesticity from the dogs, was a witness to her wonderful wisdom.

Some earlier sentences in Victor's long comment on the Syra-phoenician are shewn by Isho'dad to come also from Theodore, who may thus be the source of the whole or the bulk of this comment.

(4) Here two passages in Victor are separated by two quotations, one partially at least from *Titus*. Victor is fuller and probably preserves more of Theodore.

Victor (316, 4-13).

εἰ καὶ ἄγαν εἰσὶ μοχθηροὶ τὸν τρόπον οἱ δαίμονες, ἀλλ' οὖν γε ἴσασιν ὅτι πάντως αὐτοὺς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων μένει τις κόλασις ὕστερον. ὅτι δὲ οὐχ ὁ καιρὸς ἐπέστη τῆς κολάσεως ῥαδίως ἡδύναντο γινῶναι, ἐξ ὧν οὐ τιμωρίᾳ παρεδίδοντο νῦν, ἀλλ' ὥστε ἀναχωρῆσαι μόνον τῶν ἀνθρώπων συνώθει αὐτούς. ἔλεγε γὰρ ὁ σωτήρ, "ἔξελθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου". ὥς οὖν καιρὸν ἔχοντες ἂ βούλονται ποιεῖν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ περὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, οὕτω κατεβόων τοῦ Κυρίου ὥς ἂν πρὸ τοῦ προσήκοντος καιροῦ μάτην αὐτοὺς βιαζομένον καὶ 'τιμωρίαις ὑπάγοντος...

318, 2-12. βουλευθεὶς οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἅπασιν δείξει καὶ ἥντινα τὴν ὁργὴν κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ δαίμονες ἔχουσι, καὶ ὅτι πολὺ ἐλάττωνα ἢ βούλονται καὶ δύνανται τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐργάζονται κακὰ, τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ κωλυόμενοι δυνάμει· ἐπὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπων ταύτην οὐ παρείχετο ἀποδείξιν· ἐπέτρεψε δὲ αὐτοῖς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους εἰσελθεῖν, ὥστε ἀπ' ἐκείνων τὴν τε ὁργὴν φανῆναι τῶν δαιμόνων καὶ τὴν δύναμιν νοεῖν, καὶ ὅτι οἱ τοσοῦτους χοίρους συντόμως ἀφανισάντες, οὐκ ἂδύναντο τὰ αὐτῇ διατιθέναι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καθεστήκασιν, ὥς διὰ πάντων φανεράν εἶναι τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δύναμιν, κωλύοντος αὐτοὺς ἅπαντα πράττειν εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὅσα καὶ βούλονται.

Isho'dad, 43.

But the demons, though they were harassed from doing their own will, yet know that in every way punishment is reserved for them at the last, on account of their wickednesses.

And because they have time in the interval to do something for men, they cried to our Lord as one who before the time of torments was forcing them uselessly and delivering them over to punishment; inasmuch as their torment in the world is this, when they are prevented from accomplishing their will, and are cast out of man, the image of God; but He allowed them to enter the swine, not because their will should be accomplished in these, but to shew every one the enmity they possess to the human race, and that they do little out of much that they long to do, because they are prevented by divine power; so therefore He allowed them to enter into the swine, first, that no man should be hurt by them; second, that from these things might be known at the same time the wrath of the demons and their power, for these sought also to kill the swine. Granted that they could hurt men, how much more would they cause these to perish if there was no one to restrain them?

Besides these instances I have noticed a few other places where

Victor and Isho'dad seem to have a common source, presumably Theodore; but the coincidence is either not so close or not very continuous, one or other writer using other material also. In comparing these two writers it must be remembered that neither professes to be quoting, and that Isho'dad probably uses a Syriac translation of Theodore. The coincidences are confined to Isho'dad's commentary on *Matthew*; I have found none in those on Mark and Luke.

Coincidences with Victor may be a clue to tracing quotations from Theodore in other Syriac commentaries, e.g. the Gannat Busamé (see Dr Rendel Harris's *Introd. to Isho'dad* xxxi-xxxii).

On *Theodoret*, see above. The comments are (1) on Mark iii 31 f, where the passage on Victor (300, 29 f) is composite. The last part is in Cramer on Matthew ascribed to *Apollinaris*, the first part to Theodoret. But there is some amount of divergence between Victor and the passage on Matthew. Isho'dad clearly coincides with part.

*Victor.**Cramer on Matthew,*
100.*Isho'dad, 55.*

Δείκνυσιν ὅτι πάσης
προτιμᾷ συγγενείας τοὺς
κατὰ τὴν πίστιν οἰκείους·
ταῦτα δὲ ἔφη οὐκ ἀπο-
δοκιμάζων πάντως τὴν
μητέρα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελ-
φούς, ἀλλὰ δεικνὺς ὅτι
πάσης σωματικῆς συγ-
γενείας προτιμᾷ τῆς
ψυχῆς τὴν οἰκειότητα·
διὰ τοῦτου κἀκείνους
στέργων εἰ ταῦτα ἐπά-
γοιντο· πρὸς γὰρ τὸν
οἰόμενον ὡς ἐπὶ σπου-
δαιότερον καλεῖν αὐτὸν
τῶν οἰκείων τὴν ὁμιλίαν,
ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τοῦτο εἰ-
πεῖν, ὁμοῦ καὶ εἰς διδα-
σκαλίαν τῶν παρόντων.

Ταῦτα δὲ ἔφη, οὐκ
ἀποδοκιμάζων πάντως
τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς
ἀδελφούς, ἀλλὰ δεικνὺς
ὅτι πάσης σωματικῆς
συγγενείας προτιμᾷ τῆς
ψυχῆς τὴν οἰκειότητα·
διὰ τοῦτο κἀκείνους
στέργων, εἰ ταῦτα ἐπά-
γοιντο· πρὸς γὰρ τὸν
οἰόμενον ὡς ἐπὶ τι σπου-
δαιότερον καλεῖν αὐτὸν
τῶν οἰκείων τὴν ὁμιλίαν,
ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τοῦτο εἰ-
πεῖν· ὁ μὲν καὶ εἰς διδα-
σκαλίαν τῶν παρόντων.
ὡς γὰρ αὐτὸς εἶπε τοῖς
μαθηταῖς “ὁ φιλῶν πα-
τέρα ἢ μητέρα” καὶ τὰ
ἐξῆς. οὕτω μοι νόει τὸν
Ἰησοῦν προκρίναντα
τοὺς μαθητὰς ὑπὲρ μη-
τέρα καὶ ἀδελφούς.

Now He says these things, not as one who rejects niother and brethren, but to shew that spiritual affinity is preferred by Him to bodily relationship; and because of this He also loves those if they have that.

(2) On Mark vi 10. Cramer on Matthew has two fragments, the first ascribed to 'Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus', the second simply to 'Theodoret'. Victor has somewhat more. Isho'dad has coincidences only with Cramer's *second* fragment.

Victor, 323, 24 f.

Ἐκέλευσε δὲ καὶ εἰς οἰκίαν μένειν μὴ μεθισταμένους, ὥστε μὴ εὐκόλου καὶ προχείρου γνώμης ἀποφέρεσθαι δόξαν παρὰ τοῖς τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦσιν. ἐκέλευσε δὲ τοῖς μὴ πειθόμενοις αὐτῶν μηδὲ ὑποδεχομένοις, καὶ τὸν κοινορτὸν ἐκτινάσσειν τῶν ποδῶν, σύμβολον ὄντα τῆς ὁδοπορίας ἣν ὑπέμενον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, ἥτοι ὡς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν ὁ κοινορτὸς εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐπανέλθοι.

Cramer, 76.

Ταῦτά φησιν ὥστε μὴ εὐκόλου καὶ προχείρου γνώμης ἀποφέρεσθαι δόξαν παρὰ τοῖς τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦσιν . . . Τὸ ἐκτινάσσειν τὸν κοινορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν κατὰ τῶν μὴ ὑποδεχομένων αὐτοὺς, σύμβολον τῆς ὁδοπορίας ἣν ὑπέμεναν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν.

Isho'dad, 45.

But He commanded them about those who would not receive them, to shake off upon them the dust of their feet, a sign therefore of the labours of the way which they had borne because of them.

The last clause in *Victor* may possibly come from a different source than *Theodoret* (*Theodore*).

I have found in *Isho'dad* no coincidences with catena fragments of *Theodoret* independent of *Victor*.

Basil is given as the source of a comment on Mark ix 50 (370, 18 f) "ἐκ τοῦ σμ. κεφαλαίου τοῦ Ἀσκητικοῦ"—really from his 'Shorter Rules', no. 266.

Gregory of Nyssa is given by Possinus as the source of the comparison of the Two Robbers (438, 28—439, 2). I have not found the reference.

Isidore of Pelusium is not used so much as might be expected. The first note on the parable of the Mustard Seed, ascribed by Possinus to Cyril (311, 4—8), comes really from *Isidore* *Epp.* iv 76, though it is quoted freely. Another passage is a conflation of a fragment of Cyril with *Isidore* iv 189 (289, lines 23—29; 23—25 come from Cyril, 25—27 from *Isidore*, and 27—29 again from Cyril).

The connexions with *Photius* present a difficult problem. Out of eleven passages ascribed to him in Possinus's catena on Mark, seven have some connexion with *Victor*. In one of these, however, the parallel is found also in *Nicetas's* catena on Luke, from *Victor's* commentary on that Gospel. In another, both clearly depend on *Chrysostom*, to which *Victor* comes closest; in another, both may be using *Theodore*. In one case *Victor* has one clause in common with *Photius*, and after a distinct interval a longer sentence; in several cases *Victor* is fullest, though this fact may be variously interpreted.

The passages are—(1) Mark i 32:

Photius.

διὰ τοῦτο ἀνέμενον τὸ πέρας τῆς ἡμέρας, ἵνα μὴ δόξωσιν ἐν σαββάτῳ θεραπευθῆναι. ἀμέλει καὶ οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡγούμενοι ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ θεραπεύοντι ἐν σαββάτῳ. οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τὴν ἐσπέραν μὴ ἀναμένοντες, παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν τὰς ἰάσεις ποιῆσθαι.

(2) i 35 f.

Photius.

Αξιὸν ἐστι ζητήσεως πῶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀναχωρήσας εἰς τὴν ἔρημον προσήνχετο· οὐ γὰρ δὴ ὡς δεόμενος καὶ χρήζων τοῦτο ἐποίει, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ τὰς τῶν λογικῶν δεχόμενος προσευχάς· ἀλλὰ οἰκονομικῶς τοῦτο ποιών καὶ τύπος ἡμῖν γινόμενος πάσης ἀρίστης πράξεως.

All this is found in Nicetas, and comes there from Victor on Luke.

(3) iii 13 f. Photius has among phrases not found in Victor· ὡς ἂν μὴ μάταια αὐτῶν γένηται ἡ προβολή—cf. 296, 27–28; and further on ἡμέρας δὲ γεγονυίας κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν, προσεκαλέσατο οὓς προέκρινε· πλείους γὰρ ἦσαν τῶν δώδεκα οἱ παρόντες· οὓς δὲ ἐξελέξατο δώδεκα ἐτύγχανον· καὶ τούτους ἐκάλεσεν ἀποστόλους, εἰς προπαρασκευὴν τοῦ κληρύματος καὶ εἰς τὸ μέλλον ὑπ' αὐτῶν πληρωθήσεσθαι ἔργον. This agrees closely, though not verbally, with Victor 297, 4–7.

(4) iii 28 f. Photius agrees practically verbally with Victor 297, 24–29, except that Photius may have lost something near the close. He has ἀσυγχώρητον δὲ εἶναι λοιδορίαν θεοῦ φησί, πρὸς σύγκρισιν ἐκείνης καθ' ἣν ἐνομίζετο καὶ ἐωράτο ὡς ἄνθρωπος—whereas Victor, omitting φησί, continues ὡς ἐν αὐτῇ συγγνώμῃ οὐκ ἔχουσιν. τὴν γὰρ εἰς νὺν ἔχειν πρὸς σύγκρισιν ἐκείνης καθ' ἣν ἐνομίστο τότε καὶ ἐωράτο ἄνθρωπος ὢν.

(5) v 8. εἰ καὶ ἄγαν εἰσὶ μοχθηροὶ οἱ δαίμονες, ἀλλ' οὖν ἐγίνωσκον ὅτι εἰς ὕστερον κολασθήσονται ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων. Cp. Victor 316. 4–6, which seems to be connected with Theodore. But the rest of the fragment of Photius depends on Chrysostom, and has no connexion with Victor.

(6) v 13. The Saviour allowed the demons to enter into the swine ἵνα δείξῃ τὴν καθ' ἡμῶν μαρίαν τῶν δαιμόνων ὅποση τίς ἐστιν, καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν, καὶ ὅτι οἱ τοσούτους χοίρους συντόμως ἀφανίσαντες οὐκ ἂν ἀδύνατοι ἦσαν οὕτω διαθεῖναι καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· ὥστε διὰ πάντων τούτων φανερὰν εἶναι τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν, κωλύοντος αὐτοὺς ποιῆσαι εἰς τοὺς

Victor, 278, 12–16.

ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἐνόμιζον μὴ ἐξεῖναι τινι θεραπεύειν σαββάτῳ, τοῦτου χάριν τοῦ σαββάτου τὸ πέρας ἀνέμενον. ἀμέλει, καὶ οἱ τῶν Ἰ. ἡγούμενοι ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ θεραπεύοντι ἐν σαββάτῳ. οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ὡς ὠφελή-θέντες ἤδη, μὴ ἀναμείναντες τὴν ἐσπέραν, παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἰασασθαι τὴν πενθερὰν Πέτρου.

Victor, 280, 3 f.

Ὅρα γὰρ πῶς ἀναχωρήσας ὁ Ἰ. εἰς τὴν ἔρημον προσήνχετο· οὐκ αὐτὸς ταύτης δεόμενος· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἦν ὁ τὰς παρὰ τῶν λογικῶν ἀπάντων δεχόμενος λιτάς· ἀλλὰ οἰκονομικῶς τοῦτο ποιών καὶ τύπος ἡμῖν, ὡς ἔφημεν, πάσης ἀρίστης γενόμενος πράξεως.

ἀνθρώπους ὅσα καὶ βούλονται. Cp. Victor 318, 6-12; reasons have been given for ascribing the early part of this to Theodore; but the latter part has nothing close in Isho'dad. Either Victor is composite here, combining Theodore and Photius; or more probably both Photius and Victor are following Theodore, the former more closely.

(7) On xiv 9—where Photius seems to depend on Chrysostom; cp. 419. 25-30.

Photius.

Τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἀπέχω, φησί, τοῦ
μεμψάσθαι αὐτήν, ὥστε οὐδὲ ἀφήσω
λαβεῖν τὸ γεγενημένον αὐτῆς ἔργον·
ἀλλ' ἅπας ὁ κόσμος γινώσεται· καὶ
γὰρ μεγάλης διανοίας ἦν τοῦτο.

Chrysostom (Field, p. 340).

ἐγὼ γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἀπέχω τοῦ κατα-
δικάσαι αὐτήν ὡς κακῶς πεποιηκυῖαν,
ἢ μεμψάσθαι ὡς οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἐργασα-
μένην, ὅτι οὐδὲ ἀφήσω λαβεῖν τὸ γε-
γενημένον ἀλλ' ὁ κόσμος εἴσεται τὸ
ἐν οἰκίᾳ εἰργασμένον καὶ ἐν κρίπτῳ.
Καὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ διανοίας εὐλαβοῦς ἦν τὸ
γεγενημένον.

Victor agrees with Chrysostom except in reading *καλῶς* for *ὀρθῶς*, and *μεγάλης διανοίας* for *ἀπὸ διανοίας εὐλαβοῦς*.

On the whole I am inclined to think that Photius uses Victor or his sources. The last passage seems fatal to Victor having used Photius.

I have found no connexions with *Severus*, who is often used in catenae.

Probably a few more passages may come from Cyril's dogmatic writings, or from various works of Athanasius, Basil, and the Gregories; but these can only be a few. Much, therefore, of Victor remains unidentified; much of this, however, probably comes from Titus and Theodore, or perhaps from Apollinaris or Victor himself.

Here and there there is some slight connexion between Victor and one of Possinus's other sources—his 'Tolosanus'. To take one instance from the parable of the Growth of the Seed—Mk. iv 26 f. 'Tolosanus' has . . . τοὺς δεξαμένους τὸν σπόρον, τούτεστι τὸν σωτήριον λόγον, ἐγείρεται δὲ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν τοῖς τῆς προνοίας λόγοις διεγείρων ἡμᾶς εἰς καρποφορίαν. Cp. Victor 309. 4-7—which looks more original. The relation resembles that of Photius.

I subjoin an approximate Table of Sources used:—

| CHRYSTOSTOM. | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>Cramer.</i> | <i>Chrysostom, Matthew.</i> |
| p. 267, l. 9-17 | H. 37, p. 415 D-416 A |
| 270, 15-17 | H. 12 160 D |
| 272, 8-273, 2 | H. 13 167 E-168 D |
| 282, 3-9 | H. 25 308 B-D |
| 12-21 | " 307 E, 309 A |
| 283, 7-15 | " 309 B-310 A |
| 287, 22-26 | H. 15 184 C D |

| <i>Cramer.</i> | <i>Chrysostom, Matthew.</i> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| p. 294, l. 7-14 | H. 40 p. 438 B, 437 B C |
| 301, 28-302, 2 | H. 44 469 E-470 A |
| 302, 26-304, 24 | " 470 B-472 E |
| 307, 24-31 | H. 15 195 A B |
| 308, 2-5 | " 195 B |
| 311, 17-25 | H. 47 487 B C |
| 312, 16-313, 31 | H. 28 333 B-335 C |
| 314, 28-315, 7 | " 335 E-336 A |
| 315, 15-316, 4 | " 335 C-336 B |
| 331, 15-333, 14 | H. 50 513 C-516 D |
| 342, 15-25 | H. 53 540 D-541 A |
| 345, 27-346, 10 | H. 54 546 B-E |
| 347, 16-348, 1 | " 550 B-551 A |
| 348, 11-349, 17 | H. 55 555 C-557 D |
| 349, 21-350, 20 | " 558 C-559 C |
| 351, 26-353, 3 | H. 56 565 A-566 B |
| 353, 16-354, 8 | " 566 B-567 A |
| 354, 20-355, 2 | " 567 B-568 C |
| 355, 25-356, 23 | " 568 C-570 C |
| 356, 33-357, 6 | " 571 A |
| 357, 11-13, 17-22 | " 571 B C |
| 357, 25-358, 26 | H. 57 575 C-577 D |
| 359, 27-361, 9 | " 578 C-580 A |
| 361, 10-16 | " 581 A |
| 364, 19-30 | H. 58 587 C-588 A |
| 366, 24-26 | H. 35 401 B |
| 32-367, 12 | H. 58 588 B D |
| 367, 30-368, 3 | H. 59 598 D E |
| 371, 13-372, 22 | H. 62 619 B-621 D |
| 372, 28-373, 25 | " 620 D-622 B |
| 375, 10-25 | " 624 D-625 B |
| 376, 9-378, 31 | H. 63 627 D-631 A |
| 380, 21-381, 17 | H. 64 634 C-637 A |
| 383, 13-15 | (H. 65 644 A) |
| 27-384, 2 | " 644 B (C) |
| 384, 8-19 | " 645 B C |
| 21-386, 22 | " 645 D-648 B |
| 386, 24-387, 23 | " 648 B-649 E |
| 389, 9-25 | H. 66 654 C-655 A |
| 390, 2-7 | " 656 C-D |
| 391, 3-24 | H. 67 662 B-663 A |
| 393, 15-25 | " 661 B C |
| 396, 23-30 | " 663 B D |
| 399, 28-400, 2 | H. 68 671 D E |
| 401, 26-402, 9 | H. 70 689 A-690 B |
| 403, 6-26 | H. 71 695 B C, 694 D |
| 404, 2-7 | " 694 E-695 A |
| 404, 23-405, 21 | " 695 E-697 B |
| 407, 10-22 (part) | H. 75 722 E-723 A |
| 26-408, 7 | " 723 B C |

| <i>Cramer.</i> | <i>Chrysostom, Matthew.</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| p. 408, l. 31—410, 12 (mainly) . . . | H. 75, p. 723 E—726 A |
| 410, 18-22 | " 725 B |
| 411, 16—412, 23 | H. 76 731 E—735 A |
| 413, 10-23 | " 735 D—736 A B |
| 414, 6-28 | H. 77 740 B—741 B |
| 415, 6-11 | " 741 B C |
| 14—416, 5 | " 741 C—742 C' |
| 416, 19-32 | " 744 A B |
| 417, 30—418, 3 | H. 80 765 C |
| 419, 3-9 | " 766 C |
| 13-30 | " 766 D—768 C |
| 420, 6-28 | H. 81 773 B D |
| 421, 2-4 | " 774 A |
| 422, 12-18 | H. 82 781 D E |
| 424, 20—426, 2 (mainly) | " 783 E—787 B |
| 426, 13-20 | H. 83 790 E—791 B |
| 22-31 | " 791 C D |
| 427, 2-16 (mainly) | " 791 E—792 B |
| 19-27 | " 792 D |
| 428, 19-25 | " 793 B C |
| 429, 22—430, 9 | H. 84 799 D—800 C |
| 431, 4-16 | " 800 E—801 B |
| 432, 31—433, 12 | H. 85 805 B D |
| 435, 25—436, 3 | H. 87 817 D E |
| 436, 4-5 | " 818 A E |
| 437, 29—438, 2 | " 819 A-C |
| 438, 6-9 | H. 88 824 D |
| 26-28 | H. 87 819 D E |
| 439, 8-16 | H. 88 824 B D |
| 18-31 | " 824 D—825 C |
| 440, 9-12 | " 825 D |
| 19-22 | " 825 D |
| 25-29 (411, 11-15) | " 825 E—826 A' |
| 441, 21-25 | " 826 A B |
| 443, 16—444, 2 | " 827 C E |
| 444, 6-9 | H. 89 834 A |
| 446, 4-15 | " 834 B D |

ORIGEN.

Cramer.

- 266, 12—267, 4 Quoted from John, tome vi (24, p. 126).
 267, 18-26 (?). Continuation of above, but free and perhaps indirect.
 269, 20-25. John, tome vi (34, p. 134).
 306, 20—307, 16 (21). Ascribed to Origen by Gallandi and Corderius (abridgement of Nicetas's catena on Luke).
 314, 5-19. Quoted from John, tome vi (41, p. 141).
 321, 1-3. Assigned to Origen by Possinus, but by others to Titus, who sometimes copies Origen.
 346, 6 f, 30 f. } Echoes of Matthew, tome xii 18-19; but not verbally close, and
 348, 1 f. } perhaps indirect.

428, 2-5. Ascribed in different form to Origen by Possinus. But as it stands in Cramer, it comes direct from Cyril.

EUSEBIUS.

266, 8-12. Quoted from 'To Marinus'.

293, 7-15. Psalm xxxiii (xxxiv).

444, 9-445, 32. } From 'To Marinus'. Free, and perhaps indirect.
446, 18-447, 10. }

TITUS OF BOSTRA.

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| 276 (10), 12-15, 22-26 (28) | On Lk. iv 35 | Sickenberger, p. 157 |
| 281, 26-282, 3 | " v 12 f | " 158 |
| 285, 3-6 | " v 27 | " 160 |
| 288, 13-14 | " v 28 | " 160 |
| 293, 5-7 | " vi 5 | " 160 |
| 294, 19-21 | " vi 13 | " 161 |
| 304, 30-305, 5 | " viii 5 | " 173 |
| 316, 30-317, 2 | " viii 31 | " 177 |
| 317, 18-21, 24-25, 28-29 | " viii 38 | " 178-9 |
| 318, 24-28 | " viii 41 | " 180 |
| 321, 1-3 | " viii 48 | " 182 |
| (ascribed by Possinus to Origen) | | |
| 355, 4-6 | " ix 33 | " 182 |
| 356, 26-29 | " ix 35 | " 183 |
| 406, 16-20 | " xx 46 | " 235 |
| 408, 18-27 (?) | " xxi 8 | " 236 |
| 421, 28-30 | " xxii 22 | " 243 |

THEODORE OF HERACLEA.

328, 13-16 Possinus, Catena on Matthew

435, 19-21. Cramer, Catena on Matthew, 233

APOLLINARIS.

301, 5-8 (10). Cramer, Matthew, 99

374, 15-22. " " 151

389, 25-32. Nicetas; Cramer on Luke

402, 22-32. Cramer, Matthew, 183

428, 17-19. Cramer, Luke, 160

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA.

(275, 6-10). Migne, col. 545; Smith, p. 66

(26-29). " 548 " 68

285, 9-10. Possinus, Matthew

286, 15-29 (31). Cramer, Matthew, 66

289, 23-25, 17-30. Cramer, Luke; Migne, 572; Smith, 87

290, 10-20. " 572-3 " 87, 89

311, 48. Possinus on Mark

395, 15 f. "

423, 8-29. Migne, col. 909-912; Smith, 667-8

427, 28-428, 5. " 920 " 684-5

428, 10-17. " 924 " 694-5

| | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|
| 428, 27—429, 8. | Migne, col (925); Smith, 695-6 |
| 431, 21-26. | " 929 " 703-4 |
| 29-31. | " 928 " 698 |
| 432, 16-31. | " (928) " 699-701 |
| 433, 23-434, 1. | " 932 " 708 |
| 434, 22-32. | " 933 " 711 |
| 435, 3-17. | " 933 " 710-1-2, 714 |
| 436, 5-10, 25-29 | " 933 f " 715 |
| 437, 6-14. | " 464 " 718-9 |
| 438, 24-26 | " 937 " 720 |

THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA.

A. *Direct.*

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| 294, 8-9. | Possinus, Mark |
| 309, 12-19, 26-28. | Possinus, Mark |
| 517, 14-17. | Cramer, Matthew, 65 |
| 340, 31-341, 3. | Cramer, Matthew, 127 |
| 341, 5-7 (9). | |
| 414, 29-415, 2. | Possinus, Mark |
| 423, 6-8. | " Matthew |

B. *In Isho'dad.*

| | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 271, 17-19. | <i>Isho'dad</i> (Eng. Transl.) 21 | (328, 1-8). | <i>Isho'dad</i> (Eng. Transl.) 62 |
| (291, 20-21). | " 44. | 336, 21-27. | " 64 |
| 299, 7, 9-12 (? 6-12). | " 53 | 337, 14-21. | " 64 |
| 300, 14-19. | " 53 | 391, 26-27 (24 f). | " 83 |
| (315, 7-12). | " 43 | 392, 1-5. | " 83 |
| 316, 4-13. | " 43 | 398, 20-21, 23-28. | " 85 |
| 318, 2-12. | " 43 | | |

THEODORET?

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| 300, 29-301, 4. | Cramer, Matthew, 100 |
| 323, 24-29. | " " 76 |

BASIL.

| | |
|-------------|---------------------|
| 370, 18-31. | 'Shorter Rules' 266 |
|-------------|---------------------|

GREGORY OF NYSSA.

| |
|----------------|
| 438, 28-439, 2 |
|----------------|

ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM.

| | |
|-------------|-----------------|
| 311, 4-8. | Book iv, Ep. 76 |
| 289, 25-27. | " iv " 189 |

PHOTIUS?

| | | | |
|-------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|
| 278, 12-16. | Possinus on Mark | 299, 24-29. | Possinus on Mark |
| 280, 3 ff | " | 316, 4-6. | " |
| 296, 27-28. | } | 318, 6-12 | " |
| 297, 4-7. | | 419, 25-30 | " |

VICTOR on Luke.

| |
|------------|
| 280, 2-17. |
|------------|

PASSAGES IDENTIFIED.

- 266, 9 f. Eusebius.
12—267, 8. Origen.
267, 9—17. Chrysostom.
18 f. Origen.
269, 20—26. "
270, 15—17. Chrysostom.
271, 17—19. Theodore.
272, 8—273, 2. Chrysostom.
275, 6—10. Cyril (?).
26—29. "
276 (10), 12—15. Titus.
22—26 (28). "
280, 2—17. Victor.
281, 26—282, 3. Titus.
282, 3—9. Chrysostom.
12—21. "
283, 7—15. "
285, 3—6. Titus.
9—10. Cyril
286, 15—29 (31). Cyril
287, 22—26. Chrysostom.
288, 13—14. Titus.
289, 23—25. Cyril.
25—27. Isidore.
27—29. Cyril.
290, 10—20. "
291, 20—21. Theodore (?).
293, 5—7. Titus.
7—15. Eusebius.
294, 7—14. Chrysostom.
8—10. Theodore
19—21. Titus.
299, 7, 9—12. Theodore.
300, 14—19. "
29—301, 4. Theodoret (?).
301, 5—10. Apollinaris.
28—302, 2. Chrysostom.
302, 26—304, 24. "
304, 30—305, 5. Titus.
306, 20—307, 16. Origen.
307, 24—31. Chrysostom.
308, 2—5. "
309, 12—19. Theodore
26—28. "
311, 4—8. Isidore.
17—25. Chrysostom
312, 16—313, 31. "
314, 5—21. Origen.
28—315, 7. Chrysostom.
315, 7—12. Theodore (?).
315, 15—316, 4. Chrysostom.
316, 4—13. Theodore.
30—317, 2. Titus
317, 14—17. Theodore.
18—21, 24—25, 28—29. Titus.
318, 2—12. Theodore.
24—28. Titus.
321, 1—3. "
323, 24—29. Theodoret (?).
328, 1—8. Theodore (?).
15—20. Theodore of Heraclea.
331, 15—333, 14. Chrysostom.
336, 21—27. Theodore.
337, 14—21. "
340, 31—341, 7. "
342, 15—25. Chrysostom.
345, 27—346, 10. "
346, 16 f. Origen.
347, 16—348, 1. Chrysostom.
348, 11—350, 20. "
351, 26—353, 3. "
353, 16—354, 8. "
354, 20—355, 2. "
355, 25—356, 23. "
356, 26—29. Titus.
33—357, 6. Chrysostom.
357, 11—13, 17—22. "
25—358, 36. "
359, 27—361, 16. "
364, 19—30. "
366, 24—26. "
32—367, 12. "
367, 30—368, 3. "
370, 18—31. Basil.
371, 13—372, 22. Chrysostom.
372, 28—373, 25. "
374, 15—22. Apollinaris.
375, 10—25. Chrysostom.
376, 9—378, 31. "
380, 21—381, 17. "
383, 13—15. "(?
27—384, 19. "
384, 21—386, 22. "
386, 24—387, 23. "
389, 9—25. "
25—32. Apollinaris.
390, 2—7. Chrysostom.
391, 3—24. "
24—392, 5. Theodore (?).
393, 15—25. Chrysostom.

- 395, 15 f Cyril(?).
 396, 23-30 Chrysostom.
 398, 20-21, 23-28. Theodore.
 399, 28-400, 2. Chrysostom.
 401, 26-402, 9. " "
 402, 22-32. Apollinaris.
 403, 6-26. Chrysostom.
 404, 2-7, " "
 23-405, 21. " "
 406, 16-20. Titus.
 407, 10-22 (part) Chrysostom
 26-408, 7. " "
 408, 18-27 Titus(?).
 31-410, 12 (mainly). Chrysostom.
 410, 18-22 " "
 411, 16-412, 23. " "
 413, 10-23. " "
 414, 6-28. " "
 29-415, 2. Theodore.
 415, 6-11. Chrysostom.
 14-416, 5. " "
 416, 19-32. " "
 417, 30-418, 3. " "
 419, 3-9. " "
 13-30. " "
 420, 6-28. " "
 421, 2-4. " "
 28-30. Titus.
 422, 12-18. Chrysostom.
 423, 6-8. Theodore.
 8-29. Cyril.
 424, 20-426, 2 (mainly). Chrysostom.
 426, 13-20. " "
 22-31. " "
 427, 2-16 (mainly). " "
 427, 19-27. Chrysostom.
 28-428, 17. Cyril.
 428, 17-18. Apollinaris.
 19-25. Chrysostom.
 27-429, 8. Cyril.
 429, 22-430, 9. Chrysostom.
 431, 4-16. " "
 21-31. Cyril.
 432, 16-31. " "
 31-433, 12. Chrysostom.
 433, 23-434, 1. Cyril.
 434, 22-32. " "
 435, 3-17. " "
 19-21. Theodore of Heraclea
 25-436, 5 (mainly). Chrysostom.
 436, 5-10, 25-29. Cyril.
 437, 6-14. " "
 29-438, 2. Chrysostom.
 438, 6-9, 21-23. " "
 24-26. Cyril.
 26-28. Chrysostom.
 28-439, 2. Gregory of Nyssa.
 439, 8-16. Chrysostom.
 18-31. " "
 440, 9-12, 19-22. " "
 25-29. " "
 441, 11-15. " "
 21-25. " "
 442, 7-8, 17-18. " "
 443, 16-444, 9. " "
 444, 9-445, 32. Eusebius (free, and
 perhaps indirect)
 446, 4-15. Chrysostom.
 15-447, 2 Eusebius.

HAROLD SMITH.