

Catenaes and Commentaries on Hebrews and their Biblical Text

Houghton, H.A.G.

DOI:

[10.1515/9783111549682-005](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111549682-005)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Houghton, HAG 2024, Catenaes and Commentaries on Hebrews and their Biblical Text. in D Müller, G Gäbel & M Geigenfeind (eds), *Textforschung zu Septuaginta, Hebräerbrief und Apokalypse : Die Relevanz von Textkritik zur Erforschung des frühen Judentums, des Neuen Testaments und des frühen Christentums*. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, vol. 60, De Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 117-136.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111549682-005>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Full AAM upload permitted by De Gruyter by email of 20th March 2024.

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

[p. 117]

Catenae and Commentaries on Hebrews and their Biblical Text

H.A.G. Houghton

Abstract:

This chapter sets out the state of scholarship on the catena tradition on the Epistle to the Hebrews. It provides details of the three main types (the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena, the Typus Parisinus and the catena of Nicetas of Heraclea), their manuscript attestation and their significance for the New Testament text. The commentary of Theophylact is also considered, in addition to other commentary manuscripts selected for the Editio Critica Maior of the Pauline Epistles. The four traditions associated with Chrysostom, Theodoret, John of Damascus and Euthymius Zigabenus often exhibit a distinctive biblical text and deserve further investigation.

Acknowledgment

It is a pleasure to write this chapter in honour of Martin Karrer. His enthusiasm and breadth of interests have enabled him to make many distinctive and important contributions to the study of the biblical text and its transmission. In addition, he has been a generous host of the editorial teams of the *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior (ECM)* for their meetings in Wuppertal. All of us at ITSEE in Birmingham offer him our congratulations and best wishes as he attains a septuagintal age. I hope that this overview of the catena traditions and commentary manuscripts on Hebrews will be useful for him and his team in their planned edition of this epistle.¹

1. Scholarship on Pauline Catenae

Modern classifications of catenae stem from the pioneering catalogue of Georg Karo and Hans Lietzmann.² This was the first attempt to bring together all [p. 118] known biblical catena traditions and divide them into groups according to their contents in a selected test passage. Its comparison of the Pauline Epistles focussed largely on a comparison of the section beginning at Rom 7,8, which led to the identification of nine types. Four of these included exposition of Hebrews:

Type IV, preserved in a single tenth-century manuscript (Gregory-Aland 1910; Paris, BnF, Coisl. 204);

Type V, the catena on Hebrews of Nicetas of Heraclea, transmitted in two thirteenth-century witnesses (GA 1938 and GA 1983; Paris, BnF, gr. 238 and Milan, Ambros., E.2.inf);

Type VI, the compilation attributed to Oecumenius, for which they list thirty-seven manuscripts;

¹ This chapter was prepared as part of the CATENA project, which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement no. 770816).

² Georg Karo and Hans Lietzmann, *Catenarum Graecarum Catalogus*. Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historische Klasse (Göttingen: Lüder Horstmann, 1902); see also Hans Lietzmann, *Catenen. Mitteilungen über ihre Geschichte in handschriftlicher Überlieferung* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Mohr Siebeck, 1897).

Type IX, a single manuscript with scholia on the whole Praxapostolos (GA 605; Paris, BnF, gr. 216).

The catalogue only presents exegetical material from Hebrews for Type V: an annotated list of twenty-eight early Christian sources is provided along with the sequence of scholia in Heb 3,1–6.³ A larger number of catena manuscripts is listed in Hermann von Soden's edition of the Greek New Testament, although his focus is entirely on the biblical text.⁴

Further investigation of catenae on the Pauline Epistles was undertaken a few decades later by Karl Staab. In his first book he refined and expanded the categories of Karo and Lietzmann, assigning them the names which have now become widely adopted.⁵ As Staab's classifications have been adopted in the register of catenae in the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (CPG), the sigla in this system are also given here.⁶ Neither the *Typus Vaticanus* (CPG C160) nor the *Typus Monacensis* (CPG C161) are extant in Hebrews. The *Typus Parisinus* (CPG C162), in contrast, extends from Galatians to Hebrews and is only preserved in the [p. 119] manuscript which constituted Karo and Lietzmann's Type IV (GA 1910). Staab identified one more witness to Nicetas' catena on Hebrews (CPG C163), from the sixteenth century (GA 2890; Milan, Ambros., A.241.inf); he suspected that Nicetas may also have been the compiler of the catena preserved in GA 1953 (Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 166), which only contains Romans and part of 1 Corinthians (CPG C164). One of Staab's principal contributions was to divide the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena (CPG C165) into five subtypes. He also included an assessment of Theophylact's commentary on the Pauline epistles (CPG C167) and described twenty-nine of its manuscripts. Staab listed four *codices singuli*. Of these, Codex Athonensis Pantokratoros 28 (GA 1900, CPG C166), contains a composite catena: although it is distinctive in much of 1 and 2 Corinthians, in the later Epistles (including Hebrews) it is a witness to the Pseudo-Oecumenian type.⁷ Neither of the other three was entered into the CPG: two are from the tradition of Chrysostom (GA 623 and 1936), while the third is a set of scholia on Romans attributed to Theodulus (Paris, BnF, Coisl. 208). Staab identified the sole witness to Karo and Lietzmann's Type IX as a member of the Pseudo-Oecumenian Expanded Type.⁸

³ Karo and Lietzmann, *Catenarum Graecarum Catalogus*, 603–604.

⁴ Hermann Freiherr von Soden (ed.), *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*. Second edition; 2 vols (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902–13). See especially the list of catena types on I.39–40 and description of commentary manuscripts (including Theophylact) on I.249–289.

⁵ Karl Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1926).

⁶ Maurits Geerard and Jacques Noret (ed.), *Clavis Patrum Graecorum. IV Concilia, Catenae*. Second edition (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018); see also the online *Clavis Clavium* which integrates and updates this information (<https://clavis.brepols.net/clacla/Default.aspx>).

⁷ Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 256–257.

⁸ Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 146–148. However, Marcon notes that GA 605 has no trace of the Photian material which characterises this type, but instead contains three layers of scholia entered by different scribes (Jacopo Marcon, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Romans" [Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2023], 55–56).

Staab followed his work on catena types with a collection of scholia from eleven Greek Christian writers preserved in these compilations.⁹ The coverage of Hebrews varies considerably: no extracts are identified from Eusebius of Emesa, Acacius of Caesarea, Apollinaris of Laodicea or Diodore of Tarsus. One scholium each is attributed to Didymus the Blind and Arethas of Caesarea, along with five to Gennadius of Constantinople. Theodore of Mopsuestia and Severian of Gabala, however, provide twenty-nine and twenty-five scholia on Hebrews respectively: these are all preserved in GA 1910 (*Typus Parisinus*, CPG C162) with a few also found in GA 1900 (CPG C166). The Pseudo-Oecumenian catena is the most abundant source in this collection, with no fewer than thirty-five Hebrews scholia attributed to Oecumenius of Trikka and forty-six to Photius of Constantinople.¹⁰

After this came a hiatus of over eighty years before a renewal of interest in Pauline catenae. Successive doctoral theses at the University of Birmingham [p. 120] have recently examined the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena in several epistles, along with a fresh survey of the Photian material in this compilation.¹¹ Most of these projects included the creation of digital transcriptions of manuscripts, in keeping with a scholarly trend towards treating catenae as works in their entirety rather than simply sources for the reconstruction of earlier writings. This documentary approach is also advocated in the publications of Agnès Lorrain on *Typus Vaticanus*.¹² Theodora Panella showed that two of Staab's five subdivisions of the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena type did not stand up to further scrutiny: the *Spezialtypus*, attested in just one manuscript (GA 622; Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1430) arose from the provision of supplements copied from differing catena types in order to repair a damaged codex, while the *Sekundärer Erweiterungs-Typus* is an expanded form transmitted in a single codex and two direct copies.¹³ In addition, Staab's fifth category, *Auszüge aus dem Ps.-Oecumenius-Typus*, is predominantly a repository for manuscripts which did not fit into the other categories rather than a coherent type.¹⁴ Jacopo Marcon confirmed Panella's findings from Galatians in his study of Romans, and identified an abbreviated form of the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena common to several manuscripts in Staab's last group, which he

⁹ Karl Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche. Aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*. NTAbh 15 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1933; repr. 1984).

¹⁰ A useful index of scholia by biblical verse is provided in Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 662–672.

¹¹ Theodora Panella, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Galatians" (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2018); Chiara Coppola, "A New Analysis of the *Scholia Photiana* in the Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena Tradition" (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2021); Marcon, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Romans" (2023); Clark R. Bates, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Ephesians: Text, Translation, and Commentary" (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2024).

¹² For example, Agnès Lorrain, "Autour du *Vaticanus gr. 762*: Notes pour l'étude des chaînes à présentation alternante," *Byzantion* 90 (2020) 67–95; Agnès Lorrain, "Éditer les chaînes exégétiques grecques: quelle place pour les mises en page?" *Byzantion* 91 (2021) 219–263.

¹³ The earliest witness is GA 056 (Paris, BnF, Coisl. 26), which was the exemplar for GA 0142 (Munich, BSB, gr. 375); from this was copied GA 1925 (Venice, BNM, gr. Z. 35): see Theodora Panella, "Re-classifying the Pseudo-Oikoumenian Catena Types for Paul's Epistle to the Galatians," in *Receptions of the Bible in Byzantium: Texts, Manuscripts, and their Readers*, ed. Reinhart Ceulemans and Barbara Crostini (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 2021), 387–403, especially 396–399.

¹⁴ Panella, "Reclassifying," 399–401.

termed the "Abridged Version".¹⁵ The research of Marcon and Bates was able to benefit from a new catalogue of New Testament catena manuscripts, produced by Georgi Parpulov.¹⁶ A comprehensive list of all witnesses before the sixteenth century, including a redating of many of the [p. 121] documents, Parpulov's catalogue is accompanied by an online Catena Catalogue with a fuller range of searchable data and links to other repositories.¹⁷ This provides a basis for research into the entire tradition of New Testament catenae, including the present contribution.

2. Types of Catenae on Hebrews

As no new catenae on Hebrews have been brought to light, this tradition continues to comprise the three long-established types: the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena (CPG C165), *Typus Parisinus* (CPG C162) and the catena of Nicetas of Heraclea (CPG C163).¹⁸ In addition, as the commentary by Theophylact (CPG C167) is also numbered among the catenae in the CPG, it too is described here.

2.1. The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena

The Pseudo-Oecumenian catena is the most widely attested compilation on the Pauline Epistles. Its origins may be placed some time between the early seventh century (the date of the latest source to be cited) and the end of the eighth century, while its final stage was developed in the tenth century, the same period as the oldest surviving manuscripts.¹⁹ Although long associated with the Oecumenius responsible for a commentary on the Apocalypse, it is unlikely that this named author was the original compiler, not least because a significant number of scholia are attributed to Oecumenius himself. The most common catena on the Acts of the Apostles has also been transmitted under the name of Oecumenius, although this takes the form of a catena rewritten into a continuous [p. 122] commentary rather than a compilation of separate scholia as in the Pauline Epistles.²⁰

At least four stages of editorial activity are reflected in the Pseudo-Oecumenian tradition. The first stage, sometimes referred to as the *Urkatena*, consists of a series of numbered scholia. There are 653 of these in Hebrews. Although the majority are not

¹⁵ Marcon, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Romans," 84–98.

¹⁶ Georgi R. Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. A Catalogue*. Texts & Studies 3.25 (Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2021).

¹⁷ <https://purl.org/itsee/catena-catalogue> (last accessed September 2023). Parpulov's classification of types in the printed volume was based on the initial and final scholia in each book, rather than the analysis of a test passage: subsequent research by members of the CATENA project has provided corrections and updates which have been incorporated into the Catena Catalogue.

¹⁸ Georgi Parpulov, "An Unknown Catena on the Pauline Epistles," *The Byzantine Review* 2 (2020) 9–16 identifies a fragment of a new compilation on Romans, allocated the siglum CPG C169.1.

¹⁹ Staab suggested the end of the eighth century (*Die Pauluskatenen*, 208–209), although more recent studies have preferred an earlier date: Panella, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena," 202 gives the mid-eighth century as the *terminus post quem*, while Marcon, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena," 7–8 more controversially takes Oecumenian authorship at face value and accepts a seventh-century date.

²⁰ CPG C151; see further Emanuele Scieri, "The Catena Manuscripts on Acts: A Revised Classification," *Vigiliae Christianae* 76.1 (2022) 281–305, esp. 294–298.

attributed, many appear to be reworked extracts from the homilies of John Chrysostom. Some, however, indicate their source as Oecumenius.²¹ In manuscripts with a frame catena layout, comprising a central panel of biblical text surrounded by commentary, the same number is written above the relevant verse and before the corresponding marginal extract in order to connect the two. However, no manuscripts survive which contain only the numbered scholia. Instead, further excerpts were added from other early Christian writers, connected to the biblical text by symbols rather than numbers and sometimes indicated by the name of the source.

Staab termed these supplementary extracts the *Extravagantes*, or collectively the *Corpus extravagantium*, and classified witnesses with the *Urkatena* and these additional scholia as his *Normaltypus* (indicated as C165a by Parpulov and C165.1 in the online Catena Catalogue). Subsequent research has isolated at least two different groups of *Extravagantes*. Some of these are found independently as occasional marginal scholia in biblical manuscripts: the principal witness to one set of *Extravagantes* by themselves is GA 627 (Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 2062), but this breaks off in Heb. 3,12. Marcon observes that, in Romans, two manuscripts lack most of the *Extravagantes* (GA 94 and GA 2011; Paris, BnF, Coisl. 202bis and suppl. gr. 1264 etc.); two others have one set of *Extravagantes* with the *Urkatena* (GA 1919 and GA 2962; Florence, BML, Plut. 10.04 and Oxford, Bodl., Auct. T.1.7); yet two more transmit the numbered scholia and a different set of *Extravagantes* (GA 075 and GA 1980; Athens, EBE, 100 and Milan, Ambros., A.62.inf).²² Panella similarly concludes that the full *Normaltypus* was developed through the combination of existing series of scholia, including two [p. 123] groups of *Extravagantes*, rather than the piecemeal addition of individual extracts to the *Urkatena*.²³ It is not clear how far this analysis also pertains to Hebrews. A comparison of three witnesses of different types in the other epistles (GA 1919, 1933 and 1997) shows that each transmits largely the same forty *Extravagantes* in Hebrews: around half are anonymous, although GA 1919 indicates five of these as John Chrysostom (Ἰω.) and two as scholia (σχολ.); between thirteen (in GA 1919) and nineteen (in GA 1997) are attributed to Oecumenius; Theodoret and Gennadius provide one each, and Cyril is the source of one (GA 1919, 1933) or two (GA 1997).²⁴ These authors and their distribution

²¹ E.g. scholia 15 on Heb. 1:5, 155 on Heb. 5:7 and 601 on Heb. 12:26.

²² Marcon, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Romans," 117–126. It is noteworthy that all of these except GA 94 (not extant in Hebrews) are in alternating format. GA 1919 has the *Urkatena* in the main text (without numbers) and the *Extravagantes* in the margin, while in GA 075 and 1980 the numbers are attached to the biblical lemmata at the beginning of each paragraph rather than the following scholia. For more on GA 2962, see Jacopo Marcon, "A Missing Link in the Chain," in *That Nothing May Be Lost: Fragments and the New Testament Text*, ed. Clark R. Bates et al., Texts & Studies 3.29 (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2022), 187–214.

²³ Panella, "Reclassifying," 389–394.

²⁴ My count for GA 1997, based on the colour images at https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Pal.gr.10, differs from the figures given in Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 188–189 (and reproduced in the CPG) largely because he misses one of the Cyril scholia (on folios 235v and 265v) and I do not count the eighteen glosses providing the names of the exemplars in Heb 11,33–37 (on ff. 261v–262r) as separate anonymous scholia: only six of these are listed in GA 1933 (fol. 195v), while in GA 1919 (fol. 413v) they are integrated into the catena.

are similar to the *Extravagantes* in other epistles, although their proportion here is much smaller.²⁵

The final stage in the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena is the addition of a series of extracts from Photius, the ninth-century Patriarch of Constantinople. These are usually indicated by a monogram consisting of the first three letters of his name and preceded by an abbreviated biblical lemma. In GA 1905 (Paris, BnF, Coisl. 27), these scholia have been added in the outer margin of the frame catena by a later hand.²⁶ Staab characterised the combination of the numbered scholia, the *Extravagantes* and these *Scholia Photiana* as the Expanded Type (*Das erweiterte Typus*; C165c in Parpulov and C165.3 in the online Catena Catalogue). As noted above, Staab's *Pauluskommentare* prints the text of forty-six extracts from Photius on Hebrews: Coppola gives the total as fifty-one, but notes stylistic differences between these and the other *Scholia Photiana* on the Pauline Epistles which lead her to cast doubt on the authorship of those included in this letter.²⁷

The only complete printed edition of the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena is that of Bernardinus Donatus in the early sixteenth century, reprinted several times including in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* (Hebrews appears in *PG* 119: 279–452).²⁸ Staab identified Donatus' source as GA 91 (Paris, BnF, gr. 219), but both Lorrain and Marcon have noted discrepancies which indicate that this edition must derive from another, similar, manuscript.²⁹ In any case, the edition is so inaccurate as to be unusable: the CPG describes its source as *omnium fere deprauatissimum* ("almost the most corrupt of all").³⁰ Some Hebrews scholia from this compilation are included in an eighteenth-century collection of lexical definitions.³¹ Apart from scholia which are also found in other catena types (i.e. Cramer's edition of the other two catenae on Hebrews or Staab's *Pauluskommentare*), access to the text is only through the manuscripts.

²⁵ Marcon counts 137 *Extravagantes* in GA 1923 in Romans ("The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Romans," 2, 102), although his online edition comprises 233 *Extravagantes* and 920 numbered scholia (<https://purl.org/itsee/marcon>), a proportion of 25%; in Galatians, this figure is 20%, from 53 *Extravagantes* and 256 numbered scholia (see Panella, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Galatians," 233–269).

²⁶ Some Photian extracts are also written in the outer margin of GA 1933 (Paris, BnF, gr. 223; e.g. fol. 7r, 46r) but this appears to be used as an overflow by the copyist and is not restricted to the *Scholia Photiana*.

²⁷ Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 637–52; Coppola, "A New Analysis," 256–279 and 362–366. The differing numbers are due largely to the division of the scholia, although Coppola identifies two extracts from Photius (on Heb 4,16 and 5,1–2, which she numbers 528 and 529 and transcribes on page 375) which are not printed by Staab because they are not present in GA 1907, 1923 or 1982.

²⁸ Bernardinus Donatus (ed.), *Expositiones antiquae ac valde utiles* (Verona: Di Sabbio, 1532).

²⁹ Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 151–153; Lorrain, "Éditer les chaînes," 229; Marcon, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Romans," 11.

³⁰ Geerard and Noret, *Concilia, Catenae*, 389.

³¹ Christian Friedrich Matthaei (ed.), *Glossaria graeca minora et alia anecdota graeca* (Moscow: University Press, 1774), 59–85. According to Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 172 this derives from three Vatican manuscripts, all of which have abbreviated biblical texts.

The online Catena Catalogue lists a total of eighty-eight manuscripts of the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena with Hebrews.³² These are distributed as follows:

Staab's type	CPG	Total manuscripts
<i>Normaltypus</i>	C165.1	44
<i>Spezialtypus</i>	C165.2	1
<i>Der erweiterte Typus</i>	C165.3	13
[p. 125] <i>Sekundärer Erweiterungs-Typus</i>	C165.4	3
<i>Auszüge</i>	C165.5	27

Table 1. Manuscripts of the Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena with Hebrews

The majority of these (a total of sixty-six) were copied in the tenth or eleventh century, with just nine from the twelfth century, eight from the thirteenth century, and five from the fourteenth century or later. Although both types of layout are seen in all centuries, the frame catena format is predominant, appearing in sixty-one manuscripts: twenty-four are in alternating format, while three of the C165.5 witnesses are mixed or consist of dispersed scholia. As noted above, C165.2 and C165.4 are singular offshoots, of little importance for the main tradition, while further research is required to identify subgroups within C165.5: Marcon presents GA 1862 (Athos, Hagiou Pavlou, 2) as an instance of his "Abridged Version".³³ Descriptions of many of these manuscripts are provided in Staab's *Die Pauluskatenen* and the theses mentioned above, which also identify representative witnesses for the main types.³⁴

There does not appear to be a distinctive form of the scriptural text associated with the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena.³⁵ Only five witnesses with this catena type are among those provisionally selected for the *Editio Critica Maior* (ECM) of Hebrews, four of C165.1 (GA 075 [and 075S], 103, 1908, 2011) and one of C165.5 (GA 442); one of the representative Byzantine witnesses, GA 424, is also classified as C165.5.³⁶ One reason for this low number may be the predominance of the frame catena layout in this tradition, whose separate, continuous biblical text could easily have been compared with other manuscripts of the epistles and adjusted as required. Alternatively, the generally Byzantine affiliation of the biblical text may be an indication of the relatively late emergence of this catena type.

³² This figure discounts the multiple entries for GA 1907, among them the portions classified as C165.4 (see Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts*, 162). As Hebrews usually occurs at the end of the corpus, it may not be fully extant in all these witnesses.

³³ See Panella, "Re-classifying the Pseudo-Oikoumenian Catena," 396–399 and Marcon, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Romans," 84–98.

³⁴ See note 11 above.

³⁵ For an analysis of catenae in other books of the New Testament, see H.A.G. Houghton, "Catena Manuscripts in the *Editio Critica Maior* of the Greek New Testament," in *Pen, Print and Pixels. Advances in Textual Criticism in the Digital Era*, ed. Daniel B. Wallace, David Flood, Elijah Hixson and Denis Salgado (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 2023), 3–31.

³⁶ See H.A.G. Houghton, "An Initial Selection of Manuscripts for the *Editio Critica Maior* of the Pauline Epistles," in *The New Testament in Antiquity and Byzantium: Traditional and Digital Approaches to its Texts and Editing*, ed. H.A.G. Houghton, David C. Parker and Holger Strutwolf, ANTF 52 (Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, 2019), 343–359.

[p. 126]

2.2. *Typus Parisinus*

The *Typus Parisinus* catena on Hebrews (CPG C162) is transmitted in a single witness, GA 1910 (Paris, BnF, Coisl. 204) from the eleventh century. Staab dates the compilation to the seventh century, claiming it as the oldest surviving Pauline catena.³⁷ The manuscript lacks any preface and begins with Galatians: Hebrews is the final epistle, written on folios 234v to 311r (with folio 242r left blank for a folium missing from the exemplar). The text is copied in alternating catena format, with two columns to a page. The biblical lemmata are in a small majuscule script and marked by double diplai in the margin. These provide most of the text of the epistle, with occasional repetitions: sometimes they occur in the middle of a scholium. Further scriptural quotations are normally indicated by a single diplo and written in the same minuscule script as the rest of the commentary. The scholia are often introduced with a phrase such as ὁ μακάριος Κύριλλος φησι ("the blessed Cyril says"), which may be accompanied by an abbreviation of the author's name in the margin.

The majority of the extracts are from John Chrysostom, but several other authors appear frequently. Staab provides the following list of authors for Hebrews:³⁸

Author	Total first-hand scholia	Marginal additions
Athanasius	5	1
Cyril	14	-
Didymus	1	-
Eusebius	1	-
Gennadius	-	3
Origen	-	1
Severian	25	-
Theodoret	-	2
Theodore of Mopsuestia	28	-

Table 2. Sources of *Typus Parisinus* scholia in Hebrews

[p. 127] It is not clear if the scholia added by a later hand in the margin and connected to the biblical text with a symbol were part of the same original tradition but overlooked by the copyist: the lack of overlap with the authors in the body of the manuscript suggests that this is not the case. The extensive use of Theodore of Mopsuestia, condemned at the Council of Constantinople in 553, is the reason Staab prefers an early date for this compilation, prior to the loss of Theodore's writings.³⁹ As noted above, both

³⁷ Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 69. Despite the continuity of the contents of this manuscript and *Typus Vaticanus*, Staab establishes that they are separate compilations (*Die Pauluskatenen*, 65).

³⁸ Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 63–64.

³⁹ The numerous lengthy passages from Severus of Antioch in the gospel catena of Codex Zacynthius may provide an analogy for this: see further William Lamb, "A Question of Attribution: The Theological

these scholia and those from Severian of Gabbala are printed in Staab's *Pauluskommentare*. This manuscript was one of the few sources used by Cramer for his nineteenth-century collection of catenae, with the result that his principal text in Hebrews is this unique *Typus Parisinus*.⁴⁰ However, his edition is not always reliable, especially in its division of the scholia and its presentation of the biblical elements. Cramer's indication of the lemmata is sometimes inconsistent with that of the manuscript, especially when the majuscule script occurs in the middle of a scholium. In addition, GA 1910 has no indications of *kephalaia* or *titloi*: these are entirely supplied by the editor, along with the table of *kephalaia* before the first verse. Most notorious is the omission of the final two pages of Hebrews from Cramer's edition (folios 310v–311r, covering Heb 13,17b–25), apparently due to an oversight by the transcriber.

GA 1910 has a distinctive text of the New Testament, and has been selected for the ECM in every epistle in which it is extant.⁴¹ In Hebrews, the agreement with the majority reading in *Text und Textwert* is 71.4% (20 of 28 *Teststellen*).⁴² While five of the other test passages agree with the text of Nestle-Aland, the other three are *Sonderlesarten* in which this codex matches the text of early witnesses. This suggests that this late manuscript may faithfully reflect the biblical version used by the original compiler. Nevertheless, the repetition of the lemmata, as well as the quotations within scholia, mean that care must be taken [p. 128] in selecting the most appropriate form to represent this witness in an apparatus of the New Testament.

2.3. Nicetas of Heraclea

Nicetas, Bishop of Heraclea at the beginning of the twelfth century, was responsible for lengthy catenae on multiple biblical books. In the New Testament, these include three on the gospels (CPG C113, C135, C144) and one on Hebrews (CPG C163). The latter is transmitted in three manuscripts, as noted above: Parpulov dates both GA 1983 (the only complete witness) and GA 1938 (which covers Heb 1,1–8,11) to the twelfth century, very close to the composition of this work; GA 2890 is a sixteenth-century copy of GA 1983 and only contains the first eight verses of Hebrews.⁴³ The attribution to Nicetas is clear from the titles legible in GA 1983 even though the name itself is obliterated: in GA 2890, this has been erroneously supplied as Jeremiah, while GA 1938 lacks any indication of the author. All three manuscripts are written in alternating format, with abbreviated source attributions in the margin. The biblical text appears to be complete, with occasional repetitions: the lemmata are short and at a considerable distance from each other, given the volume of exegesis. In the two earlier manuscripts, they are indicated by double diplai.

Significance of the Catena in Codex Zacynthius," in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Palimpsest, Lectionary*, ed. H.A.G. Houghton and D.C. Parker, *Texts & Studies* 3.21 (Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2020), 121–135.

⁴⁰ John Anthony Cramer (ed.), *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum. VII. In Epistolas S. Pauli ad Timotheum, Titum, Philemona et Ad Hebraeos* (Oxford: University Press, 1843), 112–275. For a list of errors in this edition, see Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 56–60.

⁴¹ See Houghton, "An Initial Selection," 357–359.

⁴² Kurt Aland et al., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. Die Paulinischen Briefen Band 4: Kolosserbrief bis Hebräerbrief*, ANTF 19 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991), 708–709.

⁴³ Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts*, 120.

According to Staab, the catena consists of 899 scholia which are attributed to twenty-four authors, as well as numerous unattributed extracts.⁴⁴ More than half of the scholia are from John Chrysostom and Theodoret, mentioned 290 and 207 times respectively; Cyril of Alexandria comes a distant third, with 69, followed by Gregory of Nazianzus (28), Basil (27) and Gregory of Nyssa (26). In many cases, the source works are also specified, although attributions become less frequent in the second half of the commentary. It appears that Nicetas compiled the catena from the direct tradition of patristic writings available to him as a teacher in Constantinople at the end of the eleventh century.⁴⁵ As a consequence, it transmits little patristic material which is not available elsewhere.

[p. 129] Cramer prints the text of GA 1938 in full as a supplement in his edition of Pauline catenae.⁴⁶ There is no indication in this manuscript that the commentary is incomplete: it ends with a tapered paragraph and a decorative line. Even so, despite covering only the first half of the epistle, its text is almost twice as long as the preceding edition of the full *Typus Parisinus*. There is no printed form of the latter part of the commentary, although the scholia from Cyril from GA 1983 have been published separately.⁴⁷ None of the Nicetas manuscripts were selected for inclusion in the ECM of Hebrews. In the *Text und Textwert* analysis of the biblical text, GA 1938 displays 100% agreement with the majority reading in the thirteen *Teststellen* for which it is extant, while the figure for GA 1983 is 87.5% (twenty-eight of thirty-two readings).⁴⁸ This contrasts with the Gospel according to John, for which the majority of Nicetas manuscripts have been selected.⁴⁹

2.4. Theophylact

The Pauline commentary of Theophylact, Bishop of Ochrid in the late eleventh century and a close friend of Nicetas of Heraclea, is not a catena proper because it contains no source attributions. Nevertheless, it was constructed on similar principles to catenae, based largely on John Chrysostom with contributions from other early exegetes: this is specified in the title provided in several manuscripts.⁵⁰ In addition, Staab states that Theophylact's commentary (CPG C167) also drew on the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena

⁴⁴ Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 78–80, partially reproduced in Geerard and Noret, *Concilia, Catenae*, 387–388.

⁴⁵ See Bram Roosen, "The Works of Nicetas Heracleensis," *Byzantion* 69 (1999) 119–144, esp. 136–138 and 142–143.

⁴⁶ Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum VII*, 279–598. For errors in this edition, see Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 76–77.

⁴⁷ Angelo Mai (ed.), *Novae patrum bibliothecae tomus tertius: Sancti Cyrilli Alexandrini* (Rome: Typis Sacri Consilii Propagando Christiano Nomini, 1845), 105–127.

⁴⁸ Aland et al., *Text und Textwert*, 712, 719.

⁴⁹ See D.C. Parker, Klaus Wachtel, Bruce Morrill and Ulrich Schmid, "The Selection of Greek Manuscripts to be Included in the International Greek New Testament Project's Edition of John in the *Editio Critica Maior*," in *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Michael W. Holmes*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner, Juan Hernández, Jr., and Paul Foster, NTTSD 50 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 287–328, esp. 325.

⁵⁰ E.g. GA 1930, 1978, 1797, 1991, 1992, 2899, quoted in Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, 234.

tradition (C165).⁵¹ As with Theophylact's commentaries on the Gospels, the most common presentation is in alternating format with the biblical lemmata in red ink.⁵² The scriptural text is [p. 130] given in full. The seventeenth-century *editio princeps* of the commentary by Lindsell is reproduced in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* (Hebrews is in *PG* 125: 187–404).⁵³

The Catena Catalogue lists forty-one manuscripts of Theophylact on Hebrews, of which all but four were copied between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries. Fifteen of these are part of the initial selection of manuscripts for the ECM of Hebrews, indicating that a significant part of this tradition shares a distinctive text.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, as Edwards has observed, many of the readings characteristic of commentary manuscripts are secondary divergences from the Byzantine standard rather than fossils from earlier generations.⁵⁵ This may have resulted in the over-representation of this tradition within the ECM.

A curious feature of Theophylact manuscripts is variation in the position of Hebrews.⁵⁶ In just over half, it appears at the end of the corpus.⁵⁷ In eight witnesses it follows Romans, while in six it follows 2 Corinthians.⁵⁸ Twice it appears before Romans: once at the beginning of the Pauline corpus after the Gospels (GA 2482) and once after the epistles from Galatians to Philemon but before the three remaining letters (GA 720). Finally, in one manuscript Hebrews occurs between Colossians and 1 Timothy (GA 1947). All these sequences are represented in manuscripts selected for the ECM, suggesting that there is no specific connection between any of them and a particular type of biblical text. Staab wonders whether Theophylact initially commented on each epistle separately, and they were then bound by different editors in a variety of sequences.⁵⁹

⁵¹ *Die Pauluskatenen*, 235.

⁵² Only two Theophylact catenae are recorded in the Catena Catalogue as 'mixed format', possibly because they are composite manuscripts (GA 1798 and 2482).

⁵³ Augustine Lindsell (ed.), *Theophylacti Archiepiscopi Bulgariae in Divi Pauli Epistolas Commentarii* (London: Royal Press, 1636).

⁵⁴ These are GA 608, 886, 1798, 1947, 1964, 1976, 1985, 1991, 1995, 2000, 2102, 2105, 2197, 2248, 2482, many of which are also selected in other Pauline Epistles (Houghton, "An Initial Selection", 356–359).

⁵⁵ Grant G. Edwards, "The Text and Transmission of 2 Thessalonians" (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2019), 206–207; for the distinctive text of Theophylact manuscripts in other New Testament writings, see Houghton, "Catena Manuscripts," esp. 9–11, 24–27.

⁵⁶ An overview of the differing sequences of epistles and other paratextual features distinctive of Theophylact is given by Bruce Morrill and John Gram, "Parsing Paul: Layout and Sampling Divisions in Pauline Commentaries," in *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition*, ed. H.A.G. Houghton, *Texts & Studies* 3.13 (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2016), 99–116, esp. 102.

⁵⁷ This includes two manuscripts from which Philemon is lacking, GA 1929 and its direct copy GA 2889.

⁵⁸ After Romans: GA 455, 1961, 1964, 1977, 1994, 2104, 2576 and Paris, BnF, gr. 228; after 2 Corinthians: GA 891, 1978 (and its direct copy GA 1930), 1992, 2000 and 2248.

⁵⁹ *Die Pauluskatenen*, 232.

[p. 131] 3. Other Commentaries in the *Editio Critica Maior*

The classification of Greek New Testament manuscripts is a complicated matter.⁶⁰ Although copies of New Testament commentaries which are the work of a single author are not normally registered in the *Kurzgefasste Liste*, some are included, apparently because they are related in some way to catenae.⁶¹ No fewer than four such commentaries are represented among the initial selection of witnesses for the ECM of Hebrews. They supply a total of fifteen manuscripts, all in the alternating format of lemmata followed by exegesis, often with a distinctive biblical text. It is beyond the scope of the present contribution to determine whether or not the selection of all these witnesses is justified: the relationship of the scriptural text of New Testament commentaries to direct biblical tradition and its significance for its history and transmission is a topic which deserves further research.⁶² Instead, these commentaries and their manuscripts are presented here in order to provide full coverage of witnesses of this type for Hebrews.

Several New Testament manuscripts are described as "Selections from Chrysostom". These are not catenae, because the scholia only come from a single author, but—in theory—neither do they contain Chrysostom's complete exegetical homilies on one or more epistles. In fact, certain entries in the *Kurzgefasste Liste* do appear to be copies of the full text of Chrysostom's exposition. In the Pauline Epistles, these are GA 1817 (on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians), 1818 (on Hebrews), 2006 (on Romans) and 2574 and 2596 (on Galatians). Although these have been analysed in *Text und Textwert* and all qualify for inclusion, they should be removed from the initial selection for the ECM: their erroneous incorporation in the *Kurzgefasste Liste* is the only thing [p. 132] which sets them apart from other Chrysostom manuscripts. This leaves four manuscripts in the Catena Catalogue which contain abbreviated expositions of multiple epistles. The earliest of these, GA 623 (copied in the year 1037), has an unusual constitution: each epistle is given in full, after which come the exegetical extracts with occasional lemmata. Only the continuous text of Hebrews was assessed in *Text und Textwert*, and it did not qualify for selection. The other three manuscripts (GA 1942, 1962 and 1969) were all chosen on the basis of the affiliation of their lemmata. In fact, the first two meet the criteria in all fourteen epistles. The relationship of the lemmata in this compilation to those of the complete homilies remains unclear, although the differences between these witnesses in individual epistles indicates that the biblical text

⁶⁰ For reflections on this, see D.C. Parker, *Textual Scholarship and the Making of the New Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 2012), esp. 32–64, and Houghton, "Catena Manuscripts," 4–5.

⁶¹ Kurt Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. Second edition, ANTF 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), also available in an updated form at <https://ntvnr.uni-muenster.de/liste>.

⁶² Initial insights from research into the textual tradition of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans* are presented in Peter Montoro, "Invariablement byzantin? Le texte de la *Lettre aux Romains* dans le manuscrit 20 de Saint-Sabas et la transformation textuelle de l'héritage exégétique de Chrysostome," in *La source sans fin. La Bible chez Jean Chrysostome*, ed. Guillaume Bady, Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 23 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2021), 161–175; Peter Montoro and Robert Turnbull, "Revising the Repetitions: The Relative Textual Stability of Repeated Patristic Citations as a Window into the Transmission History of Patristic Exegesis – Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans* as an Initial Text Case," *Sacris Erudiri* 60 (2021) 69–99.

has been subject to variation. For the time being, these manuscripts may be retained for the ECM by analogy with catenae, but additional study of both the scriptural and exegetical text in this tradition is needed to clarify their significance.

Theodoret, a fifth-century Bishop of Cyrrhus in Asia Minor, composed a series of exegetical works including a commentary on all fourteen Pauline Epistles (CPG 6209). Like most of the catenae, this is heavily reliant on Chrysostom.⁶³ Nine manuscripts of this work are listed in the *Kurzgefasste Liste* and the *Catena Catalogue*.⁶⁴ Of the seven which include Hebrews, five are selected for the ECM (GA 606, 1963, 1996, 1999, 2012). The *Text und Textwert* analysis suggests that the earliest of these, the eleventh-century GA 606 (Paris, BnF, gr. 217), has the most distinctive biblical text: its agreement with the majority text is only 68.75%.⁶⁵ The other manuscripts, copied between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, are much closer to Byzantine tradition.⁶⁶ Further investigation is required to determine whether the earlier text could represent that originally used by the commentator, which was then altered in the other witnesses.

[p. 133] Another Pauline commentary derived from Chrysostom is that of the eighth-century John of Damascus (CPG 8079). Unlike Theodoret's reformulation of his predecessor's text, these scholia preserve much of Chrysostom's exegesis verbatim. The biblical lemmata are usually given in full and clearly distinguished from the exegesis: in several manuscripts, the sections are each given a number and marked respectively with κείμενον, "text", and ἑρμηνεία, "interpretation". The commentary is transmitted in eight Greek manuscripts, four of which contain Hebrews.⁶⁷ Of these, three are selected for the ECM through the *Text und Textwert* analysis: GA 018 and 0151 are just below the threshold of 85%, while GA 0150 (Patmos, St John, 61) has a strikingly low agreement of 41%.⁶⁸ In contrast, GA 2110 only differs from the majority in one test passage. This makes it likely that the biblical text has been adjusted independently of the commentary, comparable to the pattern seen above in catenae.

⁶³ On Theodoret's compositional approach, see Agnès Lorrain, *Le Commentaire de Théodoret de Cyr sur l'Épître aux Romains. Études philologiques et historiques*, TU 179 (Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter, 2018). The full text of Theodoret's commentary on Hebrews is printed in PG 82: 673–786; see also Charles Marriott and Philip E. Pusey (ed.), *Theodoret's episcopi Cyri Commentarius in omnes B. Pauli epistolas: Pars II* (Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1870).

⁶⁴ An additional twenty are currently found in the online *Pinakes* database (<https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/8829/>): several of these are small fragments, from a later period, or no longer extant.

⁶⁵ Aland et al., *Text und Textwert*, 661: this is due to an unusually high proportion of *Sonderlesarten* (seven of the thirty-two *Teststellen*).

⁶⁶ In some cases Hebrews is only selected because the overall corpus agreement is below 85% (see Houghton, "Selection," 348–351). The remaining two manuscripts, GA 1939 and 1945, fall just above the threshold for inclusion in Hebrews. It should be noted that Lorrain, *Le Commentaire*, 15 n. 33, identifies GA 1939, 1963 and 1996 as descendants of GA 1999: if this is confirmed in their biblical text, they should be excluded from the *ECM*.

⁶⁷ Details are provided in the edition by Robert Volk (ed.), *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos VII*, PTS 68 (Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, 2013), as well as the *Catenae Catalogue* and *Pinakes* (<https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/1495/>).

⁶⁸ Aland et al., *Text und Textwert*, 634, 636. GA 0150 has fourteen distinctive agreements with the Nestle-Aland text, five *Sonderlesarten* and one singular reading.

The fourth commentary on Hebrews is that of Euthymius Zigabenus, a twelfth-century monk from Constantinople known for his dogmatic and exegetical writings. Sometimes described as catenae, his expositions of the Pauline Epistles follow the standard pattern of short lemmata followed by scholia.⁶⁹ The six complete copies included in the *Catena Catalogue* and *Kurzgefasste Liste* all share the same unusual sequence after Colossians, comprising Philemon, 1–2 Thessalonians, Philippians, Hebrews, 1–2 Timothy, and Titus.⁷⁰ The *Text und Textwert* analysis indicates that they also have a similar textual profile across the whole Pauline corpus, although only three are selected for the ECM of Hebrews: GA 1678, 2690 and 2739.⁷¹ These similarities suggest that the tradition of Zigabenus reflects the biblical text originally used by the compiler, constituting a separate group which stands apart from the direct tradition of the Pauline Epistles.

[p. 134] 4. Conclusion

This overview has shown that numerous manuscripts of catenae and commentaries on Hebrews are of interest for their biblical text. The distinctive readings in this type of witness provide further support for the recommendation to indicate such manuscripts in the apparatus of the ECM in order to assist with the evaluation of their evidence.⁷² Although the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena and that of Nicetas of Heraclea appear to be of little significance in the broader transmission of Hebrews, *Typus Vaticanus*, the earliest catena on Paul, is more important. In addition, a high proportion of the witnesses to the commentaries by Theophylact, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John of Damascus and Euthymius Zigabenus have been included in the initial selection of manuscripts for the ECM of Hebrews. As the relationship of these documents to the direct tradition of the epistle and their contribution to its textual history remain unclear, work on the ECM will provide an opportunity to reach a new understanding.

Bibliography

- Aland, Kurt, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. Second edition, ANTF 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994). Online at <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste>.
- Aland, Kurt, et al., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. Die Paulinischen Briefen Band 4: Kolosserbrief bis Hebräerbrief*, ANTF 19 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991).

⁶⁹ The critical edition is Nikeforos Kalogeras (ed.), *Euthymii Zigabeni commentarius in XIV epistolas catholicas sancti Pauli*, 2 vols (Athens: Perri, 1887).

⁷⁰ It has not been possible to verify this in one further manuscript listed in the *Catena Catalogue*, the eighteenth-century St Petersburg, NLR, СПб.ДА.62 (Diktyon 57965). GA 2668 only contains Ephesians.

⁷¹ GA 2999 is not included in *Text und Textwert*; GA 1840 and 2008 are both one reading above the threshold for selection; see Aland et al., *Text und Textwert*, 688–737 (ad loc.).

⁷² The proposal is to add a superscript K to the end of the siglum: see Houghton, "Catena Manuscripts," 31–32.

- Bates, Clark R. "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Ephesians: Text, Translation, and Commentary" (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2024). *Catena Catalogue*. <https://purl.org/itsee/catena-catalogue> (last accessed September 2023).
- Clavis Clavium*. <https://clavis.brepols.net/clacla/Default.aspx> (last accessed September 2023).
- Coppola, Chiara, "A New Analysis of the *Scholia Photiana* in the Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena Tradition" (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2021).
- Cramer, John Anthony (ed.), *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum. VII. In Epistolas S. Pauli ad Timotheum, Titum, Philemona et Ad Hebraeos* (Oxford: University Press, 1843).
- Donatus, Bernardinus (ed.), *Expositiones antiquae ac valde utiles* (Verona: Di Sabbio, 1532).
- Edwards, Grant G., "The Text and Transmission of 2 Thessalonians" (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2019).
- Geerard, Maurits and Jacques Noret (ed.), *Clavis Patrum Graecorum. IV Concilia, Catenae*. Second edition (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018).
- [p. 135] Houghton, H.A.G., "An Initial Selection of Manuscripts for the *Editio Critica Maior* of the Pauline Epistles," in *The New Testament in Antiquity and Byzantium: Traditional and Digital Approaches to its Texts and Editing*, ed. H.A.G. Houghton, David C. Parker and Holger Strutwolf, ANTF 52 (Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, 2019), 343–359.
- Houghton, H.A.G., "Catena Manuscripts in the *Editio Critica Maior* of the Greek New Testament," in *Pen, Print and Pixels. Advances in Textual Criticism in the Digital Era*, ed. Daniel B. Wallace, David Flood, Elijah Hixson and Denis Salgado (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 2023), 3–31.
- Kalogeras, Nikeforos (ed.), *Euthymii Zigabeni commentarius in XIV epistolas catholicas sancti Pauli*, 2 vols (Athens: Perri, 1887).
- Karo, Georg and Hans Lietzmann, *Catenarum Graecarum Catalogus*. Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historische Klasse (Göttingen: Lüder Horstmann, 1902).
- Lamb, William, "A Question of Attribution: The Theological Significance of the Catena in Codex Zacynthius," in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Palimpsest, Lectionary*, ed. H.A.G. Houghton and D.C. Parker, Texts & Studies 3.21 (Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2020), 121–135.
- Lietzmann, Hans, *Catenen. Mitteilungen über ihre Geschichte in handschriftlicher Überlieferung* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Mohr Siebeck, 1897).
- Lindsell, Augustine (ed.), *Theophylacti Archiepiscopi Bulgariae in Divi Pauli Epistolas Commentarii* (London: Royal Press, 1636).
- Lorrain, Agnès, *Le Commentaire de Théodoret de Cyr sur l'Épître aux Romains. Études philologiques et historiques*, TU 179 (Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter, 2018).
- Lorrain, Agnès, "Autour du *Vaticanus gr. 762*: Notes pour l'étude des chaînes à présentation alternante," *Byzantion* 90 (2020) 67–95.
- Lorrain, Agnès, "Éditer les chaînes exégétiques grecques: quelle place pour les mises en page?" *Byzantion* 91 (2021) 219–263.

- Mai, Angelo (ed.), *Novae patrum bibliothecae tomus tertius: Sancti Cyrilli Alexandrini* (Rome: Typis Sacri Consilii Propagando Christiano Nomini, 1845).
- Marcon, Jacopo, "A Missing Link in the Chain," in *That Nothing May Be Lost: Fragments and the New Testament Text*, ed. Clark R. Bates et al., Texts & Studies 3.29 (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2022), 187–214.
- Marcon, Jacopo, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Romans" (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2023).
- Marriott, Charles and Philip E. Pusey (ed.), *Theodoret's Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul: Pars II* (Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1870).
- Matthaei, Christian Friedrich (ed.), *Glossaria graeca minora et alia anecdota graeca* (Moscow: University Press, 1774).
- Montoro, Peter, "Invariablement byzantin? Le texte de la *Lettre aux Romains* dans le manuscrit 20 de Saint-Sabas et la transformation textuelle de l'héritage exégétique de Chrysostome," in *La source sans fin. La Bible chez Jean Chrysostome*, ed. Guillaume Bady, Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 23 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2021), 161–175.
- Montoro, Peter and Robert Turnbull, "Revising the Repetitions: The Relative Textual Stability of Repeated Patristic Citations as a Window into the Transmission History of Patristic Exegesis – Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans* as an Initial Text Case," *Sacris Erudiri* 60 (2021) 69–99.
- Morrill, Bruce, and John Gram, "Parsing Paul: Layout and Sampling Divisions in Pauline Commentaries," in *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition*, ed. H.A.G. Houghton, Texts & Studies 3.13 (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2016), 99–116.
- Panella, Theodora, "The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Galatians" (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2018).
- [p. 136] Panella, Theodora, "Re-classifying the Pseudo-Oikoumenian Catena Types for Paul's Epistle to the Galatians," in *Receptions of the Bible in Byzantium: Texts, Manuscripts, and their Readers*, ed. Reinhart Ceulemans and Barbara Crostini (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 2021), 387–403.
- Parker, D.C., *Textual Scholarship and the Making of the New Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 2012).
- Parker, D.C., Klaus Wachtel, Bruce Morrill and Ulrich Schmid, "The Selection of Greek Manuscripts to be Included in the International Greek New Testament Project's Edition of John in the *Editio Critica Maior*," in *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Michael W. Holmes*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner, Juan Hernández, Jr., and Paul Foster, NTTSD 50 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 287–328.
- Parpulov, Georgi R., "An Unknown Catena on the Pauline Epistles," *The Byzantine Review* 2 (2020) 9–16.
- Parpulov, Georgi R., *Catena Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. A Catalogue*. Texts & Studies 3.25 (Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2021).
- Roosen, Bram, "The Works of Nicetas Heracleensis," *Byzantion* 69 (1999) 119–144.
- Scieri, Emanuele, "The Catena Manuscripts on Acts: A Revised Classification," *Vigiliae Christianae* 76.1 (2022) 281–305.
- Staab, Karl, *Die Pauluskatenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1926).

This is the author's accepted manuscript of H.A.G. Houghton, "Catenae and Commentaries on Hebrews and their Biblical Text," in *Textforschung zu Septuaginta, Hebräerbrief und Apokalypse. Die Relevanz von Textkritik zur Erforschung des frühen Judentums, des Neuen Testaments und des frühen Christentums. Festschrift für Martin Karrer zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Georg Gäbel, Matthias Geigenfeind and Darius Müller. ANTF 60 (Berlin & New York, De Gruyter 2024), 117–136 with indications of the pagination of the published version. 17

Staab, Karl, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche. Aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*. NTAbh 15 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1933; repr. 1984).

Volk, Robert (ed.), *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos VII*, PTS 68 (Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, 2013).

von Soden, Hermann Freiherr (ed.), *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*. Second edition; 2 vols (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902–13).