

An Ancient Commentary on the
**BOOK OF
REVELATION**

A Critical Edition of the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*

P. TZAMALIKOS

CAMBRIDGE

An Ancient Commentary on the Book of Revelation

This is a new critical edition, with translation and commentary, of the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*, which were falsely attributed to Origen a century ago. These comments include extensive sections from Didymus the Blind's lost Commentary on the Apocalypse from the fourth century, and therefore counter the prevailing belief that Oecumenius' sixth-century commentary was the most ancient. Professor Tzamalikos argues that their author was in fact Cassian the Sabaite, an erudite monk and abbot at the monastery of Sabas, the Great Laura, in Palestine, who was different from the Latin author John Cassian, who allegedly lived a century or so before the real Cassian. The *Scholia* attest to the tension between the imperial Christian orthodoxy of the sixth century and certain monastic circles, which drew freely on Hellenic ideas, as well as those of alleged 'heretics'. They show that Hellenism was a vigorous force during this period and inspired not only pagan intellectuals, but also influential Christian quarters.

P. Tzamalikos is Professor of Philosophy at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. His main research interests include the relation and interplay between Hellenism and Christianity, the roots and evolution of Christian doctrine from its origins until the ninth century, Classical and Late Antique philosophy and its influence on Christianity, the influence of Christian thought on Neoplatonism, Patristic Theology, and the real import of Origenism and its various implications, from Origen's death down to the late sixth century.

An Ancient Commentary on the Book of Revelation

A critical edition of the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*

P. TZAMALIKOS



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107026940

© Panayiotis Tzamalikos 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ International Ltd., Padstow, Cornwall

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

ISBN 978-1-107-02694-0 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

*For my beloved daughters
Maritsa and Leto*

*Σαφήνεια δὲ ἀναντίρρητος περὶ τούτων γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν τῆς
Ἀποκαλύψεως τοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους Παύλου ἐπιστολῆς.*

Indisputable clarity concerning these issues was established in the
Commentaries on the Revelation of John and Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

Didymus, *Commentarii in Zachariam*, 3.73.

*The weight of this sad time we must obey,
speak what we feel, not what we ought to say.*

William Shakespeare, *King Lear*

CONTENTS

PREFACE [page IX]

EXORDIUM [XII]

ABBREVIATIONS [XVII]

INTRODUCTION

The Codex	[1]	The aim	[60]
The texts of the Book of Cassian	[7]	The method	[62]
A Sabaite Codex	[8]	The result	[64]
The vernacular of the Codex	[10]	Conclusion	[65]
Christian authors and the Book of Revelation	[10]	The index of authors	[66]
<i>Antioch</i> and <i>Alexandria</i>	[22]	Authorship of the Scholia	[70]
The Alexandrians and Origen, Eusebius, and Theodoret	[31]	Some philological remarks	[77]
The ‘Fifth Edition’ of scripture	[51]	All Scholia identified	[79]
Theodoret and his arsenal	[54]	The designation σχόλιον	[83]
Cassian and the Scholia	[60]	The initial edition	[86]
		Conclusion	[91]

PART I

TEXT OF REVELATION AND SCHOLIA IN APOCALYPSIN

Scholion I	[97]	Scholion XXI	[134]
Scholion II	[99]	Scholion XXII	[136]
Scholion III	[100]	Scholion XXIII	[138]
Scholion IV	[102]	Scholion XXIV	[140]
Scholion V	[104]	Adnotatio post Scholion XXIV	[141]
Scholion VI	[106]	Scholion XXV	[143]
Scholion VII	[108]	Scholion XXVI	[145]
Scholion VIII	[110]	Scholion XXVII	[149]
Scholion IX	[111]	Scholion XXVIII	[152]
Scholion X	[114]	Scholion XXIX	[154]
Scholion XI	[116]	Scholion XXX	[158]
Scholion XII	[118]	Scholion XXXI	[164]
Scholion XIII	[120]	Scholion XXXII	[169]
Scholion XIV	[121]	Scholion XXXIII	[171]
Scholion XV	[123]	Scholion XXXIV	[173]
Scholion XVI	[125]	Scholion XXXV	[178]
Scholion XVII	[127]	Scholion XXXVI	[181]
Scholion XVIII	[129]	Scholion XXXVII	[186]
Scholion XIX	[130]	Scholion XXXVIII	[188]
Scholion XX	[132]	Scholion XXXIX	[195]

PART II
EXPANDED NOTES TO THE SCHOLIA

EN I	[199]	EN XXI	[284]
EN II	[205]	EN XXII	[288]
EN III	[206]	EN XXIII	[293]
EN IV	[211]	EN XXIV	[298]
EN V	[220]	EN PSchXXIV	[300]
EN VI	[222]	EN XXV	[303]
EN VII	[225]	EN XXVI	[313]
EN VIII	[228]	EN XXVII	[320]
EN IX	[229]	EN XXVIII	[329]
EN X	[236]	EN XXIX	[333]
EN XI	[242]	EN XXX	[341]
EN XII	[248]	EN XXXI	[358]
EN XIII	[253]	EN XXXII	[376]
EN XIV	[261]	EN XXXIII	[379]
EN XV	[264]	EN XXXIV	[385]
EN XVI	[268]	EN XXXV	[388]
EN XVII	[271]	EN XXXVI	[393]
EN XVIII	[273]	EN XXXVII	[399]
EN XIX	[276]	EN XXXVIII	[405]
EN XX	[279]	EN XXXIX	[409]

BIBLIOGRAPHY	[413]
INDEX OF AUTHORS CITED IN THE SCHOLIA	[441]
INDEX OF NAMES IN THE SCHOLIA	[445]
INDEX OF TERMS IN THE SCHOLIA	[446]
BIBLICAL CITATIONS IN THE SCHOLIA	[451]
INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS	[455]
GENERAL INDEX	[456]

PREFACE

When I set out to do this research, I never imagined that in order for this book to be published, two books had to be written to support its results. These books were published a short while before the present volume. They are, as it were, its siblings and the two pedestals that make it possible to establish definitively the authorship of the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*, which Adolf Harnack attributed hastily, and erroneously, to Origen a century ago. Codex 573, of the Meteora monastery of Metamorphosis (the Great Meteoron) was discovered in 1908, and it is the sole manuscript that preserves these Scholia. Harnack received them from a Greek theologian in July 1911, and it took him only a couple of months to determine that their author was Origen. It was a time when German authorities of the day pronounced their oracles, and everyone had to comply unquestioningly (as happens today, when they teach the rest of Europe lessons of economic decorum and of the proper organization of life). But Harnack's research was quite inadequate: it ignored philosophical sources altogether, and sought to detect 'similar words' in Origen in order to establish that this was a work of the Alexandrian, while considering too small a number of early Christian theologians. For all the presumed weight of his authority, however, never did this attribution enjoy unanimous acceptance by scholars. As a result, this document, which is pregnant with information about early Christianity as well as about the exigencies of sixth-century life, remained an 'orphan', of which scholarship made nothing.

As early as 1986, and then in 1991, in *The Concept of Time in Origen*, I wrote: 'As regards other works of Origen, we have reservations about the authenticity of the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*. Not so much because there is not any testimony that he ever wrote any comment on the Apocalypse; but because to anyone who is familiar with his thousands of pages in Greek, this text seems unlike him and alien to his style. We have no reason to make this point one of dispute whatever. For, as far as our topic is concerned, of what is stated in that work there is nothing to appeal to, or to dispute.'

Although the Scholia contain detectable quotations from authors supposedly as different from each other as

Clement of Alexandria and Theodoret, it was clear that there was a third party that put them all in order, while he added to this collection his own independent comments. In order to find out who this person was, I had to take the Meteora Codex in my hands and see that this is not simply a manuscript classified under a certain number. This is 'The Book of Cassian', which also contains other works of his, alongside texts that were of interest to him, and they were as different from each other as a text by Cyril of Alexandria and a set of mathematical rules about how to determine a leap-year. It is a personal companion of Cassian. But Cassian who?

The reply to this question resulted in the two volumes that have now been published. First, the edition volume, *A Newly Discovered Greek Father, Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles*. Second, the monograph, *The Real Cassian Revisited, Monastic Life, Greek Paideia, and Origenism in the Sixth Century*.

By the time I was granted access to the codex in 2008, and following my research since 2006, I had reached the conclusion that the *Scholia in Apocalypsin* were a compilation by an Antiochene, who probably was Theodoret of Cyrrhus heavily quoting from the lost Commentary on the Apocalypse by Didymus the Blind, as well as from his own work on the Book of Paralipomenon (= Chronicles), plus a portion from Clement of Alexandria, while constantly having in mind Origen's works. It turned out that the author was Cassian, yet not the one known from Latin literature, namely John Cassian, but *another* Cassian: a Sabaite monk, who was the spiritual offspring of the great Antiochene doctors (Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus) and of St Sabas himself. An intellectual of Antiochene extraction, who was born in Scythopolis c. 470 and died an abbot of the renowned Laura of Sabas on 20 July AD 548. Cassian was a Sabaite monk and an intellectual of profound erudition. He was the fifth abbot of the Laura of Sabas, indeed a spiritual child educated by Sabas himself. He spent some years of his life living at the monastery of the Akoimetoi, in Constantinople, and took part as a representative of the Laura of Sabas in the Local Synod of Constantinople in 536.

The text of Cassian is a genuine part of an uninterrupted chain of Greek writings with technical terms and striking parallels to earlier Greek authors, in both language and concepts. The distinctive characteristic of Cassian's Greek terminology is unfailingly present, advising posterity about the real author of his texts. This manuscript as a whole was copied from a 9th-century precise copy of a 6th-century codex belonging to Cassian himself, and my comparative studies have shown that the transcription took place at the scriptorium of the Laura of Sabas. The Codex was copied by a monk called Theodosius (as well as one or two other anonymous monks), and the critical apparatus to the Scholia shows that the accompanying text of Revelation which Cassian used was one of Antiochene/Syrian provenance.

When Cassian the Sabaite wrote the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*, his main source was Didymus' commentary on the same scriptural book. It then hardly comes as a surprise that these *Scholia* are anonymous. For neither does this work have any title, nor is its author indicated in the header. There is only a series of passages of the Apocalypse, with each of them followed by a comment. The dominating figure underlying them is Didymus, a *persona non grata* during the 540s, a fact which could immediately put Cassian at risk. In addition, however, the Scholia are the fruit of an amazingly rich library which was studied by Cassian. He availed himself of not only orthodox theologians and the acceptable Philo, but also an impressive abundance of pagan writers, including sixth-century ones such as Simplicius, Damascius, and John Philoponus. This was precisely the 'universal' spirit of the monastic community of the Akoimetoï in the sixth century. Following his Origenistic sympathies, Cassian made extensive use of the Commentary on the Apocalypse by Didymus, in order to make up his mind as to whether the Apocalypse should be regarded as a canonical book. That Didymus was condemned in 553 clearly shows that his theological views were current among certain monastic circles, such as the Origenists in Palestine and the monastery of Akoimetoï in the capital. How could Cassian possibly have divulged this source of his amidst an environment where controversy was raging over Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius?

On account of the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*, when we now speak of 'the most ancient commentary on the Apocalypse', we must go back two more centuries,

compared to what has been thought heretofore. For it is currently believed that Oecumenius' Commentary on the Apocalypse, written during the 540s, is 'the most ancient commentary on the Apocalypse' extant. Cassian, however, has preserved for us a very large part of Didymus' own Commentary on the Apocalypse, which was written two centuries before Oecumenius set out to write his own Commentary, indeed almost simultaneously with Cassian writing his own compilation of the Scholia.

The Scholia testify to Christian influence upon Neoplatonism. Either Simplicius or Damascius, or both, were converted to Christianity by the end of their lives and were in contact with the Akoimetan community, who cherished the Antiochene spirit. It is possible that Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite might have been either Simplicius or Damascius himself. In contrast to the Alexandrian tendency to Platonism, Cassian built on Aristotelism. Many of Origen's catena-fragments are probably the fruit of the Sabaite and Akoimetan monks' reception of Origen's thought. Consequently, Antioch emerges as the true heir to Origen's intellectual and textual concerns.

The sixth century has yet many secrets to reveal. During that period, the tension, as well as interplay, between Hellenism and Christianity was at its height. It turns out that at that time Hellenism was not dead, not even moribund, despite Justinian's oppressive policies against Greek philosophers. Cassian's writings reveal the tension between the imperial Christian orthodoxy of the sixth century and certain monastic circles, which drew freely on the Hellenic lore, as well as on those whom the Catholic Church condemned as 'heretics'. For all the tension between the imperial policies and Greek *paideia*, Hellenism was a vigorous force during the sixth century, and it inspired not only pagan intellectuals, but also influential Christian quarters. Certain monastic communities, such as the (mainly Antiochene) Akoimetoï of Constantinople, were an oasis of open-mindedness, notwithstanding the oppressive policies of Justinian. Cassian the Sabaite emerges as a vigorous representative of this mindset and as an erudite Aristotelian, who drew freely on both the Hellenic and Christian lore, including doctrines that had been styled 'heresy' by imperial orthodoxy, such as Origenism, Monophysitism, and Nestorianism.

My heartfelt thanks are expressed to senior editor and fine scholar Michael Sharp. During a process that

had crucial scientific ramifications and unexpected shifts, he managed to be supportive and sympathetic, while at the same time being an impeccable professional. This handling of things seems to me a kind of art, which, although not always easy to grasp, is in fact, I suppose, as English as a cup of tea. I also thank the production team, especially the production manager Elizabeth Davey and assistant editor Elizabeth Spicer. I am also grateful to Andrew Dyck, my copy editor at Cambridge University Press, for his patient reading and suggestions, which improved the manuscript.

I am grateful to my wife Eleni for her tolerance of my interminable hours of work in my study, and her steadfast support and care of the family during my endless travels.

I dedicate this book to my beloved adolescent daughters, Maritsa and Leto. This is the least I can do, as an expression of gratitude to this endless source of support, affection, and inspiration, to my beloved girls who guide me through the mysteries of Being, of Life, of Love.

P. T.

EXORDIUM

The *Scholia in Apocalypsin* are the fruit of the turbulence of the sixth century, by an author that was educated in the Antiochene mindset and had some Nestorian tendencies along with Origenistic sympathies, whatever ‘Origenism’ may have meant in the sixth century. The aim is to sanction the Book of Revelation as an authoritative, that is canonical, one, by evincing its concurrence with the entire scriptural message.

Their author was Cassian, a monk and abbot at the monastery of Sabas, the Great Laura, in Palestine. My assertion is that he was a different person from the Latin author John Cassian, who allegedly lived a century or so before the real Cassian. The texts included in Codex 573 of the Monastery of Metamorphosis at the Meteora rock-complex are only a small part of all of this author’s production, which is lost in the vast corpus currently circulating under the designation ‘spuria’. Cassian the Sabaite’s writings were ascribed to ancient champions of orthodoxy, such as Athanasius, Chrysostom, Basil of Caesarea, and others. This is an author heretofore virtually non-existent, an author who had somehow to be resurrected and be granted by argument the credit he deserves. With reference to Christian authors, during and following the fifth century, the designation ‘Nestorian’ is tantamount to ‘Aristotelian’. For it was the Nestorians who cultivated studies on Aristotle at the School of Edessa and its successor, the School of Nisibis, thus creating an important channel for Aristotle to be transmitted to Persia, as well as to the Arab world.

The *Scholia* are comments by Cassian extensively culling from Didymus’ lost Commentary on the Apocalypse, and also include verbatim portions excerpted from Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus. All of them are coupled with analyses of his own, drawing on a variety of identifiable authors, but are couched in his own phraseology wherever necessary.

Cassian clearly wished to see Revelation disentangled from prolonged dissension and unanimously sanctioned as a canonical book. Yet he sought to secure canonicity not in order to appease the powerful guardians of orthodoxy of his day, or as acceptance of what might be thought to be sheer daemonology in

disguise. His method was to demonstrate that simple and trenchant ideas of the canonical books of scripture are also present in the apocalyptic text.

A considerable number of the founding fathers of Christianity had sanctioned the Book. There are explicit statements by some of them, while we can trace the views of others into testimonies by third parties. Cassian wrote during a time when post-Nicene Christianity had moulded and taught by argument the essentials of its beliefs about the Trinitarian God and the world. He did not actually canvass any subtler or more reflective theories produced by the debates of his own era, such as the inconclusive Christological controversy, which allowed little room for the dispassionate critical study that an already controversial book (Revelation) required. Rather, he opted to establish that the text is orthodox on rather old issues, such as Arianism, Gnosticism, Docetism, which nevertheless were not out of date: as late as during the fifth century, Theodoret of Cyrrhus had striven to convert to orthodoxy not only Macedonians, but also Marcionites and Arians; and during Justinian’s reign the Arianizing Goths were a real menace to the empire.

Although heavily drawing on Didymus (that is, an Alexandrian), Cassian’s first Scholion makes his own Antiochene identity plain, by entertaining the notion of not simply God, but of Christ himself being *δεσπότης* (‘Lord’). Although Rev. 1:1 actually refers to the ‘servants of God’, not to those ‘of Christ’, in [Scholion I](#) Cassian seized this opportunity to expound the notion of one being ‘a servant of Christ’. The term *δεσπότης* is accorded to God, but here ‘God’ clearly means Christ. No doubt it takes a leap by this commentator in order to embark on such a line of interpretation, yet this is an illuminating leap, since it reveals Antiochene priorities and concerns. Before Cassian had written those notes, Theodoret had dared overcome monotheistic and Monarchian qualifications by applying the term *δεσπότης* to Christ unreservedly, thus not allowing his human nature to either detain or qualify the Second Person’s eternal properties. The Council of Ephesus revisited and confirmed this approach by endorsing this relentless Trinitarianism advanced by Theodoret. The term

δεσπότης accorded to Christ encapsulates a concept which in essence is nothing more than a Nicene one, even though earlier theologians were slow (perhaps out of an abundance of caution) to use such a bold term. It was the imposing personality of Theodoret that made the term δεσπότης for Christ a recurring motif in the vocabulary and the distinctive mark which this characteristically Antiochene concept makes at the outset of the Scholia is by no means accidental. Cassian's aim is clear, though not stated explicitly therein. Ephesus was in fact not only the battleground for the rival personalities of Theodoret and Cyril, but this antagonism was seen at the time as one between two different Christological approaches, however subtly the disagreement was put. Nestorius was condemned unanimously, but this does not mean that all of those who condemned his alleged views were actually in agreement on all other issues. Theodoret had a balanced view of Christ's divinity and humanity. On the other hand, Cyril spoke of 'Christ' while tacitly and wilfully allowing the notion to be almost synonymous with 'God the Logos'. His obsession with the term θεοτόκος was due to this implicit identification rather than to his concern to safeguard the *communicatio idiomatum*, which means licence to apply human characteristics to Christ considered to be God (e.g. 'God was born') and, vice versa, to apply divine characteristics to Christ considered to be man. Cyril's viewpoint can be summarized in his opinion that Jesus was not actually *subject* to the human condition: it was the Logos who had willingly acquiesced to his subjection to the laws determining human existence.¹ This was in effect an opinion that any Alexandrian could allow, though only implicitly. In that case, the idea of Christ's 'one action' is bound to be that of the Logos, which of course smacks of Eutycheanism. It is quite telling that the proverbial Cyrillian metaphor of the incarnate Logos being the 'fire' that transforms 'wood' into its own 'glory' was fully upheld by the Monophysite champion Severus of Antioch: he was quick to employ this in order to condemn not those who confessed the properties of the natures of which the one Christ consists, but those who separate the properties and apportion them to each nature apart, in other words, the Tome of Leo.

It is indicative of Theodoret's brilliance that on the one hand he argued for the need to consider Christ both divine and human at the same time, while on the other he laid immense stress on the notion δεσπότης Χριστός ('Lord Christ'). This was actually an innovation since the tradition made 'Lord' a designation for 'God' in general ever since the times of Isaiah,² but the idea had some basis in the New Testament,³ however much this had been overlooked by earlier authors. Theodoret was cautious nevertheless: he took care to warn against underscoring 'either of' Christ's 'natures' (ἐκατέραν φύσιν) and urged his audience always to consider 'the [nature] which [Christ] assumed as well as the one which was assumed' (καὶ τὴν λαβοῦσαν καὶ τὴν ληφθεῖσαν).⁴

The exegeses of several Scholia are Alexandrian (they were taken up from Didymus, after all), but even in such cases the rendering has an Antiochene colour, such as Christ styled δεσπότης, or John the Evangelist designated θεολόγος. In effect this method reflects the open-minded spirit of the Akoimatoi during the sixth century. This is therefore a case of an eminent Antiochene author taking advantage of the Alexandrian wisdom. This case also shows the crudeness of the typical schematization dividing the two schools by means of an iron curtain. Several points in the Scholia induced scholars who reflected on them a century ago to presume that they were written by a certain scholar of the Alexandrian school. But this impression stemmed from the fact that Didymus' commentary was heavily quoted. The reality is that it was Cassian who quoted Didymus, and [Scholion I](#) is virtually the colophon pointing to the writer's spiritual identity since it staunchly advances a distinctive Antiochene approach.

For all the heavy quotation from Didymus's work, Cassian's train of thought is subtly different but clearly distinct from that of Didymus. Salient features of Theodoret's thought are present in this text: the epithet θεολόγος is applied to John the Evangelist, which Didymus never did. The exegesis purporting to reconcile two contradictory passages in 2 Kings and 1 Paralipomenon is also illuminating. Didymus had identified the 'wrath of God' with 'inflicted punishments'. Theodoret and Cassian stand out by rendering

¹ Cf. Severus, *Ep.* 1, quoted on p. 95.

² Isaiah 3:1; 10:33; Prov. 29:25; Job 5:8; Wisdom of Solomon 6:7; 8:3; *et passim*.

³ 2 Peter 2:1; Jude 4:4. Which made Rev. 6:10 concur with Scripture.

⁴ Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 114, quoted on p. 25.

the ‘wrath of God’ not as the ‘punishments’ inflicted upon sinners (which was the hackneyed interpretation), but as ‘the devil’ himself, which is the interpretation coined by Origen. This interpretation was helpful to him in order to resolve such difficult points of scripture as the apparent conflict between 2 Kings 24:1 and 1 Paralipomenon 21:1. The reference to this teaching of his in [Scholion XXX](#) is indeed the sole point where the author appears to speak of himself in the first person: ‘as we have taught’ (ὡς ἐδιδάξαμεν, discussed in [EN XXXII](#)). But this person is Theodoret, whose analysis Cassian quotes word for word, which he had also done in [Scholion V](#), quoting Clement of Alexandria to the letter. This notwithstanding, the characteristic colloquial Greek at certain points reveals that Didymus’ text is being quoted through simple peculiarities in composite words (συνκατάβασις for συγκατάβασις in [Scholion XV](#), συνβαδίζων for συμβαδίζων in [Scholion XX](#), λημφθέντες for ληφθέντες in [Scholion XXIX](#)). Didymus is also the author who distinctively uses the adjective ἀδιάδοχος in relation to the New Testament being ‘unsurpassed’.

Definitive orthodox doctrines were conveniently taken up by Cassian and adapted to his own outlook and purpose. There was no need for new reasoning. Arguments against idolatry and polytheism, which are called for by the apocalyptic text itself, were already available since the times of Clement of Alexandria. Had the issue of the canonicity of Revelation been entangled in the theological parlance of his day, this could have been enmeshed in a fatal storm. What therefore might appear to be an amateurish or trivial theological approach in those Scholia is in fact part of the author’s method in order to get his message across without stumping his audience with contemporary sixth-century dilemmas. The question was only the consistency of the Apocalypse with scripture: what this text had to say, had already been said by both Testaments alike. The Scholia are therefore a conspectus drawing on both Testaments. This is persuasively demonstrated as a text which conveys the same theology as canonical writings do.

Cassian presented his thought with an unblased and tolerant open-mindedness. As a man who had spent a considerable period of his time at Constantinople, he wished to address all the different streams of doctrine, regardless of specific local sentiments or philosophical priorities. He was already a cosmopolitan in this

respect. His masters, St Sabas and Theodosius the Coenobiarch had taught him the value of the Cappadocians and Cassian is indeed all too devoted a student of Gregory of Nyssa. Leontius of Byzantium had taught him the values of the thought of Origen, as well as of Didymus and Evagrius, without disregarding Clement of Alexandria as an erudite forerunner. Yet Cassian was for the most part the spiritual offspring of Antioch, of which the roots were such theologians as Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, whereas Theodoret of Cyrrhus was its flower and shining star.

If the Scholia have something important to tell us beyond their specific theological message, this is the lesson that the difference of approach between Antioch and Alexandria was not a rift, still less a chasm. We should therefore consider that the two schools coexisted in Cassian’s mind and heart in a constructive way that modern thought has only recently begun to allow for as a possibility. In order to explore this relation between the two schools, no personality is more suitable to follow than Theodoret of Cyrrhus. So far, we have been accustomed to consider him to be the last great scholar of Late Antiquity. It may turn out that his tradition lasted for one more century, through such gifted men as Cassian the Sabaite.

A brief summary concerning Cassian’s identity is called for at this point.

My initial impression was that my engagement with the Scholia on the Apocalypse would last for only a few months. In fact, I was eager to finish this interlude as soon as possible, in order to satisfy a long-time curiosity of mine regarding this pseudo-Origenist work, and then go ahead with other projects, on which my research had already been conducted. Had I not come across the Codex of Meteora (which is an early ninth-century manuscript and the sole one containing this commentary on the Apocalypse), I would have concluded that the anonymous text is a series of comments by Theodoret. However, once I was eventually granted access to the Codex itself, it became plain that the author was Cassian, the Sabaite monk and abbot, who turned out to be not the figment currently known as ‘John Cassian’, but a different and heretofore eclipsed author.

The *peripeteia* began once I had (out of mere curiosity) read the rest of the Codex, indeed its very beginning. The colophon has it that this Codex is ‘The

Book of monk Cassian' and later hands over the centuries wrote the same indication at difference points; on the last page of the Codex, a later hand wrote, 'By Monk Cassian'. Folios 1r–118v contain works ascribed to Cassian. Each of them is indicated through specific titles *beyond the colophon*, which makes this colophon a clear indication of the owner of this book, actually a book copied from an older one that was a *personal companion* of Cassian himself.

To my amazement, philological analysis of those texts immediately showed an author abundantly drawing on specific eminent authors, not only Christian, but also Classical and Late Antique ones. On the other hand, there is a current and long-standing tradition that claims Cassian to have been a *Latin* author and any Greek text ascribed to him to be only a Greek *translation* of an *Epitome*, of which no manuscript exists. Despite desperate efforts, never has any Latin manuscript of this *Epitome* been traced anywhere – actually this has never existed at all, as I myself claim and other scholars suspected, but they lacked the ancient manuscripts which could establish the point.

There is a vast literature about the 'Latin' 'John Cassian' to whom an entire corpus of Latin texts has been attributed. They are now shown to be simply the product of interpolation and extensive medieval forgery. The Vienna Corpus of Latin authors (1898) ascribed extensive Latin works to this 'John Cassian', who is currently considered to be 'the father of Western monasticism'; he is also claimed to have been the source of Benedict's Rule (end of the seventh century) and of the Benedictine Order itself. It is also Cassian who is acclaimed as 'the sole Latin author included in the collection known as *Philocalia*'.

Some of the authors that Cassian appears to have dealt with are the most brilliant Christian minds. They happen to be the same ones that were officially condemned by the episcopal Church: Origen, Didymus the Blind, Evagrius, John Philoponus, whereas Theodoret escaped this fate only at the very last moment. It seems that what is currently known as the history of doctrine is only the history of episcopal decisions: the 'right doctrine' that has come down to us is what came from the pulpit, by bishops who had always had an open ear and eye to mundane imperial politics.

The critical development that turns all Cassian scholarship upside down and exposes and frustrates the medieval forgery involving his name are the dis-

covery of the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*. They provide the grounds for a fresh approach coupled with publication of the rest of Cassian's texts found in the Meteora Codex. These texts show the author drawing abundantly on Classical and Late Antique pagan (Greek and Oriental) literature. I should have thought that there may have been specific persons who might have cared to obliterate this Meteora Codex over the centuries, had the 'secret' contained therein (*viz.* the testimony inherent in the *Scholia* themselves) been made known. Fortunately, this codex was discovered only in 1908 and has remained concealed in the monastery of Great Meteoron (Metamorphosis) ever since. What the colophon 'Book of monk Cassian' really suggests was not noticed, and no one cared to study the *implications* of these texts.

Establishing the existence of a new author is a very serious proposition. That objections will arise is only to be expected. But my claim supported by argument is that 'Cassian' was in fact a *Greek* writer from Palestine and the 'Latin author' of Romania who came to be called 'John Cassian' (although no Greek manuscript has it so) is simply a figment produced by medieval forgery.

It is not therefore simply a case of an author appearing for the first time, which would perhaps be a case of limited interest. It is a case of an author argued to be the *real* historical person in antithesis to the current literature about 'John Cassian'. I do not see any serious reason why the real Cassian, the man who inspired St Benedict should have been baptized a *Latin*, and yet this has been the case.

Therefore, this is the phenomenon of an author taken *instead of another*, which involves a direct challenge to an entire stream of scholarship and to long-standing allegations about the origins of Western monasticism. I cannot see, however, why this truth could do any harm to the *inspiration* of those foundations. Nor do I see why the *auctoritas vetustatis* of Western monasticism (desperately sought in the seventh century and afterwards, until today) would be compromised if the real Cassian is identified as a Greek author, as he really was.

I realize that this is a proposition that could appear challenging to many scholars, especially those who have specific allegiances. I have neither allegiances nor commitments, and, as I have declared in previous books, I only wish to be an accurate scholar. Which is why I felt that no room for controversy should be left or allowed. It is not just about a theoretical 'question of

authorship'; it is about the *real* existence of an eclipsed author instead of a figment.

Beyond this, we come upon the real Cassian as a scholar of immense Greek *paideia*, whereas the phantasmal 'John Cassian' is known to have had hardly any knowledge of Greek at all. Consequently, we experience the tension inherent in those texts – the tension between Justinian's imperial 'Christian faith' during the first half of the sixth century and a large group of highly erudite Antiochene intellectuals, namely the monks of the Monastery of the Akoimetoï, who had established a spiritual colony of Antioch in the heart of Constantinople.

Even though the community was persecuted by Justinian in the early 530s, it was the Akoimetoï who cherished the thought of such 'condemned' intellectuals as Theodore of Mopsuestia, Diodorus of Tarsus, Origen, Didymus the Blind, Evagrius, Theodore of Cyrrhus, and Nestorius, alongside Homer, the three Athenian tragic poets, Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, Lucian, Demosthenes, Hyperides, Pindar, Isocrates, Galen, Posidonius, and an immense host of other Greek intellectuals down to Proclus, Damascius, and Simplicius, all of whom I identify one by one by means of patient perusal of the texts and concrete references.

This is why the Scholia are anonymous: amidst Justinian's caesaropapism of the 530s and 540s, their author Cassian could never have cited the names of the 'heretics' on whom he had drawn so heavily. For it is only the visible peak of the iceberg that Cassian availed himself of Didymus' lost Commentary on the Apocalypse, which can now be largely reconstructed, thus dating the 'most ancient known' commentary on the Apocalypse two centuries earlier: he also drew on such supposedly different authors as Origen and Theodore (a *persona non grata* at the time), not to mention pagan ones. The anonymity of the collection

actually shows the Akoimetan spirit aspiring to cherish the patrimony bequeathed to them by both Alexandria and Antioch alike, including such 'daemonized' authors as Theodore of Mopsuestia, Severus of Antioch (the Monophysite doctor), and Nestorius. No less does the way this collection is presented illustrate the clandestine (yet all too real) interplay between Hellenism and the imperial Christianity during Justinian's reign. However different (and sometimes hostile to each other) those personalities appear in histories of doctrine, what is unique about the Antiochene Akoimetoï and Cassian himself is that they sought a *synthesis*, which has its contemporary parallel in the synthesis by Neoplatonist Aristotelian commentators arguing that the difference between Plato and Aristotle was not so sharp as previous centuries had taken this to have been. This collection of comments, therefore, discloses critical facets of the Byzantine sixth-century social, political, and intellectual world, and casts new light on the backlash of this period which (though generally accepted today) has yet to be explored.

We should bear in mind that Cassian's texts occur as follows: folios 1r–118v: texts of Cassian (with the name of the author indicated in headers *beyond* the colophon itself), folios 245v–290r: *Scholia in Apocalypsin*, with Cassian as their author indicated on folio 290r by a later hand, as 'the Book of Cassian'. The relevance of those texts in terms of philology has been expounded in the aforementioned books of mine reinstating the real Cassian.

During the distressing decades of the 530s and 540s, Cassian resolved that he should 'obey the weight of his sad time, and speak what he felt, not what he ought to say'. He cherished this text as his personal companion, which came down to us as the Metamorphosis-Codex 573. He deserves a fair hearing, and now the time for this has come.

ABBREVIATIONS

General

ACO	E. Schwartz, <i>Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum</i>
An.(M)	Andreas of Caesarea, <i>Commentarius in Apocalypsin</i> , J. P. Migne edition
An.(S)	Andreas of Caesarea, <i>Commentarius in Apocalypsin</i> , J. Schmid edition
Ar.	Arethas of Caesarea
COT	P. Tzamalikos, <i>Origen: Cosmology and Ontology of Time</i>
GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
H.	A. Harnack
M.	Migne, <i>Patrologia Graeca</i> (critical apparatus to the text of Revelation)
N-A.	Nestle-Aland, <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i>
NDGF	P. Tzamalikos, <i>A Newly Discovered Greek Father, Cassian the Sabaite, Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles</i>
O.	Oecumenius, <i>Commentarius in Apocalypsin</i> , ed. H.C. Hoskier
O.(G)	<i>Oecumenii Commentarius in Apocalypsin</i> , ed. Marc De Groote
PG.	J. P. Migne, <i>Patrologia Graeca</i> (volume, page, line)
PHE	P. Tzamalikos, <i>Origen: Philosophy of History and Eschatology</i>
PL	Migne, <i>Patrologia Latina</i>
RCR	P. Tzamalikos, <i>The Real Cassian Revisited, Monastic Life, Greek Paideia, and Origenism in the Sixth Century</i>
SVF	<i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> (volume, page, verse)
T.	C. H. Turner
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
2329	The full text of Book of Revelation in Meteora-Codex 574
2551	The passages from Book of Revelation accompanying the <i>Scholia in Apocalypsin</i> , in Meteora-Codex 574

All Authors

<i>commEccl</i>	<i>Commentarii in Ecclesiasten</i>
<i>commJob</i>	<i>Commentarii in Job</i>
<i>commPs</i>	<i>Commentarii in Psalmos</i>
<i>HE</i>	<i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>

Origen

<i>adnotGen</i>	<i>Adnotationes in Genesim</i>
<i>adnotJos</i>	<i>Adnotationes in Josuam</i>
<i>Cant</i>	<i>Libri x in Canticum Canticorum (fragmenta)</i>
<i>Cels</i>	<i>Contra Celsum</i>
<i>comm1Cor</i>	<i>Fragmenta ex Commentariis in Epistulam I ad Corinthios</i>
<i>commEph</i>	<i>Fragmenta ex Commentariis in Epistulam ad Ephesios</i>
<i>commEx</i>	<i>Fragmentum ex Commentariis in Exodum</i>
<i>commGen</i>	<i>Fragmenta ex Commentariis in Genesim</i>
<i>commJohn</i>	<i>Commentarii in Joannem</i>

<i>commLuc</i>	<i>Scholia in Lucam (fragmenta e cod. Venet. 28)</i>
<i>commMatt</i>	<i>Commentariorum in Matthaeum libri 10–17</i>
<i>commProv</i>	<i>Fragmenta in Proverbia</i>
<i>deOr</i>	<i>De Oratione</i>
<i>Dial</i>	<i>Dialogus cum Heraclide</i>
<i>epAfr</i>	<i>Epistola ad Africanum</i>
<i>excPs</i>	<i>Excerpta in Psalmos</i>
<i>exhMar</i>	<i>Exhortatio ad Martyrium</i>
<i>expProv</i>	<i>Expositio in Proverbia</i>
<i>frEz</i>	<i>Fragmenta ex Commentariis in Ezechielem</i>
<i>frJer</i>	<i>Commentariorum in Jeremiam</i>
<i>frJohn</i>	<i>Fragmenta in Evangelium Joannis</i>
<i>frLam</i>	<i>Fragmenta in Lamentationes</i>
<i>frLuc</i>	<i>Fragmenta 1–112 in Lucam</i>
<i>frMatt</i>	<i>Commentariorum series 1–145 in Matthaeum</i>
<i>frOs</i>	<i>In Oseam</i>
<i>frProv</i>	<i>Fragmenta in Proverbia</i>
<i>frPs</i>	<i>Fragmenta in Psalmos 1–150</i>
<i>homEx</i>	<i>Homiliae in Exodum</i>
<i>homGen</i>	<i>Homiliae 1–16 in Genesim</i>
<i>homJer</i>	<i>In Jeremiam (homiliae 12–20)</i>
<i>homJob</i>	<i>Homiliae in Job</i>
<i>homJos</i>	<i>Homiliae in Josuam</i>
<i>homLev</i>	<i>Homiliae in Leviticum</i>
<i>homLuc</i>	<i>Homiliae in Lucam</i>
<i>JesNav</i>	<i>In Jesu Nave Homiliae xxvi</i>
<i>Princ</i>	<i>De Principiis (P. Koetschau)</i>
<i>schCant</i>	<i>Scholia in Canticum Canticorum</i>
<i>schMatt</i>	<i>Scholia in Matthaeum</i>
<i>selDeut</i>	<i>Selecta in Deuteronomium</i>
<i>selEx</i>	<i>Selecta in Exodum</i>
<i>selEz</i>	<i>Selecta in Ezechielem</i>
<i>selGen</i>	<i>Selecta in Genesim</i>
<i>selJos</i>	<i>Selecta in Josuam</i>
<i>selNum</i>	<i>Selecta in Numeros</i>
<i>selPs</i>	<i>Selecta in Psalmos</i>

Didymus

<i>commEccl</i>	<i>Commentarii in Ecclesiasten</i>
<i>commJob</i>	<i>Commentarii in Job</i>
<i>commPs</i>	<i>Commentarii in Psalmos</i>
<i>commZacch</i>	<i>In Zachariam</i>
<i>frPs(al)</i>	<i>Fragmenta in Psalmos altera</i>

Eusebius

<i>commPs</i>	<i>Commentaria in Psalmos</i>
<i>DE</i>	<i>Demonstratio Evangelica</i>
<i>PE</i>	<i>Praeparatio Evangelica</i>

Theodore

<i>commIs</i>	<i>Commentarius in Isaiam</i>
<i>De Providentia</i>	<i>De Providentia Orationes Decem</i>
<i>intDan</i>	<i>Commentarius in Visiones Danielis Prophetarum</i>
<i>intPaulXIV</i>	<i>Interpretatio in XIV Epistulas Sancti Pauli</i>
<i>intProphXII</i>	<i>Interpretatio in XII Prophetas Minores</i>

Cyril of Alexandria

<i>commProphXII</i>	<i>Commentarius in XII Prophetas</i>
<i>De Adoratione</i>	<i>De Adoratione in Spiritu et Veritate</i>
<i>expPs</i>	<i>Explanatio in Psalmos</i>
<i>GlaphPent</i>	<i>Glaphyrorum in Pentateuchum</i>
<i>In Isaiam</i>	<i>Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam</i>
<i>In Sanctum Joannem</i>	<i>Commentarii in Joannem</i>

Theodore of Mopsuestia

<i>commProphXII</i>	<i>Commentarius in XII Prophetas</i>
<i>expPs</i>	<i>Explanatio in Psalmos</i>

Pseudo-Justin or Pseudo-Theodore

<i>QetR</i>	<i>Quaestiones et Responsiones</i>
-------------	------------------------------------

Epiphanius of Salamis

<i>Panarion</i>	<i>Panarion (Adversus Haereses)</i>
-----------------	-------------------------------------

Cassian the Sabaite

<i>Const</i>	<i>Ad Castorem Episcopum De Canonicis Occidentalis et Aegyptionis Coenobiorum Constitutionibus</i>
<i>De Panareto</i>	<i>Ad Leontium Hegumenum Contributio Sereni Abbatis De Panareto</i>
<i>DT</i>	<i>De Trinitate (Pseudo-Didymus = Cassian the Sabaite)</i>
<i>OctoVit</i>	<i>Ad Castorem Episcopum De Octo Vitiis Cogitationibus</i>
<i>ScetPatr</i>	<i>Ad Leontium Hegumenum De Scetae Sanctorum Patrum</i>
<i>SerenPrim</i>	<i>Ad Leontium Hegumenum Contributio Sereni Abbatis Prima</i>

Psalms are numbered after LXX.

INTRODUCTION

The Codex

Codex 573 of the Metamorphosis cloister (the Μεγάλον Μετέωρον, the Great Meteoron) is a little token of the fate of old treasures of all kinds over the centuries. More specifically, it betokens the conflict waged in Greece in 1882, over preservation of extant manuscripts, shortly after Greece had become an independent state, after the annexation of Thessaly, while Northern Greece was still under the rule of Ottoman Turks. One facet of this battle was the enterprise by the newly independent state to bring all manuscripts that had remained after centuries of looting together for preservation in the National Library in Athens. This story I will relate shortly. Another facet of this battle is the one between scholars striving to capture the glory of originality in recording and cataloguing manuscripts. This story I will not relate, since this is the same everywhere in the world of scholars.

In the seventeenth century, a Cypriot monk called Athanasius had bought manuscripts from Meteora by weight. During the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, monks used to sell manuscripts to visitors from Western Europe. However disturbing to later locals the phenomenon may have appeared, this was the cause for many texts being saved and respected. When the government sent two savants to collect manuscripts for the National Library in Athens (in the late nineteenth century), this resulted in a real war between the peasants (including wives and children) and the state military force. Locals saw the removal of manuscripts from Meteora to the National Library of Athens as either a sacrilege, or appropriation of treasures belonging to the convents. Earlier still, the two savants, escorted by the same soldiers and faced with the resistance of the monks objecting to the removal of all extant books from the country to the capital, had taken by force all the books that were not hidden, and packed them in cases. However, the peasants who fell upon the military convoy, proved victorious. As a result, the government decided to yield to the will of the regional people, and only nine boxes with about 350 manuscripts were taken to Athens to be lodged in the

National Library. This was virtually nothing, when one considers that the monastery of Metamorphosis alone has more than six hundred manuscripts. Before this, the only scholarly investigation of which we know is the visits to Meteora paid by the French archaeologist Léon Heuzey (1858) and the Russian archimandrite Porphirij Uspenski (1859), who studied the archives.

This is the background against which N. Béés visited the Meteora in 1908 and 1909 to examine the manuscripts that had been withheld there following this uproar. A thorough investigation of the archival and manuscript treasures was carried out by Béés, later (1924) a professor at the University of Athens. He unearthed, pieced together, and assessed a vast number of manuscripts, for which he deserves the gratitude of scholars. His report is a stunning account of the situation he was faced with during his detective work.¹ The books which were shown to him by the monks were only one-fifth of those which he eventually discovered himself. He searched under roofs and floors, he unearthed ancient hiding-places of which the existence was unknown even to the monks themselves. However distressed he was, Béés was not frustrated at the monks laughing at this oddball who had set out to do such an eccentric job. In his report, Béés describes graphically the conditions under which he worked, struggling to overcome the mockery (and sometimes wrath) of monks aiming to demoralize him. He describes how he strove ‘to decode certain comments and insinuations made by monks to each other, which intimated the existence of secret old hiding-places’. He also wrote of the ‘utter awe’ he felt at finally discovering a secret crypt above and next to a vault, at entering this and unearthing innumerable manuscripts, ‘almost all of them in parchment’. For a moment, he felt as if he were seeing, ‘under the light of a candle’, ‘hallucinations, apparitions, ghosts, and the like’, due to the fact that the place was completely dark, shrouded in ‘heavy dust’ and amidst all kinds ‘of insects attacking with stings, as well as various germs’.

¹ N. Béés read his report on 1 February 1910 to the members of the Greek Society for Byzantine Studies: Ἐκθεσις παλαιογραφικῶν

καὶ τεχνικῶν ἐρευνῶν ἐν ταῖς μοναῖς τῶν Μετεώρων κατὰ τὰ ἔτη 1908 καὶ 1909 (Athens 1910).

Bées' investigations resulted in a number of significant publications, not only of archival and cataloguing, but also of scholarly interest, like the publications of the works of Hippolytus and the one with the Scholia. He reported that he discovered 1,124 manuscripts in all of the Meteora monasteries. Of these, more than half (610 items) were found in the Great Meteoron, which is the alternative name for the monastery of Metamorphosis. One wonders whether a catalogue has ever been compiled under such hard and adverse circumstances. Today it is not easy to access the manuscripts, which for this reason are hardly studied and largely unpublished. I myself was at last able to see this codex only after my efforts of nearly two years had failed.

The text of Revelation and the Scholia are part of a cursive manuscript included in Codex 573, conserved in the monastery of Metamorphosis,² in Meteora, Thessaly.³ This Codex is an exquisite piece of art: the 'Book of monk Cassian' is made of fine leafs of parchment; the binding is wood-plates covered with leather, whereas the clip keeping the book closed is also a fine bronze buckle. There are 290 folia (dimensions: 0,12 x 0,185), which also contain other noteworthy material, such as Hippolytus' *On the Blessings of Jacob* (ascribed to Irenaeus in the title of this MS).⁴ The text of Revelation occupies folia 210r to 245r. The Codex is considered to be a tenth-century manuscript, yet my own assessment is that this is an early ninth-century one.⁵

Caspar René Gregory and Kurt Aland designated the Revelation manuscript of this codex as 2329 (Kurt & Barbara Aland: Date: AD 950, Category II) (Hoskier's n^o: 200). The Revelation text consisting of the passages

accompanying the ensuing Scholia are manuscript 2351 (Kurt & Barbara Aland: Date: 950 AD, Category III) (Hoskier's n^o: 201). These manuscripts of the Revelation (2329: complete; 2351: partial) are two of the 286 cursive ones containing the Revelation text.

With folio 245v the Scholia appear, and they extend up to folio 290r, which is the end of the Codex. Folio 290v is blank, which means that the text of the Scholia did not end for want of room. The Scholia comment on the text of Revelation up to 14:5.

In folio 245r the scribe (a monk called Theodosius) wrote a prayer asking God (through the prayers of John the Evangelist) for mercy and forgiveness for all the scribal mistakes he had possibly committed during carrying out the task of transcribing the manuscript. This is one of the infrequent cases where the name of a scribe has been made known to us. Of all the tenth-century manuscripts in that cloister, this is one of only two names of scribes for the tenth century, of which we know.

The note by the scribe reads thus:

ἐπληρώθη ἡ ἀποκά|λυψις τοῦ ἀγίου ἰω|άννου του
θεολόγου· | στιχῶν ,α΄:- | Κ(ύρι)ε δια πρεσβειῶν τοῦ
ἀγίου ἰωαν|νου τοῦ θεολογου· συγχώρησον | παcas
μου τὰς ἁμαρτίας· καὶ ἔαν | ἔσφαλον ἔντινι ρηματι ἢ
λέξει | ἢ ἀντιστοιχῶ ἢ τόνῳ ἢ λογῶ | ἢ ἄλλο τι κατα
αγνοίαν ἢ κ(αὶ) γνώσῃ·- | Θεοδοσιος ἁμαρτωλος ὕπερ
πάντ(ας) | Κ(ύρι)ε ἔλεησον καὶ τα | πν(ευμα)τικὰ μου
τεκνα· | φίλους κ(αὶ) ἀδελφους· | AMHN:-

The Apocalypse comprising a thousand verses is now complete. Forgive all my sins, O Lord, through the intercession of John the Theologian. [Also, forgive my sin] should I have erred on writing either a verb or a word

² This was catalogued by N. Bées, in 1908, following earlier scholars who explored the treasures of the Meteora cloisters. These were Léon Heuzey (1858), the Russian archimandrite Porphirij Uspenski (1859), see Lambros (1894), J. Bogiadjedes (c. 1900). For relevant publications, see Donald M. Nicol, *Meteora: The Rock Monasteries of Thessaly* (London 1963) pp. 191–99, with extensive bibliography.

³ The *Catalogue of the Meteora Manuscripts* was published posthumously by the Centre for the Study of Medieval and Modern Hellenism at the Academy of Athens: *Τὰ Χειρόγραφα τῶν Μετεώρων, Κατάλογος περιγραφικῶς τῶν χειρογράφων κωδίκων τῶν ἀποκειμένων εἰς τὰς Μονὰς τῶν Μετεώρων ἐκ τῶν καταλοίπων τοῦ Νίκου Α. Βέη* (*The Manuscripts of Meteora: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts Conserved in the Monasteries of Meteora, Published from the Extant Work of Nikos A. Veis*), Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν, Κέντρον Ἑρεῦνης τοῦ Μεσαιωνικοῦ καὶ Νέου Ἑλληνισμοῦ, Athens, 1998, Τόμος Α', *Τὰ Χειρόγραφα τῆς Μονῆς Μεταμορφώσεως*. Volume 1 of the catalogues published by

the Academy of Athens, pp. 598–601 and 681. See also, N. Bees, 'Die Kollation der Apokalypse Johannis mit dem Kodex 573 des Meteoronklosters', *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 13 (1912), 260–265, with plates.

⁴ Cf. C. Diobouniotis–N. Weis, *Hippolytus Schrift über die Segnungen Jakobs*. C. Diobouniotis, *Hippolytus Danielcommentar in Handschrift No 573 des Meteoronklosters*. TU 38, 1 (Leipzig, 1911). The author wavers in the orthography of his name; whether Bees or Wies, he is the same person.

⁵ The texts of this Codex, which are written by Cassian (folia 1r–118v, 209r–v) are published in the edition, P. Tzamalikos, *A Newly Discovered Greek Father, Cassian the Sabaites Eclipsed by 'John Cassian' of Marseilles, A Critical Edition from an Ancient Manuscript with Commentary and an English Translation* (Leiden 2012). The identity of the author is established in the monograph, P. Tzamalikos, *The Real Cassian Revisited, Monastic Life, Greek Paideia, and Origenism in the Sixth Century, A Critical Study of an Ancient Manuscript* (Leiden, 2012).

or a corresponding letter or an accent or quotation, or anything of the like, out of ignorance, or not ignorance. Theodosius, the worst sinner of all [sinners]. O Lord, have mercy also on my spiritual children, on my friends, and on my brothers. Amen.

The prayer comprises sixty words. Of them only twenty-five are grammatically correct; thirty-five words have mistakes of the kind designated by the scribe himself (grammatical, accents, verbs, etc.). There are some abbreviated forms of sacred names (I count none of them as a mistake), according to the habit of iconographers writing on icons the name of either Christ or Mary with two letters (the first and the last; yet although κε for κ(ύρι)ε and κ for και are normal, πνικα for πνευματικὰ is not, although πνμα for πνεῦμα could be a normal abbreviation). Anyway, this portion is a fatal seal showing how poorly Theodosius was educated. His elementary knowledge extends only to writing and reading, his Greek is by and large restricted to the language of liturgical books.

The codex is written by different hands and the handwriting varies. H. C. Hoskier believed that two different persons had written 2329 and 2351, and that Theodosius was only one of them and wrote 2329, as he himself tells us. The fact is, however, that Theodosius wrote both Revelation-texts, namely, 2329 and 2351. Of the latter, he wrote up to [Scholion V](#), to be replaced by someone else, yet his handwriting reappears later.

The dimensions of the written part of each folio are normally 0,12 × 0,185. Each face of a folio has 21 verses. Capital letters are elegantly designed in both parts (that is, in the text of Revelation and certain Scholia). In folio 1r of the Codex there is a coloured decorative colophon, partially corrupt. There are also some capital letters artistically drawn in brown ink. A later reader (perhaps of the seventeenth century) made some corrections in the margins, obviously because he was unable to stand

some egregious misspellings. In 2351, the text of Revelation is divided into sections, each of which is followed by a Scholion. Following the point where a new scribe took over from Theodosius, he started each Scholion with 'Ερ', which stands for Ἑρμηνεία. I have included all these indications in the edited text.

H. C. Hoskier was enthusiastic about this manuscript, which he hailed as one of a 'new type'. He believed that 'Theodosius did his best with the transcription of Apoc. 200 from a very ancient text'.⁶ 'We can confidently say that one document directly underlies Apoc. 200 coeval with our oldest uncial witness.'⁷ This means that Hoskier believed that Theodosius had copied from an exemplar as old as the oldest uncials of which we know. Actually, he went so far as to assert that 'in the whole range of our documents, there is none more important'.⁸ J. Schmid made only a brief statement about this manuscript, which he cited regularly. What he believed of minuscules 2329, 1854, and 1611, which he (*viz.* Hoskier) regarded as witnesses to an ancient text, was that they 'stand beside or indeed before the standard ecclesiastical text, are similar to each other precisely at the points where they deviate from K'.⁹

As regards the text of Revelation in this codex (MS 2351), there is little to emend. I have only corrected egregious errors of spelling and added some commas where necessary. No more than this was called for, since the Greek language immediately evinces that the Greek scriptural text has been at points emended by an exceptionally erudite person, who wished to have as correct a Greek text as possible.

There are 303 manuscripts which contain the Book of Revelation (of these, 286 are cursive ones, as already noted). Some of these manuscripts contain only this scriptural book, others record more of the New Testament alongside Revelation.¹⁰ It was Joseph Schmid who drew attention to a distinctive feature of this biblical

⁶ As already noted, Apoc. 200 is the designation 2329 according to Hoskier.

⁷ H. C. Hoskier, 'Manuscripts of the Apocalypse – Recent Investigations. I', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 7 (1922–23), 120–137 and 2 plates. This was revised in his *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse. Collations of all Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephens's Third Edition, together with the Testimony of Versions, Commentaries and Fathers*. 2 vols. (London, 1929), vol. 1, pp. 637–652. Vol. 2 contains the collations (p. 641).

⁸ *Ibid.* vol. 1, p. 636.

⁹ J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes* (Münchener Theologische Studien), 1. Teil, *Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia* 2 vols. (Munich, 1956); 2. Teil, *Die alten Stämme* (Munich, 1955), pp. 9: 'Die Minuskel 2329, 1854 und 1611, die er als Zeugen eines alten, neben oder vielmehr vor dem "kirchlichen Standardtext" stehenden Textes nennt, sind gerade dort, wo sie von K abweichen, mit P47 S und AC verwandt.'

¹⁰ J. K. Elliott gives an account of the proportions: 'The distinctiveness of the Greek manuscripts of the Book of Revelation', *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS 48 (1997) 116–124.

book, namely that it is frequently complemented by commentary alongside the text. This pattern evidently results from the fact that authors or scribes felt that Revelation needed to be sanctified as a divinely inspired text. Comments could have been added at any later time, which means that quite often the decision to expand a codex by adding the text of Revelation was an afterthought.¹¹

To further my discussion I have to avail myself of the work of an important New Testament scholar, namely J. Schmid, and his contributions to the study of the Greek text of Revelation. Studying the commentary on the Apocalypse by Andreas of Caesarea, Schmid came to establishing a new type of text, the *Av* text (*apud* Ἀνδρέας) alongside the other existing ones, which counts eighty-three witnesses, including three uncials.¹² He argued that all germane manuscripts go back to one archetype, which is posited to be the original of Andreas' commentary. However, the scriptural text which Andreas of Caesarea used is *older* than his commentary. Nevertheless, the Andreas-type is defined pretty solidly and, relying on Schmid, we can accept that this text was used in Andreas' commentary and in the manuscripts that depend on it. It was definitely not Andreas who had constructed or edited the text that he himself used. This had just reached him, and he used it with confidence. The text can already be found in the corrector **K**^a to **K** (**S**^a, according to Schmid's notation) of the fourth century. In addition, Andreas himself appears wary, and perhaps anxious, to keep with observing an already existing text rather than constructing one of his own. He therefore relied on an already existing text, and had no reason to create a new version of the Apocalypse. No doubt he was aware of the editor and clearly respected both him and the text he had produced.

His reference to the 'doctors of the Church' surely

includes Theodoret and Cassian, as the following evidence shows. Andreas refers to the 'doctors of the Church' (κατὰ τοὺς διδασκάλους τῆς Ἐκκλησίας).¹³ A closer exploration of the issues he deals with reveals that he has in mind Cassian, though he refrained from naming him.¹⁴ Cassian had suffered the fate of all those who were immensely erudite yet suspected of heresy. The vast bulk of his writings went on to be ascribed to Christian celebrities of the past.

Andreas' only dissent was that he did not approve of much intervention in the simple and peculiar language of Revelation, even if such intervention was called for by a real need to correct its language.

διαμαρτύρεται ἡμῖν τοῖς ἀκούουσι, μήτε προσθεῖναι
τι μήτε ἀφελεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὰ γραφικὰ ἰδιώματα τῶν
Ἀττικῶν συντάξεων καὶ τῶν διαλεκτικῶν
συλλογισμῶν ἡγεῖσθαι ἀξιοπιστότερα καὶ σεμνότερα,
ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν ἐκείνοις πολλὰ τις εὗρισκων μὴ
κανονιζόμενα ἐπὶ τὸ ἀξιόπιστον τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς
ποιητῶν καὶ συγγραφέων παραπέμπεται.¹⁵

'The expressions peculiar to scripture' (τὰ γραφικὰ ἰδιώματα) are therefore deemed more 'trustworthy'. In order to explain a passage, one should refer to another point of scripture, not embark on dialectical syllogisms about concepts, or on grammatical technicalities. More specifically, the book of Daniel is one of those which might serve to explain certain themes and images of Revelation.

Andreas' criticism of those who are fascinated by Attic structures of speech and syllogisms and regard them as 'more noble' than the scriptural language, leaves no doubt that he is hinting at Cassian. For one thing, it is natural for Andreas to have in mind someone who had already dealt with the text of Revelation. For another, expressions such as 'dialectical syllogism' (which means 'an argument' as well as the way for con-

¹¹ Ibid. p. 118.

¹² In broad terms, there are four main text-types in Revelation: (1) A C Oecumenius 2057 2062 2344. (2) **K**^a Andreas of Caesarea. (3) Koine. (4) *P*⁴⁷ **K**^{*}. All of these differ from the text-types identified for the rest of the New Testament. According to Schmid, all these types can be traced back to at least the fourth century.

¹³ Andreas of Caesarea, PG.106.269.58 (those who entertained typological interpretation); PG.106.292.30 (ὥς καὶ τισι τῶν διδασκάλων ἔδοξε, meaning those who identify the 'divine wrath with the devil', among whom are Origen, Theodoret, and Cassian in *Scholion XXX*).

¹⁴ Andreas of Caesarea, PG.106.312.26–27: πολλοὶ τῶν διδασκάλων

ἐνόησαν. Among these doctors Theodoret is included, along with Hippolytus, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom. Michael Glycas says that 'this is the explanation by those who interpreted' Revelation – but who are they? Cf. Andreas of Caesarea, PG.106: 340; 393/6; 408 (καὶ τινὰ τῶν διδασκάλων εἰπεῖν εὗρισκεσθαι ἐνίους ζῶντας μετὰ τὴν Ἀντιχρίστου καθάρεσιν). This 'doctor' is Oecumenius, who claims that Elias and Enoch will be present at the critical time. Cf. Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 128. Theodoret, *intDan*, PG.81.1541.13f: στεφανώσει τοὺς ἄσυχον τῆς ὑπομονῆς τὸ κτῆμα φυλάξαντας. *Epistulae* 96–147: ἀντιχρίστου τὸν ὄλεθρον προθεσπίζων.

¹⁵ Andreas of Caesarea, PG.106.452.39–42.

structing one)¹⁶ is simply an alternative to saying ‘Aristotelian scholars’. For Cassian was an erudite Aristotelian scholar indeed. By the same token, Andreas’ derision of the ‘Attic’ structures, once again points to Cassian, who used some extremely unusual Attic variations of terms, such as ἐφίσης.¹⁷

Therefore, this reference by Andreas may well point to Cassian and probably to the Antiochene mindset as a whole, where Aristotelian studies had flourished, first at Edessa, then at Nisibis. This remark could have included Theodoret, too. For although he was not one of those who had commented on Revelation, he had done so on the Book of Daniel, of which the imagery, vocabulary, and style stand very close to the ones of Revelation. As a matter of fact, since the text of Revelation owes obvious debts to the Book of Daniel, and Theodoret had commented on the Book of Daniel, he was evidently qualified to render a proper text of the Apocalypse.

It can then be surmised that Andreas had in front of him a certain text, from which he quoted the Apocalypse passage after passage, which presumably was a text of the fifth century originating in Theodoret’s lifetime and was used by Cassian too. Whereas Cassian’s text of Revelation opts for strict correctness of grammar, Andreas seems to be less rigid, allowing the scriptural text to develop its own style. As we have just seen, the only independent witness to this text is **Κ**^a of the fourth century. Hence the *Av* text can be inferred to comprise two witnesses: **Κ**^a and the codex which Andreas used.

There are also further significant conclusions to be drawn from Schmid’s remarkable work, notably his considerations of certain textual types. First, there is a group of witnesses which seems to be associated with Egypt, due to Origen and the Coptic version: this is *P*⁴⁷, **Κ**, Origen, the Coptic versions, and a few minuscules.

Next, there are A, C, and Oecumenius supported by some minuscules, such as 2344. Here A appears to stand out. G. D. Kilpatrick wondered how it is possible for so good a text to have survived, when Origen two hundred years earlier had an inferior one. He subsequently makes a very significant remark: in the Gospels, A has the Antiochene text, whereas in the Epistles and Acts this is an Alexandrian one.¹⁸ In his view, those two traditions would have converged in Constantinople in order to produce such a fine text. I myself believe, however, that A must have been written under the supervision of Theodoret improving on Origen’s text, along with additional witness to the Apocalyptic one. In order to sustain his point, Kilpatrick felt that he should show how a person of Constantinople could have obtained his text. But he bases his argument on the erroneous presumption that Oecumenius was from Thessaly, which is not the case. In fact he was from Asia Minor.¹⁹ Neither does it seem plausible ‘that A was corrected from an earlier and uncorrected manuscript brought from Asia’.²⁰ The case is rather that a *corrected* text was brought from Asia Minor on the basis of which a new one was edited. My own conjecture is, therefore, that this corrected text originates in the exertions of Cassian. This squares with Kilpatrick’s hypothesis that a person from Constantinople played a role in this respect. This person is, I believe, Cassian himself, who spent years in Constantinople and who, I have argued, should be identified with Pseudo-Caesarius.²¹

If Andreas made some corrections of his own deviating from Cassian, he probably produced an inferior rather than superior text. He was suspicious of Cassian’s Greek erudition and was prone to believe that this Sabaite intellectual had introduced some corrections which resulted in the text being close to ‘Attic syntax’, which Andreas rejected as a method. On

¹⁶ Cf. διαλεκτικὸς συλλογισμὸς and the meaning of it in Aristotle, *Analytica Priora et Posteriora*, 24a25; 46a9; 68b10; 81b19; *Metaphysica*, 1078b25; *Ars Rhetorica*, 1355a9; 1355b16; 1356b1; 1358a4 f.; 1395b25; 1396b24; 1402a5; *Sophistici Elenchi*, 170a39; 171b7; 171b9; 172a18; *Topica*, 100a22–30; 157a19; 158a14; 161a36; 162a16 f. The concept was received respectfully by Aristotelian commentators, such as Alexander of Aphrodisias, Ammonius of Alexandria, Syrianus, John Philoponus, Elias of Alexandria. The Christian author who disputed the authority of ‘dialectical syllogism’ as a means to reach truth was Clement of Alexandria. To him, this procures only a relative ‘human impression’, whereas ‘the supreme proof’ which is ‘scientific’ comes from scripture alone. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.11.49.2–4: ἡ δὲ δοξαστικὴ ἀπόδειξις

ἀνθρωπικὴ τέ ἐστι καὶ πρὸς τῶν ῥητορικῶν γινόμενη ἐπιχειρημάτων ἢ καὶ διαλεκτικῶν συλλογισμῶν. ἡ γὰρ ἀνωτάτω ἀπόδειξις, ἣν ἡνιξάμεθα ἐπιστημονικὴν, πῖστιν ἐντίθησι διὰ τῆς τῶν γραφῶν παραθέσεως τε καὶ διοίξεως ταῖς τῶν μανθάνειν ὀρεγομένων ψυχαῖς, ἥτις ἂν εἴη γνῶσις.

¹⁷ I canvass this in *RCR*, pp. 271–72; *NDGF*, pp. 100; 160; 161.

¹⁸ G. D. Kilpatrick, ‘Professor J. Schmid on the Greek text of the Apocalypse’, *Vigiliae Christianae*, 130 (1959), 1–13 (pp. 3–4).

¹⁹ I hope this will be shown in a forthcoming work of mine on Oecumenius, Andreas, of Caesarea, and Arethas, canvassed in relation to the Scholia.

²⁰ Kilpatrick (n. 18 above)

²¹ See *NDGF*, Appendix I.

this account, this is probably the sole point on which I could espouse a view of Harnack's, namely, his statement about the present text of the Apocalypse. 'Though it may not prove to be a rival of C, perhaps even not of A, it is at all events on a par with **K** and P, while it is certainly superior to the text of 046 and Andreas.'²² Although I am hardly qualified to make such statements on my own, it seems to me that the facts make this statement plausible in view of the rest of my results.

I myself have been interested mainly in manuscripts used by the commentators on Revelation. In the critical apparatus, I have pointed out all the differences between 2329 and 2351, taking into account the specific points in the rest of the commentators, namely, Oecumenius, Andreas, Arethas, in juxtaposition to the modern reconstruction by Nestle–Aland. I take into account the text of Andreas as edited by both Schmid and Migne, and the text of Oecumenius as edited by both Marc de Groote and Migne.²³ It turns out that K stands very close to 2351, and it is my assumption that the latter was the source for the former.

R. H. Charles made a convincing point showing that the 2351-text of Revelation is simply different from that which Origen used.²⁴ It is clear that 2351 comes from the region of Syria and was the exemplar of K. 2329 is close mainly to A, and in the second place to **K** and A. This allows for the surmise that this might well be the text of Didymus. By contrast, 2329 is mostly dependent on A and **K**. Points showing 2329 and 2351 concurring in rare readings evince that Cassian consulted 2329, yet by and large he preferred his own text. When 2329 concurs with K, it normally does so with 2351, too.

There are points at which K differs from 2351: at these points, however, the latter concurs with Syriac versions, especially the *versio Heraclensis*. Heavy coincidence of uncommon points between 2351 and the *versio Harclensis* shows the latter to be the source of the

former. Hence I have focused mainly on points of 2329 that differ from 2351. It then turns out that 2351 has expressions that occur in a very limited number of manuscripts, the normal case being either Syriac or K codices: the former are the source, the latter (*viz.* 2351) is the result.

On the other hand, the reader can see for himself from the critical apparatus of Nestle–Aland that Arethas used mainly K, which in turn bears on 2351. All the emendations brought about to the text of Revelation by Cassian moved in one direction, namely to improve on the Greek. This is the tendency to which Andreas reacted, as already noted, remarking that the 'expressions peculiar to scripture' (γραφικὰ ἰδιώματα) are superior to 'Attic syntax and dialectical syllogisms' (τῶν Ἀττικῶν συντάξεων καὶ τῶν διαλεκτικῶν συλλογισμῶν).²⁵

Only a very erudite person such as Didymus could have used the term βιβλῆριον ('little book'), which appears in Rev. 10:10 of the text of 2329. As far as I know, the sole attestation of the term is in Diogenes Laertius,²⁶ relating the life of Antisthenes (445–360 BC), the founder of the Cynic school.

Furthermore, the genitive and dative case-forms of μάχαιρα (μαχαίρης, μαχαίρη respectively) in this text of Revelation (namely, 5351: Rev. 13:10 and 14) reveal specific authors behind this version of the text. Although these forms occur in both the Septuagint,²⁷ and the New Testament,²⁸ they are actually Homeric forms. In respect to the text of Revelation, the forms μαχαίρη, μαχαίρης,²⁹ occur in 2351, whereas 2329 (included in the present Codex, like 2351), Oecumenius, Andreas, and Arethas, have it μαχαίρας and μαχαίρα.

Only specific Christian authors made use of the archaic forms μαχαίρη, μαχαίρης. These authors are Hippolytus, Didymus, Theodoret, Pseudo-Macarius, and the present edition which Cassian quoted, namely,

²² K. Diobouniotis and A. Harnack, *Der Scholien-Kommentar des Origenes zur Apokalypse Johannis nebst einem Stück aus Irenaeus, Lib. V, Graece*, TU, 38,3 (Leipzig, 1911), p. 81.

²³ Different renderings of Oecumenius by either Migne or M. de Groote are indicated as O.(M) and O.(G). Andreas' text by either Migne or Schmid is indicated as An.(M) and An.(S) respectively.

²⁴ R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1920), vol. 1, pp. clxxvi–clxxvii.

²⁵ Andreas of Caesarea (n. 9 above) (Schmid), Logos 24, chapter 72, section 22, 18–19.

²⁶ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 6.3: πρὸς τε τὸ Ποντικὸν μειράκιον μέλλον φοιτᾶν αὐτῷ καὶ πυθόμενον τίνων αὐτῷ δεῖ, φησί, 'βιβλῆριον καινοῦ καὶ γραφείου καινοῦ καὶ πινακιδίου καινοῦ,' τὸν νοῦν παρεμφαίνων.

²⁷ Gen. 27:40; Ex. 15:9; Num. 21:24; 2 Reg. (*Samuelis ii in textu Masoretico*), 15:14.

²⁸ Matt. 26:52; Luke, 21:24; 22:49; Acts, 12:2; Heb. 11:34 and 37; Rev. 13:10 and 14.

²⁹ Rev. 13:10 and 14. *Scholion XXXVIII*, notes 61, 63 to the text of Revelation.

2351. Of them, Didymus quotes Rev. 13:10, yet he evidently uses another version of the text.³⁰ Hippolytus and Theodoret apply the dative *μαχαίρη* quoting an old Pythagorean maxim: Πῦρ *μαχαίρη* μὴ σκάλεψε, which warns not to irritate an already angry person by further argument.³¹ What is impressive about Theodoret is that he quotes the archaic form *μαχαίρη*, even though a series of writers, who provided him with the core of his erudition, had rendered this *μαχαίρα* (so did Aristotle, Plutarch, Galen, Lucian of Samosata, Athenaeus, Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry). Hippolytus, Iamblichus, Theodoret, Cassian, and John Philoponus are the only authors to have rendered the maxim in its original Pythagorean language. I hardly need to note that this adherence to accuracy is one more token of the erudition of these authors. Therefore, the text of Revelation which Cassian uses is probably the one which Theodoret had handed down to posterity, into which he had presumably introduced his own emendations. It is characteristic that the rest of the commentators on Revelation, namely Oecumenius, Andreas, and Arethas, apply the word *μαχαίρα*.

The specific text of Revelation stands out in respect to its correct Greek. This was probably the reason why Andreas declared that ‘the Scriptural language is superior to any Attic language’. My surmise is that Andreas had in mind Theodoret (probably alongside Cassian), whom he implicitly rebuffs for his emendations to the scriptural text. The fact that the form *τῆς μαχαίρης* appears in the Pseudo-Macarian corpus,³² suggests that this version of the New Testament (or of Revelation, at least) was circulating at the monastery of the Akoimetoι in Constantinople, which was used both by the author of this corpus and Cassian himself.

It seems therefore that Cassian copied from Didymus’ commentary, while at the same time he used a Greek scriptural text of his own from a manuscript of Syriac provenance. In this scriptural text several points were emended with the purpose of producing a ‘more

correct’ Greek text, as it were. Whether the person who produced this version of the Greek scriptural text was Cassian himself, or this had reached him as a legacy from Theodoret or some other erudite Antiochene, is not easy to determine. I can only set forth my foregoing hypothesis, that this person was Theodoret, and his work served to produce some Syriac versions. In any case, there is a continuous line of the text from the Syriac version (*versio Heraclensis*)³³ to Antioch, where the 2351-version was produced to yield the K manuscripts.

The scribe of both 2329 and 2351 is the same person, namely Theodosius (up to [Scholion V](#), yet evidently he took over again at a later point). This is why the same scribal errors occur in both 2329 and the text of the Scholia.

The texts of the Book of Cassian

The colophon of this parchment codex which comprises 290 folios, advises that this is ‘The Book of Monk Cassian’ (not ‘the Roman’) (*Κασσιανοῦ μοναχοῦ βιβλίον*), which seems to designate the owner of this volume as a whole. Folios 1r–118v contain texts ascribed to Cassian himself, who on folio 1r, immediately below the colophon, has the heading ‘By monk Cassian the Roman’ (*Κασσιανοῦ μοναχοῦ Ῥωμαίου*). His texts are the following:

1. By monk Cassian the Roman, To Bishop Castor, On the Rules and Regulations of the Coenobia in the East and Egypt (*Κασσιανοῦ μοναχοῦ Ῥωμαίου, Πρὸς Κάστωρα ἐπίσκοπον περὶ διατυπώσεως καὶ κανόνων τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀνατολὴν καὶ Αἴγυπτον κοινόν* βίον, folios 1r–22r).

2. By monk Cassian, On the eight considerations [of evil] (*Κασσιανοῦ μοναχοῦ περὶ τῶν ἡ λογισμῶν*, folios 22v–56r).

3. By the same [monk Cassian], To abbot Leontius On the Holy Fathers at Scetis (*Τοῦ αὐτοῦ Κασσιανοῦ, πρὸς Λεόντιον ἡγούμενον περὶ*

³⁰ Didymus, *In Psalmos 22–26.10*, Cod. p. 85: πάντες οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν *μαχαίρη* ἀπολοῦνται. He makes the same quotation in *In Psalmos 40–44.4*, Cod. p. 247. In *In Zachariam*, 3.127, he quotes Exodus 15:9: ἀνελὼ τῇ *μαχαίρῃ* μου.

³¹ Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* 6.27.3–4. Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 8.1. Hippolytus nevertheless uses the word as one of his own (*op. cit.*, 9.30.8), and so does Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones*, Homily 7.3.

³² Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones*, Homily 7.3.

³³ In the year 508 the Monophysite bishop Philoxenus of Mabbug on

the Euphrates requested his suffragan bishop Polycarp to make ‘a translation’ (or edition) of the New Testament into Syriac. This recension is preserved in a later version made by Thomas of Heraclea in 616. This is the *versio Heraclensis*, and the standard name for that manuscript is *Codex Heraclensis*. It should be noticed that the production of Polycarp’s version of the New Testament was made when Cassian the Sabaite was a senior pupil of St Sabas, and was about to begin his scholarly production, perhaps had already begun composing some of his works.

τῶν κατὰ τὴν Σκῆπτων ἁγίων πατέρων, folios 56v–80r).

4. First contribution by abba Serenus (Συνεισφορά τοῦ ἀββᾶ Σερήνου πρώτη, folios 80r–100v).

5. Contribution by Abba Serenus on the panaretus [wisdom] (Συνεισφορά τοῦ ἀββᾶ Σερήνου περὶ τῆς παναρέτου, folios 101r–118v).

In folios 210r–245r, there is a full text of the Revelation of John, which is followed by the *Scholia in Apocalypsin* (folios 245v–290r), for which there is no heading indicating either authorship or content. These Scholia were attributed to Origen by Adolf Harnack³⁴ in 1911, following the discovery of this Meteora-codex in 1908. This text is now published and its author has been identified as none other than Cassian himself, who cherished them in ‘his book’, that is, his personal companion.

The rest of the codex contains the ‘Blessings of Jacob by Irenaeus of Lugdunum’ (119r–200v) (in fact by Hippolytus), most of which deal with apocalyptic vision seen by Daniel. Also, texts by Hippolytus ‘on the captivity of King Johakim and the sons of Judah and of Jerusalem’ (156r), and ‘On the sundry visions by Daniel,’ (160r–200v). Also a text by Cyril of Alexandria ‘Exegesis on Melchisedek’ (201r–204v), followed by an interesting passage from the *Chronicon* by Hippolytus of Thebes (205r–207r).

The ensuing two folios (207v–208r) contain two texts ascribed to an obscure figure called ‘James the newly baptized’ (Ἰακώβου τοῦ νεοβαπτίστου).³⁵ This is an alleged chronicle about the ‘birth of Joseph’, setting out to expound the genealogy of Joseph, the husband of ‘saintly Mary the theotokos’, explaining how Mary is a descendant of the tribe of Judah and of David himself.

Then an interesting text follows.³⁶ This has to do with astronomical considerations providing practical mathematical rules for calculating leap years (209r–v) and probably the Easter, but on this we can only speculate, since there are some folios missing at that point. These folios³⁷ record information for the personal use of the owner of the codex, namely Cassian himself,

which has to do with calendar reckoning, according to either ‘the Romans’ or ‘the Alexandrians’: how the days of the full moon can be determined; how the days of February during a leap year are counted; how the twenty-ninth day is determined, and so on. This is an illuminating text casting light on why 29 February was determined as Cassian’s feast day, which points to his scientific interest in astronomy. The same text also tells us that Cassian is probably the author on whom the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* drew heavily, at least as far as calculations and rules for determining the date of Easter are concerned.

A Sabaite Codex

Codex 573 is a product of the milieu of the Monastery of St Sabas near Jerusalem. An investigation in the Patriarchal Library in Jerusalem (where the Sabaite manuscripts were transferred a hundred years ago) showed that no scribe named Theodosius appears. This name appears in the Meteora Codex 573 only. However, it turned out that the same hand wrote at least two more Sabaite codices (St Sabas 76 and 8).³⁸ This makes the scribe of the Jerusalem codices identifiable: he was the monk Theodosius. Nevertheless, philological exploration shows that the content of this ‘Book of Cassian’ was definitely known to the monastery of Studios and Theodore Studites himself. For it turns out that exquisite parallels to Cassian’s text occur frequently in the work of Theodore Studites. Theodore is the man who had built the most renowned scriptorium of his time in the monastery of Studios. This institution was in many respects the heir of the Akoimatoi, certainly the heir to their vast library, which was abundantly reproduced therein. Cassian was one of the Akoimatoi and, given the close contact between them and Palestine, his book should have been made available to them and reproduced in their library.

Colophons are an important source of information. The one in Codex 573 advises that this is ‘the book of monk Cassian’, in other words, his companion. The contents of this book in relation to its owner and his era afford some valuable knowledge, since there are

³⁴ According to his prologue, Harnack received the text in July 1911 and published this at the end of the same year, which means he made an all too hasty study and attribution of authorship to Origen, which never enjoyed universal acceptance by scholars. See K. Diobouniotis and A. Harnack, n. 22 above.

³⁵ This is the sole attestation of the term νεοβαπτιστος (‘newly baptized’) in Greek literature.

³⁶ This is now published for the first time in *RCR*, Appendix III.

³⁷ Approximately three folios are missing, since they were cut off before pagination was applied to the Codex.

³⁸ See and compare photos in *RCR*, pp. 529–48.

interesting interconnections which come to light once these small texts are explored. Although ‘James the newly baptised’ is an unknown figure, the question of the genealogy of Mary is explored by one author alone, namely the Sabaite John of Damascus.³⁹ Quite evidently, both Cassian and Damascenus found this work by ‘James the newly baptized’ at the library of the Great Laura in Palestine. Furthermore, the question about full moons and determination of specific days during February of a leap year is scarcely found in literature. Although we come upon this in two fourth-century authors (namely, Epiphanius of Salamis and the mathematician Theon of Alexandria),⁴⁰ it can be determined that the actual source is Ptolemy of Alexandria, the second-century astronomer, astrologer, mathematician, and philosopher.⁴¹ The questions on which Cassian kept notes for his personal use are treated by Theon as a commentary to Ptolemy’s *Προχείρους Κανόνας* (‘easy tables’, actually meaning calendars), which was also recorded by a later Byzantine monk and theologian of Thessaloniki.⁴²

Therefore, it is not only the colophon, which definitely determines that Cassian is the owner of the Codex: it is also the content of the book. In this book, he had works favoured by him transcribed (including some of his own), along with practical information which was valuable to him and to which he could have quick and easy access. His interest in the apocalyptic literature (which is evident from the text of Daniel therein that he cherished) culminates with writing down the entire text of John’s Revelation. And since there was more space available, he went on to compose some comments (the Scholia) on the Apocalypse, in order to prove that this book was indeed a divinely-inspired one and therefore was correctly regarded as canonical.

Consequently, there are interesting conclusions that follow from a study of the contents of this codex.

First, Cassian draws directly on Ptolemy, and had read not only his astronomical works (which he uses here), but also his astrological ones. He must have read other astrological works, too, since he uses the extremely rare colloquialism βίσεκτον for δίσεκτον for a leap year, which occurs in only a handful of instances throughout Greek literature. The leap year is normally called δίσεκτον (δῖς [=twice]+ ἕξ [six]), but since this was introduced by Julius Caesar,⁴³ and the idea is a Roman one, people used to call this βίσεκτον (pronouncing *bis* for δῖς).⁴⁴ Usage of this colloquial form was rare and these instances are all that can be found for the time being. It is then interesting that we find this colloquialism attested in the present Codex (folio 209v), as it is remarkable that Cassian is especially interested in determining 29 February and relevant information with respect to leap years: for this day was later stipulated as Cassian’s feast day.

Second, the fact that Cassian quotes a passage from Hippolytus of Thebes has important consequences. This unknown chronicler of Egypt was frequently confused with Hippolytus of Rome, especially when the name ‘Hippolytus’ appeared with no further specification in manuscripts. I deal with this person elsewhere. I only wish to note at this point that his appearance as part of this Codex makes him neither a seventh- nor an eighth-century figure (as Franz Diekamp had it), nor one later than the eleventh century, which is a prevailing opinion owing to specific misunderstandings. My own exploration has shown that not only was this Hippolytus earlier than Cassian’s times (which is plain), but indeed he was in all probability a fourth-century intellectual.

³⁹ John of Damascus, *Expositio Fidei*, 87. Beside Damascenus, only a Synaxarium explores this question, which otherwise was of no interest to authors. Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopoleos, *Synaxarium Mensis Septembris*, Day 8, section 1.

⁴⁰ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 246. Theon of Alexandria, *Υπόμνημα εἰς τοὺς Προχείρους Πτολεμαίου Κανόνας* (a commentary on Ptolemy’s ‘easy tables’, which provide quick calendar-solutions to the problems Cassian dealt with in those notes of his), pp. 257–276. Cf. Ptolemy of Alexandria (astronomer, astrologer, mathematician, philosopher second. cent.), *Προχείρων Κανόνων Διάταξις καὶ Ψηφοφορία*.

⁴¹ Ptolemy’s presence in Cassian’s *Scholia in Apocalypsin* is impressive. Cf. *Scholia*, XV; XXIX; XXXI; XXXIII; XXXIV.

⁴² Matthaeus Blastares (fourteenth cent.), *Collectio Alphabetica*, Alphabetic letter Pi, 7.

⁴³ Joel (chronicler, thirteenth cent.), *Chronographia Compendiaria*, p. 24. He also writes βίσεκτον for δίσεκτον.

⁴⁴ Matthaeus Blastares, *Collectio Alphabetica*, Alphabetic letter Beta, 13. Lemma: Περὶ βισέκτου. He advises that ‘all Roman words have β instead of δ’. This is how he uses the word himself throughout. Likewise, Acta Monasterii Theotoci Euergetae (eleventh-twelfth cent.), *Synaxarium*, Month 6, day 28. John Camaterus (astronomer, astrologer, twelfth cent.), *Introductio ad Astronomiam*, line 51. Michael Glycas, *Annales*, p. 379. Also in the anonymous astrological works, *Περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑπτὰ Πλανητῶν Εὐρέσεως*, v. 10, p. 70; *Paraphrasis Carminis de Terrae Motibus*, v. 5, p. 159.

The vernacular of the Codex

The colloquial *συνγ-*⁴⁵ (for *συγγ-*) occurs in Didymus.⁴⁶ This is also the vernacular of Pseudo-Caesarius⁴⁷ but of no other Christian author.

The colloquialism *ἐφ' ἴσης*,⁴⁸ instead of *ἐπίσης*, is a very rare one and means 'equally'. Lexicographer Hesychius of Alexandria (fifth/sixth century AD) seems to have been aware of this, but it is remarkable that it is used by a series of scholars related to the Laura of Sabas in one way or another, namely Cassian and his admirers Maximus Confessor, John of Damascus, and Theodore Studites. Similar instances of this vernacular form occur in the *Epistulae et Amphilochia* at two points, epistles 34 and 43, a fact that comes as further support for my argument that the epistles are wrongly attributed to Photius.⁴⁹ This form is also present in Pseudo-Caesarius, whom I have claimed to be Cassian himself. Two instances in Justinian's dogmatic writings⁵⁰ also point to the Laura of Sabas and the circle of abbot Gelasius, who composed the imperial edict against Origen.

The colloquial *σύνψηφοι*⁵¹ for *σύμψηφοι*, also appears in the magical papyri.

The spelling in the Codex *ἀφελπίσης*⁵² is an interesting colloquialism, which appears, among others, in Didymus⁵³ and Pseudo-Caesarius.⁵⁴

The colloquialism *ἀφιδιάζειν*⁵⁵ is used in a few instances, of which those in Cassian's professed admirers John Climacus and Theodore Studites are of special interest.⁵⁶ Furthermore, the rendering *ἀπιδιάζειν* is a peculiar word meaning 'to conduct a life in seclusion': it appears once in Gregory of Nyssa,⁵⁷ in Julian the Arian,⁵⁸ and in a spurious text,⁵⁹ all of which play an important role in the Scholia.

The colloquial *κακχασμοῖς*⁶⁰ (instead of *καρχασμοῖς*) is one more word occurring in the magical papyri and recorded by Hesychius of Alexandria.⁶¹ Not strangely, John of Damascus used this term, too.⁶²

The term *Βεζεβούλ*⁶³ used by Cassian⁶⁴ occurs only in Didymus, who uses the name *Βεζεβούλ* instead of *Βεελζεβούλ*.⁶⁵ This might well be owing to Didymus' works having been transcribed in Palestine, especially the *Fragmenta in Psalmos altera*, the authorship of which I discuss presently.

Christian authors and the Book of Revelation

Christian theologians have treated the book of Revelation as an authoritative one since early times. Justin Martyr was confident that the author of the book is 'a man who is one of us, whose name is John, and was a disciple of Christ, to whom an apocalypse was

⁴⁵ Cassian the Sabaite, *Const*, p. Cod. p. 19r.

⁴⁶ Didymus, *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 17 (*συνγένηται*); *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 240 (*συνγένηται*). Likewise, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 98 (*συνγραφικὸν*); *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 251 (*συνγραφικόν*); *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 7 (*συνγραφικός*); *ibid.* Cod. p. 7 (*συνγραφικός*); *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 49 (*συνγραφικόν*); *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 73 (*συνγράμμασιν*); *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 204 (*συνγνώστως*); *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 308 (*συνγραψαμένους*); *ibid.* Cod. p. 337 (*συνγραφεύς*); *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 91 (*συνγίνονται*).

⁴⁷ Caesarius, *QR*, 12.9 (*συνγεραιρούμενον*); 191.24 (*συνγεραυρεῖσθαι*); 11.43 and 163.15 (*συνγραφέων*); 139.61 (*συνγραφεύς*); 218.374 (*συνγραψάμενον*); 218.440 (*συνγράψας*).

⁴⁸ See Cassian the Sabaite, *OctoVit*, Cod. p. 33v.

⁴⁹ See *RCR*, pp. 20; 21; 80 (n. 132); 92; 180 (n. 212); 192; 200 (n. 349); 232 (n. 95); 318; 319; 399. *NDGF*, 230 (n. 47); 241 (n. 75); 371 (n. 44); 381 (n. 35); 407; 481; 485; 523 (n.485); 524 (n. 494); 568; 569; 587; 601 (n. 807); 603–5.

⁵⁰ Justinian, *Epistula contra Tria Capitula*, 63; *Edictum Rectae Fidei*, p. 150.

⁵¹ Cassian the Sabaite, *ScetPatr*, p. 66v: Οὗτος τοίνυν ὁ ὅρος καὶ ἡ γνώμη τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀντωνίου, ὃν καὶ σύνψηφοι οἱ λ < οἱ > ποὶ πατέρες ἐγένοντο.

⁵² Cassian the Sabaite, *ScetPatr*, p. 75v.

⁵³ Didymus, *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 26 (*ἀφελπισθεῖς*); *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 27 (*ἀφελπίσουσιν*); *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 142 (*ἀφελπίσει*).

⁵⁴ Caesarius, *QR*, 191 (*ἀφελπίζων*). See *NDGF*, App. I.

⁵⁵ Cassian the Sabaite, *ScetPatr*, p. 67r.

⁵⁶ Theodore Studites (eighth/ninth cent. AD), *Sermones Catecheseos Magnae*, Catechesis 62, p. 22 (*ἀφιδιάζόμενος*); *Parva Catechesis*, Catechesis 2 (*ἀφιδιάζειν*); Catechesis 71 (*ἀφιδιάζειν*, then *ἀφιδιάζόμενος*). Vitae Sancti Pauli Junioris, *Laudatio Sancti Pauli Junioris*, 11 (*τὴν ἀφιδιάζουσιν πολιτεῖαν*). There is one instance of the form *ἀπιδιάζειν* in John Climacus, *Scala Paradisi*, 832, line 12 (*τὸ μὴ ἀπιδιάζειν εὐσεβῶς*).

⁵⁷ Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 3.10.36 (*ἀπιδιάσαντος*).

⁵⁸ Julian the Arian, *In Job*, p. 316 (*ἀπιδιάσει*).

⁵⁹ *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaia*, 14.284 (ascribed to Basil of Caesarea) (*ἀπιδιαστικά*).

⁶⁰ Cassian the Sabaite, *SerenPrim*, p. 90r.

⁶¹ Hesychius of Alexandria (fifth/sixth cent. AD), *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter kappa: entries 369 (*καρχάζει*); 1931 (*καρχάζοι*); 1940, (*καρχάζει*). *Papyri Magicae*, (Preisendanz) number 13: lines 164 (*καρχάσαντος*); 172: (*καρχάσαι*); 191: (*καρχάσαντος*); 192: (*καρχάζων*); 475: (*καρχάσαντος*); 486: (*καρχάσαι*).

⁶² John of Damascus, *Passio Magni Martyris Artemii*, 59 (*κατακαρχάζειν*). Cf. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, 14.5 (*ἀνακαρχασάντων*). John Chrysostom, *De Babyla Contra Julianum et Gentiles*, 17 (*ἀνακαρχάζοντες*).

⁶³ Cf. Matt. 12:24.

⁶⁴ Cassian the Sabaite, *De Panareto*, p. 108r.

⁶⁵ Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 369; *commPs* 29–34, Cod. pp. 145; 147; *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. pp. 294; 304; *frPs(al)*, fr. 662a.

revealed'.⁶⁶ Likewise, it is attested that the apologist Melito of Sardis drew on the Apocalypse in order to make a point on the devil.⁶⁷ Irenaeus, a theologian who took a special interest in the composition of the canon, quotes from Rev. 5:8, along with other quotations from both testaments, in order to make a certain point.⁶⁸

The apologist Papias of Hierapolis, writing in the first third of the second century, asserted that the book of Revelation is both a divinely inspired one (τοῦ θεοπνεύστου τῆς βίβλου) and trustworthy (ἀξιόπιστον). He is normally listed as the most ancient in the series of theologians who are attested as having urged this view ('Papias, Irenaeus, Methodius, Hippolytus, Gregory the Theologian, and Cyril' of Alexandria).⁶⁹ Arethas mentions him as one of those assenting to 'the divinely inspired book' (τοῦ θεοπνεύστου τῆς βίβλου): 'Basil of Caesarea, Gregory the divine, Cyril, Papias, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, the Church fathers'. Although by and large reproducing the text of Andreas, Arethas added the name of Basil of Caesarea and omitted that of Methodius of Olympus.⁷⁰ As a matter of fact, Papias is attested (though not unanimously) as having been an immediate pupil (αὐτήκοον) of John, 'whom he [viz. Papias] mentioned at many points' in respect of the authorship of Revelation.⁷¹ Besides, in an epistle allegedly addressed to the people of Tarsus, Ignatius of Antioch is represented as approving of Revelation, since a text ascribed to him confidently advises that John the Evangelist 'fled to Patmos'.⁷² A valuable catalogue of authors accepting

Revelation is also supplied by Nicetas of Paphlagonia (see below).

According to existing testimonies, Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–215) accepted the authority of the apocalyptic book. He was inclined to allegorical interpretation anyway.⁷³ He cites this book,⁷⁴ whereas Maximus Confessor tells us that he read in Clement's fifth book of the *Hypotyposes* arguments based on the same revelation by John.⁷⁵ Besides, a later scholiast of Clement attests to having read in his work the same acceptance of the authority and canonicity of Revelation.⁷⁶ Clement also employs the story circulating about John, according to which 'once the tyrant [Domitian] died, John returned to Ephesus from the isle of Patmos' (τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου τῆς νήσου μετῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἔφεσον)⁷⁷ and preached in neighbouring regions. He is supposed to have ordained bishops, and some stories on his life are preserved by Clement in that treatise of his. He proclaims staunchly that this story about 'John the apostle' is not a 'myth', but sound testimony treasured by historical 'memory' (ἄκουσον μῦθον οὐ μῦθον, ἀλλὰ ὄντα λόγον περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου παραδεδομένον καὶ μνήμη πεφυλαγμένον).⁷⁸

Eusebius (c. 265–c. 339/40), apparently acting as a historian of conscience, recorded this testimony of Clement's to the letter along with one by Irenaeus. He seems to employ the information about John having returned to Ephesus 'following the death of Domitian'. Eusebius refers to both testimonies respectfully, adding

⁶⁶ Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 81.4: καὶ ἔπειτα καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνὴρ τις, ὃ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένη αὐτῷ.

⁶⁷ Melito of Sardis, *Fragmenta*, fr. 5 (title): Μερίτωνος (Περὶ τοῦ Διαβόλου καὶ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου), *apud* Eusebius, *HE*, 4.26.2.

⁶⁸ Irenaeus, *Fragmenta*, Fr. 36: ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει λέγει· Τὰ θυμιάματά εἰσιν αἱ προσευχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων.

⁶⁹ Papias, *Fragmenta*, fr. 5.1, *apud* Andreas of Caesarea (n. 9 above), PG.106.220.

⁷⁰ Arethas, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, PG.106.494.

⁷¹ Papias, *Fragmenta*, Fr. 2.6–7; Fr. 7, *apud* Eusebius, *HE*, 3.39.7.

⁷² Pseudo-Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistulae Interpolatae et Epistulae Suppositiciae*, Epistle 4.3.3: Ἰωάννης δὲ ἐφυγαδεύετο ἐν Πάτμῳ.

⁷³ Clement's genuine erudition allowed him to allegorize using at the same time pagan and Christian symbols. In his *Paedagogus*, 1.6.43.4, he takes 'milk' to stand for the word of God (Heb. 5:12–13; 1 Peter 2:2), associates this with the 'bosom of the Father' (John, 1:18), and interprets *Iliad*, XXII.83, where Hector's mother reminds him of having given him the 'banishing care' of her 'breast', which prevented all harm (λαθικηδέα μαζόν), to lull his pain.

Clement quotes the Homeric expression itself. I am not sure whether P. Canivet had this in mind (*Histoire d'une entreprise apologétique au V^e siècle*, Paris, 1957, p. 147) when he said that Clement provided by his allegorical interpretation 'un exemple très curieux de cette méthode, utilisant simultanément des textes bibliques et profanes'. He refers the reader to '*Pédagogue*, II, 10, 114, 4' of O. Stählin's edition, which is not available to me; but I know that such a *locus* as II, 10, 114, 4 does not exist.

⁷⁴ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 6.13.106.2: ὡς φησιν ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννης. In *Pedagogus*, 2.10.108.3, he quotes Rev. 6:11 along with Daniel 7:9.

⁷⁵ Clement of Alexandria, *Fragmenta*, fr. 5: Λέγει δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ἀγγέλους ὁ θεὸς Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει, καὶ ἐπὶ εἶναι τοὺς πρώτους ἐν τῷ Τωβία ἀνέγνωμεν καὶ παρὰ Κλήμεντι βιβλίῳ ε' τῶν Ὑποτυπώσεων.

⁷⁶ *Scholia in Clementis Protrepticum et Paedagogum*, p. 333: ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις] ἡ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ θεολόγου. ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις] σημειῶσαι ὅτι ὡς ἐγκεκριμένης μέμνηται τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως.

⁷⁷ Clement of Alexandria, *Quis Salvetur Dives*, 42.2.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 1–2.

that they should be regarded as trustworthy, since their authors embraced ‘the ecclesiastical orthodoxy’. He first quotes a portion from Irenaeus’ ‘second book against the heresies’, ‘which he also does in the third book of the same treatise’: according to Irenaeus, ‘all the presbyters of Asia’ attest that John returned and ‘lived with its people until the times of Trajan’. Coming to Clement, Eusebius notes that not only does Clement agree with Irenaeus, but in his work entitled *Quis Salvetur Dives* (*Who is the saved rich man*), he also added a story ‘which is most welcome to those who love to hear whatever is good and beneficial’. He then goes on to quote the foregoing section from Clement’s *Quis Salvetur Dives*.⁷⁹ According to another testimony by Eusebius, the anti-Montanist ecclesiastical writer Apollonius of Ephesus (second/third century, *fl.* 180–210) made use of the Revelation of John (κέχρηται δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψεως),⁸⁰ in order to sustain his polemic against the heretics.⁸¹

During the same period, Hippolytus (c. 170–c. 236) was categorical in arguing not only for the authority of Revelation, but also for its authorship by ‘John, the apostle and disciple of the Lord’, who ‘saw a revelation of awful mysteries on the isle of Patmos’.⁸² Later chroniclers, such as George Syncellus of Constantinople (eighth/ninth century), report that Hippolytus wrote a commentary on Revelation among other commentaries on scriptural books (Genesis as well as ‘Ezekiel, Daniel, and many prophets, and on different books of both old and new scriptures, among which is the Revelation of John in Patmos’). One should notice that Syncellus

specifies only this book ‘of the new scriptures’, whereas he supplies several titles from the ‘old’ ones. He is also accurate in placing the floruit of Hippolytus in the year 215. Syncellus is also one of the chroniclers reporting the influence that Hippolytus exerted upon Origen, whom he urged to compose his own commentaries.⁸³ That Hippolytus had sanctioned the book of Revelation is also reported by Nicetas of Paphlagonia, who supplied us with a valuable catalogue of Christian theologians sharing this view.⁸⁴ This catalogue lists the names of Polycarp of Smyrna,⁸⁵ Irenaeus (claiming them both to be immediate ‘disciples of apostle John’), Hippolytus (who is styled ‘a martyr’), Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzus (mentioning his *Syntacterion* oration discussed below), Ephraem Syrus, John Chrysostom,⁸⁶ Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius of Salamis (‘Epiphanius of Cyprus’), ‘and many others’.⁸⁷ I am going to discuss evidence about each one of them later. For now, it should be inferred that authors who drew on Revelation in order to make a point, should be considered to be allowing for the authority of the book, implicitly at least. For example, as canvassed in [EN IVc](#), quotation of the expression of Revelation, ‘He who is, and who was, and who is to come’ (ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος),⁸⁸ in effect provides a catalogue of theologians who allowed for the scriptural authority of the Book of Revelation. This catalogue includes Hippolytus, Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Alexandria, the author of (Pseudo-Didymus) *De Trinitate* (= Cassian himself),⁸⁹ Ephraem Syrus, Didymus, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.

⁷⁹ Eusebius, *HE*, 3.23.1–19.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 5.18.14.

⁸¹ Apollonius of Ephesus (second–third cent.), *Fragmenta Adversus Montanistas*, Fr. 7, *apud* Eusebius (n. 79 above). Apollonius wrote against the Phrygian Montanists and the unknown author of *Praedestinatus* says he was a bishop of Ephesus, which though is not otherwise attested. Beyond Eusebius citing him, Apollonius was praised by Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, 40.

⁸² Hippolytus, *De antichristo*, 36: οὗτος γάρ [scil. Ἰωάννης] ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ ὣν ὁρᾷ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίων φρικτῶν, ἅτινα διηγούμενος ἀφθόνως καὶ ἐτέρους διδάσκει. λέγε μοι, ὦ μακάριε Ἰωάννη, ἀπόστολε καὶ μαθητὰ τοῦ κυρίου. Cf. Hippolytus quoting from Revelation: *In Danielelem*, 3.9.10; 4.22.3; 4.23.5; (obliquely, about the number of the beast) 4.49.2; *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* (*Philosophumena*), 7.36.3.

⁸³ George Syncellus (chronicler, eighth–ninth cent, Constantinople), *Ecloga Chronographica*, p. 438: Ἰππόλυτος ἱερὸς φιλόσοφος ἐπίσκοπος Πόρτου κατὰ τὴν Ῥώμην σφόδρα διαπρεπῶς ἦνθαι ἐν τῇ κατὰ Χριστὸν φιλοσοφίᾳ, πλείστα ψυχωφελῆ συντάττων ὑπομνήματα. εἷς τε γὰρ τὴν ἑξαήμερον καὶ εἰς τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον, εἰς πολλὰ τε τῶν προφητῶν, μάλιστα Ἰεζεκιὴλ καὶ Δανιὴλ τῶν μεγάλων, ἔτι μὴν εἰς τὰ ὅσματα καὶ εἰς ἄλλας

παντοίας παλαιάς καὶ νέας γραφάς, ἐν οἷς καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐν Πάτμῳ τοῦ θεολόγου ἀποκάλυψιν, πρὸς Μαρκίωνα καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς αἱρέσεις, καὶ τὸν ἐξκαιδεκαετηρικὸν τοῦ πάσχα κανόνα ἐξέθετο περιγράφας εἰς τὸ α΄ ἔτος Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μαμμαίας τούτου, καὶ συντόμως φάναι θεοφράδης ποταμὸς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ζώντων ναμάτων γέγονε, τὸν μαρτυρικὸν περιθέμενος στέφανον πρὸς τῷ τέλει.

⁸⁴ Nicetas of Paphlagonia (or Nicetas David or Nicetas the philosopher), *Orationes*, Oration 2. Nicetas was a Christian scholar and grammarian of ninth–tenth century. He was among the so-called *zealots*, the followers of Patriarch Ignatius. He wrote a *Life of Ignatius*, in an apologetic mode and in tendency hostile to Photius. He also wrote laudatory orations, hymns, and poems.

⁸⁵ The text has it ‘Carpus (Κάρπος) bishop of Smyrna’, which is evidently a mistake. Carpus was one among the seventy apostles who followed Paul and became the bishop of Veroia in Macedonia (or, Veroe in Thrace). Nicetas of Paphlagonia (n. 84 above).

⁸⁶ This is inaccurate; see below.

⁸⁷ Nicetas of Paphlagonia (n. 84 above).

⁸⁸ Rev. 1:4; 1:8; 4:8.

⁸⁹ See, *NDGF*, Appendix II.

Then comes Origen (currently thought c. 185–254), who not only upheld Revelation as a divinely inspired canonical book, but also quoted extensively from it, thus making himself a valuable source for New Testament scholarship.⁹⁰ As a matter of fact, the celebrated passage of Gregory of Nazianzus about ‘angels’ each of which is assigned with ‘supervising a certain local church’⁹¹ is Origen’s idea, which Gregory entertained in the same terms.⁹²

Although Methodius of Olympus and Gregory of Nyssa are appealed to as writers who recognized the authority of Revelation⁹³ (since they wrote commentaries on it), passages in their writings which make mention of the apocalyptic book are scarce.⁹⁴ Gregory nevertheless includes John in the ‘choir’ of ‘prophets’ along with some other apostles,⁹⁵ evidently because Revelation was regarded as a ‘prophecy’. On this, he probably followed Origen, who was the first to declare that John the Evangelist was ‘a prophet’ (ὁ ἀπόστολος καὶ ὁ εὐαγγελιστής, ἥδη δὲ καὶ διὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ προφητείας) on account of the vision of the Apocalypse.⁹⁶ At any rate, Nicetas of Paphlagonia includes both Methodius and Gregory in the catalogue of theologians who favoured the canonicity of the book.⁹⁷

The first author to approach the Book of Revelation as a historian rather than theologian was Eusebius. Notwithstanding his enormous admiration for Origen, he endeavoured to be accurate in reporting the controversy surrounding the authorship and authority of the book. In any case, he is loath to attribute it explicitly to John the Evangelist. In his history, he wrote an entire section ‘about John the apostle and the Revelation’ (Περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως).⁹⁸

At this point of his narration, Eusebius evidently distances himself from Irenaeus’ affirmation of the authority of the book. He only styles it ‘the so-called Revelation of John’ (ἐν τῇ Ἰωάννου λεγομένη Ἀποκαλύψει),⁹⁹ though at that point the main issue is not the authorship, but the dating of the controversial book. The question of determining which books are really ‘divine’ (θείων γραφῶν) comes up later. With such an array of earlier authorities espousing the canonicity of Revelation, Eusebius could hardly have afforded not to concur, which he does, though out of deference rather than conviction. His chapter ‘on the books that are either accredited or rejected as divine ones’ shows his approach. His own canon, as it were, includes the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles of Paul, the first epistle by John and the first epistle by Peter. ‘Beside them, if one would like to concede this (εἴ γε φανείη), the Revelation of John [might be included], on which we are going to expound different views in due course’ (ἐπὶ τούτοις τακτέον, εἴ γε φανείη, τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου, περὶ ἧς τὰ δόξαντα κατὰ καιρὸν ἐκθησόμεθα).¹⁰⁰ However, there is more: Eusebius goes on to books which are considered spurious. ‘Among these spurious books, one should place the Acts of Paul, the so-called *Pastor*, and the Revelation of Peter, plus the circulated Epistle of Barnabas, the so-called Constitutions of the Apostles, as well as the Revelation of John, if one could allow for this (εἴ γε φανείη), which, as I have said, some people reject, while others approve as one of the acknowledged books. Besides, in these books that have been accepted, some people have already included the gospel according to the Hebrews, which pleases most of the Hebrews who have embraced Christ.’ In fact, never did Eusebius say explicitly that the Revelation of John is controversial. While placing it

⁹⁰ Cf. Origen drawing on Revelation: *Cels*, VI.23; *commJohn*, X.42.295; *frPs*, 23, 10; *selEz*, PG.13: 772.48–51; 781.33–41. Quotations from Rev. along with comments: *Cels*, VIII.17; *commJohn*, I.1.1–8; I.14.84; I.22.132; II.5.42; *homJer*, 9.2; *frJer*, 68; *Homiliae in Lucam*, Homily 13, p. 80; *frLuc*, 209; *Philocalia*, 2.1; *Homiliae in Ezechielem*, p. 452; *commMatt*, 16.6; *selPs*, PG.12.1077.1–31; *selEz*, PG.13.797.30–34; *excPs*, PG.17.116.23–27.

⁹¹ See below.

⁹² Origen, *deOr*, XI.3: ὡς καὶ προεστῶτάς τινας τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἁγγέλους λέγεσθαι παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει.

⁹³ Methodius is cited by Andreas of Caesarea and Arethas, as we saw a moment ago. About Gregory of Nyssa, see below.

⁹⁴ Methodius of Olympus, *Symposium*, Oration 1.5; also, Orations 6.5; 8.4; 8.7. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 114.

⁹⁵ Gregory of Nyssa, *In Basilium Fratrem*, 1: πρῶτον ἡμῖν ἀπόστολοί τε καὶ προφῆται τῆς πνευματικῆς χοροστασίας κατήρξαντο. τὰ δύο γὰρ πάντως περὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐσσι χαρίσματα, τὸ τε ἀποστολικὸν πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ τῆς προφητείας. εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι: Στέφανος, Πέτρος, Ἰάκωβος, Ἰωάννης, Παῦλος.

⁹⁶ Origen, *commJohn*, II.5.45: Καλῶς μέντοι γε διαγράφων τὰ περὶ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει ὁ ἀπόστολος καὶ ὁ εὐαγγελιστής, ἥδη δὲ καὶ διὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ προφητείας, φησὶ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον ἐωρακέναι ἐν ἀνεργότι τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐφ’ ἵππῳ λευκῷ ὀχοῦμενον.

⁹⁷ Nicetas of Paphlagonia (n. 84 above). He adds that Methodius (whom he styles ‘the bishop of Patara’) died a martyr.

⁹⁸ Eusebius, *HE*, 3, table of contents, and then 3.18.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.* 3.18.2 and 3.25. 4.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* 3.25.2–3.

on a par with such disputed texts as the gospel according to the Hebrews, he seeks to please both parties: when listing the book as either sanctioned or not, in both instances he uses the same expression: ‘if one would like to concede this’ (εἴ φανείη). In other words, to regard (or not to regard) the book of Revelation as an authoritative one is a matter of personal choice.¹⁰¹ Reading this identical expression twice, each time addressed to stridently opposed parties with respect to the authority of Revelation, one cannot help but recall the title of Luigi Pirandello’s play *Così è (se vi pare)*. This notwithstanding, Eusebius draws on this book, seeking historical evidence on issues such as the whereabouts of Cerinthus or the heresy of the Nicolaitans.¹⁰²

Seeking to be an accurate historian, Eusebius recorded the views of Irenaeus on Revelation, reporting that the ancient father authorized as canonical books not only Revelation, but also the *Pastor* of Hermas, the first Epistle of John, and the Wisdom of Solomon.¹⁰³ He did the same appealing to ‘the words of Justin’,¹⁰⁴ who ‘clearly preached that this is the work of the apostle’.¹⁰⁵ Likewise, referring to Theophilus of Antioch, he made special mention of him, who, in his polemical work against the heresy of Hermogenes, availed himself ‘of evidence from the Apocalypse of John’ (ἐν ᾧ ἐκ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου κέχρηται μαρτυρίαις).¹⁰⁶ Melito of Sardis is likewise attested to have drawn on Revelation, in order to tackle the topic of the devil.¹⁰⁷

When Eusebius comes to record the life of Dionysius of Alexandria, he has to deal with the same point: ‘On the Revelation of John’ is the title of a section,¹⁰⁸ which expounds Dionysius’ argument dismissing the idea that John the Evangelist was the author. While Dionysius does not espouse the hearsay that Revelation was

the work of the heretic Cerinthus,¹⁰⁹ he disputes the view that this specific ‘John’, the writer of Revelation, was actually the disciple of Jesus: he is argued to have been simply another John, indeed one of the presbyters of Ephesus. Once Eusebius recorded this testimony, the argument was dignified in effect with everlasting value: the views of Dionysius¹¹⁰ have always been, and still are, reproduced by those who dispute the authenticity of its authorship.

The ambivalent attitude of Eusebius toward the Book of Revelation is interesting. In the beginning of his history he is reserved and impartial, yet his personal doubts about the authority of the book can hardly be concealed behind the ostensible scholarly impartiality. Then he produces a subsequent section (Book 7 of his History) in order to allow Dionysius of Alexandria to voice his own doubts and arguments against the authorship of the book. These arguments are sound and solid, expressed in a mild manner; they are neither combative nor aggressive, which is why they still remain the same ones used by those who dispute that John the disciple was the author of the book. One should have thought that the structure itself of Eusebius’ exposition with respect to the authority of the book favours the views of Dionysius. I believe that this is the reason why commentators on the Apocalypse such as Oecumenius and Andreas of Caesarea, who reserved numerous exalting epithets for other previous theologians (‘divine’, ‘blessed’, and the like), mentioned Eusebius simply by his name and only as a historian, never as a theologian.¹¹¹ It is then rather unexpected that Eusebius cites Revelation while writing as a theologian.¹¹² A striking instance appears in his commentary on Isaiah, where he quotes from Revelation, in order to show that the book is in accord with the rest of scriptural proclamations.¹¹³ However, the

¹⁰¹ Ibid. 3.25.3–5.

¹⁰² Ibid. 3.28 & 29.

¹⁰³ Ibid. 5.8.5–7.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. 4.18.1.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. 4.18.8.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid. 4.24.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. 4.26.2.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. 7.25.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Gaius (Roman theologian, third cent.) *apud* Eusebius, *HE*, 3.28.2. Cf. *ibid.* 3.28.3; 3.29.1; 7.25.2.

¹¹⁰ Ibid. 7.25.1–27.

¹¹¹ Cf. Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin* (simply ‘Eusebius’), pp. 39; 61; 188; (‘Eusebius of Pamphilus’), p. 259; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Galatas*, (‘Eusebius of Pamphilus’), p. 446. Andreas of Caesarea (n. 9 above), PG.106.269.19.

¹¹² Eusebius, *DE*, 8.2.31 quoting from Rev. 5:5. There is also a testimony representing Eusebius assenting to John having lived in exile in Patmos: Eusebius, *Fragmenta in Lucam*, PG.24.537.42–43.

¹¹³ Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.34: ὑπομνήσκει δὲ αὐτοὺς τῆς ἑαυτοῦ θεολογίας πρῶτον καὶ ἔσχατον εἶναι ἑαυτὸν λέγων. διὸ κατὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς εἴρηται· ἐγὼ πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ ἔσχατος. εἴρηται δὲ πον περὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος, καί· τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ω. πῶς δὲ πρῶτος καὶ πῶς ἔσχατος, ἐξῆς διασαφεῖ φάσκων· ὁ ζῶν, καὶ ἐγενόμενος νεκρός. ἀρχὴ μὲν γὰρ ζωῆς αὐτός, ὅτι αὐτός ἦν ἡ ζωὴ, καὶ ἔσχατος δὲ πάλιν αὐτός, ἐπεὶ ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν καὶ γενόμενος ὑπήκοος τῷ πατρὶ ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.

enthusiastic admirers of the authenticity of the book of Revelation evidently found such quotations by Eusebius too few and too late. His impartiality as a historian was viewed as merely ostensible, indeed as the chaste veneer enshrouding his antipathy to the book of Revelation.

Eusebius was by and large a conscientious historian, which is what inspired respect in Theodoret (c. 386–d. after 457), who also acted as a historian. Nevertheless, for all his respect for Eusebius, Theodoret records with remarkable accuracy how the Bishop of Caesarea wavered with respect to Arianism and how he eventually came to opt for the Nicene orthodoxy.¹¹⁴ By the same token, philological analysis of Cassian's vocabulary reveals an extensive reliance on Eusebius' writings. A distinction should be made, however. There is a difference between Eusebius writing either as a historian or as a theologian. The former writes with respect for facts, though he is presumably sometimes prone to make some room for accounts which contribute to the institutional stability and authority of the Church, accounts which are not supported by facts. It is strange, yet indicative of Eusebius' autonomy as a historian, that he had written extensively on Origen's views of the ecclesiastical canon and the 'books which belong to the Testaments' (ἐνδιαθήκους βίβλους,¹¹⁵ or ἐνδιαθήκους γραφάς).¹¹⁶ The term ἐνδιάθηκος remained for centuries a neologism introduced by Origen and was employed only by Eusebius, until it was adopted in later Byzantine writings. On the other hand, Eusebius expressed his own views on Revelation and John himself as its possible author. In fact, however, his attitude was ambivalent. As a historian, he sought to be accurate, reasonable, and fair. As a theologian, he was an ardent admirer of Origen and at times, although writing as a historian, he indulged his fondness for Origen. To cite an instance, he never mentions

Methodius of Olympus, who is renowned for his vitriolic attacks on Origen rather than his own theological aptitude. It seems that, as a theologian, Eusebius eventually accepted Revelation as an authoritative book, no doubt yielding to the genius of Origen, who sanctioned the book. Nevertheless, his statements as a historian gave some ammunition to those who disputed that John the Evangelist was its author. The sixth-century Alexandrian author Cosmas Indicopleustes purports to quote from Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (mentioning both the author and the work), in order to remind the reader that, according to this history, 'in Ephesus there are two tombs, one of John the Evangelist and another presbyter John, who wrote the two [out of three] catholic epistles'.¹¹⁷ This was in fact an inference by Eusebius himself quoting Papias, who had mentioned two Johns – one among the names of the apostles, and another one 'the presbyter'. Papias mentioned the latter after 'Aristion, who was another disciple of the Lord'.¹¹⁸ Following this, Eusebius inferred that since Papias mentioned another John beside the Evangelist, and this second 'John the presbyter' was mentioned subsequent to Aristion, one should infer that there were two Johns in Ephesus. The latter was a 'presbyter', which suggests that he was inferior to Aristion in the hierarchy of the Church. Therefore, the ancient story about 'two Johns', each of whom had his own tomb, is shown to be true on the showing of Papias himself. Consequently, it would be natural to believe that the second (presbyter) 'John was the one who saw the vision of the Apocalypse, which circulates under the name of John',¹¹⁹ not to mention that the first and second epistles of John were written by a writer styling himself a 'presbyter'. Since Papias had claimed that he had been the pupil of both Aristion and John (the presbyter), Eusebius, as a historian reporting and assessing facts, is plausibly not prepared to

¹¹⁴ Theodoret, *HE*, pp. 2; 37f.

¹¹⁵ An expression of Origen himself: *deOr*, XIV.4; *Philocalia*, 3.1; *selPs*, PG.12.1084.8. Eusebius, *HE*, 6.25.1. The expression ἐνδιάθηκος βίβλος was not adopted by any of the subsequent Christian authors, save Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana*, 7.68: he borrowed this from Eusebius, whom he mentioned and quoted at this specific point.

¹¹⁶ The expression was made up by Eusebius paraphrasing Origen, and remained exclusive to him: *HE*, 3.3.3; 3.9.5; 3.25.6; 5.8.1; 6. Table of Contents; 6.14.1.

¹¹⁷ Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana*, 7.68, quoting from Eusebius, *HE*, 3.39.6–7 (quoting Papias, *Fragmenta*, fr. 2). Eusebius makes the same point *ibid.* 7.25.16.

¹¹⁸ Eusebius, *HE*, 3.39.6.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.* 3.39.6–7: ὥς καὶ διὰ τούτων ἀποδείκνυσθαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀληθῆ τῶν δύο κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ὁμωνυμία κεχρησθαι εἰρηκότων δύο τε ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου ἔτι νῦν λέγεσθαι· οἷς καὶ ἀναγκαῖον προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν, εἰκὸς γὰρ τὸν δεῦτερον, εἰ μὴ τις ἐθέλοι τὸν πρῶτον, τὴν ἐπ' ὀνόματος φερομένην Ἰωάννου ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακέναι. Cf. *op. cit.* 7.25.16: ἄλλον δὲ τινα οἶμαι τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ γενομένων, ἐπεὶ καὶ δύο φασὶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου λέγεσθαι.

reject out of hand the possibility of another John having written Revelation. However, his approach as a theologian, indeed as a pupil of Origen, is a quite different story.

When Epiphanius of Salamis (c. 310/20–403) launched a vehement attack on those who rejected the authority of Revelation, he assailed also those ‘heretics of Phrygia’, against whom Apollonius of Ephesus had also written.¹²⁰ In this context, he quotes some of their arguments in order to refute them. Coming to the ancient argument about the difference in style of the Joannine writings, his retort is plain. He abides by the *theological* voice emerging out of them, rather than sticking to scrutiny of words and style, hence arguing that the Gospel, the Apocalypse, and the epistles of John, are all in agreement with each other and written by one and the same person. Consequently, in order to sanction Revelation as a canonical book,¹²¹ he is concerned with the theological purport rather than the style of the text. Epiphanius is therefore a staunch defender of the scriptural authority of Revelation, and his extensive quotations from this text are valuable for a critical exploration of it. It then hardly comes as a surprise that Andreas of Caesarea reserved for Epiphanius of Salamis the laudatory descriptions: he is the ‘great Epiphanius’,¹²² the ‘blessed Epiphanius’,¹²³ the ‘saint Epiphanius’.¹²⁴ Why is that so? Evidently, because he was a staunch defender of Revelation as a work by the Evangelist.

This could explain why Cassian set out to assess the theological authority of the Apocalypse by annotating the Revelation text. Both this book and the rest of the scripture (old and new) speak with one voice. The

entire purport of all of the Scholia is plain: if the text of Revelation is examined passage by passage, it is shown to be entirely in agreement with the whole of scripture. Cassian simply followed Epiphanius’ argument, and all he did was to prove this true by commenting on Revelation passage by passage.

Epiphanius of Salamis, who saw himself as the grand inquisitor who had taken over from Irenaeus and Hippolytus, reports that the heretics known as *Alogoi*¹²⁵ dismiss not only the gospel of John, but also his book of Revelation.¹²⁶ To him, this book was a source of theological inspiration and an authority to appeal to.¹²⁷ Despite his vitriolic attacks on Origen, he went so far as to quote extensive sections where the Alexandrian had advanced the thesis that this is a canonical book.¹²⁸

Epiphanius embarked also on allegorical exegeses of delicate portions of Revelation (such as Rev. 20: 2–7, about the ‘a thousand years’), in order to reject any implication that Millenarism was professed by this book. This is the point supplying him with the opportunity to proclaim that ‘it is plain that the Revelation of John is a book believed by most people, indeed by the pious ones. And when those “most” and “pious” people read this book’ they are able to comprehend it in a spiritual sense and discover the deeper truths lying hidden therein. For the spiritual truth expressed through the phrase ‘a thousand years’ is stated ‘in a profound and mystical manner’, it actually involves not a simple numbering of years, ‘but many other truths’.¹²⁹ Since these ‘truths’ are also present throughout the scripture, although in a concealed manner, Epiphanius infers that this fact is itself a proof, making Revelation an integral part of scripture, and

¹²⁰ See above, p. 12 and note 81.

¹²¹ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, pp. 306–8, esp. p. 308: Ἐπαίρονται δὲ πάλιν τῇ διανοίᾳ οἱ αὐτοὶ λεξιθηροῦντες ἀπείρως, ἵνα δόξωσι παρεκβάλλειν τὰ τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου βιβλία, φημί δὲ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου τό τε εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν (τάχα δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολάς· συνάδουσι γὰρ καὶ αὐταὶ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ καὶ τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει).

¹²² Andreas of Caesarea, (n. 9 above) PG.106.253.34.

¹²³ Andreas of Caesarea, (n. 9 above) PG.106.224.55: ‘by the blessed (τῷ μακαρίῳ) Epiphanius’; PG.106.232.33: ‘the blessed Irenaeus and Epiphanius’. Likewise, Andreas of Caesarea, *Therapeutica*, 1: ‘the blessed (ὁ μακάριος) Epiphanius’.

¹²⁴ Andreas of Caesarea, (n. 9 above) PG.106.437.22: τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἐπιφανίῳ.

¹²⁵ Ἄλογοι: those who reject the theology of the Logos.

¹²⁶ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 1, pp. 158; 160; v. 2, pp. 248; 250; 305; 306; 308; *Ancoratus*, 13.5. Pseudo-Epiphanius of Salamis, *De xx Haeresibus*, v. 2, p. 212.

¹²⁷ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 1, p. 269; v. 2, pp. 232; 306; 310; 416; v. 3, pp. 369; 462; 463.

¹²⁸ Cf. Epiphanius quoting from ‘the beginning of Origen’s commentary on the First Psalm’: *Panarion*, v. 2, pp. 414f. From this book of Origen’s Eusebius had quoted, too: Eusebius, *HE*, 6.25.1–2. This quotation by Eusebius was preserved by the *Suda* lexicon, Alphabetic letter omega, entry 182.

¹²⁹ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 449: Καὶ ὅτι μὲν γέγραπται περὶ τῆς χιλιονταετηρίδος ταύτης [ὅτι] ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννου καὶ ὅτι παρὰ πλείστοις ἐστὶν ἡ βίβλος πεπιστευμένη καὶ παρὰ τοῖς θεοσεβέσι, δῆλον. τὴν δὲ βίβλον ἀναγινώσκοντες οἱ πλείστοι καὶ εὐλαβεῖς, περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν εἰδότες καὶ ἅ· ἐν αὐτῇ πνευματικῶς ἔχοντα πνευματικῶς λαμβάνοντες ἀληθῆ μὲν ὄντα, ἐν βαθύτητι δὲ σαφηνιζόμενα πεπιστεύκασιν. οὐ μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο ἐκεῖ βαθέως εἴρηται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλα πολλά. Following this point, Epiphanius produces an allegorical exegesis of the notion of ‘a thousand years’, of course rejecting Millenarism.

therefore of the New Testament canon. As already noted, and also argued later, this was the purpose of Cassian in composing his Scholia: he aims to explain each passage of Revelation in such a way as to convey the same message as passages which he cites from both Testaments. His method and argument are plain: if Revelation contains the same ideas as both Testaments do, why should it not be a canonical book?

In spite of all the authorities who had sanctioned Revelation, Eusebius' exposition in effect counterbalanced them. On the face of it, with the passage of time, the question of authority looked as though it remained moot. The acceptance of the book had taken root in the Church, but so had criticism, which the author of the Scholia did not espouse. As late as the sixth century, both Oecumenius and Andreas were eager to engage in a name-dropping of authorities embracing Revelation, which only evinces that even by that time no unanimity on the book's authority had been reached. Cassian therefore felt it incumbent on him to redeem the text not only from the scepticism of the erudite, but also from the vagaries of public opinion. He comments on portions of Revelation, supporting or explaining them by means of other scriptural passages selected invariably from both Testaments. The aim was to establish divine writing as opposed to spurious writing. Since the theology flowing from Revelation is shown to be parallel and concordant with that of the rest of scripture, this makes Revelation a constitutive element of the canon.

I am now coming to Didymus' approach to Revelation. Quite plainly, the Alexandrian sage (310/13–c. 398) considered this book to be an indisputable part of the scripture. To him there is no question of the canonicity of this book. When he expounds the notion of 'gold' betokening 'the intelligible things', which is a notion that can 'be found at not many points of scripture' (οὐ πολλαχού τῆς γραφῆς), he quotes from the Book of Revelation in order to buttress his argument.¹³⁰ The ideas of 'scripture' and of 'Revelation' are inherently interwoven with each other.

Didymus attests to having written himself an *ad hoc* Commentary on the Apocalypse.¹³¹ At the point where he indicates this, he treats this book as a canonical one. He was keen to explore the symbolism of divine numerology, which is an echo of Pythagoreanism within Christianity. At one point, he tells us that he has explained 'the divine truths betokened by means of numbers, which [truths] are scattered throughout scripture' (τὰ περὶ τῶν ἀριθμῶν θεῖα θεωρήματα ἐπεσπαρμένα τῇ γραφῇ) in two previous works of his. These works are the 'commentaries on the Apocalypse of John and on Paul's Epistle to the Romans'.¹³² He entertains this divine numerology also at others points in connection with Revelation, regarding this as a text which demonstrates the significance of specific numbers occurring in scripture.¹³³

Didymus points out a special feature of Revelation: this is the only book¹³⁴ of the New Testament where the epithet Pantocrator (Παντοκράτωρ) is applied to Christ.¹³⁵ Therefore, this book is of special value in the battle against the Gnostics, for it establishes a link between the two Testaments, since the designation Παντοκράτωρ appears in scores of instances in the Old Testament. Thus Revelation provides further support for the doctrine of the Church, according to which God who spoke to the holy men of the Old Testament was actually God the Logos, the second Person of the Trinity. The term Παντοκράτωρ in the Apocalypse is therefore a valuable link between the two testaments, which contributes to securing the continuity and unity of scripture. Whenever Didymus finds it suitable, he considers passages from Revelation juxtaposed with ones of the Old Testament, being satisfied that in this way he secures the unity of scripture. For instance, the passage Zachariah, 14:5–7 is regarded as a parallel to Rev. 1:7. Didymus has no doubt that the eschatology featuring in Revelation is the same as the one in the rest of scripture. Where the prophet speaks of 'that day, when the light shall not be clear, nor dark. But it shall be one day which shall be known to

¹³⁰ Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.278: Εὐρίσκομεν οὐ πολλαχού τῆς γραφῆς ὡς τὰ νοητὰ ὀνόματι τοῦ χρυσοῦ σημαίνεται τάχα οὐν ἢ νοητὴ λυχνία ὁ πνευματικὸς οἶκος καὶ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τυγχάνει, ὡς ἐν Ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννου λέγεται.

¹³¹ Ibid. 3.73: Σαφήνεια δὲ ἀναντίρρητος περὶ τούτων γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως τοῦ Ἰωάννου.

¹³² Ibid. 3.73.

¹²³ Cf. Didymus, *In Genesis*, Cod. p. 36, referring to number 144,000

indicating a 'pious doctrine' (λόγος τις περὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦτον τίμιός ἐστιν).

¹³⁴ Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.153: Ἀναντιρρήτως ἐν Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψει παντοκράτωρ ὁ Σωτὴρ ὁμολογεῖται. *frPs(al)*, fr. 215: ἀριθιλότατα δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψει παντοκράτωρ ὁ σωτὴρ λέγεται.

¹³⁵ Rev. 1:8; 4:8; 11:17; 15:3; 16:7; 16:14; 19:6; 19:15; 21:22. The instance in 2 Cor. 6:18 is actually an OT paraphrased quotation (Cf. Jer. 38:1 and 9).

the Lord, not day not night',¹³⁶ he deciphers the same eschatological reality subscribed to by Revelation: 'Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him.'¹³⁷ He makes this argument by quoting both passages, which unify both Testaments.¹³⁸ By the same token, where Psalm 90:13 refers to a 'dragon', Didymus sees 'the ancient Satan' of Rev. 12:9 and 20:2, where the 'dragon' is mentioned, too.¹³⁹

At another point, the celibate intellectual is faced with the Old Testament's sanctioning of 'wives' and 'offspring', which makes 'husbands' and 'fathers' blessed. Recourse is naturally had to allegorical exegesis:¹⁴⁰ there have been many blessed men ('such as Elias and Elissaeus') who were never married or never had any offspring. Didymus then appeals to Revelation, where the 'thousands of virgins'¹⁴¹ are explicitly called blessed ones, which means that one can be 'blessed' without necessarily being married or having children. This notwithstanding, his main purpose is not to make the specific points on the basis of the Old Testament passage: it is to show that it is Revelation which explains properly (and allegorically) those passages of the Old Testament which apparently recommend marriage and the procreation of children.¹⁴² The conclusion therefore is all too natural: the value of this New Testament book consists in providing a solution to Old Testament passages which otherwise could be stumbling blocks.

Sometimes Didymus makes use of philological (even verbal) affinities between a certain Old Testament passage and one from Revelation, in order to establish a theological affinity. For instance, since the expression 'upon those who dwell on earth' (ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν γῆν)¹⁴³ is used in both Testaments to denote infliction of plagues upon sinners, the point is promptly pointed out as showing that all scripture speaks with one voice.¹⁴⁴

A telling instance showing how Didymus put Revelation to functional theological use is the following. Considering Psalm 43:23, 'we are counted as sheep for the slaughter', he sets out to find a parallel in Revelation, which he eventually does.¹⁴⁵ Despite its use by Paul in Rom. 8, 36, and although there are no parallel expressions in Revelation, he appeals to Rev. 20:4, where 'the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus' were standing. In both Old and New Testament, reference is made to 'victims' on the 'heavenly altar of God'. Whereas in the psalm the victims are still suffering slaughter, in Revelation they 'dance' triumphantly before the 'heavenly altar of God' (ὕπὸ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ οὐράνιον ἐφάνησαν χορεύουσai), by virtue of the fact that they are 'victims' (θύματα).¹⁴⁶ They were 'sheep', yet 'sacrificial sheep' (πρόβατα ἱεουργούμενα): their 'sacrifice', which had been 'pleasing' to God' (εὐάρεστον θυσίαν),¹⁴⁷ was only a temporary accident in the course of history. The end is vividly portrayed in the apocalyptic vision of Revelation, which in this way appears to sustain the teleological character of history until the end. This end is depicted by means of the apocalyptic vision of Revelation. The specific imagery plays an important role in Didymus, who returns to this in order to argue that the eschatological consequence of such a 'sacrifice' is sheer triumph already represented through this Book which (for that reason, in addition to other ones) is an integral part of the New Testament. The notion of 'sacrifice' points to those 'sacrificed' who eventually appear in triumph before the altar of God at the end of the world. To Didymus, this promise is already there and is portrayed in Revelation as a vivid image, to which he returns time and again.¹⁴⁸ In line with Origen, and stressing the historical character of Revelation until the end, Didymus saw this book not as a dreadful intimidation, but as the portrayal of Christian hope destined to be eventually fulfilled.

¹³⁶ Zachariah, 14:5–7.

¹³⁷ Rev. 1:7.

¹³⁸ Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.69.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.* 1.191.

¹⁴⁰ Didymus quotes Wisdom of Solomon 8:2; Prov. 10:23; 4:8; Psalm 127:3–4.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Rev. 14:4.

¹⁴² Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.383. So *ibid.* 2.274.

¹⁴³ Cf. the expression in Jer. 1:14 and Rev. 8:13.

¹⁴⁴ Didymus, *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 280.

¹⁴⁵ This passage from the Psalms is quoted by Paul, whom Didymus does not mention at that point. Cf. Rom. 8:36.

¹⁴⁶ Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 324.

¹⁴⁷ Phil. 4:18.

¹⁴⁸ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 551 (comm. on Psalm, 50, 21, 'then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt offerings and whole burnt offerings: then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar'): ψυχὰς οὐκ ἄλλας τυγχανούσας τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν μαρτύρων ὁφθείσας παρὰ τὸ ἐπουράνιον θυσιαστήριον ἀναφερομένας ἐπ' αὐτῷ μόσχων δίκην. ἐν γὰρ τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννου αἱ τῶν πεπελεκισμένων ψυχαὶ διὰ τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ ἐπουράνιον τεθεώρηται.

Amphilochius of Iconium (c. 339/40–394/403) was a younger contemporary of Didymus. The catalogue of canonical writings which he lists virtually rejects Revelation, along with four of seven catholic epistles. According to this text, ‘although some people accept the Revelation of John, most people dismiss it as spurious’ (τὴν δ’ ἀποκάλυψιν τὴν Ἰωάννου πάλιν τινὲς μὲν ἐγκρίνουσιν, οἱ πλείους δὲ γε νόθον λέγουσιν).¹⁴⁹ Cosmas Indicopleustes reports that Amphilochius ‘who was a friend of the blessed Basil’, tags all the catholic epistles as dubious, ‘in the *Iambi* he wrote to Seleucus’. Cosmas is of course wrong, since the text of Amphilochius says something different, as stated above. He also claims that these epistles have always been dismissed by the Church and by all the commentators of scripture.¹⁵⁰ He thus commits one more egregious error of fact, which is fatal for the overall trustworthiness of this Nestorian traveller, who was severely criticised by Photius for his bizarre views about the structure of the universe.

However, we have seen Epiphanius (contemporary with both Didymus and Amphilochius) arguing that ‘most people’ accept the Book, and these people happen to be the ‘pious’ ones. Besides, since Basil and Gregory accepted Revelation, it would be extremely strange for Amphilochius to dismiss it, given his strong spiritual relation with both these Cappadocians. One wonders which is the region where ‘most people’ dismissed this book, since Didymus lived in Egypt, Epiphanius in Cyprus, the Cappadocians in Eastern Asia Minor – and in all of these places this book enjoyed both currency and respect. To them Ephraem Syrus should be added, since he draws on ‘John’s Revelation’, evidently treating this as a canonical book.¹⁵¹

The sole possible region that remains as one where the authority of Revelation might be mistrusted is Antioch and Palestine. We should recall that Eusebius was the Bishop of the Palestinian Caesarea. He appears to doubt its authority, even though his master Origen, who had decamped from Alexandria, lived and taught in the same city, and proclaimed the authority of the book.

Besides, an important remark is called for. Another offspring of Antioch, John Chrysostom (345–407), never appears to mention Revelation, or to draw on it.¹⁵² A later testimony by Nicetas of Paphlagonia advising that John Chrysostom was among those who accepted the Revelation of John seems to be inaccurate, and no evidence for that can actually be found. Nicetas mentions that Chrysostom did so ‘in his sermon *De Consummatione*’ (ἐν τῷ περὶ συντελείας αὐτοῦ λόγῳ), which however is only one more spurious work ascribed to Chrysostom.¹⁵³

In its lemma about John, the *Suda* lexicon feels it necessary to say that ‘Chrysostom accepts his [sc. John the Evangelist’s] three epistles and his Apocalypse’,¹⁵⁴ which is extremely odd. Why should a tenth-century lexicon mention the attitude of a specific Christian author (indeed as old as a fourth-century one) toward a specific work ascribed to John the Evangelist? The only explanation I can think of is that the hand which wrote the lemma had some affiliation with the hands which wrote the spurious texts ascribed to Chrysostom representing him as accepting Revelation.¹⁵⁵ In other words, some spurious works that were ascribed to Chrysostom later attributed to him faith in the authority of Revelation, which he really never had.

Cyril of Alexandria (c. 378–c. 444) opted for abiding by the vast number of authorities who had sanctioned

¹⁴⁹ Amphilochius of Iconium (fourth cent), *Iambi ad Seleucum*, lines 316–17.

¹⁵⁰ Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana*, 7.68.

¹⁵¹ Ephraem Syrus, *De Paenitentia et Caritate*, pp. 73; 74 (rejecting the existence of any Millenarist ideas in the book); 81. To the tantalizing confusion of attributions of one and the same text to different Christian authors, one should add numerous instances of texts ascribed to both to Ephraem Syrus and the mysterious Pseudo-Macarius (who in my view is a product of the Akoimetoï community in Constantinople). For instance, the text of Ephraem Syrus, *Regulae ad Monachos*, p. 342 is the same as Pseudo-Macarius, *Epistula Magna*, p. 267, which in turn coincides with Pseudo-Macarius, *Homiliae I*, Homily 4. Likewise, Pseudo-Macarius, *Epistula Magna*, p. 261 is the same as Ephraem Syrus, *Regulae ad Monachos*, p. 335. The number of pages does not suggest a full-scale exploration, but comparing the text in order to determine the extent of such coincidence is far beyond my scope.

¹⁵² There is only a spurious text ascribed to John Chrysostom: *De Paenitentia*, PG.60.693.21–28, which evidently allows for the authority of the book. The same goes for the likewise spurious works, *In Sanctum Joannem Theologum*, PG.59.610.27, and *In Infirmos*, p. 323, where the author essays to show Chrysostom approving of the Apocalypse and its authorship. Quite plainly, some later writers set out to make Chrysostom one of those who approved of the Apocalypse as a canonical book.

¹⁵³ Cf. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *De Patientia et de Consummatione Huius Saeculi*, PG.63.937–942. This work however makes no reference to the Revelation of John.

¹⁵⁴ *Suda* lexicon, Alphabetic letter iota, entry 461.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. another spurious ascription to Chrysostom, interpolating the verse Rev. 1:18: *In Sancta Lumina sive In Baptismum et Tentationem*, 2.1: καὶ δεξιόμενος βέλος, οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ νεκρὸς ὢν ζῶν ἐγένετο.

the Book, recognising that ‘honour had been accorded to this’, since ‘the Fathers’ had professed the book a divinely inspired one.¹⁵⁶ He employed the same method as that of previous Christian writers. In order to make a theological point, he draws on Revelation as a matter of course, in the same way as he does on any other scriptural book. For instance, in order to demonstrate that the Logos is present both in timelessness and temporal everlastingness, he considers the opening of John’s gospel as much an authority as the text of Revelation positing the Logos to be and to rule over all time,¹⁵⁷ past, present, and future.¹⁵⁸ By the same token, setting out to prove that ‘no creature can be worshipped as god’, Cyril quotes invariably from ‘scriptural instances’ (ἐξ ἐπιτηρήσεων γραφικῶν). In these instances he regularly includes Rev. 19:10 and 22:9, where ‘an angel’ prevented John from making obeisance. This instance is considered as authoritative as the one in Acts 10:26 and Judges 13:15–19, Heb. 1:6, Isaiah 45:14, which Cyril also quotes for comparison.¹⁵⁹

In the next century, Procopius of Gaza (c. 464–528) does not mention the book: in fact, he seems to disdain the very term ‘revelation’ (ἀποκάλυψις). We have then one more author from Palestine with a reserved attitude toward this book. Pseudo-Dionysius shows that he subscribes to its authorship, since one of his epistles is addressed to ‘John, the Theologos, Apostle and Evangelist, detained in the isle of Patmos’.¹⁶⁰ Besides, Andreas of Caesarea draws on Pseudo-Dionysius by name,¹⁶¹ quoting his exegesis of Rev. 4:8, and he returns to him at other points of his commentary.¹⁶² In a later Armenian commentary on Revelation, by Nerses of Lambron written in the late twelfth century, the author notes in a colophon that ‘the great Dionysius wove its [viz. the Revelation’s] testimony in his theological

homilies’, which is strange; for there are only few direct quotations from Revelation in the known works by Pseudo-Dionysius. Nerses lists also the names of theologians who wrote commentaries on Revelation: ‘Irenaeus Bishop of Megalu’ (*sic*, intending Lugdunum), ‘Gregory the Theologian, in his abdication homilies’ (meaning *Oratio* 42), ‘the great Cyril, Methodius, and Hippolytus, also the not yet tested Origen’ (meaning the period of his staying in Alexandria). Those authors ‘placed [Revelation] as allegorical in the series of the divinely inspired new testaments’, and ‘the Church has honoured [them] for their trustworthiness’.¹⁶³

Maximus Confessor ignores the Book altogether, despite his respect¹⁶⁴ for Pseudo-Dionysius. John Philoponus quotes from this as unreservedly as he does the rest of scripture.¹⁶⁵ But this John was an Alexandrian.

The eleventh/twelfth-century theologian of Constantinople Nicetas Seides (1040–1120) recounts (and so taught his students in the Patriarchal School of the capital city) that Gregory of Nyssa wrote twenty-four discourses on Revelation. He also says that Gregory the Theologian in his *Cantica* professed that the New Testament comprises twenty-six books, making no mention either of the Constitutions of the Apostles (τῶν ἀποστολικῶν κανόνων) ascribed to Clement of Rome, or to the Book of Revelation.¹⁶⁶ However, Gregory is said to have mentioned them in other works of his, as indeed Basil and Gregory of Nyssa did. ‘Many holy fathers accepted the authority of the Book [of Revelation] and some of them went on to produce an exegesis of this.’¹⁶⁷ The argument is quite plain: although Nazianzen did not mention Revelation in his songs, he did so in his ‘first discourse on the Son’¹⁶⁸ and in his *Syntacteron Oration* (Συντακτήριος λόγος), delivered in the presence of one hundred and fifty bishops.¹⁶⁹

¹⁵⁶ Cyril of Alexandria, *De Adoratione*, PG.68.433.22–25: τὸ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως βιβλίον ἡμῖν συντιθεῖς ὁ σοφὸς Ἰωάννης, ὃ καὶ ταῖς τῶν Πατέρων τετίμηται ψήφοις.

¹⁵⁷ Rev. 1:4; 1:8; 4:8.

¹⁵⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.37.8f.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid. PG.75.252.1–23.

¹⁶⁰ Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite, *Epistulae*, Epistle 10.

¹⁶¹ Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, Logos 4.10.4,8.

¹⁶² Ibid. Logos 10.28.10,2–3; 15.45.15,7; 23.68.22,3b–4.

¹⁶³ Nerses of Lambron, *Commentary on the Revelation of Saint John*, translation of the Armenian text, notes and introduction by Robert W. Thomson, (Leuven, 2007), pp. 4–5. The translator felt it necessary to write this note (p. 5, n. 23): ‘New testaments: in the plural, perhaps meaning the books of the NT.’

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Maximus Confessor, *Mystagogia*, Proemium, chapters 51; 23; 24; *De Caritate*, 1.100; 3.5; *Quaestiones et Dubia*, sections 2 (question 14); 142.

¹⁶⁵ John Philoponus, *De Opificio Mundi*, p. 174 (ref. to the ‘seven churches in Asia’ of Revelation).

¹⁶⁶ Nicetas Seides, *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae*, ch. 1, p. 55.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. ch. 1, p. 56: τοὺς ἄλλους ἁγίους πατέρας, οἳ καὶ ἐδέξαντο καὶ ἐπεκύρωσαν ταύτας, τινὲς δὲ καὶ ἡρμήνευσαν. He refers to the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* and the Book of Revelation.

¹⁶⁸ This part of *De Filio* is no longer extant, since we have only the third and fourth discourses available.

¹⁶⁹ He refers to Gregory of Nazianzus, *Supremum Vale*, PG.36.469.10–13: Πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐφεστῶτας ἀγγέλους (πεῖθομαι γὰρ ἄλλους ἄλλης προστατεῖν Ἐκκλησίας, ὡς Ἰωάννης διδάσκει με διὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως).

The expression ἐφεστῶτας ἀγγέλους used by Nazianzen is interesting and comes from Zachariah, 1:11: καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν τῷ ἀγγέλῳ κυρίου τῷ ἐφεστῶτι. All the authors who employed this locution are more or less related to the Scholia: Eusebius,¹⁷⁰ Didymus,¹⁷¹ Pseudo-Macarius,¹⁷² Evagrius,¹⁷³ Cyril of Alexandria,¹⁷⁴ John Chrysostom.¹⁷⁵ Theodoret¹⁷⁶ shows that some draw on John Chrysostom,¹⁷⁷ in fact, however, he entertained the idea most decisively of all authors.¹⁷⁸ Hippolytus¹⁷⁹ and Clement¹⁸⁰ should be added to the list. Then again comes Oecumenius,¹⁸¹ along with some occasional use by Pseudo-Dionysius¹⁸² and Basil of Seleucia.¹⁸³ Oecumenius of course holds Revelation to be a work by the Evangelist: to sustain this, he appeals to the *Syntacterion* discourse by Gregory of Nazianzus and to the ‘discourses on Revelation’ by Basil of

Caesarea.¹⁸⁴ With regard to the latter, Oecumenius claims that since Basil quotes from ‘John the Evangelist’, and the quoted portions which follow are both from John’s gospel and Revelation,¹⁸⁵ this is a definitive proof that Basil regarded John as the author of Revelation as well. Were that not the case, so Oecumenius has it, Basil would have stated the name of the author he believed to have written Revelation.¹⁸⁶ Besides, the foregoing passage of Gregory of Nazianzus is also quoted by Oecumenius at three different points.¹⁸⁷

Nicetas Seides also argues against those who dismiss the canonicity of Revelation on the grounds that its style is different compared to either the gospel or the epistles by John. Basil’s style, so Seides urges, differs from work to work, since his works, be they polemical or moral or ascetic ones, as well as his *Hexaemeron*,

¹⁷⁰ Eusebius, *PE*, 13.13.6: δι’ ἀγγέλων τῶν ἐφεστῶτων. *DE*, 4.10.1 and 4.10.4: ἐφεστῶτων ἀγγέλων. *Ibid.* 4.10.12: ἀγγέλοις ἐφεστῶσιν. *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.68: ἀγγέλους τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐφεστῶτας. *Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG.23.777.14: τινὲς ἐφεστήκασιν ἄγγελοι.

¹⁷¹ Didymus, *commZach*, 1.32: ὁ ἐφεστὼς τῇ προφητείᾳ ἄγγελός ἐστιν. Also, *ibid.* 1.41 (quot. Zach. 11:1). Also, *frPs(al)*, fr.215: Προτρέχοντες θεοὶ ἄγγελοι προσεφώνουν τοῖς ἐφεστηκόσιν ταῖς οὐρανίαις πύλαις.

¹⁷² Pseudo-Macarius, *Preces*, PG.34.448.29: Ἄγιε ἄγγελε, ὁ ἐφεστὼς τῆς ἀθλίας μου ψυχῆς. Again, in *op. cit.* PG.34.448.36. However, there are texts attributed to both Didymus and Theodoret. For instance, the text in Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1065 is the same as the one in *Catena in Epistulam Petri i*, p. 45 (text in brackets: in Theodoret only; text in parentheses in *frPs(al)* only): [Θεοδωρήτου Ρητὰ Προκειμένα ‘Ὁ Οὐρανὸς τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ.’] εἰς τοῦτον τὸν οὐρανὸν οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, ἐπεὶ κάκειθεν ἀποσταλεῖς ἐλήλυθε φάσκων· Καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. (ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦτου ἀπεστάλη τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), ἢ ὁ Πέτρος φησὶν Ἄ δὴ ἀνηγγέλη ἡμῖν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ἡμᾶς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ. ἔθθα γὰρ ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. ἄλλ’ ἐπίστησον ἀκριβῶς μὴ εἰς αἰσθητὰ κατενέγκης τὴν περὶ τούτων νόησιν, οὐρανὸν τοπικὸν καὶ μετὰβασιν ἐκεῖθεν κατὰ φορὰν γινομένην ὑπολαβὼν θεοῦ γὰρ προηγουμένην, ἵν’ οὕτως εἴπω, ὑπεροχὴν καὶ κατάστασιν δηλοῖ ἢ τοῦ διηγηθέντος οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία.

¹⁷³ Evagrius of Pontus, *De Oratione*, PG.79.1197.32–34: Ὁφεῖλε γάρ, φησὶν, ἡ τοιαύτη κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, διὰ τοὺς ἐφεστῶτας ἀγγέλους, αἰδῶ, καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνην.

¹⁷⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 2, pp. 290 and 291 (quoting Zach. 1:11); *Commentaria in Matthaeum*, fr. 216 (οἱ τῆς καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἐφεστῶτες ἄγγελοι); *De Adoratione*, PG.68.312.53 (ἐφεστηκότες ἄγγελοι).

¹⁷⁵ John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ii ad Corinthios*, PG.61.471.45–48. The same portion in Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *De Perfecta Caritate*, PG.56.284.56–58.

¹⁷⁶ Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 76: ἐπέδειξε μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ κλίμακα μέχρις αὐτοῦ δίκνουμένην τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· τοὺς δὲ ἁγίους ἀγγέλους ἀνιόντας καὶ κατιόντας. αὐτὸς δὲ ἄνωθεν ἐφεστὼς παρεθάρρυνέ τε καὶ τὸ δέος ἐξήλασεν. This imagery

and expression was taken up by Cyril of Alexandria, *GlaphPent*, PG.69.193.14–21.

¹⁷⁷ Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 7 (after Origen): καὶ ἐκάστω δὲ ἔθνεϊ ἄγγελον ἐφεστάναι φησὶν ἡ θεία γραφή. The point is likewise made by John Chrysostom, *In Job*, p. 13. Also, in the spurious work ascribed to John Chrysostom, *Interpretatio in Daniele Prophetam*, PG.56.242.3–6: Ἦκουσας ὅτι ἔθηκεν ὄρια ἔθνων κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ; Καὶ ἕκαστον ἔθνος ἔχει τὸν ἐφεστῶτα, καὶ βούλεται αὐτὸς εἶναι δυνατώτερος.

¹⁷⁸ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1212.39–40: καὶ πρὸς τούτοις τοὺς ἐφεστῶτας τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν ἄγγελους. *intProphXII*, PG.81.1880.24–1881.28 (quoting and interpreting Zach. 1:11); *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.312.54.55: τῶν ἀγγέλων ἕνεκα, οἱ ἐφεστῶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὴν τούτων κηδεμονίαν πεπιστευμένοι.

¹⁷⁹ Hippolytus, *De Mundo*, lines 19–35: τῇ πύλῃ ἐφεστῶτα ἀρχάγγελον . . . καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐφεστῶτων κατὰ τόπον ἀγγέλων ὑμνούμενοι . . . ἀλλὰ μετὰ βίας ὡς δέσμοι ἐλκόμενοι, οἷς οἱ ἐφεστῶτες ἄγγελοι ἐπιγελῶντες διαπέμπονται . . . οὓς ἀγομένους ἔλκουσιν οἱ ἐφεστῶτες ἕως πλησίον τῆς γεέννης.

¹⁸⁰ Clement of Alexandria, *Eclgae Propheticae*, 50.1: τῶν τῇ γενέσει ἐφεστῶτων ἀγγέλων. *Ibid.* 55.1: ἀγγέλοις ἐφεστῶσι διοικούμενα.

¹⁸¹ Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 43 (quoting Gregory) πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐφεστῶτας ἀγγέλους· πείθομαι. p. 169: τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ τιμωρίᾳ ἐφεστῶτων ἵππων εἴ τ’ οὖν ἀγγέλων.

¹⁸² Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *De Caelesti Hierarchia*, p. 44, in *Catena in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 299: τινὰ δὲ τῶν ἡμῖν ἐφεστηκότων Ἀγγέλων.

¹⁸³ Basil of Seleucia, *Orationes*, p. 236: ἐφεστήκασιν ἄγγελοι.

¹⁸⁴ Oecumenius (n. 181 above), p. 259: ἔγραψεν ἄν καὶ ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως λόγους.

¹⁸⁵ Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.677.38–43: τοῦ δὲ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος. Καὶ οὐχ ἄπαξ τὸ ἦν, ἀλλὰ τέταρτον. Καὶ πάλιν ἄλλαχού· Ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ· Ὁ ὢν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ Πατρὸς· καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις· Ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· Καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει· Ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

¹⁸⁶ Oecumenius, (n. 181 above), p. 259.

¹⁸⁷ Oecumenius (n. 181 above), pp. 43; 203. On p. 259, he attests to Gregory having used the same portion in his *Syntacterion* (Συντακτήριος λόγος).

are all written in different styles, and yet they are all ascribed to a single person, namely, Basil.¹⁸⁸ What is more, ‘Gregory of Nyssa interpreted not just some sayings of this Book – which other fathers did, too – but he actually produced a comprehensive exegesis of Revelation, comprising twenty-four discourses’ (Ὁ δέ γε Νύσσης Γρηγόριος οὗ τινα ταύτης ῥητὰ ἐξηγήσατο ὥς οἱ ἄλλοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλην δι’ ὅλου ἡρμήνευσεν ἐν εἰκοσιτέσσαρσι λόγοις).¹⁸⁹

Naturally, Nicetas Seides adds himself to the series of authors who regard the festal epistle by Athanasius¹⁹⁰ as the authoritative source sanctioning the canonicity of the Book of Revelation.¹⁹¹

There are also testimonies that Basil of Caesarea, too, wrote sermons on the Apocalypse. One of the sources is Oecumenius.¹⁹² That he identifies the Evangelist with the writer of the Apocalypse who was exiled in Patmos is hardly a surprise, assuming Oecumenius’ catena fragments belong to the author who wrote the commentary on Revelation, which I believe is the case.¹⁹³ The other comes from Michael Attaliates, a ‘patrician and proconsul’¹⁹⁴ of Constantinople (eleventh–twelfth century). He attests to having seen books by Basil of Caesarea, which contained the text of Revelation and sermons on this by Basil along with his *Hexaameron*.¹⁹⁵ In the seventh century, the *Chronicon Paschale* also urges the same identification appealing to the testimony of Irenaeus.¹⁹⁶

When Theodoret was born (c. 386) there was little time remaining for Didymus (c. 310–c. 398) to live. And when Cassian was born (c. 475), Theodoret had been dead since sometime after 457. For all the Christian authorities attesting to the canonical authority of the Revelation, it seems that in Antioch and perhaps to a lesser extent, in Palestine, this authority was disputed. Cassian, who was an Antiochene among the Akoimetoι of the sixth century, set out to establish this authority and had on his desk a commentary on the Revelation written by an Alexandrian, namely Didymus. They were born in different places, which are also posited as two different watchwords indicating two different schools of theology. My contention is that the theological differences between Antioch and Alexandria are not so hard and fast as has been supposed. For it was Antiochene intellectuals, including Cassian the Sabaite, who, more than anyone else, cherished the patrimony of the Alexandrian stars of theology.

Antioch and Alexandria

Antioch was always careful to emphasize the true humanity of the Lord’s person. Along with the doctrinal emphasis paid to the Logos become man, the true human shape assumed was always accentuated and insisted upon.

Instead of Bearer/Mother of God (θεοτόκος) for Mary, Nestorius argued that she should be called

¹⁸⁸ Nicetas Seides, *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae*, ch. 23, p. 283. Seides did not even suspect that a vast number of epistles and probably all ascetic writings are not Basil’s, which is what my research on Cassian’s writings suggests to me. See RCR, pp. 378; 382 etc.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid. ch. 1, p. 56.

¹⁹⁰ Athanasius, *Epistula Festiva* 39 (fragmentum in collectione canonum), p. 74. Besides, Athanasius quotes from Rev. 22:9, in *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.196.19–24. This was probably the source and reason for spurious attributions to him. Cf. Pseudo-Athanasius, *Synopsis Scripturae*, PG.28: 293.41f; 428.49f; *Oratio Quarta Contra Arianos*, 28.

¹⁹¹ Nicetas Seides (n. 188 above), ch. 1, p. 55: ‘while Gregory in his *cantica* attested that the books of the New Testament canon numbered twenty-six, the great Athanasius of Alexandria handed down a list of twenty-eight books’ (τὰ δέ γε τῆς Νέας εἴκοσι καὶ ὀκτώ, ὥς ὁ πολὺς Ἀθανάσιος Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐν τῇ τριακοστῇ ἐνάτῃ αὐτοῦ ἑορταστικῇ ἐπιστολῇ ἀπλῶς καὶ οὐκ ἐμμέτρως παρέδωκεν). According to Seides, whereas in his songs Gregory had omitted the Constitutions of the Apostles and the Book of Revelation, he nevertheless mentions them elsewhere (ἀλλ’ ἐν ἑτέροις λόγοις εὐρίσκεται μνημονεύων αὐτῶν). It is interesting that John of Damascus (seventh/eighth cent.) details a New Testament canon comprising a list of twenty-eight books: four gospels, the Acts, seven catholic epistles (one by James, two by Peter, three by John, one by Jude), fourteen epistles by Paul, the Revelation of John the Evangelist (Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου

εὐαγγελιστοῦ), adding also ‘the constitutions of the apostles by Clement’ of Rome (κανόνες τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων διὰ Κλήμεντος), even though Athanasius had placed this outside the canon (along with the *Pastor*) a long time ago: John of Damascus, *Expositio Fidei*, 90. The author rebukes the Ἄλογοι who were rejecting Revelation along with the gospel of John. *De Haeresibus*, 51. By contrast, a text at least one century later, ascribed to Nicephorus I of Constantinople (eighth/ninth cent.) recognizes a NT canon comprising twenty-two books, relegating Revelation to the disputed ones, along with the Epistle of Barnabas, the Revelation of Peter, and the ‘gospel according to the Hebrews’. Nicephorus I of Constantinople, *Chronographia (recensiones duae)*, p. 134 (some scholars doubt attribution of this work to Nicephorus).

¹⁹² Oecumenius (n. 181 above), p. 259.

¹⁹³ I postpone discussion of this until a future work. Oecumenius in *Catena in Epistulam i ad Corinthios (e cod. Paris.)*, p. 332: φησὶν ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει. Cf. Catenae, *Supplementum et Varietas Lectionis ad Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 468.

¹⁹⁴ Michael Attaliates, *Diataxis*, 1, title lines 1–2: Μιχαὴλ πατρικίου ἀνθυπάτου.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid. 3, line 1257: καὶ ἡ Ἑξαήμερος τοῦ ἁγίου Βασιλείου, μετὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ διαφόρων λόγων.

¹⁹⁶ *Chronicon Paschale* (seventh cent.), pp. 467–468: ὁ ἀπόστολος Ἰωάννης εἰς Πάτμον ἐξορίζεται τὴν νῆσον, ἔνθα τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακέναι λέγεται, ὥς δηλοῖ Εἰρηναῖος.

Bearer/Mother of Christ (Χριστοτόκος), since Christ took only human nature from his mother, while the Logos was pre-existent and external. Besides, only the human part of Christ suffered and died on the Cross. Cyril of Alexandria championed the use of the term θεοτόκος, and imposed this on, and through, the Council of Ephesus in 431. The term was popular in the West and Constantinople, but was deprecated in Antioch, which is why John Chrysostom never actually employed it.¹⁹⁷ The designation seems to have originated in a couple of casual references by Gregory of Nyssa,¹⁹⁸ and it also appeared in later spurious works under the name of the same theologian.

Nestorius was condemned by the Council of Ephesus in 431. Unfortunately, his sermons were destroyed and transcribing them was banned, as normally happened with all those who were branded as heretics. We know something of his ideas from the acts of Ephesus. The usual charge against him was that he divided Christ in two persons with separate experiences: the divine Logos did not suffer, while Jesus did; God the Logos was omniscient, while Jesus had limited knowledge. It seems however that Nestorius' thought was far more elaborate. Put in Greek terms, and opposite those who identified 'person' with 'hypostasis', he taught that Christ was indeed one πρόσωπον, though not one ὑπόστασις. Strange though this seems, it makes sense once considered within its own context. The Syriac fathers (including Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorius) used the Syriac term *kyana* in order to describe the human and divine natures of Christ. In a general abstract sense, this term embraces all the elements of the members of a certain species. Alongside this universal sense, however, it may also have a concrete one referring to a real individual entity: this meaning is called *qnoma*, which does not betoken the person, but the concretized *kyana*, the real existing nature. The Greek term *prosopon* (πρόσωπον) appears in Syriac as a loan, which is *parsopa*. Put in those terms, therefore, the Christological formula espoused by the great doctors of Antioch was 'two real *kyana* united in a single *parsopa*, in

sublime perfect union without confusion or change'. By *parsopa*, Nestorius meant *prosopon*, which however is weaker in meaning than *hypostasis*, the term used by his detractors. At no moment did Nestorius deny the deity of Christ; he only insisted on distinguishing this from his humanity. Nor does it seem true that he ever sustained two Sons. He only held Christ to be a true God by nature and a true man by nature, both in one person.

Nevertheless, the Syriac Fathers by and large allowed room for the way in which the divine and human nature coexist in Christ to remain in the realm of mystery. By contrast, and against Origen's legacy, which urged that numerous aspects of theology should remain intact as mysteries not susceptible to detailed rational elaboration, the Alexandrians insisted on reaching a clear-cut doctrine. Of course, misunderstanding always lay in wait, perhaps owing to a failure to grasp the sense of the Syriac: whereas Antiochenes held that there were two natures, they were represented as urging that Christ had two persons. Consequently, the Cyrillian obsession with securing the oneness of Christ's person paved the way for making him 'of one nature' (μία φύσις), which resulted in Monophysitism making Cyril its prophet. In any event, both sides were unclear (and not always consistent) in their use of the germane Greek philosophical terminology.

Theodoret had a balanced view of 'Christ's divinity and humanity'. Cyril spoke of 'Christ' while in his mind he wilfully allowed the notion to be almost synonymous with 'God the Logos'. His obsession with the term θεοτόκος was owing to this implicit identification rather than to his concern to safeguard the *communicatio idiomatum*.¹⁹⁹ Cyril argued that there can be no true incarnation without this *communicatio*. Nestorius, on the other hand, argued that only incomplete natures could come together: soul and body are both incomplete, yet they form a complete ordinary human being. In Jesus, however, both divinity and humanity are complete natures, which is why they cannot come together in the same sense that soul and body do. This union, therefore, is not 'natural' or 'hypostatic', but only 'moral'. This is the sense of 'conjunction'

¹⁹⁷ This is why later forgers felt it necessary to add the designation in all of the numerous spurious works which appeared later under his name. The case is analogous to the one representing Chrysostom sanctioning the book of Revelation, as discussed, above, p. 19.

¹⁹⁸ Gregory of Nyssa, *De Virginitatis Integritate*, 14.1; 19.1; *Oratio in Diem Natalem Salvatoris*, PG.46.1136.32.

¹⁹⁹ This means transferral of predicates, properties, appellations, functions from one nature to another, which makes it possible to say that Virgin Mary gave birth to God (θεοτόκος), or that she is Mother of God, or that 'God suffered' or 'God was crucified'.

(συνάφεια) of the two natures involved in arguments either for or against the hypostatic union. Consequently, in Christ there are two complete natures, which are united by a common will and purpose.

Ephesus was in fact the battleground not only for the rival personalities of Theodoret and Cyril, but also for what was seen as different Christological approaches, however indirectly expressed. What is strange is that whenever Theodoret felt it necessary to elaborate, he did not fall too far away from Cyril, and the same goes for Cyril explaining himself with reference to Theodoret. One wonders then whether the case was actually one of different Christologies, or merely one of different terminological predilections. Nestorius was condemned unanimously, yet this does not mean that all those who condemned his real or alleged teaching were at one.

Antiochene theology always emphasised the humanity of Christ. Nestorianism was Antiochene Christology taken to its extreme: it sought to secure the true humanity of Jesus by drawing a clear distinction between this and his divinity. The term δεσπότης was the Antiochenes' epithet used to counterbalance their emphasis on Christ's humanity. After all, Antioch had a tradition of introducing terminology which was destined to prevail all over Christendom. As a matter of fact, cardinal Christian notions such as 'Trinity' (τριάς) originated in Antioch, since the apologist Theophilus of Antioch was the first to use this term.²⁰⁰ Likewise, it was in Antioch where the term *Christian* itself appeared for the first time, which Christendom acknowledged in

the most solemn and formal terms.²⁰¹ Besides, Antioch is credited by Theodoret with having introduced the antiphonal chanting of the Psalms in church: it was Diodorus of Tarsus along with his friend Flavian of Antioch, who 'separated the chorus into two groups' and taught how 'the Davidic melody should be chanted', the practice of which was thereafter transmitted to 'all over the world'.²⁰² It is hardly a coincidence that the Psalms are often styled 'melody' (and David a 'melodist') by Antiochene writers, which is what the texts by Pseudo-Caesarius as well as *De Trinitate* do.²⁰³ Nor is it a coincidence that the Akoimetoι in Constantinople cherished their Antiochene extraction by making pious antiphonal chanting around the clock a distinctive characteristic of their community.

According to the Church historian Socrates (fourth/fifth century), Ignatius of Antioch introduced antiphony in the Antiochene Church, after he had seen a vision of angels offering hymns to the Holy Trinity. At that time, the emperor forbade the Arians to chant their hymns in public.²⁰⁴ Sozomenus explains that Chrysostom urged congregations to practise this because the Arians of the capital used to chant in antiphonal mode.²⁰⁵ Certainly antiphonal playing of musical instruments was already introduced in the second temple of Jerusalem, and its introduction is ascribed to David himself.²⁰⁶ The late Byzantine historian Nicetas Choniates (c. 1155–1215) claims that antiphony already existed in the Syrian Church of old and was taken up by Flavian and Diodorus, whereas Theodore of Mopsuestia wrote

²⁰⁰ Theophilus of Antioch (c. 170), *Ad Autolycum*, 2.15: Ὡσαύτως καὶ αἱ τρεῖς ἡμέραι πρὸ τῶν φωστήρων γεγρονῆται τύποι εἰσὶν τῆς τριάδος, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ.

²⁰¹ Cf. Acts 11:26. Theodoret has preserved a letter by the bishops who participated in the council addressed 'to pope Damasus and the western bishops'. Theodoret, *HE*, p. 293: τῆς δὲ πρεσβυτάτης καὶ ὄντως ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας, ἐν ἣ πρώτῃ τὸ τίμιον τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐχρημάτισεν ὄνομα. So Nicephorus Callistus (thirteenth–fourteenth cent.), *HE*, 12.16. This letter has been regarded as part of the minutes of the Second oecumenical Council of Constantinople (381). Giuseppe Alberigo (ed.), *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta*, Concilium Constantinopolitanum 381 (Brepols 2006), p. 63.

²⁰² Theodoret, *HE*, p. 154: Ἡ δὲ ἀξιάγαστος ξυνορίς Φλαβιανὸς καὶ Διόδωρος, . . . πρῶτοι διχῇ διελόντες τοὺς τῶν ψαλλόντων χοροὺς ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἤδειν τὴν Δαυϊτικὴν ἐδίδασσαν μελωδίαν· καὶ τοῦτο ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ πρῶτον ἀρξάμενον πάντοσε διέδραμε καὶ κατέλαβε τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ τέρματα.

²⁰³ Cf. Pseudo-Caesarius, *Quaestiones et Responsiones* (chapter/line), 1.32 (Δαυὶδ μελωδοῦντος); 1.47 and 14.19 and 30.40 and 36.18 and 48.10 and 60.28 and 89.7 and 107.25 and 121.31 and 122.36

and 128.14 and 139.65 and 145.11 and 146.77 and 146.127 and 162.14 and 168.25 and 175.29 and 179.12 and 187.15 (Δαυὶδ ὁ τῶν θείων μελωδός); 20.16 and 20.37 (Δαυὶδ τὸν θεῖον μελωδόν); 22.12 and 101.39 (Δαυὶδ μελωδοῦντος); 25. 7 (Δαυὶδ μελωδοῦντος); 35. 20 and 50.9 (ὁ θεσπέσιος Δαυὶδ μελωδεῖ); 58.12 (ἐν μελωδίαις ὁ Δαυὶδ φησιν); 71.5 (ἐκ τοῦ θεσπεσίου Δαυὶδ παιδευόμεθα μελωδοῦντος); 74.5 and 78.4 (Δαυὶδ περὶ θεοῦ μελωδοῦντος); 97.8 (Δαυὶδ φησιν ἐν μελωδίαις); 104.10 (φησιν ἐν μελωδίαις ὁ Δαυὶδ); 128.51 (Δαυὶδ μελωδῶν); 134.21 (τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεσπεσίου Δαυὶδ μελωδοῦμενα); 202.15 (Δαυὶδ μελωδός); 214.99 (ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ Δαυὶδ μελωδοῦμενος). *DT* (lib. 1), 15.58: τὰ ἴσα μελωδεῖ καὶ περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ. 15.72: καὶ ἰσοδύναμον τῷ μελωδηθέντι περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρός. 18.47: ὁ μνημονευθεὶς Δαυὶδ ἐν κδ' ψαλμῷ μελωδεῖ. *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), PG.39: 652.10: Παρὰ τῷ μνημονευθέντι τοίνυν ἀκριβεστάτῳ μελωδῷ. 673.38: Ἐπιφώνει γοῦν τῷ τοιούτῳ Ὁ Μελωδός. 721.20: Καὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀφορῶν Ὁ Μελωδός. *DT* (lib. 3), PG.39: 869.38: Δαυὶδ μελωδεῖ. 916.39: ἅμα δὲ τῷ μελωδῷ ψαλλέτωσαν. See further, *NDGF*, pp. 529–530.

²⁰⁴ Socrates, *HE*, 6.8.

²⁰⁵ Sozomenus, *HE*, 8.8.1–5.

²⁰⁶ 1 Paralipomenon, 6:31 (6:16 in LXX).

hymns for antiphonal chanting following Syrian patterns.²⁰⁷ However, had this been the case, Theodoret would have proudly reported this. For he was a Hellenized Syrian himself, born of Syrian parents, and (as his biblical commentaries attest) he knew the language of his parents. Be that as it may, one thing is clear from all three historians: Antiochene theologians had a very special and intimate relation with religious hymns and music. This is, I believe, the reason why philological analysis of Antiochene theologians reveals their characteristic vocabulary occurring abundantly in the collection of hymns known as *Analecta Hymnica Graeca*.²⁰⁸

To the Antiochenes, Christ was truly human, but his divine nature accounts for his being the Lord Christ. Since not all men could see the light of the Godhead in the human shape of the Logos, this designation was a balanced reminder. For indeed, and though not professed explicitly, Theodoret's aim in stressing that Christ is δεσπότης is pretty clear. Theodoret had dared overcome monotheistic and Monarchian qualifications by applying the term δεσπότης to Christ unreservedly, and thus did not allow his human nature to restrict his eternal properties. The Council of Ephesus simply revisited and confirmed this approach approving the relentless Trinitarianism advanced by Theodoret. The term δεσπότης accorded to Christ encapsulates a concept which is of course nothing more than a Nicene one, even though earlier theologians were perhaps wary of using so bold a term. It was the force of Theodoret's personality that moved this theme to centre stage at Ephesus. This theme is present at the outset of the

Scholia, namely in *Scholion I*, which Cassian himself wrote. Theodoret argued for the need to consider Christ both divine and human at the same time, and laid immense stress on the notion δεσπότης Χριστός, while warning against underscoring 'either of' his 'natures' (ἐκατέραν φύσιν) and admonishing to consider always 'that which assumed and that which was assumed' (καὶ τὴν λαβοῦσαν καὶ τὴν ληφθεῖσαν).²⁰⁹

On the other hand, Cyril's tenet can be summarised in his opinion that Jesus was not actually subject to the human condition: in fact it was the Logos who had willingly acquiesced in his subjection to the laws determining human existence.²¹⁰ In that case, the idea of 'one action' or 'one will' is bound to be the one of the Logos, which of course smacks of Eutychianism. It is quite telling that the proverbial Cyrillian metaphor of the incarnate Logos being the 'fire' that transforms 'wood' unto its own 'glory' was fully upheld by the Monophysite champion Severus of Antioch, in order to condemn not those who confessed the properties of the natures of which the one Christ consists, but those who separate the properties and apportion them to each nature apart, that is, the Tome of Leo.

A significant term employed by Cassian is συνάφεια ('conjunction'). Although Nestorians and Monophysites were hostile to each other, they both used the term συνάφεια in order to indicate sheer different ontological statuses. By means of this term, Nestorians denoted two distinct natures co-existing, yet not fused. On the other hand, Monophysites using Cyril's statements meant co-existence of two natures being fused in one single nature. Whereas by this term Monophysites

²⁰⁷ Nicetas Choniates, *Thesaurus Orthodoxiae Fidei*, V.30. PG.139.1390: 'Atque ut Theodorus Mopsuestenus scribit, illam psalmodiae speciem, quas antiphonas dicimus, illi ex Syrorum lingua in Graecam transtulerunt, et omnium prope soli admirandi hujus operis omnibus orbis christiani hominibus Auctores apparuerunt.'

²⁰⁸ See NDGF, p. 529

²⁰⁹ Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 114: Ἀτρεπτος μὲν ὁ θεὸς λόγος καὶ ἦν καὶ ἔστι καὶ ἔσται· ἀνθρωπείαν δὲ φύσιν λαβὼν ἐννηνθρώπησε. Προσῆκει τοίνυν ἡμᾶς ἐκατέραν φύσιν ὁμολογεῖν καὶ τὴν λαβοῦσαν καὶ τὴν ληφθεῖσαν. *ibid.* p. 176: ὁ Χριστός, ἐκατέραν φύσιν εἰς φιλίαν συνήγαγε. *ibid.* p. 180: Ταῦτα δὲ τούτου χάριν διὰ βραχέων ὑπέδειξα, ἵνα ἐκατέραν φύσιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ νοεῖσθαι μνημονεύωμεν.

²¹⁰ Cf. Severus of Antioch, *Epistula 1*: 'But God the Word did not permit his flesh in all things to undergo the passions proper to it. If he sometimes permitted his flesh by dispensation to undergo the passions proper to it, he did not preserve its property undiminished. For in many instances it is seen not to have undergone the things which manifestly belong to its nature, since it was united to the Word, the Maker of nature.' To support this, he quotes Cyril saying,

'For, though it is said that he hungered and thirsted, and slept and grew weary after a journey, and wept and feared, these things did not happen to him just as they do to us in accordance with compulsory ordinances of nature; but he himself voluntarily permitted his flesh to walk according to the laws of nature, for he sometimes allowed it even to undergo its own passions.' Severus probably had in mind Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.37344–376.4. *De Incarnatione Domini*, PG.75.1461.25–30: Οὕτως τεχθεὶς ὁ Δεσπότης Χριστός (οὐ γὰρ εὐαγὲς μετὰ τὸν τόκον ἢ Θεὸν Λόγον μόνον αὐτὸν προσαγορεύειν, ἢ ἄνθρωπον γεγυμνωμένον θεότητος, ἀλλὰ Χριστόν, ὃ ἐκατέραν φύσιν τὴν τε λαβοῦσαν καὶ τὴν ληφθεῖσαν δηλοῖ), πάντως τὰ ἡμέτερα πλὴν τῆς ἁμαρτίας καταδέχεται πάθῃ. So also in . PG.75.1473.9–16. and Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, PG.77.1156.7–11: Ἐπεὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐδίψα, νυσταγμὸν ἔφερε, κοπιῶν ἦν, λυπούμενος ἦν, δακρύων, δειλιῶν, ἀγωνιῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκουσίως, ὅτε θέλων αὐτὸς ἐνεδίδου τῇ αὐτοῦ ἀνθρωπότητι τὸ ἴδιον ἀμέμπτως ποιεῖν. Τοῦτο ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς; τέλος, ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλ' ἐθελοῦσιον ἦν αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ πάθος, καὶ τὸ ἄλγος, καὶ τὸ θανεῖν.

meant absolute and indivisible union, Nestorians denoted only a certain ‘conjunction’ leaving the two components (namely, natures) ontologically intact and different from each other.²¹¹

In short, Nestorius spoke of Christ as one person (πρόσωπον) in two natures. The Monophysites spoke of one person (ὑπόστασις) and one nature (μία φύσις), which is both divine and human. Chalcedon appears to have sought a compromise between the two positions: Christ was posited as one person in ‘two natures after the union’ (δύο φύσεις μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν).²¹²

Doctors of the Antiochene school,²¹³ among (a few) others,²¹⁴ had used the simile of union between man and wife to express the union of natures in Christ by means of the term συνάφεια. In a way, this was not far from Origen’s conception of the eschatological deification of human nature considered from the viewpoint of humanity existentially ascending to the deity, whereas later Christological debate considered the union of divine and human nature in the context of the deity descending to union with humanity. The same term συνάφεια was used for ‘intercourse’ between man and woman.²¹⁵ This usage is actually Nestorian, since the συνάφεια between man and woman is only an accidental natural function, and has no ontological import whatsoever. This happens to be precisely the sense in which Cassian used the same term.²¹⁶ To be sure, the specific usage by Cassian does not involve

Christology. However, the sense in which he applied this term, is the same as that in which Nestorius did.

The consequences of Nestorius’ condemnation that are normally considered are those in the political and ecclesiastical realm. The staunch defense of Nestorius by Theodoret was not accidental: this was in fact the expression of a deep Antiochene sentiment and mentality, which remained intact, despite the fact that Theodoret was blackmailed into endorsing the acts of Chalcedon. There was a substantial difference between Alexandria and Antioch with respect to the scientific standing of their doctors: the Alexandrian school took the institutional shape of a catechetical school and was always under the dominion and influence of the local bishop.²¹⁷ The authoritarian ambition of the Alexandrian see and the monarchic power of its bishop were probably the psychological reaction to its struggle to create for itself the legitimacy of apostolic provenance by claiming Mark as its founder and first Bishop.²¹⁸ Before Origen was ordained presbyter in Caesarea of Palestine, he was invited to preach in the presence of bishops: this was what outraged Bishop Demetrius of Alexandria, who took exception to this, and wrote to Palestinian bishops that ‘it is unheard of that laymen preach in the presence of bishops’ (τοῦτο οὐδέποτε ἠκούσθη, οὐδὲ μέχρι νῦν γεγένηται τό, παρόντων ἐπισκόπων λαϊκοὺς ὁμιλεῖν). To which two Bishops (Alexander of Jerusalem, Theoctistus of Caesarea)

²¹¹ Nestorius, *Sermones*, Sermon 8: ὁ κατὰ τὴν Παύλου φωνὴν ἐκ σπέρματος γεγεννημένος Δαυὶδ, παντοκράτωρ τῇ συναφείᾳ θεός. . . . οὕτω καὶ τὸν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστὸν ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν λόγον συναφείας θεὸν ὀνομάζομεν τὸ φαινόμενον εἰδότες ὡς ἄνθρωπον. ἄκουσον ἀμφοτέρω τοῦ Παύλου κηρύττοντος· ὁμολογεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον πρότερον καὶ τότε τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ συναφείᾳ ὁμολογεῖ τὸ φαινόμενον. . . . ἀσύγχυτον τοῖνον τὴν τῶν φύσεων τηρῶμεν συνάφειαν· ὁμολογῶμεν τὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεόν, σέβωμεν τὸν τῇ θεῇ συναφείᾳ τῷ παντοκράτορι θεῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον ἄνθρωπον. Sermon 15: σφόδρα τις τῆς θεότητος ὑπῆρχε συνάφεια καὶ ἐν βρέφει τῆς δεσποτικῆς καθορωμένης σαρκός. *Ad Cyrillum Alexandrinum II*, p. 176: ὡς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν θεῶν λόγῳ προσδόντων τῇ τοῦ ναοῦ συναφείᾳ διεφθαρμένων.

²¹² ACO, *Concilium Universale Chalcedonense anno 451*, 2,1,1, pp. 93; 172; 174; 181; 2,1,2, pp. 111; 120.

²¹³ Severus of Antioch, in *Catena in Epistulam Petri i*, p. 60. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Resurrectione Domini*, line 34. Pseudo-John of Damascus, *Commentarii in Epistolas Pauli*, PG.95.852.15–17.

²¹⁴ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 1, p. 357. Ammonius, presbyter of Alexandria, *Fragmenta in Joannem* fr. 95 in *Catena in Joannem* p. 212. Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentarii in Apocalypsin*, Logos 19, chapter 56, 19, 6–7. Photius, *Homiliae*, Homily 9, p. 91; *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, Epistle 179, line 49.

²¹⁵ Severianus of Gabala, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Ephesios*, p. 312 (*Catena in Epistulam ad Ephesios*, p. 208): αὕτη ἡ πλάσις τοῦ Ἀδάμ καὶ τῆς Εὔας τῆς ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ συνάφεια τύπος γέγονε τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς Εκκλησίας.

²¹⁶ Cf. Cassian the Sabaite, *SerenPrim*, pp. 84r–v: προσομιλεῖν ταύτῃ ἀνεπαισθήτως καὶ συνάπτεσθαι καὶ ἐμπνέειν αὐτῇ ἅπερ ἂν βουληθῶσιν; καὶ τίς τῆς διανοίας ἡ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔνωσις τε καὶ συνάφεια . . . ὅθεν καὶ συνάπτεσθαι ἀλλήλοις δύνανται διὰ τῶν λογισμῶν. *De Panareto*, p. 112v: Οὐδαμῶς οὖν πιστευτέον ἐστὶν τὰς πνευματικὰς φύσεις συνάπτεσθαι μετὰ γυναικῶν σαρκικῶς. Ibid. 113r: Ἐξέπεσαν δὲ εἰς συνάφειαν τῶν θυγατέρων τῶν λεγομένων ἀνθρώπων. Ibid. 113v: εἰ αὐτοῖς ἐδόθη ἐντολὴ τοῦ μὴ συνάπτεσθαι ἀλλοτρίαις θυγατράσιν. Ibid. 117r: τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ μὴ διὰ τῆς συναφείας τῶν ἐκατέρων γεννώμενον.

²¹⁷ Pantaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen are reported to have been masters of this school.

²¹⁸ The sole information about it is a rather uncertain story by Eusebius in his *HE*, 2.16. It has been argued, however, that before the episcopate of Demetrius (189–231) no trace of bishops can be found. Before Constantine there is a vast blank in Egypt, which Walter Bauer famously styled a ‘mere echo and a puff of smoke’. Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. R.A. Kraft and G. Krodel from the 2nd German edn (1934), (Philadelphia, 1971), p. 45.

replied that it is all too natural for laymen to be invited by both ‘the people and bishops’ to preach ‘in order to benefit the brethren’. What was unthinkable to the Bishop of Alexandria, was a matter of course in Palestine and the East in general.²¹⁹

In Antioch, by contrast, the great theologians were personalities immune to influence of the patriarch. In this context, *school* does not suggest the institutional format of Alexandria’s διδασκαλεῖον, that is, an academic institution functioning under supervision and protection by the local bishop. As a matter of fact, schools such as those of Edessa and its successor at Nisibis were located and functioning at a safe distance from Antioch. This state of affairs had a profound impact which I am now going to discuss.

When one considers ‘patriarch in Alexandria’ in relation to Christology, there is only one name that comes to mind: that of Patriarch Cyril (412–444), an ambitious and ruthlessly fanatic monk. He always took it for granted that ‘orthodoxy’ can only be episcopal resolutions themselves. If other prelates disagreed with him, then orthodoxy was his own determinative formulas, however obscure or obtuse. This of course was made possible by playing politics with the imperial throne, and contriving plots with the royalty in general, with parallel politics always being under way with the pope. His determination to form an orthodoxy (notably, a Christology) rendered in concrete terms, and to allow no room for any ‘mystery’ within the doctrine, was abetted by two decisive factors: first, the Roman inclination for clear-cut clauses, which could be easily grasped, sustained, and observed; second, the Platonism which imbued the spiritual life of Alexandria: this was what allowed, and contributed to, theoretical formulations and abstractions which could form a closed system. These two factors are ostensibly contradictory, but they are not, in fact. For by means of them both it was possible to construct clauses which were terse, and yet their laconic phrasing consisted of terms which were not only elusive and abstruse, but also allowed room for the likelihood that not everyone understood the same

thing while professing the selfsame shibboleth. The fifth- and sixth-century controversies make too much of such Greek terms as *ousia*, *hypostasis*, *physis*, *prosopon*, but at the same time everyone felt free to fill the terms with a content to his own liking. In episcopal resolutions of this controversial character, the way to eschew further tantalizing analyses was to have recourse to sublime abstractions, such as those which had been offered long ago by another theologian, namely Plato.

By contrast, Aristotelian Antioch was anxious to explore concrete details of reality. After having studied twenty years with Plato, Aristotle made himself the most formidable detractor of Plato’s theory of Ideas, which he styled *τερετίσματα* (‘twitterings’).²²⁰ It was with Aristotle that the term *οὐσία* came to signify not only a generalized abstraction, but also the concrete material object, whether alive or inanimate. It was Aristotle who was himself interested in every aspect of the natural reality, which he explored, thus making himself a scientific researcher. In view of the specific purposes of the Antiochene school, it was Aristotle, not Plato, who could offer both the conceptual means and the method to explore the history of Jesus, and through this, the real character of his humanity. This is why Antioch pursued and adhered to historical exegesis; this is why they eagerly affirmed the full humanity of Jesus and emphasized that, although the Godhead fully dwelt in Christ, it did not eclipse his humanity. It was taken for granted that the letter of the historical narrative was important enough to deserve an exploration on its own merit. History was the milieu in which man could discover theological truth.

Contradictory though it may appear (and against hackneyed scholarship) I have shown in detail that taking the scriptural *literal* narrative seriously and pondering on the higher significance of historical occurrences was the concern and feat of Origen. I have advanced the thesis that to Origen, history is not a parable. For a parable relates instances that never occurred: its value lies in the ideas and morals

²¹⁹ Eusebius, *HE*, 8.19.17. Nicephorus Callistus, *HE*, 5.14. The two bishops give precedents of laymen having been invited by bishops to preach: Euelpis was invited by bishop Neon in Laranda; Paulinus was invited by bishop Celsus in Iconium; Theodore was invited by bishop Atticus in Synada; ‘and this naturally happens in other cities, too, even though we are not aware of it’. This could never have happened in Alexandria, of course.

²²⁰ Aristotle, *Analytica Priora et Posteriora*, 83a32–33. The statement was reproduced by Christian authors: Origen, *Cels*, I.13 (*Philocalia*, 18, 7); II.14. Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 15.13.1. Procopius of Gaza, *Epistulae*, Epistle 126. Photius, *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, Epistle 77. Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Julianum*, 2.45. Cyril also used the term in order to rebuke Nestorius’ teaching: ACO, *Concilium Universale Ephesenum anno 431*, 1, 1, 6, p. 36.

it conveys. What may conduct action toward a teleological destination is a flux of *signals*. Origen's interpretation of these signals has the constant aim of rectifying history through the transformation of human nature. His ultimate concern is with history, since interpretation always returns to history with the objective of transforming it.²²¹

History is written not simply to narrate occurrences, but mainly to convey expressive messages. This is 'the intention' of the scripture,²²² which is unfailingly contrasted with the bare letter, although this is one and the same corpus: 'there is not a certain scripture which is understood in its higher import, and another one which is read in its literal sense'.²²³ The literal narration is not dismissed, since even this 'narration of tangible things is highly beneficial' (καὶ ἡ κατ' αἴσθησιν τῶν πραγμάτων ἱστορία μεγάλης ὠφελείας πεπλήρωται).²²⁴ This concern for real facts stimulated Origen to visit places recorded here and there in the stories, following 'the footprints of Jesus and his disciples and the prophets' for the sake of confirming the 'literal historical account' (ἐπὶ ἱστορίαν).²²⁵ The same concern for the 'letter' urged him to consult with different editions of scriptural texts.²²⁶ It was after all this assiduity and adhesion to the historical reality of 'things' that instigated occasional attacks on Origen for literalism.²²⁷ Regarding the milestones of biblical history, never did Origen dispute their historical reality. Going out of Egypt, passing through the Red Sea, living in the desert and finally reaching the Promised Land, are all considered through the lens of allegory. The historicity of all these events, however, is never denied. Besides, the allegories identifying 'Egypt' and 'Pharaoh' with an evil domain, 'desert' with the exigencies of life, the 'Promised Land' with the eschatological expectation, and so on, are not simply theories in a Platonic vein, such as those of Philo. In contrast, he makes both the narrative and its spiritual meaning a real part of everyone's life. The struggle, progress, and set-

backs, both in action and in faith in God, are conditions to be experienced by the faithful during their lifetime. Allegorical exegesis is a support for everyone, so that one does not lose courage, faith, and hope. They are patterns for Christian life to be lived in actuality, in real history, in any historical age.²²⁸

Despite all allegations to the contrary, Origen was the actual father of the Christian concern for history and exploration of historical narrative. He was the master who pointed out the significance of *the concrete fact*. Little wonder therefore that my ensuing exploration shows Theodoret and his followers to be the true heirs to Origen's concerns, be they historical or textual. And little wonder that it will turn out that Origen's catena-fragments were in fact compiled by intellectuals who breathed this spiritual atmosphere.

What Antioch actually did was to carry on. The significance of the concrete and its study was the object of another great Greek, namely Aristotle.

To Alexandrians Christ was the old Greek philosophical concept of the Logos, who only needed a *personal* character along with the notion of *transcendence* in order to make a difference from the universal Stoic logos. To Antiochenes, Christ was a concrete human *ousia*, that could be explored in terms of real history, in the same sense that Aristotle had researched over the entire realm of nature, and had written about human beings, plants, animals, and the heavens.

The shift (or contrast) of interest from Plato to Aristotle is in fact a shift of interest from the *universal* (the Platonic priority) to the *concrete* (the Aristotelian importance attached to perceptible things), on account of which Aristotle himself had mocked the Platonic tenet of autonomous existence of the Ideas, even of the autonomous existence of the human soul after death.

Nestorius represented the right wing of Antioch. Preoccupied as he was with Christ's humanity more than was normally the case in Antioch, he felt (or, his

²²¹ PHE, pp. 377; 392–394; 401–402; 418–419.

²²² c.f. Origen τὸ βούλημα τῆς γραφῆς: *commJohn*, II.16.113; *commMatt*, 16, 1; *commGen*, PG.12.88.34–35 (*Philocalia*, 14, 1); *exhMar*, XXIX; τὸ βούλημα τῶν γεγραμμένων: *homJer*, 1, 2; 3, 1. τὸ βούλημα τῶν γραφῶν: *commMatt*, 12, 14; *Commentarii in Romanos* (III.5–V.7) p. 218; *selPs*, 4, PG.12.1148.35–36; τὸ βούλημα τῶν γραψάντων. *Cels*, I.42 (*Philocalia*, 15, 15); *Cels*, III.c, 74 (*Philocalia*, 18, 26); IV, 87 (*Philocalia*, 20, 14); τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἡμετέρων, or ἱερῶν, (or ἁγίων, or simply) γραμμάτων: *Cels*, III.c, 53 (*Philocalia*, 18, 23); IV, 17; VI, 37; *homJer*, 19, 11; *commMatt*,

15, 3; 16, 3; 16, 10; τὸ βούλημα of any scriptural author: *Cels*, I, 18 (Moses); III, 33 (Paul); *commJohn*, X.41.287 (Paul inspired by the Logos); τὸ βούλημα τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων: *Cels*, II.c, 76.

²²³ Origen, *Princ*, IV.2.2 (*Philocalia*, 1, 9).

²²⁴ Origen, *selNum*, PG.12.577.36–37.

²²⁵ Origen, *commJohn*, VI.40.204.

²²⁶ *selEz*, PG.13.781.37: ἐπισκευάμενοι τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκδόσεις.

²²⁷ Eustathius of Antioch (fourth cent. AD), *De Engastrimytho Adversus Origenem*, 21.3; 21.10; 22.4; 22.6; 22.7.

²²⁸ Origen, *Homilies on Joshua*, 4.1.

followers did) that Aristotle was the master who could best serve to their exposition. The Alexandrians sought to understand *what* Christ was, and did so by taking *the Logos* as their starting point. Antioch pursued an answer to the same question considering *Jesus* and his human life on earth. Both schools of course held that Jesus was the Christ, and that he was human/divine. However, the Greek philosophical tools to advance their respective beliefs were different, indeed as much as Plato was different from Aristotle. In the fifth century, when the Alexandrian interest was restricted mainly to medical and allied sciences, the Nestorian churches focused on Aristotle's logic and speculative philosophy.

The persecution following Nestorius' condemnation, and Cyril's well-known ruthlessness, forced Nestorian preachers to move to Syria and Persia, where they adopted Syriac, the common man's language, for sermonizing. Aristotle and his commentators (mainly Alexander of Aphrodisias) supplied them with the philosophical tools and vocabulary to expound their theology. As a matter of fact, it was a group of Nestorian translators who, by making Arabic versions from Syriac, first brought Aristotle and Hellenistic philosophy to the Arab world.²²⁹

As a rule, the early Greek fathers dealt more with Plato than Aristotle. The common attack against the latter was that he denied providence, which was a slogan rather than the product of any actual study of the Stagirite.²³⁰ Irenaeus (140–202) accused the Gnostic Valentinus of corrupting the candour and simplicity of Christian faith by subtleties drawn from Aristotle.²³¹ His pupil Hippolytus claimed that the teaching of the Gnostic Basilides amounted merely to 'Aristotelian sophistry' (τὰ ὑπὸ Βασιλείδου εὗρεθέντα ὄντα Ἀριστοτελικά σοφιστεύματα).²³² Gregory of Nazian-

zus emphasised that he spoke 'according to the logic of the Fishermen, not that of Aristotle' (ταῦτα ὡς ἐν βραχέσι πεφιλοσόφηται . . . ἀλιευτικῶς, ἀλλ' οὐκ Ἀριστοτελικῶς).²³³ Gregory of Nyssa accused Eunomius of having concocted his heresy after Arius' doctrines had been discussed in 'schools of medicine' while making a distorted use of 'Aristotelian echoes' (ἐξ Ἀριστοτελικῶν ἀπηχημάτων).²³⁴ He believed that by and large Eunomius' argument made use of the Aristotelian method of producing syllogisms,²³⁵ which is why his heretical doctrine is 'difficult to rebut' (δυσανταγώνιστον).²³⁶ Aristotelian logic was by and large considered a menacing challenge to the exposition of Christian doctrine that had to be taken seriously once put to use by heretics.²³⁷ Epiphanius relates that the heretic Aetius owed his dialectical weaponry to his teacher, who was an 'Alexandrian Aristotelian philosopher and sophist',²³⁸ and refers to the Aristotelian armour as a serious threat.²³⁹ Eusebius reproached Artemon and Paul of Samosata for having preached that Jesus was a mere human being and that this was the doctrine of the Church up until the time when Victor was the pope, which was thirteen years after the death of the apostle Peter in Rome. Once Zephyrinus became pope, the doctrine about Jesus being divine was concocted. Eusebius' censure against them both is that they held 'Aristotle and Theophrastus' in such high regard, that they engaged in 'construction of syllogisms' (ποιῆσαι σχῆμα συλλογισμοῦ) and 'geometry', whereas they also admired Euclid and Galen.²⁴⁰

As a result, Aristotelism had actually little and only oblique influence on Christianity during its first centuries, although the Peripatetic echoes in Clement of Alexandria are not as scarce as was initially thought.

²²⁹ See the informed work by Masarrat Husain Zuberi, *Aristotle 384–322 BC and Al Gazali 1058–1111 AD* (Karachi, Pakistan, 1986).

²³⁰ Cf. Clement of Alexandria arguing that Aristotle did not allow providence to work 'below the moon'. *Stromateis*, 5.14.90.3. Eusebius, *PE*, 13.13.4.

²³¹ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, II.14.752: 'Et minutiloquium et subtilitatem circa questiones, cum sit Aristotelicam, inferre fidei conantur'. At the end, *ibid.* I.25, Irenaeus accuses a certain sect of adoring Aristotle as much as the Saviour.

²³² Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, 7.14.1; 7.19.9; 7.20.5; 7.24.1.

²³³ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Tertia de Pace (orat. xxiii)*, PG.35.1164.44–47.

²³⁴ Gregory of Nyssa, *ibid.*, I.1.46.

²³⁵ Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 2.1.620: τίς ἔδωκε τῷ τὴν Ἀριστοτελικὴν ἡμῖν αἰχμὴν ἐπισείοντι; *Ibid.* 3.5.6: ταῦτα τῆς

Ἀριστοτελικῆς τεχνολογίας τὰ κατορθώματα. *Ibid.* 3.10.50: τὴν Ἀριστοτελικὴν τῶν ὄντων διαίρεσιν ἐπιθρυλῶν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ λόγῳ ἐξεύργασται γένη καὶ εἶδη καὶ διαφορὰς καὶ ἄτομα καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐν ταῖς κατηγορίαις τεχνολογίαν ἐπὶ διαβολῇ τῶν ἡμετέρων δογμάτων προεχειρίσατο.

²³⁶ *Ibid.* 3.10.50.

²³⁷ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 218: Ὁμοίαν δὲ ταύτῃ λέξει, ὡς ἔφην, ἄλλην ἡμῖν ἐφευρίσκουσιν οἱ νέοι Ἀριστοτελικοί. ἐκείνου γὰρ ἀπεμάζαντο τὴν ἰσβολίαν καὶ κατέλιπον τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τὸ ἄκακον καὶ τὸ πρᾶον. Cf. *DT (lib. 2.1–7)* (=Cassian the Sabaite), 3.30: καὶ Ἀριστοτελικὴ δῆθεν δεινότητι καὶ τῇ ἐν λόγοις τέχνῃ.

²³⁸ Epiphanius, *ibid.* v. 3, p. 341.

²³⁹ *Ibid.* v. 3, pp. 371; 375.

²⁴⁰ Eusebius, *HE*, 5.27–28.

The great centre of Aristotelian doctrine was the School of Edessa (the present-day Urfa, in Turkey), the city which is generally regarded as the birthplace of Syriac literature and philosophy. From this city, Aristotelism was carried far and wide throughout the East. The city became first known worldwide by Bardaisan (born c. 154), the great poet, orator, and educator, the champion of the Church during times of persecution.²⁴¹ It is from this school that Lucian of Samosata came forth. He produced a Greek version of scripture which was held in high esteem in the region as well as in Asia Minor in general. Lucian's presence in the vocabulary of the Scholia is clearly discernible,²⁴² and it is certain that Cassian was aware of his writings and probably made some use of his version of scripture.

Lucian is by tradition said to have been the first master of the school of Antioch, though there is no written evidence to confirm this, apart from a reference in the *Suda*, which tells us that Lucian had established a great school in Antioch, joined by people from various regions who pursued study there.²⁴³ But the writer of this lexicon is a committed Christian always inclined to sustain hagiographic tradition. Two other authors, namely Eusebius and Jerome, claim that Lucian died a martyr.²⁴⁴ Currently, some Christian scholars (R. Cellier, H.M. Guathin, F. Loofs, G. Bardy)²⁴⁵ prefer to posit two Lucians rather than one, thus clearing the name of the Antiochene and laying all blame at the door of an alleged delinquent figure who abused Christians.²⁴⁶ But Christian scholarship has never managed to afford a satisfactory solution as to why Patriarch Alexander of Alexandria (who wrote this epistle) makes no mention of any rehabilitation of Lucian in the Church, nor does he say that he died a martyr. Theodoret reproduces this epistle which relates that Lucian remained 'excommunicated for many years extending over the

office of three bishops'.²⁴⁷ The issue is far from being clear, and this is not the place to resolve it; moreover, Arianism and its relation to Lucian adds further obscurity and perplexity to the issue.²⁴⁸

Nevertheless, whether one person or two, Lucian is generally regarded as the founder of the School of Antioch after the model of that of Edessa. His principles were devotion to the letter of scripture; refraining from allegorical exegesis or any attempt to decipher a presupposed concealed meaning; study of the literal biblical history, with no restriction by accounts afforded by earlier Christian authors. Although the School of Edessa had been overshadowed during the last three centuries by the personality of Bardaisan and its magic affect on the Syrian soul, Edessa experienced one more glorious period which lasted for nearly eighty years under the brilliant spell of Ephraem Syrus (c. 306–c. 373). He taught scripture at the School of Edessa and, having a fine command of his mother tongue, Syriac, he produced the religious poems on the basis of which he was accorded the title Lyre of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, Ibas, the Nestorian bishop of Edessa, had translated into Syriac both Aristotle's works and writings by Theodore of Mopsuestia (c. 350–428), which came to replace those of Ephraem as the pre-eminent text for teaching Christian exegesis at the School. This was a seminal decision, which resulted in Qiore (director of the School of Edessa) embarking on a syllabus which aimed at intermingling the deductive principles of Aristotle with the staunch Dyophysite ('two natures of Jesus') doctrine advanced by Theodore of Mopsuestia inspired by Diodorus of Tarsus (died c. 390). This is how the place became the counterpoint of the Monophysite tendencies of Alexandria. Ephraem's successor, Bishop Rabbula, however, in a seismic shift, reformed the course of study once again

²⁴¹ It was only toward the end of his life that Bardaisan became a Gnostic, according to certain testimonies.

²⁴² See Index of Authors.

²⁴³ *Suda*, lexicon, *Alphabetic letter lambda*, entry 685: προῦβη δὲ καὶ εἰς ἱερωσύνην, πρεσβύτερος ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ γενόμενος, καὶ διδασκαλεῖον μέγα ἐκεῖ συνεστήσατο, ἐκασταχόθεν σπουδαιωτάτων εἰς αὐτὸν ἀλλαχόθεν ἄλλων ἀφικνουμένων.

²⁴⁴ Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, LXXVII, PL.23.723: 'Lucianus, vir disertissimus, Antiochenae Ecclesiae presbyter, tantum in Scripturarum studio laboravit, ut usque nunc quaedam exemplaria Scripturarum Lucianea nuncupentur. Feruntur ejus de Fide libelli, et breves ad nonnullos epistolae. Passus est Nicomediae ob confessionem Christi, sub persecutione Maximini, sepultusque Helenopoli Bithyniae.' Likewise Eusebius, *HE*, 79.6.3.

²⁴⁵ Cf. B. Stephanides, *Ecclesiastical History* (Εκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία) (Athens, 1959); p. 156, note 1. It is, however, beyond my scope to settle this debated issue.

²⁴⁶ Cf. reference to 'Christians' by Lucian of Samosata, *Alexander*, 25; 38; *De Morte Peregrini*, 11; 12; 13; 16.

²⁴⁷ Theodoret, *HE*, p. 18: Λουκιανὸς ἀποσυνάγωγος ἔμεινε τριῶν ἐπισκόπων πολυετὲς χρόνους. This is actually a quotation from the letter of Patriarch Alexander of Alexandria against the Arians, PG.18.562.6–8.

²⁴⁸ In a letter which Arius wrote to his follower Eusebius of Nicomedia, he styles the latter 'co-Lucianist' (συλλουκιανιστά), evidently pointing to common allegiances. This letter has been preserved by Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 157; Theodoret, *HE*, p. 27; Nicephorus Callistus, *HE*, 8.8.

and replaced Theodore's works with those of Cyril of Alexandria. This is evidently why he was praised by Justinian himself.²⁴⁹

Such events made the School of Edessa a stronghold of Nestorianism, which resulted in the Emperor Zeno unleashing a persecution against it in 489: the premises of the School were demolished, and a church was built upon its ruins. The personality who taught for twenty years at Edessa was Narses, an enthusiastic Aristotelian. He moved to Nisibis and established a school which enjoyed a far-reaching reputation for the cultivation of history, philosophy, geography, and astronomy, as well as the translation of the theological works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and those of Aristotle and his commentators. It was through the translations and commentaries by masters of this school that Aristotle was transmitted to the schools of Baghdad, where fertile ground for this philosophy was waiting.

The theological studies at Edessa, and those of its successor, the School of Nisibis, were formed after the logic of Aristotle. Translations of *On Interpretation* and the *Analytics* by Aristotle have survived in manuscripts, and so has the *Isagoge* by Porphyry. Aristotle's *Organon* became the foundation of East Syrian methodology, which resulted in exegeses that were Aristotelian in structure and Mopsuestian in content. It was felt that the Aristotelian *Categories* could be of service towards rendering a philosophical account of the doctrine, especially the Trinitarian one. Besides, Syriac versions of scripture were composed within the spiritual atmosphere of Edessa, if not Edessa itself. We also know of a Syriac version of the entire Old Testament, which was produced in mid-sixth century by the Nestorian scholar Maraba I.

We should bear all these facts in mind when we find Cassian using Syriac versions of scripture. He was of Antiochene origin, and he was inevitably nourished and inspired by the spiritual atmosphere of his region. His text is full of Aristotelian ideas and terms. So are the texts which, it will be my contention, were composed at the Laura of Sabas, such as the catena-fragments of Origen's commentaries on the Psalms. This is one more point supporting my assertion that Antioch was the true heir to Origen's work, as well as to his textual studies.

Against the current claim that Origen was a Platonist, which I have rebutted,²⁵⁰ the truth is that 'Platonic' Alexandria forced him to decamp to Palestine and the true heirs to his legacy (save Didymus) were non-Alexandrian: Eusebius, Evagrius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Cassian. Theodoret was his true successor as both a scholar and an editor. As to Origen's work, I believe Cassian was the protagonist who contributed to the survival of a considerable part of it, including the *Philocalia*, as it is known today.

In Cassian's time, the early sixth century, the notions of *Antioch* and *Alexandria* could hardly have been those held by modern scholarship. A hundred years earlier, Cyril suspected Antioch of attenuating the divine nature of Christ by making too much of Aristotelism – and yet the learned Aristotelian, Didymus, had settled and taught in Alexandria before Cyril himself was even born. Since heresiologists had represented Alexandria as the cradle of the most seductive errors, the Antiochenes suspected that Cyril's theology could open the door to Arianism and Monophysitism, and yet Severus, the protagonist of Monophysitism, was based in Antioch. Besides, John Philoponus was another protagonist of Monophysitism, and, although an Alexandrian, notwithstanding his criticism, did not pay homage to Plato, but to Aristotle: this has resulted in John Philoponus having produced learned commentaries on Aristotle along with those of Alexander of Aphrodisias. Origen is regarded as an iconic figure of Alexandrian theology, and yet it was Cappadocian, Palestinian, and Antiochene hands that saved his work for posterity.

Should one accept the idea of a radical chasm between the two emblematic cities, such phenomena could appear paradoxical. They have been regarded as natural, however. But to accept them as a matter of course presupposes allowing not for hostility, but for communication and creative dialogue between Alexandria and Antioch.

The Alexandrians and Origen, Eusebius, and Theodoret

A main difference between the schools that modern scholarship has segregated as 'Alexandrian' and

²⁴⁹ Justinian, *Epistula Contra Trium Capitula*, 54, lines 17 and 53. A near-contemporary historian tells us that Rabulla was blind: Παβουλᾶς Ἐδέσσης ἐπίσκοπος τυφλὸς ἦν. John Diacrinomenus (fifth–sixth cent.), *HE*, chapter 2.

²⁵⁰ COT and PHE, *passim*.

‘Antiochene’ lies in the significance they attribute history and the occurrences with in it. I, however, dispute this as a cardinal criterion, since I have made extensive analyses showing that Origen’s contour of historical process is actually what the modern mindset normally describes as the Antiochene one, and, I should add, it is even more ‘pragmatic’ than that. Theodoret mentions Origen with respect and admiration. To him Origen is one among those ‘ancient doctors of the Church’ (ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας διδασκάλων) who made their own ‘tongue’ a ‘weapon against the lie’ (οἱ κατὰ τοῦ ψεύδους τὰς γλώττας καθόπισαν), and is counted among Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Diodorus of Tarsus, ‘and the other ones’ (καὶ τῶν ἄλλων).²⁵¹ Due to the nature of Theodoret’s book *Eranistes* (‘beggar’), which records views of Christian writers set forth for discussion, he cites a brief passage from Theophilus of Alexandria, who had launched an attack against Origen (κατὰ Ὁριγένους). Theophilus turns out to have engaged in a duel with shadows. As has happened in numerous other instances, some of which I have discussed,²⁵² Theophilus attacked Origen for alleged views he ascribes to him; besides, he propounds his own ‘orthodoxy’, which, though, happens to be Origen’s own theology.²⁵³ However, all in all, Theodoret’s sentiment referring to Origen is one of respect for a master who wrote against many heresies, who was an eminent ‘polymath’ (Ὁριγένης, ὁ πολυμαθεὶς ἀσκήσας),²⁵⁴ always ready to ‘fight for the truth’ (καὶ Ὁριγένης, τῆς ἀληθείας ὑπερμαχοῦντες).²⁵⁵ The name of Origen is regularly mentioned as one of those who wrote against specific heresies.²⁵⁶ He is normally considered among the most prominent theologians of the first three centuries of Christianity, and Theodoret regards his views as part of the armoury of the Church against heretics. It is then not surprising that Theodoret refers to Origen with pride and attachment as ‘our Origen’

(Ὁριγένην τὸν ἡμέτερον),²⁵⁷ and appeals to him, among others, as an authority to sanction books as canonical ones, such as the Song of Songs.²⁵⁸ For all the outcry surrounding the name of Origen (which was the case even during his lifetime), Theodoret definitely regards Origen as standing out within the Church.

The following example is instructive. While recording different heresies, Theodoret mentions that of Theodotus of Byzantium, who denied the divinity of Christ. This heretic was condemned by Pope Victor of Rome, and a treatise was written against him entitled *Little Labyrinth* (Σμικρὸς Λαβύρινθος); but this text itself had doctrinal flaws and turned out to be a heretical writing, too. Some people ascribed this book to Origen, yet Theodoret rejects this hypothesis on account of ‘the character of the book’ (ἀλλ’ ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐλέγχει τοὺς λέγοντας). The book was merely not like Origen. Theodoret’s subsequent brief exposition of the content of the book shows that what he meant by ‘character’ was not simply the style of it, but also its actual theological content, which was quite alien to the Alexandrian’s theology.²⁵⁹ It would have been impossible for Origen to have penned this text, which praises Melito of Sardis, whom Origen had upbraided by name for claiming that God is corporeal.²⁶⁰

Origen was a scientist who wanted to find out for himself all sorts of evidence, textual, historical, and archaeological. I have canvassed his concerns and visits to places where biblical events had taken place, so that he could find further evidence to support his arguments.²⁶¹ He did the same with different versions of the scriptural text; in this respect he was matched only by Theodoret. He made ample reference to different editions of the sacred text, and to different versions of the Old Testament by different translators, not only to the Septuagint. He even had in his possession ‘uncorrupted’ copies of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, which he compared with his own edition

²⁵¹ Theodoret, *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.340.7–16.

²⁵² *COT*, pp. 17; 73; 135–136; 149; 144; 147–150; 225–232; 239; 249–251; 262–263; 266–267; *PHE*, pp. 118; 162; 300; 336–337; 351.

²⁵³ Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 171–172.

²⁵⁴ Theodoret, *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.345.46–47.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.* PG.83.349.46–47. Reference is made to Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Origen.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.* PG.83: 369.32–34; 372.24; 377.4; 389.12; 393.28; 401.41.

Pseudo-Theodoret (or Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, pp. 88; 91.

²⁵⁷ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 6.60.

²⁵⁸ Theodoret, *Explanatio in Canticum Cantorum*, PG.81.32.18.

²⁵⁹ Theodoret, *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.392.9f. However, the historian Nicephorus Callistus (*HE*, 4.20–21), while reproducing Theodoret’s text at this point, concludes that this work was actually written by Pope Victor I of Rome (c. 189–c. 200) against the heretics Artemon and Theodotus. See *RCR*, p. 71, n. 90.

²⁶⁰ Origen, *selGen*, PG.12.93.10f. Melito had written a treatise entitled *On God being Corporeal* (*Περὶ Ἐνσωμάτου Θεοῦ*), which is attested by Eusebius, *HE*, 4.26, and Jerome (the title also in Greek), *De Viris Illustribus*, 24. So does Nicephorus Callistus, *HE*, 4.10, who evidently reproduces Eusebius’ text.

²⁶¹ *PHE*, p. 373.

and with the Hebrew text.²⁶² This means that Origen acted as a gifted editor, always ‘making comparison with the other editions’ (συγκρίναντες ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεσιν).²⁶³ Never did Origen rest content with just one copy of the Septuagint. Instead, he was always anxious to make minute comparisons with the majority of copies of the edition of the Seventy’ for the sake of accuracy.²⁶⁴ He reports that his investigations extend not only to ‘the rest of editions’ (ἐπισκεψάμενοι τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκδόσεις, meaning those of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, the Fifth and Sixth Editions), but also to different copies of the Septuagint text (τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων).²⁶⁵ At points where the text of the Septuagint was doubtful, ‘because of different copies diverging from each other’, he made his own decisions,²⁶⁶ either omitting portions, or marking others ‘with asterisks’ at the points where he had introduced a translation of his own from the Hebrew.²⁶⁷ His references to how and where he had consulted with ‘other editions’ is a theme recurring throughout his work.²⁶⁸ In his Epistle to Africanus, Origen explains his methodology as an editor.²⁶⁹ No doubt, his main concern was doctrinal, not editorial. His main guide and norm of theology was the Septuagint, although he consulted the Hebrew original in order to remove the Septuagint’s obscurities and inconsistencies. He did not actually assert that the authority of the Greek would be contingent on the existence of the Hebrew, even though

at points he contends that certain passages now extant only in Greek may have had a Hebrew archetype. The case normally is that he puts forward an exegesis based on the Septuagint and using terms *not* actually existing in the Hebrew original.

Eusebius followed Origen in this scrupulous practice, mentioning the other interpreters, ‘Aquila and Symmachus and Theodotion’ along with the Septuagint. However, his interest in different readings of the holy text is restricted only to his commentary on the Psalms.²⁷⁰ By contrast, Theodoret followed Origen’s example, working on different books of scripture, making mention of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, as well as to the ‘Fifth Edition’ and the Septuagint along with the Hebrew text.²⁷¹

It should be remarked that Eusebius refers to Origen’s *Hexapla*²⁷² only in a casual statement recounting the discovery of the ‘Fifth Edition’,²⁷³ but he does not mention this as an edition available and useful to himself as a commentator. We can only infer that his references to ‘the other interpreters’ originated in this work of Origen’s. By contrast, Theodoret uses the *Hexapla* (he calls the work Ἑξαπλοῦν, in the singular) *alongside* the editions of Aquila and the others. He actually mentions these editions along with the *Hexapla*, which serves him as a source for the Septuagint and sometimes for the Hebrew text.²⁷⁴ Quite understandably, Didymus, blind as he was, does not

²⁶² Origen, *commJohn*, VI.41.212. ὡς ἡκριβώσαμεν ἀπὸ Ἑβραίων μαθόντες, καὶ τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις αὐτῶν τὰ ἡμέτερα συγκρίναντες, μαρτυρηθεῖσιν ὑπὸ τῶν μηδέπω διαστραφεισῶν ἐκδόσεων Ἀκύλου καὶ Θεοδοτίανος καὶ Συμμάχου.

²⁶³ Origen, *homJer*, 16.5; so *ibid.* 16.10; 20.5; *homGen*, p. 27; cf. *commJohn*, VI.6.40; *frLam*, 3; 36.

²⁶⁴ Origen, *homJer*, 15.5: εἰ καὶ ἀνέγνωμεν οὕτως, ἀλλὰ καὶ δεῖ εἰδέναι ὅτι τὰ πλείονα τῶν ἀντιγράφων τῆς ἐκδόσεως τῶν Ἑβδομήκοντα οὐκ ἔχει οὕτως, ὕστερον δὲ ἐπισκεψάμενοι καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκδόσεις ἐγνωμεν γραφικὸν εἶναι ἀμάρτημα.

²⁶⁵ Origen, *selEz*, PG.13.781.34f.

²⁶⁶ Origen, *commMatt*, 15.14: θέντων ἡ ἀφαιρούντων. τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν θεοῦ διδόντος εὐρομεν ἰάσασθαι, κριτηρίῳ χρησάμενοι ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεσιν: τῶν γὰρ ἀμφιβαλλομένων παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφωνίαν τὴν κρίσιν ποιησάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.* τὴν κρίσιν ποιησάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων τὸ συνᾶδον ἐκείναις ἐφυλάξαμεν, καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὠβελίσκαμεν ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ μὴ κείμενα (οὐ τολμήσαντες αὐτὰ πάντη περιελεῖν), τινὰ δὲ μετ’ ἀστερίσκων προσεθήκαμεν.

²⁶⁸ *commMatt*, 16.16; *comm1Cor*, 65; *commEph*, 24; *Commentarii in Epistolam ad Romanos (I.1–XII.21)*, 13; *Commentarii in Romanos (III.5–V.7)*, pp. 134; 192; 220; *selGen*, PG.12.141.39–40; *homJob*,

PG.12: 1040.57; 1041.33–34; *selPs*, PG.12: 1057.7; 1069.47; 1072.17; *frPs*, 64, 5–6; 70, 1; 88, 2–3; 88, 13; 118, 28; 137, 1; et *passim*.

²⁶⁹ Origen, *epAfr*, PG.11: 60f; 77.

²⁷⁰ Eusebius, *HE*, 6.16.1; 6.16.4; et *passim*.

²⁷¹ Theodoret, *commIs*, 18; 19; *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80: 541.23; 561.35; 749.33; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80: 1469.22; *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81: 157.51–52; 181.34–35; *intProphXII*, PG.81.1733.47–50.

²⁷² The *Hexapla* (‘six-fold’) is Origen’s most important work of textual criticism, a comparative study of the most important versions of the Old Testament placed in columns. He had placed the Hebrew text, then the same text transliterated in Greek characters, then four translations by Symmachus, Aquila, the Septuagint, and the one by Theodotion in parallels. To them Origen had added a fifth (Heptapla) and a sixth version (Octapla). The four translations (Symmachus, Aquila, Septuagint, Theodotion) make up the Tetrapla. Keenly conscious of the textual difficulties as he was, he refers to different renderings of a certain point throughout his exegetical work.

²⁷³ Eusebius, *HE*, 6.16.3–4.

²⁷⁴ Theodoret, *commIs*, 14; 19; 20; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80: 1029.7; 1048.44; 1061.3; 1345.21; 1361.9; 1417.1; 1440.4; 1456.35; 1472.38; 1624.9; 1840.46; 1960.6; 1973.39.

mention this work of Origen's. There should be no doubt that Didymus was a scholar of the same calibre and disposition, and he could have achieved similar results, had the unfortunate problem with his sight not limited the capabilities of this genius.

Theodoret studied Origen, not only in order to gain a first-hand knowledge of his theology, but also in order to be inspired for his own exposition. There are points where he feels that there is nothing that could be added to Origen's analysis, so he opts to quote him verbatim. Commenting on Psalm 122:2, Theodoret feels that he can confidently quote from Origen's commentary on the same verse. Thus we have the same text by both authors, which may also suggest that a good number of Origen's catena-fragments were in fact mediated by Theodoret himself. To cite an instance, both authors appear to dismiss implicitly the Millenarism of Irenaeus and of other early authors by means of the same passage.²⁷⁵ Theodoret of course was so cordial toward Irenaeus as to declare that his own statements rebuking Millenarism were levelled against the heresy of Cerinthus (meaning: not against Irenaeus).²⁷⁶ This could be regarded as simply the hand of Theodoret reproducing Origen, since the latter had made similar statements on other occasions, too.²⁷⁷ Furthermore, we have passages ascribed to both Origen and Theodoret, a fact which clearly suggests Origen being mediated through Theodoret.²⁷⁸ Beyond this, however, Theodoret in his own works felt free to

copy extensively from Origen. This is why it is possible to read some of his comments and assume that the text is probably Origen's, whereas it is only Theodoret quoting from him. This is distinctively the case with a large part of *Scholion XXX*, as the analysis of it makes clear.

Moreover, it is clear that Didymus' *Fragmenta in Psalmos altera*, which we come upon every now and then in canvassing the terminology of the Scholia, is mediated by a later catenist. This catenist is a person heavily concerned with the Christological dispute of times later than Didymus. To cite an instance, when he purports to cull from Didymus' commentary on Psalm 88:20–23, he is critical of him for 'dividing the one Christ' (διαίρων τὸν ἕνα Χριστόν) into two persons (δύο πρόσωπα). This is the gravamen of the accusation against both Nestorians and Apollinarists. The catenist therefore declares that he removed from this compilation all the false doctrines of Didymus, employing versions of exegetes 'prior to him' instead.²⁷⁹ This passage probably allows for identifying the person of the catenist, who uses the expression *προβιοτή* ἀπάγει δόγμα ('he diverts the argument toward the doctrine of pre-existence'). It was Gregory of Nyssa who used the verb *προβιοτεύειν*, indeed in reference to souls pre-existing before coming to this world.²⁸⁰ The term *προβιοτή* was a Neoplatonic coinage,²⁸¹ and the Christian authors who used this up until the sixth century were Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria,²⁸²

²⁷⁵ Origen, *frPs*, 122, 2: οὐ ῥητὼ δὲ χρόνῳ ταύτην τὴν ἐλπίδα περιορίζομεν, ἀλλὰ προσμένομεν ἕως ἂν ἀξιοθῶμεν τοῦ οἰκτεῖρησαι ἡμᾶς. Cf. *PHE*, pp. 287; 351. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1884.14–15: Ἐως οὐ οἰκτεῖρησαι ἡμᾶς. Οὐ ῥητὼ γὰρ χρόνῳ τήνδε τὴν ἐλπίδα περιορίζομεν, ἀλλὰ προσμένομεν ἕως ἂν ἀξιοθῶμεν φειδοῦς. I could have concluded the Scholia with just the first phrase from *Scholion XXXVIII*. The ensuing text is Irenaeus', which ironically expounds Millenarist ideas.

²⁷⁶ Cf. Theodoret, *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.520.33–37: οὐ γάρ, κατὰ τὴν Κηρίνου, καὶ τῶν ἐκείνῳ παραπλησίων, ἐπίγειος ἔσται τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἡ βασιλεία, οὐ χρόνῳ περιγεγραμμένη ῥητὴ. Ἐκείνοι γὰρ φανταζέσθωσαν τῶν χιλίων ἑτὼν τὴν περίοδον.

²⁷⁷ Cf. Origen, *commMatt*, 12.34: Ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ δόξαι ἂν τις τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐπαγγελίαν περιορίζειν χρόνῳ . . . παραστήσωμεν κατὰ τινα συνθήειαν τῆς γραφῆς τὸ ἕως δηλοῦν τὸν κατεπείγοντα περὶ τοῦ δηλουμένου χρόνον, οὐ περιοριζόμενον. Origen, *Scholia in Lucam*, PG.17.341.25f: Τὸ δέ, ἕως, ἐνταῦθα δηλοῖ τὸν κατεπείγοντα περὶ τοῦ δηλουμένου χρόνον, οὐ περιοριζόμενον.

²⁷⁸ The passage Origen, *frPs*, 72, 13, is ascribed to both (entitled, Ὠριγένους, Θεοδωρήτου).

²⁷⁹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 889: Ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Δίδυμος, προφανῶς διαίρων τὸν ἕνα Χριστόν, εἰ καὶ ποσῶς τὰς προφανεῖς αὐτοῦ δυσφημίας ἐξέκλινε. δύο γὰρ πρόσωπα φανερώς ὕφιστησι καὶ υἱοὺς δύο, καὶ εἰς τὸ τῆσδε προβιοτῆς ἀπάγει δόγμα· ὅθεν

δοκεῖ μοι ἡ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἐρμηνεία μᾶλλον αἰρετωτέρα εἶναι τοῖς εὐσεβῶς νοεῖν βουλομένοις.

²⁸⁰ Gregory of Nyssa, *De Hominis Opificio*, p. 229: τῶν τε προβιοτεύειν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐν ἰδίᾳ τινὶ καταστάσει μυθολογούντων. This is a point allegedly representing Gregory as criticizing Origen's *De Principiis* for introducing 'a crowd of pre-existent souls living in a state of their own' (καθάπερ τινὰ δῆμον ἐν ἰδιαζούσῃ πολιτείᾳ τὰς ψυχὰς προῦφεστάναι λέγειν). In fact, though, Gregory had another author in mind. Anyway, he concedes that 'the issue of relation between soul and body was a controversial one among the churches' (ἀμφιβαλλόμενον ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις περὶ ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος).

²⁸¹ Cf. Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 2, p. 292. Hermias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 94 (προβιοτάς). Olympiodorus, the philosopher of Alexandria, *In Platonis Gorgiam Commentaria*, 17.2; 19.3. Damascius, *In Phaedonem* (versio 1), 138; 270; 273; 284; *In Phaedonem* (versio 2), 28. Also, Hierocles, who was a staunch opponent of the doctrine of pre-existence of souls, which he held to abolish freedom of will: *In Aureum Carmen*, 10.27. There is an uncertain usage in Plutarch (*Fragmenta*, (Sandbach), frs. 215j; 217c) which, however, appears to reflect the vocabulary of those who rendered his thought. So, Pseudo-Galen, *Ad Gaurum Quomodo Animetur Fetus*, 11.4. Also, cf. Stobaeus quoting Porphyry's views on free will, *Anthologium*, 2.8.42, which suggests that Porphyry had used the term *προβιοτή*.

²⁸² Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *commEccl*, PG.93.525.17.

and Cosmas Indicopleustes.²⁸³ Since the latter was a Monophysite and the writer of the catena is not, Olympiodorus is the sole possible Christian to have made this excerpt from Didymus. Otherwise, Christian authors hardly ever used this term at all.²⁸⁴ Under different conditions, we have an instance of Aeneas of Gaza doing so. He was a Neoplatonist philosopher who had been converted to Christianity. He alludes to Hierocles having been his teacher. Like Hierocles, he uses the term *προβιοτή* in the course of rejecting the pre-existence of souls. To all appearances, he took up the term from his teacher.²⁸⁵ One could hardly imagine Aeneas embarking on a rejection of Arianism, which was far too old a doctrine to be known to a convert at the turn of the fifth to sixth century. Besides, it would be impossible for Theodoret to be the catenist, since this specific one is antipathetic to Eusebius, whom he almost identifies with the Arianists, whereas Theodoret was far too far from sharing such a view about Eusebius.²⁸⁶ We are therefore left with Olympiodorus as the likely compiler of the specific comment of Didymus on the Psalms. To this it should be added that the term *ἀμεγέθης* ('one who has no magnitude'), applied to God, is used by a few Christian authors. This is employed by *De Trinitate* (which I have argued to be Cassian's work),²⁸⁷ whereas from the rest of Didymus' work this is found only in the *Fragmenta in Psalmos altera*,²⁸⁸ which is evidently owing to a compiler. Now, among those few who used the term is Olympiodorus,²⁸⁹ who seems to be a

highly likely anthologist. The catenist of Didymus' commentary on the Psalms is plainly a staunch anti-Monophysite, which tallies with Olympiodorus, since we have a fragment of his work excoriating Severus of Antioch.²⁹⁰ Besides, Olympiodorus is one of the very few Christians showing himself with scholarly abilities much like those of Theodoret, which is probably the reason why some catenists are not sure whether a certain exegesis originates with Theodoret or Olympiodorus.²⁹¹

At all events, this specific collection does not have to be the work of a single catenist. Anastasius of Sinai might be considered as a possible alternative: the foregoing catenist of Didymus, who declares that he has dismissed some of his impious exegeses, says that interpretations by exegetes 'prior to' Didymus are 'preferable to those who wish to comprehend [scripture] piously' (ὅθεν δοκεῖ μοι ἢ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἐρμηνεῖα μᾶλλον αἰρετωτέρα εἶναι τοῖς εὐσεβῶς νοεῖν βουλομένοις).²⁹² Following a casual use by Origen,²⁹³ the expression *εὐσεβῶς νοεῖν* thrived in the writings of Gregory of Nyssa and Epiphanius of Salamis, and the notion (though not in the same grammatical form) left its mark on Theodoret and Cyril of Alexandria. However, at this point we have to look for a later author, indeed a professed anti-Monophysite. This author might well be Anastasius of Sinai.²⁹⁴ Besides, the foregoing fragment by Olympiodorus using the term *προβιοτή* has been preserved in a work ascribed to Anastasius,

²⁸³ Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana*, 5.178; 7.93. His text is reproduced in the *Chronicon Paschale* (p. 444), which is a work drawing heavily and verbatim on Indicopleustes, as well as on Cassian. The author of *Chronicon Paschale* copied extensively from Cosmas Indicopleustes' work. See the same text in the two works. *Chronicon Paschale* (CP), pp. 33–34 (On Adam), [*Topographia Christiana* (TC), 5.67–68]; CP, p. 34 (On Abel) [TC, 5.75]; CP, pp. 41–42 (On Noah) [TC, 5.86–88]; CP, pp. 35–36 (On Enoch) [TC, 5.82]; CP, p. 104 (On Isaac) [TC, 5.104]; CP, p. 108 (On Jacob) [TC, 5.107–108]; CP, pp. 142–143 (On Moses) [TC, 5.111–112]; CP, pp. 157–160 (How the Psalms came to be composed – the word *ψαλτήρ* is unknown to Lampe's lexicon.) [TC, 5.116–119]; CP, pp. 443–450 [TC, 5.179–189]. See NDGF, Appendix III.

²⁸⁴ Photius (referring to Hierocles), *Bibliotheca*, Codex 214, 172b21 and 39. Also (referring to Hierocles' *De Providentia*), *Bibliotheca*, Codex 251, 463a.7. Cf. *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 444.

²⁸⁵ Aeneas of Gaza (sixth cent. AD), *Theophrastus sive De Animarum Immortalitate et Corporum Resurrectione Dialogus*, p. 1.

²⁸⁶ Ibid. Εὐσέβιος δὲ διὰ τῶν ὁμοίων Διδύμῳ σχεδὸν πρόεισιν ἐνθυμημάτων. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 908 (on Psalm 90:14–16): Οὐ δὴ νομιστέον περὶ τοῦ κυρίου ὅλον εἰρησθαι τὸν ψαλμόν, ὥς οἱ Ἀρειανοὶ βούλονται καὶ Εὐσέβιος. There is of course the possibility that this is a reference to Eusebius of Nicomedia, which,

however, is rather unlikely, since he is normally dignified with a reference of his own beside 'the Arians'.

²⁸⁷ See, NDGF, Appendix II.

²⁸⁸ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, Fr. 307: τὸ δὲ μεγαλύναι τὸν θεὸν οὐκ αὐξῆσαι μέγεθος ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ (ἀμεγέθης γάρ· σωμάτων ἴδιον τοῦτο, ὃ δὲ θεὸς ἀσώματος).

²⁸⁹ Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Job*, p. 15: ὁ μὲν θεὸς ἀόρατος πάση γεννητῇ κτίσει, ἄποσος ἀμεγέθης, πανταχοῦ παρὼν καὶ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐφιστάμενος. I canvass this term in NDGF, Appendix II, pp. 518; 610; 611; 614–617.

²⁹⁰ Olympiodorus, *Contra Severum Antiochenum*, PG.89.1189. The work was published under Athanasius' name.

²⁹¹ Cf. the compilation ascribed to Olympiodorus: *Fragmenta in Jeremiam*, PG.95.664.6. Migne notes that some ascribe this text to Theodoret, others to Olympiodorus.

²⁹² Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 889.

²⁹³ Origen, *homJer*, Homily 16.6: ἐπὶ τούτοις ἔστι τὸν νοοῦντα καὶ εὐσεβῶς διακείμενον πρὸς τὰ λεγόμενα εἰπεῖν.

²⁹⁴ Anastasius of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, chapter 10.2, 3: εὐσεβῶς νοεῖν καὶ ἐρμηνεύειν. Ibid. chapter 13, 3: εὐσεβῶς νοητέον. *Capita VI Adversus Monotheletas*, 7.2: τῷ εὐσεβῶς χωροῦντι νοεῖν. 9.1: εὐσεβῶς νοεῖν. Also, Pseudo-Anastasius of Sinai, *De Haeresibus*, 24: εὐσεβῶς νοεῖν.

albeit spuriously. The problem is that, for one thing, Anastasius himself does not appear to have used the term *προβιοτή*, whereas, for another, Olympiodorus himself has an equivalent to the foregoing *εὐσεβῶς νοεῖν*, which therefore might be an expression of his own.²⁹⁵ However, the expression *τοῖς εὐσεβῶς νοεῖν βουλομένοις* in Didymus' excerpt has only one parallel, which is in the *Doctrina Patrum* (*τῷ εὐσεβῶς νοεῖν βουλομένῳ*),²⁹⁶ which reinforces the ascription of this work to Anastasius of Sinai by F. Diekamp. In addition, Olympiodorus uses the peculiar term *ἐσθότε* ('sometimes'), which we come upon in the compilation *Fragmenta in Psalmos*, as indeed in both Cassian and Didymus himself, but this is absent from Anastasius of Sinai.²⁹⁷

Moreover, sometimes details are more telling than they seem on the face of it. Joshua's name in Greek is invariably *Ἰησοῦς τοῦ Ναυῆ*. However, there are four instances where the name *Ναυῆ* is spelled *Ναβῆ*. In modern terms this makes no difference, but the variation betokens a significant difference of pronunciation at the time when this was so spelled. Of those instances, three are culled from Theodoret,²⁹⁸ which makes it possible for the excerptor to be a Palestinian or Antiochene, rather than an Alexandrian. The fourth instance of *Ναυῆ* spelled *Ναβῆ* occurs in the collection of Didymus' commentaries on the Psalms.²⁹⁹ It is hard to imagine that the excerptor is a different person than the

one who culled from Theodoret, or he must at least be a person from the same milieu or region. In other words, Anastasius of Sinai comes up once again as a likely composer of the collection of Didymus' commentaries on the Psalms.

Since evidence suggesting Olympiodorus as composer of this collection is contradicted by instances pointing to Anastasius of Sinai, the case might be that we now have the text of the latter that drew selectively on a compendium that had been composed by the former. Be that as it may,³⁰⁰ and whoever Didymus' anthologist was, the relation between Antioch/Palestine and Alexandria is manifest from this example. Besides, the catenist associated Didymus closely with Eusebius, in fact he believed that the former built on the latter:³⁰¹ there are portions of exegesis which he ascribed to Didymus, although they are plainly the words of Eusebius himself.³⁰²

By the same token, exploring the expression 'the appellation *heavens*' (*ἡ οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία*) appearing in *Scholion XXV* yields interesting results. The phrase *ἡ οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία* occurs in only a few instances, all of them by Christian authors. Once again, this seems to have been used by Origen.³⁰³ Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa used Origen's expression *ἡ οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία*, yet in a rather irrelevant context (associating the appellation *heavens* with the visible heavens).³⁰⁴ Origen's idea actually was

²⁹⁵ Olympiodorus, *commJob*, p. 313: ἄλλ' οὖν εὐσεβεῖ διανοία προσήκει πιστεύειν.

²⁹⁶ F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum De Incarnatione Verbi* (Münster, 1907), p. 225.

²⁹⁷ See discussion of this in *RCR*, chapter 3.

²⁹⁸ *Catena in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 185 (Theodoret): Ἰησοῦν τὸν τοῦ Ναβῆ. *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 450 (Theodoret): καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναβῆ. Ibid. p. 452: Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναβῆ.

²⁹⁹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, Fr. 26: ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ γὰρ τοῦ Ναβῆ.

³⁰⁰ What I can say for sure is this: whoever the catenist is, he is the same person who authored the text spuriously ascribed to Anastasius of Sinai, *Quaestiones et Responsiones* (Pseudo-Anastasius of Sinai), in which he is equally hostile to Eusebius: Τοῦτο ἀκούσας ὁ ματατόφρων Ὁριγένης καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παλαιστινὸς ἀποκατάστασιν τῆς κολάσεως μιαιῶς ἐδίδαξαν. Ibid. Appendix 19, 6. Cf. his remark in Didymus' *frPs(al)*, fr. 908, where Eusebius is plainly styled an Arian: Οὐ δὲ νομιστέον περὶ τοῦ κυρίου ὅλον εἰρησθαι τὸν ψαλμόν, ὥς οἱ Ἀρειανοὶ βούλονται καὶ Εὐσέβιος. In the *Doctrina Patrum* Eusebius' name is never mentioned, neither is Didymus', whereas Origen is mentioned eight times only to be rebuked, plus one, where his edition of the *Hexapla* is discussed. Cassian is only named as the author of 'three discourses comprising 3,300 verses' and *RCR*, pp. 127; 144; 242. It would be hard to imagine that Anastasius, writing in the middle of the desert and lacking books (which is

why some of his scriptural quotations are not accurate) had the books of an allegedly 'Latin' author, such as Cassian, available to him in translation, only to be informed by a 'Latin' author about monastic life in Palestine. See *RCR*, where Cassian is shown to be Cassian the Sabaite.

³⁰¹ Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 879: Καὶ οὕτως μὲν Εὐσέβιος ὁ Καισαρείας καὶ Δίδυμος καὶ Ἀπολλινάριος ἐξηγήσαντο. Fr. 889: καὶ Εὐσέβιος δὲ διὰ τῶν ὁμοίων Διδύμῳ σχεδὸν πρόεισιν ἐνθυμημάτων οἷς ἐπιλέγει. Ὁ μὲν τῶν προφητῶν κτλ. Fr. 894: Δίδυμος δὲ τῆς Εὐσεβίου ἐρμηνείας τὴν διάνοιαν οὕτως ἀποδέδωκε.

³⁰² Cf. *ibid.* fr. 995: καὶ ὁ λόγος δὲ ὁ περὶ τῶν ἔργων τῆς δημιουργίας καὶ προνοίας αὐτοῦ νοηθεῖς οἷα καρπὸς ἔργων θεοῦ τυγχάνων χορτάσει τὴν γῆν, φημί δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διατρίβοντας ἄνθρώπους. The same in Eusebius, *Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG.23.1273.36–38: Καὶ ὁ λόγος δὲ ὁ περὶ τῶν ἔργων τῆς δημιουργίας καὶ προνοίας αὐτοῦ νοηθεῖς, οἷα καρπὸς ἔργων Θεοῦ τυγχάνων, χορτάσει τὴν γῆν.

³⁰³ Origen, *excPs*, PG.17.108.30–33 (comm. on Ps. 13:2 and quoting Ps. 113:24): Ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλαχοῦ τῆς θείας παιδεύσεως ἡ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία δηλοῖ τὴν νοητὴν οὐσίαν, ἐν ᾗ μάλιστα Θεὸν προσήκει ζητεῖν. Ὁ οὐρανὸς γὰρ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ.

³⁰⁴ Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Hexaemeron*, 3.8. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 2.1.272–273.

that *heavens* betokens the nature of the intelligible and divine things. This is the idea appearing in [Scholion XXV](#), as well as in Didymus and Theodoret alike. The same passage, Ps. 113:24 (in connection with which Origen furnishes his own foregoing exeegesis), received a comment from both Didymus and Theodoret. It is more than evident that both drew on Origen's expression ἡ οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία. What is more, however, both comments, that of Didymus and that of Theodoret on the specific Psalmic verse, are the same.

Didymus, *Fragmenta in Psalmos altera*, fr. 1065 and Theodoret, in the *Catena in Epistulam Petri i*, p. 45 (both authors comment on Psalm 113:24, as Origen himself had done by using the notion of οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία): Εἰς τοῦτον τὸν οὐρανὸν 'οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς' ἐπεὶ κάκειθεν ἀποσταλεῖς ἐλήλυθε φάσκων. 'καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.' ἢ ὁ Πέτρος φησὶν 'ἂ νῦν ἀνγγέλη ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ.' ἔνθα γὰρ ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ ὁ Υἱός, καὶ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. ἀλλ' ἐπίστησον ἀκριβῶς· μὴ εἰς αἰσθητὰ κατενέγκῃς τὴν περὶ τούτων νόησιν· οὐρανὸν τοπικὸν καὶ μετάβασιν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ καταφορὰν γινομένην ὑπολαβόν· Θεοῦ γὰρ προηγουμένην, ἵνα οὕτως εἴπω, ὑπεροχὴν καὶ κατάστασιν δηλοῖ ἡ τοῦ διηγηθέντος οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία.

We have ample evidence that Didymus had used the idea of 'heavens' meaning the 'essence of the intelligible things'.³⁰⁵ This is interesting, since this ran contrary to the hackneyed ancient concept of heavens denoting the visible universe.³⁰⁶ It has to be observed, however, that this idea appears almost exclusively in

Didymus' fragments on the Psalms. Since this is shared by Theodoret, the bishop of Cyrrhus himself might well have been one of those who picked up fragments from Didymus' commentaries. This appears to be a strong possibility once the entreaty, ὦ δέσποτα σῶτερ ([Scholion XXIX](#)), is considered,³⁰⁷ which is owed to Theodoret.

Likewise, there are instances which make it impossible for this catena to be the very words of Didymus. As I discuss on [Scholion XXV](#), we come across the verb συγκαταβαίνειν, which however actually appears in the form συνκαταβαίνειν.³⁰⁸ Likewise, in [Scholion XXIX](#), we have the spelling λημφθέντες instead of ληφθέντες.³⁰⁹ Both forms appear in Didymus, indeed they attest to Didymus' text itself having been copied literatim. There is an important point to be made, however: both forms occur (indeed recur) in different works of Didymus, except for one: *Fragmenta in Psalmos altera*, in which only the normal forms (συγκαταβαίνειν, ληφθείς, ληψόμενος, etc.) occur. In fact, the future tense ληψόμενος appears only in fragments of this collection,³¹⁰ whereas the instance in *De Trinitate* is one more indication that this is not a work by Didymus.³¹¹ It is interesting that the form συγκαταβαίνων appears in works ascribed to Didymus.³¹² However, there is not a single case in which *both* forms (συνκαταβαίνων and συγκαταβαίνων) appear in one and the same work ascribed to him. What is certain is that in the foregoing Scholia we have Didymus quoted, whereas these colloquialisms never appear in the *Fragmenta in Psalmos altera*.

What could possibly be the reason for the compiler of this anthology to associate Eusebius with Didymus (with Didymus presumed to have 'rendered

³⁰⁵ Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, Fr. 595a: μήποτ' οὖν σημαίνει ἡ οὐρανὸς φωνὴ τὴν ἀσώματον καὶ νοητὴν οὐσίαν. Fr. 808: ἡ οὐρανὸς φωνὴ σημαίνει τὴν τῶν νοητῶν οὐσίαν καθὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν διειλήφαμεν. Fr. 991: τὴν νοητὴν οὐσίαν οὐρανὸν ὀνομάζει. Fr. 1065: θεοῦ γὰρ προηγουμένην, ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω, ὑπεροχὴν καὶ κατάστασιν δηλοῖ ἡ τοῦ διηγηθέντος οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία. *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 86: περὶ ἔρωτος λέγει ὁ Σωκράτης, καθ' ὃν ἐρᾷ τις τῶν οὐρανίων πραγμάτων, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς νοητῆς οὐσίας. Also Didymus, *Catena in Joannem*, pp. 255–256: Οὐρανὸν λέγει σημαίνεσθαι τὴν ὥσανει περιωπὴν καὶ κατάστασιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἥτις οὐχ ἑτέρα τῆς νοητῆς αὐτοῦ οὐσίας τυγχάνει.

³⁰⁶ John Philoponus records that 'the appellation *heavens*' (ἡ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία) 'among the ancient people denoted the entire world' (τὸν πάντα κόσμον): *In Aristotelis*

Libros de Generatione et Corruptione Commenntaria, v. 14,2, p. 1.

³⁰⁷ This is canvassed in [EN XXIXc](#).

³⁰⁸ Didymus, *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 15; *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 222; *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 313.

³⁰⁹ Harnack did not notice either of these spellings, though they actually are in the codex: he wrote simply the normal συγκαταβαίνειν and ληφθέντες.

³¹⁰ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, frs. 337; 767; 1069; 1268.

³¹¹ *DT* (lib. 2.1–7), 7.8,12 (ληψόμενος.).

³¹² *commZacch*, 1.143; 2.355; 5.37; *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.39.1632.53; *In Genesin*, Cod. pp. 225; 227; *frPs(al)*, frs. 104; 173; 268; 581; 869. 972. Again, there is one instance in *DT* (lib. 3), PG.39.885.2, in which the form συνκαταβαίνων never occurs.

Eusebius’),³¹³ or else to ascribe a specific exegesis jointly to Didymus, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Apollinaris?³¹⁴ According to my discussion a few lines below, the catenist culls what he holds to be the right exegesis, even from Christians who were either suspected of heresy or indeed already branded as heretics.³¹⁵ Nevertheless, this did not prevent Procopius of Gaza in compiling his catena on the Song of Songs from excerpting from such authors as Origen, Apollinaris, and Didymus, along with Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Eusebius, and Theodoret.³¹⁶

By the same token, Theodoret’s interest in both Alexandrian theology and Eusebius is confirmed from other points: there are cases of a passage being ascribed to all three, namely, Theodoret, Athanasius, and Cyril of Alexandria. Once again, the catenist is probably a student of Theodoret,³¹⁷ who elsewhere excerpted from Apollinaris³¹⁸ and even from Cyril of Alexandria.³¹⁹ As a matter of fact, once works of biblical exegesis by either Theodoret or Cyril are studied carefully, it turns out that essential differences between those two allegedly lethal foes hardly exist.

To cite an instance, let us examine the comments by either of them on the verse Zachariah, 9:9. The gospel of Matthew quotes this as a prophecy fulfilled upon the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem ‘sitting upon an ass’s colt’ (Matt. 21:5–6). The same passage is quoted in

John, 12:12–15 as a prophetic utterance, which was fulfilled upon that event.³²⁰ It immediately turns out that both theologians share the same exegetical approach.

Furthermore, there are cases where a certain text is ascribed to both Eusebius and Didymus’ compilation from commentaries on the Psalms. There is of course no question of Didymus’ having copied Eusebius. The case may well be that this is an ascription by the catenist, who lumped together two writers whom he regarded as not impeccably orthodox, yet he deemed them eminent scholars, whose work was worthy of being quoted.³²¹ The motif, ‘the teaching about Providence’ (ὁ λόγος ὁ περὶ προνοίας), common in both writers on this passage, should be given some attention, since this is an all but hackneyed phrase in Christian writers, and is used in [Scholion XXVII](#). We shall come upon telling notions such as God’s ‘power to punish’ (κολαστική δύναμις),³²² and ‘universal judgement’ (καθολικὴ κρίσις),³²³ which show a close affiliation between Eusebius and Didymus.

Accordingly, the imagery of ‘heavens opening’ (Rev. 4:1) occurring in [Scholion XXV](#), is employed by both Theodoret and Origen. Theodoret comments on Psalm, 77:23, seeing this as an imagery betokening ‘the divine grant’ (τὴν θεϊαν χορηγίαν),³²⁴ which is an idea derived from Origen via Eusebius.³²⁵ Origen is attested to have taken ‘gates of heaven’ to mean ‘rational

³¹³ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 894: Δίδυμος δὲ τῆς Εὐσεβίου ἐρμηνείας τὴν διάνοιαν οὕτως ἀποδέδωκε.

³¹⁴ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 879: Καὶ οὕτως μὲν Εὐσέβιος ὁ Καισαρείας καὶ Δίδυμος καὶ Ἀπολλινάριος ἐξηγήσαντο.

³¹⁵ Cf. the author repudiating Apollinaris: Didymus, *commEccl* (5–6), Cod. p. 154; *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 221; *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. pp. 73. Of these references, Apollinaris is tagged as ‘a heretic’ only in the commentary on the Psalms.

³¹⁶ Procopius of Gaza, *In Canticum Cantorum*, p. 1545.

³¹⁷ Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.561.4 (the passage is a wholesale attribution to Athanasius, Cyril, and Theodoret at the same time).

³¹⁸ Cf. Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Fragmenta in Psalmos*, fr. 153 (comm. on Psalm 88, 36–39), indicating that ‘these have been expounded by Theodoret, as Apollinaris did’ (Ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Θεοδώρητος ὁμοίως Ἀπολλινάριος ἐξέθετο).

³¹⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, *expPs*, PG.69: 976.28; 985.19; 992.30; 993.23; 1008.54; 1012.18; 1104.38; 1105.11; 1108.3; 1141.7; 1165.17; 1169.46; 1172.3 and 29; 1176.45; 1177.40. At all these points the indication is, ‘by Cyril and Theodoret’ (Κυρίλλου καὶ Θεοδώρητου). At PG.69:1069.7 and 1161.41 the title is, ‘by Cyril, Eusebius, Theodoret’.

³²⁰ Cf. Theodoret, *intProphXII*, PG.81.1924.3–19. Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 2, pp. 415 (line 6) – 417 (line 8). Both authors comment on the prophet Zachariah.

³²¹ Since the compiler of Didymus’ *frPs(al)* was equally hostile to both Didymus and Eusebius, he eventually was confused. Hence, we

have the same text attributed to both Eusebius, *Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG.23.1273.21–39 and Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 995 (comm. on Psalm 103:13–15). In Didymus there is only the addition κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν (according to an anagogical interpretation) added both in the beginning and at a subsequent point: ὁρῶ· εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ πνευματοφόροι ἄνδρες. ποτίζονται ἐκ τῶν ὑπερφῶν αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, πληρούμενοι τῶν τοῦ πνεύματος χαρισμάτων, λόγου σοφίας καὶ τῶν ἐξῆς ἀπηριθμημένων. ὑπερῶα δὲ θεοῦ ἅφ’ ὧν τὰ ὅρη ποτίζει ἀκραφνεῖς καὶ ὑπερβάλλουσαι θεωρίαι τῆς ἀληθείας τυγχάνουσιν, ὑπερῶα καλούμεναι τῷ μηδὲν αὐτὰς ὑπεραναβεβηκέναι. Ἀπὸ καρποῦ τῶν ἔργων σου χορτασθήσεται ἡ γῆ. αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶπε· Βλαστησάτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου καὶ ξύλον κάρπιδιον ποιοῦν καρπὸν, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Didymus, κατὰ δὲ ἀναγωγὴν] ἐκ τῶν Ἰησοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιδημίαν ἔργων πολλὴν καρπὸν ἐχόντων ἅπανα ἡ γῆ χορτάζεται μεταλαμβάνουσα τῶν οὕτω παραδόξως ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ γεγεννημένων. οὗτος γὰρ καρπὸς τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ τυγχάνει. καὶ ὁ λόγος δὲ ὁ περὶ τῶν ἔργων τῆς δημιουργίας καὶ προνοίας αὐτοῦ νοηθεὶς οἷα καρπὸς ἔργων θεοῦ τυγχάνων χορτάσει τὴν γῆν, φημί δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διατρίβοντας ἀνθρώπους.

³²² [EN XXXc](#).

³²³ [EN XXXI](#).

³²⁴ Theodoret, *commIs*, 1; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1489.26–35.

³²⁵ Cf. Origen, *frPs*, 77, 19–25. Eusebius renders ‘opening of the heavens’ as the ‘divine actions’: *Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG.23.917.30–32.

natures moving towards spiritual teaching'.³²⁶ However, all the content of catena-passages about 'heavens opening' may have been derived from Theodoret. More to the point, his hero Theodore of Mopsuestia had indeed made much of the notion.³²⁷ On this topic, there is a passage that is at the same time ascribed to Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria, and Didymus.³²⁸

Misattribution is always a ready refuge for those who seek to maintain old stereotypes intact. I shall therefore make the following point, as both an example and a caveat.

The expression 'since the creation of the world' takes two forms in scripture: first, ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου;³²⁹ second, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.³³⁰ Consequently the two nouns, namely, κτίσεως and καταβολῆς, came to be considered to be synonymous, pointing to the beginning of creation. Naturally, both scriptural expressions appear in many Christian authors as a matter of course. What is extremely rare, however, is to come upon passages using *both* nouns at the same point, in order to make reference to the beginning of the world. Once this point is considered, significant conclusions flow. For indeed the expression occurs in only a handful of writings. Origen appears once again as the father of the combination.³³¹ Following this, an instance occurs in a commentary on Isaiah, which I believe is Cassian's,³³² and at two points in Photius, neither of which is actually Photius' own. Of these, one is the collection *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, where affinities with Cassian are too striking and too many to be discounted, which means that a serious re-

examination of the attribution of many of these epistles is necessary.³³³ The second point occurs in a review by Photius. The book reviewed is the *Contra Fatum* of Diodorus of Tarsus, and this expression is a quotation from Diodorus' book.³³⁴ In other words, a specific locution which was introduced by Origen was copied and reproduced by two Antiochenes, namely Diodorus of Tarsus and Cassian.

Moreover, we have large portions which are ascribed to both Origen and Didymus. For instance, a comment on Psalm 23:10, which draws on the Apocalypse to make the point that Christ is *Pantocrator*, is the same text attributed to either of them in different collections. Didymus was enthusiastic about establishing this designation for Christ by means of the Apocalypse, as we have seen. Cassian was happy to see Didymus laying stress on this appellation, which was not far from the Antiochene tendency to ascribe the term δεσπότης not only to God in general, but specifically to Christ.³³⁵

Origen, *frPs*, 23, 10. The same text, in Didymus, *Fragmenta in Psalmos altera* (on Psalm 23:8–10), fr. 215: Εἰκότως ἡ Παντοκράτωρ φωνὴ τοῦ Σωτῆρος κατηγορηθεῖη· εἰ γὰρ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γέγονεν, καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν, κρατεῖ τε προνοητικῶς τῶν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντων γεγεννημένων, καὶ πρὸ πάντων ἐστὶν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ συστάντων, ἀκολουθῶς Παντοκράτωρ λέγεται· αὐτοῦ γοῦν ἐστὶν πρόσωπον λέγον ἐν *Ζαχαρία*: Οὕτως λέγει Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ· Ὅπισω δόξης ἀπέστειλέ με, καὶ γνώσῃ ὅτι Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ ἀπέσταλκέ με πρὸς σέ. Παντοκράτωρ γὰρ ὑπὸ Παντοκράτορος ἀποστελλόμενος ὁ Υἱὸς ἐστίν,

³²⁶ Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1541.25–27.

³²⁷ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *expPs*, 67, 10. The 'opening of the heavens' suggesting divine activity through his angels recurs in Theodore's *commProphXII*, Prophet Malachi, 3.1a.

³²⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *expPs*, PG.69.801.49–50.

³²⁹ Rom. 1:20.

³³⁰ Matt. 25:34; Luke 11:50; John 17:24; Eph. 1:4; Heb. 4:3; 9:26; 1 Peter, 1:20; Rev. 13:8; 17:8. In Matt. 13:35 the word κόσμου is doubtful and seems to be an editorial insertion.

³³¹ Origen, *deOr*, VI.3: ἀναγκάτως τοῦτο μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν, πρὶν γένηται, τῷ θεῷ ἔγνωσται 'ἀπὸ κτίσεως' καὶ 'καταβολῆς κόσμου'. *Commentariorum Series in Evangelium Matthaei* (Mt. 22.34–27.63), p. 113: οἱ ἀπὸ κτίσεως καὶ καταβολῆς κόσμου χαράντες ἐπὶ τῷ ἰδεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ ὡς Ἀβραάμ. *selEx*, PG.12.293.6–8: Τοσοῦτῳ χρόνῳ ὁ διάβολος ἡμαρτάνει ἀπὸ κτίσεως, καὶ καταβολῆς κόσμου. The expression ἀπὸ κτίσεως, καὶ

καταβολῆς κόσμου is a gloss to the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς of 1 John 3:8. In Origen the term καταβολή is taken literally, notably, in the sense of the world being a 'downfall'. In other words, this suggests the Actual Creation (see *COT*, pp. 116; 117; 118; 131; 240; 317; 327; 362). *commJohn*, XIX.149; *Princ*, III.5.4.

³³² Pseudo-Basil of Caesarea, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 6.183: Πρὸς τοὺς ἀπὸ κτίσεως καὶ καταβολῆς κόσμου Ἄγιους ἀεὶ ἀποστέλλονται θεῖαι δυνάμεις.

³³³ Photius (?), *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, Epistle 16, lines 28–29: ἐν τῇ τῆς κτίσεως καταβολῇ. In *RCR*, I have shown in detail that this epistle was written by the same hand as the text of Pseudo-Caesarius. See the two uniquely parallel passages in that book, Appendix I, p. 432.

³³⁴ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 223, p. 212b (quoting Diodorus of Tarsus): ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κτίσεως.

³³⁵ See *Scholion I*.

ὑπὸ Πατρὸς πεμπόμενος. Ἀριδηλότατα³³⁶ δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψει, Παντοκράτωρ ὁ Σωτὴρ λέγεται. Τάδε γὰρ λέγει Κύριος, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός, ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος Κύριος, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Παντοκράτωρ. Ἀναμφισβητήτως ταῦτα περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ εἴρηται.³³⁷

The quoted text is from Zachariah, 2:12, a prophet Didymus especially liked. Yet strange to say, the text is not from the Septuagint, but a paraphrased translation from the Hebrew, which is highly unlike Didymus, who did not know the language, as he himself says.³³⁸ In no instance other than this is this text quoted as a rendering from the Hebrew. My explanation of this is relevant to a point I often make in this book: Origen's excerpts from the Commentary on the Psalms were compiled in Palestine, probably in the Laura of Sabas, by monks of Antiochene sentiment. Cassian is to me highly likely to be a compiler and is the one who at many points of his book quotes biblical passages specially rendered from the Hebrew, not the Septuagint.

There are telling details that show both Origen and Theodoret sharing common concerns and readings. Along with Eusebius, they are the only authors (until the ninth century) to mention Herophilus,³³⁹ who in

turn had been amply cited by Galen, and was also mentioned by Plutarch, Lucian of Samosata, and Julius Naucratis.³⁴⁰ Those four Greek authors make a distinctive mark in my exploration of the Scholia, and all four of them were intellectuals whom both Origen and Theodoret had studied in the first place.³⁴¹ Plutarch is the author whom Origen explicitly says he has read,³⁴² and both Eusebius and Theodoret mention in abundance.³⁴³

The same goes for the notion of θύραθεν νοῦς ('the mind which enters a human being from outside' and is 'divine'), which I have canvassed elsewhere.³⁴⁴ Once again, the idea turns out to have been used by Origen and Theodoret only,³⁴⁵ which reflects study of Aristotle via Alexander of Aphrodisias,³⁴⁶ as I will discuss in due course in relation to most of the Scholia. There is indeed a continuous, yet hardly visible, line from Origen to Theodoret. Gregory of Nazianzus was also aware of the notion,³⁴⁷ which is otherwise mentioned in the ninth century only by Photius and his *protégé* Arethas of Caesarea.³⁴⁸

Theodoret had good reason for reading Alexander of Aphrodisias, since he was the authoritative exponent of Aristotle at the dawn of Late Antiquity. Besides,

³³⁶ The adjective ἀριδής and its cognates (adverb ἀριδηλότατα) was heavily entertained by Philo and Clement of Alexandria, but it was never taken up by Origen, whereas Didymus favoured its use, and so did Theodoret. Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.411 (ἀριδηλότατα); 3.16 (ἀριδηλότατα); *frPs(al)*, fr. 116 (φανερὰ καὶ ἀριδής); fr. 215 (ἀριδηλότατα). This is the text of Origen's, *frPs*, 23, 10; fr. 1291 (ἀριδής); *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 106 (σαφές καὶ ἀριδηλότατον). Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 5.62 (ἀριδήλους); *Eranistes*, p. 84 (ἀριδής).

³³⁷ Likewise, Origen, *Excerpta in Psalmos* (on Psalm 23:10), PG.17.116.16–27: Καὶ τὸ νῦν ἄρα λεχθέν, παντοκράτωρ τὸν Σωτῆρα δηλοῖ. Οὕτως λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ: Ὅπισω δόξης ἀπέστειλέ με πρὸς σέ. Παντοκράτωρ γὰρ ὢν ὁ Πατήρ, τὸν Υἱὸν ἀπέστειλε παντοκράτωρ. Καὶ Ἰωάννης δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει, Τάδε λέγει, φησὶν, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός, ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος· περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ὁμολογουμένως εἰπὼν.

³³⁸ The text has Zach. 2:12 thus: Οὕτως λέγει Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ· Ὅπισω δόξης ἀπέστειλέ με, καὶ γνώσῃ ὅτι Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ ἀπέσταλκέ με πρὸς σέ. The Septuagint text has it: τάδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ· Ὅπισω δόξης ἀπέσταλκέν με ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ σκυλεύσαντα ὑμᾶς, διότι ὁ ἀπτόμενος ὑμῶν ὡς ἀπτόμενος τῆς κόρης τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ αὐτοῦ.

³³⁹ Cf. discussion in *PHE*, p. 84.

³⁴⁰ Plutarch, *De Curiositate*, 518D3; *Aetia Physica*, 912D11. Lucian of Samosata, *Icaromenippus*, 16. Julius Naucratis, *Onomasticon*, 2.202. Galen, *De Pulsuum*, v. 8, pp. 746; 747; 749; 754; *et passim*; *De Pulsibus libri iv*, v. 8, pp. 771; 786; 787; 853; *et passim*; *De Pulsuum Causis*, v. 9, pp. 22; 139; *De Praesagitione ex Pulsibus Libri iv*, v. 9, pp. 275; 278; *et passim*. Herophilus is mentioned by Galen in

his books at more than a hundred and thirty points, to which those in the pseudo-Galenic literature should be added.

³⁴¹ Cf. Herophilus mentioned by name. Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1053.18 and 29; Eusebius, *PE*, 15.61.4; Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 5.22. In fact Theodoret quotes from Eusebius.

³⁴² Origen, *Cels*, V.57.

³⁴³ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 1.21; 2.24; 2.84; *et passim*; Eusebius, *PE*, 1.7.16; 3.2.1; *et passim*.

³⁴⁴ Aristotle, *De Generatione Animalium*, 736b27–28: λείπεται δὴ τὸν νοῦν μόνον θύραθεν ἐπεισέναι καὶ θεῖον εἶναι μόνον· οὐθὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ κοινωνεῖ ἡ σωματικὴ ἐνέργεια. Cf. 744b20–21; *De Respiratione*, 472a22. Cf. *PHE*, pp. 265.

³⁴⁵ Origen, *Cels*, III.80. Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 5.28.

³⁴⁶ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Anima*, pp. 90; 91; *Fragmenta*, frs. 1; 16c. Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Anima*, pp. 108–113; Plutarch was also aware of this Aristotelian notion, even though he did not make much use of it. Plutarch, *De Genio Socratis*, 589b.

³⁴⁷ Gregory of Nazianzus, *De Spiritu Sancto*, 5.

³⁴⁸ Photius, *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, Epistle 315: διττός, ἵνα νῦν τὸν θύραθεν καὶ τὸν συγκατασκευασθέντα τῷ ἀνθρώπινῳ συγκρίματι ὡς μηδὲν προσήκοντα τῇ ὑποθέσει ἑάσω. Arethas was also aware of the notion, which is natural since he was a disciple of Photius. Cf. Arethas, *Scripta Minora*, Opus 17, p. 191: κἄν εἰ τῇ τοῦ θύραθεν προσλήψει, τὸ τοῦ Σταγειρίτου εἰπεῖν. Photius no doubt had received his knowledge about θύραθεν νοῦς from Alexander, of whom he writes in *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 251, 461b (the same text, in Cod. 214, 172b).

Eusebius had both treated Alexander respectfully and quoted extensively from his treatise *On Fate*.³⁴⁹

Never did Theodoret seek to conceal his admiration and respect for Theodore of Mopsuestia (c. 350–428)³⁵⁰ and for Diodorus of Tarsus (bishop, 378–390),³⁵¹ both of whom he praised. Theodore is the great ‘doctor of the universal Church’ (πάσης ἐκκλησίας διδάσκαλος);³⁵² Diodorus, ‘the most wise, the most brave, the great one’ (Διόδωρος μὲν ὁ σοφώτατός τε καὶ ἀνδρειότατος καὶ μέγας . . . τὸν μέγαν Διόδωρον), who used to take ‘arrows’ out of his own ‘armoury’ against the Arians (οὗτος δὲ καθάπερ ἔκ τινος ὀπλοθήκης, ἔκ τῆς διανοίας τὰ βέλη προσέφερεν);³⁵³ the ‘divine Diodorus’ (τὸν θεῖον Διόδωρον);³⁵⁴ the ‘excellent Diodorus’ (Διοδώρου τοῦ πάνυ).³⁵⁵ Later, Theodoret had to defend himself, when he was arraigned by certain of the orthodox for having included both of them among the doctors of the Church.³⁵⁶ Emperor Julian the Apostate almost dreaded Diodorus’ rhetorical aptitude, so much so, that in a letter to his friend Photinus, the emperor claims that ‘the divinity of Christ is an invention by Diodorus building on a tale’, whereas in reality Christ ‘died a shameful death’. This epistle by Julian addressed to Photinus is not extant. We have the passage, albeit quoted in Latin, in a treatise by Facundus, the African bishop of Herminiane, addressed to Justinian.³⁵⁷

The seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale* names Theodoret as the ‘one who extended many words and commendations in favour of Theodore’ of Mopsuestia.³⁵⁸ This is important, since philological analysis shows the vocabulary of the Scholia to have links with the two theologians. Theodoret praises Diodorus in glowing terms that can hardly leave any reader untouched.

As a matter of fact, Theodoret was not alone in doing so. Diodorus’ pupil, John Chrysostom, praises his master in the usual flowery prose, which is characteristic of the Antiochene archbishop of Constantinople. Diodorus’ voice is described as both sweet like the sound of a ‘lyre’, and ‘powerful’; this is like the trumpets of the Jews, which demolished the walls of Jericho; in like manner Diodorus’s voice demolished heretical doctrines.³⁵⁹ In a letter to Diodorus, Basil of Caesarea praises both the potency of his exposition and the beauty of his writing, adding that it had taken much labour for him to assimilate the subtle notions that Diodorus had expounded.³⁶⁰

The Scholia do not contain critical or groundbreaking theological statements. One can only see the writer launching a wholesale attack on two mutually conflicting parties. First, the revived Docetism, which in the fourth century was espoused by Apollinaris, and made Christ not fully human – to which both Theodore and Diodore reacted fiercely. Second, Arianism,

³⁴⁹ Cf. Eusebius, *PE*, 6.9.1: συνήφθω δὲ τούτοις καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Ἀφροδισιεύως, ἀνδρὸς εὖ μάλα διαφανοῦς ἐν τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγοις, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς Περὶ εἰμαρμένης τοιαῖσδ’ ἐχρήσατο φωναῖς εἰς ἀνασκευὴν τοῦ δόγματος. Eusebius then engages in an extensive quotation from Alexander’s *De Fato*.

³⁵⁰ Cf. Theodoret, *HE*, pp. 82; 87; 97; 187; 277; 286; 329; 348; *Epistulae*, 1–52, Epistle 16.

³⁵¹ Cf. Theodoret, *HE*, pp. 92; 154; 208; 263; 264; 267; 282; 287; 321; 347; 348. *Historia Religiosa*, Vitae 2.16; 8.6–7; *Epistulae*, 1–52, 16; *Explanatio In Canticum Cantorum*, PG.81.32.26; *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83: 340.14; 381.28; 397.16; *Eranistes*, p. 95.

³⁵² Theodoret, *HE*, p. 347.

³⁵³ *Ibid.* p. 264.

³⁵⁴ Theodoret, *Historia Religiosa*, vita 8.7.

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.* p. 347.

³⁵⁶ Theodoret, *Epistulae*, 1–52, Epistle 16: Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐπιμέμφεσθέ μοι καὶ ὡς τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ μακαρίους καταλελοιπότι Πατέρα Διόδωρον καὶ Θεόδωρον ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ τῶν διδασκάλων.

³⁵⁷ Facundi, Hermianensis Episcopi, *Pro Defensione Trium Capitulum Concilii Chalcedonensis Libri XII Ad Justinianum Imperatorem*, IV.2 (PL.67.621A–B): ‘Julianus etenim Christo perfidus imperator,

sic Photino haeresiarchae adversus Diodorum scribit: “Tu quidem, o Photine, verisimilis videris, et proximus salvare, beneficiens nequaquam in utero inducere quem credidisti Deum. Diodorus autem Nazaraei magus, ejus pigmentalibus manganes acuens irrationabilitatem, acutus apparuit sophista religionis agrestis.” Et post paululum: “Quod si nobis opitulati fuerint dii et deae, et musae omnes, et fortuna; ostendemus infirmum et corruptorem legum, et rationum, et mysteriorum paganorum, et deorum infernorum; et illum novum ejus Deum Galilaeum, quem aeternum fabulose praedicat, indigna morte et sepultura, denudatum confictae a Diodoro deitatis.”

³⁵⁸ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 681: Θεοδόρητος, ὁ πολλοὺς ὑπὲρ Θεοδώρου λόγους τε καὶ ἐπαίνους ἐκτείνας.

³⁵⁹ John Chrysostom, *Laus Diodori Episcopi*, PG.52.764.46–51: Ὅταν μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἐννοήσω τῶν ῥημάτων, λύραν καλῶ τὴν τοῦτου φωνήν· ὅταν δὲ τὸ δυνατόν τῶν νοημάτων, σάλπιγγά τινα πολεμικήν, καὶ τοιαύτην, οἷαν εἶχον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἥνικα τὰ τῆς Ἱερικῶς τείχης κατέβαλον.

³⁶⁰ Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae*, Epistle 135.1: Τὸ δὲ πρότερον τὴν μὲν δύναμιν ἔχον τὴν αὐτὴν ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι, λέξει δὲ πολυτελεστέρα καὶ σχήμασι ποικίλοις καὶ διαλογικαῖς χάρισι κεκομψευμένον, πολλοῦ μοι ἐφάνη καὶ χρόνου πρὸς τὸ ἐπελθεῖν καὶ πόνου διανοίας πρὸς τὸ καὶ συλλέξαι τὰς ἐννοίας καὶ παρακατασχεῖν αὐτὰς τῇ μνήμῃ δεόμενον.

which taught that Jesus Christ was not fully divine. These two parties were actively opposed by Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, which is also what Theodoret himself had done countering the two heresies, while detecting Apollinarism in Cyril's teaching.³⁶¹

Although according to current criteria 'Antiochene', Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia constitute a strong spiritual link between Theodoret and Origen. For Diodorus was a staunch exponent of God's loving mercy and therefore, of the doctrine of *apokatastasis*.

The Scholia make much of Revelation's statement that the number of those eventually saved will be as many as one hundred and forty-four thousand. The author stresses not only the symbolic significance of this sacred number, but also that this is an overwhelmingly greater number of people than comprised the first-century Church. This number therefore signifies those who shall be saved at the end: they will be a crowd the number of which exceeds any expectation. This indicates universal salvation and the defeat of the Adversary, which is evil itself rather than any specific person representing Satan.

Theodoret was an 'Antiochene', and he could hardly be expected to be fond of allegory according to the current criteria. He knew however that one cannot approach Revelation without allowing some room for allegory, since the vision of John is itself in fact a metaphor heavily loaded with symbols and parabolic narrative. We come upon statements in the Scholia that allow for divine numerology, which we can confidently identify as statements by Didymus. Still they are points that Theodoret's pupil Cassian embraced and used in order to show the authority of the book of Revelation. Since Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse was Cassian's main guide, it was inevitable

for him to imbibe some of the Alexandrian's overall approach while using this as the main source for his own commentary.

The term 'allegory' does not occur in the Scholia, yet it makes its presence felt by means of germane terminology, such as ἀναγωγή³⁶² or νοητός,³⁶³ or simply 'spiritual' interpretation.³⁶⁴ However, neither divine numerology nor allegory is banned from Theodoret's theology, as one might perhaps have assumed. No matter how cautious he was about using the term 'allegory', how could he possibly have written a commentary on the Song of Songs without having recourse to allegory? As a matter of fact, in the prologue to this exegetical work, Theodoret launches an attack on those who wished to interpret the book in historical terms, as a story of the love between Solomon and the daughter of Pharaoh. This approach is styled 'myths' that are inferior even to 'those narrated by elderly women talking nonsense' (μύθους δέ τινας οὐδὲ γραϊδίους παραληροῦσιν ἀρμόττοντας ὑφαινότων). Theodoret attacks extreme literalism, urging that this book is a 'spiritual' one (πνευματικὸν εἶναι τὸ βιβλίον). Once literalism is applied to this text, one can only expect a 'false and harmful' interpretation (τὴν διεψευσμένην ταύτην καὶ βλαβερὰν), which is why there is no other way to explain this poem than by a 'spiritual' exegesis. The term 'spiritual' to him denotes simply an 'allegorical' exegesis. It is no accident that we come upon this in the Scholia, since Cassian eschews the terms 'allegory' or 'allegorical'.³⁶⁵ That Antiochenes refrained from using the word does not mean that they shunned the method. Theodoret opted for the adverb 'tropologically' (τροπικῶς),³⁶⁶ which he used almost exclusively, whereas, apart from one instance,³⁶⁷ the adjective τροπικός is not used at all. When Theodoret says that something 'is so styled tropologically', he normally introduces an allegorical

³⁶¹ Theodoret, *Oratio ad Eos Qui in Euphratesia et Osrhoena Regione*, PG.83.1416-1433.

³⁶² Cf. *Scholia VII* (ἀνηγμένως) and *XIII* (κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν).

³⁶³ Cf. *Scholia XXIII*; *XXV*; *XXVII*; *XXXI*; *XXXV*.

³⁶⁴ Cf. *Scholion XIV* (πνευματικὴ ψήφω); *XXIX* (πνευματικαὶ θυσίαι); *XXXI* (κατὰ πνευματικὴν ἀκολουθίαν).

³⁶⁵ *Scholion XIV*: ἐπειδὴ δὲ περὶ πνευματικῶν ὁ λόγος, ἀνωτέρω χωρητέον παντὸς αἰσθητοῦ δηλουμένου περὶ τῆς ψήφου, ἐν τῇ πνευματικῇ τοίνυν ψήφω, λευκῇ διὰ τὸ φωτοειδές, ὄνομα καινόν γράφεται. *Scholion XXIX*: τὰ θυμιάματα εἰσιν αἱ προσευχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ

πνευματικαὶ θυσίαι καὶ εὐπρόσδεκτοι θεῷ αἱ ἀγαθαὶ πράξεις. *Scholion XXXI*: ἐπεὶ τοίνυν πολὺ τὸ ἀδύνατον ἢ αἰσθητῇ διήγησις ἔχει, ἀληθὴ δὲ εἰσιν τὰ ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ ἁγία οὐσία, ἀνάγκη κατὰ πνευματικὴν ἀκολουθίαν ἐκλαμβάνειν τὰ προκειμένα.

³⁶⁶ Cf. τροπικῶς in Theodoret, *comm.* 2; 3; 4; 5; et passim in *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, *intProphXII*.

³⁶⁷ Theodoret, *De Providentia*, PG.83.721.44 (τροπικῇ).

interpretation.³⁶⁸ He is anyway conscious of the term ‘allegorically’ being contrasted with ‘historically’.³⁶⁹ Besides, ‘spiritual’ for allegorical is indeed used,³⁷⁰ and the term ἀναγωγή (occurring in *Scholia VII* and *XIII*) is reluctantly used at one point only, whereas another instance appears in a spurious work, which is highly likely to be Cassian’s.³⁷¹ The Song of Songs is to Theodore the work of ‘the wise Solomon’ (τοῦ σοφοῦ Σολομῶντος).³⁷² Once some allegorical exegesis is indispensable, to an Antiochene mind it appeared that some ‘boldness’ is necessary in order to interpret this text.³⁷³ At some points his style is very much like Origen, and Theodore was prepared to acknowledge his debts: this is why he asks his readers not to think of him as ‘a plagiarist’ (μὴ κλοπὴν ἡμῶν κατηγορεῖν), since the literary heritage of the Church is a common ‘patrimony’ (ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο οὐ κλοπή, ἀλλὰ κληρονομία πατρῶα).³⁷⁴

An entire section in this commentary is based on speculation about numbers symbolizing divine truths. This is a section that could have made Didymus admire not only the exegetical decisions by Theodore explaining the mystical significance of numbers in scripture, but also the fine combination of didactic with speculative reasoning.³⁷⁵ When, therefore, Cassian entertains the same method in the *Scholia* (although

largely culling from Didymus) treating such Pythagorean doctrines as legitimate Christian exegesis, he does so trusting that the path that had been paved by Theodore had the blessing of Antioch as well. It could be argued that since Theodore practised allegory, he implied in effect that the Antiochene hostility to allegory was superannuated. Discussing such a question is outside my scope, however. Suffice it to say that if some quarters of scholarship cannot stomach open-mindedness as a trait of Theodore, he should at least be tolerated as an unclassified specimen. What cannot be reasonably claimed is that his acquiescence in allegorical exegesis is simply a seasonal complexion which Cassian followed confidently and defiantly. Furthermore, one might be surprised that the notion of *apokatastasis* is not alien to Theodore. Reflecting in a genuinely Origenistic vein, Theodore comments on the sublime conclusion of the Song of Songs, which Origen regarded as the work in which the highest theological truths have been enshrined.

It has been held that symbology of numbers is a distinctive characteristic of the Alexandrian school and was disturbing to the Antiochenes. And yet, Theodore regards the number ‘one thousand’ as symbolizing Christ,³⁷⁶ whom man can eventually reach by piously using his five physical senses, in other words, through

³⁶⁸ Theodore, *commls*, 2: Κέρας δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν τροπικῶς ὀνομάζει. Ibid. 10: Οὐρανὸν οἶμαι τροπικῶς ἐνταῦθα (τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ) ὀνομάζεσθαι. *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1061.25: καὶ τροπικῶς πλῆθος ὑδάτων τῶν πολεμίων ὀνομάζων τὸ πλῆθος. Ibid. PG.80.1513.36–37: Ἀμπελον τροπικῶς τὸν λαὸν ὀνομάσας. Ibid. PG.80.1892.43: Ὑπνον ἐνταῦθα τροπικῶς τὴν ἀνάπαισιν προσηγόρευσεν. *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.512.9: Πόαν τὰ ἀπὸ γῆς φυόμενα ῥύμματα ὀνομάζει· καὶ διδάσκει τροπικῶς διὰ τούτων. Ibid. PG.81.533.5: Κάρυλλον ἐνταῦθα τροπικῶς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ ὀνομάζεσθαι. *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.940.25: ἐπειδὴ πορνείαν τὴν εἰδωλολατρείαν τροπικῶς ὀνομάζει. Ibid. PG.81.948.14: οὐ γυναῖκας δὲ τὰς γυναῖκας ὀνομάζει, ἀλλὰ τροπικῶς τὰς πόλεις οὕτω καλεῖ. Ibid. PG.81.984.10–11: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τροπικῶς αὐτὸν ἐκάλεσε λέοντα, ἀκολούθως καὶ τὰ συμβάντα αὐτῷ τροπικῶς ὀνομάζει. *intDan*, PG.81.1529.35: Εἰ δὲ καὶ τροπικῶς ταῦτα δεῖ νοῆσαι τὰ ὀνόματα. *intProphXII*, PG.81.1636.26: Τινὲς μὲν οὖν ταῦτα τροπικῶς εἷς τε τὸν Ἀσσύριον καὶ Βαβυλώνιον ἐξειλήφασιν. Ibid. PG.81.1764.36: τροπικῶς αὐτὴν ὀνομάζει. Ibid. PG.81.1784.19: τροπικῶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκάλεσε πρόβατα. *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.33.3–5: καὶ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ πολλὰ τροπικῶς ἡ θεία λέγει Γραφή· καὶ ἑτέροις ὀνόμασι κεχρημένη, ἕτερα δὲ διὰ τούτων σημαίνει. Ibid. PG.81.44.2: μίξιν δὲ πάλιν ἐνταῦθα τροπικῶς τὴν τῶν εἰδώλων θεραπείαν ὀνομάζει. Ibid. PG.81.65.43: Τοῦτο γὰρ τροπικῶς ὁ οἶνος ὀνομάζεται, and *passim* in the same work.

³⁶⁹ Theodore, *intDan*, PG.81.1532.8–10: Εἰ μὲν οὖν τροπικῶς βούλει

νοῆσαι τὰ ὀνόματα, οὕτω νοήσεις. Εἰ δὲ ἱστορικῶς, ὥς ἤδη προειρήκαμεν.

³⁷⁰ Theodore, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1028.32 (τὸ πνευματικὸν ἔλαιον); *ibid.* PG.80.1212.33 (τῆς πνευματικῆς πόλεως); *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.152.14 (πνευματικὴν περιστέραν).

³⁷¹ Theodore, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.949.18–19 (τὴν δὲ ἀναγωγὴν ἰσχυρότεραν ἐξετάσωμεν). Pseudo-Theodore (or Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, p. 250 (τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀναγωγῆς νόημα).

³⁷² Theodore, *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.29.48–49; so on 49.10 and 31.

³⁷³ Ibid. PG.81.49.7–8: τῆς ἐρμηνείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου κατεθάρρησαμεν.

³⁷⁴ Theodore, *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.48.36–41.

³⁷⁵ Ibid. PG.81.209.31f.

³⁷⁶ Cf. Theodore commenting on Song of Songs, 12:12: ‘My vineyard, which is mine, is before me: thou, O Solomon, must have a thousand, and those that keep the fruit, thereof two hundred.’ Ibid. PG.81.212.37–49: καὶ γὰρ ὁ μὲν χίλια ἀριθμὸς τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἐμφαίνει τελειότητα, ἀπροσδεῖς ὑπάρχων μόνος· . . ἡ γὰρ χιλιάς καὶ ἡ μυριάς τῷ τῆς μονάδος στοιχείῳ γνωρίζονται· ὁ δὲ διακόσιος πάλιν ἀριθμὸς τὴν τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν εἰς ἑαυτὴν διὰ τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐργασίας δηλοῖ ἀποκατάστασιν, ὥς δεκαπλασιάζων κατὰ τὴν δεκάδα τῶν ἐντολῶν τὸν ἐκ τοῦ τετράκις πέντε συντιθέμενον· κἀντεῦθεν δηλοῦντα τὸν ἐξ ὕλης καὶ εἶδους τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν σύνθετον εἰκοστὸν ἀριθμόν. Notice the Aristotelian terminology: ‘our nature consists of matter and form’ (ἐξ ὕλης καὶ εἶδους).

proper *historical* moral action. ‘One thousand’ divided by ‘five’ makes ‘two hundred’, which is the proportion of fruit for each of the senses: all of them together (once they have acted in an upright manner) make up ‘one thousand’, which signifies the *return* to Christ, as the ‘fruit’ of proper action. The surprised reader will find that Theodoret’s point is no different from the eschatological *apokatastasis* Origen had advanced. As a matter of fact, this is the term (ἀποκατάστασις) Theodoret himself uses, in order to refer to ‘the restoration of our nature to its own self’. By the same token, explaining Ezekiel 16:55, he advises his audience that (in regard to that specific point) by ‘apokatastasis to the state one was in in the beginning’,³⁷⁷ one should understand not ‘the apokatastasis towards the better state’ but the primeval Fall (ἀποκατάστασιν ἐνταῦθα οὐ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ὠνόμασε).³⁷⁸ Furthermore, Photius thought it natural that Theodore of Mopsuestia would have held the doctrine of universal restoration. In reviewing a book about the practice of witchcraft by the Persians written by a certain ‘Theodore’, once he had read that the author was sympathetic to Nestorius and maintained the doctrine of apokatastasis, Photius resolved that this ‘Theodore’ seemed to be Theodore of Mopsuestia.³⁷⁹

Consequently, when Cassian culls from Didymus’ commentary on Revelation, he is confident that this is befitting his Antiochene upbringing. For seeking counsel in an Alexandrian work, Cassian reflected on a point that had been made by Theodoret: the lesson he had learned was that there is an invariable Christian patrimony to draw on. To cite an instance, in *Scholion VI* we come upon the expression ‘select shafts’ (βέλῃ ἐκλεκτά).³⁸⁰ The idea of a *tongue* being a *sharp sword*, or a ‘shaft selected’ by God (βέλος ἐκλεκτόν) portrays pious people acting as vehicles of the divine teaching, and this originates in Origen. The metaphor was subsequently used by Eusebius, as well as by Gregory of Nyssa at one point. It was Didymus who made the most of it and furnished an extensive exposition, part of which is the content of *Scholion VI*.³⁸¹ Theodoret

embraced the spirit of the analysis,³⁸² making himself part of the line that had started with Origen, and continued with Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Didymus. Likewise, the expression ‘laudable sword’ (μάχαιρα ἐπαινετή)³⁸³ comes from Origen and Didymus, yet both Gregory of Nazianzus and Theodoret used this in the same spirit; actually the expression ‘laudable weapons’ (ὅπλα ἐπαινετά)³⁸⁴ is characteristic of Theodoret and was used by Gregory of Nazianzus, whereas Didymus did not use this at all. When, therefore, Cassian composed this *Scholion* by means of such formulations, he drew on Eusebius, Didymus, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Theodoret at the same time. He did not write under any impression that he availed himself of different theological schools, let alone schools hostile to each other.

Diodorus of Tarsus was condemned in 499, at a local synod in Constantinople, which branded him a Nestorian, even though during his lifetime he was regarded as a staunch defender of Nicene orthodoxy. Once again, the imperial Church had yielded to the juggernaut of a cool-hearted fanatic monk such as Cyril of Alexandria, who did not like Diodorus’ views. Since 438 Cyril had published a work of his against Diodorus and Theodoret of Mopsuestia; he did so only because Rabbula had convinced him that those theologians were the genuine sources of Nestorianism. The irony of history is that it was Cyril who supplied the ground for the Monophysite Church to emerge, and the Byzantine empire to be mutilated by the Arabs in the seventh century. Monophysites fell back upon selected and awkwardly ambiguous (meaning, arid and hardly sophisticated) statements by Cyril, presuming him to afford the best exposition and authority for their views. Cyril became a Monophysite prophet, and the region became Arab.

The fate of Diodorus and Theodore, on the one hand, and that of Origen, on the other, have some remarkable similarities. All three of them were famous during their lifetimes and died in glory. While alive, their teaching encountered no dissentient voice, at

³⁷⁷ Ezek. 16:55: ‘when thy sister Sodom and her daughters shall return to their former estate’. The Septuagint text has the term ἀποκατάστασις (‘Καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ σου Σόδομα, καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες αὐτῆς ἀποκατασταθήσονται, καθὼς ἦσαν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς’). Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.953.3–8.

³⁷⁸ Ibid.

³⁷⁹ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 81, p. 64a: Οὗτος ὁ Θεόδωρος ὁ Μοψουεστίας εἶναι δοκεῖ: τὴν τε γὰρ Νεστορίου αἵρεσιν,

καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ λόγῳ, κρατύνων προαναφωνεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἀποκατάστασιν τερατεύεται.

³⁸⁰ See EN V1b.

³⁸¹ Cf. Didymus *commZacch*, 3.186–191 and 197.

³⁸² Theodoret, *commls*, 15.

³⁸³ See EN V1c.

³⁸⁴ See EN V1d.

least not one that could be heard. Nevertheless, the storm was gathering, but it did not break until after their deaths. They also had eminent admirers: Origen was admired by the emperor's mother Mamaea, Diodorus enjoyed the admiration of the Emperor Theodosius I and his grandson Theodosius II. Origen was admired by theologians such as Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus. Diodorus and Theodore were admired by Theodoret. The ashes of all three of them were scarcely cold when in certain quarters people began to hold them up to obloquy. Rufinus and Pamphilus stood up against Origen's detractors, Theodoret stood up against the calumny levelled against his two heroes. Jerome was once an admirer of Origen's, then he turned against him out of fear of being accused of heresy. Cyril of Alexandria wrote against Theodore, while earlier he had praised some of his works.³⁸⁵ When Theodore attacked certain heretics, they reacted in a covert yet formidable manner, by tampering with his writings, thus hoping to involve him in heterodox statements.³⁸⁶ Origen's theology was bedeviled at an early date by a host of false ascriptions and falsifications of his books, which called for an entire book to be written by Rufinus to thwart the fraud. Origen was regarded as the fountain from which Arius received his seeds of heresy. Diodorus (though already dead for decades) and his pupil Theodore³⁸⁷ were branded by Cyril of Alexandria and later by Emperor Justinian (which was one hundred and twenty-five years after Theodore's death) as the source of Nestorius' heresy. Diodorus' name was added to the long list of all those victimized by Justinian, the emperor who emerged as the most typical figure of absolute caesaropapism. This list included the Academy of Athens, the Samaritans, the Jews and their synagogues along with the rabbinical teaching, Arians, Apollinarists, Nestorians, Neo-Origenists, and Monophysites. In Justinian's kingdom no room for Christian minorities, called 'heresies', was allowed whatsoever,

and notions such as tolerance, freedom of speech, or human rights were entirely unknown.

The petulance surrounding the 'Three Chapters' left upon Theodoret an undefined foggy tincture. Cyril, although the virtual instigator of Monophysitism, and thereafter its hammer due to his clumsy, contradictory, and unlearned statements, is still immune to indictment, and was never called to account. Both Origen and Theodore engaged in their reflections in intellectual independence from the mundane power of the day. Finally, both Origen and Theodore were condemned by the Fifth Council of Constantinople, in 553, and yet neither ceased to be regarded as a great theologian.

Theodoret had taken exception to Cyril's anathemas in *Against the Eastern Bishops* and the *Letter to Euoptius*.³⁸⁸ He wrote with animus against Cyril, virtually charging him with abandonment of Trinitarianism, and refused to allow Christian theology to be fettered by an aridly rigid monotheism. Besides, Cyril was a protagonist in the condemnation of the Christological approach of Apollinaris, whose views Theodoret contests yet partially includes in his *Eranistes*,³⁸⁹ composed in 447 (that is, after Cyril's death in 444). This work was aimed at the Monophysitism propagated by Eutyches at Constantinople, with some success in Egypt, especially Alexandria, through the support of Patriarch Dioscorus, the successor of Cyril. Thus *Eranistes* is aimed to a degree at Cyril, in whom later Monophysitism sought (not without good reason) the ultimate authority for establishing its own doctrine. However, there is no direct attack on the Alexandrian theology in this book. Theodoret did not even attack it while writing his *Ecclesiastical History*, after his banishment by the Council of Ephesus in 449. It is beyond my scope to consider whether such an attitude was somehow the result of second thoughts of a diplomatic or even political character, since the Alexandrian band was the victorious one at the time. Be that as it may, one fact is

³⁸⁵ Facundus, bishop of Hermiane in Africa (sixth cent. AD), n. 357 above, VIII.6. He actively opposed the condemnation of the Three Chapters.

³⁸⁶ Facundus of Hermiane, *ibid.* X.1.

³⁸⁷ Among the pupils of Theodore of Mopsuestia were Nestorius, John I of Antioch, and Ibas of Edessa. Theodoret was not one of Theodore's pupils, since in 392 Theodore (at the age of 42) was promoted to bishop and moved to Mopsuestia. Theodoret was born one year after Theodore became a bishop. Nevertheless, Theodoret

calls Theodore, along with Diodorus, his 'masters' (διδασκάλους) and 'fathers'. Theodoret, *Epistulae* 1-52, epistle 16: Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐπιμέμφεσθέ μοι καὶ ὡς τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ μακαρίους καταλειπότες Πατέρας Διόδωρον καὶ Θεόδωρον ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ τῶν διδασκάλων. . . . Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἔπαινον πατέρων συγγράφων τοῦσδε τοὺς ἁγίους παρέλιπον, ἡδίκησα ἂν καὶ περὶ τοὺς διδασκάλους ἀχάριστος ἐγενόμην.

³⁸⁸ PG.76.385-452: *Epistola ad Euoptium*.

³⁸⁹ Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 184.

characteristic: in both of his books, Theodoret attacks Arianism every now and then,³⁹⁰ which one might well see as a reminder of the dangers he saw from aspects of Cyril's Christology. For indeed Arius' premise was that the Logos was subject to even the human operations and sufferings of Christ (which the Antiochenes rejected), and whatever is predicated of the Logos should be applied to him as an attribute 'according to nature' (κατὰ φύσιν) (which the Alexandrians also rejected). To Cyril, the personal identity of Christ was simply and clearly the Logos; this is why he refused vehemently to disallow the designation θεοτόκος accorded to Mary. To Theodoret, Christ was a *homo assumptus*, in whom divinity and humanity co-existed. He was nevertheless at pains to stress that Christ would not become a *tertium quid*³⁹¹ against God the Logos and the man Jesus, since 'Christ was not anyone different from God the Logos'.³⁹² This statement could, of course, satisfy any Alexandrian, save Cyril, who was not prepared to grant Theodoret a proper hearing. However, today's scholarship should be detached enough to reassess the presumed difference between Antioch and Alexandria and allow for the possibility that they were not as opposed and dissenting as many believe. Despite the Antiochene disapproval of the term θεοτόκος, this cannot become a point of demarcation. For indeed there was an Alexandrian who did not use the term at all, namely Didymus: he did not do so,³⁹³ even though Origen probably had done so, to be followed by Gregory Thaumaturgus and Eusebius.

The real opponent of the Antiochenes was Monophysitism, not Cyril's theology, which was deemed

dangerous only insofar as it provided ground for the one-nature theology to build on. On the other hand, Aristotelian studies were not exclusive to the Antiochene milieu. The writings of the Stagirite were perused in certain Alexandrian quarters, too. Didymus was an erudite Aristotelian, not only because Theodoret says so, but mainly because a Peripatetic aroma is given off by his own writings. Besides, at the very same time when Cassian was writing, not only was John Philoponus composing his own commentaries on Aristotle, but he was also heavily involved in the Monophysite dispute. As a matter of fact, in his defense of Monophysitism, Philoponus is probably the sole intellectual who uses germane Greek terminology knowledgeably.

To see this state of affairs, however, takes some time. For during that era feelings were too hot and too hard to allow a clear-minded assessment of what was seen as rivalry. Hence, the declaration *Against Diodorus and Theodore* (written in c. 438) against the great Antiochene doctors Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, as a part of the campaign unleashed by implacable anti-Nestorians against them, was supported by Cyril. After all, it was Theodoret who had authored the *Ὅροι Διαλλαγῶν*, in 433, in order to reconcile Cyril's extremism expressed through his *Twelve Anathemas* with the theological theses of the Antiochene see. In fact it was his resistance to Cyril's doctrinal headship that made monks of Egypt, Palestine, and Syria brand him an opponent of the Alexandrian Patriarch. Theodoret was also the one who wrote the *Ἀνατροπὴ τῶν Δώδεκα Ἀναθεματισμῶν τοῦ Κυρίλλου* (*Reprehensio Duodecim Caputum seu*

³⁹⁰ Theodoret, *Eranistes*, pp. 62; 64; 93; 112; 116; 117; 119; 121; 140; 160; 163; 164; 237; 240; 243; 249; 254; 263; 264. *HE*, pp. 1; 2; 6; 7; 8; 9; 18; 23; 25; 27; 31; 33; 34; 37; 37; 38; 39; 48; 55; 56; 57; 58; 61; 65; 66; 68; 70; 72; 80; 93; 96; 98; 99; 100; 101; 105; 109; 110; 111; 113; 121; 122; 123; 126; 128; 129; 138; 139; 140; 145; 148; 151; 152; 153; 154; 156; 166; 167; 171; 172; 173; 174; 180; 188; 208; 209; 213; 214; 215; 217; 227; 232; 235; 236; 237; 244; 252; 254; 255; 256; 259; 260; 264; 267; 268; 273; 275; 279; 283; 285; 286; 287; 289; 292; 294; 298; 303; 305; 330; 332; 338; 348.

³⁹¹ In the Christological debates of the fourth century *tertium quid* became a catchphrase used to refer to those (mainly followers of Apollinaris) who spoke of Christ as something neither human nor divine, but a mixture of the two, and therefore a 'third thing'. The Latin phrase was fashionable since it came from Tertullian who wrote that if Christ 'was only a *tertium quid*, some composite essence formed out of the two substances, like the electrum, there would be no distinct proofs apparent of either nature' (that is, of the divine and human natures of Christ). Tertullian, *Adversus Praxeam*, XXVII, PL.2.191A-C.

³⁹² Theodoret, *Epistulae* 96-147, Epistle 147: οὐκ ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ

Χριστὸς παρὰ τὸν μονογενῆ Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Eranistes*, p. 167: Καὶ εἰ δεῖ συντόμως εἰπεῖν, ἄλλο μὲν καὶ ἄλλο τὰ ἐξ ὧν ὁ σωτὴρ, ἐπεὶ μὴ ταῦτ' ὁρατὸν τῷ ἀοράτῳ, καὶ τὸ ἄχρονον τῷ ὑπὸ χρόνον· οὐκ ἄλλος δὲ καὶ ἄλλος, μὴ γένοιτο. *Ibid.* p. 247: Πάντως δὲ τὸ σῶμα ἐν ἐστὶ πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος τις παρ' αὐτοῖς. Εἰ δὲ ἐν πρὸς τὸν κύριον γέγονε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου, τὰ ἴδια τοῦ σώματος ἴδια αὐτοῦ κατέστη διὰ τὸ σῶμα. *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.141.35-41: Πρωτότοκος γὰρ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὀνομάζεται· Μονογενὴς γάρ ἐστιν ὡς Θεός. Οὐκ ἔχει γὰρ ἀδελφοὺς ὡς Θεός, ὡς δὲ ἄνθρωπος, ἀδελφοὺς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας καλεῖ. Τούτων ἐστὶ πρωτότοκος, οὐκ ἄλλος ὢν παρὰ τὸν μονογενῆ, ἀλλ' ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ μονογενὴς καὶ πρωτότοκος. *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.489.45-51: Ἐχρίσθη δέ, οὐχ ὡς Θεός, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄνθρωπος. Εἰ δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπειον κέχρισται, μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν καὶ Χριστὸς ὀνομάσθη. Ἀλλ' ὅμως οὐκ ἄλλος ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος, καὶ ἄλλος ὁ Χριστός· ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς Λόγος ἐνανθρωπήσας ὀνομάσθη Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς.

³⁹³ The term θεοτόκος appears only in *De Trinitate*, only to confirm that this work is not Didymus'.

Anathematismorum Cyrilli). Cyril defended his anathemas in three apologies, in the second of which³⁹⁴ Theodoret's text is preserved.

The second council of Ephesus (449) condemned Theodoret without a hearing, thus yielding unthoughtfully to the thuggery of Cyril's followers, which had prevailed due to clandestine machinations with the imperial court. Theodoret spent a sequestered period of his life (449–451) facing the invective by both the episcopate and the imperial throne confronting him and forcing him into seclusion in order to suppress his theology. Often, however, such periods, which third parties might see as a cessation of activity, prove more productive than ordinary ministry.

The custodians of orthodoxy kept an open file against Theodoret's name for the next century, resulting in the Second Council of Constantinople (553) condemning his writings as a result of the Three Chapters controversy. Since Theodoret's name was embroiled in the dispute, his opinion was on trial, and eventually condemned on the grounds of glib extrapolations. Although he escaped the taint of heresy, some of his theological propositions in *Reprehensio Duodecim Caputum seu Anathematismorum Cyrilli* were condemned, since they had been attacked by the decree of Justinian against the Three Chapters. This was how Theodoret somehow shared the fate of Origen, whose alleged theology seems to have been condemned at the same council.³⁹⁵ This has always been the fate of broad-minded and brilliant scholars facing a hostile state authority, amidst the fanaticism of *hoi polloi*.

Theodoret was among those whom the Monophysite Emperor Anastasius sought to have condemned 'by a mob of pseudo-monks'. For this purpose, he instigated a council in Antioch determined to anathematize 'the Council of Chalcedon, Diodorus, Theodore, Ibas, and

Theodoret. This the horrified [Patriarch] Flavian actually did: he anathematized them all within the church, along with the council [of Chalcedon].'³⁹⁶ Hence, both a Monophysite and a Chalcedonian synod condemned Theodoret. This notwithstanding, Theodoret was mentioned later with all due respect by another distinguished Alexandrian scholar, namely, John Philoponus.³⁹⁷ He was in turn himself excommunicated. His name was therefore added to the list of brilliant minds who, unmatched by men of the cloth of the time, incurred the wrath of fanatic and unlearned bishops. Origen, Didymus, Evagrius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Diodorus of Tarsus were condemned, while Clement of Alexandria remained suspected of Platonism and was never made a saint.

Whether Theodoret knew that Jerome had eulogized Clement of Alexandria as 'the most learned among the ancients',³⁹⁸ I cannot say, since I have not been able to trace the evidence in primary sources. The fact is that the bishop of Cyrrhus himself acclaimed the Alexandrian sage as 'a holy man, who surpassed all others in erudition' (Κλήμεντα, ἱερὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ πολυπειρίᾳ ὑπαντας ἀπολιπόντα), and quotes from his *Stromateis*³⁹⁹ in order to support his own exposition. As a matter of fact, Clement and Origen, along with Eusebius, were regarded by Theodoret as exemplary authorities. He followed them in making the central Christian point that Plato ineptly appropriated the arcane wisdom. It was Christianity that expressed this wisdom best, since it is the authentic sequel of the Judaeo-Christian wisdom initiated by Moses and the prophets. The treatise in which Theodoret mentions Clement is indeed aptly entitled: *The Cure of Greek Maladies*, meaning of course *pagan* ones. What is equally opportune is the subtitle ascribed to the book: *The Truth of the Gospels Proved from Greek*

³⁹⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistula ad Euoptium Adversus Impugnationem Duocetim in Caputum a Theodoro Editam*, PG.76.385–452.

³⁹⁵ This is how *Chronicon Paschale* (p. 635) sums up the wholesale condemnation of all those whom Justinian judged as underminers of doctrinal discipline: Τοῦτ' ὁ κ' ἔτει τῆς Ἰουστινιανοῦ βασιλείας μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλ. Βασιλείου τὸ ἰα' μόνου γέγονεν ἡ ἐ' σύνοδος ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει κατὰ τῶν δυσσεβῶν καὶ μισαρῶν καὶ ἀκαθάρτων καὶ ἄλλοτριῶν τοῦ χριστιανισμοῦ ἑλληνικῶν δογμάτων Ὀριγένους καὶ Διδύμου καὶ Εὐαγρίου τῶν θεομάχων καὶ Θεοδώρου τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς καὶ τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων καὶ τῆς ἀκαθάρτου ἐπιστολῆς τῆς πρὸς Μάριν τὸν Πέρσην Ἰβὰ λεγομένης καὶ

τῶν μωρῶν συγγραμμάτων Θεοδώρητου τῶν κατὰ τῶν ιβ' κεφαλαίων Κυρίλλου τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ διδασκάλου.

³⁹⁶ Theodore Anagnostes (historian, theologian, Constantinople, fifth/sixth cent.), *HE*, 4.497a.

³⁹⁷ John Philoponus, *De Opificio Mundi*, pp. 33; 36; 40; 45; 48; 84; 85; 86.

³⁹⁸ Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 'Introductory Note to Clement of Alexandria', *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids 1983), v. 2, p. 166.

³⁹⁹ Theodoret, *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.353.8. Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 3.4.27.1.

Philosophy.⁴⁰⁰ It has been urged that Theodoret is heavily dependent on Clement's *Stromateis* and Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*. This could hardly be denied,⁴⁰¹ although Theodoret sometimes shows independence in dealing with Greek literature,⁴⁰² which Canivet does not concede, but I will discuss pertinent instances in a few moments.

As a matter of fact, Theodoret refers his audience to the stories and doctrines recorded in Eusebius' work.⁴⁰³ However, to say that the specific reference is a statement by Theodoret that Eusebius is 'his source' and that he 'acknowledges' this,⁴⁰⁴ is simply not accurate. That Theodoret thought highly of Eusebius and his work is a view which I endorse. That Eusebius is a source of knowledge and inspiration to Theodoret is plausible. There is a difference as regards this point, however. Theodoret has just declared that he does not wish to recount the myths expounded by the multitude of authors whom he has just cited. The reason why he opted for this was that he did not want his readers to regard him as 'talkative and long-winded'; he only wished to recount a few of those stories, merely in order to demonstrate how 'silly' they were.⁴⁰⁵ To take this statement as a confession that his quotations from Plato

are always derived from Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* is an extrapolation, notwithstanding the fact that many of Plato's quotations by Theodoret occur in both Eusebius and Clement.⁴⁰⁶ Apropos of this, I contest the claim that Theodoret 'does not mention Clement, perhaps because of the antagonism between the Schools of Antioch and Alexandria' and that 'his polemic against Gnostic tendencies may have also played a role'.⁴⁰⁷ This is simply a tralaticious reproduction of claims by Pierre Canivet, only because some scholars thought that use of the word γνωστικός by Clement was a sign of Gnostic tendencies. This however is certainly not the case and is hardly tenable any more. For it is commonly known that Clement used this term not to designate people as 'gnostic' by nature, but only those who had become so by education and conduct of life.

All Canivet was ready to concede is that 'Clement's gnosticism is less radical'⁴⁰⁸ than it had been thought on the face of it. Nevertheless, he asserted that Theodoret thought that once he cited the name of Clement in his *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, this could either colour his work with a 'Gnostic tone' ('accent gnostique') or with 'Alexandrian tendencies'.⁴⁰⁹ This is not simply a

⁴⁰⁰ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, Prologue, 16: "Ὅνομα δὲ τῷ βιβλίῳ Ἑλληνικὸν θεραπευτικὴ παθημάτων ἢ Εὐαγγελικῆς ἀληθείας ἐξ Ἑλληνικῆς φιλοσοφίας ἐπίγνωσις. Following a citation of Theodoret by the sixth-century catenist Hypatius of Ephesus, we find out that Theodoret was aware of Platonic texts not extant today and interpreted with a confidence, which only an immediate knowledge of such texts could have allowed.

⁴⁰¹ Theodoret de Cyr, *Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques*, ed. and French transl. by Pierre Canivet, 2 vols. Paris 1958. The author dates the work to the early 420s. Cf. P. Canivet, *Histoire d'une entreprise apologétique au V^e siècle* (Paris 1957), p. 162: 'Mais précisément, Théodoret a-t-il reçu une véritable formation littéraire et philosophique? Nous avons bien dû reconnaître que, né à Antioche, Théodoret avait sans doute parcouru des études classiques, mais les documents manquent pour étayer cette hypothèse et le moment est venu où l'on pourra peut-être savoir si Théodoret n'aurait été qu'un ignorant des lettres profanes sans le truchement de deux œuvres apologétiques, les *Stromates* de Clément d'Alexandrie et la *Préparation évangélique* d'Eusèbe de Césarée.'

⁴⁰² For instance, if one compares the rhetorician Demosthenes mentioned by Clement, Eusebius, and Theodoret, it turns out that Theodoret has independent knowledge of him. Cf. Eusebius, *PE*, 10.2.6; 10.3.14; 10.3.15. He mentions (ibid. 10.3.17) the titles of two orations by Demosthenes, showing awareness of their content. Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 1.21; 8.2. Ibid. 8.25 and *Epistulae* 1–52, Epistle 12, he culls from Demosthenes. Clement of Alexandria mentions Demosthenes in order to quote from him in *Stromateis*, 6.2.20.2; 6.2.20.7;

6.2.22.5; 6.2.23.6; ibid. 7.16.101.4, Demosthenes is simply mentioned by name.

⁴⁰³ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 2.94–96: Εἰ δὲ τῷ φίλον καὶ αὐτὴν διαγνῶναι τὴν ζύγκρισιν, εὐρήσει ταύτην ἐν τοῖς Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παλαιστίνου συγγράμμασιν, Εὐαγγελικὴν δὲ προπαρασκευῆν τόνδε τὸν πόνον ἐκεῖνος ὠνόμασεν.

⁴⁰⁴ So claims N. Siniossoglou, *Plato and Theodoret* (Cambridge, 2008), p. 7, n. 19.

⁴⁰⁵ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 2.96–97: Ἐγὼ δ' αὐτοὺς θεῖναι παραιτοῦμαι τοὺς μύθους, ἵνα μὴ μέ τις ἀδολεσχήν ὀνομάσῃ καὶ φλήναφον· ἐνίων δὲ καὶ μάλα ὀλίγων ἐν τῇ μετὰ τήνδε, ζῶν θεῶ φάναι, γραφησομένη διαλέξει μνησθήσομαι, ἵνα τῶν μυθολογουμένων περὶ τῶν καλουμένων θεῶν μὴ μόνον τὸ ἀπίθανον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀνόητον καὶ δυσαγὲς ἐπιδείξω.

⁴⁰⁶ Such references have long been known following philological research by É. des Places, 'Le Platon de Théodoret: les citations des *Lois* et de l'*Epinomis*', *Revue des Études Grecques*, 68 (1955) 171–84. Also, 'Le Platon de Théodoret: les citations du *Phédon*, de la *République* et du *Timée*', in *Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni*, (Milan, 1956), vol. I, pp. 325–336.

⁴⁰⁷ N. Siniossoglou, (n. 404 above).

⁴⁰⁸ Pierre Canivet, *Histoire d'une entreprise apologétique au Ve siècle*. (Paris, 1957), p. 263: 'Le gnosticisme de Clément est sans doute moins radical qu'on a pensé naguère.'

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid. 'Il n'est pas douteux que Théodoret a voulu se préserver de tout qui pouvait évoquer le gnosticisme ou les tendances alexandrines'.

fanciful extrapolation: this is sheer surprise, since Canivet was the editor of two of Theodoret's works, namely *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio* and *Historia Religiosa (Philotheus)*.⁴¹⁰ For the true story is that Theodoret held Clement in the highest regard, not only on account of the Alexandrian's learnedness, but also by reason of his impeccable orthodoxy. Furthermore, not only was Theodoret not indisposed to mention Clement, but he actually did quote his name unreservedly at other points, styling him 'a holy man who surpassed all others in erudition'.⁴¹¹ Furthermore, he recounts Clement's leading role in the battle against various heresies,⁴¹² among which his polemic against different Gnostic streams is highly praised.⁴¹³

Whereas Didymus and Cyril appear above all as theologians, the one to resemble Origen and share his concern for the controversial relation between Hellenism and Christianity was Theodoret. He explored

different editions in order to clarify delicate points during his exegesis. He availed himself of Origen's edition of the *Hexapla*, which he cites at many points, quoting from it and critically juxtaposing its text with all the rest of the editions available, especially when he comments on the Psalms.⁴¹⁴ He also says that the Septuagint was available to him through the edition of Origen,⁴¹⁵ which he repeats time and again.⁴¹⁶ He had studied the history of Josephus, who is mentioned in no fewer than fifty places.⁴¹⁷ He essays to square discrepancies, or simply variance, between different editions of the scriptural text, making mention of such editors as Aquila (whose edition is cited in nearly three hundred instances), Symmachus (quoted far more heavily than Aquila), and Theodotion (appearing in more than a hundred quotations).

On the other hand, Didymus never mentions Josephus, even though Origen had done so lavishly.⁴¹⁸

⁴¹⁰ P. Canivet (ed.), *Théodoret de Cyr. Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques*, Sources chrétiennes 57 (Paris, 1958). P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen (eds.), *Théodoret de Cyr. L'histoire des moines de Syrie*, 2 vols., Sources chrétiennes 234, 257, (Paris, 1977–1979).

⁴¹¹ Theodoret, *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.353.6–8: Καὶ τοῦτου δὴ μάρτυρα τὸν Στρωματέα παρέξομαι Κλήμεντα, ἱερὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ πολυπειρίᾳ ἅπαντας ἀπολιπόντα.

⁴¹² Theodoret, *ibid.* PG.83: 340.10–11; 372.22; 401.20–21 and 33–37 and 40–43.

⁴¹³ *Ibid.* PG.83.349.44–46: Καὶ Ἰσίδωρος δέ, ὁ τοῦ Βασιλίδου υἱός, μετὰ τινος ἐπιθήκης τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς μυθολογίαν ἐκράτυνε. Καταγωνίζονται δὲ τούτους, Ἀγρίππας, ὁ καὶ Κάστωρ ἐπίκλην, καὶ Εἰρηναῖος, καὶ Κλήμης ὁ Στρωματεύς, καὶ Ὠριγένης, τῆς ἀληθείας ὑπερμαχοῦντες. *Ibid.* PG.83.369.32–33: Κατὰ δὲ Βαλεντίνου, καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἐκείνου, καὶ Εἰρηναῖος, καὶ Κλήμης, καὶ Ὠριγένης.

⁴¹⁴ Theodoret, *commIs*, 14: Ἀλλ' οὔτε παρὰ τῷ Ἑβραίῳ τὸ Ἰσραὴλ κείμενον εὗρον οὔτε παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐρμηνευταῖς οὔτε παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ. *Ibid.* 19: Τὸ Σιών ἓν τῶν ἀντιγράφων οὐκ ἔχει οὐδὲ τὸ Ἑξαπλοῦν οὐδὲ ἡ Ἀκύλα καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ Θεοδοτίωνος ἑκδοσίς οὐδ' αὐτὴ ἡ Ἑβραϊκὴ γραφή, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἡμεῖς ὥς κείμενον ἐρμηνεύσομεν. *Ibid.* 20: οὕτω δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα εὗρον κείμενον ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ. *Interpretatio in Psalmos* (comm. on Psalm 23:1), PG.80.1029.6–7: Ἐν ἐνίοις ἀντιγράφοις εὗρον, 'τῆς μιᾶς τῶν Σαββάτων.' Ἐν δέ γε τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ τοῦτο οὐ πρόσκειται. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 26:1), PG.80.1048.44–45: 'Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαβίδ, πρὸ τοῦ χρισθῆναι.' Ταύτην ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν οὐχ εὗρον, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐνίοις ἀντιγράφοις. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 28:1) PG.80.1061.2–3: 'Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαβίδ· ἐξόδου σκηνῆς.' Οὐδὲ ταύτην εὗρον ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν, ἀλλ' ἐν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 64:1), PG.80.1345.19–21: Ταῦτα οὔτε τὸ Ἑβραϊκὸν ἔχει, οὔτε οἱ ἄλλοι ἐρμηνευταῖ, οὔτε οἱ Ἑβδομήκοντα ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 65:1), PG.80.1361.7–11: 'Εἰς τὸ τέλος, Ὡδὴ ψαλμοῦ ἀναστάσεως.' Οὐδὲ ταύτην τὴν προσθήκην τὸ Ἑβραϊκὸν ἔχει, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄλλοι ἐρμηνευταῖ, οὐδὲ οἱ Ἑβδομήκοντα ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ· ἀλλὰ καὶ

ταύτην τινὲς, ὥς ἔοικε, προστεθείκασιν. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 69:5), PG.80.1417.1: Τὸ Κύριος οὐ κεῖται ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 71:17), PG.80.1440.1–4: Τὸ εὐλογημένον παρ' οὐδενὶ κεῖται. οὔτε ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ, οὔτε παρ' Ἑβραίοις. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 73:3), PG.80.1456.34–37: Οὔτε ὁ Ἑβραῖος, οὔτε οἱ λοιποὶ ἐρμηνευταῖ, οὔτε μὲν οἱ Ἑβδομήκοντα ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ πληθυντικῶς ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις τεθείκασιν, ἀλλ' ἐνικῶς, ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 75:1), PG.80.1472.36–39: Τὴν τοῦ Ἀσσυρίου προσθήκην οὐχ εὗρον ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐνίοις ἀντιγράφοις. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 75:1), PG.80.1624.7–9 (citing Eusebius): 'Αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαβίδ, ἀνεπίγραφος παρ' Ἑβραίοις.' Τὸ Ἀνεπίγραφος παρ' Ἑβραίοις οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ, οὔτε παρ' Εὐσεβίῳ. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 118:59), PG.80.1840.42–46: Ὁ Ἑβραῖος δὲ τὰς ὁδοὺς μου ἔχει· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἡρμήνευσαν ἐρμηνευταῖ, καὶ οἱ Ἑβδομήκοντα ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 143:1), PG.80.1960.2–7: Τῷ Δαβίδ. Ἐν ἐνίοις τῶν ἀντιγράφων τῇ ἐπιγραφῇ προσκείμενον εὗρον, 'Πρὸς τὸν Γολιάθ.' Οὔτε δὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἑβραίῳ, οὔτε παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐρμηνευταῖς, οὔτε μὴν παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα εὗρον ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ. *Ibid.* (comm. on Psalm 145:1), PG.80.1973.35–38: Ἐν ἐνίοις ἀντιγράφοις πρόσκειται Ἀγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου. Τοῦτο δὲ οὔτε παρὰ τῷ Ἑβραίῳ, οὔτε παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις εὗρον ἐρμηνευταῖς, οὔτε παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα εὗρον ἐν τῷ Ἑξαπλῷ.

⁴¹⁵ Theodoret, *commIs*, 19: Τὸ Σιών ἓν τῶν ἀντιγράφων οὐκ ἔχει οὐδὲ τὸ Ἑξαπλοῦν οὐδὲ ἡ Ἀκύλα καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ Θεοδοτίωνος ἑκδοσίς οὐδ' αὐτὴ ἡ Ἑβραϊκὴ γραφή, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἡμεῖς ὥς κείμενον ἐρμηνεύσομεν.

⁴¹⁶ Theodoret, *commIs*, 14; 19; 20; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80: 1029.7; 1048.44; 1061.3; 1345.21; *et passim*.

⁴¹⁷ Theodoret, *commIs*, 2; 6; 18; *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, pp. 118; 123; 146; 207; 243; 278; 279; *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80: 541.21; 544.35; 580.13; *et passim*; *intDan*, PG.81: 1393.20; 1393.32; 1396.16, *et passim*; *intProphXII*, PG.81.1933.13.

⁴¹⁸ Origen, *Cels*, I.16; I.47; II.13; IV.11; *frJer*, 14; *frLam*, 105; 109; 115; *Commentariorum Series in Evangelium Matthaei* (Mt. 22.34–27.63), p. 42; *commMatt*, 10.17; *frPs*, 73, 5; *selPs*, PG.12.1529.47.

He mentions Aquila only once,⁴¹⁹ Theodotion three times,⁴²⁰ and Symmachus five times.⁴²¹

By the same token, Cyril of Alexandria, though fairly often drawing on Josephus,⁴²² avails himself of Theodotion's edition only once,⁴²³ and mentions Aquila's edition along with that of Symmachus a few times,⁴²⁴ whereas he considers Symmachus alone more frequently.⁴²⁵

One can see, therefore, that Theodoret as a scholar stands closer to Origen than any of his Alexandrian adherents. For we find Origen appealing to Aquila's rendering at more than a hundred points. Against Cyril mentioning Theodotion only once and Didymus doing so three times, Origen did so at thirty-five points in his work,⁴²⁶ and Theodoret offers more than a hundred quotations, as already mentioned. Likewise, Origen had compared his scriptural text with that of Symmachus at no less than a hundred and fifty points,⁴²⁷ which is matched only by Theodoret's extensive usage. Therefore, it was Theodoret, neither Didymus nor Cyril of Alexandria, who was the true heir of Origen's textual concerns. It is also Theodoret who owes clear debts to Origen, with respect to fascinating expressions which remained exclusive to a scholarly élite all the way through the centuries. To cite an instance, the rare expression εὐαγγελικὴ τελειότης ('evangelical perfection') is one of those proving Cassian's text to be an original Greek one, not a Latin translation, and distinctively suggests that Cassian was an Antiochene author. This expression was introduced by Origen to

make the point that the realization of the Old Testament prefiguration through historical occurrences in the New Testament was in itself a kind of perfection.⁴²⁸ This perfection was established through the Gospel, which produced the 'perfect' ones, of which the writer of Heb. 5:14 spoke. The expression was taken up exclusively by the Antiochene school, notably by Theodoret, Severus of Antioch,⁴²⁹ and Cassian the Sabaite.⁴³⁰ No authors other than they seem to have used the expression during the first Christian millennium. It was only centuries later that this was taken up by Eustratius,⁴³¹ the philosopher and bishop of Nicaea (1092–1120) and pupil of John Italus.

One more example: when one investigates the expression δυνατόν ἐκλαβεῖν ('it is possible to interpret as') in *Scholion XI*, it turns out that this was used by only a handful of theologians (most of them did so casually, and only once). It was only Didymus who used the expression forty times, whereas John Philoponus did so in the sixth century four times.⁴³² Although this means that this locution flourished in Alexandria, it appears also in a catena composed in Palestine. In light of our findings, it is not surprising that Cassian and the Laura of Sabas contributed to such instances of survival.⁴³³

Origen refers to different *editions*, indeed to different editors who *rendered* the scriptural text, to a degree of obsession regarding accuracy and scholarly scrutiny. The procedure that is now known as construction of a critical apparatus is studied with constant care. The

⁴¹⁹ Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 174.

⁴²⁰ Didymus, *commZacch*, 4.254; *commJob*, PG.39.1129.3; *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.39.1624.10.

⁴²¹ Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 174; *frPs(al)*, frs. 106; 912; *commJob*, PG.39.1149.5; *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.39.1624.11.

⁴²² Cyril of Alexandria *commProphXII*, v. 2, pp. 185; 446; 455; 496; *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, p. 32; *In Isaiam*, PG.70.28.34; 153.19; 265.7; 276.21; 468.53; 761.4.

⁴²³ Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 476.

⁴²⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, pp. 476 (Ἀκύλας καὶ Θεοδοτίων); p. 617 (Ἀκύλας, Σύμμαχος); *GlaphPent*, PG.69.53.44–46 (Ἀκύλας, Σύμμαχος); *expPs*, PG.69: 809.42 (Ἀκύλας); 976.7 (Ἀκύλας, Σύμμαχος); 1021.13 (Ἀκύλας, Σύμμαχος); 1044.31 (Ἀκύλας, Σύμμαχος); 1065.15 (Σύμμαχος, Ἀκύλας); 1069.49 (Σύμμαχος, Ἀκύλας).

⁴²⁵ Cyril of Alexandria, *expPs*, PG.69: 800.18; 828.16; 973.25; 976.13; 1004.38 and 57; 1017.24; 1020.29; 1129.23; 1140.19; 1165.18; 1172.4; *Fragmenta in Jeremiam*, PG.70.1456.39.

⁴²⁶ Origen, *commJohn*, VI.41.212; *frJer*, 6; *frLam*, 3; 102; *commEph*, 24; *et passim*.

⁴²⁷ Origen, *commJohn*, VI.41.212; *homGen*, pp. 23; 27; *homLev*, p. 403; *commMatt*, 16.16; *et passim*.

⁴²⁸ Origen, *homJer*, 12.13: ὡς Χριστοῦ μὴ ἐπιδεδμηκότος, τοῦ τελειούντος ἡμᾶς καὶ διαβιβάζοντος ἀπὸ τῶν νομικῶν στοιχείων ἐπὶ τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν τελειότητα. See also, p. 161, n. 62.

⁴²⁹ Severus of Antioch in *Catena in Acta*, p. 349: τῆς ἐν Πνεύματι λατρείας καὶ εὐαγγελικῆς τελειότητος.

⁴³⁰ Cassian the Sabaite, *OctoVit*, p. 34v: διὰ τὸ βαλεῖν ἀρχὴν χαύνην καὶ διεφθαρμένην ἀνατρέπειν τοὺς ἄλλους ἀπὸ τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς τελειότητος. *De Panareto*, p. 115v: μήτε μὴν τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν τελειότητα δύνασθαι παραδεχθῆναι πρὸ τῆς τοῦ νόμου παραφυλακῆς.

⁴³¹ Eustratius of Nicaea, *Orationes*, Oration 4, p. 100: ἰδιάζων ἐστὶ καὶ τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς λειπόμενος τελειότητος. *op cit.* p. 105 οὕτω κἀνταῦθα τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς τελειότητος ἐπιγενομένης.

⁴³² See *Scholion XI*.

⁴³³ See, M. Harl, *La chaîne Palestinienne sur le Psaume 118 (Origène, Eusèbe, Didyme, Apollinaire, Athanase, Théodoret)*, Sources chrétiennes, 189 (Paris, 1972). The comment on Psalm 118:75 is attributed to Origen by this editor, yet another one (E. Mühlberg) ascribed it to Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1110.

verb pointing to how others ‘rendered’ (ἐξέδωκαν) a certain expression or word, is characteristic of this unflinching concern.⁴³⁴

Only Origen, Eusebius, and Theodoret mention different ‘interpreters’ and ‘editions’ (namely Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, the Septuagint, and the Fifth Edition), once they come to deal with a specific phrase. Cassian followed suit, mentioning a certain rendering of Genesis 3:1 by ‘the Hebrew’ editor.

There are recurring references to how the Old Testament translators ‘rendered’ (one who ἐκδέδωκεν, or many ones, who ἐκδέδωκασιν)⁴³⁵ a certain point of the scriptural text in this or that way. Similar references are extremely scarce, and they appear in only a few other theologians, among whom, however, accuracy fades. Cyril of Alexandria refers to ‘other interpreters’ (οἱ ἕτεροι ἐκδέδωκασιν ἑρμηνευταί)⁴³⁶ in general. Epiphanius, writing as a theologian, not a historian, does the same,⁴³⁷ as Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, later did as well.⁴³⁸ As I show next, the so-called ‘Fifth Edition’ of scripture is mentioned by Origen, Eusebius, and Theodoret acting as qualified editors. Beyond them, there is only casual reference to

this edition by Cyril of Alexandria, Procopius of Gaza, and no one else.

References to specific translators (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion) are not frequent, but pursuing them reveals a couple of later true scholars, Procopius of Gaza (c. 464–528) and Olympiodorus the deacon of Alexandria (sixth century). In the course of this book, both will turn out to be associated with the vocabulary of the Scholia.⁴³⁹

The ‘Fifth Edition’ of scripture

Origen, Eusebius, and Theodoret, are the authors who mention the so-called ‘Fifth Edition’ of scripture. Mention of this is also made by Cyril of Alexandria, and Procopius of Gaza. Epiphanius of Salamis (following Eusebius, as I will discuss in a moment) provides us with a more detailed account of the succession of the scriptural translators Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, who had composed their versions subsequent to the one by the Seventy. During the reign of Caracalla, books of scripture were found in Jericho, in large wine-jars, which had the name neither of the translator nor the editor. Other Greek and Jewish books

⁴³⁴ Cf. ἐξέδωκαν then referring to all or some of the other interpreters, normally by name, in Origen, *frJer*, 6; 14; *frLam*, 102; *homLev*, p. 403; *frPs*, 112, 1–2; *excPs*, PG.17.140.27; *Scholia In Canticum Canticorum*, PG.17.280.40; Eusebius, *Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG.23: 97.33; 133.56; PG.24: 20.33; 21.22; Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1197.38. Cf. ἐξέδωκαν ref. to a certain interpreter: Origen, *commJohn*, XX.15.117; *frJer*, fr. 45; *frLam*, 35; 47; 49; 96; 101; *frPs*, 1, 3; 18, 3–4; 18, 13–14; 48, 2–3; 48, 6; 103, 10–11; 118, 65–66; 118, 118–119; 128, 2–8; 138, 11–12; 148, 2; *homJob*, PG.12.1040.13; *selPs*, PG.12: 1444.38; 1497.53; 1513.21; 1649.40; *selEz*, PG.13.773.30; *homJob*, PG.17.65.24; *Scholia in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.17.285.59. Eusebius, *DE*, 4.15.58; 4.16.35; 5.18.1; 7.1.34; 7.1.108; 8.1.25; 8.2.38; 9.4.2; 9.14.5; 10.1.16; 10.8.39; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.11; 1.27; 1.31; 1.41; 1.42; 1.51; 1.62; 1.68; 1.73; 1.79; 1.84; 1.85; 2.1; 2.6; 2.19; 2.22; 2.28; 2.34; 2.40; *Eclogae Prophetarum*, pp. 75; 87; 112; *Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG.23: 101.45; 164.53; 177.33; 181.40; 192.39; 193.28; 229.13; 241.46; 244.23; 249.33; 253.52; 265.36; 284.8; 297.38; 297.49; 301.26; 312.12; 321.45; 321.54; 325.24; 329.55; 336.1; 348.27; 348.51; 360.39; 365.25; 388.22; 485.14; 492.47; 557.19; 589.21; 589.28; 780.2; 896.9; 913.34; 933.35; 1032.10; 1048.20; 1048.41; 1056.12; 1056.17; 1056.47; 1057.38; 1061.4; 1061.40; 1065.24; 1085.8; 1121.22; 1125.5; 1328.18; 1376.7. PG.24: 44.37; 65.18. Theodoret, *commIs*, 16; *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80.553.28; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1336.39.

⁴³⁵ Cf. reference to an interpreter who ἐκδέδωκεν, or more ones who ἐκδέδωκασιν a certain version of the scriptural text. Origen, *Libri x in Canticum Canticorum*, (fragmenta), pp. 169; 191; *commI Cor*, 38; *frPs*, 77, 45; 118, 29; *epAfr*, PG.11.52.21; *homJob*, PG.12.1041.30; *selPs*, PG.12.1069.46; 1073.9; 1073.20; 1112.25; 21; *homJob*, PG.17.92.51; *Scholia in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.17: 260.21; 261.42; 272.18; 272.25. Eusebius, *DE*, 2.3.152; 5.4.16; 6.15.5;

6.24.3; 7.1.67; 8.4.13; *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, 3.2.22; *Onomasticon*, pp. 30; 106; *Epistula ad Caesarienses*, 2; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.29; 1.44; 1.67; 1.85; 1.98; 2.13; 2.15; 2.18; 2.24; 2.25; 2.36; 2.38; 2.53; 2.56; 2.58; *Eclogae Prophetarum*, pp. 75; 148; 162; *Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG.23: 180.57; 213.54; 272.14; 276.48; 416.42; 493.56; 576.13; 576.27; 660.12; 721.43; 877.2; 904.38; 905.2; 928.11; 944.35; 948.46; 984.52; 996.51; 1028.9; 1040.23; 1057.46; 1141.22; 1156.29; 1333.14; 1353.28; PG.24.24.12. Theodoret, *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80: 577.41; 608.36; 780.9; *intDan*, PG.81.1469.50.

⁴³⁶ Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 385; likewise, ἕτεροι τῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν, in *ibid.* v. 2, p. 104, and *In Isaiam*, PG.70.788.31.

⁴³⁷ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Ancoratus*, 97.2: οἱ δὲ ἑρμηνευταί ἐξέδωκαν οὕτως. Cf. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Psalmum 118*, PG.55.691.25.

⁴³⁸ Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *commJob*, p. 72: ἕτερος τῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν οὕτως ἐκδέδωκεν. p. 274: οἱ δὲ ἕτεροι ἑρμηνευταί οὕτως ἐκδέδωκασιν. *commEccl*, PG.93.617.26: ἕτερος τῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν ἐκδέδωκε.

⁴³⁹ Reference to Aquila, Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, pp. 2012; 2040; 2049; 2105; 2136; 2164; 2200; 2212; 2497. Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *commJob*, pp. 10; 121; 129; 179; 225; 318; 349; *commEccl*, PG.93.593.48; *Fragmenta in Jeremiam*, PG.93.645.2. *Anonymi Dialogus cum Judaeis (e cod. Vatoped. 236)*, 5; 6; 9; 10. Cyril of Alexandria is hardly present, *commProphXII*, v. 1, pp. 476; 617. Reference to Symmachus, Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *commJob*, pp. 32; 68; 122; 126; 257; 267; 296; 315; 316; 319; 322; 324. Maximus Confessor, *In Ecclesiasten*, 8. *Anonymi Dialogus cum Judaeis*, 1; 5; 10. Reference to Theodotion, Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, pp. 1896; 2105; 2212; 2213; 2424; 2520; 2608.

were found in the same place, too. These were called the ‘Fifth Edition’, which is mentioned by the foregoing theologians. Epiphanius tells us that when Origen made this discovery,⁴⁴⁰ he included the books in his *Hexapla*, which thus became *Octapla* (eight different versions). Since Origen did not know who the translators of these newly discovered books were, he designated them as the *Fifth* and *Sixth* Editions. Epiphanius says that he cannot tell who the translators of these editions are; he can only be sure of the period during which these texts were discovered.⁴⁴¹

What this edition is about we first learn from Eusebius, who, however, is not as clear as Epiphanius. Origen is attested by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion to have been the one who unearthed the versions. Eusebius refers also to a ‘Seventh’ Edition,⁴⁴² whereas Epiphanius is aware of, and quotes from, only the Fifth and Sixth Editions.⁴⁴³ Eusebius adds that it was Origen who had annotated these editions of the unknown translators, and ahead of one of them he had noted that this ‘was found in Jericho, within a jar, during the times of Antoninus, the son of Severus’, whereas the other was found in Actium opposite Nicopolis.⁴⁴⁴ However, Eusebius is not clear as to the precise place where either the Fifth or the Sixth edition was found: he only says that ‘one of them was discovered at Actium opposite Nicopolis and the other at another such place’ (ἐν ἑτέρῳ τοιῷδε τόπῳ). This information is provided by Epiphanius, who relates the sixth version to have been discovered at Actium Nicopolis. This report is echoed by Photius: in addition to the four editions (LXX, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion), there is a ‘Fifth translation’

(πέμπτη ἑρμηνεία) by an unknown translator which was discovered during the reign of Caracalla at Jericho in a jar. A ‘Sixth’ one, also by an unknown translator, was discovered during the reign of Alexander, son of Mamaea, also hidden in jars, at Actium opposite Nicopolis.⁴⁴⁵

As a matter of fact, it is Origen himself who specified the whereabouts of his two additional versions. The Fifth edition was found at Nicopolis, the sixth one at Jericho. G. Mercati discovered that the information, which Eusebius provides about a prologue that he had found in a catena on the Psalms, was actually the one provided by Origen himself.⁴⁴⁶ It is remarkable that this passage was known to the Migne-editor of Theodoret’s work, J. L. Schulze, who reproduced them,⁴⁴⁷ yet the credit has been granted to Mercati, who pointed out the Origenian provenance of this prologue. It is remarkable, however, that we once again find Origen and Theodoret being considered side by side.

The specific point concerning Nicopolis is a remarkable piece of information. Actia Nicopolis at Actium was an ancient city of Western Greece (southern Epirus), founded in 31 BC by Octavian (Augustus), in memory of his victory over Mark Antony and Cleopatra at Actium. The city became a prosperous one and was the capital of southern Epirus and Acarnania, with 30,000 citizens. Octavian instituted the Actian Games in honour of Apollo Actius. The stadium of Nicopolis is extant today and archaeological excavations are still in progress. The question, however, is this: what was Origen doing in a city such as Nicopolis, during the times of Alexander, son of Mamaea (222–235)? What

⁴⁴⁰ Meantime, during the reign of Alexander, son of Mamaea (222–235) the so-called ‘Sixth Edition’ was discovered in Actia Nicopolis, ‘also concealed within jars’. Epiphanius of Salamis, *De Mensuris et Ponderibus*, lines 483f. Cf. Eusebius, *HE*, 6.16.2, copied by Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, *HE*, 5.11.

⁴⁴¹ Epiphanius of Salamis, *De Mensuris et Ponderibus*, lines 483f. Epiphanius mentions these editions also in his *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 408, adding that Origen composed the *Hexapla* at the urging and support of Ambrose, in Tyre in Phoenicia, where he lived and worked for twenty-eight years.

⁴⁴² This entire section of Eusebius was later recorded in the *Suda*, lexicon, Alphabetic letter omega, entry 182; George Cedrenus (eleventh–twelfth cent.), *Compendium Historiarum*, v. 1, p. 445; Nicephorus Callistus, *HE*, 5.11. Unlike Epiphanius, Eusebius writes that the Sixth and Seventh Edition were used by Origen expanding the text of the Psalms. Epiphanius speaks of ‘the Sixth Edition’ of scripture in general.

⁴⁴³ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 408; v. 3, p. 6.

⁴⁴⁴ Eusebius, *HE*, 6.16.1–4.

⁴⁴⁵ Photius, *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, Epsitile 154. He testifies to one

more translation from the Hebrew, composed by ‘saint Lucian, the great ascetic and martyr’; he engaged in a brave editing of the text, so as to produce an ‘orthodox’ one. This edition was discovered at Nicomedia, ‘after his martyrdom during the reigns of Maximian and Diocletian, in a manuscript written by Lucian himself’. The text was discovered ‘during the reign of Constantine by certain Jews within the wall of a small tower, into which this had been build and covered with plaster for security’. The person behind this hagiographic account is no other than Lucian of Samosata himself. The biographical information, and even more, is expounded in the *Suda*, under the lemma ‘Lucian’. *Suda*, lexicon, Alphabetic letter lambda, entry 685. To explore whether there is any shred of reality behind this hagiography is beyond my scope.

⁴⁴⁶ G. Mercati, *Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e testi, 5)*, Rome, 1901, p. 29: ε’ ἑκδοσις, ἣν εὑρον ἐν Νικοπόλει τῇ πρὸς Ἀκτίου; τὰ δὲ παρακείμενα αὐτῇ ἐστὶν ὅσα ἐναλλάσσει παρ’ αὐτήν. Then, ζ’ ἑκδοσις εὑρεθεῖσα μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων βιβλίων ἐβραϊκῶν καὶ ἑλληνικῶν ἐν τινὶ πύθῳ περὶ τὴν Ἱερικῶν ἐν χρόνοις τῆς βασιλείας Ἀντωνίνου τοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβήρου.

⁴⁴⁷ Cf. PG.80.30 f.

were the circumstances surrounding the discovery of books ‘concealed within a jar’, as indeed had happened with the ones found in Jericho also in jars? A plausible hypothesis is that Origen was on his way to, or from, Rome, the city of Hippolytus. In any case, this information about the discovery of the ‘Fifth Edition’ is reproduced in the seventh-century text *Doctrina Patrum*.

It is worth following another document, which I believe comes from Cassian himself.

There is a testimony about a ‘Seventh Edition’ of scripture produced by Lucian, in a work spuriously ascribed to Athanasius (others ascribed this to Chrysostom).⁴⁴⁸ No one believes today that this work was written by either of them, and there are some who would like to ascribe it to Theodoret. This text is a catalogue of seven different editions of scripture: the first is the LXX; second, Aquila; third, Symmachus; fourth, Theodotion; fifth, the one found during the times of Antoninus Caracalla in Jericho; sixth, the one found at Actium opposite Nicopolis. Of the Sixth edition, however, the author says that this was not found by Origen himself, but by one of his friends (ὕπὸ τινος τῶν Ὀριγένους γνωρίμων). The ‘Seventh and last one’ is the edition ‘by Lucian, the great ascetic and martyr’ who ‘died during the reign of Diocletian and Maximian, the tyrants’⁴⁴⁹ and who had embarked on a courageous editing of the text, either adding or deleting phrases properly. This edition was unearthed ‘by Jews, at Nicomedia, during the reign of Constantine, in the wall of a small tower, which had been built and covered with plaster for security’.⁴⁵⁰ This is in fact the testimony taken up by Photius. We are going to encounter this text entitled *Synopsis Scripturae*, which was possibly written by Cassian himself. For instance, Cassian used the extremely rare adverb ἀπαφυλάκτως, which is used by only a handful of authors, as well as by the

author of the *Synopsis Scripturae* (this time the same text is ascribed to Chrysostom).⁴⁵¹ By the same token, the expression πανάρετος σοφία used by Cassian⁴⁵² appears in the *Synopsis Scripturae* ascribed to both Athanasius and Chrysostom.⁴⁵³ Besides, Cassian is aware of different editions of scripture, and refers to an alternative rendering of Gen. 3:1 at one point.⁴⁵⁴ I am not surprised that scholars ascribe this text to Theodoret: I myself was almost ready to attribute the *Scholia in Apocalypsin* to him until I discovered Cassian, the eclipsed author. For both are the offspring of the Antiochene mindset and it would be easy to mistake one for the other. The point is, nevertheless, that this text treats Lucian with respect, which is not surprising since analysis of Cassian’s writings shows him to be aware of his writings and drawing on him.⁴⁵⁵ As already noted, Lucian was so confident of his philological aptitude as to emend the scriptural text in order to make it more elegant. In what are known as ‘the Lucian manuscripts’, the solecisms of the scriptural *koine* were consistently replaced by lucid Attic structures. We are going to come upon Cassian using terms and forms of Greek which reveal a highly erudite person, as I remark at several points. I am therefore satisfied that when Andreas of Caesarea rebukes those who opt for ‘Attic syntax’ at the expense of the ‘scriptural colloquial expressions’⁴⁵⁶ he has in mind Lucian, and, by the same token, Cassian himself. The latter’s text makes it all too clear that he regularly drew on Lucian and, as I argue at some points,⁴⁵⁷ there is good reason to believe that Andreas was aware of Cassian’s texts including the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*. As a matter of fact, when Andreas makes the scornful reference not only to ‘Attic syntax’, but also to ‘dialectical syllogisms’, he actually has in mind the Aristotelian tendency of such theologians of the Antiochene climate as Cassian

⁴⁴⁸ Pseudo-Athanasius, *Synopsis Scripturae*, PG.28.435.22–436.33.

⁴⁴⁹ Reference to the Diocletianic persecution of 303–311.

⁴⁵⁰ Photius (n. 445 above).

⁴⁵¹ Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *Synopsis Scripturae*, PG.56.375.51

⁴⁵² *Synopsis Scripturae*, PG.56.375.51. Cf. NDGF, Cassian the Sabaite, *De Panareto*, p. 101r.

⁴⁵³ PG.28.376.48 and PG.56.370.14 and 30.

⁴⁵⁴ NDGF, Cassian the Sabaite, *De Panareto*, p. 106r.

⁴⁵⁵ Despite the ‘Diocletian’ anachronism, I do not subscribe to the hypothesis of two Lucians. Cassian is at numerous points drawing on non-religious works by Lucian. It could hardly be expected to find a monk such as Cassian, on the one hand praising Lucian for his edition of scripture and on the other drawing on ‘another’ Lucian who had written caustic satiric works.

The sole plausible case for Cassian doing so is that all writings by ‘Lucian’ had actually been written by the same person, who was a Christian only for a while.

⁴⁵⁶ Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, Logos 24.72.22.18–19: διαμαρτύρεται ἡμῖν τοῖς ἀκούουσι, μήτε προσθεῖναι τι μήτε ἀφελεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὰ γραφικὰ ἰδιώματα τῶν Ἀττικῶν συντάξεων καὶ τῶν διαλεκτικῶν συλλογισμῶν ἡγεῖσθαι ἀξιοπιστότερα καὶ σεμνότερα.

⁴⁵⁷ In a future work I hope to show the relation between Cassian’s *Scholia in Apocalypsin* and the commentaries on the same scriptural work by Oecumenius, Andreas of Caesarea and Arethas of Patras. What I can say now is that I definitely believe that Andreas was aware of Cassian’s compilation on the Apocalypse.

himself. After all, the authors that had produced commentaries on the same work (that is, the book of Revelation) along with Andreas were less than a handful, and of these the concept of ‘dialectical syllogisms’ applies only to Didymus and Cassian. But the condemnation of those who ‘either add or detract’ phrases from the sacred book can point to no other than to the second-century Lucian of Samosata.

What we see, therefore, is not simply Origen’s scrutiny and proverbial laboriousness.⁴⁵⁸ We also see who were his posthumous acolytes in his textual concerns, and these were Eusebius⁴⁵⁹ and Theodoret.⁴⁶⁰ They were both historians, scholars, theologians, bishops. Quite interestingly, neither of them was Alexandrian.⁴⁶¹ It is also noteworthy that the ‘Fifth Edition’ is mentioned in only one catena, which is a Palestinian one. This means that it had circulated in the region of Eusebius and of Procopius of Gaza, who is the sole author to have made a similar reference in the following century.⁴⁶²

There is therefore a strong affiliation between Origen, Eusebius, and Theodoret: all three of them were true scholars, not simply theologians, until Procopius of Gaza, Cassian the Sabaite, and Olympiodorus the deacon of Alexandria came along later, acting in the same erudite and scrupulous spirit.

Theodoret and his arsenal

The erudition of Theodoret is hard to overstress. The sixth-century catenist Hypatius Metropolitan of Ephesus makes reference to Theodoret’s exegesis, and points out that ‘the verb ἐκονδύλιζον was actually used

in the Septuagint’. He then mentions Theodoret, ‘who understood this verb in the sense of beating’ someone (ἐπὶ τοῦ τύπτειν ἐννόησεν) and rendered αἰκίζόμενοι τοὺς πενεστέρους accordingly.⁴⁶³ This is precisely the phrase Theodoret had used in his interpretation of the twelve minor prophets.⁴⁶⁴ The specific passage of prophet Amos received some limited comment by a few exegetes.⁴⁶⁵ Of these, it is only Theodoret who used the form αἰκίζόμενοι, the present participle of the verb αἰκίζεσθαι.

This would probably be of no importance, since others, such as Theodore of Mopsuestia, had made use of similar expressions.⁴⁶⁶ It is however indicative of Theodoret’s erudition. As the second-century grammarian Julius Naucratis (or Julius Pollux, or Julius Polydeuces) had recorded in his lexicon,⁴⁶⁷ the verb αἰκίζεσθαι in the sense of ‘beating someone’ had been used by Plato himself.⁴⁶⁸ The association of the two senses (that is, κονδυλίζειν and αἰκίζόμενοι) remained therefore a feature exclusive to Theodoret which the later catenist Hypatius recorded. As a matter of fact, in no extant Platonic work does the verb κονδυλίζειν appear to be used at all, neither do we come across Platonic expressions using the verb αἰκίζεσθαι in any form.⁴⁶⁹ This means that Theodoret knew more of than we do (that is, he was aware of Platonic texts not extant today), since he was not the kind of scholar to rest content only with a lexicon reference by a grammarian such as Julius, no matter how good he was. Likewise, when Theodoret (in his Prologue to *Philotheus*) portrays the soul as an acropolis or citadel, he actually echoes Plato’s *Timaeus* referring

⁴⁵⁸ Cf. reference to the πέμπτῃν ἔκδοσιν. Origen, *selPs*, PG.12: 1069.47; 1072.17 and 23; 1473.32; 1660.10; *Scholia in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.17: 272.25; 280.39; 285.58; *commMatt*, 16.16.

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. ref. to the πέμπτῃν ἔκδοσιν. Eusebius, *Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG.23: 192.38; 225.3; 229.15; 249.31; 289.54; 308.15; 308.55; 324.34; 349.15; 416.51; 453.9; 492.42; 493.55; 540.40; 553.51; 557.56; 576.30; 592.35; 637.11; 661.38; 685.49; 689.18 and 29; 712.31; 821.18; 861.56; 893.14; 917.44; 977.12; 1012.31; 1016.40; 1052.32; 1057.56; 1072.29; 1092.16; 1092.39; 1141.21; 1149.47; 1332.21; 1333.2; 1341.53; PG.24: 24.11: 65.18.

⁴⁶⁰ Cf. reference to the πέμπτῃν ἔκδοσιν: Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1469.22; *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81: 157.51; 181.35.

⁴⁶¹ Of the remaining occurrences, only that of Procopius of Gaza is noteworthy. Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *expPs*, PG.69.1069.50. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Psalmos 101–107*, PG.55.674.32. Procopius of Gaza, *In Canticum Canticorum*, pp. 1589; 1728.

⁴⁶² *Catena Palestinae* (post fifth cent.). It quotes from ‘the Fifth Edition’

in biblical verse 85, section b; biblical verse 119, section b. It quotes from the ‘Fifth and Sixth Edition’ in biblical verse 28, section b.

⁴⁶³ Hypatius, *Fragmenta in Prophetas Minores*, prophet 3, p. 137. Cf. Amos, 2:7.

⁴⁶⁴ Theodoret, *intProphXII*, PG.81.1673.32.

⁴⁶⁵ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *commProphXII*, Prophet Amos, 2.7b. Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, pp. 403; 461; 466; 609; *Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam*, PG.70.1421.20–21. Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2693. Antiochus of Palestine (a monk of the seventh cent.), *Pandecta Scripturae Sacrae*, Homily 37. He is also known as Antiochus of Ancyra.

⁴⁶⁶ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentarius in XII Prophetas Minores*, Prophet Amos, 2.7b: προσέπληττον ἁδεῶς.

⁴⁶⁷ E. Bethe, *Pollucis Onomasticon*, 2 vols. *Lexicographi Graeci* 9.1–9.2 (Leipzig, 1900–1931 (repr. 1967)).

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid. 8.76.

⁴⁶⁹ There is only one instance in a spurious text. Cf. Plato, *Spuria*, 372a2: καὶ πᾶσαν αἰκίαν αἰκίζόμενοι ἁδίοις τιμωρίαῖς τρύχονται.

to the ‘citadel of reason’.⁴⁷⁰ Nevertheless, it is not within my scope to resolve conclusively an issue tantalizing modern scholarship, namely, whether, in general, Theodoret had a first-hand knowledge of Greek texts, or not. Theodoret is of interest to me in this work only in so far as his patrimony bears on Cassian.

It is a customary to draw a distinction between the two so-called ‘schools’: Alexandria laid a lot of stress on allegorical interpretation, Antioch used typology in scriptural exegesis. Alexandria is supposed to have paid little or no attention to real historical events, Antioch is said to have pursued a historical and grammatical interpretation of the sacred text. I have discussed the issue in relation to Origen and have shown that those clichés have nothing to do with him. No other author engaged so devotedly in the grammatical exploration and analysis of the sacred text; nor did any other author pursue different sorts of evidence (including visits to archaeological sites related to scriptural instances) more than Origen did in order to inquire into the scriptural narration in real historical terms.⁴⁷¹ On the other hand, the Antiochene Theodoret indulges in allegory, as already discussed. Besides, the man who spoke of allegory in not very flattering terms was not an Antiochene: it was Basil of Caesarea, an admirer of Origen. He refers to the ‘laws of allegory’, which he did not ‘invent himself’, but came across ‘in works by others’; he adds that he is not prepared to read statements about ‘fishes and hay’ and to understand anything other than fish and hay; one should understand something ‘as it is written: for otherwise it looks as if

one is seeking to make oneself wiser than the words uttered by the Spirit’.⁴⁷² Basil had in mind Didymus, who spoke of ‘the laws of allegory’ (νόμους ἀλληγορίας), rather than Origen himself.⁴⁷³ But so did Theodoret, who had used the same expression along with Procopius of Gaza and Eusebius.⁴⁷⁴ However, when Basil says that when he reads ‘fish’ he is only prepared to understand fish and nothing (allegorical) beyond this, he contradicts himself. For it is Basil who allows for scripture to speak allegorically ‘as usual’ applying the verb ‘belch’ (ἐρεύγομαι);⁴⁷⁵ it is also Basil who regards ‘tropology and allegory’ acceptable when ‘theologians’ speak of the ‘essence of God’, and shuns all those who read such accounts literally as indulging in ‘Jewish tales befitting silly elderly women’.⁴⁷⁶ It is also Basil who allows for allegory when Christ is said to be ‘the creative hand’ of God.⁴⁷⁷

The text of Revelation is at all events a singular case: in the main it relates a *vision*, not a set of real historical occurrences amidst Israel, the people of God. Since typology establishes a certain correspondence between facts occurring at different moments of history, it would be rather difficult to use typology while reading about a vision. It is more an axiom than an argued thesis that Theodoret was against the use of allegory, on account of his Antiochene traits. And yet, strange though it may seem, Theodoret did accept Didymus’ method, in which allegory held sway. Theodoret did not reject this method out of hand, as we have seen. He only disallowed abuse of the method. Setting out to account for the Psalms, he states that he has read various commentaries, yet he

⁴⁷⁰ Plato, *Timaeus*, 70a: ἐκ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τῷ ἐπιτάγματι καὶ λόγῳ.

⁴⁷¹ See above and PHE, p. 373.

⁴⁷² Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Hexaemeron*, Homily 9.1: Οἶδα νόμους ἀλληγορίας, εἰ καὶ μὴ παρ’ ἐμαντοῦ ἐξευρών, ἀλλὰ τοῖς παρ’ ἐτέρων πεπονημένοις περιτυχόν. Ἄς οἱ μὴ καταδεχόμενοι τὰς κοινὰς τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐννοίας, τὸ ὕδωρ οὐχ ὕδωρ λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ τινα ἄλλην φύσιν . . . Ἐγὼ δὲ χόρτον ἀκούσας, χόρτον νοῶ, καὶ φυτὸν, καὶ ἰχθύν, καὶ θηρίον, καὶ κτήνος, πάντα ὡς εἴρηται οὕτως ἐκδέχομαι. Καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον . . . Ὁ μοι δοκοῦσι μὴ συνειδότες τινές, παραγωγαῖς τισι καὶ τροπολογίαις σεμνότητά τινα ἐκ τῆς οἰκειᾶς αὐτῶν διανοίας ἐπεχείρησαν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐπιφηνίσαι. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἑαυτὸν σοφώτερον ποιοῦντος τῶν λόγων τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ ἐν προσποιήσει ἐξηγήσεως τὰ ἑαυτοῦ παρεισάγοντος. Νοεῖσθω τοίνυν ὡς γέγραπται.

⁴⁷³ Cf. Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 56; *In Genesin*, Cod. pp. 8B; 21; 44; 45; 235; *commZacch*, 2.15.

⁴⁷⁴ Theodoret, *Explanatio In Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.40.6–7 (for ‘salt’): Καὶ τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ τοὺς τῆς ἀλληγορίας νόμους

νοήσομεν. *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.1124.15–16 (for ‘wood’ in ‘paradise’): κατὰ τοὺς τῆς ἀλληγορίας νόμους. Likewise, Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, pp. 2205; 2116. Eusebius, *Demonstratio Evangelica*, 2.3.89; 4.15.54; *In Isaiam Prophetam*, 2.50; *et passim*.

⁴⁷⁵ Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.393.24–25: κατὰ τὴν τῆς Γραφῆς συνήθη τροπολογίαν. Reference to Psalm 44:2 using the verb ἐξηρεύετο (‘has belched’), which according to Basil is a ‘usual tropology’ in scripture, which he allows for.

⁴⁷⁶ Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.544.33–38: Ἐπεὶ γε ὅσα παρὰ τοῖς θεολόγοις περὶ οὐσίας Θεοῦ ἀναγεγράφθαι δοκεῖ τροπολογίαις τιςὶν ἢ καὶ ἀλληγορίαις, πρὸς ἐτέρας ἐννοίας οἱ λόγοι φέρουσιν. Ὡστε εἴ τις ἄβασανίστως κατὰ τὴν πρόχειρον ἐκδοχὴν ψιλῶ παρίστασθαι φιλονεικοῖη τῷ γράμματι, πρὸς Ἰουδαϊκοὺς καὶ γραῶδεις μύθους ἐκτραπεῖς, πτωχὸς παντελῶς τῶν ἀξίων περὶ Θεοῦ νοημάτων καταγῆραςται.

⁴⁷⁷ *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.713.37–39: Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ δύναμις, καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία, ἥτις ἐστὶ χεὶρ δημιουργικὴ κατὰ τὸν τῆς τροπολογίας λόγον.

dismisses ‘greed for allegory’ (τοὺς εἰς ἀλληγορίαν μετὰ πολλῆς χωρήσαντας ἀπληστίας)⁴⁷⁸ as much as he bans that sort of arid literalism which treats the Psalms as nothing more than historical events relating to the Jews. He was a moderate man, not only in relation to ecclesiastical affairs (conciliatory as he was on the eve of the Council of Ephesus), but also in using this or that method of biblical exegesis. In the main, however, he held that ‘a testimony supplied by facts can yield the truth’.⁴⁷⁹

Theodoret associated allegory with what he saw as the Greek method aiming to conceal ‘shameful depravity’⁴⁸⁰ concealed under sublime formulations. He had in mind of course the Stoic allegorical method being used upon Homer, which was pursued by Porphyry and some other intellectuals throughout Late Antiquity. To him, this method was a cunning ‘monstrous invention of philosophers’ aimed at embellishing downright baseness. He was responding to Porphyry, on behalf of Plato, as it were, at a time when Plato’s strong condemnation of Homer had been taken up by Christians. Certainly, the contest was no longer about Homer: what Theodoret actually had in mind was a host of authors and works that should be assessed, so that the difference between the lies (τοῦ ψεύδους) of the Greeks and the noble divine lessons of scripture (ἄξιέραστα καὶ

ἄξιάγαστα τὰ θεῖα μαθήματα) should come to light (τῇ ἀποστολικῇ καὶ προφητικῇ διδασκαλίᾳ παρατιθείς καὶ ἐκ παραλλήλου θεώμενος τὸ διάφορον).⁴⁸¹

Theodoret had nothing against allegory in principle, which he entertained whenever necessary, as we saw in his comments on the Song of Songs. He simply believed that Christianity could cope with its own (Biblical) history considered in pragmatic terms, better than the Greeks did with their Homeric and other stories.⁴⁸² Besides, he was alert to preserving the reality of historical events,⁴⁸³ which is why he urges that Paul’s statement in Gal. 4:24, where the term ‘allegory’ is explicitly used (ἀλληγορούμενα), suggests a *typological*, not allegorical, understanding of history. This is a thesis staunchly advanced by John Chrysostom,⁴⁸⁴ who implicitly sought to ‘correct’ this expression of Paul’s. Chrysostom had a distaste for allegory anyway.⁴⁸⁵ On the other hand, Theodoret was prepared to allow allegorical exegesis in general, as well as specific allegorical reading of certain passages. For example, he concedes the allegory about the ‘dragon’ of Isaiah, 27:1: ‘If certain people believe that this “dragon” should be understood allegorically, we shall not dismiss this meaning’.⁴⁸⁶

Theodoret was prepared to entertain allegory not as a concession, but as a choice of his own.⁴⁸⁷ In doing so,

⁴⁷⁸ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.860.37–43: Διαφόροις γὰρ ἐντυχὼν ὑπομνήμασι, καὶ τοὺς μὲν εἰς ἀλληγορίαν μετὰ πολλῆς χωρήσαντας ἀπληστίας εὐρών, τοὺς δὲ τισιν ἱστορίαις τὴν προφητείαν ἀρμόσαντας, ὡς Ἰουδαίοις μᾶλλον τὴν ἐρμηνείαν συνηγορεῖν, ἢ τοῖς τροφίμοις τῆς πίστεως· πανούργου νενόμικα καὶ τούτων κἀκείνων τὴν ἀμετρίαν φυγεῖν.

⁴⁷⁹ Ibid. PG.80.860.50–861.3: Ἰκανὴ γὰρ καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἡ μαρτυρία ποδηγῆσαι πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῆς ἐρμηνείας τοὺς ταύτην ἐφιεμένους εὐρεῖν.

⁴⁸⁰ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 4.4: καὶ τὸ τῆς ποιητικῆς μυθολογίας ἀπογυμνῶσαντες αἰσχος καὶ τὴν τερατώδη τῶν φιλοσόφων ἀλληγορίαν ἐλέγξαντες. Cf. ibid. 3.43; 3.46; 3.54; 79.

⁴⁸¹ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 2.94–96.

⁴⁸² There are points where Theodoret rejects exegeses proposed by ‘the allegorists’ (οἱ ἀλληγορηταί). This, for instance, he does with the ‘skin tunics’ of Gen. 3:21 allegorized as betokening corporeality. Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 40. I have studied the point and shown that whereas Origen had dismissed this Platonic notion, it was actually Gregory of Nazianzus who had advanced it. See RCR, pp. 290–299.

⁴⁸³ Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 268: οὐ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκβάλλων, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ παραβάλλων τὸν τύπον. Likewise, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.489.44–50: Οὐ γὰρ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀνεῖλεν, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ προτυπωθέντα διδάσκει . . . Δείκνυσι δὲ καὶ τὴν προφητείαν συμφωνοῦσαν τῷ τύπῳ.

⁴⁸⁴ Cf. John Chrysostom, *De Paenitentia*, PG.49.320.55f (μάνθανε καὶ διὰ τῶν τύπων). In *illud: Habentes Eundem Spiritum* (homiliae 1–3), PG.51.285.40–41: Τί δὲ ἐστίν, Ἀλληγορούμενα; Τύποι τῶν ἐν τῇ χάριτι γενομένων ἦσαν τὰ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ Διαθήκῃ γινόμενα. In *Epistulam ad Galatas Commentarius*, PG.61.662.19–21: Ἄτινά ἐστίν ἀλληγορούμενα.

Καταχρηστικῶς τὸν τύπον ἀλληγορίαν ἐκάλεσεν.

⁴⁸⁵ Commenting on Prov. 25:27 (‘it is not good to eat too much of honey’) along with Eccl. 7:16, Chrysostom takes ‘honey’ to indicate ‘allegory’, which may lead not only to intellectual arrogance, but also to improper speculation. John Chrysostom, *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, (in *catenis*), PG.64.733.25–28: Ἐσθίειν μέλι πολύ, οὐ καλόν. (Prov. 25:27) Καὶ ἀνωτέρω μέλι, ἡ ἀλληγορία εἴρηται. Πολὺ οὖν εἶναι περὶ τούτων ὄντων θεωρίαν ἀσύμφορον. Μὴ σοφίζου γὰρ πολλά, μήποτε ἐκπλαγῆς· (Eccl. 7:16) ἀλλαχοῦ. Ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ.

⁴⁸⁶ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1704.35: Εἰ δὲ τισι δοκεῖ καὶ ἀλληγορῆσαι τὸν δράκοντα . . . οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς παραιτησόμεθα τὴν τοιαύτην διάνοιαν.

⁴⁸⁷ Cf. Theodoret introducing allegory, *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum* (comm. on Ezek. 16:4), PG.81.40.6–7: Καὶ τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ τοὺς τῆς ἀλληγορίας νόμους νοήσομεν. *Interpretatio in Ezechielem* (comm. on Ezek. 23:18), PG.81.1040.23–24: πάλιν γὰρ κατὰ τὸ τῆς ἀλληγορίας εἶδος τὴν ψυχὴν τέθεικεν.

he identified ‘allegory’ and ‘tropology’.⁴⁸⁸ This is in turn also suggested by the term *anagoge* (ἀναγωγή), which (like allegory) denotes an exegesis *beyond* historical events.⁴⁸⁹ Likewise, in the Scholia the terms ‘allegory’ and ‘tropology’ do not occur, whereas ἀναγωγή and its cognates make a distinctive mark, which is in fact one more indication of their Antiochene tendency. For all his hostility to the term ‘allegory’, John Chrysostom did use the notion of ἀναγωγή, and the expression κατὰ ἀναγωγήν is a frequent theme, though mainly in his exegeses on the Psalms.⁴⁹⁰

The common ground for Theodoret and the Scholia is to be found in the use of the epithet νοητός and its cognates, which are abundantly present in both.⁴⁹¹ Besides, common to Theodoret and the Scholia is reference to shunning arid approaches, which consider only the bare literal sense: this is suggested by the expression τὸ πρόχειρον (‘the ordinary literal meaning’).⁴⁹² Consequently, a sublime sense which emerges out of a certain anagogical interpretation is said to be grasped ‘in an anagogical sense’ (present perfect participle ἀνηγμένος, adverb: ἀνηγμένως).⁴⁹³ Theodoret appears to use the term not as one of his own, but following Amphilochius of Iconium,⁴⁹⁴ which suggests that the term used in the Scholia is the product of Cassian’s own pen, not an influence from Theodoret.

A letter dating to the turn of the fifteenth to sixteenth century, which is ascribed to a certain Sergius Stissus, is an important testimony to how Theodoret was known to the Greeks of that late period. The letter is addressed to Janus Lascaris, the noted Greek scholar (1445–1535). Janus (also called John) Lascaris was the most distinguished Greek scholar who lived in Italy and France during the Renaissance. He taught the Greek *paideia* in Florence, Paris, and Rome. He was the editor of the *editiones principes* of major Greek works, from manuscripts he had himself managed to obtain from Greek localities under Turkish rule. In this effort he was supported by Lorenzo de Medici, who dreamed that some day he might rival the legendary library of Alexandria.⁴⁹⁵ The authors published by him were Euripides, Isocrates, Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, Musaeus, Lucian of Samosata, as well as commentaries on Homer by Porphyry and Didymus (the grammarian).⁴⁹⁶

The author of the letter, Sergius Stissus, complains that he lives in a (not identified) ‘remote country, inhabited by barbarians and enemies of wisdom’ (evidently meaning the Turks), where there is a ‘scarcity of books’. He adds that ‘it would be superfluous to enumerate the books that are not available to us’, since in effect there were actually no books at hand.

⁴⁸⁸ Theodoret, *ibid.* (comm. on Ezek. 23:18), PG.81.1040.40–41: Εἴτα πάλιν ἀλληγορικῶς καὶ τροπικῶς τὴν τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας ποιεῖται κατηγορίαν. *Ibid.* (comm. on Ezek. 23:18), PG.81.1105.1–4: Καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς Τύρου τὰς τῆς ἀλληγορίας ἀφορμὰς ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάττης ἔλαβε (παραλία γὰρ ἡ πόλις), οὕτως ἐνταῦθα ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ κέχρηται τῇ τροπῇ. *Ibid.* (comm. on Ezek. 31:9: the ‘pieces of wood in the paradise’ betoken ‘incorporeal natures’), PG.81.1124.14–15: κατὰ τοὺς τῆς ἀλληγορίας νόμους.

⁴⁸⁹ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.949.17–19: Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὅσον πρὸς ἱστορίαν, τὴν δὲ ἀναγωγὴν ἰσχυρότεραν ἐξετάσωμεν. *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 250: Τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀναγωγῆς νόημα σαφὲς ἡμᾶς ἐδίδαξεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπόστολος. καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ πρόχειρον εὐσεβές. I have canvassed the germane terms in *PHE*, pp. 25–37.

⁴⁹⁰ John Chrysostom, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55: 84.19; 116.53; 117.17; 126.45; 130.23; 171.14; 171.17; 173.34; 194.4; 206.57; 208.55; 217.59; 269.3; 278.1; 303.45; 317.54; 325.36; 327.11; 334.34; 335.11; 355.47; 358.15; 444.29; 450.27; 483.2; 483.15; 484.15; 494.23; *In Sanctum Matthaeum*, PG.57.355.5; *In Epistolam ad Ephesios*, PG.62.165.39; *Fragmenta in Job*, PG.64.653.18; *In Job*, 196.3. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Psalmum 118*, PG.55.680.24; *Synopsis Scripturae*, PG.56.377.13 and 36. However, in his work *In Isaiam*, 1.7, he reprimands those who understood the text ‘according to an anagogical interpretation’ (κατ’ ἀναγωγήν).

⁴⁹¹ Cf. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1365.13 (τὸν νοητὸν Φαραώ); *ibid.* PG.80.1668.44 (νοητὸν ὄρος Σιών); *ibid.* PG.80.1677.14 (τοῦ νοητοῦ ἄρτου); *Explanatio in Canticum*

Canticorum, PG.81.76.49 (τὸν νοητὸν Φαραώ); *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.737.20–22 (τῆς νοητῆς αἰχμαλωσίας); *et passim*.

⁴⁹² Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 74: τὸ πρόχειρον καὶ ἐπιτόλαιον τοῦ γράμματος νόημα. *Ibid.* p. 250: Τὸ τῆς ἀναγωγῆς νόημα contrasted with τὸ πρόχειρον νόημα. *Ibid.* p. 318: κατὰ μὲν τὸ πρόχειρον νόημα. *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1340.39–40: τὸ πρόχειρον νόημα. Cf. *Scholion II*: μὴ προχείρως ἀκούειν ἀλλὰ πιστῶς. *Scholion II: XXV*: πρὸς οὓς ἐροῦμεν μὴ κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον ταῦτα γεγράφθαι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κεκρυμμένον. ἡ τῶν νοητῶν οὐσία δηλοῦται ἐν τῇ γραφῇ πολλάκις τῇ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία.

⁴⁹³ Cf. *Scholion VI*: ἀνηγμένως νοήσας. This adverb ἀνηγμένως and its significance in the Scholia eluded both Harnack (who emended the erroneous codex writing ἀνοιγμένως to ἀνεωγμένως) and Turner, who took Harnack’s mistake to be an inspired emendation. Cf. *Scholion XII*: κατὰ ἀναγωγήν.

⁴⁹⁴ *Eranistes*, pp. 107 and 242: τοὺς ἀνηγμένους καὶ θεοπροπεῖς λόγους. 107 and 242: Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ πῇ μὲν ἀνηγμένους, πῇ δὲ ταπεινοὺς φθέγγομαι λόγους.

⁴⁹⁵ In one of the seven ‘Raphael Cartoons’ drawn in 1515, Lascaris is portrayed as a bearded man standing at the extreme left of the image next to Pope Leo X (=Giovanni di Lorenzo di Medici, 1475–1521, pope since 1513). These ‘cartoons’ were designed for tapestries (1515–16) and are now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, in London.

⁴⁹⁶ Paul Lejay, article in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, v. 9 (New York, 1913), lemma ‘Janus Lascaris’.

Nevertheless, he lists some ‘books that are most needed’ (τῶν πάνυ ἀναγκαιοτέρων), which are evidently the books that any person purporting to be regarded as educated should study at that period. The list is short: the commentaries on Homer by Eustathius of Thessaloniki; an exegesis on the moral philosophy⁴⁹⁷ of Aristotle; the moral philosophy of Basil the Great; ‘the polymath Eusebius’ (with no titles of his works cited); ‘Theodoret’s treatise “on gods”’; ‘any exegesis on [Aristotle’s] *Metaphysics*’,⁴⁹⁸ and ‘many more, which have eluded me, since they are so many’. The work requested by Stissus is in fact the Third Book of Theodoret’s *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, which is entitled ‘On the angels and the so-called gods, and the evil daemons’. As a last-minute reminder by the letter-writer to his noble compatriot Lascaris, whose erudition had been eagerly hailed in Europe, Stissus requests that he dispatch the ‘tables of Ptolemy’ (ἡ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου πινακογραφία),⁴⁹⁹ which means the catalogue of the works of Aristotle composed by the grammarian Ptolemy of Ascalon.⁵⁰⁰

This epistle is important for one more reason. The author asks Lascaris to be excused for not having sent the books which Lascaris had asked him to. The reason was that these books had been reproduced by ‘scribes who were barbarians and ignoramuses’ (ἀντέγραψαν αὐτὰ βάρβαροί τινες καὶ ὀλιγομαθεῖς); hence these books needed to be ‘copied for a second time’ (δις μεταγραφῆναι).⁵⁰¹ This shows that there was a real problem resulting from the deficient education of scribes. This is evident also in the Scholia, where spelling mistakes point to a poorly educated person, namely

the monk Theodosius. He was replaced at some point (at *Scholion V*), yet he resumed work later. Being aware of his own shortcomings, he wrote the short text quoted above, asking God to forgive him for all the mistakes he may have made during the copying of the scriptural text. We learn that as late as the sixteenth century similar bugbears were still besetting educated people who wished to have books copied.

Evidently, Sergius Stissus cites Theodoret’s name to his correspondent as a matter of course. That Lascaris knew of this work was taken for granted. Theodoret was naturally respected in sixteenth-century Europe, not only because he was a Christian, but also because he was an exemplary scholar for the erudite of Europe of that period, the Europe that was re-discovering Hellenism, publishing texts and reviving scholarship, the Europe of the Renaissance. Bessarion, the Greek who became a cardinal, the man who made it possible for Lascaris to study in the university of Padua, speaks with respect for Theodoret. It is quite remarkable that Bessarion confesses that the writings of Theodoret are available to him, whereas those of Chrysostom are not. In two passages of a treatise on the Holy Eucharist, the cardinal quotes from Theodoret asserting that this is how ‘he thinks’ (οἶμαι) the bishop of Cyrrhus had rendered Chrysostom, ‘since the commentaries of Chrysostom on the Psalms are not available to us’ (οὐ γάρ εἰσι νῦν παρ’ ἡμῖν τὰ εἰς τοὺς Ψαλμοὺς Χρυσοστόμου).⁵⁰² Bessarion was mistaken in supposing Theodoret to be dependent on Chrysostom here. Chrysostom makes no point of that kind. Bessarion was actually quoting from Theodoret’s

⁴⁹⁷ On the moral philosophy of Aristotle, we have commentaries only on the *Nicomachean Ethics* by Aspasius (second cent.), Eustratius of Nicaea (eleventh–twelfth cent.), and Michael of Ephesus (on the fifth book) (eleventh–twelfth cent.). There are also some anonymous commentaries on the same book of Aristotle, and I should have thought that at least two of them were written by Christian hands.

⁴⁹⁸ Stissus asked for any interpretation of *Metaphysics*. So far as I know, the treatises on this work of Aristotle’s that have reached us were produced by the Aristotelian commentators, Alexander of Aphrodisias (second/third cent. AD), Syrianus of Athens (Neoplatonist, fifth cent.), Asclepius of Tralles (Books A–Z), (sixth cent.).

⁴⁹⁹ Sergius Stissus, *Epistula ad Joannem Lascarin*, p. 366, *apud* É. Legrand, *Cent-dix lettres grecques de François Filelfe* (Paris, 1892), pp. 363–366 (p. 366). The humanist Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481) had studied with Lascaris’ protector Bessarion under Ignatius Chortasmenus, bishop of Selymbria, in the late 1420s. The correspondence which Filelfo preserved for posterity is a valuable source of information on some important personalities of his era.

⁵⁰⁰ Cf. Ptolemy of Ascalon (second cent. BC–second cent. AD). These ‘tables’ are mentioned in the *Vitae Aristotelis*, Vita Marciana, section 43: Καὶ τελευτᾷ ἐκεῖσε διαθήκην ἔγγραφον καταλιπόν, ἣ φέρεται παρὰ τε Ἀνδρονίκῳ καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ μετὰ τῶν πινάκων τῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων. Since Ptolemaeus is mentioned after Andronicus, he was probably a grammarian of the first/second century AD.

⁵⁰¹ Ibid. The author also asks Lascaris to send ‘not the epistles of St Paul’ but something else, which could be ‘new and necessary’ (πέμψον μοι νέον ἄλλο τι καὶ ἀναγκαῖον). This shows Lascaris’ correspondent to be interested in Greek rather than Christian literature. Nevertheless, Stissus was erudite enough to quote the prophet Micah, 71 in his letter.

⁵⁰² Bessarion, *De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, section 13,9, line 13. He appeals to Theodoret (ὁ Θεοδώρητος ὡς ἀπὸ φωνῆς τοῦ θείου Χρυσοστόμου ἐξηγούμενος) and then quotes from him. He does the same a few lines later: *loc. cit.* line 39: Θεοδώρητος ὡς ἀπὸ φωνῆς οἶμαι του θείου Χρυσοστόμου, and then he quotes from Theodoret again.

commentary on the Psalms.⁵⁰³ Unless reference is made to a lost text, the portion has no parallel in Chrysostom.

Theodoret is considered as the last great scholar of Late Antiquity, and his treatise rebutting Greek doctrines is the last great Christian anti-pagan apologetic treatise. Since Theodoret himself had been a student of the Greek philosophical tradition, he felt the intense ambivalence of all erudite Christians dealing with it. The range of figures parading in his learned exposition is impressive and surpasses all previous similar compositions, including Origen's polemical work against Celsus. No Christian writer after Origen was able to counter Greeks with their own weapons as Theodoret did. When he set out to disarm the ridicule of cultured pagans, he confronts them as a foe even more formidable and more effective than Origen had been. Quite evidently, Theodoret was more inclined to quote pagan writings than Origen, who deliberately refrained from doing so, and this parsimony is a feature of his work, save in his reply to Celsus, only because the specific circumstances called for it. Whereas Origen was thrown on the defensive, Theodoret lampooned pagan religion on his own initiative, since his rejoinder was not the result of any vituperative challenge, such as those by Celsus, Porphyry, or the Emperor Julian. He struggles not only against the currents of his day, but against the entire arsenal of pagan tenets and precepts.

The very fact that Theodoret wrote the combative *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio* denotes that he was hardly content with the *Contra Celsum* standing as a comprehensive rejoinder to the pagan intelligentsia. Basic lines of Origen's methodology are there, but the project is far more refined. The old Patristic thesis that Plato had usurped and misappropriated Moses, and Jewish lore in general, is coupled with erudite quotations from the Greek heritage purporting to show its debts to the divine wisdom, of which Christians are the natural and eligible heirs. That Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius are the sources Theodoret drew on (principally the *Stromateis* and *Preparatio Evangelica* respectively) is too entrenched a thesis to need further discussion here. What scholars are slow to allow is that Theodoret himself also had

independent access to certain ancient texts, and no Christian author can surpass his erudition. My foregoing discussion on the verb ἐκονδύλιζον and his knowledgeable use of it is only one telling example. The poor philosophical record of Christian theologians (including Basil, who is supposed to have studied philosophy – but even today many graduates in philosophy hardly measure up to the title) is manifest in Patristic literature. Not to regard philosophy as a primary authority, and not to aspire to be regarded as a philosopher of note, is one thing, but to be a careful and well-informed student of philosophy is quite another, and on this the overall Patristic record leaves much to be desired.

Theodoret was an enterprising and sophisticated advocate; he could move confidently to a contrary position and claim the philosophers and other distinctive authors (such as Pindar)⁵⁰⁴ as allies when it suited him. On the whole, however, he regarded himself as upholding the invariable tradition of the Church, and he is not unreservedly open to suggestions from philosophers, all the more so since the mystery of the Cross confounded the philosophers, as Eusebius had already taught him.⁵⁰⁵ Although philosophers could be casually drawn on to confirm and develop various details of biblical narrative, they are generally regarded as all too prone to errors, and Theodoret's allegiance to scripture and Christian tradition is unfailingly an indispensable part of his discipleship. Scholars have been at pains to show that Theodoret is dependent either on Clement or Eusebius (which is partially true for some quotations in his *Curatio*), or on *florilegia* circulating during his time. It is manifest, however, that texts of philosophers, historians, and poets were familiar to him: he quotes with the confidence of one to whom these texts were available first-hand. This, I believe, is what makes Theodoret a case entirely and exceptionally singular among all Christian theologians.

The list of Christian authors in Late Antiquity is long, but that of Christian scholars and learned philosophers is all too short. Of these Theodoret is the coryphaeus. The range of Greek writers whom Theodoret cites has no parallel in Christian literature.⁵⁰⁶

⁵⁰³ Cf. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.889.36–41.

⁵⁰⁴ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 1.115; 6.25; 8.35; 12.25. Cf. Theodoret quoting Demosthenes in *Epistulae*, 1–52, Epistle 12.

⁵⁰⁵ Eusebius, *DE*, 3.6.26–27.

⁵⁰⁶ See below, some comments on the index of authors discussed in the expanded notes.

He mentions by name philosophers (Thales, Parmenides, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Numenius, Plutarch of Chaeronea, Plotinus, Porphyry, Amelius, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Xenocrates, Chrysippus, Oenomaus the Cynic, Diogenianus (the philosopher), Timaeus of Locris, Diagoras of Melos, Theodore of Cyrene, Euhemerus of Tegea, Aetius, Alcman); orators (Demosthenes); historians (Xenophon, Diodorus of Sicily, Philo of Byblos, the historian); medical doctors and philosophers (Hippocrates, Galen).

The texts of Codex 573 reveal that, though he was the greatest, Theodoret was not followed by sheer silence. Cassian comes up as an heir to Theodoret's patrimony, a follower, and a scholar who tells us that during the sixth century the Greek *paideia* was not dead, not even moribund. But Cassian the Sabaite earns the title only *because* he followed Theodoret's example by making much of the lore bequeathed by Origen. This is tragic, in the original sense, suggesting a noble person engaging in a morally momentous struggle ending in ruin, essentially as a consequence of some extreme quality, which is both the source of his greatness and the cause of his downfall. Despite the fact that both the authorship of the Scholia and the allegiances of their author were obscured by the author himself, Cassian suffered obloquy, which resulted in his spiritual death, the 'second death' of Revelation, the idea which he made so much of in his own analyses.

Cassian and the Scholia

Theodoret mentions the book of Revelation only once, in his *Eranistes*. This clearly denotes indifference to this specific book, which was also the attitude of John Chrysostom. A century later, Cassian the Sabaite, another spiritual offspring of Antioch, set out to assess the attitude of two scholars whom he admired. Consequently, he found himself on the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand, Eusebius was an exemplar to him as both a historian and a scholar. On the other, Didymus was a theologian of outstanding erudition on pagan thought. Besides, he was a rare specimen amid writers of his milieu: although an Alexandrian, he was an erudite Aristotelian.

As a historian, Eusebius doubted the authority of the Apocalypse, yet as a theologian he put it to casual use. On the other hand, not only did Didymus accept the authority and authorship of the book, but he also wrote a commentary on it. Had Didymus not cited his own commentary on Revelation, this would have been virtually non-existent, as has been the case with his commentary on Zachariah, lost until the twentieth century.

The Scholia are in fact notes and remarks by Cassian, who did not seek to offer any comprehensive commentary on the Apocalypse. His only aim was to establish the authority of the Book of Revelation as canonical. These notes are personal reflections on how the exposition on the Book of Revelation neatly fits into the entire truth and harmony of both Testaments. Nevertheless, although only notes, they are written as a continuous text. Cassian resolved that Revelation is a divinely inspired book, and this attitude permeates the text from start to finish. It seems that the original was not written in the form of the apocalyptic text accompanied by remarks written in the margin, for some Scholia are too extensive for them possibly to have been written in margins. The author quotes passage after passage and comments on each in turn, in a text so continuous that there is no change of paragraph when he moves from the conclusion of one Scholion to the quotation of the ensuing passage of Revelation.

The aim

This set of comments seems to have been intended for personal use. Cassian probably also composed this as part of his pastoral care as an abbot,⁵⁰⁷ in order to provide his monks with arguments buttressing up the canonicity of Revelation. Why did he do this? Had the Book of Revelation not been sanctioned by so many authors since the age of Irenaeus as an authoritative one? Had this not been endorsed by such authoritative and influential theologians as Origen and Hippolytus? Was it not Cyril of Alexandria, who, during the fifth century, had subscribed to the canonicity of the book, aligning himself with previous fathers who had accepted it?

⁵⁰⁷ On folio 290r, just below the later note 'by Cassian the Roman', the same hand wrote a hardly legible phrase of which I have tentatively deciphered the abbreviated words as 'by whom [this text is]

homilies to everyone', probably suggesting that these are sermons by Abbot Cassian addressing his monks.

Cassian knew this, of course. However, alongside these distinguished authors there was another one, subsequent to them, who had expressed implicit doubts. This was Eusebius, and Cassian had a great deal of respect for that erudite historian, theologian, and scholar. After all, it was Basil of Caesarea who had written that ‘the Palestinian Eusebius is trustworthy, on account of his vast experience’ (καὶ ὁ Παλαιστίνος Εὐσέβιος ἀξιόπιστος διὰ πολυπειρίαν) and declares himself prepared to draw on him, in order to make his own points (καὶ αὐτὰς φωνὰς ἐπιδείκνυμεν).⁵⁰⁸ Besides, Eusebius (c. 265–c. 339/40) was the scholar who had instructed personalities of the younger generation, such as Didymus (310/13–c. 398), Evagrius (345–399) and Leontius Byzantius (c. 485–c. 542), that the legacy of Origen was valuable and should be cherished. On the other hand, his spiritual Antiochene fathers, such as Chrysostom, clearly dismissed the book, whereas Theodore himself was reserved towards it, to say the least. As a matter of fact, no catena on Revelation has ever been composed, which is indicative of the prolonged ambivalence vis-à-vis this book. Even today, the official Church holds this last book of the canon subpar: no part of it is ever read in any office or service throughout the year.

Cassian was in need of argument in order to establish the canonicity of the Book of Revelation. The Scholia evince his struggle to show that Revelation speaks exactly the same truths that the rest of the canon does. He was a theologian and a priest, but he was also a scholar. It was not sufficient for him to say that since theologians of note had authorized the Book of Revelation, he also sanctioned it on this account alone. Hence, he set out to establish that in fact the Book of Revelation says what both Testaments say, if in different words. The entire message of Christianity can be found in that Book alone. This book is not simply about eschatological prediction. It is about theology, which is not below the level of that flowing from the rest of scripture. Therefore, he did not set out to write a commentary on Revelation; he purported to write arguments bolstering the authority, and therefore the canonicity, of this Book. To him, the *auctoritas vetustatis* of the famed Alexandrian school was the dignifying patina on the surface of a commentary, which claims

the decipherment of the cryptic, as well as a controversial, apocalyptic vision. The fact was, however, that Eusebius’ reports lingered, and thus allowed no unanimous ‘Patristic tradition’ on this question, not to mention Chrysostom again. Considered as a whole, Patristic attitudes to Revelation appeared to Cassian to be a host of self-defeating and contumacious material that resisted and often belied attempts to position it theologically.

Cassian sought to adjudicate on a question almost as old as the life of the Church. He set out to provide conclusive evidence that the book was divinely inspired. His predecessors appeared by and large to have sanctioned the book. Still his aim was to improve on this, by crowning faith in it with some elaborate reasoning. His background supplied him with an arsenal of reading and the ability to render the obscure text with clarity and rigour. The source of all legitimate inquiry was of course scripture itself, but the entire legacy of Greek philosophy provided the terms in which to couch it.

Although the exposition is not desultory, the aim of the author is not to offer a comprehensive account of any aspect of the doctrine. Rather, the reader (or, the audience) is given to understand how the truth of the entire Holy Writ is instantiated in the narrative of John. There is scant regard paid to the theological debate of his day. On the whole, the text is a double accolade for both Revelation itself and Didymus, who had cast light on the apocalyptic narration, which otherwise could have appeared as either arcane or exotic. Since differences in style between different scriptural books are already there, the idiosyncratic character of this revelation appears to be contrapuntal rather than contradictory in respect of the rest of the Bible. In this holy polyphony, John’s text is the peroration of a speech that commenced ‘In the beginning’ of Genesis and was somehow reiterated ‘In the beginning’ of John’s gospel. Considering the eschatological vision, the Pantocrator who is enthroned on high is the same one as the Resurrected One, who was restored to his glory after having been made ‘a little lower than the angels’, he is indeed the selfsame person of the Trinity who jointly uttered the demiurgic *fiat*. Furthermore, the honorific designation *Pantocrator* is one that safeguards one more point of unity between the two Testaments, since this

⁵⁰⁸ Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto*, 29.72.

Septuagintal epithet hardly ever appears in the New Testament, and 2 Cor. 6:18 is only an Old Testament-quotation. This pregnant appellation is one of the points of this revelation contributing to the New Testament, as Didymus had pointed out.⁵⁰⁹

The method

At the turn of the thirteenth to the fourteenth century, the Byzantine monk and Aristotelian commentator Sophonias described the different methods employed by intellectuals in their comments on major philosophical treatises of Aristotle. The first method was to quote the Aristotelian text first, then to add an exegesis. This formula had been followed by such commentators as Alexander of Aphrodisias, Ammonius, Simplicius, and John Philoponus, all of whom Sophonias mentions with admiration. The second manner was different: commentators spoke as if they were themselves Aristotle (αὐτὸν γὰρ ὑποδύντες Ἀριστοτέλην καὶ τῷ τῆς αὐταγγελίας προσχρησάμενοι προσωπεῖω) producing a continuous elaborate discourse not interrupted by quotations followed by comments. Sophonias reserves equal admiration for this category of commentators, whom he actually does not regard as having produced mere exegeses, but entire paraphrases (οὐκ ἐξηγηταὶ μᾶλλον ἢ παραφρασταί). He has some names for this category, too, which he cites with respect: Themistius, Michael Psellus, ‘and others’.⁵¹⁰ These commentators actually composed treatises of their own, which were designed not simply to clarify Aristotle’s text, but also to expound the commentator’s own ideas.

The aim of the former class of commentators was ‘to clarify the text and reveal its sense’ (σαφηνίσαι τὸ κείμενον καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἐκφάναι), which was more or less a ‘technical’ (meaning ‘philological’) approach (τῷ τεχνικῷ καθάπαξ ἐπόμενοι). The latter are regarded by Sophonias as ‘inventive’ minds, who opened new

horizons with respect to the ideas involved (καὶ ἐπιστασίας καὶ ἐπιβολάς, ὥς ἐφεῦρον, τὰς χρησιμωτάτας ἐπισυνῆψαν καὶ θεωρημάτων πλῆθος ἐκάστῳ τῶν κεφαλαίων προσέφερον). They made ‘the avenue of philosophy easier for later generations to tread’, since they produced their own solutions to old problems.⁵¹¹ For ‘Aristotle is at times so obscure, that he proclaims oracles rather than philosophy’, which calls for a *mantis* rather than a commentator.⁵¹²

Cassian belonged to the first category. He quotes the apocalyptic text and then he produces his own exegeses on the foregoing passage. This was the method of Aristotelian commentators employed by all exegetes of Revelation, too. Not only Cassian as the author of the Scholia, but also Oecumenius, Andreas, and Arethas employed the same method. Later still, the Cyprian monk and presbyter Neophytus Inclusus (Νεόφυτος Ἐγκλειστος, twelfth/thirteenth century) divided Revelation into fourteen ‘hypotheses’ (ὑποθέσεις), that is, chapters, each of which included a number of ‘interpretations’ (ἐρμηνεῖαι) written subsequently to quotations from John’s text.⁵¹³

Cassian employed allegory, since *ipso facto* common sense bans literal reading of this work. If a figurative and tropic reading is called for (which is indeed the case), this should aim at disclosing the quintessential message concealed behind the letter. The fruit can be obtained only by showing the relevance of this oracular text to the rest of scripture. Origen had taught that this should be the solid touchstone for determining whether the text has the same authority as that which holds for the rest of scripture. However, especially with regard to Revelation, one would be disappointed if by ‘figurative reading’ one understood an endless series of substitutions, namely of the sort ‘this image stands for this, that one stands for that’. Although this tradition could not be entirely disregarded, the specific text could be

⁵⁰⁹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 215: παντοκράτωρ γὰρ ὑπὸ παντοκράτορος ἀποστελλόμενος ὁ υἱὸς ἐστίν, ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς πεμπόμενος. ἀριδιηλότετα δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψει παντοκράτωρ ὁ σωτὴρ λέγεται. Τάδε γὰρ λέγει κύριος, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἄληθινός, ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ. ἀναμφισβητήτως γὰρ ταῦτα περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ εἴρηται.

⁵¹⁰ Sophonias (Aristotelian commentator, thirteenth/fourteenth cent.), *In Aristotelis Libros de Anima Paraphrasis*, p. 1 (proem).

⁵¹¹ Ibid. pp. 1–2: εὐπορον ἐντεῦθεν τὴν εἰς φιλοσοφίαν ὁδὸν τοῖς μετ’ αὐτοὺς ὑπολείποντες, ταῖς τε ἀνακυπτούσαις ἀπορίαις γενναιοτάτας τὰς λύσεις ἐπήνεγκαν.

⁵¹³ Neophytus Inclusus, *Πανηγυρική Βίβλος*, Oration section 9. He says he discerns that John’s text is actually composed ‘in fourteen hypotheses’ (ἔγνων δὲ αὐτὴν εἰς δεκατέσσαρας ὑποθέσεις ὑποδιαίρουμένην). This classification however is not a rule. For instance, John Chrysostom’s commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews (compiled from extracts after his death, as the title explains) is called ‘ἐρμηνεία’ as a whole, while divided into ‘ὑποθέσεις’. John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos Commentarius*, 1–34), PG.63.9f. This Theodoret employs in his *commis*, *intDan*, *intProphXII*, etc. Sophonias, like Neophytus, regards ὑπόθεσις as the whole and ἐρμηνεία as only a part of it. Ibid.

perused in the light of scripture calling for allegorical rather than typological exegesis. This means that most of the images stand for ideas: they are not a prefiguration of future events – at least, no more so than the rest of scripture is.

Cassian's lot then was cast with those who opted for a clear positive thesis, instead of the inchoate attitude of Eusebius, while simultaneously dealing tacit death blows to heresies such as Arianism, Gnosticism, and Docetism. The author is particularly eager to prove that the apocalyptic text is immune to any charge that the second Person of the Trinity was anything like what Arius had claimed him to be, arguing for a clear distinction between the nature of God and His workmanship. However prepotent and unrestrictedly free the divine will is, the Son was not born out of the deliberate exercise of this will. On the whole, however, criticism is not a salient characteristic of these comments, which are propaedeutic in the sense that the main theme is not the vision of John, but the coherence of his statements with scripture.

Glossing the revealed text from the rest of scripture is in turn shown to be another inspired manner in which scripture expresses its divine message. The task demanded a proficient reader capable of discerning the latent sense of the Bible and one who could attach comments apposite to the apocalyptic words while dexterously wrestling with the difficulties of the sacred text.

In Didymus Cassian found a reliable preceptor on the Book of Revelation, who also happened to be an Aristotelian scholar. Hence, in the hands of Cassian, Didymus' commentary added a cluster of further arguments that conspired to establish the book as an inalienable part of the Holy Writ. It has to be said, though, that Cassian did not rest content with the commentary of Didymus only. He availed himself of all his personal erudition and knowledge of the previous Patristic period. Canvassing the language of the Scholia reveals debts to certain Christian theologians, from whom he picked up passages suiting his own purpose. These passages were culled from various works: in the first place, each of their authors had not penned them as comments on Revelation, but on different points or books of scripture.

The vatic manner in which the text is enjoined is coupled with its apposition to analogous scriptural portions showing that there is an indefeasible message

to be conveyed. Cassian in effect tells us that no forfeiture of either reason, or 'the mind of Christ', is entailed once we acquiesce in this specific revelation. The Scholia, then, are not some sort of oracle: we read an intellectual who arrives at his exegeses by rational processes; he is not a hierophant who delivers obscure oracles amidst Delphic smoke. Even if the asseverations of the book were taken as an omen, this is only the premise in an argument, or a conclusion, that can at the same time be reached by exegesis or indeed by ratiocination. No matter what pictures the author borrows to portray his message, all the aspects of it sit cheek by jowl with elements of the two Testaments and of Patristic lore.

Opting for allegorical rather than typological exegesis suggests that the author explores the theological rather than historical message of the text. Cassian did not concern himself with any veridical resemblance of the narration in Revelation to the historical reality surrounding either him or that of his ancestors. Had he attempted to produce substitutes for the literal meaning, he would have fallen short of symbols prefiguring the world of the near or distant future, which has been the craving of many people approaching the apocalyptic text during the last two thousand years. In contrast, all we actually have is the homology of the one and same Christian love. Cassian points out the sameness, not the otherness, of this message in the apocalyptic text. There is nothing startlingly new in this text – which is what vouchsafes its authority. Consequently, no need for furnishing hermeneutic rainbows is felt by the author. True, no scriptural text is couched in such awe-inspiring pictures. However, were the veil concealing this text torn away, and the text become diaphanous, the messages that would emerge are already present in the New Testament. This is the quintessential consistency of the text.

The main concern is with the eternal prototype 'sitting on the throne' and the voice adumbrating the eschatological reality, not about speculative numerology on the 'name' of the beast. The writer of the Scholia addresses himself to the real question, which is this: is the spirit of the Scholia the same as that which permeates the Old Testament, where the occluded mystery of salvation was tacitly but ubiquitously prefigured, somehow present and still awaiting the Incarnation in order for this old text to be illuminated? Is the obscurity in the apocalyptic text of the

same nature and, in its turn, is this text pregnant with eschatological anticipation?

Cassian does nothing more, yet nothing less, than show that the Holy Spirit is present throughout. For all his immense learning, his approach is an all but pedantic one: he searches for the truth that shapes the words, not the verbal canopy making up the text. The comments are designed so as to leave the reader with the afterglow of the apocalyptic epiphany, and with the anticipated universal sharing of this reality, not with barren concern about beasts, dragons, and arithmetized names. Granted, the text is enigmatic, it is cryptic, its message is cloaked in riddles. But this only serves to stir the mind to reflection. This is how not only John, but also Jesus, couched much of his teaching. If we are to do away with the arid literal form of the text, we must embark on a specific kind of reading, for which the precedent of the great Alexandrians is the prototype and catalyst.

This prototype Cassian followed skilfully, yet sensibly. For all his learning and scholarship (and probably because of them), he adduces no extraneous wisdom: he only elicits what the Logos has already made incarnate in the text of scripture. This is the epitome of the exegetical method and the hermeneutic key for unlocking Revelation's latent truth. No fanciful substitution of the elements of the vision by modern or ancient historical realities is furnished at all. Through such imagery, which for two thousand years has been styled 'apocalyptic', we descry another world.

And yet, with this commentator, the play stops at the point where the name of the murderer is about to be revealed ('and his number is...'), and our text is interrupted at Rev. 13:18). After all, readers had been warned since the time of Hippolytus and Irenaeus that there is no point in speculating about the meaning of 'the name of the beast' etc.⁵¹⁴ This is to all appearances the reason why Cassian stopped short of dealing with the question of 'the number of the beast'. At the end of [Scholion XXXIX](#) Cassian had already quoted an extensive section from Irenaeus: this is in effect the entire [Scholion XXXVIII](#), save the first couple of lines. In that section of Irenaeus, Millenarian ideas are

expounded, and Cassian knew that such ideas had been explicitly rejected by Origen. It was probably Cassian himself who had excerpted the specific phrase from Origen's commentary on the Psalms, which appears identically in Theodoret's commentary on the very same Psalm.⁵¹⁵

Since, however, monks are partial to such questions as well as answers, Cassian, who compiled the archetype of Codex 573, had recourse to another author, namely Irenaeus. This explains the abrupt shift to the ensuing excerpt from Irenaeus' fifth book of *Adversus Haereses*, which is quoted in [Scholion XXXVIII](#). It seems, however, that at a certain point Cassian had enough of Irenaeus' account, so quotation from his work stops at the end of folio 245a: up to that point, it has been explained that it makes no sense to guess names corresponding to the number of the beast. All this however was irrelevant to Cassian's aim, which is why he stopped at that point and the remaining last page of the 'Book of Cassian', namely folio 245v, remained blank for ever.

The result

The Scholia evince that Cassian found Revelation consonant with the entire theology of scripture and sought to authorize each passage by quoting invariably from both Testaments. He did not set out to disclose the apocalyptic content of the scriptural text in its own right. Neither did he see this as cryptic imagery which needed to be deciphered, which is a sport favoured by modern readers of Revelation. Cassian did not make it an ad hoc task to see the eschatological, or indeed the historical, connotations of the text itself. All he did was to find out and establish how this text is (in both essence and function) related to the rest of scripture, and to expound considerations which prove it concordant with this corpus. If particular portions of the text express in essence what other writers of the Bible do in their own manner, vocabulary, or imagery, this should be a sound reason for establishing the last book of the New Testament as a canonical one.

Although the Scholia could eventually crystallize into a commentary, this was not actually necessary. One does not need to deduce an entire philosophy of History,

⁵¹⁴ Hippolytus, *De antichristo*, 50. Pseudo-Hippolytus, *De Consummatione Mundi*, 28; the same statements were echoed by Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, PG.106.340. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses (liber 5)*, frs. 22–25: this is in fact the text of the rest of [Scholion XXXVIII](#) and [Scholion XXXIX](#).

⁵¹⁵ Origen, *frPs*, Psalm 122:2: οὐ ῥητὸν δὲ χρόνον ταύτην τὴν ἐλπίδα περιορίζομεν. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1884.14–15: οὐ ῥητὸν δὲ χρόνον τήνδε τὴν ἐλπίδα περιορίζομεν. Cf. *PHE*, p. 287.

or an entire eschatology, out of this text, just as one would not require this from a single catholic epistle. This is why extracts are culled: they conspire to show that the passages are in tune with canonical scripture.

The Scholia derive their merit, both severally and collectively, from scripture. Far from being the whim of an angry, or hopeful, or hallucinated, member of the Church of Ephesus, the Book is shown through careful reasoning to partake of the same wisdom as any other book in the corpus and is thus as susceptible of theological gloss.

Cassian is here a monk, a scholar, and a theologian, as he is in the rest of his writings included in the Codex. The lesson he teaches is that the canon should be built following reasonable reflection, and that there is ample room to do so. To reject Revelation out of hand on the grounds of philology (as Dionysius of Alexandria did) might be ill considered; to accept it unthoughtfully would be temerity. Nevertheless, being an abbot, he was an officer assigned with the duty to shepherd the transmission of the original deposit. Therefore, he also said things concerning doctrinal aberration, which he felt a Christian theologian must gainsay.

It cannot be denied that the Scholia radiate the aura of Origen, but in almost all instances his commanding influence is filtered through later enthusiasts, such as Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, or Didymus. The exposition is authoritative since it unfailingly yields testimony to Christ. The Scholia give off the ubiquitous aroma of the scriptures showing the text of John to be in harmony with them all. The message imparted is the same as any commentary which does not do away with the *kerygma*, but draws on the same reservoir of faith. Therefore, the Scholia effect a spiritual pendant, a diadem, attached to Revelation and ushering it into canonicity. They are not heterogeneous with respect to the rest of scripture, which vouches for its divine inspiration and therefore canonicity.

It is reasonable for Cassian to pay his dues to the Evangelist. The Apocalypse is not scriptural because John the Theologos wrote it. But since it is shown to be a scriptural book, and given its date, John the Theologos is the author. It is the Spirit and his message that allows the author of the Apocalypse to be recognized; it is not the author who will grant authority to the book. The

rationale for Cassian's aim to establish the authority of Revelation should not elude us. Even if the style of the book were like that of the gospel of John (which it is not), this would not suffice to make it canonical on that account alone. It is divinely inspired because its content (rather than its signature) makes it an integral part of scripture, which is held to be divinely inspired, but is not itself deified.⁵¹⁶ The biblical corpus is not regarded as an idol. What has to be comprehended therein in the first place is *life*, as an uninterrupted consequence of historical events, through which God speaks to men. Scripture is only a *record* of events, and what is valued are the *events* themselves through which God manifested himself and intervened in History. The aim of exegesis, then, is not to accomplish an insightful intellectual deciphering of the 'meaning of the History' or the 'meaning of the letter', as if it were an ambiguous cryptic oracle. On account of this, the reader of the Scholia must pay particular attention to the fact that Cassian strives to establish the divine character of Revelation by appealing to *events* of scripture, normally citing instances rather than *concepts* from both Testaments in each Scholion.⁵¹⁷

This work was for good reasons found as a companion of monks, particularly of neophytes. For not only is daemonology an everyday concern to them, but also because they are satisfied that the dregs of evil still linger in the soul, even the one that has been reformed.

Conclusion

The portions of Revelation corresponding to the specific Scholia are not of equal length. By the end of the text, we come upon extensive portions of Revelation with relatively short comments. This may in fact not be the result of a rational decision. As the author goes on and progresses in establishing the canonical accord of the Book with the rest of scripture, he feels he needs less and less to make detailed comments on short passages of Revelation. The Book is no longer scrutinized phrase by phrase, or in small portions, as it is in the beginning. As he goes on, Cassian feels he has supplied sufficient argument. Happy as he is about this, he skips large portions of the Book or makes short comments on them. His task had been fulfilled. The Book had already

⁵¹⁶ *PHE*, pp. 381–421.

⁵¹⁷ I have discussed this method in *PHE*, pp. 404–15.

been shown to be nothing less than a full exposition of Christian Truth as found in the rest of scripture. The scholia are not actually unfinished.

So, what we have is not a commentary, but Scholia, or notes, on the sacred text read by Cassian. In fact they are *adnotationes in Apocalypsin*. They are personal notes of an erudite scholar, which, however, are not meant for personal use only. They were probably intended for circulation among the monks of his coenobium, as well as the rest of his brethren, both locally and in Constantinople. This is why this text is found in a codex that aims to fulfil personal spiritual needs of monks in the region of Palestine, that is, in the region where the authority of Revelation had been strongly resisted for a long time.

Cassian did not finish, and did not need to finish, his notes on John's text. Given his aims, he did not need or intend to write a commentary on the entire Book of Revelation. The commentary was already there, written by Didymus. Cassian more or less quoted from that lost Commentary on the Apocalypse of John (Υπόμνημα εἰς τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ Ἰωάννου). One Scholion (the fifth one) is a verbatim quotation from a text by Clement of Alexandria. Some Scholia are mainly annotations of his own, which draw on his personal readings of writers such as Origen, Eusebius, and Gregory of Nyssa (probably his reported, and now lost, orations on the Apocalypse), as well as Aristotle, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Plutarch, Galen, and others. In [Scholion XXX](#), Theodoret's personal seal for posterity to detect him is quoted: 'as indeed we have taught in our exegeses of 1 Paralipomenon'.

The encomium following [Scholion XXIV](#) is a tribute paid by Cassian to Didymus, for indeed it was Didymus who was really a 'scientific' figure, an exemplar to Cassian as both shared a remarkable Aristotelian learnedness.

The philological analysis of the Scholia brings to the fore the influence of Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Severianus of Gabala, in short, what has been known as the Antiochene School. Moreover, there is the commanding presence of Didymus (whose commentary is heavily quoted), whereas echoes of Eusebius and Gregory of Nyssa are clearly noticeable. On the whole, the Scholia make clear how obsolete the distinction between the Alexandrian and Antiochene

schools was in the middle of the sixth century. Clearly the Antiochenes always revered the legacy of the eminent Alexandrians. This holds particularly true for Theodoret and Cassian, who appear to be genuine heirs to Origen's textual explorations. In any event (and beyond this or that quotation from either Didymus or Clement, or of remarks of his own evincing his philosophical, and theological debts to specific figures, such as Origen, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, or Theodore of Mopsuestia), Cassian allows his spiritual ancestor Theodoret to speak for himself and put his personal signature upon some Scholia. This is the revealing remark he makes in [Scholion XXX](#): 'as we have taught in [our exegesis] from the First [book] of the Paralipomenon' (ὥς ἐδιδάξαμεν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης τῶν Παραλειπομένων). No theologian other than Theodoret ever produced a commentary on this scriptural book. In addition, the exegesis he produced on the difficult similarity between 2 Kings 24:1 and 1 Paralipomenon 21:1 stands out in Christian exegesis and was praised by Photius.⁵¹⁸

The index of authors

In the section where the initial edition of the Scholia was discussed, I have reasoned on the basis of the present research. Study of the Scholia and the Expanded Notes and of the ensuing Index of Authors Cited in the Scholia might invite some questions of methodology, which places an onus on me to address them.

The process of identifying a text inevitably has to engage in parsing it followed by a critical analysis of cardinal ideas contained in it. Far from being a panacea, this process only gropes for some signs, rather than seeking an established criterion, let alone proof. Besides, not rarely does the case turn out to be inconclusive. The presence of Didymus is the first element which indisputably emerges from this research, owing to his characteristic of repeating his remarks on certain issues at different points of his texts in almost identical phraseology. Antioch as a specific school of thought comes to light right from the first Scholion, followed by Theodoret coming into view later. Besides, there is clearly the person of the compiler, namely Cassian, who makes his own comments here and there. Although he feels free to paraphrase the Patristic texts he uses, there is clear evidence that he frequently

⁵¹⁸ See [EN XXXi](#).

quotes word for word, as is shown by the texts of Clement of Alexandria, Theodoret, and Irenaeus, all of whom he quotes. Besides, the indications that Didymus' lost Commentary on the Apocalypse are quoted verbatim are so strong, that eventually we are confident that Didymus' text was often copied to the letter, just as those by the other theologians were.

Problems arise when there is not a shortage of evidence, but an abundance of it. This is the point calling for consideration of complex relations between authors, intellectuals, schools, and theologies.

Philology can hardly establish dependence of one author on another, but it can track the itinerary of a term or of a notion. In such a case one has to wonder why it is that a large stock of terminology becomes a coin common to some authors, while others, both contemporary and later, refrain from employing a certain usage. Besides, it is evident that a common language may be used either by authors contradicting each other, or by intellectuals sharing common values and views. Linguistic flirtations may indicate simply that an intellectual picked up a certain vocabulary suitable to his own purposes. Even so, however, one fact cannot be escaped: the latter *knew* where and how the authors who inspired its employment had used a specific technical terminology.

An author does not fall short of originality just because he took up some terms, into which he may well have instilled a different sense. The same usage occurring in different authors does not have to suggest debts: it may simply advise about what scholarship had already made of this. Demonstrable evidence makes it certain that, like Origen, Cassian was an assiduous student of Alexander of Aphrodisias and Plutarch, but this only indicates his early learning and interests. Such authors may have inculcated some fundamentals of 'propaedeutic' study, which certainly conduce to apprehension of wisdom, but this does not necessarily

instil any affiliation or dependence. Such authors were simply antecedents, not ancestors, who contributed to the erudition of these theologians and possibly to their grasp of morality and logic.

In the course of exploring the Scholia we shall come across Aristotelian vocabulary, which I believe stems from Cassian's personal education.⁵¹⁹ Why such an education should have been received I shall discuss in a moment. Just now I wish to recall the following: Theodoret recounting the life of Didymus tells us that the Alexandrian received lessons on 'poetry, rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, as well as the syllogisms of Aristotle and the fine language of Plato'.⁵²⁰ As a matter of fact, the references made by Didymus himself to Aristotle by name (not to mention Aristotelian vocabulary) evince direct knowledge⁵²¹ of the Stagirite. Likewise, the vocabulary of both the Scholia and the rest of Cassian's work in the same codex is full of Aristotelian terms.

Nevertheless, a particular question calls for a study on its own. By all appearances, a heavy Aristotelian vocabulary was applied to the text of Origen, at a later stage. Any student of Origen will be struck by the Aristotelian terminology imbuing Origen's catena-fragments on the Psalms. At first sight, one would be tempted to attribute this Aristotelian colour to Didymus. However, there are signs which point to later hands. To cite an instance, the expression τελεία ἔξις (Scholion X) occurs in a casual use in both Didymus and Origen. Didymus' fragments are stamped by the catenist's vocabulary (no doubt an Aristotelian) and the same goes for Origen's fragments on the Psalms.⁵²² It cannot therefore be maintained that Origen himself used this or that Aristotelian phrase. Still further research is required in order to identify Origen's catenist.

Cassian discovered Aristotle in Alexander of Aphrodisias, but he did not become an Aristotelian because of Alexander. On the other hand, Proclus uses

⁵¹⁹ Cf. Aristotelian terminology in the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*: τελεία ἔξις, X; διαίρεσις, XXV; ἐνεργεῖν κατ' ἀρετήν, X; ἐνέργειαι ἀρετῆς, XXI; μεγαλοφροσύνη, XXV; XXXVI; συμβεβηκός πάθος, XXX; ποιότης, XIV; σοφιστικὸς meaning 'lie' and 'deception' (*Ethica Nicomachea*, 1146a22; *Metaphysica*, 1004b19, etc.). There is of course Stoic terminology used: διοίκησις, XXVII; ἡγεμονικόν, XXIX; προκοπή, XIV; πρόνοια, XXVII; XXX.

⁵²⁰ Theodoret, *HE*, p. 269: ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος, παιδόμενος τῆς ὀπτικῆς ἐστέρημένος αἰσθήσεως, καὶ ποιητικῶν καὶ ῥητορικῶν μετέλαχε παιδευμάτων ἀριθμητικῆς τε καὶ γεωμετρίας καὶ ἀστρονομίας καὶ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους συλλογισμῶν καὶ τῆς Πλάτωνος εὐεπείας.

⁵²¹ Cf. Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 77 (quoting *Topica*, 116a36–38); *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 69 (quoting from *Analytica Priora*); *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 90 (quoting from *De Caelo*); *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 116 (quoting *Categoriae*, 7b). References to Aristotle in *DT* are a different matter, since this work was actually composed by Cassian, as I argue in *NDGF*, Appendix II. Cf. *DT* (*lib.* 2.1–7), 3.30; *DT* (*lib.* 3), PG.39: 776.14; 840.30.

⁵²² Cf. τελεία ἔξις: Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 878; Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1193.20.

elements of Didymus' thought. Such points show Proclus' personal debt to the Alexandrian sage, since Neoplatonists such as Simplicius and Damascius remained rather indifferent to Didymus. That Proclus took some pains to learn something of Christian theology through the work of Didymus is an intriguing point. As a matter of fact, one can trace a certain influence of Didymus on Proclus.⁵²³ For it was not just goods and commodities that travelled through the world: it was religion, culture, ideas, and a specific terminology. Although commonly available, this language was not taken up by all intellectuals alike. What I am suggesting is that study of predilections or aversions is a good start (yet only a start) to a task such as the one undertaken in this book.

The project of identifying a text is bound to be carried out amid all of these accompanying uncertainties. One has to be alert to when a common language is a token of spiritual affiliation, or when a shared commodity makes its mark only as an adjunct to controversy, or whether this is mere coincidence. Of course the sole point of reference is the context, which should be as wide as possible. But we should always bear in mind that this context of Late Antiquity is often elusive, with intellectuals inconclusively disputing with each other, and sometimes wavering themselves, as to how the ancient wisdom of the great masters Plato, Aristotle, and Chrysippus should be construed, or rendered. To this, Christian theologians added their own anxiety, as they embarked (more heavily than currently thought) on appropriating the same heritage for their own purposes. Parallel vocabularies may simply mean parallel lives indifferent to each other, as they may suggest casual contact, or indeed appropriation, or even criticism. The latter case is the more rare, it has to be said. Writers simply drew on a common stock, each one for his own purposes. It is an axiom rather than an argued thesis that Late Antiquity experienced life as a fervent dialogue, or even rancorous division, between different schools of thought and theologies over critical terms and concepts. On the other hand, Late Antiquity was not the still life portrayed by some modern historians, even though it was not an incessant engagement in argument or criticism either, the old bugbears being notwithstanding still around. Both Theodoret and Didymus were sedulous

exegetes and prolific writers. But this does not make them the ordinary specimens of their epoch. Cassian turns out to be a learned Aristotelian, who is always ready to entertain Aristotelian vocabulary. However, both then as indeed today, theologians hardly ever dabbled in such fields as Aristotelism and Neoplatonism, and circulating some truisms on Stoic morals does not make up a setting for philosophical dialogue. Theodoret wrote on the maladies of Greeks, but this was not the norm. It was Greek philosophers who took issue with the Christians rather than the other way round. Nevertheless, between appropriation and polemic there was not always dialogue: there might also have been indifference or ignorance of each other, notwithstanding common coinage occurring here and there. Therefore, it should not be assumed that intermittent common usage of terms suggests relevance by any means.

A survey produces tantalizing considerations about affiliations that turn out to be critical. In the first place, it reveals the scope (intellectual, geographical, social, doctrinal) of a notion which is being entertained. This may mean nothing significant on its own. However, it provides the setting within which certain potential relations can be pointed out. A specific term, for instance, turns out to have a specific meaning in a certain Scholion and in Didymus only. How the other intellectuals used it may be instructive, although it may not be essential. Still we cannot do away with this analysis if we wish to reach more substantial conclusions.

One caveat should be introduced: not all unidentified texts are susceptible to the same method of investigation. What happened with the case at hand may only be of relative value for similar explorations of other texts. Everything depends on the writer. I could hardly tell what the outcome of this research would have been, had Cassian not quoted from Didymus so extensively, or had Didymus not mentioned his own commentary on Revelation, or had this particular text of Didymus' not been discovered at Toura, or had Theodoret not identified himself as the author behind some of those lines, or had Photius not helped us with references supporting such an identification.

The Index does not employ the normal segregation of Christian from non-Christian authors. I have opted

⁵²³ See *RCR*, chapter 7, 'Christian influences on Neoplatonism', pp. 333–65.

for lumping them all together, because I believe that this is a better mirror of the situation in Late Antiquity. In certain cases I have made allowance even for mutual indifference between scholars using the same terminology. This notwithstanding, and although most authors were past (or long past) for Cassian, one should not overlook the plain fact that pagans and Christians were not immune to each other's influence. They lived under the same sky, they ran their lives under the same institutions, and they experienced the same needs. They shared common concerns. Sometimes they were friends with each other, certainly they conversed with each other, and we know that it was normal for both Christians and pagans to study under common teachers in the same classes, although it was not easy for all of them to reason on the same principles. On the other hand, two critical notions, Incarnation and Resurrection, had opened an abyss between the complacent pedantry of the Athenian logic and the lofty poetic wings of Jerusalem. In view of this, 'common principles of reason' were sometimes on the verge of being an empty theoretical rubric, all the more so since to Christians the foregoing ideas were not just 'ideas', but a living experience within their Church. Two different worlds were cohabiting, and for all the mutual spiritual alienation they often experienced, and sometimes advanced, they were bound even to express their 'otherness' in terms of the common stock of the language they shared. 'Togetherness' and 'otherness' at the same time made up the amalgam of that transient world. On this account there was nothing awkward felt about the grammarian Orion of Alexandria being the teacher of both Proclus and Eudocia,⁵²⁴ the devout Christian wife of Emperor Theodosius II.

Much has been said of the influence of Hellenism upon Christian thought, which is true, especially of Platonism, Aristotelism, and Stoicism. What is not considered, however, is the influence the other way round: for in fact Christian thinkers did exert some considerable influence upon pagan philosophers, sometimes major ones, as for instance the influence of Didymus upon Proclus which I have canvassed elsewhere.⁵²⁵

The Index of Authors alone can of course prove nothing. If read properly, however, there are interesting conclusions flowing from it. This index is in itself a conclusion, following the analysis of the Scholia, since it lists the authors involved in the philological reading of the Scholia, not those discussed in other parts of this book. Composition of this index was possible once the study of the Scholia was complete. Returning to the author of the Scholia after this index is studied, one can see or, at least, speculate Cassian's reading, concerns, and predilections.

In turn, this index reveals some secrets about the author of the Scholia. The vocabulary points to some unexpected liaisons not easy to guess otherwise. Poets,⁵²⁶ philosophers,⁵²⁷ orators and rhetors,⁵²⁸ historians,⁵²⁹ classical personalities (such as Solon of Athens), lexicographers (such as Julius Naucratis), or basic sources for any erudite person of Late Antiquity,⁵³⁰ make their appearance in this index.

The discussion on the vocabulary and ideas occurring in Scholia was carried out on its own account. And yet, we subsequently discover that most of the persons standing behind them, as either sources or inspiration, are mentioned by Theodoret, who was to Cassian not simply a predecessor, but in fact a spiritual ancestor. Such persons or works, or both, are either quoted or cited by the Bishop of Cyrrhus in his works. He had expressed unqualified respect for some of them, such as for Pindar, Diodorus of Sicily, Plutarch, and Xenophon. By the same token, exploration turns up Christians who could barely have been expected to have such an association with the phraseology of the Scholia. Such a person is the hardly known Severianus of Gabala; and yet, we subsequently discover that Theodoret had excerpted from this theologian while composing his *Eranistes*, which no doubt must have been a companion to Cassian. Controversial though Severian was, he seems to have been a person of notable philosophical erudition and knowledge of Greek. This actually seems to have been a motive for Theodoret and Cassian to pay attention to his writings, despite Severian's ambiguous behaviour to Chrysostom, which

⁵²⁴ See RCR, pp. 333–365

⁵²⁵ See RCR, chapter 7, 'Christian influence upon Neoplatonism'.

⁵²⁶ Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, whereas Pindar is treated with especial respect.

⁵²⁷ Heraclitus of Ephesus, Parmenides of Elea, Plato, Aristotle, Chrysippus, Numenius of Apamea, Speusippus, Theophrastus, Xenocrates, Plotinus, Porphyry, Aristocles of Messene.

⁵²⁸ Demosthenes, Libanius.

⁵²⁹ Herodotus, Josephus, Diodorus of Sicily, Xenophon, Hecataeus of Abdera.

⁵³⁰ Plutarch of Chaeronea, Galen.

might well have prevented Theodoret from taking him seriously. The index, therefore, reveals the author's appreciation of an entire world, both pagan and Christian. It somehow notifies us about his sources, his values, his spiritual priorities and predilections.

Theodoret's name is present in almost all of the Scholia, and so is Didymus'. Present in abundance are writers such as Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Plutarch, Galen, Aristotle, and Alexander of Aphrodisias, who was the main source for studying Aristotle in Late Antiquity. Cassian also had a contemporary guide to Aristotle, namely, John Philoponus, whom he turns out to have studied carefully. From both the Scholia and the rest of Cassian's writings in this Codex, one can detect the influence of writers such as Eusebius and Gregory of Nyssa, who are in fact the scholars who along with Didymus communicated Origen to him, and Evagrius. One can also find out (through analysis, not from the index alone) some of Cassian's favourite writers (apart from Alexander of Aphrodisias, Plutarch, Galen, and Eusebius), such as Lucian of Samosata and the grammarian Julius Naucratis and his handy and prototypical lexicon. Finally, one can see how all this complex of influences and predilections of Greek authors, used by both pagans and Christians, advances well into the fifth and sixth centuries. Furthermore, some light is cast on how this treasure thereafter fades amidst gruesome scenery of arid literalism, obsession with barren pursuit of extravagant neologisms, want of scholarly skill, and lack of freedom of thought. In Arethas' texts one can hardly find anything even remotely reminiscent of either Cassian's open-mindedness, or Theodoret's elegance, from whom later lexicographers quoted just for the sake of authorizing correct usage of Greek.⁵³¹ By the ninth century, the Greek language of Late Antiquity had given way to flamboyant yet dry platitudes, in the absence of any notable theological or philosophical impetus.

Authorship of the Scholia

The way to determine the author of the Scholia is like the one of Odysseus returning to Ithaca: there are

temptations besetting our verdict before we have actually reached our goal. I believe therefore that it is necessary for me to give a brief account of this process of identification, which turned out to be a real *peripeteia*.

The first enticement is a century old: Origen appeared to distinguished scholars as the author of the Scholia, either because he is supposed to have expressed his intention to write a commentary on the Apocalypse, or because scattered terms of the Scholia are found here and there in Origen. The fact that plenty of other authors used the same terms, or that other terminology appearing in the Scholia does not occur in Origen, was ignored.

I set out with a detailed philological analysis of the text, which was available to me through the 1911 edition by Adolf Harnack, who published the Scholia only a few months after they were handed over to him. At the time of Harnack and H. Turner, the Toura papyri had not yet come to light. I was intrigued that almost all key expressions pointed to parallels in Didymus, especially in works of his that have been discovered recently, which were of course unknown to Harnack.

The discovery of a cache of Coptic papyrus codices at Toura in 1941 resulted in some important texts of Didymus being unearthed. These included his Commentaries on Genesis, on Psalms, on Job, and on Zachariah (the latter was not published until 1962). A Commentary on Ecclesiastes was also attributed to Didymus. From these papyri a compelling figure emerges who deserves our attention and demands a hearing: this is Didymus of Alexandria, now also reaching us through the pen of Cassian. After the discovery of the Toura manuscripts, the voice of Didymus of Alexandria, advising us that he himself had written a Commentary on the Apocalypse, was at last heard after many centuries. This commentary was the main source for Cassian's exposition of his own views on the apocalyptic text. His Scholia drawing on different authors account for this Apocalypse being accorded

⁵³¹ Cf. *Etymologicum Gudianum*, Alphabetic entry omicron, p. 433 (lemma ὀρίγανον, Theodoret had proposed a different etymology of it; his text is no longer extant): ἀλλὰ κατὰ Θεοδώρητον ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥιγῶ γέγονεν. *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 443: Θαρσεῖς: Ἀπὸ τοῦ Ταρσεὺς ἐτυμολογεῖται, καθὼς παρὰ Θεοδώρητῳ ἀνέγνω. *Lexicon Syntacticum*, Alphabetic letter alpha, p. 18 (syntax of verb ἀνέχομαι): ὅτε σημαίνει τὸ καταφρονῶ, ὡς τὸ ἀνέχομαι σου τοῦ θράσους· καὶ παρὰ τῷ Θεοδώρητῳ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τῆς

προνοίας λόγοις αἰεὶ γενικῇ. Ibid. p. 25: ἀφαιροῦμαι σε χρημάτων καὶ χρήματα· καὶ παρὰ Θεοδώρητῳ, λόγῳ ἑκτῷ Περὶ προνοίας: 'τὸν πλοῦτον ὁ ληστής μόνον ἀφαιρεῖται τὸν κεκτημένον', ἀλλὰ καὶ 'ὁ συκοφάντης ἀφείλετό σε τῶν δεσμῶν'. Theodoret's text is extant. Cf. *De Providentia*, PG.83.660.51-54: Καὶ τὴν μὲν τέχνην τοῦ πένητος οὐδεὶς ἂν λάβοι ληστής, τὸν δὲ πλοῦτον, οὐ ληστής μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ συκοφάντης ἀφαιρεῖται τοὺς κεκτημένους.

canonical status. What during the last hundred years have been styled ‘Origen’s Scholia on the Apocalypse’ are in fact annotations by Cassian the Sabaite seeking to establish the divine inspiration and scriptural authority of this book. The text of the Scholia reveals them to contain extensive passages which are stunningly parallel to those of Didymus, both in vocabulary and import. No doubt, the composer of the Scholia had Didymus’ commentary in front of him during his work. Further research however showed that we were dealing not with this commentary itself, but with a work by a certain unknown author, who had drawn heavily – yet not exclusively – on it.

But who was he?

Further analysis showed that eminent Origenists, such as Eusebius and Gregory of Nyssa, were abundantly used. But the real surprise was that another author was profusely present, and this author has been asserted to be the opposite of the Alexandrian school. There is a unique reference in [Scholion XXX](#), where – quite unexpectedly – we have the author speaking in the first person: ‘as we have already taught apropos of 1 Paralipomenon’. Theodoret is the sole author to have offered a comment on this Old Testament book, and Photius refers to this fact in praise and admiration. This makes the passage a unique seal of Theodoret’s identity. Besides, the overall Antiochene sentiment of the theology of the compilation, along with significant parallels to Theodoret’s work (both philological and doctrinal), had for some time left me in no doubt that his pen had produced this work.

A question arises at this point. How can we be sure that it is Theodoret himself speaking in this passage, and that this is actually an excerpt from a now lost work of his? Could it not be the case that Cassian himself had written a commentary on 1 Paralipomenon and he speaks of his own work? Cassian speaks for himself in quite a number of Scholia; why not at this point too? The reply to this question comes with [Scholion XXXVIII](#). Of this, it is only the first three lines, indeed up to the point where he quotes Isaiah 14:12, that are his own. The text following that point is a plain quotation from

Irenaeus’ *Adversus Haereses*, V, which has been preserved as Fragment 25.⁵³² However, the text is too long for Cassian to quote in full, hence he decided to be selective. He then abridges the quotation, noting this: καὶ μεθ’ ἕτερα, which means ‘and after he [sc. Irenaeus] has said certain other things, he continues thus’. Then the quotation goes on with the text of Irenaeus being quoted verbatim. This means that Cassian is by no means averse to quoting a certain patristic text word for word, which we also know from [Scholion V](#), where he quotes from Clement of Alexandria without adding a single word of his own. The same goes for [Scholion XXXVIII](#) and for [Scholion XXX](#), in part of which Theodoret speaks for himself. This is the normal practice for Cassian in composing his work. We can see him doing so in [Scholion XX](#), where the first two words of this are a mere quotation from Rev. 3:7, to be followed by the comment, which is a verbatim quotation from Didymus’ Commentary on the Apocalypse.

In light of detailed philological examination of striking parallels, it turned out that there are crucial signs pointing to an Antiochene compiler. Besides, my textual research on the text of Revelation used by Cassian (the passages heading each Scholion) are clearly an Antiochene/Syriac version of the scriptural text. Furthermore, Theodoret emerges as a commanding presence. For one thing, we have remarkable points of Antiochene theology in evidence right from the start of the compilation. [Scholion I](#) shows a writer at pains to demonstrate that the second Person of the Trinity, not simply the first, should be styled ‘Lord’ (δεσπότης).⁵³³ So does [Scholion XXIX](#).

Next, [Scholia IV](#) and [VII](#) style John the Evangelist θεολόγος, which is a very characteristic Antiochene construction. Θεολόγος was and eventually remained an epithet attributed to Gregory of Nazianzus. So much so that later lexicographers quoting from his works feel that they do not need to state his name: mere reference to θεολόγος indicates Gregory.

Being a theologian of Antiochene mindset, Cassian (like Theodoret) did not see in Nestorius⁵³⁴ (c. 386–c. 451)

⁵³² Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses*, ed. A. Rousseau, L., Doutreleau, and C. Mercier, *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies, livre 5*, vol. 2, Sources chrétiennes 153 (Paris, 1969).

⁵³³ See further discussion on this below.

⁵³⁴ Nestorius, a Syrian monk from Antioch, was elected archbishop of

Constantinople in 428. Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus, under whom he probably studied, influenced him. He propounded his doctrine in 428, defending his chaplain who excoriated the designation θεοτόκος, which, however, was favoured by Cyril of Alexandria.

a hideous heretic, but only a spiritual compatriot who had probably just gone too far in his effort to counter-balance Cyril's emphasis on the divinity of Christ at the expense of his humanity. I am sure that the *Quaestiones et Responsiones* is not a work by Theodoret.⁵³⁵ There are such striking similarities with Cassian that one might surmise that this is a work written by his own pen. During discussion of the language and ideas contained in the Scholia, we come upon this tract over and over.⁵³⁶ Be that as it may, the fact is that in this specific work there is not a single point relating to Nestorianism, either directly or implicitly.

A couple of points evince that Cassian treated the condemned erstwhile patriarch of Constantinople as a person whose theological statements were not entirely without reason. Such a point is Cassian's assertion 'the Holy Spirit does not give birth to offspring' (τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὐ γεννᾷ). This could appear as too bizarre a statement (all the more so since Cassian is the sole author besides Nestorius to make such a blunt confession), unless this is considered in the context of Nestorian theology.⁵³⁷

A second point is Cassian's usage of the term συνάφεια ('conjunction'). Although not used in a Christological context, this can be shown by argument to be a usage after a Nestorian idea.⁵³⁸ A third point

is his expression ἀκατάσχετος Θεός ('God, who is unrestrained').⁵³⁹ Styling Godhead ἀκατάσχετος is an expressive designation, since it was Nestorius alone who had used this epithet.⁵⁴⁰ This diction occurs only in *De Trinitate*, which I have claimed to be Cassian's work.⁵⁴¹

This is not to say that Cassian himself had deeply rooted Nestorian sympathies as regards Christology, although the environment in which he was brought up certainly cherished such allegiances. Whether he had sympathies of the kind or not, for the time being we simply cannot say, in the absence of more evidence.⁵⁴² Such instances nevertheless clearly suggest that he was seeing Nestorius as an Antiochene doctor, on whom he could somehow draw. This is one more lesson Cassian had been taught by the great doctors of Antioch, Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret. We should bear in mind that Theodoret defended Nestorius consistently for twenty years, from 431 to 451, until he was forced to anathematize him at Chalcedon. Bitter though the pill he had to swallow was to him, his followers could not forget that he had defended Nestorius' orthodoxy.⁵⁴³ And Cassian was a genuine son of Antioch, and Theodoret himself.

Exploration of Cassian's text in Codex 573 has shown that he was an assiduous student of Gregory of

⁵³⁵ The *Quaestiones et Responsiones* (J. C. T. Otto, ed., *Corpus apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi*, vol. 5, 3rd edn. (Jena, 1881 (repr. 1969)), pp. 2–246) was a work ascribed to Justin (Pseudo-Justin) along with three other works: *Quaestiones Christianorum ad Gentiles* (ibid. pp. 246–326), *Quaestiones Gentilium ad Christianos* (pp. 326–366), (ed. J.C.T. Otto, *Corpus apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi*, vol. 4, third edn. [Jena, 1880 (repr. Wiesbaden, 1969)], pp. 100–222). A. Harnack had claimed Diodorus of Tarsus to be the writer of the *Quaestiones et Responsiones* but F. X. Funk rejected this, only to allow that this was a work produced by Antiochene circles. Cf. F. X. Funk, 'Le pseudo-Justin et Théodore de Tarse', *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (1902), 947–971. Today there is a tendency to attribute this work to Theodoret for two reasons: First, in the catena to the gospel of Luke by Nicetas, bishop of Heraclea, Question number LVIII is there, and this is ascribed to Theodoret. See M. Richard, 'Les citations de Théodoret conservées dans la chaîne de Nicéas sur l'évangélisme selon saint Luc', *Revue Biblique* 43 (1934) 92. Second, A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus found a manuscript at Constantinople (no. 452 X, belonging to the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem) which contains sixty-one questions and replies and is explicitly attributed to Theodoret. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Θεοδωρήτου Ἐπισκόπου Πόλεως Κόπρου, Πρὸς τὰς ἐπενεχθείσας αὐτῷ ἐπερωτήσεις παρά τινος τῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐπισκόπων Ἀποκρίσεις*, St Petersburg, 1895, pp. 1–150.

⁵³⁶ See Scholia (and expanded notes) IX; XI; XX; XXV; XXVII; XXIX; XXX; XXXI; XXXV; XXXVI.

⁵³⁷ Cassian the Sabaite, *De Panareto*, p. 116r; see NDGF, pp. 366–370; RCR, pp. 15–16..

⁵³⁸ Cf. Cassian the Sabaite, *SerenPrim*, p. 84v. See endnote 17 to the Greek text, NDGF, pp. 298–299.

⁵³⁹ Cassian the Sabaite, *ScetPatr*, p. 59v NDGF, pp. 174; 223.

⁵⁴⁰ Cf. Nestorius, *Sermones*, Sermon 4, *apud* ACO, *Concilium Universale Ephesenum Anno 431*, 1,1,6, p. 12: καὶ εἰ μεμένηκεν ὁ θεὸς λόγος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἀκατάσχετος καὶ τῆς σφαγῆς οὐ κεκοινώνηκε τῇ σαρκί. So ibid. p. 99.

⁵⁴¹ *DT* (lib. 2.1–7), 6.8,5: ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἔκχυσις, ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι, ἡ ἀκατάσχετος καὶ ἄφθονος ἐπιφοίτησις αὐτοῦ. NGDF, Appendix II, p. 599.

⁵⁴² What I suggest is that Cassian the Sabaite will turn out to be the author of a good number of texts currently spuriously ascribed to celebrities of Christianity. It is then that a more detailed study of the point will be possible.

⁵⁴³ There is of course the claim that Theodoret wrote a libel renouncing Nestorius in his *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.432–436. At this point scholarship should only pause. I simply declare that I do not believe this is a text of Theodoret's. Having studied Origen for decades and Cassian recently, I have learned one lesson: the history of Christian literature is a nasty story which involves the most hideous and cunning cases of distortion and interpolation. The second half of the fifth century and the sixth century probably produced more spurious texts than genuine literature.

Nyssa,⁵⁴⁴ and I could endorse A. Grillmeier's view suggesting an almost direct line between the Cappadocians and Nestorius.⁵⁴⁵ According to him, Cappadocian Christology saw the unity of Christ in terms of the Stoic doctrine of *κρᾶσις δι' ὅλων*. This suggests two natures mixed together without either of them losing its properties. This was the way Basil explained that what suffered on the Cross was Christ's humanity, whereas his divinity remained impassible. The body is subject to hunger, thirst, and fatigue, and the soul suffers anxiety, ignorance, and sorrow. The Logos took upon Himself both a body and a soul that suffered such passions as are natural to humanity; but he did not assume those passions which are relevant to the Fall, that is, passions which occur in a human being as a result of a will revolting against God. This distinction allows for the soul to function in a truly theological sense during the Incarnation. However, as Grillmeier put it, he did not even think of transferring this 'to the spiritual decisions that are decisive for our redemption'.⁵⁴⁶ Likewise, both Theodoret and Gregory of Nyssa focus their attention on discussing the properties of each nature rather than elaborating on how they make up the Person of Christ. Paul Clayton Jr. makes a telling point showing that although the formula uniting the two natures in Christ is not the same in either Gregory of Nyssa or Theodoret, 'the fundamental metaphysical assumptions of the Cappadocian and Theodoret's Antiochene tradition are the same'.⁵⁴⁷ It should be further added that Theodoret is the sole Christian intellectual to make use of the Stoic expression *κρᾶσις δι' ὅλων*,⁵⁴⁸ at the point where he expounds the notions of two natures of

Christ by means of the simile of air and light.⁵⁴⁹ It is at that very same point of the *Eranistes* that Theodoret makes an exposition of the functions of two natures during the Incarnation, which seem to me not too different from the Cappadocian ones and, anyway, they appear to share more than 'fundamental metaphysical assumptions', as Clayton had it. This means that when Cassian was writing, he did not actually need to distinguish for himself whether he had in mind Theodoret or Gregory of Nyssa: in fact he must have written under the impression that he was in line with both, cherishing the theology of both. His attack on Arianism⁵⁵⁰ is made from an Antiochene point of view, which is evinced by his emphasis on the expression *δεσπότης Χριστός*. This is actually an echo from Theodoret, who had struggled to reach out to Alexandria as much as he could by affirming 'two perfect natures' and yet 'one Son'.⁵⁵¹ He had at the same time warned of the danger of falling either into Arianism by excessive emphasis on playing down Christ's humanity and thinking and speaking of Jesus Christ not as a man in the ordinary way, but rather as 'the Logos of God incarnate'.⁵⁵² For his part, Theodoret took some steps towards Cyril's Christology, even though he may have thought of it in his own terms.

From my exploration, therefore, some interesting results flowed: despite assertions to the contrary, there was not actually any iron curtain between Alexandria and Antioch. My initial impression was that Theodoret (an eminent scholar above all, as well as a catenist) had compiled this series of comments in order to establish the authority of the book of Revelation, both for himself

⁵⁴⁴ See NDGF and RCR, *passim*.

⁵⁴⁵ Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, v. 1, *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, tr. J. S. Bowden, revised 2nd edn (London, 1975), p. 368.

⁵⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴⁷ Paul Clayton Jr., *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, (Oxford, 2007), p. 88.

⁵⁴⁸ Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Logica et Physica*, Fr. 478 *apud* Plotinus, *Enneades*, II.7.1. Cf. testimonies and discussion by Plutarch, *Amatorius*, 769F. Galen, *De Temperamentis*, v. 1, p. 563; *Circa Doctrinas Hippocratis et Platonis*, 8.7.17; In *Hippocratis De Natura Hominis Librum Commentarii* iii, v. 15, p. 61. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Mixtione*, p. 221. John Philoponus, *De Aeternitate Mundi*, p. 462.

⁵⁴⁹ Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 144–46.

⁵⁵⁰ Cf. Cassian the Sabaite, *SerenPrim*, p. 99r: an attack on both Arius and Eunomius (NDGF, p. 280). Also, *Scholion XXXVI*.

⁵⁵¹ Theodoret, *Quod Unicus Filius Sit Jesus Christus (ex epistula 151)*, PG.83.1436.12–16: 'Ἐνα τοιγαροῦν προσκυνοῦμεν Υἱόν, ἐκατέραν δὲ φύσιν τελείαν ἐν αὐτῷ θεωροῦμεν, καὶ τὴν

λαβοῦσαν, καὶ τὴν ληφθεῖσαν· καὶ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Δαβὶδ.

⁵⁵² Cyril of Alexandria, *Quod Unus Sit Christus*, p. 715: σεσαρκωμένον τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρός φύντα Λόγον. p. 726: Χριστὸν ἓνα καὶ Υἱόν, ὡς Κύριον ἐνανθρωπήσαντα καὶ σεσαρκωμένον τὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον. P. 729: τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρός δηλονότι Λόγον ἐνανθρωπήσαντα καὶ σεσαρκωμένον. p. 737: εἰ δὴ μία πρὸς ἡμῶν ὁμολογοῖτο φύσις Υἱοῦ σεσαρκωμένου τε καὶ ἐνηνθρωπηκότος. *Homiliae Paschales*, PG.77.880.1–2: τὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, καὶ σεσαρκωμένον. *Commentarius In Isaiam Prophetam*, PG.70.312.46–48: αὐτὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον, τὸν δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα, σεσαρκωμένον τε καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα θεωρῶν. *Explanatio in Lucam*, PG.72.561.5–7: ἓνα Κύριον ἴσμεν, τουτέστι μονογενῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον σεσαρκωμένον. Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, PG.77.1160.13–15: Ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ μίαν φύσιν εἰρηκῶς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένην, οὐ μᾶς φύσεως τὸν Κύριον ἐδογμάτισε.

and his flock. Two points, however, suggested that I have not yet arrived at my Ithaca.

First, there is a peculiar phenomenon which I noticed with the Scholia. Whereas Theodoret's influence is clear (along with that of Didymus), and while we also have a text which is clearly Theodoret's in a certain Scholion, a third party appeared who made further (very short) remarks on points already covered by a preceding Scholion. For instance, whereas in [Scholion XXXI](#) the issue of the 'virgin men' of Rev. 14:4 had been treated fully, [Scholion XXXII](#) returns to this topic, in order to say things more or less similar to what had been said before. It turns out that in [Scholion XXXI](#) we have a quotation from Didymus' commentary on Revelation, whereas the next one is a comment by the compiler, who is not Theodoret.

Who could this person actually be? If there was a third party making such comments, then he (not Theodoret) would be the compiler. In any case, no matter who this person was, he had clearly drawn on other writers, too. For instance, [Scholion V](#) is simply a verbatim quotation from Clement of Alexandria, [Scholion XXXIX](#) a passage from Irenaeus.

But the crucial point was yet to come. An ancient reader of the 'Book of Cassian' wrote on the top of the last folio (295v – the last one of the Scholia, and of the entire Codex): 'by monk Cassian the Roman' (Κασσιανοῦ μοναχοῦ Ρωμαίου). The hand is probably later, but whoever wrote this must have known who the composer of the Scholia actually was.

But Cassian who? It was at that time that I looked at the entire Codex itself.⁵⁵³ My interest up to that moment was focused on the continuous text of Revelation (Codex, pp. 210r–245r) followed by the Scholia (Codex, pp. 245v–290r). Which means that until that moment I had studied only the last eighty folios of the Codex. It was only then that I surveyed the rest of the Codex – this time as a piece of art, as well as a depository of various ancient manuscripts in the rest of its pages. It was only then that I came upon its first page. A beautiful colophon had this title: 'The Book of monk Cassian'. Then the title of the first work followed: 'By Monk Cassian the Roman, *On the Rules and Institutions of Monasteries Located in Egypt and in the East*'. The name was written twice, which (as normally happens in ancient codices) indicated the owner of the 'Book of

Cassian' (namely, Codex 573 itself) and, subsequently, the author of the first of the treatises contained therein.

The first two works are well known, and after the seventh century they circulated under the name of Athanasius. They were published by Migne (as 'spuria', ascribed to Athanasius), but in fact they are Cassian's, which was also known to the editor. The ensuing three treatises are in fact an unpublished Greek manuscript.

Consequently, I edited the Greek manuscript (Codex, folios 1r–118v), which was a revealing and rewarding work. The language of Cassian was very important to me, all the more so since it contained rare colloquialisms and notable technical vocabulary, both theological and philosophical.

What was revealed was pretty shocking: monk Cassian (the owner and writer of the original codex from which the present one was transcribed) is *not* the man known as 'John Cassian' in the *Patrologia Latina*. He is not the Scythian 'John Cassian of Marseilles', allegedly mentioned by Gennadius of Marseilles (in fact interpolated) in his supplement to Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus*. It has been asserted that 'John Cassian' (who lived at the turn of the fourth to fifth century) wrote the *Conferences*, the *Institutions of Monasteries*, and the treatise *On the Eight Dispositions* to Evil. Also, that Greek versions of these works are Greek translations from the Latin original. Migne's editor A. Galland, in his introductory comment, surmised that 'some Graeculus' wrote this.

Detailed word-for-word philological analysis, however, showed that we are dealing with a Greek original text of the highest philological quality, both in terms of language and of classical and theological erudition. There is extremely rare theological as well as Aristotelian terminology, which is impossible for any translation from Latin to contain. Writers such as Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Didymus are present in their own words, along with Homer, Pindar, the great Greek tragic poets, Aristophanes, Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, Athenaeus, Galen, and others, including unique instances of extremely specialized terminology.

This Cassian was not the Scythian of Marseilles. It was *another* Cassian, more than a hundred years later than the Scythian. This was a monk of the Laura of Sabas in Palestine, coming from Scythopolis, a town of Koile Syria closely affiliated with Antioch, a student

⁵⁵³ See RCR, pp. 524–548, for photos of this Codex and selected folios in it with photos of folios from some other Sabaite codices on facing pages.

of the sixth-century 'Origenism' (of which Origen was all but the father), certainly of Didymus, and most certainly of Evagrius. He was a spiritual son of St Sabas, the famous founder of the Great Laura. Cassian was the founder of the Zouga monastery in his native Scythopolis in Palestine, and the abbot of another one in 540–547 (the Souka monastery, or the convent of Chariton, on which light was cast by recent archaeological excavations during the 1990s). Finally he became the abbot of the Great Laura of Sabas in 548, only to remain in the post for ten months until his death on 20 July 548. Cassian was a close friend of Leontius of Byzantium, a sixth-century 'Origenist' and protagonist in the so-called 'Origenistic-controversy' of the period in Palestine, who took part in the local synod of 536 in Constantinople, where Cassian was present, too, as a delegate of the Great Laura. They both signed the synodical acts. To *this* Leontius some of Cassian's works are addressed. These works have now been published in a Greek edition, along with an English translation. The results, comparing terms and expressions from all Greek literature, both pagan and Christian, are stunning. The Greek text is not, and cannot be, a Greek translation from the Latin. This is a Greek original, full of technical terminology coming from both Classical Greek and Patristic literature. This is *another* Cassian, unknown and non-existent to scholarship thus far.

Further investigation showed that no Greek author (from the sixth to the fourteenth century) knows of any 'John Cassian', the alleged fourth/fifth century deacon of John Chrysostom. They all know of Cassian and sometimes mention him in admiration as the 'great Cassian'. However, he has been eclipsed by the Scythian John Cassian of Marseilles, by means of tampering with manuscripts (indeed extinguishing ancient Greek ones) and heavily interpolating the works ascribed to him in the *Patrologia Latina*, and in the Vienna corpus of the Latin authors. He has been advertised as the father of the Benedictine monastic order and as 'the sole Latin Father included in the *Philocalia*', that is, the anthology compiled by Nicodemus of Athos. All these are simply a myth conspiring to establish the presence of a figment called 'John Cassian' instead of the real one, namely, Cassian the Sabaite.

The comparative study of Cassian's Greek works

in Codex 573 and the Scholia (that is, a comparison of Codex folios 1r–118v and 845v–290r) provided me with the final conclusion. Monk Cassian the Sabaite is the compiler of the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*.

The 'Book of Cassian' (Codex 573 itself) was a personal companion to this erudite man, influenced by sixth-century 'Origenism'. A spiritual son of St Sabas, tutored by the saint himself, he became the abbot of the Laura of Sabas at the recommendation of Patriarch Peter I of Jerusalem (524–552). When this prelate suggested to the leading monks of the Great Laura that Cassian be appointed, he presumably took into account the unstable circumstances of the times. Given the power of the Origenists at the time, Cassian's respected personality (and moderate Origenism) was a compromise accepted by both parties. This happened in October 547, while the Origenistic controversy was raging, at the Laura itself, as well as at the New Laura and surrounding monasteries, only four years before the Fifth Oecumenical Council of Constantinople in 553, and five years after Justinian had issued his *Edictum contra Origenem* (Letter to Patriarch Mennas). This edict was compiled in the Laura of Sabas itself by Abbot Gelasius and other elders (as is definitely shown by means of ancient testimony in *RCR*), and was subsequently sent to Patriarch Peter I of Jerusalem (524–552), who dispatched it to Justinian. The emperor immediately employed it, made it an imperial edict verbatim, and finally implemented it through condemnation of Origen by a local synod summoned by the Patriarch Mennas on the emperor's order.

In determining the author of the Scholia, Cassian had in the first place to be resurrected as a writer. Cassian the Sabaite, monk of St Sabas' Great Laura, was born c. 470 and died on 20 July 548. He spent six years (c. 533–539) living at the monastery of the Akoimetoï, in Constantinople. As a presbyter of the Laura of Sabas, he took part in the local synod of 536 in Constantinople and signed its acts along with Leontius of Byzantium.

Cyril of Scythopolis left a fairly detailed account of the death of Sabas at the age of ninety-four, in 533 AD. In this story, Cassian is described as a 'gifted' person, in both ethical and intellectual terms (κεκοσμημένος τῷ λόγῳ).⁵⁵⁴ According to Cyril, Sabas was a real saint, yet

⁵⁵⁴ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Cyriaci*, p. 231. Besides Cassian, the chronicler attributed this characterization only to Sabas and

Theodosius the Coenobiarch. Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae*, p. 115. See *RCR*, pp. 55; 79; 80.

it is important that his story involves Cassian's sanctity, too. Cassian died sixteen years after Sabas. He was the abbot, and a decision was made that the body of the deceased 'blessed Cassian' (τοῦ μακαρίου Κασσιανοῦ) should be interred along with that of Sabas. When the crypt was opened for the occasion, they found the body of Sabas incorrupt and with no signs of decay, and Cyril of Scythopolis assures us that he saw this himself.

This testimony is important for an additional reason. It appears that Cassian was considered to be so exceptional a personality as to deserve to be placed next to the body of the deceased venerated founder of the Laura. It could be argued that he was placed in the crypt which was reserved for the abbots of the monastery. During the period of fifteen years since the death of Sabas there had been other abbots, whom Cassian succeeded, and he himself remained in the post for only ten months. The successor of Sabas was a certain abba Melitas, born in Beirut, and was chosen by Sabas himself, who had a premonition about his own death a few days before this actually occurred. The new abbot remained in office for five years until he died in September 535. He was succeeded by Gelasius (September 537–October 546), who immediately took anti-Origenist action. Then a certain Origenist monk, called George took up and remained in office for seven months (547), to be deposed by the Origenist party itself on the grounds of corruption. Therefore, if a specific site for interring the bodies of abbots had been determined, this should have happened with the body of at least two of Cassian's predecessors, notably Melitas and Gelasius. Therefore, the findings about the incorrupt body of Sabas could have come to light at least a year earlier. Still, it seems that special treatment was reserved for Cassian, on account of his personality, not simply his office as abbot.

An ancient reader (and, perhaps, later owner) of the 'Book of Cassian' wrote the following on the top of the last folio (295r – the last page of the Scholia and of the Codex itself): Κασσιανου του ρωμαίου μοῦ, that is, (emending orthography and abbreviation), Κασσιανοῦ τοῦ Ῥωμαίου μοναχοῦ ('by monk Cassian the Roman'). The hand is later, but whoever wrote this knew who the author of the Scholia actually was.

It was only then that I had arrived in my Ithaca.

The Codex 573, entitled 'The Book of Cassian', in beautiful embellishment on its opening page, has yet something more to tell us. Indeed, it is significant that a cross is drawn on the left side, beside the name of Cassian, on both headings of the first page. This suggests the clerical status of the author (he signed the acts of the synod of 536 as 'presbyter at the Laura of Sabas'), and the fact that he was still alive at the time when the original book (from which this codex was copied later) was compiled at his own behest. Clergymen in the East draw a cross before their name even today. On the first page of the Codex, the name of Cassian is written twice: first, the decorated one, which suggests the owner of the Codex; second, Cassian the author of the first of the treatises addressed to Bishop Castor. A cross on the left side accompanies the name of Cassian at both points, which are only a couple of lines from each other. There is a treatise following, which is ascribed to Irenaeus,⁵⁵⁵ where there is a cross by the name of that bishop. No cross exists by the name of Hippolytus (folio 156r), or Cyril of Alexandria (folio 201r), nor even by the name of John the Evangelist at the beginning of both the text of Revelation (folio 210r), and the Scholia (folio 245v).

The rubric 'the Book of monk Cassian' (Κασσιανοῦ Μοναχοῦ Βιβλίον) means that Codex 573 is a copy from a book owned by Cassian. This header refers to the entire book, not just to the works by Cassian himself, which occupy the first 118 folios of the 290 ones which comprise the Codex. If this colophon applied to the works of Cassian only, then there would have been no reason for another title to follow just two lines further, which reads: 'By Monk Cassian the Roman: On the Order and Canons [Governing] the Coenobia in the East and Egypt' (Κασσιανοῦ Μοναχοῦ Ῥωμαίου, Περὶ διατυπώσεων καὶ κανόνων τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀνατολὴν καὶ Αἴγυπτον Κοινοβίων). Had the designation 'the Book of monk Cassian' been intended to denote only the works by Cassian included therein, then there was no reason for a second heading also to exist on the first page. Therefore, the first headings signifies the owner and compiler of the Book, whereas the second one is the first in the series of headings indicating the author of each work included in the book.

⁵⁵⁵ Codex pp. 119r–155v: Irenaeus bishop of Lyon, *De Benedictionibus Jacobi*.

The present codex is a copy transcribed from the original book, in which the Scholia were written during the 530s or 540s. At that time it was too dangerous to declare allegiances to theologians such as Origen, Didymus, Evagrius, Severianus of Gabala, Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, or Julian the Arian, featuring along with orthodox theologians. This was too large a crowd of heretics to be reproduced by Cassian at a time when the fervour against them all was still burning. We know that the treatise underlying the Scholia, indeed their main source, is Didymus' lost Commentary on the Apocalypse. Likewise, Theodoret was theologically suspect, as one who had opposed Cyril of Alexandria and defended Nestorius. At a period when the dispute over Monophysitism was raging, the name of Cyril of Alexandria had come to be venerated much more than had been the case during his lifetime. This, even though Cyril was the actual culprit in causing Monophysitism to emerge. Cyril was, however, also highly valued by Justinian. Each party interpreted his ambiguous and ill-considered statements to suit their partisan interests. Within this inflamed setting, Theodoret was remembered as a foe of Cyril, the man who had once even instigated Cyril's condemnation at the early stage of the council of Ephesus. In 553 Theodoret just barely escaped full condemnation, and only the Three Chapters became the target.

In view of this state of affairs, for Cassian to quote names such as Origen, Didymus, or Theodoret, would be nothing short of embarking on a precarious venture. Cassian therefore withheld the names of his authorities and made no mention of such authors at all. In view of his erudition that is revealed in this study, it would have been impossible for him not to be aware of his real sources.

Besides, Cassian had the text of Revelation (now known as MS 2351) included in his own 'Book'. One point in this text should be considered. The 2351

rendering, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀνοίγει, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀνοίξει⁵⁵⁶ is a unique one. The sole author who had treated an apocalyptic text with this language was Theodoret.⁵⁵⁷ Therefore, there is a strong possibility that this specific text of Revelation was the result of Theodoret's emendation in an unknown manuscript.

Some philological remarks

In addition to the later handwriting on folio 295v ascribing the Scholia to Cassian, once his texts of the first 118 folios are studied, one can see that a characteristic style is reproduced in the Scholia. This is not to say that there are characteristic expressions exclusive to Cassian. But juxtaposition of the texts does suggest that Cassian had been influenced by certain patterns of expression, and his writing displays a clear predilection for them. Let me therefore cite some examples, which attest to the same writer having written both the first and last part of this codex.

The structure 'being aware of this (τοῦτο ἐπιστάμενος) . . . he says' is characteristic of Didymus.⁵⁵⁸ However, in [Scholion IV](#) it is not Didymus speaking, it is Cassian, simply because John the Evangelist is styled θεολόγος. Didymus never accorded this title to John the Evangelist, as shown in [EN IVb](#). The Scholion is a comment by Cassian himself, who employed the expression,⁵⁵⁹ and used it in the Scholion and the rest of his text in the same characteristic manner.

[Scholion XVIII](#) is indeed one by Cassian using the expression τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡλίου (as in Malachi, 3:20), which is characteristic of Didymus. However, this is not actually a quotation from Didymus, but only a very short comment by the compiler, who is one of the few theologians to use the metaphor in a phrase of his own instead of just quoting Malachi.⁵⁶⁰

The same goes for the expression⁵⁶¹ διὰ τὸ ἐμπαθεῖς in [Scholion XVI](#). This Stoic notion of one being bowled head over heels by passion was used by Didymus, but

⁵⁵⁶ Cf. [Scholion XX](#).

⁵⁵⁷ Cf. Theodoret, *commls*, 6, line 711, commenting on Isaiah 22:22: καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ τὴν κλεῖδα οἴκου Δαυὶδ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄμου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀνοίξει, καὶ οὐδεὶς κλείσει, καὶ κλείσει, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀνοίγων.

⁵⁵⁸ [Scholion IV](#), note 3.

⁵⁵⁹ *OctoVit*, p. 49r: Ταύτην τὴν νόσον βαρυτάτην οὖσαν ὁ θεὸς ἀπόστολος ἐπιστάμενος καὶ βουλούμενος αὐτὴν ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν ὡς σοφὸς ἱατρὸς πρόρριζον ἀνασπᾶσαι, καὶ τὰς αἰτίας, ἀφ' ὧν μάλιστα τίκεται, δείκνυσιν. Ibid. p. 56r: Ταῦτα καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐπιστάμενοι, πάντες μὲν γνῶμη

παραδεδόκασι. *ScetPatr*, p. 57v: τοῦτο καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐπιστάμενός φησιν. Ibid. p. 58v: ὅπερ καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ἐπιστάμενος ἔλεγεν. *SerenPrim*, p. 92r: Ταῦτα πάντα ἐπιστάμενος ὁ Δαβὶδ καὶ ἔχων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ ἔνδον ἀνθρώπου ὑγιεῖς, καὶ γινώσκων ὅτι χαίρουσιν ἐπὶ τῇ πτώσει ἡμῶν, ἔλεγεν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. *OctoVit*, p. 32r: Ὅθεν ὁ μακάριος ἀπόστολος τοῦτο γινώσκων . . . ἐκάλεσε.

⁵⁶⁰ Cf. Cassian the Sabaite, *OctoVit*, Cod. p. 39r: θεάσασθαι τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης. p. 40r: τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης Χριστόν. On p. 40v he quotes Malachi 3:20.

⁵⁶¹ Canvassed in [EN XVIc](#).

Cassian employed it to make this short comment, which is evidently an ad hoc remark, not a quotation from Didymus.⁵⁶²

Cassian's style in the rest of the texts included in the Codex can tell us with some certainty when it is he who speaks and when we have a plain quotation (sometimes more or less paraphrased) from other authors. For instance, he used the verb forms πιστοῦται (present)⁵⁶³ or πιστώσεις (future)⁵⁶⁴ and the noun πίστωσης.⁵⁶⁵ The first two had been used by Theodoret⁵⁶⁶ and Cyril⁵⁶⁷ alike. However, the third (i.e. the noun πίστωσης) was never used by either Theodoret or Cyril, and appears in *spuria* which are most likely to be Cassian's own writings.⁵⁶⁸ Likewise, Cassian's verb πιστοποιεῖσθαι⁵⁶⁹ was not used by Theodoret and appears only once in Cyril.⁵⁷⁰ Furthermore, Cassian uses the term νοητός in the same way in both works,⁵⁷¹ which Theodoret also uses, as is discussed in the next section. Besides, some distinctive words, such as the verb ἀναπεῖθιν applied to the devil inciting men,⁵⁷² seem to appeal to him. Likewise, Cassian is fond of quoting Isaiah, 14:12, which refers to the fall of the Lucifer, and he does so in

both works.⁵⁷³ He does so also with Heb. 4:12, which seems to have a special appeal for him.⁵⁷⁴

The expression of *Scholion XXX* τὴν προσοῦσαν δικαιοσύνην is a very rare one. This is a phrase that Cassian coined, but his debt is to Didymus using the expression τὴν προσοῦσαν ἀρετήν, as discussed in *EN XXXIf*. Indeed Cassian took up the expression and used it in his writings.⁵⁷⁵ The participle προσοῦσα was applied to sundry nouns, such as 'virtue', 'sinlessness', 'grace', 'mortification of one's passions', 'power', 'ignorance' etc. as quoted in the expanded note. However, the participle attached to 'justice' (δικαιοσύνη) is far too rare, occurring no more than three times in literature. One of them is a spurious work ascribed to Chrysostom, which calls for some exploration of a possible relation between this and the pen of Cassian.⁵⁷⁶

Finally, let me consider the expression of *Scholion XXI*, ἐννοίας αὐτῷ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐνχαράπτων ('He engraves upon him concepts of the Father'). The noun ἐννοία means 'notion' or 'concept' and is as old as Socrates, who invented this brilliant term. *Concept* means a mental construction from observation of

⁵⁶² Cassian the Sabaite, *OctoVit*, p. 39v: τοὺς ἐμπαθεῖς καὶ φιληδόνους λογισμοὺς. p. 40v: τῆς ἐμπαθοῦς διαθέσεως. Pseudo-Caesarius, *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, 139: εἰ δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ δι' ἀμελεστέρον καὶ ἐμπαθοῦς βίου προσχωρήσωμεν. Ibid. 188: ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῆς ἐμπαθοῦς καὶ ὑλώδους [scil. ζωῆς].

⁵⁶³ *Scholion XXIX*. Cf. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1136.27 (πιστοῦται); *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.549.38 (πιστοῦται); *intProphXII*, PG.81: 1677.19 (πιστοῦται); 1769.24 (πιστοῦται); 1912.46 (πιστοῦται); *intPaulXIV*, PG.82: 317.36 (πιστοῦται); 648.30 (πιστοῦται); 797.43 (πιστοῦται); 865.40 (πιστούμενος); *Eranistes*.244.22 (πιστούμενος); *HE*, 195.7 (πιστούμενος).

⁵⁶⁴ *Scholion XXV*.

⁵⁶⁵ *Scholion XXV*.

⁵⁶⁶ Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 108 (πιστώσασθαι); p. 162 (πιστώσεται); p. 174 (πιστώσεται); p. 177 (πιστώσασθαι); p. 246 (πιστώσεται); *HE*, p. 141 (πιστώσασθαι). Pseudo-Theodoret (or Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, pp. 5 (πιστώσασθαι); 56 (πιστώσασθαι); 115 (πίστωσιν and πιστώσεται).

⁵⁶⁷ Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarius in XII Prophetas*, v. 1, p. 578 (πιστούμεθα); v. 2, p. 96 (πιστοῦται); *Commentarii in Joannem*, v. 1, p. 162 (πιστοῦται); p.198 (πιστούμενος); *Commentarii in Joannem*, v. 3, p. 103 (πιστοῦται); *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 292 (πιστοῦται); p. 298, line 7 (πιστούμενος); *De Incarnatione*, p. 713 (πιστούμενος); *Commentaria in Matthaeum*, fr. 134 (πιστοῦται); fr. 134col2 (πιστοῦται); *Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam*, PG.70: 985.18 (πιστούμενος); 1304.6 (πιστοῦται); *Explanatio in Lucam*, PG.72.948.4 (πιστούμενος); *De Incarnatione Domini*, PG.75.1464.19 (πιστοῦται); and *passim*.

⁵⁶⁸ Cf. Cassian the Sabaite, *Scholion XXV*: ὅταν ἀναβαίνων τις ἐκεῖ τῶν ἁγίων λέγει τὰς πιστώσεις. *Const*, Cod. p. 10b: Καὶ πρὸς πίστωσιν τῶν εἰρημένων. Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, PG.77.1169.14–16: Τὰ δέ, διὰ τὴν πρὸς

ἡμᾶς φανέρωσιν τε καὶ πίστωσιν, ὡς τό, 'Πάτερ, δόξασόν με τῇ δόξῃ, ἣ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί.' Pseudo-Theodoret, *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, p. 115 (and Pseudo-Justin, *QetR*, p.466A): ἐχρήσατο δὲ ὁ ἀπόστολος τῷ κατὰ τὰ σπέρματα ὑποδείγματι πρὸς πίστωσιν τῆς τῶν νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, ἵνα κατὰ ἀναλογίαν πιστώσεται τῆς ἀναστάσεως τὸν λόγον.

⁵⁶⁹ Cassian the Sabaite, *De Panareto*, p. 103r: πιστοποιῆσαι.

⁵⁷⁰ Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.492.16: πιστοποιεῖν.

⁵⁷¹ Cf. νοητός meaning 'intellectual' or 'incorporeal'. Cassian the Sabaite, *SerenPrim*, p. 86v: τῇ Τριάδι δυνατόν, ἥτις πάσῃ τῇ νοητῇ φύσει ἐνυπάρχει. *Scholia in Apocalypsin*, *Scholion XXV*: ἡ τῶν νοητῶν οὐσία . . . τὴν κατὰ σαφήνειαν διαίρεσιν τῶν νοητῶν. *Scholion XXVII*: τὸ βιβλίον οὐ μόνον τὰ περὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν περιέχει πραγματῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ νοητῶν, where νοητός means 'understood in an allegorical sense'. Cassian the Sabaite, *SerenPrim*, p. 83v: τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ ἐνδοτέρου πολέμου. *Scholia in Apocalypsin*, *Scholion XXIII*: ἡ ψύξις ἡ νοητή. *Scholion XXXI*: τὸ νοητὸν τοῦτο ἔθνος.

⁵⁷² Cassian the Sabaite, *Const*, p. 6r: τὸ ἀναπεῖθιν αὐτὸν τοὺς μαθητευομένους ἀπὸ τῶν πατέρων κρύπτειν τοὺς ἰδίους λογισμοὺς. *OctoVit*, p. 33v: ἀλλὰ τῇ τῆς φιλαργυρίας μανίᾳ τοῦτον ἐνδῆσας, τὴν πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ἔχειν εἰς τὸ ἐργόχειρον ἀναπεῖθι. *Scholion XXX*: ἀλλὰ, καθὼς εἴρηται, ὁργὴν θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν διάβολον, τὸν ἀναπεῖθοντα ἁμαρτάνειν.

⁵⁷³ *Scholion XXXVIII*; Cassian the Sabaite, *OctoVit*, p. 54v; *De Panareto*, p. 105r.

⁵⁷⁴ Cf. *Scholion XII* and Cassian the Sabaite, *SerenPrim*, p. 87r.

⁵⁷⁵ Cassian the Sabaite, *Const*, p. 13r: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ πολιτείαν. *ScetPatr*, 67v: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ μεγάλῃν ἀρετήν. *SerenPrim*, 80r: διὰ τὰς προσοῦσας αὐτῷ ἀρετάς.

⁵⁷⁶ See *EN XXXIf*. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *Oratio de Epiphania*, 7: τῇ γὰρ προσοῦσῃ δικαιοσύνῃ θαρρῶν.

certain phenomena, purportedly claiming objectivity. *Notion* (like *conception*) is more moderate, since it allows for some subjectivity while claiming universality of a notion, in the sense that a notion is a human mental construction. Ἐννοια (although etymologically meaning that which is *in* one's mind) received a wide spectrum of interpretations by different philosophers: Plato saw Socrates' ἔννοια as an objective reality having its own independent standing in the Beyond, and he called it *Idea* – but his theory failed, as he realized by the end of his life (this is what the first half of the dialogue *Parmenides* is about). Modern science allows universality for ἔννοια, but does not go so far as to grant them absolute objectivity. In any event, the Christian use of ἔννοια means apprehension of a doctrine which adumbrates an objective and utterly transcendent divine reality.

However, Cassian uses the term ἔννοια in a pretty peculiar manner. All of the instances we come upon suggest a subjective rather than objective conception. He says, for instance, that 'we should pursue lofty conceptions which lead to God',⁵⁷⁷ but he does not care whether these 'conceptions' have any objective character. Likewise, he refers to ἔννοια as simply a subjective thought in one's mind: the 'thought' instilled by the devil into one's mind,⁵⁷⁸ or an indecent thought, which might occur to a monk.⁵⁷⁹ This is in fact how ἔννοια is used in both Cassian's monastic texts and in [Scholion XXI](#). Cassian cares about 'concepts of the Father' being produced in one's mind. He does not actually care which they are specifically; all he cares about is that such 'conceptions' should be befitting the grandeur of God.

In light of this discussion, it is now time for me to identify the Scholia one by one.

All Scholia identified

[Scholion I](#) is a composition by Cassian extensively, yet not exclusively, quoting from the opening of Didymus'

Commentary on the Apocalypse. The telling point is Cassian's use of the term δεσπότης accorded to Christ. Didymus applies this appellation to none other than God, and only a certain exception is made for quoting the passage of the epistle of Jude, 4.⁵⁸⁰ By contrast, this epithet applied to Christ is used no fewer than two hundred times in *De Trinitate*, which is one more indication (from the many which will follow in this book) that this is not a work by Didymus, but by Cassian the Sabaite, as I have shown elsewhere. The same designation occurs in some catena-fragments on the Psalms (*frPs (al)*), which, however, are couched in the vocabulary of the catenist rather than that of Didymus himself. Besides, the expression φανερώσαι τὸν λόγον, which is used in the same Scholion, is a rare one, yet it recurs also in [Scholion XXVII](#).⁵⁸¹ Although that Scholion draws heavily on Didymus, this specific point is Cassian's, since Didymus does not actually use the expression ἐλάττωσις τῆς φύσεως, which originates in Cassian's reading of Plutarch and Gregory of Nyssa, as discussed in [EN XXVIII](#).

[Scholion II](#) is an excerpt from Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse, adapted by Cassian, as a certain parallel in Didymus immediately makes clear.

Cassian wrote [Scholion III](#) on Rev. 1:3–4, consulting Didymus' commentary on this same scriptural book and this comment is a rendering *ipsissimis verbis*. The verb μακαριοποιεῖν is a fine seal of Didymus' vocabulary bequeathed to Cassian. Even the expression οὐχ ὡς ἔτυχεν is characteristic of Didymus, who used this abundantly, whereas in other authors (save Chrysostom) it appears only in a single casual instance. Once again, we come upon this in the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*,⁵⁸² and in *De Trinitate*.⁵⁸³ Likewise, this tells us that Origen's fragments on the Psalms are probably a compilation by Cassian or his colleagues, since this appears only once in a homily, thereafter to appear only in these catenae fragments.⁵⁸⁴ On the other hand, Didymus used this abundantly, and so did his

⁵⁷⁷ Cassian the Sabaite, *SerenPrim*, pp. 82v–83r: θελήσωμεν, τοιτέστιν ὑψηλὰς ἐννοίας καὶ πρὸς Θεὸν ἀγούσας.

⁵⁷⁸ Ibid. 87v: ὅποτεν αἰσθανόμεθα συνεχῶς ἀναφρομένους εἰς ἡμᾶς τὰς πονηρὰς αὐτῶν ἐννοίας.

⁵⁷⁹ Cassian the Sabaite, *ScetPatr*, p. 73r: ὡς μηδὲ εἰς ἐννοίαν με ἐλθεῖν τοῦ λοιποῦ τῆς τοιαύτης ἐπιθυμίας.

⁵⁸⁰ Didymus, *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 89.

⁵⁸¹ [Scholion XXVII](#): οὐδεὶς . . . ἄξιος εὐρηται διὰ τὴν ἐλάττωσιν τῆς φύσεως τὸν τῆς προνοίας λόγον διακρίσεως καὶ διοικήσεως φανερώσαι.

⁵⁸² Pseudo-Basil of Caesarea, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*. 16.306. Its alleged author Basil of Caesarea never used this expression.

⁵⁸³ Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 3)*, PG.39.965.11.

⁵⁸⁴ Origen, *homJer*, Homily 20.5. *Selecta in selPs*, PG.12: 1121.49; 1473.34; 1616.32.

Sabaite compilers, indeed Cassian himself.⁵⁸⁵ No wonder then that the verb is used by authors who reproduce Cassian's vocabulary.⁵⁸⁶

Scholion IV was penned exclusively by Cassian, and the content once again shows him to be a student not only of Theodoret, but also of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Scholion V is a plain quotation from Clement of Alexandria, which tells us that in composing this compilation Cassian sometimes quoted Patristic texts verbatim without bothering to paraphrase them. He also did so in **Scholia XXXVIII** and **XXXIX** quoting Irenaeus, from which we can safely infer that in the passage of **Scholion XXX**, where the author says 'as we have taught in the 1 Paralipomenon', it is Theodoret who is actually speaking.

Scholion VI draws heavily on Didymus, and probably this is a paraphrase quoted from his Commentary on the Apocalypse, with some adaptation to Cassian's own style formed under the influence of Theodoret.

Scholion VII is a quotation from Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse. Passages in Didymus' Commentary on Ecclesiastes run strikingly parallel to this Scholion.

Cassian wrote **Scholion VIII** as a brief comment following the previous **Scholion VII**, which was a plain quotation from Didymus.

Scholion IX is largely a quotation from Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse. However, Cassian paraphrased this at points after Theodoret, such as the expression *λυχνιαῖον φῶς*, which is absent from Didymus.

Scholion X is a composition by Cassian himself. As regards his vocabulary, however, he draws heavily on Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Didymus. Besides, he reveals himself to be a sixth-century author by availing himself of the Aristotelian expression *κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργεῖν*, which was canvassed by his contemporary John Philoponus. In other respects, however, Cassian's vocabulary and mood at this point are profoundly influenced by a specific passage from Gregory of Nyssa writing in honour of his brother Basil of Caesarea.

The entire **Scholion XI** was penned by Cassian quoting from Didymus' commentary on Revelation verbatim.

Scholion XII was written by Cassian following Didymus, in all probability verbatim from his lost Commentary on the Apocalypse.

Scholion XIII was penned by Cassian himself building further on the previous one. He wished to present his own view of the ideas treated by Didymus in **Scholion XII**.

The first paragraph of **Scholion XIV** is a short comment by Cassian. He subsequently quotes Rev. 2:17 and thereafter quotes from Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse.

Scholion XV is distinctly close to Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse, yet there are points which suggest adaptation by Cassian himself.

Scholion XVI is a quotation from Didymus' own Commentary on the Apocalypse.

Cassian wrote **Scholion XVII** under the influence of Theodoret and Chrysostom, while Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse was still on his table.

Scholion XVIII was written by Cassian after Didymus, but at the same time he was satisfied that Theodoret shared the same point of view.

Scholion XIX was written by Cassian following Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse, but Cassian applied his own awareness of the language of Eusebius.

Scholion XX is a quotation from Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse, which Cassian seems to use mostly to the letter, while sometimes using his own vocabulary, which seems to draw on either Theodoret or John Philoponus or both.

In **Scholion XXI** Cassian continues to quote from Didymus' commentary on Revelation literatim.

Scholion XXII was written by Cassian having Didymus' commentary in front of him. Nevertheless, he employed his own vocabulary at certain points, including phraseology pointing to Gregory of Nyssa, who had influenced Cassian. Besides, the proof-texts that reveal the hand of Didymus come, for the most

⁵⁸⁵ Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 319; *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 339; *commZacch*, 1.184; 2.222; *Adversus Manichaeos*, PG.39.1097.11; *commPs* 20–21, Codex pp. 24; 56; *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 185; *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 258; *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 300; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 154; *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 93. *frPs(al)*, frs. 1; 46; 163; 661a; 1182; 1246; *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 39.

⁵⁸⁶ Cf. John Climacus, *Scala Paradisi*, 26, column 1088 (*bis*). John of Damascus, *Expositio Fidei*, 96. Theodore Studites, *Μεγάλη Κατήχησις*, Catechesis 28, p. 197; Catechesis 67, p. 473; Catechesis 78, p. 45; Catechesis 84, p. 590; Catechesis 104, p. 761; *Epistulae*, Epistles 24; 25; 225; 361; 395; 497.

part, from catenae fragments, notably from the *Fragmenta in Psalmos altera*.

Scholion XXIII is a personal comment by Cassian having in mind not Didymus, but his readings of Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Theodoret.

Scholion XXIV is one more comment by Cassian himself. He is eager to introduce it with the statement ‘Paul concurs with these words’, which illustrates his overall aim while writing this composition: this was to demonstrate that the text of Revelation is in harmony with the rest of scripture. While writing this Scholion, his mind was with the Antiochene doctors rather than with Didymus.

Scholion XXV is Cassian’s own, which he wrote under the influence of Antiochene intellectuals, even though it would have been impossible to expel Didymus from his mind. At the same time, however, this comment brings to the fore the author’s remarkable Aristotelian erudition, as well as a later debate on certain Aristotelian ideas.

Nevertheless, Cassian was bound to return to Didymus once again. **Scholion XXVI** has unique characteristics fitting only Didymus, which means that this is a plain quotation from his Commentary on the Apocalypse.

Scholion XXVII by and large reproduces Didymus’ Commentary on the Apocalypse, with Cassian contributing vocabulary from his own readings (Plutarch, Gregory of Nyssa), such as the expressions τὰ ἐμφορόμενα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ, ἐλάττωσις τῆς φύσεως, and perhaps σφίγγεται τὸ βιβλίον, which might belong to Didymus, as discussed in the expanded note.

Scholion XXVIII by and large reproduces Didymus’ Commentary on the Apocalypse, with Cassian applying his own phraseology, which is partially taken up from Gregory of Nyssa.

As regards **Scholion XXIX**, the first part of it is by and large a quotation from Didymus. Cassian even maintained Didymus’ vernacular, yet he also put his own Antiochene seal thereon, such as the designation δεσπότης for Christ and the technically incorrect vocative σωτήρ. The latter reveals not only Antiochene extraction, but also connection with the

Akoimetan community. The second part is a remark by Cassian himself, essaying to affiliate the specific passage of Revelation (Rev. 5:8) with both Testaments, which he actually does by quoting 1 Peter, 2:5 and Malachi, 1:11. This was in general Cassian’s principal aim in composing these Scholia.

Scholion XXX is a most interesting text, highly indicative of Cassian’s setting no firm boundaries between ‘Alexandria’ and ‘Antioch’, since he draws on them both. I have arranged the text in paragraphs, according to the sources Cassian avails himself of. The overall idea occurred to Cassian from the imagery of the Revelation text which he was going to comment on, namely, the ‘horses’, which represent the powers through which God’s ‘wrath’ is to be administered to the world, according to the eschatological imagery which follows shortly.⁵⁸⁷ The author who supplied Cassian with the problem was Origen, notably a passage from the *Contra Celsum*. ‘While the free will of each man is preserved, and even if God makes use of the wickedness of evil men to order the whole, arranging them so as they may serve the universe, yet such a man is nonetheless blameworthy and as a blameworthy one he has been appointed to perform a certain function, which is repulsive to an individual but beneficial to the whole’.⁵⁸⁸

This is of course a Stoic idea fully employed by Origen. The problem Cassian sets out to treat is the theodicy of the Christian God, to whom ‘anger’ is often ascribed, especially in the book of Revelation. The first paragraph is an introduction to the question: he asserts that there are ‘certain holy powers’ assigned with implementing punishments inflicted by God upon human beings. This part draws on Didymus. Furthermore, in the second paragraph, ‘since’ the Book of Revelation ‘is going to make reference to the *wrath of God*’, Cassian draws on Origen, who had taught that this notion of divine wrath should not be taken in the ordinary human sense (as an ‘accidental passion’, thus put in Aristotelian terms). With respect to God, this ‘wrath’ should be identified with ‘the devil’, through whom plagues are inflicted upon men. The third paragraph introduces the question of human freedom in relation to human responsibility. Cassian returns to the old question⁵⁸⁹

⁵⁸⁷ Rev. 6:16–18; also in Rev. 14:10; 16:19; 19:15.

⁵⁸⁸ *Cels*, IV.70. Cf. *Princ*, II.9.2; *homJer*, 12, 5.

⁵⁸⁹ Cf. Origen, *Cels*, IV.72. Cassian is the sole author to use Origen’s peculiar expression εἰς χρεῖαν κατατάσσεσθαι, which occurs in *Cels*, *deOr*, and in **Scholion XXX** (see note 16 to the Greek text).

of two scriptural passages (2 Kings, 24:1, on the one hand, and 1 Paralipomenon, 21:1, on the other), which appear to introduce an egregious incongruity. It is at that point that Cassian quotes from Theodoret *literatim*, since he was the sole author to have written a treatise on 1 Paralipomenon and was praised by Photius for his solution. The last paragraph was written by Cassian availing himself of Eusebius' notion of 'universal judgement' (καθολικὴ κρίσις) and the notion of God judging both angels and men, especially angels with regard to whether they carried out the task of supervising humans properly, or not. The vocabulary that he uses at this point is notably an Origenistic one, indeed to such an extent that I should have thought that Cassian might have quoted from a non-extant work of Origen. I only stop short of drawing this conclusion only because in the second paragraph Cassian does the same (that is, draws on Origen): since we have the parallel portion from *Contra Celsum*, we are able to see Cassian emulating Origen's style and yet not quoting from him word for word.

Scholion XXXI is a quotation from Didymus' commentary on Revelation. In his *In Zachariam*, 3.66–73, Didymus had put forward the same analysis in identical terms. He advises that he had already expounded those ideas in his commentary on Revelation. This Scholion is part of the relevant point excerpted by Cassian from Didymus' commentary. In all probability, Cassian quoted this to the letter, since he returns to make his own comment on the same theme of Revelation, which is the text of the ensuing **Scholion XXXII**.

Scholion XXXII is a personal note by Cassian, following (and commenting on the same subject as) the previous one, which was entirely a quotation from Didymus. This is also one more token of Cassian's having studied not only Eusebius and Theodoret, but also John Philoponus.

The phraseology of **Scholion XXXIII** is Cassian's own. It stands closer to Philoponus, his contemporary Christian and Aristotelian commentator. Following **Scholion XXXII**, Cassian carries on with one more comment of his own, even though Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse was wide open on his table while he was writing, providing him with some characteristic terms and verb-forms.

Scholion XXXIV is couched in phraseology characteristic of Didymus, which means this is a quotation from his Commentary on the Apocalypse.

Scholion XXXV is another scholion written by Cassian himself.

Scholion XXXVI has all the indications of an independent text and was written by Cassian. He was considerably influenced by the vocabulary of Origen (e.g. ἀλλὰ μήποτε), as well by his thought (e.g. the notion of 'wheel'). The expression ὁ προφήτης τάχα μὲν δηλοῖ, which has a unique parallel in Origen,⁵⁹⁰ may well mean that Cassian is not only the author of this Scholion, but also the excerptor from Origen's commentary on Lamentations.

For all affinities traced at some points, **Scholion XXXVII** has a standing of its own and is one written by Cassian himself, drawing on Origen as well as his reception by Didymus and Gregory of Nyssa.

Let me now turn to **Scholion XXXVIII**. Following a brief opening sentence written by Cassian, we arrive at the domain of Irenaeus. For the text of **Scholion XXXVIII** folio 287v onwards is a passage from Book V of Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses*. This text occupies the rest of folio 287v and folios 288r, 288v, 289r, 289v to the end of the page. At that point, the text of Irenaeus is suddenly interrupted (ἀνακεφαλαιούμενος δὲ καὶ . . .), which may mean that one folio is missing, and that the ensuing one on 290 was initially the 291, since the pagination of the codex is a twentieth-century addition.

This discontinuity appears also in the next folio 290r, which commences with a quotation from Rev. 14:3²–14:5 (οἱ ἡγορασμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς . . . ἄμωμοί γάρ εἰσιν). However, the immediately following **Scholion XXXIX** is a comment on Rev. 13:18², which is quoted at the beginning of this (Ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν χξζ'). This **Scholion XXXIX** occupies the entire folio 290r, to be also suddenly interrupted, with folio 290v (the last of Codex 573) left blank. The Greek text of **Scholion XXXIX** has, at almost all points, Latin parallels in the translation of Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses*, Book V.⁵⁹¹

This means that although Rev. 14:3²–14:5 is quoted on folio 290r, the ensuing **Scholion XXXIX** (on the rest of folio 290r) is actually a comment on Rev. 13:18². This is

⁵⁹⁰ Origen: προφήτης τάχα οὖν δηλοῖ. *frLam*, 23.

⁵⁹¹ Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses* see above, p. 71, note 532.

apparently due to the author's having already discussed the meaning of 'the virgin men' in [Scholia XXXI](#) and [XXXII](#).

Therefore, the text of Rev. 13:18–14:3¹ (Καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἰδοῦ . . . αἱ ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες) is missing. It can be inferred that this text is quoted in the missing folio – which must have been extracted before 1908, the year when N. Béés wrote page numbers in his own hand on the top right margin of each folio. Therefore the passage Rev. 13:18²–14:5 was quoted on the missing folio, after the quotation from Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses*, V.28–30 was complete. The last folio 290r (which should be 291r) is the last part of this quotation, and is actually the end of Irenaeus' work (V.30.3).

The person who quoted from Irenaeus is the one who ordered and sponsored the original of the entire Codex: this was monk Cassian, the Roman (Κασσιανὸς ὁ Ῥωμαῖος μοναχός). Folio 290r has a note on its upper margin that reads thus: κασιανου του ρομεου μου intending Κασσιανοῦ τοῦ Ῥωμαίου μοναχοῦ. This note, which was added by a hand other than the scribe's, indicates that this compilation belongs to Cassian, the patron and sponsor of the original book (which is indicated in the first-page heading of the Codex). The person who wrote this note knew that the Scholia were the product of Cassian's pen.

Cassian chose to turn to Irenaeus' analysis because the bishop of Lyon was the one who had elaborated on the question of 'the number of the beast'. Nevertheless, Cassian was selective, probably owing to the limited space left in the Codex. As a matter of fact, once we study the text of Irenaeus which Cassian quotes, we can identify the content of the missing folio. In 287v, [Scholion XXXVIII](#) continues with a passage from *Adversus Haereses*, V.28, opening of §2 (ὁ ἀπόστολός φησιν· ἀνθ' ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐδέξαντο, that is, quoting 2 Thess. 2:10–11). When Irenaeus includes a long quotation of Rev. 13:2–14¹, Cassian skips this and quotes Irenaeus' short comment. Then again Cassian skips a quotation of Rev. 13:15–17¹, to quote another comment by Irenaeus (288r–288v, and so also on 289r). The following is an interesting point: when Cassian comes to the last line of folio 289r, and in

view of shortage of space,⁵⁹² he notes within the text, καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα ('and after other comments' [by Irenaeus], who, however, is not mentioned by name), he skips part of V.29.1 to quote the last few lines of it. Therefore, we have the first and last part of Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses*, V.29.1 in Greek. Folio 289v quotes the final part of this section and part of V.29.2 verbatim. Then there is the missing folio, which presumably quoted selected parts of Irenaeus' V.29.2–V.30.1 and 2. Of folio 290, only 290r is written, its content being a quotation of Rev. 14:3²–14:5 followed by the first few lines of Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses*, V.30.3. This is precisely the text of [Scholion XXXIX](#). The important point which should be made is that the text of Revelation that is quoted in this final section continues to be the one used in the entire body of Scholia, namely the one known as 2351. Cassian selected from Irenaeus' text only the bishop's comments, and retained his own version of the text of Revelation which he used throughout the Scholia, and which was the one produced in a Syriac/Antiochene milieu.

The designation σχόλιον

When another scribe took over from Theodosius in [Scholion V](#), he saw fit to place the indication EP (for Ἑρμηνεία, 'interpretation') on the left margin, near the first words of each Scholion. Most of them, but not all, have this indication, which I have preserved in this edition. The passage of the Apocalypse preceding each Scholion is numbered with a Greek letter, which I retain, too, as indeed I also include the corresponding pagination of the codex in the right margin. It is evident that the indication EP did not exist in the original: this was an innovation by the second scribe. It is noteworthy that the text of each Scholion continues on the same line after the preceding portion of Revelation which corresponds to it. This means that the scriptural text was in fact a quotation within a continuous text, with this text followed by Scholia, which in turn were followed by the next passage of Revelation, without moving to the next line at all.

The indication EP by the scribe need not detain us. The term Ἑρμηνεία ('interpretation') means rendering of the full theological import of a text. We

⁵⁹² However, if one assumes that Codex 573 is a precise copy of Cassian's companion ('The Book of Cassian') in terms of shape and volume (not merely of content), he did not use all the pages

available to him. Folio 295v is blank, since Irenaeus' analyses were of no further interest to him: he had already had enough of Irenaeus' Millenarist ideas, which he did not share.

do not consider at this point ἔρμηνεία in the sense of translating a text from one language in another; in the case of the scriptural text, the Septuagint, Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion are all called ἑρμηνευταί.

On the other hand, σχόλιον ('comment') is either a short part of the 'interpretation', many of which make up the whole, i.e. the 'interpretation'. There can of course be a 'comment' on a certain 'interpretation'.

A 'comment' (σχόλιον) indicates not only shortness, but also leisure: σχολή means relaxed idleness, from which the term σχολή ('school') is derived. Etymological lexica always associated them: a 'comment', being the product of intensive reflection, demands intellectual serenity, peace, and leisure.⁵⁹³ A 'comment' is the core of a certain understanding; still this is always partial, fragmentary, and relatively short. According to an unrefined approach, 'comment' and 'interpretation' are by and large identified.⁵⁹⁴ As far as I can tell, this is a remark made by Anastasius of Sinai, and was then reproduced from one lexicon to another, though not invariably.⁵⁹⁵ However, there was awareness of the distinction. Despite the definition which Photius employs in his lexicon, he knows of 'interpretations' (ἑρμηνείας) and 'comment' (σχόλιον) as two different things, as above. It is one thing to refer to Cyril of Alexandria's *interpretation* of the epistle to the Hebrews; but it is quite another to refer to his 'comments', which point to short fragmentary remarks, indeed not comprehensive analyses, of entire treatises or works.⁵⁹⁶ This is the sense in which remarks such as this are made: 'so I found in a commentary

on the Iliad' (οὕτως εὗρον σχόλιον ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἰλιάδος).⁵⁹⁷

If a 'comment' (σχόλιον) becomes too extensive, then it might be called a 'memorandum' (ὑπόμνημα); and if an entire treatise is embraced and explained, then we have an 'interpretation' (ἑρμηνεία) or 'exegesis' (ἐξήγησις), which are normally treated as synonyms and amount to an organized 'commentary', in other words, a treatise or monograph. The works which Aristotelian commentators produced are not simply comments on Aristotelian passages, they are in fact treatises in their own right.

All this terminology has not always been followed strictly, since there were other factors involved, such as the modesty of a particular author. Clement calls each of his *Stromateis* an ὑπόμνημα,⁵⁹⁸ thus identifying ὑπόμνημα and ἑρμηνεία. Cyril of Alexandria makes the identification explicitly in his title (ἑρμηνεία ἡγουν ὑπόμνημα).⁵⁹⁹ Alexander of Aphrodisias styled his treatise on the first book of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* an ὑπόμνημα.⁶⁰⁰ So did Aspasius entitling ὑπόμνημα his treatise commenting on the *Nicomachean Ethics* of Aristotle;⁶⁰¹ so did Eustratius,⁶⁰² another commentator on Aristotle. Commentary on 'the six days' (εἰς τὴν ἑξαήμερον) of Genesis, ascribed to Eustathius of Antioch, also bore this title.⁶⁰³ Diogenes Laertius entitles treatises written by philosophers ὑπομνήματα.⁶⁰⁴ Galen also opts for the term ὑπόμνημα in some of the titles of his commentaries on Hippocrates' works.⁶⁰⁵ This is also the term Origen opts for at a couple of points,⁶⁰⁶ yet he actually favours the term ἑρμηνεία.⁶⁰⁷ The term ὑπόμνημα is used in titles of the commentaries by

⁵⁹³ *Etymologicum Gudianum*, Alphabetic entry sigma, p. 519: Σχόλιον, διὰ τὸ κατὰ σχολὴν παρατίθεσθαι πρὸς σαφεστέραν ἑρμηνείαν τῶν δυσνοήτων ὀνομάτων ἢ ῥημάτων ἐπὶ τοῖς λογίοις. *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 741: Σχόλιον: Εἴρηται διὰ τὸ κατὰ σχολὴν παρατίθεσθαι πρὸς σαφεστέραν ἑρμηνείαν τῶν δυσνοήτων ῥημάτων. Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter sigma, p. 1701: Σχόλιον. ἢ ἑρμηνεία. διὰ τὸ κατὰ σχολὴν περιτίθεσθαι πρὸς σαφεστέραν ἑρμηνείαν τῶν δυσνοήτων νοημάτων ἢ ῥημάτων.

⁵⁹⁴ Cf. three lexica reproducing the same definition. Photius, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter sigma, p. 563. *Suda*, lexicon, Alphabetic letter sigma, entry 1804. Lexica Segueriana, *Collectio Verborum Utilium e Differentibus Rhetoribus et Sapientibus Multis*, p. 379. Σχόλια: σεμνολογήματα· ἢ ὑπομνήματα καὶ ἑρμηνεῖαι.

⁵⁹⁵ Anastasius of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, 2.8. The actual definition by Anastasius is the one reproduced in Pseudo-Zonaras' *Lexicon*.

⁵⁹⁶ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 229, 257b: Κύριλλον τε τὸν σοφὸν . . . καὶ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Ἐβραίους ἑρμηνείας καὶ ἐκ τῶν σχολίων.

This is the meaning of ἑρμηνεία also in Anastasius of Sinai, (n. 595 above). Ibid. 10.7.

⁵⁹⁷ *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 42.

⁵⁹⁸ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 1.1.1.1.

⁵⁹⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 1, p. 1.

⁶⁰⁰ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 1.

⁶⁰¹ Aspasius, *Commentaria in Ethica Nichomachea*, p. 95.

⁶⁰² Eustratius of Nicaea, *In Aristotelis Analyticorum Posteriorum Commentarius*, p. 1.

⁶⁰³ Pseudo-Eustathius of Antioch, *Commentarius in Hexaemeron*, p. 708.

⁶⁰⁴ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 1.16.

⁶⁰⁵ Galen, *In Hippocratis de Natura Hominis Librum Commentarii* iii, v. 15, p. 108; *In Hippocratis de Victu Acutorum*, v. 15, p. 418.

⁶⁰⁶ Origen, *Cels*, II.13; *commJohn*, VI.15.92; XX.1.1.

⁶⁰⁷ Cf. the title of his treatise of free will: Origen, *Princ*, 3.1.2. *Philocalia*, 21.1.

Chrysostom on the two epistles to the Thessalonians,⁶⁰⁸ but we have four other works of his where the term ἐρμηνεία is used in the title.⁶⁰⁹

As to Theodoret, two commentaries are styled ὑπόμνημα, yet the term is not his own: the heading states ‘by the blessed Theodoret’ (τοῦ μακαρίου), which evinces that Theodoret was not alive when this title was written by a scribe.⁶¹⁰ Instead, all the headings written by Theodoret’s hand invariably designate his treatises ἐρμηνεία.⁶¹¹ Theodoret knew Greek as well as only few intellectuals did. His titles consistently apply the correct term to the treatises he composed. He was not alone in being conscious of this, since Didymus had made plain what later centuries obscured: ὑπόμνημα is only a short exegesis. This is somewhat longer than a mere ‘comment’ (σχόλιον), yet it is always a brief account. If it is extended, it should be given the title ὑπόμνημα. Likewise, once the exegesis of a work comprises such longer remarks, the entire work is entitled ὑπόμνημα. If the explanation of a certain issue sets out to be a λόγος ὑπομνηματικός, it has to be brief, not expanded. At a certain point, Didymus makes an implicit reference to the Gnostics in order to rebut them, yet he does not proceed to a full-scale analysis, since, as he says, his reference was only intended to be a short excursus, which does not allow for long analyses.⁶¹² He styles this λόγος ὑπομνηματικός, that is, relatively short and condensed.

On the other hand, Didymus refers to his works as ὑπομνήματα, which has to be taken as a special case. No doubt this is a modest appellation employed for his own works, which, being blind, he used to dictate. Didymus is a unique case, owing to his specific condition and the need to dictate rather than write himself. We should then be content with his reference to his own works as ὑπομνήματα.

Therefore, if the entire exegesis on Revelation is designated either as an ὑπόμνημα or ἐρμηνεία

according to tradition, obviously any part of it should be only a ‘comment’ (σχόλιον). The scribe, or the person who read the Scholia to the scribes, evidently regarded them as ἐρμηνεῖαι, since the Scholia have the indication EP written on the left margin. This however was not the invariable approach: this indication enters the text only after the scribe Theodosius (who wrote no indication such as EP) had handed over the task to the next scribe, who saw fit to add EP on the left margin. This is why the comment following *Scholion XXIV* is specified as σχ (meaning, σχόλιον), in the hackneyed sense of ‘a short comment’.

The term ἐρμηνεία is definitely not fitting, unless it purports to ‘explain’ the specific passage of Revelation relative to it. However, the comments do not set out to *explain* the theological meaning of a passage, they only mean to show its inherent coherence with the rest of scripture. They are *partial* exegeses, short notes for a specific purpose, not full expositions of any integral exegesis of each passage. We should therefore use the term σχόλιον for each of these comments, but we should bear in mind that their author added no specific title or heading of this kind.

Two more observations should be made about the pious monk who transcribed most of the present codex. He himself tells us that it is he who wrote the text of Revelation in Codex 573, but his handwriting can be recognized on other pages, too. That this ‘Book of Cassian’ was written in an Antiochene/Syriac milieu has now been made clear. According to a testimony by a valuable as well as rare source,⁶¹³ a monk Theodosius was described as ‘the skilful teacher’ in an appendix (added at the end of the twelfth century) to the Zafaran manuscript transcribed in the year 1000. His name is also mentioned by the table containing the names of the Syriac doctors in the handwriting of Isaac the Saved, Metropolitan of Cyprus. One might wonder whether this Theodosius was the

⁶⁰⁸ John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam i ad Thessalonicenses Commentarius*, PG.62.391.26t; *In Epistolam ii ad Thessalonicenses Commentarius*, PG.62.467.39.

⁶⁰⁹ John Chrysostom, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.39.47; *In Epistolam ad Romanos Commentarius*, PG.60.391.4; *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos Commentarius*, PG.63.9.6; Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *intDan*, PG.56.193.4; *Interpretatio Orationis Pater Noster*, PG.59.627.7.

⁶¹⁰ Theodoret, *intProphXII*, PG.81.1545.8; *intDan*, PG.81.1256.23.

⁶¹¹ Theodoret, *commIs*, title; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.857.16 (title); *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.28.3 (title) &

PG.81.49.3 (title); *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.865.22 (title); *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.496.3 (title); *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.808.3 (title); *intProphXII*, PG.81.1634.3 (title); so on pp. 1873; 1809; 1860; 1552; 1837; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.505.3 (title); so in PG.82.460.9 (title); PG.82.557.22 (title); PG.82.225.38 (title); so on pp. 36; 44; 376; 592; 1664; 1710; 1720; 1741; 1788; 1960.

⁶¹² Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.185: ἄρκεστέον τοῖς ἐκτεθεῖσιν, ἵνα μὴ πέρα τοῦ δέοντος μηκυνθῇ ὁ λόγος ὃν ὑπομνηματικός.

⁶¹³ Ignatius Aphram Barsoum, Patriarch, *The Scattered Pearls: A History of Syriac Literature and Sciences*, tr. Matti Moosa (Piscataway, NJ, 2003), pp. 370–371.

monk scribe from the Stylite (Pillar) Monastery, who transcribed the *Divine Providence* by the Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch Cyriacus (793–817) in 806, if it was not copied by another scribe of the same name in Melitene around the tenth century. One thing is certain: Codex 573 is a Sabaite book, and no matter who Theodosius was, he was at the time a monk of the Laura of Sabas.

Mention of ‘monk Theodosius’ is also made by Photius, who read a book of his ‘against John Philoponus rejecting the resurrection of bodies’.⁶¹⁴ We also have letters to ‘monk Theodosius’ by both Photius⁶¹⁵ and an Anonymous Professor who lived at the turn of ninth to tenth century.⁶¹⁶ All three epistles evince a monk who is an intellectual as well as apprehensive about the problems of his era. However, there is no evidence that he engaged in transcribing books. Therefore, a Sabaite monk Theodosius of Syria is likely to have transcribed Cassian’s Book in the early ninth century. This also fits well with the palaeography of the specific handwriting of Codex 573, which is recognized as a Sabaite hand.

The initial edition

The Scholia, in the form edited and published by A. Harnack and K. Diobouniotis in 1911, have never been unanimously accepted as a work of Origen’s.⁶¹⁷

Nevertheless, too much has been made of Origen’s mention of a commentary on Revelation that he purportedly wrote.⁶¹⁸ No allowance has been made for the possibility that Origen eventually may have unable or unwilling to go ahead with this project, or to satisfy himself with the fact that (virtually) most of his commentary on Revelation *ipso facto* was included in his commentary on the gospel of John. It seems, however, that this statement was fatal to the position of Harnack, who resolved to ascribe the Scholia to Origen.⁶¹⁹ Some scholars (inevitably taking into account the prestige of that busy authority) employed Harnack’s attribution to Origen;⁶²⁰ others appeared hesitant, and only a few were dismissive.⁶²¹ This set of Scholia then lay fallow, and the text itself is, to date, of no avail to scholarship. Harnack was in fact all too quick to publish this text, which was handed over to him by the Greek scholar K. Diobouniotis. The reason for this haste, according to the final remarks of Harnack, was that he wished to publish in time for a new edition of the New Testament in preparation at the time, so that the specific text of Revelation could be accounted for in the critical apparatus.⁶²² Hence he issued his verdict attributing the Scholia to Origen, after having studied the text for a couple of months. I myself was slower: the project occupied four years of my life, including a one-year sabbatical.

⁶¹⁴ Photius *Bibliotheca*, Codex 22, p. 5a: Ἀνεγνώσθη Θεοδοσίου μονάζοντος τῶν τῷ Φιλοπόνῳ Ἰωάννῃ παραληφθέντων χρήσεων κατὰ τῆς τῶν σωμάτων ἀναστάσεως ἐσπουδασμένη ἀνατροπή, καὶ παράθεσις ῥητῶν γραφικῶν τε καὶ πατρικῶν εἰς ἔλεγχον τῆς Ἰωάννου ματαιοπονίας.

⁶¹⁵ Photius, *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, Epistle 118: ‘to Theodosius, monk and hesychast’.

⁶¹⁶ Anonymous Professor, *Epistulae*, 45 and 122.

⁶¹⁷ Although in his final remark, Harnack opts to cast some doubt on his ascription (‘Wir müssen also die Frage, ob unser Text der Origenes-Text sei, in suspenso lassen’, p. 81), the fact is that he made this triumphant attribution in the title of his book.

⁶¹⁸ Origen, *commMatt*, § 49: ‘Omnia haec [sc. Rev. 12:3 f] exponere . . . non est temporis huius: exponetur autem tempore suo in revelatione Iohannis.’

⁶¹⁹ K. Diobouniotis and A. Harnack, (n. 22 above), p. 45.

⁶²⁰ E. Klostermann, ‘Des Origenes Scholien-Kommentar zur Apocalypse Johannis’, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 37 (1912) 73–74. A. Robinson, ‘Origen’s comments on the Apocalypse’, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 13 (1912) 295–97. C. H. Turner, ‘The text of the newly discovered Scholia of Origen on the Apocalypse’, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 13, (1912) 386–397. *Id.* ‘Document: Origen Scholia in Apocalypsin’, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 25 (1923), 1–16. G. Wohlenberg conceded the ascription with some reservations: ‘Noch einiges zu dem Scholien-Kommentar (des Origenes) zur Offenbarung Johannis’, *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, 33 (1912), 217–220. J. F. T. Kelly thought that he had found medieval

testimony that Origen had made Revelation an ad hoc concern of his: ‘Early Medieval evidence for twelve homilies by Origen on the Apocalypse’, *Vigiliae Christianae*, 39 (1985), 273–279.

⁶²¹ F. Diekamp, deemed it possible for *Scholia XIV, XV, XX, XXX, XXXII, and XXXVI* to be Origen’s. He expressed doubt about XXII and XXVI (and determined V to have been written by Clement, XXXVIII and XXXIX by Irenaeus). See F. Diekamp reviewing the initial edition of the Scholia, in *Theologische Revue*, 11 (1912) 51–55. De Boysson saw similarities with Clement in *Scholia V, IX, XII*, and with Origen in *IV, VI, VII, IX, XI, XV, XVIII, XXI, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXX* and *XXXI*: A. de Boysson, ‘Avons-nous un commentaire d’Origène sur l’Apocalypse?’, *Revue Biblique Internationale*, NS 10 (1913) 555–567. D. Strathmann, 1923, 231 n. 1 and J. Quasten, *Patrology* (Allen, Tx., 1975), II.46, dismiss the hypothesis that this is a work by Origen: D. Strathmann, ‘Origenes und die Johannesoffenbarung’, *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 34 (1923) 228–236. So did J. Schmid, who made the ascription to ‘Pseudo-Origen’: J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*, 1 Teil, (Munich, 1955), p. 158.

⁶²² K. Diobouniotis – A. Harnack (n. 22 above), p. 81: ‘Ich habe den Druck dieser Blätter beschleunigt, um sie ihm vor Abschluß seiner großen Ausgabe des Neuen Testaments noch zu unterbreiten’. He refers to Hermann von Soden. Although Harnack placed Diobouniotis’s name first in the book-title, he speaks in first person throughout this book, and he does so also in all the emendations (he actually) made. At a few points, he simply records in footnotes the dissenting opinion of Diobouniotis on specific emendations.

It was my initial decision to rely on Harnack's edition for the text of the Codex, until I was granted access to the Codex itself. Although I thought this might be of merely personal rather than scientific value (following years of continuous intensive work on the Scholia), my visit to Meteora turned out to be a stunning surprise.

One cannot help but study Harnack's edition with ambivalence. On the one hand, there is an indisputable erudition. On the other, there are fatal flaws in the text. The discrepancies between Harnack's supposed text of the Codex and what I actually read in the Codex myself were by no means insignificant. Too many words were misread, or misrendered, or indeed misspelled, with others being omitted altogether. Besides, the editor did not make use of typography to indicate within the text which were his own emendations. I had therefore to read the codex *ab ovo* as if no edition of it had ever existed at all, since the edition available to me had turned out to be a dangerously misleading one. I saw no reason to cite the points where Harnack's text deviates from the codex, even though omitted or misread words are sometimes critical for identifying the author of the Scholia.⁶²³ Anyone interested can easily juxtapose my text with the previous one. Even before my several visits to Meteora I was, however, surprised that A. Harnack, C. H. Turner, and other scholars had not seen some telling points which needed emendation. When the scribe writes ἀνοιγμένως νοήσας ('understood openly', which makes no sense), it is unfortunate that the erudite Harnack emended this to ἀνεωγμένως νοήσας ('understood openly'), simply using the same verb in a phrase that makes no sense either way. Worse still, C. H. Turner applauded this nonsensical emendation by Harnack. However, had they emended to ἀνηγμένως ('understood in an anagogical manner'), an entire door would lie open ready to reveal some

secrets of this codex, since *anagogical* exegesis is clearly denoted here, as it is indeed at another point, too. By the same token, in [Scholion XXXVII](#) an adjective was needed instead of the Codex's adverb ἐπὶ πλεῖον. This adjective does in fact exist, although unknown to modern lexicographers: this is ἐπιπλείων, as I have discussed at the relevant point. Likewise, the Codex's reading κατεμαξευμένης is actually closest to the correct one κατημαξευμένη, which I propose. Harnack made this καθημαξευμένης, with C. H. Turner going along.

Although Harnack apparently refrained from being entirely categorical on his ascription of the Scholia to Origen, he was enthusiastic about the specific text of Revelation. To him, this is a text of 'the highest character of the tenth century'. 'Though it may not prove to be a rival to C, perhaps even not of A, it is at all events on a par with **K** and P, while it is certainly superior to the text of 046 and Andreas'.⁶²⁴

R. H. Charles rebutted this appraisal of the material by Harnack, yet he was at pains to show that this text of Revelation is not Origen's, rather than to discredit Harnack's argument, which is in effect not one of attribution but of appraisal of a certain manuscript.⁶²⁵ Charles' argument was ignored by C. H. Turner, who, only one year after Charles' book, published the second part of his comments on the Scholia, taking for granted that they were the product of Origen's pen.⁶²⁶ The attitudes of scholars towards the authorship of the Scholia varied, though they did not really dissent from each other *au fond*. Some of them immediately employed Harnack's ascription to Origen,⁶²⁷ others were moderate while favouring ascription to Origen;⁶²⁸ others appeared either hesitant or dismissive.⁶²⁹ Later still, P. Nautin argued in an appendix to his book that Origen never wrote any work on the Revelation, apart

⁶²³ The forms συνκαταβαίνειν ([Scholion XV](#)) and λημφθέντες ([Scholion XXIX](#)) actually existing in the manuscript were unduly emended to συγκαταβαίνειν and ληφθέντες, thus obscuring the presence of Didymus. Likewise, the participle γενόμενος of the MS ([Scholia XXI, XXV](#)) is perfectly acceptable and should not have been emended to γένόμενος, since this brilliantly testifies to the person of Didymus.

⁶²⁴ K. Diobouniotis and A. Harnack, n. 22 above, p. 81.

⁶²⁵ R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1920), vol. 1, pp. clxxvi–lxxvii.

⁶²⁶ C. H. Turner, 'The text of the newly discovered Scholia of Origen on the Apocalypse', [Scholia i–xxvii](#); *Journal of Theological Studies*, 13, (1912) 386–397. C. H. Turner, 'Document: Origen Scholia in Apocalypsin', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 25 (1923) 1–16.

⁶²⁷ See above, note 621.

⁶²⁸ Seuls Skard addressed the problem in 1936 focusing on some parallels of the Scholia found in Origen. 'Zum Scholien-Kommentar des Origenes zur Apokalypse Joannis', *Symbolae Osloenses*, 15–16 (1936) 204–208. His arguments related to [Scholia I, III, IV, VI, IX, XII, XV, XVII, XXI, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXVII](#).

⁶²⁹ See above, note 621. I have arrived at the attribution of [Scholion V](#) to Clement independently. I came upon works by German scholars at a later stage. Attribution to Stählin was made by C. H. Turner (p. 387), but he adduced no citation. My research identified O. Stählin, who presented his conclusion in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 32 (1912) 132–140. It seems that a similar suggestion was made by T. Schermann in *Theologische Revue*, 11 (1912) 29.

from scattered marginal comments on it in some works of his. It appeared to Nautin that the Scholia are Origenistic comments excerpted by someone who set out to copy them into the Codex of Meteora.⁶³⁰

We should, however, recollect a devastating question raised by R. H. Charles: how could these Scholia possibly be Origen's since the text of Revelation is not the text he used? 'It has nothing to do with the text Origen used', he rightly judges in light of some shrewd comparisons he makes.⁶³¹ It should be recalled that in the manuscript there is no distinction between the text of Revelation and the Scholia at all. All we have is a document in cursive script. Once a certain passage of Revelation is complete, the scribe does not even start the Scholion attached to it by moving to the next line. When this comment ends, the scribe proceeds to write down the next passage from Revelation without moving to the next line. There is no question whatsoever of Scholia written in 'margins' or the like.

Despite the apt remarks by R. H. Charles, C. H. Turner defiantly went on with publishing the last eleven Scholia, bravely and unreservedly ascribing the work to Origen, in the very same year that R. H. Charles made these remarks, namely, 1923. C. H. Turner was meantime advised that *Scholion V* is simply a passage by Clement of Alexandria. Still, he regarded the entire compilation as one made by Origen. This is why he dismisses the entire *Scholion XXXIX*, save a couple of lines at the beginning, simply because this is a passage by Irenaeus. The idea of another compiler drawing on different authors in order to make his own points did not occur to him. He insisted to the end that this was a work by Origen.

Different though the views of these scholars may be, they share a common characteristic: the desperately narrow scope of research.

Scholars engaged in a selective truffle-hunting, in order to attribute severally each of the Scholia (but not every one) to a Christian theologian. It was mostly felt that since Scholia XXXVIII and XXXIX should be

ascribed to Irenaeus and *Scholion V* is an excerpt from Clement of Alexandria, the whole point is to find out the author of each and every one of the rest of the Scholia. Of course, Origen was always the first option and in any case the discussion focused on whether a Scholion should, or should not, be ascribed to the Alexandrian. Following Harnack, many scholars contented themselves with pointing out that Origen had used this or that term or expression, which often resulted in several of them making a hasty and triumphant ascription to him. There seems to have been a tacit assumption that it suffices to find some terms occurring in Origen in order to make up one's mind, as if no other theologian had ever written in this world, or as if Origen had not exerted an enormous influence on theologians such as Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, or Didymus; or, as if Plutarch or Alexander of Aphrodisias had not exerted a decisive influence on Origen himself. Hence we come upon numerous cases where Origen had introduced a peculiar and inspired term just casually in order to make a point, and this term was thereafter taken up by his enthusiasts and was put to abundantly recurring use. Renowned though his influence is, there has been far too little concern to find Origenistic influence rather than Origen himself. In reflecting on this narrowness of scope, I have wondered whether this is owing to the name 'Origen' exerting an excessive sway on research, or if in fact the real culprit is the illustrious name 'Harnack', the indisputable authority who seems to have exerted a commanding influence following a hasty, infelicitous ascription of these Scholia.

Besides, germane research has taken for granted that in Late Antiquity theologians were borrowing only from other theologians. A few Philonians made allowance for Philo. Moreover, precisian men of the cloth throughout the empire were all too eager to discover Platonic terms in Christian writings, normally in order to satisfy the philomathy and rancour of those who appointed themselves either antipathetic critics of

⁶³⁰ P. Nautin, *Origène*, (Paris 1977), p. 449. A note on the following article is called for: E. Junod, 'A propos des soi-disant scholies sur l'Apocalypse d'Origène', *Rivista de Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* (Firenze) 20 (1984), 112–121. The author points out the comment by Didymus referring to Didymus himself having written a commentary on the Apocalypse, but he does nothing to associate Didymus with the Scholia except to point to the absence of germane research ('la recherche est loin d'être achevée', p. 120, n. 33). Instead, his hypothesis is that each of the Scholia was written in

different epochs and by different authors, to be later collected by some erudite person. Finally, a recent article purporting to give scholars access to existing Patristic commentaries on Revelation is poorly informed as far as the present topic is concerned (most of the bibliography cited in the present Introduction is absent), and there are mistakes (*Scholion V*, not XXV is an excerpt from Clement). Francis X. Gumerlock, 'Patristic Commentaries on Revelation', *Kerux*, 23 (2008) 3–13.

⁶³¹ R. H. Charles, (n. 625 above), p. clxxvi.

all theological aberration, or simply custodians of doctrinal integrity.

However, Christian theologians did not live in a vacuum and were not nurtured in a sterilized educational (let alone cultural) environment. Neither Didymus nor Theodoret nor Cassian could have ever been what they actually were, had they not studied Aristotle, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Plutarch, Galen, and Chrysippus. Defence of dogma and catechism is one thing, patrimony of erudition is quite another, and to this plain fact some Christian scholars of note were not alert. But how could they possibly have expressed themselves without this stock of knowledge (or, of language, at least) and make it serviceable to their own aims and aspirations? And how could a modern scholar possibly leave research into this background out of his duties, and restrict himself only to some theologians of the time?

I am therefore citing and quoting as heavily as necessary, so that what really happens with the Scholia, their language, and those involved with this intellectual armoury, can be judged by means of scholarship, not by mere conjecture or presumption. It will then turn out to be profitable to determine not only Christian and pagan writers who used a common stock of language and ideas, but also those who did not do so, which can also provide some inspiration for further research. Furthermore, such a wide scope is serviceable in order to discern inspiration from parrotry, breakthroughs from mimesis, knowledgeable usage from lip-service, barbarism from subtlety, a sycophant from a guileless one, pleonasm from learned finesse.

A wide horizon is necessary in order to determine, to the best of our ability, the scope, the purpose, the reasoning, and the possible trajectories of critical points of terminology. For instance, when the term ἀσυντρόχαστος ('incompatible with', 'impervious to', [Scholion XIX](#)) has not apparently been used in more than four instances, how did Simplicius come to use it, when the presumed precedents are only Origen (*De Oratione*, importantly not a catena-fragment, but a complete tract), and Didymus, in his Commentary on

the Psalms, plus [Scholion XXIX](#)? How could we remain apathetic to the fact that those who use the colloquial participle γενάμενος standing for γενόμενος (or, the future λήψομαι for λήψομαι, or the aorist ἐλήμην for ἐλήφην, or the verb συγκαταβαίνει for συγκαταβαίνει) are only a handful of specific authors, and Didymus stands out among them, sometimes being entirely unique? How could we possibly find out that, along with the extremely rare adjective μακαριοποιός ('imparting blessedness' could perhaps be an acceptable neologism, as rare as the Greek word itself, [Scholion III](#)) there is also a verb μακαριοποιεῖν (unknown to lexicographers)? For in fact Didymus is the sole author to use this adjective more than once, whereas usage in excerpts of his *commentarius alter* on the Psalms points to his catenist, who might have been either Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, or Anastasius of Sinai. And how is it that we find Cassian using extremely rare expressions and terms along with such intellectuals as Simplicius and Damascius? Could it have been that he had met them in Syria and conversed with them or heard some of their lessons? Or was it that Simplicius and Damascius had sought to discuss with an erudite Aristotelian such as Cassian in Constantinople, in order to find out what the actual message of his religion was? And, since it is to be taken for granted that Cassian came from Syria, what should we make of the testimony about a certain Cassian coming from Veroia of Syria who was 'a most qualified rhetor',⁶³² which in the sixth century suggested an intellectual of profound learning, not simply an orator?

There is also good reason to surmise that the version of *Philocalia* that is now available to us was reproduced in Cassian's milieu. The text of Revelation of [Scholion XXVII](#) renders Rev. 5:1 (about the 'book written within and on the back')⁶³³ ἔσωθεν ἔξωθεν.⁶³⁴ Whereas Origen has the Revelation text ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὀπίσθεν,⁶³⁵ the author of the Scholion has it ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν, which happens to be in Origen's foregoing quotation in *Philocalia*, 2.1, deviating from the rest of Origen's quotations. This ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν is also the

⁶³² Stephanus Byzantius (sixth cent.), *Ethnica*, p. 165: (Lemma) Βέροια· . . . ἔστι καὶ πόλις τῆς Συρίας, ἀφ' ἧς Κασσιανὸς ἄριστος ῥήτωρ.

⁶³³ Rev. 5:1: Καὶ εἶδον ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου βιβλίον γεγραμμένον ἔσωθεν καὶ ὀπίσθεν.

⁶³⁴ Scholia [XXVII](#): [EN XXVIIc](#).

⁶³⁵ Origen, *commJohn*, V.6.1 (so in *Philocalia*. 5.5); *ibid.* V.7.1 (so in *Philocalia*. 5.6). But in *Philocalia*, 2.1: ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν. Origen reads the scriptural text of Ezekiel 2:8–10 in the same way, 'ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὀπίσθεν' in *Cels*, VI.6; *selEz*, PG.13.773.7–19. However, in *selEz*, PG.13.772.43, the text reads ἔσωθεν καὶ ὀπίσθεν. Epiphanius also quotes Revelation ἔσωθεν καὶ ὀπίσθεν. *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 415. See [EN XXVIIc](#).

quotation by Hippolytus⁶³⁶ and of Gregory of Nyssa.⁶³⁷ Didymus rendered Ezekiel 2:8–10 ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν, too,⁶³⁸ and it would be plausible to assume that this is how he read the text of Revelation, which is also the quotation in the text of the Scholion drawing heavily on Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse. It is not plausible to assume that Origen read this passage of Revelation in two different versions, since his scriptural quotations are consistent throughout. The other plausible surmise that remains is that the *Philocalia*, as we now read it, was transcribed by Palestinian monks and that this is the text used by Cassian in his *Scholia in Apocalypsin*. The preface to this anthology is illuminating indeed. Although the editor accepts that this has been compiled by Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus, he is convinced that this has also been interpolated by Origenist scribes, since it contains doctrines about 'pre-existence of souls and the apokatastasis and the like' (τὸν περὶ προϋπάρξεως καὶ ἀποκαταστάσεως καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων δογμάτων). The phrase is typical of the sixth century, and it epitomized the obloquy against Origen. This version of the *Philocalia* was evidently transcribed by men who shared common beliefs and sympathies, as well as readings, with Cassian.

In like manner, the expression ὁμότιμος τριάς ('equally honoured, or equal in degree, Trinity'), although occurring in the minutes of Ephesus,⁶³⁹ is characteristic of writings closely related to Cassian and indeed writings of Cassian himself.⁶⁴⁰ There are other indications, too. The author of the *Philocalia* assures

the reader that he has drawn on 'the seventh book of the *Praeparatio Evangelica*' of Eusebius' of Palestine, where a certain Christian writer named Maximus is quoted. The text of this Maximus, the *Philocalia* goes on, 'has been put to verbatim use by Origen, in a dialogue of his against the Marcionites and other heretics'. In this dialogue, the Marcionite cause was supposedly advanced by a certain Megethius.⁶⁴¹ However, this statement is fraudulent. Neither in the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, nor anywhere else does Eusebius say anything about this. Likewise, Cassian's recurring expression, ταῦτα τοίνυν καὶ τὰ τοῦτοις ὅμοια, is a rhetorical expression coming from Classical times and was taken up by Hellenistic and Late Antique writers. Whereas neither Origen nor any of the three Cappadocians ever used the expression, it does appear in the *Philocalia*, 24.4. The expression occurs in writers and writings relating to Antioch (John Chrysostom, Theodoret), the Laura of Sabas (Antiochus of Palestine, Pseudo-John of Damascus, translations of Ephraem Syrus), and the Akoimetoι (Pseudo-Clement, Pseudo-Justin, Pseudo-Athanasius, Pseudo-Chrysostom, Theodore Studites).⁶⁴²

By the same token, the characteristic designation ἀρχικὴ τριάς ('original trinity'), was introduced by Origen,⁶⁴³ and taken up by only a couple of Christian authors,⁶⁴⁴ with Gregory of Nazianzus having done so particularly often.⁶⁴⁵ It can hardly be a coincidence that the idiom was used by Proclus, even though he eschewed the Christian notion,⁶⁴⁶ which was also used

⁶³⁶ Hippolytus, *In Daniele*, 4.34.2.

⁶³⁷ Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita atque Encomium Ephraem Syri*, PG.46.836.8. This is also his quotation of Ezekiel: *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 413.

⁶³⁸ Didymus, *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 286.

⁶³⁹ ACO, *Concilium Universale Ephesenum anno 431*, 1.1.7, p. 51: τὴς τριάδος ὁμοούσιον καὶ ὁμότιμον καὶ ὁμοδύναμον.

⁶⁴⁰ Theodoret, *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.456.45. Pseudo-Justin, *QetR*, p. 417B (Theodoret. *ibid.* p. 60). My suggestion is that this is a work by Cassian. *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), PG.39.604.20–21; *DT* (lib. 3), PG.39.781.6; *DT* (lib. 3), PG.39.928.47. *Analecta Hymnica Graeca*, 1.1.1.8 (line 75); 1.1.2.8 (line 39); 12.19.9 (line 3); 20.39.1.5 (line 42); 20.39.1.9 (line 49); 6.14.1 (line 46); 6.14.3 (line 51); 11.22.8 (line 11); 18.28.2.1 (line 10); 27.32.1.3 (line 39); 27.32.2.1 (line 13); 15.19.3 (line 6); 24.16.1.3 (line 84); 24.16.1.7 (line 86); 29.18.9 (line 60); 11.17.1.7 (line 74); 6.5.2.8 (line 29).

⁶⁴¹ Origen, *Philocalia*, 24.8: Ταῦτα ἀπὸ τοῦ ζ' λόγου τῆς Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παλαιστίναιου εὐαγγελικῆς προπαρασκευῆς ἦντληται, ὄντα ὡς φησιν Μαξίμου οὐκ ἀσήμου ἐν τοῖς χριστιανοῖς συγγραφέως. αὐτολεξεῖ δὲ ταῦτα ἡῤρηται κείμενα ἐν τῷ Ὑριγένους πρὸς Μαρκωνιστὰς καὶ ἄλλους αἰρετικῶς διαλόγῳ, Εὐτροπίου δικάζοντος, Μεγεθίου δὲ ἀντιλέγοντος.

⁶⁴² See NDGF pp. 272; 305–306

⁶⁴³ Origen, *commMatt*, 15.31: τῶν ὑποκάτω τῆς ἀρχικῆς τριάδος.

⁶⁴⁴ Zacharias Scholasticus (bishop, rhetor, theologian, fifth/sixth cent.), *Ammonius*, section 2, lines 1094–1095: περὶ τῆς ἀρχικῆς καὶ μακαρίας τριάδος. So in line 1130. Theodore Studites, *Epistulae*, Epistle 525: τῆς μακαρίας καὶ ἀρχικῆς Τριάδος. Epistle 532: τὴν πολυύμνητον, παντουργὸν καὶ ἀρχικὴν Τριάδα. *Canon in Requiem Monachi*, lines 163–166: Μονάδα τῇ φύσει σε, Τριάς, ἄνυμνῳ ἄναρχον, ἄκτιστον, ἀρχικὴν, βασιλικὴν, ὑπερτελεῖ ἐνάδα. *Parva Catechesis*, Catechesis 34: τῆς μακαρίας καὶ ἀρχικῆς Τριάδος. *Testamentum*, p. 1813: τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ ὁμοούσιον καὶ ἀρχικὴν Τριάδα.

⁶⁴⁵ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Apologetica*, PG.35.444.24–25: ὅσα περὶ τῆς ἀρχικῆς καὶ μακαρίας Τριάδος ὑποληπτέον. *Ad Gregorium Nysseum* (*orat.* 11), PG.35.840.27–28: τῷ φωτὶ τῆς μακαρίας καὶ ἀρχικῆς Τριάδος. *In Laudem Cypriani* (*orat.* 24), PG.35.1185.13–14: τῆς ἀρχικῆς καὶ βασιλικῆς Τριάδος τὴν θεότητα. *Carmina Moralia*, p. 688: Πρῶτην τε λαμπρὰν Τριάδος τῆς ἀρχικῆς.

⁶⁴⁶ Proclus, *Theologia Platonica*, v. 6, p. 35: καὶ τὴν μίαν πηγὴν τῆς δημιουργικῆς σειρᾶς εἰς τριάδα παντελῆ προαγαγόντες ἀρχικὴν, ἣν καὶ ὁ Πλάτων ἐνδεικνύμενος ἀρχὴν προσείρηκεν. p. 44: Ὅλως δὲ ὁ Ζεὺς Ποσειδῶνι μὲν καὶ Πλούτωνι συνταττόμενος ὁ τῆς ἀρχικῆς τριάδος ἐστὶν ἀκρότατος.

by Theodore Studites,⁶⁴⁷ whereas *De Trinitate* accords the expression to the Holy Spirit.⁶⁴⁸ In view of the scarcity of germane instances, to come upon this formula in the introduction to the *Philocalia* suggests that the opening note warning against heretical ideas included therein⁶⁴⁹ must have been written by a Studite monk. This author must have been Theodore Studites himself, after he had reproduced the book in his renowned scriptorium.

Likewise, the expression ἐπιπορεύεσθαι τῷ νῷ (canvassed in EN XVh), which denotes supervision and exploration through the mind (normally, the mind of God), appears in Origen, but only as a presumably second-hand expression by a catenist. One instance occurs in fragments from the commentary on John, and a second, in the *Philocalia* purporting to record from Origen's commentary on Genesis.⁶⁵⁰ No indisputable text from Origen's own pen uses this idiom. In Didymus we have the idea couched in this phraseology, too, but once again we have several instances preserved by the anthologist of the commentary on the Psalms.⁶⁵¹ The locution was used by no other author, except for the author of *De Trinitate*,⁶⁵² and the *Scholia in Apocalypsin*,⁶⁵³ so as to notify us that he is the same author, namely, Cassian the Sabaite. Therefore, the passage of the *Philocalia* (as indeed the fragments on John) have a strong Didymean colour transmitted by the hand of the author of both the *Scholia in Apocalypsin* and *De Trinitate*. Once again, it appears as though the *Philocalia* is the product of an Akoimetan hand.

Instances of this kind suggest that a third hand (probably an Akoimetan one) has edited the text of the *Philocalia* as we know it today. Theodore Studites, the

heir to the Akoimetan patrimony, as I have recently argued, is by all appearances the one who wrote the introductory note to this version of the *Philocalia* warning against points of theological aberration, which cannot have been endorsed (let alone culled) by the Cappadocians.

Conclusion

What during the last hundred years has been styled 'Origen's Scholia on the Apocalypse' are in fact annotations by Cassian the Sabaite seeking to establish the divine inspiration and scriptural authority of this book. Although an Antiochene, an affiliation which denotes a specific attitude towards reading of the scriptural text, as well as towards History and Christology, and therefore towards allegorical exegesis, Cassian set out to interpret a text which more than any other requires allegorical interpretation. He was not alone in this. Theodoret himself had engaged in an allegorical approach, which was for him all but alien ground.⁶⁵⁴ For all the tumult surrounding allegory, Cassian took up the method that had been officially censured while eschewing Procrustean rigour. In view of the calumny surrounding the father of its Christian application, namely Origen, having recourse to allegory was a precarious proposition. Yet he carried this out while refraining from both entertaining fanciful extrapolations, and making no mention of the term 'allegory' at all.

The Scholia are comments by Cassian extensively culling from Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse, and also include verbatim passages excerpted from Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus – all of them

⁶⁴⁷ Theodore Studites, *Canon in Requiem Monachi*, lines 163–165.

There is, nevertheless, a casual poetic reference by Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmina Moralia*, column 688, line 4.

⁶⁴⁸ *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), PG.39.725.8: τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἀρχικῷ.

⁶⁴⁹ Theodore Studites had attacked Origen and Origenism by name in his writings. Cf. *Epistulae*, epistle 532, reporting Origen's condemnation by the Council of 553. This is all Theodore had to say about this synod. Also, *ibid.* epistle 471; *Μεγάλη Κατήχησις*, Catechesis 45; *Parva Catechesis*, Catechesis 22.

⁶⁵⁰ Origen, *frJohn*, XXXVII: ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ πνεύματος, ἣν ἐπιπορεύεται διὰ τῆς τῶν θείων λογίων παιδεύσεως. *Philocalia*, 23.8, *apud commGen*, PG.12.64.16–24: Πρὸς οὓς λεκτέον ὅτι ἐπιβάλλων ὁ θεὸς τῇ ἀρχῇ τῆς κοσμοποιίας, οὐδενὸς ἀναιτίως γινομένου, ἐπιπορεύεται τῷ νῷ ἕκαστον τῶν ἐσομένων, ὁρῶν ὅτι ἐπεὶ τότε γέγονε τότε ἔπεται, ἐὰν δὲ γένηται τότε τὸ ἐπόμενον τότε ἀκολουθεῖ, οὐ ὑποστάντος τότε ἔσται· καὶ οὕτω μέχρι τέλους τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιπορευθεὶς οἶδεν ἃ ἔσται, οὐ πάντως ἐκαστῶ τῶν γινωσκομένων αἰτίος τοῦ αὐτοῦ συμβῆναι τυγχάνων.

⁶⁵¹ Didymus, *commPs*22–26.10, Cod. p. 79. Then, *frPs(al)*, frs. 799a; 1138; 1259; fr. 1280.

⁶⁵² Cf. *DT* (lib. 3), PG.39.777.46–780.1: Φωρᾶν ἔνεστι ταῦτα μὴ ἄλλως ἔχειν, ἐπιπορευόμενον τῷ νῷ, ὡς αὐτίκα τῷ τοιοῦτῳ ἐπιλάμπει καὶ συνεργεῖ ὁ ἐπιβεβηκὼς τοῖς ὅλοις Υἱὸς Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. Origen, *commGen* (*fragmenta*), PG.12.64.16–18, in the *Philocalia*, 23.8, also preserved by Eusebius, *PE*, 6.11.34: ἐπιβάλλων ὁ Θεὸς τῇ ἀρχῇ τῆς κοσμοποιίας, οὐδενὸς ἀναιτίως γινομένου, ἐπιπορεύεται τῷ νῷ ἕκαστον τῶν ἐσομένων.

⁶⁵³ Cf. *Scholion XV*: Τὴν ἐποπτικὴν καὶ ἔφορον τῶν ὅλων δύναμιν καὶ τὴν πορευτικὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῶν προκειμένων δηλοῖ . . . καὶ οὐ πόδες αὐτοῦ, καθ' οὓς ἐπιπορεύεται τῷ παντὶ διαφωτιστήσας, . . . ἦχον ποιῶν τινα ἐπιπορευόμενος. *Scholion XXVII*: καὶ ἐπεὶ ἀνεξερεύνητα τὰ κρίματα καὶ αἱ ὁδοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, καθ' ἃς ἐπιπορευόμενος τοῖς ὅλοις κρίνει καὶ οἰκονομεῖ τὰ περὶ ἕκαστον.

⁶⁵⁴ Cf. Theodoret using allegory on the Song of Songs, above, pp. 42–43; 56.

coupled with ideas of his own, drawing on a variety of authors and couched in his own phraseology wherever necessary.

Cassian clearly wished to see Revelation disentangled from prolonged dissension and at last unanimously sanctioned as a canonical book. Yet he sought to attain this not as a sop to convention, or as acceptance of what might be thought to be sheer daemonology in disguise. The way was to show that simple and trenchant ideas of the already canonical books of scripture are also present in the apocalyptic text.

Studying Cassian's texts throughout the codex, one can see that he quotes freely from scripture and quite often he takes some liberties while quoting a certain passage by heart. Being a knowledgeable and scrupulous scholar, he must have consulted all versions available to him in order to prepare an edition on which to comment.⁶⁵⁵

Discussion has shown that both Antioch and Alexandria were centres familiar to Cassian. Even if he had Antiochene sympathies, which he certainly had, he saw in Alexandria a sacrosanct patrimony handed down to all caring Christians. This means that in Cassian's time, theologians knew each others' works, they conversed with each other, and Antioch was prepared to cull from the Alexandrians in comprehensive expositions of a certain issue by composing catenae. I now have no doubt that the excerpts from Origen's commentaries on the Psalms were composed by Antiochene hands.⁶⁵⁶

Not only did Cassian care for the textual legacy of the great Alexandrian masters, but it was to them that he mainly turned in order to make up his own mind with regard to the authority of Revelation. For all his respect for Eusebius, he does not rest content with Eusebius' ambivalence on the question. Besides, Origen had written extensive comments on Revelation, which were in effect incorporated in his commentary on John. Didymus had written a commentary on Revelation ad hoc. This concern of Cassian's about the authority of Revelation turns out to provide us with extensive passages from Didymus' own commentary. Nevertheless

there are also valuable exegeses by Cassian himself. Beyond these, however, our debt for having Didymus' own commentary, this treasure of Alexandrian scholarship, available to us, goes entirely to a theologian of the Antiochene school.

A considerable number of the founding fathers of Christianity had accepted Revelation. For some of them we have their own reasoning; for others, there are only testimonies by third parties. In any event, post-Nicene Christianity had already moulded the essentials of its beliefs about the Trinitarian God and the world, and had argued them in detail. Cassian did not canvass subtler and more reflective theories on issues that were disputed during his own era. He stood aloof from the inconclusive Christological controversy of the sixth century, which allowed little room for the dispassionate, critical study that an already controversial book required. Rather, he opted for establishing that the text takes an orthodox line on rather old issues, such as Arianism,⁶⁵⁷ Gnosticism, and Docetism, which nevertheless were not out of date: we know that as late as Theodoret's lifetime, this bishop strove to convert not only Macedonians, but also Marcionites and Arians to orthodoxy.

Cassian's first Scholion using the notion of Christ as δεσπότης introduces both Antiochene concerns and indeed Theodoret's person as the authority inspiring the fundamentals of Cassian's thought. Hence, although Rev. 1:1 set before [Scholion I](#) actually refers to the 'servants of God', not to those 'of Christ', Cassian seized this opportunity to expound the notion of being 'a servant of Christ' by using the term δεσπότης accorded to God, at a point where 'God' clearly refers to Christ. No doubt it takes a jump in order to embark on such a line of interpretation, yet it is this leap which reveals Cassian's priorities and constant concerns. This Scholion is indeed an illuminating text right from the start. The footnotes to this text show beyond doubt that we have a faithful quotation from the opening of Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse. Not quite, however. Cassian is anxious to introduce his notion of Christ, not simply God, being the δεσπότης of all creation. Not only his Antiochene allegiances, but also

⁶⁵⁵ At a certain point, he considers an alternative rendering of Gen. 3:1 'by the Jew'. Cassian the Sabaite, *De Panareto*, p. 106r.

⁶⁵⁶ For instance, the term ὁπηνίκα ([Scholion XX](#)), which Origen never used (only Celsus did), appears abundantly in his catena-fragments on the Psalms. The same goes for abundance of Aristotelian

terminology which appears only in those fragments, but not in the rest of Origen's works.

⁶⁵⁷ Nevertheless, Arianism was a problem of Cassian's era, too, since the Goths were Arians.

the text of Revelation⁶⁵⁸ itself, introduce this notion which otherwise receives only a casual reference in the New Testament.⁶⁵⁹ It is striking however that Didymus applies this appellation to no one other than God, and only a certain exception is made for simply quoting the passage of the epistle of Jude.⁶⁶⁰ By contrast, the epithet *θεσπότης* is applied to Christ no less than two hundred times in *De Trinitate*, a fact that confirms that this is not a work of Didymus, but of Cassian, as I have shown.⁶⁶¹

Many, though not all, of the exegeses in the Scholia are Alexandrian, but the shroud is Antiochene. Which is why in the Scholia the terms ‘allegory’ and ‘tropology’ are not used, whereas *ἀναγωγή* and its cognates make a distinctive mark, which is in fact one more indication of the Antiochene tendency.

This is therefore the case of an eminent Antiochene also employing the Alexandrian sagacity. The fruits of this study attribute some crudeness to the schematization postulating separation of the two schools in terms of essence of doctrine. Although several points in the Scholia induced scholars who reflected on them a century ago to presume that they were written by a scholar of the Alexandrian school, this is owing to the fact that Didymus was heavily quoted. The reality is that it was Cassian who quoted Didymus and *Scholion I* is virtually the colophon pointing to Cassian’s theological personality staunchly advancing a distinctive Antiochene approach. For all the heavy quotation from Didymus, Cassian’s train of thought is subtly yet clearly different from that of Didymus. Distinctive features of Theodoret’s thought are present throughout: the epithet *θεολόγος* is applied to John the Evangelist, which Didymus never did in his indisputable works. The exegesis of the difficult relation of 2 Kings and 1 Paralipomenon is also an illuminating point. Whereas the sage of Alexandria following Origen identified the ‘wrath of God’ with ‘inflicted punishments’, Theodoret stands out by rendering the ‘wrath of God’ not as the ‘punishments’ inflicted upon sinners (which was the hackneyed interpretation), but ‘the devil’ himself – an exegesis that helped him to resolve such difficult points of scripture as the conforming of 2 Kings, 24:1 with 1 Paralipomenon 21:1. The reference to this teaching in *Scholion XXX* presents the author speaking

of himself in the first person. This notwithstanding, the distinctive colloquial Greek at times reveals that Didymus’ text is being quoted through simple peculiarities in compound words (*συνκατάβασις* for *συγκατάβασις* in *Scholion XV*, *συνβαδίζων* for *συμβαδίζων* in *Scholion XX*, *λημφθέντες* for *ληφθέντες* in *Scholion XXIX*). Didymus is also the author who distinctively uses the adjective *ἀδιάδοχος* in relation to the New Testament being ‘unsurpassed’.

The author took up definitive orthodox doctrines and adapted them to his own outlook and purpose. He saw no need for new reasoning. Arguments against idolatry and polytheism, which are called for by the apocalyptic text, had already been available since the times of Clement, and traditional considered approaches were well established. Had the issue of the canonicity of Revelation been entangled in the theological parlance of his day, a fatal storm would have ensued. What therefore might appear to be an amateurish or trivial theological approach in these Scholia is in fact part of the author’s method in order to get his message across without perplexing his audience with contemporary dilemmas. The question was only the agreement of the Apocalypse with scripture. The Scholia draw on both Testaments and show persuasively that the Book is a text which conveys the same theology as canonical writings do.

The lesson that these Scholia teach beyond their theology itself is that there was no substantial rift between Alexandria and Antioch, their different approaches notwithstanding.

Cassian draws confidently on the Cappadocians, of whom he had been taught by his tutors St Sabas and Theodosius the Coenobiarch (who were both Cappadocian). His special devotion to Gregory of Nyssa is all too evident. In addition, however, Leontius of Byzantium had taught him the value of the stream of thought emanating from Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius. Whereas Evagrius also had important things to say about monastic ethos (which is the theme of Cassian’s monastic texts), Origen reached Cassian via Eusebius and Gregory of Nyssa as well.

Above all, however, Cassian was an offspring of Antioch, whose roots were such theologians as Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and

⁶⁵⁸ Rev. 6:10.

⁶⁵⁹ Jude 4 and (not quite plain) in 2 Peter 2:1.

⁶⁶⁰ Didymus, *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 89.

⁶⁶¹ See NDGE, Appendix II.

whose flower and shining star was Theodoret of Cyr-rhus. If therefore we wish to assess the real relation between Antioch and Alexandria, it could suffice to explore the relation of the emblematic figure of Theodoret with the tradition of Alexandria that had reached him. Our exploration has revealed that it was Theodoret and Antioch, not Alexandria, that was the true heir to Origen's doctrinal concerns. Despite the slogan about Antioch and Alexandria denoting two rancorously divergent poles of Christian theology, it was Theodoret's Antiochene tradition that cared for the textual legacy of such theologians as Origen and Didymus.

Our education has taught us that Theodoret was the last great scholar of Eastern Christianity. That he

took exception to specific arguments advanced by Cyril, which resulted in Theodoret's personal predicament, does not mean that he was antipathetic to the Alexandrians.

I now know that Theodoret was *not* the last great scholar of Eastern Christianity. Cassian emerges as a figure who demands our attention. He is the author not only of the Scholia, but also of a number of other works, which are currently branded as 'spuria' and wait for scholarly exertions in order to enable their eclipsed author once again to say the dictum of Revelation, which he did not feel necessary to comment upon, since he had already proven the scriptural authority of the book: 'I am he that lives and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore.'

PART I

TEXT OF REVELATION AND *SCHOLIA IN APOCALYPSIN*

| ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ
ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΛΟΓΟΥ¹

<I. Rev. 1:1> Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός,· δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει, καὶ ἐσήμανεν ἀποστείλας² διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ,

¹ 2329: ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΛΟΓΟΥ.

² 2329: O., An. (S.), Ar., N.-A. ἐσήμανεν ἀποστείλας διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ. An. (M.) ἐσήμανεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ ἀποστείλας.

(Σχόλιον α')

Οὐ μάχεται¹ τῷ λεχθέντι ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος πρὸς τοὺς γνωρίμους,² οὐκέτι καλῶ ὑμᾶς δούλους, ἀλλὰ φίλους³ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὁμολογούμενον περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς εἰσι⁴ δούλοι τοῦ κυρίου.⁵ κἂν γὰρ αὐτὸς τιμῇν καὶ ὑπεροχὴν αὐτοῖς δωρούμενος φίλους⁶ καὶ τέκνα⁷ καὶ ἀδελφοὺς⁸ αὐτοὺς καλεῖ, ἀλλ' οὖν αὐτοὶ εὐγνώμονες⁹ ὄντες ὁμολογοῦσιν ὡς τυγχάνουσι

¹ Οὐ μάχεται ('it does not contradict') is an expression characteristic of Didymus, taken up from Origen, but not used by Eusebius. Cf. Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 231: Οὐ μάχεται δὲ τοῖς ἐνταῦθα τὰ ἐν τῇ Εξόδῳ γεγραμμένα. *commEccl*(11–12), Cod. p. 329: αὐτὸν λέγομεν 'ἀμνόν' καὶ 'ποιμένα' καὶ οὐ μάχεται ταῦτα. *frPs(al)*, fr. 75: οὐ μάχεται τὸ Κύριος ἐξετάζει τὸν δίκαιον καὶ τὸν ἀσεβῆ τῷ μὴ ἀνίστασθαι ἀσεβεῖς ἐν κρίσει. *Fragmenta in Joannem (in catenis)*, Fr.12: οὐ μάχεται τὸ μὴ τεθνάναι Ἐνὼχ καὶ Ἥλιαν. *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 51: οὐ μάχεται τούτοις τὸ δικαιοσύνην αὐτὸν εἶναι λέγεσθαι. Origen, *Cels*, VIII.55; *Princ*, III.1.21; *frJohn*, XLVII; *selGen*, PG.12.113.51; *commJohn*, XIX.3.18. The idiom is as old as Chrysippus, and occurs in Galen, Plutarch, Herodian of Alexandria, and Diogenes Laertius. Cf. *Scholion X*: μαχόμενον· γὰρ ἂν ἦν.

² The term γνωρίμοι τοῦ σωτῆρος ('those intimate with Christ') originates with Origen and is characteristic of Eusebius and Didymus. Origen, *commMatt*, 15.35; οἱ Χριστοῦ γνωρίμοι. So in *frLuc*, fr. 206; *Scholia in Lucam*, PG.17.361.24. *Cels*, II.13: τοὺς Ἰησοῦ γνωρίμους καὶ ἀκροατάς. *frJohn*, XXXV. ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς γνωρίμοις ἔλεγεν. Eusebius, *DE*, 3.4.32: Εἰ δὲ λέγοιεν μηδὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν πεποικέναι τὸν σωτῆρα ἡμῶν θαυμαστὸν μηδὲ τι παράδοξον ὃν ἐμαρτύρησαν οἱ γνωρίμοι. *Ibid.* 3.18. 1: ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ κύριος ἡμῶν, ὡς ἐπὶ ὀλέθρῳ καὶ ἀπωλείᾳ τοῦ γνωρίμου δυσφορῶν. *Quaestiones ad Marimum (addenda)*, PG.22.1004.37: τούτων δὲ ἐκτός, ὑπῆρχον καὶ ἕτεροι πλείους γνωρίμοι τοῦ Σωτῆρος. *commPs*, PG.23.797.44: Υἱοὶ δὲ πενήτων ἦσαν οἱ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ μαθητῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν γνωρίμοι. *Fragmenta in Lucam*, PG.24.540.13: Διὸ δὴ θαρρύνει ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐν τῇ τῶν δεινῶν ὑπομονῇ τοῖς κατ' αὐτοῦ παρεκελεύετο γνωρίμοις. *Ibid.* Δι' αὐτῶν γὰρ ἐκείνων τῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος γνωρίμων. *Laudatio Constantini*, 16.8: μόνος εἰς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ μετὰ τὴν κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου νίκην διεπράξατο, τοῖς αὐτοῦ γνωρίμοις λόγον εἰπὼν καὶ ἔργῳ τελέσας. *HE*, 6.14.7: τὸν μέντοι Ἰωάννην ἔσχατον, συνιδόντα ὅτι τὰ σωματικά ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδήλωται, προτραπέντα ὑπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων, πνεύματι θεοφορηθέντα πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι εὐαγγέλιον. Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.236: τὰ εὐαγγελικά μαθήματα, ἃ βασιλείας μυστήρια εἶπεν ὁ Σωτὴρ τοῖς γνωρίμοις. *Ibid.* 3.89: κατὰ τὸ ἐν Εὐαγγελίῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος εἰρημένον τοῖς γνωρίμοις. 4.146: τοῦ τοσοῦτου καὶ τηλικούτου ἀγαθοῦ κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως καιρὸν

πληρωθησομένου, ὁπνίκα ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ γεγωνὸς ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς ἰδίῳις γνωρίμοις, ἵν' ἔτι μᾶλλον προκόψαντες θεάσωνται τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός. *frPs(al)*, fr. 900: τότε γὰρ γνωρίμος γέγονεν ἡ θεοῦ δεξιὰ, ὅτε ὁ λόγος σὰρξ γενόμενος ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν· ἐθεασάμεθα γὰρ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός. *commGen*, Cod. p. 136: καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος περὶ τῶν θανάτου μὴ γενομένων· 'Εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐσθηκῶν', οἵτινες ἦσαν οἱ γνωρίμοι αὐτοῦ.

³ John, 15:15.

⁴ Cod. εἶναι. Cf. below: ὁμολογοῦσιν ὡς τυγχάνουσι δούλοι. *EN Ia*.

⁵ *EN Ib*. See a parallel text of Didymus in *EN Id*: *frPs (al)*, Fr. 858: Αὐχοῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ μεγάλῳ ἀξιώματι οἱ ἄγιοι πάντες ἐπὶ τῷ δούλῳ θεοῦ εἶναι . . . καὶ τῶν γραμμάτων γοῦν ἑαυτῶν προτάττουσι ταύτην τὴν σημασίαν ὡς ἐπὶ μεγίστῳ ἀξιώματι ἐναβρυνόμενοι· Ἰάκωβος γὰρ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος, καὶ Παῦλος δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ὡς γὰρ οἱ τοῦ κόσμου ἄνθρωποι ἐν ταῖς συγγραφαῖς τῶν βιωτικῶν συναλλαγμάτων ἐκ τῶν περὶ αὐτοὺς ἀξιομάτων χρηματίζουσιν θέλουσιν, οὕτως οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτῶν δούλοι θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ χρηματίζουσιν ἀξιοῦσι.

⁶ Luke 12:4; John 15:13–15.

⁷ Mark, 10:24; John 13:33. Cf. Isaiah, 8:18 quoted in Heb. 2:13.

⁸ There is a peculiar rendering of John 15:15: 'Henceforth I call you not servants, but friends and brothers', which takes the expression and brothers (καὶ ἀδελφοὺς) to be part of the scriptural passage. Beside this Scholion, the peculiar quotation occurs in three writings only: Cassian the Sabaite (=Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 3)*, PG.39.840.3–4: 'Οὐκ ἔτι ὑμᾶς καλῶ δούλους, ἀλλὰ φίλους καὶ ἀδελφοὺς', ὡς γέγραπται. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Exaltationem Sancti Crucis*, PG.59.680.4: Οὐκ ἔτι δούλους, ἀλλὰ φίλους καὶ ἀδελφοὺς ὠνόμασεν, Ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, λέγων. Ὁρᾷ πόσῃν μεταβολῇ ὁ σταυρὸς κατεργάσατο; Ephraem Syrus, *Ad Novitium de Virtute*, 2, line 118: Ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, μακάριοι οἱ τοιοῦτοι, ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔρεϊ ὁ Κύριος, οὐκέτι ὑμᾶς καλέσω δούλους, ἀλλὰ φίλους καὶ ἀδελφοὺς. I have argued that the Pseudo-Didymean *De Trinitate* is a work by Cassian the Sabaite and the present instance attests to this, too. See, *NDGF*, Appendix II.

⁹ Cod. ευγνωμονες.

246r δοῦλοι,¹⁰ ἄξιον καὶ¹¹ μέγιστον¹² ἡγούμενοι θεὸν δεσπότην¹³ ἔχειν.¹⁴ ἐν γοῦν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ἄν¹⁵ γράφουσιν, ὡς ἄλλοι τὰ θνητῶν ἀξιώματα,¹⁶ προτάττουσιν τοῦτο αὐτό· καὶ γοῦν ὁ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Παῦλος καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ συμφῶ|νως πράττουσι τὸ αὐτό· ἐλαττωτικοί¹⁷ γὰρ ἑαυτῶν δι¹⁸ ἀτυφίαν¹⁹ ὑπάρχοντες, τὰ τῶν ὑπεροχῶν δηλωτικὰ γεγραμμένα περὶ ἑαυτῶν σιωπῶσι.

¹⁰ Cf. Rom. 1:1; 1 Cor. 7:22; Gal. 1:10; Eph. 6:6; Phil. 1:1; Col. 4:12; Tit. 1:1; James 1:1; 2 Peter 1:1; Jude 1; cf. Rev. 1:1.

¹¹ Cod. α1.

¹² EN 1c.

¹³ Jude 4; Acts 4:24.

¹⁴ The passage ἄξιον καὶ μέγιστον ἡγούμενοι θεὸν δεσπότην ἔχειν is Cassian's. This is an addition to Didymus' sentence ending with the preceding word δοῦλοι. Both expressions ἄξιον ἡγοῦμαι and μέγιστον ἡγοῦμαι are virtually synonymous and mean 'I regard something as an honour, or important' (Lexica Segueriana, *De Syntacticis*, alphabetic entry tau, p. 175). By Cassian's time, these expressions had been used by important authors, yet no one other than Cassian ever used both ἄξιον and μέγιστον (ἡγοῦμαι) together. The authors who had used both expressions, each of them at different points of their work, are Lysias, Diodorus of Sicily, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarch, and Libanius. Of Christians, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and John Chrysostom. There are of

course others (e.g. orators, such as Aeschines, Isocrates, and Demosthenes), who had used either of them (though not both of them) according to their personal predilection. Didymus belongs to neither of the two categories. EN 1c.

¹⁵ Cod. αῖσ.

¹⁶ EN 1d.

¹⁷ Cf. *Scholion X*: ἐλάττωσις ἐγγένοι περὶ τὴν ἀγαπητικὴν αὐτοῦ διάθεσιν. *Scholion XXVII*: διὰ τὴν ἐλάττωσιν τῆς φύσεως. EN 1e.

¹⁸ Cod. δια.

¹⁹ This use of the expression ἐλαττωτικὸς ἑαυτοῦ is a striking parallel. Didymus, *commJob*(12.1–16.8a), fr. 310 (comm. on Job, 12:4): δίκαιος γὰρ καὶ ἄμεμπτος ἀνὴρ ἐγεννήθη εἰς χλεύασμα. ὅταν τὰ ἐλάττωνα λέγῃ, ἑαυτῷ αὐτὰ προσάπτει· ἐλαττωτικὸς γὰρ ἑαυτοῦ διὰ ἀτυφίαν ὑπάρχει. *frPs* (al), fr. 1069: οἱ γὰρ ἄγιοι δι' ἀτυφίαν ὄντες ἑαυτῶν ἐλαττωτικοὶ τὰ ἐλάττωνα ἑαυτοῖς διδόασιν ὧν ἔχουσιν.

Scholion I

The acknowledgement that they are **servants**, professed by those intimate with the Saviour, does not controvert that which was said by Jesus to them, *I no longer call you servants, but friends*.¹ For although he calls them *friends*² and *children*³ and *brothers*,⁴ thus bestowing honour and excellence on them, still they profess in gratitude that they are *servants*.⁵ For they deem that it is noble and great to have God as a *master*.⁶ Therefore, in their epistles they state this appellation first, in the same tenor as others declare the high-office titles of mortal human beings. As a matter of fact, James and Paul and the rest of the [holy] men unanimously do the same thing. For, humbling themselves due to their freedom from arrogance, they keep silent on designations which have been written about themselves and proclaim their pre-eminence.

¹ John 15:15.

² Luke 12:4; John 15:13–15.

³ Mark 10:24; John 13:33.

⁴ Matt. 12:48–50; 25:40; Luke 8:21; Mark 3:33–35; John 20:17; 21:23.

⁵ Cf. Rom. 1:1; 1 Cor. 7:22; Gal. 1:10; Eph. 6:6; Phil. 1:1; Col. 4:12; Tit. 1:1; James 1:1; 2 Peter 1:1; Jude 1; cf. Rev. 1:1.

⁶ Jude 4; Acts 4:24.

SCHOLION II

Ⲯ

<Π. Rev. 1:2> ὃς ἐμαρτύρησεν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅσα ἶδεν.¹

¹ 2329: ὅσα ἶδεν. An. ὅσα εἶδε. Ar. ὅσα τε εἶδεν. N.-A. ὅσα εἶδεν. Ar. notes that 'in another manuscript it is added: καὶ ὅσα ἤκουσε, καὶ ἅτινά εἰσι, καὶ ἅτινα δεῖ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα'. N.-A. have the alternative (from A), καὶ ὅσα ἤκουσε, καὶ ἅτινα εἰσι καὶ ἅτινα χρὴ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα, but not the actual alternative occurring in Arethas.

Ⲭϣόλιον β'

Τὸ ἀπαγγεῖλαι τὰ γνωσθέντα καὶ φανερωῖσθαι¹ τὸν περὶ αὐτῶν λόγον μαρτυρίαν εἶπεν.

¹ Cf. [Scholion XXVII](#): τὸν τῆς προνοίας λόγον διακρίσεως καὶ διοικήσεως φανερωῖσθαι. [EN IIa](#). In the left margin, the scribe numbered this passage as Γ, which I emend to B. The indication EP

(for ἐρμηνεία) appears from [Scholion V](#) onwards, when another scribe takes over.

Scholion II

He styled **testimony** the proclamation of the things that were made known to him and the divulgence of the preaching that pertains to them.

SCHOLION III

Γ

<III. Rev. 1:3> μακάριος ὁ ἀναγινώσκων¹ καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες² τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας³ καὶ τηροῦντες⁴ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα· ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς. <1:4> Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ· χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ.⁵

¹ 2329: ἀναγινώσκων.

² O. ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ ἀκούων. 2329, An., Ar., N.-A. ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες.

³ Cod. προφητείας. [Scholia I, II, III](#), have the text of Revelation in uncials with some accents (in [Scholion I](#) the first three words of the scriptural text are miniscule, the rest are in uncials with some accents). 2329, An., Ar., N.-A. τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας. O. τῆς προφητείας ταύτης.

⁴ 2329: τηροῦντες.

⁵ 2329, O. ἀπὸ θεοῦ. An.(M.) ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. An.(S.), N.-A. ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. Ar. ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

Σχόλιον γ'

Γ

246v

Καθόλου ἡ θεία γραφή ἐπὶ θείοις καὶ μεγάλοις,¹ ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπὶ² μικροῖς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνοις³ μακαρίζει· διὸ καὶ ἐνταῦθα μακαριζομένων τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων καὶ ἀκουόντων,⁴ οὐχ ὥς ἔτυχεν τῶν προ|κειμένων ἀκουστέον⁵ τὸ γὰρ συνετῶς⁶ ἀναγινώσκειν⁷ καὶ μὴ προχείρως⁸ ἀκούειν ἀλλὰ πιστῶς,⁹ μακαριοποιεῖ.¹⁰ καὶ ἐκ τῆς προκειμένης λέξεως μανθάνομεν¹¹ ὥς προφήτης Ἰωάννης

¹ [EN IIIa](#).

² Cod. οὐκέτι. In the left margin the scribe numbers the Scholion as Δ, which I emended to Γ.

³ [EN IIIb](#).

⁴ Rev. 1:3. [EN IIIc](#).

⁵ Cf. [Scholion XXV](#): Φρονιμώτερον ἐντυγχάνειν δεῖ τῇ θεοπνεύστῃ γραφῇ.

⁶ Cf. συνετῶς ἀκούειν. Didymus, *commJob* (7.20c-11), Cod. p. 215; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 198. σοφῶς αὐτῶν ἀκούειν δεῖ. *commEccl*(5-6), Cod. p. 166. καλῶς ἀκούειν. *commPs* 35-39, Cod. p. 285. On the meaning of ἀκούειν, Cf. *frPs(al)*, Fr. 834: δηλοῖ δὲ ἡ ἀκούειν φωνὴ καὶ τὸ συνιέναι καὶ νοῆσαι.

⁷ 1 Tim. 4:13. Cf. [Scholion XXIX](#): ἡμεῖς οὖν οἱ ἀναγινώσκοντες ταῦτα καὶ μαθόντες.

⁸ Cf. [Scholion XXV](#): μὴ κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον ταῦτα γεγράφθαι. Cassian the Sabaite, *Const*, p. 19v-20r: καὶ πρόχειρος ἐν γέλῳ. *OctoVit*, p. 50r: καὶ εἰς λοιδορίαν πρόχειρος. [EN IIIId](#).

⁹ Didymus, *commJob* (7.20c-11), Cod. p. 280: πιστῶς δὲ καὶ

φρονίμως ἀκουστέον τοῦ 'πάντα δύνασαι', ἵνα μὴ ὑποπέσωμεν τῇ τῶν δοκητῶν ἀνοίᾳ. Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.860.13-15: Κὰν γὰρ γνησίως ὁ κηρύττων πιστεύῃ, ὁ δὲ ἀκούων μὴ πιστῶς τὰ μαθήματα δέχοιτο. [EN IIIe](#).

¹⁰ Although the verb μακαριοποιεῖν does not occur anywhere else, and the verbal adjective μακαριοποιός is exclusive to the following instances, the reading of the Codex is perfectly acceptable, as it points to certain Origenist thinkers. Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.174: μακαριοποιὰ μαθήματα. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1243: οὐ γὰρ τὸ ἐπίστασθαι αὐτὸ ἄνευ τοῦ ἐνεργεῖν ἀγιαστικὸν καὶ μακαριοποιὸν ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐνεργοῦμενον καὶ πραττόμενον. fr. 1292: τῆς μακαριοποιου ἀγιαστικῆς ζωῆς. Origen, *commEph*, 29, in *Catena in Epistulam ad Ephesios*, p. 202: διὰ τὸν κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπαθὴ καὶ μακαριοποιὸν φόβον. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.1012.7-8: ἀποκλείεται κλαυθμὸν τὸν μακαριοποιὸν κατὰ τὸ Μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες. Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogiae*, Catechesis 4.8: τὴν σωτήριον καὶ μακαριοποιὸν κλήσιν.

¹¹ Cod. μανθάνωμεν.

πρὸς τῷ¹² εἶναι ἀπόστολος καὶ εὐαγγελιστής· σύζυγος γὰρ ἡ προφητεία
προφήτη.¹³

¹² Cod. to. The expression πρὸς τῷ εἶναι is first attested in the orator Lysias, *In Philonem*, 5: τοὺς πρὸς τῷ εἶναι πολίτας καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦντας τούτου. All usage thereafter occurs in authors whose vocabulary bears on the Scholia. Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*, 2.247: ἵνα πρὸς τῷ εἶναι μηδὲν χρήσιμοι τὸ παράπαν καὶ δασμὸν οὐκ ἐτήσιον ἀλλ' ἐφήμερον ἀναπράττωσι παρὰ τῶν ἡδικημένων. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Topiconum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 270: καὶ τὸ πρὸς τῷ εἶναι δίκαιον καὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ἔχειν τοῦ μόνον εἶναι. *In Aristotelis Meteorologicorum Libros Commentaria*, p. 176: ἥτις πρὸς τῷ εἶναι σύμμετρος καὶ μένει ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ συμμετρίας. Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Anima*, p. 142: τὰ δὲ πρὸς τῷ εἶναι διαφανῆ καὶ ἐμφανῆ ἐστίν. Origen (commenting on Revelation), *commJohn*, II.5.46: Τί δὲ αἰνίττεται τὸ ἀνεῶχθαι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ὁ λευκὸς ἵππος καὶ τὸ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ καθέζεσθαι τὸν καλούμενον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, πρὸς τῷ εἶναι θεοῦ λόγον καὶ πιστὸν καὶ ἀληθινὸν καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κρίνοντα καὶ πολεμοῦντα λεγόμενον, κατανοητέον. *commJohn*, XX.5.32: ὥς γὰρ δυνατοῦ ὄντος τοῦ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι

τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ πρὸς τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σπέρμα, φησὶν αὐτοῖς. Ibid. XX.6.41: εἰ δὲ πρὸς τῷ εἶναι σπέρμα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐγεώργησαν καὶ εἰς μέγεθος καὶ αὖξιν τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐπεδεδόκει. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 1, p. 56: ἵνα πρὸς τῷ εἶναι Θεὸς καὶ Πατήρ, ὑπάρχη καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος. *expPs*, PG.69.1032.3: Ἀλλ' οὗτος ὁ κάλαμος πρὸς τῷ εἶναι ταχὺς καὶ δξύς, ἔχει καὶ τὸ ὥραϊον ἐν κάλλει παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. The following work is spuriously ascribed to Basil of Caesarea. My ongoing research leaves no doubt that this a commentary by Cassian the Sabaite. But in what follows I will cite this without attribution to any author pending the appearance of the critical edition I am currently preparing. *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 1, 54: πρὸς τῷ ἀπειθεῖν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἀγαπῶσι δῶρα. Ibid. 3, 121: πρὸς τῷ μὴ διδάσκειν τὰ δέοντα, ἔτι καὶ τὸν ἐκ τῆς δυσσεβείας ἐμπρησμόν. Ibid. 5, 163: Τοῦτο γὰρ πρὸς τῷ ἐναγεῖ ἔτι καὶ τὸ ἀπίθανον ἔχει.

¹³ EN IIIf.

Scholion III

As a rule, Holy Scripture pronounces blessedness on the basis of conditions that are divine and grand, not petty and human. Hence at this point, too, where **those who read and hear**¹ are deemed **blessed**, one should understand what is written not in a random manner. For *to read*² sensibly, and to **listen** not mindlessly but faithfully, is what makes people **blessed**. We also learn from this text that, besides being an apostle and evangelist, John is also a prophet. For **prophecy** is concomitant with a prophet.

¹ Rev. 1:3.

² 1 Tim. 4:13.

SCHOLION IV

247r

<IV. Rev. 1:4> ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος,¹ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων ἃ ἐνώπιον² τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, <1:5> καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, ὁ πρωτότοκος³ τῶν νεκρῶν⁴ καὶ ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλείων⁵ τῆς γῆς. Τῷ ἀγαπῶντι⁶ ἡμᾶς καὶ λύσαντι⁷ ἡμᾶς⁸ ἀπὸ⁹ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, <1:6> καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλεῖον ἱεράτευμα¹⁰ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν καὶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων¹¹ ἀμήν. <1:7> ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν¹² καὶ ὄψονται¹³ αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν· καὶ κόψονται αὐτὸν¹⁴ | πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς. ναί, ἀμήν.¹⁵

¹ 2329: ὁ ὢν καὶ ἦν καὶ ἐρχόμενος.

² 2329: ἃ ἐνώπιον. O., An. . ἃ ἐστὶν ἐνώπιον. Ar. ἃ <ἐστὶν> ἐνώπιον. N.-A. ἃ ἐνώπιον.

³ 2329: πρωτότοκος.

⁴ 2329: νεκρῶ.

⁵ 2329, O., An., Ar. βασιλέων. This βασιλείων appears to be unique and exclusive to 2351. N.-A. do not mention this variant in this specific MS.

⁶ 2329: ἀγαποντι.

⁷ An. λούσαντι. Arethas advises that he knows of two alternative readings, namely, λύσαντι and λούσαντι. He comments on them both, but he quotes the scriptural text employing λούσαντι. O. opts for λούσαντι, too. N.-A. λύσαντι.

⁸ 2329: ἡμῶν.

⁹ ἀπὸ (instead of ἐκ) occurs in K.

¹⁰ βασιλεῖον ἱεράτευμα (Cf. Ex. 19:6; 23:22, quot. by 1 Peter, 2:9) occurs only here and in Vulgate codices.

2329, O., Ar. βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς. An. (S.) βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς. An. (M.), βασιλεῖς, καὶ ἱερεῖς. According to N.-A. βασιλεῖον ἱεράτευμα of 2351 occurs only in Jerome's Vulgate.

¹¹ Cod. αἰόνων.

¹² 2329, An., Ar., N.-A. μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν. O. ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν.

¹³ ὄψονται in K, Syriac, and Bohairic MSS. 2329, O., Ar. ὄψεται. An. ὄψονται.

¹⁴ 2329: κοψονται ἐπ' αὐτῶν. O., An., Ar. κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτόν. According to N.-A. ὄψονται obtains in K and the Syriac versions. This proves 2329 and 2351 to be versions fairly remote from each other, with 2351 being relevant to Theodore's region.

¹⁵ 2329: τῆς γῆς ἀμήν. A unique version, not recorded by N.-A.

Σχόλιον δ'

Τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους¹ περιείληφεν ὁ Ἀπόλογος.² Τοῦτο ἐπιστάμενος³ ὁ θεολόγος⁴ Ἰωάννης ἐνταῦθα φησὶν ὅτι ὁ σωτὴρ ἐστὶν ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος.⁵ Τὸ ὢν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐνεστώτα ἀναφέρει, τὸ ἦν ἐπὶ τὸν παρεληλυθότα, τὸ ἐρχόμενος ἐπὶ τὸν μέλλοντα.

¹ EN IVa. No number of Scholion in margin.

² Cod. λόγος.

³ The syntax 'being aware of this . . . he says' is a distinctly Origenistic one. Cf. *Cels*, I.61; IV.18; V.17 and 19; VI.79; VII, 39; VIII, 4; *commJohn*, II.2.13; XXXII.18.237; *deOr*, II.3; XXVIII.9; *homJer*, 20.2: *commMatt*, 10.11 and 18; 11.12 and 18; 14.11 and 16; 15.6 and 7; *comm1Cor*, 35; *homLuc*, 2; Didymus followed. Cf. *commJob* (1-4), Cod. pp. 35 and 105; *commJob* (5.1-6.29), Cod. p. 155; *commEccl* (7-8.8), Cod. p. 237; *commPs* 22-26.10, Cod. p. 58. However, it is neither Origen nor Didymus speaking: it is Cassian the Sabaite, since John the Evangelist is styled θεολόγος, which Origen and Didymus never did, as shown in EN IVb. Cassian himself employed the formula more than any other author: *OctoVit*, p. 49r: Ταύτην τὴν νόσον βαρυτάτην οὖσαν ὁ θεὸς ἀπόστολος ἐπιστάμενος καὶ βουλόμενος αὐτὴν ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν ὡς σοφὸς ἰατρὸς πρόρριζον ἀνασπᾶσαι, καὶ τὰς αἰτίας, ἀφ' ὧν μάλιστα τίκεται,

δείκνυσιν. Ibid. p. 56r: Ταῦτα καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐπιστάμενοι, πάντες μιᾷ γνώμῃ παραδεδώκασιν. Ibid. p. 32r: Ὅθεν ὁ μακάριος ἀπόστολος τοῦτο γινώσκων . . . ἐκάλεσε. *ScetPatr*, p. 57v: τοῦτο καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐπιστάμενός φησιν. Ibid. p. 58v: ὅπερ καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ἐπιστάμενος ἔλεγεν. *SerenPrim*, p. 92r: Ταῦτα πάντα ἐπιστάμενος ὁ Δαβὶδ καὶ ἔχων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ ἔνδον ἀνθρώπου ὑγιεῖς, καὶ γινώσκων ὅτι χαίρουσιν ἐπὶ τῇ πτώσει ἡμῶν, ἔλεγεν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. Ibid. p. 93r: Ταύτας τοίνυν τὰς πτώσεις τῶν πολέμιων καὶ τὰς ἰδίας νίκας βλέπων εἰς ἕκαστος τῶν ἁγίων, μετὰ ἀγαλλιᾶσεως ἀναβοᾷσιν. This Scholion therefore was written by Cassian.

⁴ The author styles John θεολόγος, which he also does in Scholion VII (κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν θεολόγον Ἰωάννην). Didymus ascribes the epithet not to John but to others, such as Peter, James, Paul, as well as to OT-figures such as Moses, David, and Malachi. EN IVb.

⁵ Cod. ἐρχόμενον. Cf. Rev. 1:4; 1:8; 4:8. See EN IVc.

τοιαῦτα περὶ τοῦ «Λόγου⁶ νοήσας, Χριστὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιστάμενος,» ὁ ἀπόστολός φησιν· Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς χθὲς καὶ σήμερον ὁ αὐτός καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας·⁷ τὸ χθὲς ἀναφέρων ἐπὶ τὸ παρεληλυθός,⁸ τὸ σήμερον ἐπὶ τὸ ἐνεστηκός,⁹ τὸ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐπὶ τὸ μέλλον.¹⁰

⁶ Cod. λόγου.

⁷ Heb.13:8.

⁸ Cod. παρεληλυθως.

¹⁰ Cod. μέλλον. Cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 272: Τὸ 'χθὲς' τὸν παρελθόντα λέγει χρόνον, τὸ 'σήμερον' τὸν ἐνεστῶτα αἰῶνα, καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα, τὸν ἄπειρον.

Scholion IV

The Logos has encompassed the three parts of time. Being aware of this, John the Theologian says at this point that the Saviour is **He who is, and who was, and who is to come**.¹ He applies the [expression] **who is**, to the present time, the **who was**, to the past, the **who is to come**, to the future. Having thus comprehended the teaching about the Logos, and recognizing Him as Christ himself, the Apostle says, *Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever*,² applying the [term] *yesterday* to past time, the [term] *today* to current time and the [term] *forever* to the future.

¹ Rev. 1:4; 1:8; 4:8.

² Heb.13:8.

247v

< V. Rev. 1:8 > ἐγὼ εἶμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος,¹ λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ παντοκράτωρ.² <1:9> ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης, ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν καὶ συκοινωνός³ ἐν τῇ θλίψει⁴ καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.⁵ ἐγενόμην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ⁶ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ | καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.⁷ <1:10> ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ⁸ καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν ὀπίσω μου μεγάλην,⁹ ὡς σάλπιγγος <1:11> λεγούσης· ὁ βλέπων¹⁰ γράψων¹¹ εἰς βιβλίον¹² καὶ πέμψον ταῖς ἐπτά ἐκκλησίαις εἰς Ἐφεσον καὶ εἰς Σμύρναν καὶ εἰς Πέργαμον καὶ εἰς Θυάτειραν¹³ καὶ εἰς Σάρδεϊς¹⁴ καὶ εἰς Φιλαδέλφειαν¹⁵ καὶ εἰς Λαοδικεῖαν.¹⁶ <1:12> καὶ ἐκεῖ¹⁷ ἐπέστρεψα βλέπειν τὴν φωνήν, ἣτις ἐλάλει μετ' ἐμοῦ.¹⁸ καὶ ἐπιστρέψας ἶδον¹⁹ ἐπτά λυχνίας χρυσᾶς²⁰ <1:13> καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐπτά λυχνίων,²¹ ὅμοιον υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου, ἐνδεδυμένον ποδήρη²² καὶ περιεζωσμένον²³ πρὸς²⁴ τοῖς μαστοῖς ζώνην χρυσῇν· <1:14> ἡ δὲ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ τρίχες λευκαὶ ὡς ἔριον²⁵ λευκόν, ὡς χιών. καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς φλόξ πυρός, <1:15> καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ,²⁶ ὡς ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένοι.²⁷ καὶ ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ

¹ 2329: ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. An. ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος. O., Ar., N.-A. om.

² 2329: τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος, ὁ θεός, ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ παντοκράτωρ (Cod. παντοκράτωρ). O. τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός, ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ παντοκράτωρ, καὶ Κύριος τῆς κτίσεως. An: τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός, ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Ar. τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός, ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ παντοκράτωρ.

³ 2329: συνκοινωνός.

⁴ Cod. θλίψει.

⁵ 2329: ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. O. ἐν βασιλείᾳ ὑπομονῇ. An. καὶ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ar. καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. N.-A. βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ ἐν Ἰησοῦ.

⁶ 2329: νισῶ.

⁷ 2329, An. καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ. O., N.-A καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ. Ar. καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

⁸ 2329: ἐν κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ (not considered by N.-A). O., An., Ar., N.-A. ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

⁹ 2329, An. ὀπίσω μου φωνὴν μεγάλην. O. φωνῆς μεγάλης. Ar. φωνὴν ὀπίσω μου μεγάλην (the same as 2351, along with K).

¹⁰ Cod. βλέπων.

¹¹ Cod. γραψων.

¹² 2329, Ar. ὁ βλέπων γράψων βιβλίον. O. Ἰωάννη ὁ βλέπων γράψων εἰς βιβλίον. An. (S.) ἐγὼ εἶμι το Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος· καὶ ὁ βλέπων, γράψων εἰς βιβλίον. (M. ἂ βλέπων).

¹³ 2329: θυατήρα.

¹⁴ Cod. σαρδισ. 2329: σαρδην.

¹⁵ Cod. φιλαδελφίαν. 2329: φιλαδελφίαν.

¹⁶ 2329: λαοδικεῖαν.

¹⁷ ἐκεῖ only in 1006, 1841, and K.

¹⁸ 2329: στρέψας βλέπειν τὴν φωνήν τίς ἐλάλει. This superb τίς ἐλάλει is unique and eluded N.-A. O., Ar., N.-A. ἐπέστρεψα βλέπειν τὴν φωνήν, ἣτις ἐλάλει. An. (S.) ἣτις ἐλάλησε. An. (M.) ἣτις ἐλάλει. The ἐκεῖ before ἐπέστρεψα of the present 2351 is rare, associating it with K.

¹⁹ 2329: ἶδον. O., An., Ar., N.-A. εἶδον.

²⁰ 2329: ἐπτά λυχνίας χρυσᾶς καὶ θυσιαστήριον. The important addition καὶ θυσιαστήριον is unique and absent from the critical apparatus of N.-A.

²¹ 2329: τῶν ἐπτά λυχνίων. O., Ar. τῶν ἐπτά λυχνίων. An. τῶν λυχνίων.

²² 2329: ποδήρη.

²³ 2329: περιεζωσμένον.

²⁴ 2329, An., Ar. πρὸς τοῖς μαστοῖς. O. ἐν τοῖς μαστοῖς.

²⁵ Cod. ἔριον. 2329: λευκαὶ ὥσει ἔριον [Cod. ὥσι] καὶ ὡς χιών. O. ὡς ἔριον λευκόν ὥσει χιών. An. ὥσει ἔριον λευκόν ὡς χιών. Ar., N.-A. ὡς ἔριον λευκόν ὡς χιών.

²⁶ 2329: χαλκολιβάνω.

²⁷ 2329: καμεινῳ πεπυρωμένοι.

ὥς φωνὴ ὑδάτων πολλῶν, <1:16> καὶ ἔχων ἐν | τῇ²⁸ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ χειρὶ²⁹ ἀστέρας
ἑπτά,

²⁸ At this point the scribe Theodosius ceases to write and another scribe takes over, starting with folio 248r. His handwriting is markedly different. He places the indication Ερ (meaning ἐρμηνεία) on the left margin, at the beginning of each Scholion.

²⁹ 2329: κατέχων ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ τῇ δεξιᾷ. O. An. (M.), καὶ ἔχων ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ. An. (S.), Ar., N.-A. καὶ ἔχων ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.

Σχόλιον ε΄¹

EP Οὐ γίνεται ἀτεχνῶς² ἐν ὧς ἔν, οὐδὲ πολλὰ ὧς μέρη ὁ υἱός, ἀλλ' ὧς πάντα³ ἔν. ἐνθεν καὶ πάντα.⁴ κύκλος γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς πασῶν τῶν δυνάμεων εἰς ἘΝ εἰλουμένων⁵ καὶ ἐνουμένων. διὰ τοῦτο τὸ **A καὶ Ω** ὁ Ἀ-λόγος⁶ εἴρηται,⁷ οὗ μόνου τὸ τέλος ἀρχὴ⁸ γίνεται καὶ τελευτᾷ πάλιν, ἐπὶ τὴν ἄνωθεν ἀρχήν, οὐδαμοῦ διάστασιν λαβών· διὸ δὴ καὶ τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ⁹ πιστεῦσαι μοναδικόν ἐστι γενέσθαι,¹⁰ ἀπερισπάστως¹¹ ἐνούμενον ἐν αὐτῷ· τὸ δὲ ἀπιστῆσαι διστάσαι ἐστὶν καὶ διαστήναι καὶ μερισθῆναι.

¹ This Scholion is a verbatim quotation from Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 4.25.156.2. The word ἐν is emphasized in the present codex by means of accented uncials.

² EN Va.

³ Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, 1.9.88.1: ὁ ὄντως θεός, ὁ ὢν αὐτὸς τὰ πάντα καὶ τὰ πάντα ὁ αὐτός. Didymus, *commEccl*(11–12), Cod. p. 329: πάντα οὖν αὐτός ἐστιν.

⁴ Cod. παν.

⁵ EN Vb.

⁶ Cod. λόγος.

⁷ Cf. Rev. 21:6; 22:13.

⁸ Cf. Rev. 21:6; 22:13.

⁹ Cf. Acts, 10:43; Rom. 11:36; 1 Cor. 8:6; Phil. 1:29; Col. 1:16; 1:20.

¹⁰ Cod. γενέσθαι.

¹¹ EN Vc.

Scholion V

The Son does not become one in the simple sense,¹ since he is one, neither does he become manifold as if he comprised parts;² but he is one, in the sense of being everything and in whom everything originates.³ For he is the same circle of all powers which are assembled and united into one. Wherefore the Logos has been styled **the alpha and the omega**,⁴ of whom alone the **end** becomes **beginning** and comes to an end again, heading yet again for its original **beginning** which is from on high,⁵ without being fragmented at any point of this course.⁶ Wherefore also to believe *in him* and *through him*⁷ is to become one⁸ and to unite with him⁹ without any distraction of mind. On the other hand, to disbelieve is to be hesitant, and disjoined, and divided.¹⁰

¹ The Son does not *become* one in the current simple sense of *becoming* something which he was not before. Cf. Origen's notion of the 'conceptions of the Son', *COT*, pp. 52–64.

² Clement advises that the verb '*become*' should be understood not in the current 'simple' manner, that is, 'to become' meaning reaching a state which someone or something was not in before.

³ Cf. *PHE*, pp. 335–336; 415–417, about everything being 'from Him' according to Origen.

⁴ Cf. Rev. 21:6; 22:13.

⁵ The verb τελευτᾷ is a double sense pointing not only to the 'end' of a cycle, but also to the 'death' of the incarnate Logos. Likewise, in the expression ἐπὶ τὴν ἄνωθεν ἀρχήν, the term ἀρχή suggests not only a 'beginning', but also the divine 'origin' of the Logos during His sojourn on earth.

⁶ An allusion to the presence of the Logos in the world in the

incorporeal form of OT times, the corporeal and currently the incorporeal, too, but not in terms of mere meaningless repetition. No matter whether the Logos appeared incarnate or non-incarnate, History moves forward. This is a statement made and understood within the context of the Christian philosophy of History. The end of the 'cycle' is a 'beginning' within a course governed by the presence of God the Logos, a course towards 'unification of history' (see *PHE*, pp. 404 and 415–417). This is what Origen called 'the mystery of unification', which is implicitly reproduced by Cassian through this quotation from Clement.

⁷ Cf. Acts 10:43; Rom. 11:36; 1 Cor. 8:6; Phil. 1:29; Col. 1:16; 1:20.

⁸ That is, an unwavering believer.

⁹ An allusion to the 'unification' urged by Paul in Eph. 4:3 and 4:13.

¹⁰ The idea was advanced by Origen. Cf. *COT*, σχίσμα, διαίρεσις, pp. 79 and 82; *PHE*, pp. 312 and 416.

SCHOLION VI

ζ

<VI. Rev. 1:16> καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, ῥομφαία δίστομος ὁξεῖα¹
ἐκπορευομένη καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος φαίνει ἐν τῇ δυνάμει² αὐτοῦ. <1:17>
καὶ ὅτε ἴδον³ αὐτόν, ἔπεσα⁴ πρὸς⁵ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὡς νεκρός,

¹ Cod. ὁξία.

² O. φαίνει τῇ δυνάμει. An.(S.), Ar., N.-A. φαίνει ἐν τῇ δυνάμει. An.(M.) φαίνων ἐν τῇ δυνάμει.

³ 2329: ἴδον. O., An., Ar. εἶδον.

⁴ 2329, O., An., N.-A. ἔπεσα. Ar. ἔπεσον.

⁵ 2329, O., An. εἰς. Ar. πρὸς.

«Σχόλιον ζ'»

248v EP Ἐν τῷ <νς¹ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται> οἱ υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων, | οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτῶν ὄπλα
καὶ βέλη καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν μάχαιρα ὁξεῖα.² οὐχ ὥστε ψεκτὰ πάντως εἶναι τὰ
λεγόμενα· εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὄπλα δικαίων³ καὶ βέλη ἐκλεκτὰ⁴ καὶ μάχαιρα⁵ ἐπαινετή,⁶ πάντων
υἱῶν ἀνθρώπων στρατευομένων τῶν μὲν θεῶ καὶ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, τῶν δὲ τῷ πονηρῷ καὶ τῇ
ἀμαρτίᾳ.⁷ οὐ δεῖ⁷ ἀμφιβάλλειν περὶ τῶν ἐνταῦθα εἰρημένων τοῦ γενομένου υἱοῦ
ἀνθρώπου ἔχοντος⁸ ῥομφαίαν ὁξεῖαν ἐν τῷ⁹ στόματι. αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶπεν· οὐκ
ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν,¹⁰ καὶ τοιαύτην, ὥστε δικνεῖσθαι¹¹ ἄχρι
μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος¹² καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. οἱ μὲν οὖν φαῦλοι μελετήσαντες¹³ ὑπὲρ τῶν
ψευδῶν δογμάτων ἱκανῶς¹⁴ ἠκόνησαν <τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν>¹⁵ ὡς μάχαιραν ὁξεῖαν,¹⁶
249r ἐπὶ κακῷ τῶν ἀκουόντων· οἱ δὲ ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς τὸν νοῦν ἀκονήσαντες
ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀκουόντων σωτηρίας | ἔχουσι γλῶσσαν ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ
μάχαιραν¹⁷ ὁξεῖαν γεγεννημένην· οἱ μὲν γὰρ φαῦλοι τιτρώσκουσι¹⁸

¹ Cod. ζ.

² Psalm 56:5. EN VIa.

³ Cf. Rom. 6:13: καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὄπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ. 2 Cor. 6:7: διὰ τῶν ὄπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν. Psalm, 5:12–13: ὅτι σὺ εὐλογήσεις δίκαιον· κύριε, ὡς ὄπλο εὐδοκίας ἐστεφάνωσας ἡμᾶς.

⁴ Cf. Is. 49:2. EN VIb.

⁵ Cf. Eph. 6:17. EN VIc, VId.

⁶ Cf. Eph. 6:17: καὶ τὴν περικεφαλαίαν τοῦ σωτηρίου δέξασθε, καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὃ ἐστὶν ῥῆμα θεοῦ. Isaiah, 27:1: Τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐπάξει ὁ θεὸς τὴν μάχαιραν τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ τὴν μεγάλην καὶ τὴν ἰσχυράν. Isaiah, 49:2: καὶ ἔθηκεν τὸ στόμα μου ὥσει μάχαιραν ὁξεῖαν. Cf. ἡ μάχαιρα κυρίου: Isaiah, 34:6; Jer. 12:12; 26:10; 29:6. Prov. 24:22c: μάχαιρα γλῶσσα βασιλέως καὶ οὐ σαρκίνη.

⁷ Cod. οὐδε.

⁸ Cod. ἔχων.

⁹ Cod. το.

¹⁰ Matt. 10:34. EN VIe.

¹¹ Cod. δεικνεῖσθαι.

¹² Heb. 4:12.

¹³ Cf. Psalms 2:1; 37:13; Acts 4:25.

¹⁴ Cod. ἱκανῶς. Notice the similarity of language with Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1171 (on Psalm 126:4): Τίς δὲ ὁ δυνατὸς ὁ ἱκανῶς ἐκπέμπων τὰ βέλη ὥστε εἰς ἀγάπην σοφίαν τε καὶ ἀλήθειαν τρῶσαι ἢ ὁ σωτήρ, περὶ οὗ γέγραπται *Τὰ βέλη σου ἠκονήμένα, δυνατέ*; *ibid.* fr. 1176: τοὺς πολέμιους κατὰ διάνοιαν ἱκανῶς ἔχοντας. *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 87: οὕτω καὶ Μωϋσῆς καίτοι πεπαιδευμένος πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων καὶ ἱκανῶς ἔχων περὶ λόγους, ἰσχνόφωνον καὶ βραδύγλωσσον ἑαυτὸν εἶπεν. Cf. Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1492.11: (comm. on Psalm 63:4): *Ὅτινες ἠκόνησαν ὡς ῥομφαίαν*, κ. τ. ἐ. Οἱ ἱκανοὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ψευδῶν δογμάτων ἐνέτειναν τόξον πρᾶγμα πικρόν.

¹⁵ I have added τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν. What we have is a combined allusion to Psalms 56:5 (which introduces this Scholion), 63:4, and 139:4. Didymus makes a similar compilation in *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. pp. 311–12. EN VIi.

¹⁶ Psalm 56:6; Isaiah 49:2. Cf. Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 247: ‘καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν μάχαιρα ὁξεῖα’· ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν οἷα μάχαιρα βλάπτει καὶ τιτρώσκει. ἐν τῷ λέγειν οὖν εἰσὶν τινες τιτρώσκοντες *μαχαίρα*.

¹⁷ Cod. *μαχαίρα*.

¹⁸ Cod. *τιτρώσκουσι*.

μαχαίρα,¹⁹ γλῶσσαι δὲ σοφῶν ἰῶνται²⁰ καὶ τιντρώσκουσιν²¹ ἀγάπη· τῇ ἀγάπῃ οὖν ἔτρωσεν²² ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος.

¹⁹ Cod. μαχαίρας.

²⁰ Cod. γλωσσαι δὲ σοφίαν ἰωνται. I wrote, γλῶσσαι δὲ σοφῶν ἰῶνται. This is actually a quotation of Prov. 12:18. [EN VIg](#).

²¹ Cod. τιντρώσκουσιν. Cf. an impressive parallel in [Scholion XII](#), note 1 (p. 118) by Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1285.

²² Cf. Song of Solomon, 2:5; 5:8. The sentiment of the Scholion and combined use of Scriptural passages is much the same in both Didymus and Theodoret. Theodoret, *commIs*, section 15: *Καὶ ἔθηκε τὸ στόμα μου ὡς μάχαιραν ὁξεῖαν καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν σκέπην τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἔκρυσέ με*. Τοιοῦτος γὰρ ὁ διακριτικὸς λόγος ὁ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις προσενεχθεῖς, οὕτω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔφη· 'Οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον ἀπὸ τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, υἱὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, θυγατέρα ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφην ἀπὸ τῆς πενθερᾶς

αὐτῆς.' Καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολός φησιν· 'Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐνεργῆς καὶ τομώτερος ἢ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον καὶ δεικνύμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, ἀρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας.' Ἐθικέ με ὡς βέλος ἐκλεκτὸν καὶ ἐν τῇ φαρέτρᾳ αὐτοῦ ἔκρυσέ με. Ὅμοίως καὶ ταῦτα τροπικῶς κέκληκε, βέλος μὲν αὐτὸν τὸν τιτρώσκοντα τὰς ἐρώσας αὐτοῦ ψυχάς, ὣν ἐκάστη βοᾷ· 'Τετρωμένη ἀγάπης ἐγώ·' φαρέτραν δὲ τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας μυστήριον. Theodoret comments on the expression *τετρωμένη ἀγάπης ἐγώ* (Song of Songs 2:5 and 5:8) in his *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.89.9f and PG.81.153.45f. He does the same *ibid.* PG.81.156.1f, using an expression that is remarkably similar to the Scholion: ὅτι τῷ ἐκλεκτῷ βέλει τῆς ἀγάπης τέτρωται. [EN VIIh](#).

Scholion VI

In Psalm fifty-six it is written, *the sons of men, whose teeth are spears and arrows, and their tongue a sharp sword*.¹ Definitely, it should not be assumed that these words indicate blame. For indeed, if there are *spears* of the righteous,² and [if there are] *select shafts*³ and a *sword* which is praiseworthy,⁴ and since of all the sons of men some are fighting for God and righteousness, while others for evil and sin, one should not wonder at what is said at this point of Him who became the Son of Man having a **sharp sword in his mouth**.⁵ For it is He who said, *I came not to send peace upon earth, but a sword*,⁶ indeed such a sword as to *divide asunder the soul from spirit*⁷ and what follows. The wicked, therefore, conspired to devise false doctrines,⁸ and skilfully *whet their tongues*⁹ like a *sharp sword*¹⁰ to the harm of their hearers. On the other hand, the people who *whet* their minds through the study of the Holy Scriptures, for the sake of both their salvation and that of those who hear them, have made their *tongue* like a **sharp sword** unto salvation. For the wicked wound with a *sword*, but the *tongues of the wise nurse back to health*¹¹ and wound by means of love. Therefore, the Lord *has wounded* us by means of love.¹²

¹ Psalm 56:5.

² Cf. Rom. 6:13; 2 Cor. 6:7; Psalm 5:12–13.

³ Cf. Is. 49:2.

⁴ Cf. Eph. 6:17: 'and take the helmet of salvation, the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God'. Isaiah 27:1: 'On that day, the Lord with his holy (ἁγίαν) and great and strong sword shall punish Leviathan.' Isaiah 49:2: καὶ ἔθηκεν τὸ στόμα μου ὡσεὶ μάχαιραν ὁξεῖαν. Cf. the sword of the Lord (ἡ μάχαιρα κυρίου): Isaiah 34:6; Jer. 12:12; 26:10; 29:6. Prov. 24:22c (Septuagint): the tongue of the king is a sword, yet one not made of flesh (quoted above). The latter version was used only by Evagrius of Pontus (*Expositio in*

Proverbia Solomonis, p. 110; *Scholia in Proverbia*, Scholion 276) and reproduced by John of Damascus (*Sacra Parallela*, PG.95.1289.4).

⁵ Rev. 1:16.

⁶ Matt. 10:34.

⁷ Heb. 4:12.

⁸ Cf. Psalms 2:1; 37:13; Acts 4:25.

⁹ Psalms 63:4; 139:4.

¹⁰ Psalm 56:6; Isaiah 49:2.

¹¹ Prov. 12:18.

¹² Cf. Song of Songs 2:5; 5:8.

SCHOLION VII

< VII. Rev. 1:17² > **καὶ ἔθηκεν¹ τὴν δεξιάν αὐτοῦ² ἐπ’ ἐμέ, λέγων· μὴ φοβοῦ, ἐγώ εἰμι³ ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος·**

¹ 2329: ἐπέθηκεν. An. ἐπέθηκε. O., N.-A. ἔθηκεν. Ar. ἔθηκε.

² 2329, Ar., O. δεξιάν αὐτοῦ. An. δεξιάν αὐτοῦ χειρά. N.-A. τὴν δεξιάν αὐτοῦ.

³ 2329: λέγων· μὴ φοβοῦ, ἐγώ εἰμι. O. λέγων ἐγώ εἰμι. An., Ar. λέγων· μὴ φοβοῦ· ἐγώ εἰμι.

Ἐσχόλιον ζ'

EP Ὁ τουνάυτας¹ ὥς ἐστιν² θείας θεωρίας ἀνηγμένως³ νοήσας, ἀνοήσει⁴ τὸν θεὸν λόγον εἶναι τὸ ἄλφα, ἀρχὴν⁵ καὶ αἰτίαν⁶ τῶν πάντων, πρῶτον τε οὐ χρόνον, ἀλλὰ τιμὴν⁷ αὐτῷ γὰρ προσφέρεται δόξα καὶ τιμὴ⁸ ὅτι ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ⁹ τῶν αἰώνων ὡς τέλος ἐπάγων τοῖς παρ’ αὐτοῦ γινομένοις <τὸ> ω εἶναι εἴρηται. καὶ **πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος** πάλιν οὐ κατὰ χρόνον,¹⁰ ἀλλ’ ὡς ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ἐπάγων¹¹ τὰ γὰρ ἄκρα τῶν στοιχείων ὡς ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ἐλήφθησαν καὶ | τὰ ἄλλα μέσα περιέχοντα.¹² ἀλλ’ οὕτως, ζωὴ¹³ ὢν κατὰ φύσιν, νεκρὸς δι’ ἡμᾶς ἐγένετο.¹⁴ λύσας τὰς ὁδὸν τοῦ θανάτου.¹⁵ ζῶν ἐστιν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας¹⁶ καὶ νεκρὸς μὲν

¹ Cod. ταῦτας.

² Cod. ὡς ἔχει.

³ Cod. θεωρίας — ἀνοιγμένως. I wrote, ἀνηγμένως. Cf. [Scholion XIII](#): ἀνακτέον and κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν, as well as the analogous expression in [Scholion XIV](#): ἐπειδὴ δὲ περὶ πνευματικῶν ὁ λόγος, ἀνωτέρω χωρητέον παντὸς αἰσθητοῦ. The expression ἀνηγμένως νοῆσαι is characteristic of, and peculiar to, Didymus. This is derived from the noun ἀναγωγή (anagogical sense, or interpretation). Cf. [Scholion XXXI](#): ἀνάγκη κατὰ πνευματικὴν ἀκολουθίαν ἐκλαμβάνειν τὰ προκείμενα. [EN VIIa](#).

⁴ I have added νοήσει. Normally the scribes who wrote this codex do not omit words. A plausible reason for such an oversight is that the scribe heard ‘νοήσας, νοήσει’ and thought that it stood for νοήσας alone. There is a parallel for such a structure (‘he who grasped that he also comprehends this’) in an almost identical theological context. Athanasius, *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.316.42–44: καὶ νοήσας τὴν ἐν τῇ κτίσει δημιουργὸν Σοφίαν, νοήσει ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ τὸν αὐτῆς Πατέρα.

⁵ Rev. 1:8; 21:6; 22:13.

⁶ Cf. [Scholion XX](#): ἀρχὴν δὲ τῆς κτίσεως εἶπεν αὐτόν· οὐχ ὡς κτίσμα πρῶτον κτίσεως ἀρχὴ ἐστὶν αὐτῆς, ἀλλ’ ὡς αἰτία τοῦ ὑπάρχειν αὐτὴν οἷα δημιουργός. [EN VIIb](#).

⁷ Cf. Didymus, *commEcll*(11–12), Cod. p. 328: ἰδοὺ ‘ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος’, ‘πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος’. τὸ ‘πρῶτον’ ὥδε κατὰ τιμὴν λάβε. The terms ‘beginning’ (ἀρχή) and ‘first’ (πρῶτος) suggest ontological priority. Likewise, Didymus, *commEcll*(3–4.12), Cod. p. 79–80: καὶ προτέρα ἐστὶν κατὰ τοῦτο ἢ ἐνέργεια, τῇ τιμῇ προτέρα ἐστίν. [EN VIIc](#).

⁸ Cf. Rev. 4:9; 4:11; 5:12; 5:13; 7:12; 21:26. The expression προσφέρειν δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν to God appears in the apocryphal *Acta Apocrypha Barnabae* 26 (ὅτι αὐτῷ πρέπει τιμὴ καὶ δόξα αἰώνιος), and thereafter in three authors who influenced Cassian the Sabaite, the compiler of these Scholia: Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalms*, PG.29.284.28–30: Ἐνέγκατε τῷ Κυρίῳ, φησί, δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν. Πῶς οὖν ἡμεῖς, ἡ γῆ καὶ σποδός, τῷ μεγάλῳ Κυρίῳ

δόξαν προσφέρομεν; πῶς δὲ καὶ τιμὴν; Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.253.28: Αὐτῷ μὲν γὰρ προσφέρομεν δόξαν διὰ δογμάτων ἐβρώμενων· ἀλλὰ καὶ τιμὴν αὐτῷ προσφέρομεν. Ephraem Syrus, *In illud: Attende Tibi Ipsi*, 6: Σὲ προσκυνούμεν, Κύριε, τὸν πλάσαντα ἡμᾶς Θεόν. Σοὶ προσφέρομεν δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν. Pseudo-Epiphanius of Salamis, *Homilia in Laudes Mariae Deiparae*, PG.43.492.12–14: Καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ὕμνον καὶ αἶνον καὶ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν προσήνεγκαν.

⁹ Cod. συντελία.

¹⁰ [EN VIIIc](#).

¹¹ Cf. [Scholion XXXIII](#): καὶ διὰ τῶν ἄλλων περιστάσεων τῶν διὰ Χριστόν, ἃς ἐπάγουσιν τοῖς Ἰησοῦ μαθηταῖς οἱ πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι τε καὶ δαίμονες. [Scholion XXVII](#): ὁ πᾶς λόγος τῆς προνοίας, καθ’ ὃν ἡ κρίσις θεοῦ ἐπάγεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. [Scholion XXXI](#): τέως μὴ ἐπάγειν αὐτά.

¹² Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), PG.39.696.1–4: Ἔστι γὰρ περιστέρα μίᾳς καὶ ὀκτακοσίων ψήφου, αἵτινες δηλοῦνται διὰ τοῦ ἄλφα καὶ ω· τὰ δὲ στοιχεῖα ταῦτα ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ὧν καθέστηκε τῶν στοιχείων. The expression τῶν στοιχείων is an allusion to Wisdom of Solomon 7:17. Cf. Didymus, *commJob*(5.1–6.29), Cod. pp. 120; 300; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 32. Consequently, what is meant by the expression τὰ γὰρ ἄκρα τῶν στοιχείων ὡς ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ἐλήφθησαν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μέσα περιέχοντα (as well as in the foregoing footnoted passage διὰ τοῦ ἄλφα καὶ ω· τὰ δὲ στοιχεῖα ταῦτα ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ὧν καθέστηκε τῶν στοιχείων) is this: the Son is the Truth, hence he is all knowledge. Since he is both the first and the last of the ‘elements’ (in the sense of both the constitutive elements of the world and the letters of the alphabet), he contains (in the sense of ‘knowing’ and ‘controlling’) all the elements which exist between these two extremes.

¹³ Cf. John 14:6.

¹⁴ Rev. 1:18.

¹⁵ Acts 2:24–30.

¹⁶ Rev. 4:10.

γεγονέναι ὁμολόγησεν,¹⁷ ζῶν δὲ οὐ γέγονε,¹⁸ ἀλλ' εἶναι διεβεβαιώσατο λέγων· ὁ ζῶν καὶ ἐγενόμην νεκρὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶν εἰμι.¹⁹ ὥστε τὴν νεκρότητα διὰ τι ὑπομεῖναι, τὴν δὲ ζῶν ἅει εἶναι ἑαυτὸν ὥρισάτο.²⁰ ὁ ταῦτα μαθὼν τὰ γράμματα, τὸ Α φημί καὶ τὸ Ω, οὐ τὰ αἰσθητά, ἀλλ' ὑπερ γράφει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,²¹ οἶδεν ὥς²² αὐτὸς ἀρχὴ τῶν ὅλων καὶ τέλος τῶν ἀπάντων,²³ κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν θεολόγον²⁴ Ἰωάννην εἰπόμενα.²⁵ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος,²⁶ καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο.²⁷ αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐνανθρωπήσαντος τὸ τέλος τῆς τῶν ὅλων σωτηρίας ἐγένετο.

¹⁷ Cod. ὁμολόγησεν.

¹⁸ Cf. John 14:6. Cf. [Scholion XX](#): Ἅγιος, ἀληθινὸς ὁ μὴ μετουσία, ἀλλ' οὐσία ὢν τοιοῦτος, αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς λόγος.

¹⁹ Rev. 1:18. Of all Christian writers, this passage is commented on only by Origen (*commJohn*, I.XXII.132), Eusebius, (*Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.34) and, more extensively, by Didymus (*commEccl* (11–12), Cod. pp. 328–30). The relevant comment by Oecumenius is fairly short: *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, pp. 44–45. So is the comment by Andreas, (PG.106.229.46f) and Arethas (PG.106.521.32f).

²⁰ Cf. Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod p. 329: εἴτα λοιπὸν εἰρηκῶς λέγει· ὁ ζῶν καὶ ἐγενόμην νεκρὸς· ἐγὼ ὁ ζῶν, οὐχ ὁ γενόμενος ζῶν· ζῶν γὰρ ἐστὶν, ζῶν γὰρ ἐστὶν, ἐγένετο δὲ νεκρὸς· ἀλλὰ τὸ μεσολαβῆσαι λύεται· ἐπήγαγεν γὰρ· καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶν εἰμι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ζῶν τυγχάνων νεκρὸς γέγονα· οὐ γέγονα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας νεκρὸς, ἀναλαμπούσης ἐκείνης τῆς ζῶντος, ἧς εἶχον πρὸ τῆς νεκρώσεως.

²¹ Cf. Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. pp. 328–9: ἐγὼ τὸ ἄλφα καὶ ἐγὼ τὸ ω· ἔστιν γράμματα, ἃ χαράττει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῶν οὕτω παρεσκευασμένων. . . αὐτὸς οὖν ἐστὶν καὶ τὰ γράμματα τὰ θεῖα.

²² Cod. ὁ.

²³ This comes as a conclusion to the structure which I mentioned at the beginning of the Scholion: εἴσεται τὸν θεὸν λόγον εἶναι τὸ **ἄλφα**, **ἀρχὴν** καὶ αἰτίαν τῶν ἀπάντων. Cf. Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 329: ἰδοὺ ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος· πάντα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐστὶν.

²⁴ Cf. [Scholion IV](#) and [EN IVb](#).

²⁵ Cod. εἰπόμενα.

²⁶ John 1:1.

²⁷ John 1:14.

Scholion VII

Anyone who has comprehended such divine visions as far as possible also in an elevated sense, knows that God the Logos is **the Alpha**, the **beginning** and cause of the existence of all things, the First One, not in terms of time, but in dignity. For to him glory and honour is extended, since [now] upon the consummation of the ages he is called **the Omega**, on account of the fulfilment he occasions to his own works. He is also called **the First and the Last**, again not in terms of time, but because it is He who brings about both a beginning and an end. For the first and last letters of the alphabet, which contain between them all the other [letters], have been employed to denote both beginning and end. Still, even though he *is life*¹ by nature, he **became dead**² for our sake. Having *loosed the pains of death*,³ **he lives forever and ever**.⁴ Granted, he professed himself to have become a *dead* [man], and yet he did not become **life**,⁵ but he assured [us] he is life, by saying this: **I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore**.⁶ On that account, he endured the state of death for a certain reason, but he declared himself to have been *life* always. Anyone who has comprehended these letters, namely Alpha and Omega (not the sensible ones, but those which the Holy Spirit writes), knows that he is **the beginning** of everything and **the end** of all things, according to John the Theologian himself, who said, *In the beginning was the Logos*⁷ and *the Logos was made flesh*.⁸ For once he became incarnate, **the end** of the salvation of all has been fulfilled.

¹ Cf. John 14:6.

² Rev. 1:18.

³ Acts 2:24.

⁴ Rev. 4:10.

⁵ Cf. John 14:6.

⁶ Rev. 1:18.

⁷ John 1:1.

⁸ John 1:14.

SCHOLION VIII

Π
250r

< VIII. Rev. 1:18 > καὶ ὁ ζῶν, καὶ ἐγενόμην νεκρός¹ καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶν εἰμι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν | αἰώνων, ἀμήν² καὶ ἔχω τὰς κλεῖδας³ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ᾄδου.> <1:19> γράψον οὖν, ἃ ἶδες καὶ ἃ εἰσιν⁴ καὶ ἃ μέλλει⁵ γίνεσθαι⁶ μετὰ ταῦτα.>⁷ <1:20> τὸ μυστήριον⁸ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀστέρων ὧν⁹ ἶδες ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς μου, καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ λυχνίας τὰς χρυσᾶς. οἱ ἑπτὰ ἀστέρες, ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν εἰσιν,

¹ 2329: ἐγενόμην ὡς νεκρός (unnoticed by N.-A.). O., An., Ar., N.-A. ἐγενόμην νεκρός.

² O., N.-A. omit ἀμήν, which appears in K and Syriac versions.

³ 2329, O., An.(S.): κλεῖς. An. (M.), Ar. κλεῖδας.

⁴ 2329: ἶδες καὶ εἰσιν (not in N.-A.). O., An., Ar. εἶδες καὶ ἃ εἰσιν.

⁵ 2329: ἃ δὴ μέλλει.

⁶ An (M.), N.-A. γενέσθαι.

⁷ 2329: μετὰ τὸ μυστήριον.

⁸ 2329 is the sole version to attach τὸ μυστήριον to the previous sentence, namely to 1:19 (ἃ δὴ μέλλει γίνεσθαι μετὰ τὸ μυστήριον). Otherwise, 2351 is close to An (M.) and Ar. Cf. An. (M.) τὸ μυστήριον τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀστέρων ὧν εἶδες ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς μου, καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ λυχνίας τὰς χρυσᾶς· οἱ ἑπτὰ ἀστέρες ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν εἰσιν καὶ αἱ ἑπτὰ λυχνίαι ἃς εἶδες, ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι εἰσιν. Ar. τὸ μυστήριον τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀστέρων ὧν εἶδες ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς μου, καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ λυχνίας τὰς χρυσᾶς. Οἱ ἑπτὰ ἀστέρες ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν εἰσιν. καὶ λυχνίαι αἱ ἑπτὰ, ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι εἰσιν. O. τὸ μυστήριον τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀστέρων οὗς εἶδες ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν μου καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ λυχνίας τὰς χρυσᾶς· οἱ ἑπτὰ ἀστέρες ἄγγελοι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰσιν καὶ αἱ ἑπτὰ λυχνίαι ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι εἰσιν. An.(S.) τὸ μυστήριον τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀστέρων, οὗς εἶδες ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς μου, καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ λυχνίας τὰς χρυσᾶς· οἱ ἑπτὰ ἀστέρες ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν εἰσιν καὶ αἱ ἑπτὰ λυχνίαι ἃς εἶδες ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι εἰσιν. N.-A. τὸ μυστήριον τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀστέρων, οὗς εἶδες ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς μου, καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ λυχνίας τὰς χρυσᾶς· οἱ ἑπτὰ ἀστέρες ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν εἰσιν καὶ λυχνίαι αἱ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι εἰσιν. By contrast, cf. 2329: ἃ δὴ μέλλει γίνεσθαι μετὰ τὸ μυστήριον. τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀστέρας οὗς εἶδες ἐπὶ τῆς λυχνίας καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ λυχνίας τὰς χρυσᾶς οἱ ἑπτὰ ἀστέρες ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν εἰσιν. καὶ αἱ λυχνίαι αἱ ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι εἰσιν.

⁹ ὧν instead of οὗς, in 1006, 1841, and K only.

Σχόλιον η΄

EP Γενόμενος γὰρ νεκρός¹ περιέγραψεν τὴν ἐπὶ γῆς αὐτοῦ ζωὴν, ἵνα ἀναληφθεὶς καθίσῃ ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὕψηλοις² ἐπὶ τὸ ζῆν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας,³ θανάτου οὐκέτι κυριεύοντος. ἐπείπερ ὁ ζῆ, ζῆ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῷ θεῷ, οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκων.⁴

¹ Rev. 1:18.

² Cf. Heb. 1:3; Cf. Heb. 1:8. see EN VIIIa.

³ Cf. Rev. 1:18; 4:9–10; 10:6; 17:7. See the notion in Daniel (*Theodotionis versio*) 6:27; Tobit 13:2.

⁴ Rom. 6:9–10.

Scholion VIII

Through [the expression] **becoming a dead man**¹ He described his life on earth, so that, after his ascension, he should *sit on the right hand of the Majesty on high*,² thereafter **living for ever and ever**,³ *with death having no more dominion over him*. For *in that he liveth, he liveth unto God forever and ever dying no more*.⁴

¹ Rev. 1:18.

² Cf. Heb. 1:3; Cf. Heb. 1:8.

³ Cf. Rev. 4:10

⁴ Rom. 6:9–10.

SCHOLION IX

Θ

250v

<IX. Rev. 1:20²> καὶ αἱ ἑπτὰ λυχνίαι, ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι εἰσίν. <2:1> τῷ ἀγγέλῳ¹ τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον· τάδε λέγει² ὁ κρατῶν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀστέρας ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἑπτὰ λυχνίων τῶν χρυσῶν· | <2:2> οἶδα τὰ ἔργα σου καὶ τὸν κόπον σου καὶ τὴν ὑπομονήν σου καὶ ὅτι οὐ δύνη³ βαστάσαι κακοὺς. καὶ ἐπείρασας⁴ τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ εἰσίν, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αὐτοὺς ψευδεῖς. <2:3> καὶ ὑπομονὴν ἔχεις, καὶ ἐβάστασας διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου καὶ οὐκ ἔκοπίσας.⁵

¹ Cod. τῶν ἀγγέλων.

² 2329: τῷ ἀγγέλῳ [Cod. τῶν ἀγγέλων] τῷ [Cod. τῶν] ἐν Ἐφέσῳ [Cod. νεφεσῳ] γράψον λέγων [Cod. λέγον]· τάδε λέγει . . .

³ 2329: Cod. δυνει. O. δύνασαι. An., Ar. δύνη.

⁴ 2329: ἐπειρασας.

⁵ 2329, O., An (S.), Ar. οὐκ ἔκοπίσας. An. (M.) οὐ κεκοπίσας. N.-A., οὐ κεκοπίσκες.

Σχόλιον Θ

EP

Ὁ πᾶς ἐνεσθηκὼς αἰὼν νῦν¹ ὀνομάζεται κατὰ τὴν ἐπίνοιαν, ὡς δηλοῖ ἡ παραβολὴ τῶν ἑπτὰ παρθένων.² ἐπεὶ οὖν ἡλίου³ ἡμέραν καὶ οὐ νύκτα φωτίζει, τοῖς ἐν νυκτὶ διάγουσιν χρεῖα λυχνιαίου⁴ φωτός. τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ κατὰ τὴν θεϊαν παιδευσιν⁵ φωτίζον⁶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας· καὶ ἐπεὶ μὴ ἀλλαχοῦ αὐτοῦ⁷ δεῖ ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις,⁸

251r

λυχνίας τὰς ἐκκλησίας ὀνομάσεν,⁹ ὑποβάλλων¹⁰ αὐτὰς τῷ ζ' | ἀριθμῷ¹¹ μυστικῶ

¹ Cf. Rev. 21:25; 22:5. Theodoret, *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.177.22–26: Ἄλλ' ἐπειδὴ νῦν ὁ βίος, κατὰ τὸν μακάριον Παῦλον· 'Ἡ νῦν γάρ, φησί, προέκοπεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν,' ἀναγκαίως ὡς ἐν νυκτὶ οἷόν τις σελήνη ἐστὶν ἡ Ἐκκλησία, τοὺς ὁδοιπόρους φωτίζουσα, καὶ τὴν εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἀποδεικνύουσα. **EN IXa.**

² Cf. Matt. 25:1f.

³ Cf. Rev. 1:16; 10:1; 12:1. Allusion to the 'sun of righteousness', as in **Scholion XVII**: Before this 'sun' had risen, men were in need of λυχνιαίου φωτός. The writer implicitly refers to John, 5:35 (reference to John the Baptist), and the idea was expounded by Theodoret. *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1853.29–37: ὁ μὲν νόμος λύχνος ὀνόμασται, ὁ δὲ Σωτὴρ καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν δικαιοσύνης ἡλίου. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ οἷα δὴ λύχνος μόγις ἐν κατηύγασεν ἔθνος, ὁ δὲ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐφώτισεν. Οὕτω καὶ τὸν θεσπέσιον Ἰωάννην λύχνον προσηγόρευσεν ὁ Δεσπότης Χριστός, ἔτι νυκτὸς οὖσης ἐπιφανέντα τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις. Ἐπειτα δὲ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀνέτειλεν.

⁴ Cod. λυχνίας ου. Of the few literary occurrences of this word, its use by Theodoret is noticeable, since it is remarkably similar to the sentiment of this Scholion. **EN IXb.**

⁵ **EN IXc.**

⁶ Cod. φωτίζων.

⁷ Cod. αὐτο. Cf. Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.289: Δυνατὸν ἐν τούτοις ἐκλαβεῖν οἰκίαν τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ ζῶντος Θεοῦ, οἶκον αὐτοῦ τυγχάνουσιν, ἐν ᾧ οἱ παραμένοντες καὶ διατρίβοντες, κατὰ δόγματα αὐτῆς διακείμενοι, καταλάμπονται πρὸς τοῦ

ἐπικειμένου τῇ λυχνίᾳ λύχνου, ἐξαπτομένου ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδεύοντος τοὺς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ διάγοντας κατὰ τοὺς θεσμούς καὶ κανόνας καὶ δόγματα τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς γνώμης. Φωτίζει δ' οὗτος ὁ διδάσκαλος ὅταν οἷα λύχνον ᾖ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν, ὅνπερ οὐ κρύπτει ὑπὸ κλίνην ἢ σκευὸς, ἀλλ' ἐπιτίθῃ τῷ προφορικῷ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, λυχνίᾳ ἀλληγορικῶς προσαγορευομένῳ, ἔχων 'γλῶτταν παιδείας ἡνίκα δεῖ εἰπεῖν'.

⁸ Cf. Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.288: Δυνατὸν ἐν τούτοις ἐκλαβεῖν οἰκίαν τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ ζῶντος Θεοῦ.

⁹ Cod. ὀνόμασεν. Rev. 1:20. Didymus is the sole theologian who made the point in connection with the Revelation, *commZacch*, 1.278: τάχα οὖν ἡ νοητὴ λυχνία ὁ πνευματικὸς οἶκος καὶ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τυγχάνει, ὡς ἐν Ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννου λέγεται, ὅτε φησὶν ὁ δεικνὺς τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῷ μυσταγωγούμενῳ· 'Αἱ ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι ἃς ὀφθαλμῷ ψυχῆς εἶδες ἐπὶ λυχνίαι εἰσίν.' The 'candlestick' standing for the Church, yet in a different scriptural context, was used by Origen at a late stage of his life, when he wrote the commentary on Luke (*frLuc*, 121b; 122; 123). Origen himself says that he also made a similar analysis in his commentary on Matthew, another late work of his. *frLuc*, 123: ἀλλὰ περὶ τούτων καὶ ἐν τῷ Ματθαίῳ εἴρηται· διὸ καὶ περιττὸν ἐνταῦθα μηκύνειν.

¹⁰ Cf. Didymus, *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 288: ὅτι κακὰ πολλὰ περιέσχον με οὐχ ὑποβαλλόμενα ἀριθμῷ ἦτοι διὰ τὸ πλῆθος - ἐὰν τὰ ἐπίπονα σημαίνηται, διὰ τὸ πλῆθος οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀριθμόν.

¹¹ Rev. 1:4. Cf. number seven recurring in Rev. 1:11; 12; 16; 20; 2:1; 3:1; 4:5; 5:1; 5:6; 6:1; 8:2; 6; 10:3; 4; 11:13; 12:3; 13:1; 15:1; 6; 7; 8; 16:1; 17:1; 3; 7:9; 11; 21:9.

δοντι,¹² διὸ ἅγιος καὶ εὐλογημένος¹³ ἐστίν. ἄπει λύχνον¹⁴ ὁ τὸν νοῦν ἑαυτοῦ προσάγων τῷ ἀληθινῷ φωτὶ¹⁵ καὶ κεῖθεν οἷα λύχνον¹⁶ αὐτὸν ἄπτων. ἴν' οὖν «ὠφελήσῃ¹⁷ τοὺς δεομένους¹⁸ ὁ τὸν λύχνον ἄψας,¹⁹ ἐπὶ τοῦ προφορικοῦ λόγου²⁰ ὡς ἐπὶ λυχνίας²¹ ἐντίθετο²² αὐτόν»²³ οὕτω γὰρ φωτίζει²⁴ διδασκαλία τοὺς μήπω καιρὸν ἔχοντας²⁵ καταυγασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ ἡλίου²⁶· μόνοι γὰρ τοῦτον ὁρῶσιν οἱ ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατοῦντες²⁷ καὶ ἀγαλλιαθέντες, ἵνα ἴδωσι τὴν ἡμέραν²⁸ τοῦ σωτήρος· ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ λείπονται²⁹ τοῦτου οἱ νυκτερινῶν³⁰ κατάστασιν³¹ ἔχοντες, ἀλλ' οὖν³² φωτίζονται ὑπὸ λύχνου ἐκεῖθεν³³ ἀφθέντος.

¹² Cf. *Scholion XXVII*: θεῖο ἀριθμῷ σφραγίδων συσφίγγεται τὸ βιβλίον. *Scholion XXVIII*: ἔχει λοιπὸν ἑπτὰ κέρατα, ἁγίαν βασιλείαν καὶ εὐλογημένην ἔχει. *EN IXd*.

¹³ The idea of the number *seven* being 'a holy one' claimed scriptural authority: this number is sacrosanct since 'God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it': Gen. 2:3. Cf. Ex. 12:16; 13:16; 31:15; Lev. 23:3; 23:8; Num. 28:25. For the conjunction 'holy and blessed', cf. Daniel 3:52: καὶ εὐλογημένον τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης σου τὸ ἅγιον. Tobit 11:14 (Cod. Vaticanus and Cod. Alexandrinus): καὶ εὐλογημένοι πάντες οἱ ἅγιοί σου ἄγγελοι. (Cod. Sinaiticus): καὶ εὐλογημένοι πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἅγιοι αὐτοῦ. Cf. *Scholion XXVIII*: ἁγίαν βασιλείαν καὶ εὐλογημένην. *EN IXe*.

¹⁴ Cf. Luke 8:16; 11:33; 12:35; 15:8; John 5:35; Rev. 18:23; 21:23; 22:5.

¹⁵ Cf. John 1:9.

¹⁶ οἷα λύχνον. Cf. Origen, *fr Luc*, fr. 122: οἷα δὲ φῶς κατ' οὐσίαν λύχνον. Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.289: οἷα λύχνον ἄρη τὸν ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν.

¹⁷ Cod. ὠφελήσῃ.

¹⁸ Cod. δυναμένους. I wrote δεομένους. Cf. above, αὐτοῦ δεῖ. Most of this *Scholion* is in fact a quotation from Didymus by Cassian. Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.72: Ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι, ἡμέρᾳ ἀλληγορικῶς καλουμένῃ, 'οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμπουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἑαυτῶν', φῶς ἀναδειχθέντες ἑαυτοὺς καταλάμποντες, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ διάγουσιν οὐ τοῦ ἔξωθεν

φωτὸς δεόμενοι. Καὶ ἐν τῇ ζῳῇ γοῦν ταύτῃ οἱ γνώσεως φῶς φωτίσαντες ἑαυτοῖς ὡς παρὰ τοῦ Σωτήρος ἀκοῦσαι· Ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου', ἐν λαμπρᾷ καταστάσει διάγουσιν οὐκ ἄλλοθεν ἀλλ' ἐξ ἑαυτῆς φωτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας οὐσης.

¹⁹ Cf. Luke 8:16; 11:33. Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.288.

²⁰ Didymus is the sole author to use this metaphor. *commZacch*, 1.289: φωτίζει δ' οὗτος ὁ διδάσκαλος ὅταν οἷα λύχνον ἄρη τὸν ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν, ὅνπερ οὐ κρύπτει ὑπὸ κλίνην ἢ σκεῦος, ἀλλ' ἐπιτίθῃσιν τῷ προφορικῷ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, λυχνία ἀλληγορικῶς προσαγορευομένη. *EN IXb*.

²¹ Cod. λυχνια τιθετω.

²² Cf. Matt. 5:15; Luke 8:16; 11:33. Ecclesiasticus 26:17.

²³ Cf. Rev. 21:23; 22:5; Matt. 5:15f; Luke 11:36; John 1:9. Cf. Psalms 138:12.

²⁴ Cf. Rev. 1:3; 11:18; 12:12; 12:14; 22:10. Cf. καιρὸν ἔχειν, 1 Macc. 15:34; Gal. 6:10; Rev. 12:12.

²⁵ Cf. John 1:9.

²⁶ Cf. Rom. 13:13.

²⁷ Cf. John 8:56.

²⁸ Cod. λείπονται.

²⁹ Cod. νυκτερινοί.

³⁰ *EN IXf*.

³¹ Cod. οὐ.

³² Cf. above: καὶ κεῖθεν οἷα λύχνον αὐτὸν ἄπτων. He means the *light* that is lit from 'the churches'.

Scholion IX

As the parable of the ten virgins¹ shows, the entire span of the current age is metaphorically called a *night*. Since therefore **the sun** illuminates the day, not the night, those who live in night-time are in need of candle-light. This is in fact [the light], which enlightens those who observe the divine edification. Since, therefore, this light is required nowhere else but in the **churches**, he styled the [seven] **churches candlesticks**, applying the number **seven** to them, which has a mystical² significance and is accordingly a blessed and sacrosanct one. He *lights the lamp*³ who tenders his own mind onto the *real light*,⁴ whence he lights up his own mind, as if this [mind] were a **candlestick**. Thus, *he who has lighted up a light*⁵ in order to benefit those who are in need of it *places* this *light* in the form of oral discourse, as if this [oral discourse] were a **candlestick**.⁶ This is indeed how one will be able to *illuminate*⁷ through instruction all those who did not happen to have the time⁸ to be enlightened by

¹ Cf. Matt. 25:1f.

² Cf. the notion of *mystical* in *PHE*, pp. 23–25; 123; 345; 367; 372; 376; 375; 414.

³ Cf. Luke 8:16; 11:33; 12:35; 15:8; John 5:35; Rev. 18:23; 21:23; 22:5.

⁴ Cf. John 1:9.

⁵ Cf. Luke, 8:16; 11:33; 12:35; 15:8; John 5:35;

⁶ Cf. Matt. 5:15; Luke 8:16; 11:33. Ecclesiasticus 26:17.

⁷ Cf. Rev. 21:23; 22:5; Matt. 5:15f; Luke 11:36; John 1:9. Cf. Psalm 138:12.

⁸ Macc. 15:34; Gal. 6:10; Rev. 12:12.

the *true*⁹ **sun**. For only they who *walk honestly* see Him, *as in the day*¹⁰ and who *rejoice to see the day* of the Saviour.¹¹ Even though those who live in the state of night-time are left without this [*true sun*], still they are illuminated by a *light* that is lit from that place.

⁹ Cf. John 1:9.

¹⁰ Cf. Rom. 13:13.

¹¹ Cf. John 8:56.

SCHOLION X

Ī
251v

< X. Rev. 2:4 > ἀλλ' ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ, ὅτι τὴν ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρώτην ἀφῆκας.¹ <2:5> μνημόνευε² οὖν πόθεν πέπτωκας,³ καὶ μετανόησον καὶ τὰ | πρῶτα ἔργα ποιήσον·⁴ εἰ δὲ μή, ἔρχομαί σοι καὶ κενήσω⁵ τὴν λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς, ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσης.⁶ <2:6> ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἔχεις, ὅτι μισεῖς⁷ τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν, ἃ κἀγὼ⁸ μισῶ.⁹ <2:7> ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω,¹⁰

¹ 2329: αφικασ.

² 2329: μνημόνευσον.

³ O. πέπτωκας. An., Ag. ἐκπέπτωκας.

⁴ O. ποιήσον ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. An., Ag., N.-A. ποιήσον·

⁵ Cod. κινήσω. 2329: κεινησω.

⁶ 2329: μετανοήσις.

⁷ 2329: τοῦτο ἔχε καὶ μισήσῃς τα ἔργα.

⁸ 2329: ἃ ἐγώ.

⁹ Cod. μισῶ.

¹⁰ Cod. ἀκουσάτω.

〈Σχόλιον ι'〉

EP Οὐ διαφωνεῖ πρὸς τὸ οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὸν κόπον καὶ τὴν ὑπομονήν·¹ ἃ σὺν ἀγάπῃ² κατορθοῦται· τὸ ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ, ὅτι τὴν πρώτην ἀγάπην ἀφῆκας·³ μαχόμενον·⁴ γὰρ ἂν ἦν, εἰ καθάπαξ ἐνεκαλεῖτο ἀποβαλὼν τὴν ἀγάπην· οὐκ ἐπιτρέπει⁵ δὲ τοῦτο ἐκλαβεῖν·⁶ προσκεείμενον· τὸ ἀφῆκας⁷ σου τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν πρώτην· ἴσως γὰρ ἄνεσις⁸ καὶ ἐλάττωσις ἐγγεγόνει⁹ περὶ τὴν ἀγαπητικὴν αὐτοῦ διάθεσιν·¹⁰ διὸ καὶ ἀνεθείσης¹¹ αὐτῆς εἶχεν καὶ κόπον καὶ ἔργα καὶ ὑπομονήν ὑπὸ θεοῦ γινωσκόμενα· οὐ γὰρ ἀναγκαίως ὑπάρχει τὸν κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργοῦντα¹² κατὰ τελείαν ἔξιν¹³ αὐτὸ πράττειν.¹⁴ |

¹ Rev. 2:2.

² An implicit reference to 1 Thess. 1:3. Cf. 2 Thess. 3:5; 1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 3:10; Tit. 2:2. Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.157. Cf. the expression σὺν ἀγάπῃ in Didymus, *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 13. EN Xa.

³ Rev. 2:4.

⁴ Cod. μαχόμενο. Cf. Scholion I: Οὐ μάχεται τῷ λεχθέντι.

⁵ Cod. ἐπιτρέπη.

⁶ Cod. ἐκλαβῆν.

⁷ Cod. ἀφήκα.

⁸ Cod. ἀνεσίς. Cf. the association of ἀνεσίς with sinful conduct in *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 2.84: Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἡ ἀνεσίς ἀκολασίας ἐστὶν ἀφορμή. 5.146: ἡ ἀνεσίς τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν κατὰ

ἐγκατάλειψιν γίνεται. 5.158: τοῖς διὰ πολλὴν ἀνεσίς τρυφῆς χρωμένοις.

⁹ Cod. γεγόνει.

¹⁰ EN Xb.

¹¹ EN Xc.

¹² EN Xd.

¹³ EN Xe. Cassian used the Aristotelian ἔξις regularly. *SerenPrim*, p. 82b: τῶν πνευματικῶν ἐν ἔξει γένηται τῶν καλῶν. *De Panareto*, p. 102r: καθολικῶς τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔξιν. Ibid. 102v: Διὰ τῶν θεωριῶν οὖν τούτων τρέφει ὁ Θεὸς τὰς ἔξεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Ibid. 113r: κατὰ τὴν ἔξιν τῆς ἀρετῆς. Scholion XV: πᾶσαν μοχθηρὰν ἔξιν.

¹⁴ Cod. πράττει.

Scholion X

The announcement, **I know thy works and labour and patience**,¹ which are deeds accomplished through *love*,² does not contradict the proclamation, **I have somewhat against thee**,

¹ Rev. 2:2.

² Cf. 1 Thess. 1:3; 2 Thess. 3:5; 1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 3:10; Tit. 2:2.

because thou hast left thy first love.³ These statements would be in conflict with each other only if [the angel of the Church of Ephesus] were altogether reproached for having discarded **love**. But since the expression **thou hast left thy first love**⁴ is conjoined, this does not allow for such a meaning. Perhaps relaxation and diminution of his loving disposition had taken place. This is why, even though this disposition had become neglectful, [the angel of the Church of Ephesus] still had **works and labour and patience** known to God. For it is not an indispensable characteristic of one acting in accordance with virtue to do so enduringly as an unfailing habit.

³ Rev. 2:4.

⁴ Rev. 2:4.

SCHOLION XI

252r
IA

< XI. Rev. 2:7 > | τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. τῷ νικῶντι¹ δώσω αὐτῷ φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τοῦ θεοῦ μου.² <2:8> καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίας γράψων.³ τάδε λέγει ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, ὃς ἐγένετο νεκρὸς καὶ ἔζησεν.⁴ <2:9> οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὴν θλίψιν⁵ καὶ τὴν πτωχείαν.⁶ ἀλλὰ πλούσιος εἶ· καὶ τὴν βλασφημίαν⁷ τῶν⁸ λεγόντων⁹ Ἰουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτοῦς,¹⁰ καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν, ἀλλὰ συναγωγὴ τοῦ σατανᾶ.¹¹ <2:10> μηδὲν φοβοῦ, ἃ μέλλεις παθεῖν.¹² ἰδοὺ δὴ¹³ μέλλει λαβεῖν ὁ διάβολος¹⁴ ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰς φυλακὴν, ἵνα πειρασθῇτε,¹⁵ καὶ ἔξετε¹⁶ θλίψιν¹⁷ ἡμέρας¹⁸ δέκα.¹⁹ γίνου πιστὸς ἄχρι θανάτου καὶ δώσω σοι τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς· <2:11> ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. ὁ νικῶν²⁰ οὐ μὴ ἀδικηθῇ ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ δευτέρου. <2:12> καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Περγάμῳ ἐκκλησίας γράψων.²¹

¹ 2329: νικοντι.

² 2329: ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τοῦ θεοῦ. O. ἐν παραδείσῳ τοῦ θεοῦ μου. An. ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ παραδείσου τοῦ θεοῦ. Ar. ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τοῦ θεοῦ μου.

³ Cod. γράψων.

⁴ 2329: ἀνέζησεν. O., An., Ar. καὶ ἔζησεν.

⁵ 2329: θληψιν.

⁶ 2329: πτωχίαν.

⁷ Cod. βλασφημείαν.

⁸ Cod. τῶν λεγόντων, instead of ἐκ τῶν λεγόντων obtaining universally. 2329 has it ἐκ τῶν λεγόντων, too, yet a later hand added a superscript ἐκ.

⁹ Cod. λεγόντων.

¹⁰ 2329: ἐκ τῶν λεγόντων Ἰουδαίων εἶναι ἑαυτοῖς.

¹¹ 2329: ἀλλὰ τοῦ σατανᾶ.

¹² O. δι' ἃ μέλλεις πάσχειν. An. (S), N.-A. An. (M), Ar. ἃ μέλλεις παθεῖν.

¹³ δὴ in K only.

¹⁴ 2329: μέλλει ὁ διάβολος βαλεῖν. O., An. (S) μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος. An. (M), Ar. μέλλει βαλεῖν ὁ διάβολος.

¹⁵ 2329: πειρασθῇται.

¹⁶ 2329: ἐξεταί.

¹⁷ 2329: θληψιν.

¹⁸ 2329: ἡμερῶν.

¹⁹ O. καὶ ἔχετε πειρασμὸν ἡμερῶν δέκα. 2329, An., N.-A. καὶ ἔξετε θλίψιν ἡμερῶν δέκα. Ar. καὶ ἔξετε θλίψιν ἡμέρας δέκα.

²⁰ Cod. νικων.

²¹ Cod. γράψων.

EP

Ἐσχόλιον ια΄

252v

Δυνατὸν εἰπεῖν πρῶτον **θάνατον**, ὃν | ὑφίσταται τὸ σύνθετον ζῶον,¹ ὃν ἔθος κοινὸν θάνατον² καλεῖν· **δεύτερος**³ δὲ μετὰ τοῦτον ὁ ἐπόμενος τῇ **ἁμαρτίᾳ**, ἥ' ἀποκτελεσθεῖσθαι⁴ ἀποκρίνεται θάνατον.⁵ τοῦ μὲν οὖν πρώτου πειρασθήσεται καὶ ὁ **νικῶν**, ἀποκειμένου πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν⁶ τοῦ δὲ **δευτέρου** ἐκτὸς ἔσται

¹ Cf. Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 54: Ὁ ἄνθρωπος σημαίνει καὶ τὸ σύνθετον ζῶον τὸ ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος συνεστὸς καὶ μάλιστα τὴν ψυχὴν. *commZacch*, 4.179: τοῦτ' ἐστὶν τὴν ψυχὴν συμπλέκων καὶ ἐνὼν ὡς ἐνδέχεται τῷ σώματι, ἵν' ἐν σύνθετον ζῶον ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἀποτελεσθῇ. [EN XIa](#).

² [EN XIb](#).

³ Cod. δεύτερον.

⁴ Cod. ἀπολεσθεῖς. Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 838: ἀποθνήσκουσι δὲ ἢ οὕτως ἀνθρωποὶ εἰσιν οὐ τὸν κοινὸν θάνατον ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐπόμενον τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ θάνατον. *Fragmenta in Joannem*, fr. 12: ὁ γὰρ τηρῶν τὸν Ἰησοῦ λόγον τὸν ἐπόμενον τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσει, εἰ καὶ γεύσεται τοῦ κοινοῦ καὶ σωματικοῦ θανάτου.

⁵ James 1:15. In Origen's extant texts this scriptural quotation is never found. This is, however, a recurrent theme in Didymus. [EN XIc](#).

⁶ Cf. Heb. 9:27.

διὰ ἀναμαρτησίαν⁷ ὥς μὴ ἀδικηθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁμῆ βλαβῆναι. δευτέρον θάνατον⁸ ἔρεϊ πάλιν τις τὴν κόλασιν,⁹ κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον· ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γενέσῃ.¹⁰ ἰσοδυναμεῖ τοῦτο τῷ¹¹ φθείρεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν φθείροντα τὸν ναὸν αὐτοῦ.¹² οὐκ ἀδικεῖται δὲ οὐδὲ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ δευτέρου θανάτου. οἰόμενός τις ἀδύνατα εἶναι περὶ ἀγγέλου ἐκλαβεῖν,¹³ ἀπολυθήσεται τοῦ περισπασμοῦ¹⁴ γνοὺς ὡς¹⁵ πᾶσα¹⁶ λογικὴ φύσις¹⁷ δεκτικὴ ἐστὶ τῶν ἀποδοθέντων σημαινομένων περὶ τοῦ θανάτου· ἴσως¹⁸ δὲ | καὶ ὁ ταραττόμενος τὸν κοινὸν θάνατον ἐν νῷ λαβὼν πέπονθεν τὴν ταραχήν.¹⁹

⁷ EN XI^d.

⁸ Rev. 2:11; Cf. Rev. 20:6; 20:14; 21:8. EN XI^e.

⁹ Cf. Matt. 25:46; 1 John 4:18.

¹⁰ Matt. 10:28.

¹¹ Cod. το.

¹² Cf. 1 Cor. 3:17.

¹³ Cod. ἐκλαβεῖν. The expression δυνατόν ἐκλαβεῖν ('it is possible to interpret as') is characteristic of only a few authors. It appears three times in Eusebius (*commPs*, PG.23: 148.11 and 32; 785.55), once each in Theodoret (*Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.1185.13) and John Chrysostom (*De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, Homily 4, line 308), but a good forty times in Didymus: *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 216; *commEccl*(5–6), Cod. pp. 196; *commEccl*(3–4.12), Cod. pp. 87; 128; *commEccl*(9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 304; *commZacch*, 1.208; 1.212; 1.289; 1.392; 4.35; 5.20; *commPs* 20–21, Cod. pp. 19; 22; *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 149; *commPs* 35–39, Cod. pp. 251; 265; *frPs(al)*, frs. 74; 96; 109; 665a; 673a; 737a; 756; 767; 896; 921; 930; 939; 983; 993; 1110; 1159; 1177; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad*

Corinthios, p. 37; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 57. Its presence in the following *spuria* or *dubia* only suggests that their relation to Cassian's pen should be explored. Pseudo-Athanasius, *Oratio Quarta Contra Arianos*, 28. Basil of Caesarea, *Sermones De Moribus*, PG.32.1376.47. *Epistulae*, Epistle 163.1. Also, in *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiaem*, 14.289. That John Philoponus used this phrase means that it was alive in the sixth century: *In Aristotelis Libros De Generatione et Corruptione Commentaria*, v. 14.2, p. 156; *In Aristotelis Libros De Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, p. 118; *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 16, p. 104; v. 17, p. 867. The expression was also alive in Palestine (see Introduction, 'Theodoret and the Alexandrians', p. 50).

¹⁴ Cf. Eccl. 1:13; 4:8; 5:13. EN XI^f.

¹⁵ Cod. ὅς.

¹⁶ Cod. πᾶσα.

¹⁷ EN XI^g.

¹⁸ Cod. ἴσως.

¹⁹ EN XI^h.

Scholion XI

It is possible to interpret 'first **death**' as the one which a composite animal undergoes. This is usually called 'common death'.¹ After this, is the **second death**, the one following *sin*, which, *when finished, bringeth forth death*.² Even **he that overcomes** will undergo the **first** [death], since *it is appointed unto men to die once*.³ But he shall be exempt from the **second** one, on account of sinlessness, so that **he shall not be hurt by this** (the expression **shall not be hurt** is used instead of 'he shall not be injured'). Besides, *hell*⁴ could be styled a **second death**, according to the saying, *to destroy both soul and body in hell*,⁵ which is tantamount to *anyone who destroys one's own temple* is destroyed by God.⁶ [**He that overcomes**], therefore, is not **hurt by this second death** either.

In case one should think that it is impossible to attribute this notion [*viz.* of **second death**] to an **angel** [*viz.* the angel of the Church of Smyrna], one will be released from all *intellectual distraction*⁷ when one recognizes that any rational nature is susceptible to **death**, understood in all the different foregoing senses of it. Perhaps, anyone who feels anxious at this [**second death**] feels so only because he mistook this death for the **common** [sc. natural] one.

¹ That is, natural death.

² James 1:15.

³ Cf. Heb. 9:27.

⁴ Cf. Matt. 25:46; 1 John 4:18.

⁵ Matt. 10:28.

⁶ Cf. 1 Cor. 3:17.

⁷ Cf. Eccl. 1:13; 4:8; 5:13.

SCHOLION XII

IB

<XII. Rev. 2:12²> τάδε λέγει ὁ ἔχων τὴν ῥομφαίαν¹ τὴν δίστομον, τὴν ὀξεῖαν· <2:13> οἶδα τὰ ἔργα σου² καὶ ποῦ κατοικεῖς, ὅπου ὁ θρόνος τοῦ σατανᾶ· καὶ κρατεῖς τὸ ὄνομά μου καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσω τὴν πίστιν³ μου· καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, αἷς⁴ Ἀντίπας⁵ ὁ μάρτυς μου, ὁ πιστὸς μου, ὃς ἀπεκτάνθη παρ' ὑμῖν,⁶ ὅπου ὁ σατανᾶς κατοικεῖ· <2, 14> ἀλλ' ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ ὀλίγα, ὅτι ἔχεις⁷ ἐκεῖ κρατοῦντας τὴν διδασχὴν Βαλαάμ, ὃς ἐδίδασκεν τὸν Βαλάκ⁸ βαλεῖν⁹ σκάνδαλον ἐνώπιον¹⁰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ φαγεῖν¹¹ εἰδωλόθυτα καὶ πορνεῦσαι·

¹ 2329: ρομφαίαν.

² 2329, O. οἶδα ποῦ κατοικεῖς.

³ 2329: πίστην.

⁴ αἷς in 1006, 1841, K, and Syriac versions only.

⁵ Cod. Ἀντίπας. 2329: ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις μου Ἀντίπας. O. καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀντίπας. An. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐν αἷς Ἀντίπας. Ar. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, ἐν αἷς Ἀντίπας. N.-A. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀντίπας.

⁶ 2329: παρ' ὑμῶν.

⁷ 2329: εἰ ἔχεις.

⁸ 2329: ὃς ἐδίδασκεν τὸν Βαλαάκ. O. ὃς ἐδίδασκεν τὸν Βαλάκ. An. ὃς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν τῷ Βαλαάμ τὸν Βαλάκ. Ar. ὃς ἐδίδαξε τὸν Βαλάκ. Only 2351, 1006, 1841, and K, have it ἐδίδαξεν.

⁹ Cod. βαλίν.

¹⁰ 2329: ἐνώπιον.

¹¹ καὶ before φαγεῖν occurs in 1006, 1841, K, Vulgata, and the Syriac *versio Harclensis*. Ar. καὶ φαγεῖν, which once again shows that his text is K.

Σχόλιον ιβ'

EP

253v

Ἡ ἐκπορευομένη ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ σωτῆρος **ῥομφαία δίστομος**¹ ἡ θεία διδασκαλία αὐτοῦ τυγχάνει,· περὶ ἧς καὶ ἐν εὐαγγελίοις φησὶν· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην,· ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν,·² εἴρηται δὲ **δίστομος**³ ἐκατέ|ρωθεν οὖσα τμητική·⁴ τέμνει⁵ γὰρ οὐ τὰ τῆς κακίας μόνης βλαστήματα,·⁶ ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς τῶν φρονημάτων ψευδοδοξίας.⁷ εἰκότως δὲ ταῦτα κέχρηται πρὸς Περγαμηνούς⁸ ἔχοντας ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τοῦ μάντεως **Βαλαάμ** καὶ τῶν

¹ Rev. 2:12. Cf. Rev. 1:16. The expression ῥομφαία δίστομος has a twofold meaning, depending on the scriptural passage. It may suggest either the word of God (in which case this is associated with Psalm 149:6 and the Book of Revelation), or evil power (after Ecclesiasticus 21:3). In the NT, the expression has the former import (Heb. 4:12; Rev. 1:16 and 2:12). In the OT, it occurs in Psalm 149:6: ῥομφαία δίστομος is the divine power placed in the hands of the righteous, but in Ecclesiasticus 21:3, this 'sword' is 'the teeth of the lion, which is sin'. In *Scholion VI*, exploration of the twofold sense of ῥομφαία is the main theme. *Scholion XII* takes this to denote the word of God, which is the meaning this expression has in the text of Revelation. The parallel in Didymus is remarkable as regards both import and vocabulary, and it has a striking affinity with *Scholion VI*. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1285: Εὖ δὲ καὶ τὸ φάναι διστόμους εἶναι τὰς ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν χερσὶ ῥομφαίας, ἐκάστου λόγου οὗ ἔχουσιν οἱ ὅσοι διστόμου ὄντος κατὰ τὸν ζῶντα τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον καὶ ἐνεργῇ καὶ τομώτερον ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον. διὸ καὶ οἱ χρώμενοι τοῖς τῆς ἀληθείας λόγοις οὐ μόνον ἐκτέμνουσι τὰ ψευδῆ καὶ τὰ περιττὰ λύοντες σοφίσματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τιτρώσκουσιν εἰς ἔρωτα τῆς ἀληθείας τοὺς ἀκροαμένους. Δυνατὸν ἀμφοτέρως τὰς διαθήκας ῥομφαίας διστόμους εἰπεῖν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ τουτέστι πράξεσι τῶν ὁσίων εὐρισκομένους. δυνατὸν δὲ καὶ ἐκάστον

προτρεπτικὸν λόγον δίστομον μάχαιραν εἰπεῖν ἀμφοτέρα ποιῶντα, ἐλέγχοντα μὲν τὸν εἰς μετάνοιαν καταδεχόμενον αὐτόν, ἐκδικοῦντα δὲ καὶ τιμωρούμενον τὸν ἀπειθοῦντα μέχρῃ παντός.

² Matt. 10:34.

³ Rev. 2:12; Heb. 4:12.

⁴ Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 456: Ἐπεὶ περὶ τὸν μηρὸν ἐνεργεῖται τὰ γενέσεως πράγματα, φύονται δὲ περὶ ταῦτα αἰσχυραὶ ἐπιθυμίαι, χρειαὶ τοῦ τμητικοῦ λόγου ῥομφαίας ὀνομαζομένου, ἵνα περὶ τὸν μηρὸν ζωσθεῖς ἐκτέμνοι τὰς ἀκολάστους ἡδονάς. The combination of ῥομφαία with the adjective τμητικός has no parallel. The imagery λόγοις τμητικοῖς comes from Philo, *Legum Allegoriarum*, 3.26: λόγοις τμητικοῖς. It was taken up by Origen, *commMatt*, 15.1: τῷ τμητικωτάτῳ λόγῳ ἐκτεμνόντες τὸ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπιθυμητικόν. *homJob*, PG.17.764-5: Σίδηρον οὐ λέγει τοῦτον τὸν αἰσθητόν, ἀλλὰ τμητικώτατον λόγον.

⁵ Cod. τέμνη.

⁶ EN XIIa.

⁷ Cod. ψευδοδοξίας. The scribe initially wrote, correctly, ψευδοδοξίας. The additional εἰς is a subsequent emendation, probably by a later hand. EN XIIIb.

⁸ Cod. περγαμενους.

Νικολαϊτῶν⁹ τὴν διδασκαλίαν· ὅτι γὰρ δεῖ ἐκτέμνειν¹⁰ καὶ ἀναιρεῖν¹¹ τὰς τῶν ἑτεροδόξων σοφιστικὰς ἀπάτας.¹²

⁹ Rev. 2:6; 2:15.

¹⁰ Cf. Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 338: τὸν ἀρραγὴ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον τὸν ἡκονημένον ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον ζώννυται περὶ τὸν μηρόν, ἵν' ἐκτέμνη τὰς περιττὰς ἐπιθυμίας. *commJob* (12.1–16.8a) Fr. 405: τοῦτο δὲ πολλάκις καὶ εὐεργετικὸν ἐστίν, καθὰ καὶ ὁ ἱατρὸς τὴν ἐπιφουμένην λύμην τῷ σώματι πολλάκις διὰ σιδήρου ἐκτέμνει καὶ οὐδὲ παύεται προσάγων τὰ ἀνιάρᾳ, ἕως οὗ τὸν σκοπόν, τὸ ὑγιεινόν, ἀποπληρώσῃ. *commZacch*, 1.354: Καὶ πάντα ἐκτεμνόμενα ἀκάθαρτα τυγχάνει.

Ibid. 4. 171: ὅνπερ βραχίονα ἐξήρανεν ἡ προερμηνευθεῖσα μάχαιρα καὶ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐξετύφλωσεν ἐκτέμνουσα τὴν χειρίστην ἀντοῦ βλέψιν. *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 338: ἐάν δὲ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου, τοῦτο λέγει ὅτι· . . . πρόσλαβε καὶ τὴν σωφροσύνην, τὸν λόγον τὸν τέμνοντα . . . ἵνα τὴν ῥομφαίαν ποῖαν λάβωμεν; τὸν λόγον τὸν περὶ σωφροσύνης, τὸν λόγον τὸν καθόλου, τὸν ἐκτέμνοντα.

¹¹ Cod. ἀνέρεσιν.

¹² EN XIIc.

Scholion XII

The **sharp two-edged sword**,¹ which goes forth from the mouth of the Saviour, is His divine teaching. Referring to this in the gospels, He says, *I am come not to send peace, but a sword.*² [This teaching] has been styled **two-edged**³ because it can cut with both sides. For it cuts out not only the offspring of wickedness, but also the false doctrines urged by the haughty. He has used these words quite naturally addressing the Pergamenes, who have the teaching of the diviner Balaam and the Nicolaitans⁴ circulating amidst them. For it is indeed necessary to cut out and destroy the sophistic deceit of the heterodox by means of the teaching of the Logos.

¹ Cf. Rev. 1:16; 2:12.

² Matt. 10:34.

³ Rev. 2:12; Heb. 4:12.

⁴ Rev. 2:6; 2:15.

SCHOLION XIII

Π

< XIII. Rev. 2:15 > οὕτως ἔχεις καὶ σὺ κρατοῦντας τὴν διδασχὴν τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν ὁμοίως· <2:16> μετανόησον·¹ εἰ δὲ μή, ἔρχομαί σοι ταχύ καὶ πολεμίσω² μετ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ τοῦ στόματός μου· <2:17> ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις·

¹ O. μετανόησον. An., Ar., N.-A. μετανόησον οὖν.

² 2329: εἰ δὲ μή, ἔρχομαι ὡς σὺ κρατεῖς καὶ πολεμίσω. A unique version not considered by N.-A.

«Σχόλιον ιγ'»

EP Ἀνακτέον¹ τὰ ἱστορικῶς² γεγενημένα ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα δηλουμένους ἀπατ(ε)ῶνας,³ πορνείαν καὶ εἰδωλο(λ)ατρείαν⁴ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν⁵ εἰσηγουμένους·⁶ τοιοῦτοι πολλοὶ τῶν | αἵρετικῶν εἰσιν· οὐκ ἀπ(ο)γνωστέον⁷ καὶ περὶ ἀσάρκων⁸ τινῶν ψευδομάντ(ε)ων⁹ ταῦτα εἰρησθαι· δι' ἀποκαλύψεως γὰρ ἐδείχθη τῷ ἀποστόλῳ.

¹ EX XIIIa. On the meaning of ἀναγωγή, see. *PHE*, pp. 29–30.

² EN XIIIb.

³ Cod. *απαταιωνας*. EN XIIIc.

⁴ Cod. εἰδωλατρείαν. Cf. Rev. 2:14; 2:20; 21:8; 22:15; 1 Cor. 5:10–11; 6:9; Eph. 5:5.

⁵ Cf. above, ἀνακτέον, and *Scholion VII*: ἀνηγμένως νοήσας.

Scholion XIV: χωρητέον ἄνω παντὸς αἰσθητοῦ. Cf.

Didymus, *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 182: εἰ ἔχει οὖν ἀναγωγάς, ταῦτα ἄλλα κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν γεγενήται. *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 337: καὶ τὸ μὲν κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν λημπτέον, τὸ δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. EN XIIId.

⁶ Cf. Didymus rebutting the Gnostics, *commZacch*, 2.175: Ἐλεγχέσθωσαν οἱ αἵρετικοί, ἀμαθῶς καὶ ἄγαν ἀπαιδεύτως

φύσεις εἰσηγούμενοι διαφόρους τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Ibid. 2.177: τῶν τὰς φύσεις εἰσηγουμένων. *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 311: ὡς οἱ γὰρ φύσεις εἰσηγούμενοι λέγουσιν.

⁷ Cod. ἀπεγνωστέον.

⁸ The 'incorporeal false diviners' (ἄσαρκοι ψευδομάντιες) are not human. Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, Fr. 788a: οἱ ἀσύνετοι ὑπὸ παθῶν τε καὶ κακίας ταράττονται, ἐσθότε καὶ ὑπὸ ἀπατεῶνων αἰσθητῶν καὶ ἀοράτων. *commZacch*, 4.290–291: Διὸ ταῦτα ἐκλαμβάνεσθω περὶ δαιμόνων. Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 524: παρὰ τῶν ψευδομάντεων ἦτοι δαιμονίων. See full quotation in EN XIIIe.

⁹ Cod. ψευδομάνταιων. EN XIIIf.

Scholion XIII

The historical occurrences should be interpreted in an anagogical sense as referring to the charlatans indicated here, so that we grasp these [charlatans] anagogically advocating *fornication* and *idolatry*.¹ Many of the heretics are of such a character. Besides, we should not exclude the idea that these words have been said of certain incorporeal false-diviners. For these things were imparted to the apostle [John] by means of divine revelation.

¹ Cf. Rev. 2:14; 2:20; 21:8; 22:15; 1 Cor. 5:10–11; 6:9; Eph. 5:5.

SCHOLION XIV

ΙΑ

< XIV. Rev. 2:17² > τῷ νικῶντι¹ δώσω αὐτῷ φαγεῖν τοῦ μάννα τοῦ κεκρυμμένου·²
καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ ψῆφον λευκὴν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ψῆφον ὄνομα καινὸν γεγραμμένον,³
ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμβάνων. <2:18¹ > καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλω τῆς ἐν Θυατεύροις⁴
ἐκκλησίας γράψον·

¹ 2329: νικοντι.

² 2329: τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ τὸ μάννα τὸ κεκρυμμένον. In O. the expression is altogether missing, and the text goes thus: τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ ψῆφον λευκὴν. An. τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ φαγεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ μάννα τοῦ κεκρυμμένου. Ar. τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ μάννα τοῦ κεκρυμμένου.

³ 2329: καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ψῆφον τὸ ὄνομα γεγραμμένον ὁ. O. καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ψῆφον ὄνομα καινὸν ὁ. An., Ar. καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ψῆφον ὄνομα καινὸν γεγραμμένον, ὁ.

⁴ Cod. Θυατηρη. 2329: ἐν Θυατήρων.

Σχόλιον ιδ΄

EP Οὐ Μωσῆς ὑμῖν δέδωκεν τὸν ἄρτον,¹ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς τοὺς ἀγνώμονας Ἰουδαίους,²
ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ δώσει τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἀληθινόν·³ οὗτος δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα τις φαγὼν ἐξ
αὐτοῦ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ.⁴ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ μάννα τὸ κεκρυμμένον.⁵

καὶ ἐπὶ⁶ τὴν ψῆφον ὄνομα κ·α·ινόν.⁷ ἐπειδὴ δὲ περὶ πνευματικῶν⁸ ὁ λόγος,⁹
ἀνωτέρω χωρ·η·τέον¹⁰ παντὸς αἰσθητοῦ δηλουμένου περὶ τῆς ψήφου· ἐν τῇ
254v πνευματικῇ τοίνυν ψήφῳ, λευκῇ διὰ | τὸ φωτοειδές,¹¹ ὄνομα καινόν·¹²
γράφεται κατὰ τὴν Κ·α·ινήν¹³ Διαθήκην, ὃ· ση·μαίνει¹⁴ τὴν ποιότητα τοῦ
εἰληφότος καὶ ἐγνωκότος αὐτό· ἐπ·ε·ι¹⁵ γὰρ κατὰ πᾶσαν προκοπὴν¹⁶ οἰκ·ε·ίαν¹⁷ τῇ ἐκ

¹ John 6:32.

² EN XIVa.

³ Cod. ἀληθινόν.

⁴ John 6:32, where ὁ πατήρ μου δίδωσιν for ὁ πατήρ δώσει.

⁵ At this point I have introduced a paragraph, since the ensuing text deals with analysis of Rev. 2:17 quoted.

⁶ Cod. ὅτι.

⁷ Cod. κοινόν. Rev. 2:17. The ensuing text is a comment on this scriptural verse.

⁸ 1 Cor. 12:1.

⁹ EN XIVb.

¹⁰ Cod. χωρεταιον. 'Let us raise ourselves above any material sense', which is a reference to the anagogical interpretation that follows. This is an expression equivalent to ἀνηγμένως νοήσας of Scholion VII, and to the characteristic expressions ἀνακτέον and κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν of Scholion XIII. Likewise, Scholion XXXI: ἀνάγκη κατὰ

πνευματικὴν ἀκολουθίαν ἐκλαμβάνειν τὰ προκείμενα. Cf. Didymus, EN XIVc.

¹¹ EN XIVd.

¹² Cod. καινην.

¹³ Cod. κενην.

¹⁴ Cod. οσημενη.

¹⁵ Cod. ἐπι.

¹⁶ The expression κατὰ πᾶσαν προκοπὴν has no parallel, either pagan or Christian, except for Didymus, frPs(al), fr. 401: τῷ γὰρ οὕτω στάντι ἐπὶ πέτραις ἀκολουθεῖ καὶ τὸ κατευθύνεσθαι τὰ διαβήματα αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ κυρίου διαβαίνοντος ἀπὸ κακίας εἰς ἀρετὴν καὶ ἀπὸ θνητῶν εἰς ἀθάνατα ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ πᾶσαν προκοπὴν. The participle διαβαίνοντος is an equivalent for προκόπτοντος.

¹⁷ Cod. οἰκίαν.

τῆς προκοπῆς¹⁸ ποιότητι¹⁹ ἔχει τις προσηγορίαν,» ἀεὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων²⁰ τῶν προτέρων παρερχομένων,»²¹ τὸ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν γραφόμενον **ὄνομα** τοῦ τελειωθέντος,»²² οὐκ ἔχον²³ ἕτερον μετὰ τοῦτο,»²⁴ ἀεὶ **καινόν** ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀδιδοχον²⁵ Καινὴν Διαθήκην καὶ ἔτι²⁶ τοῦ κρούπτου²⁷ τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπου²⁸ παραστατικόν. τοῦτο οὐδεὶς αὐτῷ²⁹ οἶδεν **εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμβάνων**³⁰ μόνος καταλλήλως³¹ τῷ³² *τίς γὰρ οἶδεν τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*,³³ καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἧς.

¹⁸ The verb προκόπτειν and the noun προκοπή are prominent terms of Stoic ethics, while ποιότης is central in both Aristotelian and Stoic philosophy. However, their appearance side by side is unique in Christian literature occurring exclusively in Didymus. What we have is evidently a passage from his lost Commentary on the Apocalypse quoted by Cassian. Cf. Didymus, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 24: οἱ γὰρ προκόπτοντες εἰσι τοιοῦτοι, ἀεὶ ἐξ ἐτέρων ἕτεροι γινόμενοι. ὅθεν οὐκ ἐπὶ ψόγου ἔλεγον κείσθαι τὸ «ἀπολλύμενοι, ἀλλ' ὡσαύτως τῷ «οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἀπολούνται,» καὶ «ἡμεῖς ἀπολλύμενοι τὸν αἰῶνα» αἱ γὰρ λέξεις αὗται «ἀπόλλυσθαι» τίθενται τοῦ ἐν προκοπῇ ἐκ ποιότητος εἰς ποιότητα μεταβαίνοντος. Similar instances correlating the two critical notions are found only in two of Aristotle's commentators: Elias of Alexandria (sixth cent. AD), *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, p. 222: διάθεσις δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰς ἕξιν δόξ, δύναμις δὲ ἐστὶν ἐπιτηδειότητος προκοπή, ἀδυναμία δὲ ἡ δυσκολία, καθὼς φαμεν τὸν νοτῆ ἀδυνάτως ἔχειν πρὸς γεωμετρίας μάθησιν. καὶ αὕτη δὲ ἡ ἀδυναμία ἡγουν δυσκολία καὶ ἡ δύναμις ἡγουν ἡ εὐκολία, ἥτοι ἐπιτηδειότητος προκοπή, ὑπὸ τὴν ποιότητα ἀνάγονται ὡς κράσει ἐπόμενοι, ὅθεν καὶ ἐπιτηδειότητα προκοπῆς τὴν δύναμιν λέγουσιν ὡς τῆς κράσεως, εἴ τιτι ἔπεται, ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον προκοψάσης. Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, v. 8, p. 225: Ἄλλ' εἰ ἐξαχῶς ἡ δύναμις λέγεται, κατὰ ποῖον σημαινόμενον αἱ ποιότητες

εἴρηνται δυνάμεις, ἄρα κατὰ τὴν ἐπιτηδειότητα τὴν κοινὴν, καθ' ἣν καὶ πρὸς πάσας τὰς τέχνας ἐπιτηδείως ἔχειν λεγόμεθα, καὶ μὴ ἀναλαμβάνωμεν αὐτάς, ἢ καθ' ἣν Ἀριστοτέλης ἔθηκεν ἐν ταῖς ποιότησιν; λέγω δὲ τὴν ἰδίως προκοπὴν πρὸς τινα ἐκ φύσεως.

¹⁹ EN XIVe.

²⁰ Cod. ὀνομάτων.

²¹ Cf. Rev. 21:4.

²² τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τελειωθέντος. The expression has a parallel in Didymus, which is unique; *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 328: εἰρήκαμεν πολλάκις, ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἕξεων ἔχουσιν οἱ παρονομαζόμενοι, ὅταν τελειωθῶσιν κατ' αὐτά. οὕτω γοῦν καὶ τὸν ἐν ἀγάπῃ τελειωθέντα, ὡς ἐνδέχεται ἐν τῷ βίῳ, ἀγάπην ὀνομάζει Παῦλος.

²³ Cod. ἔχων.

²⁴ Cod. τουτον.

²⁵ Cod. ἀδιδοχον. EN XIVf.

²⁶ Cod. ἐπι.

²⁷ Cod. κρούπτου.

²⁸ 1 Peter 3:4.

²⁹ Cod. αὐτῷ. EN XIVg.

³⁰ Cod. ἐλαμβάνων. Rev. 2, 17. EN XIVg.

³¹ Cod. κατὰ ἀλλήλως.

³² Cod. το.

³³ 1 Cor. 2:11.

Scholion XIV

The Lord said to the hard-hearted Jews, *Moses gave you not the bread; but my Father will give you the true bread. This is the bread of God that once a man eats thereof, he may not die.*¹ This is indeed **the hidden manna**.

And on the white stone [I will give that man] a new name [written].² Since the foregoing saying is about spiritual³ things, let us rise above any material sense that might be attributed to the word 'stone'. On this spiritual⁴ **stone** then, which is **white** by virtue of being radiantly glorious, according to the New Testament **a new name** is written. This indicates the quality of anyone who has received and recognized this. For indeed each one is designated in proportion to one's own quality according to one's progress, whereas former appellations always pass away.⁵ But the **name, which is written** upon all, of him who became perfect, and which has no other subsequent name, is always **new**, according to the New Testament which has no successor. Moreover, this **name** betokens *the hidden man of the heart*,⁶ and this **name no one knows** within himself **save he who alone**⁷ **takes [it] in accordance with** the saying, *what man knoweth the things of a man*,⁸ and the ensuing scriptural words.

¹ John 6:32; 33; 50.

² Rev. 2:17.

³ 1 Cor. 12:1.

⁴ That is, the stone taken allegorically.

⁵ Cf. Rev. 21:4.

⁶ 1 Peter 3:4.

⁷ Rev. 2:17.

⁸ 1 Cor. 2:11.

SCHOLION XV

IE

255r

< XV. Rev. 2:18² > τάδε λέγει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἔχων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ὡς φλόγα πυρὸς καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκῷ· λιβάνω·¹ < 2:19 > οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν·² καὶ τὴν διακονίαν | καὶ τὴν ὑπομονὴν σου καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου τὰ ἔσχατα³ πλείονα τῶν πρώτων· < 2:20¹ > ἀλλὰ ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ, ὅτι⁴ ἀφεῖς⁵ τὴν γυναικά⁶ σου

¹ Cod. χαλκωλιβάνω. 2329: χαλκωλιβάνω.

² Cod. πιστην. 2329: πιστην.

³ O. ἔργα σου καὶ τὰ ἔσχατα. 2329, An., N.-A. ἔργα σου τὰ ἔσχατα.

⁴ 2329, O., N.-A. ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ ὅτι. An. (S) ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ πολὺ ὅτι. An. (M) ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ ὀλίγω ὅτι. Ar. ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ ὀλίγα ὅτι.

⁵ 2329 intends ἀφεῖς (Cod. ἀφῆς). O., N.-A. ἀφεῖς. An. ἀφῆκας. Ar. ἀφίης.

⁶ Cod. γυνέκα. The pronoun σου after γυναῖκα occurs in K and the Syriac versions. Arethas has it after K.

Σχόλιον ιε'

EP

255v

Τὴν ἐποπτικὴν¹ καὶ ἔφορον² τῶν ὅλων δύναμιν καὶ τὴν πορευτικὴν³ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῶν προκειμένων⁴ δηλοῖ· καὶ ἐπειδὴ διὰ τοῦ ἐπιβλέπειν ἀναιρεῖ καὶ ζηραίνει τὰ φαῦλα· οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ φλόξ εἶρη·⁵ πυρὸς· ἀναλ·οῦ·σι⁶ γὰρ πᾶσαν μοχθηρὰν ἔξ·⁷ ἔξ·⁸ ἔξ·⁹ ἔξ·¹⁰ ἔξ·¹¹ ἔξ·¹² ἔξ·¹³ ἔξ·¹⁴ ἔξ·¹⁵ ἔξ·¹⁶ ἔξ·¹⁷ ἔξ·¹⁸ ἔξ·¹⁹ ἔξ·²⁰ ἔξ·²¹ ἔξ·²² ἔξ·²³ ἔξ·²⁴ ἔξ·²⁵ ἔξ·²⁶ ἔξ·²⁷ ἔξ·²⁸ ἔξ·²⁹ ἔξ·³⁰ ἔξ·³¹ ἔξ·³² ἔξ·³³ ἔξ·³⁴ ἔξ·³⁵ ἔξ·³⁶ ἔξ·³⁷ ἔξ·³⁸ ἔξ·³⁹ ἔξ·⁴⁰ ἔξ·⁴¹ ἔξ·⁴² ἔξ·⁴³ ἔξ·⁴⁴ ἔξ·⁴⁵ ἔξ·⁴⁶ ἔξ·⁴⁷ ἔξ·⁴⁸ ἔξ·⁴⁹ ἔξ·⁵⁰ ἔξ·⁵¹ ἔξ·⁵² ἔξ·⁵³ ἔξ·⁵⁴ ἔξ·⁵⁵ ἔξ·⁵⁶ ἔξ·⁵⁷ ἔξ·⁵⁸ ἔξ·⁵⁹ ἔξ·⁶⁰ ἔξ·⁶¹ ἔξ·⁶² ἔξ·⁶³ ἔξ·⁶⁴ ἔξ·⁶⁵ ἔξ·⁶⁶ ἔξ·⁶⁷ ἔξ·⁶⁸ ἔξ·⁶⁹ ἔξ·⁷⁰ ἔξ·⁷¹ ἔξ·⁷² ἔξ·⁷³ ἔξ·⁷⁴ ἔξ·⁷⁵ ἔξ·⁷⁶ ἔξ·⁷⁷ ἔξ·⁷⁸ ἔξ·⁷⁹ ἔξ·⁸⁰ ἔξ·⁸¹ ἔξ·⁸² ἔξ·⁸³ ἔξ·⁸⁴ ἔξ·⁸⁵ ἔξ·⁸⁶ ἔξ·⁸⁷ ἔξ·⁸⁸ ἔξ·⁸⁹ ἔξ·⁹⁰ ἔξ·⁹¹ ἔξ·⁹² ἔξ·⁹³ ἔξ·⁹⁴ ἔξ·⁹⁵ ἔξ·⁹⁶ ἔξ·⁹⁷ ἔξ·⁹⁸ ἔξ·⁹⁹ ἔξ·¹⁰⁰ ἔξ·¹⁰¹ ἔξ·¹⁰² ἔξ·¹⁰³ ἔξ·¹⁰⁴ ἔξ·¹⁰⁵ ἔξ·¹⁰⁶ ἔξ·¹⁰⁷ ἔξ·¹⁰⁸ ἔξ·¹⁰⁹ ἔξ·¹¹⁰ ἔξ·¹¹¹ ἔξ·¹¹² ἔξ·¹¹³ ἔξ·¹¹⁴ ἔξ·¹¹⁵ ἔξ·¹¹⁶ ἔξ·¹¹⁷ ἔξ·¹¹⁸ ἔξ·¹¹⁹ ἔξ·¹²⁰ ἔξ·¹²¹ ἔξ·¹²² ἔξ·¹²³ ἔξ·¹²⁴ ἔξ·¹²⁵ ἔξ·¹²⁶ ἔξ·¹²⁷ ἔξ·¹²⁸ ἔξ·¹²⁹ ἔξ·¹³⁰ ἔξ·¹³¹ ἔξ·¹³² ἔξ·¹³³ ἔξ·¹³⁴ ἔξ·¹³⁵ ἔξ·¹³⁶ ἔξ·¹³⁷ ἔξ·¹³⁸ ἔξ·¹³⁹ ἔξ·¹⁴⁰ ἔξ·¹⁴¹ ἔξ·¹⁴² ἔξ·¹⁴³ ἔξ·¹⁴⁴ ἔξ·¹⁴⁵ ἔξ·¹⁴⁶ ἔξ·¹⁴⁷ ἔξ·¹⁴⁸ ἔξ·¹⁴⁹ ἔξ·¹⁵⁰ ἔξ·¹⁵¹ ἔξ·¹⁵² ἔξ·¹⁵³ ἔξ·¹⁵⁴ ἔξ·¹⁵⁵ ἔξ·¹⁵⁶ ἔξ·¹⁵⁷ ἔξ·¹⁵⁸ ἔξ·¹⁵⁹ ἔξ·¹⁶⁰ ἔξ·¹⁶¹ ἔξ·¹⁶² ἔξ·¹⁶³ ἔξ·¹⁶⁴ ἔξ·¹⁶⁵ ἔξ·¹⁶⁶ ἔξ·¹⁶⁷ ἔξ·¹⁶⁸ ἔξ·¹⁶⁹ ἔξ·¹⁷⁰ ἔξ·¹⁷¹ ἔξ·¹⁷² ἔξ·¹⁷³ ἔξ·¹⁷⁴ ἔξ·¹⁷⁵ ἔξ·¹⁷⁶ ἔξ·¹⁷⁷ ἔξ·¹⁷⁸ ἔξ·¹⁷⁹ ἔξ·¹⁸⁰ ἔξ·¹⁸¹ ἔξ·¹⁸² ἔξ·¹⁸³ ἔξ·¹⁸⁴ ἔξ·¹⁸⁵ ἔξ·¹⁸⁶ ἔξ·¹⁸⁷ ἔξ·¹⁸⁸ ἔξ·¹⁸⁹ ἔξ·¹⁹⁰ ἔξ·¹⁹¹ ἔξ·¹⁹² ἔξ·¹⁹³ ἔξ·¹⁹⁴ ἔξ·¹⁹⁵ ἔξ·¹⁹⁶ ἔξ·¹⁹⁷ ἔξ·¹⁹⁸ ἔξ·¹⁹⁹ ἔξ·²⁰⁰ ἔξ·²⁰¹ ἔξ·²⁰² ἔξ·²⁰³ ἔξ·²⁰⁴ ἔξ·²⁰⁵ ἔξ·²⁰⁶ ἔξ·²⁰⁷ ἔξ·²⁰⁸ ἔξ·²⁰⁹ ἔξ·²¹⁰ ἔξ·²¹¹ ἔξ·²¹² ἔξ·²¹³ ἔξ·²¹⁴ ἔξ·²¹⁵ ἔξ·²¹⁶ ἔξ·²¹⁷ ἔξ·²¹⁸ ἔξ·²¹⁹ ἔξ·²²⁰ ἔξ·²²¹ ἔξ·²²² ἔξ·²²³ ἔξ·²²⁴ ἔξ·²²⁵ ἔξ·²²⁶ ἔξ·²²⁷ ἔξ·²²⁸ ἔξ·²²⁹ ἔξ·²³⁰ ἔξ·²³¹ ἔξ·²³² ἔξ·²³³ ἔξ·²³⁴ ἔξ·²³⁵ ἔξ·²³⁶ ἔξ·²³⁷ ἔξ·²³⁸ ἔξ·²³⁹ ἔξ·²⁴⁰ ἔξ·²⁴¹ ἔξ·²⁴² ἔξ·²⁴³ ἔξ·²⁴⁴ ἔξ·²⁴⁵ ἔξ·²⁴⁶ ἔξ·²⁴⁷ ἔξ·²⁴⁸ ἔξ·²⁴⁹ ἔξ·²⁵⁰ ἔξ·²⁵¹ ἔξ·²⁵² ἔξ·²⁵³ ἔξ·²⁵⁴ ἔξ·²⁵⁵ ἔξ·²⁵⁶ ἔξ·²⁵⁷ ἔξ·²⁵⁸ ἔξ·²⁵⁹ ἔξ·²⁶⁰ ἔξ·²⁶¹ ἔξ·²⁶² ἔξ·²⁶³ ἔξ·²⁶⁴ ἔξ·²⁶⁵ ἔξ·²⁶⁶ ἔξ·²⁶⁷ ἔξ·²⁶⁸ ἔξ·²⁶⁹ ἔξ·²⁷⁰ ἔξ·²⁷¹ ἔξ·²⁷² ἔξ·²⁷³ ἔξ·²⁷⁴ ἔξ·²⁷⁵ ἔξ·²⁷⁶ ἔξ·²⁷⁷ ἔξ·²⁷⁸ ἔξ·²⁷⁹ ἔξ·²⁸⁰ ἔξ·²⁸¹ ἔξ·²⁸² ἔξ·²⁸³ ἔξ·²⁸⁴ ἔξ·²⁸⁵ ἔξ·²⁸⁶ ἔξ·²⁸⁷ ἔξ·²⁸⁸ ἔξ·²⁸⁹ ἔξ·²⁹⁰ ἔξ·²⁹¹ ἔξ·²⁹² ἔξ·²⁹³ ἔξ·²⁹⁴ ἔξ·²⁹⁵ ἔξ·²⁹⁶ ἔξ·²⁹⁷ ἔξ·²⁹⁸ ἔξ·²⁹⁹ ἔξ·³⁰⁰ ἔξ·³⁰¹ ἔξ·³⁰² ἔξ·³⁰³ ἔξ·³⁰⁴ ἔξ·³⁰⁵ ἔξ·³⁰⁶ ἔξ·³⁰⁷ ἔξ·³⁰⁸ ἔξ·³⁰⁹ ἔξ·³¹⁰ ἔξ·³¹¹ ἔξ·³¹² ἔξ·³¹³ ἔξ·³¹⁴ ἔξ·³¹⁵ ἔξ·³¹⁶ ἔξ·³¹⁷ ἔξ·³¹⁸ ἔξ·³¹⁹ ἔξ·³²⁰ ἔξ·³²¹ ἔξ·³²² ἔξ·³²³ ἔξ·³²⁴ ἔξ·³²⁵ ἔξ·³²⁶ ἔξ·³²⁷ ἔξ·³²⁸ ἔξ·³²⁹ ἔξ·³³⁰ ἔξ·³³¹ ἔξ·³³² ἔξ·³³³ ἔξ·³³⁴ ἔξ·³³⁵ ἔξ·³³⁶ ἔξ·³³⁷ ἔξ·³³⁸ ἔξ·³³⁹ ἔξ·³⁴⁰ ἔξ·³⁴¹ ἔξ·³⁴² ἔξ·³⁴³ ἔξ·³⁴⁴ ἔξ·³⁴⁵ ἔξ·³⁴⁶ ἔξ·³⁴⁷ ἔξ·³⁴⁸ ἔξ·³⁴⁹ ἔξ·³⁵⁰ ἔξ·³⁵¹ ἔξ·³⁵² ἔξ·³⁵³ ἔξ·³⁵⁴ ἔξ·³⁵⁵ ἔξ·³⁵⁶ ἔξ·³⁵⁷ ἔξ·³⁵⁸ ἔξ·³⁵⁹ ἔξ·³⁶⁰ ἔξ·³⁶¹ ἔξ·³⁶² ἔξ·³⁶³ ἔξ·³⁶⁴ ἔξ·³⁶⁵ ἔξ·³⁶⁶ ἔξ·³⁶⁷ ἔξ·³⁶⁸ ἔξ·³⁶⁹ ἔξ·³⁷⁰ ἔξ·³⁷¹ ἔξ·³⁷² ἔξ·³⁷³ ἔξ·³⁷⁴ ἔξ·³⁷⁵ ἔξ·³⁷⁶ ἔξ·³⁷⁷ ἔξ·³⁷⁸ ἔξ·³⁷⁹ ἔξ·³⁸⁰ ἔξ·³⁸¹ ἔξ·³⁸² ἔξ·³⁸³ ἔξ·³⁸⁴ ἔξ·³⁸⁵ ἔξ·³⁸⁶ ἔξ·³⁸⁷ ἔξ·³⁸⁸ ἔξ·³⁸⁹ ἔξ·³⁹⁰ ἔξ·³⁹¹ ἔξ·³⁹² ἔξ·³⁹³ ἔξ·³⁹⁴ ἔξ·³⁹⁵ ἔξ·³⁹⁶ ἔξ·³⁹⁷ ἔξ·³⁹⁸ ἔξ·³⁹⁹ ἔξ·⁴⁰⁰ ἔξ·⁴⁰¹ ἔξ·⁴⁰² ἔξ·⁴⁰³ ἔξ·⁴⁰⁴ ἔξ·⁴⁰⁵ ἔξ·⁴⁰⁶ ἔξ·⁴⁰⁷ ἔξ·⁴⁰⁸ ἔξ·⁴⁰⁹ ἔξ·⁴¹⁰ ἔξ·⁴¹¹ ἔξ·⁴¹² ἔξ·⁴¹³ ἔξ·⁴¹⁴ ἔξ·⁴¹⁵ ἔξ·⁴¹⁶ ἔξ·⁴¹⁷ ἔξ·⁴¹⁸ ἔξ·⁴¹⁹ ἔξ·⁴²⁰ ἔξ·⁴²¹ ἔξ·⁴²² ἔξ·⁴²³ ἔξ·⁴²⁴ ἔξ·⁴²⁵ ἔξ·⁴²⁶ ἔξ·⁴²⁷ ἔξ·⁴²⁸ ἔξ·⁴²⁹ ἔξ·⁴³⁰ ἔξ·⁴³¹ ἔξ·⁴³² ἔξ·⁴³³ ἔξ·⁴³⁴ ἔξ·⁴³⁵ ἔξ·⁴³⁶ ἔξ·⁴³⁷ ἔξ·⁴³⁸ ἔξ·⁴³⁹ ἔξ·⁴⁴⁰ ἔξ·⁴⁴¹ ἔξ·⁴⁴² ἔξ·⁴⁴³ ἔξ·⁴⁴⁴ ἔξ·⁴⁴⁵ ἔξ·⁴⁴⁶ ἔξ·⁴⁴⁷ ἔξ·⁴⁴⁸ ἔξ·⁴⁴⁹ ἔξ·⁴⁵⁰ ἔξ·⁴⁵¹ ἔξ·⁴⁵² ἔξ·⁴⁵³ ἔξ·⁴⁵⁴ ἔξ·⁴⁵⁵ ἔξ·⁴⁵⁶ ἔξ·⁴⁵⁷ ἔξ·⁴⁵⁸ ἔξ·⁴⁵⁹ ἔξ·⁴⁶⁰ ἔξ·⁴⁶¹ ἔξ·⁴⁶² ἔξ·⁴⁶³ ἔξ·⁴⁶⁴ ἔξ·⁴⁶⁵ ἔξ·⁴⁶⁶ ἔξ·⁴⁶⁷ ἔξ·⁴⁶⁸ ἔξ·⁴⁶⁹ ἔξ·⁴⁷⁰ ἔξ·⁴⁷¹ ἔξ·⁴⁷² ἔξ·⁴⁷³ ἔξ·⁴⁷⁴ ἔξ·⁴⁷⁵ ἔξ·⁴⁷⁶ ἔξ·⁴⁷⁷ ἔξ·⁴⁷⁸ ἔξ·⁴⁷⁹ ἔξ·⁴⁸⁰ ἔξ·⁴⁸¹ ἔξ·⁴⁸² ἔξ·⁴⁸³ ἔξ·⁴⁸⁴ ἔξ·⁴⁸⁵ ἔξ·⁴⁸⁶ ἔξ·⁴⁸⁷ ἔξ·⁴⁸⁸ ἔξ·⁴⁸⁹ ἔξ·⁴⁹⁰ ἔξ·⁴⁹¹ ἔξ·⁴⁹² ἔξ·⁴⁹³ ἔξ·⁴⁹⁴ ἔξ·⁴⁹⁵ ἔξ·⁴⁹⁶ ἔξ·⁴⁹⁷ ἔξ·⁴⁹⁸ ἔξ·⁴⁹⁹ ἔξ·⁵⁰⁰ ἔξ·⁵⁰¹ ἔξ·⁵⁰² ἔξ·⁵⁰³ ἔξ·⁵⁰⁴ ἔξ·⁵⁰⁵ ἔξ·⁵⁰⁶ ἔξ·⁵⁰⁷ ἔξ·⁵⁰⁸ ἔξ·⁵⁰⁹ ἔξ·⁵¹⁰ ἔξ·⁵¹¹ ἔξ·⁵¹² ἔξ·⁵¹³ ἔξ·⁵¹⁴ ἔξ·⁵¹⁵ ἔξ·⁵¹⁶ ἔξ·⁵¹⁷ ἔξ·⁵¹⁸ ἔξ·⁵¹⁹ ἔξ·⁵²⁰ ἔξ·⁵²¹ ἔξ·⁵²² ἔξ·⁵²³ ἔξ·⁵²⁴ ἔξ·⁵²⁵ ἔξ·⁵²⁶ ἔξ·⁵²⁷ ἔξ·⁵²⁸ ἔξ·⁵²⁹ ἔξ·⁵³⁰ ἔξ·⁵³¹ ἔξ·⁵³² ἔξ·⁵³³ ἔξ·⁵³⁴ ἔξ·⁵³⁵ ἔξ·⁵³⁶ ἔξ·⁵³⁷ ἔξ·⁵³⁸ ἔξ·⁵³⁹ ἔξ·⁵⁴⁰ ἔξ·⁵⁴¹ ἔξ·⁵⁴² ἔξ·⁵⁴³ ἔξ·⁵⁴⁴ ἔξ·⁵⁴⁵ ἔξ·⁵⁴⁶ ἔξ·⁵⁴⁷ ἔξ·⁵⁴⁸ ἔξ·⁵⁴⁹ ἔξ·⁵⁵⁰ ἔξ·⁵⁵¹ ἔξ·⁵⁵² ἔξ·⁵⁵³ ἔξ·⁵⁵⁴ ἔξ·⁵⁵⁵ ἔξ·⁵⁵⁶ ἔξ·⁵⁵⁷ ἔξ·⁵⁵⁸ ἔξ·⁵⁵⁹ ἔξ·⁵⁶⁰ ἔξ·⁵⁶¹ ἔξ·⁵⁶² ἔξ·⁵⁶³ ἔξ·⁵⁶⁴ ἔξ·⁵⁶⁵ ἔξ·⁵⁶⁶ ἔξ·⁵⁶⁷ ἔξ·⁵⁶⁸ ἔξ·⁵⁶⁹ ἔξ·⁵⁷⁰ ἔξ·⁵⁷¹ ἔξ·⁵⁷² ἔξ·⁵⁷³ ἔξ·⁵⁷⁴ ἔξ·⁵⁷⁵ ἔξ·⁵⁷⁶ ἔξ·⁵⁷⁷ ἔξ·⁵⁷⁸ ἔξ·⁵⁷⁹ ἔξ·⁵⁸⁰ ἔξ·⁵⁸¹ ἔξ·⁵⁸² ἔξ·⁵⁸³ ἔξ·⁵⁸⁴ ἔξ·⁵⁸⁵ ἔξ·⁵⁸⁶ ἔξ·⁵⁸⁷ ἔξ·⁵⁸⁸ ἔξ·⁵⁸⁹ ἔξ·⁵⁹⁰ ἔξ·⁵⁹¹ ἔξ·⁵⁹² ἔξ·⁵⁹³ ἔξ·⁵⁹⁴ ἔξ·⁵⁹⁵ ἔξ·⁵⁹⁶ ἔξ·⁵⁹⁷ ἔξ·⁵⁹⁸ ἔξ·⁵⁹⁹ ἔξ·⁶⁰⁰ ἔξ·⁶⁰¹ ἔξ·⁶⁰² ἔξ·⁶⁰³ ἔξ·⁶⁰⁴ ἔξ·⁶⁰⁵ ἔξ·⁶⁰⁶ ἔξ·⁶⁰⁷ ἔξ·⁶⁰⁸ ἔξ·⁶⁰⁹ ἔξ·⁶¹⁰ ἔξ·⁶¹¹ ἔξ·⁶¹² ἔξ·⁶¹³ ἔξ·⁶¹⁴ ἔξ·⁶¹⁵ ἔξ·⁶¹⁶ ἔξ·⁶¹⁷ ἔξ·⁶¹⁸ ἔξ·⁶¹⁹ ἔξ·⁶²⁰ ἔξ·⁶²¹ ἔξ·⁶²² ἔξ·⁶²³ ἔξ·⁶²⁴ ἔξ·⁶²⁵ ἔξ·⁶²⁶ ἔξ·⁶²⁷ ἔξ·⁶²⁸ ἔξ·⁶²⁹ ἔξ·⁶³⁰ ἔξ·⁶³¹ ἔξ·⁶³² ἔξ·⁶³³ ἔξ·⁶³⁴ ἔξ·⁶³⁵ ἔξ·⁶³⁶ ἔξ·⁶³⁷ ἔξ·⁶³⁸ ἔξ·⁶³⁹ ἔξ·⁶⁴⁰ ἔξ·⁶⁴¹ ἔξ·⁶⁴² ἔξ·⁶⁴³ ἔξ·⁶⁴⁴ ἔξ·⁶⁴⁵ ἔξ·⁶⁴⁶ ἔξ·⁶⁴⁷ ἔξ·⁶⁴⁸ ἔξ·⁶⁴⁹ ἔξ·⁶⁵⁰ ἔξ·⁶⁵¹ ἔξ·⁶⁵² ἔξ·⁶⁵³ ἔξ·⁶⁵⁴ ἔξ·⁶⁵⁵ ἔξ·⁶⁵⁶ ἔξ·⁶⁵⁷ ἔξ·⁶⁵⁸ ἔξ·⁶⁵⁹ ἔξ·⁶⁶⁰ ἔξ·⁶⁶¹ ἔξ·⁶⁶² ἔξ·⁶⁶³ ἔξ·⁶⁶⁴ ἔξ·⁶⁶⁵ ἔξ·⁶⁶⁶ ἔξ·⁶⁶⁷ ἔξ·⁶⁶⁸ ἔξ·⁶⁶⁹ ἔξ·⁶⁷⁰ ἔξ·⁶⁷¹ ἔξ·⁶⁷² ἔξ·⁶⁷³ ἔξ·⁶⁷⁴ ἔξ·⁶⁷⁵ ἔξ·⁶⁷⁶ ἔξ·⁶⁷⁷ ἔξ·⁶⁷⁸ ἔξ·⁶⁷⁹ ἔξ·⁶⁸⁰ ἔξ·⁶⁸¹ ἔξ·⁶⁸² ἔξ·⁶⁸³ ἔξ·⁶⁸⁴ ἔξ·⁶⁸⁵ ἔξ·⁶⁸⁶ ἔξ·⁶⁸⁷ ἔξ·⁶⁸⁸ ἔξ·⁶⁸⁹ ἔξ·⁶⁹⁰ ἔξ·⁶⁹¹ ἔξ·⁶⁹² ἔξ·⁶⁹³ ἔξ·⁶⁹⁴ ἔξ·⁶⁹⁵ ἔξ·⁶⁹⁶ ἔξ·⁶⁹⁷ ἔξ·⁶⁹⁸ ἔξ·⁶⁹⁹ ἔξ·⁷⁰⁰ ἔξ·⁷⁰¹ ἔξ·⁷⁰² ἔξ·⁷⁰³ ἔξ·⁷⁰⁴ ἔξ·⁷⁰⁵ ἔξ·⁷⁰⁶ ἔξ·⁷⁰⁷ ἔξ·⁷⁰⁸ ἔξ·⁷⁰⁹ ἔξ·⁷¹⁰ ἔξ·⁷¹¹ ἔξ·⁷¹² ἔξ·⁷¹³ ἔξ·⁷¹⁴ ἔξ·⁷¹⁵ ἔξ·⁷¹⁶ ἔξ·⁷¹⁷ ἔξ·⁷¹⁸ ἔξ·⁷¹⁹ ἔξ·⁷²⁰ ἔξ·⁷²¹ ἔξ·⁷²² ἔξ·⁷²³ ἔξ·⁷²⁴ ἔξ·⁷²⁵ ἔξ·⁷²⁶ ἔξ·⁷²⁷ ἔξ·⁷²⁸ ἔξ·⁷²⁹ ἔξ·⁷³⁰ ἔξ·⁷³¹ ἔξ·⁷³² ἔξ·⁷³³ ἔξ·⁷³⁴ ἔξ·⁷³⁵ ἔξ·⁷³⁶ ἔξ·⁷³⁷ ἔξ·⁷³⁸ ἔξ·⁷³⁹ ἔξ·⁷⁴⁰ ἔξ·⁷⁴¹ ἔξ·⁷⁴² ἔξ·⁷⁴³ ἔξ·⁷⁴⁴ ἔξ·⁷⁴⁵ ἔξ·⁷⁴⁶ ἔξ·⁷⁴⁷ ἔξ·⁷⁴⁸ ἔξ·⁷⁴⁹ ἔξ·⁷⁵⁰ ἔξ·⁷⁵¹ ἔξ·⁷⁵² ἔξ·⁷⁵³ ἔξ·⁷⁵⁴ ἔξ·⁷⁵⁵ ἔξ·⁷⁵⁶ ἔξ·⁷⁵⁷ ἔξ·⁷⁵⁸ ἔξ·⁷⁵⁹ ἔξ·⁷⁶⁰ ἔξ·⁷⁶¹ ἔξ·⁷⁶² ἔξ·⁷⁶³ ἔξ·⁷⁶⁴ ἔξ·⁷⁶⁵ ἔξ·⁷⁶⁶ ἔξ·⁷⁶⁷ ἔξ·⁷⁶⁸ ἔξ·⁷⁶⁹ ἔξ·⁷⁷⁰ ἔξ·⁷⁷¹ ἔξ·⁷⁷² ἔξ·⁷⁷³ ἔξ·⁷⁷⁴ ἔξ·⁷⁷⁵ ἔξ·⁷⁷⁶ ἔξ·⁷⁷⁷ ἔξ·⁷⁷⁸ ἔξ·⁷⁷⁹ ἔξ·⁷⁸⁰ ἔξ·⁷⁸¹ ἔξ·⁷⁸² ἔξ·⁷⁸³ ἔξ·⁷⁸⁴ ἔξ·⁷⁸⁵ ἔξ·⁷⁸⁶ ἔξ·⁷⁸⁷ ἔξ·⁷⁸⁸ ἔξ·⁷⁸⁹ ἔξ·⁷⁹⁰ ἔξ·⁷⁹¹ ἔξ·⁷⁹² ἔξ·⁷⁹³ ἔξ·⁷⁹⁴ ἔξ·⁷⁹⁵ ἔξ·⁷⁹⁶ ἔξ·⁷⁹⁷ ἔξ·⁷⁹⁸

ποιῶν²¹ τινὰ ἐπιπορευόμενος διεγερτικὸν²² τῶν κοιμωμένων,²³ κατὰ τὰς
προνοητικὰς²⁴ κινήσεις.²⁵

(*Questiones et Responsiones*, 35; 41; 47; 137), Didymus stands out as the author to have used the colloquial form συνκαταβαίνειν. Didymus, *commEccl*(7–8.8), Cod. p. 222 (συνκαταβαίνειν); *commEccl*(1.1–8), Cod. p. 15 (συνκαταβαίνοντες); *commEccl*(9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 313 (συνκαταβαίνων); *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 5 (κατὰ συνκατάβασιν); *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 138 (συνκαταβαίνων); *ibid.* Cod. p. 152 (συνκαταβαίνων); *ibid.* p. 187 (κατὰ συνκατάβασιν); *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 237 (συνκαταβαίνειν); *ibid.* Cod. p. 287 (συνκαταβαίνομεν); *ibid.* p. 237 (συνκαταβατική); *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 327 (συνκαταβαίνειν); *ibid.* Cod. p. 328 (συνκαταβαινούσης). It should be noticed that the specific colloquialism does not appear in Didymus' *frPs(al)*, where only the normal συγκαταβαίνειν is used (frs. 104; 173; 268; 581; 869; 972). The absence of συνκαταβαίνειν denotes the hand of a different compiler, whom I have suggested to be Anastasius of Sinai, drawing on Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria (see Introduction, pp. 35–36). The colloquialism σύν + κ = συνκ (instead of συγκ-) occurs abundantly in Pseudo-Caesarius (=Cassian) and occasionally in Cyril of Scythopolis and John of Damascus. All three of them were Sabaite monks. The vernacular usage is attested in the region of Palestine and Alexandria, a fact which is useful to bear in mind while considering authors who use it, such as Hermas, the theologian Hesychius of Jerusalem, the lexicographer Hesychius of

Alexandria, the grammarian Orion (the teacher of Proclus). Finally, its occurrence in authors significant to the Scholia should be cited: Diodorus of Tarsus, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 91 (συνκατέβαινεν); Severianus of Gabala, *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 243 (συνκατακρίνων); Cyril of Alexandria, *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 316 (συνκαινουργεῖσθαι). In *Isaiam*, PG.70.53.48; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *expPs*, Psalm 45, 10b (συνκλάσει). In all authors the idiom occurs as an *obiter dictum*, possibly owing to the vernacular of a scribe. Only in Didymus and Pseudo-Caesarius there are scores of instances consistently applied. For the identification of Pseudo-Caesarius with Cassian the Sabaite, see NDGF, Appendix I.

²¹ Cod. ποιεῖν.

²² Cod. διεγερτικῶν.

²³ EN XVj.

²⁴ Cod. προνοϊτικασ.

²⁵ Cod. κεινήσεις. Here is one more influence of this theology of the Logos upon Proclus: διττῆς γὰρ οὔσης τῆς θείας τελειότητος, τῆς μὲν νοερᾶς, τῆς δὲ προνοητικῆς, καὶ τῆς μὲν ἐν στάσει, τῆς δ' ἐν κινήσει, τὸ μὲν μόνιμον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ νοερόν καὶ τὸ ἀκλινὲς ἀπεικονίζεται διὰ τῆς θεωρίας, τὸ δὲ προνοητικὸν καὶ τὸ κινήτικὸν διὰ τῆς γενεσιουργοῦ ζώης. Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 3, p. 324.

Scholion XV

Through these words, he indicates the power of the Son of God which [power] superintends and oversees and supervises all things. Besides, his **eyes** have been portrayed as a **flame of fire**, because he destroys and invalidates all depravity through his supervision. For they [sc. his **eyes**] annihilate any wicked habit, called [in scripture] *wood, hay, stubble*.¹ Of this overseeing power it is written, *He looketh on the earth, and it trembleth*.² For once God has looked over all these materials, they are eliminated from the minds of those who hold them. What is more, his **feet**, on which he goes since he has imbued the universe, are represented as **fine brass**.³ *Frankincense*⁴ is befitting his divine dignity, brass is proper to him condescending to creatures, since his footsteps produce a certain sound stimulating all those who are asleep, as he strides according to his providential activities.

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. 3:12.

² Cf. Psalm 103:32.

³ The word χαλκολίβανος has a double meaning. In the text of Revelation, this means 'fine brass' (or, 'brass of Lebanon'), but its components are 'brass' (χαλκός) and λίβανος, which is the same word λίβανος used for one of the gifts (frankincense) presented to

the new-born Messiah, indeed the gift acknowledging his divine rank (Matt. 2:11). The author of the Scholion uses the word in both senses. 'Brass' is applied to the 'feet' of God condescending to creation, since it is by its clang that the 'sleepers' are roused (sc. from the sleep of sin).

⁴ Cf. Matt. 2:11.

SCHOLION XVI

Ις

< XVI. Rev. 2:20² > Ἰεζάβελ, ἣ λέγει¹ ἑαυτὴν προφήτην² καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾷ³ τοὺς ἐμοὺς δούλους πορνεῦσαι καὶ φαγεῖν εἰδωλῶ-όθουτα,⁴

¹ 2329: λέγουσα.

² Cod. προφήτην. 2329: προφήτην.

³ So O., An., Ar. διδάσκειν καὶ πλανᾷν.

⁴ Cod. εἰδολώθουτα.

«Σχόλιον ις¹»

Επίστησον,² μὴ ἐφαρμόζει³ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς Ἰεζάβελ τῇ⁴ γνώμῃ καὶ αἰνρέσει⁵ τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν διὰ τὸ τὰ ἔργα⁶ τῆς γνώμης⁷ ἐκείνης προσήφθαι⁸ τῇ Ἰεζάβελ εἰς πορνείαν⁹ κατασπᾶν¹⁰ καὶ χρῆσιν εἰδωλοθύτων πειρωμένης¹¹ ὅθεν καὶ γυναικα¹² αὐτὴν διὰ τὸ ἐμπαθεῖς¹³ καὶ ἐκτεθλυμένον¹⁴ εἶπεν·

¹ This Scholion is relevant to [Scholion XIII](#), which refers to εἰδωλολατρεία, ψευδομάντις, and ἀπατεῶνας ([EN XIIIff](#)). A reference by Didymus is an interesting parallel, *commZacch*, 3.239 and 243: Τοῦτ' οὐ πεποίηκεν, ἐπικρατησάσης ἀπάτης ὡς δυναμένων τῶν εἰδώλων ἐπινεύειν τοῖς ζητοῦσιν παρ' αὐτῶν ἃ μὴ δύνανται παρασχεῖν. Γέγονε δὲ ἡ φρενοβλάβεια ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰεζάβελ, γυναικὸς τοῦ βασιλεύοντος τῶν Ἑβραίων, σφόδρα εἰδωλολατρούσης ὡς συναπαχθῆναι αὐτῇ καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα . . . (243) Ἐπεὶ τοίνυν αἰεὶ Θεὸς ποτίζει τὴν γῆν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔνεκα, αὐτὸν ἐξευμενίζεσθαι προσήκει ἀβροχίας γινομένης, καὶ οὐ ψευδομάντεσιν προσέχειν.

² [EN XVIa](#).

³ [EN XVIb](#). Both Origen and Didymus used the expression ἐπίστησον μὴ always with indicative. The indicative ἐφαρμόζει and εἰσιν ([Scholion XIX](#)) of the Codex are correct and Harnack should not have emended them to the respective subjunctives ἐφαρμόζη and ὦσιν. Cf. [Scholion XIX](#): ἐπίστησον, μὴ τὰς πνεύματα αἰ μετουσίαι τοῦ πνεύματος εἰσιν. [Scholion XXXIV](#): ἐπίστησον, εἰ αἱ πλυθεῖσαι καὶ λευκανθεῖσαι στολαὶ τῶν ἐκ μεγάλης θλίψεως ἀναβεβηκότων εἶναι δύναται· τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν. Technically, a subjunctive would be called for, but only so if the verb meant 'mind yourself, lest something happen'. However, what we have here is an idiomatic expression: ἐπίστησον μὴ (as well as, ἐπίστησον εἰ) only means 'notice this!'. See ἐπίστησον μὴ in this sense in Origen, *exhMar*, X: ἐπίστησον, μὴ ποτε . . . εἴρηται. *commMatt*, 11.9: ἐπίστησον μήποτε ἐλήφθη. Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), p. 371: ἐπίστησον, μὴ ἄρα . . . ἄρμόζει οὕτως. *Ibid.* p. 384: ἐπίστησον, μὴ . . . δηλοῖ. *frPs(al)*, fr. 635: ἐπίστησον μὴ καὶ τρίτον δυνατόν εἶπεν. Fr. 1268: ἐπίστησον μήποτε . . . εἴρηται. Like ἐπίστησον μὴ, there are far more instances of ἐπίστησον εἰ being used by both authors with indicative, too. Harnack emended the text of the Codex only because he did not notice that this is an idiomatic usage. Cf. Origen, *Cels*, II.69;

commJohn, I.3.16; I.18.108; XIII.6.36; XX.30.269; XXVIII.19.169; *frJohn*, VIII; *exhMar*, XXX; *commMatt*, 11.17; 15.27; Didymus, *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 307; *commZacch*, 1.145; 1.342; 1.369; 2.49; *et passim*.

⁴ Cod. την.

⁵ Cod. ἐρέσει.

⁶ Cf. Rev. 2:6, 15.

⁷ Cf. Rev. 17:13; 17:17.

⁸ Cod. προσήφθε.

⁹ Cf. Rev. 17:15–16.

¹⁰ εἰς πορνείαν κατασπᾶν. The expression is characteristic of Didymus, *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 208: τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ καὶ τῆς Αἰγυπτίας νόει· κάκειν ἐλογίσατο κακὸν τὸ τῆς πορνείας, εἰς ὃ κατασπάσαι αὐτὸν ἠβουλήθη. There is only one parallel occurring in Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, 2.10.96.1: αὐταὶ γὰρ πορνείας ἐπικαλύμματα τοῖς ἐς παντελὴ κατασπῶσι φθορὰν φθορίοις.

¹¹ Cf. 1 Cor. 8:7 and 10.

¹² Rev. 2:20.

¹³ [EN XVIc](#).

¹⁴ Cf. Didymus, *commEccl*(11–12), Cod. pp. 353–354: διὰ τὸ ἄνανδρον αὐτῶν καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐκτεθλυμένον. Didymus writes after Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.3: διαβάλλων δὲ τὸ ἄνανδρον τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ τεθλυμένον γυναικας αὐτοὺς ἀποκαλεῖ. Eusebius considering the notions of ἐμπαθεῖς and ἐκτεθλυμένον as equivalent to each other is the sole parallel for this Scholion: *DE*, 4.15.9: μυρίοι γοῦν τῶν τὰ σώματα τεθλυμένων ἐμπαθεῖς ἄλλως καὶ ἀκόλαστοι. This is one more influence of Didymus upon Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 1, p. 247: ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁσῶ τὸ θῆλυ γένος ἀσθενέστερον ὢν ἐπιρρεπέστερόν ἐστιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαθεῖς. [EN XVIId](#). See, *RCR*, chapter 7, 'Christian influence on Neoplatonism'.

Scholion XVI

And you should examine carefully whether the name of **Jezebel** applies to the doctrine and heresy of the **Nicolaitans**. For the **practices**¹ of that doctrine² are associated with the name of **Jezebel**, since it attempts to drag men into **fornication**³ and the use of meat offered to **idols**. Therefore, he labelled her '**woman**',⁴ pointing to her yielding to passion and to having become effeminate.

¹ Cf. Rev. 2:6, 15.

² Cf. Rev. 17:13; 17:17.

³ Cf. Rev. 17:15–16.

⁴ Rev. 2:20.

SCHOLION XVII

ΙΖ
256r

<XVII. Rev. 2:21> καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτῇ¹ χρόνον, ἵνα μετανοήσῃ καὶ οὐ θέλῃ² μετανοῆσαι ἐκ³ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς· <2:22> ἰδοὺ βάλλω⁴ αὐτήν⁵ εἰς κλίνην καὶ τοὺς | μουχεύοντάς⁶ μετ' αὐτῆς εἰς θλίψιν μεγάλην,⁷ ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσωσιν ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς·⁸ <2:23> καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς⁹ ἀποκτενῶ ἐν θανάτῳ. καὶ γινώσκονται πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἐρευνῶν νεφροὺς καὶ καρδίας·¹⁰ καὶ δώσω ὑμῖν ἐκάστω¹¹ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν·¹² <2:24> ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐν Θυατ¹³ οἱ¹⁴ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τὴν διδαχὴν ταύτην· οἵτινες οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰ βαθέα τοῦ σατανᾶ¹⁵ ὡς λέγουσιν·¹⁶ οὐ βαλῶ¹⁷ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἄλλο βάρος· <2:25> πλὴν ὃ ἔχετε¹⁸ κρατήσατε, ἄχρι οὗ ἂν ἴξω· <2:26> καὶ ὁ νικῶν καὶ ὁ τηρῶν ἄχρη·¹⁹ τέλους τὰ ἔργα μου δώσω αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν· <2:27> καὶ ποιμανεῖ²⁰ αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, ὡς τὰ σκευὴ τὰ κεραμικὰ²¹ συντριβήσεται,²² <2:28¹> ὡς²³ κἀγὼ εἴληφα παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου,

¹ Cod. αὐτήν.

² Cod. θέλη.

³ 2329, O., An. (M), Ar. ἵνα μετανοήσῃ, καὶ οὐ θέλει μετανοῆσαι ἐκ. An. (S). ἵνα μετανοήσῃ ἐκ. It is hardly understandable why Schmid omitted καὶ οὐ θέλει μετανοῆσαι, which occurs in several and important MSS.

⁴ Cod. βάλλω. 2329. βάλλω. O., An., Ar. βάλλω.

⁵ 2329: αὐτούς. O., An, Ar., N.-A. αὐτήν.

⁶ Cod. μουχευοντασ.

⁷ Cod. μεγαλιν.

⁸ 2329, An. αὐτῶν. O., Ar. N.-A. αὐτῆς.

⁹ 2329: αὐτῶν (not considered by N.-A.). O., An, Ar., N.-A. αὐτῆς.

¹⁰ 2329: καρδίας καὶ νεφρούς. O., An., Ar., N.-A. νεφροὺς καὶ καρδίας.

¹¹ 2329: ἐνὶ ἐκάστω (not considered by N.-A.). O., An., Ar., N.-A. ὑμῖν ἐκάστω.

¹² 2329: κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. O., An., N.-A. κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν.

¹³ Cod. θυατριοις. 2329: θυατηριοις.

¹⁴ 2329: οἱ (not considered by N.-A.).

¹⁵ 2329: τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τοῦ σατανᾶ. This is a unique version. O. An. (S) τὰ βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ. An. (M), Ar. τὰ βαθέα τοῦ σατανᾶ.

¹⁶ ὡς λέγεται. This is also a unique variant, not considered by N.-A.

¹⁷ 2329: οὐκ οὐ βαλῶ (not noticed by N.-A.). O., An., Ar., N.-A. οὐ βάλλω. The formula of emphasis οὐκ οὐ is rare, but indicative of an erudite author. Cf. *Scholia in Sophoclem*, verse 583: οὐκ οὐ φανήσομαι κακὸς φίλος. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Sanctum Ephraem*, PG.45.828.35–35: ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ζωῇ μου κατηρασάμη οὐκ οὐδένα. John Climacus, *Scala Paradisi*, chapter 709: οὐκ οὐδὲν τὸ κωλύον εἰπεῖν. Normally, the two negations placed side by side mean 'in no way' (οὐδαμῶς) as explained in the *Scholia in Aristophanem*, *Scholia in Nubes* (*Scholia anonyma recentiora*), verse 118a, where οὐκ οὐδ' means οὐδαμῶς. Hence this rendering οὐκ οὐ βαλῶ of Rev. 2:24 is emphatic: "I will put upon you no other burden of any kind".

¹⁸ 2329: εἴχεται.

¹⁹ Cod. ἄχρη.

²⁰ 2329: ποιμανῶ.

²¹ Cod. κεραμηκα.

²² O., An., Ar. συντριβήσεται. N.-A. συντρίβεται.

²³ 2329: οὕτως.

EP Ἐπεὶ **χρόνος** μακροθυμίας¹ τοῦ κριτοῦ² δέδοται ἐν ᾧ **μετανοῆσαι** ἦν δυνατόν εἰ
256v ἡβούλετο ἡ **Ἰεζάβελ**, οὐ φύσεως ἀπολλυμένης³ ἐστίν.

¹ A rare construction characteristically used by Didymus. This is a scholion by Cassian using Didymus' vocabulary, in the spirit of Origen's attitude toward the Gnostics. Cf. Cassian the Sabaite, *ScetPatr*, p. 60v: *ὅταν ἐννοήσωμεν τὴν ἄρρητον καὶ ἀνεκδιήγητον φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ τὴν ἀκάματον μακροθυμίαν*

βαστάζουσιν τὰ ἀναρίθμητα πλημμελήματα τῶν ἀμαρτανόντων.
[EN XVIIa.](#)

² [EN XVIIb.](#)

³ A distinctly Origenistic expression, characteristic of him. [EN XVIIc.](#)

Scholion XVII

Since **a time** of forbearance by the Judge has been granted, during which it was possible for **Jezebel to repent** had she wished to do so, [it follows that] she is not of a damned nature.

SCHOLION XVIII

Π

<XVIII. Rev. 2:28²> καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ τὸν ἀστέρα τὸν πρωῒνόν.¹ <2:29> ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. <3:1¹> καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἐκκλησίας

¹ 2329: αὐτῷ ἀστέρα τὸν πρωῒνόν.

᾿Σχόλιον ιη᾿

EP Πρὸς τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ,¹ ἢ² εἴληφεν ὁ τηρῶν μέχρι τέλους τὰ θεῖκα ἔργα,³ δίδεται αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος ὁ πρωῒνός ἀστήρ, φῶς ὡν⁴ ἐνεργῶν πρὸ ἀνατολῆς τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡλίου.⁵ τούτῳ⁶ καταλαμβάνονται⁷ οἱ ἀληθῶς δυνάμενοι φάναι,⁸ ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν ἢ δὲ ἡμέρα ἡγγικεν,⁹ καὶ ἐξεγερθήσεται ὄρθρον.¹⁰

¹ Cf. Rev. 2:26.

² Cod. ἦ.

³ Cf. Rev. 2:26. EN XVIIIa.

⁴ EN XVIIIb.

⁵ Cf. Mal. 4:2; Wisdom of Solomon, 5:6. Cf. Scholion IX, note 3.

⁶ Cod. τοῦτο.

⁷ EN XVIIIc.

⁸ EN XVIIId.

⁹ Cod. ἡγγικεν. Both the phraseology and exegesis are like Didymus in quoting Rom. 13:12: *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 23: τίς δὲ ἔχει τὴν ἑωθινήν καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἡμέρας ἢ ὁ δυνάμενος εἰπεῖν· ‘ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν, ἢ ἡμέρα ἡγγισεν’; *frPs(al)*, fr. 636: Κατορθοῦται τοῦτο τῷ γενομένῳ ἐκτὸς ἀγνοίας καὶ κακίας, ὡς φάναι· Ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν, ἢ δὲ ἡμέρα ἡγγικεν. *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 326: τοῦτο οὖν λέγει· τέλος ἀπείληφεν ὁ τῆς ‘ἀγνοίας’ καιρὸς ‘νύξ’ ὀνομαζόμενος· τοῦτο ‘προκόψαντος’ διαδέχεται ἢ ‘ἡμέρα’. *commZacch*, 4.240: Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐγγισάσῃ μετὰ τὸ προκόψαι τὴν τῆς ἀγνοίας καὶ κακίας νύκτα. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1136: Πρῶτον ἐν ἁωρίᾳ, ὅπερ νοήσεις καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος αἰῶνος νυκτὸς ὀνομαζόμενου πολλάκις ὡς πρὸς τὸν μέλλοντα αἰῶνα ἡμέραν καλούμενον, κατὰ τὸ Ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν, ἢ δὲ ἡμέρα ἡγγισεν. *In Genesis*, Cod. p. 8A: Σωτήρ εἶναι εἴρηται, κατ’ ἀλληγορίαν ἡμέρα ἔσται ὡς εἴρηται· ‘Ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν, ἢ δὲ ἡμέρα ἡγγικεν.’ Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἡμέρα καὶ φῶς ὑπάρχει, φῶς μὲν κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν.

Theodoret stood in the line of Didymus. Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.197.13–16: Νύκτα καλεῖ τὸν τῆς ἀγνοίας καιρὸν, ἡμέραν δὲ τὸν μετὰ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Δεσπότης χρόνον. Ἀνατείλας γὰρ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὁ ἥλιος ταῖς ἀκτίσι τῆς θεογνωσίας τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐφώτισεν. Cf. *ibid.* PG.82.652.36–41; *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 12.54.

¹⁰ Psalms 56:9; 107:3. Cassian subjoined this quotation while seeking authority in both Testaments. Although Didymus had commented on this passage once, Theodoret’s interpretation of Psalm 107:3–4 is closer to the sentiment of this Scholion. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1749.37–1752.6: ἀλλὰ μετὰ μυρίων ἔθνων καὶ λαῶν τὴν θείαν ᾠδὴν ποιησάμενος· ὄρθρον δὲ καλεῖ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν. Ἐξ ἐκείνου γὰρ ἀνέτειλε τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ φῶς. On the other hand, Didymus’ comment is couched in phraseology notably relevant to that of the Scholia. Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.274 (commenting on Zach. 4:1–3, not on the Psalm): Ἐπαινετὴ δὲ αὕτη ἡ διέγερσις, ὥστ’ ἂν εἰπεῖν τὸν προσδοκῆσαντα αὐτὴν μετὰ θάρσους· Ἐξεγερθήσεται ὄρθρον. Τούτου πληρωθέντος δι’ ἐκβάσεως τοῦ προαναφωνηθέντος, χαριστηρίως βοᾷ· Ἐξηγέρθη ὅτι Κύριος ἀντιλήμψεται μου. For ἐπαινετὴ, cf. Scholion VI (μάχαιρα ἐπαινετὴ); for the rare expression δι’ ἐκβάσεως, which is characteristic of Didymus, cf. Scholion XX and EN XXb. Also, EN XXXIXb.

Scholion XVIII

In addition to the **power** which **he who keepeth** the divine **works unto the end**¹ has received, the Saviour has granted him **the morning star**, which is a light acting before *the rise of the Sun of righteousness*.² All those who can truly say, *the night is far spent, the day is at hand*³ and, *I myself will awake early*,⁴ are illuminated by this [Sun].

¹ Cf. Rev. 2:26.

² Cf. Mal. 4:2; Wisdom of Solomon 5:6.

³ Rom. 13:12.

⁴ Psalms 56:9; 107:3. EN XVIIIe.

SCHOLION XIX

ΙΘ

257r

< XIX. Rev. 3:1 > γράψον· τάδε λέγει ὁ ἔχων τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀστέρας· οἷδά σου τὰ ἔργα ὅτι ὄνομα ἔχεις ὅτι ζῆς καὶ νεκρὸς εἶ. <3:2> γίνου¹ γρηγορῶν² καὶ στήρισον³ τὰ λοιπὰ, ἃ ἤμελλον⁴ ἀποθανεῖν· οὐ γὰρ εὗρηκά σου τὰ ἔργα πεπληρωμένα ἐνώπιον⁵ τοῦ θεοῦ μου· <3:3> μνημόνευσον⁶ οὖν πῶς εἴληφας καὶ ἤκουσας καὶ τήρει⁷ καὶ μετανόησον· ἔαν οὖν μὴ γρηγορήσης⁸ ἤξω ὡς κλέπτης καὶ οὐ μὴ γνώσῃ⁹ ποίαν ὥραν ἤξω | ἐπὶ σέ· <3:4> ἀλλὰ ἔχεις¹⁰ ὀλίγα ὀνόματα ἐν Σάρδεσιν, ἃ οὐκ¹¹ ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν καὶ περιπατήσουσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς, ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν·¹² <3:5> ὁ νικῶν οὕτως¹³ περιβαλεῖται ἐν ἱματίοις¹⁴ λευκοῖς, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐξαλείψω¹⁵ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς¹⁶ βίβλου τῆς ζωῆς καὶ ὁμολογήσω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ πατρὸς μου καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ. <3:6> ὁ ἔχων οὗς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. <3:7¹> καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Φιλαδελφείᾳ¹⁷ ἐκκλησίας γράψον·

¹ Cod. γηνου. 2329: γενοῦ.

² Cod. γρηγορον.

³ 2329: στεριρίζων.

⁴ 2329, O., An., N.-A., ἔμελλον. Ar. ἔμελλεν. Various MSS of K have it ἤμελλες ἀποβάλλειν (N.-A., p. 637). 2351 and 2329 concur, among others, with K, A, C, and the Syriac *versio Harclensis*.

⁵ 2329: ενοπιον.

⁶ 2329: καὶ μνημόνευε πῶς.

⁷ 2329: τίρει.

⁸ 2329: γρηγορισισ.

⁹ 2329: ἤξω ὡς κλέπτης, καὶ οὐ μὴ γνώσῃ. O. ἤξω ὡς κλέπτης, καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς. An., N.-A. ἤξω ὡς κλέπτης· καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς. Ar. ἤξω ἐπὶ σέ ὡς κλέπτης. Καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς. The form γνώσῃ in 2351, 2329, K, along with K, 1006, 1841, 2344.

¹⁰ 2329: ἀλλ' ἔχω ὀλίγα. O. ἀλλ' ἔχεις ὀλίγα. An. (S) ἔχεις ὀλίγα. An. (M), Ar. . ἀλλ' ὀλίγα ἔχεις. N.-A. ἀλλὰ ἔχεις ὀλίγα.

¹¹ 2329: εν σαρδαισ οτι ουκ. O., N.-A. ἃ οὐκ. An., Ar. οἱ οὐκ.

¹² 2329: μετ' ἐμοῦ ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν.

¹³ 2329, N.-A. ὁ νικῶν οὕτως. O. ὁ νικῶν οὕτος. An., Ar. ὁ νικῶν, οὕτος.

¹⁴ 2329: περιβαλεῖται ἱματίοις.

¹⁵ 2329: ἀπαλείψω, intending ἀπαλοῖψω, which is more accurate than ἐξαλείψω (not considered by N.-A.).

¹⁶ 2329: του.

¹⁷ Cod. and 2329: Φιλαδελφία.

ᾠχόλιον ιθ'

EP

Ἐπειδὴ ἡ νῦν ἀπαγγελλομένη διδασκαλία¹ πρὸς ἐκκλησίας ἑπτὰ τὰς δηλουμένας γίνεται, ἐπίστησον μὴ² τὰ ζ' πνεύματα αἱ μετουσίαι τοῦ πνεύματος εἰσιν· ἐκάστης ἐκκλησίας μετοχὴν ἐχούσης ἀσυντρόχαστον⁴ πρὸς τὰς τῶν λοιπῶν· συμφώνως τοῖς ζ' πνεύμασιν ἐκλήψει⁵ καὶ τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀστέρας·⁶ ἐκάστου ἀστέρος σημαίνοντος τὸν

¹ Use of the expression ἀπαγγέλλειν διδασκαλίαν is rare, yet telling. Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.290: Παραπλησίως ἔχει καὶ τὸ ἐν μωσαϊκῇ διδασκαλίᾳ δεικτικῶς ἀπαγγελλόμενον: *frPs(al)*, fr. 1289: οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας κήρυκες ἐπὶ τῷ παρρησιέστερον καὶ σαφῶς ἀπαγγέλλειν τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν ὡς σάλπιγγι ἐαυτῶν ὑψοῦν τὴν φωνήν. Eriphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 1, p. 156: κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων διδασκαλίαν σαφῶς ἀπαγγελλεῖσιν. Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogiae*, Catechesis 2.1: καὶ διδασκαλῖαι καινότεραι, καινοτέρων οὐσαι πραγμάτων ἀπαγγελτικά.

² Cf. *Scholion XVI*: Ἐπίστησον, μὴ ἐφαρμόζει τὸ ὄνομα τῆς Ἰεζάβελ. *Scholion XXXIV*: Ἐπίστησον, εἰ αἱ πλυθεῖσαι καὶ λευκανθεῖσαι στολαὶ τῶν ἐκ μεγάλης θλίψεως ἀναβεβηκότων εἶναι δύναται· τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν. This is a verbatim passage from Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse. For the indicative εἰσιν, cf. *Scholion XVI*, n. 3 and *EN XVIa*.

³ *EN XIXa*. Cf. μετουσία in *Scholion XX*.

⁴ *EN XIXb*.

⁵ Cod. ἐκλήψει. *EN XIXc*.

⁶ Rev. 1:16; 1:20; 2:1; 3:1.

257v τινος⁷ ἐκκλησίας φωτισμόν· δυνατόν ἀναφέρειν⁸ | τοὺς ἐπτὰ ἀστέρας εἰς τοὺς ἐπτὰ
ἄγγέλους⁹ τῶν ἐπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν.¹⁰

⁷ Cod. τινός.

⁸ EN XIXd.

⁹ Rev. 8:2; 15:1; 15:7–8; 16:1; 17:1; 21:9.

¹⁰ Rev. 1:4; 1:11; 1:20. With regard to the symbolism attributed to the number ‘seven’, cf. Scholia XXVIII, XXXVI.

Scholion XIX

Since the teaching is now addressed to the **seven churches** indicated, you should examine carefully whether the **seven spirits** are the shares in the Spirit, since each **church** has a participation of its own, which is independent of any [participation] of the rest. You should comprehend the **seven stars**¹ in accordance with the meaning of the **seven spirits**: each star denotes the illumination of a certain **church**. It is [also] possible to refer the **seven stars** to the **seven angels**² of the **seven churches**.³

¹ Rev. 1:16; 1:20; 2:1; 3:1.

² Rev. 8:2; 15:1; 15:7–8; 16:1; 17:1; 21:9.

³ Rev. 1:4; 1:11; 1:20.

K

258r

<XX. Rev. 3:7²> τάδε λέγει ὁ ἄγγελος¹ ἀληθινός² ὁ ἔχων τὴν κλεῖν τοῦ Δαυίδ,³ ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδείς κλείσει αὐτήν⁴ καὶ κλείων καὶ οὐδείς ἀνοίγει,⁵ εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδείς ἀνοίξει.⁶ <3:8> οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα· ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ἐνώπιόν σου θύραν ἀνεωγμένην⁷ ἣν οὐδείς δύναται κλείσαι αὐτήν· ὅτι μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν⁸ καὶ ἐτήρησάς⁹ μου τὸν λόγον καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσω¹⁰ τὸ ὄνομά μου· <3:9> ἰδοὺ δίδωμι ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τοῦ σατανᾶ τῶν λεγόντων ἑαυτοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἶναι καὶ οὐκ εἰσίν, ἀλλὰ ψεύδονται· ἰδοὺ ποιήσω αὐτούς, ἵνα ἥξωσι¹¹ καὶ προσκυνήσωσιν¹² ἐνώπιον¹³ τῶν ποδῶν σου, καὶ γνώσει,¹⁴ ὅτι ἠγάπησά¹⁵ σε. <3:10> ὅτι ἐτήρησας¹⁶ τὸν λόγον τῆς ὑπομονῆς¹⁷ μου, καὶ γὰρ σε τηρήσω ἐκ τῆς ὥρας τοῦ πειρασμοῦ, τῆς μελλούσης ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης, πειράσαι τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπ' αὐτῆς¹⁸ τῆς γῆς. <3:11> ἔρχομαι ταχύ· κράτει, ὃ ἔχεις, ἵνα μηδεὶς | λάβῃ¹⁹ τὸν στέφανόν σου.

¹ Cod. ἄγγελος. The version of 2351 ὁ ἄγγελος ἀληθινός is unique.

² Cod. ἀληθινός.

³ 2329: κλεῖδα Δαυίδ. O., N.-A. κλεῖν Δαυίδ. An., Ar. κλεῖδα τοῦ Δαυίδ. Andreas notes that 'certain copies have ἔδου' instead of the word Δαυίδ.

⁴ The καὶ οὐδείς κλείσει αὐτήν is a unique reading of 2351, perhaps pointing to Theodoret (see below, n. 6).

⁵ Cod. ἀνοίγει.

⁶ 2329: ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδείς κλείσει [Cod. κλησει]· καὶ κλείων καὶ οὐδείς ἀνοίξει. O. ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδείς κλείει, καὶ κλείων καὶ οὐδείς ἀνοίγει. An. ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδείς κλείει· καὶ κλείων, καὶ οὐδείς ἀνοίγει. Ar. οὐδείς κλείσει, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀνοίγων, καὶ οὐδείς ἀνοίξει, εἰ μὴ ὁ κλείων. This reading of 2351 is unique. There is an indication that this was the result of Theodoret having edited the text which Cassian uses. Cf. Theodoret, *comuls*, 6, line 711, commenting on Isaiah 22:22: καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ τὴν κλεῖδα οἴκου Δαυίδ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄμου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀνοίξει, καὶ οὐδείς κλείσει, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀνοίγων.

⁷ 2329, O., An (M): ἠνεωγμένην. An (S), Ar. ἀνεωγμένην.

⁸ Cod. δύναμιν.

⁹ 2329: ἐτηρῖσας.

¹⁰ 2329: ἠρνήσω.

¹¹ 2329: ἥξουσιν. O (H). ἥξουσι. O. (G), An., Ar. ἥξωσι.

¹² 2329, O. (H): προσκυνήσουσιν. O. (G), An., Ar. προσκυνήσωσιν.

¹³ Cod. ἐνώπιον.

¹⁴ 2329, O., An., Ar., N.-A.: γνώσιν.

¹⁵ 2351, K, 1006, 1841, and the Vulgate have ἠγάπησα instead of ἐγὼ ἠγάπησα.

¹⁶ 2329: ἐτηρῖσας.

¹⁷ 2329: ὑπομονησ.

¹⁸ Cod. ἐπι.

¹⁹ 2329: λαβει.

«Σχόλιον κ'»

EP

Ἅγιος ἀληθινός¹ ὁ μὴ μετουσίᾳ, ἀλλ' οὐσίᾳ² ὢν τοιοῦτος. αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς λόγος³· ἔχων τὴν κλεῖδα⁴ τοῦ Δαυίδ· ὁπλινικά⁵ σὰρξ γὰρ γέγονεν <ὁ>

¹ This ἅγιος could be emended to ἄγγελος, since this is a quotation purporting to comment on the foregoing expression of Rev. 3:7². This is actually a mishearing by the scribe, since no MS of Revelation has ἅγιος for ἄγγελος, yet I leave it as it stands.

² EN XXa. The author is anxious to confirm that the Son is God by nature, not by participation in Deity. Cf. Scholion XXII: Ο πιστός καὶ ἀληθινός ὁ σωτὴρ ὑπάρχει οὐ διὰ τὸ πιστεῶς καὶ ἀληθείας

μετέχειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ βέβαιος καὶ οὐσίᾳ εἶναι ἀληθινός.

³ Cf. John 1:1. Cf. Scholion VII: ἀλλ' οὕτως, ζωὴ ὢν κατὰ φύσιν, νεκρὸς δι' ἡμᾶς ἐγένετο . . . ζωὴ δὲ οὐ γέγονε, ἀλλ' εἶναι διεβεβαιώσατο.

⁴ Cod. κλεῖδα.

⁵ Cod. ὁπνικά.

λόγος,⁶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ κλειδί⁷ ἀνοίγει τὰς γραφὰς πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας οὔσας κεκλεισμένας, ἃς κλείσαι οὐδεὶς δύναται, φάσκων⁸ αὐτὰς μὴ πεπληρωθῆναι. οὗτος⁹ ἥνοιξεν¹⁰ αὐτὰς τοῖς ἀμφὶ Κλεόπαν¹¹ συνβαδίζων¹² ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.¹³ ὥς δὴ ταύτας ἠνέφξεν, πληρώσας αὐτὰς δι' ἐκβάσεως,¹⁴ ἐκκλίσεν¹⁵ τὴν τοῦ νόμου σκιάν,¹⁶ ἔξω¹⁷ τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ποιήσας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους. διὸ οὐδεὶς ἀνοίξει τὰ κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου,¹⁸ οὐκέτι ἐφεξῆς τῶν λοιπῶν φυλαχθῆναι¹⁹ χώραν ἐχόντων.²⁰ ἀνοίγει μὲν τὰ δυνατὰ ἀνθρώποις νοῆσαι, κλείει²¹ δὲ ὅσα ὀν²² δύνανται²³ ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ζωῇ γινῶναι.

⁶ John 1:14. Cf. Didymus, *commZacch*, 4.146: τοῦ τοσοῦτου καὶ τηλικούτου ἀγαθοῦ κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως καιρὸν πληρωθῆσομένου, ὁπνίκα ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ γεγονῶς ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς ἰδίῳις γνωρίμοις, ἵν' ἔτι μᾶλλον προκόψαντες θεάσωνται τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός. *frPs(al)*, fr. 900: τότε γὰρ γνώριμος γέγονεν ἡ θεοῦ δεξιὰ, ὅτε ὁ λόγος σὰρξ γενόμενος ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν· ἐθεασάμεθα γὰρ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός. Cf. *Scholion I*, note 2; the term γνώριμοι τοῦ σωτῆρος ('those intimate with Christ'), which is characteristic of Didymus.

⁷ Cod. κλειδί.

⁸ Cod. φάσκων.

⁹ Cod. οὗτος.

¹⁰ Cf. Luke 20:45.

¹¹ Cf. Luke 24:13ff. Cf. *Scholion XXVII*: οὕτω δὲ σαφὴ γέγονεν μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τοῦ κυρίου, ὡς τοὺς πεῖραν τῆς ἀνοίξεως ἐσχηκότας λέγειν. At both points reference is made to the revealed typology of the OT during the incident with Cleopas and other disciples 'on their way to Emmaus'.

¹² This should be συμβαδίζων. However, we have a distinctive token of Didymus' colloquialism once again: in compound words, the letter nu (ν) occurring before beta (β) is not converted into mu (μ), as it is normally the case. Hence he had συν-βαδίζων instead of συμβαδίζων. Cf. Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 72 (συνβασιλεύσωμεν for συμβασιλεύσωμεν); *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 377 (συνβαίνειν for συμβαίνειν); *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 19 (συνβάλλεται for συμβάλλεται); *ibid.* Cod. p. 25

(συνβάλλεσθαι for συμβάλλεσθαι); *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 6 (συνβασιλεύσωμεν for συμβασιλεύσωμεν); *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 323 (συνβαίνει for συμβαίνει); *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 105 (συνβαίνοντα for συμβαίνοντα). There is only one other Christian using the colloquialism συν + ν = συνβ (instead of συμβ) repeatedly: Pseudo-Caesarius (= Cassian the Sabaite), *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, 114 (συνβαίνει); 218 (σύνβολον, συνβεβηκότων, συνβολήν); 157 (συνβεβλημένα); 204 (συνβήσεσθαι); 188 (συνβιοτεύων); 218 (συνβοσκηθήσεται); 138 (συνβουλῇν). See *NDGF*, Appendix I.

¹³ Cf. Luke, 24:32.

¹⁴ The expression δι' ἐκβάσεως is exclusive to, and characteristic of, Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.274; *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 83. *EN XXb*.

¹⁵ Cod. ἐκκλίσεν.

¹⁶ Cf. Heb. 10:1.

¹⁷ Rev. 3:12. Cf. 11:2; 22:15.

¹⁸ Cf. Rom. 2:27. Didymus is markedly present once again. *EN XXc*.

¹⁹ Cod. οὐκέτι φυ ὕφεξαι τα λοιπα λαχθῆναι. Allusion to the Mosaic Law precepts, which should not be observed literally any more. *EN XXe*.

²⁰ Cod. ἔχοντα. *EN XXd*. Cassian took up the idea at this point from John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam i ad Corinthios Commentarius*, PG.61.126.18–19: Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἦλθεν ἡ ἀλήθεια, οὐκέτι χώραν ἔχουσιν οἱ τύποι.

²¹ Cod. κλειον.

²² Cod. μή.

²³ Cod. δύναται.

Scholion XX

He that is holy, he that is true: This is God the Logos,¹ who is what He is not by participation, but by essence. **Who hath the key of David:** when the Logos became flesh, through this **key** he **openeth** the scriptures, which were sealed before the advent, that **no man** can **shut** since he declares them not [yet] fulfilled. It is He who *opened*² them to those who were with Cleopas, *while walking with them by the way*.³ Hence, at the time when he opened them, fulfilling them through the eventuality that has already occurred in his person, he shut [sc. abolished] *the shadow of the Law*,⁴ thus causing the *Jews to be cast out*⁵ of *Jerusalem*.⁶ This is why **no man** shall ever **open** [the truth] of the Law [by reading only] its bare *letter*,⁷ since posterity no longer has any place for the observance of it.⁸ He then **openeth** those things that men are able to comprehend, but he **shutteth** those which they cannot recognize in the present life.

¹ Cf. John 1:1.

² Cf. Luke 20:45.

³ Cf. Luke 24:32.

⁴ Cf. Heb. 10:1.

⁵ Rev. 3:12. Cf. 11:2; 22:15.

⁶ See *EN XXe*.

⁷ Cf. Rom. 2:27. Read: διὸ οὐδεὶς ἀνοίξει τὰ τοῦ νόμου κατὰ τὸ γράμμα.

⁸ That is, in the time from the Incarnation until the end of the world.

SCHOLION XXI

KA

<XXI. Rev. 3:12¹> ὁ νικῶν ποιήσω αὐτῷ¹ στύλον ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ θεοῦ μου.

¹ 2329. O., An., Ar., N.-A. αὐτόν. Nevertheless, αὐτῷ transpires in K*, 1611, 1854.

⟨Σχόλιον κα'⟩

EP 258v **Στύλους**¹ πάντας εὐρίσκομεν ὀνομαζομένους τοὺς δυναμένους τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ἐκκλησίας φέρεσθαι.² | αὐτίκα γοῦν Παῦλος *Ἰάκωβον καὶ Κηφᾶν καὶ Ἰωάννην* εἶπεν *στύλους*³ εἶναι. καὶ ὁ θεὸς φησιν περὶ τῶν τοιούτων· *ἐγὼ ἐστερέωσα τοὺς*⁴ *στύλους αὐτῆς*.⁵ καὶ ἐπ' ἐὶ μετεωρίζονται⁶ οὗτοι εὐσεβείας καὶ ἀρετῆς⁷ *πτεροῖς*,⁸ λέγεται περὶ αὐτῶν τῶν *φορούντων* *λοιπὸν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου*⁹ *στύλοι οὐρανοῦ ἐπετάσθησαν*.¹⁰ καὶ ἐπ' ἐὶ¹¹ ἕκαστος τῶν οὕτω τυγχανόντων *στύλων* ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ θεοῦ *ἑδραῖος καὶ ἀμετακίνητος*¹² ἐστίν, *ἐρριζωμένος*¹³ καὶ *τεθεμελιωμένος ἐν ἀγάπῃ*,¹⁴ οὐκ ἂν ποτε γένοιτο *ἔξω*,¹⁵ ἔνθα γέγονεν *Καὶν ἐξελθὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου*¹⁶ *τοῦ θεοῦ*.¹⁷ *ἐρχόμενος* γὰρ δι' ἐνεργειῶν¹⁸ *ἀρετῆς*¹⁹ *πρὸς τὸν σωτήρα, οὐκ ἐκβάλλεται ἔξω*.²⁰ ἐπὶ τὸν οὕτω γενάμενον²¹ **στύλον** γράφει τὸ **ὄνομα** τοῦ πατρός,²² ἐννοίας αὐτῷ τοῦ πατρὸς²³ ἐνχαράττων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα *τῆς πόλεως τοῦ ζῶντος θεοῦ*, ἥτις *ἐπουράνιος Ἰερουσαλήμ*²⁴ ἐστίν **καταβάσα**²⁵ *παρὰ θεοῦ ἐκ | τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*.²⁶ *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος*.²⁷

¹ EN XXIa.

² EN XXIb.

³ Cod. στοίλους. Cf. Gal. 2:9.

⁴ Cod. τοῦ.

⁵ Psalm 74:4. EN XXIc.

⁶ Cf. Ez. 10:16–17. Cod. ἐπιμετεωρίζονται. The expression καὶ ἐπ' ἐὶ μετεωρίζονται οὗτοι εὐσεβείας καὶ ἀρετῆς *πτεροῖς* is an implicit reference to the vision of Ezekiel, 10:1–19. Cf. reference to the 'sons of thunder' in Scholion XXXVI, where John and James are mentioned, as well.

⁷ Cf. 2 Peter 1:3.

⁸ Cf. Ez. 10:1–19 and Ez. 1:7.

⁹ Cf. 1 Cor. 15:49.

¹⁰ Job 26:11. EN XXIId.

¹¹ Cod. ἐπί.

¹² Cf. 1 Cor. 15:58.

¹³ Cod. ἐρριμένος.

¹⁴ Cf. Eph. 3:17.

¹⁵ Cf. Rev. 3:12.

¹⁶ Cod. προσώπου.

¹⁷ Cf. Gen. 4:16.

¹⁸ Cod. ενεργιῶν.

¹⁹ Cf. Phil. 4:8; 1 Peter 2:9; 2 Peter 1:5.

²⁰ Cf. John 6:37. EN XXIe.

²¹ EN XXIf. Cf. Scholion XXIX: ἐκ τῆς οὕτω γεναμένης σφαγῆς, and EN XXIId.

²² Rev. 3:12; cf. 2:17; 14:1; 16:9; 19:12; 22:4.

²³ EN XXIg.

²⁴ Cf. Heb. 12:22.

²⁵ Cod. καταβασαι.

²⁶ Cf. Rev. 3:12; 21:2 and 10. Cf. 17:18.

²⁷ Cf. 1 Tim. 3:15.

Scholion XXI

[In scripture] we find the appellation **pillars** applied to those who are capable of being leaders of the Church. Hence Paul said that *James and Cephas and John* are *pillars*.¹ Likewise, God referring to such [leaders] says, *I have made the pillars of it firm*.² Since then they are *lifted up*³ by the *wings*⁴ of *godliness and virtue*,⁵ it is said of them, *the pillars of heaven trembled*.⁶ they are those who thereafter *bear the image of the heavenly*.⁷ Since each and every one of those

¹ Cf. Gal. 2:9.

² Psalm 74:4.

³ Cf. Ez. 10:16–17.

⁴ Cf. Ez. 10:1–19 and Ez. 1, 7.

⁵ Cf. 2 Peter 1:3.

⁶ Job 26:11.

⁷ Cf. 1 Cor. 15:49.

who happen to be *pillars* in the temple of God, is *steadfast and immovable*,⁸ *being rooted and grounded in love*,⁹ he could never be cast out to the place where Cain arrived when he *went out from the face of God*.¹⁰ For since he comes close to the Saviour by means of actions of *virtue*,¹¹ he is not *cast out*.¹² Upon such a man who has become a **pillar**, He [sc. the Lord] writes the **name** of the Father.¹³ He engraves upon him concepts of the Father, as well as [concepts of] the name of *the city of the living God*, which is *the heavenly Jerusalem*¹⁴ that **has come down out of heaven, from God**.¹⁵ *This is the Church of the living God*.¹⁶

⁸ Cf. 1 Cor. 15:58.

⁹ Cf. Eph. 3:17.

¹⁰ Cf. Gen. 4:16.

¹¹ Cf. Phil. 4:8; 1 Peter 2:9; 2 Peter 1:5.

¹² Cf. John 6:37.

¹³ Rev. 3:12; Cf. 2:17; 14:1; 16:9; 19:12; 22:4.

¹⁴ Cf. Heb. 12:22.

¹⁵ Cf. Rev. 3:12; 21:2 and 10. Cf. 17:18.

¹⁶ Cf. 1 Tim. 3:15.

SCHOLION XXII

KB

<XXII. Rev. 3:12²> καὶ ἔξω οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἔτι· καὶ γράψω ἐπ’ αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ μου, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως¹ τοῦ θεοῦ μου, τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἣ καταβαίνειν² ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μου, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ καινόν.³ <3:13> ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. <3:14> καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ⁴ ἐκκλησίας γράψον·

¹ Cod. πολεος.

² Cod. καταβαινῃ. 2329: ἡ καταβενουσα.

³ O., An. καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ καινόν. Ag. καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ καινόν.

⁴ Cod. Λαοδικεία. 2329: τῆς ἐν τη Λαοδικαίων ἐκκλησίας.

᾿Σχόλιον κβ’

EP

Ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς¹ ὁ σωτὴρ ὑπάρχει οὐ διὰ τὸ πιστεῶς καὶ ἀληθείας μετέχειν,² ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ βέβαιος καὶ οὐσίᾳ³ εἶναι ἀληθινός.⁴ τὰ αὐτὸν γὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ⁵ τὸ ‘ἀλήθεια’⁶ καὶ ‘ἀληθινός’ εἶναι.⁷ ὅτι δὲ τὸ πιστὸς ἀντὶ βεβαίου καὶ ἀτρέπτου⁸ κεῖτα φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος· «εἰς⁹ ἀπιστοῦμεν, αὐτὸς πιστὸς μένειν».¹⁰ ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται¹¹ καὶ Μωσῆς· θεὸς πιστὸς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία.¹² εἰς τοῦτο λήψει¹³ καὶ τὸ γραφόμενον Τιμοθέε· πιστὸς ὁ λόγος,¹⁴ ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘μένων ἀεί’ καὶ ‘οὐ διαπίπτων’.¹⁵ εἴρηται δὲ ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός¹⁶ πρὸς παράστασιν βεβαιότητος,¹⁷ ὥς αὐτὸς ἐστὶν τὸ ἀμήν.¹⁸

259v

ἀρχὴν δὲ τῆς κτίσεως¹⁹ εἶπεν αὐτόν. οὐχ ὡς κτίσμα²⁰ πρῶτον κτίσεως ἀρχή ἐστὶν αὐτῆς, ἀλλ’ ὡς²¹ αἰτία²² τοῦ ὑπάρχειν αὐτὴν οἷα δημιουργός·²³ ἀρχὴ γὰρ ποιημάτων ὁ ποιητής,²⁴ τουτέστιν τῆς κτίσεως ὁ κτίστης²⁵ ἐστὶν αὐτῆς καὶ ἄρχων.²⁶ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ ἐστὶν λέγειν· μέλλω σε ἐμέσσαν,²⁷ καὶ τὸ ἐγενήθητέ μοι εἰς πλησμονήν,²⁸

¹ Rev. 3:14.

² EN XXIIa.

³ Cf. Scholion XX: Ἅγιος, ἀληθινὸς ὁ μὴ μετουσίᾳ, ἀλλ’ οὐσίᾳ ὢν τοιοῦτος. Scholion IXI: αἱ μετουσίαι τοῦ πνεύματος.

⁴ The expression πιστεῶς μετέχειν contrasts with βέβαιος, whereas ἀληθείας μετέχειν is the antithesis of οὐσίᾳ εἶναι ἀληθινός. The author argues against the idea that the Son is not Himself ‘truth’ but simply participates ‘in truth’, in the same line of argument which was developed in Scholion XX.

⁵ Cod. γὰρ τον αὐτον ἐπ’ αὐτου.

⁶ John 14:6.

⁷ Cod. γὰρ τον αὐτον ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ το ἀλήθεια καὶ αληθινος εἶναι.

⁸ EN XXIIb.

⁹ Cod. ἦ.

¹⁰ Cod. μενη. EN XXIIc.

¹¹ 2 Tim. 2:13.

¹² Deut. 32:4.

¹³ Cod. λείψει.

¹⁴ 1 Tim. 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim. 2:11. Cf. Tit. 3:8.

¹⁵ EN XXIIId.

¹⁶ Rev. 3:14, which is a passage associated with the next Scholion.

¹⁷ EN XXIIe.

¹⁸ Ibid. I introduce a paragraph at this point, where the subject shifts to rebuttal of Arianism.

¹⁹ Rev. 3:14.

²⁰ Cf. Rev. 5:13. EN XXIIIf.

²¹ Cod. ἀλλωσ.

²² Cod. ετια. Cf. Didymus, *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.39.1632.12:

Προϋπάρχων τῆς κτίσεως, σοφία ὢν, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐὰν λέγει· ‘Κύριος ἐκτίσέ με’, μὴ οὐσίωσιν τὴν νόησιν ἐξη. ἀλλ’ εἰς σχέσιν τὴν πρὸς τὰ κτίσματα. Εἰς ἔργα γὰρ ἐκτίσθαι φησὶν, ἐπὶ τῷ ἀρχῇ εἶναι τῶν ποιητικῶν καὶ προνοητικῶν ὁδῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τουτέστιν αἰτία. Likewise, *ibid.* PG.39.1629.56: Πολλὰ σημαίνουσα, καθάπερ εἵπομεν, ἡ ἀρχή, νῦν τὸ αἰδῖον δηλοῖ, καὶ τὸ αἴτιον, καὶ τὸ ποιητικόν. Ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ τινῶν ἐστὶν ἀρχή, καὶ σημαίνει σχέσιν, ἀλλ’ οὐκ οὐσίωσιν. Cf. Didymus identifying ἀρχή with αἰτία: *ibid.* PG.39.1632.12; *commEccl*(5–6), Cod. p. 152; *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 272; *frPs(al)*, fr. 1050; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 1B. EN XXIIIf. Cf. Scholion VII and EN VIIb.

²³ Cf. Scholion XII: τὸν θεὸν λόγον εἶναι τὸ ἄλφα, ἀρχὴν καὶ αἰτίαν τῶν ἀπάντων, πρῶτον τε οὐ χρόνον, ἀλλὰ τιμῇ. EN XXIIg.

²⁴ Cf. Rev. 14:7.

²⁵ John of Damascus took up the expression of the Scholion verbatim, identifying the Son as ἀρχή with αἰτία: *Adversus Manichaeos*, 3: Λέγεται ἀρχὴ καὶ κατὰ τὸ αἴτιον καὶ τοῦτο τριχῶς; ἡ γὰρ φυσικὸν ὡς ἀρχὴ υἱοῦ πατὴρ, ἡ ποιητικὸν ὡς ἀρχὴ κτίσεως ὁ κτίστης, ἡ μιμητικὸν ὡς ἀρχὴ εἰκόνοσ τοῦ εἰκονιζόμενον. John of Damascus was a monk of the Laura of Sabas, and the writings of its erstwhile abbot Cassian were available to him. Cf. Origen, *commJohn*, I. 17–19; *frJohn*, I.

²⁶ Rev. 1:5. EN XXIIh. I introduce a paragraph at this point.

²⁷ Cod. ἐμεσε. Rev. 3:16, which is a passage associated with the next Scholion.

²⁸ Isaiah, 1:14.

οἶονεἰ γὰρ ἐπ'εὶ²⁹ πολλὰ <ἐβ'δ'ελύξ'ατ'ε>³⁰ ἐν ἐμοί·³¹ ὅταν γὰρ τὴν περὶ τινος μνήμην ἀποβάλῃ³² ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ὁ κύριος,³³ τὸν τοιοῦτον ἡμεσεν, γενόμενον αὐτῷ εἰς πλησμονήν, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας παχύτητα μὴ χωροῦντα εἶναι ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

²⁹ Cod. επι.

³⁰ Cod. πολῶζεται. The verb βδελύσσω appears in the active voice in Exodus 5:21, which is quoted by four authors only: Cyril of Alexandria, *De Adoratione*, PG.68.192.43 (also, an oblique reference, in *ibid.* PG.68.200.48). *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 126. John Chrysostom, *Ad Stagirium Ascetam a Daemone Vexatum*, PG.47.474.17. Didymus modified the passage, quoting the verb in the middle voice: *frPs(al)*, fr. 44. The notion is glossed in the same collection, *frPs(al)*(comm. on Ps. 52,2), fr. 559: οἱ γοῦν δι' ἀφροσύνην λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι θεὸν διέφθειραν τὴν ἑαυτῶν γνώμην ἐν ἀνομίαις αἷς ἐπραξαν, ἐξ ὧν ἐβδελύχθησαν τουτέστι βδελυκτοὶ γεγονόασιν.

³¹ Cf. the verb βδελύσσω, in (LXX) Ex. 5:21: ἐβδελύξασθε γὰρ τὴν ὁσμὴν ἡμῶν ἐναντίον Φαραώ. Lev. 11:43: καὶ οὐ μὴ βδελύξητε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν from Lev. 11:43: καὶ οὐ βδελύξετε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν. Quite characteristically, Cyril of Alexandria is the sole author to quote Leviticus 11:43, but he changes the verb to middle voice (οὐ μὴ βδελύξησθε). *De Adoratione*, PG.68.937.12. Whereas Eccl. 11:2 applies the verb in middle voice (μὴ βδελύξη), some authors quoted this scriptural passage in active voice (μὴ βδελύξης): Hesychius of Jerusalem (presbyter, fifth cent. AD), *Commentarius*,

Psalms 50:13; 101:3. *John of Damascus, Sacra Parallela*, PG.96.217.45. So did Antiochus of Palestine, who mistook the passage as being from the Proverbs. *Pandecta Scripturae Sacrae*, Homily 47, lines 18–20. Ancient lexicographers made the active βδελύσσω a lemma. *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 192. *Etymologicum Gudianum*, p. 246. *Etymologicum Symeonis*, p. 414. Therefore, the texts that confidently apply the active βδελύσσω are the present one by Cassian, another by Agathangelus (fifth century AD), *Historia Armeniae*, 76 (Μὴ βδελύξωσι ἔθνη τὸ πανάγιον ὄνομα σου) and two *spuria*, which were in all probability composed at the monastery of the Akoimatoi: Pseudo-Gregory of Nazianzus, *Liturgia Sancti Gregorii*, PG.36: 700.36 and 704.28 (μὴ βδελύξης με), and Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *De Paenitentia*, PG.59.763.10: οὐ βδελύσσετε τῶν κρότων τοὺς λογισμούς;. This use of the active voice fits with Cassian's Greek erudition: only a man who had read Aristophanes could have used this form, since the Athenian comic poet appears to have been the sole author to have done so: Aristophanes, *Pax*, line 395: εἴ τι Πεισάνδρου βδελύττει τοὺς λόφους καὶ τὰς ὀφρῦς.

³² Cod. αποβαλει. EN XXIII.

³³ Cf. Rev. 1:8; 4:8; 4:11; 11:8; 17:14; 18:8; 19:6; 19:16; 21:22; 22:5–6; *et passim* in scripture.

Scholion XXII

The Saviour is **the faithful and true one**¹ not because he participates in faith and truth, but because he is undeviating and true by essence. For in reference to Him, to be 'truth'² and 'true' is the same thing. That the appellation **faithful** stands for undeviating and unalterable, the Apostle witnesses [saying], *if we believe not, yet he abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself*.³ So does Moses [saying], *a God of faithfulness and without iniquity*.⁴ Furthermore, that which is written to Timothy you should understand to suggest the same meaning: [it is said], *this is a faithful saying*,⁵ instead of, [designating a saying] that stays for ever and does not fail. It is then said, *the faithful and true witness*⁶ in order to provide the certitude that he is the **amen**.⁷

What is more, He styled Himself *the beginning of creation*.⁸ He is the beginning of it not in the sense of being the first **creature**⁹ of **creation**, but in the sense of being the cause for this creation to exist at all, since he is its creator. For a creator¹⁰ is the **beginning** of creatures, which means that the creator of **creation** is also the **ruler**¹¹ of it.

In addition, to say, **I will spew thee out of my mouth**,¹² is quite the same as to say, *I am wearied at you*,¹³ as if he said, 'since you have perpetrated many abhorrent things before me'. For once **the Lord**¹⁴ casts the memory of a certain person from Himself, he has in fact **spewed** him **out** of his **mouth**,¹⁵ **having become weary of him**, since [this person] can have no place in His [divine] being on account of the grossness of his vice.

¹ Rev. 3:14.

² John 14:6.

³ 2 Tim. 2:13.

⁴ Deut. 32:4.

⁵ 1 Tim. 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim. 2:11; Cf. Tit. 3:8.

⁶ Rev. 3:14.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Rev. 3:14.

⁹ Cf. Rev. 5:13.

¹⁰ Cf. Rev. 14:7.

¹¹ Rev. 1:5.

¹² Rev. 3:16.

¹³ Isaiah 1:14.

¹⁴ Cf. Rev. 1:8; 4:8; 4:11; 11:8; 17:14; 18:8; 19:6; 19:16; 21:22; 22:5–6 *et passim* in scripture.

¹⁵ Rev. 3:16.

SCHOLION XXIII

260r

ΚΓ

260v

<XXIII. Rev. 3:14²> τάδε λέγει ὁ ἀμήν, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς ὁ ἀληθινός,¹ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως² τοῦ θεοῦ· <3:15> οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι οὔτε ψυχρὸς εἶ οὔτε ζεστός· ὀφελον ψυχρὸς ἦς ἢ ζεστός. <3:16> οὕτως ὅτι χλιαρὸς εἶ καὶ οὐ³ ζεστός οὔτε ψυχρὸς, μέλλω σε ἐμέσαι ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου.⁴ <3:17> ὅτι λέγεις· πλούσιός⁵ εἰμι καὶ πεπλούτηκα⁶ καὶ οὐδενὸς χρεῖαν⁷ ἔχω, καὶ οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ταλαίπωρος⁸ καὶ ὁ ἐλεεινὸς καὶ πτωχὸς καὶ τυφλὸς καὶ γυμνός· <3:18> συμβουλεύω⁹ σοι ἀγοράσαι παρ' ἐμοῦ χρυσίον¹⁰ πεπυρωμένον¹¹ ἐκ πυρός, ἵνα πλουτήσης, καὶ ἱμάτια λευκά, ἵνα περιβάλῃ καὶ μὴ φανῇ¹² ἡ αἰσχύνῃ¹³ τῆς γυμνώτητός¹⁴ σου, καὶ κολλούριον,¹⁵ ἵνα ἐγχρισῇ¹⁶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς σου, ἵνα βλέπῃς. <3:19> ἐγὼ ὅσους ἐὰν φιλῶ,¹⁷ ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεύω· ζήλυνε οὖν καὶ μετανόησον. <3:20> ἰδοὺ ἔστηκα ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν καὶ κρούω· ἐάν τις ἀκούσῃ τῆς φωνῆς μου καὶ ἀνοίξῃ τὴν θύραν, καὶ εἰσελεύσονται¹⁸ πρὸς¹⁹ αὐτὸν καὶ δειπνήσω²⁰ | μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς μετ' ἐμοῦ.

¹ ὁ ἀληθινὸς instead of καὶ ἀληθινός, in 2050, 2053, Syriac *versio Harclensis*, and *versio Bohairica*.

² Cod. κτήσεως. About the number ΚΓ of this Scholion, see n. 11 on next page.

³ 2329, An., Ar., N.-A. οὔτε. O. οὐ. The K versions have οὐ.

⁴ 2329: οὔτε ψυχρὸς, ἐλέγχω σε ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου. This is a unique version not occurring in any known MS.

⁵ 2329, Ar. λέγεις· ὅτι πλούσιος. O., An. λέγεις· πλούσιος.

⁶ Cod. πεπλουτικά.

⁷ 2329: εἰμι καὶ πέτωκας καὶ οὐδενός. This peculiar πέτωκας is not considered by N.-A. O., N.-A. εἰμι καὶ πεπλούτηκα καὶ οὐδεν. An., Ar. εἰμι καὶ πεπλούτηκα καὶ οὐδενός.

⁸ 2329: ταλεπωρος.

⁹ Cod. συμβουλενο.

¹⁰ 2329: ἀγοράσαι χρυσίον παρ' ἐμοῦ.

¹¹ Cod. πεπυρομενον.

¹² Cod. φανει. 2329, O., An., Ar., N.-A. φανερωθῇ.

¹³ 2329, O., An. (M), Ar. αἰσχύνῃ. An. (S). ἀσχημοσύνη.

¹⁴ Cod. γυμνωτητος. 2329: γυμνωτητος.

¹⁵ Cod. κολλούριον. This is a rare and hardly known word, and I know of certain attempts to explain it etymologically. One of them essays to associate the term κολλούριον with κωλύειν (= to hinder), which sounds like an extrapolation (*Etymologicum Gudianum*, Alphabetic entry kappa, pp. 334 and 339; *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 530), yet it was employed by Anastasius of Sinai (*Viae Dux*, 2.8, line 78). Another one has recourse to associating κολλούριον with κολοβός, hence meaning 'curtailed' or 'mutilated'. Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter epsilon, entry 811; Alphabetic letter kappa, entry 1240. *Etymoplogicum Parvum*, letter kappa, entry 15. The *Suda*, lexicon, Alphabetic letter epsilon, entry 2428; alphabetic letter kappa, entry 1940 and 1954; *Etymologicum Magnum*, pp. 526 and 530; *Additamenta in Etymologicum Gudianum*, Alphabetic entry epsilon, p. 505, reproduced verbatim in *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 361. Oecumenius (in the Messina MS, Hoskier, pp. 63 and 66) has the word κολλούριον (καὶ κολλούριον ἐγχριῖσαι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς σου), which Marc de Groote (p. 100) emended to κολουρίον. It was not necessary for him to do so, however, since actually κολλούριον did exist as a word, although not widely used. In fact, κολλούριον is a honey-based 'eye-salve'. A recipe for this is supplied in the *Hippiatrica* (Hippiatrica, section 376; cf. also *Hippiatrica*, Excerpta Lugdunensia, section 145; Philumenus of Alexandria (cf. EN XXII, n. 17), *De Venenatis Animalibus Eorumque Remediis*, 5.1). Apart from Oecumenius, the Christian who knew this as κολλούριον was Photius in his review of a book by Theon, an Alexandrian medical doctor: (*Bibliotheca*, Codex 220, p. 177a). However, in another review of the sixth-century medical doctor Aetius of Amida in Mesopotamia (*Bibliotheca*, Codex 221, p. 178b) the word appears as κολουρίον. John of Damascus has κολουρίον (*Sacra Parallela*, PG.96.289.31). The *Suda* is the sole dictionary to offer a definition of κολλούριον (Alphabetic letter kappa, entry 2177). Later still, the term came to be κολλύριον, which is, in fact, the word 'collyrium' itself. Cf. An. καὶ κολλύριον ἐγχρισον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς σου. Ar. καὶ κολλούριον, ἵνα ἐγχρισῇ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς σου.

¹⁶ 2329: ενχρησαι, intending ἐνχρίσαι. O., N.-A. ἐγχριῖσαι. An. ἐγχρισον. Ar. ἵνα ἐγχρισῇ. K versions have it ἵνα ἐγχρισῇ with 2351, 1006, 1611, 1841.

¹⁷ 2329: φιλίσω, intending φιλήσω.

¹⁸ 2329: εἰσελευσονται.

¹⁹ 2329: μετ αυτον.

²⁰ 2329: δεπνισω.

Σχόλιον κγ'

Παιδευόμεθα ἐκ τούτων τῶν θείων φωνῶν¹ ὡς ὁ πάντη **ψυχρὸς**² καὶ τῆς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος πυρώσεως³ ἄμοιρος⁴ (αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ **ψῦξις**⁵ ἡ νοητή) βελτίων ἐστὶ τοῦ δοκοῦντος⁶ μὲν ἐν οἰκείῳς τετάχθαι θεοῦ,⁷ τὴν δὲ μεσότητά τὴν ἄπρακτον ἔχοντος καὶ τὸ **χλιαρόν**,⁸ ὅπερ δηλοῖ τὴν πρὸς πάντα ῥαδίαν μετάπτωσιν,⁹ ὃ δὴ καὶ *κυβερνάν*¹⁰ ἀπεκάλεσεν ὁ ἀπόστολος.¹¹

¹ EN XXIIIa.

² Rev. 3:14.

³ Cf. Rom. 12:11; Acts 18:25. EN XXIIIb.

⁴ EN XXIIIc.

⁵ Cf. Jer. 6:7. EN XXIIId.

⁶ Cod. δοκουντῶς.

⁷ Cf. Eph. 2:19. EN XXIIIe.

⁸ Cf. Rev. 3:16.

⁹ Cod. μετάκλησιν. EN XXIIIff.

¹⁰ Eph. 4:14. Cod. κυβίαν. EN XXIIIg.

¹¹ The unknown monk who substituted for monk Theodosius is to us just a 'scribe', who contributed to the preservation of this valuable text. But beyond our scholarly pursuits, there is also a *human being*. At the end of folio 259v, he knew that next morning Theodosius was to take over again, and before he beginning of the passage of Revelation of our *Scholion XXIII* (previous page, Rev. 3:14^{2ff}), he wrote in uncials: TO KEIMENON TOY KB (= The text [of Revelation] for [Scholion 22]), meaning that what was going to follow should be *Scholion XXII*, which should start with folio 260r.

This was in fact Scholion 23, however, and this unknown scribe forgot that he had also marked the previous Scholion on folio 259r with the letters KB (=22). In all probability, this was the end of his laborious day, and KB was a signal marking the next morning's start, after the liturgy, when Theodosius was going to resume transcribing in place of his unknown brother. Although Scholion 23 was meant to start folio 259v, it is illuminating that Theodosius started with the *last line* of the same folio 259v, clearly in order to use the parchment-page in a spirit of economy. It is significant that on the next page, only a few lines below, he realized that this was Scholion 23, not 22, and marked it correctly in the margin, writing ΚΓ. After 1,200 years since this text was written, we can realize the fatigue of this unknown man, the brother of Theodosius. To me, who spent several years of my scholarly life in order to take advantage of the work of this humble monk, this was a moving instance, and I solemnly dedicate this unpretentious note to these two simple but holy men, who knew that History would never account for their exertions, of which nevertheless we are now taking advantage.

Scholion XXIII

Those divine utterances instruct us that he who is altogether **cold**,¹ and has absolutely no share in the fervency of the divine Spirit (which is the allegorized *coldness*²), is superior to anyone who is **lukewarm**³ and stands idle midway [between good and evil], even though he may regard himself as being placed *in the household of God*.⁴ This [attitude] in fact betokens a prompt volatility toward any possible attitude, which the Apostle styled *trickery*.⁵

¹ Rev. 3:14.

² Cf. Jer. 6:7.

³ Cf. Rev. 3:16. Cf. Eph. 2:19.

⁴ Being spiritually and morally lukewarm is tantamount to moral volatility and susceptibility to any vice. Cf. Origen's rejection of any attitude 'between' good and evil. *PHE*, pp. 44–48.

⁵ Eph. 4:14.

SCHOLION XXIV

ΚΔ

<XXIV. Rev. 3:21> ὁ νικῶν, δώσω αὐτῷ¹ καθίσαι² μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ μου,³ ὡς καὶ ἐνίκησα καὶ ἐκάθισα⁴ μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ. <3:22> ὁ ἔχων οὐς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

¹ 2329: αυτον.

² Cod. καθησαι.

³ 2329: εις τον θρονον. In Ar. (p. 564) the phrase, ὁ νικῶν, δώσω αὐτῷ καθίσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ is missing. The text then goes thus: καὶ αὐτὸς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ μου.

⁴ Cod. εκαθησα. 2329: εκαθησα.

Σχόλιον κδ'

261r

Συμφωνεῖ τούτοις ὁ Παῦλος γράφων· *συνήγειρεν δὲ ἡμᾶς καὶ συνεκάθισεν¹ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.*² πάντες γὰρ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, νικήσαντες πρὸς ἃς εἶχον τὴν *πάλην*³ ἀρχὰς | καὶ ἐξουσίας,⁴ τῆς νίκης ἔπαθλον ἔσχον τὸ καθίσαι⁵ μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους, ἵνα κρίνωσιν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς.⁶ εἴρηται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν σωτήρα· *κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ὥς ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.*⁷ διὸ τὸ συγκαθεσθῆναί⁸ τινα τῷ πατρὶ⁹ ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ¹⁰ αὐτοῦ δηλοῖ τὸ συμβασιλεύσαι αὐτῷ.¹¹ σύμβολον γὰρ βασιλείας θρόνος.¹² καὶ δώσει γὰρ φησιν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.¹³

¹ Cod. συνεκάθησεν.

² Eph. 2:6.

³ Cod. πάλιν.

⁴ Eph. 6:12.

⁵ Cod. καθῆσαι. Rev. 3:21.

⁶ Matt. 19:28; Luke 22:20. Cf. Rev. 20:4.

⁷ Psalm 109:1; Heb. 1:13.

⁸ EN XXIVa.

⁹ Cf. Rev. 1:6.

¹⁰ Cf. Rev. 3:21; 4:2, 3, 4, 9, 10; 5:1, 5, 7, 13; 6:16; 7:10, 15; 19:4; 21:5.

¹¹ Cf. 2 Tim. 2:12.

¹² EN XXIVb.

¹³ Luke 1:32–33.

Scholion XXIV

Paul concurs with these words when he writes, *and [God] hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.*¹ For all of the apostles received as an award to be **seated with the Father**² upon twelve thrones, in order to judge the twelve tribes of Israel,³ once they had prevailed over the principalities and powers, against whom they had to wrestle.⁴ Moreover, it has been said by the Father to the Saviour, *Sit at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.*⁵ Hence, to sit with the Father on his **throne**⁶ denotes to reign along with him.⁷ For a **throne** is the symbol of royal sovereignty. And [the scripture likewise] says, *and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever.*⁸

¹ Eph. 2:6.

² Rev. 3:21.

³ Matt. 19:28; Luke 22:20. Cf. Rev. 20:4.

⁴ Eph. 6:12.

⁵ Psalm 109:1; Heb. 1:13.

⁶ Cf. Rev. 3:21; 4:2, 3, 4, 9, 10; 5:1, 5, 7, 13; 6:16; 7:10, 15; 19:4; 21:5.

⁷ Cf. 2 Tim. 2:12.

⁸ Luke 1:32–33.

ADNOTATIO POST SCHOLION XXIV

Cχόλιον Ὡ σου πάντως ἀκούειν ἐστὶν <τά>¹ ἐπιστημονικὰ λέγ<ο>ν<τος>,² ἧ³ μόνου
 τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην⁴ <εἰ>θισμένου⁵ οὕτω σου πάντως ἐστὶν ἀκούειν τοῦ
 261v πνεύματος,⁶ ἧ⁷ μόνου τοῦ πνευματικῶν⁸ ἔχ<ο>ντος⁹ ὥτιον προστεθειμένον
 αὐτῷ | θεόθεν κατὰ τὸ λεχθέν· προσέθηκέν μοι ὥτιον τοῦ ἀκούειν.¹⁰ Τὸ γὰρ
 τῆς αἰσθήσεως τῆς ἀκουστικῆς ὄργανον καὶ τὰ ἄλογα ἔχουσι,¹¹ μόν<ω>ν¹² τῶν

¹ I have added τά. Cf. Didymus, *commEcc11-12*, Cod. p. 342–3: καὶ νοεῖ ὁρθῶς καὶ θεωρεῖ τὰ ἐπιστημονικὰ καὶ λέγειν αὐτὰ δύναται διδασκαλικῶς. Proclus, *In Platonis Alcibiadem* i, 310: καὶ τὰ προσήκοντα τῶν λόγων εἶδη πᾶσιν ἀποδιδόναι, καὶ τοῖς μὲν τὰ ἐπιστημονικά, τοῖς δὲ τὰ δοξαστικά. Iamblichus, *De Vita Pythagorica*, 6.31: μαθήματα δὲ καὶ θεωρία καὶ τὰ ἐπιστημονικά πάντα. John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Libros de Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, p. 76: ἡ ἐπιστήμη ἢ τὰ ἐπιστημονικά.

² Cod. λέγων. EN PSchXXIVa.

³ Cod. ἧ.

⁴ EN PC XXIVb.

⁵ Cod. ἡθισμένου. Cassian wrote <εἰ>θισμένου, which is a perfect participle. This is a construction lending emphasis. Cassian regularly drew on the *Onomasticon* by Julius Naucratis. A certain section of it furnishes terms for description of (and praise for) an erudite and experienced *scientist*. In this handy lexicon, Cassian found all the nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs which are pertinent to both the subject and object of *science*. One of these adjectives is ἐπιστήμων. There are terms for describing the ‘things’ (τὰ πράγματα) a scientist deals with: these are ἐμπειρία, ἐπιστήμη, ἔθος, while one of the verb-forms proposed is εἰθίσθαι and some of the adverbs are ἐμπείρως, ἐπιστημόνως, εἰθισμένως. In all three cases, there is a distinct central root (ἔθος, εἰθίσθαι, εἰθισμένως) for the specific participle εἰθισμένου to be used. Cassian then could hardly eschew the felicitous recommendation. Cf. Julius Naucratis, *Onomasticon*, 5.144.

⁶ Cf. Psalm, 94:7, quoted in Heb. 3:7; 3:15; 4:7. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1: Ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ λέξεων ἀπὸ τῆς βίβλου τῶν ψαλμῶν παραληφθεῖσων μαρτυρία κεῖνται ὡς ὑπὸ ἀγίου πνεύματος εἰρημέναι. Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνενηκοστοῦ τετάρτου ψαλμοῦ κεφάλαιον λαβὼν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος ἀπηγγέλλεται αὐτὸ γράφει φήσας Καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσῃτε, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

⁷ Cod. ἧ.

⁸ Cod. πνευματικοῦ.

⁹ Cod. ἔχωντος.

¹⁰ Isaiah 50:4. EN PSchXXIVc.

¹¹ This is reminiscent of what St Anthony is reported to have said to Didymus, when he paid a visit to the blind polymath: ‘Μηδέν, ὦ Δίδυμε, ταραττέω σε ἢ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀποβολή· τοιοῦτοι γάρ σοι λείπουσιν ὀφθαλμοί, οἷς καὶ μυῖαι καὶ κώνωπες βλέψαι ἰσχύουσιν· χαῖρε δὲ ὅτι ἔχεις ὀφθαλμούς, οἷς καὶ ἄγγελοι βλέπουσι, δι’ ὧν καὶ ὁ Θεὸς θεωρεῖται, καὶ τὸ αὐτοῦ φῶς καταλαμβάνεται.’ (Socrates, *HE*, 4.25. Sozomenus, *HE*, 3.15.1. Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca*, Vita 4.1. George Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum*, v. 1, p. 522). At this point, Cassian the Sabaite refers to spiritual senses through which God and divine truth are grasped, as Origen himself had maintained, referring to the ‘divine senses’ (or, the ‘divine sense’) after Prov. 2:3–5. Cf. Origen, *Cels*, I, 48; VII: 34, 36, 37; VIII, 20; *frLuc*, frs. 186, 192; *commJohn*, 10, XL; 20, XLIII; *Commentarii in Romanos* (III.5–V.7), p. 210; *schCant*, PG.17.281.52; *frPs*, 113, 3 and 4; 134, 15–18; 37, 6; *excPs*, PG.17.116.45; *selPs*, 27, PG.12.1284.26. Origen invariably quotes the expression ‘αἰσθησιν θεῖαν εὐρήσεις’, which does not belong to the LXX text. Probably he quotes from Clement of Alexandria, who was the first Christian author to use this variant of Prov. 2:3–5 at *Stromateis*, 1.4.27. 2: ‘ἐὰν γὰρ τὴν φρόνησιν τὴν τε αἰσθησιν ἐπικαλέσῃ μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ καὶ ζητήσῃς αὐτὴν ὥσπερ ἄργυρίου θησαυροῦς καὶ προθύμως ἐξιχνιάσῃς, νοήσεις θεοσέβειαν καὶ αἰσθησιν θεῖαν εὐρήσεις.’ Cf. Athanasius, *De Morbo et de Sanitate*, p. 8. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 34. John Climacus, *Scala Paradisi*, 26. This version was quoted by no other author. I discuss this in *PHE*, pp. 410 and 421.

¹² Cod. μόνον.

κατὰ πνεῦμα σοφῶν¹³ ἐχόντων τὸ τῆς συνέσεως¹⁴ ὥτίον, περὶ οὗ καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ πληθυντικῶς¹⁵ εἶπεν· ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.¹⁶

¹³ EN PSchXXIVd.

¹⁴ Cf. Mark 12:33; Col. 2:2; Ex. 31:3; 35:31 and 35; Deut. 34:9; Job 15:2; 20:3; Ecclesiasticus 1:19; 3:23; 15:3; 17:7; 22:17; 39:6; 47:14; Isaiah 10:13; 11:2; Daniel 1 (Susanna, 44/45; 63; Gr. tr.).

¹⁵ The term πληθυντικῶς is characteristic of Origen, Didymus, and Theodoret. They used it more than any other Christian author did, with Eusebius and Gregory of Nyssa having shared a predilection for the adverb. Origen, *commJohn*, VI.6.41; VI.27.140; XIII.58.396; XX.10.66; *deOr*, XV; *frLam*, 3; *commMatt*, 14.1; *Epistola ad Africanum*, PG.11.65.26, *et passim*. Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.339; 3.200; 3.201; 3.304; 4.293; *commJob*(5.1–6.29), Cod. p. 149; *commJob*(7.20c–11), Cod. p. 274; *et passim*. Theodoret, *commIs*, 6; *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, pp. 14; 15; 21; 22; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80: 992.27, 31, 43; 1456.36; 1916.24; 1988.43, 45; *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81: 1104.17; 1221.9; 1221.11; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.716.47.

¹⁶ Cod. ακουετο. Luke, 8:8; 14:35; Cf. Matt. 11:15; 13:9; 13:43.

«Note after Scholion XXIV»¹

Oh! It is definitely possible to be instructed by you teaching in a scientific manner, since surely it is only yourself who are familiar with the scientific method. It is therefore definitely possible for anyone to be instructed by your spirit, since surely it is only you who have the spiritual *ear* added to yourself by God, according to the saying, *He attached an ear to me, to hear [as the learned]*.² For even irrational animals have the organ of the sense of hearing, whereas it is only the wise in spirit that have the ear of *understanding*,³ of which the Saviour spoke addressing the multitude, *He that hath ears to hear, let him hear*.⁴

¹ Cod. cχο. The parallel in Didymus leaves no doubt that it is he who inspired Cassian to make this comment addressing Didymus, his main source for these Scholia. Cassian, in admiration for Didymus, proclaims that the ideal described by the erudite Alexandrian doctor finds its realization in Didymus himself. He therefore addresses Didymus using Didymus' own vocabulary. Cf. Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 308: ὁ θεός, ἐν τοῖς ὧσιν ἡμῶν ἠκούσαμεν, οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἀνήγγειλαν ἡμῖν. ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτῶν ὧσιν, φασὶν οἱ ἄγιοι, ἠκούσαμεν τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγων. πρὸς τῇ κοινῇ ἀκοῇ προσθήκη ὧτων γίνεται, ὅταν τις δύνῃται ἐπιστημονικῶν λόγων ἀκούειν. ὁ ἱατρὸς ἀκούων ἱατρικῶν λόγων ἔχει ὥτίον ἱατρικόν, ἄλλος δὲ οὐ. ὁ δυνάμενος εἰπεῖν· ἡ παιδεία κυρίου διανοίγει μου τὰ ὦτα, οὐ περὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς ἀκοῆς λέγει, ἀλλὰ τῆς δυναμένης ἀκούειν ἐπιστημονικῶν θεοῦ λόγων. οὕτως οὖν ἀκουστέον τό· ἐν τοῖς ὧσιν ἡμῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν παρέλκον· οὐ γὰρ τὸ ὑπάρχον σημαίνει, ἀλλὰ τὸ προσγενόμενον. καὶ θεῶρει γε, πῶς λέγει ὁ ἄγιος· ἡ παιδεία κυρίου διανοίγει μου τὰ ὦτα. λέγει· κύριος δίδωσίν μοι γλῶσσαν παιδείας τοῦ γνῶναι ἡνίκα δεῖ εἰπεῖν λόγον, ἔθικέν μοι πρωῒ, προσέθηκέν μοι ὥτίον τοῦ ἀκούειν· καὶ ἡ παιδεία κυρίου διανοίγει μου τὰ ὦτα. τὸ κατὰ προσθήκην διδόμενον ὥτίον ἐπιστημονικόν ἐστίν, θεοπρεπῶς

λόγων ἀκούει. καὶ ὅταν τοῦτο προστεθῇ, ἡ παιδεία αὐτοῦ λοιπὸν τὰ ὦτα διανοίγει, τοῦτο τὸ προστεθέν, τὸ ἄλλο ὥτίον, τὸ ἐπιστημονικόν, τὸ θεοπρεπῶς ἀκούον, τὸ δυνάμενον εἰπεῖν· ἡκουσα ἄρρητα ῥήματα· οὐ παντὸς γὰρ ἔστιν τοῦτο εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ προσθήκην ὥτὸς λαβόντος θεόθεν. ταῦτα ἐν νῷ ὁ σωτὴρ ἔχων ἔλεγεν· ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω. οὐ πάντες δὲ εἶχον τὰ ἀκούοντα τῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐπικεκαλυμμένων λόγων, τῶν ἐν παραβολαῖς ἀπαγγελλομένων λόγων. ὅθεν ἐμάνη Πορφύριος καὶ ἐν τούτῳ. ὁ θεός, ἐν τοῖς ὧσιν ἡμῶν ἠκούσαμεν. τοῖς ἰδίους ἡμῶν, οὐ τοῖς κοινοῖς πρὸς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα, ἀλλὰ ἐν ἡρμοσμένοις πρὸς τοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιστημονικοὺς λόγους. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν δὲ διαλέκτων τοῦτο σημαίνει· ὁ Αἰγύπτιος τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐν τοῖς ἰδίους ὧσιν ἀκούει, τῷ ἰδίῳ ὧτι ἀκούει. . . . ἐνταῦθα οὖν κατὰ τὸ ἐπιστημονικόν λαμβάνομεν; οἱ περὶ διδασκαλίαν ὄντες προσωποποιοῦνται πάντας· ἡλὸς πλήρης ἁμαρτιῶν.

² Isaiah, 50:4.

³ Cf. Mark 12:33; Col. 2:2; Ex. 31:3; 35:31 and 35; Deut. 34:9; Job 15:2; 20:3; Ecclesiasticus, 1:19; 3:23; 15:3; 17:7; 22:17; 39:6; 47:14; Isaiah 10:13; 11:2; Daniel 1 (Susanna 44/45; 63; Gr. tr.).

⁴ Luke 8:8; 14:35. Cf. Matt. 11:15; 13:9; 13:43.

SCHOLION XXV

< XXV. Rev. 4:1 > μετὰ¹ ταῦτα εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ θύρα ἀνεῳγμένη² ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη³ ἦν ἤκουσα ὡς σάλπιγγος λαλοῦσης⁴ μετ' ἐμοῦ λέγων·⁵ ἀνάβα ὧδε, καὶ δεῖξω σοι ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα.

¹ 2329: καὶ μετα.

² 2329, An.(M), N.-A. ἡνεῳγμένη. O., An.(S), Ar. ἀνεῳγμένη.

³ 2329: καὶ φωνὴ πρώτη. O., An., N.-A. καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη.

⁴ 2329: λαλοῦσας. O. λαλοῦσα. An., Ar., N.-A. λαλοῦσης.

⁵ 2329: μετ' ἐμοῦ λαλοῦσα λέγων.

Σχόλιον κε'

EP Φρονιμώτερον¹ ἐντυγχάνειν² δεῖ τῇ θεοπνεύστῳ³ γραφῇ, ἵνα μὴ γέλωτα ὀφλισκάνωμεν⁴ παρὰ τοῖς τοῦ κόσμου σοφοῖς·⁵ ἀκούοντες γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἀνεῳχθαι⁶ θύραν, ἀδύνατον τίθενται⁷ τὸ λεχθέν· πρὸς οὓς ἐροῦμεν μὴ 262r κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον⁸ ταῦτα γεγράφθαι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κεκρυμμένον⁹ ἢ τῶν νοητῶν οὐσία¹⁰ δηλοῦται ἐν τῇ γραφῇ πολλάκις τῇ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ προσηγορίᾳ.¹¹ διὸ ὅταν λέγῃ¹² θύραν ἀνεῳχθαι¹³ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, τὴν κατὰ σαφήνειαν¹⁴ διαίρεσιν τῶν

¹ Cod. φρονιμώτερον. Cf. Didymus, *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 30: λοιπὸν ἴδωμεν αὐτὸ φρονιμώτερον, ὡς ὁ θεὸς βούλεται λόγος. In *Genesin*, Cod. p. 65: ὅπερ φρονιμώτερον νοεῖς δεῖ. *Catena in Acta*, p. 52 (Didymus): οὐ φρονίμως τινὲς ἐντυγχάνοντες τοῖς γεγραμμένοις. EN XXVa.

² Didymus, *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 214: πολλοὶ ἐντυγχάνουσιν ταῖς γραφαῖς καὶ νοοῦσιν αὐτὰς ὡς οὐ δεῖ. *frPs(al)*, fr.1250: αἱ τῶν θείων γραφῶν λέξεις· ναὸς γὰρ αὐταὶ θεοῦ εὐρισκομένου ἐν αὐταῖς τοῖς ὀρθῶς ἐντυγχάνουσιν. *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 28: εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα τινα δηλοῦται ὑπὸ τῆς φωνῆς, ἐπιστήτῳ ὁ ἐντυγχάνων ταῖς γραφαῖς. *Fragmenta (apud Pseudo-Maximus Confessor, Locis Communes)*, PG.91.821.23: Ἐντυγχάνειν δεῖ ταῖς θείαις Γραφαῖς.

³ Cf. 2 Tim. 3:16.

⁴ EN XXVb.

⁵ Cf. 1 Cor. 1:20; 1:27; 3:19.

⁶ Cod. ἡνεῳχθαι.

⁷ EN XXVc.

⁸ Cf. *Scholion III*: καὶ μὴ προχείρως ἀκούειν ἀλλὰ πιστῶς. EN XXVd.

⁹ Cf. Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 316: ἐπιστήσαι καὶ τῷ καθ' αὐτὸν ὡς κεκρυμμένῳ καὶ μὴ προχείρως.

¹⁰ Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 808: ἡ οὐρανὸς φωνὴ σημαίνει τὴν τῶν νοητῶν οὐσίαν καθὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν διειληφάμεν, αἱ δὲ ἀνοιγόμεναι θυρίδες τῶν οὐρανῶν αἱ ἐξαπλώσεις καὶ φανερώσεις τῶν πατρικῶν εἰσιν, ῥέοντος τοῦ θεοῦ τὰς αὐτοῦ δωρεὰς διὰ τούτων τῶν θυρίδων. Ibid. fr. 595a: μήποτ' οὐκ σημαίνει ἡ οὐρανὸς φωνὴ τὴν ἀσώματον καὶ νοητὴν οὐσίαν. Unlike other authors of Late Antiquity who use 'essence' and 'nature' as synonymous, the author of this text is conscious of their distinction. Cf. *Scholion VII*: ζωὴ ὢν κατὰ φύσιν, νεκρὸς δὲ ἡμᾶς ἐγένετο. *Scholion XI*: ὡς πᾶσα λογικὴ φύσις δεκτικὴ ἐστὶ τῶν ἀποδοθέντων σημαινόμενων περὶ τοῦ θανάτου. *Scholion XVII*: ἡ Ἰεζάβελ, οὐ φύσεως ἀπολλυμένης ἐστίν. *Scholion XXVII*: οὐδεὶς . . . ἄξιος εὐρηταὶ διὰ τὴν ἐλάττωσιν τῆς φύσεως. By contrast,

Scholion XX: Ἄγιος, ἀληθινὸς ὁ μὴ μετουσία, ἀλλ' οὐσία ὢν τοιοῦτος. *Scholion XXII*: ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ βέβαιον κατ' οὐσίαν εἶναι. This is the sole point where οὐσία actually suggests 'nature', or at least 'being'. The author is obviously an erudite person. Cf.

Scholion X, where he quotes and then uses the grammatically correct word ἀφῆκας instead of ἀφήκες, even though the (incorrect) form ἀφήκες is used in the Book of Revelation. The pursuit of grammatical correctness overwhelmed the task of quoting accurately. Besides, the correct form ἀφῆκας is also scriptural: Tobit 11:2; Psalms 31:5; 84:3; Ecclesiasticus 27:19. Only in Rev. 2:4 is this verb misused. EN XXVe.

¹¹ EN XXVf.

¹² Cod. λέγει.

¹³ Cod. ἡνοιχθαι. Harnack's emendation to ἡνεῳχθαι is wrong, and so is the Codex's use of the same infinitive a couple of lines above. The perfect infinitive of the verb ἀνοίγομαι is ἀνεῳχθαι. The word ἡνεῳχθαι is simply non-existent. There are five or six instances of ἡνεῳχθαι used in literature, which are either scribal or editorial errors. For instance, against one erroneous instance (ἡνεῳχθαι) in Galen, there are eleven where the correct ἀνεῳχθαι is used. Besides, there are dozens of instances which the correct ἀνεῳχθαι is used, indeed by such authors as Aristotle, Diodorus of Sicily, Galen, Plutarch, Libanius, Justin Martyr, Origen, Chrysostom, Procopius of Gaza. Moreover, it would not have been possible for the erudite Eusebius to have used both ἡνεῳχθαι and ἀνεῳχθαι (as indeed he apparently does) and to consider both of them correct. Presumably, either a scribal or editorial hand intervened between Eusebius and us. Furthermore, the erudite author of the Scholia has at this point the corresponding scriptural passage Rev. 4:1, written in exquisite Greek: θύρα ἀνεῳγμένη (a perfect participle). The author used the same correct participle in the scriptural text throughout: Rev. 3:8 (*Scholion XX*): θύραν ἀνεῳγμένην. Rev. 10:2 (*Scholion XXXV*): βιβλαρίδιον ἀνεῳγμένον. Rev. 10:2 (*Scholion XXXVI*): βιβλαρίδιον τὸ ἀνεῳγμένον.

¹⁴ Cod. σαφήνιαν.

νοητῶν¹⁵ ἐκλαμβάνωμεν, καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν ἀναβαίνων¹⁶ τις ἐκεῖ τῶν ἁγίων λέγει τὰς πιστώσεις.¹⁷ πιστώσεις δὲ¹⁸ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ γεγράφθαι ὡς ἕτερός τις¹⁹ ἀνέλαβε τὸν Ἰωάννην, ὥσπερ τὸν Ἡλίαν.²⁰ αὐτὸς γὰρ προσετάγη·²¹ ἐκουσίῳ ὁρμῇ ἀναβῆναι, ἔνθα ὁ καλῶν ὑπῆρχεν.²² ἦν δὲ ἐν οὐρανῷ.²³ φησὶν δὲ τὸν προτρεψάμενον φωνῇ μεγάλῃ οἶα²⁴ σάλπιγγος εἰρηκέναι αὐτῷ τὰ προκείμενα· σημαίνει δὲ τὸ²⁵ οὕτω λεχθὲν τὴν ἐννότησιν²⁶ τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας²⁷ μετὰ σαφηνείας²⁸ γενομένης²⁹ πρὸς αὐτόν.

¹⁵ τὴν κατὰ σαφήνειαν διαίρεσιν τῶν νοητῶν. EN XXVg and h. The author invites readers to recall the Aristotelian account of ‘division of the meanings’ (ἡ διαίρεσις) concerning the ‘immovable cause’ and ‘the reality of the heaven’, after the ability of the mind to grasp ‘intelligible essence’ (τὸ γὰρ δεκτικὸν τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ τῆς οὐσίας νοῦς): Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, 1072b1f. EN XXVh.

¹⁶ Cod. αναβαίνειν.

¹⁷ This refers to Rev. 4:1, λέγων, Ἀνάβα ὧδε, taken up at this point and the subsequent narration of the vision by John.

¹⁸ Cod. πιστώσει δέ. Πίστωσις means a credible and authoritative asseveration, or a well-founded confirmation. The verb is πιστοῦν (active voice) and πιστοῦσθαι (middle or passive voice). Cf. Scholion XXIX: πιστοῦται ἢ προτέρα ὑπόθεσις.

¹⁹ Cod. τι.

²⁰ Cf. 2 Paralipomenon 2:11.

²¹ Cod. προσετάγει.

²² Cf. John 13:36.

²³ Rev. 4:1.

²⁴ Cod. οἶα. EN XXVi.

²⁵ Cod. τῷ.

²⁶ Cod. εννωησιν. EN XXVj.

²⁷ Cod. μεγαλοφωνίαν. Cf. Scholion XXXVI: τὴν μεγαλοφωνίαν τῶν νοημάτων καὶ δογμάτων. EN XXVk.

²⁸ Cod. σαφηνίαις.

²⁹ Cod. γενομένην.

Scholion XXV

We should study *Scripture*, which is *given by inspiration of God*,¹ in a more insightful manner, so that we should not make ourselves a laughing-stock of the wise of this world.² For when they hear that **a door was opened in heaven**, they declare this saying impossible. We will reply to them that these things have been written not in the ordinary sense. But quite often in scripture, the nature of spiritual things is denoted in an esoteric manner³ through the appellation **heaven**. When therefore he says that **a door was opened in heaven**, we should grasp the distinctive classification of intelligible things, all the more so when one of the saints gives a reliable account of what he has seen once he **ascended** there. You can confirm this from the fact⁴ that [in this passage of Revelation] it has not been written that John was drawn up, like Elias, by someone else.⁵ Instead, he [sc. Elias] was bidden to go up of his own accord, to the place where the One who summoned him was and he was **in heaven**. He then says that He who urged him [sc. John], said these words in a loud **voice**, which was like a **trumpet** sound. Put in that way, this indicates the comprehension of the lofty utterance, which was addressed to him explicitly.

¹ Cf. 2 Tim. 3:16.

² Cf. 1 Cor. 1:20; 1:27; 3:19.

³ About the notion of ‘mystical’, see *PHE*, pp. 24; 258; 260; 288; 360; 362; 406.

⁴ Cassian argues that ‘heaven’ has to be read allegorically since the voice from heaven was speaking allegorically, too. In other words, the entire passage of Revelation itself calls for allegory. For when

Christ said to John ‘come up here’, he did not mean this in a literal sense, as had happened with Elias, who was elevated to heaven literally. By bidding John ‘go up to heaven’, Christ simply enjoined him to comprehend allegorically the revelation he was about to see.

⁵ That is, Elias was elevated to the heavens by heavenly power, whereas John had to rise to the heavens by his own action.

262v

263r

<XXVI. Rev. 4:2> εὐθέως¹ ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι· καὶ ἰδοὺ θρόνος ἔκειτο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον καθήμενος·² <4:3> καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ὅμοιος³ ὁράσει λίθω ἰάσπιδι⁴ | καὶ σαρδίῳ, καὶ ἴρις κύκλωθεν⁵ τοῦ θρόνου· ὁμοίως ὡς ὁράσει⁶ σμαραγδίνῳ.⁷ <4:4> «καὶ κύκλωθεν⁸ τοῦ θρόνου⁹ θρόνοι εἴκοσι τέσσαρες, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς θρόνους¹⁰ τοὺς¹¹ εἴκοσι τέσσαρας¹² πρεσβυτέρους καθημένους, περιβεβλημένους ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς,¹³ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν στεφάνους χρυσοῦς.¹⁴ <4:5> καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου¹⁵ ἐκπορεύονται ἄστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταί· καὶ ἑπτὰ λαμπάδες πυρὸς καίόμεναι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ,¹⁶ καὶ τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ.¹⁷ <4:6> καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου ὡς θάλασσα ὑαλίνη, ὁμοία κρυστάλλῳ.¹⁸ καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου τέσσαρα¹⁹ ζῶα γέμοντα²⁰ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν· <4:7> καὶ τὸ ζῶον τὸ πρῶτον ὅμοιον λέοντι,²¹ καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ζῶον ὅμοιον μόσχῳ, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ζῶον ἔχων²² τὸ πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου,²³ καὶ τὸ τέταρτον ζῶον ὅμοιον ἀετῷ πετομένῳ· <4:8> καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα, ἐν καθ' ἑν²⁴ ἔχον²⁵ ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἕξ,

¹ 2329, O. εὐθέως. An. καὶ εὐθέως.

² 2329: καθήμενον.

³ O. ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον καθήμενος ὅμοιος ὁράσει σμαραγδίῳ. He nevertheless quotes the expression ὅμοιον ἰάσπιδι καὶ σαρδίῳ later, although not in his scriptural text. An. ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου καθήμενος ὅμοιος. Ar. ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον καθήμενος ὅμοιος.

⁴ 2329: καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ὡς ὄρασις λίθω ἰάσπιδι [Cod. ἡάσπιδι].

⁵ 2329: καὶ ἦν ἱερεὺς κύκλῳ, which transpires in K* and A.

⁶ Cod. ὁράσει.

⁷ Cod. σμαραγδίνῳ. Some text was omitted and thereafter written in the margin thus: ὁμοίως ὡς ὁράσει σμαραγδίνῳ θρόνον κυκλώθεν τοῦ θρόνου. Then within the text normally, θρόνοι εἴκοσι τέσσαρες. O(H). ὅμοιος ὁράσει σμαραγδίῳ. O(G) σμαραγδείῳ. Then, ἴρις κυκλόθεν τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ ὁμοία ὁράσει σμαραγδίῳ. An. ὁμοία ὁράσει σμαραγδίνῳ. Ar. ὁμοίως ὁράσει σμαραγδίνῳ. N.-A. ὅμοιος ὁράσει σμαραγδίνῳ.

⁸ 2329: κύκλῳ. O., An., Ar. κυκλόθεν.

⁹ 2329: τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ.

¹⁰ 2329: ἐπὶ τοὺς θρόνους καθημένους πρεσβυτέρους. O. ἐπὶ τοὺς κδ' θρόνους κδ' πρεσβυτέρους καθημένους. An. ἐπὶ τοὺς θρόνους εἰκοσιτέσσαρας πρεσβυτέρους καθημένους. Ar. ἐπὶ τοὺς θρόνους τοὺς εἰκοσιτέσσαρας πρεσβυτέρους καθημένους.

¹¹ τοὺς added also in K, 1006, 1611, 1841.

¹² Cod. τέσσαρες.

¹³ 2329: ἐν λευκοῖς. O., An., Ar. N.-A. ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς.

¹⁴ 2329: στεφανοὶ χρυσοὶ (not mentioned by N.-A.). O., An., Ar. N.-A. στεφάνους χρυσοῦς.

¹⁵ 2329: θρόνου αὐτοῦ. N.-A. ascribes this to 2351, which is incorrect, instead of 2329, which is not mentioned (p. 640).

¹⁶ αὐτοῦ add. also in K, *versio Harclensis* and Sahidic MSS.

¹⁷ 2329: πυρὸς εἰς τὰ ζ' πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐνώπιον [Cod. ἐνοπίον] τοῦ θρόνου ὡς θάλασσα. O. πυρὸς καίόμεναι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου, ἃ εἰσι τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου θάλασσα. An. (S), N.-A. *sic*, then ὡς θάλασσα. An. (M): αἱ εἰσιν τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ. Καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου θάλασσα. Ar. τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, αἱ εἰσιν ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου ὡς θάλασσα.

¹⁸ 2329: κρυστάλλῳ.

¹⁹ So An, Ar. But 2329: ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου τέσσαρα. O. κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου τέσσαρα.

²⁰ Cod. γέμωντα.

²¹ Cod. λέωντι.

²² 2329, N.-A. ἔχων. O., An., Ar. ἔχον.

²³ 2329, O., An. (S): ὡς ἄνθρωπος. An. (M), Ar. ἔχον πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου. K versions have it πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου.

²⁴ 2329: ἐν ἑκαστῷ αὐτῶν, with K and a few Syriac versions. O., An., N.-A. ἐν καθ' ἑν αὐτῶν. Ar. ἐν καθ' ἑν. 2351 omits αὐτῶν, and so do K, 1006, 1841.

²⁵ Cod. ἔχων with a τ subscript. 2329, N.-A.: ἔχων. O., An. ἔχον. Ar. εἶχον.

κύκλωθεν²⁶ ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν²⁷ γέμουσιν²⁸ ὀφθαλμῶν²⁹ καὶ ἀνάπαισιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν³⁰ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, λέγοντες³¹ ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντὸς κράτωρ,³² ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος.³³ «4:9» καὶ ὅταν δώσωσιν³⁴ τὰ ζῶα δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ εὐχαριστείαν³⁵ τῷ καθημένῳ³⁶ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, τῷ ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν, «4:10» πεσοῦνται³⁷ οἱ εἴκοσιν τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι ἐνώπιον τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν³⁸ τῷ ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων³⁹ καὶ βαλοῦσι⁴⁰ τοὺς στεφάνους αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον⁴¹ τοῦ θρόνου, λέγοντες· «4:11» ἄξιός ἐστι ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν,⁴² ὁ ἅγιος⁴³ λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν,⁴⁴ ὅτι σὺ ἔκτισας⁴⁵ τὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου ἦσαν⁴⁶ καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν.⁴⁷

²⁶ Cod. κυκλῶθεν. 2329: κυκλῶθεν.

²⁷ Cod. ἔξωθεν.

²⁸ 2329, Ar. καὶ ἔσωθεν γέμοντα. O., An., N.-A. καὶ ἔσωθεν γέμουσιν.

²⁹ O. ἐν καθ' ἐν αὐτῶν ἔχον ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἔξ, κύκλωθεν· καὶ ἔσωθεν γέμουσιν ὀφθαλμῶν. An. ἐν καθ' ἐν αὐτῶν ἔχον ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἔξ, κύκλωθεν, καὶ ἔσωθεν γέμουσιν ὀφθαλμῶν. Ar. ἐν καθ' ἐν εἶχον ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἔξ κυκλῶθεν. Καὶ ἔσωθεν γέμοντα ὀφθαλμῶν.

³⁰ 2329: ἔχοντα. O. ἔχοντες. An., Ar. ἔχουσιν.

³¹ 2329: λέγοντα. O., An., Ar. λέγοντες.

³² Cod. παντὸς κράτορ. 2329: παντὸς κράτορ.

³³ 2329, An. (S), Ar., N.-A.: ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. O., An. (M) ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

³⁴ 2329: ἔδωκαν. O. δώσει. An. (S). δώσωσι. An. (M). δώσουσι. Ar. ὅτ' ἂν δῶσι. N.-A. δώσουσιν. Besides 2351, δώσωσιν occurs in K, 046, 1854, and A.

³⁵ Cod. εὐχαριστείαν. 2329: εὐχαριστείαν. Nevertheless, this rendering (instead of εὐχαριστία) is an acceptable colloquialism rather than a mistake: among other writings, the form εὐχαριστεία occurs in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (systematic order), p. 241; *ibid.* (collectio systematica) (cap. 1–9), 7.47; *Catena in Epistolam ii ad Corinthios* (catena Pseudo-Oecumenii), p. 346; Pseudo-Gregory of Nazianzus, *Liturgia Sancti Gregorii*, PG.36.725.20. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 261 (which should be the catenist's word). It appears also in other writings by Cassian in the same Codex. Cassian the Sabaite, *Const*, p. 9r: καὶ τῇ τοῦ τρέφοντος Θεοῦ εὐχαριστείᾳ ἐνατενίζουσιν. *ScetPatr*, p. 68v: μετὰ χαρᾶς καὶ εὐχαριστείας. *De Panareto*, p. 101v: Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετάληψιν τῆς εὐλογίας καὶ τὴν συνήθη εὐχαριστείαν.

³⁶ Cod. καθεμιμενω.

³⁷ 2329: πεσοντες. The three letters that follow (οβυ) make no sense.

³⁸ 2329: προσεκύνησαν. This variant πεσόντες προσεκύνησαν has no parallel and, although elegant and telling, is not considered by N.-A.

³⁹ 2329: αἰώνων ἀμήν. It occurs only in K and Syriac MSS.

⁴⁰ Cod. βάλλουσι. 2329, O., An.(S) βάλλουσι. An.(M), Ar. βαλοῦσι. N.-A. βαλοῦσιν.

⁴¹ 2329: ενοπιον.

⁴² 2329: ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. O. ὁ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. An. κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. Ar., N.-A. ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.

⁴³ Besides 2351, ὁ ἅγιος is added in 1006, 1841, K, and some lectionaries of the *versio Harclensis*.

⁴⁴ Cod. δυναμην.

⁴⁵ Cod. εκτησας.

⁴⁶ 2329: ἐγένοντο. This is a unique reading with no parallel.

⁴⁷ O., Ar. ἦσαν καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν. An. ἐκτίσθησαν καὶ εἰσίν.

«Σχόλιον κς'»

Τοῦτο «τὸ» ὃν «οὐ»¹ κτίζεται,² ἀλλὰ τὸ κτίζο³ν μέν³ ἐστι· τὰ λογικὰ⁴ δὲ μετὰ τὸ οὐσιωθῆναι καὶ⁵ εἶναι δέχονται τ'ὸ⁶ κτισθῆναι⁷ αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶπεν, φησίν, καὶ

¹ Cod. ὃν. The author states that the 'being' that 'sat on the throne', which is described in the foregoing passage of Revelation, is not a creature.

² He refers to the 'being' described in the apocalyptic vision, contrasting this with creatures. Cod. τοῦτο ὃν κτίζεται, ἀλλὰ το κτιζομενον ἐστὶ (sic).

³ Cod. κτιζομενον. EN XXVib.

⁴ τὰ λογικὰ is an expression and notion characteristic of Origen. Cf. PHE, p. 44, n. 8. Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 3.2.123–124: οὐ πρὸς τὰ λογικὰ τοῖς ἀλόγοις.

⁵ EN XVIa.

⁶ Cod. τῷ, with no iota subscript. This is a minuscule codex with no exclamation or question marks, and certainly no subscripts.

⁷ EN XXVic.

263v ἐγενήθησαν,⁸ αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο καὶ | ἐκτίσθησαν.⁹ κτίζεται γὰρ τις ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς,¹⁰ πρὸ τοῦτου ὦν θεοῦ ποίημα¹¹ «εἰς¹² καρδίαν καθαρὰν.¹³ καὶ οὐκ αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ πατὴρ ἐκτέλῃσάτο¹⁴ σε καὶ ἐποίησέν σε καὶ ἔπλασέν σε,¹⁵ ἀλλὰ τοῦτ' ἐποίησεν ὁ υἱὸς ὅπερ ὁ πατὴρ ὑποστήναι ἠθέλησεν». ¹⁶ σημειωτέον, ὡς¹⁷ τὰ κτίσματα¹⁸ τῷ θελήματι¹⁹ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγονέναι φησὶν· ὅθεν οὐκ²⁰ ἐξαπτεόν²¹ τὴν ὑπαρξιν τοῦ σωτήρος τῆς θελήσεως τοῦ πατρὸς· οὐ γὰρ κτίσμα²² τυγχάνει²³ τὸ γὰρ ἐξῆς δηλοῖ²⁴ τοῦτο σαφῶς.

⁸ Cod. ἐγενήθησαν.

⁹ Psalms 32:9; 148:5.

¹⁰ Eph. 2:10. EN XXVId.

¹¹ Cf. Psalm 118:73; Job 10:8. EN XXVIe.

¹² Cod. ὥς.

¹³ Psalm 50:12; Gen. 20:5–6; Job 11:13; 33:3; 1 Tim. 1:5; 2 Tim. 2:22.

¹⁴ EN XXVIe. Cod. ἐκτίσατο. The LXX text has, 'αὐτὸς οὗτος σου πατὴρ', not 'αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ πατὴρ', which appears here. The sole instance where Deut. 32:6 appears in this form occurs in Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, 1.9.81.2.

¹⁵ Deut. 32:6. The expression ἐποίησέν σε καὶ ἔπλασέν σε of the same portion is not read by Philo and the main Christian theologians, who wrote ἐποίησέν σε καὶ ἔκτισέν σε. Philo, *De Confusione Linguarum*, 145. Origen, *deOr*, XXII.1. Athanasius, *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.269 and 272. Basil of Caesarea, *Quod Deus non est Auctor Malorum*, PG.31.336.34–35. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Illuminandum*, 7.8. Later (during the fourth century) there is a shift, and ἐποίησέν σε καὶ ἔπλασέν σε is universally employed, in the few passages where the text is quoted: Julian the Arian, *In Job*, p. 306. *Doctrina Patrum* (seventh/eighth cent. AD), p. 320. George Monachus (ninth cent.), *Chronicon*, p. 390. George Cedrenus (eleventh/twelfth cent. AD), *Compendium Historiarum*, v. 1, p. 385.

¹⁶ There is no actual lacuna in the text of the codex, but the context requires an addition, which I have supplied following Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 37. Cf. Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT* (lib. 1), 15.16: ἐποίησεν δὲ δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ πατὴρ ὡς φῶς δι' οἰκείου ἀπανγασματος καὶ ὡς νοῦς διὰ λόγου. Ibid. 36.6: εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ διὰ μὲν τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ θεοῦ ὑποστήναι πάντα, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἁγιασθῆναι. *DT* (lib. 2.1–7), 6.4.9: ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ εὐδόκησεν διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου πάντα δημιουργηθῆναι. Ibid. 7.3.16: ἐπεὶ μὴ γε τῷ ἐκείνων λόγῳ καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ οὔτε ὁ πατὴρ δημιουργὸς ἢ νεκροῦς ἐγείρων. πάντα γὰρ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐγένετο ἀπόνως. *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), PG.39.616.2–6: εὐδόκησε δὲ ἅπαξ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ, καθὰ ἀνωτέρω εἴρηται, διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ Λόγου πάντα ἐκ μὴ ὄντων παροισθῆναι, συνεπινοουμένου (πῶς γὰρ οὐ;) αὐτοῦ τε τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἁγιαστικοῦ Πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ δημιουργῆσαι. EN XXVIg.

¹⁷ EN XXVIh.

¹⁸ Cf. Rev. 5:13; 8:9.

¹⁹ Rev. 4:11. Cf. Rev. 5:13.

²⁰ ὅθεν οὐ + verbal adjective is a rare structure of non-Christian origin. Didymus was the sole Christian ever to use it. *commJob*(1–4), Cod. p. 53: ὅθεν οὐκ ὀλιγορῆτέον. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1040: ὅθεν οὐ ταῦτὸν τὸ κτίζειν καὶ τὸ γεννᾶν ἐπὶ θεοῦ ῥητέον, ὡς οἴονταί τινες., *Catena in Acta*, p. 191: ὅθεν οὐ φοβητέον. The origin of this syntax can be traced to Philo and Josephus. Philo, *De Praemiis et Poenis et De Exsecrationibus*, 88: ὅθεν οὐκ ἀπελπιστέον. Josephus, *Antiquitas Judaica*, 4.288: ὅθεν οὐκ ἀποστερητέον. It was subsequently used by only a few distinguished Greeks, who were an essential part of the Christian *paideia*. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 47: ὅθεν οὐκ ἡγήτεον τὸ ἐν Κατηγορίαις εἰρημένον. Plutarch, *Quomodo Adolescens Poetas Audire Debeat*, 15F14: ὅθεν οὐ φευκτέον. Ibid. 36A1: ὅθεν οὐ παρέργως ὑποδεικτέον. Damascius, *De Principiis*, v. 1, p. 155: ὅθεν οὐκ εὐλαβητέον.

²¹ EN XXVIIi.

²² Cf. Rev. 5:13.

²³ EN XXVIj.

²⁴ The expression τὸ ἐξῆς δηλοῖ (or, τὸ ἐφεξῆς δηλοῖ) was used by some authors, including Didymus, *commJob*(1–4), Cod. p. 90; *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 279, but it was Theodoret who used it extensively: *commIs*, 15; 18; 20; *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, pp. 100; 173; 197; *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80: 704.5; 716.17; *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.652.37. Cf. *DT* (lib. 3), PG.39.921.18–19: τὰ ἐφεξῆς δηλοῖ. Leading Christian authorities, such as Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Clement, Origen (apart from a catena fragment, *comm1Cor*, 84), Eusebius (except for once, in *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.19), Athanasius, and the Cappadocians, did not use the phrase. The exception was John Chrysostom, who used it more than ten times. Pagan usage is virtually absent, save one instance apiece in Alexander of Aphrodisias, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Strabo. Later still, Simplicius took this up, which may suggest a certain Christian influence (See RCR, pp. 26; 244; 367–9; 374–6). In *Aristotelis Quattuor Libros De Caelo Commentaria*, v. 7, p. 171. In *Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 9, pp. 202; 594.

Scholion XXVI

This being is not a created one,¹ but the one who **creates**. By contrast, rational creatures receive their actual creation subsequent to their initial substantiation and coming-to-being.² For scripture says, *He spake, and they were made; he commanded, and they stood fast*.³ Anyone is indeed *created unto good works*,⁴ while before this [creation] one is *something made*

¹ This 'being' is the 'one sat on the throne', described in Rev. 4:1f.

² The infinitive οὐσιωθῆναι illustrates Origen's fundamental distinction between Providential and Actual creation. The notion was elaborated by Didymus. Cf. *COT*, pp. 39–118, and the distinction

between γένεσις and πλάσις, which was also canvassed by Pseudo-Caesarius (=Cassian), *ibid.* 137; 173.

³ Psalms 32:9; 148:5.

⁴ Eph. 2:10. EN XXVId.

by God⁵ towards a clean heart.⁶ Moreover, *is it not thy Father Himself that hath bought thee? Hath he not made thee, and established thee*⁷ [but it was the Son who brought into being all the things which the Father willed him to]. It should be particularly noticed that he says that **creatures** were made by God's **will**. Therefore, one should not regard the being of the Saviour as dependent upon the **will** of the Father. For he [sc. the Saviour] is not a **creature**,⁸ which is in fact clearly declared through the text that follows.⁹

⁵ Again, this is about distinction between κτίσμα and ποίημα. A ποίημα precedes a κτίσμα. The former is the product of Providential creation, the latter is the outcome of Actual creation. Cf. *COT*, p. 84.

⁶ Psalm 50:12; Gen. 20:5–6; Job 11:13; 33:3; 1 Tim. 1:5; 2 Tim. 2:22.

⁷ Deut. 32:6. [EN XXVIg](#).

⁸ This means, it is *creatures* which are dependent on the divine creative will. Since the Son is not a creature, his being is not dependent on this will.

⁹ Cf. Rev. 4:11: 'For Thou hast created all things, and due to Thy will they are, and were created.' Since the Son is not included in 'all things', he is not the product of the divine will. However, there is

more concerning what the author calls 'the text that follows'. In the Book of Revelation the word κτίσμα (creature) appears twice. Of them, Rev. 8:9 (τῶν κτισμάτων) is irrelevant to the point made here. But in Rev. 5:13, κτίσμα is a significant term, since a crucial differentiation is made: the creatures 'in heaven, and the earth, and under the earth' are ontologically distinct from the Logos. He is sitting together with the Father 'upon the throne', and he is 'blessed and honoured and glorified' by πᾶν κτίσμα ('every creature'). The ontological precedence of the Son over Creation is made explicit in this Scholion. Hence 'the text that follows' is in fact that of Rev. 5:13.

SCHOLION XXVII

264r
KZ

<XXVII. Rev. 5:1> καὶ ἴδον¹ ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου βιβλίον γεγραμμένον ἔσθθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν,² κατεσφραγισμένον σφραγῖσιν³ ἑπτὰ. <5:2> καὶ ἴδον ἄγγελον⁴ ἰσχυρόν⁵ κηρύσσοντα ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· τίς ἄξιός⁶ ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον καὶ λῦσαι τὰς σφραγῖδας⁷ αὐτοῦ;> <5:3> καὶ οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω,⁸ οὔτε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὔτε⁹ ὑποκάτω¹⁰ τῆς γῆς¹¹ ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον οὔτε βλέπειν αὐτό.¹² <5:4> καὶ ἐγὼ ἔκκλαιον¹³ πολύ, ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἄξιος εὐρέθη ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον, οὔτε βλέπειν αὐτό.¹⁴ <5:5> καὶ εἷς ἐκ | τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λέγει μοι· μὴ κλαῖε.¹⁵ ἰδοὺ ἐνίκησεν ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, ἡ ρίζα Δαυὶδ, ὁ ἀνοίγων¹⁶ τὸ βιβλίον καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ σφραγῖδας¹⁷ αὐτοῦ.

¹ 2329: ἴδον.

² An., O., Ar. ἔσθθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν. 2329, N.-A. ἔσθθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν, also occurring in A and Syriac MSS.

³ Cod. σφραγῖσιν. 2329: σφραγῖσιν.

⁴ Cod. ἀγγελον Ἀγγελον.

⁵ 2329: καὶ ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἰσχυρόν (not considered by N.-A.).

⁶ 2329, O. τίς ἄξιός. An., Ar. τίς ἄξιός ἐστιν. N.-A. τίς ἄξιός.

⁷ Cod. & 2329: σφραγῖδας.

⁸ 2329: ἠδύνατο οὔτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ οὔτε. O(H)., N.-A. ἐδύνατο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ οὐδέ. An.(S). ἠδύνατο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ οὐδέ. An.(M), Ar. ἠδύνατο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ οὔτε. Adverb ἄνω add. in 1006, 1841, K and the Syriac *versio Harclensis*.

⁹ οὔτε (*bis*) in 2050, 2329, and K.

¹⁰ 2329: υποκατο.

¹¹ 2329: τῆς ἀβύσσου. A unique reading not considered by N.-A.

¹² Cod. αὐτό.

¹³ Cod. εκκλειον. The K versions, among a few MSS, have ἐγὼ added.

¹⁴ Cod. αὐτό. The entire Rev. 5:5 passage is missing from 2329.

¹⁵ 2329: κλαε.

¹⁶ 2329, O., An., N.-A. ἀνοῖξαι. Ar. ὁ ἀνοίγων. Arethas' version (which I assume to be K) evidently followed 2351. The participle ὁ ἀνοίγων occurs only in 2351, K, and the Syriac *versio Harclensis*.

¹⁷ Cod. and 2329: σφραγῖδας.

Σχόλιον κζ'

EP Λέξει τις περὶ τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου, ὡς εἶη ὁ πᾶς λόγος τῆς προνοίας,¹ καθ' ὃν κρίσεις θεοῦ ἐπάγονται² τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἡδέα τε καὶ ἀηδῆ.³ καὶ ἐπεὶ⁴ τὸ βιβλίον οὐ μόνον τὰ περὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν περιέχει πραγμάτων, ἀλλὰ καὶ νοητῶν, ἔσθθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν⁵ γεγραμμένον ἐστίν.⁶ καὶ ἐπεὶ⁷ ἀνεξερεύνητα τὰ κρίματα καὶ αἱ ὁδοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ,⁸ καθ' ἃς ἐπιπορευόμενος⁹ τοῖς ὅλοις⁹ κρίνει καὶ οἰκονομεῖ τὰ περὶ

¹ See below: τὸν τῆς προνοίας λόγον Cf. [Scholion XXX](#): καὶ «κοῦλαστικὸν» προνοία θεοῦ. [EN XXVIIa](#).

² Cod. επαγεται.

³ Cod. ἡδῆ. Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 60: λέγουσιν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀηδῆ κακά, ἐπεὶ τὰ ἡδέα οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν εἶναι ἀγαθὰ. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1092: σωφρόνως καὶ γενναίως πάντα φέρειν, οὐ μόνον τὰ ἡδέα ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐπίπονα καὶ ἀηδῆ. The terms ἐπίπονα and ἀηδῆ are treated as equivalent. Cf. [Scholion XXXI](#): ἄγγελος θεοῦ φωνεῖ πρὸς τοὺς ἐγγχειρισθέντας τὰ ἐπίπονα. *commEccl*(3–4.12), Cod. p. 82: μία γοὺν τῶν ἀρετῶν ἡ λεγομένη μεγαλοψυχία ἔξις ἐστίν, καθ' ἣν δυνατόν ἐστιν καὶ ἀηδῆ καὶ ἡδέα ὁμοίως φέρειν. [EN XXVIIb](#).

⁴ Cod. ἐπὶ.

⁵ [EN XXVIIc](#).

⁶ Cod. ἐπὶ.

⁷ Rom. 11:33.

⁸ Cf. [Scholion XV](#): καὶ «οἱ» πόδες αὐτοῦ, καθ' οὓς ἐπιπορεύεται τῷ παντὶ διαφωτισίας . . . ἄρχον ποιῶν ἐπιπορευόμενος. [Scholion XXVIII](#): τῶν ἐπτὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πνευμάτων, ἃ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐπισκοποῦντα τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων πραττόμενα.

⁹ Cf. Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 79: διττῶς αἱ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁδοὶ λέγονται· ἥτοι αἱ φέρουσαι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ ἃς αὐτὸς ὁδεύει ἐπιπορευόμενος τοῖς ὅλοις. [EN XXVIIId](#).

ἕκαστον,¹⁰ θείῳ ἀριθμῷ σφραγίδων¹¹ οὖν σφίγγεται¹² τὸ βιβλίον. ἐνεστῶτος καιροῦ¹³ καθ' ὃν¹⁴ δεῖ¹⁵ συμβῆναί τινα τοῖς ἐπὶ γῆς, τοῖς «μὲν» ἡδέα, τοῖς δὲ σκυθρωπά,¹⁶ ζητεῖται τίς ἔχει δύναμιν τοσαύτην ὡς λαβεῖν τὸ βιβλίον ἐκ τῆς δεξιᾶς¹⁷ τοῦ κατέχοντος καὶ λῦσαι τὰς σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ. εἴτα δηλοῦται ἐκ τῶν ἐπομένων¹⁸ ὡς οὐδεὶς γεννητός, | οὐκ ἐπουράνιος, οὐκ ἐπίγειος,¹⁹ ἄξιος «ἐϋρηται»,²⁰ διὰ τὴν ἐλάττωσιν τῆς φύσεως,²¹ τὸν τῆς προνοίας λόγον διὰ κρίσεως²² καὶ διοικήσεως φανερωσάιν,²³ μόνου τοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα²⁴ ὄντος φανέντος ἁξίου πρᾶξι τὰ ἐμφερόμενα²⁵ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ· οὐ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει οὐδένα.²⁶ οὗτος ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα λέων,²⁷ ἡ ῥίζα Δαυὶδ,²⁸ τὸ ἀρνίον τὸ ἐσφαγμένον²⁹ τυγχάνει. περὶ τούτου τοῦ βιβλίου³⁰ καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν καὶ ἐν Ἡσαΐα³¹ γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ πολλαχοῦ τῆς γραφῆς.³² ἐπ' ἐὶ³³ πρὸς τῆς³⁴ ἐπιδημίας³⁵ πολλὴν ἀσάφειαν³⁶ εἶχεν ἢ προτέρα Διαθήκη, ἐν σφραγίσιν³⁷ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐσφράγιστο τὰ γεγραμμένα· οὕτω δὲ σαφῆ γέγονεν μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τοῦ κυρίου, ὡς τοὺς πείρα τὴν ἄνοιξιν ἐσχηκότας λέγειν περὶ

¹⁰ Christian exegesis appears as a continuous chain of contributions. Didymus had received this point from Eusebius. Notice the similarity of this point of the Scholion with this comment by Eusebius in his *commPs*, PG.23.225.15–24: Εἰσὶ δὲ ὁδοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου αἱ τῆς προνοίας αὐτοῦ διοικήσεις, καθ' ἃς τὰ σύμπαντα διακυβερνᾷ· περὶ ὧν ὁ θεὸς Ἀπόστολος διδάσκων ἔλεγεν· Ὁ βάθος πλοῦτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως Θεοῦ· ὡς ἀνεξερευνήτα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ. Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τρίβοι αὐτοῦ εἶναι αἱ κατὰ μέρος διοικήσεις τῶν ὅλων, καθ' ἃς ὥσπερ ἐπιπορευόμενος τὰ τε κατ' οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς τῇ προνοητικῇ δυνάμει, τρίβους ἑαυτοῦ καὶ πορείας τοῖς νοεῖν δυναμένοις δείκνυσσι. Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 79: διττῶς αἱ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁδοὶ λέγονται· ἥτοι αἱ φέρουσιν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ αἱ αὐτὸς ὁδεύει ἐπιπορευόμενος τοῖς ὅλοις, δέον κατὰ τὸν τῆς προνοίας λόγον ἢ κατὰ τὸ ὠφελεῖν καὶ εἶναι ἐν τοῖς δεκτικοῖς ἑαυτοῦ. λέγει γοῦν· ‘ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐνπεριπατήσω’. ὁ δὲ ἐνπεριπατῶν ἔχει ὁδούς, ἃς αὐτὸς ὁδεύει. διττῶς οὖν ὁδοὺς θεοῦ λέγομεν ἢ τὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀγούσας αὐταὶ δὲ εἰσιν αἱ ἀρεταὶ ἢ ἃς αὐτὸς ἐπιβαδίζει κατὰ τὴν πρόνοιαν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ κρίσιν καὶ διοίκησιν καὶ δωρεάς.

¹¹ Cod. σφραγίδων. Cf. Rev. 6:1; 10:4.

¹² EN XXVIIe.

¹³ EN XXVIIIf.

¹⁴ Cod. καθον.

¹⁵ Cod. δη.

¹⁶ Didymus is the sole Christian author to make the distinction between ἡδέα and σκυθρωπά. Cf. Scholion XXXI: Σκυθρωπῶν μελλόντων ἐπιφέρεισθαι. EN XXVIIg.

¹⁷ Cf. Rev. 1:20; 5:7.

¹⁸ Cod. επομενωσ.

¹⁹ The author employs the scriptural distinction between rational beings which are either ἐπίγεια (‘earthly’) or ἐπουράνια (‘heavenly’), as in Phil. 2:10. Cf. 1 Cor. 15:40. Likewise, he has in mind John 3:12 distinguishing ‘things’ that are ἐπίγεια from the ἐπουράνια: the latter are far too hard to comprehend.

²⁰ Cod. ηρηται.

²¹ EN XXVIIIf.

²² Cod. διακρίσεως. The sequence of notions, πρόνοια – κρίσις – διοίκησις, within the same sentence is exclusive to Didymus. See note 10 to this Scholion: κατὰ τὴν πρόνοιαν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ κρίσιν καὶ διοίκησιν. EN XXVIIIf.

²³ Cf. Scholion II: φανερωσάιν τὸν περὶ αὐτῶν λόγον.

²⁴ Rom. 1:3.

²⁵ The expression τὰ ἐμφερόμενα, suggesting words or expressions contained in a certain text, is never used by Didymus, but it appears

in Cassian (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT* (lib. 2.1–7), 5.26: πόσα δὲ ἄλλα ἐμφέρεται περὶ τοῦ θεικοῦ πνεύματος. *DT* (lib. 3), PG.39: 900.16: καὶ τὸ ἐν Ματθαίῳ ἐμφερόμενον. 968.16: κἂν μήποτε ἰδικῶς ἐμφέρεται. It was used by Eusebius, Epiphanius, Asterius of Antioch, and a variety of sixth-century authors (Theodore Anagnostes, John Malalas, and Evagrius Scholasticus). This occurs only once in the spurious *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, which has been attributed to either Theodoret or Pseudo-Justin, but I have surmised that this is probably Cassian's work.

²⁶ John 5:22. Cf. EN XXVIIg: the Father acts through the Son, yet there is only one Trinitarian action. Origen introduced the idea that God who acts and speaks throughout biblical history is actually God the Logos. After Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus used this against Docetism and Arianism: Didymus, *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 17: εἰ πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς μία θεότης, κρίνοντος τοῦ υἱοῦ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ κρίνων ἐστίν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς δύναται πατὴρ εἶναι τῶν γεννητῶν γεννήσας αὐτοὺς μετουσίᾳ ἀγιότητος· . . . Καὶ ταῦτα διελέγχει τοὺς διακόπτοντας τὴν θεότητα. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 171: λέγει γὰρ καὶ ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς καὶ ὁ αἰρετικὸς, ὅτι Ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει οὐδένα, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ, νοεῖ δὲ οὐχ ὁμοίως τὸ εἰρημένον ἐκάτερος· διὰ γὰρ τῶν αὐτῶν ῥημάτων ὁ μὲν ἐκκλησιαστικὸς τὴν ἐπὶ πάντων ἐξουσίαν νοεῖ, οὗτος δὲ κατασκευάζει τὸ ὑποδέξ τε καὶ ὑποχεῖριον.

²⁷ EN XXVIIIf.

²⁸ Rev. 5:5. Cf. Gen. 49:8.

²⁹ Rev. 5:12; Cf. 5:6; 13:8.

³⁰ Cf. Rev. 22:7; 22:9; 22:10; 22:18.

³¹ Cod. ἐνησαι.

³² Didymus makes explicit references to Gen. 49:8; Jer. 23:5–6; Isaiah 11:10 and Rom. 15:12; Ezek. 34:23; Zach. 6:12 and 9:14–15; Habakkuk, 3:11; 2 Tim. 2:8. Perhaps this is also an implicit reference to Deut. 32:34: οὐκ ἰδοὺ ταῦτα συνήκται παρ' ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐσφράγισται ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς μου; In relation to this, Didymus refers to Isaiah 29:11: καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ὡς οἱ λόγοι τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ ἐσφραγισμένου τούτου, ὃ ἐὰν δῶσιν αὐτὸ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐπισταμένῳ γράμματα λέγοντες Ἀνάγνωθι ταῦτα· καὶ ἐρεῖ· Οὐ δύναμαι ἀναγνῶναι, ἐσφράγισται γάρ. Didymus, *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 286.

³³ Cod. ἐπι.

³⁴ Cod. ἐπὶ πρώτῃσ.

³⁵ EN XXVIIIf.

³⁶ Cod. ασαφίαν.

³⁷ Cod. σφραγίσιν. Cf. Isaiah 29:11; Daniel 12:4.

τοῦ³⁸ ἐσφαγμένου ἀρνίου· οὐχ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν κ' αἰομένη³⁹ ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτε διήνοιγεν⁴⁰ ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς;⁴¹

³⁸ Cod. τουσ.

³⁹ Cod. κεομένη.

⁴⁰ Cod. διηνυγεν.

⁴¹ Luke 24:32. Cf. [Scholion XX](#), note 9, reference to the same notion of the OT being disclosed by Jesus to Cleopas and the rest of the disciples after the resurrection. Unexpected though it is, this scriptural passage was quoted by a limited number of authors: Origen, *commJohn*, I.8.50; X.18.105; *homJer*, 20.8; *frPs*, 38, 2–4. Didymus, *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 274; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 196. Cyril of Alexandria, *Explanatio in Lucam*, PG.72.753.1. Pseudo-John

Chrysostom, *In Samaritanam*, PG.59.541.22. The following is a parallel which tells us that Cassian by and large quoted from Didymus while writing this Scholion: Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1133:

Ὅθεν τὸ οὕτως πεπρωμένον λόγιον σφόδρα παρά τινας ἀγαπηθὲν ποιεῖ αὐτὸν τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντα ἅτε δοῦλον ὄντα τοῦ θεοῦ. ὁ τοιοῦτος καὶ σαφηνιζομένων ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ τῶν γραφῶν ἐξάπτεται τὴν καρδίαν, ὥς φάσκειν κατὰ τοὺς περὶ τὸν Κλεώπαν Οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν αἰομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, ὥς διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς;

Scholion XXVII

With regard to this **book**, one could say that this is the entire rationale of the Providence, according to which God's judgement is brought upon men, with either pleasant or unpleasant results. Since the content of this **book** refers not only to perceptible things, but also to spiritual ones, [this **book**] is **written within and without**. Furthermore, since *unsearchable are His judgements and His ways*,¹ along which he goes through all existing things and passes judgement and administers individually everything that pertains to each one, this **book** is bound tightly closed by means of a divine number of **seals**. At certain opportune times, when certain things have to befall those living on earth (pleasant ones for some people, unpleasant ones for others), the question is who is the one who has such a strength as to take **the book** from **the right hand**² of Him who holds it, **and to loose the seals thereof**. It is subsequently indicated through the following words, that no created being (be it heavenly or earthly) has ever been found worthy of deciphering the rationale of Providence (as it is manifested in the Judgement and Administration [of the world]), owing to [created] nature being inferior [to the Uncreated one].³ Only *he who was made from the seed of David according to the flesh*⁴ proved worthy to realize the things recounted in this **book**. For *the Father judgeth no man*.⁵ He is **the Lion of the tribe of Judah**,⁶ **the Root of David**,⁷ the **Lamb**, which **has been slain**.⁸ Of this **book** Moses wrote; there are also references to this in Isaiah, as well as at many points of scripture. Since the former Testament was very obscure, **what was written** therein was **sealed** with seven **seals**.⁹ However, after the resurrection of the Lord everything that was written has been made so clear, that those who have experienced this disclosure can now say of **the lamb that has been slain**, *Did not our heart burn within us, while he opened to us the scriptures?*¹⁰

¹ Rom. 11:33.

² Cf. Rev. 1:20; 5:7.

³ This Scholion, as indeed the previous one, lays considerable emphasis on the ontological difference between created and uncreated nature and the consequences of this difference.

⁴ Rom. 1:3.

⁵ John 5:22. The Son is the only one to be able to recognize the rationale of Providence and Judgement, because of his divine nature

and because he is God the Logos, who passes Judgement on the world, according to the passage of John quoted at this point. Once again, the author stresses his anti-Arian intention.

⁶ Rev. 5:5.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Rev. 5:6; 5:12; 13:8.

⁹ Cf. Isaiah 29:11; Daniel 12:4.

¹⁰ Luke 24:32.

SCHOLION XXVIII

265r
KH

<XXVIII. Rev. 5:6> καὶ ἴδον¹ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἄρνιον ἑστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον, ἔχων² κέρατα ἑπτὰ καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἑπτὰ, αἳ³ εἰσιν τὰ ἑπτὰ⁴ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποστελλόμενα⁵ εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. <5:7> καὶ ἦλθεν καὶ εἴληφεν ἐκ τῆς δεξιᾶς τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου.⁶ <5:8¹> καὶ ὅτε ἔλαβεν τὸ βιβλίον,

¹ 2329: ἴδον.

² O., An., Ar. ἔχον. 2329, N.-A. ἔχων.

³ αἳ (instead of οἱ) in 1854, 2050, 2329, 2344, and K; so Arethas.

⁴ 2329: ὀφθαλμοὺς ἑπτὰ, εἰσιν δὲ τὰ ἑπτὰ. O., An., N.-A. ὀφθαλμοὺς ἑπτὰ, οἱ εἰσιν τὰ ἑπτὰ. Ar. ὀφθαλμοὺς ἑπτὰ, αἳ εἰσι.

⁵ 2329: ἀπεσταλμένα. O., N.-A. ἀπεσταλμένοι. An.(S). τὰ ἀπεσταλμένα. An.(M). τὰ ἀποστελλόμενα. Ar. ἀποστελλόμενα. Arethas once again reads K, since ἀποστελλόμενα occurs only therein, along with 2351 and possibly 1611.

⁶ O., N.-A. ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου. An. Ar. ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου τὸ βιβλίον.

«Σχόλιον κη΄»

KH EP Μετὰ τὸ ἐγνωκέναι¹ μέ, φησιν, ὅτι ἡ ρίζα Δαυίδ, ὁ νικήσας² λέων ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα,³ εἴληφεν⁴ τὸ βιβλίον ἐπὶ τὸ⁵ λῦσαι τὰς σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ,⁶ εἶδον⁷ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ «θρόνου»⁸ καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων⁹ ἄρνιον ἑστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον.¹⁰ μετὰ «τὴν» ἀνάστασιν γὰρ καὶ ἀνάληψιν ὀφθὲν τὸ ἄρνιον οὐκέτι ἐσφαγμένον¹¹ ὥφθη καὶ ἐπιεικτόν,¹² τουτέστιν οὐκέτι ἀλλοιούμενον. «Εἰ»¹³ οὖν κατὰ καινὴν¹⁴ στάσιν ἔχει λοιπὸν ἑπτὰ¹⁵ κέρατα,¹⁶ ἁγίαν βασιλείαν¹⁷ καὶ εὐλογημένην¹⁸ ἔχει ταύτης γὰρ σύμβολον τὰ πνεύματα.¹⁹ πρὸς τοῖς | ἑπτὰ κέρασιν καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἑπτὰ ἔχει, οὐκ ἄλλους ὄντας τῶν ἑπτὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πνευμάτων, αἱ

¹ EN XXVIIIa.

² Cf. Rev. 3:21.

³ Rev. 5:5.

⁴ Rev. 5:7.

⁵ EN XXVIIIb.

⁶ Rev. 5:2.

⁷ The form εἶδον occurs instead of ἴδον. This is because at this point we have another scribe, with a remarkably different handwriting, who took over from Theodosius at the fifth line of folio 264r of the Codex, starting with writing Scholion XXVII. This confirms that the spelling ἴδον is owing to scribe Theodosius, who reappears on folio 270v of the Codex. On that very page the form ἴδον reappears.

⁸ Restoring the scriptural text, Rev. 4:6. Cod. ουρανου. The scribe evidently misheard the recitation of the scriptural text.

⁹ Rev. 5:6. Cf. Rev. 14:3.

¹⁰ Rev. 5:6.

¹¹ Oecumenius made the point tellingly: ἦν δὲ τὸ ἄρνιον οὐκ ἐσφαγμένον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐσφαγμένον. ἀνεβίω γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς πατήσας τὸν θάνατον, καὶ σκυλεύσας τὸν Ἄδην τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ κατεχομένων ψυχῶν· ὡς τὸν Χριστοῦ θάνατον μηδὲ εἶναι θάνατον βεβαίως, ἀλλ' ὡς θάνατον διὰ τὸ τῆς ἀναστάσεως σύντομον . . . διὰ τοῦτο ἦν ὡς ἐσφαγμένον ἐν τῇ ὁράσει τῆς ὁπτασίας. *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 79.

¹² Cod. επιεστοσ. I wrote, ἐπιεικτόν (= yielding, weak, tolerating).

EN XXVIIIc.

¹³ Cod. η.

¹⁴ Cod. καινον.

¹⁵ EN XXVIIId.

¹⁶ Cod. καιρατα.

¹⁷ Rev. 1:6; 1:9; 5:10; 11:15; 12:10. Cf. Scholion XIV: σύμβολον γὰρ βασιλείας θρόνος.

¹⁸ Cf. Scholion IX and note 13 (with Scriptural references): τῷ ἁριθμῷ, μυστικῷ ὄντι διὸ ἅγιος καὶ εὐλογημένος.

¹⁹ This is an abbreviated reference, since the 'symbol of the kingdom' is not the 'spirits', but the number *seven*. He therefore means, 'the *seven* spirits are a symbol.' However, there is no need to correct the MS by adding the word ἑπτὰ, which is clearly implied, since the point made is about the significance of the number *seven* apropos of Rev. 5:6. Didymus repeatedly lays a great deal of stress upon the meaning of the number *seven*. Cf. Scholion IX: ὑποβάλλων αὐτὰς τῷ ζ' ἀριθμῷ, μυστικῷ ὄντι. Scholion XXVII: θεῖο ἀριθμῷ σφραγίδων σφίγγεται τὸ βιβλίον. Also, Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 36: Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγων ῥηδ' χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν ἔπεσθαι τῷ ἁρνίῳ, ὃ ἐστὶν ὁ Σωτὴρ, καὶ ταῦτα παρθένων μετὰ γυναικῶν μὴ μολυνθέντων, δείκνυσιν ὅτι λόγος τις περὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦτον τίμιός ἐστιν. Cf. Scholion XXXI.

πορεύεται²⁰ ἐν πύλιν²¹ τῆς γῆς ἐπισκοποῦντα²² τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων²³ πραττόμενα.²⁴
συνάδει τούτοις τὸ ἐπὶ τὰ ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου εἰσὶν ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.²⁵

²⁰ Cf. [Scholion XV](#): καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ, καθ' οὓς ἐπιπορεύεται τῷ παντὶ διαφοροῖται . . . ἤχον ποιῶν ἐπιπορευόμενος. [Scholion XXVII](#): ἐπιπορευόμενος τοῖς ὁλοῖς κρίνει καὶ οἰκονομεῖ τὰ περὶ ἕκαστον.

²¹ Cod. ἀπο.

²² Cf. Didymus, *commZach*, 2.165: Οὐ μόνον τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπραξαν οἱ ἀλάστορες, ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦτα ἔδειξαν τῷ ἐπισκοποῦντι ἀκοιμήτῳ ὀφθαλμῷ. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1213: ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπισκοπεῖ καὶ ἐφορᾷ τὰ ὅλα, ποῦ φυγεῖν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ δυνήσομαι; *ibid.* fr. 278: Ἐν ἐκστάσει, τουτέστιν ἐν ἐκπλήξει γεγενημένος, εἶπα Ἀπέρριμμα ἄρα ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου [Ps.30:23] τουτέστιν μακρὰν ἔδοξα εἶναι τῶν ἐποπτικῶν καὶ ἐπισκοπευτικῶν σου δυνάμεων.

²³ The structure τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων, instead of τὰ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων. There is no need to emend the Codex reading.

²⁴ The notion of 'the eyes of the Lord' is notably present in the Scholia. Cf. [Scholion XV](#): Τὴν ἐποπτικὴν καὶ ἐφορὸν τῶν ὅλων δύναμιν καὶ

τὴν πορευτικὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῶν προκειμένων δηλοῖ. καὶ ἐπειδὴ διὰ τοῦ ἐπιβλέπειν ἀναιρεῖ καὶ ξηραίνει τὰ φαῦλα, οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ φλόξ εἴρηται πυρός. [Scholion XXX](#): ἄγιά εἰσι τινες δυνάμεις, οἷον αἱ ὑπηρετικαὶ χεῖρες καὶ ἐποπτικοὶ ὀφθαλμοί.

²⁵ Zach. 4:10. Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse was written before his commentaries on Zachariah. Cf. Didymus, *commZach*, 3.73: Σαφήνεια δὲ ἀναντίρρητος περὶ τούτων γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως τοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους Παύλου ἐπιστολῆς, ἅπερ ὁ ἀναγνὼς ὄψεται τὰ περὶ τῶν ἀριθμῶν θεῖα θεωρήματα ἐπεσπαρμένα τῇ γραφῇ, τῇ τε πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ Σωτῆρος, αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ἡ καλουμένη παλαιὰ διαθήκη, καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν δεῦρο τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἄφιξιν, προσαγορευομένη καινῇ. See Didymus' references to John's Revelation, which are impressively interlaced with expressions which occur in the Scholia. [EN XXVIIIe](#).

Scholion XXVIII

He subsequently says: 'After I had recognized that **the root of David, the Lion of the tribe of Judah¹ who overcame,² had received³ the book** in order to **loose the seals thereof,⁴ I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne⁵ and of the four beasts, and [in the midst of] the elders,⁶ a Lamb stood, as if it had been slain.⁷** For indeed after the resurrection and ascension **the Lamb** was no longer seen as **slain** and standing in tolerance, that is, [it was seen] no longer changed. If therefore in this new state it has **seven horns**, this betokens him having a **kingdom⁸** that is *blessed* and *sanctified*.⁹ For those [seven] **spirits** are a symbol of this [kingdom]. In addition to the **seven horns**, it also has **seven eyes**, which are not in fact other than **the seven spirits of God**, which go through the earth and supervise human actions. The saying [then], *they are the seven eyes of the Lord, which oversee the whole earth*,¹⁰ conforms to the foregoing considerations.

¹ Rev. 5:5.

² Cf. Rev. 3:21.

³ Rev. 5:7.

⁴ Rev. 5:2.

⁵ Rev. 4:6.

⁶ Rev. 5:6. Cf. Rev. 14:3.

⁷ Rev. 5:6.

⁸ Cf. Rev. 1:6; 1:9; 5:10; 11:15; 12:10.

⁹ After Gen. 2:3. see [Scholion IX](#), note 11.

¹⁰ Zach. 4:10.

ΚΘ

266r

<XXIX. Rev. 5:8²> τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα καὶ οἱ εἴκοσιν τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι ἔπεσαν¹ ἐνώπιον² τοῦ ἄρνιου, ἔχοντες ἕκαστος κληθήραν³ καὶ φιάλας χρυσᾶς γεμούσας θυμιαμάτων, αἷ εἰσιν προσευχαί⁴ τῶν⁵ ἁγίων, <5:9> καὶ ᾄδουσιν ᾠδὴν καινὴν, λέγοντες· ἄξιός ἐστι λαβεῖν τὸ βιβλίον, καὶ ἀνοῖξαι τὰς σφραγίδας⁶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐσφάγης καὶ ἡγόρασας⁷ τῷ θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς καὶ γλώσσης καὶ λαοῦ καὶ ἔθνους, <5:10> καὶ ἐποίησας αὐτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ βασιλεύουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. <5:11> καὶ εἶδον⁸ καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν⁹ ἀγγέλων πολλῶν | κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν ζώων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν μυριάδες μυριάδων καὶ χιλιάδες χιλιάδων,¹⁰ <5:12> λέγοντες φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· ἄξιόν ἐστιν τὸ ἄρνιον τὸ ἐσφαγμένον λαβεῖν τὴν δύναμιν¹¹ καὶ τὸν¹² πλοῦτον καὶ σοφίαν καὶ ἰσχὺν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν καὶ εὐλογίαν.¹³ <5:13> καὶ πᾶν κτίσμα, ὃ¹⁴ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς¹⁵ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, ὅσα ἐστίν,¹⁶ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα¹⁷ ἤκουσα λέγοντας¹⁸ τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ¹⁹ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῷ ἄρνιῳ²⁰ ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δόξα²¹ καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. <5:14> καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα ἔλεγον ἀμήν· καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἔπεσαν καὶ προσεκύνησαν. <6:1> καὶ ἶδον, ὅτι²² ἤνοιξεν τὸ ἄρνιον

¹ O., N.-A. ἔπεσαν. An., Ar. ἔπεσον.

² 2329: ἐνώπιον.

³ Cod. κηθαραν. 2329: κηθαραν.

⁴ 2329: εἰσι προσευχαί. O., An., Ar., N.-A. εἰσιν αἱ προσευχαί. The reading προσευχαί instead of αἱ προσευχαί is found in K*, 1854, 2329, and 2351.

⁵ Cod. ὧντων.

⁶ 2329: σφραγιδας.

⁷ In 2329, the text Rev. 5:9–10, from καὶ ἡγόρασας τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς reads thus: καὶ ἡγεiras τῷ θεῷ ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ βασιλεύουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Then, 5:11. An interesting variant for βασιλεύουσιν 2329 (or βασιλεύουσιν of Or., An.) is βασιλεύομεν in Arethas, which is not considered by N.-A.

⁸ Cod. ἰδων. 2329: ἰδον.

⁹ 2329, O., An. (M). φωνῆς. An. (S). φωνήν. Ar. ὡς φωνήν.

¹⁰ 2329: χειλιαδες χειλιαδων.

¹¹ Cod. δυναμην.

¹² τὸν in 1006, 1611, 1841, 1854, K.

¹³ 2329: τὴν δύναμιν καὶ πλοῦτον καὶ δόξαν καὶ εὐλογίαν. O. τὴν δύναμιν καὶ σοφίαν καὶ πλοῦτον καὶ ἰσχὺν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν καὶ εὐλογίαν. An. τὴν δύναμιν καὶ πλοῦτον καὶ σοφίαν καὶ ἰσχὺν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν. Ar. τὴν δύναμιν καὶ τὸν πλοῦτον, καὶ σοφίαν, καὶ ἰσχύν, καὶ τιμὴν, καὶ δόξαν, καὶ εὐλογίαν. N.-A. τὴν δύναμιν καὶ πλοῦτον καὶ σοφίαν καὶ ἰσχὺν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν καὶ εὐλογίαν.

¹⁴ 2329: κτίσμα ὄν (not considered by N.-A.).

¹⁵ 2329, O.: καὶ ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς omitted.

¹⁶ 2329, Ar. ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ἐστίν. O. ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης σὰ ἐστίν. An. ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ἃ ἐστίν. N.-A. ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης.

¹⁷ πάντα instead of πάντα, in 1006, 1841, 2351, K, and the Vulgate. Arethas follows once again, using πάντας.

¹⁸ 2329: ἤκουσα δὲ λέγοντας, introducing a new sentence; the preceding πάντα has a full-stop. So in O. and An. (M). Thus, 'I heard them saying to him that sitteth upon the throne'. O., Ar., N.-A. ἤκουσα λέγοντας. An. (S). ἤκουσα λέγοντα. An. (N). λέγοντα (ἤκουσα om.).

¹⁹ O. πάντα: ἤκουσα λέγοντας τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ. An. πάντα: λέγοντα τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ. Ar. πάντα ἤκουσα λέγοντας. Tῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ. N.-A. πάντα ἤκουσα λέγοντας: τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ.

²⁰ 2329: τῷ καθημένῳ καὶ τῷ ἄρνιῳ.

²¹ 2329: ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι . . . The text καὶ τὸ κράτος . . . ἀμήν is not part of this version.

²² ὅτι instead of ὅτε in 2053, 2351, K, and the Vulgate. 2329, N.-A. εἶδον ὅτε. O. ὅτε εἶδον. An., Ar. εἶδον ὅτι.

μίαν ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ σφραγίδων,²³ καὶ ἤκουσα²⁴ ἑνὸς ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων λέγοντος²⁵ ὡς φωνῇ²⁶ βροντῆς· ἔρχου. <6:2> καὶ ἰδοὺ²⁷ ἵππος λευκὸς καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔχων τόξον, | καὶ ἐδόθη²⁸ αὐτῷ στέφανος, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν νικῶν καὶ ἵνα νικήσῃ.

²³ At this point the scribe notes the letter A in the left margin, notifying future readers that here starts the narrative of the opening of the 'first seal'. The scribe of 2329 is the same person, namely Theodosius, who does the same in that text of Revelation, too.

²⁴ O.(H) ἤκούσαμεν ἐκ τῶν. O.(G) ἤκουσα μὲν ἐκ τῶν. An., Ar., N.-A. the same as 2351.

²⁵ 2329: λέγων. O. λεγόντων. An., Ar., N.-A. the same as 2351.

²⁶ O. ὡς φωνήν. An., ὡς φωνῆς. Ar. ὡς φωνῇ. N.-A. ὡς φωνή.

²⁷ 2329: καὶ ἰδοὺ. This omission of καὶ εἶδον occurs in 2351 and K. O., N.-A. ἔρχου. καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ. Ar. ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε. Καὶ ἰδοὺ. An. (M). ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε. Καὶ εἶδον· καὶ ἰδοὺ. An. (S). ἔρχου. Καὶ εἶδον· καὶ ἰδοὺ.

²⁸ 2329: ἐδόθη,

〈Σχόλιον κθ'〉

EP Εἴρηταί που κατευθυνθήτω ἡ προσευχή μου ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου.¹ πλήρεις τούτων τῶν **θυμιαμάτων φιάλαι**² τυγχάνουσι τὰ ἡγεμονικὰ τῶν γνησίως εὐχομένων Χριστῶ. ἔρεῖς δὲ καὶ τὰς **κιθάρας**³ τὴν ἡρμοσμένην εὐμούσως⁴ καὶ ἐμμελῶς⁵ δύνανται αὐτῶν, καθ' ἣν νοοῦσι καὶ ἀγαπῶσι Χριστόν. τί δὲ ἐν τῷ⁶ τὸ ἕδειν τὴν **καινὴν ᾠδὴν**⁷ λέγουσιν ἢ τό· **ἄξιός εἰς**,⁸ ὃ δέσποτα⁸ σωτήρ,⁹ **λαβεῖν τὸ βιβλίον**¹⁰ καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς; προφανῶς δὲ περὶ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐστὶ ταῦτα, **ἀχθέντος ὡς προβάτου**¹¹ ἐπὶ **σφαγῇ**.¹² ἐκ τῆς οὕτω γενναμένης¹³ **σφαγῆς**, τὸ **ῥέυσαν αἷμα** **τιμὴ** δέδοται¹⁴ ὑπὲρ τῶν σεσωσμένων. καὶ ἐπειδὴ μὴ ὑπὲρ μέρους, 267r ἢ ἐνὸς **ἔθνους** τῶν ἀνθρώπων **ἐσταυρώθη**,¹⁵ **ἡγόρασεν τῷ αἵματι** αὐτοῦ | **ἀπὸ πάσης φυλῆς**¹⁶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ διαλέκτου¹⁷ πάσης τῶν ἀνθρώπων,¹⁸ ἔτι μὴν¹⁸ καὶ **λαοῦ**,¹⁹ καὶ **ἔθνους καὶ λαοῦ** διαφορὰν **ἐστὶ**,¹⁹ **λαβεῖν**,²⁰ φάσκοντα **ὥς**²⁰ οἱ **μὲν**²¹ ἐκ τῶν καθαρῶν καὶ σοφῶν²² ἀνθρώπων **λημφθέντες**²³ ἀπὸ **λαοῦ**, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν χυδαιοτέρων καὶ πολλῶν²⁴ ἀπὸ **ἔθνους** **ἡγοράσθησαν**.²⁵ πιστοῦται²⁶ ἢ προτέρα

¹ Psalm 140:2.

² Rev. 5:8.

³ Rev. 5:8.

⁴ EN XXIXa.

⁵ Cod. εὐμελῶς. EN XXIXb.

⁶ Cod. μετα. The 'new ode' of Rev. 5:8 is sung at the same time with ἄξιός εἰ etc., which is indeed the content of the ode. Thus the present tense should be indicated with ἐν τῷ, denoting the simultaneity of ἕδειν and λέγουσιν.

⁷ Rev. 5:9.

⁸ The appellation δέσποτα is Cassian's. Didymus does not use this in his genuine works. It only appears in catena-fragments (no more than eight times out of a collection comprising more than fifteen hundred attributions) and is an addition by the catenist. By contrast, in DT, which is not a work of Didymus but Cassian, the designation δεσπότης appears more than two hundred times.

⁹ EN XXIXc.

¹⁰ Rev. 5:9.

¹¹ Cod. πρόβατον. The scribe stuck to the scriptural word as it stands. However, since ἀχθέντος precedes being in the genitive case, the nominative πρόβατον is plainly wrong.

¹² Isaiah 53:7; Acts 8:32.

¹³ EN XXIXd. Cf. Scholion XXI: ἐπὶ τὸν οὕτω γενόμενον στύλον, and EN XXIf.

¹⁴ Cod. τίμιον δοτε. Cf. Rev. 5:9; also, an allusion to 1 Cor. 7:23: τιμὴς ἡγοράσθητε. See below: ἡγόρασεν, ἡγοράσθησαν.

¹⁵ Cf. 1 Cor. 1:13.

¹⁶ Rev. 5:9.

¹⁷ EN XXIXe.

¹⁸ EN XXIXf.

¹⁹ Cod. διαφοραν διαφοραν. EN XXIXg.

²⁰ I have added ὡς. See below, αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὡμολόγησαν ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡγοράσθησαν. EN XXIXh.

²¹ I have added μὲν, which is obviously needed.

²² EN XXIXi.

²³ The form λημφθέντες, although found in the Septuagint, appears only in a few authors (the Apologist Melito of Sardis, the mathematicians Theon and Pappus) among whom Didymus made the most use of it. Two instances transpire in Pseudo-Caesarius (= Cassian), *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, 135 (λημφθέντι) and 218 (λημφθέντος). No other Christian author used this verb-form. Although in Didymus we come upon this usage nearly sixty times, no such usage occurs in his *frPs(al)*, although it does in his *commPs*. Cf. Scholion XV: συνκαταβαίνειν, and note 20.

²⁴ Cf. Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 319: 'λαοὶ' δὲ δύνανται πάντες οἱ χυδαιότεροι ἄνθρωποι λέγεσθαι οὐδὲν ἔχοντες ἀνηγμένον, οὐ σοφοὶ ὄντες. οὗτοι οὖν ἡμῶν ἕνεκα κίνησιν κεφαλῆς ἔθεντο. ἡμεῖς γοῦν γενόμενοι πρὸς τοὺς λαοὺς, τοὺς χυδαιοτέρους ἀνθρώπους. EN XXIXj.

²⁵ Cf. Rev. 5:9; 1 Cor. 7:23.

²⁶ Cod. πιστοῦτε. Cf. Scholion XXV: πιστώσεις, and Cassian, Cod. p. 10r: Καὶ πρὸς πίστωσιν τῶν εἰρημένων.

«ὁπόθεσις²⁷ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν εἴκοσι τεσσάρων πρεσβυτέρων²⁸ ἐκ τῆς προκειμένης λέξεως· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὁμολόγησαν²⁹ ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡγοράσθησαν³⁰ καὶ ἐξελέγησαν.

ἡμεῖς οὖν οἱ ἀναγινώσκοντες³¹ ταῦτα καὶ μαθόντες ὅτι τὰ **θυμιάματα εἰσιν αἱ προσευχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων**³² καὶ πνευματικαὶ θυσίαι καὶ εὐπρόσδεκτοι³³ θεῷ³⁴ αἱ ἀγαθαὶ πράξεις,» ὁρῶμεν, ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημίας, ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ **θυμίαμα προσάγεται**³⁵ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου καὶ **θυσία καθάρᾳ**· μέγα γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν³⁶ διὰ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδασκαλίαν,» ὥς φησιν ὁ προφήτης. |

²⁷ Cod. ἀπόθεσις.

²⁸ Rev. 4:4; 4:10; 5:8; 11:16; 19:4.

²⁹ Cod. ὁμολόγησαν.

³⁰ Rev. 14:4.

³¹ Cod. ἀναγινώσκοντες. Cf. **Scholion III**: τῶν ἀναγινώσκόντων καὶ ἀκουόντων . . . συνετῶς ἀναγινώσκειν καὶ μὴ προχεῖρως ἀκούειν, ἀλλὰ πιστῶς. Cf. 1 Tim. 3:13: πρόσεχε τῇ ἀναγνώσει. Up to this point, Cassian quotes from Didymus verbatim. I made this part a separate paragraph, since this is a concluding remark of his own. Regarding the expression ἀναγινώσκοντες ταῦτα, the pronoun ταῦτα should be understood as pointing to both the text of Revelation corresponding to this Scholion, and the foregoing text of Didymus, which Cassian ‘read’ and just quoted. Cassian’s aim in making this final remark is plain: he wishes to affiliate this specific passage of Revelation with both Testaments, which he actually does by quoting 1 Peter 2:5 and Malachi 1:11. This is after all for Cassian the principal aim in composing these Scholia.

³² Rev. 5:8.

³³ Cod. εὐπρόσδεκται.

³⁴ 1 Peter 2:5.

³⁵ Cod. πρὶοαγεται.

³⁶ Malachi 1:11. There is no text of Origen where this scriptural passage is quoted. It is cited, however, in Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 10.90; 10.92; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80: 1648.26–29; 1785.22–27. *intProphXII*, PG.81.1968.1–6 and 33. We have only one oblique instance in Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 680a. Comment on this passage appears in Christian literature as early as Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 41.2. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 5.14.136.3. Eusebius, *DE*, 2.3.10; *Eclogae Prophetarum*, p. 130; *commPs*, PG.23: 253.39–46; 877.31–39; 1224.20–24. Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 2, pp. 229; 267; 564; *De Adoratione*, PG.68.225.4–9; *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.649.37. John Chrysostom, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.301.53–55. Also, Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 1)*, 15.33. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *commProphXII*, Prophet Malachi 1.11 and 1.14. The *Delecta Testimonia Adversus Judaeos*, where Malachi 1:11 occurs at four points (PG.46: 221.14–17; 224.30; 225.34–36; 228.12–14), is ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa, but this is actually spurious. It appears also in the *Dissertatio Contra Judaeos*, chapter 7 (lines 164–166; 178–184; 203–204).

Scholion XXIX

It is written somewhere, *Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense*.¹ **Vials** full of **incense**² are the intellects³ of those who earnestly pray to Christ. You could also render the **harp**s as the power of those people, which is artistically and harmoniously adapted within themselves: by virtue of this [power] they recognize and love Christ. Further, while they sing a **new song**,⁴ what else could they possibly sing other than the [song], **Thou art worthy to take the book**,⁵ o Lord Saviour, and the verses which follow? Quite obviously, these [words] pertain to Him who was crucified and *brought as a lamb to the slaughter*.⁶ Subsequent to *the slaughter* that was so executed, the **blood** that was shed was the *price*⁷ given for the redemption of those saved. Furthermore, since *he was crucified for the sake*⁸ of not just a part of humanity or of one nation only, he has **redeemed by his blood** people **out of every tribe**⁹ of Israel and of every human **tongue**, and, yes, **of every people**. It is indeed possible to make the distinction between **people and nation**, saying this: those who have been selected from the clean and the wise have been purchased from the **people**, whereas those who came from the vulgar and the multitude **have been purchased**¹⁰ from a

¹ Psalm 140:2.

² Rev. 5:8.

³ τὰ ἡγεμονικά. This Stoic term indicates the governing (principal) part of the soul.

⁴ Rev. 5:9.

⁵ Rev. 5:9.

⁶ Isaiah, 53:7; Acts 8:32.

⁷ 1 Cor. 7:23.

⁸ Cf. 1 Cor. 1:13.

⁹ Rev. 5:9.

¹⁰ Cf. Rev. 5:9; 1 Cor. 7:23.

nation.¹¹ The number of **twenty-four presbyters**,¹² which is found in the present text,¹³ corroborates this hypothesis. For it is they who professed that they **were redeemed** and selected **from among men**.¹⁴

Therefore, we who study these sayings, and have learned that **the prayers of the saints are incense**,¹⁵ and the good deeds are *spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God*,¹⁶ see that ever since the advent of Christ, *in every place incense is offered to the name of the Lord and a pure sacrifice*. For thanks to the teaching of Christ, *His name is great among the nations*,¹⁷ as the prophet says.

¹¹ The word *λαός* indicates 'the people of God', understood as both Israel and advanced Christians. The term *ἔθνος* (a word with numerous negative connotations in the Old Testament) refers to both the Gentiles and the common Christian faithful.

¹² Rev. 4:4; 4:10; 5:8; 11:16; 19:4. The twenty-four presbyters, divided into two groups of twelve each, represent the *λαός* (the select race) and the *ἔθνος* (the rest of the peoples of mankind). Since they 'were redeemed from among men' (stated at this point and quoted from Rev. 14:4), these presbyters represent all humanity.

¹³ He means Rev. 5:8, which is included in the passage under consideration.

¹⁴ Rev. 14:4.

¹⁵ Rev. 5:8.

¹⁶ 1 Peter 2:5.

¹⁷ Malachi 1:11.

SCHOLION XXX

267v

<XXX. Rev. 6:3> | καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν δευτέραν σφραγίδα,¹ ἤκουσα τοῦ δευτέρου ζώου λέγοντος· ἔρχου.² <6:4> καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄλλος ἵππος πυρρός,³ καὶ τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἐδόθη⁴ αὐτῷ λαβεῖν τὴν εἰρήνην ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἵνα ἀλλήλους σφάζωσι,⁵ καὶ ἐδόθη⁶ αὐτῷ μάχαιρα μεγάλη. <6:5> καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξε τὴν σφραγίδα τὴν τρίτην,⁷ ἤκουσα τοῦ τρίτου ζώου λέγοντος· ἔρχου.⁸ καὶ ἰδοὺ⁹ ἵππος μέλας καὶ ὁ καθημένος ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἔχων ζυγὸν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ· <6:6> καὶ ἤκουσα ὡς φωνήν¹⁰ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων λέγουσαν· χοῖνιξ σίτου δηναρίου,¹¹ καὶ τρεῖς χοίνικες κριθῆς,¹² δηναρίου.¹³ καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον καὶ τὸν οἶνον μὴ ἀδικήσης.¹⁴ <6:7> καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγίδα τὴν τετάρτην,¹⁵ ἤκουσα φωνὴν τοῦ τετάρτου ζώου λέγοντος· ἔρχου.¹⁶ <6:8> καὶ ἰδοὺ¹⁷ ἵππος χλωρός, καὶ ὁ καθημένος ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὁ θάνατος,¹⁸ καὶ ὁ ἄδης ἠκολούθει¹⁹ αὐτῷ·²⁰ καὶ ἐδόθη²¹ αὐτῷ²² ἐξουσία ἐπὶ τὸ τέταρτον τῆς γῆς, | ἀποκτεῖναι ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ,²³ καὶ ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν θανάτῳ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς.

268r

¹ 2329, O., N.-A. τὴν σφραγίδα τὴν δευτέραν. An., Ar. τὴν δευτέραν σφραγίδα. In the left margin, the letter B is written by the scribe. This notifies the reader that the ‘second seal’ is being revealed.

² O., N.-A. ἔρχου. An. ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε. Ar. ἔρχου καὶ βλέπε.

³ Cod. πυρρός. 2329: πυρρός.

⁴ 2329: αὐτῷ ἐδόθη.

⁵ 2329: σφάζουσιν.

⁶ 2329: ἐδόθη.

⁷ In the left margin, the letter Γ notifies the reader that the ‘third seal’ is being revealed.

⁸ 2329, An., Ar. ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε. O., N.-A. ἔρχου.

⁹ 2329, Ar. καὶ ἰδοὺ. O., An., N.-A. [καὶ εἶδον,] καὶ ἰδοὺ.

¹⁰ 2329: ὡς φωνῆς. O., Ar. φωνήν. An.(S), N.-A. ὡς φωνήν. An.(M) ὡς φωνῆς.

¹¹ 2329: διναρρίου.

¹² κριθῆς for κριθῶν in 2344, 2351, K, and the Syriac *versio Harclensis*. 2329, O., An., N.-A. κριθῶν. Ar. κριθῆς.

¹³ 2329: διναρρίου.

¹⁴ 2329: ἀδικήσας.

¹⁵ In the left margin, the letter Δ notifies the reader that the ‘fourth seal’ is being revealed.

¹⁶ 2329, O. ἔρχου. An. ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε. Ar. ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε. N.-A. ἔρχου.

¹⁷ 2329, Ar. καὶ ἰδοὺ. O. εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ. An., N.-A. καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ.

¹⁸ So Ar. and N.-A. 2329: ἐπάνω ὁ θάνατος. O., An. ἐπάνω ὄνομα αὐτῷ θάνατος.

¹⁹ 2329: ἠκολούθη.

²⁰ αὐτῷ for μετ’ αὐτοῦ in K, K, the *versio Harclensis*, and 1006, 1841, 1854, 2344. 2329: ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ. O., N.-A. μετ’ αὐτοῦ. An., Ar. αὐτῷ. N.-A. μετ’ αὐτοῦ.

²¹ 2329: ἐδόθη.

²² αὐτῷ for αὐτοῖς, in 1611, 1854, 2329, 2351, K, the Syriac versions, the Vulgate, and Coptic versions.

²³ 2329: ἀποκτεῖναι ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ.

Ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν ἔστιν εὐρεῖν¹ «ὅτι»,² ὥσπερ σῶμα³ θεοῦ, ἁγιαί εἰσὶ τινες «δυνάμεις»,⁴ οἷον αἱ ὑπηρετικαὶ χεῖρες⁵ καὶ ἐποπτικοὶ⁶ ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν εὐχῶν τεταγμένα⁷ ὄντα καὶ «κοιλαστικὸν»⁸ προνοία θεοῦ πόδες τοῖς κατὰ γῆν διαιτωμένοις.

ἐπεὶ⁹ οὖν μέλλει ἐρεῖν¹⁰ ὁργὴν θεοῦ¹¹ μεγάλην, «οὐ τὸ»¹² συμβεβηκὸς¹³ πάθος¹⁴ ὀνομάζεται θεοῦ ὁργὴ καλούμενον, ἔξω ὑπάρχον¹⁵ αὐτοῦ, πλὴν εἰς χρεῖαν κατατασσόμενον¹⁶ τοῖς τούτου δεομένοις, ὅ καὶ παραδίδονται ὡς ἀνάξιοι¹⁷ θεοῦ, ἵνα ποθήσωσι¹⁸ τὸν θεόν, οὗ καταπεφρονήκασιν, ὅτε ὑπὸ τὴν τοῦ χείρονος ἐξουσίαν γίνονται. καὶ ἔστιν ὁργὴ¹⁹ θεοῦ ὁ διάβολος²⁰

καὶ γὰρ ἐν «τῇ»²¹ δευτέρᾳ τῶν Βασιλειῶν εἴρηται καὶ προσέθετο ὁργὴν κυρίου ἐκκαῆναι ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἐπέσειε²² τὸν Δαυὶδ λέγων· βάδιζε καὶ ἀρίθμησον τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τὸν Ἰούδαν.²³ καὶ ἔστιν | ἡ ὁργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ ἐπισείσασα τὸν Δαυὶδ, οὐχὶ ὀλέγουσα, ἀλλὰ λέγων· παρὰ αὐτὸν ἄρα τὸν θεὸν τὸν λεγόμενον εἰρηκέναι πολλά τινα πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους, ἑτέρα τίς ἔστιν ἡ ὁργὴ αὐτοῦ, «εἶτα»²⁴ λέγουσα καὶ κελεύουσα ἁμαρτάνειν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐφ' ἣ²⁵ κόλασις ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἀκολουθεῖ τῷ πεπισθέντι²⁷ τῇ τοιάδε εἰρηκυῖα²⁸ ὁργῇ. καὶ πῶς ἡ κολάζουσα ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν καὶ δικαίως κολάζουσα ἀνασειεῖ ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίαν, ἵνα πείσασα ἐπὶ τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν κολάσῃ²⁹ δικαίως; ἀδίκως γὰρ κολάζει ἡ αἰτία τῆς ἁμαρτίας τὸν

¹ Cf. Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 198: Καὶ ἔστι τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν εὐρεῖν, ὅτι. Cf. ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν used by Didymus: *commJob*(1–4), Cod. p. 39; *commJob*(5.1–6.29), Cod. p. 143; *commZacch*, 1.42; *commEccl*(1.1–8), Cod. p. 39.

² EN XXXa.

³ An implicit reference to Eph. 4.12: ‘for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying the body of Christ’. Cf. σῶμα Χριστοῦ: 1 Cor. 12:27; 6:15; Col. 1:24; 2:17. The Church is a heavenly reality within the world; it infallibly reflects and instantiates the reality of the higher realm.

⁴ Cf. Didymus, in EN XXXb. Likewise, Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae super Psalms*, PG.29.376.40–377.2: Ὡςπερ οἱ ἅγιοι σῶμα εἰσι Χριστοῦ . . . οὕτω καὶ αἱ ἅγιοι δυνάμεις . . . αἱ μὲν ὀφθαλμοὶ λέγονται, . . . αἱ δὲ ὄντα.

⁵ Cod. χεῖρει. Compare the term ὑπηρετικαὶ used here with ὑπηρετῶν ἄγγελος appearing in the following Scholion. The idea occurs in Didymus: the devil is the ‘wrath’ of God, whose ‘hands’ are ‘ministering angels’ (ὑπηρετοῦντες ταῖς κολάσεσιν ἄγγελοι) imposing his ‘punishing power’ (κολαστικὴ δύναμις). Cf. Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 309: δύνανται καὶ οἱ ὑπηρετοῦντες ταῖς κολάσεσιν ἄγγελοι χεῖρες τοῦ θεοῦ λέγεσθαι, ὡς λέγομεν χεῖρα βασιλέως, καὶ οὐ δήπου τὸ μέλος τοῦ σώματος διὰ τούτων σημαίνομεν. καὶ ὁ Ἰωβ δὲ περὶ τῆς κολαστικῆς δυνάμεως – αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ διάβολος ἦν – ἔλεγεν· ‘ἀπόστειλον τὴν χεῖρά σου’. τοῦτο οὖν λέγει· ‘ἡ χεῖρ σου’ ἦτοι ἡ κολαστικὴ δύναμις ἦτοι ἡ δραστηριότης τῶν ἐπιπόνων ἦτοι ἡ διακονοῦσα δυνάμις σου ‘ἐξωλόθρευσεν ἔθνη’. EN XXXib.

⁶ Cod. ἐποπτικοί.

⁷ Cod. τεταγμένα.

⁸ Cod. The scribe wrote ἐπελεστικοί, which is a mistake for ἀπελαστικοί. Above the initial letter ε a corrector inserted α, intending ἀπελαστικοί. EN XXXc.

⁹ Cod. ἐπὶ.

¹⁰ Cod. αἰρεῖν.

¹¹ Rev. 6:16–17, reference to the ‘Great Day of the wrath of God and the Lamb’. Cf. 11:18; 14:10; 16:19; 19:15.

¹² Cod. οὕτω.

¹³ Cod. ἀσυμβεβηκος.

¹⁴ EN XXXd.

¹⁵ Cod. ὑπάρχων.

¹⁶ εἰς χρεῖαν κατατασσόμενον. There can be no doubt that once Cassian chose to treat the question of human free will and accountability vis-à-vis God, he had in mind both the ideas and phraseology from the following passage of Origen’s *Contra Celsum*, IV.70: λελέξετο ὅτι σφζομένου τοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν ἐκάστῳ κἂν συγγρήσηται τῇ κακίᾳ τῶν φαύλων εἰς τὴν διάταξιν τοῦ παντός ὁ θεός, κατατάσσων αὐτοὺς εἰς χρεῖαν τοῦ παντός, οὐδὲν ἤττον ψεκτός τε ἔστιν ὁ τοιόσδε καὶ ὡς ψεκτός κατατάσσεται εἰς χρεῖαν ἀνευκταίαν μὲν ἐκάστῳ χρήσιμον δὲ τῷ παντί. Likewise, *De Oratone*, 7.1: ὥσπερ οὖν εἰρήκαμεν τῷ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν ἐκάστου τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς καταχρῶμενον τὸν θεὸν εἰς τινα χρεῖαν τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς κατατεταχέναι εἰς δέον αὐτά. Only Origen and Cassian use the expression εἰς χρεῖαν κατατάσσεσθαι. Origen used this to imply the Stoic doctrine of the benevolent arrangement of the whole, despite individual suffering, which is ‘duly ordered’ within the flux of events, so as to contribute to the benefit of the whole. Likewise, Cassian argues that ‘the wrath of God’ indicates no ‘accidental passion’, but punishment duly inflicted on the wicked, for the purpose of universal benefit. Cassian drew heavily on Origen.

¹⁷ Cod. ἀναξίου.

¹⁸ Cod. ποθήσουσιν.

¹⁹ Cod. ὁργὴν.

²⁰ EN XXXe. Origen was the first author to point out the scriptural instances laying the foundation for this idea. These passages, that is, 2 Kings 24:1 and 1 Paralipomenon (Chronicles 1), 21:1, are also quoted in this Scholion.

²¹ Cod. ση.

²² Cod. ἐπειοσε.

²³ 2 Kings (2 Samuel, in the Masoretic text) 24:1.

²⁴ Cod. ητα.

²⁵ Cod. ἀμαρτιασ.

²⁶ Cod. εφη.

²⁷ Cod. πισθέντι.

²⁸ Cod. εἰρηκυα.

²⁹ Cod. κολασει.

ἡμαρτηκότα.³⁰ ἀλλά, καθὼς εἴρηται,³¹ ὀργὴν θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν διάβολον, τὸν ἀναπειθόντα³² ἁμαρτάνειν, βουλόμενον ὑποχείριον λαβεῖν τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα³³ ἐκ τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν Παραλειπομένων τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ Δαυὶδ ἱστορῶν, οὕτω φησίν· καὶ ἔστη ὁ διάβολος ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπέσεισε τὸν Δαυὶδ | τοῦ ἀριθμῆσαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ·³⁴ τῇ³⁵ γὰρ ὁ ἐπέσεισε·³⁶ προσηγορίᾳ³⁶ ἐχρήσατο καὶ ἡ δευτέρα τῶν Βασιλειῶν καὶ ἡ πρώτη τῶν Παραλειπομένων·³⁷ τῇ μὲν, ἐπὶ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ κυρίου, τῇ δέ, ἐπὶ τοῦ³⁸ διαβόλου. εἰ δὲ τὸ ὁ ἐπέσεισεν· αἴτιον τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν ἐστίν, αἴτιον δὲ τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν ὁ διάβολός ἐστιν, διάβολος δι' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν προσηγοριῶν ὠνομάσθη,³⁹ διὰ τῆς⁴⁰ κατεμαζευμένης⁴¹ καὶ τῆς τοὺς πολλοὺς λανθανούσης· τῆς αὐτὸν ὀνομαζούσης ὀργὴν κυρίου, κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην ὥδην καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ λέγουσαν· ἀπέστειλας τὴν ὀργὴν σου καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτοὺς·⁴² ὡς καλὰ μὲν,⁴³ καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. πᾶν γὰρ τὸ ἀποστελλόμενον ὑπὸ τινος τοῦτο⁴⁴ ἕτερόν ἐστιν τοῦ ἐξαποστέλλοντος. τίς οὖν ἂν εἴη ἡ ὀργή⁴⁵ ἡ ἀποστελλομένη ἐπὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἢ, ὡς ἐδιδάξαμεν⁴⁶ ἐκ τῆς | πρώτης τῶν Παραλειπομένων⁴⁷ ὁ διάβολος; εἰ τοίνυν παραδίδοσθαι⁴⁸ τῇ ὀργῇ⁴⁹ τοῦ θεοῦ λέγονται οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί, νοητέον αὐτοὺς παραδίδοσθαι⁵⁰ τῷ διαβόλῳ, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος τὸν Κορίνθιον καὶ οὗς παρέδωκε τῷ Σατανᾷ, ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημεῖν.⁵¹

ἔχομεν⁵² καὶ ἀγγέλους ἐφορῶντας⁵³ καὶ βοηθοῦντας ἡμῖν εὖ πράττουσι καὶ κρίσις γίνεται καθολικῇ⁵⁴ πρὸς τούτους πάντας, ὡς φησιν.⁵⁵ ἀνάσταθι,⁵⁶ γὰρ φησι,⁵⁶ κρίθητι πρὸς τὰ ὄρη, καὶ ἀκουσάτωσαν οἱ βουνοὶ φωνὴν σου. ἀκούσατε, βουνοί, τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ κυρίου.⁵⁷ καὶ δοκεῖ ἐν τούτοις προστάσσεσθαι⁵⁸ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ κρίνεσθαι μετὰ τῶν

³⁰ Cod. μη ἡμαρτηκότα. The word μή should be deleted, since it runs contrary to the argument, which goes thus: if a man is persuaded to commit sin by a power sent by God, this man will be unfairly punished for the sin he committed.

³¹ καθὼς εἴρηται ('as it has been said'): An implicit reference to Origen, who introduces this exegesis in *Cels*, IV.72 and *commRom*, 5. See texts quoted in [EN XXXe](#).

³² Cod. το ἀναπειθον. Cf. Jer. 36:8. [EN XXXf](#).

³³ Cod. ἡμαρτικοτα.

³⁴ 1 Paralipomenon 21:1.

³⁵ Cod. τὴν.

³⁶ Cod. προσηγορειαν.

³⁷ Cod. παραλειπωμενων.

³⁸ Cod. τῆς τοῦ. The wrath of God (2 Kings 24:1) indicates the devil, not the wrath of the devil. Therefore, I omit τῆς.

³⁹ Cod. ὀνομάσθη.

⁴⁰ Cod. δε.

⁴¹ Cod. κατεμαζευμένης. [EN XXXg](#).

⁴² Cod. αὐτόν.

⁴³ Ex. 15:7, restored. Didymus is the sole Christian author to quote this Scriptural portion. [EN XXXh](#).

⁴⁴ Cod. τοῦτο ἕτερον. I omit τοῦτο. Cf. Origen, *commGen*, PG.12.69.42 (*Philocalia*, 23.14), repeated verbatim by Eusebius, *PE*, 6.1.56: Πᾶν γὰρ τὸ ποιοῦν πρεσβύτερον τοῦ πεποιημένου.

⁴⁵ Reference to Psalm 77:49.

⁴⁶ [EN XXXi](#). This is the person of Theodoret speaking and quoted by Cassian. The expression (ὡς) ἐδιδάξαμεν, although a simple one, appears in only a few authors, with Origen strikingly absent. Galen used it frequently (twenty-nine instances), Alexander of Aphrodisias and Sextus Empiricus only once each. Didymus' extant writings

show the expression only once, yet the verb refers to Paul 'having taught': *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 18 (ὥσπερ ἐδιδάξαμεν). The same goes for Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 1, p. 456 (ὡς ἐδιδάξαμεν). On the other hand, we have three instances in Theodoret, *intProphXII*, PG.81.765.34: Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους προφήτας ἐρμηνεύσαντες ἐδιδάξαμεν. *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.645.1: Καὶ ἡδὴ γὰρ ἐδιδάξαμεν ὡς κριτὴς ἐστὶ δίκαιος. *Ibid*. PG.82.672.23: Οὐδὲν καινὸν ὑμῖν γράφομεν, ἀλλ' ἅπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑμᾶς ἐδιδάξαμεν. Cf. the expression ἐδιδάξαμεν ὡς . . . with [EN Ia](#), where ὡς is shown to be used instead of ὅτι in order to introduce a sentence dependent on a verb suggesting either a declaration, or knowledge of something, or the reproduction of an earlier statement. Cf. [EN Ia](#) and [XXIXh](#).

⁴⁷ Cod. παραλειπωμενων.

⁴⁸ Cod. παραδίδωσθαι.

⁴⁹ Cod. τὴν ὀργήν.

⁵⁰ Cod. παραδίδωσθαι.

⁵¹ 1 Tim. 1:20. See [EN XXXj](#). Theodoret is one of the few authors to put this passage to use, indeed the sole one to do so in a context that is identical with the one of this Scholion. Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.796; see text quoted in [EN XXXi](#).

⁵² Cod. εχόμεν.

⁵³ [EN XXXk](#).

⁵⁴ [EN XXXl](#).

⁵⁵ The verb φησίν, although appearing twice at this point, is not redundant. Cassian actually has in mind Eusebius arguing for 'universal judgement'. Cf. Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.68; 2.7. [EN XXXl](#).

⁵⁶ [EN XXXm](#).

⁵⁷ Micah 6:1.

⁵⁸ Cod. προστασεσθαι.

ἐγκεχειρισμένων τὰ ἀνθρώπων⁵⁹ δυνάμεων,⁶⁰ ἵνα δύνῃται⁶¹ τις παραστήσαι
 270r «εἰ», διὰ τὴν τινος αὐτῶν ἀμέλειαν καὶ παράλειψιν τῶν ἐπιβαλλόντων αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ
 ἀνθρώπων, ἐν ἁμαρτήματι ἢ αἰτία γέγονεν.⁶² | νοήσωμεν⁶³ δὲ τοῦτο χρησάμενοι
 παραδείγματι,» φέρε εἰπεῖν κρίσει λαοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἐπισκόπων καὶ κρίσει υἱῶν μετὰ τοῦ
 πατρὸς καὶ κρίσει μανθανόντων μετὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου, ὅτε ποτὲ μὲν ὁ λαὸς τὴν αἰτίαν
 τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων αὐτοῦ δείξει παρὰ τῶν ἐπισκόπων⁶⁴ γεγονέναι, ποτὲ δὲ ὁ
 ἐπίσκοπος,» παραστήσας⁶⁵ πάντα τὰ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ,» πεποιηκέναι καὶ ἐλλελοιπέναι⁶⁶
 «οὐ»⁶⁷ τῶν ἐπιβαλλόντων σπουδαίῳ ἄρχοντι,» τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ἔνοχον ἀποδείξει τὸν
 λαόν. τὸ δὲ ὅμοιον νόει⁶⁸ καὶ περὶ υἱῶν τὴν παρὰ τοῖς πατράσιν ἀνατροφὴν
 αἰτιωμένων⁶⁹ καὶ περὶ ἑαυτῶν μὲν ἀπολογουμένων, ἀποδεικνύντων δὲ τοὺς πατέρας
 270n αὐτοὺς αἰτίους γεγονέναι τοιούτων πταισμάτων· ὁμοίως δὲ τοῦναντίον τῶν πατέρων
 ἀπολογουμένων ὡς μηδὲν παραλελοιπότων εἰς τὴν κατὰ τὸν θεοῦ λόγον ἀνατροφὴν
 πρὸς τοὺς υἱούς, | τῶν δὲ υἱῶν ἐλεγχόμενων «ὥς»⁷⁰ παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ῥαθυμίαν ἐν
 ἁμαρτήμασι γενομένων. οὐ μακρὰν δὲ τούτων ἐστὶν νοῆσαι καὶ περὶ μαθητῶν καὶ
 διδασκάλων.

⁵⁹ Cod. ἀνθρώπων. An implicit reference to 1 Cor. 6:3, about men who 'shall judge angels', quoted by certain authors (Origen, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Didymus, Theodoret, John Chrysostom, Julian the Arian, Cosmas Indicopleustes, John Philoponus, Procopius of Gaza, Photius). According to these authors, the specific 'angels' suggest 'daemons'. There are only three instances where 'judgement' is taken to point to heavenly powers. The idea comes from Origen, who conceded this by the end of his life (*commMatt*, 10.13), in antithesis to earlier exegeses of his. Cassian, the author of (Pseudo-Didymus) *DT* (*lib.* 2.1–7), 4.5, follows Origen once again. In Didymus there are contradictory statements, but Cyril of Alexandria agrees: *GlaphPent*, PG.69.361. This is all Christian literature had to say with reference to the point made in this Scholion.

⁶⁰ EN XXXo.

⁶¹ Cod. δύνανται.

⁶² Origen is the sole Christian to analyse 'how it is possible' (πῶς γὰρ δύνανται) for angels to be judged by humans (*commMatt*, 10.13). At that point the phraseology of this Scholion is strikingly parallel: ἀγγέλων τῶν μὴ τοιαύτην οἰκονομίαν ἐγκεχειρισμένων. Cf. *Cels*, VIII, 36: βλάπτουσι δαίμονες, μηδεμίαν σατραπείαν ἢ στρατηγίαν ἢ ἐπιτροπὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγκεχειρισμένοι. With regard to the expression ἐγκεχειρισμένοι δυνάμεις, there are only two

authors who used this. Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod, p. 194: ὅπερ ἢ τὸ βούλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ εἴη ἢ θεία δύναμις τοῦτο ἐγκεχειρισμένη. John Chrysostom, *In Heliam et Viduam*, PG.51.337.45–46. αἱ τὰς πύλας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐγκεχειρισμένοι δυνάμεις. It should be remembered that at the time when Chrysostom was ordained a deacon, Didymus was eighty years old. Theodoret at this point employed the same vocabulary and presumably the same text, as both Origen and Didymus, using an analysis of Origen's maturity. This was a usual practice of Theodoret (see Introduction, pp. 34; 50). For instance, Theodoret's comment on 1 Cor. 4:16 (*Int Paul XIV*, PG.82.260) is nothing more than a verbatim quotation from Origen (*Catena in Epistola lavre i ad Corinthios*, p. 87).

⁶³ Cod. νοήσωμεν.

⁶⁴ Cod. ἐπισκοπον.

⁶⁵ Cod. παραστήσας.

⁶⁶ EN XXXp.

⁶⁷ Cod. τι.

⁶⁸ EN XXXq.

⁶⁹ Cod. αἰτιομένων.

⁷⁰ I have added ὥς. Cf. above, ἀπολογουμένων ὥς. Normally in such usage, ὥς denotes the subjectivity of the argument set forth: 'according to the viewpoint of parents'.

Scholion XXX

It is possible to confirm from the scriptures that, on account of [the notion of] *the body* of God, there are certain holy powers, such as the ministering *hands* and overseeing *eyes* and *ears* assigned with listening to prayers, and *feet* which punish, thus realising the providence of God upon those who dwell on earth.

Since then he is going to refer to the great **wrath of God**,¹ it is not an accidental passion which is called by the expression the **wrath of God**,² since this is extraneous to Him, yet it is put to use for those people who need it. Once they become unworthy of God, they are handed over to [this wrath], so that they come to crave God whom they previously despised, namely,

¹ That is, to Rev. 6:16.

² Since the author promised to establish his propositions 'from scripture' (ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν), he makes the distinction between the 'wrath of God' mentioned in Rev. 6:16 and that mentioned at other points of the scripture and is 'accidental and external' to God. Cf.

John 3:36; Rom. 1:18; 2:5; 3:5; Eph. 5:6; Col. 3:6. In the OT, cf. Ex. 32:11; 2 Paralipomenon (Chronicles 2) 25:15; 28:9; 29:10; Esdras i (*liber apocryphus*), 8:21; Esdras ii (*Ezra et Nehemias in textu Masoretico*), 7:23; 10:14; Psalms 77:31; Baruch 4:9; 4:25.

when they came to be subjugated by the power of evil. As a matter of fact, the devil is the **wrath of God**.

For indeed in 2 Kings it has been said, *And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and He moved David against them saying, Go, number Israel and Judah.*³ It is then *the anger of the Lord* that *moved David*, since the one that was *saying* was not ‘she’ [viz. λέγουσα], but ‘he’ [viz. λέγων].⁴ Therefore, besides God, who is recounted to have said so many things to the saints, there is his *wrath*, a different factor, which therewith says these things and bids people to commit sin. Punishment by God ensues upon anyone who has acquiesced in the *wrath* that has said such things. How is it possible for [the power] that punishes for sin (and indeed punishes rightly) to stimulate one to commit sin, so that, after [this power] has persuaded one to commit sin, it subsequently punishes him justly? For indeed it is unjust for the cause of sin to inflict punishment upon the one who sinned. As it has been said, however, the devil is the **wrath of God**, who seduces [people] to sin and seeks to make the sinner his subject as a result of sin. Accordingly, the writer of 1 Paralipomenon writes at the point where he recounts the same accusation against David: *And the devil intruded into Israel and moved David to number the Israelite people.*⁵ Both books, 2 Kings and 1 Paralipomenon, used the same word, namely, *moved*: the former did so referring to *the wrath of the Lord*, the second referring to *the devil*. If the action of ‘moving’ is the cause of sin, and the devil is the cause of sin, it follows that both appellations point to the devil: one of them is the hackneyed appellation, the other is the one that eludes most people, which designates him as **the wrath of God** and can be found in the great Ode, which at another point says, *thou sentest forth thy wrath, which consumed them as stubble*,⁶ and so on. For indeed anything that *is sent* by someone, is distinct from the one *who sends* it. What else, therefore, could the *wrath*⁷ sent to the Egyptians be other than the *devil* himself, as we have already taught apropos of 1 Paralipomenon? If therefore the sinners are said to be delivered unto the **wrath of God**, one should understand from this that they have been delivered unto the devil, which also Paul did with the Corinthian man and the others, whom he *delivered unto Satan*⁸ *that they may learn not to blaspheme*.⁹

We also have overseeing angels who contribute to our well-being, and who are all subject to universal Judgement, too, as [the Book of Revelation] says.¹⁰ For indeed [the prophet Micah also] says, *Arise, contend thou before the mountains, and let the hills hear thy voice. Hear ye, O mountains, the Lord’s judgement.*¹¹ By this, the word of God seems to decree that human affairs should be judged along with the [angelic] powers, which are assigned with overseeing human affairs.¹² This, in order that one may have a chance of showing whether one fell into a certain sin or accusation¹³ because of some one of these angels having neglected or omitted any of the duties assigned to him for the sake of men. We can comprehend this by using, for instance, the example of the people criticizing bishops, or of sons [criticizing] their own father, or pupils [criticising] their teacher. The case may be either that, on certain occasions, people

³ 2 Kings (2 Samuel, in Masoretic text), 24:1.

⁴ In this scriptural passage, δργή (wrath) is a feminine noun, but ‘saying’ (λέγων) is a masculine participle. Therefore, it was not the ‘wrath’ of God speaking, but a certain masculine subject, namely the devil.

⁵ 1 Paralipomenon 21:1.

⁶ Ex. 15:7.

⁷ Ref. to Psalm 77:49.

⁸ 1 Cor. 5:5.

⁹ 1 Tim. 1:20.

¹⁰ Who is he who says so? The Logos of God right from the start of the Book of Revelation. The writer of the Book is bidden ‘to write unto’ (Rev. 2:1) the ‘angels of the seven churches’ (Rev. 1:20); each one of them is held responsible for the iniquities taking place within his domain. Thus, the Logos judges the conduct of angels, too, since ‘he was bidden’ to do so, according to this reading of Micah 6:1.

¹¹ Micah 6:1.

¹² This is the fundamental idea of Origen: judgement encompasses rational creatures of all ranks of being. Cf. *COT*, pp. 296–309. *PHE*, pp. 207–223.

¹³ αἰτίαι: Cf. Matt. 27:37; Mark 15:26.

will lay the responsibility for their sins at the door of their bishops, or, on other occasions, the bishop will show that it is the people who are responsible for all transgressions committed, by showing that he [*viz.* the bishop] himself met all the terms of his duties and neglected nothing of the obligations befitting a conscientious ruler. In like manner you should understand the case of sons who blame the education they received from their fathers, and defend themselves by showing that it is their fathers who are responsible for their mistakes. Likewise, one could see the situation reversed, namely, fathers arguing that there is nothing they neglected during the upbringing of their sons according to the teaching of God, subsequently censuring these sons for falling into sin out of their own indolence. By the same token, with regard to pupils and teachers, it is possible to understand the arguments by both sides, which are not too different from the foregoing ones.

271r

271v

<XXXI. Rev. 6:9> καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν πέμπτην¹ σφραγίδα, ἴδον ὑποκάτω² τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφραγισμένων³ διὰ τῶν⁴ λόγων⁵ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τοῦ ἀρνίου, ἣν εἶχον.⁶ <6:10> καὶ ἔκραζον⁷ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγοντες· ἕως πότε, ὁ δεσπότης ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἀληθινὸς οὐ κρίνεις⁸ καὶ ἐκδικεῖς τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν κατοικούντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; <6:11> καὶ ἐδόθη⁹ αὐτοῖς¹⁰ στολὴ λευκὴ καὶ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς ἀναπαύσασθαι μικρόν,¹¹ ἕως πληρώσωσιν¹² καὶ οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν καὶ¹³ οἱ μέλλοντες ἀποκτείνεσθαι¹⁴ ὡς καὶ αὐτοί. <6:12> καὶ ἴδον, ὅτε ἤνοιξεν¹⁵ τὴν σφραγίδα τὴν ἕκτην, καὶ σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἐγένετο μέλας | ὡς σάκκος τρίχινος, καὶ ἡ σελήνη ὅλη ἐγένετο¹⁶ ὡς αἷμα, <6:13> καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔπεσαν εἰς τὴν γῆν ὡς συκὴ βάλλουσα¹⁷ τοὺς ὀλύνθους αὐτῆς, ὑπὸ ἀνέμου μεγάλου σειομένη.¹⁸ <6:14> καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπεχωρίσθη ὡς βιβλίον ἐλισσόμενον. καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ νῆσος ἐκ τῶν τόπων αὐτῶν ἐκινήθησαν.¹⁹ <6:15> καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς²⁰ τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ μεγιστᾶνες, καὶ οἱ χιλιάρχοι²¹ καὶ οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ ἰσχυροί, καὶ πᾶς δοῦλος καὶ ἐλεύθερος ἔκρυσαν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὰ σπήλαια καὶ εἰς τὰς πέτρας τῶν ὀρέων, <6:16> καὶ λέγουσιν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ ταῖς πέτραις· πέσατε²² ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ κρύψατε²³ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ²⁴ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου· <6:17> ἦλθεν ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τίς δύναται σταθῆναι;²⁵ <7:1> μετὰ²⁶ τοῦτο εἶδον τέσσαρας ἀγγέλους, ἑστῶτας ἐπὶ τὰς τέσσαρας γωνίας²⁷ τῆς γῆς,

¹ In the left margin, the letter E added by the scribe notifies the reader that the 'fifth seal' is being revealed.

² 2329: ἴδον ὑποκατο.

³ 2329, O., Ar. τῶν ἐσφραγισμένων. An. τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἐσφραγισμένων.

⁴ Cod. τῶν.

⁵ Cod. λόγων.

⁶ 2329, N.-A. διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἣν εἶχον. An.(S). διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἣν εἶχον. An.(M), Ar. καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τοῦ ἀρνίου ἣν εἶχον. O. καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἣν εἶχον. Adding τοῦ ἀρνίου is peculiar to 2351, 1611^c, versions of K, and the *versio Harclensis*.

⁷ 2329, Ar., N.-A. ἔκραξαν. An., O. ἔκραζον.

⁸ 2329: κρίνῃς καὶ ἐκδικήσεις. N.-A. do not consider the use of the verb ἐκδικήσεις, which is unique.

⁹ Cod. ἐδόθη. 2329: ἐδόθη.

¹⁰ 2329, An., O., N.-A. ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἑκάστῳ. Ar. ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς.

¹¹ 2329: ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται τινὰ χρόνον μικρόν (Cod. ἀναπαύσονται). An., Ar., N.-A. ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται ἔτι χρόνον μικρόν. O. ἵνα ἀναπαύσονται ἔτι μικρόν χρόνον. Ar. ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται ἔτι χρόνον, which is the reading of K.

¹² 2329: ἕως ἂν πληρώσουσιν. O. ἕως πληρώσωσι. An. ἕως οὐ πληρώσωσι. Ar. ἕως πληρώσονται.

¹³ καὶ is added in 2351 and K.

¹⁴ Cod. ἀποκτενεσθαι. 2329: ἀποκτενεσθαι. An., Ar. ἀποκτείνεσθαι. O., N.-A. ἀποκτείνεσθαι.

¹⁵ 2329: ἴδον καὶ ἤνοιξεν. O., Ar., N.-A. εἶδον ὅτε ἤνοιξε. An. εἶδον, καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξε.

¹⁶ 2329, An. ἡ σελήνη ἐγένετο. O., Ar., N.-A. ἡ σελήνη ὅλη ἐγένετο.

¹⁷ 2329: ἀποβαλλούσα (intending ἀποβαλοῦσα). An., Ar., N.-A. βάλλει. O. βάλλουσα.

¹⁸ 2329: σιωμενη.

¹⁹ Cod. ἐκείνηθησαν. 2329: ἐκείνηθησαν.

²⁰ 2329: οἱ βασιλεῖς. O., An., Ar., N.-A. καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς.

²¹ 2329: χειλιάρχιοι.

²² 2329: πέσατε. An., Ar., O., N.-A. πέσετε.

²³ 2329: καλυψατε (a unique reading). O. An., Ar., N.-A. κρύψατε.

²⁴ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ for ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, in 2351 and K only.

²⁵ An., N.-A. σταθῆναι. O. στήναι. Ar. σωθῆναι.

²⁶ 2329: καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο. O., Ar., N.-A. μετὰ τοῦτο. An. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα.

²⁷ Cod. γωνίας. 2329: γονίας.

κρατοῦντας τοὺς τέσσαρας ἀνέμους τῆς γῆς, ἵνα μὴ πνέῃ·²⁸ ὁ ἄνεμος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μήτε ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης,²⁹ μήτε ἐπὶ τι³⁰ δένδρον.³¹ <7:2> καὶ ἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα³² ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου, ἔχοντα³³ σφραγῖδα³⁴ θεοῦ ζώντος· καὶ ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ τοῖς τέσσαρσιν ἀγγέλοις, οἷς ἐδόθη³⁵ αὐτοῖς ἀδικῆσαι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν· <7:3> λέγων· μὴ ἀδικήσητε³⁶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, μήτε³⁷ τὰ δένδρα, ἄχρις οὗ³⁸ σφραγίσωμεν³⁹ τοὺς δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων⁴⁰ αὐτῶν. <7:4> καὶ ἤκουσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐσφραγισμένων·⁴¹ «ἐκατὸν» σαράντα⁴² τέσσαρες χιλιάδες⁴³ ἐσφραγισμένων⁴⁴ ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ· <7:5> ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰουδα δώδεκα χιλιάδες ἐσφραγισμένοι, ἐκ φυλῆς Ρουβὴν⁴⁵ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Γὰδ δώδεκα χιλιάδες,⁴⁶ | <7:6> ἐκ φυλῆς Νεφθαλεὶμ⁴⁷ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Μανασσῆ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, <7:7> ἐκ φυλῆς Συμεὼν δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Λευὶ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰσασάχαρ⁴⁸ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, <7:8> ἐκ φυλῆς Ζαβουλὼν δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰωσήφ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμὴν⁴⁹ δώδεκα χιλιάδες ἐσφραγισμένοι.⁵⁰

²⁸ Cod. πνεει. 2329: ἵνα μὴ γένηται (a unique reading).

²⁹ 2329: ἐπὶ θαλάσσης. O., An., Ar., N.-A. ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης.

³⁰ An. ἐπὶ πᾶν. O., Ar. ἐπὶ τι.

³¹ ἐπὶ τι for ἐπὶ πᾶν, in C, 046, 1006, 1841, 2053, K, and Sahidic versions. 2329: ἐπὶ δένδρον. O., Ar. ἐπὶ τι δένδρον. An., N.-A. ἐπὶ πᾶν δένδρον.

³² Cod. ἀναβενοντα.

³³ 2329: ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἦν ἔχων (a unique reading not considered by N.-A.). O., An., Ar., N.-A. ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου ἔχοντα.

³⁴ Cod. σφραγηδα.

³⁵ Cod. ἐδόθη. 2329: ἐδόθη (om. αὐτοῖς).

³⁶ 2329: ἀδικήσηται. The text goes μὴ ἀδικήσητε τὴν θάλασσαν (i.e. τὴν γῆν καὶ om. – not considered by N.-A.).

³⁷ 2329: μηδε. O., An., Ar., N.-A. μήτε.

³⁸ ἄχρις οὗ for ἄχρι, in 1611, 1854, 2329, 2351, and K. Once again, Arethas follows, employing ἄχρις οὗ.

³⁹ 2329: σφραγισωμεν.

⁴⁰ Cod. μετοπων. 2329: μετοπων.

⁴¹ Cod. ἐσφραγισμένω.

⁴² 2329: ρκδ'. The term σαράντα for τεσσαράκοντα has come to be a modern Greek form. However, in Late Antiquity it appears in only one work which is hard to date, and its vocabulary seems to be very late: *Historia Alexandri Magni*, Recensio F (Cod. Flor. Laurentianus Ashburn 1444), 11.5; 11.7; 23.2; 30.5; 42.1; 120.1. Likewise, *ibid.* Recensio E (Cod. Eton College 163) (seven instances); Recensio V (Cod. Vind. theol. gr. 244) (five instances); Recensio K (Cod. 236 Kutlumussiou-Kloster of Athos, eight instances), rescensio F (three instances), Rescensio R (*rescensio poetica*, four instances). What remains as a definite usage during the first millennium is the one by a seventh-century bishop, who was an iconographer and ecclesiastical author, namely, Leontius of Cyprus, *Vita Sancti Symeonis*, p. 87, line 11: σαράντα ἡμέρας ἐβράχυσαν.

⁴³ 2329: χειλιαδες.

⁴⁴ ἐσφραγισμένων for ἐσφραγισμένοι, only in 2351 and versions of K. 2329, An., Ar., N.-A. ἐσφραγισμένοι. O. om.

⁴⁵ 2329: ρουβιν.

⁴⁶ 2329 adds ἐκ φυλῆς Ἀσὴρ δώδεκα χιλιάδες (Cod. ασιρ).

⁴⁷ 2329: νεφθαλημ.

⁴⁸ Cod. ισαχαρ. 2329: ισαχαρ.

⁴⁹ 2329: βενιαμιν.

⁵⁰ Cod. εσφ.

Σκυθρωπῶν μελλόντων¹ ἐπιφέρεισθαι,² ὑπηρετῶν τις ἄγγελος³ θεοῦ φωνεῖ⁴ πρὸς τοὺς ἐγγχειρισθέντας τὰ ἐπίπονα,⁵ τέως μὴ ἐπάγειν αὐτὰ⁶ ἕως **σφραγίδας ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων**⁷ λάβωσιν⁸ **οἱ θεοῦ δοῦλοι**.⁹ ἐντέλλεται τοῦτο αὐτὸ λέξεσιν ἑτέραις, «ὁ φέρεται ἐν Ἰεζεκιήλ τῷ προφῆτῃ· κόπτετε καὶ μὴ φεῖδεσθε¹⁰ τι,¹¹ ἐφ' οἷς δέ ἐστι τὸ σημεῖον, μὴ ἐγγίσητε.¹² μήποτε οὖν,¹³ ἐπεὶ οἱ κολαζόμενοι διὰ ἰδίας ἁμαρτίας τοῦτο πάσχουσιν, τοῖς δικαίοις χαρακτήρ τις σημαίνων τὴν προσ|οῦσαν αὐτοῖς δικαιοσύνην¹⁴ τίθεται ἐπὶ «τοῦ **μετώπου**»,¹⁵ τουτέστιν ἐπὶ τῇ σὺν ἄρετῇ παρρησίᾳ¹⁶ αὐτῶν.» οἱ τοῦ προκειμένου τυχόντες σημείου χάριν ὁμολογοῦντες τῷ δεδωκότι φασίν· *ἐσημειώθη ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου σου, κύριε*.¹⁷ καὶ πάλιν· *δέδωκας τοῖς φοβουμένοις σε σημείωσιν τοῦ φυγεῖν ἀπὸ προσώπου τόξου*.¹⁸

ζητητέον εἰ «δυνατὸν¹⁹ ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα *Ἰσραήλ*»,²⁰ ἔτι ἐν τούτῳ²¹ τοῦ Ἰωάννου τῷ βίῳ περιόντος,²² ἀνδρῶν **παρθένων**²³ τοσαύτας εἶναι χιλιάδας.²⁴ ἐπεὶ

¹ EN XXXIa.

² Cf. Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.22: Ἡμέρας τοῦ Κυρίου λέγει καθ' ἃς ἐπιφέρεται τοῖς ὑπαιτίοις τὰ ἐπίπονα καὶ κολαστικά.

³ EN XXXIb.

⁴ Cod. τῇ θεοῦ φωνῇ. I wrote φωνεῖ. Cf. discussion in EN XXXIb.

⁵ EN XXXIc.

⁶ EN XXXId. Cf. *Scholion VII*: ὡς τὸ τέλος ἐπάγων τοῖς παρ' αὐτοῦ γινομένοις τὸ ὦ εἶναι εἴρηται. καὶ πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος πάλιν οὐ κατὰ χρόνον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ἐπάγων. *Scholion XXVII*: ὁ πᾶς λόγος τῆς προνοίας, καθ' ὃν ἡ κρίσις θεοῦ ἐπάγεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Cf. *Scholion XXXIII*: καὶ διὰ τῶν ἄλλων περιστάσεων τῶν διὰ Χριστόν, ἃς ἐπάγουσιν τοῖς Ἰησοῦ μαθηταῖς οἱ πονηροὶ ἀνθρώποι τε καὶ δαίμονες.

⁷ Cod. μετοπών.

⁸ Cod. λαβουσιν.

⁹ Rev. 7:3; cf. 2:20; 10:7; 11:18; 15:3; 19:5; 22:3; 6.

¹⁰ Cod. διδεσθε.

¹¹ EN XXXIe.

¹² Ezek. 9:5–6. Cod. ἐγγήσητε.

¹³ Origen took up the idiomatic μήποτε οὖν from Alexander of Aphrodisias and used it abundantly. Origen, *commJohn*, XIII: 37.241; 50.334; *homJer*, 9.4; 16.10; 20.3; 20.9; *et passim* (some three dozens of instances). Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, pp. 390; 400; 424; 605; 826; *In Aristotelis Analyticorum Priorum Librum i Commentarium*, p. 209; *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 46. Didymus used it only in three passages. Other Christian authors made almost no use of it. The instances in Proclus, Damascius, and Simplicius are counted in the dozens, whereas John Philoponus used it a fair amount. Interestingly, we come upon this in the monastic text by Barsanuphius and John, *Quaestiones et Responsiones ad Coenobitas*, Epistle 252, line 26. However, as the following discussion will show, this text was taken from Didymus. For if we also take account of the word which follows this expression and examine the phrase μήποτε οὖν, ἐπεὶ, Didymus is found to be the one who used it, along with John Philoponus. Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 160: μήποτε οὖν, ἐπεὶ ἐν πολλαῖς κακοπαθείαις καὶ ἐπιπόνοις ὁ Ἰακώβ γεγέννηται ὡς τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ σύμβολον τῆς ἀθλητικῆς πολιτείας εἶναι.

¹⁴ The expression is characteristic of Cassian the Sabaite. EN XXXIf.

¹⁵ Cod. μετοπου.

¹⁶ EN XXXIg. Cod. ἐπὶ τὴν συναρετὴν παρρησια.

¹⁷ Psalm 4:7.

¹⁸ Cod. τόξον. Psalm 59:6. The scriptural word is in fact ἔδωκας. Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. pp. 134–35: Τοιαύτην τὴν διάνοιαν ὑποβάλλει τὸ ἐν ψαλμοῖς λεγόμενον· Ἐσημειώθη ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου σου, Κύριε', ὅπερ προσώπου φῶς τὸν Υἱὸν ἢ τὰς θείας ἐννοίας λέγων οἰκειῶς ἐρεῖς. Οὕτω γὰρ ἂν καὶ τὸ φυγεῖν ἀπὸ προσώπου τόξου γενήσεται, τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, ὡς εἴρηται, ὑπάρχοντος. Cf. all authors commenting on Psalm 59:6, in EN XXXIh.

¹⁹ Cod. τον. EN XXXIi.

²⁰ 1 Cor. 10:18. Quotation of this expression appears for the first time in Origen, *Cels*, II.1; *Princ*, IV.1.4; IV.3.6; *commJohn*, I.1.7; *frJohn*, XXVII; *frLuc*, 45a; *commMatt*, 10, 18; 11, 17; 17, 5; *frPs*, 35, 13; *selPs*, PG.12.1536.29; *frProv*, PG.13.17.37. He was followed by Eusebius, Didymus, Theodoret, and Cyril of Alexandria. The Cappadocians made almost no use of it, and yet it appears in Pseudo-Basil's *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam* (1.42; 4.133; 14.285), which I maintain to be Cassian's work.

²¹ Cod. τῷ.

²² The expression Ἰωάννην ἔτι περιόντα βίῳ appears in a catena-fragment ascribed to Origen, *frLuc*, 9: Λόγος ἐστὶ παραγραπτέος Ἰωάννην ἔτι περιόντα βίῳ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος τὰ συγγεγραμμένα εὐαγγέλια συναγαγεῖν καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐγκρίναι καὶ ἀποδέξασθαι, ὧν οὐδὲν ἢ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐπιβουλὴ καθήψατο, τὰ δὲ ἀποδέξασθαι καὶ καταργῆσαι, ὅσα μὴ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχόμενα συνέγνω. This extraordinary expression was reproduced by Photius in a fairly similar context: *Bibliotheca*, Codex 229, p. 253b: Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ τοῖς εἰρημένοις Ἐνὼχ καὶ Ἡλίας καὶ ὁ τῆς βροντῆς υἱὸς Ἰωάννης, ἔτι περιόντες ἐν τῷ σώματι. Cf. *Scholion XXV*. A remarkable parallel occurs in Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 36. οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτω τοσοῦτο πλήθος παρθένων ἔτι τοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐν βίῳ ὄντος εἴποι τις ἂν ἐκ τῶν πεπιστευκότων συνῆχθαι, τάχα μηδὲ αὐτῶν τοσοῦτων ὄντων. But in *commZacch*, 1.383, he says: οὐ λυπεῖ ἐκδέξασθαι τὸ ῥητὸν κατὰ πρόχειρον. Ibid. 2.280: τῶν καταλοιπῶν τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν περιόντων εἰσέτι.

²³ Cod. παρθνων (abbreviated, with the θ superscripted). Rev. 14:4.

²⁴ EN XXXIj.

τοίνυν πολὺ τὸ ἀδύνατον ἢ αἰσθητὴ διήγησις ἔχει,²⁵ ἀληθὴ δέ εἰσι²⁶ τὰ ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ ἁγία οὕσῃ,²⁷ ἀνάγκη κατὰ πνευματικὴν²⁸ ἀκολουθίαν²⁹ ἐκλαμβάνειν τὰ προκειμένα.³⁰ ἀκόλουθον γὰρ τὸν ἀληθινὸν Ἰσραὴλ, τὸν οὐκ ἔχοντα δόλον,³¹ εἰς 273r φυλὰς διηρεῖσθαι.³² τούτου οὖν | τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ «εἰ» λέγωμεν³³ πλῆθος ἀνδρῶν **παρθένων** εἶναι, οὐκ ἀδύνατόν τι φαμέν.³⁴ οἱ γὰρ ἐν Χριστῷ³⁵ προσεληλυθότες³⁶ πάντες Ἰουδαῖοι τε καὶ Ἑλλήνες³⁷ συμπληροῦσιν³⁸ τὸ νοητὸν τοῦτο ἔθνος.³⁹ καὶ ἐπεὶ οἱ οὕτως Ἑβραῖοι πολλήν⁴⁰ ἁρμονίαν καὶ συμφωνίαν⁴¹ ἔχουσιν στρεφόμενοι⁴² περὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ καταρτίζεσθαι ἐνὶ νοῷ⁴³ καὶ μὲν γνώμη,⁴⁴ τοσοῦτῳ ἀριθμῷ καὶ ἴσαις διαιρέσεσιν αὐτοῦ ὑπόκεινται.⁴⁵ ἔστι τοίνυν τετράγωνος⁴⁶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς, ἰσάκις⁴⁷ ἴσος κυλισθὲν⁴⁸ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰβ' < > δωδεκάκις γὰρ ἰβ', ρμδ' βεβαίως δὲ στάσεως⁴⁹ σύμβολον τὸ τετράγωνον⁵⁰ σχῆμα φέρει.

²⁵ Cod. φέρει The expression τὸ ἀδύνατον φέρει is a mistake of the scribe. No author ever used such an expression. This should be τὸ ἀδύνατον ἔχει, which is an expression typical of Aristotle and his commentators. This was also used by Didymus, in a context identical with this one. Didymus, *commZacch*, 3.72: Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ τῆς λέξεως ἀδυνάτως ἔχει. Cf. Aristotle, *De Caelo*, 279b24: δυνατόν ἂν ἦν ἄλλως ἔχειν τὸ ἀδύνατον ἄλλως ἔχειν. 279b25–26: εἰ μὲν αἰεὶ οὕτως ἐχόντων καὶ ἀδυνάτων ἄλλως ἔχειν. *Metaphysica*, 1055b4: ἢ γὰρ τὸ ἀδύνατον ὅλως ἔχειν. *Analytica Priora et Posteriora*, 87a7–8: ἢ δ' εἰς τὸ ἀδύνατον ὅδε ἔχει. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 621: ἢ γὰρ τὸ ἀδύνατον ὅλως ἔχειν λέγεται. p. 622: ἢ τὸ ἀδύνατον ἔχειν λέγουσα στέρησις. Themistius, *Analyticorum Posteriorum Paraphrasis*, v. 5,1, p. 10: τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ἀποδεικτικαῖς ἐπιστήμαις τὸ ἀδύνατον ἄλλως ἔχειν. John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Analytica Posteriora Commentaria*, v. 13,3, p. 58: ὅτι μὲν τὸ ἀδύνατον ἄλλως ἔχειν καὶ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον οὕτως ἔχειν ταυτὸν, δηλόν. . . εἰ γὰρ ἀδύνατον ἄλλως ἔχειν τὸ ἐπιστητόν. *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 16, p. 37: διότι πρὸς τῷ ψεύδει καὶ τὸ ἀδύνατον ἔχει. *In Aristotelis Libros de Generatione et Corruptione Commentaria*, v. 14,2, p. 24: οὐ μὴν εἰσάγεται τὸ ἀδύνατον οὕτως ἔχειν. Ibid. v. 14,2, p. 29: οὐκ ἔχει γὰρ ἐπόμενον τὸ ἀδύνατον. Ibid. v. 14,2, p. 73: τὸ μὲν οὖν στιγμὴν ἢ κενὸν ὑποτίθεσθαι προφανὲς ἔχει τὸ ἀδύνατον. Ibid. v. 14,2, p. 92: τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς τῷ ἀτόπῳ καὶ τὸ πλάσματῶδες καὶ τὸ ἀδύνατον ἔχει. Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Quattuor Libros de Caelo Commentaria*, v. 7, p. 688: καίτοι δοκοῦντα λόγον ἔχειν τὸ ἀδύνατον ὡσαύτως συμβήσεται. By the same token, *Dissertatio contra Iudaeos*, 5 (line 155): καὶ τὸ ἀδύνατον ἔχειν δοκοῦντα.

²⁶ Cod. εἶναι.

²⁷ Cod. οὐσα.

²⁸ Cf. Origen, *commJohn*, I.8.44–45: Ταῦτα δὲ ἐξετάζοντες περὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐ μάτην εἰρηκέναι ἡγοῦμεθα, οἷον αἰσθητὸν εὐαγγέλιον νοητοῦ καὶ πνευματικοῦ τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ διακρίνοντες. Καὶ γὰρ νῦν πρόκειται τὸ αἰσθητὸν εὐαγγέλιον μεταλαβεῖν εἰς πνευματικόν· τίς γὰρ ἡ διήγησις τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ, εἰ μὴ μεταλαμβάνοιτο εἰς πνευματικόν; *Cels*, VI.51: Νῦν δὲ διηγῆσθαι τὸν περὶ νοητῶν καὶ αἰσθητῶν λόγον.

²⁹ Cod. ἀκολουθίαν.

³⁰ Cf. *Scholion XIV*: ἐπειδὴ δὲ περὶ πνευματικῶν ὁ λόγος ἄνωτέρω, χωρητέον ἄνω. Cf. Didymus: *commZacch*, 1.324: Ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἀδύνατον καθ' ἱστορίαν οὕτω τὰς ἡμέρας κολοβοῦσθαι, ἀνακτέον τὸ εὐαγγελικόν. *EN XXXIk*.

³¹ John 1:47. *EN XXXII*.

³² The division of the 'people of God' (Hosea, 2:23) into 'tribes', now denoting Christians, is an exegesis produced by Origen in his opening of *commJohn* (I.1.1–8). He mentions a certain 'proof' which he had furnished 'earlier': according to that, the 144,000 of those 'sealed' from 'all the tribes of Israel' (Rev.7:4–8) are the same as the 144,000 'virgins' 'who were not defiled with women' (Rev. 14:3):

Ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ 'ἀπὸ φυλῶν' εἰ οἱ αὐτοὶ εἰσι τοῖς 'παρθένοις', ὥς προαπεδείξαμεν. *commJohn* I.1.7. However, the text expounding Origen's argument identifying the two gatherings of 144,000 saints is not extant. Oecumenius (p. 160) dismissed this identification of the two gatherings. Andreas (p. 341) agrees with Oecumenius and uses the same argument, and so does Arethas (p. 684).

³³ Cod. λέγωμεν. I have added εἰ.

³⁴ Cf. Origen making this point: *commJohn*, I.1.6–7 and *frLuc*, 45a.

³⁵ Cod. ἐν Χριστῷ. I have omitted ἐν, since this preposition at this point is simply a mistake.

³⁶ Cod. προσεληλυθωτες.

³⁷ Cf. 1 Cor. 12:13. The two tribes of people that make up the nation of the spiritual Israel: Christians are now 'the people of God'. In *Scholion XXIX*, these two categories are indicated by means of the distinction between a *people* and a *nation*.

³⁸ Cod. συμπληρουσαι.

³⁹ *EN XXXIm*.

⁴⁰ Cod. πολλή.

⁴¹ *EN XXXIn*.

⁴² This is a pun on the verb στρέφεσθαι, which may mean (among other senses) either 'revolve', or 'circle', or 'be always engaged in or about'. Christians are engaged with each other, since they are all committed to serving a common cause and a common (orthodox) doctrine.

⁴³ Cod. νοεῖ.

⁴⁴ 1 Cor. 1:10.

⁴⁵ Cod. ὑποκειται. Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1199 (*commPs* 135:13–15): Οὐκ εἰς μίαν διαίρεσιν ἀλλ' εἰς πλείονας καταδιέλεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῷ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἐπὶ ξηρὰς βαδίζοντα ἐξαχθῆναι ἐκ μέσου αὐτῆς ὑπὸ θεοῦ. παραδέδοται δὲ εἰς δώδεκα διαιρέσεις ἐπὶ τῷ δώδεκα διόδους εἶναι, ὅπως ἐκάστη τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ φυλὴ ἰδίαν διάβασιν ἔχουσα διέλθοι.

⁴⁶ Cod. τετράγωνος. *EN XXXIo*.

⁴⁷ Cod. ἰσάκεισ. *EN XXXIp*.

⁴⁸ Cod. κυλισθῆς. *EN XXXIq*. Cf. discussion in *Scholion XXXVI*, about the notion of 'wheel' after Psalm 76:19. This 'rolling' is explained by Didymus himself. The act of multiplying the number twelve by itself is an intellectual one. The reflecting mind acts like a rolling 'wheel' or a 'circle': *commEccl*(7–8.8), Cod. p. 225: ὁ νοῦς δὲ οὐ λοξῶς οὐδὲ εἰς εὐθείαν χωρεῖ, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἑαυτὸν στρέφεται. αὐτίκα γοῦν καὶ τινες τῶν ἔξω εἰρηκάσιν, ὅτι αἱ νοήσεις ὥσπερ τροχοὶ εἰσιν καὶ κύκλοι στρεφόμενοι. ὅταν γὰρ ὁ νοῦς περὶ τὰ ἔξω τεῖνῃ ἑαυτὸν καὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν θέλῃ φαντασίαν δέχεσθαι, οὐκ ἔστιν περὶ ἑαυτὸν, οὐ στρέφεται περὶ ἑαυτὸν. ὅταν δὲ νοῦς καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἐπιστάνῃ, αὐτὸς ἔστιν καὶ τὸ νοοῦν καὶ τὸ νοούμενον. ὁ γὰρ κατ' ἐνέργειαν νοῦς αἰεὶ τὸ νοεῖν ἔχει, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε χεῖται ἐπὶ τὰ ἔξω. He refers to Aristotle, *De Anima*, 407a.

⁴⁹ *EN XXXIr*.

⁵⁰ Cod. τετράγωνον.

Since punishments were about to be inflicted, a ministering angel of God enjoins those assigned with inflicting the suffering not to carry out this task until **the servants of God have their foreheads sealed**.¹ In the prophet Ezekiel [God] bids the same thing in different words: *smite ye and have no pity; but come not near any man upon whom is the mark*.² Since then those who are punished incur this punishment as a result of their sins, one should examine whether there is a certain mark put upon the **forehead** of the righteous, which indicates the righteousness existing in them, that is, they can speak to God freely and confidently due to their virtue. Those who have received this mark say in gratitude to the Giver, *the light of thy countenance has been marked upon us*,³ and again, *thou hast given a mark to them that fear thee, that they may escape any [hostile] bow*.⁴

One should inquire whether it is possible for so many thousands of **virgin** men physically originating in the Israelite race still to exist during the time of John still being alive. Since therefore the narration, if taken literally, is quite impossible, and since everything contained in the Bible is true, since it is holy, it is needful to interpret these statements in a spiritual [*viz.* allegorical] manner. It is then reasonable for the *real* Israel, *in whom there is no guile*,⁵ to have been divided into tribes. Consequently, if we assert that in this [*real*] Israel there is a multitude of **virgin** men, we do not assert something that is impossible. For all those who came to Christ, both *Jews* and *Greek*,⁶ make up this allegorically understood ‘nation’. Since those who are ‘Jews’ of this kind stand in much harmony and agreement with each other, and move around each other by way of being *joined together in the same mind and in the same judgement*,⁷ they can be designated through this number, while they are assigned to equal divisions of it.⁸ As a matter of fact, this number is a square one, since it is produced from the number twelve having been rotated around itself twelve times. For twelve by twelve makes the number one hundred and forty-four, and the square is positively a symbol betokening steadfastness.

¹ Rev. 7:3; Cf. 2:20; 10:7; 11:18; 15:3; 19:5; 22:3; 6.

² Ezek. 9:5–6.

³ Psalm 4:7.

⁴ Psalm 59:6.

⁵ John 1:47.

⁶ Cf. 1 Cor. 12:13.

⁷ 1 Cor. 1:10.

⁸ That is, the number 144, which contains 12 times the number 12.

SCHOLION XXXII

AB

273v

<XXXII. Rev. 7:9¹> μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄχλος πολὺς, ὃν ἀριθμῆσαι αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς¹ ἠδύνατο, ἐκ παντὸς ἔθνους καὶ φυλῶν² καὶ λαῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν, ἐστῶτας³ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρ|νίου,

¹ 2329, O., Ar. ἀριθμῆσαι οὐδεὶς. An., N.-A. ἀριθμῆσαι αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς.

² 2329: καὶ φυλῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν καὶ λαῶν πολλῶν. O. καὶ φυλῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν καὶ λαῶν. An., Ar., N.-A. καὶ φυλῶν καὶ λαῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν.

³ 2329, Ar. ἐστῶτας. An., N.-A. ἐστῶτες.

«Σχόλιον λβ»

Παρακατιῶν¹ λέγει ταύτας² ρμδ' χιλιάδας παρθένους.³ καὶ ἐὰν λαμβάνης φυλάς⁴ ταύτας τὰς σωματικὰς ὥς⁵ λεγομένας⁶ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, ποῦ παρθένος, ποῦ ἰβ' χιλιάδας παρθενίας⁷ εὔροις ἂν κατὰ φυλὴν; ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦτο εὐρίσκωμεν,⁸ παρθενίαν ἐξηλωμένην,⁹ διδάξαντος αὐτὴν τοῦ Ἀλόγου¹⁰ οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν¹¹ οὐδὲ ἵνα βρόχον ἐπιβάλῃ¹² τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, ἀλλ' αὐθαίρετον¹³ ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ ἀγαλλιάσει,¹⁴ καθὼς γέγραπται. οὗτοι οὖν εἰσιν οἱ μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν, ὥς εἴρηται παρθένοι γὰρ εἰσιν· καὶ οὐχ εὐρέθη ψεῦδος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν.¹⁵

¹ Cod. παρακατιῶν. EN XXXIIa. The participle παρακατιῶν suggests that the author refers also to Rev. 14:3–4, which 'at a subsequent point' mentions the 'virgin' men, while at present he canvasses the expression 'huge crowd' (ὄχλος πολὺς) of Rev. 7:9. Didymus had made an extensive analysis of this in *commZacch*, 3.66–73 (styling the author of Revelation the 'beloved pupil of Jesus': τοῦ ἡγαπημένου ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαθητοῦ). Cf. Scholion XXXI, n. 22. Cassian now draws on this specific analysis by Didymus. This Scholion is a supplementary comment, relevant to the second part of Scholion XXXI. The text of Revelation about 'the virgin men' is actually attached to Scholion XXXIX, which is a passage from Irenaeus. See discussion at the end of Scholion XXXVIII.

² He refers to the tribes (ταύτας, viz. τὰς φυλάς) comprising 144,000 virgins.

³ Cod. παρθινους (abbreviated, with the θ superscript).

⁴ Rev. 7:4; Cf. 5:9.

⁵ Cod. ας.

⁶ EN XXXIIb.

⁷ Cod. παρθενίας. Only a few authors had a comment on Jews not recognizing virginity as a virtue. Cf. Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.804.52–54: Τὴν δὲ παρθενίαν οὐτε Ἕλληνας ἥσκουν, οὐτε Ἰουδαῖοι μετέθεσαν· εὐλογίαν γὰρ τὴν παιδοποιίαν ἐνόμιζον. Theodotus of Ancyra (bishop, fourth–fifth cent.), *In Jesu Christi Diem Natalem*, 4: Οὐδὲ γοῦν παρὰ Ἰουδαίους παρθένο τις ἦν,

οὐδὲ παρ' Ἑλλήσι παρθενία ἐτετίμητο. John Chrysostom, *De Virginitatis Integritate*, 1: Ὅτι τῶν αἵρετικῶν ἡ παρθενία μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχει. Τὸ τῆς παρθενίας καλὸν ἀποστρέφονται μὲν Ἰουδαῖοι. Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 160: παρθενία γὰρ οὐ πάντῃ παρὰ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐσπουδάζετο, ὥσπερ ἀμέλει παρὰ τῶν ἐξ ἔθνων ὕστερον. A later brother of Cassian the Sabaite, who also lived in the Laura of Sabas, made the same rare comment: Antiochus of Palestine (or Antiochus of Ancyra), *Pandecta Scripturae Sanctae*, Homily 21: Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ μέχρι τῆς σήμερον παρθενίαν μὲν οὐτε μετέρχονται, οὐτε ἀσπάζονται. The person of Antiochus, the Sabaite monk, is discussed in RCR, chapter 1, pp. 86f. In Appendix I of the same book, also the extensive texts which Antiochus copied from Cassian (without naming his predecessor) are quoted in full. They are printed side by side with the respective original texts of Cassian.

⁸ Cod. εὐρίσκωμεν.

⁹ Cod. ἐξηλωμένην. EN XXXIIc.

¹⁰ Cod. λόγου.

¹¹ Cod. ἐπιταγὴν. Cf. 1 Cor. 7:6; 2 Cor. 8:8.

¹² Cf. 1 Cor. 7:35. Cf. EN Vc.

¹³ Cod. αυθερετον.

¹⁴ Psalm 44:16. EN XXXIId. Cf. Psalms 99:2; 104:43.

¹⁵ Rev. 14:4–5.

Scholion XXXII

At a subsequent point,¹ he states that they [viz. the tribes] comprise a hundred and forty-four thousand **virgin** [men]. If by **tribes**² you were taking the physical ones³ which belong to the

¹ Pointing to Rev. 14:4.

² Rev. 7:4; Cf. 5:9.

³ Contrasting the material tribes of the historical Israel with those of the 'allegorized Israel', viz. the Church.

[literal] Israel, where could you possibly find any virgin at all, let alone twelve thousand **virgins** per tribe?⁴ However, we find this [reality of virgin] within the Church, since yearning for celibacy is a teaching taught by the Logos himself. [This is pursued], as it is written, neither *by commandment*,⁵ nor in order *to cast any snare upon*⁶ those who hear, but [is] chosen by free will *with gladness and rejoicing*.⁷ **These are indeed they who were not defiled with women,** as has been said; **for they are virgins, and in their mouth was found no guile.**⁸

⁴ The author is aware that Israel did not maintain celibacy as an ideal.

⁵ Cf. 1 Cor. 7:6; 2 Cor. 8:8.

⁶ Cf. 1 Cor. 7:35.

⁷ Psalm 44:16; Cf. Psalms 99:2; 104:43.

⁸ Rev. 14:4–5.

ΛΓ

274r

<XXXIII. Rev. 7:9²> περιβεβλημένοι¹ στολᾶς λευκάς, καὶ φοίνικας² ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν <7:10> καὶ κράζουσι³ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγοντες· ἡ σωτηρία τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ⁴ τῷ ἁρνίῳ.⁵ | <7:11> καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι εἰστήκεισαν⁶ κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων, καὶ ἔπασαν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ,⁷ <7:12> λέγοντες· ἁμήν· ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστεία⁸ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἁμήν·⁹ <7:13¹> καὶ ἀπεκρίθη εἰς ἓκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, λέγων μοι·

¹ 2329: καὶ περιβεβλημένοι. O., An. καὶ περιβεβλημένοι. An. περιβεβλημένοι. Ar., N.-A. περιβεβλημένους.

² φοίνικας for φοίνικες, in **X***, 2351, and versions of K only. Cod. φυνικας.

³ 2329: ἔκραζαν. O., AN. κράζουσι. N.-A. κράζουσιν. Ar. κράζοντες.

⁴ 2329: ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἁρνίῳ. O. ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου. An., Ar., N.-A. 2329: ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῷ ἁρνίῳ.

⁵ O. τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου. An. τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, καὶ τῷ ἁρνίῳ. Ar. τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῷ ἁρνίῳ.

⁶ Cod. ἰστεικισαν. 2329: ἰστικισαν. O. καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οἱ ἄγιοι ἐστήκασιν. An., Ar. καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι εἰστήκεισαν.

⁷ 2329: τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῷ ἁρνίῳ· ἡ εὐλογία. O. τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ἁμήν. An., Ar., N.-A. τῷ θεῷ λέγοντες· ἁμήν· ἡ εὐλογία.

⁸ Cod. ευχαριστεια. See footnote 35 to the text of Revelation attached to **Scholion XXVI** (Rev. 4:9).

⁹ O. καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἁμήν. An. καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ λέγοντες· ἁμήν· ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστεία· καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἁμήν. Ar. καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ λέγοντες· ἁμήν· ἡ εὐλογία, καὶ ἡ δόξα, καὶ ἡ σοφία, καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστεία, καὶ ἡ τιμὴ, καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἁμήν. N.-A. prints the same text as 2351.

Ἐσχόλιον λγ'

EP

274v

Αὐταὶ αἱ λευκαὶ στολαὶ δύνανται δηλοῖν¹ τὰς ἀχράντους προθέσεις καὶ πράξεις αὐτῶν· πρὸς ταῖς λευκαῖς στολαῖς, ἅς² εἰσιν περιβεβλημένοι, φοίνικας³ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν κατέχουσιν, σύμβολον τῆς νίκης,⁴ ἧς⁵ νενικήκασιν τὸν κόσμον.⁶ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης θλίψεως⁷ ἐρχόμενοι⁸ διὰ μαρτυρίου καὶ ὁμολογίας,⁹ δῆλον ὅτι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων περιστάσεων τῶν διὰ Χριστόν,¹⁰ ἃς | ἐπάγουσι¹¹ τοῖς Ἰησοῦ μαθηταῖς οἱ πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι τε καὶ δαίμονες,¹² λευκάναντες καὶ πλύναντες, ἃς περικέινται στολᾶς τῷ

¹ There are only two instances where this contracted form of the specific infinitive occurs, which is correctly reproduced in the Codex. Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 306: διαφόρους μονὰς τὰς παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ δηλοῖν τὰ πληθυντικῶς. The other instance is in *Vitae Aesopi*, Vita G (e Cod. 397 Bibliothecae Pierponti Morgan) (*recensio* 3), section 4· ὁ Αἴσωπος . . . θεοσεβῆς ὑπάρχων προσεκύνησεν καὶ ἤρξατο διανεύειν καὶ δηλοῖν. The present comment was mainly written by Cassian, yet this infinitive form used by Didymus was in his mind.

² Cod. αἱ.

³ Cod. φυνικας.

⁴ Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 913: ὅθεν καὶ ἡ νύμφη ἡ ταῦτα λέγουσα, οὐκ ἄλλῃ τοῦ ἀνθοῦντος κατὰ τὸν φοίνικα δικαίου τυγχάνουσα, φησὶν· Ὅμοιωθήσομαι τῷ φοίνικι. ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ φοίνικος κάλλυνθρα κοσμητήρια τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν κλάδων τῶν φοινίκων γινόμενα λαμβάνων τις ἄγει τὴν τῆς σκηνοπηγίας ἐορτήν, καὶ τὰ σύμβολα δὲ τῆς νίκης ἐκ τούτου οἱ νικηταὶ φέρονται. **EN XXXIIIa.**

⁵ Cod. ἧσ.

⁶ Cf. John 16:33.

⁷ Cod. θληψεως.

⁸ Cf. Rev. 7:14.

⁹ **EN XXXIIIb.**

¹⁰ The expression περίστασις ὑπὸ πονηροῦ ἐπαγομένη is characteristic of Didymus and exclusive to him. *commJob*(5.1–6.29), Cod. pp. 148: διὰ περιστάσεως τινος ὑπὸ πνεύματος πονηροῦ ἐπαγομένης. Cf. a unique parallel for περιστάσεων τῶν διὰ Χριστόν in Severianus of Gabala, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 283: τῷ δημοσιεύοντι ἡμῶν τὰς ὕβρεις καὶ τὰς περιστάσεις τὰς διὰ Χριστόν. **EN XXXIIIc.**

¹¹ Cf. **Scholion VII**: ὡς τὸ τέλος ἐπάγων τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῦ γινομένους τὸ ω εἶναι εἴρηται. καὶ πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος πάλιν οὐ κατὰ χρόνον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ἐπάγων. **Scholion XXVII**: ὁ πᾶς λόγος τῆς προνοίας, καθὼν ἡ κρίσις θεοῦ ἐπάγεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. **Scholion XXXI**: τῶς μὴ ἐπάγειν αὐτά.

¹² **EN XXXIIId.**

αἵματι τοῦ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν σφαγέντος¹³ ἀρνίου.¹⁴ ὅπως δὲ οἱ ἄνθρωποι νοήσωμεν τὸ ἀδιάστατον¹⁵ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτῶν, ὡνομάσθη¹⁶ ὁ παρ' ἡμῖν χρόνος¹⁷ τεμνόμενος εἰς ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα.¹⁸

¹³ Rev. 5:6 and 12; 13:8.

¹⁴ Rev. 7:14.

¹⁵ EN XXXIIIe.

¹⁶ Cod. ὀνομάσθη.

¹⁷ 'The time perceived by *our* condition'. The notion of relativity in the conception of time, as treated by Origen, appears here. Cf. COT, pp. 259–60.

¹⁸ Rev. 7:15. EN XXXIII f.

Scholion XXXIII

Those **white robes** may indicate their undefiled objectives and actions. Besides the **white robes**, which they are **clothed in**, they bear **palms in their hands** as a symbol of the victory by which they *have overcome the world*.¹ **Those are those who came out of great tribulation**,² through martyrdom and profession [of faith], and clearly also through other hardships for the sake of Christ, which are inflicted upon the disciples of Jesus by both evil men and daemons. They now stand **having washed their robes**, which they wear, **and made them white and pure in the blood of the Lamb**,³ which was slain⁴ for their sake. Furthermore, in order that we humans apprehend the incessancy of their service [in God's temple],⁵ their condition is illustrated after our time, which is divided into **day and night**.⁶

¹ Cf. John 16:33.

² Cf. Rev. 7:14.

³ Rev. 7:14.

⁴ Rev. 5:6 and 12; 13:8.

⁵ Rev. 7:15.

⁶ Rev. 7:15: 'Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple.' But is it possible to speak of *night* in the temple of God? The day/night-metaphor is central to the Scholia. In IX, the 'present age' is styled 'a night', and people are divided into two categories: the saved will see the Day of the Lord

(see PHE, pp. 294–308) whereas those damned will experience 'night-time'. In XVIII, all those who can say, *the night is far spent, the day is at hand* (Rom. 13:12) and *I myself will awake early* (Psalms 56:9; 107:3) are illuminated by the Sun of Righteousness. Since 'night' is associated with the present fallen state, the author feels it necessary to say a few words about the 'night' appearing in Rev. 7:15. Hence his final comment: there is not night actually; the expression 'day and night', indicates only the *unfailing constancy* of the service offered by the saved ministering in the temple of God.

SCHOLION XXXIV

275r <XXXIV. Rev. 7:13²> οὗτοι οἱ περιβεβλημένοι τὰς στολὰς τὰς λευκάς¹ τίνες εἰσὶν καὶ πόθεν ἦλθον; <7:14> καὶ εἶρηκα αὐτῷ² κύριέ μου, σὺ οἶδας· καὶ εἶπεν μοι· οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι ἐκ τῆς θλῖψεως³ τῆς μεγάλης καὶ ἔπλυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν⁴ ἐν⁵ τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἁρνίου. <7:15> διὰ τοῦτό εἰσιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ λατρεύουσιν αὐτῷ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ⁶ καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ⁷ σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτούς· <7:16> οὐ πᾶν⁸ νάσουσι⁸ ἔτι οὐδὲ μὴ διψήσουσιν ἔτι, οὐδ' οὐ μὴ⁹ πέση¹⁰ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὁ ἥλιος οὐδὲ πᾶν καύμα· <7:17> ὅτι τὸ ἁρνίον τὸ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ θρόνου ποιμαίνει¹¹ αὐτοὺς καὶ ὁδηγεῖ¹² αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ ζωῆς πηγᾶς¹³ ὕδατων καὶ ἐξαλείψει¹⁴ ὁ θεὸς πᾶν δάκρυον ἀπὸ¹⁵ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. <8:1> καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγιδα¹⁶ τὴν ἐβδόμην, ἐγένετο σὺγῆ¹⁷ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὡς ἡμῶριον, <8:2> καὶ ἶδον τοὺς¹⁸ ἑπτὰ ἁγγέλους, οἱ ἐνώπιον¹⁹ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστήκασιν, καὶ ἐδόθησαν²⁰ αὐτοῖς ἑπτὰ σάλπιγγες. <8:3> καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἐξῆλθεν²¹ καὶ ἐστάθη ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου²² ἔχων λιβανῶ²³ τὸν²³ χρυσοῦν, καὶ ἐδόθη²⁴ αὐτῷ θυμιάματα πολλὰ, ἵνα δώσῃ²⁵ ταῖς προσευχαῖς πάντων τῶν ἁγίων²⁶ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν τὸ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου. <8:4> καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ καπνὸς τῶν θυμιαμάτων ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ ἁγγέλου | ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. <8:5> καὶ εἴληφεν ὁ ἄγγελος τὸν λιβανωτὸν²⁷ καὶ ἐγέμυσεν²⁸ αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ ἔβαλεν

275v

- ¹ 2329: τὰς λευκάς στολάς. O., An., Ar., N.-A. τὰς στολὰς τὰς λευκάς.
- ² 2329, Ar. εἶπον. O., An., N.-A. εἶρηκα.
- ³ Cod. θληψεως.
- ⁴ ἐλεύκαναν for ἐλεύκαναν αὐτάς, only in 2351 and versions of K (Arethas follows once again). 2329, O. ἐπλάτυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν αὐτάς. An., N.-A. ἔπλυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν αὐτάς. Ar. ἔπλυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν.
- ⁵ 2329: ἐπι (not considered by N.-A.). O., An., Ar.N.-A. ἐν.
- ⁶ 2329: καὶ νυκτὸς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (not considered by N.-A.). O., N.-A. καὶ νυκτὸς ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ.
- ⁷ τῷ θρόνῳ for τοῦ θρόνου, in 1854, 2053, 2351, and versions of K. Arethas and Oecumenius follow: τῷ θρόνῳ. 2329, An., Ar. τοῦ θρόνου.
- ⁸ Cod. πινάσουσιν. 2329, O., An., Ar. πινάσουσιν.
- ⁹ οὐδ' οὐ for οὐδέ, in 052, 2329, 2351, and versions of K only. The author at this point has οὐδ' οὐ μή, which appears at some characteristic points of the New Testament (Matt. 24:21; Heb. 15:5) and of the Septuagint: Deut. 10:17; 13:9; 15:7; 28:65; Job 7:10; Amos 9:10; Zephaniah 1:12; Isaiah 7:12; 65:17; Daniel (*translatio Graeca*), 4:32. O., An.(S), N.-A. οὐδὲ μή. Ar. οὐδ' οὐ μή. An.(M) οὐδ' οὐ μή.
- ¹⁰ 2329: πεσεῖται.
- ¹¹ ποιμαίνει for ποιμανεῖ and ὁδηγεῖ for ὁδηγήσει occurs only in 2351, versions of K, and some Bohairic versions. Cod. ποιμενεῖ. 2329, O., An, Ar. ποιμανεῖ.
- ¹² Cod. οδηγη. 2329: ὁδηγήσει.
- ¹³ O., Ar. ἐπὶ ζωῆς πηγᾶς. An. ἐπὶ ζώσας πηγᾶς.
- ¹⁴ Cod. εξαληψη.
- ¹⁵ ἀπὸ for ἐκ, only in K, 1854, 2053, and 2351. 2329, An.(S), Ar. ἐκ. O., An.(M), ἀπό.
- ¹⁶ Cod. σφραγηδα. 2329: σφραγηδα.
- ¹⁷ Cod. σηγη.
- ¹⁸ 2329: τοὺς om. (not considered by N.-A.).
- ¹⁹ 2329: ἐνοπιον.
- ²⁰ 2329: ἐδόθησαν.
- ²¹ 2329: καὶ ἄλλος ἦλθεν.
- ²² 2329, O., An. τὸ θυσιαστήριον. Ar. τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.
- ²³ Cod. λιβανοτον. 2329: λιβανοτον.
- ²⁴ 2329: ἐδόθη.
- ²⁵ Cod. δοση.
- ²⁶ 2329, An., Ar, N.-A. τῶν ἁγίων πάντων.
- ²⁷ 2329: λιβανοτόν.
- ²⁸ Cod. εγεμησεν. 2329: εγεμησεν.

276r

276v

εἰς τὴν γῆν. καὶ ἐγένοντο βρονταὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ σεισμοί.²⁹ «8:6» καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ ἄγγελοι ἔχοντες³⁰ τὰς ἑπτὰ σάλπιγγας, ἠτοίμασαν αὐτοὺς³¹ ἵνα σαλπίσωσιν.³² «8:7» καὶ ὁ πρῶτος³³ ἐσάλπισεν,³⁴ καὶ ἐγένετο χάλαζα καὶ πῦρ μεμιγμένα ἐν αἵματι καὶ ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν. καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς κατεκάη,³⁵ καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν δένδρων κατεκάη,³⁶ καὶ πᾶς χόρτος χλωρός³⁷ κατεκάη.³⁸ «8:8» καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν,³⁹ καὶ ὡς ὄρος μέγα πυρὶ⁴⁰ καίόμενον ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ τρίτον τῆς θαλάσσης αἷμα, «8:9» καὶ ἀπέθανεν τὸ τρίτον τῶν κτισμάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ, τὰ ἔχοντα ψυχάς, καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν πλοίων⁴¹ διεφθάρη.⁴² «8:10» καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν,⁴³ | καὶ ἔπescen ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀστὴρ μέγας καίόμενος ὡς⁴⁴ λαμπάς, καὶ ἔπescen ἐπὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ποταμῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων. «8:11» καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀστέρος λέγεται ὁ⁴⁵ Ἄψινθος. καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ τρίτον μέρος τῶν ὑδάτων⁴⁶ εἰς ἄψινθον,⁴⁷ καὶ πολλοὺς⁴⁸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπέθανον ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων ὅτι ἐπικράνθησαν. «8:12» καὶ ὁ τέταρτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν,⁴⁹ καὶ ἐπλήγη τὸ τρίτον τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς σελήνης καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων, ἵνα σκοτισθῇ τὸ τρίτον αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ τρίτον αὐτῆς μὴ φάνη ἡμέρα,⁵⁰ καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα μὴ φάνη⁵¹ τὸ τρίτον αὐτῆς,⁵² καὶ ἡ νύξ ὁμοίως. «8:13» καὶ ἴδον καὶ ἤκουσα⁵³ ἑνὸς ἀετοῦ πετομένου ἐν μεσουρανήματι,⁵⁴ λέγοντος φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· οὐαί, οὐαί, οὐαί,⁵⁵ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν⁵⁶ φωνῶν τῆς σάλπιγγος τῶν τριῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν | μελλόντων σαλπίζειν. «9:1» καὶ ὁ πέμπτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ἴδον ἀστέρα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεπτωκότα⁵⁷ εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἐδόθη⁵⁸ αὐτῷ ἡ κλεῖς τοῦ

²⁹ 2329, O. βρονταὶ καὶ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ σεισμός. O., An., φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ σεισμός. Ar. βρονταὶ καὶ ἀστραπαὶ. N.-A. βρονταὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ σεισμός.

³⁰ 2329, An., Ar., N.-A. οἱ ἔχοντες. O. ἔχοντες.

³¹ 2329, O., An., Ar. ἐαυτοῦς. N.-A. αὐτοῦς.

³² Cod. σαλπησωσιν. 2329: σαλπισουσιν. O., Ar. σαλπίσωσιν. An., N.-A. σαλπίσωσιν.

³³ 2329. An. ὁ πρῶτος ἄγγελος. O., Ar., N.-A. ὁ πρῶτος.

³⁴ Cod. εσαλπησε.

³⁵ Cod. κατεκαει. 2329: κατεκαει.

³⁶ Cod. κατεκαει. 2329: κατεκαει.

³⁷ Cod. χλορος. 2329: χλορος.

³⁸ Cod. κατεκαει. 2329: κατεκαει.

³⁹ Cod. εσαλπησε.

⁴⁰ 2329: ὡς ὄρος πυρὶ (not considered by N.-A.). O., An., Ar. ὡς ὄρος μέγα πυρὶ.

⁴¹ Cod. πλοίων.

⁴² Cod. διεφθαρει. 2329, O., An., N.-A. διεφθάρησαν. Ar. διεφθάρη.

⁴³ Cod. εσαλπησεν.

⁴⁴ 2329: ὥσπερ (not considered by N.-A.). O., An., Ar., N.-A. ὡς.

⁴⁵ 2329, O., An. λέγεται Ἄψινθος. Ar., N.-A. λέγεται ὁ Ἄψινθος.

⁴⁶ 2329, O., An., Ar., N.-A., τὸ τρίτον τῶν ὑδάτων. N.-A. did not consider the 2351 version, τὸ τρίτον μέρος τῶν ὑδάτων.

⁴⁷ O., N.-A. ἄψινθος . . . εἰς ἄψινθον. Av. ἀψίνθιος . . . εἰς ἄψινθον. Ar. ἄψινθος . . . εἰς ἀψίνθιον.

⁴⁸ Cod. πολλοί.

⁴⁹ Cod. εσαλπησεν.

⁵⁰ This sequence for ἡ ἡμέρα μὴ φάνη τὸ τρίτον αὐτῆς, in 046, 2351, and versions of K only.

⁵¹ 2329: φανει.

⁵² Evidently, the scribe wrote the same phrase twice.

⁵³ O., Ar. καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἤκουσα. Av. καὶ ἤκουσα.

⁵⁴ Cod. μεσουρανίματι. 2329: ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (not considered by N.-A.). O.(H). μεσουρανίματι. O.(G), An., Ar. ἐν μεσουρανίματι.

⁵⁵ 2329: οὐαὶ bis.

⁵⁶ 2329: πολλῶν (a unique version not considered by N.-A.).

⁵⁷ 2329: ἀστέρης πεπτωκότας (not considered by N.-A.).

⁵⁸ 2329: ἐδόθη.

277r

277v

φρέατος⁵⁹ τῆς ἀβύσσου·» 9:2 καὶ ἦν·ουξεν⁶⁰ τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ἀβύσσου, καὶ ἀνέβη καπνὸς ἐκ τοῦ φρέατος ὡς καπνὸς καμίνου καιομένης⁶¹ καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ὁ ἄηρ ἐκ τοῦ καπνοῦ τοῦ φρέατος. 9:3 καὶ ἐκ τοῦ καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ἀκρίδες εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἐδόθη⁶² αὐταῖς⁶³ ἐξουσία⁶⁴ ὡς ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ σκορπίοι τῆς γῆς, 9:4 καὶ ἐρρέθη αὐταῖς ἵνα μὴ ἀδικήσουσιν⁶⁵ τὸν χόρτον τῆς γῆς οὐδὲ πᾶν χλωρὸν⁶⁶ οὐδὲ πᾶν δένδρον, εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔχουσι τὴν σφραγῖδα⁶⁷ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων⁶⁸ αὐτῶν. 9:5 καὶ ἐδόθη⁶⁹ αὐταῖς,⁷⁰ ἵνα⁷¹ μὴ ἀποκτείνωσιν⁷² αὐτούς, ἀλλ' ἵνα βασανισθῶσιν⁷³ μῆνας | πέντε. καὶ ὁ βασανισμὸς αὐτῶν ὡς βασανισμὸς σκορπίου, ὅταν παύσῃ⁷⁴ ἄνθρωπον. 9:6 καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ζητήσουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὸν θάνατον καὶ οὐχ⁷⁵ εὕρήσουσιν⁷⁶ αὐτόν· καὶ ἐπιθυμήσουσιν ἀποθανεῖν, καὶ φεύξεται⁷⁷ ὁ θάνατος ἀπ' αὐτῶν. 9:7 καὶ τὰ ὁμοιώματα τῶν ἀκριδῶν ὁμοίωμα⁷⁸ ἵπποις ἡτοιμασμένοις εἰς πόλεμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν ὁμοίωμα ὡς στέφανοι χρυσοὶ ὅμοιοι χρυσῷ⁷⁹ καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ὡς πρόσωπα ἀνθρώπων, 9:8 καὶ εἶχον⁸⁰ ὡς τρίχας γυναικῶν, καὶ οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτῶν ὡς λεόντων ἦσαν· 9:9 καὶ εἶχον⁸¹ θώρακας ὡς θώρακας σιδηροῦς· καὶ ἡ φωνὴ τῶν πτερυγῶν αὐτῶν ὡς φωνὴ ἁρμάτων ἵπων πολλῶν τρεχόντων εἰς πόλεμον. 9:10 καὶ ἔχουσιν⁸² οὐρὰς ὁμοίας σκορπίοις καὶ κέντρα· καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς | αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν⁸³ ἀδικῆσαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μῆνας πέντε. 9:11 καὶ ἔχουσιν⁸⁴ βασιλέα ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς ἀβύσσου· ὄνομα αὐτοῦ⁸⁵ Ἑβραϊστὶ⁸⁶ Ἀβαδδὼν, ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ⁸⁷ ὄνομα ἔχει Ἀπολλύων. 9:12 ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ μία

⁵⁹ 2329: κλειῖσις τοῦ φρεατος.

⁶⁰ Cod. ηνυξεν.

⁶¹ Cod. καιομένης. The participle καιομένης is added in 2351, versions of K, and the *versio Harclensis* only.

2329, An., N.-A. καμίνου μεγάλης. O. καμίνου μεγάλης καιομένης. Ar. καμίνου καιομένης.

⁶² Cod. εδωθη.

⁶³ 2329: εδωθη αυτοις.

⁶⁴ Cod. εξουσιαν.

⁶⁵ 2329: ἀδικήσουσιν.

⁶⁶ Cod. χλορον. 2329: χλορον.

⁶⁷ Cod. σφραγηδα.

⁶⁸ Cod. μετοπων. 2329: μετοπων.

⁶⁹ Cod. εδωθη. 2329: εδωθη.

⁷⁰ 2329, An., Ar. αὐταῖς (2329 not considered by N.-A.). O., N.-A. αὐτοῖς.

⁷¹ 2329: αὐταῖς ἐξουσία ἵνα.

⁷² Cod. αποκτινωσιν.

⁷³ 2329, O., An.(S), N.-A. βασανισθήσονται. An.(M), Ar. βασανισθῶσι.

⁷⁴ Cod. πεση. 2329: πεσει.

⁷⁵ 2329, An.(M), Ar., N.-A. οὐ μὴ εὕρήσουσιν. O., An.(S) οὐ μὴ εὕρωσιν.

⁷⁶ 2329: ευρισουσιν.

⁷⁷ φεύξεται for φεύγει, only in 1854, 2329, 2351, versions of K, the Vulgate, and Bohairic versions.

⁷⁸ 2329, O., An., Ar. ὅμοια.

⁷⁹ 2329, O., An., N.-A. στέφανοι ὅμοιοι χρυσῷ. Ar. στέφανοι χρυσοῖ. This reading of 2351 ὁμοίωμα ὡς στέφανοι χρυσοῖ ὅμοιοι χρυσῷ is unique.

⁸⁰ Cod. ἦχον.

⁸¹ Cod. ηχον. 2329: ἦχον.

⁸² 2329: ηχον (intending εἶχον).

⁸³ So O. 2329: αὐτῶν ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσαι τοῦ ἀδικῆσαι. Ar. αὐτῶν ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσιν ἀδικῆσαι. An. κέντρα καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν. καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἀδικῆσαι. N.-A. καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἀδικῆσαι.

⁸⁴ 2329: ἔχουσι δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῶν. An., O.(H), N.-A. ἔχουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῶν. O.(M) ἔχουσιν ἀπ' αὐτῶν. Ar. ἔχουσαι βασιλέα ἐπ' αὐτῶν.

⁸⁵ 2329: αὐτό.

⁸⁶ Cod. εβραϊστη.

⁸⁷ Cod. ελληνικη. 2329: ἑλληνικῇ γλώσσῃ.

ἀπῆλθεν· ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται⁸⁸ ἔτι⁸⁹ δύο οὐαί.⁹⁰ μετὰ ταῦτα <9:13> καὶ ὁ ἕκτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ἤκουσα μίαν φωνὴν⁹¹ ἐκ τῶν κεράτων τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ χρυσοῦ, τοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ· <9:14> λέγοντος τῷ ἕκτῳ ἀγγέλῳ· ὁ ἔχων⁹² τὴν σάλπιγγα, λῦσον τοὺς τέσσαρας ἄγγέλους τοὺς δεδεμένους ἐπὶ τῷ ποταμῷ⁹³ τῷ μεγάλῳ Εὐφράτῃ. <9:15> καὶ ἐλύθησαν οἱ τέσσαρες ἄγγελοι οἱ ἡτοιμασμένοι εἰς τὴν ὥραν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν⁹⁴ καὶ μῆνα καὶ ἑνιαυτόν, ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν⁹⁵ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων. <9:16> καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν στρατευμάτων τοῦ ἱππικοῦ δισμυριάδες μυριάδων⁹⁶ | ἤκουσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν⁹⁷ αὐτῶν. <9:17> καὶ οὕτως εἶδον⁹⁸ τοὺς ἵππους⁹⁹ ἐν τῇ ὁράσει, καὶ τοὺς καθημένους ἐπ’ αὐτῶν ἔχοντας θώρακας πυρίνους καὶ ὑακινθίνους¹⁰⁰ καὶ θειώδεις.¹⁰¹ καὶ αἱ κεφαλαὶ τῶν ἵππων ὡς κεφαλὰι λέοντων,¹⁰² καὶ ἐκ τῶν στομάτων αὐτῶν ἐκπορεύεται πῦρ καὶ καπνὸς καὶ θεῖον.¹⁰³ <9:18> ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν πληγῶν τούτων, ἀπεκτάνθησαν τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς τοῦ καπνοῦ καὶ τοῦ θείου¹⁰⁴ τοῦ ἐκπορευομένου ἐκ τῶν στομάτων αὐτῶν· <9:19> ἡ γὰρ ἐξουσία τῶν ἵππων ἐν τῷ¹⁰⁵ στόματι αὐτῶν ἐστὶ καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν. αἱ γὰρ οὐραὶ αὐτῶν ὅμοιαι ὄφεσιν ἔχουσαι κεφαλὰς, καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς ἀδικοῦσι.

⁸⁸ 2329: ἔρχονται.

⁸⁹ 2329: ἔρχονται ἔτι (intending ἔτι).

⁹⁰ 2329: αἱ οὐαὶ αἱ δύο. O. ἔτι δύο οὐαὶ. An., Ar., N.-A. δύο οὐαὶ μετὰ ταῦτα.

⁹¹ 2329: ἤκουσα φωνῆς ἑνὸς ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων κεράτων. O. ἤκουσα φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐκ τῶν κεράτων.

An.(S), Ar., N.-A. ἤκουσα φωνὴν μίαν ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων κεράτων. An.(M). φωνῆς μιᾶς.

⁹² So O., An., 2329: τῷ ἔχοντι τὴν σάλπιγγα. Ar. ὃς εἶχε τὴν σάλπιγγα.

⁹³ So O., An., Ar., N.-A. 2329: ἐπὶ ποταμῷ (not considered by N.-A.).

⁹⁴ καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν for καὶ ἡμέραν is exclusive to 2351 and versions of K. 2329, O., An. καὶ ἡμέραν. Arethas follows 2351 once again: καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν.

⁹⁵ 2329: ἀποκτινώσι.

⁹⁶ 2329: μύρια δις (Cod. δεισ) μυριάδων. O., An. μυριάδες μυριάδων. Ar. δύο μυριάδες μυριάδων. N.-A. δισμυριάδες μυριάδων.

⁹⁷ 2329: τῶν ἀριθμῶν.

⁹⁸ So O., An., Ar. 2329: καὶ ἴδον.

⁹⁹ Cod. ἱππικους.

¹⁰⁰ Cod. υακινθινους.

¹⁰¹ 2329: θιωδεις.

¹⁰² 2329: λεωντων.

¹⁰³ 2329: θιον.

¹⁰⁴ 2329: θιου.

¹⁰⁵ 2329: το.

ᾠχόλιον λδ’

EP 278v Ἐπίστησον, εἰ¹ αἱ πλυθεῖσαι καὶ λευκανθεῖσαι στολαὶ τῶν ἐκ μεγάλης θλίψεως² ἀναβεβηκότων³ εἶναι δύναται·⁴ τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν, ἥδη προτεθεωρημένα⁵ ὡς ἀνίστανται ἄφθαρτα⁶ καὶ πνευματικά.⁷

¹ EN XVIa. Cf. Scholion XVI: Ἐπίστησον, μὴ ἐφαρμόζειτὸ ὄνομα τῆς Ἰεζάβελ. Scholion XIX: ἐπίστησον, μὴ τὰ ζ πνεύματα αἱ μετουσίαι τοῦ πνεύματος εἰσιν.

² Cod. θληψεως. Rev. 7:14.

³ EN XXXIVa.

⁴ Cod. δυνατη.

⁵ EN XXXIVb.

⁶ Cf. 1 Cor. 15:42.

⁷ EN XXXIVc. Cf. 1 Cor. 15:44 and 52.

Scholion XXXIV

You should then examine whether it is possible for **the robes** of those **who came out of great tribulation**,¹ which were **washed and made pure and white**, to betoken their *bodies* being seen in advance [by John] as they are raised up *incorrupt*² and *spiritual*.³

¹ Rev. 7:14.

² Cf. 1 Cor. 15:42.

³ Cf. 1 Cor. 15:44.

ΛΕ

279r

<XXXV. Rev. 9:20> καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οἳ οὐκ ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἐν ταῖς πληγαῖς ταύταις, οὐ¹ μετενόησαν ἐκ τῶν ἔργων τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ προσκυνήσωσι τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ τὰ εἰδωλα τὰ χρύσεα² καὶ τὰ ἀργύρεα³ καὶ τὰ χαλκᾶ καὶ τὰ λίθινα⁴ καὶ τὰ ξύλινα· ἃ οὔτε βλέπειν δύνανται, οὔτε ἀκούειν, οὔτε περιπατεῖν· 9:21> καὶ οὐ μετενόησαν ἐκ τῶν φόνων αὐτῶν, οὔτε ἐκ τῶν φαρμακιῶν⁵ αὐτῶν, οὔτε ἐκ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῶν, οὔτε ἐκ τῶν κλεμμάτων αὐτῶν. 10:1> καὶ ἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἰσχυρὸν καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, περιβεβλημένον νεφέλην, καὶ ἡ ἴρις⁶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὡς στῦλοι⁷ πυρός, 10:2> καὶ ἔχων ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ βιβλαρίδιον⁸ ἀνεωγμένον.⁹ καὶ ἔθηκεν τὸν πόδα αὐτοῦ τὸν δεξιὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης,¹⁰ τὸν δὲ εὐὼνυμον¹¹ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, 10:3¹> καὶ ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὥσπερ λέων μυκάται.¹²

¹ οὐ for οὐδὲ in C, 1006, 1841, 1854, 2351, and versions of K. Arethas once again reads K (οὐδὲ) and so does Oecumenius. An.(S). οὔτε. An.(M). οὐ. 2329: καὶ οὐ.

² A term of the golden age of Greek poetry and prose (Homer, Hesiod, Anacreon, Pindar, Bacchylides, Aeschylus, Euripides, Sophocles, Herodotus et. al.) employed in the translation of Exodus, 32:24. Cf. Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhoniae Hypotyposes*, 2.31. Plutarch, *Timoleon*, 15.11; *Agesilaus*, 11.7; *Aratus*, 19.2; *Artaxerxes*, 5.4; *De Iside et Osiride* (351c–384c), 363A3; *De Tranquillitate Animi*, 472A3; *De Herodoti Malignitate*, 864C4. Lucian of Samosata, *Dialogi Meretricii*, 4.1. Clement of Alexandria also quoted the passage, including this adjective: *Paedagogus*, 3.7.37.4; 3.11.58.3. Also used by Origen (or, probably, the catenist), *frJohn*. XXXII. Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 95. Procopius of Gaza, *Descriptio Imaginis*, 22. Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.276.38. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Hexaemeron*, p. 124. John Chrysostom (every now and then). Theodoret, *Historia Religiosa (Philotheus)*, Vita 9.6; *commIs*, section 2, line 350; *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 147. see below Rev. 9:20. Unlike 2351, 2329 has χρυσᾶ. So do O., An., Ar., employed by N.-A.

³ Cod. ἀργύραια (not used in antiquity). Ἀργύρεα is an adjective appearing in Homer, Pindar, and Herodotus, as well as in Josephus. It was employed by Plutarch, Lucian of Samosata, Olympiodorus, the philosopher of Alexandria, and Eustathius of Thessaloniki. Its use by Didymus is characteristic, since (unlike χρύσεα) no Christian author used the adjective until the seventh century, save Pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Homiliae* 10.8.3. Many of the Pseudo-Clementine writings were composed at the monastery of the Akoimetoι, where Cassian lived for a long time. See, *RCR*, pp. 20; 63; 283; 399; *NDGF*, pp. 302; 306; 383; 523–24. Cf. Herodotus, *Historiae*, 7.112; 119; 190; 9.82; 186. Josephus, *Antiquitas Judaica*, 3.109; 7.108; 8.90; 8.91; 8.92; 11.15; 13.243. Lucian of Samosata, *De Syria Dea*, sections 49 and 60. Didymus, *commEccl*(11–12), Codex pp. 342, 343; *frPs(al)*, fr. 146. Eustathius of Thessaloniki, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, v. 1, pp. 225, 527, 660, 723, v. 3, pp. 138; v. 4, p. 447; *Commentarius in Homeri Odysseam*, v. 1, pp. 74, 75, 154, 155, 241, 364, 384; *De Thessalonica Capta*, p. 126; *Commentarius in Dionysii Periegetae Orbis Descriptionem*, 496. Olympiodorus the philosopher of Alexandria, *In Aristotelis Meteora Commentaria*, p. 105 (bis).

⁴ 2329: λιθηνα.

⁵ Both 2351 and 2329 have it φαρμακιῶν, which was emended by later authors and editors to the more customary φαρμακειῶν. O., An. φαρμακειῶν. Ar. φαρμάκων. Uncommon though it is, φαρμακία is a spelling that occurs in authors relevant to the Scholia, although it was used along with φαρμακειῶν. Cf. Didymus, *commEccl*(5–6), Cod. p. 149 (quot. Gal. 5, 20): ἔρις καὶ φαρμακία καὶ αἰρέσεις. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Illuminandum*, Catechesis 4.37: φαρμακίαν καὶ ἐπαισίαν, καὶ τὰ νεκρομαντεῖων παρανομώτατα πράγματα μηδὲ μέχρις ἀκοῆς παραδέχου. *Didache Apostolorum*, 5.1: εἰδωλολατρίαι, μαγεῖαι, φαρμακίαι.

⁶ Cod. ηρεῖς. A superscript ι by the same scribe emends to ιρεῖς. 2329: εἰρις.

⁷ 2329: εἰστοῖλοι.

⁸ 2329: βιβλάριον. O., An.(S), βιβλιδάριον. An.(M), Ar., N.-A. βιβλαρίδιον.

⁹ 2329: ἠνεωγμένον.

¹⁰ 2329: θαλάσις.

¹¹ Cod. ευονυμον.

¹² 2329: μοικωμενοσ, intending μυκόμενος (not considered by N.-A.). O., Ar., N.-A. μυκάται. An. βρυχᾶται.

EP Κρίνας ὁ θεὸς¹ πληγαῖς ὑποβάλλειν τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς, ἀπειράτους² τῶν **πληγῶν τούτων** ἐνίοις ἀνθρώπους ἐΐασεν³ καὶ τοὺς ἔτι ἐμμένοντας οἷς εἰργάζοντο καὶ ὅσους⁴ ἄγευστοι διὰ τῶν⁵ πληγῶν ἀπελείφθησαν, ἵνα ἔχῃσι μετανοίας τόπον,⁶ ὥστε **μὴ προσκυνεῖν ἔτι τὰ δαιμόνια, τὰ χρύσεα⁷ καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὕλης κατεσκευασμένα ἀγάλματα⁸** δηλοῦντα ὡς προσκυνοῦσι τινὲς **τὰ δαιμόνια τὰ χρυσᾶ καὶ τὰ ἀργύρεα, χάλκεα⁹ τε καὶ ξύλινα**, ἵνα **δαιμόνια** μὲν νοῆται¹⁰ τὰ ἐφεδρεύοντα πνεύματα¹¹ τοῖς ἀψύχοις¹² μορφώμασιν, **χρύσεά¹³** τε καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ μὴ αἰσθανόμενα δι' ὄψεως καὶ | ἀκοῆς, μηδὲ βαδίζοντα,¹⁴ τὰ αἰσθητὰ ἀγάλματα· **στόμα γὰρ ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐ λαλήσουσιν¹⁵** καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν ψαλμοῖς.¹⁶

¹ Cod. θου. See the style of this opening of the Scholion discussed in [EN XXXIa](#).

² [EN XXXVa](#).

³ Cod. ἴασεν.

⁴ Cod. οσοι. This is governed by the preceding verb; thus: εἶασεν . . . τοὺς ἔτι ἐμμένοντας . . . καὶ ὅσους.

⁵ Cod. διετων.

⁶ Cf. God granting μετανοίας τόπον, Wisdom of Solomon 12:10; *a contrario*, Heb. 12:17.

⁷ Cod. χρύσαια. [EN XXXVb](#).

⁸ A clear reference to 2 Maccabees 2:2, also alluding to Isaiah 21:9. Cf. [EN XXXVc](#).

⁹ Cod. χαλκαία.

¹⁰ Cod. νοητε.

¹¹ [EN XXXVd](#).

¹² The following passage (cf. [EN XXVIIe](#)) runs in the same mood; Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.165: Οὐ μόνον τοῦτο οὐκ ἔπραξαν οἱ ἀλάστορες, ἀλλὰ καὶ νῶτα ἔδειξαν τῷ ἐπισκοποῦντι ἀκοιμήτῳ

ὀφθαλμῷ, τὰ ὅλα ὀπίσω τῆς Βαῦλ πορευθέντες καὶ πάσης εἰδωλολατρείας ὡς σέβειν καὶ προσκυνεῖν δαίμονας πονηροῦς, τοὺς τοῖς ἀψύχοις ἀγάλμασιν παριδρυμένους, ἡδομένους κνίσῃ καὶ καπνῷ, ποπάνοις τε καὶ λοιβαῖς, καιομένοις ἐπὶ τοῖς παρὰ νόμῳ καὶ σφόδρα ἀσεβῶς οἰκοδομηθεῖσι βωμοῖς. Cf. the attack on 'idolatry', [Scholion XIII](#); against 'sacrificial meat', [Scholion XVI](#).

¹³ Cod. χρυσαία.

¹⁴ Cf. Rev. 9:20.

¹⁵ Psalms 113:12–15; 134:16–18. Cf. Deut. 32:17; Psalm 95:5; 1 Paralipomenon (Chronicles 1) 16:26; Wisdom of Solomon 15:15–17. Didymus, *commZacch*, 4.287: Δυνατὸν καὶ περὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀφιδρυμάτων καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὰ δαιμόνων εἰρησθαι ἐξολοθρεῦεσθαι αὐτὰ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. Ὅτι δὲ τὰ ἀγάλματα δηλοῦται τῇδε τῇ προσηγορίᾳ, ὑπὸ τοῦ ὑμνωδοῦ μαθεῖν ἔστιν λέγοντος· 'Τὰ εἰδῶλα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον, πόδας ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐ περιπατοῦσιν', καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [EN XXXVc](#).

¹⁶ [EN XXXVe](#).

Scholion XXXV

Once God determined to inflict plagues upon sinners, he left some people unaffected by these plagues. They were either those who persisted in the [depraved] works they committed, or those who had been excused from plagues during the period of infliction, thus allowing *room for repentance*¹ for them, so that they should no longer **worship devils of gold and the statues²** which were made of different materials. These [words] suggest that certain people **worship devils of gold, and silver, and brass, and of wood³**, whereby as 'devils' one should understand the spirits which dwell within the inanimate [sculpted] forms.⁴ These are the perceptible

¹ Cf. Heb. 12:17; Wisdom of Solomon 12:10.

² Cf. Maccabees 2:2; Isaiah 21:9.

³ Rev. 9:20.

⁴ The conjunction ἵνα is used in the peculiar sense of Rev. 9:20 (ἵνα μὴ), which does not introduce any teleological sense. Eccentric though it may seem, ἵνα is used as a copulative conjunction, not as an intentional one.

statues, which are made either of gold or of the rest [of the materials]: they do not have the senses of vision and hearing, and they cannot walk.⁵ For *they have a mouth, but they speak not*,⁶ and the rest as written in the Psalms.

⁵ Cf. Rev. 9:20.

⁶ Psalms 113:13; 134:16.

Λς

280r

<XXXVI. Rev. 10:3²> καὶ ὅτε ἔκραξεν, ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἐπτὰ βρονταὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν φωνάς.¹ <10:4> καὶ ὅτε ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἐπτὰ βρονταί, ἤμελλον² γράφειν· καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσαν· σφράγισον ἃ ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἐπτὰ βρονταί, καὶ μὴ αὐτὰ γράψῃς.³ <10:5> καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος, ὃν ἶδον ἐστῶτα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἦρε⁴ τὴν χειρὰ αὐτοῦ τὴν δεξιὰν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν <10:6> καὶ ὤμοσεν τῷ⁵ ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ὃς ἔκτισεν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ· ὅτι⁶ χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται· <10:7> ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ἐβδόμου ἀγγέλου, ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, καὶ τελεσθῇ⁷ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς εὐηγγελίστατο⁸ | τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ δούλους τοὺς⁹ προφήτας. <10:8> καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἦν¹⁰ ἤκουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πάλιν λαλοῦσα¹¹ μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ λέγουσα· ὕπαγε λάβε τὸ βιβλαρίδιον¹² τὸ ἀνεωγμένον¹³ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ ἐστῶτος ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. <10:9> καὶ ἀπῆλθα¹⁴ πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον λέγων αὐτῷ δοῦναί μοι τὸ βιβλαρίδιον¹⁵. καὶ λέγει μοι· λάβε καὶ κατάφαγε αὐτό,¹⁶ καὶ πικρανεῖ σου τὴν καρδίαν,¹⁷ ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ στόματί σου ἔσται γλυκὺ ὡς μέλι. <10:10> καὶ ἔλαβον τὸ βιβλαρίδιον¹⁸ ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ ἀγγέλου¹⁹ καὶ κατέφαγα

¹ So O., An., Ar., N.-A. But 2329: ταῖς ἑαυτῶν φωναῖς (not considered by N.-A.).

² An., Ar. ἤμελλον. O., N.-A. ἤμελλον. The form ἤμελλον is used by certain authors. The vocabulary of some of them is relevant to that of the Scholia. Hippolytus, *In Daniele*, 2.25.4; 2.33.5; 3.22.3; 4.32.7. Origen, *frJohn*, CXXI (bis); *Homiliae in Lucam*, Homily 21, p. 126; Homily 29, p. 168; *frLuc*, frs. 57: 58b: 59c: 60a: *adnotGen*, PG.17.13; *Homiliae in Job*, PG.17.88, only in a specific MS or the three extant ones (see Bibliography), namely, *Fragmenta in catenis, e codd. Marc. Gr. 21, 538; expProv*, PG.17.192; *commLuc*, PG.17.332. Eusebius, *DE*, 1.2.15 and 16; 3.3.12; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.32; 1.83; *commPs*, PG.23: 265; 500; 641; 656; 660; 680; 681; 765; 837; 860. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Cantorum*, v. 6, p. 292. Didymus, *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 150; *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 267; *frPs(al)*, fr. 1248. John Chrysostom, *Orationes Adversus Judaeos*, PG.48: 866; 901; 913; *In Proditionem Judae*, PG.49: 377; 386; *In Paralyticum per Tectum Demissum*, PG.51.59; *et passim*. Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 122; *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 441. Eustathius of Thessaloniki, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, v. 2, p. 37; *Commentarius in Homeri Odysseam*, v. 1, p. 199. Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, pp. 2064; 2093; 2228; 2281; 2360; 2372; 2573. Theodoret, *Historia Religiosa (Philothus)*, Vita 21.17: *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, pp. 49; 130; 272. Pseudo-Theodoret (or Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, p. 147. However, the Scholion has ἤμελλον.

³ 2329: γραψῇς. O., Ar., N.-A. γράψῃς. An.(S). καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα γράφεις. An.(M). καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα γράψων.

⁴ 2329, N.-A. ἦρεν. O., An., Ar. ἦρε.

⁵ τῷ for ἐν τῷ, also in versions of K. 2329, O., An., Ar. ἐν τῷ.

⁶ O., An., Ar. ὅτι.

⁷ τελεσθῇ, in 1854, 2351, and versions of A. 2329, N.-A. ἐτελέσθη. An. τελεσθῇ. Ar. τελεσθήσεται.

⁸ 2329: ὡς εὐηγγέλισεν intending εὐηγγέλισεν. An.(S)., Ar. ὡς εὐηγγέλησε. An.(M). ὃ εὐηγγελίστατο.

⁹ 2329: καὶ τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ δούλους. N.-A., An.(S). τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ δούλους τοὺς προφήτας. An.(M) τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις τοῖς προφήταις. Ar. τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς προφήταις.

¹⁰ 2329: καὶ φωνὴ ἦν. O. καὶ φωνὴν ἤκουσα. An., N.-A. καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἦν. Ar. ἤκουσα φωνήν.

¹¹ λαλοῦσα, λέγουσα (for λαλοῦσαν, λέγουσαν) only in 2351 and versions of K. 2329: πάλιν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λαλοῦσαν. O., An.(S) ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πάλιν λαλοῦσαν. An.(M)., Ar. λαλοῦσα.

¹² 2329: βιβλαριον intending βιβλαριον. O. βιβλίον. An. βιβλαρίδιον. Ar. βιβλιδάριον. N.-A. βιβλίον.

¹³ 2329, An., N.-A. ἠνεωγμένον. O., Ar. ἀνεωγμένον.

¹⁴ 2329, N.-A. ἀπῆλθα. O., An., Ar. ἀπῆλθον.

¹⁵ 2329: αὐτῷ· δός (Cod. δῶς) μοι τὸ βιβλάριον (Cod. βυβλάριον). Cod. βυβλαριδιον. O. βιβλίον. An.(M). βιβλαρίδιον. An.(S)., Ar. βιβλιδάριον.

¹⁶ 2329: αὐτῷ.

¹⁷ καρδίαν for κοιλίαν occurs in A, 2351, and some marginal notes in MSS of the *versio Harclensis*. 2329, O., An., Ar., N.-A. κοιλίαν.

¹⁸ 2329: βυβλαριον intending βιβλάριον. Cod. βυβλαρυδιον. O. βιβλιδάριον. An., N.-A. βιβλαρίδιον. Ar. βιβλίον.

¹⁹ So. O., An., Ar. But 2329: αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀγγέλου (not considered by N.-A.).

αὐτό,²⁰ καὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ στόματί μου ὡς μέλι γλυκύ· καὶ ὅτε ἔφαγον²¹ αὐτό, ἐπικράνθη ἡ καρδιά²² μου.²³ <10:11> καὶ λέγουσί μοι· δεῖ σε πάλιν προφητεῦσαι ἐπὶ λαοῖς καὶ ἔθνεσι²⁴ καὶ γλώσσαις καὶ βασιλεῦσι πολλοῖς.

280v

<11:1> καὶ ἐδόθη²⁵ μοι κάλαμος ὅμοιος | ῥάβδῳ, καὶ «ἰσθίκει²⁶ ὁ ἄγγελος²⁷ λέγων· ἔγειρε καὶ μέτρησον²⁸ τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας ἐν αὐτῷ, <11:2> καὶ τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν ἔξωθεν²⁹ τοῦ ναοῦ ἔκβαλε ἔξωθεν καὶ μὴ αὐτὴν μετρήσης,³⁰ ὅτι ἐδόθη τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν πατήσουσιν μῆνας τεσσαράκοντα δύο. <11:3> καὶ δώσω τοῖς δυσὶ μάρτυσί μου καὶ προφητεύσουσιν ἡμέρας χιλίας³¹ διακοσίας ἐξήκοντα³² περιβεβλημένοι³³ σάκκους. <11:4> οὗτοί εἰσιν αἱ δύο ἐλαῖαι³⁴ καὶ αἱ δύο λυχνίαι, ἐνώπιον³⁵ τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς ἐστῶτες.³⁶ <11:5> καὶ «εἰ τις³⁷ αὐτοὺς θέλει ἀδικῆσαι, πῦρ ἐκπορεύεται³⁸ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν καὶ κατεσθίει³⁹ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν· καὶ εἰ τις θελήσῃ⁴⁰ αὐτοὺς ἀδικῆσαι,⁴¹ οὕτω δεῖ αὐτὸν ἀποκτανθῆναι. <11:6> οὗτοι ἔχουσι τὴν ἐξουσίαν καὶ κλεῖσαι⁴² τὸν οὐρανόν, ἵνα μὴ ὑετὸς βρέχῃ⁴³ | τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς προφητείας αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσιν⁴⁴ ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων στρέφειν⁴⁵ αὐτὰ εἰς αἷμα καὶ πατάζει τὴν γῆν ἐν πάσῃ πληγῇ, ὅσάκις ἐὰν θέλωσι⁴⁶ <11:7> τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτῶν. τὸ θηρίον τὸ ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου ποιήσει⁴⁷ μετ' αὐτῶν πόλεμον καὶ νικήσει αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀποκτενεῖ αὐτούς. <11:8> καὶ τὸ πτώμα⁴⁸ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῆς πλατείας τῆς πόλεως τῆς μεγάλης ἣτις καλεῖται πνευματικῶς Σόδομα καὶ Αἴγυπτος, ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη. <11:9> καὶ βλέπουσιν⁴⁹ ἐκ τῶν λαῶν καὶ φυλῶν καὶ

281r

²⁰ 2329: κατέφαγα αὐτῷ. O., An, Ar., N.-A. κατέφαγον αὐτό.

²¹ 2329: ἔφαγα.

²² Cod. superscript, κοιλία μου.

²³ 2329: ἐγεμίσθη ἡ κοιλία μου πικρίας. O., An., Ar., N.-A. ἐπικράνθη ἡ κοιλία μου.

²⁴ ἐπὶ ἔθνεσι for ἔθνεσι occurs only in 2351, versions of K, and the *versio Harclensis*. Arethas is here once again: ἐπὶ ἔθνεσι. O., An., N.-A. ἔθνεσι.

²⁵ 2329: ἐδόθη.

²⁶ Cod. ἰσθίκει. 2329: ἰστικει

²⁷ An illuminating supplement to an obvious lacuna, since the participle λέγων alone hardly makes sense. This is found in some manuscripts. Cf. N.-A. p.652.

²⁸ 2329: μετρίσον καλά.

²⁹ 2329: τὴν αὐλὴν ἔσωθεν τοῦ ναοῦ ἔκβαλε ἔξωθεν (intending ἔξωθεν).

³⁰ 2329: μετρίσις. O., ἔκβαλε ἔξωθεν τοῦ ναοῦ· ἔκβαλε καὶ μή. An. ἔξω· καὶ μή. Ar. ἔξω, καὶ μή. N.-A. ἔξωθεν καὶ μή.

³¹ 2329: χειλίας.

³² 2329: ἐξήκοντα.

³³ 2329: περιβεβλημένους. O., An., Ar., N.-A. περιβεβλημένοι.

³⁴ 2329: ἐλαῖε.

³⁵ 2329: ἐνώπιον.

³⁶ O., τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς γῆς ἐστῶσαι. An., Ar. τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς ἐστῶσαι. 2329, N.-A. ἐστῶτες.

³⁷ Cod. ἡτις.

³⁸ 2329, O., An., Ar. ἐκπορεύεται.

³⁹ 2329: κατεσθίει.

⁴⁰ Cod. θελίσσει.

⁴¹ O., Ar. ἀδικῆσαι. An. ἀποκτεῖναι.

⁴² 2329: ἐξουσίαν κλεῖσαι (Cod. κλησαι).

⁴³ 2329: βρέξει.

⁴⁴ So. O., An., Ar., N.-A. But 2329: καὶ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν (not considered by N.-A.).

⁴⁵ 2329: στρέψαι (not considered by N.-A.).

⁴⁶ καὶ ὅταν τελέσωσι is missing. Period ends at αὐτῶν. 2329: θέλωσιν. καὶ ὅταν τελέσωσι τὴν μαρτυρίαν. O., An.(S). θελήσωσιν. καὶ ὅταν τελέσωσι τὴν μαρτυρίαν. . An.(M). θελήσωσι. καὶ ὅτε τελέσωσι τὴν μαρτυρίαν. Ar., θελήσωσι ἐν πάσῃ πληγῇ. καὶ ὅταν τελέσωσι τὴν μαρτυρίαν.

⁴⁷ Cod. ποιήση.

⁴⁸ 2329, An. τὰ πτώματα. O., Ar., N.-A. τὸ πτώμα.

⁴⁹ 2329: βλέπωσιν. O., An., Ar., N.-A. βλέπουσιν.

281v

282r

γλωσσῶν καὶ ἔθνῶν τὸ πτώμα⁵⁰ αὐτῶν ἡμέρας τρεῖς καὶ ἡμισυ, καὶ τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀφήσιν⁵¹ τεθῆναι εἰς μνήμα. <11:10> καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς χαίρουσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς καὶ εὐφραίνονται⁵² καὶ δῶρα πέμπουσιν⁵³ ἀλλήλοις,⁵⁴ ὅτι οὗτοι οἱ δύο προφητὰι ἐβασάνυσαν⁵⁵ τοὺς | κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. <11:11> καὶ μετὰ τὰς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ ἡμισυ,⁵⁶ πνεῦμα ζωῆς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς,⁵⁷ καὶ ἔστησαν⁵⁸ ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν, καὶ φόβος μέγας ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τοὺς θεωροῦντας αὐτούς. <11:12> καὶ ἤκουσα⁵⁹ φωνὴν μεγάλην⁶⁰ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσαν αὐτοῖς· ἀνάβατε⁶¹ ὧδε· καὶ ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐθεώρησαν αὐτοὺς οἱ ἔχθροί αὐτῶν. <11:13> καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ⁶² ἐγένετο σεισμὸς μέγας, καὶ τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως ἔπεσεν, καὶ ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἐν τῷ σεισμῷ ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων χιλιάδες⁶³ ἑπτά. καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἐν φόβῳ⁶⁴ ἐγένοντο⁶⁵ καὶ ἔδωκαν δόξαν τῷ θεῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. <11:14> ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ δευτέρα ἀπῆλθεν· ἰδοὺ, ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ τρίτη ἔρχεται ταχύ. <11:15> καὶ ὁ ἔβδομος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν,⁶⁶ καὶ ἐγένοντο φωναὶ μεγάλαι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ λέγοντες·⁶⁷ ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ <τοῦ> κόσμου⁶⁸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν | καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύσει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. <11:16> καὶ οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ οἱ καθήμενοι ἐπὶ⁶⁹ τοὺς θρόνους αὐτῶν, ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ <11:17> λέγοντες· εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν, ὅτι <εὐλ·η·φας⁷⁰ τὴν δύναμίν⁷¹ σου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐβασίλευσας, <11:18¹> καὶ τὰ ἔθνη <ὠ·ργίσθησαν,⁷²

⁵⁰ 2329, An. τὰ πτώματα. O., Ar., N.-A. τὸ πτώμα.

⁵¹ 2329: ἀφίωσιν (intending ἀφήσιν). O., ἀφήσουσιν. An., Ar. ἀφήσουσι.

⁵² 2329, An.(M), Ar. εὐφρανθήσονται. O., An.(S). εὐφραίνονται.

⁵³ 2329: πέμπουσιν. O., An.(S). πέμπουσιν. An.(M), Ar. δώσουσιν.

⁵⁴ O., N.-A. χαίρουσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς καὶ εὐφραίνονται, καὶ δῶρα πέμπουσιν ἀλλήλοις. An., Ar. χαρήσονται ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται, καὶ δῶρα δώσουσιν.

⁵⁵ Cod. εβασανησαν.

⁵⁶ 2329: τὰς τρεῖς ἡμισυ ἡμέρας. N.-A. did not consider this remarkable τρεῖς ἡμισυ, which occurs in some significant authors, such as Dioscorides Pedanius (or Tarseus, a medical doctor, born in Anazarbon, first cent. AD.), *De Materia Medica*, 1.52.1; 1.54.1. Theodore, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 123 (quoting Josephus). Theodore Anagnostes, *HE*, 3.440, et. al., as well as Arethas in his commentary, quoting Rev. 11:9.

⁵⁷ 2329: O. πνεῦμα ζωῆς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς. O. πνεύματα ζωῆς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσῆλθεν αὐτοῖς. An., Ar. πνεῦμα ζωῆς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς αὐτούς.

⁵⁸ 2329: στήσονται.

⁵⁹ 2329: ἀκούσονται φωνὴν μεγάλην. O. ἤκουσαν φωνὴν μεγάλην. An. ἤκουσα φωνῆς μεγάλης. Ar. ἤκουσα φωνὴν μεγάλην. N.-A. An. ἤκουσαν φωνῆς μεγάλης.

⁶⁰ O., ἤκουσαν φωνὴν μεγάλην. An. ἤκουσα φωνῆς μεγάλης. Ar. ἤκουσα φωνὴν μεγάλην. N.-A. ἤκουσαν φωνῆς μεγάλης.

⁶¹ 2329, N.-A. ἀνάβατε. O., An., Ar. ἀνάβητε.

⁶² So O., An.(S)., N.-A. But 2329, An.(M)., Ar. τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

⁶³ 2329: χιλιάδες.

⁶⁴ 2329, O., N.-A., Ar. ἔμφοβοι.

⁶⁵ O. ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι. An., Ar., N.-A. ἔμφοβοι ἐγένοντο.

⁶⁶ 2329: ἐλάλησεν (not considered by N.-A.).

⁶⁷ 2329, An., Ar. λέγουσαι. O., N.-A. λέγοντες.

⁶⁸ 2329: ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ κόσμου.

⁶⁹ 2329, An.(M)., N.-A. οἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενοι ἐπὶ. O. οἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ κάθονται ἐπὶ. An.(S). ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενοι ἐπὶ. Ar. οἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ οἱ κάθονται ἐπὶ.

⁷⁰ Cod. ηλιφας.

⁷¹ 2329: δυναμην.

⁷² Cod. οργισθησαν. 2329: οργισθησαν.

EP "Οτι οἱ *μεγάλοι λόγοι*¹ σαφηνιζόμενοι **βρονταί** εἰσι τοῖς δικαίοις, καὶ ὁ προφήτης τάχα μὲν δηλοῖ² φάσκων *φωνή τῆς βροντῆς σου ἐν τῷ τροχῷ*.³ ζητήσεις⁴ γὰρ ἐκεῖ *τροχὸν καὶ κύκλον*⁵ καὶ τὸν τροχὸν ἰδὼν ὧσει ἐκεῖ *βροντήν*.⁶ ἐξετάζων δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦς *υἱοὺς τῆς βροντῆς* *Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην*,⁷ οὓς ἐκάλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Βοανεργές*,⁸ ὃ ἐστὶν *υἱοὶ βροντῆς*,⁹ | εὐρήσεις αὐτοὺς εἰκότως *υἱοὺς βροντῆς* κεκλημένους διὰ τὴν μεγαλοφωνίαν⁸ τῶν νοημάτων καὶ δογμάτων αὐτῶν. **ἤκουσα** γάρ, φησι, **βροντῶν ἐπτά**⁹ καὶ ὅσα **ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἐπτά βρονταί** **ἔμελλον γράφειν** καὶ ἐλέχθη μοι **μὴ γράψης**, ὅσα **ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἐπτά βρονταί**.¹⁰ ἄρα νοεῖς ἐπὶ τούτων ὅτι αἱ τοιαῦται **βρονταί ἐλάλησαν** λόγους δυναμένους γράφεσθαι καὶ μὴ γράφεσθαι,¹¹ καὶ ὅτι ἤκουσεν ἐνάρθρου φωνῆς¹² διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης φωνῆς ὁ ἱερὸς Ἰωάννης.¹³ ἀλλὰ μήποτε¹⁴ αἱ **ἐπτά βρονταί**¹⁵ αἱ «*ελαληκυῖαι*¹⁶ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, ἐὰν πρόσχης¹⁷ τῇ γραφῇ, εὐρήσεις τίνες εἰσίν. μία **βροντὴ σοφία**¹⁸ ἄλλη **βροντὴ σύνεσις**¹⁹ τρίτη **βροντὴ βουλή**²⁰ τετάρτη **βροντὴ ἰσχὺς**²¹ γνῶσις²² πέμπτη **βροντὴ**, «*εὐσέβεια*²³ ἔκτη· ἐβδόμη **βροντὴ φόβος**. ἐὰν ταῦτα λαλουσῶν ἀκούσω τῶν ἐπτά **βροντῶν**, δύναμαι γράφειν. | οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον *χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία*²⁴ ἀπὸ **φωνῆς** τῶν ἁγίων **βροντῶν**²⁵ *λαλουσῶν ἐν Χριστῷ*²⁶ *Ἰησοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν*.²⁷

¹ The expression *μεγάλοι λόγοι* comes from Daniel 7:11 (translatio Graeca) and was used by a handful of authors. Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 31.3: ἐθεώρουν τότε τὴν φωνὴν τῶν μεγάλων λόγων. Hippolytus, *De antichristo*, 21; *In Daniele*, 4.1.3 and 4.4.2. Origen used it writing of the words of the Lord's Prayer, which were 'great words'; *deOr*, II.4: ὅτε ἐπιστημόνων καὶ μεγάλων λόγων ἤκουεν ἀπαγγελλομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εὐχῇ. Theodore comments on this passage of Daniel in his *intDan*, PG.81.1424.33f.

² A characteristic expression by a catenist excerpting Origen, with no other parallel, *frLam*, 23: προφήτης τάχα οὖν δηλοῖ. This catenist might have been Cassian himself, who wrote the present Scholion which is considerably influenced by the vocabulary of Origen.

³ Psalm 76:19.

⁴ Cassian urges his readers to explore the meaning of 'wheel' and 'circle' in the Old Testament. Cf. parallels to the expression *ζητήσεις* γὰρ following a semicolon Origen, *commMatt*, 15.12: 'δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ, ἵνα ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ'· *ζητήσεις γάρ*· 'ἐκβάλῃ' πόθεν; Pseudo-Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ars Rhetorica*, 11.10: *ζητήσεις γάρ* τί ὠφελεῖ ἢ βλάπτει τὰ ἀνεγνωσμένα. Besides, two future tenses follow: ὧσει and εὐρήσεις.

⁵ Allusion to the vision of Cherubim by Ezekiel (Ez. 10, especially 10, 12).

⁶ In the New Testament, apart from Mark 3:17 and John 12:29, the theme of thunder indicating a certain functioning relation between heaven and earth (*viz.* voice or act of God) recurs only in Revelation, indeed as an echo from the Old Testament. Cf. Rev. 4:5; 6:1; 8:5 (Isaiah 29:6); 10:3–4; 11:19; 14:2 (Cf. Psalm 103:7; Ecclesiasticus 43:17); 16:18 (cf. Esther 1:1d; Isaiah 29:6); 19:6. [EN XXXVIa](#).

⁷ Mark 3:17.

⁸ [EN XXXVIb](#). Cf. [EN XXVk](#): τὴν ἐννόησιν τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας.

⁹ Cf. Rev. 10:4.

¹⁰ Rev. 10:3–4.

¹¹ The author explains that the divine words communicated to the holy men can be pronounced and written only partially, as declared by John 21:25. I canvass this in *PHE*, pp. 408–9; 411. He then says that he could write only after hearing the 'voice of thunder'.

¹² [EN XXXVIc](#).

¹³ The origin of the expression ὁ ἱερὸς Ἰωάννης is quite clear, since it is uniquely characteristic of Marcellus of Ancyra quoted by Eusebius. Marcellus of Ancyra, *Fragmenta*, fr. 33 *apud* Eusebius, *Adversus Marcellum*, 2.2.13 and *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, 2.8.2: ὁ τοίνυν ἱερὸς ἀπόστολός τε καὶ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰωάννης. Marcellus of Ancyra, fr. 51, *apud* Eusebius, *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, 2.2.11 and 2.11.3 and 2.25.1: ὁ δὲ ἱερὸς ἀπόστολός τε καὶ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰωάννης. Later, the designation was taken up by Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 44, which owes a manifest debt to this Scholion, to be echoed only by Arethas, *Scripta Minora*, Opus 11, p.114 (τοῦ ἱεροῦ Ἰωάννου).

¹⁴ [EN XXXVIId](#).

¹⁵ [EN XXXVIe](#).

¹⁶ Cod. *ελαληκυῖαι*.

¹⁷ Cod. *πρόσχης*. H. *προσσχῆς*. Nevertheless, the ancient manuscripts which use the Codex's spelling outnumber those which have the correct form. This only means that in practice the pronunciation with one sigma had prevailed.

¹⁸ The author names the 'thunders' after Isaiah 11:1–3. Nevertheless, the expression *ἐὰν πρόσχῃς τῇ γραφῇ*, εὐρήσεις τίνες εἰσίν suggests that those names of 'thunders' can be found also at other points of scripture, though not all seven of them at one point as in Isaiah (e.g. Job 12:13). Hence, cf. Acts 6: 10. 1 Cor. 2:6–7; 3 Kings (1 Kings *in textu Masoretico*), 5:26; Psalms 36:30; 48:4.

¹⁹ Psalm 48:4; Daniel (*Theodotionis versio*) 9:22.

²⁰ Isaiah 9:5; 44:26.

²¹ Cf. Rev. 19:6; Job 37:5; Acts 6:10; 1 Peter 4:11; Ex. 19:19; Daniel 10:19.

²² Cf. 1 Cor. 14:6; Ex. 25:22; 29:42; Num. 12:6; Ez. 37:14; 39:7–8.

²³ Cf. Isaiah 11:1–3. Cod. *σύνεσις*, which however has been used for the second thunder. Didymus associated this exegesis of Isaiah with the Book of Revelation; *commZacch*, 1.278–281. [EN XXXVIe](#).

²⁴ John, 21:25.

²⁵ Cf. Rev. 19:6.

²⁶ Cf. 2 Cor. 2:17; 12:19.

²⁷ Rom. 6:17; Heb. 13:12; 1 Peter 4:11. Cf. 2 Tim. 4:18; 4 Macc. 18:24.

Through the saying, *The voice of thy thunder was in the wheel*,¹ the prophet [David] perhaps indicates that the *sublime words*² being clarified are **thunders** to the righteous. For you should explore the meaning of *wheel* and *circle*³ in these writings and, once you grasp the meaning of *wheel*, then you shall also grasp the meaning of *thunder*. Besides, you should reflect on what was said of *the sons of thunder*, namely, *James and John*, both of whom Jesus called *Boanerges*, which means, *the sons of thunder*.⁴ You then shall find out that they were duly called *the sons of thunder*, on account of the magnificent concepts and doctrines that they professed. For indeed, he says, **I heard seven thunders**,⁵ and **I was about to write down all these things which the seven thunders uttered**, and I was bidden, **write not those things which the seven thunders uttered**.⁶ Concerning these words, therefore, you understand that these **thunders uttered** words that either can or cannot be committed to writing. Besides, [you understand that] through this kind of **voice** the blessed John heard an articulate voice. But perhaps you will find out what the **seven thunders**, which spoke unto John, actually are, once you ponder upon scripture carefully. As a matter of fact, one **thunder** was *wisdom*, another **thunder** was *understanding*, the third **thunder** was *counsel*, the fourth **thunder** was *might*, the fifth **thunder** was *knowledge*, the sixth **thunder** was *reverence*, the seventh **thunder** was *fear* [of the Lord].⁷ I am able to write only once I hear the seven **thunders** professing these things. Indeed *even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written*⁸ out of the things pronounced by the **voice** of the holy **thunders**, which *speak in Christ*⁹ *Jesus, to whom be glory forever, amen*.¹⁰

¹ Psalm 76:19. A literal rendering: 'in the wheel' means 'all around the heaven'.

² Cf. Daniel 7:11.

³ Cf. Psalm 90:4: ὅπλῳ κυκλώσει σε ἡ ἀλήθεια αὐτοῦ.

⁴ Mark 3:17.

⁵ Cf. Rev. 10:4.

⁶ Rev. 10:3–4.

⁷ Cf. Isaiah 11:1–3.

⁸ John 21:25.

⁹ Cf. 2 Cor. 2:17; 12:19.

¹⁰ Cf. Rom. 16:27; Heb. 15:21; 1 Peter 4:11; Rom. 11:36; 2 Tim. 4:18; Rev. 1:6.

ΛΖ

283v

<XXXVII. Rev. 11:18²> καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ ὀργή σου¹ καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν² σου, κριθῆναι καὶ δοῦναι μισθὸν τοῖς δούλοις σου τοῖς προφήταις καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους³ τὸ ὄνομά σου, τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους,⁴ καὶ διαφθεῖραι τοὺς διαφθείροντας τὴν γῆν. <11:19> καὶ ἡν·ού·γη⁵ ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ὤφθη ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης τοῦ κυρίου⁶ ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐγένοντο ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ σεισμός καὶ χάλαζα μεγάλη. <12:1> καὶ σημεῖον μέγα ὤφθη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, γυνὴ περιβεβλημένη τὸν ἥλιον καὶ ἡ σελήνη ὑποκάτω⁷ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς στέφανος ἀστέρων δώδεκα,⁸ <12:2> καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ | ἔχουσα, ἔκραζεν⁹ ὠδίνουσα καὶ βασανιζομένη τεκεῖν.

¹ 2329: σου ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῶν ἐθνῶν.

² Andreas and Arethas opt for νεκρῶν, but none of them has νεκρῶν σου ('your dead'), which is not considered by N.-A. either. Andreas comments on the resurrection of the dead, whereas Oecumenius employed ἐθνῶν, interpreting them as 'daemons' to be punished. Arethas employs the exegesis of Oecumenius, namely 'demolition and suspension of all those who ostensibly rule over and tyrannize the earth'. The present version of the text reinforces the rendering νεκρῶν.

³ 2329, O., An., Ar., N.-A. τοῖς φοβουμένοις. N.-A. (p. 654) claim that 2351 have καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους, which is incorrect. 2351 reads thus: καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους.

⁴ 2329, N.-A. τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους. O., An., Ar. τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις.

⁵ cod. ηνυγη.

⁶ 2329, O., N.-A. τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ. An., Ar. τῆς διαθήκης τοῦ κυρίου.

⁷ 2329: υποκατο.

⁸ 2329: ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἀστέρων δεκαδύο. O. στέφανος ἀστέρων δώδεκα. An. στέφανος δι' ἀστέρων δεκαδύο. Ar. στέφανοι ἀστέρων δώδεκα.

⁹ ἔκραζεν, in C, 2351, versions of K, and the Syriac *versio Harclensis*. 2329, An. κράζει. O., N.-A. καὶ κράζει. Ar. ἔκραζεν.

〈Σχόλιον λζ'〉

EP

284r

Καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ ὀργή σου καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν.¹ κατὰ τὸν τῆς συντελείας καιρόν,² φανερωθέντων πάντων τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ,³ ἐπὶ τὸ λαβεῖν ἕκαστος⁴ ἐπαξίως τῶν βεβιωμένων,⁵ ἡ ὀργή τοῦ θεοῦ⁶ συνίσταται,⁷ ἦν ἕκαστος ἐθησαύρισεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ.⁸ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ καὶ ὁ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ ἁγίων καὶ φοβουμένων τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ⁹ μισθὸς ἀποδοθήσεται. τῶν οὖν τὸν μισθὸν ληψομένων¹⁰ τρία τάγματα δηλοῦνται, προφητῶν καὶ ἁγίων καὶ ἑτέρων φοβουμένων τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ.¹¹ καὶ ὅρα ἐν¹² οἱ εἰσαγόμενοι εἰς εὐλάβειαν σημαίνονται τῷ φοβεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ,¹³ οἱ δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἔτι φοβούμενοι δηλοῦνται τῇ τῶν ἁγίων προσηγορίᾳ· φοβήθητε γὰρ | τὸν κύριον οἱ ἅγιοι

¹ Rev. 11:18.

² The vocabulary of the Book of Daniel is here once again. Cf. καιρὸς συντελείας: Daniel (*translatio Graeca*), 8:19; 9:26 and 27; 11:35; 12:4 and 7; (*Theodotionis versio*), 9:27; 12:4. The same in Ecclesiasticus 39:28.

³ EN XXXVIIa.

⁴ Cf. 2 Cor. 5:10.

⁵ EN XXXVIIb.

⁶ Cf. Scholion XXX.

⁷ EN XXXVIIc.

⁸ Cf. Rom. 2:5. EN XXXVIId.

⁹ EN XXXVIIe.

¹⁰ This is not a quotation from Didymus, since this should be the colloquial λημψομένων (cf. λημψόμενος, *commZacch*, 2.368). All non-colloquial forms occurring in Didymus are the catenist's rendering. Cf. *frPs(al)*, frs. 337 (ληψόμενοι); 767 (ληψομένων); 1069 (ληψόμενος); 1268 (παραληψόμενοι).

¹¹ Cf. Psalms 60:6; 85:11; 101:16; Cf. Psalm 98:3; Baruch 3:7.

¹² EN XXXVIIIf.

¹³ This is an implicit reference to Christianity being the accomplished evolution of Judaism. The Old Testament speaks of the 'name of the Lord' and the 'glory of the Lord' as though they were His surrogates in this world. The New Testament has revealed God Himself, by the advent of Him who spoke to the holy men of biblical history.

αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὑστέρημα τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν,¹⁴ ὡς λέγειν¹⁵ ἐν εἴδει τούτων τῶν ἁγίων εὐρήσεις τοὺς προφήτας· ἐπιπλείων¹⁶ γὰρ τοῦ προφήτου ὁ ἅγιος· ἀνάγκη γὰρ τὸν θεοῦ προφήτην καὶ ἅγιον εἶναι· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀντιστρέφει· πολλοὶ γὰρ ἅγιοι ὄντες οὐ προφητεύουσιν.¹⁷

¹⁴ Psalm 33:10. I explore its annotation by Christian authors in [EN XXXVIIe](#).

¹⁵ I have added λέγειν. In Didymus ὡς λέγειν introduces an exegetical sentence and means 'in other words, it is said'. *commJob*(7.20c–11), Cod. p. 241: ὅτι ὁ ποιῶν μεγάλα καὶ φοβερά καὶ βαθέα κρίματα ἔχει καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστα, ἅπερ καὶ ἐνδοξά ἐστιν, ὡς λέγειν δόξης πεπληρωμένα.

¹⁶ Cod. ἐπὶ πλείον. What is needed, however, is an adjective, not the adverb ἐπὶ πλείον (another form for ἐπιπλέον = furthermore, at greater length), which makes no sense at this point. The author purports to point out the distinction between a saint and a prophet.

This comparative adjective does in fact exist, albeit overlooked by both ancient and modern lexicographers: it is ἐπιπλείων (= superior, greater, higher). Cf. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.1004: Πολὺς γοῦν ἦν ὁ περὶ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ λόγος, ἦν ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ ψαλμῷ ἐπικεκρυμμένως ἠνείξατο· καὶ ἐπιπλείων καὶ βαθύτερος ὁ περὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ ὃν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων ἀνεδέξατο ('the teaching about the birth [of Jesus] is a great one, still [the teaching] about his death for the sake of men is greater and more profound').

¹⁷ [EN XXXVIIg](#).

Scholion XXXVII

And Thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead.¹ At the time of consummation, everyone will be standing before the judgement seat of Christ,² so that each one may receive that which is befitting the life he lived. [It is then that] the **wrath** of God appears, which each one has *treasured up unto oneself against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgement of God*.³ At that time, **the reward** shall be granted to **the prophets** and **to the saints** and to **them who fear the name** of God. It is declared that there are three orders⁴ of those who shall receive the **reward**: **prophets, saints**, and others **who fear the name of God**. And consider whether those who are in the stage of introduction to [Christian] piety are meant by [the expression] **to fear the name of God**, whereas those who have come to fear not his name, but Him Himself, are declared through the appellation **saints**. Certainly [the saying], *O fear the Lord, ye his saints; for there is no want to them that fear him*,⁵ is tantamount to saying that prophets can be found only in the condition of those *saints*. For a *saint* is superior to a **prophet**, since it is necessary that a prophet of God should also be a saint. The converse, however, does not hold: many people do not prophesy, even though they are saints.⁶

¹ Rev. 11:18.

² Cf. 2 Cor. 5:10.

³ Cf. Rom. 2:5.

⁴ Using the word τάγμα, of 1 Cor. 15:23.

⁵ Psalm 33:10.

⁶ According to 1 Cor. 12:28, prophets within the Church are 'second' (δεύτερον) to the apostles, that is, to the saints. Cf. Eph. 3:5: 'The mystery of Christ' 'which was made known unto his holy apostles

(ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις) and prophets'. Prophets, nevertheless, are 'saints', too: in 2 Peter 3:2, reference is made to 'the holy prophets' (τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν) and the 'apostles of the Lord'. Rev. 16:6 and 18:24 refer to 'the blood of prophets and saints' (προφητῶν καὶ ἁγίων) and in Rev. 18:20, 'the saints and the apostles and the prophets' (οἱ ἅγιοι καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται) are likewise mentioned. Hence, although prophets are classified as 'saints' (ἅγιοι), there are also other saints who are not prophets.

ΛΗ

284v

285r

<XXXVIII. Rev. 12:3> καὶ ὤφθη ἄλλο σημεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἰδοὺ δράκων μέγας πυρροῦς¹ ἔχων κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ κέρατα δέκα, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ ἑπτὰ διαδήματα, <12:4> καὶ ἡ οὐρὰ αὐτοῦ σύρει τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων² τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν. καὶ ὁ δράκων³ ἔστηκεν ἐνώπιον τῆς γυναικὸς τῆς μελλούσης τεκεῖν, ἵνα, ὅταν τέκῃ⁴ τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς, καταφάγῃ⁵ <12:5> καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν ἄρρενα, ὃς μέλλει ποιμαίνειν⁶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, καὶ ἠρπάσθη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς | πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ. <12:6> καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον⁷ ὅπου ἔχει⁸ ἐκεῖ τόπον ἡτοιμασμένον ὑπὸ⁹ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ἐκεῖ τρέφωσιν¹⁰ αὐτὴν ἡμέρας χιλίας¹¹ διακοσίας ἑξήκοντα.¹² <12:7> καὶ ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ¹³ μετὰ τοῦ δράκοντος· καὶ ὁ δράκων ἐπολέμησεν καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, <12:8> καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν, οὔτε τόπος εὗρέθη¹⁴ αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. <12:9> καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων, ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλούμενος διάβολος καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς¹⁵ ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην, ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν. <12:10> καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν μεγάλην¹⁶ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, λέγουσαν· ἄρτι ἐγένετο ἡ σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐβλήθη¹⁷ ὁ κατήγορος τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν, ὁ κατηγορῶν αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός. | <12:11> καὶ αὐτοὶ¹⁸ ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου, καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν, ἄχρι θανάτου. <12:12> διὰ τοῦτο εὐφραίνεσθε¹⁹ οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς σκηνοῦντες· οὐαὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ,²⁰ ὅτι κατέβη ὁ διάβολος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχων θυμὸν μέγαν,²¹ εἰδὼς ὅτι ὀλίγον καιρὸν ἔχει. <12:13> καὶ ὅτε ἶδεν ὁ δράκων ὅτι ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐδίωξεν²² τὴν γυναῖκα ἣτις²³ ἔτεκεν τὸν ἄρσενά.²⁴ <12:14> καὶ ἐδόθησαν²⁵ τῇ γυναικὶ δύο

¹ Cod. πυροσ. 2329: πυρὸς μέγας.

² 2329, An., Ag. ἀστέρων. O. ἀστρων.

³ 2329: δρακον.

⁴ Cod. τεκει. 2329: τέξη.

⁵ 2329: καταφαγει αὐτῷ, intending καταφάγη αὐτό.

⁶ 2329: ποιμένειν.

⁷ 2329: ερημων.

⁸ 2329: ἔχεν τόπον, intending εἶχεν τόπον.

⁹ 2329: αὐτῇ ὑπό. O. ἀπό, but at a subsequent point ὑπό. An., Ag. ὑπό. N.-A. ἀπό.

¹⁰ 2329: τρέφουσιν. O., An. τρέφωσιν. Ag. ἐκτρέφωσιν.

¹¹ 2329: χιλιασ.

¹² 2329: ἑξήκοντα.

¹³ 2329, O. An. καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ πολεμήσαι. Ag. καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ ἐπολέμησαν.

¹⁴ 2329: ηυρεθη.

¹⁵ 2329: καὶ σατανᾶς.

¹⁶ An. φωνῆς μεγάλης. O. Ag. φωνὴν μεγάλην.

¹⁷ 2329, O. Ag. ἐβλήθη. An. κατεβλήθη.

¹⁸ O. Ag. αὐτοί. An. αὐτοῦ.

¹⁹ 2329: εὐφραίνεσθαι.

²⁰ 2329, An., Ag. τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ. O. τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.

²¹ 2329: μέγα.

²² O. ἐδίωκε. An., Ag. ἐδίωξε.

²³ 2329: ειτις.

²⁴ 2329, An., Ag. ἄρρενα. O. ἄρσενά.

²⁵ 2329: ἐδόθησαν.

285v

286r

πτέρυγες τοῦ ἀετοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, ἵνα πέτηται²⁶ εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς, ἵνα ὅπου²⁷ τρέφεται ἐκεῖ καιρὸν καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἡμισυ καιροῦ, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ ὄφεως. <12:15> καὶ ἔβαλεν ὁ ὄφις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω τῆς γυναικὸς ὕδωρ ὡς ποταμόν ἵνα αὐτὴν ποταμοφόρητον²⁸ ποιήσῃ. | <12:16> καὶ ἐβοήθησεν ἡ γῆ τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἡνοιξεν ἡ γῆ τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς καὶ κατέπιεν τὸν ποταμόν, ὃν ἐνέβαλεν²⁹ ὁ δράκων ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. <12:17> καὶ ὠργίσθη³⁰ ὁ δράκων ἐν³¹ τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς, τῶν τηρούντων τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν³² Ἰησοῦ. <12:18> καὶ ἐστάθη³³ ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης· <13:1> καὶ ἶδον³⁴ ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον,³⁵ ἔχον³⁶ κέρατα ἰ', καὶ κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων αὐτοῦ δέκα διαδήματα,³⁷ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ ὀνόματα³⁸ βλασφημίας. <13:2> καὶ τὸ θηρίον ὃ ἶδον ἦν ὅμοιον παρδάλει, καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὡς ἄρκου.³⁹ καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ὡς στόμα λεόντων.⁴⁰ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ δράκων τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην, <13:3> καὶ μίαν⁴¹ ἐκ τῶν κεφαλῶν αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ ἐσφαγμένην⁴² εἰς θάνατον. καὶ ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ⁴³ ἐθεραπεύθη καὶ ἐθαύμασεν⁴⁴ ὅλη ἡ γῆ ὀπίσω τοῦ θηρίου, <13:4> καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ δράκοντι, ὅτι ἔδωκεν⁴⁵ ἐξουσίαν⁴⁶ τῷ θηρίῳ, καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θηρίῳ λέγοντες· τίς ὅμοιός σοι τῷ θηρίῳ;⁴⁷ καὶ τίς δυνατός⁴⁸ πολεμῆσαι μετ' αὐτοῦ; <13:5> καὶ ἐδόθη⁴⁹ αὐτῷ⁵⁰ στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα καὶ «βλασφημίαν»⁵¹ καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία πολεμῆσαι⁵² μῆνας τεσσαράκοντα δύο. <13:6> καὶ ἡνοιξεν τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰς βλασφημίαν⁵³ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, βλασφημῆσαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν⁵⁴ αὐτοῦ, τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνουῦντας.⁵⁵ <13:7> καὶ ἐδόθη⁵⁶ αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ νικῆσαι αὐτούς, καὶ

²⁶ Cod. πετητε. 2329: πετεται.

²⁷ O., N.-A. αὐτῆς, ὅπου. An. αὐτῆς ὅπως. Ar. αὐτῆς, ὅπως.

²⁸ 2329: ποταμοφόριτον.

²⁹ 2329, O., An., Ar. ἔβαλεν. N.-A. did not consider the reading of 2351 ἐνέβαλεν.

³⁰ 2329: ὀργίσθη.

³¹ 2329, O. An., Ar. ἐπί.

³² 2329: μαρτυρίαν τοῦ (not considered by N.-A.).

³³ 2329, O., An., Ar. ἐστάθη. N.-A. ἐστάθη. The reading of 2329 ἐστάθην was not considered by N.-A.

³⁴ O. An., Ar. εἶδον.

³⁵ 2329: ἀναβαίνοντα.

³⁶ 2329: ἔχων.

³⁷ Cod. διαδιματα.

³⁸ 2329, An. ὄνομα. O., Ar. ὀνόματα.

³⁹ O. ἄρκου. An., Ar. ἄρκτου.

⁴⁰ 2329, O., An., Ar. λέοντος.

⁴¹ O. καὶ μίαν. Ar. καὶ εἶδον μίαν. An. καὶ [εἶδον] μίαν, the editor's deletion.

⁴² 2329, O. ὡς ἐσφαγμένην. An. ὥσπερ ἐσφαγισμένην. Ar. ὥσπερ ἐσφαγμένην. Cod. ἐσφαγμένην.

⁴³ 2329: καὶ ἡ πληγὴ αὐτοῦ (not considered by N.-A.).

⁴⁴ ἐθαύμασεν ὅλη ἡ γῆ, in **K**, P, 1006, 1611, 1841, 1854, 2329, 2351, and versions of K. 2329: ἐθαύμασεν. O. ἐθαμβήθη. An., N.-A. ἐθαυμάσθη. Ar. ἐθαύμασεν.

⁴⁵ 2329, O. ὅτι ἔδωκε τὴν. An. ὅτι ἔδωκε. Ar. (and K) τῷ δεδωκότι τὴν.

⁴⁶ The reading τὴν ἐξουσίαν for ἐξουσίαν is exclusive to 2351.

⁴⁷ 2329, O., An., Ar., N.-A. ὅμοιος τῷ θηρίῳ; The version of 2329 σοὶ τῷ θηρίῳ was not considered by N.-A.

⁴⁸ τίς δυνατός for τίς δύναται is exclusive to 2351 and versions of K. 2329, O., An. τίς δύναται. Ar. τίς δυνατός.

⁴⁹ 2329: ἐδόθη.

⁵⁰ Cod. αὐτό.

⁵¹ 2329, An. (M). βλάσφημα. O. βλασφημία. An. (S)., Ar. βλασφημίαν.

⁵² A reading exclusive to 2351. 2329, Ar. ἐξουσία πόλεμον ποιῆσαι. O., An. ἐξουσία ποιῆσαι.

⁵³ Cod. βλασφημειαν.

⁵⁴ Cod. σκινην

⁵⁵ Cod. σκινουῦντας.

⁵⁶ 2329: ἐδόθη.

286v

287r

ἐδόθη⁵⁷ αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν φυλὴν καὶ λαὸν καὶ γλῶσσαν καὶ ἔθνος. <13:8> καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα⁵⁸ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ | τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. <13:9> εἴ τις ἔχει οὖς, ἀκουσάτω· <13:10> εἴ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ἀπάγει⁵⁹ εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει,⁶⁰ εἴ τις ἐν μαχαίρῃ⁶¹ ἀποκτενεῖ,⁶² δεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν μαχαίρῃ⁶³ ἀποκτανθῆναι. ὧδε ἐστὶν ἡ ὑπομονὴ καὶ ἡ πίστις τῶν ἁγίων. <13:11> καὶ ἶδον ἄλλο θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ εἶχεν κέρατα δύο, ὅμοια ἀρνίῳ, καὶ ἐλάλει⁶⁴ ὡς δράκων. <13:12> καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πρώτου θηρίου πᾶσαν ποιεῖ⁶⁵ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐποίει⁶⁶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικοῦντας, ἵνα προσκυνήσουσι⁶⁷ τὸ θηρίον τὸ πρῶτον, οὗ ἐθεραπεύθη ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ.⁶⁸ <13:13> καὶ ποιεῖ σημεῖα μεγάλα, καὶ πῦρ⁶⁹ ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνει⁷⁰ εἰς⁷¹ τὴν γῆν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων. <13:14> καὶ πλανᾷ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας⁷² ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, διὰ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐδόθη⁷³ αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θηρίου, | λέγων τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ποιῆσαι εἰκόνα τῷ θηρίῳ, ὡς⁷⁴ εἶχεν τὴν πληγὴν καὶ ἔζησεν ἀπὸ τῆς μαχαίρης⁷⁵ <13:15> καὶ ἐδόθη⁷⁶ αὐτῷ δοῦναι πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου, ἵνα καὶ λαλήσῃ ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ποιήσῃ, ἵνα ὅσοι ἂν⁷⁷ μὴ προσκυνήσουσιν τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου ἀποκτανθῶσι.⁷⁸ <13:16> καὶ ποιεῖ⁷⁹ πάντας τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ τοὺς

⁵⁷ 2329: ἐδόθη.

⁵⁸ 2329: ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν. O., N.-A. οὐ οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. An. ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα. Ar. ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὰ ὀνόματα.

⁵⁹ εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ἀπάγει for εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν occurs in 2351, Syriac MSS, Vulgata Clementina.

⁶⁰ 2329, O. εἴ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει. An. (M). εἴ τις ἔχει αἰχμαλωσίαν, ὑπάγει. An. (S). εἴ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, ὑπάγει. Ar. εἴ τις αἰχμαλωσίαν συνάγει, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει. N.-A. εἴ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει.

⁶¹ 2329: μαχαίρα. Of all Christian authors, the form μαχαίρα appears in Hippolytus, Didymus, and Theodoret: Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium (Philosophumena)*, 6.27.3; 9.30.8. Didymus, *commZacch*, 3.12; *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 85; *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 247. Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 8.1. Cf. Homer, *Iliad*, XI.844. Herodotus, *Historiae*, 2.41; 2.61; 4.70; 7.91; 7.225; 8.137. The form may claim scriptural attestation according to certain manuscripts: Gen. 27:40; Ex. 15:9; Num. 21:24; Kings II (*Samuelis ii in textu Masoretico*), 15:14. Matt. 26:52; Luke 21:24; 22:49; Acts 12:2; Heb. 11:34; 11:37; Rev. 13:10; 13:14.

⁶² Cod. ἀποκτενεῖ. Cf. ἀποκτεννεῖ, δεῖ, in K, 1006, 1841, 1854, the Syriac *versio Harclensis*. But 2329, O., An., Ar. μαχαίρα ἀποκτεννεῖ.

⁶³ 2329, O., An., Ar. μαχαίρα.

⁶⁴ ἐλάλει for ἐποίει, in 051, 1611, 2329 (Cod. ἐλάλη), 2351, 2377, versions of K, the Syriac *versio Harclensis*, Vulgata Clementina.

⁶⁵ 2329: ἐπεποίει.

⁶⁶ 2329, O. ποιεῖ. An., Ar. ἐποίει.

⁶⁷ 2329: προσκυνήσωσιν.

⁶⁸ 2329: ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου. O., An., Ar., N.-A. τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ.

⁶⁹ 2329: πῦρ ποιήσει καταβαίνειν. O., An. πῦρ ποιη καταβαίνειν.

⁷⁰ καὶ πῦρ ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνει (Cod. καταβαίνει), in 2377 and versions of K. Arethas follows (see next note).

⁷¹ O. ἵνα πῦρ ποιῇ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνειν εἰς. An. ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ποιῇ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνειν ἐπὶ. Ar. καὶ πῦρ, ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνει ἐπὶ.

⁷² O., An. καὶ πλανᾷ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας. Ar. καὶ πλανᾷ τοὺς ἐμοὺς τοὺς κατοικοῦντας.

⁷³ 2329: καὶ ἐδόθη (Cod. ἐδόθη) αὐτῷ πνεῦμα δοῦναι.

⁷⁴ N.-A. incorrectly report that 2351 reads ὅς; the alternative ὡς (see next note) is not considered at all.

⁷⁵ 2329: ὡς ἔχει τὴν πληγὴν τῆς μαχαίρης (Cod. μαχαίρις) καὶ ἔζησεν. So O. (ἔζησε). An. ὅς ἔχει τὴν πληγὴν τῆς μαχαίρας καὶ ἔζησεν. So N.-A. (μαχαίρης). Ar. ὁ εἶχε τὴν πληγὴν τῆς μαχαίρας καὶ ἔζησεν. The additional expression καὶ ἔζησεν ἀπὸ τῆς μαχαίρης is exclusive to 2351, 2377, and K.

⁷⁶ 2329: ἐδόθη.

⁷⁷ 2329, An(M), Ar., N.-A. ἐάν. An(S). ἂν.

⁷⁸ 2329, O., An., Ar. ἀποκτανθῶσιν.

⁷⁹ 2329: ποιήσει. O., An., Ar., N.-A. ποιεῖ.

πτωχούς, καὶ τοὺς ἐλευθέρους καὶ τοὺς δούλους, ἵνα δώσιν αὐτοῖς χαράγματα⁸⁰
ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν τῆς δεξιᾶς ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον⁸¹ αὐτῶν, <13:17> καὶ ἵνα μὴ
τις⁸² δύνηται ἀγοράσαι ἢ πωλῆσαι,⁸³ εἰ μὴ ὁ ἔχων τὸ χάραγμα,⁸⁴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ
θηρίου ἢ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ.> <13:18> ὧδε ἡ σοφία ἔχει⁸⁵· ὁ ἔχων νοῦν⁸⁶
ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ⁸⁷ θηρίου.> ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν. ὁ ἀριθμὸς⁸⁸
αὐτοῦ

⁸⁰ χαράγματα in P^{47*}, 051, 2351, 2377, versions of K, and the Sahidic version. 2329, O. ἵνα δώσει αὐτοῖς
χάραγμα. An. ἵνα δώσουσιν αὐτοῖς χάραγμα. Ar. ἵνα δώσωσιν αὐτοῖς χαράγματα.

⁸¹ Cod. μέτωπον. 2329, Ar. ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον. An. ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων. In O. the text is missing.

⁸² So An., Ar. 2329: μηδεὶς (not considered by N.-A.).

⁸³ Cod. πωλῆσαι. 2329: ἀγοράσαι εἰ μὴ ὁ ἔχων. This version omitting ἢ πωλῆσαι was not considered by N.-A.

⁸⁴ 2329: ὁ τὸ χάραγμα, ἔχων ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου αὐτοῦ (not considered by N.-A.).

⁸⁵ 2329: ἡ σοφία ὧδε ἐστίν. O., An., Ar. ὧδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν.

⁸⁶ 2329: τὸν νοῦν.

⁸⁷ 2329: ψηφισάτω (Cod. ψηφισατω) τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θηρίου (not considered by N.-A.).

⁸⁸ 2329, O., An., Ar.: καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς.

〈Σχόλιον λη〉

287v Ὁρμῇ¹ ὁ δράκων | πολεμήσας μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων² καὶ θληβεῖς,³ βληθεῖς⁴ κάτω ἐκ τοῦ
EP οὐρανοῦ ἔσυρεν πίπτων τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων⁵ ἅτινα ἄστρα θείας δυνάμεως⁶ οὔσας
«ἔπεισε»⁷ συναποστῆναι⁸ αὐτῷ καὶ συγκατενεχθῆναι τῷ δράκοντι, ὡς Ἡσαΐας φησὶν·
πῶς ἐξέπεσεν ὁ ἑωσφόρος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ;⁹

καὶ ἐστάθη ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης.¹⁰ ὁ ἀπόστολός φησιν¹¹ ἀνθ' ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην
τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐδέξαντο εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι αὐτούς, διὰ τοῦτο πέμπει αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ἐνέργειαν πλάνης
εἰς τὸ πιστεῦσαι αὐτοὺς τῷ ψεύδει.¹² τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἐρχομένου ἰδίῃ¹³ γνώμῃ τὴν ἀπιστίαν¹⁴
ἀνακεφαλαιουμένου πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καὶ αὐτεξουσίου πράξαντος ὅσα καὶ πράξει καὶ εἰς τὸν
ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθήσαντος,¹⁵ ἵνα ὡς Χριστὸν αὐτὸν προσκυνήσωσιν¹⁶ οἱ πλανώμενοι¹⁷
288r ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, διὸ καὶ δικαίως εἰς τὴν κάμινον¹⁸ βλη|θήσονται τοῦ πυρός.¹⁹ τοῦ θεοῦ δὲ κατὰ
τὴν ἰδίαν πρόγνωσιν προειδότος τὰ πάντα καὶ ἀρμόζοντι καιρῷ τὸν τοιοῦτον μέλλοντα
ἔσεσθαι ἐπάγοντος²⁰ εἰς τὸ πιστεῦσαι αὐτοὺς τῷ ψεύδει,²¹ οὗ τὴν παρουσίαν Ἰωάννης
ἐνταῦθα²² οὕτως ἐμήνυσεν.

¹ EN XXXVIIIa.

² Rev. 12:7.

³ Cod. θληβεῖς.

⁴ Rev. 12:9.

⁵ Rev. 12:4. EN XXXVIIIb.

⁶ Cod. δυναμῖς.

⁷ I add ἔπεισε, since the two following infinitives should be dependent on a verb. Origen, *Cels*, I.30: Ἐπεισε γὰρ οὐθ' ὡς τύραννος συναποστῆναι αὐτῷ τινὰ τῶν νόμων. John Chrysostom, *Ad Stagiritum Ascetam a Daemone Vexatum*, PG.47.436.5–8: Εἰ γὰρ μὴ δεξαμένῳ τὴν ἐντολὴν προσελθὼν ὁ διάβολος ἀποστῆναι τοῦ Θεοῦ συνεβούλευσε, καὶ τοῦτο εὐκόλως ἂν ἔπεισεν. Cf. ἔπεισε ἀποστῆναι in *Id.*, *Ad Eos Qui Scandalizati Sunt*, 10.24; *In Annam*, PG.54.639.47; *In Sanctum Matthaeum*, PG.58.690.33–34; *In Epistolam ii ad Corinthios Commentarius*, PG.61.458.20. Cf. ἔπεισε ἀποστῆναι in Diodorus of Sicily, *Bibliotheca Historica*, 13.37.4; 15.66.3; 32.17.1. Plutarch, *Galba*, 19.4. Pseudo-Plutarch, *Regum Apophthegmata*, 185A10.

⁸ Cod. συναποστατηκέναι. EN XXXVIIIc.

⁹ Isaiah 14:12. EN XXXVIIIId.

¹⁰ Rev. 12:18.

¹¹ Cf. text ὁ ἀπόστολός φησιν . . . Ἰωάννης ἐνταῦθα οὕτως ἐμήνυσεν in Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, fr. 22.

¹² 2 Thess. 2:10–11.

¹³ Cod. ἵνα.

¹⁴ Cod. ἀπιστείαν.

¹⁵ 2 Thess. 2:4.

¹⁶ Cod. προσκυνήσουσιν.

¹⁷ Cod. πλανόμενοι.

¹⁸ Cod. κάμινον.

¹⁹ Cf. Rev. 19:20: εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρός. The same expression with the same term κάμινον occurs in Matt. 13:42 and 50. Nevertheless the author has in mind the Apocalypse, not Matthew.

²⁰ Cod. ἐπάγοντα.

²¹ 2 Thess. 2:11.

²² ἐνταῦθα means Rev. 13:2–8.

288v ἵνα οὖν μή τις αὐτὸν θεϊκῇ δυνάμει²³ δόξῃ²⁴ ποιεῖν τὰ σημεῖα, ἀλλὰ μαγικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ, ἔφη· **καὶ πλανᾷ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.**²⁵ καὶ οὐδέν γε καὶ θαυμαστὸν εἰ τῶν δαιμονίων καὶ ἀποστατικῶν πνευμάτων ὑπουργούντων αὐτῷ δι' αὐτῶν ποιῇ²⁶ σημεῖα, ἐν οἷς πλανήσῃ **τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** καὶ **τὸν ἀριθμὸν δὲ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ** φησιν καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ καὶ εἶναι τὸν ἀριθμὸν **χξς'.**²⁷ ὃ ἐστὶν ἑκατοντάδες ἑξ καὶ δεκάδες ἑξ καὶ μονάδες ἑξ, εἰς ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν²⁸ πάσης τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἑξακισχιλίῳις ἔτεσιν γεγνουῖας ἀποστασίας. ὅσαις γὰρ ἡμέραις ἐγένετο ὁδε ὁ κόσμος, τοσαύταις χιλιονταεταίαις²⁹ συντελεῖται· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο φησὶν ἡ γραφή· *καὶ συνετέλεσέν* φησιν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, ὅσα ἐποίησεν.³⁰ τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν προγεγονότων διήγησις, ὡς ἐγένετο, καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων προφητεία· εἰ γὰρ *ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη.*³¹ ἐν δὲ «ἑξ» ἡμέραις συνετέλεσθη τὰ γεγονότα, φανερόν ἐστιν «ὅτι» ἡ συντέλεια αὐτῶν τὸ ἑξακισχιλιοστὸν ἔτος. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παντὶ τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ πλασθεὶς ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, τουτέστιν υἱοῦ καὶ πνεύματος, γίνεται κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ, τοῦ μὲν ἀχύρου ἀποσκευαζομένου, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποστασία, τοῦ δὲ σίτου εἰς ἀποθήκην ἀναλαμβανομένου, ὅπερ ἐστὶν οἱ τὴν πρὸς θεὸν πίστιν καρποφοροῦντες. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ θλίψις ἀναγκαία³² τοῖς σωζομένοις, ἵνα τρόπον τινὰ λεπτωθέντες καὶ συμφυραθέντες διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πυρωθέντες, ἐπιτήδριοι ἔσονται εἰς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως εὐωχίαν,³³ ὡς εἶπε τις τῶν ἡμετέρων, διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν μαρτυρίαν κατακριθεὶς πρὸς θηρία, ὅτι *σίτος εἶη τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ ὀδόντων θηρίων ἀλήθομαι, ἵνα καθαρὸς θεοῦ ἄρτος εὔρεθῃ.*³⁴

289r τὰς δὲ αἰτίαις³⁵ ἀπεδώκαμεν ἐν ταῖς πρὸ ταύτης βίβλοις, δι' ἃς ἀνέσχετο ὁ θεὸς τοῦτο οὕτως³⁶ γενέσθαι, καὶ ἀπεδείξαμεν ὅτι πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα ὑπὲρ τοῦ σωζομένου ἀνθρώπου³⁷ γέγονεν, τὸ αὐτεξούσιον αὐτοῦ πεπαίνοντα πρὸς τὴν ἀθανασίαν καὶ ἐπιτηδειότερον³⁸ αὐτὸν πρὸς τὴν εἰς αἰὶ ὑποταγὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καταρτίζοντα.

289v καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα³⁹ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῷ τέλει⁴⁰ | ἀθρόως ἐντεῦθεν τῆς ἐκκλησίας λαμβανομένης ἔσται, φησὶν, *θλίψις, οἷα οὐκ ἐγένετο ἀπ' ἀρχῆς οὐδὲ μὴ γένηται.*⁴¹ ἔσχατος γὰρ ἀγὼν οὕτως⁴² τῶν δικαίων, ὃν νικήσαντες στεφανοῦνται⁴³ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰς τὸ θηρίον τὸ ἐρχόμενον ἀνακεφαλαίωσις γίνεται πάσης τῆς ἀδικίας καὶ παντὸς δόλου, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ συνρεύσασα πᾶσα δύναμις ἀποστατικὴ εἰς τὴν κάμινον βληθῇ τοῦ πυρός. καταλλήλως οὖν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἕξει τὸν ἀριθμὸν **χξς'**, ἀνακεφαλαιούμενον ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ πᾶσαν τῆς κακίας ἐπίδειξιν ἐξ ἀγγελικῆς ἀποστασίας γεγεννημένης· Νῶε γὰρ ἦν ἐτῶν χ' καὶ ὁ κατακλυσμὸς ἐπῆλθεν τῇ γῇ, ἑξαλείφον τὸ ἀνάστημα τῆς γῆς διὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ κίβδηλον γενεάν. ἀνακεφαλαιούμενος δὲ καὶ . . . |

²³ Cf. text ἵνα οὖν μή τις αὐτὸν θεϊκῇ δυνάμει . . . αἰὶ ὑποταγὴν καταρτίζοντα. in Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, Fr. 23.

²⁴ Cod. δόξει.

²⁵ Rev. 13:14.

²⁶ Cod. ποιεῖ.

²⁷ Rev. 13:17–18.

²⁸ Cod. ἀνακεφαλᾶωσιν

²⁹ χιλιονταέτεσι.

³⁰ Cf. Gen. 2:2: ἃ ἐποίησεν.

³¹ 2 Peter 3:8. Cf. Psalm 89:4.

³² Cod. ἀναγκαζόμενος ἵνα.

³³ Cod. εὐωχείαν.

³⁴ Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistulae*, Epistle 4.4.1. So Eusebius in his *HE*, 3.36.12, quoting Irenaeus. Likewise, Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, *HE*, 3.19.

³⁵ Cod. ἐτίας.

³⁶ Cod. οὔτος.

³⁷ Cod. ἄνθρωπον.

³⁸ Cod. ἐπιτηδιότερον.

³⁹ καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα. In other words, 'after skipping some phrases' by Irenaeus, Cassian goes on with quoting from him.

⁴⁰ Cf. text, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῷ τέλει . . . ἀνακεφαλαιούμενος δὲ καὶ. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, fr. 24.

⁴¹ Matt. 24:21.

⁴² Cod. οὔτως.

⁴³ Cf. 2 Tim. 4:8.

Once **the dragon** had waged a fiery war against **the angels**,¹ and **was afflicted**² and cast down from heaven, **he drew the third part of the stars**³ down along with his fall. These stars, which are divine powers, he made rebel along with him and be cast down [from heaven] with him, as indeed Isaiah says, *How is Lucifer fallen from heaven?*⁴

And he stood upon the sand of the sea,⁵ the Apostle says: *Because they received not the love of God, that they might be saved. And for this cause God sends them a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie.*⁶ For, on the one hand, he [sc. the Antichrist] comes, and of his own accord he recapitulates all the apostasy in his own person, and accomplishes whatever he shall do according to his own free will, and *is seated in the temple of God*,⁷ so that his dupes may adore him as the Christ, which is why they shall deservedly *be cast into the furnace of fire*.⁸ On the other hand, [stands] God, who by his prescience foresees everything and at the proper time sends such a man, *that they may believe a lie*,⁹ whose coming John has thus described at this point.

And in order that no one should believe that he [sc. the Antichrist] performs these wonders by divine power, but by the working of magic, he [sc. John] said: **And he deceiveth them that dwell on the earth**.¹⁰ And it is no surprise that if, since the daemons and apostate spirits are at his service, he, by means of them, performs wonders, by which **he leads astray those that dwell on earth**. He further declares the **number of his name**, and certain other things; indeed he says that this **number is six hundred and sixty-six**;¹¹ that is, six times a hundred, six times ten, and six units. This is a summing up of the whole of that apostasy which has taken place during six thousand years. For in as many days as this world was made, in so many thousand years shall it be consumed. And for this reason scripture says: *And on the sixth day God brought to a conclusion the works that He had made*.¹² This is an account of the things formerly created, as also it is a prophecy of what is to come. For if *one day is with the Lord as a thousand years*,¹³ and in six days created things were completed, it is evident that the sixth thousandth year marks the consummation of them. And therefore throughout all this time, man, who was moulded at the beginning by the hands of God, that is, of the Son and of the Spirit, is made after *the image and likeness* of God. The chaff, which is the apostasy, is cast away; but the wheat, that is, all those whose faith in God brings forth fruit, is gathered into the barn. This is why sorrow is necessary for those who are saved: once they have been made thin and by their endurance kneaded together with the Logos of God and heated [by Him], they will be fit [to enter] into the feast of the King. As a certain man of ours said, when he was condemned to the wild beasts because of his testimony with respect to God: "I am the wheat of Christ, and am ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of God."¹⁴

As regards the causes, on account of which God allowed those things to happen so, we have explained them in our books preceding this one. We have shown that all those

¹ Rev. 12:7.

² Rev. 12:9.

³ Rev. 12:4.

⁴ Isaiah 14:12.

⁵ Rev. 12:18. From this point onwards (the rest of [Scholion XXXVIII](#) and [Scholion XXIX](#)), Cassian quotes from the fifth book of Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses*.

⁶ 2 Thess. 2:10–11.

⁷ 2 Thess. 2:4.

⁸ Cf. Rev. 19:20; Matt. 13:42 and 50.

⁹ 2 Thess. 2:11.

¹⁰ Rev. 13:14.

¹¹ Rev. 13:17–18.

¹² Gen. 2:2.

¹³ 2 Peter 3:8. Cf. Psalm 89:4.

¹⁴ Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistulae*, Epistle 4.4.1. So Eusebius quoting Irenaeus in his *HE*, 3.36.12. Likewise, Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, *HE*, 3.19.

things have been done to the purpose of man being saved, who ripens his free will in order to attain to immortality and trains himself so as to become more fit for unfailing subjection to God.

And following some other analyses [by Irenaeus, which we omit]:¹⁵

And therefore, when in the end the Church shall be suddenly caught up from this [world], it is said, *There shall be tribulation such as has not been since the beginning, nor ever shall be.*¹⁶ For this is the last *fight* of the righteous, and when they overcome this, they are crowned¹⁷ with incorruption. This is why in this beast, when he comes, a recapitulation of all sorts of iniquity and of every deceit takes place, in order that all rebellious power, which converges in him, may be thrown into the furnace of fire. Fittingly, therefore, shall his name have the number six hundred and sixty-six. For in his own person, all wickedness which took place previous to the deluge due to the apostasy of the angels, will be recapitulated. For Noah was six hundred years old when the deluge came upon the earth, sweeping away the rebellious world, because of that fraudulent generation which lived since the times of Adam. And [the Antichrist] also sums up . . .

¹⁵ καὶ μεθ' ἑτέρα. In other words, 'after skipping some phrases' by Irenaeus, Cassian goes on with quoting from him.

¹⁶ Matt. 24:21.

¹⁷ Cf. 2 Tim. 4:8.

SCHOLION XXXIX

290r

| <XXXIX. Rev. 14:3> οἱ ἡγορασμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. <14:4> οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν· παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν. οὗτοί εἰσιν¹ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ ἀρνίῳ ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγῃ. οὗτοι ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ² ἡγοράσθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρχὴ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ· <14:5> καὶ ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν οὐχ εὗρέθη ψεῦδος³ ἁμωμοὶ γάρ εἰσιν.

¹ οὗτοι εἰσιν for οὗτοι, in 051, 2351, versions of K, and the Syriac *versio Harclensis*. Arethas is once again with K (Ar. οὗτοι εἰσίν). O., An.(S). παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν. οὗτοι οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες. An.(M), οὗτοι <εἰσίν>.

² ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ occurs only in 051, 1611, 2351, K, and the Syriac *versio Harclensis*. This marks a return to Theodore's text of Revelation, following the interpolation of Irenaeus' text in most of *Scholion XXXVIII*. Once again (and quite expectedly, following our previous critical reading of the text) Arethas follows this text, writing ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ, which is absent from the text of Oecumenius and Andreas. O., An. οὗτοι ἡγοράσθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Ar. οὗτοι ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ ἡγοράσθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

³ N.-A. employs the same syntax, καὶ ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν οὐχ εὗρέθη ψεῦδος, which occurs only in versions of K and the present one.

⁴ On the top margin of this folio (290r), which is the last written one of the Codex, a later hand wrote: κασιανου τον ρομεου [μοναχ]οῦ (= by Monk Cassian the Roman), indicating the compiler of the Scholia. See photo, RCR, p. 548.

«Σχόλιον λθ'»

Ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν χξς'.¹ ἀσφαλέστερον καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον² τὸ περιμένειν τὴν ἐκβασιν τῆς προφητείας³ ἢ τὸ καταστοχάζεσθαι καὶ ἀπομαντεύεσθαι⁴ ὀνόματα τυχόντα, πολλῶν ὀνομάτων εὗρεθῆναι δυναμένων ἐχόντων τὸν προειρημένον ἀριθμόν. καὶ οὐ περ ἡττωμένη⁵ αὕτη ἡ ζήτησις· εἰ γὰρ πολλά ἐστι τὰ εὗρισκόμενα ὀνόματα ἔχοντα⁶ τὸν ἀριθμόν, ποῖον ἐξ αὐτῶν φορέσει ὁ ἐρχόμενος ζητηθήσεται.⁷ ὅτι δὲ οὐ δι' ἀπορίαν ὀνομάτων . . . |[290v: blank]

¹ Rev. 13:18.

² EN XXXIXa.

³ EN XXXIXb.

⁴ EN XXXIXc.

⁵ Cod. ἡττωμένη EN XXXIXd.

⁶ Cod. ἔχειν.

⁷ Cod. ζητήσεται.

Scholion XXXIX

For it is the number of a man [that is,] six hundred and sixty-six. It is safer and less hazardous to await the fulfilment of the prophecy, than to surmise and guess this or that name, since it is possible to find many names which can be found possessing the number mentioned. This inquiry then cannot be overcome. For if there are many names found possessing this number, one will have to find out which among them the coming man shall bear. And that it is not because of want of names . . .

PART II

EXPANDED NOTES TO THE SCHOLIA

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION I

EN Ia: τὸ ὁμολογοῦμενον περὶ αὐτῶν
ὥς εἶσι

Normally, the verb ὁμολογεῖν should be followed by an infinitive (viz. εἶναι). Here, however, the participle ὁμολογοῦμενον, followed by ὥς, should govern a sentence with the verb in indicative mood, unless the meaning of the ensuing sentence were ‘so that’ – which it is not. Were ὥς absent, an infinitive following ὁμολογεῖν would certainly be called for.

A similar structure can be noticed throughout: **Scholion I**, further *infra*: ἀλλ’ οὖν αὐτοὶ εὐγνώμονες ὄντες ὁμολογοῦσιν ὥς τυγχάνουσι **δοῦλοι**. **Scholion III**: καὶ ἐκ τῆς προκειμένης λέξεως μανθάνομεν ὥς προφήτης **Ἰωάννης** πρὸς τῷ εἶναι ἀπόστολος καὶ εὐαγγελιστής. **Scholion XI**: ἀπολυθήσεται τοῦ *περισπασμοῦ* γνῶνς ὥς πᾶσα λογικὴ φύσις δεκτικὴ ἐστὶ τῶν ἀποδοθέντων σημαινομένων περὶ τοῦ **θανάτου**. **Scholion XXII**: πρὸς παράστασιν βεβαιότητος, ὥς αὐτὸς ἐστὶν τὸ **ἀμήν**. **Scholion XXIII**: Παιδευόμεθα ἐκ τούτων τῶν θείων φωνῶν ὥς ὁ πάντη **ψυχρὸς** . . . βελτίων ἐστί. **Scholion XXV**: πιστώσεις δὲ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ γεγράφθαι ὥς ἕτερός τις ἀνέλαβε τὸν Ἰωάννην ὥσπερ τὸν Ἥλιαν. **Scholion XXVII**: εἶτα δηλοῦται ἐκ τῶν ἐπομένων, ὥς οὐδεὶς γεννητός, οὐκ ἐπουράνιος, οὐκ ἐπίγειος, ἄξιος εὐρηται. **Scholion XXVII**: Λέξει τις περὶ τοῦ **βιβλίου** τούτου, ὥς εἴη ὁ πᾶς λόγος τῆς προνοίας. **Scholion XIX**: αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὁμολόγησαν ὥς **ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡγοράσθησαν** καὶ ἐξελέγησαν. **Scholion XXX**: Ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν ἔστιν εὐρεῖν ὥς ὥσπερ σῶμα θεοῦ οἱ ἅγιοι, ἅγιάι εἰσὶ τινες δυνάμεις. **Scholion XXXV**: δηλοῦντα ὥς προσκυνοῦσι τινὲς **τὰ δαιμόνια**.

Writing this comment, Cassian took up the structure which Theodoret had used. *HE*, p. 113: καὶ εἰ ζητοῖεν, τίς τοῦ υἱοῦ ἢ ὑπόστασις ἐστίν, ὁμολογοῦμεν ὥς αὕτη ἦν ‘ἡ μόνη τοῦ πατρὸς ὁμολογουμένη’. *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.733.2: Οἶμαι καὶ αὐτοὺς ἂν ὁμολογήσαι . . . ὥς καὶ ταῦτα τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, ἀλλ’ οὐ τῆς θεότητος ἴδια.

The same syntax appears in Cassian’s *DT* (*lib.* 3), PG.39.949: εὐγνωμόνως ὁμολογοῦντας ὥς παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἢ ὑπαρξίς ἐστίν, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν πάλιν ἢ ἀνάλυσις. This had already been used authoritatively by Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 809: καὶ ταῦτα χρωμένων καὶ ὁμολογούντων ὥς εἰσι πολλὰ τὰ πρὸς τι.

Cf. *Scholia In Demosthenem* (*Scholia vetera*), Oration 21.522: τεχνικῶς εἰσάγει τοὺς φίλους αὐτοῦ ὁμολογοῦντας ὥς μεγάλα καὶ δεινὰ τῷ Μειδίᾳ τετόλμηται.

This structure, which occurs in Origen¹ and Theodoret,² associates the instance in this Scholion with some sublime passages of Greek literature,³ and was taken up later by Oecumenius.⁴

EN Ib: δοῦλοι τοῦ κυρίου

The idea, as well as the vocabulary, of one ‘in gratitude’ proclaiming ‘oneself a servant of God’ is Theodoret’s, *intDan*, PG.81.1500.29–36: Μηδεὶς δὲ νομιζέτω, τὸν ὀφθέντα αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Δεσπότην, ἐπειδὴ Κύριον αὐτὸν ὁ Δανιὴλ προσαγορεύει. Οὗτος γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ τέλει τῆς ὀπτασίας ‘Ἀνατείνας, φησίν, εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ, ὥμοσεν ἐν τῷ ζῶντι Κυρίῳ,’ τὴν δουλείαν εὐγνωμόνως ὁμολογῶν.

¹ Origen, *commJohn*, XX.32.285: ἐπακούσεται γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁμολογούντων τὰ αἷτια τοῦ μηδέπω ἡμᾶς πιστεῦειν, καὶ ὥς κακῶς ἔχουσιν καὶ χρήζουσιν ἰατροῦ.

² Theodoret, *intProphXII*, PG.81.1765.45–46: καὶ διαρρήδην ὁμολογοῦσα, ὥς ἐγὼ σοὶ ταύτης γεγέννημαι χορηγός. *De Providentia*, PG.83.725.41: ὁμολογοῦσιν ὥς πονηρὰ τὰ γινόμενα. Cf. **EN XXIXh**.

³ Demosthenes, *De Halonneso*, 14–15: καὶ ὁμολογήσαι ἡμᾶς ὥς ἄνευ Φιλίππου οὐδὲ τὴν ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ φυλακὴν δυνατοὶ ἐστε φυλάττειν. Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Logica et Physica*, fr. 858, *apud* Plotinus, *Enneades*, IV.7.7: ἡ δ’ αἰσθησις τοῦ ἀλγεῖν δηλὸν ὅτι ὁμολογήσουσιν ὥς περὶ τὸ ἡγεμονοῦν γίγνεται. *Fragmenta Moralia*, fr. 229a, *apud* Galen, *Circa Doctrinas Hippocratis et*

Platonis, 5.5.18. Posidonius, *Fragmenta*, fr. 416: ὁμολογεῖν ἔοικεν ὁ Χρῦσιππος, ὥς ἐστὶν οἰκείως τέ τις ἡμῖν καὶ ἀλλοτρίως φύσει πρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν εἰρημένων. *Fragmenta Moralia*, fr. 384, *apud* Plutarch, *De Virtute Morali*, 449C8–13: αὐτὸς τε Χρῦσιππος ἐν πολλοῖς ὀριζόμενος τὴν καρτερίαν καὶ τὴν ἐγκράτειαν ἐξείς ἀκολουθητικὰς τῷ αἰροῦντι λόγῳ, δηλὸς ἐστὶν ὑπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων ὁμολογεῖν ἀναγκαζόμενος ὥς ἕτερόν ἐστι τὸ ἀκολουθεῖν ἐν ἡμῖν τοῦ ὅ ἀκολουθεῖ πειθόμενον, ἢ πάλιν μάχεται μὴ πειθόμενον.

⁴ Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 33: ὁρᾷς τὸ φιλάληθες τοῦ θεσπεσίου τούτου, ὁμολογήσαντος ὥς δι’ ἀγγέλου αὐτῷ ἀποκεκάλυπται.

The idea appears partially in Didymus, *fr2Cor*, p. 14: πατέρα ἑαυτῶν τὸν θεὸν εἰρηκότες οὐκέτι ἀδελφὸν ἀλλὰ κύριον ἑαυτῶν τὸν σωτῆρα φασίν, δεικνύντες ὅτι καὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ γένωνται οἱ γεννητοί, οὐδὲν ἦττον δοῦλοι μένουσι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ δημιουργοῦ αὐτῶν τυγχάνοντος· μόνος γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀληθεία καὶ οὐ θέσει υἱὸς ὢν θεοῦ δεσπότης ἐστὶ τῶν υἱοποιουμένων. Nevertheless, attribution of these fragments to Didymus calls for further exploration, since at points (e.g. δεσπότης τῶν υἱοποιουμένων) they are like Cassian's (Pseudo- Didymus) *De Trinitate*.

EN 1c: θεὸν δεσπότην ἔχειν

Styling God Θεὸς καὶ δεσπότης is scriptural, which, however, does not appear in the gospels, except for the instance of Symeon's prayer in Luke 2, 29, where the vocative δέσποτα alone is used. In this sense, the term δεσπότης occurs in 2 Tim. 2:21 (τῷ δεσπότη); 2 Peter 2:1 (τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοῦς δεσπότην), Jude 4 (τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν), and Rev. 6:10 (ὁ δεσπότης ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἀληθινός). The instance in Luke 2:29 is a Judaic resonance from the OT. Cf. Judith 5:20; 9:12; Maccabees 5:28; Wisdom of Solomon 8:3; 13:3; Ecclesiasticus 36:1; Daniel (Greek tr.) 9:15.

In Cassian's (Pseudo-Didymus') *De Trinitate* the expression is applied to the Holy Spirit, too. *DT* (*lib. 1*), 18.66: Σημαίνεται δὲ ὁμοίως τὸ ἰσόρροπον καὶ ἰσοδύναμον τῶν παντίμων ὑποστάσεων καὶ ἐν τῷ τὸν δεσπότην θεὸν λόγον διὰ τῆς προλεχθείσης αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ βάπτισμα πανυμνήτου φωνῆς τὴν ἰσοτιμίαν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα φυλάξαι. *DT* (*lib. 2.1-7*), 6.11: τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ αὐθεντικῶς προφῆταις καὶ ἀποστόλοις προστάττει, ὡς θεὸς καὶ δεσπότης, καθὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις κεφαλαίοις ἀποδειχθεῖ. Ibid. 7.8. ὅτι ὥσπερ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα χρηματίζει, σημαίνονμενον θεὸς καὶ δεσπότης. *DT* (2.1-7), 7.8.1: ἐδέξατο Συμεὼν τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὰς ἀγκάλας κατὰ τὸ χρηματισμόν· εὐλόγησεν τὸν χρηματίσαντα, τουτέστιν ἐδόξασεν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἑωρακώς τὸ

σωτήριον τοῦ χρησμοῦ δεξάμενον πέρας· θεὸν τε καὶ δεσπότην αὐτὸν τὸν χρηματίσαντα ἐκάλεσεν. *DT* (*lib. 3*), PG.39.801: ὁμολογουμένως δὲ Θεὸς ἐστὶν καὶ Δεσπότης, ἴσην γνῶσιν ἔχων τῷ Θεῷ, ὅπερ ἀμήχανον καὶ ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἐπὶ παντὸς κτιστοῦ.

The same work accords the appellation to Christ no fewer than eighty times. *DT* (*lib. 1*), 26.23: υἱὸς μὲν ὢν αὐτοῦ ἀγαπητὸς καὶ ἀληθινός, θεὸς δὲ ὡμῶν καὶ δεσπότης. Ibid. 27.1: Ὅμοίως θεολογία περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ . . . καὶ 'ἀληθινὸς θεός' καὶ 'ζωὴ αἰώνιος' καὶ 'μόνος δεσπότης'. Ibid. 27.64: εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριν μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.

Didymus reserved the expression for God rather than Christ. He did not favour the notion δεσπότης itself,⁵ as I explain in [EN XXIXc](#) (p. 334). The designation is in fact an addition by Cassian himself and bespeaks his Antiochene education, since he actually follows Theodoret, who championed this term.

However, if we focus on the expression θεὸς καὶ δεσπότης, we see that, while it is absent from the rest of Didymus' works, it recurs in *De Trinitate*, and is abundantly present in Theodoret at the same time. In contrast to Didymus' works, the term δεσπότης accorded to Christ occurs no less than eighty times. One can notice that early writers, such as Irenaeus and Hippolytus, refrain from applying the term δεσπότης to Christ (Δεσπότης Χριστός). It occurs only in some second-century apocrypha (Acts of Philip, Acts of Thomas, if they are indeed second-century ones). The apparent reason is that this designation might seem to impugn monotheism. Origen employed the expression, yet not extensively (no more than six instances, of which one in *commJohn* is certain, whereas the rest are catena-fragments). The use by Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius, Epiphanius of Salamis was likewise rare: they designate Christ as 'Lord' only casually no more than two to six times each, with only Athanasius going as far as eleven instances. Five attributions to Gregory of Nazianzus are all spurious. Chrysostom makes extensive use of it (nearly

⁵ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 199: ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εἰς γῆν κατιόντας ἀγγέλους πάντας καὶ τῷ δεσπότη καὶ σωτῆρι προσκυνούντας. *Commentarii in Job*, PG.39.1132: ἀλλά γε πρόνοιαν ἐπιστάμενος, καὶ εἰδώς τὸν

Θεὸν Δεσπότην πάντων, καὶ καιρῶν, καὶ τόπων, καὶ πραγμάτων, ἐπικαλοῦμαι αὐτόν.

forty instances) and Ephraem Syrus matches that total. Against this textual reality, Theodoret uses this designation ‘Christ the Lord’ no less than two hundred and ninety times, thus making the term δεσπότης an almost inalienable designation for Christ. His sources can be easily identified: they are Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Cassian also applied the designation δεσπότης to Christ abundantly, quite evidently after the great Antiochene doctors.⁶

The label δεσπότης Χριστός was heavily used during the debate surrounding Nestorius, which is why it occurs so often in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (431). Pope Celestinus writing to Patriarch John of Antioch issued an ultimatum demanding that the latter condemn Nestorius within ten days. In this letter, the repeated use of δεσπότης Χριστός is remarkable.⁷

It would be a mistake to regard Theodoret’s use of the expression as suggesting opposition to Cyril arguing against Nestorius, who had allegedly made the Logos ‘either God or master (θεὸν ἢ δεσπότην) of Christ’,⁸ as a result of allegedly dividing Christ into two persons. For Theodoret used this designation evenly and consistently throughout his writings, and this usage *ipso facto* distances him from Nestorius. Quite simply, the designation is characteristic of Antioch. Therefore, the Scholia commence with Cassian setting his own Antiochene seal upon them.

One of the points that Ephesus made against Nestorius was that the Son also deserves the appellation δεσπότης as much as the Father does. Failure to do this was deemed tantamount to opening a back door to Arianism as a consequence of Nestorius’ teaching. It is natural to assume that it was Theodoret’s party that insisted on this. This is why Pope Leo in his Tome and the Council of Chalcedon applied the same epithet to Christ in general. Nestorius did in fact allow this appellation for Christ, but he had introduced qualifications as to its actual import.⁹ In the Local Council of Constantinople in 536, the designation occurs too, yet to a notably lesser extent. In the Lateran Council it was

used only twice, still it made a comeback with the Third Council of Constantinople (680–681) as a recurrent theme.

In essence, therefore, the Scholia commence with a tacit affirmation of this Christological point made by Ephesus: the term δεσπότης should be applied to Christ without any reservation or qualification at all.

The term appears in [Scholia I](#) and [XXIX](#). In view of the rarity of the designation in the New Testament, Cassian definitely was delighted to come across it in the Apocalypse.¹⁰

There is one other point that should be made: using the terms Θεός and δεσπότης side by side is a theme which grew more frequent as time went by, and Christianity entered gradually the era of stabilizing its social status. We do not find the combination of the two terms in early theologians as frequently as in later ones. This simple expression occurs in Clement of Alexandria no more than seven times, whereas in Tatian only four, in Hippolytus one, yet in Gregory of Nazianzus it obtains twenty-four times, forty-one in Gregory of Nyssa, some fifty times in Didymus and Eusebius. In Theodoret it occurs in nearly five hundred instances. It may seem strange, but Origen appears to have used the combination no more than twenty times. However, almost all of them appear in catena-fragments, which may well reflect the vocabulary of the catenist. In his major works, such as *Contra Celsum*, the designation Θεός and δεσπότης makes no appearance, albeit the term δεσπότης is certainly there (and more frequently so, the term οἰκοδεσπότης, coming directly from the phraseology of the parables). Much the same goes for the expression δεσπότης Χριστός. It appears four times in Origen (but only in catenae); three times in Eusebius; seven in Basil of Seleucia, but never in his namesake of Caesarea; three in Gregory of Nyssa, only once in Gregory of Nazianzus; eighteen times in Athanasius; nineteen in Cyril of Alexandria, but only two in Cyril of Jerusalem; five in Didymus, twenty-two in Ephraem, fifty-eight in John Chrysostom, sixteen in John of Damascus. Against

⁶ Cassian the Sabaite, *Const*, pp. 14v; 16r; 17a; *OctoVit*, pp. 44r; 47r; *De Panareto*, p. 118r. He also applies this term invariably to God: *OctoVit*, pp. 26v; 54v; *SerenPrim*, p. 80v; *De Panareto*, p. 109v.

⁷ ACO, 1,1,1, p. 91 (bis).

⁸ ACO, *Concilium Universale Ephesenum Anno 431*, 1,1,1, p. 36; 1,1,1, pp. 11; 15; 32; 37; 47; 48; 50; 64; 65; 71; 72; *ibid.* 1,1,5, p. 63;

et passim. This was the content of the sixth of the twelve anathemas by Cyril (*ibid.* p. 41, explained in 1,1,5, p. 21f. Theodoret rebuts it in 1,1,6, pp. 128f). He insists on his accusation *ibid.* 1,1,2, pp. 92–93 and p. 99 (accusing John of Antioch).

⁹ Cf. ACO, *ibid.* 1,1,2, p. 47.

¹⁰ Rev. 6:10.

this usage, the expression δεσπότης Χριστός appears in Theodoret at no fewer than two hundred and ninety points.

Therefore, it would appear that the more Christianity advances in mundane power and is involved with (and bolstered by) the state, the more the terms Θεός and δεσπότης, or Χριστός and δεσπότης, appear side by side and become increasingly frequent in Christian vocabulary. In the present corpus of Scholia, the designation appears right from the start.

The expression ἄξιον καὶ μέγιστον is an echo from Philo, *De Virtutibus*, 117: τῷ μὲν ἄλογον ζῶον καὶ οὐδενὸς ἴσως ἄξιον περιγίνεται, σοὶ δὲ τὸ μέγιστον καὶ τιμιώτατον τῶν ἐν τῇ φύσει, καλοκἀγαθία.

μέγιστον ἡγούμενοι θεὸν δεσπότην ἔχειν

This is a phrase from Philo, *De Cherubim*, 107–109: χαίρει δ' ἐπ' οὐδενὶ μᾶλλον ἢ κεκαθαρμένη διάνοια ἢ τῷ δεσπότην ἔχειν τὸν ἡγεμόνα πάντων ὁμολογεῖν· τὸ γὰρ δουλεύειν θεῷ μέγιστον αὐχίμα καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐλευθερίας ἀλλὰ καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἀρχῆς καὶ πάντων ὅσα τὸ θνητὸν ἀσπάζεται γένος τιμιώτερον.

The same notion, that is, 'having God as one's master is superior to any freedom', appears in John Chrysostom, whose exposition (referring to Paul, too, as the Scholion does) runs in the same vein. John Chrysostom took up the idea from Philo along with the Alexandrian's vocabulary: *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.176–177: Μηδεὶς τοίνυν ἐπὶ πλούτῳ μεγαλοφρονεῖτω· μηδεὶς ἐπὶ τινὶ τῶν βιωτικῶν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ μόνον, ἐπὶ τῷ τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν Δεσπότην. Τοῦτο πάσης ἐλευθερίας ἄμεινον, τοῦτο τῶν οὐρανῶν αὐτῶν βέλτιον. Εἰ γὰρ τὸ ἀκούειν τοῦ δεῖνος καὶ τοῦ δεῖνος καύχημα πολλάκις ἤνεγκε παρ' ἀνθρώποις, ἐννόησον τὸ ἀκούειν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡλικὴν φέρει δόξαν. Διὸ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἀντὶ μεγάλου ἀξιώματος τέθεικε τοῦτο λέγων· Οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν.

Theodoret makes a remark on the mystery of 'having God as one's master'; *commIs*, 15: καταγέλαστον ἐδόκει τοῖς ἀπιστοῦσι τὸ κήρυγμα καὶ οἱ ἀνθρώποις ἄρχουσι δουλεύοντες τὸν τῶν ἀπάντων κύριον δεσπότην ἔχειν οὐ κατεδέχοντο.

EN Id: ὡς ἄλλοι τὰ θνητῶν ἀξιώματα

Along with Chrysostom's positing that 'having God as one's master' is a 'great office of dignity', the idea which appears in this Scholion is also professed by Didymus, where the phraseology is closer to this text. The following are statements closely parallel to this Scholion.

Didymus, *frPs (al)*, fr. 858: Αὐχοῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ μεγάλῳ ἀξιώματι οἱ ἅγιοι πάντες ἐπὶ τῷ δοῦλοι θεοῦ εἶναι . . . καὶ τῶν γραμμάτων γοῦν ἑαυτῶν προτάττουσι ταύτην τὴν σημασίαν ὡς ἐπὶ μεγίστῳ ἀξιώματι ἐναβρυνόμενοι· Ἰάκωβος γὰρ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, καὶ Παῦλος δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ὡς γὰρ οἱ τοῦ κόσμου ἄνθρωποι ἐν ταῖς συγγραφαῖς τῶν βιωτικῶν συναλλαγμάτων ἐκ τῶν περὶ αὐτοὺς ἀξιωματῶν χρηματίζουσιν, οὕτως οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτῶν δοῦλοι θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ χρηματίζουσιν ἀξιοῦσι.

Didymus, *commPs35–39*, Cod. p. 231: οὗτος ἐστὶν δοῦλος θεοῦ. καὶ ὅρα γε, βασιλεὺς ἦν ὁ ταῦτα λέγων καὶ προέκρινεν τὴν θεοῦ δουλείαν τῆς βασιλείας· μεγάλη γὰρ εὐγένειά ἐστιν τὸ εἶναι θεοῦ δοῦλον. αὐτίκα γοῦν πολλάκις εἴρηται, ὅτι τάττουσιν ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ταῖς προγραφαῖς οὕτως οἱ ἅγιοι· Ἰάκωβος κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, καὶ· Παῦλος δοῦλος Χριστοῦ, καὶ Ἰωῆς ἐρωτώμενος· 'ἐκ ποίας χώρας καὶ ποίου λαοῦ', εἶτα λέγει· 'ἐγὼ δοῦλος θεοῦ εἰμι'. καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ διὰ ἀξίωμα προταττόμενοι τῶν συνταγμάτων ἑαυτῶν τὴν ἀξίαν καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα, οὗτοι οἱ ἅγιοι ὥσπερ μεγίστην εὐγένειαν καὶ υπερβάλλουσαν εὐκλειαν καὶ ἀξίωμα μέγα τὴν θεοῦ δουλείαν ὁμολογοῦσιν.

The idea is Origen's, but the Scholion is in fact a reproduction of Didymus' style and phraseology. Cf. Origen, *Commentarii in Epistolam ad Romanos (cod. Vindob. gr. 166)*, fr. 2: καὶ πᾶσιν ἑαυτὸν ποιεῖ δοῦλον ἐλεύθερος ὢν ἐκ πάντων κατὰ τὴν ὑψηλοτάτην δουλείαν τὴν πρὸς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ καθὸ ἄγαμος ὡς μὴ δοῦλος ὢν τῆς γυναικὸς ἀλλ' ἐλεύθερος, ἐν τούτῳ δοῦλος ἐστὶ Χριστοῦ ὡς μὴ μεριζόμενος τῇ κἀκεῖσε ἀλλὰ μόνον μεριμνῶν τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ οὐ περισπώμενος ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς τὸν λόγον δουλείας, καὶ καθὸ δουλεύει τῷ ὀνησαμένῳ αὐτὸν ἰδίῳ αἵματι, δοῦλός ἐστι αὐτοῦ. ταῦτόν δὲ εἰπεῖν δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ δοῦλος λόγου καὶ ἀληθείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ σοφίας

καὶ εἰρήνης καὶ ἥ τι ἄλλο ὄνομα ἀναγράφεται τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. . . . διὰ τοῦτο τε οὖν τὸ δοῦλος Χριστοῦ πρὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου τέθεικε καὶ ἅμα διότι τὸ τῆς ἀποστολῆς οἷς ἂν προσεῖη ἀξίωμα, χρείας ἄλλων ἔνεκα πρόσεστι, τὸ δὲ Χριστοῦ δοῦλον εἶναι τινά, τοῦτο ἴδιον τοῦ κεκτημένου κέρδος ἐστίν.

EN Ie: ἐλαττωτικοὶ ἑαυτῶν

The term ἐλαττωτικός is Aristotelian,¹¹ but it was rarely used in Greek literature. Even Aristotle's commentators hardly use it. As it stands, it appears only in *Scholion I*. Nevertheless, interesting derivatives of it appear in two other Scholia. *Scholion X*: ἴσως γὰρ ἄνεσις καὶ ἐλάττωσις ἐγγέγονει περὶ τὴν ἀγαπητικὴν αὐτοῦ διάθεσιν. *Scholion XXV*: ὡς οὐδεὶς . . . ἄξιος εὖρηται διὰ τὴν ἐλάττωσιν τῆς φύσεως.

ὁ ἐλαττωτικὸς ἑαυτοῦ

This particular expression involving a very rare use of ἐλαττωτικός comes from Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, 5.15.1: οὐδ' ἂν ὁ ἐλαττωτικὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἔν τινι τούτων ἀγαθὸς ᾖν.

Didymus may have borrowed the expression from the intellectual emperor, but it seems more likely that he took this up from Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 435: καὶ ὁ ἐπιεικὴς ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς συμφέρουσι ἐλαττωτικὸς αὐτοῦ. The same expression had been used by Porphyry, *De Abstinencia*, 3.26: ἐλαττωτικὸς ἑαυτοῦ. It can reasonably be assumed that Didymus came upon the expression in Porphyry, whom he mentions by name.¹²

Didymus' use of the expression is striking, since it appears in identical phraseology with *Scholion I. commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 310: δίκαιος γὰρ καὶ ἄμεμπτος ἀνὴρ ἐγενήθη εἰς χλεύασμα. ὅταν τὰ ἐλάττονα λέγῃ, ἑαυτῷ αὐτὰ προσάπτει· ἐλαττωτικὸς γὰρ ἑαυτοῦ διὰ ἀτυφίαν ὑπάρχει.

The following passage of Didymus is also a parallel to *Scholion I* as a whole: *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 230: 'καὶ γὰρ ὁ δοῦλός σου φυλάσσει αὐτά'. οὐχ ἑαυτὸν μόνον λέγει, ἀλλ' εἴ τίς ἐστιν τοιοῦτος δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ. ἐλαττωτικὸς οὖν ὢν ἑαυτοῦ ὅταν κατορθώματα λέγῃ,

Furthermore, the following passage, which applies once again the expression οἱ γὰρ ἅγιοι δι' ἀτυφίαν ὄντες ἑαυτῶν ἐλαττωτικοί of *Scholion I*, is at the same time a parallel to *Scholion XXXVII*, where the distinction between 'the name of the Lord' and the 'Lord Himself' is made. Didymus, *frPs* (al), fr. 1069: οἱ γὰρ ἅγιοι δι' ἀτυφίαν ὄντες ἑαυτῶν ἐλαττωτικοὶ τὰ ἐλάττονα ἑαυτοῖς διδόασιν ὧν ἔχουσιν.¹³

Michael of Ephesus presents the exceptional case of a commentator on Aristotle using the term. *In Librum Quintum Ethicorum Nicomacheorum Commentarium*, p. 68: ἐπὶ τὸ χειρόν ἐστιν ἀκριβοδίκαιος ὁ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τοῖς νόμοις πάντα φυλάσσειν βουλόμενος κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ χειρόν ἐξηγούμενος. ὁ δ' ἐπιεικὴς οὐ τοιοῦτος ἀλλ' ἐλαττωτικὸς· τρέπει γὰρ τὰς κολάσεις καὶ τὰς εὐθύνas ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλαττον.

Therefore, Didymus is the sole Christian author who used the expression ἐλαττωτικὸς ἑαυτοῦ, whereas germane pagan instances originate with Marcus Aurelius, enter the Christian era with Alexander of Aphrodisias, and end with Porphyry. The identification

¹¹ Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea*, 1136b21: ὁ γὰρ ἐπιεικὴς ἐλαττωτικὸς ἐστίν. Ibid. 1138a1: φανερόν δ' ἐκ τούτου καὶ ὁ ἐπιεικὴς τίς ἐστιν· ὁ γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων προαιρετικὸς καὶ πρακτικὸς, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀκριβοδίκαιος ἐπὶ τὸ χειρόν ἀλλ' ἐλαττωτικὸς, καίπερ ἔχων τὸν νόμον βοηθόν, ἐπιεικὴς ἐστί, καὶ ἡ ἕξις αὐτῇ ἐπιείκεια, δικαιοσύνη τις οὐσα καὶ οὐχ ἑτέρα τις ἕξις. *Magna Moralia*, 2.1.1: ἔστιν δὲ ἡ ἐπιείκεια καὶ ὁ ἐπιεικὴς ὁ ἐλαττωτικὸς τῶν δικαίων τῶν κατὰ νόμον. ἃ γὰρ ὁ νομοθέτης ἐξαδυνατεῖ καθ' ἕκαστα ἀκριβῶς διορίζειν, ἀλλὰ καθόλου λέγει, ὁ ἐν τούτοις παραχωρῶν, καὶ ταῦθ' αἰρούμενος ἃ ὁ νομοθέτης ἐβούλετο μὲν τῷ καθ' ἕκαστα διορίσαι, οὐκ ἡδυνήθη δέ, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐπιεικὴς. οὐκ ἔστιν δὲ ἐλαττωτικὸς τῶν δικαίων ἀπλῶς· τῶν μὲν γὰρ φύσει καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς ὄντων δικαίων οὐκ ἐλαττοῦται, ἀλλὰ τῶν κατὰ νόμον, ἃ ὁ νομοθέτης ἐξαδυνατῶν ἀπέλιπεν.

¹² Cf. Didymus, *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 280; *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p.308; *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p.281. Cf. Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), v. 39, pp.760 and 761.

¹³ This shows Didymus' awareness of Aristotle's *Ethica Nicomachea* and *Magna Moralia*. Notice the similarity with certain anonymous works. Anonymi, *In Artem Ars Rhetoricam Commentaria*, p. 79 (using Aristotle's vocabulary): οἱ γὰρ ἐπιεικεῖς οὐ προσέχουσι τῷ νόμῳ· ἐλαττωτικοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν, ὧν οἱ νόμοι προστάττουσι. Anonymi, *In Ethica Nicomachea II–V Commentaria*, p. 250: ἐπὶ τὸ χειρόν δὲ εἰσιν ἀκριβοδίκαιοι οἱ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τοῖς νόμοις φυλάσσειν βουλόμενοι κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ χειρόν, ὡς ἂν ἀκριβῶς δίκαιον ἐξηγούμενοι τὰ γεγραμμένα. ἀλλ' ἐλαττωτικὸς· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλαττον τὰς κολάσεις τρέπων· οὐ γὰρ πικροτέρως ἐπέξεισι τῷ ποιήσαντι τὸ μοχθηρὸν ὁ ἐλαττωτικὸς (cf. *Scholion XV*: μοχθηρὰ ἕξις). Anonymi, *In Ethica Nicomachea Paraphrasis*, p. 110: ἔστι γὰρ ὁ τῶν εἰρημένων προαιρετικὸς καὶ πρακτικὸς, καὶ ὁ μὴ ὁ ἀκριβοδίκαιος ἐπὶ τὸ χειρόν ἀλλὰ ἐλαττωτικὸς, καίπερ ἔχων τὸν νόμον βοηθόν· καὶ ἡ ἕξις αὕτη ἐπιείκεια, δικαιοσύνη τις οὐσα, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλη τις παρὰ ταύτην καὶ διάφορος ἕξις.

of this expression of [Scholion I](#) with Didymus is then indisputable. As a matter of fact, Didymus is the sole author to use the expression twice, in two different works. Besides, the theme of this Scholion, which is to regard oneself as highly honoured in being (and being called) ‘a servant’ of God, has identical parallels in Didymus.

However, [Scholion I](#) is actually a composition by Cassian quoting extensively (yet not exclusively) from the opening of Didymus’ Commentary on the Apocalypse. The telling point is Cassian’s use of the term δεσπότης for Christ. Didymus applies this appellation to none other than God, and only an isolated exception is made for quoting the passage of the epistle of Jude 4.¹⁴

By contrast, the term δεσπότης applied to Christ is used at no less than two hundred points in *De Trinitate*, which is one more indication (from the many that I have canvassed)¹⁵ that this is not a work by Didymus, but by Cassian the Sabaite. Besides, the same designation occurs in Didymus’ *Fragments on the Psalms* (*frPs(al)*), through the pen of the catenist (either Olympiodorus the deacon of Alexandria, or Anastasius of Sinai, who both use the expression themselves in their own works).

Therefore, while Didymus’ Commentary on the Apocalypse is drawn on right from the start, Cassian puts his own Antiochene seal thereon also right from the start.

¹⁴ Didymus. *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 89.

¹⁵ See NDGF, Appendix II: ‘Pseudo-Didymus’ *De Trinitate* is Cassian’s work.’

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION II

EN IIa: φανερω̃σαι τὸν λόγον

The expression φανερω̃σαι τὸν λόγον is a rare one, yet it appears also in [Scholion XXVII](#): ἄξιός ἐστιν διὰ τὴν ἐλάττωσιν τῆς φύσεως τὸν τῆς προνοίας λόγον διακρίσεως καὶ διοικήσεως φανερω̃σαι. Although the Scholion draws heavily on Didymus, this specific point is Cassian's. For Didymus did not use the expression ἐλάττωσις τῆς φύσεως, which originates in Cassian's reading of Plutarch and Gregory of Nyssa, as discussed in [EN XXVIII](#) (p.324). This also occurs in catena fragments ascribed to Origen, *frLuc*, fr. 3: τὸ δὲ 'ἀνατάξασθαι' σημαίνει τὸ ἐκθεῖναι, τὸ ἐξηγήσασθαι, τὸ συγγράψαι. 'ἀνατάξασθαι' ἀντὶ τοῦ συντάξαι γραφῇ καὶ φανερω̃σαι τὸν λόγον.

It might be that this is an echo from Hippolytus,

Chronicon, 21: ἔδοξε δὲ ἡμῖν ἐναρξάμενοις ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως τὴν κατὰ λόγον ἀπόδειξιν, καθὼς ἀπαιτεῖ, ἐν συντόμῳ φανερω̃σαι.

Didymus reproduced this vocabulary in an instance, which is remarkable since it allows for a catena-fragment to be compared with the same fragment in a papyrus. It should be noticed that the abridgement made by the catenist is not extensive, whereas he is faithful to Didymus' text. *commJob*(12.1–16.8a), fr. 351: (The same in *Commentarii in Job*, PG.39.1149.33–35): τὸ τούτους γινῶναι τὸν καὶ περὶ τούτου τῆς προνοίας λόγον, ὅντινα φανερω̃σαι βουλόμενος ἔλεγεν τὸ 'καὶ ἐλέγξω'.

The parallel in Didymus shows [Scholion II](#) to be an excerpt from his Commentary on the Apocalypse adapted by Cassian.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION III

EN IIIa: ἐπὶ θείοις καὶ μεγάλοις

A study of this uncommon expression shows that Didymus borrowed this from Plutarch and possibly from Origen, *Cels*, VII.44: ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἀληθῶς θεῖα. Didymus, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 16 (2 Cor. 1:11): Ἐν τοῖς προκειμένοις διδάσκει ὡς τὰ μεγάλα ὄντως καὶ θεῖα δωρήματα δίδονται, εὐχῆς πλειόνων ὑπὲρ ἑνὸς λαμβάνοντος ἀναπεμπομένης.

Theodoret, *intDan*, PG.81.1329: Ἀπεστερήμεθα γάρ, φησί, βασιλείας, προφητείας, ἱερωσύνης, τῶν θείων σου καὶ μεγάλων δωρεῶν, δι' ὧν κυβερνώμενοι διετελοῦμεν.

The common source for both Alexandrians is in fact Plutarch, *Non Posse Suaviter Vivi secundum Epicurum*, 1107B6: ἐν ᾧ χρόνῳ πολλὰ καλὰ καὶ μεγάλα καὶ θεῖα προδοκῶσιν οἱ τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνωλέθρους εἶναι διανοοῦμενοι.¹

Dio Chrysostom made ample use of the expression. *Orationes*, 11.24b: σμικρὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπεια ψεύσματα πρὸς θεῖα καὶ μεγάλα. Ibid. 30.29: εἶναι δὲ πάντα ὅμοια τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν γιγνομένοις ἐν ταῖς ὑποδοχαῖς, πλὴν ὡς μικροῖς καὶ ἀγεννέσι θεῖα καὶ μεγάλα εἰκάσαι. Ibid. 48.14: ὅτι τὰ θεῖα ταῦτα καὶ μεγάλα ὁμοιοῦσιν τυγχάνει δεόμενα καὶ φιλίας. Ibid. 74.26: ὁ δὲ σύμπας οὐρανός, ὅφ' ᾧ πάντες ἐσμέν ἀρχῆθεν, οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ πρὸς ὁμόνοιαν οὐδὲ ἡ τῶν ὄλων κοινωνία θείων οὔσα καὶ μεγάλων, ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ἡ τῶν μικρῶν καὶ οὐδενὸς ἀξίων. Ibid. 12.28: περιλαμπόμενοι πάντοθεν θείοις καὶ μεγάλοις φάσμασιν οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ ἄστρων, which is in fact a quotation from Posidonius, *Fragmenta*, fr. 368: περιλαμπόμενοι πάντοθεν θείοις καὶ μεγάλοις φάσμασιν οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ ἄστρων.

Philostratus, *Heroicus*, p. 663: μηδὲ γὰρ λανθάνοι τοὺς χαρίεντας τῶν ἀνθρώπων θεῖα οὕτω καὶ μεγάλα ὄντα.

Later, Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 4.50c.95: ἔλεγε δὲ περὶ τε ψυχῆς ἀνθρώπου καὶ σώματος, ὅτι ἄρα τὰ μὲν θεῖα καὶ μεγάλα καὶ οἷς ἐφέστηκε δαίμων τις ἢ θεὸς ἢ τύχη, ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἀκόντων ἡμῶν κρατεῖ.

Basil of Seleucia, *Orationes*, p. 428: καίτοι σημεῖοις θείοις τε καὶ μεγάλοις, τῆς ἄνωθεν ἐπικουρίας τὴν πίστιν λαμβάνοντα.

Eustathius of Thessaloniki, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, v. 2, p. 645: ὡς ὅτε ἀνθρωπίνως φράζει τὰ θεῖα, καὶ αὖ πάλιν μικροῖς μεγάλα, ὀπηνίκα ποιεῖ ἔμπαλιν. v. 4, p. 484: καὶ τις ἕτερος τῶν θείων καὶ πάνυ μεγάλων ἐν οἰκείῳ λόγῳ ἀπὸ τῶν περιφανῶν ἀστέρων Σειρίου μόνου ἐμνήσθη καὶ Ὠρίωνος.

I also record the spurious text the author of which is in all probability Cassian himself (Pseudo-Basil of Caesarea), *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 4.135: τὴν περὶ τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν τῶν τὰ μεγάλα καὶ θεῖα θεωρούντων ἱεροπρεπῆ κατάστασιν.

EN IIIb: ἐπὶ μικροῖς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνους

Didymus makes the same contrast between 'things that are divine and great' and things 'small and human'. The sentiment (and characteristic vocabulary) of both *Scholia II* and *III* appear in his *frPs(al)*, fr. 932: μεγαλοπρέπειαν δὲ ζητῶν τὸ πρέπον καὶ εὐπρεπὲς ἐν μεγάλοις καὶ ὑπερτέροις: μεγαλοπρέπεια γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐν μεγάλοις πρέπον, μικροπρέπεια δὲ τὸ ἐν μικροῖς.

This expression was used also by Dio Chrysostom, who spoke of 'education' which is θεῖα μεγάλη ἀνθρωπίνη μικρά. *Orationes*, oration 4.29: οὐκ οἶσθα, ἔφη, ὅτι διττὴ ἐστὶν ἡ παιδεία, ἡ μὲν τις δαιμόνιος, ἡ δὲ ἀνθρωπίνη; ἡ μὲν οὖν θεῖα μεγάλη καὶ ἰσχυρὰ καὶ ῥαδία, ἡ δὲ ἀνθρωπίνη μικρὰ καὶ ἀσθενὴς καὶ πολλοὺς ἔχουσα κινδύνους καὶ ἀπάτην οὐκ ὀλίγην.

Gregory of Nazianzus, *De Se Ipso et ad Eos Qui Ipsum Cathedram Constantinopolitanam Affectare Dicebant et de Populi Alacritate*, PG.36.272.32–33: Ἐγὼ γάρ, εἰ μὲν ἀνθρώπινόν τι καὶ μικρὸν ἐννοῶν. *Adversus Julianum Imperatorem* 1, PG.35.556.17–19: μηδὲ γὰρ δεῖσθαι, πλήρης ὢν, μηδενὸς τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων τε καὶ μικρῶν, ἵνα χαίρη καὶ τοῖς ἀναξίως προσφερομένοις.

¹ Origen mentions Plutarch by name (*Cels*, V.57), and Theodoret often does so, too. *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 1: 14, 21, 24; 2: 84, 87,

95, 108, 109, 112, 116; 3: 4, 23, 54, 56; 4: 31; 5: 16; 7: 43; 10: 5; 11: 42, 46; 12: 71.

Eustathius of Thessaloniki, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, v. 2, p. 645: οὐκ ἐξ ἀνάγκης αἱ τροπαὶ αἰετοῦ ποιότητος μεγαλεῖον ζητοῦσι καὶ ποσότητος ἀλλ’ ἢ μόνον ὅτε που ἐγχωρεῖ, μεγάλοις τε μικρὰ προσβιβάζουσα, ὥς ὅτε ἀνθρωπίνως φράζει τὰ θεῖα, καὶ αὖ πάλιν μικροῖς μεγάλα, ὁπνηῖκα ποιεῖ ἔμπαλιν.

EN IIIc: τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων καὶ ἀκουόντων

The verb ἀναγινώσκειν has various senses in scripture.

1. It may mean ‘to read for the purpose of grasping the meaning’ of a passage. Matt. 24:15 and Mark 13:14: ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω. Eph. 3:4: πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ecclesiasticus, Prologue, 4: καὶ ὥς οὐ μόνον αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας δέον ἐστὶν ἐπιστήμονας γίνεσθαι. Habakkuk, 2:2: Γράψον ὅρασιν καὶ σαφῶς ἐπὶ πυξίον, ὅπως διώκη ὁ ἀναγινώσκων αὐτά. 2 Macc. 2:25: ἐφροντίσαμεν τοῖς μὲν βουλομένοις ἀναγινώσκειν ψυχασγωγίαν. Esther 6:1: Ὁ δὲ κύριος ἀπέστησεν τὸν ὕπνον ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην, καὶ εἶπεν τῷ διδασκάλῳ αὐτοῦ εἰσφέρειν γράμματα μνημόσυνα τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀναγινώσκειν αὐτῷ.

2. The sense made out of a text, the import of which is obscure. This was the meaning of the question which Jesus asked the lawyer, in Luke 10:26: Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 875: Δύναται πεῦσις ἀναγινώσκεσθαι οὕτως. *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 23: στίζουσι δὲ τινες εἰς τὸ ἐν οἷς ὁ θεός, ἐξῆς ἀναγινώσκοντες ἀπ’ ἰδίας ἀρχῆς· τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων. Ibid. p. 32: Στίζεται δὲ ἡ προκειμένη λέξις διαφόρως. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀναγινώσκουσιν· ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀγαπητοί, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος,

3. It may mean the mere act of reading a text, which does not necessarily entail ‘comprehension’ of it. Acts, 8:30: προσδραμὼν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος ἤκουσεν αὐτοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος Ἡσαΐαν τὸν προφήτην, καὶ εἶπεν, Ἄρα γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις; The reading may, or may not, result in grasping the message, as Paul says to the Corinthians: in this case ἀναγινώσκειν is contrasted with ἐπιγινώσκειν: cf. 2 Cor. 1:13: οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα γράφομεν ὑμῖν ἀλλ’ ἢ ἃ ἀναγινώσκετε ἢ

καὶ ἐπιγινώσκετε, ἐλπίζω δὲ ὅτι ἕως τέλους ἐπιγνώσεσθε. This is also the meaning of 2 Cor. 3:2, although the reversed order of participles γινωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη may suggest that when this ‘epistle’ is read it is already comprehended: ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν ὑμεῖς ἐστε, ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, γινωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη ὑπὸ πάντων ἀνθρώπων.

4. The reading of the prophets in synagogues, taking place on Saturdays, according to Acts 13:27: τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας. Acts 15:21: Μωϋσῆς γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος. 2 Cor. 3:15: ἀλλ’ ἕως σήμερον ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται Μωϋσῆς κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κεῖται. This reading was continued in Christian worship, where ‘the gospels, the law, and the prophets’ were read to the congregation. Cf. Didymus, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 17 (comm. on 2 Cor. 1:1–14): Παρειληφόσιν ὑμῖν ἀναγινώσκειν τὰ εὐαγγέλια καὶ τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας, οὐχ ἕτερα ὧν ἀναγινώσκετε γράφομεν· ὡσαύτως γὰρ ἐκείνοις ἐστὶ θεόπνευστα ἃ χαράττομεν ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς. ἐπιγινώσκετε οὖν καὶ ὑμεῖς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, μερικὴν διάληψιν τέως ἔχοντες.

5. Last, and most importantly for our topic, is the sense of ‘reading a prophecy to the people’ for the purpose of edifying, of advising about the divine will, and possibly about the punishments which those who do not comply will incur. This is the sense in which the verb ἀναγινώσκειν is used in important passages in Jeremiah. Jer. 28:63: καὶ ἔσται ὅταν παύσῃ τοῦ ἀναγινώσκειν τὸ βιβλίον τοῦτο. Jer. 43:13: καὶ ἀνήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς Μιχαίας πάντα τοὺς λόγους, οὓς ἤκουσεν ἀναγινώσκοντος τοῦ Βαροὺχ εἰς τὰ ὄτα τοῦ λαοῦ. Jer. 43:14: Τὸ χαρτίον, ἐν ᾧ σὺ ἀναγινώσκεις ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν ᾧ τοῦ λαοῦ, λαβὲ αὐτὸ εἰς τὴν χειρὰ σου καὶ ἤκε. Jer. 43:23: καὶ ἐγενήθη ἀναγινώσκοντος Ἰουδὶν τρεῖς σελίδας καὶ τέσσαρας, ἀπέτεμνε αὐτὰς τῷ ξυρῷ τοῦ γραμματέως καὶ ἔρριπτεν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐσχάρας, ἕως ἐξέλιπεν πᾶς ὁ χάρτης.

This is the sense applied to the verb ἀναγινώσκειν in Rev. 1:3, which is also the one applied in [Scholion III](#): the author of the Book of Revelation meant to write a prophecy, which should be read to the people in order to

alert, edify, and admonish them. This is what Jeremiah and the other prophets did, too, which is why John the author of the Book of Revelation is styled ‘a prophet’.

Scholion III refers to *one* who reads and to the *many* who listen. Origen had implied this ceremonial process in some of the works of his maturity, when he refers to instructors who imitate Jesus explaining to his disciples the divine mysteries. Therefore, in church there is one who reads and many who listen essaying to comprehend the divine text.

Origen, *homJer*, 5.8 δι’ ὃ κάλυμμα ‘ἐὰν ἀναγινώσκηται Μωσῆς’, ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς οὐ νοεῖ αὐτόν· ‘Κάλυμμα’ γὰρ ‘εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ κεῖται’ δι’ ὃ κάλυμμα, ἐὰν ἀναγινώσκηται ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη, οὐ συνήσει ὁ ἀκούων· δι’ ὃ κάλυμμα καὶ ‘τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶ κεκαλυμμένον’. Ibid. 12.13: κἂν παραβολαὶ εὐαγγελικαὶ ἀναγινώσκωνται καὶ ὁ ἀκροατὴς ἢ τῶν ἔξω, οὐ κεκρυμμένως αὐτῶν ἀκούσεται. ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ἀκροατὴς ἀπόστολος ἢ ἢ τῶν εἰσερχομένων ‘εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν’ Ἰησοῦ, προσέρχεται τῷ Ἰησοῦ, πυνθάνεται καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀσαφείας τῆς παραβολῆς, καὶ ἐρμηνεύει αὐτὴν Ἰησοῦς καὶ γίνεται ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἀκροατὴς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἀκούων αὐτοῦ κεκρυμμένως. *com-mlCor*, 73: Κίνδυνός ἐστι τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσιν ἀπλῶς ἀποφαίνεσθαι, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.

Later theologians formed their exposition on the premise that this procedure is the standard one.

Athanasius, *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.153: Ὡς περ τοίνυν ἀναγινώσκοντες ταῦτα διανοούμεθα καλῶς· καὶ ἀκούοντες δοῦλον τὸν Σολομῶντα, οὐ νομίζομεν αὐτὸν εἶναι δοῦλον, ἀλλὰ φύσει καὶ γνήσιον υἱόν. John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos*, PG.63.195: Εἰς τοῦτον τοίνυν ἀφορῶμεν καὶ εἰς τὰ τῶν μαθητῶν τῶν τούτου, ἀναγινώσκοντες τὰ Παύλου, καὶ ἀκούοντες αὐτοῦ λέγοντος.

EN IIIId: προχείρως ἀκούειν
(cf. EN XXVd: κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον)

The expression suggests mere reception of the literal meaning of the text, contrasted with apprehension of the spiritual sense of scripture. In line with the Origenistic tradition of allegorical or anagogical exegesis, Didymus made this a recurring theme, always warning the reader against sticking to the literal sense of the holy

text: one should always seek the spiritual meaning concealed under the letter.

Didymus, *commPs40–44.4*, Cod. p. 296: καὶ ὥς περ ‘προσέχειν’ δεῖ ‘τῇ ἀναγνώσει’ ‘τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς’, οὐ μόνης τῆς τῶν γραφῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ‘πάσης’, οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι μετὰ συνέσεως καὶ λέγεσθαι ὀφείλουσιν καὶ ἀκούεσθαι. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὸ τῆς συνέσεως ὄνομα πρὸς τῷ προχείρως δηλούμεν καὶ ἄλλο δηλοῖ. *frPs(al)*, fr. 4: Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ πεφυτευμένου παρὰ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὑδάτων (τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ σοφία) καρπὸς μὲν ἐστὶν ἡ μυστικὴ καὶ πνευματικὴ τῶν γραφῶν διάνοια, φύλλα δὲ σκέποντα τὸν εἰρημένον καρπὸν αἱ πρόχειροι λέξεις. Fr. 44: οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἅπαντος πάντες οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ σφαγῇ προχείρως νοουμένη ἀναιροῦνται. Fr. 187: Πρὸς τῇ ἱστορίᾳ ἀλληγορικώτερον ἱμάτια καὶ ἱματισμὸς Ἰησοῦ εἶναι δύναται αἱ πρόχειροι τῶν γραφῶν λέξεις· ταύτας γὰρ ἀμφίσκεται καὶ περιβάλλεται ὁ θεὸς λόγος ὑφeskτῶς κατὰ τὰ πνευματικὰ νοήματα. Fr. 1174: Προχείρως μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ περὶ πόδα τὴν λέξιν ἐξομαλίζοντα ταύτας δίδοσθαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p. 92: δύναται δὲ προχείρως τοῦτο. *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 197: ἐὰν περὶ τῆς γῆς ταύτης ἐκλάβης καὶ τούτων τῶν κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον γονέων, διαψεύδεται. *commPs35–39*, Cod. p. 236: ἐστὶν δὲ ἡ φωνὴ ἢ πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις τῶν γραφῶν ἢ φθάνουσα καὶ κρούουσα τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν ἀκοὴν αὐτῆς, οὐ μὴν τὸν νοῦν. Cod. p. 240: καὶ μειζόνως μὲν σαφηνίζειν δεῖ τὰς γραφάς ... Ἰουδαῖοι γοῦν κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ἐκλαμβάνοντες αὐτὰς λέγονται ‘μὴ νοεῖν μηδὲ ἃ λέγουσιν μηδὲ περὶ ὧν διαβεβαιοῦνται’. Cod. p. 245: ‘καὶ ζητήσεις τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ μὴ εὔρης.’ προχείρως πάλιν· δεῖ γὰρ καὶ τὰς δημωδεστέρας ἐξηγήσεις λέγειν. Ibid. ἐὰν προχείρως αὐτὸ θέλης λαβεῖν, τῷ μηκέτι ἁμαρτάνειν δοκεῖ μὴ ἁμαρτωλὸς εἶναι. *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 142: ἐκλαμβάνων τὴν μὲν πρόχειρον λέξιν τῶν γραφῶν φωνήν, τὸν δὲ μυστικὸν νοῦν λόγον. Ibid. Cod. p. 230: Ἐκστάντος οὖν τοῦ Ἀβράμ, σκοτεινὸς φόβος ἐπιπίπτει αὐτῷ, οὐ σκότους μετέχων ἀλλ’ ἀσαφείας καὶ μὴ γινωσκόμενος προχείρως. Ibid. Cod. p. 223: ‘Καὶ ἐπεκαλέσατο ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου’, ὅπερ προχείρως τις ἐκλαμβάνων λέξει ὅτι τὸ θυσιαστήριον, ὀκοδόμησεν. *commEccl (1.1–8)*, Cod. p. 16: ‘οὐ δυνήσεται’ οὖν ἄρχειν ‘τοῦ λαλεῖν’, ἐὰν μὴ κάμη περὶ αὐτῶν.

προχείρως ‘οὐ δύναται’ αὐτοὺς εἰπεῖν, ἵνα τὸ ‘λαλεῖν’ τὸ ‘ἀληθῶς λαλεῖν’ λέγωμεν. *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 207: καὶ προχείρως αὐτὸ λέγομεν, τάχα δὲ ἀληθεύοντες. *commZacch*, 2.357–358: Εἰ γὰρ τὸ προχείρως γινώσκειν λαμβάνοιτο, ταῦτόν εἴη τῷ ἐπίστασθαι. *commJob*(1–4), Cod. p. 72: διακριτικός ὢν ὁ ἅγιος καὶ οὐ πρόχειρος γινώσκειν, ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἀντίδικος πολλάκις ‘μετασχηματίζεται εἰς ἄγγελον φωτός’.

We have a noticeable presence of the anonymous author currently assigned the name ‘Pseudo-Macarius’, whom we will come across again and again. A certain text of his seems to originate with Clement of Alexandria. It has recently been ascribed to Gregory of Nazianzus, but this is an attribution which I doubt.

Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv (collectio B)*, 62.1.7: φυλάττου δὲ ὅπως μηδὲν ποτὲ λαλήσης ὃ μὴ προσκέψω καὶ προενοήσας μηδὲ προχείρως ἄκουε, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ μεταξὺ τῶν ἑτέρου λόγων ὑπόβαλλε τοὺς σαυτοῦ. Different editors have ascribed the same text to Clement of Alexandria, *Fragments*, fr. 44 and to Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ὁ Προτρεπτικός εἰς ὑπομονήν, ἢ Πρὸς τοὺς Νεοστί Βεβαπτισμένους*. Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Quis Salvatur Dives*, 2.2: οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτόθεν καὶ προχείρως ἀκούσαντες τῆς τοῦ κυρίου φωνῆς.

Simplicius took up the expression, and he is the philosopher in whose work the phrase of the Scholia recurs. In *Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 9, p. 484: καὶ ἄλλως δὲ προχειρότερον ἔστιν ἀκούειν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς τὸ ἐν καὶ ἄπειρον ἐν ἀφορισμένῳ τόπῳ ἐποίει. Ibid. v. 9, p. 71: τὸ μὴ ἐν εἶναι τὸ ὄν εἴ τις κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον ἀκούοι, ἐκ διαιρέσεως ἀνασκευάζων. Ibid. v. 10, p. 1029: καὶ ἐδόκει τοῦτο τοῖς προχείρως ἀκούουσιν ἄπειρον ἐκάστην ὑποτίθεσθαι μεταβολήν. Ibid. v. 10, p. 1165: ὅτι δὲ ὁ Πλάτων γενητόν τόν τε κόσμον εἶπεν καὶ τὸν χρόνον οὐ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει σημαινόμενον, καὶ ὅπως ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης παλαιὰν συνήθειαν διασφύζων οὐ πρὸς τὸν Πλάτωνα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς κατὰ τὴν πρόχειρον ἐκδοχὴν τὸ γενητόν ἀκούοντας ἀντιλέγει.

EN IIIe: πιστῶς ἀκούειν

The idiom means ‘listening to someone faithfully’, that is, granting credibility to what is said, since the words deserve to be believed. This is one of the cases where the Scholia make use of an expression coming directly from a classical author, namely Demosthenes, whom we shall come across also in [Scholia XIX](#), [XXX](#), [XXXV](#), and [XXXVII](#). Origen and the three Cappadocians made casual reference to him, but there is nothing to suggest that they had ever read the orator first-hand. The Christians who quote from him confidently are only Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and Theodoret.² Otherwise, to Christians Demosthenes was just a famous ancient orator, but nothing beyond this. Once again, three major scholars of Christian thought turn out to have a common background. The expression in this Scholion, therefore, shows an influence of Theodoret upon Cassian, who must have received it directly from Demosthenes, since I know of no text of Eusebius or Clement where this expression is used. Besides, *De Trinitate*, which is in fact a work of Cassian, employs the expression, too. *DT (lib. 2.1–7)*, 7.3,11: πιστῶς οὐδὲ ταῦτα ἀκούοντες.

Demosthenes, *Contra Phormionem*, 49: οὐκ οὐκ ἄτοπον, εἰ τῆς ἐκείνου μαρτυρίας τὸ μὲν πρὸς τοῦ ἀποστεροῦντος πιστῶς ἀκούσεσθε, τὸ δ’ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀποστερουμένων ἄπιστον ἔσται παρ’ ὑμῖν;

Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.860.13–16: Κἂν γὰρ γνησίως ὁ κηρύττων πιστεύῃ, ὁ δὲ ἀκούων μὴ πιστῶς τὰ μαθήματα δέχοιτο, υἱὸς χρηματίζειν οὐ δύναται τοῦ κηρύττοντος γνωμικὴ γὰρ ἢ τοιαύτη συγγένεια.

Hippolytus, *De antichristo*, 2: τῷ μὲν λέγοντι τὸ ἀκίνδυνον ἐξεπείν, τῷ δὲ ἀκούοντι τὸ πιστῶς ἀκούσαντι καταδέξασθαι τὰ λεγόμενα. Pseudo-Epiphanius of Salamis, *Homilia in Divini Corporis Sepulturam*, PG.43.444: Ἐὰν δὲ μυθικῶς ταῦτα καὶ οὐ πιστῶς ἀκούῃς. Severianus of Gabala, *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p.263: πίστις τὸ πιστεῦσαι μόνον τῷ κηρύγματι· οὐ γὰρ τὸ ἀκοῦσαι ἀπλῶς τοῦτο πίστις ἀλλὰ τὸ δέξασθαι πιστῶς τὰ εἰρημένα.

² Eusebius, *PE*, 10.2.6; 10.3.14; 10.3.15. He mentions the titles of two orations by Demosthenes (ibid. 10.3.17), being evidently aware of their content. Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 1.21; 8.2. Ibid. 8.25 and *Epistulae* 1–52, Epistle 12, he culls from Demosthenes.

Clement of Alexandria mentions Demosthenes in order to quote from him in *Stromateis*, 6.2.20.2; 6.2.20.7; 6.2.22.5; 6.2.23.6; ibid. 7.16.101.4, Demosthenes is simply mentioned by name.

Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 4.53.35: ὅσα μέντοι ἀγαθὰ παρέχει δεξάμενος ἡμᾶς, ἀδεῶς τε καὶ πιστῶς ἀκούετε.

The expression occurring in Origen's catena-fragments on John is the product of a catenist's pen. *frJohn*, L: τοῦτο δὲ πιστῶς καὶ φρονίμως ἐκλαβεῖν δεῖ.

Scripta Anonyma Advesus Iudaeos, *Dialogus Contra Iudaeos* 1.3: οὐκοῦν πιστῶς ἄκουσον.

EN IIIf: σύζυγος ἢ προφητεία προφήτη

'Prophecy is conjoint with a prophet.' The expression has a parallel in Philo, where Moses is stated to be at the same time a 'king', a 'lawgiver', an 'arch-priest', and a 'prophet'. These are the 'four powers' which stand in oneness or 'in conjunction' (συζυγία).

Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, 2.6–7: ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ μυρία καὶ βασιλεῖ καὶ νομοθέτῃ καὶ ἀρχιερεῖ τῶν ἀνθρωπείων καὶ θείων ἄδηλα . . . ἀναγκαιῶς καὶ προφητείας ἔτυχεν. . . καλὴ γε ἡ συζυγία καὶ παναρμόνιος τῶν τεττάρων δυνάμεων.

The terms σύζυγος and συζυγία occur in the following passage from the commentaries on the Proverbs by Origen and Didymus, where Didymus repeats Origen almost verbatim (or, perhaps, Origen's thought has been rendered in Didymus' vocabulary). Both portions use the terms in the sense that is used in [Scholion III](#), which is also the sense obtaining in Philo.

Origen, *expProv*, PG.17.185: σύζυγος οὖν ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῖς κτίσμασιν ὧν γέγονεν ἀρχή, τουτέστιν ἡ πρὸς τὰ γεννητὰ σχέσις. Didymus, *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.39.1632: Σύζυγος οὖν ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῖς κτίσμασι. Προῦπάρχων τῆς κτίσεως, σοφία ὧν, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐὰν λέγει· 'Κύριος ἔκτισέ με,' μὴ οὐσίωσιν τὴν νόησιν ἔχῃ, ἀλλ' εἰς σχέσιν τὴν πρὸς τὰ κτίσματα.

Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 213: ὁ σοφὸς γὰρ μετὰ τῆς σοφίας ἐστὶν ἥτοι ἀρχόμενος ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἢ

ἐξ αὐτῆς ἔχων τὸ ἄρχειν, καὶ σύζυγον αὐτὴν ἔχων. *frPs(al)*, fr. 130: Ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην λογίζεται. συζύγως δὲ καθαριότητα χειρῶν ἐρεῖς. Ibid. fr. 932: καὶ ταύτη μεγαλοπρέπειαν ἔχει σύζυγον οὖσαν ἢ κέκτεται ἀγιότητι. Ibid. fr. 986: ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ σύζυγος τῷ ἐλείει τούτῳ δικαιοσύνη. *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 227: τοῦ τελείου σύζυγός ἐστιν αὕτη ἡ παιδευσίς.

Origen, *commGen*, PG.12.88.23–27 (*Philocalia* 14, 1): Φασὶ δὲ οἷς ἐμέλησε τῆς τῶν σημαινομένων ἐξετάσεως, ἐν τοῖς τόποις τοῖς ἔχουσι συζυγίαν προσηγοριῶν καὶ κατηγορημάτων, προϋφίστασθαι τὰ τυγχάνοντα τῶν προσηγοριῶν, καὶ ἐπιγίνεσθαι τὰ κατηγορήματα παρὰ τὰς προσηγορίας. *selPs*, PG.12.1281.34–36: Μακάριος ὁ ἐγκαταλειφθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ τῆς συζύγου αὐτοῦ κακίας, ἐξ ἧς τίκτει τοὺς παρανόμους τούτου υἱούς. *commJohn*, XX.23.196: ἐπομένου πάντως τῷ καλῷ θέλῃν τοῦ συζύγου αὐτῷ τοῦ ἐνεργεῖν.

I conclude, therefore, that Cassian wrote this comment on Rev. 1:3–4, consulting Didymus' commentary on this book, and this comment is a quotation *ipsissimis verbis*. The verb μακαριοποιεῖν is a fine seal of Didymus' vocabulary bequeathed to Cassian. Even the expression οὐχ ὥς ἔτυχεν is characteristic of Didymus, who used it abundantly, whereas in other authors (save Chrysostom) it occurs only in single casual instances. Once again, we come upon οὐχ ὥς ἔτυχεν in the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaïam*, although Basil of Caesarea himself never used it; it appears also in *De Trinitate*.³ By the same token, this usage tells us that Origen's fragments on the Psalms are probably a compilation by either Sabaite or Akoimetan monks, since it appears only once in a homily, thereafter to appear only in catena-fragments.⁴ On the other hand, Didymus used it abundantly, and so did his Sabaite compilers, including indeed Cassian himself.⁵ No wonder then that it occurs in authors who regularly reproduce Cassian's vocabulary.⁶

³ *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaïam*, 16.306. *DT (lib. 3)*, PG.39.965.11.

⁴ Origen, *homJer*, 20.5. *selPs*, PG.12: 1121.49; 1473.34; 1616.32.

⁵ Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), Fr. 319; *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 339; *commZacch*, 1.184; 2.222; *Adversus Manichaeos*, PG.39.1097.11; *commPs20–21*, Codex pp. 24; 56; *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 185; *commPs35–39*, Cod. p. 258; *commPs40–44.4*, Cod. p. 300; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 154; *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 93.

So *frPs(al)*, frs. 1; 46; 163; 661a; 1182; 1246; *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio (in catenis)*, p. 39.

⁶ Cf. John Climacus, (sixth/seventh cent.), *Scala Paradisi*, chapter 26, column 1088 (*bis*). John of Damascus, *Expositio Fidei*, 96. Theodore Studites, *Μεγάλη Κατήχησις*, Catechesis 28, p. 197; Catechesis 67, p. 473; Catechesis 78, p. 45; Catechesis 84, p. 590; Catechesis 104, p. 761; *Epistulae*, Epistles 24; 25; 225; 361; 395; 497.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION IV

EN IVa: Τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους

Changing the non-capital lambda of the word λόγος to a capital one (Λόγος) makes a substantial difference. A lower-case lambda means, ‘the teaching (of this passage of Revelation) has included all three tenses (of the verbs used therein)’. In that case, λόγος betokens ‘teaching’, and the author would have suggested ‘the teaching of this scriptural passage’. This rendering, however, can be definitely excluded on account of the sentence that follows: ‘Being aware of this, John the Theologian says . . .’ What John ‘is aware of’ is obviously not the ‘three tenses’ of verbs, which he himself used, but the deeper meaning of the statement, ‘the Logos encompasses all time’. This time is understood to be a ‘tripartite’ one (past, present, future): the Logos is the Lord of all time, and dominates all History, which is a quotation from Clement of Alexandria styling the Logos ‘the alpha and the omega’.

This Scholion integrates two major traditions: one, the Hellenic (Stoic) concept of the Logos as a universal principle, which is ‘god’, even though the term is employed by John in a substantially different context. Second, the biblical concept of Christ (also transformed in import), which is dominant in Paul’s theology. The aim is to show that this passage of Revelation is compatible with both John and Paul, since it expresses the same theology about the Second Person of the Trinity. Hence the parallel expressions referring to John and Paul respectively: Τοῦτο ἐπιστάμενος ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης, and Χριστὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιστάμενος, ὁ ἀπόστολός φησιν.

The author of the Scholion takes for granted that the author of Revelation is John the Evangelist. He therefore takes the statements of Rev. 1:4 and 1:8 (which technically belong to the ensuing [Scholion V](#), but at that point it is only Clement’s text that is quoted) as de-

noting the rule of Christ over the entire world. This rule is adumbrated by asserting his dominion over all time, as well as by the appellation ‘Pantocrator’ accorded to Him. The Logos rules over all time, which is just a way of illustrating his dominion over the entire world.

Cassian’s contemporary John Philoponus urged that by ‘notions which denote time’ we also indicate that which is *in* time.¹ Therefore, He who dominates all *parts* of time actually rules all over the world.

This idea of tripartite time was present in Philo,² and subsequently in Origen.³ However, what we have here is rather peculiar: the psychological understanding of time comprising past, present, and future is described as the ‘three times’ (τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους). The term ‘time(s)’ in this Scholion has a twofold sense, as it does in other authors. In the first place, it means the ‘tense’ of a verb, as studied in grammar. The author says that ‘the Logos has encompassed the three tenses’ meaning *also* the three grammatical forms of the participle, namely, ὄν (present), ἦν (past), and ἐρχόμενος (future), applied to Him. It is plain, however, that speaking of grammatical ‘times’ (= tenses) of the participles occurring in Rev. 1:4 (and 1:8) is only the point of departure. For the remark is about the Logos dominating all time, that is, all History. Speaking of ‘three tenses’, therefore, involves a certain echo of theories about time proper.⁴ This is the point that allows us to discern the person of the author of this Scholion, which seems to lie behind these expressions. This person is Cassian the Sabaite.

There are three groups of authors making mention of ‘three times’ (τρεῖς χρόνοι): those expounding questions of grammar (or rhetoric); others who express the psychological experience of time; and, third, authors dealing with the question of time proper. Christians scarcely make conscious use of the terminology of the third category.

¹ John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, v. 13,1, p. 164: ποτὲ δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ χρόνου δηλωτικὸν ἥτοι τὸ ἐν χρόνῳ ὄν· τούτου δὲ εἶδη τρία, ἐνεστώς παρεληλυθὼς μέλλον· . . ὁ κόσμος καὶ τὸ παρεληλυθὸς ἔχει καὶ τὸ ἐνεστὸς καὶ τὸ μέλλον. Also, *De Aeternitate Mundi*, p. 582.

² Philo, *De Plantatione*, 114: τῶν τριῶν ἐτῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ τριμεροῦς χρόνου παραλαμβάνομένων, ὃς εἰς τὸν παρεληλυθότα καὶ

ἐνεστώτα καὶ μέλλοντα τέμνεσθαι πέφυκεν. Also, *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, 47: τριμερὴς γὰρ ὁ χρόνος, ἐκ παρεληλυθότος καὶ ἐνεστώτος καὶ μέλλοντος συνεστώς.

³ Origen, *selEz* (comm. on Ez. 16:30), PG.13.812.56–813.1: Καὶ ἐξεπόρνευσας τρισσῶς. Ἀντὶ τοῦ, πολλαχοῦ· οἱ γὰρ τρεῖς χρόνοι εἰς πάντα αἰῶνα παραλαμβάνονται.

⁴ Cf. *COT*, pp. 179–206.

In the first class we find remarks such as the following:

Anonymi, *Commentarium in Aristotelis de Interpretatione*, p. 70: αὐται τριπλασιαζόμεναι κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους, οἷον ἦν ἔστιν ἔσται, ποιοῦσιν κδ' ἀντιφάσεις. Anonymi, *In Artem Rhetoricam Commentaria*, p. 12: ἀναλόγως γὰρ τοῖς τρισὶν εἵδεσι τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους ἀπέδωκεν. Anonymi, *Commentarium in Librum Περὶ Εὐρεσεως*, v. 7, p. 794: Εἰ γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους τῇ διατυπώσει χρῶ, προσκορῆς ἔση, καὶ ψυχρολογία ἀλώση. Ibid. v. 7, p. 795: οὐδεὶς γὰρ τῶν ἄρτι πραττομένων καὶ μήπω πέρας εἰληφότες ὑπέχει εὐθύνας· μόνη οὖν τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους ἔχει πραγματική, διὰ μὲν τὰ ἐνεστώτα ἔσθ' ὅτε δοκιμάζουσα καὶ τῶν μελλόντων κατευστοχεῖν, περὶ ὧν καὶ πρόκειται ταύτῃ διαλαβεῖν. Anonymi, *Commentarium in Librum Περὶ Στάσεων*, v. 7, p. 448: καὶ ταύτην ἐργαζόμεθα τὴν ποιότητα κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους, κατὰ τὸν παρῳχημένον, κατὰ τὸν ἐνεστώτα, κατὰ τὸν μέλλοντα. Anonymi, *Commentaria In Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, p. 59: Διὰ τῶν τριῶν τούτων ἐπιρρημάτων οἱ τρεῖς χρόνοι δηλοῦνται, διὰ μὲν τοῦ νῦν ὁ ἐνεστώς, διὰ δὲ τοῦ τότε ὁ παρεληλυθός, διὰ δὲ τοῦ αὐθις ὁ μέλλων. Anonymi, *Περὶ τῶν ὀκτὼ μερῶν τοῦ ῥητορικοῦ λόγου*, v. 3, p. 594: Πᾶσα δὲ ἡθοποιία ἐπιδέχεται τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους, τὸν ἐνεστώτα, τὸν παρεληλυθότα καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα. Anonymi, *Epitome Artis Rhetoricae*, v. 3, p. 634: ἀπλῶς δὲ τὰ ἐνεστώτα, γνώριμα γὰρ καὶ δῆλα. καὶ ἄλλως δὲ περίεργος καὶ μακρήγορος δόξεις. εἴπερ κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους ἐνδιασκευῶς γράφεις. εἰ δὲ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἄξιον διασκευῆς ὑπάρχει. εἰ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους διήγησιν ἐφεύροις, χρήζουσιν τῆς διασκευῆς, οὕτω μοι τότε γράφε. Pseudo-Theodosius (grammarian), *Περὶ γραμματικῆς*, p. 149: τὰς τρεῖς διαθέσεις, τὴν ἐνεργητικὴν, τὴν παθητικὴν καὶ τὴν μέσσην· ἐκάστη δὲ διάθεσις περιέχει τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους, τὸν ἐνεστώτα, τὸν παρεληλυθότα καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα. Theognostus (grammarian), *De Orthographia*, 970: ἔστι γὰρ τὸ ἥδη, ὃ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους ὑπισχνεῖται· ἐνεστώτα· παρῳχημένον, καὶ μέλλοντα. Eustathius of Thessaloniki, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, v. 1, p. 254: ἰστέον γὰρ ὅτι τὸ 'νῦν' κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους δηλοῖ, τὸν ἐνεστώτα, οἷον· ἦ γὰρ ἄν, Ἀτρεΐδη, νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσαιο· καὶ τὸν παρῳχημένον, ὥς τὸ 'νῦν ὦλετο πᾶσα Ἰλίου κατ'

ἄκρης· καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα, οἷον· 'νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνεΐαιο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει'.

Regarding the second set, we come upon remarks such as the following:

Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 459: εἰ γὰρ τὸ ὀριστὸν ἔχει τὴν παράστασιν ἀἴδιον καὶ ἀθάνατον καὶ κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους διήκουσαν, ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὁ ὀρισμὸς τοιοῦτος, καλῶς ἀποδέδοται.

Galen, *De Arte Medica*, v. 1, p. 313: καὶ ταῦτα δὲ κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους ὁμοίως τοῖς ὑγιεινοῖς τε καὶ νοσώδεσι. In *Hippocratis Librum Primum Epidemiarum Commentarii III*, v. 17a, p. 147: γινώσκων γὰρ καὶ προλέγων παρὰ τοῖς νοσέουσιν τὰ τε παρεόντα καὶ τὰ προγενόμενα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι, ὥς περὶ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους καταγιγνομένης τῆς προγνώσεως. In *Hippocratis Prognosticum Commentaria iii*, v. 18b, p. 11: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῶν κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους ἢ πρόγνωσης ἔστιν, οὐ μόνων τῶν κατὰ τὸν μέλλοντα.

Pseudo-Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata*, 9: Ἡ δὲ ἐργασία κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους πρόεισι.

Pseudo-Epiphanius of Salamis, *Tractatus de Numerorum Mysteriis*, PG.43.512.12–13: Τρεῖς χρόνοι, ἐνεστώτων, παρεληλυθόντων, μελλόντων.

Severianus of Gabala, *In Illud: Quando Ipsi Subiciet Omnia*, p. 165: Εἰς τρία τέμνονται χρόνοι, εἰς τὰ παρεληλυθότα καὶ ἐνεστώτα καὶ μέλλοντα.

Maximus Confessor, *De Caritate*, 3.100: Τριχῶς τέμνεται ὁ χρόνος καὶ ἡ μὲν πίστις τοῖς τρισὶ συμπαρατείνεται τμήμασι.

Olympiodorus of Alexandria (the philosopher, sixth cent. AD), *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, p. 132: τὸ δὲ ποτὲ τριχῶς κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους· κατὰ τὸν ἐνεστώτα, κατὰ τὸν μέλλοντα καὶ κατὰ τὸν παρεληλυθότα.

Scholia ad Hermogenis Librum Περὶ Στάσεων, v. 4, p. 215: ἰστέον δέ, ὅτι γίνεται ὁ στοχασμὸς κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους, παρεληλυθότα, ἐνεστώτα, μέλλοντα. Ibid. v. 4, p. 538: ἐξετάζεται δὲ ἡ ποιότης κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους, τὸν παρεληλυθότα καὶ ἐνεστώτα καὶ μέλλοντα.

Eustathius of Thessaloniki, *Commentarius in Homeri Odysseam*, v. 2, p. 272: καὶ οὕτω παράγοντο οἱ τρεῖς χρόνοι, ὁ πρῶην, ὁ νῦν καὶ ὁ εἰσέπειτα.

Finally, some authors refer to the three 'parts' of time proper.

Origen, *selEz*, PG.13.812.56–813.1, quoted above.

Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 6.12: Τὸν δὲ ἀριθμὸν τῶν Μοιρῶν τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους παραδηλοῦν, ἐν οἷς κυκλεῖται τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' ὧν ἐπιτελεῖται. *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 69: καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ χρόνος ἰσάριθμος· τρεῖς γὰρ ἡμέραι καὶ τρεῖς νύκτες καὶ ἐνταῦθα κάκει.

Suda lexicon, Alphabetic letter tau, entry 1003: Τρίπους· κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους μαντευόμενος, ἐνεστῶτα, παρελθούτα, μέλλοντα.

Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter eta, p. 978: καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπάρτι, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ πρὸ τούτου. ἀόριστος ἐστὶ καὶ τρεῖς χρόνους δηλοῖ· παρωχημένον, ἐνεστῶτα καὶ μέλλοντα.

This last category involves a specific conception of time. I have argued that Origen held a certain idea of time having no duration. Didymus followed him in this, for theological reasons. The notion is expressed though the idea of a 'now' which is 'crushed' between the past (which exists no more) and future (which does not exist yet), indeed by the past instantly overtaken by the future in the flux of time. This is of course the Aristotelian argument, which I have canvassed elsewhere.⁵

Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 353: οὐκ ἔστιν διαστῆσαι χρόνον ἀπὸ χρόνου. τὸ λεγόμενον οὖν 'νῦν', ὃ λέγουσιν σημειῶδες καὶ πέρας χρόνου, τοῦ μὲν παρελθούτος τέλος ἐστίν, τοῦ δὲ ἐνεστῶτος μέλλον καὶ πάλιν τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος τέλος, ἀρχὴ δὲ τοῦ μέλλοντος.

This is part of the philosophy of time proper, which had been expounded in Classical Antiquity and later, as well as after Didymus:

Damascius, *In Parmenidem*, p. 243: Καὶ γὰρ ὁ χρόνος εἶδος ὅλον, τοῦτο δὲ τὸ πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον, μόρια ἤδη δύο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνὸς προελθόντα· καὶ γὰρ εἰς δύο ταῦτα διαιρεῖται ὁ χρόνος πρὸ τῆς εἰς τρία τομῆς, εἰς τὸ πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον, ὧν ἐν μέσῳ οὐ χρόνος, ἀλλὰ πέρας χρόνου, τὸ νῦν ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ γένεσις αἰεὶ τὸ μὲν πρότερον, τὸ δὲ ὕστερον ἔχει· μέσον δὲ τὸ πέρας ὃ κατὰ τὸ γεγονέναι ὁράται, ἀμερὲς δὲ καὶ τοῦτο. Ἔστιν ἄρα τὸ πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον μία φύσις τοῦ χρόνου, ἀλλ' οὐπω τὸ ὕστερον καὶ πρότερον ἀντιδιηρημένα. Ibid. p. 237: Ἔστιν ἄρα ἅπτεσθαι ἅμα καὶ ἀφίεσθαι

τοῦ νῦν· μέρους μὲν ἄρα ἅπτεται, μέρους δὲ ἀφεθήσεται· μεριστὸν ἄρα τὸ νῦν· χρόνος ἄρα, καὶ οὐ πέρας χρόνου. Ἔτι δὲ πορεύεται μὲν ἐν τῷ γίγνεσθαι τὸ γιγνόμενον, ἐπίσχει δὲ καὶ ἴσταται ἐν τῷ εἶναι, ὥς δὲ ἡ κίνησις, οὕτω καὶ ἡ στάσις ἐν χρόνῳ. Ibid. p. 242: μέτρα ὄντα χρονικὰ δημιουργικαῖς τομαῖς διωρισμένα καὶ ταύτη γε ἀμέριστα, καὶ ὅλον ὁμοῦ ἕκαστον τὴν ἐπίσχεσιν τοῦ πορευομένου χρόνου φατέον ἐνδείκνυσθαι, καὶ νῦν καλεῖσθαι, οὐχ ὥς πέρας χρόνου, ἀλλ' ὥς χρόνον ἀμέριστον δημιουργικῶς, εἰ καὶ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἐπινοίᾳ διαιρετόν, καὶ τοῦτο ἐπ' ἄπειρον, ἐπεὶ καὶ πᾶν σῶμα ἐπ' ἄπειρον διαιρετόν.

Archedemus of Tarsus (second cent. BC), *Fragmenta*, fr. 14 (*apud* Plutarch, *De Communibus Notitiis Adversus Stoicos*, 41, p. 1081): Ἀρχέδημος μὲν ἀρχὴν τινα καὶ συμβολὴν εἶναι λέγων τοῦ παρωχημένου καὶ τοῦ ἐπιφερομένου τὸ 'νῦν' λέλθην αὐτόν, ὥς ἔοικε, τὸν πάντα χρόνον ἀναιρῶν. εἰ γὰρ τὸ 'νῦν' οὐ χρόνος ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ πέρας χρόνου, πᾶν δὲ μόριον χρόνου τοιοῦτον οἶον τὸ νῦν ἐστίν, οὐδὲν φαίνεται μέρος.

John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, v. 13,1, p. 46: οὐσία αὐθυπόστατον τί ἐστι, τούτων δὲ οὐδὲν ἰδίαν ἔχει ὑπόστασιν· τό τε γὰρ σημεῖον ἐν γραμμῇ ἔχει τὸ εἶναι πέρας ὃν γραμμῆς καὶ ἀρχή, καὶ τὸ νῦν ἐν χρόνῳ· ἀρχὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ πέρας χρόνου καὶ οὐ χρόνος (νῦν δὲ λέγω τὸ ἀκαριαῖον, οὐ τὸ πλατυκῶς λεγόμενον), καὶ ἡ μονὰς ἀρχή. *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 17, p. 803: ἀρχὴ δὲ τοῦ μέλλοντος, τοῦτο καὶ ἔν ἐστι καὶ ἀδιαίρετον, ὥσπερ τῆς γραμμῆς τὸ σημεῖον· εἰ γὰρ εἴη διαιρετόν, χρόνος ἔσται καὶ οὐ πέρας χρόνου. τοῦτο δὲ τὸ ἄτομον πρῶτως λέγεται νῦν, τὸ δὲ ἐν πλάτει οὔτε πρῶτως οὔτε καθ' αὐτό· διὸ γὰρ πλησιαιότερον τοῦ κυρίως νῦν, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸ νῦν λέγεται.

Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 9, p. 799: ἐνεργεῖα τὸ νῦν ἀφορισμένον, ὥς ὅ γε διδοὺς εἶναι τὸ νῦν πέρας ὃν χρόνου πάντως δώσει καὶ τὸ περατούμενον. αἱ δὲ ἐφεξῆς ἀπορίαι πειρῶνται δεικνύναι, ὅτι τὸ νῦν οὐ πέρας χρόνου ἀνυπόστατον ἐστίν, ἀλλ' οὐδ'

⁵ COT, pp. 254–259.

ὥσπερ χρόνου ἔχειν τινὰ ὑπόστασιν δύναται, εἴπερ ἀνάγκη μὲν, εἰ πάρεστιν, ἢ τὸ αὐτὸ διαμένειν ἢ ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο γίνεσθαι· ἐκάτερον δὲ ἀδύνατον δείκνυται. Ibid. v. 10, p. 982: νῦν δείκνυσιν ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ ἐν ᾧ πρῶτῳ μεταβέβληκε τὸ μεταβεβληκός, οὐ χρόνος ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ ἄτομόν τι πέρας χρόνου, ὅπερ ‘νῦν’ καλοῦμεν, ὅπερ Πλάτων ‘ἐξαίφνης’ ἐκάλεσεν. Ibid. v. 10, p. 1286: τὸ γὰρ συνεχῶς κινούμενον ἔστι μὲν καθ’ ἕκαστον τῶν δυνάμει τέως σημείων, καὶ ἔστιν οὐκ ἐν χρόνῳ, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ νῦν, ὃ ἐστὶ πέρας χρόνου. διὸ οὔτε γίνεται ἐν τινι τῶν τοιούτων οὔτε ἀπογίνεται, ὥστε ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς συνεχοῦς κινήσεως τῆς ἐπὶ συνεχοῦς μεγέθους γινομένης ἀδύνατον λέγειν, γίνεσθαι. Ibid. v. 10, p. 1297: οὐ ἀνακάμπτει, προσχρησάμενος ἐν τῇ δεῖξει τῷ μὴ δύνασθαι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νῦν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πέρας χρόνου, ἀλλ’ οὐ χρόνος, γενέσθαι τι ἐν τινι καὶ ἀπογενέσθαι ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, ὅπερ ἠκολούθει τῷ μὴ ἐξ ἀμερῶν συγκεῖσθαι τὸν χρόνον, μηδὲ δύνασθαι ἔχεσθαι ἀλλήλων τὰ νῦν.

Unlike Origen and Didymus, on this particular question we see Cassian holding the simple idea of a tripartite time, according to the psychological conception of it. He is one of the very few authors, and indeed the sole Christian one, using the expression ‘three times’ (τρεῖς χρόνοι) in this context.

EN IVb: John the Evangelist styled θεολόγος

The epithet θεολόγος applied to John originates in the region of Antioch. The designation was, and still is, applied also to Gregory of Nazianzus, but since it was John (1:1) who said, Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, he was accorded the title θεολόγος. A later spurious text

ascribed to John Chrysostom claims that ‘John was the great and the sole theologos’ (ὁ μέγας καὶ μόνος θεολόγος Ἰωάννης).⁶ The sixth-century historian Procopius of Caesarea implies that the appellation θεολόγος was accorded to John by Christians of Ephesus, ‘because he had related those characteristics [of Christ] which pertain to the divine nature, better than the ones involving his human nature’.⁷

Gregory of Nazianzus did not care to accord the designation θεολόγος to John, while his namesake of Nyssa used an ambiguous expression calling John the Baptist ‘theologian of the Saviour’ (θεολόγος τοῦ σωτῆρος), in a rhetorical rather than theological context.⁸ He nevertheless applied the epithet to the Evangelist casually at one point;⁹ still this could hardly appear as a distinctive appellation accorded to John the disciple.

The designation θεολόγος appears in Cyril of Alexandria only once,¹⁰ and so it does also in Justinian quoting Cyril.¹¹ It is noteworthy that it occurs in the Acts of Ephesus, but not in those of Chalcedon, where the term is simply a quotation from Cyril of Alexandria¹² by bishop Paul of Emesa.¹³ It also occurs in a letter by Patriarch John of Antioch and his synod,¹⁴ and in an epistle by the same gathering addressed ‘to the people and clergy of Constantinople’.¹⁵ Justinian quotes Paul of Emesa preaching in a church of Alexandria at the urging and in the presence of Cyril himself.¹⁶ Oecumenius (sixth cent.), who wrote a Commentary on the Apocalypse, could not remain out of the catalogue.¹⁷

Other authors styling John θεολόγος are Cyril of Jerusalem (fourth cent.),¹⁸ Asterius of Amasea (fourth/fifth cent.),¹⁹ Hesychius of Jerusalem (fifth cent.),²⁰ John Malalas (fifth/sixth cent),²¹ Leontius of

⁶ Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *Encomium in Sanctum Joannem Evangelistam*, p. 665.

⁷ Procopius of Caesarea (historian, sixth cent. AD), *De Aedificiis* 5.1.5: ἐνταῦθα νεῶν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι ἐν τοῖς ἄνω χρόνοις Ἰωάννη τῷ ἀποστόλῳ ἀνέθηκαν, θεολόγος δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ κλησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος οὗτος ὠνόμασται, ἐπεὶ τὰ γε ἅμῃ τῷ θεῷ ἄμεινον αὐτῷ ἢ κατὰ ἀνθρώπου δεδιήγηται φύσιν.

⁸ Gregory of Nyssa, *Encomium in Sanctum Stephanum Protomartyrem*, PG.46.729.19.

⁹ Gregory of Nyssa, *De Sancto Theodoro*, PG.46.74830: ὁμοίως τὸν θεολόγον καὶ φιλούμενον μαθητήν.

¹⁰ Cyril of Alexandria, *Dialogi de Sancta Trinitate*, p. 496. Ἀφῖχθαί γε μὴν ‘εἰς τὰ ἴδια’ φησὶν αὐτὸν ὁ θεολόγος ἡμῖν Ἰωάννης.

¹¹ Justinian, *Adversus Monophysitas*, 165: ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης λέγει

‘καὶ ἐσκίνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, δύο φύσεις καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς τὸ ἐν πρόσωπον.

¹² ACO, *Concilium Universale Ephesenum Anno 431*, 1,1,2, p. 70 and 1,1,7, p. 20.

¹³ Ibid. 1, 1,4, p. 12; also, p. 13.

¹⁴ Ibid. 1, 1, 5, p. 128.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Justinian, *Adversus Monophysitas*, 165: ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης.

¹⁷ Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, pp. 29 and 258.

¹⁸ Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Illuminandum*, 12.1.

¹⁹ Asterius of Amasea (fourth/fifth cent. AD), *Homiliae*, 8.12.4.

²⁰ Hesychius of Jerusalem, *In Conceptionem Joannis Praecursoris*, Homilia 16, section 9. Pseudo-Hesychius of Jerusalem, *Encomium in Sanctum Lucam*, section 6.

²¹ John Malalas, *Chronographia*, pp. 262; 269; 366.

Byzantius (fifth/sixth cent.).²² Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (fifth/sixth cent.) addresses one of his epistles to 'John', whom he styles 'Theologian (θεολόγῳ), Apostle, and Evangelist'.²³ Attributions to Hippolytus,²⁴ Athanasius,²⁵ Basil of Seleucia (fifth cent.),²⁶ and John Chrysostom²⁷ are spurious, and the texts are actually later than these authors. *Chronicon Paschale* (seventh cent.) applies the designation θεολόγος to John as a matter of course.²⁸ This also appears in the *Apocalypsis Apocrypha Joannis*, yet it is doubtful whether this is a second-century text (as has been claimed), or (as it seems to me) a much later document.²⁹ In the Greek translations of Ephraem Syrus, he appears to ascribe this designation to John the Evangelist exclusively and consistently,³⁰ with only one instance dignifying the prophet Joel with the same epithet. However, these texts are translations from Syriac. Therefore, one cannot be sure whether the epithet θεολόγος³¹ was actually attributed to John by Ephraem himself, or it was just a translator who took the initiative. Furthermore, the term itself suggests that the translations were made later, and we know that many such translations were produced at the Laura of Sabas.³²

Didymus applied the term θεολόγος to eminent biblical figures,³³ such as Moses,³⁴ David,³⁵ Paul,³⁶ James,³⁷ Peter,³⁸ as well as to the prophets in general,

yet not to John the Evangelist. On the other hand, *De Trinitate* ascribes this epithet to John the Evangelist exclusively, which is one more indication that this work was not written by Didymus. It is remarkable that not only does *De Trinitate* make reference to 'John the θεολόγος',³⁹ but also the author (that is Cassian the Sabaite) deemed it sufficient to refer to John by simply using θεολόγος alone as virtually a proper name, not an epithet.⁴⁰ This is significant, since later times regarded the appellation θεολόγος alone as pointing to Gregory of Nazianzus, even though his name was not mentioned. *De Trinitate* also acclaims John for having emphasized the divinity of the Holy Spirit.⁴¹ Cassian's phraseology in the Scholia⁴² does in fact bear on the phrasing of *De Trinitate*. Beyond Cassian, other Sabaite monks, such as Antiochus of Palestine (or Antiochus of Ancyra,) and John of Damascus used the same designation, too.⁴³ Among them Caesarius should be included, since I have advanced the thesis that he is Cassian himself.⁴⁴

The theologian who introduced this dignifying appellation consciously and decidedly was Theodoret.

If Gregory of Nyssa used it casually, and John Chrysostom never did so, Theodoret used θεολόγος definitely as an epithet exclusively applied to John, indeed as peculiar to John as his own name. As a matter of fact, sometimes this is applied in a context strongly

²² Leontius of Byzantium, *In Mesopentecosten*, line 421.

²³ Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite, *Epistulae*, 10.

²⁴ Pseudo-Hippolytus, *De Consummatione Mundi*, 21: Ἰωάννης ὁ θεολόγος, *op. cit.* 10 7 21.

²⁵ Pseudo-Athanasius, *Sermo Major de Fide*, Fr.63; *Synopsis Scripturae*, PG.28: 293.42; 428.53; 613.45.

²⁶ Pseudo-Basil of Seleucia, *De Vita et Miraculis Sanctae Theclae* 1.28.

²⁷ Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *De Sacra et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.48.1087.60; *In Psalmos 101–107*, PG.55.646.79; *De Pseudopropheta*, PG.59.554.35; *In Sanctum Joannem Theologum*, PG.59.609.17; *In Laudem Sancti Joannis Theologi*, PG.61.719, 3 & 5 & 45; *De Caritate*, PG.62.771.28; 772.1; *In Infirmos*, pp. 323 & 325.

²⁸ *Chronicon Paschale*, pp. 10; 398; 416; 461.

²⁹ Cf. *Apocalypsis Apocrypha Joannis*, pp. 317, 320; (*versio altera*), section 1.

³⁰ Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo Compunctorius*, p. 102; *Sermo in Secundum Adventum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi*, p. 13; *De Communi Resurrectione*, p. 48; *De Secundo Adventu Domini*, p. 212, *De Caritate*, pp. 120 and 122; *De Ludicris Rebus Abstinencia*, p. 242; *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, p. 226.

³¹ Ephraem Syrus, *Laudatio in Petrum et Paulum et Andream*, p. 126.

³² See RCR, Introduction, pp. 35–36.

³³ Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.35: The designation τῶν θεολόγων, refers to the prophets Malachi and David, as well as to Paul and James. Likewise, the expression οἱ θεολόγοι in *commZacch*, 2.195, is

applied to Malachi, David, and James, through respective quotations from them (Mal. 3:6; Psalm 101:28 and Heb. 1:12; James 1:17).

³⁴ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1213. Moses is pointed to through the expression τῶν θεολόγων τις alluding to Deut.4:39.

³⁵ Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.94.

³⁶ Didymus, *ibid.* 1.312; *frPs(al)*, frs. 748 and 1196.

³⁷ Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.54.

³⁸ Didymus, *ibid.* 1.214.

³⁹ *DT (lib.1)*, 15.4: ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης. *Ibid.* 27.61: Ἰωάννης μὲν ὁ πολὺς ἐν θεολόγοις. *DT (lib. 3)*, PG.39.796.8: τῷ Θεολόγῳ. *Ibid.* PG.39.825.4: ὁ παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ δῶρον τῆς θεολογίας δεξάμενος.

⁴⁰ *DT (lib.3)*, PG.39.796.8: παρὰ τῷ Θεολόγῳ.

⁴¹ *DT (lib.2.8–27)*, PG.39.641.10: ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης θεολογῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα. A comprehensive reference to 'theologians' (τῶν θεολόγων) is made.

⁴² The appellation θεολόγος appears in *Scholia IV* and *VII. Scholion IV*: ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης. *Scholion VII*: τὸν θεολόγον Ἰωάννην.

⁴³ Antiochus of Palestine, *Pandecta Scripturae Sacrae*, Homily 122, line 83. John of Damascus, *Orationes De Imaginibus Tres*, sections 1.19; 3.30; 3.43. *Adversus Jacobitas*, section 85; *Adversus Nestorianos*, section 1; 42 (*bis*); *In Transfigurationem Salvatoris*, section 7. Pseudo-John of Damascus, *Vita Varlaam et Joasaph*, p. 168.

⁴⁴ Caesarius (= Cassian the Sabaite), *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, 2; 197; 198. *NDGF*, Appendix II.

reminiscent of this Scholion. No previous author used the term as purposefully and consistently as Theodoret did.⁴⁵ When it occurs in Ephraem Syrus, it is to be assumed that these works were translated in an environment in which the designation θεολόγος had been dominant.⁴⁶ Therefore, the epithet occurring in Ephraem Syrus is a question which I leave moot, since one cannot actually know whether this is Ephraem Syrus or indeed the so-called ‘Ephraem Graecus’ (writings by Greek hands ascribed to Ephraem Syrus), or else whether these translations (mostly composed at the Laura of Sabas) were imbued by the Antiochene spirit, thus easily subjoining the designation θεολόγος to the name of John the Evangelist.⁴⁷ My own belief is that the Sabaite monks who translated Ephraem’s works simply added the epithet to the name of John. In any event, since the term indicates an Antiochene sentiment, it was all too natural for Severus of Antioch to use the term θεολόγος with reference to John the Evangelist.⁴⁸

As a consequence of this discussion, certain apocrypha styling John θεολόγος should be assigned to a later date. Such writings are the *Acta Ioannis*,⁴⁹ the *Apocalypsis Apocrypha Ioannis*, the *Apocalypsis Apocrypha Ioannis (versio tertia)*.⁵⁰ The same goes for spurious works, such as *De Consummatione Mundi*, ascribed to Hippolytus, *Sermo Major de Fide, Quaestiones ad Antiochum Ducem* and *Synopsis Scripturae* ascribed to Athanasius, *De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, *In Psalmos 101–107*, *De Pseudoprophetis*, *In Sanctum Joannem Theologum*, *De Caritate*, *In Infirmos*, *In Laudem Sancti Joannis Theologi*; *Encomium in Sanctum Joannem Evengelista*, ascribed to John Chrysostom.

The same goes for a work ascribed to Basil of Seleucia, entitled *De Vita et Miraculis Sanctae Theclae* (1.28) and the anonymous *Dissertatio contra Iudaeos* (chapters 8 and 10). These writings should be dated not earlier than mid-fifth century to mid-sixth century. In all probability, a good number of them were composed either at the Laura of Sabas or at the monastery of the Akoimetoι in Constantinople. Cassian should be surmised a likely author of some of them, which is a question that has to be left moot for the time being.

Since some noteworthy results flow from the acts of Ephesus, and questions arise from them, I should dwell on this point for a moment. The expression Ἰωάννης ὁ θεολόγος appears in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus not ever to appear again in any other council. Normally, theologians were prone to attribute the designation to Gregory of Nazianzus rather than to John the Evangelist. Hence, it was Ephesus which extolled John as the θεολόγος, whereas nowhere is Gregory mentioned by this appellation. By contrast, Gregory is styled ὁ θεολόγος once in the Acts of Chalcedon, six times in the Local Council of Constantinople (536), twelve times in the Lateran Council (649), and eight times in the Third Council of Constantinople (680–81). A careful reading of the points and context where the designation ὁ θεολόγος is applied to John makes it clear that its usage at Ephesus was owing to Theodoret and to the Antiochene party in general. It should be recalled that both Cyril of Alexandria and Memnon of Ephesus were anathematized during earlier stages of that turbulent period, following action by the Antiochenes.

⁴⁵ Theodoret, *De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, PG.75.1156.46: ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης. So in *De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, PG.75.1169.50. *commls*, 3: κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ θεολόγου διδασκαλίαν. In *De Incarnatione Domini*, PG.75.1448.46; *ibid.* PG.75.1169.51: καὶ ὁ θαυμάσιος δὲ Ἰωάννης ὁ θεολόγος, and through a phraseology reminiscent of that of the Scholia, in *De Incarnatione Domini*, PG.75.1448.45: τὸν μεγαλοφρονότατον κήρυκα τῆς θεολογίας, τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Ἰωάννην. Likewise, *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.1241.45–46: τοῦ θεσπεσίου Ἰωάννου παραδηλοῦν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, θεολογίαν ἔχον ἄβατον ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἀνυπέρβατον. It is known that *De Incarnatione Domini* was found in works attributed to Cyril of Alexandria (PG.75.1419–78). This is one more point suggesting that Theodoret (or perhaps another Antiochene) is the real author.

⁴⁶ Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo Compunctorius*, p. 102; *In Secundum Adventum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi*, p. 13; *De Communi Resurrectione*, p. 48; *De Secundo Adventu Domini*, p. 212; *De Caritate*, pp. 120; 122. *De Ludicris Rebus Abstinencia*, p. 242.

⁴⁷ Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo Compunctorius*, p. 102; *In Secundum Adventum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi*, p. 13; *De Communi Resurrectione*, p. 48; *De Secundo Adventu Domini*, p. 212; *De Caritate*, pp. 120; 122; *De Ludicris Rebus Abstinencia*, p. 242.

⁴⁸ Severus of Antioch, *Catena in Epistolam Ioannis*, p. 114, line 21: ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης.

⁴⁹ The designation θεολόγος appears in the title and in sections 5 and 9. In this apocryphon the term οὐρανοπολίτης obtains, which however I have suggested to be a probably sixth-century and distinctively Sabaite term. See my *NDGF*, pp. 382; 532.

⁵⁰ Cf. John θεολόγος on pp. 317, 319, 320. I discuss this in [EN XXIIe](#).

First, the designation Ἰωάννης ὁ θεολόγος appears in the letter addressed by the synod to ‘all clergy and the people’ (κλήρω καὶ λαῷ).⁵¹ It also appears in a sermon by Paul of Emesa (that is, from Antiochene lips) delivered in Alexandria in the presence of Cyril, which sometimes praised him.⁵² The vocabulary is notably redolent of the Scholia.⁵³ Paul was the messenger who conveyed a libel against Cyril by Patriarch John of Antioch and handed this over to Cyril personally.⁵⁴ Paul was an Antiochene, and quite naturally he couched his sermon in his native theological language, including persistent application of the designation θεολόγος to the Evangelist, even though Cyril himself was not keen on this. His compliments for Cyril notwithstanding, Paul of Emesa signed the condemnation of the Alexandrian bishop in Ephesus, along with the other Antiochenes.⁵⁵

Then the designation of John as ‘theologos and Evangelist’ occurs in the resolution of the Antiochenes condemning Cyril and Memnon. This is also the appellation occurring in the title of many manuscripts of Revelation.⁵⁶ Later still, Cyril appears to use this epithet in addressing the emperor and arguing for the propriety of the title θεοτόκος being accorded to Mary.⁵⁷ However, since he does not appear prone to employ the designation in his own works, it is evident that he does so as a concession to the Antiochenes, thus appearing to speak on behalf of the entire synod, which was split. The anathemas against ‘the heretic chapters’ of Cyril were of course signed by Theodoret, as were they signed by all Antiochenes, with the signature of Patriarch John of Antioch featuring first and foremost.⁵⁸

The designation Ἰωάννης ὁ θεολόγος is in fact a seal of Theodoret and of Antioch at large. Furthermore,

the actual aim in attributing this appellation to John cannot be determined with absolute certainty. No doubt it is a laudatory one. However, given the emphasis laid upon the humanity of Christ by the Antiochenes, θεολόγος may further suggest that this specific evangelist was the one who emphasized the divinity of Christ. Were that the case, the appellation might subsequently function as a tacit and gentle warning to the reader against underestimating the humanity of Christ while reading the gospel of John. This is probably the reason why Oecumenius made this point right from the start of his own commentary.⁵⁹ This very same consideration might well have deterred others from applying this designation to the Evangelist, whereas it was deemed safer to accord it to a later Christian writer, namely Gregory of Nazianzus. Be that as it may, Theodoret arises as the author who probably fathered the appellation θεολόγος on John the Evangelist. He appears as one of the earliest authors, and probably the foremost one (since we have no relevant texts by Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia), to apply it confidently to the Evangelist. In any event, this key term points to Antioch. In conclusion, the epithet θεολόγος applied to John is a fifth-century attribution.

It should be remarked that one of the earliest authors appearing to style John the Evangelist θεολόγος is Agathangelus (fifth century).⁶⁰ However, his work was originally written in Armenian (the chronicle was entitled *Patmowt' iwn Hayoc*). In his work, the rare colloquialism συνψηφισθῶμεν is used, which is reminiscent of Cassian using the term σύνψηφοι instead of the normal σύμψηφοι.⁶¹ But since the chronicler under the (probably fictional) name Agathangelus wrote in Armenian, the rare

⁵¹ ACO, *Concilium Universale Ephesenum anno 431*, 1,1,2, p. 70: ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης.

⁵² See above, p. 214 and note 13.

⁵³ Ibid. 1,1,4, p. 12: ἐβουλόμην δὲ ὑμᾶς καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ μεγαλοφρονότατου Ἰωάννου γινῶναι, ἵνα εἰδῇτε τοῦ προειρημένου τὴν δύναμιν. ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης ὁ τῆς βροντῆς υἱὸς ὁ καταξιώθεις ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ στήθους κατακλιθῆναι. So on p. 13: ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης.

⁵⁴ Ibid. 1,1,1, p. 7; the text in 1,1,4, p. 6; 1,1,7, p. 12. Cyril later accused Paul of conspiring to restore deposed allegedly Nestorian bishops: ibid. 1,1,7, p. 164. But the Council of Chalcedon praised Paul for mediating between John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria for the sake of ecclesiastical peace. ACO, *Concilium Universale Chalcedonense anno 451*, 2,1,3, p. 15.

⁵⁵ Ibid. 1,1,5, p. 123. His signature follows immediately after that of Theodoret.

⁵⁶ Ibid. 1,1,5, p. 128: τοῦ τρισμακαρίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ θεολόγου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ.

⁵⁷ 1,1,7, p. 20: ὁ μὲν θεολόγος Ἰωάννης ἐν εὐαγγελίοις διδάσκει.

⁵⁸ Ibid. 1,1,5, p. 123. Theodoret took an active part in the synod and his signature occurs at other points, too. Cf. ibid. 1,1,3, pp. 25; 26.

⁵⁹ Oecumenius, p. 31 (my rendering): ‘In proem, it is as well to point out that in all his writings the divine John was prone to accounts that are appropriate to the divinity of our Saviour, Jesus Christ. In the present work, however, he opts for abiding by exposition appropriate to his humanity, lest he would seem to know of him from his divine attributes, and not also from his human ones.’

⁶⁰ Agathangelus, *Historia Armeniae*, chapter 71.

⁶¹ Cassian the Sabaite, *ScetPatr*, p. 66v: Οὗτος τοῖνυν ὁ ὁρος καὶ ἡ γνώμη τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀντωνίου, ὃν καὶ σύνψηφοι οἱ λαινοὶ πατέρες ἐγένοντο.

colloquialism συνψηφισθῶμεν⁶² only tells us that its Greek translation was composed by a monk speaking the same vernacular as Cassian did.

EN IVc: The Logos identified with Christ

The doctrine that the Logos and Christ are identical is authorized by the New Testament. Still, the author of the Scholion is at pains to emphasize this identity, underscoring not the Son's timeless eternity, but his omnitemporality. This is in effect the reason for bracketing Rev. 1:4 and Heb.13:8 together.

Although a doctrinal truism, specific theologians appear to have been particularly keen to stress this identity: Irenaeus,⁶³ Origen,⁶⁴ Athanasius,⁶⁵ Eusebius,⁶⁶ Gregory of Nyssa,⁶⁷ Didymus,⁶⁸ Epiphanius of Salamis,⁶⁹ Cyril of Alexandria,⁷⁰ and Theodoret.⁷¹ Once again, we encounter Pseudo-Macarius,⁷² and later still Maximus Confessor explicitly maintains the idea.⁷³

Ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος

Certain authors, who nevertheless are not many, quote this from the Revelation.⁷⁴ This in effect provides a

catalogue of theologians who recognized the scriptural authority of this Book.⁷⁵ Furthermore, it is instructive to point out the authors who quote the passage of Rev. 1:4 in order make the identification of the Logos with Christ, or to emphasize His everlastingness.⁷⁶ Theodoret made the point, although not by using this specific passage of Revelation. He canvassed the implications of the words ὢν and ἦν by means of different scriptural passages,⁷⁷ but he mentioned John as the author of Revelation at another point.⁷⁸

Rev. 1:4 along with Heb. 13:8

A combined reference to Rev. 1:4 and Heb. 13:8 (which is the case in this Scholion) is otherwise never found in Christian literature.

Heb. 13:8 is normally used in order to stress the immutability of the timeless Logos, even during His action in incarnate form.⁷⁹ Theodoret quotes Heb. 13:8 at six points.⁸⁰ It also appears twice in *De Trinitate*,⁸¹ but it does not occur anywhere in the extant works of Didymus, even though Origen himself had used the ideas involved in this passage.⁸² Cyril of Alexandria holds this scriptural idea and considers its

⁶² Ibid. chapter 43.

⁶³ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* (libri 1–2), 1.1.20.

⁶⁴ Origen, *Cels.* VII, 6; *commEph.* 11; *commMatt.* 10.14; *frJohn.* CXVIII.

⁶⁵ Athanasius, *De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi*, 26.4; *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.280; *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.572. Also, in texts ascribed to him: Pseudo-Athanasius, *Quaestiones Aliae*, p. 789; *Oratio Quarta Contra Arianos*, 1 and 3 and 4; *De Incarnatione Contra Apollinarium libri II*, PG.26.1112.

⁶⁶ Eusebius, *commPs.* PG.23.577; *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, 1.20.57 and 60–61; *DE*, 5.5.2; .29.1; *HE*, 1.4.12; 10.4.49.

⁶⁷ Gregory of Nyssa, *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 119.

⁶⁸ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 887.

⁶⁹ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 264.

⁷⁰ Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, pp. 463 and 712; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, pp. 405 and 417; *Unus sit Christus*, p. 747; *De Adoratione*, PG.68.665; *expPs.* PG.69.1201.

⁷¹ Theodoret, *commIs.* 14, 6; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1505.

⁷² Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv* (collectio B), 3.1.3.

⁷³ Maximus Confessor, *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, 25.

⁷⁴ Rev. 1:4; 1:8; 4:8.

⁷⁵ Hippolytus, *Contra Noetum*, 6.2. Origen, *frPs.* Psalm 23:10; *excPs.* PG.17.116.25. Athanasius, *De Synodis Arimini et Seleucia*, 49.2; *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.33.42–43; 329.17; *Ad Serapionem de Spiritu Sancto*, PG.26.609.41–42. Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.677.41. Gregory of Nazianzus, *De Filio*, 17. Cyril of Alexandria, *CommProph XII*, v. 2, p. 94; *Dialogi de Sancta Trinitate*, pp. 453; 568. *GlaphPent*, PG.69.432.1; *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.37.11–12. Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo in Secundum Adventum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi*, p. 13; *De Communi Resurrectione*, p. 59; *De Paenitentia et Caritate*, p. 59; *In Pretiosam*

Crucem et in Secundum Adventum, p. 141. *DT (lib.1)*, 15.5.

Didymus, *commZacch.* 1.153; *frPs(al)*, fr. 215. Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite, *De Divinis Nominibus*, p. 123.

⁷⁶ Hippolytus, *Contra Noetum*, 6.2. Origen, *excPs.* PG.17.116. *DT (lib.1)*, 15.5. *DT (lib.3)*, PG.39: 53 and 912–13. Didymus, *commZacch.* Book 1.151–154.

⁷⁷ He quoted and discussed John, 1:1 and Heb.1:3. Cf. Theodoret, *De Sancta et Vivi fica Trinitate*, PG.75.1153.12–13: Καὶ οὕτε ἐκεῖνος τὸ ἦν, οὕτε οὗτος τὸ ὢν καὶ ὑπάρχων, ἐᾷ.

⁷⁸ Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 102.

⁷⁹ All writers make the correction of NT's ἐχθὲς to χθὲς, with the exception of Origen, *deOr.* XXVII.13, and Cyril of Alexandria only at one of the many points where he quotes the passage. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, p. 692.

⁸⁰ Theodoret, *Eranistes*, pp. 153 and 126; *Epistulae* 53–95, epistle 83; *De Incarnatione Domini*, PG.75: 1460.20 and 1472.30; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.781.11.

⁸¹ *DT (lib.2.1–7)*, 6.4.2; *DT (lib.3)*, PG.39.897.

⁸² Origen, *deOr.* XXVII.13; *frPs.* 94, 8. Athanasius, *De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi*, 35.14; *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26: 85; 112; 168; *Ad Serapionem de Spiritu Sancto*, PG.26.613; *Fragmenta*, PG.26.1236; *Epistula ad Epictetum*, 5; Pseudo-Athanasius, *Sermo Major De Fide*, Fr. 55; *De Sancta Trinitate*, PG.28.1265. Gregory of Nazianzus, *De Filio*, 21; *In Theophania*, PG.36.313.27. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 422. John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos Commentarius*, PG.63: 226.33; 226.45; 228.43. Severianus of Gabala, *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Timotheum*, p. 336. Asterius of Antioch (fourth cent. AD), *commPs.* 21.12. Socrates (fourth/fifth cent. AD), *HE*, 1.6. Proclus of Constantinople (theologian, fifth cent. AD), *Mystagoga in Baptisma*, 6.37 and 39.

implications,⁸³ which was the cause for the Council of Ephesus to do so, too.⁸⁴ Chalcedon and the Local Synod of Constantinople (536) also approved this practice, but later authors, save John of Damascus and Photius, scarcely drew on this specific passage. John of Damascus and Photius happen to be among the few authors who follow Cassian's vocabulary at numerous points in their writings.

On the other hand, the interpretation of the three 'tenses' (after Heb. 13:8) occurring in this Scholion can be traced in three authors only. One, Origen,⁸⁵ essays to establish his tenet that prolonged time comprises 'aeons'. This he does at the point when he repudiates the 'notorious' Millenarist ideas (ἡ διαβόητος χιλιονταετηρίς). The second author is John Chrysostom.⁸⁶ The third one is Theodore of Mopsuestia.⁸⁷

A close look at those three instances shows Origen refraining from calling 'future time' an endless one, since he does not actually hold it to be endless.⁸⁸ The phraseology of John Chrysostom and Theodore is similar, with Chrysostom not using the word 'future' at all, although clearly implying this.

Therefore, the point made in this Scholion falls very close to the account by Theodore of Mopsuestia. His reference is the sole point other than the Scholia where it occurs. The historical evidence suggesting that Theodoret had studied with Theodore may be disputed, but a certain textual and intellectual affinity is definitely there, and we will come across this over and over during this study. In conclusion, the present Scholion was penned exclusively by Cassian, who shows himself a student of not only Theodoret, but also of the great Antiochene doctors, such as Theodore of Mopsuestia.

⁸³ Cyril of Alexandria, *Fragmenta Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, pp. 367; 403; 417; *Dialogi de Sancta Trinitate*, pp. 397; 549; 584; *De Incarnatione*, pp. 710; 746; 747; *Homiliae Paschales*, PG.77.568.28 and 42; *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75: 212.12; 364.11; 472.18.

⁸⁴ ACO, *Concilium Universale Ephesenum anno 431*, 1,1,1, pp. 69; 70; 1,1,2, p. 84; 1,1,4, p. 28; 1,1,5, p. 83; 1,1,6, pp. 62 and 79; 1,1,7, pp. 30 and 42. *Concilium Universale Chalcedonense anno 451*, 2,1,2, p. 50; 2,1,3, p. 112. *Synodus Constantinopolitana et Hierosolymitana anno 536*, vol. 3, pp. 15; 228.

⁸⁵ Origen, *deOr*, XXVII.13: εἰ δὲ 'σήμερον' ὁ πᾶς οὗτος αἰὼν, μή ποτε 'ἐχθὲς' ὁ παρεληλυθὼς ἐστὶν αἰὼν.

⁸⁶ John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos Commentarius*, PG.63.226: Ἐνταῦθα τό, Χθὲς, τὸν παρελθόντα πάντα λέγει χρόνον· τό, Σήμερον, τὸν ἐνεστῶτα· ὁ αἰὼν, τὸ ἄπειρον καὶ λήξιν οὐκ ἔχον.

⁸⁷ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 272: Τὸ 'χθὲς' τὸν παρελθόντα λέγει χρόνον, τὸ 'σήμερον' τὸν ἐνεστῶτα αἰῶνα, καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα, τὸν ἄπειρον.

⁸⁸ *COT*, p. 255.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION V

EN Va: ἀτεχνῶς

The text of the Scholion is Clement's, but some remarks point to the compiler of the Scholia.

The adverb ἀτεχνῶς appears in Christian authors, as it does in pagan ones, too. From the frequency of its usage, some interesting conclusions flow. The term is definitely Plato's and appears no fewer than seventy-seven times in his work, still it also occurs in Aristotle (five times), in Chrysippus (twice), Plotinus (once), Galen (four times), Plutarch (thirty-six times), and Posidonius (three times). It also occurs in Christian authors, such as Athanasius (twice), Basil of Caesarea (three times), Eusebius (eleven times), Cyril of Alexandria (three times), Evagrius of Pontus (three times), Gregory of Nazianzus (twice), Gregory of Nyssa (eight times), even Gregory Thaumaturgus (four times) in his speech paying homage to Origen. John Philoponus had also employed this (six instances), and so did Lucian of Samosata (twenty-seven instances). Procopius of Gaza used it once in one of his epistles (no. 46). Origen himself did not actually use the term, since four instances in *Contra Celsum* are actually a quotation from Celsus.

Against this, we see Clement using this adverb nineteen times, notably in his *Protrepticus* (once), in *Paedagogus* (three instances) and *Stromateis* (fifteen times, the text of this Scholion being one of them). Theodoret used the term heavily.¹ In the extant work of Didymus,

it does not occur at all. Christians therefore used this adverb rather sparingly and some of them never employed it at all.

EN Vb: εἰλουμένων or εἰλομένων?

By changing the Codex's εἰλουμένων to εἰλομένων Harnack made a mistake. It is true that the possibility that the two forms may be used as alternatives is allowed by a certain dictionary,² but use of εἰλούμενος is far more extensive than that of εἰλόμενος. Besides, all the other lexica set forth and interpret only the correct and prevailing form.³ Furthermore, Origen (whom Harnack thought to be the author of the Scholion) used the former spelling.⁴ So did Clement of Alexandria, not only in this passage, but also at another point,⁵ and so did Theodoret himself.⁶

EN Vc: ἀπερισπάστως

Theodoret used the adverb ἀπερισπάστως, which appears in 1 Cor. 7:35.⁷ Cassian himself quotes this scriptural passage in *Scholion XXXII*, which is his own comment on the same subject. Theodoret quotes the Pauline text at two points,⁸ and at a third one he paraphrases the passage, accommodating it to his own style.⁹

The terms derived from the verbs περισπᾶν or περισπᾶσθαι are scriptural.¹⁰ Of all these derivatives,

¹ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 1.70; 1.120; 2.18; 2.73; 3.65; 4.25; 5.70; 6.28; 7.29; 8.39; 8.49; 9.26. *Eranistes*, p. 62. *Historia Religiosa*, Prologue, 9. *Epistulae* 1–52, Epistle 37. *commis*, 14. *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80: 1169.21; 1281.15. 1429.12.

² *Lexicon Vindobonense*, entry 274: εἰλόμενος γράφεται καὶ εἰλούμενος.

³ Cf. the lemma εἰλόμενος in lexica: *Suda*, lexicon, Alphabetic letter epsilon iota, entries 128, 129, 131. *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 298. Hesychius of Alexandria, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter epsilon, entry 908. *Lexica Segueriana. Collectio Verborum e Rhetoribus et Sapientibus*, Alphabetic entry epsilon, p. 209.

⁴ Origen, *frLuc*, fr. 171 (εἰλουμένην); *schLuc*, PG.17.353.15: (εἰλουμένην).

⁵ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 5.11.68.1 (εἰλούμενοι).

⁶ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.996.34: (εἰλούμενοι).

⁷ 1 Cor. 7:35: τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς τὸ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν σύμφορον λέγω, οὐχ ἵνα βρόχον ὑμῖν ἐπιβάλω, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ εὐσχημον καὶ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως.

⁸ Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.284.30; *Haeticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.536.8.

⁹ Theodoret, *intProphXII*, PG.81.1988.10.

¹⁰ Tobit (Cod. Sinaiticus) 10:6: περισπασμός. 2 Macc. 10:36: περισπασμῷ. Ecclesiastes 1:13: περισπασμόν. 1:13: περισπᾶσθαι. 2:23: περισπασμός. 2:26: περισπασμόν. 3:10: περισπασμόν. 3:10: περισπᾶσθαι. 4:8: περισπασμός. 5:2: περισπασμοῦ. 5:13: περισπασμῷ. 5:19: περισπᾶ. 8:16: περισπασμόν. Wisdom of Solomon 16:11: ἀπερίσπαστοι. Ecclesiasticus 41:1: ἀπερίσπαστῳ.

Theodore used only the adverb ἀπερισπάστως. Clement used this form,¹¹ too, and so did Origen¹² and

Didymus¹³ in the rare instances where they employed cognate terms.

¹¹ Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, 2.9.82: ἀπερισπάστου. *Stromateis*, 22.9.3: ἀπερίσπαστος. 3.6.53.3: ἀπερισπάστως. 3.12.82.6: ἀπερίσπαστος. 4.5.22.1: ἀπερισπάστως. 4.23.149.3: ἀπερισπάστως. 4.25.157.2: ἀπερισπάστως. 6.10.82.4: ἀπερίσπαστον. 7.3.13.3: ἀπερισπάστως. 7.7.43.5: ἀπερίσπαστον. 7.11.64.2: ἀπερίσπαστον. *Eclogae Propheticae*, 35, 3: ἀπερισπάστοις.

¹² Origen, *Cels*, VII, 39: ἀπερισπάστως. *commMatt*, 15.21: ἀπερισπάστως. *commEph*, 17: ἀπερισπάστω. *Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos (I.1–XII.21)*, 7: ἀπερίσπαστος. *selPs*, PG.12.1576: ἀπερισπάστως. Cf. *DT (lib. 2.8–27)*, PG.39.765.20: ἀπερισπάστως.

¹³ Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.235: ἀπερισπάστως; 1.236: ἀπερισπάστως; *Adversus Manichaeos*, PG.39.1092.42: ἀπερίσπαστον; *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 83: περισπαστέον.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION VI

EN VIa: Quoting Psalm 56:5

There are only a few Christian theologians who cared to comment on Psalm 56:5. Almost all of them happen to be Cassian's spiritual guides. Didymus, *commPs*40–44.4, Cod. p. 311. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1292.28. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23: 509.38; 617.35; PG.24.72.29. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 156. Hesychius of Jerusalem, *Encomium in Sanctum Stephanum*, 23. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Psalmum 118*, PG.55.701.3. Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1472.22–24.

EN VIb: βέλη ἐκλεκτά

The idea of a *tongue* being a *sharp sword*, or a 'shaft selected' by God (βέλος ἐκλεκτόν) originates in Origen.¹ It portrays pious people acting as vehicles proclaiming the divine teaching. The imagery was subsequently used heavily by Eusebius, and by Gregory of Nyssa at one point.² However, it was Didymus who made the most of it and furnished an extensive exposition, part of which is the content of the present Scholion.³ Theodoret embraced the spirit of the analysis,⁴ placing himself in a direct line starting with Origen and ending with himself, via Eusebius and Didymus.⁵ It was then all too natural for Cassian to embrace the exposition of Didymus, which was in fact an elaboration of Origen's analyses, while Theodoret used the same idea.

EN VIc: μάχαιρα ἐπαινετή

While the idea came from Origen and the germane comment by Didymus was extensive, Cassian applies his own vocabulary, which naturally was formed during his own education. The expression μάχαιρα ἐπαινετή is the product of his study of Theodoret,⁶ and perhaps of Gregory of Nazianzus,⁷ although the latter does not seem to be a main source for Cassian.

EN VIId: ὅπλα ἐπαινετά

This is an allusion to 2 Cor. 6:7, διὰ τῶν ὅπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης, and probably to Psalm 5:13. It could also be redolent of Rom. 6:13, which Didymus does not use this in his extant writings. Theodoret returns to this motif over and over.⁸ Certainly Didymus had made reference to the 'weapons of righteousness',⁹ yet the text of the Scholion was penned by Cassian.

EN VIe: Quoting Matt. 10:34 along with Heb. 4:12

Didymus quotes¹⁰ Matthew 10:34, but not Heb. 4:12, as far as our knowledge of his works goes. This combined use is exclusive to Origen, precisely at the point we just saw him using the idea of 'select shafts'.¹¹ On the other hand, Theodoret quotes both Matt. 10:34 and Heb. 4:12 in the fifteenth section of his commentary on Isaiah, which is the text that virtually makes the same

¹ Origen, *commJohn*, I.32.229; *ibid.* I.22.134. *frPs*, 37, 3.

² Eusebius canvassed the idea mainly in his *commPs*, PG.23.897.17–26; yet see also, *DE*, 2.2.14; *Eclogae Prophetarum*, p. 211. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 119.

³ Cf. Didymus *CommZacch*, 3.186–191 and 197.

⁴ Theodoret, *commIs*, 15.

⁵ Although Isaiah's portion received comments by Cyril of Alexandria and Procopius of Gaza (as anthologist), the language of those authors is not relevant to this Scholion. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Isaiam*, PG.70: 1033.47–53; 1040.19–20. Ephraem Syrus, *De Patientia*, p. 321. Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2461.

⁶ Cf. Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.196.8–12: Προέτρεψε δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, φήσας εἶναι τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἐπαινετάς τῶν ἀγαθῶν. Ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῇς, φοβοῦ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ· Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν, εἰς ὀργὴν ἐκδικῶς τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι. (Rom. 13:4).

⁷ Gregory of Nazianzus, *De Moderatione in Disputando Servanda*, PG.36.177.41–45: οὐ τὴν ἐπαινετὴν διαίρεσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ψεκτὴν,

οὐδὲ τὸν καθάρσιον ἐμπρησμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸν ὀλέθριον. Οὐ γὰρ ὁ τομὸς διαιρεῖ λόγος, ἡ Χριστοῦ μάχαιρα, τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπίστων.

⁸ Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82:109.7 and 23; 116.6; 185.13; 413.38.

⁹ Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 904; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 30 (which runs in the spirit of *Scholion VI*): ὁ ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἀτιμαζόμενος, δυσφημούμενός τε καὶ πλάνος ὑπολαμβάνόμενος, γενναίως καὶ ἐπαινετῶς ταῦτα φέρων. *commPs*35–39, Cod. p. 260: λαμβάνεται δὲ καὶ ἐπαινετῶς· 'τὰ βέλη σου ἡκονημένα, δυνατέ, λαοὶ ὑποκάτω σου πεσοῦνται'. *Id.* αὐτίκα γοῦν ἡ τοῦτο παθοῦσα ψυχὴ ἤτοι ἐκκλησία λέγει· 'τετρωμένη ἀγάπης εἰμὶ ἐγώ'. εἰσὶν οὖν καὶ ἐπαινετά βέλη, εἰσὶν οὖν καὶ ψεκτά. Cf. the fuller quotation in EN VIIh.

¹⁰ Didymus, *commZacch*, 4.166–167; *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 8; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 98.

¹¹ Origen, *comJohn*, I.32.229. Also, *exhMar*, XXXVII.

exposition as *Scholion VI*. Likewise, sections 6 and 7 of the same commentary are built on the basis of a concurrent analysis of both passages¹²

EN VI:f: ἡκόνησαν τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν

This theme is a favourite of Didymus, and it should certainly have played a part in his lost Commentary on the Apocalypse.¹³ Theodoret also developed pertinent ideas denoted by means of this psalmic vocabulary.¹⁴ The fragment from the lost work of Theodore of Mopsuestia should also be mentioned,¹⁵ since his influence on Theodoret should not elude us.

EN VIg: The missing passage Prov. 12:18.

This Scholion reproduces Didymus and probably was quoted from his lost *Commentary on the Apocalypse* with some adaptation to Cassian's own style formed under the influence of Theodoret. As a matter of fact, there is a parallel analysis at another point of Didymus' extant work, which confirms his influence on this Scholion. At that point Proverbs, 12:18 is quoted, which makes it an almost unique instance in Christian literature and the sole parallel to this Scholion.¹⁶

Didymus, *commPs40–44.4*, Cod. p. 247: *ῥομφαίαν ἐσπάσαντο οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ καὶ ἐνέτειναν τόξον αὐτῶν τοῦ καταβαλεῖν πτωχὸν καὶ πένητα*.¹⁷ ἡτοίμασαν ῥομφαίαν, ἵνα πτωχὸν καὶ πένητα καταβάλωσιν. ἀναστρέφεται καὶ εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν ἔρχεται καρδία, ὡς τὸ λεγόμενον· ‘ὁ ὀρύσσων βόθρον τῷ πλησίον ἐνπεσεῖται εἰς αὐτόν’.¹⁸ καὶ πάλιν· ‘καὶ ἡ θήρα, ἡ ἔκρυψαν, συναβέτω αὐτούς’. καὶ ἐν Ἐκκλησιαστικῇ λέγει· ‘καθαίρουντα φραγμόν, δῆξεται ὄφιν’.¹⁹ τὸν ἄλλου φραγμόν καθαίρουντα ὄφιν δῆξεται, τὴν ἀσφάλειαν ἄλλου καθαίρουντα. ‘ῥομφαίαν ἐσπάσαντο’· ἀπὸ τῆς θήκης ἐσπάσαντο εἰς φανερόν αὐτὴν . . . δύναται ῥομφαία ὁ σὺν δόλῳ λόγος εἶναι· ἐκσπῶσιν γάρ, ἵνα διὰ τούτου πλήξωσιν. ἔχεις ἐν Παροιμίαις λεγόμενον· ‘εἰσὶν οἱ λέγοντες τιτρώσκουσιν μαχαίρα, γλῶσσαι δὲ σοφῶν ἰδῶνται’.²⁰ εἰσὶν οἱ ἐν τῷ λέγειν τιτρώσκουσιν μαχαίρα. δοτικῇ δὲ ἀναγνωστέον· εἰσὶν οἱ ἐν τῷ λέγειν τιτρώσκοντες μαχαίρα. οἱ φθείροντες ἦθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακαῖς,²¹ ἐν τῷ λέγειν τιτρώσκουσιν μαχαίρα. ‘καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν μάχαιρα ὀξεῖα’.²² ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν οἷα μάχαιρα βλάπτει καὶ τιτρώσκει. ἐν τῷ λέγειν οὖν εἰσὶν τινες τιτρώσκοντες μαχαίρα, αἱ δὲ τῶν σοφῶν γλῶσσαι, οἱ λόγοι τῶν σοφῶν, ἰδῶνται. αἱ μάχαιραι αὐται φαρμάκου εἰσὶν, οὐ τιτρώσκουσιν, οὐ πλήττουσιν,

¹² Theodoret on Matt. 10:34: *commMs*, 6 and 15. *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1628.20–24. *intProphXII*, PG.81.1833; *ibid.* PG.82.277.27–28; *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 11.74. Theodoret on Heb. 4:12: *commMs*, 7 and 15. *intPaul XIV*, PG.82.705.21–27.

¹³ Didymus, *commPs40–44.4*, Cod. p. 311: *πολλάκις ῥομφαία τῶν ἐχόντων ὁ λόγος λέγεται· ‘οἵτινες ἡκόνησαν ὡς ῥομφαίαν τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν’· καὶ· ‘υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων, οἱ δδόντες αὐτῶν ὄπλον καὶ βέλη, καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν μάχαιρα ὀξεῖα’· καὶ ἄλλο δέ· ῥομφαία αὐτοῦ. *frPs(al)*, fr. 360: ἡκονημένη ἡ γλῶσσα ἦτοι ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν ἀναιρετικός ἐστὶν διαφορῶν. ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ὁ ἁμαρτάνων τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀποθνήσκει, καὶ τούτων ἡ ῥομφαία ἦν κατ’ ἄλλων ἡκόνησαν βλάψει αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν. *Ibid.* fr. 1220: ἀκονήσαντες τὴν γλῶσσαν ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀπατηλῶν καὶ τρώσει δυνάμενον λόγον. *Ibid.* fr. 645a: ἀμφοτέρω γὰρ τὰ στρατόπεδα ταῦτα ῥομφαίας δίκην τὰς γλώσσας ἑαυτῶν ἡκόνησαν. *Ibid.* fr. 764: κατερίφθησαν ὡς τὴν γλώτταν αὐτῶν ἦν κατὰ τοῦ ὑψίστου ἡκόνησαν. *Ibid.* fr. 44: Ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ ἐπιστραφῇτε, φησὶν, ἡδόμενοι τῷ ἐμμένειν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, στυλβώσει τὴν ῥομφαίαν αὐτοῦ (ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκονήσει). σὺν αὐτῇ δὲ καὶ τὸ τόξον αὐτοῦ εὐτεπέσει. *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.39.1637.39: τὸ διορατικὸν ἀκονήσας εἰς τὸ κακόν. *Commentarii in Job*, PG.39.1124.21: θρασυνόμενος ἀκονήσκει τὴν γλῶσσαν. *commPs40–44.4*, Cod. p. 247: ἀλλ’ οὖν γε ἡ ῥομφαία κατὰ τῶν ἀκονησάντων αὐτῶν στραφεῖσα πλήττει καὶ ἀναιρεῖ αὐτούς· ὥσαύτως καὶ τὸ τόξον συντρίβεται.*

¹⁴ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80:1341.30–34; 1944.12–14; *Eranistes*, p. 93.

¹⁵ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *expPs*, 63, 4a.

¹⁶ Prov. 12:18 is quoted in *DT (lib. 3)*, PG.39.812.35–36, yet this is simply a glossary-collection of references to ‘wisdom’ and ‘wise people’, with no further analysis or comment. Of all Christian authors later than Didymus, only in a spurious text ascribed to John Chrysostom is this scriptural passage quoted: *Ascetam Facietis uti non Debere*, PG.48.1060.10–12.

¹⁷ Psalm 36:14.

¹⁸ Prov. 26:27; Ecclesiastes, 10:18; Ecclesiasticus 27:26.

¹⁹ Ecclesiastes 10:8.

²⁰ Proverbs, 12:18.

²¹ Probably *apud* Euripides, *Fragmenta*, fr. 24 or Menander (the comic), *Fragmenta*, fr. 218. Didymus made use of this. Cf. Didymus, *commPs20–21*, Cod. p. 10; *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p. 81; *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 208; *commPs35–39*, Cod. p. 268; *commPs40–44.4*, Cod. pp. 247 and 295; *frPs(al)*, fr. 1226. The expression was a commonplace in Christian theologians, since it had been quoted in 1 Cor. 15:33. Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, 2.6.50.4; *Stromateis*, 1.14.59.4. Also, Pseudo-Clement, Athanasius, Eusebius, Basil of Caesarea, Asterius of Antioch, Amphilochius of Iconium, John Chrysostom, Palladius of Helenopolis, Ephraem Syrus, Cyril of Alexandria, Diodorus of Tarsus, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, Theodoret, Procopius of Gaza, Cyril of Scythopolis. In spite of its classical provenance, pagan literature did not make much use of this proverb.

²² Psalm 56:5.

οὐ τραυματίζουσιν, ἀλλ' ἰδῶνται τὰ γενόμενα ὑπ' ἄλλων λόγων τραύματα.

EN VIh: τῇ ἀγάπῃ οὖν ἔτρωσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος

The imagery of the Lord 'striking through the weapon of love' draws on the Song of Solomon, 2:5 and 5:8 (τετρωμένη ἀγάπης). As already observed in EN VIId, the vocabulary and sentiment of Didymus are much the same as those of the Scholion. The expression τετρωμένη ἀγάπης ἐγὼ of the Song of Solomon appears in Origen²³ and Didymus, but not in Hippolytus and Irenaeus.

Didymus, *commPs*35–39, Cod. p. 260: λαμβάνεται δὲ καὶ ἐπαινετῶς 'τὰ βέλη σου ἠκονημένα, δυνατέ, λαοὶ ὑποκάτω σου πεσοῦνται'. οἱ λόγοι σου οἱ τιτρώσκοντες εἰς ἔρωτα καὶ ἀγάπην ἠκονημένοι εἰσὶν· δυνατὸς γὰρ εἶ καὶ δυνατῶς πέμπεις σου τοὺς λόγους καὶ τιτρώσκεις εἰς ἀγάπην τοὺς βαλλομένους. αὐτίκα γοῦν ἢ τοῦτο παθοῦσα ψυχὴ ἤτοι ἐκκλησία λέγει· 'τετρωμένη ἀγάπης εἰμὶ ἐγώ'. εἰσὶν οὖν καὶ ἐπαινετὰ βέλη, εἰσὶν οὖν καὶ ψεκτά. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ταῦτα μετὰ ὀργῆς καὶ θυμοῦ ὠνομάσθησαν, οὐκ εἰσιν εἰς ἔρωτα καὶ ἀγάπην τιτρώσκοντα, ἀλλ' αἰσθησιν ποιοῦντα, οἱ κακῶν τίς ἐστιν.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 3.189: Οὐ τοιαῦτα δὲ τὰ ἀκόντια τοῦ δυνατοῦ Σωτῆρος, περὶ ὧν ἐν τεσσερακοστῷ καὶ τετάρτῳ Ψαλμῷ λέγεται πρὸς τὸν μακάριον καὶ ἄριστον τοξότην· 'Τὰ βέλη σου ἠκονημένα, δυνατέ', ἅπερ ἔρωτα θεῖον ἐμποιεῖ τοῖς βαλλομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ὡς τὴν θείαν νύμφην μακάριον ἔρωτα σχοῦσαν λέγειν· 'Τετρωμένη

ἀγάπης εἰμί.' Καὶ ὅρα τὸ παράδοξον· ὁ αὐτὸς Σωτὴρ τόξον καὶ τοξότης καὶ βέλος ὑπάρχει. Ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ προκειμένῳ προφητικῷ ῥήτῳ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγεται· 'Ἐνείναι σε, Ιουδα, ἐμαυτῷ τόξον'· ἐν δὲ τῷ Ψαλμῷ οἱ ὑμνοῦντες αὐτὸν λέγουσιν· 'Τὰ βέλη σου ἠκονημένα, δυνατέ'· αὐτὸς δὲ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ φησιν ἐν Ἡσαΐα· 'Ἐθηκέν με ὡς βέλος ἐκλεκτόν, ἐν τῇ φαρέτρᾳ αὐτοῦ ἔκρυψέν με.' Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἐκλεκτόν βέλος ὁ κατασκευάζων ἐκλεκτοὺς τοὺς τιτρώσκομένους, κρυπτόμενον ἐν τῇ φαρέτρᾳ ἣ ἔσχεν ἐκ τῆς Μαρίας σαρκί; Ἐνταθέντος τούτου τοῦ θεοῦ τόξου, ἀφ' οὗ ἐντείνεται καὶ ἀπολύεται τὰ πλήττοντα εἰς θεῖον ἔρωτα βέλη, ἐμπίπλαται ὁ Ἐφραίμ.

Ibid. 3.200, (comm. on Zach. 9:14–15): Ἐντείναντος Θεοῦ οἷα τόξον τὸν Ιούδαν, βολίς ὡς ἀστραπὴ ἐξελεύσεται, τιτρώσκουσα καὶ πλήττουσα εἰς θεῖον ἔρωτα, ὡς φῶς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσθαι τὴν δυναμένην εἰπεῖν τελείαν ψυχὴν ἢ ἔνδοξον Ἐκκλησίαν· 'Τετρωμένη ἀγάπης εἰμί.' . . . Ὁ τιτρώσκων λόγος εἰς πόθον τοὺς τὰς κατ' εἶδος ἀρετὰς ἀναλαμβάνοντας καὶ τὰ κατὰ μέρος δόγματα, βολίς ἐστιν.

Theodoret also canvassed the idea of the Song of Songs, 2:5 and 5:8 (τετρωμένη ἀγάπης) in connection with Isaiah, 49:2, where mention is made of the 'select shaft' (βέλος ἐκλεκτόν).²⁴

While interpreting this particular scriptural imagery Cassian was fascinated by Didymus' ideas and vocabulary. This Scholion shows how he identified himself with the Alexandrian sage, while influences upon him by Theodoret are also traceable.

²³ Origen, *commJohn*, I.32.229; *frLam*, fr. 104; *Cant*, p. 191; *selPs*, PG.12.1629; *excPs*, PG.17.128; *schCant*, PG.17.261.

²⁴ Theodoret, *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.89.10–12 and 48–49; *ibid.* PG.81: 153.48; 156.1–3. Likewise, *commIs*, 15. Cf. *Historia Religiosa, Vitae* 9.2; 31.20.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION VII

EN VIIa: ἀνηγμένως

The adverb ἀνηγμένως is rare in literature. Didymus used it profusely, whereas Cyril of Alexandria¹ and John Chrysostom² did so only casually. The term means ‘according to an anagogical grasp’, or an exegesis rendered according to ‘an elevated, or sublime, manner’.³ The adverb is derived from the perfect participle of the verb ἀνάγεσθαι, which also gives the noun ἀναγωγή and the adjective ἀναγωγικός.⁴ The following discussion reveals that this Scholion was by and large culled from Didymus’ work.

The two Cappadocian Gregories had used the adjective ἀνηγμένος, yet not as a technical term. Rather, this was a literal usage in order to denote the general sense of one or something being ‘elevated’. To all appearances, it was an off-hand usage.⁵ The instances of the term ἀνηγμένος occurring in Theodoret are in fact quotations from Amphilochius of Iconium⁶ in a specific sense that is not relevant to the present instance. For Amphilochius used this not as a technical term loaded with a significant meaning,

but simply as a loan from the accidental vocabulary of Gregory of Nazianzus, with whom he had close spiritual and personal connection, and who was possibly his first cousin. Besides, he refers to elevated ‘words’ rather than elevated ‘understanding’.⁷ Likewise, a literal and casual usage occurs in Aristotle’s commentator, Dexippus,⁸ who was contemporary with Didymus.

It was Didymus who put the term to conscious and consistent theological and philosophical use, thus making it a significant element of his vocabulary, indeed a term peculiar to him.

The Neoplatonist Proclus, who lived shortly after Didymus, took up the term from him along with its import: ἀνηγμένος suggests an elevated life⁹ befitting the divine one, or the sublime conception of it, or a *theoria* appropriate to the divine reality.¹⁰ This is an example confirming that it was not only Christians who were influenced by Neoplatonism; things happened the other way round, too.¹¹ It seems that Proclus received the idea from Hermias of Alexandria, who must have taken it up from Didymus via the grammarian Orion.¹² In any case, it was Proclus, not Hermias, who used both

¹ Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, p. 683. ἀνηγμένως τε καὶ θεοπρεπῶς.

² John Chrysostom, *In Acta Apostolorum. Homiliae*, PG.60.55–56: καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνηγμένως αὐτοῖς διαλέγεται.

³ The term is also used to denote an ‘allegorical’ narration: Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.83: δυνατὸν τυγχάνοντος πάνυ εὐρεθῆναι τὰ κατ’ ἀλληγορίαν λεχθέντα τύμπανα ταῖς ἔτεσιν πλείοσιν ἢ διὰ ἀνηγμέναις θεοσεβδῶς.

⁴ The adverb ἀνεωγμένως appears only once in literature and actually means ‘openly’ or ‘explicitly’. *Commentaria In Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, Commentariolus Byzantinus, p. 584: Περὶ συνδέσμου. ‘Σύνδεσμός ἐστι λέξις συνδέουσα διάνοιαν μετὰ τάξεως καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐρμηνείας κεχηρὸς δηλοῦσα’, τοῦτέστιν τρανῶς καὶ ἀνεωγμένως. A. Harnack inserted ἀνεωγμένως for the Codex’s ἀνοιγμένως. Unfortunately, the erudite C.H. Turner was misled by this, which he accepted, and made no emendation.

⁵ Gregory of Nazianzus, *In Sanctum Pascha*, PG.36.637.40: τῶν ἁγαν θεωρητικῶν καὶ ἀνηγμένων. Gregory of Nyssa, *De Vita Mosis*, 2.50: Εἰ δέ τι τῶν ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ γεγονότων ἔξω τοῦ εἰρμού τῆς ἀνηγμένης διανοίας ἢ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀνάγκη πεσεῖν ἐκβιάσαιτο.

⁶ See Introduction, p. 57.

⁷ Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 107 (and p. 242) (quoting Amphilochius of Iconium): Οὐκοῦν εἰ διδῶς σαρκὶ τὰ πάθη, δὸς αὐτῇ καὶ τοὺς ταπεινοὺς λόγους, καὶ ὅ τὰ θαύματα ἐπιγράφεις, τοὺς ἀνηγμένους ἀνάθες λόγους. Further: τοὺς μὲν ταπεινοὺς λόγους τῷ ἐκ Μαρίας ἀνθρώπῳ, τοὺς δὲ ἀνηγμένους καὶ θεοπρεπεῖς τῷ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντι λόγῳ. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ πῇ μὲν ἀνηγμένους, πῇ δὲ ταπεινοὺς φθέγγομαι λόγους, ἵνα διὰ μὲν τῶν ὑψηλῶν τοῦ

ἐνοικοῦντος λόγου δείξω τὴν εὐγένειαν, διὰ δὲ τῶν ταπεινῶν τῆς ταπεινῆς σαρκὸς γνωρίσω τὴν ἀσθένειαν.

⁸ Dexippus (fourth cent. AD), *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, p. 4: ἐπαινῶ δέ σου τὴν τε τῆς φύσεως ἐπιτηδειότητα πρὸς πάντα ἀνηγμένην τὰ καλὰ.

⁹ Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 2, p. 103: πρὸς τὴν χωριστὴν ἀνηγμένους καὶ τὴν ἔξω γενέσεως ζωὴν. *Theologia Platonica*, v. 1, p. 96: ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ὁπαδοῖς καὶ τὸν πολλὸν ὄχλον τῆς γενέσεως ἀπολιπούσας καὶ γυμναῖς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον καὶ καθαρὸν ἀνηγμέναις.

¹⁰ Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 1, p. 16: μιμεῖται γὰρ ἡ μὲν ψυχῆς ἔτι πρὸς τὰ πάθη μαχομένης ζωὴν, ἡ δὲ παντελῶς εἰς θεωρίαν ἀνηγμένης καὶ ἀπεκδυσσάμενης τὴν μνήμην τῶν ἀγόνων ἐκείνων. Ibid. v. 1, p. 137: τῷ δημιουργῷ πρόσσειν τοῦ παντὸς ἐπὶ τὸ σφέτερον ἀνηγμένῳ νοητόν. Ibid. v. 1, p. 176: καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμφανῶν ἀνηγμένον καὶ τῶν εἰκόνων εἰς τὴν ἀφανῆ ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν ἡμῶν θεωρίαν. *Elementa Theologica*, section 204: τὰς αἰεὶ ἐπομένας ψυχὰς καὶ κατὰ νοῦν ἐνεργοῦσας καὶ εἰς νόας ἀνηγμένας. *In Platonis Parmenidem*, p. 646: ἐν θεῷ στόματι φθεγγομένης, δι’ ὀνομάτων ἱεροπρεπῶν καὶ εἰς τὸ ὕψος ἀνηγμένης ἰδέας. Ibid. p. 705: τὸν γὰρ ἀνηγμένον πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ ὄντως ὄν ἀνάγκη καὶ τῆς ἐκεῖθεν καλλωνῆς καὶ τῆς ἀγαθότητος εἶναι πλήρη τὴν ψυχὴν. Ibid. p. 1037: ὁ κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν ἀνηγμένην.

¹¹ See, RCR, chapter 7, ‘Christian influence on Neoplatonism’.

¹² Hermias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 46: πάντα ταῦτα οἰκεῖα ὀνόματα τοῖς ἐνύλοις καὶ γεῶδεσι καὶ μήπω ἀνηγμένοις. Ibid. p. 254: ὁ γὰρ τοῖς θεοῖς ἀρέσκων καὶ ἀνηγμένος.

the idea and the term, making this as much characteristic of him as it was of Didymus. When Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite used the notion, he actually echoed Didymus, even if (as I suspect) he was not actually aware that it was one of Christian provenance.¹³

Didymus had no followers in regard to this specific usage. Quite ironically, his followers on this were the Neoplatonists. The term remained typical of his phraseology, being therefore one of the means by which he can be identified as the source of the Scholion. I quote some of his numerous references to the ‘elevated’ conception of divine things. Although ἀναγωγή had been heavily used by Origen as a technical term,¹⁴ Didymus went well beyond him and attached a wider import to the perfect participle ἀνηγμένος and to its cognate adverb ἀνηγμένως.

Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 38: τοῖς μὲν ἀνηγμένοις ἥλιος δικαιοσύνης γινόμενος. Ibid. p. 97: οὐδὲν θεῖον ἢ ἀνηγμένον ἔχοντι. *commJob*(5.1–6.29), Cod. p. 137: ἀνηγμένης θεωρίας. *commJob*(7.20c–11), Cod. p. 216: δύναται δὲ καὶ ἀνηγμένως θεωρεῖσθαι σκιά. *commZacch*, 1.342: ὁ ἀνηγμένος προφήτου λόγος. Ibid. 2.148: κατὰ θεωρίαν ἀνηγμένην. Ibid. 2.236: Σιών καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ ἀνηγμένως ἐστίν, ἀληθινὴ καλουμένη. Ibid. 2.302: τὴν μυστικὴν καὶ ἀνηγμένην θεωρίαν. Ibid. 3.23: πρὸς διάνοιαν ἀνηγμένην. Ibid. 3.102: θεωρητέον τὰ πρὸς ἀνηγμένην ἀπόδοσιν. Ibid. 3.176: ἀνηγμένης θεωρίας. Ibid. 4.51: τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὰ φρονήματα τῶν χριστιανῶν οὐκ ἀνηγμένως ἀποδιδόντων. Ibid. 4.117: Μισθὸν δὲ καὶ ἀργύριον ἀνηγμένως προσήκει ἐκλαβεῖν. Ibid. ἀκόλουθον μετὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀνηγμένως νοῆσαι τὰ περὶ τῶν δύο ῥάβδων ὧν ἔλαβεν ἑαυτῷ ὁ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου υἱός. Ibid. 5.115: περὶ νοημάτων ὑψηλῶς ἀνηγμένων. Ibid. 5.184: Τὸ ἀνηγμένως ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐορτάσαι τὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ἐορτήν. *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 38: κατὰ ῥητόν, οὐκ ἀνηγμένως. *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 87: πρὸς ἀναγωγήν καὶ ἀνηγμένην διάνοιαν. Ibid. Cod. p. 100: ὁ γὰρ λέγων

ταῦτα οὐκ ἔξει ἀνηγμένην διάνοιαν. Cod. p. 100: κατὰ τὴν ἀνηγμένην θεωρίαν. Ibid. Cod. p. 124: δύναται δὲ ἀνηγμένως λεχθῆναι. *frPs(al)*, fr. 774a: πρὸς θεωρίαν ἀνηγμένην. *commPs35–39*, Cod. p. 233: οὐδὲν ἀνηγμένον διανοοῦμενοι. *commPs40–44.4*, Cod. p. 298: θεῖοι ἄνδρες πρὸς θεολογίαν ἀνηγμένοι. *commPs40–44.4*, Cod. p. 319: οὐδὲν ἔξοντες ἀνηγμένον, οὐ σοφοὶ ὄντες.

The term remained the property of Didymus, so that we can identify him. Never did Christians have any inkling of its value, with the exception of John Philoponus, who displays awareness of it,¹⁵ nearly a hundred and fifty years after the death of Didymus.¹⁶

EN VIIIb: ἀρχὴ καὶ αἰτία

To regard the Son as the ‘beginning’ and ‘cause’ of everything is a thesis stated by Didymus throughout his work. *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.39.1629.48f: Πολλὰ σημαίνουσα, καθάπερ εἶπομεν, ἡ ἀρχή, νῦν τὸ αἶδιον δηλοῖ καὶ τὸ αἷτιον καὶ τὸ ποιητικόν. Εἰς ἔργα γὰρ ἐκτίσθαι φησίν, ἐπὶ τῷ ἀρχῇ εἶναι τῶν ποιητικῶν καὶ προνοητικῶν ὁδῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τουτέστιν αἰτία. Ibid. PG.39.1632.36–39: οὕτω καὶ τῇ κτίσει παρασχεῖν τὸ εἶναι βουλόμενος, κατ’ αὐτὴν γέγονεν, τὴν προειρημένην σχέσιν εἰσάγων, γινόμενος τοῖς ἐσομένοις ἀρχὴ καὶ αἰτία. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1050: δύναται τὸ ἀρχῇ ὄνομα καὶ ἐνταῦθα οὐκ ἀντὶ εἰσαγωγῆς ἀλλ’ αἷτιον κεῖσθαι, ἵν’ ἡ τὸ λεγόμενον αἰτία καὶ ἀρχὴ ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ φόβος. *commEccl* (5–6), Cod. p. 152: καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν αἰτίαν σημαίνει τὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὄνομα. *commPs35–39*, Cod. p. 272: ‘ἀρχὴ τῶν λόγων σου ἀλήθεια’. ἡ αἰτία τοῦ λέγειν με τοὺς λόγους σου ἢ ἀλήθειά σου ἐστίν. ταύτην φανερώσω ἐὰν γνῶ αὐτήν. ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν οὖν καὶ τῶν εὖ ἐχουσῶν ὁδῶν ἡ ἀλήθεια ἀρχὴ ἐστίν, αἰτία. *commPs20–21*, Cod. p. 54: λοιπὸν τὴν αἰτίαν ‘ὅτι’ αὐτοῦ ἐστίν ‘ἡ βασιλεία’. βασιλείαν ὧδε λέγει οὐ τὴν ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς βασιλευομένους. *In Genesin*, Cod. pp. 1B–2A: εἰ δέ τις τινα χρόνον ἂν οἰηθεῖν εἶναι τὴν ἀρχὴν . . . ἐξετάζων

¹³ Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *De Hierarchia Ecclesiastica*, p. 86: ὁ καθόλου θεῖος ἀνὴρ ὁ τῶν θεῶν ἄξιος κοινωνὸς ὁ πρὸς τὸ τοῦ κατ’ αὐτὸν θεοειδοῦς ἄκρον ἐν παντελέσει καὶ τελειωτικαῖς θεώσεσιν ἀνηγμένος. Ibid. p. 113: ἐραστός ἐστι ταῖς ὁμοταγέσι καὶ ἱερωτάταις τάξεσιν εἰς τὸ θεοειδέστατον ἀνηγμένος κάλλος.

¹⁴ Cf. *PHE*, pp. 29–30.

¹⁵ John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 16, p. 132; *De Opificio Mundi*, p. 4.

¹⁶ The term is mostly absent from the vocabulary of Didymus’ younger contemporary, the long-winded Chrysostom, who used it once and then put it to rest. *In Acta Apostolorum Homiliae*, PG.60.25.54–55: Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀνήχθησαν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνηγμένως αὐτοῖς διαλέγεται.

εὔροι ταῦτα τοῦ χρόνου προεπινοεῖσθαι· καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὄνομα οὐχ ἓν ἀλλὰ πολλὰ σημαίνει· . . . σημαίνει ποτὲ τὴν αἰτίαν ὡς ἐνταῦθα τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐστίν.

Origen, *expProv*, PG.17.185.1–8: Οὐσία οὐσα ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ σοφία, πρὸ αἰώνων γεγένηται, καὶ πρὸ κτίσεως αἰδίου ἦν· ὅτε δὲ σχέσιν πρὸς τὰ γεννητὰ ἐδέξατο, τότε ἀρχὴ τῶν ὁδῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ γέγονε τῶν ποιητικῶν καὶ προνοητικῶν· σύζυγος οὖν ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῖς κτίσμασιν ὧν γέγονεν ἀρχή, τουτέστιν ἡ πρὸς τὰ γεννητὰ σχέσις.

DT (*lib.* 3), PG.39.841: Δηλοῖ γὰρ ἡ μὲν ἀρχή, τὸ αἴτιον αὐτὸν εἶναι, ὡς ἄναρχον, καθὰ ὁ Θεὸς Πατὴρ τῆς πάντων συστάσεως. Ὁ γὰρ ὧν ἀρχὴ οὐκ ἔχει τὸν προϋπάρχοντα, ὡς ὁ ὑστατος οὐκ ἔχει τὸν ὑστατον.

EN VIIc: οὐ χρόνῳ, ἀλλὰ τιμῇ

Didymus emphasizes that the Son's seniority is *ontological*, not simply temporal. This he accomplishes by means of the distinction of seniority understood either in terms of time, or in terms of ontological priority. He accordingly makes the distinction between seniority τῷ χρόνῳ (in time) and seniority τῇ τιμῇ (in honour). He uses Aristotle's analyses in *De Interpretatione*, and it is to him that he actually refers, quoting from him implicitly.

Didymus, *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 79–80: ἐνίστε οὐ κατὰ χρόνον τὰ πάντα λημπτέον, ἀλλὰ ὅτε καὶ κατ' αἰτίαν. (He then quotes from Aristotle, *De Interpretatione*, 23a, which he cites, while also paraphrasing *De Anima*, 430a21–431a; *De Caelo*, 283a; *Metaphysica*, 1049b–1050a): ἔνια γὰρ τῷ χρόνῳ προτέραν ἔχουσιν τὴν δύναμιν, ὑστέρα δὲ τὴν ἐνέργειαν. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἀναγκαίων προηγουμένως καὶ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐνέργεια· αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ τέλος. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν μετὰ δύναμιν ἐχόντων τὴν ἐνέργειαν χρόνῳ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις προτέρα καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια ὑστέρα. κατὰ τι οὖν ἡ ἐνέργεια λέγεται προτέρα καὶ κατὰ τι ὑστέρα· καθ' ὃ μὲν αὐτὴ αἰτία ἐστὶν τῶν δυνάμεων (ἐνεκα γὰρ τοῦ ὑπαρχθῆναι

τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἢ δύναμιν ἐστίν), προτέρα ἐστὶν ἡ ἐνέργεια, τῷ δὲ χρόνῳ ἡ δύναμις. More than a century later, John Philoponus made the same point. Cf. *In Aristotelis Libros de Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, pp. 216–17, commenting on 412a26.

Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 328 (quoting heavily from Revelation): αὐτὸς οὖν Ἰησοῦς λέγει εἶναι 'ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος'· 'ἐγώ', φησὶν, 'εἰμι τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ω, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος', 'ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, ὁ ζῶν καὶ ἐγενάμην νεκρὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶν εἰμι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.' ὅρα πῶς αὐτὰ τὰ δοκοῦντα ἀντικείμενα καὶ πρότερα καὶ ὕστερα αὐτὸς εἶναι λέγει. λέγει γοῦν ὅτι 'ἐγὼ ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ ὁ ἔσχατος', ἢ πρῶτον 'ἐγὼ τὸ ἄλφα καὶ ἐγὼ τὸ ω'. ἐστὶν γράμματα, ἃ χαράττει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῶν οὕτω παρεσκευασμένων. λέγει γάρ· 'οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις, ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν σαρκίνας ἐπιγράφω'. καὶ λέγει ταύτας γράφεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ὑπὸ τοῦ 'ζῶντος πνεύματος'. αὐτὸς οὖν ἐστὶν καὶ τὰ γράμματα τὰ θεῖα ἐν ἧ γράφεται ἡ 'βίβλος τῶν ζώντων', ἐν ἧ χαράττονται 'τὰ ὀνόματα' τῶν ἀποστόλων 'ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς', ἐκεῖ ἐνπολιτογραφοῦσιν. λέγει οὖν 'ἐγὼ τὸ ἄλφα καὶ ἐγὼ τὸ ω'. διὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐδήλωσεν ὅτι καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐστίν. 'ἀρχή' οὖν καὶ 'τέλος' αὐτός ἐστιν. ἐξὸν οὖν αὐτοῦ μετέχειν 'ἅμα', καθ' ὃ 'ἀρχή' ἐστὶν καὶ 'τέλος' κατὰ ἄλλο μὲν 'ἀρχή', κατὰ ἕτερον δὲ 'τέλος'.

The expression κατὰ τιμὴν is used by Didymus to indicate qualitative superiority. *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 329; *ibid.* Cod. p. 329; *commZacch*, 3.286; *ibid.* 5.110.

EN VIId: οὐ κατὰ χρόνον

Didymus, *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 79: ἐνίστε οὐ κατὰ χρόνον τὰ πάντα λημπτέον, ἀλλὰ ὅτε καὶ κατ' αἰτίαν. *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p. 109–110: τὸ δὲ 'δεῖ' οὐ κατὰ χρόνον λαμβάνω, ἀλλὰ κατὰ νόησιν.

Therefore, we have a quotation from Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse, which has striking parallels in his commentary on Ecclesiastes.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION VIII

EN VIIIa: Quoting Heb. 1:3 and Rom. 6:9.

Once again, the author avails himself of the New Testament, in order to show that the text of Revelation stands in theological harmony with the entire Christian doctrine and, consequently, should be included in the Canon of scripture. The passages adduced at this point are Heb. 1:3 and Rom. 6:9.

Certain authors including Didymus and Theodoret, but not Origen, quote Heb. 1:3. The same expression combined with the expression *μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν* or *ἀναληφθεὶς* ('after the ascension'), appears in Didymus and Theodoret,¹ whereas it occurs also in Pseudo-Macarius.² On the other hand, Rom. 6:9 appears in Origen and Theodoret.³ One cannot know whether this had also been used by Didymus in texts which no longer exist.

EN VIIIb: ζῆ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

The expression ζῆ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας appears rarely as an implicit reference to this passage of Revelation, yet it occurs in connection with its Old Testament usage. The notion of the Son 'living for the aeons' occurs in Origen.⁴ Hippolytus made the point after Daniel's book,⁵ and so did Theodoret.⁶ Didymus confidently quoted from the germane parts of Revelation, as we saw in the previous Scholion. Cyril of Jerusalem made references, which clearly point to Revelation rather than to Old Testament passages.⁷ On the other hand, a resemblance with both the Scholion and Didymus appears in Pseudo-Macarius, quoting Rom.6:9, hence we probably once again come upon an Akoimetan author.⁸

The actual point made in this Scholion is that Revelation at this point concurs with both Testaments. My conclusion is that Cassian wrote [Scholion VIII](#) as a brief comment following the previous [Scholion VII](#), which was a plain quotation from Didymus.

¹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1038. Theodoret, *HE*, p. 23. Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, 22.2.7. Cf. Heb. 1:3, quoted by Didymus, *frPs(al)*, frs. 48; 894; 1038. Theodoret, *HE*, p. 23; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.733.

² Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, 2.3.14 and 22.2.7. Also, Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT* (lib. 1), 26.63.

³ Origen, *Cels*, II.16; *commJohm*. XIII.8.48; *Dial*, 6; *commMatt*, 12.4; *Commentarii in Epistolam ad Romanos (I.1-XII.21)*, 30. Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.108.3–4. Asterius of Antioch, *commPs*, 20.11. Eusebius, *Adversus Marcellum*, 2.1.13. Basil of Caesarea, *De Baptismo*, PG.31: 1537.46; 1552.47; 1553.9; 1569.50. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Ancoratus*, 92.5; *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 504; v. 3, pp. 215; 446; 518. John Chrysostom, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.229.39; *In Acta Apostolorum Homiliae*, PG.60.361.29; *In Epistolam ad*

Romanos Commentarius, PG.60.485.46; *et passim*. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, pp. 378; 644; *De Adoratione*, PG.68: 625.2; 653.53; 684.47; 1069.18; *GlaphPent*, PG.69.428.51.

⁴ Origen, *commJohm*, I.22.132; I.31.227.

⁵ Hippolytus, *In Danielelem*, 3.11.4; 3.31.1; 4.2.10.

⁶ Theodoret, *intDan*, PG.81: 1372.25; 1409.11. Likewise, in a spurious work: Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa, *Inventio Imaginis in Camulianis*, 8.

⁷ Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Illuminandum*, 2.18; 15.26.

⁸ Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, Homily 38.2.10; Homily 45.3.1; so in *Homiliae I*, Homily 15, and in *Opusculum I*, PG.34.824.19–20: οὗτος ἀληθῶς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ζῆ καὶ οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει. Cf. *RCR*, pp. 20; 30; 162–2; 169; 290; 356; 360; 378; 381–2.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION IX

EN IXa: Ὁ πᾶς ἐνεστηκὼς αἰὼν νύξ ὀνομάζεται

The metaphor of the present ‘aeon’ being a ‘night’ is Origen’s, who posited that full knowledge is an eschatological prospect. *Homiliae in Job* (e codd. Paris.), PG.12.1044.41–46 (so in *Homiliae in Job*, (e codd. Marc. gr. 21, 538), PG.17.96.42–48 and *Homiliae in Job* (e codd. Vat.), pp. 382–383): Ὁλος ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος νύξ ἐστι, σκότος ἐστὶ. Τὸ φῶς τηρεῖταί σοι νῦν γὰρ δι’ ἐσόπτρου βλέπεις, μέλλεις δέ ποτε βλέπειν τὸ φῶς. Οὐκοῦν νύξ ἐστι πᾶς ὁ αἰὼν, καὶ χρεία φυλάκων τεταγμένων εἰς νύκτα ταύτην, ἵνα οἱ φύλακες, οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν νυκτῶν, φρουρῶσι τοὺς ἐν νυξὶν ἀπὸ τῶν ληστῶν, ἀπὸ τῶν θηρίων, ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων. Τίνες οἱ φύλακες; Οἱ παρεμβάλλοντες ἄγγελοι.¹

Cf. his dubious text *De Pascha* (p. 126) expounding the same notion: ἡ νύξ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος κόσμου λαμβάνεται, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπόστολος μαρτυρεῖ λέγων. Ἡ νύξ προέκοπεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν.

The idea was taken up by Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1136, (comm. on Ps. 118:147): Πρῶτον ἐν ᾠρίᾳ, ὅπερ νοήσεις καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος αἰῶνος νυκτὸς ὀνομαζομένου πολλάκις ὡς πρὸς τὸν μέλλοντα αἰῶνα ἡμέραν καλούμενον, κατὰ τὸ Ἡ νύξ προέκοπεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγισεν.²

A later catenist approved Origen’s idea, but he disliked the author; hence he attributed the portion to John Chrysostom. Consequently, Migne gives rise to some confusion by attributing the same passage to both Origen and Chrysostom, which is not an unusual case in this *Patrology*. Cf. Origen’s foregoing text also ascribed to John Chrysostom, *Fragmenta in Job*, PG.64.644.

Theodoret took the church as ‘the moon’ that casts light on the ‘night’³ of the present world (footnote 1 to

the Scholion-text). This is an allusion to the Song of Songs 6:10, which is also an idea originating in Origen.⁴

EN IXb: λυχνιαίου φωτὸς

This point reveals Theodoret’s influence on this Scholion, although the thought goes back to Didymus. Theodoret is one of the few Christian theologians to have used this expression profusely, while neither Clement of Alexandria nor Origen nor Didymus ever used such an expression at all.

Theodoret, *Historia Religiosa*, Vita 3.6: καὶ διακύψας ὁρᾷ φῶς οὐ λυχνιαῖον, οὐδὲ χειροποιήτον, ἀλλὰ θεόσδοτον καὶ τῆς ἄνωθεν χάριτος. Ibid. Vita 11.1: Διετέλεσε δὲ μέχρι γήρως μῆτε πυρὶ χρησάμενος, μῆτε λυχνιαῖον δεξάμενος φῶς. Ibid. Vita 25.2: τὰς ἀποκρίσεις ποιούμενος μὲν, οὐχ ὀρώμενος δὲ καὶ οὔτε πυρὶ χρώμενος οὔτε λυχνιαίου φωτὸς ἀπολαύων. *commIs*, 2: Προτρέπει τοίνυν ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος μηκέτι προσεδρεύειν τῷ λυχνιαίῳ φωτὶ τοῦ νόμου, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀληθινῷ τὰς ψυχὰς καταυγάζειν. *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 142: θυμίαμα γὰρ καὶ λυχνιαῖον φῶς προσφέρομεν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τὴν μυστικὴν τῆς ἀγίας τραπέζης ἱερουργίαν. *Haeticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.353.3–5: (the same in the *Catena in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios [catena Pseudo-Oecumenii]*, p. 368 and p. 456): Οὐδὲ γὰρ χάριν, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς δεῖπνοις μόνον, τὸ λυχνιαῖον φῶς ἐκποδὼν ποιούμενοι, ἤπερ ἄν ἕκαστος ἐπέτυχεν συνεμίγνυτο.

The following text is of especial value. Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.396.4–7; the same text also in *Catena in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios (catena Pseudo-Oecumenii)*, pp. 368 and 456. Ἐν νυκτὶ μὲν γὰρ τὸ λυχνιαῖον φῶς φανώτατον εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ δὲ μέση κρύπτεται, καὶ οὐδὲ φῶς εἶναι νομίζεται.

¹ Nevertheless, at a certain point Origen has to render ‘this aeon’ as a ‘day’. He adds however, ‘I am aware that I have said different things at other points’. Cf. *homJer*, 12.10: ‘ἐργάζεσθε ὡς ἡμέρα ἐστὶν ἔρχεται νύξ ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι.’ ἡμέραν ἐκεῖ ὠνόμασε τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον (ἀλλὰ ἀναγκαίως προσέθηκα τὸ ἐκεῖ· οἶδα γὰρ ἐν ἄλλοις ἄλλα πάλιν δηλοῦμενα) ἡμέραν οὖν ὠνόμασε τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον, σκότος δὲ καὶ νύκτα τὴν συντέλειαν διὰ τὰς κολάσεις.

² John Chrysostom employed the figure. *Fragmenta in Job*,

PG.64.644.21; *De Virginitate*, 58 (cf. section 73); *In Heliam et Viduam*, PG.51.339.13. This appears also in spurious works. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Psalmum 100*, PG.55.636.38; *In Sanctum Pascha (sermo 2)*, 12.

³ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 12.54; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82: 197.12–14 and 652.36–38.

⁴ Origen, *commJohn*, I.25.163. Didymus, *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 202. *frPs(al)*, fr. 755. Theodoret, *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.176.16–19.

The idea underlying this passage is that the saints act as candles providing light to all those who cannot be illuminated directly by the ‘true sun’ Himself, namely, the Logos. Therefore, any doctor of the Church is a ‘candle’ to those under instruction, who are in a ‘state of darkness’; but ‘once the full light of the sun’ appears at ‘noon’, these candles fade vis-à-vis the power of the ‘real sun’. This is the idea expounded in the present Scholion, which is very much the same as the import of Theodoret’s foregoing passage. The same image occurs in the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*,⁵ which is one more indication that this work is not by Basil of Caesarea, who never used this expression.

The expression λυχνιαῖον φῶς is rare in Christian literature,⁶ and it is absent from the shining stars of Christian theology, save John Chrysostom⁷ and Cyril of Alexandria.⁸ A reference in Basil of Seleucia is the closest one to the spirit of Theodoret, who regarded the ‘light of the candle-stick’ as betokening the Old Testament.⁹ This imagery made a mark only in Scepticism,¹⁰ which was hardly of interest to Christian authors, whereas John Philoponus made ample use of it.¹¹

φῶς and λυχνία

Although probably introduced by Origen, the figure and reflection over φῶς and λυχνία did not remain exclusive to him, since they occur also in Hippolytus¹² and Didymus. Parallel texts by Origen and Didymus deserve to be quoted extensively, since their relevance to the phraseology of this Scholion becomes evident immediately.

Origen, *fr Luc*, fr. 121d: οἱ τῷ ‘ἀληθινῷ φωτί’ καὶ λόγῳ τῷ λαμπρῷ καὶ ταῖς ἀκτῖσι τῆς σοφίας ἀνάπτοντες τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς νοῦν, φύσιν ἔχοντα, καθ’ ἣν κατεσκεύασεν αὐτὸν ὁ Δημιουργός, λύχνου

δέονται τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου καὶ σοφίας καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ φωτὸς ἀνάψεως.

Ibid. fr. 121e: καὶ νομιστέον τὴν ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι ἐντολὴν πληροῦσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν προνοουμένων ἔχειν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τὸν νοῦν διορατικώτατον καὶ μετέχοντα τοῦ εἰπόντος ‘ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα’. οἱ γὰρ καίοντες τὸν ‘λύχνον’ καὶ τιθέντες ‘ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν’, ἵνα λάμπῃ ‘πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ’, προτρέπονται καὶ τοὺς ‘ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ’ βλέποντας τὴν τοῦ λύχνου λαμπρότητα καὶ αὐτοὺς καίειν τὴν ἑαυτῶν λυχνίαν.

Ibid. fr. 122: Τάχα δὲ ‘λύχνον’ ἑαυτὸν καλεῖ ὁ κύριος, πᾶσι λάμποντα τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, λέγω τῷδε τῷ κόσμῳ, ὡς κατὰ φύσιν θεὸς ὑπάρχων καὶ σὰρξ κατ’ οἰκονομίαν γενόμενος, οἷα δὴ φῶς κατ’ οὐσίαν λύχνου δίκην ἀπεριγράφως διὰ μέσης ψυχῆς ὡς διὰ θρυαλλίδος πῦρ τῷ τῆς σαρκὸς ὀστράκῳ κρατούμενος. ‘Λυχνίαν’ δὲ ὀνομάζει τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν, ἐφ’ ἧς τῷ κηρύγματι λάμπων ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῷδε τῷ κόσμῳ ὡς ἐν οἰκίᾳ τινι τυγχάνοντας καταφωτίζει ταῖς ἀκτῖσι τῆς ἀληθείας, τὰς πάντων διανοίας θείας πληρῶν ἐπιγνώσεως.

Ibid. fr. 123: ‘ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τίθεται’ λέγω δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἡγουν τὴν ἐν πνεύματι λογικὴν λατρείαν, ἵνα πάντας φωτίσῃ, διδάσκων τοὺς ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ λόγῳ ζῆν μόνῳ καὶ πολιτεύεσθαι. μὴ τοίνυν τὸν θεῖον λύχνον, ἡγουν τὸν φωτιστικὸν λόγον, ἀνάπτοντες διὰ θεωρίας καὶ πράξεως ὑπὸ μόδιον θήσομεν, ἵνα μὴ κατακριθῶμεν ὡς περιγράφοντες τῷ γράμματι τὴν τῆς σοφίας ἀπερίληπτον δύναμιν ‘ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν’, φημὶ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν ἐν τῷ ὕψει τῆς ἀληθοῦς θεωρίας, πᾶσι τὸ φῶς τῶν θείων δογμάτων πυρσεύουσιν.

⁵ *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 2.87: Οἱ γὰρ Ἅγιοι πάντες οἷον φῶς εἰσι λυχνιαῖον ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ σταθιρᾷ ὑπεραυγαζόμενον τῷ ἡλίῳ. Theodoret, *commis*, 18: Τοσαύτη δὲ αὐτῶν ἡ τυφλότης ὡς ἐν σταθιρᾷ μεσημβρίᾳ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι τῆς δικαιοσύνης τὸν ἥλιον.

⁶ Cf. Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, pp. 249–50 (φωτισμοῦ ἡλιακοῦ ἢ λυχνιαίου). Maximus Confessor, *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, 63 (τὸ λυχνιαῖον φῶς). Photius, *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, Epistle 268 (λυχνιαῖον φῶς).

⁷ John Chrysostom, *In illud: Habentes Eundem Spiritum*, PG.51.277.2; *In Genesi Sermones*, PG.53.367; PG.54.513; *In Sanctum Joannem*, PG.59.235 and 309; *In Epistolam i ad Thessalonicenses Commentarius*, PG.62.461.

⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentaria in Matthaum*, fr. 34.

⁹ Basil of Seleucia, *Homilia in Sanctum Andream*, PG.28.1104.10–13: Ἦν μὲν γὰρ τῶν Ἰωάννου [the Baptist] μαθητῶν ὁ δοκιμώτατος· ἐν λυχνιαίῳ φέγγει ζητῶν τοῦ φωτὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὥσπερ τις ἐν ἀμυδροτέραις αὐγαῖς πρὸς τὰς Χριστοῦ μαρμαρυγὰς ἐθιζόμενος. Cf. above, Theodoret, *commis*, 2.

¹⁰ Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhoniae Hypotyposes*, 1.119; 2.149.

¹¹ John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Analytica Posteriora Commentaria*, v. 13,3, p. 171; *In Aristotelis Meteorologicorum Librum Primum Commentarium*, v. 14,1, pp. 20 and 86. *In Aristotelis Libros De Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, p. 298. Also, Olympiodorus, the philosopher of Alexandria, *In Aristotelis Meteora Commentaria*, p. 230.

¹² Hippolytus, *De Benedictionibus*, p. 2.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.277–78: Διὰ τοῦ εἰπεῖν τὴν λυχνίαν χρυσὴν ὅλην εἶναι, δηλοῖ ὅτι ὅλη δι’ ὅλων ἢ φωτῶν πεπληρωμένη λυχνία νοερὰ καὶ ἀσώματός ἐστιν. Εὐρίσκομεν οὐ πολλαχοῦ τῆς γραφῆς ὡς τὰ νοητὰ ὀνόματι τοῦ χρυσοῦ σημαίνεται τάχα οὖν ἡ νοητὴ λυχνία ὁ πνευματικὸς οἶκος καὶ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τυγχάνει, ὡς ἐν Ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννου λέγεται, ὅτε φησὶν ὁ δεικνὺς τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῷ μυσταγωγουμένῳ ‘Αἱ ἐπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι ἃς ὀφθαλμῷ ψυχῆς εἶδες ἐπτὰ λυχνία εἰσίν.’

Ibid. 1.287–89 (which is a striking parallel to the present Scholion): Ἐπεὶ ἡ προκειμένη θεωρία περὶ λυχνίας οὐκ αἰσθητῆς ἀλλὰ νοητῆς ὑπάρχει, ὅρα μὴ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἢν εἶδεν Μωϋσῆς ἐν ἐν τῷ ὄρει κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα αὐτῷ, οὐχ ἕτερον ὄντα τῆς καλουμένης ἰδέας πρὸς τὴν ἀόρατον καὶ νοητὴν λυχνίαν ἢ αἰσθητὴ κατεσκευάσθη κατὰ τὴν ὑφήγησιν τοῦ ἱεροφάντου Μωϋσέως. Οὐκ ἄκαιρον προσπαραγράφειν τοῖς τεθεωρημένοις καὶ τὸ ἐν Εὐαγγελίῳ λεχθὲν ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ ‘Οὐδεῖς’, φησιν, ‘ἄνας λύχνον εἰς κρυπτὴν τίθησιν ἢ ὑπὸ σκευδὸς ἢ κλίνην, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, ἵνα πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ὁρῶσι τὸ φῶς.’ Δυνατὸν ἐν τούτοις ἐκλαβεῖν οἰκίαν τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ ζῶντος Θεοῦ, οἶκον αὐτοῦ τυγχάνουσιν, ἐν ᾗ οἱ παραμένοντες καὶ διατρίβοντες, κατὰ δόγματα αὐτῆς διακείμενοι, καταλάμπονται πρὸς τοῦ ἐπικειμένου τῇ λυχνίᾳ λύχνου, ἐξαπτομένου ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδεύοντος τοὺς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ διάγοντας κατὰ τοὺς θεσμούς καὶ κανόνας καὶ δόγματα τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς γνώμης. Φωτίζει δ’ οὗτος ὁ διδάσκαλος ὅταν οἶα λύχνον ἄρη τὸν ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν, ὃν περ οὐ κρύπτει ὑπὸ κλίνην ἢ

σκευδὸς, ἀλλ’ ἐπιτίθῃσιν τῷ προφορικῷ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, λυχνία ἀλληγορικῶς προσαγορευομένῳ, ἔχων ‘γλῶτταν παιδείας ἥνικα δεῖ εἰπεῖν’.

EN IXc: θεία παιδευσίς

The expression θεία παιδευσίς (‘divine instruction’) is not frequent in literature. It appears casually in Gregory of Nyssa,¹³ Gregory of Nazianzus,¹⁴ and in Origen’s catena-fragments on the Psalms.¹⁵ In Didymus however it recurs as a favourite motif. In Origen we come upon this only twice, which may well be a rendering by a catenist otherwise expressing Origen authentically. But Didymus used it every now and then.¹⁶ After him, the expression fades. Rare as it is in Cyril of Alexandria,¹⁷ it is almost absent from the entire literature thereafter.¹⁸ Theodoret did not use the expression itself, but the notion of God ‘educating’ people (with Theodoret using the verb παιδεύειν) is recurrent.

EN IXd: The mysticism attached to number ‘seven’ (Cf. EN XXVIII d)

Didymus undoubtedly profited from Philo’s iteration of Pythagorean arguments in praise of the number seven,¹⁹ yet this Pythagorean echo was also communicated to him through Iamblichus. Didymus’ views are in fact a reproduction of Iamblichus’ expositions of Pythagorean ideas.²⁰ Christian theologians were not shy about espousing the idea. Whether Epiphanius of Salamis was one of them is not certain,²¹ yet Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria explicitly embraced the Pythagorean idea.²² On this Theodore of Mopsuestia

¹³ Gregory of Nyssa, *De Vita Gregorii Thaumaturgi*, PG.46.917.33.

¹⁴ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Adversus Julianum Imperatorem*, PG.35.708.9.

¹⁵ Origen, *frPs*, Psalm 97, verses 5,6; *excPs*, PG.17.108.31.

¹⁶ Didymus, *commJob*(1–4), Cod. pp. 24, 107; 138; 276; *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 228; *commZacch*, 1.116 and 228; 2.363; 3.111 and 278; 4.117 and 291; *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. pp. 63; 239; 260; 280; *frPs(al)*, frs. 201, 951,1079; *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 85; *In Genesin*, Cod. pp. 69; 70; 86; 99; 140; 141; 242; 249.

¹⁷ Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, p. 552; *De Adoratione*, PG.68.1100.8; *In Isaiam*, PG.70.1293.51.

¹⁸ See this expression in the following authors: Macarius of Magnesia (fourth–fifth cent. AD), *Μονογενής*, Book 2, p. 39; Hermias of Alexandria (fifth cent. AD), *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 61; Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria (sixth cent. AD), *Commentarii in Job*, p. 1; *Commentarii in Ecclesiasten*, PG.93.512.44; Severus of Antioch (sixth cent. AD), in the *Catena in Epistulam Joannis*, p. 114.

¹⁹ Philo, *De Opificio Mundi*, 91; 101; 120; 127; *Legum Allegoriarum*,

1.12; 1.14; *De Mutatione Nominum*, 143; *De Vita Mosis*, 2.103; *De Decalogo*, 160; *De Specialibus Legibus*, 1.182; 1.188; 2.156; 2.176; *Quaestiones in Genesim (fragmenta)*, 2.13b; *De Numeris, (fragmenta)*, frs. 40; 43a; 45b; 56a; 62b; 66; 73b; 74; 130a; 130c.

²⁰ Iamblichus, *Theologoumena Arithmeticae*, p. 54f. He ascribes the particular section expounding the significance of the number seven to Anatolius. See similar, if less detailed, analyses in the spurious *Problemata*, 2.47, attributed to Alexander of Aphrodisias. This work ascribes the idea ‘to Pythagoras, mathematicians, and musicians’.

²¹ Epiphanius of Salamis is represented as endorsing the idea of seven being a perfect number in the spurious work, Pseudo-Epiphanius of Salamis, *Tractatus de Numerorum Mysteriorum*, PG.43.513.34f.

²² Gregory of Nazianzus, *In Pentecosten*, PG.36.433.1: ἐπτὰ, τὸν τέλειον ἀριθμόν. Cyril of Alexandria, *De Adoratione*, PG.68: 608.16–17; 641.44. 688.49; *GlaphPent*, PG.69: 297.25; 632.10–11. So did Olympiodorus the deacon of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Job*, p. 386: ὁ ἐπτὰ παρὰ τῇ γραφῇ τίμιος καὶ τέλειος ἀριθμός.

made the comment that it is a peculiarity of Scripture (ιδίωμα τῆς γραφῆς) to regard the number seven as a perfect one, yet one should beware of falling into absurd exegeses on account of this. Theodore remained impartial about this tendency; still his implicit disapproval could hardly be concealed.²³ A work ascribed to Theodoret urges that undoubtedly certain marvellous things which happened in nature can be associated with the number seven. However, it is not this number itself that caused them to happen, but the other way round: the ‘power of nature’ is the cause for the number seven to be involved in these occurrences.²⁴ Later still, Oecumenius made the idea a recurrent theme.²⁵

Once again, therefore, we come across Didymus:

commEccl (11–12), Cod. p. 319: λέγει οὖν ὅτι οἱ πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας ἄγιοι ‘ἐπεγεροθήσονται ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀσύριον ἑπτὰ ποιμένες’, ἵνα πάντας τοὺς προφήτας πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας, αὐτοὺς τοὺς πατριάρχας τούτους πρὸς τούτους ‘ποιμένας’ λάβῃς, οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν ‘ἑπτὰ’ ἀριθμὸν ἱστάμενον τὸν τεμνόμενον εἰς πέντε καὶ δύο, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ μυστικὸν τῆς ἑβδομάδος. οἱ τὸν ‘ἀπολειπόμενον σαββατισμὸν τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ’ ἐσχηκότες εὔροντες διὰ Ἰησοῦ ‘ψυχῆς ἀνάπαυσιν’ – ‘εὐρήσετε’ γὰρ ‘ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν’ οὗτοι ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ σαββάτῳ εἰσὶν καὶ παρονομάζονται ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ ‘ἑπτὰ’.

commZacch, 1.51: Οὐ γὰρ ἔτι ἐπίπονος ἐργασία ἔσται σαββατικοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ πληρωθέντος· ὁ γὰρ ἑβδομήκοντα ἀριθμός, ἐκ δεκάδων ἑπτὰ συνεστηκώς, τελείαν ἀνάπαυσιν ἐπιφέρει, παρέχοντος αὐτὴν τοῦ ἐληλυθότος ‘κηρῦξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν’, ἀνατείλαντος ἐκ τοῦ Ἰούδα.

The following passages run parallel to [Scholion XXXI](#):

Didymus, *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p. 107: ἔστιν δὲ ὁ ἀριθμὸς οὗτος δευτέρου τετραγώνου ἀριθμοῦ ἀρχή. τετράγωνός ἐστιν ὁ ἰσάκις μετρούμενος,²⁶ δις δύο, τρις τρεῖς. οὗτος οὖν ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἐστιν καὶ λοιπὸν ἡ προσθήκη τῆς μονάδος ἀρχὴν ἄλλου καταβάλλεται < > ἑβδομηντὰ ἑπτὰ. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ

περὶ τῆς μετανοίας ὁ σωτὴρ ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου ἐρωτώμενος ‘ποσάκις ἁμαρτάνει;’ λέγει ἕως ‘ἑπτὰ;’ λέγει ‘οὐ λέγω σοι ἕως ἑπτὰ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτὰ’. τετράγωνός ἐστιν ὁ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ. οὗτος δὲ πλευρὰς ἔχει ἁγίας· ἡ γὰρ ἑβδομάς πολλάκις ἡμῖν ἀποδέδεικται ὅτι πάντοθεν ἐστὶν εὐλογημένη· ‘εὐλόγησεν’ γὰρ ‘ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑβδόμην καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτήν’, καὶ ‘οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου οἱ ἐπιβλέποντες πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἑπτὰ εἰσιν’. οὐχ ὅτι ἑπτὰ οὕτω λέγω τρεῖς καὶ τέτταρες, ἀλλὰ πληρεστάτη ἐστὶν ἐφόρασις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπίβλεψις.²⁷ οὕτω γοῦν καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐορτῇ τῶν ἑβδομάδων ἡ πεντηκοστή ἄγεται ἡ κατὰ τὴν παλαιὰν διαθήκην καὶ τὴν νέαν· ἔχεις γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν τῶν ἀποστόλων ὅτι ‘ἐν τῷ συνπληροῦσθαι τὴν πεντηκοστήν’ ἡ δόσις τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος δέδοται, τὰ διάφορα χαρίσματα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιμετρήθη ἔδει γὰρ ὑπερβεβηκέναι τὸν ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἀριθμὸν καὶ ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν ἄλλου τοιοῦτου ἀριθμοῦ καὶ οὕτω τελειωθῆναι. ὁ πενήκοντα οὖν ἐπὶ πολλῶν παραλαμβάνεται μεγάλων. ὁ ἑβδομος μὴν πάλιν τέλειός ἐστιν. ἡ σκηνοποιία οὖν ἐν τῷ ἑβδόμῳ μηνὶ γίνεται κατ’ Ἑβραίους. πάλιν ἐξ ἑτῆ ἐσπείρετο ἡ γῆ, τῷ δὲ ἑβδόμῳ ἔτει ἄσπορος ἔμενεν, τοῖς πτωχοῖς φυλαττόμενος ὁ ἐνιαυτός ἐκεῖνος. κακεῖ οὖν πάλιν, εἰ διὰ ἑπτὰ ἐτῶν ἄγεται τις πανήγυρις, πάλιν ἑβδομαδικός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνιαυτός ἐκεῖνος. ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἄγεται δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὸν λεγόμενον παρὰ Ἑβραίοις Ἰωβηλαῖον. ὁ Ἰωβηλαῖος πεντηκοστός ἐστιν ἐνιαυτός. διὰ πενήκοντα ἐτῶν ἐπετελεῖτο τινα πανηγυρικά. πλεῖον δὲ εἶχεν οὗτος ὁ ἐνιαυτός τῶν ἄλλων ἐνιαυτῶν. ἐλέγομεν εἶναι καὶ ἑβδόμους ἐνιαυτοὺς καὶ ἑβδόμους μῆνας. ἐν τῷ πεντηκοστῷ ἐνιαυτῷ τῷ καλουμένῳ Ἰωβηλαίῳ καὶ χρεοκοπία ἐγένετο τῶν χρεῶν· ἐχαρίζοντο οἱ δανεισταὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου εἰς τοῦτο ἀγόμενοι, ἐχρεοκόπουν κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν, καὶ οὐδὲ τόκους εἰσεπράττετο.

commPs35–39, Cod. p. 259–60: ἅγιος δὲ καὶ ὁ ἑπτὰ· πολλάκις γὰρ καὶ περὶ τούτου ἐλέχθη ὅτι ἀδιάφθορός ἐστιν, παρθένος ἐστίν, ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ ἐστίν.

²³ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *commProphXII*, Prophet Micah, 5, 5b–6a.

²⁴ Pseudo-Theodoret (or Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, p. 77: οὐχ ἡ ἑβδομάς οὖν αἰτία τῆς ἐκπληρώσεως τῶν ἔργων τῆς φύσεως, ἀλλ’ ἡ δύναμις τῆς φύσεως αἰτία τῆς ἑβδομάδος, καθ’ ἣν συμβῆναι τῇ φύσει τὰ οἰκεία ἔργα ἐκτελεῖσαι.

²⁵ Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, pp. 76; 79; 100; 150.

²⁶ Cf. [Scholion XXXI](#): ἔστιν τοίνυν τετράγωνός ὁ ἀριθμός ἰσάκις ἴσος κυλισθ·εῖς.

²⁷ Cf. [Scholion XV](#): Τὴν ἐποπτικὴν καὶ ἔφορον τῶν ὅλων δύναμιν καὶ τὴν πορευτικὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.

commPs40-44.4, Cod. p. 303: ὁ ἐπτὰ δὲ ἐστὶν ἀδιάφθορος καὶ παρθένος ἀμήτορι καὶ ἀπάτορι ἐοικώς· οὐδὲ γὰρ γεννᾶν πέφυκεν ὁ ἐπτὰ οὐδὲ γεννᾶσθαι. παρθένος ἐστὶν ἢ οὐ γεννᾷ, παρθένος ἀδιάφθορος.

In Genesin, Cod. pp. 183-4: Πάντες οἱ ἐν τὸς δεκάδος ἀριθμοὶ διπλασιαζόμενοι ἢ τριπλασιαζόμενοι πλὴν τοῦ ἐπτὰ καὶ γεννῶσιν καὶ γεννῶνται, οἷον ὁ εἷς γεννᾷ τὸν δύο, καὶ ὁ δύο τὸν τέσσερα οὕτως γεννηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἑνός, καὶ ὁ τέσσερα τὸν ὀκτὼ γεννηθεὶς καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὸ τῶν δύο, ὁ δὲ πέντε τὸν δέκα, καὶ ὁ ἕξ δὲ ποτε γεννώμενος οὐ γεννῶν, ὁ δὲ ἐπτὰ οὔτε ὑπὸ τῶν φθασάντων γεννᾶται οὔτε τινὰ μεθ' ἑαυτὸν ἕως δεκάδος γεννᾷ ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ δύο τὸν ἕξ καὶ ὁ τρία τὸν ἑννέα τριπλασιαζόμενοι γεννῶσιν. Ἐχει δὲ καὶ ἕτερόν τι προνόμιον· ἐὰν γὰρ ἐν διπλασίονι λόγῳ πολυπλασιάσῃ τοὺς ἀπὸ μονάδος ἀριθμοὺς ἕως ἐπτὰ, ἴσος ἅμα καὶ τετράγωνος γίνεται· εἷς γάρ, δύο, τέσσερα, ὀκτὼ, δέκα ἕξ, τριάκοντα δύο, διπλασιασθέντα τὸν ἐξήκοντα τέσσερα, ὅστις τετράγωνός μιν ἐστίν, ὀκτὰ γὰρ ὀκτὼ ἐξήκοντα τέσσερα, κύβος δὲ, τέτρα γὰρ τέσσερα τέτρα ἐξήκοντα τέσσερα. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τριπλασιαζόμενοι ἕως ἐπτὰ πάλιν ἀπὸ μονάδος ἀποτελεῖ τὸν ἐπτακόσια εἴκοσι ἑννέα καὶ αὐτὸν ὄντα τετράγωνον ἅμα καὶ κύβον· εἷς γάρ, τρία, ἑννέα, εἴκοσι ἐπτὰ, ὀγδοήκοντα εἷς, διακόσια τεσσεράκοντα τρία, ἐπτακόσια εἴκοσι ἑννέα, ὡς εἴρηται, κύβον ἅμα καὶ τετράγωνον συμπληροῖ, τετράγωνον μὲν οὕτως ἐπτὰ εἰκοσάκις εἴκοσι ἐπτὰ ἐπτακόσια εἴκοσι ἑννέα, κύβον οὕτως.

frPs(al), fr. 533: Καλούμενος δὲ παρ' Ἑβραίοις Ἰωβηλαῖος ὁ διὰ πεντήκοντα ἐτῶν ἐνιαυτός ἐστιν ἐορτάσιμος, ἐν ᾧ χρεῶν ἀποκοπαὶ καὶ τῶν Ἑβραίων ἐλευθερίαι κτήσεων ἀποκαταστάσεις βεβαιοῦνται· ὅθεν ἀκόλουθον καὶ τὸν περὶ μετανοίας τοῦ Δαυὶδ ψαλμὸν πεντηκοστὸν τετάχθαι. ἔστιν δὲ συγκείμενος καὶ ἐξ ἑβδομάδων ἐπτὰ καὶ μονάδος, ὡς εἶναι ἑβδομάδα ἑβδομάδων ἀριθμὸν. ἔδει οὖν ἐν ἑβδομάδων γενέσθαι τὸν ἀποβάλλοντα τὸ ἄχθος καὶ τὸ ἔργον τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

Ibid. fr. 823: Ἐπειδὴ ὁ ἐπτὰ ἀριθμὸς καταπαύσεως σύμβολον ἔχει, βούλονται τὴν ἀναπαύοσιν ἐπὶ τῷ περιγραφῆναι τὴν ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν, ἐφ' ἣ

ὠνείδισαν θεὸν καὶ ὁμῶς προσηνέχθησαν τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ, ἐπαχθῆναι· οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀναιρέσει τῶν κολαζομένων οἱ θεὸν ἀγαθὸν ἐπιστάμενοι ἐπιφέρεισθαι βούλονται τὰς κολάσεις, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ ἀργῆσαι τῶν ἔργων ἐκείνων οἷς ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀκολουθεῖ τιμωρία. ἀργίας δὲ σύμβολον ὁ σαββατικὸς ἀριθμὸς.

In Genesin, Cod. p. 56: Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπτὰ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχειν τὸν Θεὸν ἢ γραφὴ διαγορεύει καθορῶντας πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν· ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος δύο ἔχει. οὐκ ἄρα κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, οὕτως ἡμῶν θεωρούντων, εὗρεθήσεται. Ταῦτα δὲ φάμεν οὐχ ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπτὰ αἰσθητοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντος, ἀλλὰ θηρεύοντες πῶς κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐστίν· τὴν γὰρ τελείαν ἐποπτικὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν διὰ τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἐδήλωσεν ὁ λόγος καὶ δι' ἃς ἔχει ἀρετὰς ὁ ἐπτὰ ἀριθμὸς, ὡς ἤδη προεῖρηται.

Ibid. Cod. p. 133: Οὗτος γὰρ ἐπτὰ ἐκδικούμενα παραλύσει, ὅπερ δηλοῖ τὴν τελείαν τιμωρίαν. Πολλάκις γὰρ ὁ ἐπτὰ ἀριθμὸς ἐν τῇ γραφῇ ἀντὶ τελειότητος παρείλημπται· τοῦτο δηλοῦται ὑπὸ τοῦ λεγομένου Ἑπτὰ ὀφθαλμοὶ εἰσὶν ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.²⁸ οὐ γὰρ δὴ σῶμά ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ἵνα καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπτὰ ἀριθμὸν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ τυγχάνωσιν, ἀλλὰ δηλὸν ὡς τὴν ἐποπτικὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν²⁹ πληρεστάτην καὶ μεγάλην εἶναι διδάσκει.

Ibid. Cod. p. 177: Εἰς τὰς φύσεις τῶν ἀριθμῶν τις ἀποσκοπῶν καὶ γινώσκων ὡς ὁ ἐπτὰ ἐν γραφαῖς πολλὰ ἔχων προνόμια μνημονεύεται. ὁ δὲ δύο ἐστὶ τῇ ὕλῃ οἰκεῖος, καθὰ καὶ πρότερον εἴρηται. ἐπιστήσει πῶς ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν καθαρῶν ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς τὸν ἐπτὰ ἔταξεν ἀριθμὸν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἀκαθάρτων καὶ νῦν τὸν δύο.

Ibid. Cod. p. 188-89: Εἰ δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀναγωγὴν³⁰ τις ἐθέλοι, λέγοι ἂν ὅτι, ἐπεὶ ὁ ἐπτὰ ἀριθμὸς ἀναπαύσεώς ἐστι σύμβολον.

EN IXe: ἅγιος καὶ εὐλογημένος

Although scriptural, the expression ἅγιος καὶ εὐλογημένος is almost absent from literature. It appears in the ode of Daniel 3:52, applied to the 'name' of God, as well as in the Book of Enoch, as a quotation

²⁸ Zach. 4:10, quoted in *Scholion XXVIII*, in the same context.

²⁹ Cf. *Scholion XV*: Τὴν ἐποπτικὴν καὶ ἔφορον τῶν ὅλων δύναμιν καὶ τὴν πορευτικὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. *Scholion XXX*: ἁγιαί εἰσι

τινες 'δυνάμεις', οἷον αἱ ὑπηρετικαὶ χεῖρες καὶ ἐποπτικοὶ ὀφθαλμοί.

³⁰ Cf. *Scholion XIII*: ἀνακτέον and *Scholion VII*: ἀνηγμένως νοήσας.

from the foregoing passage.³¹ Theodoret quotes the canonical scriptural passage,³² whereas Ephraem Syrus is the sole author using the expression without quoting or citing or paraphrasing any scriptural instance.³³

The important point is how Didymus uses this expression, which is the last case to be considered, since there are no other authors who use this wording. He employs ἅγιος καὶ εὐλογημένος as an oblique reference to Daniel, 3:52, and applies these adjectives to the ‘name of the Lord’ (ὄνομα κυρίου). The significance of the passage however lies in the fact that the entire point is the same as that in [Scholion IX](#).³⁴

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 929: τῆς γὰρ θεοῦ προσηγορίας ἐπικληθείσης ἡμῖν, πάντα πράττοντες τὰ κατὰ λόγον τὸν ὁρθὸν δι’ εὐλογίας ὧν εὐλογοῦμεν, ἐνεργοῦμεν ὃ φοροῦμεν ὄνομα κυρίου οὐ γὰρ ἄλλως ἔχοντος αὐτοῦ, εὐχόμεθα εὐλογημένον αὐτὸ καὶ ἅγιον γενέσθαι.

Didymus uses this expression εὐλογημένον καὶ ἅγιον in relation to Matt. 5:15–16, which is also commented upon in this Scholion. This is further evidence that this Scholion originates in Didymus’ work quoted by Cassian.

EN IXf: νυκτερινὴ κατάστασις

The ‘nightly state’ is a recurrent theme in Didymus, but it comes from Origen, as we can learn by studying Evagrius. In all probability, the expression νυκτερινὴ κατάστασις had been used in at least one of Origen’s lost works, since it is used by Eusebius and Evagrius, who are the only Christian theologians to do so. The notion is of course a moral one: a soul living in ‘the state of night’ (that is, in darkness) is a sinner.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 178: Καὶ νυκτὸς δὲ κεκράξομαι, οὐκ ἀνοίας μοι λογιζομένης, ὅτε τὰ περιεστηκότα ἐστὶν σκυθρωπά, τῶν πολλῶν ἐν ταῖς περιστάσεσιν σκοτιζομένων ὡς καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο τί δεῖ κράζοντα πρὸς θεὸν λέγειν ἀγνοεῖν· ἐπίσταμαι γὰρ ἐγὼ τίνοος ἔνεκα περὶ ἐμὲ νυκτερινὴ κατάστασις ἐστίν. However, this passage is also attributed to Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.204.51–56.

The following passage of Didymus is a paraphrase of part of [Scholion IX](#), which can leave no doubt that he is the author of it.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 869: Κεκράξομαι πρὸς σὲ οὐ μεθ’ ἡμέραν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ νύκτωρ, οὐκ ἐν μόνοις τυγχάνων τοῖς λαμπροῖς καὶ προσηγέσι τοῦ βίου πράγμασιν (ἀδύνατον ἡμέραν εἶναι) ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς σκυθρωποῖς γεγεννημένος νυκτερινὴν κατάστασιν περιέχουσιν· ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μὲν κεκραγώς, ὅπως παραμένῃ μοι ἡ τῶν ἀγαθῶν μετουσία, ἐν νυκτὶ δέ, ὅπως τέλος αὐτῆς λαβούσης ἐκ νυκτὸς πρὸς σὲ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ὁρθίσει δινηθῇ.

Ibid. fr. 903: εἰ γὰρ ποτε καὶ ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ τις γενόμενος δόξειεν ἐν νυκτερινῇ καταστάσει εἶναι, οὐ φοβηθήσεται, ἔχων τὸ τῆς γνώσεως αἴτιον φῶς ὃ ταυτὸν εἴρηται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

In *Genesisin*, Cod. p. 38: Καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν φωτιζομένων, οἱ μὲν ἐπ’ ἐλάττον οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ πλεῖον τὸν φωτισμὸν δέχονται· παρὰ δὲ τούτους εἰσὶν οἱ ἐν νυκτερινῇ καταστάσει τυγχάνοντες.

At this point, it is worth exploring how the text ascribed to Evagrius stands in relation to that of Origen. Commenting on the Book of Proverbs, Evagrius actually quotes Origen, but with a substantial difference, since there is a passage of Evagrius which is missing from Origen’s text. The missing text reads as follows:

Evagrius, *Scholia in Proverbia*, Scholion 91: Ἡσυχίαν νυκτερινὴν καὶ γνοφώδη τὴν ἀκάθαρτον κατάστασιν ὠνόμασε τῆς ψυχῆς, καθ’ ἣν ἀναπομένη τὴν ἁμαρτίαν διὰ τοῦ σώματος κατεργάζεται.

Let us see the entire context. Evagrius’ text is not a paraphrase, but a word-for-word quotation. The sole point missing is the foregoing one:

Evagrius, *expProv Salomonis*, p. 87: Οἱ πρὸς χάριν ἐμβαλλόμενοι λόγοι οἱ ἐμπαθεῖς εἰσι λογισμοί. Τὴν σάρκα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου θυρίδα νῦν ὀνομάζει· διὰ γὰρ ταύτης ὁ πονηρὸς τὰς ἀπάτας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐργάζεται, τοῖς βουλομένοις ὁδεύειν τὴν πλατεῖαν ὁδὸν καὶ εὐρύχωρον καὶ ἀπάγουσαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπώλειαν. ἀλλ’ ἐνταῦθα προσεκτέον τί φησιν ὁ Σολομὼν περὶ τῆς κακίας, ὅτι οὐχ αὕτη τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν ἀρχαῖς ἐπὶ τὴν κακίαν ἀπάγει, οὐδ’

³¹ Cf. *Apocalypsis Apocrypha Enochii*, chapter 9 col 1, section 4: καὶ τὸ ὄνομά σου ἅγιον καὶ εὐλογημένον εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.

³² Theodoret, *intDan*, PG.81.1336.7.

³³ Ephraem Syrus, *De Abstinendo*, p. 230: Εἰ μὴ γάρ, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς πλάσας ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐνώσας ἑαυτῷ σάρκα κατηξίωσεν ἐμφανῶς

βαδίσαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ διὰ τοῦ εὐλογημένου καὶ ἁγίου αὐτοῦ βήματος ἀγιάσαι τὴν γῆν.

³⁴ Cf. the same expression in [Scholion XXVIII](#): ἁγίαν βασιλείαν καὶ εὐλογημένην.

ἀναγκάζει πορεύεσθαι ἐν διόδοις οἴκων αὐτῆς, ἢ προσεγγίζειν γωνία, ἢ λαλεῖν ἐν σκότει ἐσπερινῷ· ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἴδῃ τινὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐπιδιδόντα ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, εὐθὺς συναντᾷ αὐτῷ, εἶδος ἔχουσα πορνικόν, ἢ ποιεῖ νέων ἐξαπατᾶσθαι καρδίας. [Now, here is the passage which is omitted in Origen's text:] Ἡσυχίαν νυκτερινὴν καὶ γνοφώδην τὴν ἀκάθαρτον κατάστασιν ὠνόμασε τῆς ψυχῆς, καθ' ἣν ἀναπτομένη τὴν ἁμαρτίαν διὰ τοῦ σώματος κατεργάζεται. [And the text goes on with a verbatim quotation] Οἱ μὲν ἐν ταῖς πλατεῖαις ῥεμβόμενοι μοιχείας καὶ πορνείας καὶ κλοπῆς λαμβάνουσι λογισμούς· οἱ δὲ ἔξω τούτων ῥεμβόμενοι παρὰ φύσιν κινεῖνται ἀρρένων κοίτην ἐπιζητοῦντες, καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἀπειρημένων πραγμάτων φαντασίας λαμβάνοντες. Εἰ τῶν λογισμῶν οἱ μὲν καθαροὶ εἰσιν, οἱ δὲ ἀκάθαρτοι· καὶ εἰ μὲν τῶν γραμμῶν αἱ μὲν εὐθεῖαι καλοῦνται, αἱ δὲ κεκλασμέναι εὐθεῖαι, γωνία δὲ ἐστὶν κεκλασμένη εὐθεῖα· γωνία ἄρα νοητὴ ἐστὶν ἀκάθαρτος λογισμός.

Here is Origen's comment, from which the portion containing the expression κατάστασις νυκτερινή was deleted, which might well be a noble act of discretion by the catenist, on account of Origen's self-castration.

Origen, *expProv*, PG.17.181.5–16: Τὴν σάρκα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου θυρίδα ὀνομάζει νῦν διὰ γὰρ ταύτης ὁ πονηρὸς τὰς ἀπάτας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐργάζεται, τοῖς βουλομένοις ὁδεύειν τὴν πλατείαν ὁδὸν καὶ εὐρύχωρον, καὶ ἀπάγουσαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπώλειαν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ προσεκτέον τί φησιν ὁ Σολομὼν περὶ

τῆς κακίας ὅτι οὐκ αὐτὴ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν ἀρχαῖς ἐπὶ τὴν πλατείαν ἄγει οὐδὲ ἀναγκάζει πορεύεσθαι διόδοις οἴκων αὐτῆς, ἢ προσεγγίζειν γωνία, ἢ λαλεῖν ἐν σκότει ἐσπερινῷ· ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἴδῃ τινὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐπιδιδόντα ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, εὐθὺς συναντᾷ αὐτῷ τὸ εἶδος ἔχουσα πορνικόν, ἢ ποιεῖ τὰς νέων ἐξίπτασθαι καρδίας.

This is the point from which three lines with the words surrounding the expression κατάστασις νυκτερινή have been omitted. Then the text goes on, PG.17.181.5–17–29 Οἱ μὲν ἐν ταῖς πλατεῖαις ῥεμβόμενοι, μοιχείας καὶ πορνείας καὶ κλοπῆς λαμβάνουσι λογισμούς· οἱ δὲ ἔξω τούτων ῥεμβόμενοι, τὰς παρὰ φύσιν ἡδονὰς μετέρχονται, ἀρσενικοκοιτεῖν ἐπιζητοῦντες, καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἀπαγορευομένων πραγμάτων φαντασίας λαμβάνοντες. ὅρα δὲ μὴ κατηγορήμα εἶη τοῦτο καὶ ἀγίων ἀνδρῶν καὶ τις μὴ ἡσυχάζων ἀλλὰ ῥεμβόμενος, τοῖς κατηγορήμασι κοινωνήσῃ τῆς ἀτίμου γυναικός. Τῶν λογισμῶν, οἱ μὲν καθαροὶ εἰσιν, οἱ δὲ ἀκάθαρτοι· καὶ τῶν γραμμῶν αἱ μὲν εὐθεῖαι καλοῦνται αἱ δὲ κεκλασμέναι· γωνία δὲ ἐστὶ κεκλασμένη εὐθεῖα ἢ γωνία νοητῶς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀκάθαρτος λογισμός.

In conclusion, the Scholion is largely a quotation from Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse. However, Cassian paraphrased this at certain points by following Theodoret, as also happened with the expression λυχνιαῖον φῶς, which does not occur in Didymus.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION X

EN Xa: ἡ σὺν ἀγάπῃ κατορθοῦται

At this point, Cassian makes a shift from Rev. 2:2 (which is the text under analysis) to 1 Thess. 1:3. Nevertheless, the idea of ‘love’ being an ‘accomplishment’ (κατόρθωμα) is one more instance of Christian authors¹ employing Stoic terminology.² The notion of any ‘virtue’ being a ‘feat’ (κατόρθωμα) is a theme occurring abundantly in Gregory of Nyssa.³ So it does also in Cassian,⁴ who once again follows his Cappadocian hero. I have shown Cassian’s debts to Gregory in my edition of his works included in the same ancient codex. Certainly Stoicism in Christian authors is not uncommon; indeed the notion of ‘accomplishment’ (κατόρθωμα) appears in Didymus abundantly. However, in Didymus the association between ‘accomplish-

ment’ (κατόρθωμα) and ‘virtue’ (ἀρετή), although definitely admired,⁵ does not enjoy the emphasis it does in Gregory of Nyssa and Cassian. Therefore, this expression is Cassian’s own and marks his wish to show that Rev. 2:2 fits well with 1 Thess. 1:3, which eventually serves to show once again that Revelation concurs with the rest of scriptural canon.

EN Xb: ἀγαπητικὴ διάθεσις

The term is notably present in Gregory of Nyssa and is used by Didymus, too.⁶ Again, the latter borrowed this from his Cappadocian hero, while the idiom does not occur in Origen. For it is in Gregory that the idea of the volatility of ‘loving disposition’ appears at various points.⁷

¹ Origen, *commJohn*, XX.34.306; *selPs*, PG.12.1148.53. Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae Fusius Tractatae*, PG.31: 920.12; 1069.21; 1224. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Basilium Fratrem*, 11. Ephraem Syrus, *Capita Centum*, 87; *Regulae ad Monachos*, p. 336; *De Iuliano*, p. 130; *Laudatio in Martyres*, p. 18. Pseudo-Macarius, *Epistula Magna*, p. 261: οὕτως γὰρ καὶ τὴν δευτέραν ἐντολήν, τὴν πρὸς τὸν πλησίον ἀγάπην, εὐχερῶς καὶ καθαρῶς κατορθῶσαι δυνάμεθα. Severianus of Gabala, *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 264; *Catena in Epistulam i ad Corinthios (typus Vaticanus)*: τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀγάπης κατόρθωμα τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς.

² The notion of ‘accomplishment’ (κατόρθωμα) in Stoicism has been attributed to Chrysippus. *SVF*, II: 295.20; 297.14–16; III: 50.25; 134.26; 136.24 and 35; 142.3; 200.88; 136.21; 70.10; 73.17; Cf. the ‘κατ’ ἀρετὴν action’ of the Scholion with III.134.24: τὰ κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἐνεργήματα.

³ Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Apollinarium*, v. 3,1, p. 198; *De Mortuis*, v. 9, p. 56; *Oratio Funebris in Flacillam Imperatricem*, v. 9, p. 488; *De Instituto Christiano*, v. 8,1, p. 65; *De Perfectione Christiana Ad Olympium Monachum*, v. 8,1, p. 173; *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, pp. 28; 144; *In Ecclesiasten*, v. 5, pp. 280; 373; 374; 379; 383; *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 298; *De Vita Mosis*, 2.166; *De Virginitatis Integritate*, Prologue.2; *In Basilium Fratrem*, 18; *De Beatitudinibus*, PG.44: 1201.3; 1216.6; 1244.35; 1245.29; 1245.31; 1252.53; *De Anima et Resurrectione Dialogus*, PG.46: 57.12; 65.35; 428.22; *Vita atque Encomium Ephraem Syri*, PG.46.841.38; *De Vita Gregorii Thaumaturgi*, PG.46: 893.12; 936.45; *Epistula Canonica Ad Letoium*, PG.45.224.15. Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa, *De Creatione Hominis*, p. 31a.

⁴ Cassian the Sabaite, *Const*, p. 4r: κατορθῶσαι τὴν ἀρετὴν. Ibid. p. 11r: πολλῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς κοινοβίοις διαλαμπάντων πατέρων κατορθώματα. Ibid. p. 19r: καὶ πλήρωμα πάντων τῶν καλῶν κατορθοῦται. Ibid. p. 20r: ἡ ταπεινότης γνωρίζεται, ἥτις ὅταν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ κατορθωθῇ. Ibid. p. 21v: καὶ τὴν μακροθυμίαν τὴν σὴν, μὴ ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῆς προσδόκα κατορθοῦσθαι. *OctoVit*, p. 25r: καθαρότητα ἐξαίρετως ἐγκράτεια καὶ νηστεία κατορθοῖ. Ibid. p. 29r: τὸ δῶρον τῆς παρθενίας κατορθοῦσθαι, ὅσον ἐν τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς ἁγιωσύνῃ καὶ καθαρότητι ἥτις φόβῳ Θεοῦ κατορθοῦσθαι ἐφύκεν. Ibid. p. 29r: περὶ τοῦ κατορθώματος τῆς σωφροσύνης. Ibid. p. 29r: τὸ κατόρθωμα τῆς ἀγνείας. Ibid. p. 37r:

τὴν δὲ ἀρετὴν ταύτην κατορθῶσαι δύσκολον. Ibid. p. 42r: καὶ ὡς εὐκόλως ἐν τῇ μονώσει ἡ ἀρετὴ τῆς μακροθυμίας κατορθωθήσεται. Ibid. p. 42r: Τὸ κεφάλαιον τοῖνυν τῆς ἡμετέρας διορθώσεως καὶ εἰρήνης, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς τῶν πλησίων μακροθυμίας τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς γινομένης κατορθοῦται. Ibid. p. 46v: γινώσκων τὴν ὑγείαν τῆς ψυχῆς οὐκ ἐν τῷ χωρισμῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατορθοῦσθαι. Ibid. p. 55r: ὅταν ἀρετὴν τινα κατορθώσωμεν. Ibid. p. 56r: ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη κατορθοῦται. *ScetPatr*, p. 58v: τὴν τῆς ἀγάπης κατόρθωσιν. Ibid. p. 59v: τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν καὶ τὸν πλησίον ἀγάπην κατορθώσωμεν· ὁ γὰρ κατορθώσας τὴν ἀγάπην ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχει τὸν Θεόν. Ibid. p. 65v: ἐλεημοσύνην κατορθώσαντες. Ibid. p. 93r: ἀνθρώπων κατορθούντων ἁγιωσύνην. Ibid. p. 95r: ἀντὶ μεγάλων κατορθωμάτων μὴ καταλιμπάνειν τὸ μοναστήριον. Ibid. κατόρθωμα οἱ πατέρες ἡγοῦνται.

⁵ Didymus, *commPs*22–26.10, Cod. pp. 70 & 97.

⁶ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1177: οὗτοι δὲ ἀπηνεῖς καὶ ὑπερήφανοι φιλαδελφίαν καὶ ἀγαπητικὴν διάθεσιν οὐδ’ ὅλως ἔχοντες. *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 44: Οὐκοῦν μὴ ἀνομία τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστὶ τὸ πειρώμενον σβέσαι τὴν διάθεσιν τὴν ἀγαπητικὴν; *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 86: καὶ ἀνδρὸς μνήμη γίνεται διάθεσιν ἀγαπητικὴν ἔχοντος.

⁷ Gregory of Nyssa, *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 146: τὴν ἀγαπητικὴν φιλοφροσύνην τε καὶ διάθεσιν. *In Ecclesiasten*, v. 5, p. 383: ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ ἀποκτείνωμεν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὴν ἔχθραν, οὐκ ἰασόμεθα τὴν ἀγαπητικὴν διάθεσιν τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν. Ibid. v. 5, p. 399: ὅταν οὖν ἡ ἀγαπητικὴ διάθεσις περιφυῇ τῷ καλῷ. Ibid. v. 5, p. 419: ἡ πεπλανημένη τε καὶ διημαρτημένη τῆς ἀγαπητικῆς διαθέσεως χρῆσις ἀρχὴ καὶ ὑπόθεσις τοῦ κατὰ κακίαν γίνεται βίου. *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 38: εἶπε τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἐπαινετῆς ἐπιθυμίας καὶ τῆς ἀγαπητικῆς διαθέσεως. Ibid. v. 6, p. 419: διὰ δὲ τῆς ἀγαθῆς συνειδήσεως τὴν ἀγαπητικὴν εἰς τὸν πλησίον διάθεσιν. *De Oratione*, p. 270: πᾶσα ἡ τῶν τοιούτων κακῶν ἀγέλη τῇ ἀγαπητικῇ διαθέσει ἐξαφανίζεται. Ibid. p. 292: Τίς γὰρ κοινωνία φιλανθρωπία τε καὶ ὁμότητι, καὶ ἀγαπητικὴ διάθεσις πρὸς ἀγριότητα; *De Beatitudinibus*, PG.44.1252.43: Καὶ εἰ τις ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσειε τὸ τοῦ ἐλέου ἰδίωμα, ἐπίτασιν εὐρήσει τῆς ἀγαπητικῆς διαθέσεως. *De Anima et Resurrectione Dialogus*, PG.46.93.32: τῆς ἀγαπητικῆς διαθέσεως, φυσικῶς τῷ καλῷ προσφυσμένης.

After Didymus, the expression appears only rarely.⁸ Of interest is a use by a younger contemporary of Didymus, namely Synesius of Cyrene, who was a Neoplatonist philosopher of note, born in 370. He studied philosophy in Alexandria and became bishop of Ptolemais (410–413/414). He is one of the exceptional cases of a bishop who was also a philosopher (or, a philosopher having been ordained a bishop). Moreover, he was baptized only when he was ordained a bishop, and he probably never disowned his secular philosophical ideas.⁹

EN Xc: ἀνεθείσης

This is the past participle of the verb ἵεμαι in passive voice. The past tense is εἴθην and the past participle is ἐθείς, ἐθείσα, ἐθέν. From this, the common nouns ἄνεσις and ἄφρεσις are derived. The past participle ἀνεθείς is a peculiar word, never used by either Origen or Didymus, nor by Christian authors in general, save Eusebius. The normal sense attached to the verb is ‘to be released’¹⁰ from certain kinds of bonds, or ‘to be abandoned’.¹¹ Almost all authors used it in this sense. However, it also may mean ‘to be or to become loose’, particularly after a condition of tension or restraint; or (as is the case here) ‘to be, or become, negligent or oblivious of a certain duty’. Thus, depending on the context, the participle may mean ‘neglectful’, ‘inattentive’, ‘unrestrained’, ‘careless’, ‘lax’, ‘relaxed’, or ‘loose’. Accordingly, the derivative noun ἄνεσις of this Scholion indicates the same idea ‘easing off and lessening of loving disposition’. This is the meaning

used by Eusebius, too, who refers to the martyr Apollonia, who refused to pronounce pagan doctrines: she leaped into the burning fire after she could no longer endure the pressure imposed upon her.¹²

This specific, uncommon meaning stems from an expression ascribed to the Athenian lawmaker Solon that came to be proverbial: he declared that the multitude should be treated ‘with neither too much freedom nor compulsion’ (μήτε λίαν ἀνεθείς μήτε βιαζόμενος).¹³ The expression was recorded for posterity by Aristotle, and was also quoted later by Plutarch.¹⁴

I am satisfied that Cassian had Plutarch in mind while writing this Scholion. This is an author whom he had definitely studied. Besides, his spiritual master Theodoret often cited him.¹⁵ The context and phraseology of Plutarch’s text is very like that of [Scholion X](#), an exposition about the conduct of life by ordinary people: ‘Satiety breeds insolence when riches dwell with men whose mind is not ready for them.’¹⁶ It is at that point, and with reference to Solon, that Plutarch uses the word ἄνεσις in the sense that the present Scholion does.¹⁷ It could hardly be a coincidence that Plutarch is the sole author who used this rare participial form regularly.¹⁸ Only a few authors used it at all,¹⁹ and it seems that the sense in which Aristotle applied it is the unique case of ἀνεθείς having the specific meaning that it has here.²⁰

Finally, in the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam* (which, I have no doubt, is Cassian’s work), the participle ἀνεθείς is used in a sense similar to the one in [Scholion X](#): ‘the vineyard that has been neglected’ or, ‘left without care at all’.²¹ Basil of Caesarea did not care to use this participle, and my objection to ascribing this

⁸ Hermias of Alexandria (fifth cent. AD), *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 23: ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμφύτου θερμότητος ἡ ἀγαπητικὴ διάθεσις τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἔχει.

⁹ Synesius of Cyrene (fourth/fifth cent. AD), *Epistulae*, 67: τὸ εἶσω γενέσθαι τῶν νόμων τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν, οἱ συνεκτικωτάτην τῶν ἐντολῶν τὴν ἀγαπητικὴν διάθεσιν ἀπεφάναντο.

¹⁰ Eusebius, *commpPs*, PG.23.217.26: δεσμῶν τε ἀνεθείς πολυπλόκων. PG.23.461.47: τῆς οὖν αἰχμαλωσίας ἀνεθείσης.

¹¹ Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.27: ἀνεθείς ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἐγκαταλειφθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου.

¹² *HE*, 6.41.7: ἡ δὲ ὑποπαραιτησαμένη βραχὺ καὶ ἀνεθείσα.

¹³ Solon, *Fragmenta*, fr. 6. Aristotle, *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, 12.2.4.

¹⁴ Plutarch, *Comparatio Solonis et Publicolae*, 2.6.

¹⁵ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 1: 14; 21; 2: 24; 84; 87; 95; 108; 109; 112; 116; 3: 4; 23; 54; 56; 4.31; 5.16; 7.43; 10: 5; 11; 42; 11.46; 12.71.

¹⁶ Aristotle, (n. 13 above).

¹⁷ Plutarch, *Comparatio Solonis et Publicolae*, 3.1: Ἴδιον δὲ τοῦ Σόλωνος ἡ τῶν χρεῶν ἄνεσις.

¹⁸ Cf. Plutarch, *Quomodo Adulator ab Amico Internoscatur*, 73D1; *Quaestiones Convivales*, 622D5; *Publicola*, 12.4.

¹⁹ An exception among Christian authors is John Chrysostom: *In Sanctum Joannem*, PG.59.202.33: (ἀνεθείς); *In Acta Apostolorum Homiliae*, PG.60.301.59 (ἀνεθείς). Still the meaning is once again ‘to be released’ (from ‘fear’ and ‘bonds of prison’, respectively in the two passages). This makes the use in [Scholion X](#) the second Christian instance, following Eusebius.

²⁰ Usage in philosophy is slightly less rare. John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Libros de Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, p. 46. Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 4.22a.24. Nicomachus of Gerasa (mathematician, second cent. AD), *Enchiridion*, 10.1. Porphyry, *De Abstinencia*, 1.11. The sole author who used the participle in abundance was a contemporary of Didymus, namely, the medical doctor Oribasius of Pergamum (fourth cent. AD), *Collectiones Medicae*, 8: 2.34; 40.2; *et passim* (more than ten instances). In Jewish literature, Josephus, *Antiquitas Judaica*, 8.244; 13.235; *De Bello Judaico*, 1.60. Philo, *De Josepho*, 234; *De Vita Mosis*, 1.281; *Legatio ad Gaium*, 367.

²¹ *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 5.147: ὁ οὖν ἀνεθείς ἀμπελῶν δύο πάσχει δεινὰ.

work to him remains. In addition, there is a passage in which the expression ‘action according to virtue’ (τὴν κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἐνέργειαν) is used. I explore this expression in EN Xd. The particular passage from *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, however, deserves some discussion of its own.²²

It turns out that not only the participle ἀνεθείσης, but also the expression εὐρυθμον καὶ ἔμμελῃ κίνησιν of this Scholion appear in the same authors in whom this verb-form occurs. Most characteristic among them are Philo and Plutarch (the author whom Theodoret cited more than anyone else),²³ and they are also the authors who used the notion of ‘virtue’ being a ‘feat’.

The idea involved is that of ‘the soul moving’ towards virtue by means of the ‘word of the Lord’, which is as harmonious as music on account of its beneficial results. The selfsame idea is expressed in the anonymous commentary on Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*,²⁴ and the two passages are parallel in terms of their essential content.

Furthermore, the same notion appears in Proclus,

who was influenced by Didymus and his terminology.²⁵ Proclus was influenced also by the same terminology about the soul being elevated upwards, which is a notion much the same as the idea that Didymus expressed through the term ἀνηγμένος. Referring to ἔμμελῃ καὶ εὐρυθμον κίνησιν, Proclus used a word with the same meaning and root, namely ἀναγομένων ψυχῶν.²⁶ It is possible that the relevant vocabulary had already appeared since the time of Irenaeus.²⁷

EN Xd: κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἐνεργείν

The notion and expression is Aristotle’s.²⁸ It appears also in Chrysippus,²⁹ and in Aristotle’s commentators, being present above all in Alexander of Aphrodisias.³⁰ So it also appears in a commentary by the philosopher Aspasius.³¹ Later, this expression along with κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἐνέργειαι appeared in Neoplatonist accounts,³² as well as in the anonymous commentary on Aristotle’s *Ethica Nicomachea*.³³ It then comes as a surprise that Philo³⁴ and John Philoponus³⁵ used this expression only once.

²² Ibid. 5.139: μέλος ἦν πρὸς εὐρυθμον καὶ ἔμμελῃ κίνησιν καὶ τὴν κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἐνέργειαν τὰς ψυχὰς διεγείρων.

²³ Plutarch, *De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo*, 1014C2: ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ ἁρμονικὸν ἄνδρα καὶ ῥυθμικὸν οὐ φωνὴν ποιεῖν οὐδὲ κίνησιν ἔμμελῃ δὲ φωνὴν καὶ κίνησιν εὐρυθμον ἀξιοῦμεν. *De Superstitione*, 167B6: φησιν ὁ Πλάτων ἔμμελείας καὶ εὐρυθμίας δημιουργόν. Philo, *Legum Allegoriarum*, 3.57: ἔμμελῆς καὶ εὐρυθμος. *De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia*, 76: ἦν δὲ εὐρυθμος, εὐάρμοστος, ἔμμελῆς, μουσικὴ δὲ ἐκαλεῖτο. *Quaestiones in Exodum*, Book 2, Fr. 38b: Τὸ ἔμμελές καὶ εὐρυθμον οὐκ ἐν φωνῇ μᾶλλον ἢ διανοίᾳ ἐπιδείκνυσθαι πειρωμένους.

²⁴ Anonymi, *In Ethica Nicomachea ii-v Commentaria*, p. 201: οἱ δὲ ἔμμελῶς παίζοντες· τὸ μέσον καὶ μέτριον ἐνδείκνυται. ἐκ τῶν κινήσεων κρίνεται, εὐρυθμία δηλονότι ἢ ἄρρυθμία· καὶ ὑγιεινὰ ἢ νοσερὰ καὶ ἀσθενῆ ἢ εὐρώστα. οὕτω καὶ τὰ ἤθη, δηλονότι ἀπὸ τῶν κινήσεων τῆς ψυχῆς.

²⁵ Cf. above, EN VIIa, a discussion showing that Proclus maintained the idea of Didymus’ expressed through the term ἀνηγμένος. I discuss this in RCR, chapter 7, ‘Christian influence on Neoplatonism’.

²⁶ The two terms are cognate: ἀναγομένων is the present participle and ἀνηγμένος (used by Didymus and Proclus alike) is the perfect participle of the verb ἀνάγεσθαι. Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 1, p. 121: ὡς γὰρ τῶν ἀναγομένων ψυχῶν τὰ ὄργανα φωνὴν ἑναρμόνιον ἀφίησιν καὶ ἔμμελῃ, καὶ εὐρυθμον ἔχοντα φαίνεται κίνησιν. *In Platonis Alcibiadem i*, 208: καὶ γὰρ τὸ ῥοδικὸς τὸ μουσικὸς ἦν καὶ τὸ ἔμμελῶς καὶ τὸ εὐρύθμως.

²⁷ Cf. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, fr. 24: σοφία δὲ ἐν τῷ εὐρύθμῳ καὶ ἔμμελῃ καὶ ἐγκατάσκευα τὰ γεγονότα πεποιηκέναι. Origen, *de Or.*, II.4: ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ψᾶλαι καὶ εὐρύθμως καὶ ἔμμελῶς καὶ ἔμμελῶς. Athanasius, *Ad Marcellinum in Interpretationem Psalmorum*, PG.27.41.12–13: Καὶ ἡ ἔμμελῆς δὲ ἀνάγνωσις σύμβολόν ἐστι τῆς εὐρύθμου καὶ ἀχειμάστου καταστάσεως τῆς διανοίας.

²⁸ Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea*, 1100b10: αἱ κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἐνέργειαι. 1177a10: ἐν ταῖς κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἐνεργείαις. 1177a24: τῶν κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἐνεργειῶν.

²⁹ Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Logica et Physica*, fr. 499 (SVF, II.161.32–33, *apud* Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Quattuor Libros de Caelo Commentaria*, v. 7, p. 163); *Fragmenta Moralia*, fr. 239 (SVF, III.57.15, *apud* Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Anima*, p. 161); fr. 494 (SVF, III.135.25, *apud* Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 2.7.8. Cf. 2.7.3; 2.7.14; 2.7.18).

³⁰ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Analyticorum Priorum Librum i Commentarium*, pp. 301, 302 (repeatedly); *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, pp. 142, 237, 243, 253, 271. Also, in spurious works ascribed to him, such as *De Anima*, p. 161; *Ἡθικὰ Προβλήματα*, p. 144 (repeatedly). The expression appears in other commentators on Aristotle as well, such as Themistius (fourth cent. AD), *Quae Fertur in Aristotelis Analyticorum Priorum Librum i Paraphrasis*, v. 23, 3: pp. 99, 100, 101 (repeatedly). Eustratius of Nicaea (eleventh–twelfth cent. AD), *In Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea I Commentaria*, pp. 37, 82, 84, 90, 96, 99 and *In Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea vi Commentaria*, p. 402. Also, in his near-contemporary Michael of Ephesus (eleventh–twelfth cent. AD), *In Ethica Nicomachea Commentaria*, pp. 505, 512, 514, 517, 532, 535, 539, 545, 563 (repeatedly), 570, 576, 578, 590, 593, 606, 613; also, *In Librum Quintum Ethicorum Nicomacheorum Commentarium*, p. 44.

³¹ Aspasius (second cent. AD), *Commentaria in Ethica Nicomachea*, pp. 22, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 143, 145, 152, 171, 173.

³² Proclus, *In Platonis Alcibiadem i*, 59. Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 2.7.8.

³³ Cf. Anonymi, *In Ethica Nicomachea Paraphrasis*, pp. 17, 20, 203, 221, 222. Anonymi *In Ethica Nicomachea Commentaria*, pp. 129, 163, 180, 181, 209, 230.

³⁴ Philo, *Legum Allegoriarum*, 3.144.

³⁵ John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Analytica Posteriora Commentaria*, v. 13.3, p. 280.

When we come to Christian authors, important conclusions follow. The expression appears only casually in Clement of Alexandria,³⁶ Athanasius,³⁷ Gregory of Nyssa,³⁸ and Basil of Caesarea (assuming that the specific texts are his own, which I doubt).³⁹ Although it might appear that this is a product of Basil's philosophical studies, the truth is that he simply took up a phrase of Eusebius.⁴⁰ There is then good reason to infer that a certain instance in Basil is only accidental.⁴¹ The terminology ascribed to Origen appears only in catenae, and so one cannot be sure whether this is really his own expression or a catenist's rendering. Normally, the catena-fragments of the Psalms are couched in the vocabulary of Didymus and there is a strong probability that they were composed at the Laura of Sabas and the monastery of the Akoimatoi, on account of their characteristic Aristotelian tenor, which is otherwise absent from Origen's works.⁴² A similar consideration applies to a certain usage by Nemesius of Emesa (fourth cent. AD), who uses the expression αἱ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνέργειαι twice in a specific passage.⁴³ There is, therefore, an obviously occasional character to the Christian usage of a purely Aristotelian expression and idea.

In contrast to these authors, Didymus avails himself of Aristotle regularly (which means, consciously), since the expression recurs in his writings.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 103: Τρίβοι δὲ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ αἱ τηρήσεις τῶν ἐντολῶν τυγχάνουσιν, μᾶλλον δὲ αἱ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνέργειαι λεῖται καὶ ὁμαλαὶ ἀναδειχθεῖσαι ἐκ τοῦ συνεχῶς πατεῖσθαι πρὸς τῶν σπενδόντων φθᾶσαι ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος αὐτῶν τέλος δὲ αὐτῶν ἡ μακαριότης. Ibid. fr. 238: τῇ σκηνῇ, τουτέστιν ἐν τῇ προκοπῇ, προσάγει. Ἄσω καὶ ψαλῶ τῷ κυρίῳ. Οὐ μόνον θεωρήσω τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ὅπερ δηλοῦται διὰ τοῦ Ἄσω, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργήσω. Ibid. fr. 376: σὺν ἀφροσύνῃ

γὰρ οὐχ ἡ τυχοῦσα συνίσταται κακία, ὥς αὖ μετὰ φρονήσεως τὰ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργεῖται.

Notice the plethora of Aristotelian terminology in the following passages:

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 603a: τὸ ἀρτίτοκον βρέφος δεκτικὸν ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας ἐστὶ δυνάμει, τότε δεχόμενον κατ' ἐνέργειαν ὁποτέραν τούτων τῶν ἐξέων ὅταν γινῶσιν ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ σχῆ τότε γὰρ καὶ συμπληροῦται ὁ λόγος ὅταν κατ' ἀρετὴν ἄρξηται ἐνεργεῖν.

Ibid. fr. 955: καὶ ἔτι τὴν μὲν ἕξιν, καθ' ἣν διακρίνεται τὸ φρονητέον καὶ μὴ φρονητέον καὶ πρακτέον καὶ οὐ πρακτέον, κρίσιν εἶπεν, αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνέργειαν δικαιοσύνην ἐκάλεσεν.

Ibid. fr. 808: γλυκαίνει δὲ αὐτὴν τὰ κατ' ἀρετὴν καὶ σοφίαν ἐνεργούμενα καὶ θεωρούμενα.

Ibid. fr. 832: πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἡ κιθάρα καὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ τύμπανον αἰνίττεται· λαμβάνομεν τὸν λόγον θεῖον ψαλμὸν ὄντα ἐπὶ τῷ δοῦναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὴν ψυχὴν τὸ σῶμα τὰς κατ' ἀρετὴν θεωρίας καὶ πράξεις ἐνεργεῖν.

Ibid. fr. 1045: Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς λάβοι τις θελήματα θεοῦ λέγεσθαι διὰ τὸ Ὅς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου, ἐρεῖ ἔργα μεγάλα ἐξεζητημένα εἰς πάντα τὰ θελήματα τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι τὰς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργείας.

Ibid. fr. 1264: Ψαλῶ τῷ θεῷ μου ἕως ὑπάρχω. ἡρμήνευται δὲ πολλάκις ὅτι τὸ ψάλλειν κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργεῖν σημαίνει.

Didymus, *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 84: ὅθεν ὁ παυσάμενος τοῦ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργεῖν οὐδὲ τηρεῖ ἔτι τὰς ἐντολὰς οὔτε περιπατεῖ ἔτι κατ' αὐτάς.

Cassian writing this Scholion took up the vocabulary of Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Didymus, along

³⁶ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 7.12.70.5: καὶ βεβαίως κτησάμενος τῆς ἐπιστήμης τὰ μεγαλεῖα, ἀφ' ὧν καρποφορεῖ τὰς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργείας.

³⁷ Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.101.29: πλέον τι τούτων ἐχόντων τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων ἐν τῷ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργεῖν.

³⁸ Gregory of Nyssa, *De Vita Mosis*, 2.226: Μόνη γὰρ ἡ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνέργεια καμάτῳ τρέφει τὴν δύναμιν.

³⁹ Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.256.14 and *Sermones de Moribus*, PG.32.1125.51: Οὐ γὰρ μία πρᾶξις τελειοῖ τὸν σπουδαῖον, ἀλλὰ παντὶ προσήκε τῷ βίῳ τὰς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργείας συμπαρατείνεσθαι.

⁴⁰ Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.152.29: Οὐ γὰρ μία πρᾶξις τελειοῖ τὸν σπουδαῖον, ἀλλὰ παντὶ προσήκε τῷ βίῳ ταῖς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργείαις συμπαρατείνεσθαι.

⁴¹ Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Hexaemeron*, 1.5: καὶ πάσης τῆς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργείας τὸ ἐν ἐπαγγελίαις ἀποκείμενον τέλος.

⁴² Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1252–3: Ἄδει δὲ τις θεωρῶν, καὶ ψάλλει κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργῶν. *excPs*, PG.17.109.33: Τρίβοι δὲ Κυρίου τῶν ἐντολῶν αἱ τηρήσεις· μᾶλλον δὲ αἱ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνέργειαι.

⁴³ Nemesius of Emesa (fourth cent. AD), *De Natura Hominis*, 38: ἐφ' ἡμῖν δὲ αἱ κατὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐνέργειαι· ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἄρα καὶ αἱ ἀρεταί. ὅτι δὲ ἐφ' ἡμῖν αἱ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνέργειαι δηλοῖ καὶ τὸ καλῶς ὑπὸ Ἀριστοτέλους λεχθὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ἠθικῶν ἀρετῶν.

with his own. He did the same with the Aristotelian term ἔξις, which I explore next.

EN Xe: τελεία ἔξις

Although originally an Aristotelian term, ἔξις came to be a common one. It would be interesting to research the expression τελεία ἔξις, which is later than Aristotle. One will be surprised to find out that only certain authors made use of this. Among Christian theologians, it was used only once by Clement of Alexandria, who reports that the expression was introduced by Speusippus as an alternative to the term ‘happiness’: Speusippus regarded τελεία ἔξις and εὐδαιμονία as synonymous.⁴⁴ It appears once in Origen’s catena-fragments, but not in his indubitable theological expositions.⁴⁵ It occurs likewise, in Eusebius,⁴⁶ and Maximus Confessor⁴⁷ as well as in a couple of writings ascribed to Cyril of Alexandria.⁴⁸

In addition, τελεία ἔξις occurs in Sextus Empiricus,⁴⁹ but the specific usage has to do with the art of grammar. On the other hand, Clement’s reference to Speusippus suggests that he used the expression only accidentally, not consciously as a technical term; besides, he uses it as a synonym for ‘happiness’.

The real origin of the notion can be traced in John Philoponus.⁵⁰ A reference in Arius Didymus (first cent. BC) ascribed to Aristotle, is in fact a reference to ‘perfect virtue’ (ἀρετῆς τελείας), although at the same point

he refers to virtue as an ἔξις ἡ βελτίστη ψυχῆς, which can suggest ‘perfect’.⁵¹

Cassian may have borrowed the idea from Speusippus.⁵² Some anonymous writings commenting on Aristotle must have been written by authors educated at either Edessa or Nisibis.⁵³ Otherwise, the notion occurs in a good many passages used by Aristotle’s commentators,⁵⁴ who are all subsequent to Didymus. For instance, we do not find this in Alexander of Aphrodisias, or in Themistius. This makes it highly likely that it was Cassian himself rather than Didymus who used the notion. Cassian definitely employed the term ἔξις in its Aristotelian sense (which probably explains the foregoing appearance of the expression in a catena-fragment ascribed to Origen),⁵⁵ whereas elsewhere he comments on this in the sense found in manuscripts of scripture (e.g. Habakkuk 3:16), which, however, has a quite different meaning, that is, human existence, or the physical power animating the body.⁵⁶

In conclusion, only in rare cases do we have Christian authors applying the expression τελεία ἔξις. Accordingly, it can be assumed that Cassian derived this from his pagan learning, while otherwise quoting from Didymus. Therefore, the first sentence of the Scholion is Cassian’s (Didymus had not predilection for the verb διαφωνεῖν), and what follows is Cassian employing distinctive expressions either from Eusebius (ἄνεσις, ἀνεθείσης), or from both Gregory of Nyssa and Didymus (ἀγαπητικὴ διάθεσις, and μαχόμενον γὰρ

⁴⁴ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.22.133.4 (Speusippus, *Fragmenta*, fr. 77).

⁴⁵ Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1193.20: δίκαιοι λέγονται οἱ τελείαν ἔξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης κτησάμενοι, The vocabulary of this work is similar to that of Didymus.

⁴⁶ Eusebius, *De Martyribus Palaestinae*, 4.6.

⁴⁷ Maximus Confessor, *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, 49, lines 288, 309. Likewise, the anonymous *Scholia in Maximum Confessorem*, 49, line 133.

⁴⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *Homiliae Paschales*, PG.77.585.27; *Fragmenta in Jeremiam*, PG.70.1457.5. Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria, *Collectio Dictorum Veteris Testamenti*, PG.77.1176.27 and 30.

⁴⁹ Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos*, 1.76.

⁵⁰ John Philoponus, In *Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, v. 13,1, pp. 166; 184; In *Aristotelis Libros de Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, pp. 94; 306; *De Aeternitate Mundi*, pp. 69; 76, 84, 87, 508.

⁵¹ Cf. Arius Didymus, *De Sectis Philosophorum (epitome apud Stobaeum)*, 59.2: ‘Ἡ δ’ ἀρετὴ ἔξις ἡ βελτίστη ψυχῆς· τελεία δὲ τριχῶς, καὶ γὰρ σύνθετος ἐκ τῶν θεωρητικῶν καὶ πρακτικῶν καὶ ἠθικῶν· τρία γὰρ ὑποτίθεται γένη, ἃ ἂν εἴποις ἀρετῆς κατὰ σύνθεσιν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν οἰκειῶν δυνάμεων συμπληρωμένης, φύσεως, λόγου, ἔθους.

⁵² Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 878: ἡ γὰρ τελεία ἔξις ἡ δι’ ἀγάπης πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τεθεῖσα ἄσβεστός ἐστιν. Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Fragmenta in Jeremiam*, PG.70.1457.5; *Homiliae Paschales*, PG.585.27.

⁵³ Cf. Anonymi, In *Ethica Nicomachea Commentaria*, p. 210; Anonymi In *Ethica Nicomachea Paraphrasis*, pp. 87, 157 (lines 3 and 22).

⁵⁴ Elias of Alexandria (sixth cent. AD), In *Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, pp. 225, 228, 229, 244. Hermias of Alexandria, In *Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 25. Michael of Ephesus, In *Ethica Nicomachea Commentaria*, p. 556. Olympiodorus, the philosopher of Alexandria (sixth cent. AD), In *Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, p. 119. Priscianus of Lydia (sixth cent. AD), *Metaphrasis in Theophrastum*, p. 32. Simplicius, In *Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, v. 8, pp. 240, 245, 288; In *Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 9, p. 450; v. 10, pp. 1213, 1216; In *Aristotelis Libros de Anima Commentaria*, v. 11, pp. 89, 122, 220, 229. Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 2.7.3.

⁵⁵ Theodoret, *Explanatio in Canticum Cantorum*, PG.81.89.53; *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 6.34.

⁵⁶ Cf. Theodoret, *intProphXII*, PG.81.1833.15.

ἄν ἦν).⁵⁷ Nevertheless, Cassian is a sixth-century author, and his own expression κατὰ τελείαν ἕξιν could have been a loan from his contemporary John Philoponus. Notwithstanding all these debts, it can be assumed that, with regard to the philological aspect of his passage, Cassian had in mind a specific work which Gregory of Nyssa had written in honour of his brother Basil of Caesarea. The terminology therein imbues this specific Scholion, as it does many other Scholia.

Gregory of Nyssa, *In Basilium Fratrem*, 11 (lines 23f): ἐλαττοῦσθαι λέγειν δεῖ κατ' ἐκεῖνο τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀγάπης τὸ μέτρον, τῆς ἐπιθυμητικῆς αὐτοῦ διαθέσεως ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὰ ὑλώδη μεταρρυσίσης . . . πᾶσαν ἐξορίζων τὴν ἐμπαθῆ περὶ ταῦτα διάθεσιν . . . (lines 51f.) οὕτως καὶ ὁ τὸ τέλειον τῆς ἀγάπης ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατορθώσας, πάντα ὅσα συνθεωρεῖται ταύτη τῶν ἀγαθῶν εἶδη μετὰ τοῦ πρωτοτύπου τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἔχει.

⁵⁷ Cf. μαχόμενον meaning 'contradicting' or 'contravening' in a logical sense. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Macedonianos De Spiritu Sancto*, v. 3,1, p. 103; *Adversus Apollinarium*, v. 3,1, p. 181; *Adversus Eunomium*, 1.1.94; 3.1.66; 3.3.22; 3.4.21; *In Hexaemeron*, pp. 108;

109. Didymus, *commJob*(7.20c–11), Cod. p. 212; *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. pp. 9; 10; *Adversus Manichaeos*, PG.39: 1104.17; 1105.25; 1108.35; *commPs*29–34, Cod. pp. 219; 227; *commPs*35–39, Cod. p. 232; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 183.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XI

EN XIa: τὸ σύνθετον ζῷον

Like διαίρεσις νοητῶν (Scholion XXV), the expression ‘a composite animal’ comes from Alexander of Aphrodisias and was taken up by Didymus. It can be traced in Philo,¹ and Justin is the first Christian author to style a human being a σύνθετον ζῷον.² It does not appear in Origen, yet the idea is there.³ Since the designation of man as a ‘composite animal’ (σύνθετον ζῷον) is otherwise almost absent from Christian literature,⁴ its presence in this Scholion points to Didymus.⁵ The same idea occurs in Pseudo-Caesarius, whom I have identified with Cassian himself. *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, 174: ἄμφω γὰρ κτιστά, ἢ τε ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ σύνθετα τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα συναφείᾳ καὶ κοινωνίᾳ· συνθέσει δὲ πάντως ἔπεται διάστασις καὶ διαίρεσις.

A ‘composite animal’ (σύνθετον ζῷον) may also mean an animal consisting of different material ‘elements’ (fire, air, water, dust, etc.), referring not only to humans, but to any animal, even plants.⁶

EN XIb: κοινὸς θάνατος

The idea of ‘common death’ (κοινὸς θάνατος, viz. the natural one, ‘shared by all animals’) is contrasted with the so-called ‘death of the soul’ owing to sin. Though this was a truism, its rendering through the phrase κοινὸς θάνατος was anything but common.

Although occurring in the New Testament at several points, the notion of ‘common death’ (κοινὸς θάνατος) was distinguished by Philo from the death of the soul, which is death par excellence (τὸν ἴδιον καὶ κατ’ ἐξοχὴν θάνατον, ὅς ἐστι ψυχῆς).⁷ This scriptural idea enters Christian theology through a usual gate, namely Origen, who draws on Philo. As a matter of fact, Origen’s expression ‘the common death’ (κοινὸς θάνατος), meaning physical death of body, is a theme characteristic of his thought.⁸ It is worth pointing out the occurrences of the expression κοινὸς θάνατος in Christian literature. The instances are considerable in number, but they are not as numerous as one might have expected.⁹

¹ Philo, *De Ebrietate*, 10: τὸ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ὕφασμα ἢ πλέγμα ἢ κράμα ἢ ὅ τι ποτὲ χρῆ καλεῖν τοῦτ’ τὸ σύνθετον ζῷον. Ibid. 144: Σαμουὴλ δὲ γέγονε μὲν ἴσως ἄνθρωπος, παρὲλθεται δ’ οὐχ ὡς σύνθετον ζῷον.

² Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 114, 3: οἰόμενοι χειρὰς καὶ πόδας καὶ δακτύλους καὶ ψυχὴν ἔχειν ὡς σύνθετον ζῷον τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὄλων καὶ ἀγέννητον θεόν.

³ Origen, *Cels*, VI.6. 63: Εἰ δ’ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ συναμφοτέρῳ τὸ ‘κατ’ εἰκόνα’ τοῦ ‘θεοῦ’, ἀνάγκη σύνθετον εἶναι τὸν θεὸν καὶ οἰοῦναι συνεστῶτα καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος. *frLuc*, fr. 186: τὸ σύνθετον ἐκ τῆς λοιπῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος. *commMatt*, 13.9: ἀποθνήσκουσιν οἱ σύνθετοι ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος χωριζομένης αὐτῶν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος.

⁴ A Christian exception is Asterius of Amasea (fourth–fifth cent. AD), *Homiliae*, 14.1.1: Σύνθετον ζῷον ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἀπὸ σώματος τοῦ φαινομένου καὶ τῆς λογικῆς καὶ ἀσωμάτου ψυχῆς λαχὼν εἶναι ὅπερ ἐστίν. Cf. the notion in Asclepius of Tralles (sixth cent. AD), *In Aristotelis Metaphysicorum Libros A–Z Commentaria*, p. 420. Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, v. 8, pp. 261 and 315. Damascius, *De Principiis*, v. 1, p. 31. Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 1.49.36 and 67.

⁵ Cf. Didymus, *commZacch*, 4.181: περὶ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ συνθέτου τοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος λέγει. *commPs20–21*, Cod. p. 42: τὸν σύνθετον ἄνθρωπον. *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 153: περὶ τοῦ συνθέτου ἄρα λέγεται. *frPs(al)*, Fr. 977: τὸν σύνθετον ἄνθρωπον . . . ὁ σύνθετος ἄνθρωπος.

⁶ Cf. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 637. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, 1.8.16. The same text in Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 22. Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis*, 1.10. Cf. mythical ‘composite animals’, such as the ‘chimaera’, Galen, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria (fragments)*, Fr. 2.

⁷ Philo, *Legum Allegoriarum*, 1.106.

⁸ Origen, *Princ*, IV.3.10; *exhMar*, XXIX; XXX; *Dial*, 16; *Philocalia*, 1.26; *commMatt*, 12.26; *Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos (I.1–XII.21)*, sections 30 and 52; *frPs*, 22, 4; 81, 6–7; *selPs*, PG.12.1128.22; *commJohn*, X. 40.380; XX.41.383.

⁹ Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23: 217.41; 481.52; 929.29. Gregory of Nazianzus, *De Vita Sua*, line 162; *Funebris Oratio in Patrem*, PG.35.924.24. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Apollinarium*, v. 3, 1, p. 226. John Chrysostom, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.452.53; *In Sanctum Joannem*, PG.59.281.5; *De Sanctis Martyribus Sermo*, PG.50.647.38; *De Davide et Saule*, PG.54.689.49, et passim. Julian the Arian (fourth cent. AD), *In Job*, p. 101. Asterius of Antioch (fourth cent. AD), *commPs*, 24.12. Procopius of Gaza, *Catena in Ecclesiasten*, 4.2–3; *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2612. Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 2, p. 530; *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, pp. 118; 120; *expPs*, PG.69.841.17. Theodore of Heraclea (fourth cent. AD), *Fragmenta in Joannem*, fr. 149. Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Job*, pp. 187 and 189; *Commentarii in Ecclesiasten*, PG.93.481.20; 497.33; 516.49; 524.55.

I have reserved a special presentation for Didymus, since his vocabulary involving the idea of κοινὸς θάνατος is strikingly like the vocabulary of this Scholion. The following passage is in all probability the one which Cassian paraphrased in writing this Scholion, on the assumption that this is not in fact a plain quotation from Didymus' lost Commentary on the Apocalypse.

Didymus, *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 200–2:1: ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς λέγει· 'θάνατος δὲ ἀμαρτωλῶν πονηρός'. οὐ πᾶς θάνατος πονηρός ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ ὁ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν. οὐ περὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ δὲ νῦν ὁ λόγος· ζῶον γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος, οὐ ποιοῦ, οὐχ ἀμαρτωλοῦ, οὐ δικαίου. κἂν τὸν κοινὸν οὖν λάβῃς, ὅταν ὡς ἀμαρτωλὸς ἀποθάνῃ, πονηρὸν ἔχει τὸν θάνατον (διαδέχεται γὰρ αὐτὸν κόλασις), καὶ ἐὰν τὸν ἄλλον, τὸν τῷ ὄντι κατάλληλον τῷ ἀμαρτωλῷ, 'ἡ ἀμαρτία', φησίν, 'ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκύει θάνατον'.¹⁰ ἡ ἀμαρτία δὲ ἀποτελεῖται οὐκ ἔξωθεν τῶν ποιούντων, ἀλλὰ ἐν τοῖς ποιοῦσιν ἀνθρώποις. θάνατος οὖν ὁ ἐπόμενος αὐτοῖς πονηρός ἐστίν. καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ προτέρου νοήματος, πονηρὸν λέγομεν εἶναι τὸν θάνατον, πονηροῦ ποιητικόν, κακωτικόν. ὧδε δὲ πονηρὸν λέγομεν κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν ἀπόδοσιν, ὅτι ἔξω ἀγαθότητός ἐστιν.

Didymus uses this phraseology numerous times throughout his work.¹¹

EN XIc: Four New Testament passages quoted

Wishing to demonstrate the relevance and harmony of the Book of Revelation with the rest of scripture, particularly the New Testament, the author of this Scholion appeals to four passages of the New Testament, namely, James 1:15, Heb. 9:27, Matthew 10:28, and 1 Cor. 3:17. Exploring into the authors who made use of these passages, or of some of them at least, will bring about useful conclusions.

To begin with James 1:15, although the 'common death' is a theme used by both Origen and Didymus, the instance of James 1:15 is not quoted by Origen, while it appears as a recurrent theme in Didymus. This passage did not enjoy much currency in Christian literature. We come upon it only in a few authors, whose vocabulary is related to the Scholia, especially this one.¹² Didymus is the sole Christian author to quote James 1:15 at as many as eight points in his extant work.¹³

As to Heb. 9:27, the authors who quoted James 1:15 turn out to be none other than those who quoted Heb. 9:27.¹⁴

Didymus also quotes Matthew 10:28.¹⁵

¹⁰ James 1:15.

¹¹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, frs. 35; 199; 697a; 838; 895; 896; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 16; *commPs29–34*, Cod. pp. 181, 200; *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. pp. 61, 98, 99; *commPs35–39*, Cod. p. 238; *commJob(12.1–16.8a)*, fr. 406; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 4.

¹² Cf. Athanasius, *Vita et Conversatio Antonii*, PG.26.873.32. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 484. John Chrysostom, *Fragmenta in Epistulas Catholicas*, PG.64.1040.41. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 1, p. 631; *De Adoratione*, PG.68: 149.2 and 981.35; *In Isaiam*, PG.70.93.8. Ephraem Syrus, *In Illud: Attende Tibi Ipsi*, 2, line 24; *Ad Monachos Aegypti*, Oration 40, line 51. Severus of Antioch (sixth cent), which is natural, since he breathed the spiritual atmosphere produced by Cyril, or what he took that to be. *Catena in Epistulam Jacobi*, p. 5.

¹³ Didymus, *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 101; *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p. 61; *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 181; *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 200–1; 203; Didymus, *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 279; *frPs(al)*, fr. 1077. *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 129: 'ψυχὴ' γὰρ 'ἡ ἀμαρτάνουσα, αὕτη ἀποθανεῖται· καὶ 'ἡ ἀμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκύει θάνατον' τῷ ἀμαρτάνοντι. τοῦτον οὖν διεγείρει εἰς τὴν ζῶν τὴν πρὸ τῆς πτώσεως· αὕτη γὰρ ἦν ἡ σὺν ἁρετῇ. Cf. *Scholion XXXI*: ἀπὸ τῆς σὺν ἁρετῇ παρρησίας.

¹⁴ Athanasius, *Ad Serapionem*, 4.1. Ephraem Syrus, *De Mortis Recordatione*, p. 249. John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Romanos Commentarius*, PG.60.486.10; *In Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, PG.63.129.21; *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 229. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 896; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 148. Theodoret, *HE*, p. 58; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.745.29.

¹⁵ Hippolytus, *In Daniele*, 2.17.1. Origen, *exhMar*, XXIV; *selPs*, PG.12.1093.6. Basil of Caesarea, *Moralia*, PG.31: 712.7; 720.24; 801.10. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Illuminandum*, Catechesis 8.3. Cyril of Alexandria, *Quod Unus Sit Christus*, p. 755. Cassian the Sabaite (=Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 3)*, PG.39.868.11. Didymus, *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 209; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 56. Ephraem Syrus, *De Abstinendo*, p. 226; *Ad Joannem Monachum*, p. 191. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 423. John Chrysostom, *Adversus Ebriosos*, PG.50.438.54; *In Sanctum Matthaeum*, PG.57.400.38, *In Sanctum Joannem Apostolum*, PG.59.258.7; *In Epistolam ad Romanos Commentarius*, PG.60: 408.46; 490.10. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Illud, Attendite ne Eleemosynam Vestram Faciatis Coram Hominibus*, PG.59.573.45; *In Psalmum 118*, PG.55.705.32. Pseudo-Justin (or Pseudo-Theodoret), *QetR*, p. 453C.

In the case of 1 Cor. 3:17, Didymus presents twelve instances, while Origen has sixteen.¹⁶

It turns out then that Didymus quotes all these NT passages.

EN XIId: ἀναμαρτησία ('sinlessness')

This is not an Origenistic term, although it occurs once in a catena-fragment.¹⁷ It appears no less than ten times in Didymus, but is also present in Clement of Alexandria,¹⁸ and in Didymus' contemporary, Basil of Ancyra.¹⁹ No author ever used it more frequently than Didymus,²⁰ as a survey of Christian applications of the term shows.²¹ However, it should be noted that this shows only in passages from his comments on the Psalms. Certain instances where this term is used deserve special attention, such as the Acts of Ephesus, since Cassian often reproduces terms from this record.²²

Likewise, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.²³ The same goes for Maximus Confessor and John of Damascus, both of whom regularly reproduced Cassian's technical vocabulary.²⁴

EN XIe: ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος

Reference to 'second death'²⁵ has been interpreted as the 'death of the soul', understood as utter destruction. Origen had explained that 'the soul is subject to death'.²⁶ Didymus followed Origen faithfully on this point, too. One could infer that he had dealt with the notion of 'second death' in his commentary on Revelation, since he comments on the idea as a matter of course.²⁷ Eusebius,²⁸ Epiphanius²⁹ and Cyril of Alexandria,³⁰ are the authors who deal with the notion of 'second death', if rather casually. Once again we come upon Severianus of Gabala.³¹

¹⁶ Origen, *Cels*, IV.26; VII.19; *deOr*, XXXIX.7; *homJer*, 12.11; *comm1Cor*, 16, 26, 27, 32, 37. Amphilochius of Iconium, *In Mulierem Peccatricem et Pharisaicum*, lines 115–16. Athanasius, *Ad Serapionem de Spiritu Sancto*, PG.26.585.25. Pseudo-Athanasius, *Homilia de Passione et Cruce Domini*, PG.28.248.29. Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae*, 46.3; *Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos*, PG.31.609.42. Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.572.53. *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), PG.39.636.4. Didymus, *Adversus Manichaeos*, PG.39.1092.52; *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 209; *frPs(al)*, frs. 61, 809, 816, 916; *In Genesim*, Cod. p. 167. Ephraem Syrus, *Ad Imitationem Proverbiorum*, p. 261; *Ad Monachum Novitium*, 77; *Ad Monachos Aegypti*, Oration 42; *Regulae ad Monachos*, p. 315. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.632.41. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Fornicarios*, v. 9, p. 217; *De Instituto Christiano*, v. 8.1, p. 55. John Chrysostom, *In Diem Natalem*, PG.49.362.23; *In Epistolam i ad Corinthios*, PG.61.78.33; 79.52; *In Illud: Vidi Dominum* (*homiliae* 1–6), 3.3. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Genesim*, PG.56.536.73; *De Paenitentia* (*sermo* 1), PG.60: 691.77; 706.66; 706.66; *In Evangelii Dictum et de Virginitate*, PG.64.39.72; *Epitimia LXXIII*, section 41, ln 5. Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, 3.4.6; 54.2.2; *Epistula Magna*, p. 245. Marcellus of Ancyra (fourth cent. AD), *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, p. 1008. Severianus of Gabala (fourth–fifth cent. AD), *Fragmenta in Epistolam i ad Corinthios*, p. 237. Theodoret, *De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, PG.75.1181.34; *intPaulxiv*, PG.82.252.14; *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.544.23. Also, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 10.244.

¹⁷ Origen, *expProv*, PG.17.193.34.

¹⁸ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.6.26.5; 4.5.21.1; 4.22.142.4; *Quis Salvetur Dives*, 21.7.

¹⁹ Basil of Ancyra (fourth cent. AD), *De Virginitatis Integritate*, PG.30: 737.42; 800.33.

²⁰ Didymus, *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p. 84; *commPs40–44.4*, Cod. p. 338; *frPs(al)*, frs. 389; 412; 539; 971; 1234; 1254; *ibid.* fr. 456: ὁραιότητα ἔχων καὶ κάλλος διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν ἐν ἀναμαρτησίᾳ

ἀρετὴν. Fr. 476: Ὁ θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ τῆς πόλεως ἰδρυμένος οὐ σαλευθήσεται, οὐ καταλιμπάνων αὐτὴν διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῇ ἀναμαρτησίαν. Cf. *Scholion XXXI*: τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτοῖς δικαιοσύνην.

²¹ Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.841.28; PG.24.41.25. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Illuminandorum*, Catecheses 13.3; 15.21. Cyril of Alexandria, *Ad Tiberium Diaconum*, p. 599; *Homiliae Paschales*, PG.77.744.18; *Explanatio in Lucam*, PG.72.881.38. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *commProphXII*, Prophet Jonas, Prologue, section 1. Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Job*, p. 31; *commEccl*, PG.93.588.37.

²² ACO, *Concilium Universale Ephesenum Anno 431*, 1.1, 5, p. 38; 1.5, 1, pp. 219; 220.

²³ Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *De Hierarchia Ecclesiastica*, pp. 93; 111 (bis).

²⁴ Maximus Confessor, *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, 61; 65. John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela*, PG.95: 1172.9; 1045.36; PG.96.445.29; Pseudo-John of Damascus, *Vita Barlaam et Joasaph*, p. 184.

²⁵ Rev. 2:11; 20:6; 20:14–15; 21:8.

²⁶ Origen, *commEph*, 26: ἔστι δὲ τι καὶ δεύτερον ἡ ψυχὴ τὸ καὶ νόσου καὶ θανάτου ἐκ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων δεκτικόν . . . ἐπεὶ περ ψυχὴ ἢ ἀμαρτάνουσα αὕτη ἀποθανεῖται. Cf. *Commentarii in Epistolam ad Romanos* (I.1–XII.21), 39, in *Catena in Epistolam ad Romanos*, p. 95. Cf. quotation of Rev. 20:6, in Hippolytus, *De antichristo*, 65.

²⁷ Didymus, *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p. 61; *commPs29–34*, Cod. pp. 181; 203; *frPs(al)*, frs. 573; 575; 697a; 838; 1149; 1066; 1077; *Fragmenta in Epistolam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 20; *Fragmenta in Joannem*, fr. 12; *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 279.

²⁸ Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.56.

²⁹ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 1, p. 200; *Ancoratus*, 97.5–6.

³⁰ Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, p. 53; *Fragmenta in Epistolam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 330.

³¹ Severianus of Gabala, *Fragmenta in Epistolam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 283.

The term περισπασμός ('distraction') and its derivatives are scriptural.³² However, the expression ἀπολύεσθαι (or, ἀπολύειν) περισπασμοῦ ('to be released from intellectual distraction') is exclusive to Origen. Making the point that sin is death, Cassian employs Origen's language and thought.

Origen, *Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos* (I.1–XII.21), 31, in *Catena in Epistulam ad Romanos* (cod. Oxon. B), p. 68: τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς Θεόν, καὶ πάλιν τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος. ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντα τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἔργα σαρκὸς ἐστίν, ἅπερ ὁ Ἀπόστολος 'φανερὰ' ὠνόμασεν. ἐν αὐτοῖς δὲ τάξας καὶ τὰς αἰρέσεις, ἐδίδαξεν ὅτι καὶ αὗται σαρκὸς εἰσιν ἔργον ἀπολύων ἡμᾶς περισπασμοῦ. *Cels*, VII.1: οἱ παντὸς περισπασμοῦ ἀπολυθέντες. Ibid. VII.28: ὀλίγοις δ' ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος ἠρκέσθημεν, βουλόμενοι ἀπολῦσαι περισπασμοῦ, τοῦ ὡς περὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας γῆς ὑπολαμβάνοντος εἰρῆσθαι τὰ περὶ ἀγαθῆς γῆς, ἣν ὁ θεὸς ὑπισχνεῖται τοῖς δικαίοις. *Princ*, IV.1.7 (*Philocalia*, 1.7): διψυχίαν πᾶσαν καὶ περισπασμὸν ἀποθέμενος, ὅλη ἐαυτὸν ἐπιδῶ τῇ ψυχῇ τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ θεοῦ. *exhMar*, III: οἷς οὐδὲ μετὰ περισπασμοῦ καὶ περιελκυσμοῦ τινος γίνεται τὸ ἀποθέσθαι 'τό' 'τῆς ταπεινώσεως' 'σῶμα'. *deOr*, XXIII.3: ὀλίγα κἀκείνων παραθέσθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ πάντα περισπασμὸν ἀφελεῖν. *commMatt*, 12.33: διαρρηξαι τοὺς τοῦ περισπασμοῦ δεσμοὺς καὶ ἀνελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ ὕψος τῆς ὑπεροχῆς τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας λόγου. *commEph*, 17: πρὸς τὸ ἀποθέσθαι πάντα περισπασμὸν καὶ ἀληθεύσαι ἀπερισπάστως καὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξῆσαι εἰς τὸν Χριστόν.

The author continues applying an Origenistic vocabulary. Cf. πᾶσα λογικὴ φύσις in Origen, *Cels*, III.54 (*Philocalia*, 18.24); ibid. VIII.72: *Commentarii in Romanos* (III.5–V.7), pp. 178–180; *frPs*, 85, 9; *selPs*, PG.12: 1524 and 1685; *expProv*, PG.17.193: *commMatt*, 16.23.

Nevertheless, the expression is reminiscent of Evagrius, *Expositio in Proverbia*, p. 99: αὕτη γὰρ ἐστίν ὁ κληρὸς τῆς φύσεως τῆς λογικῆς . . . Ἐνταῦθα λέγει τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι θανάτου καὶ ζωῆς δεκτικὴν, ἀφ' ὧν τὸ αὐτεξούσιον αὐτῆς γεγονέναι κατασκευάζομεν. Cf. Origen, *commEph*, 26: ἔστι δέ τι καὶ δεύτερον ἡ ψυχὴ τὸ καὶ νόσου καὶ θανάτου ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων δεκτικόν.

EN XI^h: πέπονθεν ταραχήν

The idea of ταραχή ('psychological, or mental, confusion') being a state of passion (πάθος) comes from Aristotle.³³ This is also the opinion of Plotinus³⁴ and Philo.³⁵ In Origen the idea is present,³⁶ and in Didymus even more so. In fact Origen regards ταραχή as a 'disgrace and disease of the soul' (ἡ ταραχὴ αἰσχος καὶ ἀσθένεια ψυχῆς),³⁷ which should be expelled.³⁸ Theodoret also saw this as a 'disease' of the soul, owing to 'foolishness'.³⁹

Didymus, *commPs*29–34, Cod. p. 142 τὰ γὰρ πάθη ταρακτικά εἰσιν τοῦ νοῦ. *commPs*35–39, Cod. p. 266: ὅταν ἡ καρδία ταραχθῇ καὶ ἡ κατάλληλος τῇ καρδίᾳ ἰσχύς ἐνκαταλείπει, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν μετὰ τοῦ ταῦτα παθόντος. *frPs(al)*, fr. 627A: Σαλεύεται πᾶς ὁ ἐξ ἀρετῆς εἰς κακίαν μεταπίπτων ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄθρόως συμβαίνει τοῦτο, προτέρας

³² Tobit (Cod. Sinaiticus) 10:6: περισπασμός. 2 Macc. 10:36: περισπασμῶ. Eccl. 1:13: περισπασμόν. 1:13: περισπᾶσθαι. 2:23: περισπασμός. 2:26: περισπασμόν. 3:10: περισπᾶσθαι. 4:8: περισπασμός. 5:2: περισπασμοῦ. 5:13: περισπασμῶ. 5:19: περισπᾶ. 8:16: περισπασμόν. *E contrario*, Wisdom of Solomon 16:11: ἀπερισπαστοί. Ecclesiasticus 41:1: ἀπερισπάστῳ. 1 Cor. 7:35: ἀπερισπάστως.

³³ Aristotle, *De Insomniis*, 461a24: πάντα γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα πάθη πνευματώδη ὄντα πολλὴν ποιεῖ κίνησιν καὶ ταραχήν.

³⁴ Plotinus, *Enneades*, III.6.4 and 5.

³⁵ Philo, *Legum Allegoriarum*, 3.160; *De Abrahamo*, 202, *De Vita Mosis*, 2.164.

³⁶ Origen, *commJohn*, XXXII.18.223–4: λεκτέον ὅτι ἐν μὲν τῷ 'Νῦν ἡ ψυχὴ μου τετάρακται' τὸ τῆς ταραχῆς πάθος ψυχῆς ἦν.

³⁷ Origen, *frPs*, 29, 8: ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς ὑπερεχούσης πάντα νοῦν εἰρήνης φρουρούμενοι, νικῶμεν τὴν ταραχὴν καὶ σύγχυσιν τῶν παθῶν. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀντίκειται, τῷ μὲν θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ ἀποστροφή, τῷ δὲ κάλλει καὶ τῇ δυνάμει ἡ ταραχὴ, εἴη ἂν ἡ ταραχὴ αἰσχος καὶ ἀσθένεια ψυχῆς.

³⁸ Origen, *frPs*, 75, 3: ἀλλὰ γὰρ παντὶ τρόπῳ καὶ ἡμῖν ἀποδιωκτέον τὴν τῶν παθῶν ταραχήν.

³⁹ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.905.4: Ἄν τε γὰρ τὴν ἀσθένειαν προβαλῶμεθα, ἂν τε τὴν ταραχήν. Ibid. PG.80.1473.28: ἄθρόαν ἐπέμειναν ταραχήν, διὰ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀφροσύνην.

γινομένης ταραχῆς ἐν λογισμοῖς διὰ παθῶν μεθ' ἧν, εἰ προσληφθεῖη κατάλληλος πρᾶξις, τοῖς τεταραγμένοις λογισμοῖς κλόνος καὶ πτῶμα γίνεται. Ibid. fr. 787a: Παντὶ τρόπῳ ἀποδιωκτέον τὴν τῶν παθῶν ταραχὴν καὶ τὸν τῶν κακιῶν πόλεμον. Ibid. fr. 1036: Ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶς ὁ ταραττόμενος τὴν καρδίαν ἀπὸ λογισμῶν ἢ παθῶν, μηδὲν δὲ πράττων ἢ λέγων κατὰ τὴν ταραχὴν, ἐρεῖ τὸ Ἑταράχθη ἡ καρδία μου ἐντός μου. Ibid. fr. 1200: Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν κατὰ τὸ ῥητόν 'πρὸς δὲ διάνοιαν ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος πολλάκις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν εἴρηται θάλασσα, ἦνπερ κυμάτων καὶ πολλῆς ἀλμυρότητος καὶ ταραχῆς πεπληρωμένην διοδεύσιμον ἡμῖν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος παρέχει, ἀναστελλόμενος καὶ διῆστον τὰς ἐκ παθῶν ἐπιθεμένους τρικυμίας.

Being part of the Aristotelian patrimony, the idea naturally occurs outside Christian exposition,⁴⁰ as indeed it does in Galen⁴¹ and Plutarch.⁴² However, it was Christian theology that made the correlation between psychological confusion and passion a main theme, thus aligning itself also with a Stoic sentiment.

Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.320: δυνάμεθα τὴν ταραχὴν καὶ τὴν σύγχυσιν τῶν παθῶν διαφυγεῖν. Ibid. PG.29.356: Οἱ κατεσταλμένοι τὰ ἡθῆ καὶ παντὸς πάθους ἀπηλλαγμένοι, ὥς μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ταραχὴν ἐνοικοῦσαν αὐτῶν ταῖς ψυχαῖς, οὗτοι πραεῖς προσαγορεύονται. *De Gratiarum Actione Homilia*, PG.31.236: οὐν σοὶ ποτε προσπέση τῶν ἀβουλήτων τι, μάλιστα μὲν τῷ προευνεπισμένῳ τῆς διανοίας τὴν ταραχὴν μὴ παθεῖν. *Homilia Adversus Eos Qui Irascuntur*, PG.31.353.15–17: ὥσπερ ῥεύματι βιαίῳ διέξοδον, καταμανθάνοντες δὲ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ τὴν ἀσχήμονα ταραχὴν τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους κατεχομένων.

Pseudo-Basil of Caesarea, *Constitutiones Monasticae*, PG.31.1372: καὶ παρὰ τὸ προσῆκον ταπεινούς, καὶ δουλοπρεπεῖς, καὶ ἀλαζόνας, καὶ μυρίας

ταραχῆς γέμοντας, τοῦτο τὸ πάθος τοὺς ἐαλωκότας ἐργάζεται.

Pseudo-Basil of Seleucia, *De Vita et Miraculis Sanctae Theclae*, Book 2, epilogue; καὶ πᾶν γε πάθος ἀπελαινούσης, πᾶσάν τε λύπην καὶ ταραχὴν ἀποκοιμίζουσης.

Pseudo-Athanasius, *De Incarnatione Contra Apollinarium*, PG.26.1153: οὐδαμοῦ δὲ θεότης πάθος προσίεται δίχα πάσχοντος σώματος οὔτε ταραχὴν καὶ λύπην ἐπιδείκνυται δίχα ψυχῆς λυπούμενης καὶ ταραττομένης.

Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *De Mystica Theologia*, p. 148: οὐδὲ ἀταξίαν ἔχει καὶ ταραχὴν, ὑπὸ παθῶν ὕλικῶν ἐνοχλουμένη.

Ephraem Syrus, *Precationes ad Matrem Dei*, Prayer 3, p. 361: Διασκέδασον τὰ νέφη τῆς ἀθυμίας μου, τῶν λογισμῶν τὴν ὁμίχλην καὶ ταραχὴν. Τῶν παθῶν τὴν καταιγίδα καὶ θύελλαν μακρὰν ποίησον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

Eriphanius, *Ancoratus*, 33.4: ἵνα δῆθεν προσάψωσι τῷ θεῷ Λόγῳ ἀνθρώπινον πάθος, δίψαν καὶ πείναν καὶ κάματον καὶ κλαυθμὸν καὶ λύπην καὶ ταραχὴν καὶ ὅσαπερ ἐν τῇ ἐνσάρκῳ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ ἐμφέρεται.

Gregory of Nyssa, *In Inscriptiōnes Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 161: τὴν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τῶν λογισμῶν ταραχὴν, πόθῳ τῆς τῶν ὁμοίων μιμήσεως καταπραῦνων τὸ πάθος. Ibid. v. 5, p. 167: τὴν ἐκ τοῦ πάθους ταραχὴν κατευνάσαντος. *De Virginitatis Integritate*, 4.6: τοῦ βίου ταραχὴν ὁ κατ' αὐτὴν γεγονώς μόνος ὑφίσταται καὶ μόνος ἀναδέχεται καθ' ἑαυτοῦ τὰ πάθη. *De Vita Gregorii Thaumaturgi*, PG.46.941.55–57: καὶ πάντα πάσχειν τὰ ἐκ δαιμόνων πάθη. Εἴτα ἐπιβαλόντος τοῦ ἁγίου τὴν χεῖρα, καὶ τὴν ταραχὴν κατευνάσαντος.

Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, Homily 38.1.1: τοῦ προκρατοῦντος πάθους ἰσόμετρον τὴν ταραχὴν ἐκφέρωντος.

⁴⁰ Stobaeus (ref. to a book by the third-cent. BC philosopher Teles, probably of Megara, *Περὶ ἀπαθείας*, p. 56), *Anthologium*, 4.44.83: οὕτω γὰρ καὶ εὐδαίμων ἔσται ὁ ἐκτός τοῦ πάθους καὶ ταραχῆς ὢν. Porphyry (third cent. AD), *Ad Marcellam*, 8: εἰ παρεῖσα τὴν ἐκ τοῦ πάθους ἀλόγιστον ταραχὴν μὴ περὶ φάυλων ἡγήσῃ μεμνησθαι ὢν εἰς φιλοσοφίαν τὴν ὀρθὴν παρὰ τῶν θείων ἐτελέσθης λόγων. Themistius, *In Parva Naturalia Commentarium*, v. 5.6, p. 36: πάντα γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα πάθη πνευματώδη ὄντα πολλὴν ποιεῖται τὴν κίνησιν καὶ ταραχὴν.

⁴¹ Galen, *Ad Epigenem de Praenotione*, v. 14, p. 640: καὶ τοῦ φοβουμένου δούλου τὴν ταραχὴν ἐπὶ ψυχικῷ τινι πάθει γενέσθαι.

⁴² Plutarch, *Pericles*, 39.2: αὐτοὺς δὲ τοὺς θεοὺς ταραχῆς καὶ δυσμενείας καὶ ὀργῆς ἄλλων τε μεστοὺς παθῶν ἀποφαίνοντες, οὐδ' ἀνθρώποις νοῦν ἔχουσι προσηκόντων. *Alexander*, 30.7: ταῦτ' ἀκούσαντα Δαρεῖον ἡ ταραχὴ καὶ τὸ πάθος ἐξέφερε πρὸς ὑποψίας ἀτόπους, *Quaestiones Convivales*, 649A: ὁ γὰρ ἐμποιεῖ τοῖς πιούσι πάθος οὐ μέθην ἂν τις εἴποι, ταραχὴν δὲ καὶ παραφροσύνην. *Amatorius*, 765B: ὅθεν διὰ σκαλιότητος ἐνιοὶ φίλων καὶ οἰκείων σβεννύναι πειρώμενοι βίᾳ καὶ ἀλόγως τὸ πάθος οὐδὲν ἀπέλαυσαν αὐτοῦ χρηστὸν ἄλλ' ἢ καπνοῦ καὶ ταραχῆς ἐνέπλησαν ἑαυτούς.

Theodoret, *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.108.20–23 (the Bridegroom-Logos addressing the Bride-Soul): λέγων πρὸς αὐτήν· ‘Νέκρωσον τὰ μέλη σου, τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς’· μελέτησον ἄσαρκίαν ἐν σώματι· ἐπίδειξαι ἀπάθειαν ἐν πάθεσιν· ἔξω γενοῦ τῆς παρούσης πόλεως, καὶ τῶν ταύτης τειχῶν.

Conclusion

Didymus is present right from the start of the Scholion, through the expression τὸ σύνθετον ζῶον. We find his seal in all four NT quotations used therein, and he is also present in all the critical terms and notions involved. We do not find him in regard to the notion of the ‘second death’, which nevertheless originates with Origen. Since it is Didymus himself who testifies that he wrote a Commentary on Revelation, it is unlikely that he had not dealt with the notion of ‘second death’, which is pivotal in that Book. Furthermore, expressions and notions such as that ‘every rational nature’ (πᾶσα λογικὴ φύσις) is ‘susceptible

of’ (δεκτικὴ) either salvation or damnation, are outstandingly Origen’s. It is striking, however, that fundamental scriptural clauses, which Origen had quoted in order to establish his view of a soul ‘dying’, namely, Ezekiel 18:4 (ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ ἁμαρτάνουσα, αὕτη ἀποθάνειται) and Ezekiel 18:20 (ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ ἡ ἁμαρτάνουσα ἀποθάνειται), are not availed of in this Scholion at all, even though they had been considered extensively by Origen, Didymus, Theodoret, and other relevant authors such as Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius, Epiphanius of Salamis, Basil of Caesarea, Evagrius, Pseudo-Justin, John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Severianus of Gabala, and Asterius of Antioch, but not by Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus. Nevertheless, besides this Scholion, Didymus is the sole Christian author to quote Ezekiel 18:4 along with James 1:15.

Therefore, the entire [Scholion XI](#) was penned by Cassian quoting from Didymus’ Commentary on Revelation.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XII

EN XIIa: τὰ τῆς κακίας βλαστήματα

Didymus used the term βλάστημα ('offshoot').¹ The expression τὰ τῆς κακίας βλαστήματα ('offshoots of wickedness') was available to Cassian, since earlier authors adopted it. He presumably took this up from Eusebius,² where the phraseology is similar to that of the present Scholion. We come upon it also in Gregory of Nyssa,³ and in the spurious work on Isaiah.⁴ Although there is a single instance in Basil where a phrase similar, yet not identical, where κακίας βλαστήματα is used,⁵ I insist that the commentary on Isaiah is not his own, as I hope to show in a future work of mine. *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam* must have been written under the influence of Eusebius, by someone who held the historian in high regard. There are parts of this *Enarratio* which are plain quotations from Eusebius' work, even though they purport to deal with different topics. To cite an instance, a specific part from this commentary is a word-for-word quotation from Eusebius' commentary on the Psalms.⁶

The verb βλαστάνειν ('to shoot forth, to bud, to sprout') is characteristic of Theodoret describing the generation of evil and sin, including heresy.⁷ On this point Cassian wrote under the influence of Theodoret

and Didymus, not Origen. For in the latter the verb βλαστάνειν has only the natural meaning (that is, a certain physical function), whereas in Didymus this is associated with 'evil' (κακία) coming to pass.⁸ There are of course instances where a simply natural sense appears,⁹ but this is only an exception.

In Hippolytus, the verb βλαστάνειν and its cognates are always used in a positive sense.¹⁰ In Clement there is no negative connotation, but only either a natural or a positive one.¹¹ In Origen the verb has either a plain natural sense, or it is used in Biblical quotations.¹² It was Eusebius who instilled the sense in which this verb is used in this Scholion, and Cassian wrote under his influence, while having in mind germane accounts by Didymus.

EN XIIb: τὰς τῶν φρονημάτων ψευδοδοξίας 'false doctrines urged by the haughty'

The unique parallel to this Scholion is the following passage of Didymus, where key words and notions of the Scholia are striking:

Didymus, *commPs*29–34, Cod. p. 140: λυτροῦται ὑπὸ θεοῦ ὁ ἔξω πάσης ταραχῆς γινόμενος. ὁ θεὸς οὖν τῆς ἀληθείας λυτροῦται ἀπὸ ἀπάτης· ἡ θεὸς

¹ Didymus, *commZacch*, 3.95: ὁ Σωτὴρ εἶπεν· Ἰὺρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, εἴθε ἤδη ἀνήφθῃ, ἵνα καταναλωθῇ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πᾶν βλάστημα βλαβερὸν ὁ ἀκανθα καὶ τρίβολος καὶ ζιζάνιον ὑπάρχει.

² Eusebius, *DE*, 3.4.34: τὸ δ' ἀπαθὲς τῆς ψυχῆς περὶ πολλοῦ προτιμᾷν, κάτωθεν ἐκ βάθους αὐτῆς διανοίας ὥσπερ ἀπὸ ῥιζῶν τὰ τῆς κακίας ἀποτέμνοντας βλαστήματα. Theodoret, *IntPaulxiv*, PG.82.65.11–15: Ἀδικίαν καλεῖ τὴν ἐναντίαν ἐκ διαμέτρου τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ κειμένην. Ἐκ γὰρ ταύτης ὡς ἐπίπαν εἶδος βλαστάνει κατηγορούμενον. Διέξεισι δὲ καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ βλαστήματα.

³ Gregory of Nyssa, *De Beatitudinibus*, PG.44.1253.19: τὰ τῆς κακίας βλαστήματα.

⁴ *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 5.180: Ἀτελὴ γὰρ τὰ τῆς κακίας βλαστήματα, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ βλαστήσει καὶ τῷ πρώτῳ ἄνθει ἀφανιζόμενα.

⁵ Basil of Caesarea, *Homilia Adversus Eos Qui Irascuntur*, PG.31.372.1–2: πονηρῶν σμῆνος, ταύτης τῆς κακίας ἐστὶν ἀποβλαστήματα.

⁶ The entire section 163 in chapter 5 of *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, is a verbatim quotation from Eusebius' *commPs*, PG.23.1248.33–1249.1.

⁷ Theodoret, *Haeticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.337.45–48 (ref. to heresies by Ebion, Marcellus, Photinus): Τὸ δὲ τρίτον τοὺς μεταξὺ τούτων κἀκείνων δηλώσει βεβλαστηκότας, οἱ διαφορῶν δογμάτων πατέρες ἐγένοντο. Likewise, referring to

heresies: *ibid.* PG.83.400.14–17: Ἐπειδὴ τὰς ἐναντίας ἀλλήλαις αἵρέσεις ἐν τοῖς προτέροις βιβλίοις πεποιήκαμεν δήλας, φέρε δὴ καὶ τὰς ἄλλας, αἱ μεταξὺ τούτων κἀκείνων ἐβλάστησαν, τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας διδάσκωμεν. Cf. a phraseology about 'evil' (κακία) generating (ἐβλάστησε) and its results. *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.885.5–8: ἐκείνης δὲ διὰ τὴν γεγεννημένην ἀποστάσης παρανομίαν, χώραν ἔλαβεν ἡ κακία, καὶ τραγωδίας ἄξια δέδρακε, καὶ φορὰν ἐβλάστησε συμφορῶν. *Ibid.* PG.80.1088.44–45: Αἰτία γάρ μοι τῶν κακῶν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἣν ἀντὶ σταφυλῆς μὲν ἐβλάστησα.

⁸ Didymus, *commJob*(7.20c–11), Cod. p. 223; *commJob*(12.1–16.8a), Cod. pp. 404; 406; *commZacch*, 3.95.

⁹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 855.

¹⁰ Hippolytus, *De antichristo*, 7; 8; *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, Fr. 17; *Commentarium in Daniele*, 4.15.2; *De Benedictionibus Isaaci et Jacobi*, pp. 68; 76; 78; *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, fr. 17.1; *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium (Philosophumena)*, 5.7.4. In Irenaeus we simply have one biblical quotation (*Adversus Haereses*, fr. 1: βλαστήσει), one usage of the term in its natural sense (*ibid.* 1.27.1: βεβλαστηκέναι), and one negative sense (*ibid.* 1.27.1).

¹¹ Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*, 2.19.3; *Paedagogus*, 2.2.19.3; 2.8.76.3; *Stromateis*, 1.7.37.1; 2.18.95.2; 4.23.150.1; 5.11.70.6.

¹² Origen, *Cels*, IV.55; VI.60; VIII.34; *Princ*, III.1.10; *commJohn*, I.2.14; I.23.142; *deOr*, XXIV.5; *commMatt*, 10.19; *et passim*.

ἀληθείας ἐστίν, ἀπὸ ἀπάτης καὶ ψευδοδοξίας λυτροῦται. ὅταν τις φρονήματα ἐσφαλμένα καὶ ψευδῇ ἔχῃ, χρήζει θεοῦ, ἵνα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἑαυτοῦ ἔξω αὐτὸν ποιήσῃ πάσης ἀπάτης. πάλιν ὁ θεὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης ῥύεται ἀπὸ ἀδικημάτων· εἴρηται γοῦν ‘εἰσάκουσόν μου, ὁ θεὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης μου’, ἵνα πάσης ἀδικίας ἐκτός με ποιήσῃς, ἵνα τοὺς ἐνεργοῦντας κατ’ ἐμοῦ τὰ ἄδικα ἦττη ὑποβάλῃς.

The remarkable appearance of key terms of this passage, which are present in some of the Scholia, should be noticed.

ὁ ἔξω πάσης ταραχῆς γινόμενος. Cf. [Scholion XI](#): ἴσως δὲ ὁ ταραττόμενος τὸν κοινὸν θάνατον ἐν νῶ λαβὼν πέπονθεν ταραχὴν.

τῆς ἀληθείας. Cf. [Scholion XXII](#): Ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ὑπάρχει οὐ διὰ τὸ πιστεῶς καὶ ἀληθείας μετέχειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ βέβαιος καὶ οὐσία εἶναι ἀληθινός· ταῦτόν γάρ ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ τὸ ‘ἀλήθεια’ καὶ ‘ἀληθινός’ εἶναι.

ἀπάτης. Cf. [Scholion XII](#): τὰς τῶν ἑτεροδόξων σοφιστικὰς ἀπάτας. [Scholion XXII](#): διὰ τὴν ἀπάτην καὶ κακίας παχύτητα μὴ χωροῦντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

ψευδοδοξίας φρονήματα. Cf. [Scholion XXII](#): τὰς τῶν φρονημάτων ψευδοδοξίας.

δικαιοσύνη. Cf. [Scholion VI](#): στρατευομένων τῶν μὲν τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, τῶν δὲ τῷ πονηρῷ καὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. [Scholion XVIII](#): τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡλίου. [Scholion XXXI](#): τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτοῖς δικαιοσύνην.

ἀδικίας. [Scholion XI](#): ὡς μὴ ἀδικηθῆναι ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τοῦ μὴ βλαβῆναι. [Scholion XI](#): οὐκ ἀδικεῖται δὲ οὐδὲ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ δευτέρου θανάτου. [Scholion XXII](#): θεὸς πιστὸς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία. [Scholion XXX](#): ἀδίκως γὰρ κολάσει ἢ αἰτία τῆς ἁμαρτίας τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα.

τοὺς ἐνεργοῦντας. [Scholion X](#): οὐ γὰρ ἀναγκαίως ὑπάρχει τὸν κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἐνεργοῦντα κατὰ τελείαν ἔξιν αὐτὸ πράττειν. [Scholion XVIII](#): ὁ πρωῒνός ἀστήρ, φῶς ὢν ἐνεργῶν πρὸ ἀνατολῆς τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡλίου.

Furthermore, in all of the instances where Didymus uses the noun ψευδοδοξία, it is always heavily surrounded by the characteristic terminology of the Scholia. We should recall that it is characteristic of Didymus that he repeats the same formulations at different points of his works.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.120: δόγματα δὲ ἄθεα καὶ ψευδοδοξίαι τυγχάνουσιν αἱ σάρκες τοῦ δράκοντος.¹³ *commPs*29–34, Cod. p. 208: καὶ ἵνα εἰκόνι συνχρήσωμαι τῇ ἐν ταῖς Παροιμίαις εἰσαγομένη πόρνη, ἥτοι ψευδοδοξία ἢ ἀκολασία ἢ πόρνη¹⁴ γυνὴ ἔφθειρεν τὰ χρηστὰ ἥθη τοῦ νεανίου ἐκείνου· σοφιστικὰ γάρ τινα αὐτῷ προσηγόχεν. *frPs(al)*, fr. 170: οὓς διαναπαυομένους ἐπὶ κακίᾳ¹⁵ καὶ ψευδοδοξίᾳ τῷ θέλγεσθαι ὑπὸ ἡδονῆς συνταράξει ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὀργῇ αὐτοῦ. *Ibid.* fr. 183: Μόσχοι δ’ ἂν εἶεν καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ γήινα καὶ σωματικὰ ἐνεργοῦσαι¹⁶ πονηραὶ¹⁷ δυνάμεις (γεωπόνον γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ ζῶον)· αἱ δὲ ψευδοδοξίας προϊστάμεναι δι’ ἀπατηλῶν λόγων καὶ σοφισμάτων.¹⁸ *Ibid.* fr. 277: ὁ τέλειος πάσης προκοπῆς¹⁹ ἀναχωρήσας αὐτὴν κατανοεῖ τὴν ἀλήθειαν δι’ ὃ ἀνεξάπατητός ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ ἐν τῷ προκόπτειν ἐπιτυγχάνων χρήζει σκεπάζοντος θεοῦ, ἐν σκηνῇ τουτέστιν τῶν διαφορῶν γλωσσῶν, ἥτοι διαφορῶν ψευδοδοξιῶν. *Ibid.* fr. 290: Οἱ τὸν ἠθικὸν κατορθώσαντες²⁰ βίον δίκαιοι εἰσιν ἀγαλλιώμενοι ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ, εὐθεῖς δὲ οἷς πρέπει αἵνεσις οἱ πᾶσαν σκολιότητα ψευδοδοξίας διαφυγόντες. *Ibid.* fr. 326: Ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ οἱ διὰ ψευδοδοξίας καὶ τῆς ἄλλης κακίας²¹ πολεμεῖν μοι προύθεντο, τούτου χάριν σὺ ἀντ’ ἐμοῦ πολέμησον αὐτοῖς. *Ibid.* fr. 649a: μαθόντες

¹³ Cf. [Scholion XXXVIII](#): Ὁρμὴ ὁ δράκων πολεμήσας μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ θλαβεῖς, βληθεὶς κάτω ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσυρεν πίπτων τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων, ἅτινα ἄστρα θείας δυνάμεις οὐσας ‘ἐπέσειε’ συναποστῆναι αὐτῷ καὶ συγκατενεχθῆναι τῷ δράκοντι.

¹⁴ [Scholion XIII](#): πορνείαν καὶ εἰδωλολατρείαν κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν εἰσηγουμένους. [Scholion XII](#): ἀνὰρρεῖν τὰς τῶν ἑτεροδόξων σοφιστικὰς ἀπάτας. [Scholion XVI](#): διὰ τὰ ἐργα τῆς γνώμης ἐκείνης προσήθαι τῇ Ἰεζάβελ εἰς πορνείαν κατασπασάση.

¹⁵ [Scholion XII](#): τέμνει γὰρ οὐ τὰ τῆς κακίας μόνης βλαστήματα. [Scholion XXII](#): τὴν ‘ἐξ’ ἀπάτης ‘καὶ’ κακίας παχύτητα μὴ χωροῦντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

¹⁶ [Scholion X](#): τὸν κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἐνεργοῦντα. [Scholion XVIII](#): φῶς

ὢν ἐνεργῶν πρὸ ἀνατολῆς τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡλίου. [Scholion XXI](#): ἐρχόμενος γὰρ δι’ ἐνεργειῶν ἀρετῆς πρὸς τὸν σωτῆρα οὐκ ἐκβάλλεται ἔξω.

¹⁷ [Scholion VI](#): ἀνθρώπων στρατευομένων τῶν μὲν τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, τῶν δὲ τῷ πονηρῷ καὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. [Scholion XXXIII](#): οἱ πονηροὶ ἀνθρωποὶ τε καὶ δαίμονες.

¹⁸ [Scholion XII](#): ἀναιρεῖν τὰς τῶν ἑτεροδόξων σοφιστικὰς ἀπάτας. [Scholion XXII](#): διὰ τὴν ἀπάτην καὶ κακίας παχύτητα.

¹⁹ [Scholion XIV](#): ἐπεὶ γὰρ κατὰ πᾶσαν προκοπὴν οἰκείαν τῇ ἐκ τῆς προκοπῆς ποιότητι ἔχει τις προσηγορίαν.

²⁰ [Scholion X](#): ἂ σὺν ἀγάπῃ κατορθοῦται.

²¹ [Scholion XII](#): τέμνει γὰρ οὐ τὰ τῆς κακίας μόνης βλαστήματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς τῶν φρονημάτων ψευδοδοξίας. [Scholion XXII](#): διὰ τὴν ἀπάτην καὶ κακίας παχύτητα.

γὰρ ἦσαν παρ' αὐτῶν ὡς οὐκ εἶη πρόνοια ὡς ἐκ ταυτομάτου φέρονται τὰ πάντα· καὶ πρὸς ἄλλων ἀπατεῶνων²² ἕτεροι συναρπαγέντες φύσει ἀγαθοὺς καὶ κακοὺς²³ ἀνθρώπους παρεδέξαντο, καὶ προσέτι ὡς εἰμαρμένης πρυτανευούσης. τούτων κλονηθεῖσιν τῶν ψευδοδοξίων ἐν τῷ ταραττέσθαι²⁴ αὐτοὺς, ἀληθῆ φανέρωσιν ἔσχον ὡς εἶη θεὸς ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων καὶ προνοητής. ἀνήγγειλαν γοῦν τὰ τῆς προνοίας ἔργα καὶ τὰ κτίσματα²⁵ αὐτοῦ συνῆκαν καὶ τὸν προνοοῦμενον ἔγνωσαν, ἐκ τοῦ μεγέθους καὶ κάλλους αὐτῶν ἀναλόγως τὸν δημιουργὸν θεωρήσαντες. Ibid. fr. 774a: κεφαλὰ δὲ τούτων τῶν δρακόντων μαντεῖαι γοητεῖαι οἰωνισμοὶ καὶ ὅσα συντελεῖ πρὸς εἰδωλολατρίαν ἀλλὰ καὶ ψευδοδοξίαι καὶ πράξεις ἐναγεῖς, μόνου τοῦ σωτῆρος²⁶ ἔργον συντρίβειν τῶν εἰρημένων δρακόντων²⁷ τὰς κεφαλὰς. Ibid. fr. 774a: ὡς γὰρ τὰς Ἰησοῦ σάρκας, τροφὴν ἀληθινὴν οὖσαν, τρέφονται πάντες οἱ τοῦ φωτὸς υἱοί, ὡς ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς χρήσεως τῆς βρώσεως φωτιζομένους ὑπὲρ χιόνα λευκαίνεσθαι²⁸ οὕτω τὰ τέκνα τοῦ σκοτοῦς Αἰθίοπες κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον ὄντα τραφήσονται τὰς σάρκας τὰς δρακοντείους (τὰ κακίας καὶ ψευδοδοξίας εἶδη), ὅταν παραδοθῶσι ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν καὶ προσέτι εἰς πάθη²⁹ ἀτιμίας καὶ ἀδόκιμον νοῦν. Ibid. fr. 777a: πενήτων αὐτοῦ τυγχανόντων τῶν ἐν ψευδοδοξίᾳ

κακίας πλοῦτον ἀποβαλόντων. Ibid. fr. 1231: τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν τῶν ἐργαζομένων τὴν ἀνομίαν τίνες ἄλλαι εἶεν εὐδοκίαι ἢ ψευδοδοξίαι καὶ πονηραὶ³⁰ διαθέσεις,³¹ ὧν εἴσω τὴν ἑαυτοῦ προσευχὴν ἀξιοῖ γενέσθαι ἐπὶ τῷ διελεγχθείσας³² καθαιρεθῆναι; ἐν ταύταις γὰρ ἡ προσευχὴ αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἄλλως γίνεται ἢ αἰτουμένου θεοῦ ἀνατροπὴν καὶ κατάλυσιν αὐτῶν. Ibid. fr. 1232: Καὶ τάχα παγὶς μὲν συνισταμένη μοι πρὸς τῶν πονηρῶν ἢ κατὰ ψευδοδοξίαν ἀπάτη ἐστὶ, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἐργαζομένων τὴν ἀνομίαν σκάνδαλον ἢ ἠθικὴ κακία. *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.39.1641: τρισὶ γὰρ κέχρηται μάλιστα κατ' αὐτῶν ὀρμητηρίοις, ἡδὼν, θέλγων, ἀπατῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κατὰ μικρὸν λεληθότως αὐτοὺς ἀναιρῶν πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ταῖς τῆς ψευδοδοξίας ὁδοῖς ἐνάγει πρὸς ἀπώλειαν. . . . τοιοῦτους γὰρ ἂν εὖροις τοὺς ταῖς ψευδοδοξίαις ἐντεθαμμένους, οὐδέποτε κόρον λαμβάνοντας, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ προεπιτείνοντας τὰ πάθη, ὡς καὶ ἑτέρους ἐπὶ ταῦτα προτρέπεσθαι. *commEccI* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 76: ὡς πρὸς τὴν ἀναγωγὴν³³ μακρυντέον ταύτης τὸ ἐκτὸς γενέσθαι ἀρετῆς³⁴ καὶ σοφίας. ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐχ ἡ σοφία³⁵ μόνη καὶ ἡ ἄγνοια ἀρετὴ ἢ ἰδίᾳ καὶ συνιεῖναι ὀφείλουσα ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ γαμετὴ ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἄγνοια καὶ ἡ κακία -μὴ πρόσσεχε' δὲ φαύλη γυναικί'-, ὅτε φαύλη γυνὴ πάρεστιν· ψευδοδοξία δὲ ἐστίν καὶ ἀσέβεια αὕτη.

²² Cf. *Scholion XIII*: ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα δηλουμένους ἀπατεῶνας.

²³ *Scholion VI*: ἡκόνησαν ὡς μάχαιραν ὅξειαν ἐπὶ κακῶ τῶν ἀκουόντων. *Scholion XII*: τῆς κακίας μόνης βλαστήματα. *Scholion XXII*: διὰ τὴν ἀπάτης καὶ κακίας παχύτητα.

²⁴ *Scholion XI*: ἴσως δὲ ὁ ταραττόμενος τὸν κοινὸν θάνατον ἐν νῷ λαβὼν πέπονθεν ταραχὴν.

²⁵ *Scholion XV*: χαλκὸς διὰ τὸ τοῖς κτίσμασι συγκαταβαίνειν. *Scholion XXII*: ἀρχὴν δὲ τῆς κτίσεως εἶπεν αὐτόν· οὐχ ὡς κτίσμα πρῶτον κτίσεως ἀρχὴ ἐστὶν αὐτῆς. *Scholion XXVI*: σημειωτέον ὡς καὶ τὰ κτίσματα τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ γεγονέναι φησὶν· ὅθεν οὐκ ἐξαπτεόν τὴν ὑπαρξίν τοῦ σωτῆρος τῆς θελήσεως τοῦ πατρὸς· οὐ γὰρ κτίσμα τυγχάνει.

²⁶ *Scholion I*: Οὐ μάχεται τῷ λεχθέντι ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος πρὸς τοὺς γνωρίμους. Cf. note 1 in *Scholion I*. *Scholion IV*: ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης ἐνταῦθα φησὶν ὅτι ὁ σωτὴρ ἐστὶν ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. *Scholion IX*: περιπατοῦντες καὶ ἀγαλλιαθέντες, ἵνα ἴδωσι τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σωτῆρος. *Scholion XII*: Ἡ ἐκπορευομένη ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ σωτῆρος ῥομφαία. *Scholion XVIII*: δίδεται αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος ὁ πρωῒνός ἀστὴρ. *Scholion XXI*: ἐρχόμενος γὰρ δι' ἐνεργειῶν ἀρετῆς πρὸς τὸν σωτῆρα οὐκ ἐκβάλλεται ἔξω. *Scholion XXII*: Ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ὑπάρχει οὐ διὰ τὸ πίστεως καὶ ἀληθείας μετέχειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ βέβαιον κατ' οὐσίαν εἶναι. *Scholion XIV*: εἴρηται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν σωτῆρα. *Scholion XVI*: ὅθεν οὐκ ἐξαπτεόν τὴν ὑπαρξίν τοῦ σωτῆρος τῆς θελήσεως τοῦ πατρὸς. *Scholion XXIX*: τί δὲ μετὰ τὸ ᾄδεν τὴν καινὴν ψῆδὴν λέγουσιν ἢ τὸ· ἄξιος εἶ, ὃ δέσποτα σωτὴρ.

²⁷ *Scholion XXXVIII*, above, note 13.

²⁸ *Scholion XIV*: ἐν τῇ πνευματικῇ τοῖνυν ψήφῳ, λευκὴ διὰ τὸ φωτοεῖδές. *Scholion XXXIII*: Αὐταὶ αἱ λευκαὶ στολαὶ δύνανται δηλοῖν τὰς ἀχράντους προθέσεις καὶ πράξεις αὐτῶν. πρὸς ταῖς λευκαῖς στολαῖς ἄν· εἰσιν περιβεβλημένοι. *Scholion XXXIII*: λευκάναντες καὶ πλύναντες ἅς περικεῖνται στολὰς τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν σφαγέντος ἀρνίου. *Scholion XXXIV*: Ἐπίστησον εἰ αἱ πλυθεῖσαι καὶ λευκανθεῖσαι στολαὶ τῶν ἐκ μεγάλης θλίψεως ἀναβεβηκότων εἶναι δύνανται τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν.

²⁹ *Scholion XXX*: ὀργὴν θεοῦ μεγάλην, οὐ τὸ συμβεβηκὸς πάθος ὀνομάζεται θεοῦ ὀργὴ καλούμενον. *Scholion XI*: ἴσως δὲ ὁ ταραττόμενος τὸν κοινὸν θάνατον ἐν νῷ λαβὼν πέπονθεν ταραχὴν.

³⁰ See note 17 above.

³¹ *Scholion X*: περὶ τὴν ἀγαπητικὴν αὐτοῦ διάθεσιν.

³² An expression of Origen's: Cf. *Cels*, IV.90 (*Philocalia*, 20.17): διελέγχουσι τὴν ἀχάριστον ψευδοδοξίαν.

³³ *Scholion VII*: Ὁ ταύτας, ὡς ἔχει, θείας θεωρίας ἀνηγμένως νοήσας. *Scholion XIII*: Ἀνακτέον τὰ ἱστορικῶς γεγενημένα ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα δηλουμένους ἀπατεῶνας πορνείαν καὶ εἰδωλολατρείαν κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν εἰσηγουμένους.

³⁴ *Scholion X*: τὸν κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργοῦντα. *Scholion XXI*: ἐπιμετρωρίζονται οὗτοι εὐσεβείας καὶ ἀρετῆς πτεροῖς. *Scholion XXI*: ἐρχόμενος γὰρ δι' ἐνεργειῶν ἀρετῆς πρὸς τὸν σωτῆρα οὐκ ἐκβάλλεται ἔξω. *Scholion XXXI*: ἀπὸ τῆς· σὺν ἀρετῇ παρρησίας· αὐτῶν.

³⁵ *Scholion XXXVI*: ἐὰν προσχῆς τῇ γραφῇ, εὐρήσεις τίνες εἰσίν. μία βροντὴ σοφία.

The term ψευδοδοξία also appears Clement.³⁶ It is after his expression ψευδοδοξία δὲ καταλύεται that we have similar ones by Didymus,³⁷ who applies the term also at other points where there is no immediate recollection of the vocabulary of the Scholia.³⁸

It should be remarked that the word is frequent not only in Didymus, but also in Origen and Clement and others. However, it is in Didymus only that it appears heavily surrounded by key terms making up the Scholia, as shown above.

EN XIIc: τὰς σοφιστικὰς ἀπάτας
(‘the sophistic acts of deceit’)

The expression and notion of associating σοφιστεία (‘sophistry’) with ἀπάτη (‘deceit’) does not appear in either Irenaeus or Hippolytus. Origen definitely excoriated the sophists relentlessly,³⁹ even though he did not employ the expression σοφιστική ἀπάτη itself. Clement’s vocabulary is remarkably close to that of the Scholion.⁴⁰ Actually, Clement twice identifies sophists with treacherousness, and Didymus does so frequently. The identification of ‘sophists’ as ‘crooks’

(οἱ ἀπατεῶνες καὶ οἱ σοφισταί),⁴¹ occurs at a considerable number of points in Didymus, who displays an extraordinary vigour in condemning ‘the sophists’ identified with ‘deception’.⁴² As a matter of fact, it is Didymus who champions the idea that ‘sophistry’ is craftiness. Plutarch⁴³ and Eusebius⁴⁴ must have inspired Cassian, who in the first place emulates Didymus. At the same time, both Philo⁴⁵ and the two Gregories⁴⁶ must have contributed to this view.

No theologian or philosopher ever rebuked sophists so vehemently as Didymus did. One of his passages illustrates the close relation of style and vocabulary between himself and the Scholia.

Didymus, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 36: ἀμέλει γοῦν ἃ φέρουσιν ὄπλα⁴⁷ οὐκ αἰσθητὰ καὶ σωματικά (ἀσθενῇ γὰρ ταῦτα) ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ εἰσιν. καθαιροῦσι γοῦν οἱ χρώμενοι τούτοις τὰς ὀχυρότητας τῶν ἀπατηλῶν λόγων πάνυ σοφιστικῶς κατεσκευασμένων πρὸς τῶν ἑτεροδόξων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ὄντα ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις ὑψώματα κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπαιρόμενα· οἱ γὰρ ἀντιταττόμενοι τῇ γνώσει τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀσεβῇ καὶ ἄθεα δόγματα παρεισάγοντες, τῇ δεινότητι τῶν λόγων φρούρια ὀχυρὰ οἰκοδομοῦντες, ἔνδον

³⁶ Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 6.10.81.1: ἀνίκητος γάρ, φησιν, ἡ ἀλήθεια, ψευδοδοξία δὲ καταλύεται. Ibid. 6.10.81.4: οὐτ’ οὖν διαβολῆς κενῆς οὐδὲ μὴν ψευδοδοξίας τῆς περὶ αὐτόν, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τοὺς πανούργους δεδίζεταί λόγους ὁ διαγνῶναι τούτους δυνάμενος. Ibid. 6.10.82.1: ἔστι γὰρ πάσης πλάνης καὶ ψευδοδοξίας αἴτιον τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι διακρίνειν.

³⁷ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 326: ψευδοδοξία καταλυθῆσονται. *commZacch*, 5.93: πάσης πλανήσεως καὶ ψευδοδοξίας καταλυθείσης.

³⁸ Didymus, *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 228; *commZacch*, 4.31; 5.93; *commPs40–44.4*, Cod. p. 334.

³⁹ Origen, *Cels*, II.27; III.39 (*Philocalia*, 19.2); *homJer*, 19.12; *commMatt*, 17.23; *comm1Cor*, 16; *et passim*.

⁴⁰ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 1.6.35.6: καὶ χρὴ μετιέναι τὸ ἐλεγκτικὸν εἶδος ἕνεκα τοῦ τὰς δόξας τὰς ἀπατηλὰς διακρούεσθαι τῶν σοφιστῶν. Ibid. 6.10.81.4: οὐτ’ οὖν διαβολῆς κενῆς οὐδὲ μὴν ψευδοδοξίας . . . ὡς μὴ καταπατεῖσθαι πρὸς τῶν σοφιστῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

⁴¹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 901. Likewise, *commPs29–34*, Cod. p. 156: σοφιστὰς τινὰς καὶ ἀπατεῶνας. *frPs(al)*, fr. 433: ἐπεὶ οὖν συμβαίνει πολλάκις ὑπὸ δεινῶν σοφιστῶν καταθλάσθαι τὰ ὅσα, ὀνειδίζουσιν οἱ ἀπατεῶνες. *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p. 93–94: ὁ σοφιστὴς καὶ ἀπατεὼν δύναται εἰπεῖν.

⁴² Didymus, *In Genesis*, Cod. p. 96: σοφιστικὴ ἀπάτη. Ibid. Cod. p. 127: τῇ κατ’ ἐκείνων ἀπάτῃ. Τοιοῦτοι δὲ καὶ οἱ σοφισταὶ τυγχάνουσιν. Ibid. Cod. p. 141: σοφιστὴς τις ὢν καὶ διὰ δῆθεν δυνατῶν πιθανότητων ἀπατῶν. *frPs(al)*, fr. 121: τοὺς ἀπατῶν προτιθεμένους διὰ ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, ὅτ’ ἂν δεινοὶ περὶ σοφιστείας ὦσιν. Ibid. fr. 183: στόμα γὰρ ἠνεωγμένον αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ἀρπάσαι τοὺς ἀπατωμένους ὁ σοφιστικὸς εἶη λόγος. Ibid.

fr. 379: ἀλλ’ ὡς ματαίας καὶ ἀπατηλῆς σοφιστείας. Ibid. fr. 1201: τοὺς διὰ σοφιστικῶν λόγων παραπικραίνονταυς, τοὺς τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθρούς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πρὸς τὸ ἀπατᾶν παρασκευῇ λαλεῖσθαι. *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 35: ὅπως μὴ ἀπατηθῶσι πρὸς φενάκων καὶ σοφιστικῶν. *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 231: ἄλλο ἐστὶν τὸ γινῶναι τινα σοφιστὴν, καὶ ἄλλο τὸ καταλαβεῖν αὐτοῦ τὰ σοφίσματα . . . τὸ τὴν ἀπάτην αὐτοῦ φανερώσαι. *commZacch*, 2.327: λυθήσεται πᾶσα ἀπάτην ἔχουσα σοφιστεία. Ibid. 4.119: τὸν γὰρ ἀπατηλὸν καὶ ἐριστικὸν σὺν δόλῳ προφερόμενον λόγον ὑπὸ σοφιστῶν.

⁴³ Plutarch, *Sertorius*, 11.2–3: ἔστι δ’ ἃ καὶ σοφιστικῶς αὐτὸς εἰς ἀπάτην καὶ κήλησιν ἐμηχανᾶτο. *Alexander*, 62.6–7: πολλὰ πρὸς δόξαν ἀπατηλὰ καὶ σοφιστικὰ μηχανώμενος. *Aprophthegmata Laconica*, 229A13: Σοφιστὴς γενόμενος ὁ Λύσανδρος καὶ ἀπάταις πολλὰ ποικίλλων.

⁴⁴ Eusebius, *PE*, 1.3.5: Πρῶτος γέ τοι πάντων ὁ ἱερὸς ἀπόστολος Παῦλος τὰς μὲν ἀπατηλὰς καὶ σοφιστικὰς πιθανολογίας παραιτούμενος. *commPs*, PG.24.36.7–11: οἱ δεινοὶ γὰρ πρὸς ἀπάτην σοφιστικὴν καταπικραίνοντές εἰσιν λαλητοί, τοὺς ὅσοι τῆς ἀληθείας εἰσὶν ἐρασταὶ θέλοντες ἐπὶ ἀπάτης λαλεῖσθαι καὶ ἄδρασθαι, πειράζουσιν τε καὶ παροργίζουν ἔχοντες τὸν σκοπὸν.

⁴⁵ Philo, *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit*, 304: τῶν σοφιστικῶν λόγων διὰ τὸ ἀνεξέλεγκτον.

⁴⁶ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Adversus Julianum Imperatorem*, PG.35.613.18–21: οὕτω κἀκείνων ἔστιν εὐρεῖν, ἄχρι μὲν τινος ἑαυτοῦ κρατοῦντα καὶ τοῦ σοφιστικοῦ δόγματος, ἀπάτη τε διατιθέντα κακῶς τὰ ἡμέτερα. Gregory of Nyssa treats the terms ‘sophist’ and ‘crook’ as virtually synonymous: *De Vita Mosis*, 2.63.

⁴⁷ Cf. *Scholion VI*: ὄπλα δικαίων καὶ βέλῃ ἐκλεκτὰ καὶ μάχαιρα ἐπαινετὴ.

αὐτῶν χωροῦντες, ἡγοῦνται εἶναι ἀκαταμάχητοι. πρὸς τούτοις, ἃ διδασκαλικῶς δῆθεν σὺν φαινομένη ἀποδείξει προφέρουσι μάταιον ὕψος ἔχοντα, ψευδεῖ νοήσει ἐπαίρεται ὡς ἀνωτέρω χωροῦντα τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς γνώμης ὀνομαζομένης ‘γνώσεως θεοῦ’. αὐτὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἀξίοις παρέχει. ἔνεκα γοῦν τοῦ καθαιρῆσαι τὰ προειρημένα ὑψώματα καὶ ὀχυρώματα,

ἐνδυσάμενοι τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ πνεῦμα, τῷ εἰρημένῳ τρόπῳ στρατευόμεθα. διαλύομεν γοῦν τοὺς σοφιστικοὺς αὐτῶν λόγους, καὶ τὰ δόγματα διελέγχομεν. ἀμέλει γοῦν πᾶν νόημα τῶν ἡπατημένων κεκρατημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπατεώνων.⁴⁸

Therefore Cassian wrote this comment following Didymus’ Commentary on the Apocalypse, in all probability word for word.

⁴⁸ Cf. *Scholion XIII*: ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα δηλουμένους ἀπατεῶνας.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XIII

EN XIIIa: ἀνακτέον

In Aristotle, the verbal adjective ἀνακτέον denotes assessing a certain phenomenon by considering it in the context of a higher principle, or according to a wider reasoning.¹ This is how this term was by and large used by subsequent philosophers, most (though not all) of whom were Aristotle's commentators.²

In Plotinus this means 'to assign something to a higher cause', that is, explaining existence or action by means of reference to a higher ontological principle.³ In other words, he retained the Aristotelian meaning.

In the existing writings of Origen, the term appears twice.⁴ Surprising though it may seem, he is the first Christian author to introduce the use of ἀνακτέον in theological exposition. After him, the term crops up rarely, but it is interesting to cite the authors who make up the list.⁵ Didymus made abundant use of it, which points to his Origenistic analogical method.

Didymus, *commJob*(1–4), Cod. pp. 64–65: διόπερ ἀνακτέον αὐτὰ κατὰ τὰ προαποδοθέντα.

commZacch, 1.135: Ἀλληγορηθείσης τῆς Σιών καὶ τῆς θυγατρὸς Βαβυλῶνος, ἀνακτέον καὶ τοὺς ἀνέμους, ἥτοι εἰς δυνάμεις ἀσάρκους⁶ ἢ τοὺς διαφόρους τῆς ψευδωνύμου διδασκαλίας ἀνέμους, κλυδωνίζοντας καὶ περιφέροντας εἰς ἄθεα φρονήματα καὶ ἀβεβαίους πράξεις τοὺς νηπιάζοντας τῇ διανοίᾳ οὐκ ἐπαινετῶς.⁷ Ibid. 1.324: Ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἀδύνατον καθ' ἱστορίαν οὕτω τὰς ἡμέρας κολοβοῦσθαι, ἀνακτέον τὸ εὐαγγελικόν. Ibid. 4.304: Καὶ ταῦτα ἀνακτέον πρὸς τοὺς ἑτερογνομονοῦντας ἐν χριστιανισμῷ. *frPs(al)*, fr. 888: τὸ δὲ Βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν ἀνακτέον ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον.

EN XIIIb: ἱστορικῶς

The adverb ἱστορικῶς ('historically', or, 'in a historical sense') is absent from Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Clement. It occurs, however, in Origen⁸ and

¹ Aristotle, *Sophistici Elenchi*, 168a18: τοὺς φαινομένους συλλογισμοὺς καὶ ἐλέγχους . . . ἀνακτέον εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἐλέγχου ἄγνοιαν, ἀρχὴν ταύτην ποιησαμένων. *De Generatione Animalium*, 778b1: εἰς τὴν ὕλην καὶ τὴν κινήσαν ἀρχὴν ἀνακτέον τὰς αἰτίας.

² Theophrastus, *De Causis Plantarum liber i*, 1.4.6; *ibid.* (*lib. ii–vi*), 3.21.3; 4.5.2; 4.6.7; *Fragmenta*, fr. 5, section 9. Proclus, *Theologia Platonica*, v. 5, p. 69; *De Malorum Subsistentia*, 32. Themistius, *Quae Fertur in Aristotelis Analyticorum Priorum Librum i Paraphrasis*, v. 23.3, p. 150. Damascius, *De Principiis*, v. 1, pp. 89, 301. John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, v.13.1, p. 48; v. 13.1, p. 67; v. 13.1, p. 87; v. 13.1, p. 94; *In Aristotelis Analytica Priora Commentaria*, v. 13.2, p. 324; v. 13.2, p. 358; *In Aristotelis Libros de Generatione et Corruptione Commentaria*, v. 14.2, p. 215; *In Libros de Generatione Animalium Commentaria*, v. 14.3, p. 212; v. 14.3, p. 213; *In Aristotelis Libros de Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, p. 423; *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 16, p. 266; v. 16, p. 483. Olympiodorus, the philosopher of Alexandria, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, pp. 39, 124. David of Alexandria (sixth cent. AD), *In Porphyrii Isagogen Commentarium*, p. 94. Hermias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 21. Asclepius of Tralles, *In Aristotelis Metaphysicorum Libros A–Z Commentaria*, p. 373. Also, the anonymous (written after the seventh century) *Scholia ad Hermogenis Librum Περὶ Στάσεων*, v. 4, p. 756; *Commentarium in Hermogenis Librum Περὶ Στάσεων*, p. 186.

³ Plotinus, *Enneades*, II.3.14: εἰς ἀρετὴν ἀνακτέον καὶ οὕτω τὴν αἰτίαν. VI.1.23: καὶ εἰς ἕξιν αὐτὰ, ὅπου ποτὲ ἡ ἕξις, ἀνακτέον. VI.2.13: καὶ εἰ γένος μὴ ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις, εἰς τι ἀνακτέον τῶν πρώτων ἢ τῶν εἰς τὰ πρῶτα. VI.3.12: εἰς κίνησιν οὖν ὅλως ἀνακτέον, ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν. VI.3.19: εἰς μίαν νόησιν τὴν τοῦ γένους ἀνακτέον. Εἰ δὲ τὸν μὲν ἐρυθρίαν εἰς τὸ ποῖον ἀνακτέον,

τὸν δὲ ἐρυθρὸν μηκέτι, ἐπισκεπτέον. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐρυθραίνεσθαι ὀρθῶς οὐκ ἀνακτέον. VI.25: εἰς ταύτας αὐτὰς ἀνακτέον. VI.3.27: εἰς τι γένος τῶν εἰρημένων ἀνακτέον.

⁴ Origen, *frJohn*, LVII; *commMatt*, 10.16.

⁵ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Adversus Julianum Imperatorem* 1, PG.35.633. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 59; *De Hominis Opificio*, p.160; *In illud: Tunc et Ipse Filius*, p. 28. Evagrius Scholasticus, *HE* (Syria, sixth cent. AD), p. 223. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 92. In Cyril of Alexandria, if indeed he ever used the term at all, this appears only once: *Commentaria in Matthaeum*, fr. 81. I also note the appearance of the term in an anonymous text, *Scholia in Sophisticos Elenchos (excerpta)*, Scholion 169a33 (twice) and section 34.

⁶ Cf. this Scholion: ἀσάρκων τινῶν ψευδομάντεων. Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.19: οἱ μάρτυρες τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ πάντες οἱ καταπαλαίσαντες τοὺς ἀσάρκους ἀντιπάλους. Ibid. 2.203: Πρὸς τοῖς οὕτως ἔχουσιν ἀνθρώποις δι' ὁμοιότητα καὶ θηριωδίαν, καὶ ἄσαρκοι ἀντικείμενοι δυνάμεις. Ibid. 4.3: πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἀλαζόνας καὶ ὑπερηφάνους πιπτομένους ἐν ἀθεμίστῳ εἰδωλολατρείᾳ τῇ πρὸς 'τοὺς ἄρχοντας τούτου τοῦ αἰῶνος'. Ἄσαρκοι αἱ δυνάμεις. Ibid. 4.25: Καὶ τάχα μὲν αἱ ἄσαρκοι πονηραὶ δυνάμεις κέδροι προσαγορεύονται. Ibid. 4.26: Οὗτοι δ' εἰσὶν οἱ ἐπὶ ἀρχῇ ὀγκυλλόμενοι, οὐκ ἀνθρώποι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἄσαρκοι ἄρχοντες τούτου τοῦ αἰῶνος. *frPs(al)*, fr. 62: ἀμαρτωλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἔθνη οὐκ ἀνθρώπους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀσάρκους δυνάμεις ἐκλαβεῖν δεῖ.

⁷ Cf. *Scholion VI*: καὶ μάχαιρα ἐπαινετὴ.

⁸ Origen, *frLam*, fr. 98; *frLuc*, fr. 217; *frPs* 77, 44 (κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν, and the distinction of ἱστορικῶς from πνευματικῶς. So in *excPs*, PG.17.147); *commLuc*, PG.17.333.13 (and *frLuc*, fr. 105). I have canvassed this in *PHE*, pp. 368; 372.

Didymus.⁹ Regarding other authors, it is not as common as one might have expected. It appears only once in Aristotle,¹⁰ then once each in Sextus Empiricus¹¹ and Galen.¹² Of later philosophers commenting on Aristotle, Simplicius¹³ and Syrianus used it rarely.¹⁴ Proclus made an interesting distinction, purporting to consider myths in different ways ‘first, ἱστορικῶς, second, φυσικῶς, third, φιλοσόφως’.¹⁵ The spirit of this classification goes back to Strabo, who while recounting historical facts intermingled them with some edifying tales.¹⁶

This rare usage is all pagan thought made of the adverb ἱστορικῶς. It is with Origen that this adverb enters Christian vocabulary, in order to lay emphasis on the historicity of Christianity.¹⁷

As happened with many of Origen’s points, the adverb ἱστορικῶς did not enjoy much currency among subsequent authors. It was used only once by Athanasius,¹⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus,¹⁹ the historian Socrates,²⁰ and Olympiodorus the deacon of Alexandria,²¹ twice by Eusebius²² and Maximus Confessor,²³ while it occurs only four times in Gregory of Nyssa,²⁴ six times in a specific commentary by Procopius of Gaza,²⁵ but never in Basil of Caesarea. The case of Eustathius of Thessaloniki is unique, since he used the adverb ἱστορικῶς at twenty-four points in his commentaries on Homer. He had to use it, since there was a tradition of allegorizing Homer; hence interpretation had to distinguish between ‘historicity’ and ‘allegory’. The extremely impressive exception is Cyril of Alexandria,

who used the adverb ἱστορικῶς no less than fifty times.²⁶ Finally, which is interesting for this analysis, the adverb ἱστορικῶς is not absent from Theodoret, who put it to use in three different works of his.²⁷

Besides, both Didymus and Theodoret used the expression κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν to mean ‘according to the literal narration’, in contrast with either the anagogical, or allegorical, or tropological interpretation of a scriptural narrative.

Cf. Didymus, using the expression κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν in this sense. *commEccl* (5–6), Cod. p.162: οὐ φαίνεται τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p.227: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. *commZacch*, 2.231: τούτων κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν φανέντων, καιρὸς εἶη τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἀναγωγὴν θεωρῆσαι. Ibid. 2.264: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. Ibid. 4.141: ἀκόλουθον μετὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀνηγμένως νοῆσαι. *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p.14: ὥς κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν βίαιόν τι. *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p.100: οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ πνευματικόν. *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. pp. 108–109: ἵνα κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν λαμβάνωμεν. *commPs29–34*, Cod. p.182: εἰ ἔχει οὖν ἀναγωγὰς ταῦτα, ἄλλα κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν γεγένηται. Ibid. Cod. p. 201: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. Ibid. Cod. p. 202: οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν λέγω. *commPs35–39*, Cod. p. 233: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. *commPs40–44.4*, Cod. p. 337: καὶ τὸ μὲν κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν λημπτέον, τὸ δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. *frPs(al)*, fr. 844: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. Ibid. fr. 845: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. Ibid. fr. 1002: κατὰ

⁹ Didymus, *commJob* (5.1–6.29), Cod. p. 144: τὰ οἰονεῖ ἱστορικῶς ἀπαγγελλόμενα. *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p. 66: τὰ ἐξῆς οὐκέτι ἱστορικῶς δύναται ληφθῆναι. *commPs29–34*, Cod. p.189: ἀμέλει γοῦν εἴ τις ἱστορικῶς ἀνεγράφη. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1286: Οὐκ ἄγνοῶ δὲ ὥς τινες τῶν ἐξηγησαμένων ἱστορικῶς ἔλαβον τὴν ἐρμηνείαν. *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p.308: ἔχομεν δὲ ἱστορικῶς τοῦτο.

¹⁰ Aristotle, *De Generatione Animalium*, 757b35.

¹¹ Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhoniae Hypotyposes*, 1.4.

¹² Galen, *Ad Pisonem*, v. 14, p. 275.

¹³ Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 9, p. 3.

¹⁴ Syrianus (fifth cent. AD), *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 103.

¹⁵ Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 1, pp. 109, 144. *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 1, p. 144: ἱστορικῶς, suggests literal narration of historical facts.

¹⁶ Strabo, *Geographica*, 1.1.10: συγγνοίη δ’ ἂν καὶ εἰ μυθώδη τινὰ προσπέλεκται τοῖς λεγομένοις ἱστορικῶς καὶ διδασκαλικῶς καὶ οὐ δεῖ μέμφεσθαι.

¹⁷ Cf. *PHE*, chapters 10 and 11.

¹⁸ Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.465.43.

¹⁹ Gregory of Nazianzus, *In Sanctum Pascha*, PG.36.636.30.

²⁰ Socrates, *HE*, 5.22.

²¹ Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Job*, p. 2.

²² Eusebius, *DE*, 9.1.12; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.28.

²³ Maximus Confessor, *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, 27; *De Caritate*, 2.31.

²⁴ Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 2.1.255; *De Vita Mosis*, 2.320; *De Oratione*, p. 238; *In Hexameron*, pp. 76 and 113.

²⁵ Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, pp. 2332, 2432, 2484, 2505, 2513, 2633. However, Procopius actually quotes from authors who had composed commentaries on Isaiah. Also in the *Anonymi Dialogus cum Judaeis*, chapter 6, line 136. In Pseudo-Didymus (=Cassian the Sabaite), *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), PG.39.672 the distinction between ὁρατῶς and νοητῶς, as well as between ἱστορικῶς and πνευματικῶς, is made.

²⁶ Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1: pp. 27, 28, 31, 34, 35, 40, 68, 72, 78, 96, 353, 445, 725; v. 2, pp. 25, 95, 98, 101, 226, 243, 303, 340, 435. *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, p. 154; *De Adoratione*, PG.68.393.43; *GlaphPent*, PG.69: 16.8; 37.32; 60.3; 192.29; 261.34; *expPs*, PG.69.833.45; *In Isaiam*, PG.70: 192.16; 277.11; 305.29; 329.54; 333.14; 360.41; 361.3; 377.19; 388.42; 436.16; 604.55; 645.57; 689.30; 692.27; 861.18; 905.8; 953.54; 1125.23; 1145.9 and 18.

²⁷ Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 78; *intDan*, PG.81.1532.9; *intProphXII*, PG.81.1836.33.

τὴν ἱστορίαν. Ibid. fr. 1059: καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῆς γραφῆς ἱστορίαν. In *Genesin*, Cod. p. 64: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. *commPs36.15–19*, Cod. p. 249: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. The specific form of the expression κατ’ ἱστορίαν occurs in Didymus alone: *commZacch*, 1.324; *ibid.* 2.147; 3.295; 4.274; In *Genesin*, Cod. pp. 81 and 210.

Theodoret made use of the expression κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν in like manner. *Eranistes*, p.126: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν . . . κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 269: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν οὕτω. *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.916.26: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. *intProphXII*, PG.81.1636.44: τροπικῶς καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. Ibid. PG.81.1636.44: κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν. Ibid. PG.81.1668.2: ταῦτα δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν μὲν συνέβη . . . παραδηλοῖ δὲ ὁμῶς διὰ τούτων καὶ ἕτερα.

Hence, the use of the adverb in this Scholion is all too natural. Once again, Cassian realized that both Antioch and Alexandria used the notion in the same sense.

EN XIIIc: The sophists are ἀπατεῶνες (‘charlatans’)

This Scholion is in fact a supplement to [Scholion XII](#). Whereas the previous one was a plain quotation from Didymus by Cassian, now it is Cassian himself speaking. He follows Didymus, who identifies ‘sophists’ (which is to be understood not in the strict historical sense, but as a wholesale designation of pagan philosophy put in the service of Christian heresy) with ‘charlatans’ (ἀπατεῶνας). His vocabulary reveals that he is the author of the present comment, and the following passage is a sign that Didymus’ language imbues the Scholia.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 649a: Ὡς περ τὰ πεμπόμενα νηπίων βέλη²⁸ οὐδὲ μέχρις ἀμυγῆς πλήττει τι τιτρώσκοντα,²⁹ οὕτω καὶ τῶν παρεσκευασμένων σοφιστῶν³⁰ ἐντεινάντων πρᾶγμα πικρὸν κεχώρηκε κατ’ αὐτῶν ἢ λώβῃ καὶ αἰ γλώσσαι³¹ ἡσθένησαν δ’ αὐτῶν, τουτέστιν οἱ λόγοι, ὥς μηδὲ κατὰ ποσὸν βαλεῖν δύνασθαι τὸν ἀναλαμβάνοντα τὸν

τῆς πίστεως θυρεόν. Θεωροῦντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὰ προειρημένα, οἱ πάλοι δεινότητα ἑαυτοῖς μαρτυροῦντες, ἐταράχθησαν, οὐκέτι μένοντες ἐν αἷς ἔσχον ὑπὸ τῶν σοφιστῶν ἠπατημέναις δόξαις, φόβον ἐσχηκότες διὰ τὸ τοιούτοις ἀσεβέσι δόγμασιν³² συγκατατεθεῖσθαι. μαθόντες γὰρ ἦσαν παρ’ αὐτῶν ὥς οὐκ εἶη πρόνοια ὥς ἐκ ταυτομάτου φέρονται τὰ πάντα. καὶ πρὸς ἄλλων ἀπατεῶνων³³ ἕτεροι συναρπαγέντες, φύσει ἀγαθοὺς καὶ κακοὺς ἀνθρώπους παρεδέξαντο καὶ προσέτι ὥς εἰμαρμένης πρυτανευούσης. τούτων κλονηθεισῶν τῶν ψευδοδοξίων³⁴ ἐν τῷ ταραττεσθαι αὐτοῦς, ἀληθῆ φανέρωσιν ἔσχον ὥς εἶη θεὸς ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων καὶ προνοητής.

Likewise, in the same collection, *frPs(al)*, fr. 433: ἐπεὶ οὖν συμβαίνει πολλάκις ὑπὸ δεινῶν σοφιστῶν καταθλᾶσθαι τὰ ὁστᾶ, ὀνειδίζουσιν οἱ ἀπατεῶνες. fr. 629: εἴτ’ ἐπεὶ μὴ βίᾳ ἐλκῦσαι εἰς κακίαν δύνανται οἱ ἐπικείμενοι ἀπατεῶνες, οὐκ Ἀπόσαντο εἶπε τὴν τιμὴν μου, ἀλλ’ Ἐβουλεύσαντο ἀπόσασθαι. Ibid. fr. 648a: πῶς γὰρ οὐχ ὑποῦται θεὸς δι’ ἀγίων ἀνδρῶν, τῆς πλάνης λυομένης τῶν ἀπατεῶνων; Μέγα ἐφρόνουν ἐπὶ γοητεία καὶ σοφιστεία οἱ Αἰγύπτου φαρμακοὶ καὶ ἐπασιδοί. Ibid. fr. 1108: Πολλῶν ἀπατεῶνων ἀπονενοημένων κατὰ τῶν ἐντολῶν σου καὶ μύρια ὅσα πρὸς διαβολὴν αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνατροπὴν δῆθεν λεγόντων, ἀδικία πολλὴ ἐπ’ ἐμὲ γεγένηται. ὁμῶς δὲ εἰ καὶ δεινὰ ἐδόκουν λέγειν ἃ τοὺς ἀνερματίστους ἀποστήσαι. Ibid. fr. 1220: Ἄνθρωπος πονηρὸς ὁ δολερὸς καὶ ἀπατεῶν ἐστίν, ἀνὴρ δὲ ἄδικος ὁ τοῦτον ὑπερاناβεβηκὼς ἐν κακία ὥς διὰ τοῦ πανουργεῦσθαι καὶ ῥαδιουργεῖν ἀδικεῖν σπεύδειν τὴν λογικὴν φύσιν ἐξ ἀρετῆς εἰς κακίαν πανουργίᾳ τινὶ πειρώμενος.

commZacch, 4.199: Οἱ ἀπατεῶνες ἄνθρωποι συνιστάμενοι ἐριστικοῖς λόγοις ‘ψευδεῖς ἵπποι εἰς σωτηρίαν’ ὑπάρχουσιν, ἀναβάτας καὶ ἐπιβάτας ἔχοντες τὰ πλάνα πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγους δαίμονας, ὧν πρεσβεύουσι τὴν διδασκαλίαν, προφερόμενοι ‘σοφίαν τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτοῦ’.

²⁸ Cf. [Scholion VI](#): οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτῶν ὄπλα καὶ βέλη καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν μάχαιρα ὀξεῖα . . . πάντων υἱῶν ἀνθρώπων στρατευομένων τῶν μὲν τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, τῶν δὲ τῷ πονηρῷ καὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ.

²⁹ Cf. [Scholion VI](#): οἱ μὲν γὰρ φαῦλοι τιτρώσκουσι μαχαίρα.

³⁰ Cf. [Scholion XII](#): τὰς τῶν ἑτεροδόξων σοφιστικὰς ἀπάτας.

³¹ Cf. [Scholion VI](#): γλώσσαι δὲ σοφῶν ἰῶνται.

³² [Scholion VI](#): οἱ μὲν οὖν φαῦλοι μελετήσαντες ὑπὲρ τῶν ψευδῶν δογμάτων τὸν νοῦν ἱκανῶς ἠκόνησαν ὥς μάχαιραν ὀξεῖαν ἐπὶ κακῷ τῶν ἀκούοντων. [Scholion XXXVI](#): διὰ τὴν μεγαλοφονίαν τῶν νοημάτων καὶ δογμάτων αὐτῶν.

³³ Cf. [Scholion XIII](#): ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα δηλουμένους ἀπατεῶνας.

³⁴ Cf. [Scholion XII](#): καὶ τὰς τῶν φρονημάτων ψευδοδοξίας.

*commPs*22–26.10, Cod. p. 93: ὁ σοφιστὴς καὶ ἀπατεῶν δύναται εἰπεῖν ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ παιδίον οὐδὲ τὸ ἄλογον οὐδὲ τὸ ἄψυχον ἔπορεύθη ἐν βουλῇ ἁσεβῶν καὶ ἐν ὁδῷ ἁμαρτωλῶν οὐκ ἔστι·

*commPs*29–34, Cod. p. 138: ἐχθροὶ πολλοί, ἀπατεῶνές τινες, ἐσκεύασάν μοι παγίδα, ἵνα με θηρεύσουσιν. Ibid. Cod. p. 156: εἶρηκεν γὰρ καὶ ἀνθρώπους ταραττοντας αὐτούς, σοφιστάς τινας καὶ ἀπατεῶνας· τούτους ὑπερηφάνους εἶπεν.

Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios, p. 18: ἐπεὶ ἐκ κατηχήσεως ἡμῶν τῇ πίστει προσεληλύθατε, ὥσπερ ἐδιδάξαμεν οὕτω καὶ ὑπομιμήσκομεν, ὅπως ἐμμένετε ἢ κατωρθώσατε πίστει. κἂν γὰρ τινες ἐκλονήθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπατεῶνων, ἀλλ' οὖν θαρρῶ ὡς ἐστήκατε ἐν ἡ παρελάβετε πίστει, ὄντες ἐν αὐτῇ βέβαιοι. Ibid. p. 19: ἀλλ' ὅρα μή τις, ἀπεκδεχόμενος τὸ βούλημα τοῦ ἀποστόλου, δόξη φαῦλον εἶναι τὸ γνῶσιν ἔχειν τῶν σατανικῶν νοημάτων· βλαπτικὸν γὰρ ἦκιστα τὸ τοιοῦτον, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὠφελητικόν. τὸ γὰρ εἰδέναι τὴν νόησιν καὶ προαίρεσιν οὐ ποιεῖ κακόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ αἰρεῖσθαι. ἀμέλει γοῦν καὶ τοὺς ἐλέγχειν τοὺς ἀπατεῶνας προαιρουμένους, εἰδόμενος τὰ τῆς ἀπάτης ἐκείνων οὐ μεμφόμεθα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ ἀποδεχόμεθα. οὐ γὰρ τὸ εἰδέναι, ἀλλὰ τὸ προαιρεῖσθαι τὰ φαῦλα κακοὺς ποιεῖ. ἴσμεν τοιγαροῦν τὰ νοήματα τοῦ σατανᾶ, οὐχ ὅπως ἐνεργῶμεν κατ' αὐτά, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἀπατώμενοι παγιδευθῶμεν. Ibid. p. 37: διαλύομεν γοῦν τοὺς σοφιστικούς αὐτῶν λόγους, καὶ τὰ δόγματα διελέγχομεν. ἀμέλει γοῦν πᾶν νόημα τῶν ἡπατημένων κεκρατημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπατεῶνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνατραφέν ἐν χώρᾳ τῇ ἐκείνων αἰχμαλωτίζοντες φέρομεν πρὸς τὸ ὑπακοῦσαι τῷ Χριστῷ. Ibid. οὕτω δὲ σκοπήσασιν ὑμῖν

γνωσθήσονται οἱ ἀπατεῶνες οὓς καὶ ἐκβαλεῖτε. Ibid. p. 39: Οὐ γὰρ μισοῦντες τοῦτο πράττομεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἐκκόψωμεν πᾶσαν πρόφασιν τῶν ποθούντων ἀφορμὰς εὐρίσκειν διαβολῆς, ἵνα κἂν αὐχεῖν δοκῶσι τὸ μὴ λαμβάνειν τι παρά τινος οἱ ἀπατεῶνες, εὐρεθῶσιν ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς. οὐ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ὡς ἐκεῖνοι, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ ὡς ἡμεῖς εὐρεθήσονται.

In Genesin, Cod. p. 134: ἐν μεταγνώσει γενέσθαι δεύτερος ἂν εἴη λιμήν, ὅπερ οἰκονομῶν ὁ Θεὸς διὰ διδασκαλίας διεγείρει πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὑποπεσεῖν τῷ ἀπατεῶνι.

EN XIIIId: κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν

Although we find Cyril of Alexandria using the expression ἱστορικῶς many times, he hardly employed the expression κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν ('according to anagogical exegesis'). He likewise failed to use the crucial term ἀνακτέον.³⁵ By contrast, Didymus is once again prominently present.

The expression κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν was introduced in Christian vocabulary (and indeed in all philosophical and theological accounts) by Origen,³⁶ who is the master of anagogical exegesis. This suggests the *method* through which a narrative or statement can be recognized as an allegory and be interpreted subsequently.³⁷ Of Origen's followers, it was Didymus who used the expression and method most faithfully, whereas this is remarkably absent from authors such as Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus. Once again, the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam* is the work where the expression κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν is put to use.³⁸

Eusebius employed the expression once,³⁹ so did Epiphanius of Salamis,⁴⁰ Cyril of Alexandria,⁴¹ and Maximus Confessor.⁴² Gregory of Nyssa used Origen's

³⁵ This appears only in Cyril's *expPs*, PG.69.768.1, and in a spurious work ascribed to him: *Collectio Dictionum Veteris Testamenti*, PG.77.1216.38.

³⁶ Origen, *commJohn*, VI.4.22: τὰς κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν ἀλληγορίας τῶν ἀναγεγραμμένων. *homJer*, 15.2: πρῶτον γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ προφητικοῦ λόγου ἴδωμεν, εἴτα καὶ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν, ἔαν πρότερον ἀναλάβωμεν εὐτονίαν καὶ ἐλευθερίαν καὶ δύναμιν καὶ παρρησίαν προφήτου. *Commentariorum Series in Evangelium Matthaei* (Mt. 22.34–27.63), p. 83: (βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως) κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν ἐτερόδοξος λόγος καὶ ἁσεβὲς δόγμα. *commMatt*, 10.23: κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν τὸν τόπον ἐξεταστέον. *frPs*, 77, 19–25 (and *excPs*, PG.17.141.4): Λυπεῖ δὲ οὐδὲν καὶ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν τὰς ἱστορίας ταύτας θεωρήσαι. *selEz*, PG.13.816.36–37: Αἱ παραβολαὶ οὐ κατὰ τὰ πράγματα ἀκούονται, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν.

³⁷ *PHE*, pp. 29; 108; 367; 368.

³⁸ *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 5.152: δυνατὸν δὲ τῷ φιλοπόνῳ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἄγειν τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς προφητείας χρήσιμον. Didymus does not use the term φιλόπονος. In *DT* (*lib.* 2.8–27) this appears only once, PG.39.633.28. Theodoret uses κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν frequently, which also Eusebius does.

³⁹ Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.1352.45.

⁴⁰ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 376: οὐχ ὅμοιος ὁ εἰς λόγος τοῖς πᾶσι λόγοις, οὐδὲ ὁ εἰς υἱὸς τοῖς πᾶσι κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν κικλησκομένοις ἴσος.

⁴¹ Cyril of Alexandria, *expPs*, PG.69.768.1: Νοητέον δὲ ταῦτα καὶ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν.

⁴² Maximus Confessor, *Mystagogia*, 6: Ὡς περ δὲ τῇ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν θεωρίᾳ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἔλεγεν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι πνευματικόν, μυστικὴν δὲ Ἐκκλησίαν τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

expression only twice,⁴³ and so did Procopius of Gaza.⁴⁴ Eustathius of Thessaloniki also uses the phrase twice. We come upon it once again in the anonymous work *Dialogus contra Iudaeos*.⁴⁵

The use of *κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν* by Cyril of Alexandria parallels his use of *ἱστορικῶς*. In the first case, we saw Cyril of Alexandria using *ἱστορικῶς* almost obsessively, while Didymus made a conscious, recurrent, yet reasonable use of it. In the second case, we see the prolix John Chrysostom reproducing the expression *κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν* to an excessive extent (amounting in no less than thirty-four instances), while Didymus used it to a reasonable extent. Besides, there is a crucial point which shows Chrysostom and Didymus using the expression in a different spirit, despite Chrysostom's flowery speech and profuse employment of this phraseology: Didymus uses *κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν* in contrast to *κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν* ('according to the literal narration'), which means that the term was used within a specific framework of exegetical method. On the other hand, despite frequent reference to *κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν*,⁴⁶ Chrysostom never made such a distinction. In fact, he did not use this expression within the context of any exegetical method: rather, he employed it as a stylistic embellishment. This is clear from the fact that in his voluminous work, and in stark contrast to the phrase *κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν*, the expression *κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν* is almost absent.⁴⁷ Even so, however, the expression *κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν* has no bearing on the philosophy of History, as was the case in Origen and Didymus. In the latter, we have a use of the

expression *κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν* that is more or less commensurate with *κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν*.⁴⁸

One could not of course expect extensive usage of this expression by Cassian, nor indeed by any other theologian of the Antiochene school. However, the star of Antioch, namely Theodoret, did use the idea of anagogical interpretation, and the term is indeed present in his work. What is more, for all his rare employment of *ἀναγωγή*, he is conscious that this is a technical term indicating a specific grasp of scripture.⁴⁹ Hence he contrasted it with the 'literal narrative' (*ὅσον πρὸς ἱστορίαν*),⁵⁰ which is a distinction never made by Chrysostom, as just discussed. Here then is Didymus' use of the phrase *κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν*.

In Genesin, Cod. p. 23: ταῦτα πάντα κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν θεωρεῖται.

commJob(5.1–6.29), Cod. pp. 137–8: τοῦ λόγου κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν ἔχοντος τὸ ἀναντίρρητον.

commZacch, 1.110: Τριχῶς τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ πολλάκις ἀποδοθείσης κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν, τῆς τε ἐναρέτου ψυχῆς καὶ 'τῆς ἐνδόξου Ἐκκλησίας στίλον ἢ ῥυτίδα οὐκ ἐχούσης', διὰ ἀγιότητος πληρότητα καὶ τῆς ἐπουρανίου τοῦ ζῶντος Θεοῦ πόλεως. Ibid. 1.173: οἱ θεοὶ προφητὰι νέφη κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν προσαγορευόμενοι. Ibid. 2.205: τῶν κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν πνευματικῶς Αἰγυπτίων καὶ Βαβυλωνίων. Ibid. 4.261: Καταβὰς γὰρ εἰς τὸν πειρασμὸν τοῦ βίου, χεῖμαρρον κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν ὀνομαζόμενον. Ibid. 4.273: Καὶ ἐπεὶ μὴ κατὰ μόνην ἱστορίαν ἄνδρες γυναικῶν διαφέρουσιν τῷ τὰς μὲν τίκτειν τοὺς δὲ γεννᾶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν. Ibid. 5.44:

⁴³ Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 3.1.27: καὶ τοῖς προδῆλοις εἶναι δοκοῦσιν ἢ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν θεωρία. *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 144: ἡ δὲ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν θεωρία τῆς προεξητασμένης ἔχεται διανοίας.

⁴⁴ Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2468: Κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν δέ, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Σωτῆρα τὴν τῶν δικαίων πηγὴν. Ibid. p. 2612: Δι' οὗ, κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν, ληψόμεθα τὸν διάβολον τὸν τῶν κακῶν χορηγόν.

⁴⁵ The expression *κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν*, in *Dialogus contra Iudaeos*, 2.4 (line 4).

⁴⁶ Cf. the expression *κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν* in John Chrysostom. *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55: 84.19; 116.53; 117.17; 126.45; 130.23; 171.14; 171.17; 173.34; 194.4; 206.57; 208.55; 217.59; 269.3; 278.1; 303.45; 317.54; 325.36; 327.11; 334.34; 335.11; 335.47; 358.15; 444.29; 450.27; 483.2; 483.15; 484.15; 494.23; *In Sanctum Matthaeum*, PG.57.355.5; *In Epistolam ad Ephesios*, PG.62.165.39; *Fragmenta in Job*, PG.64.653.18; *In Job*, p. 196. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Psalmum 118*, PG.55.680.24; *Synopsis Scripturae* PG.56.377.36.

⁴⁷ Cf. the expression *κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν* in John Chrysostom. *In Genesin Sermones*, PG.54.535.53; *In Epistolam ad Romanos Commentarius*, PG.60.438.34. Also, in spurious works. Pseudo-

John Chrysostom, *In Psalmos 101–107*, PG.55: 654.52; 660.3; *In Sanctum Pascha (sermo 7)*, 29.

⁴⁸ Cf. *κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν* (or *καθ' ἱστορίαν*) in Didymus: *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 14; *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 67; *commEccl* (5–6), Cod. pp. 162, 171; *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 227; *commZacch*, 2.147 (τῶν οὕτως ἐχόντων καθ' ἱστορίαν, μάλιστα δὲ κατ' ἀναγωγὴν); 2.231; 2.264; 2.295 (πρὸς τὴν ἀναγωγὴν, καὶ καθ' ἱστορίαν ὑπαρχθῆναι δύναται); *commPs*20–21, Cod. pp. 7, 39; *commPs*22–26.10, Cod. pp. 100, 108; *commPs*29–34, Cod. pp. 200, 201, 202, *commPs*35–39, Cod. p. 233; *commPs*36.15–19, Cod. p. 249; *commPs*40–44.4, Cod. pp. 330, 337; *frPs(al)*, frs. 844, 845, 1002; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 64; 81; 210.

⁴⁹ Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 250: Τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀναγωγῆς νόημα σαφῶς ἡμᾶς ἐδίδαξεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπόστολος. καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ πρόχειρον εὐσεβές. Notice the expression τὸ πρόχειρον, which points to a literal understanding of the scriptural text. This is precisely how the term is used in the Scholia. [Scholion III](#): μὴ προχείρως ἀκούειν. [Scholion XXV](#): μὴ κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον ταῦτα γεγράφθαι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κεκρυμμένον.

⁵⁰ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.949.17–19: Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὅσον πρὸς ἱστορίαν, τὴν δὲ ἀναγωγὴν ἰσχυροτέραν ἐξετάσωμεν.

ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν τούτων οὐδαμῶς μετέσχον, ἀλλὰ γε κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν καὶ υἱοὺς καὶ οἰωνοὺς ἔσχον, εὐλογηθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῇ Σιών.

commEccl (1.1–8), Cod. p. 12: κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν δὲ λέγομεν τοῦτο· πολλαχοῦ τῶν θείων παιδευμάτων ἑτέρως λέγεται ἢ 'γενεά'. Ibid. Cod. p. 37: καὶ ὅτι εἰσὶν 'ξύλα' τοιαῦτα κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν πολλαὶ εἰσὶν διδάσκουσαι γραφαί. Ibid. Cod. p. 38: λαμβανέτω δὲ ἡμῖν ὁ Ἰωάννης κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν 'φωνή' ἢ λέξεις τῶν γραφῶν τῶν παλαιῶν. ἢ γὰρ διάνοια αὐτῶν ὁ 'βοῶν' λόγος ἐστίν. προτρέπει οὖν ἡ 'φωνή' αἰεὶ τοῦ λόγου.

commEccl (5–6), Cod. p. 162: ἐὰν κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν, τοῦτο λέγει.

commEccl (9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 309: λοιπὸν κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν λαμβάνεις τὴν τοιάνδε πολιτείαν 'πόλιν' ἢ ἐπαινετὴν ἢ ψεκτὴν εἶναι.

commEccl (11–12), Cod. p. 325: ἵνα 'ὁστᾶ τῆς κυοφοροῦσης' κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν τὰ ἰσχυρὰ δόγματα λάβῃς. Ibid. Cod. p. 316: δεῖ οὖν πρὸς διάνοιαν μόνην καὶ ἀναγωγὴν τὴν λέξιν ταύτην λαβεῖν.

commPs 20–21, Cod. p. 7: εἰρήκαμεν κατ' ἱστορίαν τὸν Δαυίδ, κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἐκ τῆς Μαρίας.

commPs 22–26.10, Cod. p. 97: κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν, οἱ αὐχοῦντες μεγάλοι καὶ ἄνδρες ὄντες, σκανδαλίζοντες δὲ τοὺς μικροὺς τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, 'ἄνδρες αἱμάτων' εἰσίν.

commPs 40–44.4, Cod. p. 309: τὸν δὲ ὄλεθρον τῶν ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν λάβε θάνατον ἀνθρώπων ἢ ποιῶν καὶ ἀποβολὴν τῆς ζωῆς, καθ' ἣν ἔθνη ἦσαν ἀλλότρια τοῦ θεοῦ. Ibid. Cod. p. 330: μεταβεβληκέναι λέγεται οὐ κατ' ἱστορίαν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν. Ibid. Cod. p. 337: καὶ τὸ μὲν κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν λημπτέον, τὸ δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν τὸ περὶ τῶν ἀκολάστων.

frPs(al), fr. 155: πρὸς τῇ λέξει νοήσεις κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν, ὅτι ὁ ἥλιος τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐκ παστοῦ τῶν κόλπων τῶν πατρικῶν ἐκπορευόμενος κατὰ τὸ *Ἐγὼ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἦκω*, ἐκπορεύεται. Ibid. fr. 808: Πητέον δὲ καὶ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν ὥδε ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἔνθα πολλὴ ἐπικρατεῖ ἄγνοια τῶν πραγμάτων. Ibid. fr. 817: Κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν δὲ γείτονας ἔρεῖς τοὺς αἰρετικούς. Ibid. fr. 995: Καὶ κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν δὲ νοήσεις τὰ ἀρτίως ἀποδοθέντα ὄρη. Ibid. fr. 1011: Κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν δὲ νοήσεις ὡς

ἕκαστος τῶν ἐν ταύταις ταῖς φυλαῖς, ὑγείαν καὶ σθένος ἔχων, ἐρεῖ *Πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντι με*. Ibid. fr. 1176: Κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν δὲ νοήσεις οὕτως. Ibid. fr. 1235: Κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν δὲ ἡ κακία καὶ ἡ δυσσεβεία πᾶσα ὥσπερ φρουρά τις ἔνδον τὰς ψυχὰς περιλαβοῦσα κατεῖχεν.

EN XIIIe: περὶ ἀσάρκων τινῶν ψευδομάντεων

Didymus stressed the anagogical sense in which 'charlatans' should be considered as instruments of the adverse power. Hence his insistence on the term ἄσαρκος ('not consisting of flesh', 'incorporeal'). He applies the adjective to anyone living outside the human condition, but he applies it especially to the devil and all daemonic powers. Here he has close affinity with this Scholion.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.135: ἀνακτέον καὶ τοὺς ἀνέμους, ἥτοι εἰς δυνάμεις ἀσάρκους ἢ τοὺς διαφόρους τῆς ψευδωνύμου διδασκαλίας ἀνέμους, κλυδωνίζοντας καὶ περιφέροντας εἰς ἄθεα φρονήματα καὶ ἀβεβαίους πράξεις τοὺς νηπιάζοντας τῇ διανοίᾳ οὐκ ἐπαινετῶς.

Ibid. 2.19: οἱ μάρτυρες τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ πάντες οἱ καταπαλαίσαντες τοὺς ἀσάρκους ἀντιπάλους, ὑπὸ πόδα λαβόντες τοὺς πρὸς οὓς τὴν πάλιν εἶχον καλουμένους 'ἀρχάς, ἐξουσίας, κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου, πνευματικὰς πονηρίας'.

Ibid. 2.203: Πρὸς τοῖς οὕτως ἔχουσιν ἀνθρώποις δι' ὁμότητα καὶ θηριωδίαν καὶ ἄσαρκοι ἀντικείμενα δυνάμεις, ἀπανθρώπως ἐξηγριωμένοι κατὰ τῶν ἐαλωκότων αἰχμαλώτων, Ἀσσύριοι καὶ Βαβυλώνιοι Αἰγύπτιοί τε κατ' ἀναγωγὴν τυγχάνουσιν.

Ibid. 3.186–192: Εἴρηται γοῦν ἐν ἑβδομηκοστῷ καὶ ἑβδόμῳ Ψαλμῷ περὶ πολεμίων σατανικῶν δυνάμεων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἑτεροδόξων.

Ibid. 4.3 (amidst lacunae): Ἄσαρκοι αἱ δυνάμεις.

Ibid. 4.25: Καὶ τάχα μὲν αἱ ἄσαρκοι πονηραὶ δυνάμεις κέδροι προσαγορεύονται, πιτύων ὀνομαζομένων τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐνεργουμένων ἀνθρώπων, ἑτεροδόξων καὶ σοφῶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου καὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος.

Ibid. 4.26: οἱ ἐπὶ ἀρχῇ ὀγκυλλόμενοι, οὐκ ἄνθρωποι μόνοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἄσαρκοι ἄρχοντες τούτου τοῦ αἰῶνος.

commPs 40–44.4, Cod. pp. 311–312: ἔχω μὲν τόξον⁵¹

⁵¹ Cf. *Scholia VI* and *XXXI*.

θέλω θεὸν σύμμαχον καὶ πρόμαχόν μου γενέσθαι, ἵν' ἰσχύν . . . δυνηθῶ βαλεῖν πρὸς οὓς πέμπω μου τὰ βέλη, καὶ ἵνα ἡ ῥομφαία μου καιρίως . . . ἀντιδίκους. ἀόρατοι δὲ εἰσιν οὗτοι.

frPs(al), fr. 62: ἁμαρτωλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἔθνη οὐκ ἀνθρώπους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀσάρκους δυνάμεις ἐκλαβεῖν δεῖ.

Ibid. fr.121: δυνατοὺς δὲ ἐχθροὺς ἐξ ὧν ρύεται ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἀοράτους ῥητέον, τάχα δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν ὑπεροχαῖς ἀνθρώπους καὶ τοὺς ἀπατᾶν προτιθεμένους διὰ ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, ὅτ' ἂν δεινοὶ περὶ σοφιστεῖαν ᾧσιν.

In Christian literature, reference is rarely made to 'discarnate daemons', who pronounce 'fake predictions'. All of these references occur in Didymus,⁵² Cyril, and Theodoret. The notion of 'falsely-prophesying daemons' (ψευδομάντεις δαίμονες) appears only in Theodoret,⁵³ Cyril of Alexandria,⁵⁴ and in a text ascribed to John Chrysostom relating the vision of Daniel. As discussed in the following note, the word ψευδομάντις is characteristically used by Cyril at scores of points. Didymus employs this extensively, too, though not as much as Cyril.

Finally, there is a relevant passage showing that the

author of *De Trinitate*, namely Cassian the Sabaite,⁵⁵ is the sole Christian author to use a specific quotation from Homer, which is indicative of his erudition.⁵⁶

EN XIIIff: ψευδομάντεις ('false diviners')

This is an interesting term to explore. It does not occur in either Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Clement, or Origen, but it does in Didymus, who used it after Plutarch,⁵⁷ as he did with the expression σοφιστική ἀπάτη in *Scholion XII*. Before Didymus, the term appears in Athenagoras, but he actually quoted from Aeschylus.⁵⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus used it once,⁵⁹ but Cyril of Alexandria was obsessed with the term (with no fewer than sixty-six instances). Nevertheless, what is interesting in him is that at two points he identifies ψευδομάντεις with 'daemons'.

Therefore, the term had not been part of the Christian vocabulary before Didymus,⁶⁰ who would have taken it either from the rare usage in Greek tragedy,⁶¹ Herodotus,⁶² and Plutarch,⁶³ with Dionysius of Halicarnassus being also a possible source for him.⁶⁴

Another author who used the term, and was in all probability earlier than Didymus, is Heliodorus, a

⁵² Didymus, *commZach*, 4.290-1: Διὸ ταῦτα ἐκλαμβάνεσθω περὶ δαιμόνων προσπεπαταλωμένων τοῖς ἀψύχοις ἀγάλασιν. Ὁλεθρευομένων τῶν εἰδώλων ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ἐξαίρονται ἀπ' αὐτῆς οἱ ψευδομάντεις καὶ ἀπαξιαπλῶς οἱ πρόγνωσιν ψευδῆ ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, ψευδοπροφητῆται ἐν δίκῃ ὑπὸ τῆς θείας παιδεύσεως καλούμενοι, τοῦτο αὐτὸ σὺν αὐτοῖς πεισομένου καὶ τοῦ ἀκαθάρτου πνεύματος. Πῶς γὰρ τὴν ἐξ ἀσεβείας ἀκαθαρσίαν οὐκ ἔχει τὸ τῶν μάντεων καὶ οἰωνοσκοποῦντων πνεῦμα; *Ibid.* 4.286: τὸ τῆς κἀδὲ τὰ ἀναπλάσματα τῶν ἑτεροδόξων, τροπικῶς εἶδωλα καλούμενα, δλοθρευθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, οὐκ ἀπατωμένων ἔτι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐλεγχθείσης τῆς τροπικῆς εἰδωλολατρείας ὑπὸ τῆς φανερωθείσης ἀληθείας καὶ ἀναιρεθείσης πάσης ψευδοῦς προφητείας καὶ τοῦ ἐνεργούντος αὐτὴν ἀκαθάρτου πνεύματος, τυγχάνοντος ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ πρὸ τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν πίστεως.

⁵³ Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.557.31-32: Ἐκεῖ γὰρ καὶ τὸν ψευδομάντιν ἐκ τινος κόρης ἐξήλασε δαίμονα.

⁵⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 524: τῶν ψευδομάντεων ἦτοι δαιμονίων. *De Adoratione*, PG.68.425.19: ψευδομαντεῖαι, καὶ δαιμονιώδεις φενακισμοί. *In Isaiam*, PG.70.944.28: ψευδομαντεῖαι πανταχοῦ, καὶ δαιμονίων φενακισμοί. *Ibid.* PG.70.848.18: ψευδομαντεῖαι τε ἦσαν, καὶ ψευδηγοῖαι δαιμονίων.

⁵⁵ See, *NDGF*, Appendix II.

⁵⁶ Pseudo-Didymus (=Cassian the Sabaite), *DT (lib. 2.1-7)*, 6.13.1: ὡς ἐν μὲν ἀσάρκοις ὁ διάβολος, ἐν δὲ σαρκίνοις καθὰ γράφει· 'πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης' καὶ 'ἀπολεῖς πάντας τοὺς λαλοῦντας τὸ ψεῦδος'. οὐ γὰρ ἐπιψεύδεσαι πατὴρ θεὸς ἔσσετ' ἄρωγός, ἔγραψαν καὶ οἱ ἔξω. (ref. to Homer, *Iliad*, IV.235). As late as the fourth century, the idea of 'discarnate devil' appears only in this Scholion, in Asterius of Antioch, *commPs*, Homily 2.6:

οἱ δαίμονες μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ οἱ δαίμονες μετὰ τῶν σαρκικῶν κατ' αὐτοῦ [sc. Jesus] συνήχθησαν, and in the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (fourth cent. AD), 5.26: δαιμόνια δὲ ἄσαρκα φανταζόμενοι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήσεσθαι. In the fifth century, presbyter Hesychius of Jerusalem made a relevant casual statement. *Commentarius*, commenting on Psalm 37:20: οἱ δαίμονες, ὡς ἀεὶ ζῶντες, ὡς ἄσαρκοι.

⁵⁷ Cf. Plutarch, *Cicero*, 17.5; *De Pythiae Oraculis*, 407C8; *De Herodoti Malignitate*, 860D1.

⁵⁸ Cf. Athenagoras, *Legatio*, 21.6. Cf. Aeschylus using the word in *Agamemnon*, line 1195: ἢ ψευδομάντις εἰμι θυροκόπος φλῆδων. Athenagoras refers to a fragment of Aeschylus adduced by Plato and quoted also by Eusebius. Aeschylus, *Fragmenta*, Tetralogy 29, play A, fr. 284a; *Fragmenta*, fr. 350. Plato, *Respublica*, 383b6; Eusebius, *PE*, 13.3.35. Besides, Euripides used this in *Orestes*, line 1667, and so did Sophocles in *Oedipus Coloneus*, line 1097. Likewise, Herodotus, *Historiae*, 4.69. Interestingly, this was also used by Lucian of Samosata, *Dialogi Deorum*, Dialogue 18.2. We shall come across Lucian again and again in the course of this study.

⁵⁹ Gregory of Nazianzus *Adversus Julianum Imperatorem* 2, PG.35.693.5.

⁶⁰ Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 524: παρὰ τῶν ψευδομάντεων ἦτοι δαιμονίων (likewise, in *In Isaiam*, PG.70.848.18), while at another point he styles them ἀπατεῶνας. *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 552.

⁶¹ Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, line 1195. Euripides, *Orestes*, line 1667. Sophocles, *Oedipus Coloneus*, line 1097.

⁶² Herodotus, *Historiae*, 4.69.

⁶³ Plutarch, *Cicero*, 17.5; *De Pythiae Oraculis*, 407C8; *De Herodoti Malignitate*, 860D1.

⁶⁴ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae*, 3.71.2.

novelist placed in the third century.⁶⁵ Another possible source for Didymus is Herodian of Alexandria, the second-century AD grammarian and rhetor,⁶⁶ who also lived in Rome and used the word *ψευδομαντεία* as a lemma for his explanation of the diphthong epsilon-iota (ει). Two authors in the turn from fourth to fifth century, namely the historian Socrates of Constantinople⁶⁷ and Theodoret,⁶⁸ also used the term.

In conclusion, we come upon Cassian using the term *ψευδόμαντις* in the same sense and context as Didymus did, namely with reference to ‘daemons’ being styled ‘false soothsayers’.

This Scholion was penned by Cassian himself building on the previous one, which he had quoted from Didymus. He wished to afford his own view of the notions treated by Didymus in [Scholion XII](#).

⁶⁵ Heliodorus, *Aethiopica*, 2.16.6.

⁶⁶ Herodian of Alexandria, *Περὶ Ὀρθογραφίας*, 3, 2, p. 608.

⁶⁷ Socrates, *HE*, 3.23.

⁶⁸ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, prologue, 13; *HE*, pp. 186; 188; *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, pp. 221; 242; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.557.31.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XIV

EN XIVa: τοὺς ἀγνώμονας Ἰουδαίους

Lexica report that Plato applied the adjective ἀγνώμων to ‘the ignorant’.¹ Clement of Alexandria used the term twice in the sense of someone ‘being unforgivable because of one’s antipathetic disposition towards something or someone’,² or being ‘unfaithful’,³ or even ‘too arrogant’.⁴ However, Clement applied this to the Greeks, not to the Jews.⁵ Although the term appears in Origen’s *frJohn* XCIV, this is probably a catenist’s expression.

The epithet ἀγνώμων and its derivatives are practically absent from Didymus,⁶ whereas there is no instance of him referring to the Jews in such a context. It was used in relation to the Jews by certain authors including Theodoret.⁷ In conclusion, the specific expression in the Scholion is Cassian’s own, and, whereas Didymus does not use the term, it appears

in *De Trinitate*,⁸ so styling doctrinal opponents, which is natural, since this Pseudo-Didymian work is actually Cassian’s.

EN XIVb: περὶ πνευματικῶν ὁ λόγος

This is an oblique reference to 1 Cor. 12:1, and the specific expression appears in Didymus⁹ and John Chrysostom.¹⁰ Whereas the first paragraph was a remark by Cassian himself, from this point onwards he quotes from Didymus.

EN XIVc: ἀνωτέρω χωρητέον παντὸς αἰσθητοῦ

Of Christian and pagan authors, Didymus is the sole one to have employed this expression.¹¹ He presumably had in mind a significant passage of Plato.¹² An expression in the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiaem* is worth quoting:

¹ *Collectio Verborum e Rhetoribus et Sapientibus*, Alphabetic entry alpha, pp. 13 and 18. Also, *Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense*, p. 70; *Lexicon Vindobonense*, Alphabetic letter alpha, entry 41.

² *Suda*, lexicon, Alphabetic letter alpha, entries 283, 284. Hesychius, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter alpha, entries 673, 680.

³ *Suda*, lexicon, Alphabetic letter alpha, entry 1460.

⁴ Hesychius of Alexandria (fifth-sixth cent.), *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter upsilon, entry 489.

⁵ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 1.26.170.4; 6.14.110.4.

⁶ This appears only at one point, in an irrelevant context and sense. Didymus, *commEccl* (5–6), Cod. p. 153: μισθὸς ἀγνωμονηθεὶς ἐργάτου, which means ‘ungrateful’ rather than ‘mindless’.

⁷ Pseudo-Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.116.51; *Dicta et Interpretationes Parabolarum Evangelii*, PG.28.725.20. Gregory of Nazianzus, *In Sanctum Pascha*, PG.36.661.8; *In Theophania sive Natalia Salvatoris*, PG.36.329.13. Amphilochius of Iconium (fourth cent AD), *In Mulierem Peccatricem et Pharisaeum*, line 220. Severianus of Gabala (fourth cent. AD), *De Caeco Nato*, PG.59: 550.54 and 552.24. John Chrysostom, *In Genesin*, PG.53: 243.28; 366.41; 367.41; 374.10; 528.63; *Orationes Adversus Iudaeos*, PG.48.869.18; *Cohabiti Suspiciosi*, 8; *et passim*. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.916.34; *intProphXII*, PG.81.1741.11. Also, Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 1)*, 27.38; *DT (lib. 2.1–7)*, 7.8.3. Basil of Seleucia, *Orationes*, pp. 176, 240, 248. Procopius of Caesarea, *De Bellis*, 2.12.5; *In Isaiaem Prophetam*, pp. 1825, 2220. Hesychius of Jerusalem (presbyter, fifth cent. AD), *Encomium in Sanctum Andream*, 3. Of all the instances where the idea occurs, more than one-half are Chrysostom’s (no less than thirty-five instances).

⁸ Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 1)*, 27.38: ἔστω δὲ ἴλαω ἡμῖν τοιαῦτα λέγειν τολμῶσιν διὰ τὴν ἄλλων ἀγνωμοσύνην. *DT (lib. 2.1–7)*, 7.8.3: τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ χωρίου ἐκόντες ἐν τῇ διαμάχῃ τοῦ λόγου παραλελοίπασιν οἱ ἀγνώμονες. Unlike the sense in Didymus, in this work the term means ‘mindless’.

⁹ Didymus, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 31: οὐ γὰρ περὶ σωματικῶν ἀλλὰ πνευματικῶν ὁ λόγος. *commPs*29–34, Cod. p. 187: εἰσὶν τινες ἔχοντες γνῶσιν πνευματικῶν, γνῶσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, τὼν τῆς εὐσεβείας δογμάτων.

¹⁰ John Chrysostom, *Ad Populum Antiochenum*, PG.49.112.21: καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπλῶς γήινον, ἀλλὰ πάντες περὶ πνευματικῶν ἡμῖν οἱ λόγοι γίνονται. *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.135.48: καὶ οὐδεὶς περὶ πνευματικῶν λόγος αὐτοῖς. *Ibid.* PG.55.199.41: ὅταν δὲ περὶ πνευματικῶν ὁ λόγος ᾗ, ἔνδον στρέφει τὸ ὄμμα τῆς διανοίας. *In Sanctum Joannem*, PG.59.446.47: Καὶ περὶ ταῦτα ἅπαντα ἡ σχολή, τῶν δὲ πνευματικῶν λόγος οὐδεὶς. *In Epistolam i ad Corinthios Commentarius*, PG.61.321.21: Ἀπαρτίσας τὸν περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν λόγον. *Ibid.* (quoting Paul), PG.61.241.13 (*Catena in Epistolam i ad Corinthios*, p. 224); *In Epistolam ad Titum Commentarius*, PG.62.670.61: οὐδενὸς τῶν πνευματικῶν λόγον ποιούμεθα. *Catecheses Baptismales*, 8.19: ἐὰν δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν ἀμελοῦντες περὶ ἐκεῖνα μόνα σπουδάζωμεν.

¹¹ Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 197: Ὁ ἄνω χωρήσας διὰ καλοκαγαθίαν ὁρᾷ τὴν κακίαν τέλος λαβοῦσαν. *Ibid.* Cod. p. 214: Ἀναγκαίως δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦτου χωρητέον ἐπὶ τὴν ἀναγωγὴν. Ὁ ἅγιος μεταστὰς ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσθητῶν, ἃ καὶ αὐτὰ καλῶς μετῆι, ἐπὶ προκοπὴν θειοτέραν. *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 74: οὐχ ἴδρυται ἐν τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ὁ πάντα ποιῶν εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ . . . ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνω χωρεῖ. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1154: Ὁ τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος ἀεὶ τῶν ὀπισθεν ἐπιλανθάνεται, οὐ πάλιν δρομῶν. ὁ σημεῖον γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως ἐπειγόμενος ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνω χωρεῖ.

¹² Plato, *Respublica*, 529b–c: ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτὸ οὐ δύναμαι ἄλλο τι νομίσαι ἄνω ποιοῦν ψυχὴν βλέπειν μάθημα ἢ ἐκεῖνο ὃ ἂν περὶ τὸ δν τε ἢ καὶ τὸ ἀόρατον, ἐὰν τέ τις ἄνω κεκηνῶς ἢ κάτω συμμεμικῶς τῶν αἰσθητῶν τι ἐπιχειρῇ μανθάνειν, οὔτε μαθεῖν ἂν ποτὲ φημι αὐτόν – ἐπιστήμην γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔχειν τῶν τοιούτων – οὔτε ἄνω ἀλλὰ κάτω αὐτοῦ βλέπειν τὴν ψυχὴν, κἂν ἐξ ὑπτίας νέων ἐν γῇ ἢ ἐν θαλάττῃ μανθάνῃ.

ᾧσπερ καὶ αἰσθήσεως θρόνος, ὁ αἰσθητικὸς καὶ ἔμφρων, οὕτως Θεοῦ θρόνος, ὁ χωρήσας τὰ ἀνωτάτω περὶ Θεοῦ διηγήσεως.¹³ Cf. Iamblichus, *De Mysteriori*, 2.2: καὶ ἀνωτέρω χωροῦσα, ἐπὶ μείζονά τε τάξιν τὴν ἀγγελικὴν ἀναγομένη.

EN XIVd: λευκῇ διὰ τὸ φωτοειδές

The association of λευκόν ('white') with φωτοειδές ('radiant', and metaphorically, 'glorious') originates with Didymus¹⁴ and Theodoret,¹⁵ following Philo,¹⁶ Alexander of Aphrodisias,¹⁷ and Plutarch.¹⁸ Meanwhile though this had become part of the Christian tradition, too.¹⁹ The relevance of Chrysippus should not be overlooked,²⁰ since this Scholion has a Stoic tenor, as I discuss in the next note. The same goes for the relevance to Galen's vocabulary.²¹

EN XIVE: οἰκείαν τῇ ποιότητι

Aristotle presumably used this expression in a non-extant work of his.²² Chrysippus also employed both the idea and expression,²³ and he may well have been a source for Didymus, since the Scholion has a

Stoic sentiment, indicated by such terms as οἰκείαν and προκοπή.²⁴ The expression οἰκεία ποιότης, signifying a correspondence between something (or someone) and a certain quality, is characteristically used by Galen²⁵ and Alexander of Aphrodisias.²⁶

EN XIVf: ἀδιάδοχος

The adjective means 'without successor or heir'. Consequently it means 'not subject to improvement', or not subject to being overshadowed in the future by something or someone superior or more valuable. Hence, ἀδιάδοχος means that which cannot change or improve, on account of being perfect; therefore, something which is of everlasting superior quality.²⁷

The term appears in catena-fragments reproducing Origen's thought. No doubt they do convey his thought, yet the vocabulary need not be Origen's, since the term ἀδιάδοχος appears only in other fragments which reproduce the vocabulary of Didymus'.²⁸ This occurs also in some instances of theological reflection,²⁹ which possibly originate with Gregory of Nyssa.

Didymus uses the term ἀδιάδοχος in connection with the notion of the New Testament being 'new'

¹³ *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 1.12.

¹⁴ Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.410; *frPs(al)*, Fr. 892.

¹⁵ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 5.18; *HE*, pp. 199 and 200; *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, pp. 151 and 173; *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81: 136.3; 177.16; *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.1096.15; *intDan*, PG.81.1493.2; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.584.41; *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.380.22; PG.83.512.25; PG.83.521.38.

¹⁶ Philo, *De Somniis*, 1.220; 1.217.

¹⁷ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Librum de Sensu Commentarium*, p. 47; *De Anima*, p. 45. Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Problemata*, 1.69; 1.114; *De Anima*, pp. 133; 150.

¹⁸ Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* (351C–384C), 382C10; *Quaestiones Convivales*, 626C12.

¹⁹ Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, 2.2.29.3. Gregory of Nazianzus, *De Theologia*, 17; *De Filio*, 19; *Apologetica*, PG.35.493.28; *De Dogmate et Constitutione Episcoporum*, PG.35.1065.41. Gregory of Nyssa, *De Mortuis non Esse Dolendum*, v. 9, p. 44; *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, pp. 48; 60; 328; 404; *De Virginitatis Integritate*, 11.4; *De Beatitudinibus*, PG.44.1272.40; *De Hominis Opificio*, p. 145. Eusebius, *PE*, 3.7.2; 7.16.7; *DE*, 5 (Proemium.27); *commPs*, PG.23: 401.55; 1228.1. Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, 32.1.1; 32.1.2; 33.3.2; 58.3.2; *Homiliae I*, 15; *Sermones*, 13.1. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Illuminandorum*, 15.22; 18.10; 18.18. Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 1)*, 28.1; *DT (lib. 3)*, PG.39: 804.31; 829.3.

²⁰ Cf. Chrysippus using the term φωτοειδής, *Fragmenta Logica et Physica*, frs. 859 and 860 (SVF, II.231.35, *apud* Galen, *De Instrumento Odoratus*, 2.10, and SVF, II.232.6, *apud* Galen, *De Usu Partium*); see next note.

²¹ Cf. Galen, *De Usu Partium*, v. 3, p. 640; *Circa Doctrinas Hippocratis et Platonis*, 7.5.8; 7.7.25 and 26.

²² Aristotle, *Fragmenta*, Category 6, treatise title 33, fr. 221: ἐν ταῖς οἰκείαις φυλάττεσθαι ποιότησιν. Ibid. fr. 226: αἱ τῶν χυλῶν οἰκείαι φαίνονται ποιότητες εἰλικρινεῖς.

²³ Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Logica et Physica*, frs. 410; 473 (SVF, II.135.13–14 and 154.24–25).

²⁴ Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Logica et Physica*, fr. 410: καὶ μεταβολὴν τοῦ τρέφοντος εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν τοῦ τρεφομένου ποιότητα. fr. 473: σωζούσης ἐκάστης αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ παραθέσει κατὰ τὴν περιγραφὴν τὴν οἰκείαν οὐσίαν τε καὶ ποιότητα. On προκοπή, cf. SVF, III.31.3; 32.36 and 42; 51.57; 143.6.

²⁵ Galen, *De Naturalibus Facultatibus*, v. 2, pp. 45, 55, 156, 160, 199, 206, 207, 214; v. 3, pp. 275, 305, 481, 540, 761; v. 4, pp. 192, 532, 533. *Circa Doctrinas Hippocratis et Platonis*, 7.1.15. *De Sanitate*, v. 6, pp. 287, 316, 395. *De Alimentorum Facultatibus*, v. 6, p. 731. *De Symptomatum Differentiis Liber*, v. 7, p. 66, *et passim*.

²⁶ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Mixtione*, pp. 216, 217, 220, 232; *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, pp. 399. *De Anima*, p. 18. Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Problemata*, 3.2.

²⁷ Cf. Arethas, *Scripta Minora*, Opus 3, p. 25.

²⁸ Origen, *frJohn*, LVI: τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον ἐπεὶ ἀδιάδοχόν ἐστιν. CXXVIII: ἐπὶ τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν καὶ σωτήριον καὶ ἀδιάδοχον διδασκαλίαν; *frPs*, 112, 1–2.

²⁹ Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Hexaemeron*, 2.8; 7.7; *De Spiritu Sancto*, 27.66. Gregory of Nyssa, *De Beneficentia*, v. 9, p. 107; *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 44; *In Sextum Psalmum*, v. 5, p. 189. Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa, *De Creatione Hominis*, p. 14a. Basil of Seleucia, *Orationes*, p. 185. Pseudo-Hippolytus, *De Consummatione Mundi*, 45. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Illuminandorum*, 18.4. Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 83; *intDan*, PG.81: 1308.29; 1356.9; *De Providentia*, PG.83.569.15 & 21. Asterius of Antioch, *commPs*, 25.40. Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 1)*, 31.7 and 15.

(καινός) and applied it to the ‘new teaching’ which will never pass away or grow old.³⁰ At a certain point, he says that he has made this remark many times.³¹

EN XIVg: ὁ λαμβάνων καταλλήλως (‘one who comprehends [the saying] properly’)

This is a pun on the words of Rev. 2:17. The expression is not only characteristic of Didymus, but also exclusive to him. A. Harnack should not have emended the reading of the Codex αὐτῶ to αὐτῶν, since the logic of the phrase is not οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν (‘none of them’). There is actually not any ‘them’ in the context, either in the Scholion or in Rev. 2:17. Cassian means οὐδεὶς αὐτῷ οἶδεν (‘no one [knows] within himself’, as in 1 Cor. 2:11). The word is αὐτῷ (a normal abbreviated form for ἐαυτῷ) and this is in fact the equivalent of Paul’s phrase in 1 Cor. 2:11, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ. I therefore restore the text at two points, leaving this as the Codex has it, and dismiss two unnecessary emendations by Harnack.

What the author means at that point is that 1 Cor. 2:11 means this: only the spirit of man, which is within him, knows the things of man; the things of God are

known by the Spirit of God. Therefore, to know ‘the new name’ which ‘is written’ on ‘a white stone’³² is tantamount to knowing not only things that are within a man, but also things of God, since this act of ‘writing a name on a white stone’ is a divine one. No one is able to know this ‘name’, except one who acknowledges that he is in need of illumination by the Holy Spirit in order to comprehend this ‘new name’. Therefore, the expression ‘to comprehend properly’ (λαμβάνειν καταλλήλως) denotes both proper interpretation of the quoted passage 1 Cor. 2:11, and acknowledgement that one needs divine illumination in order to comprehend one’s ‘new name’.

Consequently, the word λαμβάνων belongs both to Rev. 2:17 and to the characteristic vocabulary of Didymus applying his peculiar expression καταλλήλως λαμβάνειν, which is exclusive to him.³³ Moreover, the phraseology occurs in one passage of Proclus, on whom Didymus seems to have exerted some influence.³⁴ Otherwise, no other author employed the expression until some centuries later.

In conclusion, the first paragraph of this Scholion is a short comment by Cassian. He then quotes Rev. 2:17, and continues with a quotation from Didymus’ Commentary on the Apocalypse.

³⁰ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1046: τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καινῆς διαθήκης ἀδιάδοχου μενούσης. *commPs*29–34, Cod. p. 160: ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀδιάδοχος ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, pp. 21–22: ἡ διαθήκη καινή, οὐ παλαιουμένη· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιγίνεται διδασκαλία ἄλλη μετ’ αὐτὴν ἐν τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ· ἀδιάδοχος γὰρ ἐστὶν . . . διαδέχεται γὰρ αὐτὴν ἡ εὐαγγελικὴ διδασκαλία, αὕτη ἀδιάδοχος οὐσα. *commPs*35–39, Cod. p. 283: ἀδιάδοχον νίκην ἔσχεν . . . τῆς ἀδιάδοχου τὸ ἐπινίκιον καινὸν ἐστὶν. τί δὲ ἐστὶν τοῦτο τὸ ἄσμα καινόν . . . ἐν τέλει γινόμενοι καινὸν ἄσμα ἄδομεν· τὸ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τέλει ἀδιάδοχόν ἐστὶν. *commPs*40–44.4, Cod. p. 337: καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἀδιάδοχον ἔχει τὴν ἱεροσύνην καὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν (κἂν γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρέλθῃ, μένουσιν αὐτοῦ οἱ λόγοι), εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα εὐλογηθή.

³¹ Although the codex has a lacuna at that point, the text makes sense. Didymus, *commPs*35–39, Cod. p. 283: πολλάκις ἡμῖν [. . .] τα περὶ καινοῦ, πῶς λέγεται. τὸ ἀδιάδοχον αἰεὶ καινὸν ἐστὶν, τὸ δὲ διαδεχθὲν παλαιόν. καὶ διὰ πλείονων παραδειγμάτων πολλάκις ἀποδέδεικται. Nevertheless, Origen’s fragments on the gospel of John show that he preceded Didymus, if the vocabulary is not one by a catenist. For indeed we come upon a fragment ascribed to the barely known Ammonius, presbyter of Alexandria (probably sixth century), who used a similar phraseology. *Fragmenta in Joannem (in catenis)*, fr. 122: Ἡ παλαιὰ γραφὴ δείτῃ τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς διδασκαλίας τῆς διαδεχομένης αὐτὴν· ἡ γὰρ νέα ἀδιάδοχος ἐστὶν αἰεὶ ἐπιρρεούσης τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς παιδεύσεως τῆς ἀναβιβαζούσης εἰς ζωὴν τὸν πίνοντα. This is a comment on John 4:13, which is the case with Origen’s *frJohn* LVI (whereas *frJohn* CXXVIII is a comment on John 4:10).

³² Rev. 2:17.

³³ Didymus, *commEccl* (5–6), Cod. p. 150: καταλλήλως ἀγαθοσύνην τὴν ἡδονὴν λαμβάνομεν. *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 341: καὶ καταλλήλως καὶ τοὺς ‘ἀστέρας’ λάμβανε. Ibid. Cod. p. 347: οὐ καταλλήλως λαμβάνομεν. *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 25: καταλλήλως λαμβάνομεν. Ibid. Cod. p. 47: καταλλήλως λαμβάνομεν τῇ ‘σοφίᾳ’ τὴν ‘ἄφροσύνην’. *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 66: συνεκδοχικῶς δὲ δύναται τὸν ‘καιρὸν’ λαμβάνειν καταλλήλως τῇ αὐτῶν ἀποτέξει καὶ τῷ αὐτῶν θανάτῳ. *commPs*20–21, Cod. p. 14: καταλλήλως δὲ ἐκάστῳ αἰῶνι καὶ τὴν ζωὴν λάμβανε, ὅτε μὲν ἀρχηγικὴν καὶ εἰσαγωγικὴν, ὅτε δὲ μεσάζουσαν, ὅτε δὲ τελείαν. *commPs*22–26.10, Cod. p. 69: τοῦτο καὶ εἰσωτερικῶς καὶ τελείως καὶ εἰσαγωγικῶς καὶ καταλλήλως τοῖς ἀρχομένοις ἐκλαβεῖν δεῖ. *commPs*35–39, Cod. p. 263: καταλλήλως δὲ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς περὶ ἧς ὁ λόγος, λάμβανε τὴν προσόξιν καὶ τὴν σῆψιν. Ibid. Cod. p. 281: καταλλήλως τοῖς λέγουσιν ἐκλαμβάνειν δεῖ τοὺς λόγους. *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 60: Ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ κατ’ ἄλλην διάνοιαν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου λέγομεν εἶναι ἄνθρωπον, κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ προσταχθέντα γενέσθαι, καταλλήλως λαμβάνομεν αὐτόν. Ibid. Cod. p. 102: καταλλήλως καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς ἐκλημπτέον. There is only a single instance in Eusebius, although not strictly a parallel, which is evidently a casual usage. *commPs*, PG.23.880.57: ἀνάγκη τῇ ἀποδοθείσῃ εἰρήνῃ καταλλήλως καὶ τὴν Σιών ἐκλαμβάνειν.

³⁴ Proclus, *In Platonis Cratylum Commentaria*, 62: καὶ δεῖ καταλλήλως αὐτὰ λαμβάνειν.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XV

EN XVa: ἐποπτική δύναμις

The real source of the notion of ἐποπτική δύναμις ('superintending power') is the scripture, namely 4 Macc. 4:5. Clement of Alexandria is the author who introduced it into Christian exegesis.¹ Although he used the adjective ἐποπτικός at some points, the one just cited is the sole instance where he refers explicitly to the 'superintending power' of God. The rest of his references point either to a 'soul' which can see clearly, or to a comprehensive scientific analysis and exposition.²

This expression ἐποπτική δύναμις appears in certain authors, including followers of Origen. Although it occurs in Origen's catena-comments on the Psalms, the vocabulary is like Didymus rather than Origen.³

Didymus, *commZacch*, 3.129: Λέγει γοῦν ὁ εὐεργέτης καὶ πάσης μακαρίου σωτηρίας αἴτιος· 'Διὰ τοῦτο μηκέτ' εἶναι ἐξελαύνοντα νῦν, ὅτι ἑώρακα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μου', ταῖς ἐποπτικαῖς δηλονότι δυνάμεσιν . . . Πητέον δευτέρως ὁρῶντας Θεοῦ ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶναι τοὺς ἐπιστατοῦντας τῶν ἀνθρώπων πραγμάτων ἐφόρους ἀγγέλους.⁴ Ibid. 4.202: τὰς ἐφόρους καὶ ἐποπτικάς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ.

frPs(al), fr. 75: αἱ δὲ ἐποπτικαὶ καὶ ἔφοροι τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεις ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ καλούμεναι. Ibid. fr. 278: τῶν ἐποπτικῶν καὶ ἐπισκοπευτικῶν σου δυνάμεων.⁵

Didymus used the expression ἐποπτική δύναμις at other points, too. In *Genesin*, Cod. p. 56: Ταῦτα δὲ φάμεν οὐχ ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπτά αἰσθητοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντος, ἀλλὰ θηρεύοντες πῶς κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ

ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐστίν· τὴν γὰρ τελείαν ἐποπτικὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν διὰ τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἐδήλωσεν ὁ λόγος καὶ δι' ἃς ἔχει ἀρετὰς ὁ ἐπτά ἀριθμός, ὡς ἡδη προεῖρηται. Ibid. Cod. p. 133: Ἐπτά ὀφθαλμοὶ εἰσιν ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ σῶμά ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ἵνα καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπτά ἀριθμὸν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ τυγχάνωσιν, ἀλλὰ δῆλον ὡς τὴν ἐποπτικὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν πληρεστάτην καὶ μεγάλην εἶναι διδάσκει. Ibid. Cod. p. 167: Ὁρᾷ οὐ πρότερον ἀγνοῶν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐπὶ ἐκδικίας ἐποπτικὴν δύναμιν δηλῶν.

Once again, Didymus follows Eusebius,⁶ yet it is his personal vocabulary that is pertinent to the Scholion. Gregory of Nyssa also made ample and confident use of the expression,⁷ whereas there is occasional usage by Procopius of Gaza⁸ and Asterius of Antioch.⁹

EN XVb: τὴν ἔφορον δύναμιν

Didymus is the sole Christian author ever to have used this notion of 'overseeing power', which suggests that this Scholion is more or less an excerpt from his commentary on Revelation.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 4.202: Ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τούτου τοῦ Ἰούδα διανοίγει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, τὰς ἐφόρους καὶ ἐποπτικάς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ ὁ εὐεργέτης. *frPs(al)*, fr. 75: αἱ δὲ ἐποπτικαὶ καὶ ἔφοροι τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεις ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ καλούμεναι. Ibid. fr. 342: Ἐξεγέρθητι, κύριε, καὶ πρόσχες τῇ κρίσει μου, τουτέστιν, ἐπίστησον τὴν ἔφορον δυνάμιν σου.

Although this language points to Didymus, debts to

¹ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.2.5.5: καὶ δὴ πάρεστιν αἰεὶ τῇ τε ἐποπτικῇ τῇ τε εὐεργετικῇ τῇ τε παιδευτικῇ ἀπομένῃ ἡμῶν δυνάμει δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ.

² Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, 1.3.8.3; 2.2.29.3. *Stromateis*, 1.1.15.2; 2.10.47.4; 5.10.66.2; 5.11.71.2.

³ Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1197.36: Αἱ δὲ ἐποπτικαὶ αὐτοῦ δυνάμεις. Ibid. PG.12.1416.17: ὡς ἀποστρέψαντος τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐποπτικὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ.

⁴ Cf. Scholion 30b: Ἐχομεν καὶ ἀγγέλους ἐφορῶντας.

⁵ Didymus is the Christian theologian who alone uses the expression ἐπισκοπευτικῶν δυνάμεων, referring to God's providential care.

⁶ Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.84: τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν ἐποπτικὴν αὐτοῦ θεωρητικὴν τῶν ὅλων δύναμιν ἀνιιττόμενος, ἐφορῶσαν τὰ πάντα.

⁷ Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Ablabium*, v. 3,1, p. 49: τὴν θεϊκὴν ταύτην

ἥτοι ἐποπτικὴν δυνάμιν τε καὶ ἐνέργειαν. Ibid. p. 50: Χριστὸς θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεοῦ σοφία καὶ τὴν ἐποπτικὴν τε καὶ θεατικὴν δύναμιν, ἥνπερ δὴ θεότητα λέγομεν. Ibid. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἷς ὁ τῆς ἐποπτικῆς τε καὶ θεατικῆς δυνάμεως λόγος ἐν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. In *Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 40: Ἀλλὰ μὴν ἰδίον ἐστὶ τῆς θεότητος ἡ ἐποπτικὴ τῶν ὄντων δυνάμις τε καὶ ἐνέργεια. οὐκοῦν ὁ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχων ὅπερ ἐπόθησε, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐποπτικὸς γίνεται καὶ τὴν τῶν ὄντων διασκοπεῖται φύσιν.

⁸ Procopius of Gaza, *In Canticum Cantorum*, p. 1693: Ὁφθαλμοὺς γάρ, τί ἄλλο ὑπολάβοι Θεοῦ, ἢ τὴν ἐποπτικὴν δύναμιν;

⁹ Asterius of Antioch, *commPs*, 19.25: Καὶ τίνες οἱ ἐπτά κυρίου ὀφθαλμοὶ; Τὰ ἐπτά τῆς σοφίας πνεύματα. Τὰ βλέφαρα αὐτοῦ ἐξετάζει τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Τίνες οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου; Αἱ ἐποπτικαὶ δυνάμεις.

Eusebius of Emesa (c. 300-c. 360), the pupil of Eusebius of Caesarea, should not elude us.¹⁰

EN XVC: πορευτική δύναμις

Dictionaries have no inkling of this meaning of the epithet πορευτικός. They know only of the literal and simply physical Aristotelian meaning, which is ‘going on foot’ or ‘walking’.¹¹ The fact is, however, that the present specific non-hackneyed sense originates with Origen¹² and was taken up by Didymus.¹³ It betokens God’s power permeating the entire universe and immanent in all events that come to pass in the world.

EN XVD: διὰ τῶν προκειμένων

The expression appears in Alexander of Aphrodisias;¹⁴ Origen was quick to employ it,¹⁵ and Athanasius followed.¹⁶ However, the locution of this Scholion is

in fact borrowed from Eusebius, who seems fascinated by it.¹⁷ Gregory of Nyssa applied it only casually.¹⁸ Didymus uses this in six instances, of which five are in his commentary on the Psalms surviving in fragments, and one in his commentary on 2 Corinthians.¹⁹ The idiom enjoyed much currency in the second-century Alexandrian milieu, with scholars as different as the grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus,²⁰ the mathematician Ptolemy,²¹ and Aristides Quintilianus, a doctor of music contemporary with Origen.²²

The expression occurs also in Christians, such as Procopius of Gaza,²³ Asterius of Antioch,²⁴ Epiphanius of Salamis,²⁵ and Theodoret.²⁶ Cyril of Alexandria made this a distinctive feature in Alexandrian literature.²⁷ Proclus is present once again.²⁸

EN XVE: μοχθηρὰ ἔξις

The expression ‘knaveish habit’ is of Aristotelian provenance²⁹ and had a special place in Old Stoicism.³⁰

¹⁰ Eusebius of Emesa, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Galatas*, p. 47 (*Catena in Epistulam ad Galatas*, p. 18): θεοῦ δόντος ἐφόρου. Eusebius of Caesarea, *Fragmenta in Lucam*, PG.24.557.17: τῆς πάντων ἐφόρου προνοίας.

¹¹ Hesychius of Alexandria took this literally, that is, as meaning simply the ability to move from one place to another. *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter iota, 482: ἵκμενον· εἰ μὲν δασέως τὸν ἱκτικὸν λέγει, οἷον πορευτικόν, τὸν ἱκνεῖσθαι ποιοῦντα, ὃ ἐστὶν πορεύεσθαι. Lampe’s dictionary ignores the term altogether, obviously deeming this has no particular bearing on theological reflection. I have canvassed the term in *PHE*, p. 359.

¹² Origen, *commJohn*, XXVIII.7.59: τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς πορευτικὰς καὶ δραστικὰς καὶ θεωρητικὰς δυνάμεις. XXVIII.10.72: τὴν πορευτικὴν καὶ τὴν δραστικὴν τῆς ψυχῆς δύναμιν. *frLuc*, 186: ‘ὁ ποῦς μου οὐ μὴ προσκόπη’ ἀναφερόμενον ἐπὶ τὴν πορευτικὴν τῆς ψυχῆς δύναμιν. The following passage from a catena-fragment shows that although the fragments on John were expressed largely through the vocabulary of Didymus, they are in essence an authentic exposition of Origen’s thought. *frJohn*, XVIII: τὸ σαφηνίσαι καὶ παραστήσαι λόγῳ τίνα τρόπον θεὸς ἀνέλαβε σῶμα, σκεπάζων καὶ κρύπτων αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν πορευτικὴν δύναμιν.

¹³ Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 339: αἱ πορευτικαὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις. *Ibid.* fr. 358: τὴν πορευτικὴν μου δύναμιν, καθ’ ἣν κατορθῶ. *commPs*22–26.10, Cod. p. 95: τὰς πορευτικὰς τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις. *frPs(al)*, fr. 137: τοὺς τοῦ ἔσω ἀνθρώπου πόδας, τουτέστιν τὰς πορευτικὰς δυνάμεις. *Ibid.* fr. 956: προσκυνούμεν τῷ ὑποπόδιῳ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸν ἐπερείσαντα αὐτῷ τὰς πορευτικὰς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεις ἀλληγορικώτερον πόδας καλουμένας.

¹⁴ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 589: Cf. the expression διὰ τοῦ προκειμένου, *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 169, lines 11 and 17; p. 170 lines 11 and 15.

¹⁵ Origen, *Cels*, IV.89 (*Philocalia*, 20 to 16); Also cf. διὰ τοῦ προκειμένου, in *excPs*, PG.17.137.49.

¹⁶ Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.400.42. Cf. διὰ τοῦ προκειμένου, *Ibid.* PG.27.316.27.

¹⁷ Eusebius, *DE*, 5.3.6; 6.13.2; 8.1.56; 8.2.104. *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, 2.25.5; 3.2.25; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.30; 1.41, *et passim*.

¹⁸ Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, pp. 173 and 460.

¹⁹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, frs. 100; 730a; 1059; 1229; 1264; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 32. Cf. διὰ τοῦ προκειμένου, in *frPs(al)*, fr. 766.

²⁰ Apollonius Dyscolus (Alexandria, second cent. AD), *De Syntaxi*, Part 2, v. 2, p. 61; Cf. διὰ τοῦ προκειμένου: *De Adverbiis*, Part 2, 1.1, p. 120.

²¹ Ptolemy (mathematician, astronomer, Alexandria, second cent. AD), *Syntaxis Mathematica*, v. 1.2, p. 514: διὰ τοῦ προκειμένου. *Ibid.* v. 1.1, p. 368.

²² Aristides Quintilianus (third cent. AD), *De Musica*, 3.2.

²³ Procopius of Gaza, *In Canticum Canticorum*, p. 1716; *In Isaiam Prophetam*, pp. 1865; 1929.

²⁴ Asterius of Antioch, *Fragmenta in Psalmos*, fr. 17. Cf. διὰ τοῦ προκειμένου, *commPs*, 2.1; 3.2.

²⁵ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Liturgia Praesantificatorum*, 1.

²⁶ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1708.49. Cf. the expression διὰ τοῦ προκειμένου, *ibid.* PG.80.1484.18.

²⁷ Cyril of Alexandria used this in no fewer than twenty-four instances: *commProphXII*, v. 1, pp. 83; 231; 240; v. 2, pp. 467; 590; *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 1, pp. 86; 182; 254; 533; v. 2, pp. 349; 470; *et passim*.

²⁸ Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 1, p. 198; *In Platonis Parmenidem*, p. 1220.

²⁹ Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea*, 1145b1; 1148b8.

³⁰ Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Moralia*, fr. 97 (SVF, III.24.9–10, *apud* Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 2.7.5e) and fr. 347 (SVF, *apud* Proclus, *In Platonis Alcibiadem i*, 215).

Before Origen, some authors who have a bearing on the vocabulary of the Scholia employed it.³¹

The phrase μοχθηραὶ ἔξεις used in the context of God causing all ‘evil’ things to be consumed by fire, appears only in Origen’s catena-fragments on the Psalms,³² where the phraseology is identical with that of the present Scholion. This might well be the vocabulary of Didymus³³ following Eusebius,³⁴ probably via Cassian or some other Sabaite monk.

EN XVf: κλονεῖται τὰ ὑλικά πάντα

This is a unique expression, in all Christian and pagan literature, employed only by Didymus. It means ‘the materials that are eliminated from the minds’ of the wicked people, where ‘material’ is the scriptural figure ‘wood, hay, stubble’ (1 Cor. 3:12) betokening evil or mean habits.

Didymus, *frPs(al)* (comm. on Psalm, 45:7), fr. 479: Σιωπῶντος θεοῦ βεβαιότητα καὶ στάσιν ἔχειν δοκεῖ τὰ γήϊνα καὶ ὑλικά πράγματα, κλονούμενα θεοῦ φωνὴν δεδωκότος.

EN XVg: θεοῦ ἐπιβλέψαντος

This phrase would give the impression that the Scholion stands close to Origen, who analysed the notion of God ‘superintending’ all human affairs. In fact, however, this is Didymus’ language, on account of the entire context and the specific expressions used. For Didymus is the author who used the notion of ‘God superintending’ along with the expression Θεοῦ ἐφορῶντος (‘God overseeing’).³⁵

EN XVh: καθ’ οὓς ἐπιπορεύεται

The relevance of terms continues to support Didymus as the source of this Scholion, which was adapted by Cassian himself. The term is absent from Irenaeus and

Hippolytus. It appears in Origen’s catena-fragments on John and in the Commentary on Genesis (from the *Philocalia*).

Origen, *frJohn*, XXXVII: ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ πνεύματος, ἣν ἐπιπορεύεται διὰ τῆς τῶν θείων λογίων παιδείας. *Philocalia*, 23.8, in *commGen*, PG.12.64.16–24: Πρὸς οὓς λεκτέον ὅτι ἐπιβάλλων ὁ θεὸς τῇ ἀρχῇ τῆς κοσμοποιίας, οὐδενὸς ἀναιτίως γινομένου, ἐπιπορεύεται τῷ νῷ ἕκαστον τῶν ἐσομένων, ὁρῶν ὅτι ἐπεὶ τότε γέγονε τότε ἔπεται, ἐὰν δὲ γένηται τότε τὸ ἐπόμενον τότε ἀκολουθεῖ, οὐ ὑποστάντος τότε ἔσται· καὶ οὕτω μέχρι τέλους τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιπορευθεὶς οἶδεν ἃ ἔσται, οὐ πάντως ἑκάστω τῶν γινωσκομένων αἴτιος τοῦ αὐτὸ συμβῆναι τυγχάνων.

Didymus, *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p. 79: διττῶς αἱ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁδοὶ λέγονται· ἥτοι αἱ φέρουσιν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ ἃς αὐτὸς ὁδεύει ἐπιπορευόμενος τοῖς ὅλοις, δέον κατὰ τὸν τῆς προνοίας λόγον ἢ κατὰ τὸ ὠφελεῖν καὶ εἶναι ἐν τοῖς δεκτικοῖς ἑαυτοῦ . . . διττῶς οὖν ὁδοὺς θεοῦ λέγομεν ἢ τὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀγούσας (αὗται δὲ εἰσιν αἱ ἀρεταί) ἢ ἃς αὐτὸς ἐπιβαδίζει κατὰ τὴν πρόνοιαν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ κρίσιν καὶ διοίκησιν καὶ δωρεάς. δεῖ οὖν γινῶναι τὰς ὁδοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ γνωρίζοντος . . . ‘καὶ τὰς τρίβους σου διδάξόν με’. ἥτοι ἃς τρίβουσιν οἱ πρὸς σὲ σπεύδοντες ἢ ἃς σὺ τρίβεις ἐπιπορευόμενος τοῖς ἔργοις τῆς χάριτός σου.

frPs(al), fr. 799a: Ἐπεὶ ἐνοικεῖ καὶ ἐμπεριπατεῖ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις ὁ θεός, ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν ἁγίων ἔχει τὴν ἰδίαν ὁδόν, ἐπιπορευόμενος τῇ ἑκάστου αὐτῶν διανοίᾳ. Ibid. fr. 1138: καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ, καθ’ ἃς ἐπιπορευόμενος τὴν ἐξέτασιν καὶ κρίσιν τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῶν ποιεῖται, ἀλήθειά εἰσιν. Ibid. fr. 1259: Ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ, αἷς ἐπιπορεύεται προνοῶν καὶ διοικῶν, κρίνων, εὐεργετῶν, χαριζόμενος, κολάζων, δίκαιος εὐρίσκεται. Ibid. fr. 1280: τοῦ δημιουργικοῦ

³¹ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, pp. 301 and 393; *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 472. Plutarch, *Sulla*, 37.4; *Quomodo Adulescens Poetas Audire Debeat*, 28. Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhoniae Hypotyposes*, 2.154.

³² Origen, *selPs*, PG.12: 1556.46; 1617.38; 1664.44; *frPs*, 49, 3; 118, 140.

³³ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, frs. 390; 921; 1012; 1201.

³⁴ Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23: 97.52; 436.22; 24.36. Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, *De Filio*, 18; *In Sanctum Pascha*, PG.36.645.7. Gregory of Nyssa, *Dialogus de Anima et Resurrectione*, PG.46.100.39.

³⁵ Didymus, *commPs22–26.10*, Cod. p. 86: ὅταν ἐπιβλέψῃ θεός, ἔλεος γίνεται τοῖς ἐπιβλεπομένοις· . . . οὐκ εἰσιν οὕτω κακοὶ ὡς ὁ ἐξελεθὼν ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου. οὗτοί εἰσιν περὶ ὧν γέγραπται· ‘οὐ διαμενοῦσιν παράνομοι ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου’. ἐθελουσίως δὲ ἔξω τῶν ὄψεων τοῦ θεοῦ γίνονται· οἱ γὰρ ὀφθαλμοὶ θεοῦ ἐφορῶντες φωτίζουν τοὺς ἐπιβλεπομένους. *commZacch*, 3.77: Μακάριον δ’ ἐστὶν τὸ ὑπὸ Θεοῦ ὁρᾶσθαι, κατὰ τὸ· ‘Ὁφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους’, καὶ τὸν εὐχόμενον τούτου τυχεῖν φάσκοντα εὐκτικῶς· ‘Ἐπιβλεψὼν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ καὶ ἐλέησόν με.’

λόγου ἀθρόως τε τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον ἐπιπορευομένου.

Therefore, Didymus definitely used the term, and so did Eusebius and Gregory of Nyssa.³⁶

EN XVI: τῷ παντὶ διαφουτήσας
(‘since he has imbued all universe’)

Didymus did not use the phrase. Cassian writing this Scholion must have received it from Origen³⁷ via Eusebius³⁸ and Gregory of Nyssa, although other intellectuals could also have supplied him with this language.³⁹ However, in Gregory the term does not have the cosmic significance accorded to it by Origen (which is found in this Scholion), namely the notion of the Logos being present throughout the entire universe. The Cappadocian only means the promulgation of Christian teaching all over the world.⁴⁰ This is a point where Cassian misunderstood the orthodox Christian doctrine, which was clearly expounded by Origen as well as Gregory of Nyssa, as I canvass in RCR, chapter 6.

EN XVj: διεγερτικὸν τῶν κοιμωμένων
(‘stimulating all those who are asleep’)

The metaphor of ‘those asleep’ suggests those who are in that condition because of sin having possessed them as a result of laxity and idleness. This is present in Didymus and his rediscovered codex confirms the text of Migne.

Didymus, *commJob*(1–4), Cod. p. 31: οὐ μάτην πρόσκειται τό· ‘τῶν υἱῶν σου καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων σου ἐσθιόντων καὶ πινόντων’, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἐπίτασιν ἀνίας καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ ἀρχεκάκου διαβόλου πραγματευομένου, ἵνα ἡ τῶν [. . .] γεγεννημένων ἀπαγγελία βαρεῖα γινομένη λύπην ὑπερβάλλουσιν τῷ ἀγίῳ ἐνποιῇ. κοιμωμένων γὰρ τῶν τέκνων εἰ συμβεβήκει τὰ τῆς πτώσεως, ἀνεπαίσθητον τὸ δεινὸν λογιζόμενος οὐχ οὕτως ἡνιάτο. A catena-fragment records the same text: *Commentarii in Job*, PG.39.1128.55.

This Scholion is distinctly close to Didymus’ Commentary on the Apocalypse, yet there are points which attest to adaptation by Cassian himself.

³⁶ Scriptural source of the word: Macc. 2:28 (ἐπιπορεύεσθαι); Epistula Jeremiae 61 (ἐπιπορεύεσθαι). Cf. Eusebius, *PE*, 3.2.7 (ἐπιπορεύεσθαι). 3.3.8 (ἐπιπορεύεσθαι); 3.6.6 (ἐπιπορευομένη); 6.11.34 (ἐπιπορεύεται, quoting Origen); 11.13.7 (ἐπιπορευομένην); 6.6.45 (ἐπιπορευομένη); 11.13.7 (ἐπιπορευόμενος); *commPs*, PG.23.225.22 (ἐπιπορευόμενος); also, *Laudatio Constantini*, 1.6; 3.6; 12.6; 12.16; 13.16. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 39 (ἐπιπορεύεσθαι). *De Oratione*, p. 274 (ἐπιπορεύεται). Procopius of Gaza, *In Canticum Canticorum*, p. 1680 (ἐπιπορεύεσθαι). Cf. pagan use: Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, 30.2 (ἐπιπορεύεσθαι); Plotinus, *Enneades*, II.2.1 (ἐπιπορεύεσθαι).

³⁷ Origen, *commJohn*, VI: 39.194: περὶ τοῦ διαπεφοιτηκέναι αὐτὸν δι’ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου. 39.202: διαπεφοιτηκέναι δι’ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου. 38,188: Οὗτος δι’ ὅλης πεφοίτηκε τῆς κτίσεως. *DT* stands in

striking resemblance with Origen’s own words. *DT* (lib. 2.1–7), 6.2,2: πρόνοια ὑπάρχων καὶ σοφία, δι’ ὅλων διαπεφοιτηκυῖα, ὡς ὁ πατήρ. Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), v. 39, p. 761: τὴν τῷ παντὶ διαπεφοιτηκυῖαν κόσμῳ.

³⁸ Eusebius, *PE*, 13.13.64. *HE*, 7.23.3; *De Martyribus Palaestinae*, 4.8; 9.2.

³⁹ Cf. Plutarch, *Caesar*, 33.1; *Sulla*, 9.1; *De Garrulitate*, 505F4; *Adversus Colotem*, 1108D5; *Fragmenta*, fr. 134. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Mixtione*, pp. 218; 225. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 5.14.133.9; *Fragmenta*, fr. 23. Cyril of Alexandria, *expPs*, PG.69.1068.25.

⁴⁰ Gregory of Nyssa, *Encomium in Sanctum Stephanum Protomartyrem*, p. 16. *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 129; *De Vita Gregorii Thaumaturgi*, PG.46.933.20. The same portion, in Cyril of Alexandria, *expPs*, PG.69.1068.25.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XVI

EN XVIa: ἐπίστησον μή (or εἰ μή)

The expression ἐπίστησον εἰ, or ἐπίστησον μή, or ἐπίστησον εἰ μή, calling for the reader's attention, is characteristic of Origen¹ and Didymus,² who both used it and appear extremely keen to apply the elegant rhetorical construction (thirty-one instances in the former, forty-six in the latter). Eusebius used it only once.³ Origen may have taken it up from Plutarch.⁴ Later still, Proclus followed suit.⁵ Consequently, use of this simple construction is generally a strong indication that either Origen or Didymus is the author of a certain text. Since Cassian himself never used either of those constructions, it is certain that he quotes from Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse.⁶

EN XVIb: ἐφαρμόζει τὸ ὄνομα

The expression τὸ ὄνομα ἐφαρμόζειν ('this name applies to') comes from Aristotle.⁷ Alexander of

Aphrodisias,⁸ who was preceded by Philo,⁹ characteristically used it. Origen took it up,¹⁰ which comes as no surprise, since Alexander was the author from whom Origen had learnt almost everything he knew about Aristotle, and above all the notion of *homonyms*.¹¹ It was then natural for Gregory of Nyssa to follow.¹² Theodoret fails to use it, even though it occurs in a theologian he admired, namely Theodore of Mopsuestia.¹³ On the other hand, that Didymus used this is one more strong indication that this Scholion quotes *ad verbum* from his Commentary on the Apocalypse.¹⁴

Although the specific usage of the expression is characteristic of Alexander of Aphrodisias,¹⁵ pagan philosophers were not too fascinated by this idiomatic wording, except for some Aristotelian commentators,¹⁶ and a couple of other intellectuals, including Proclus.¹⁷ I also note an instance in the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*.

¹ Cf. ἐπίστησον εἰ in Origen, *Cels*, II.69; III.2; *commJohn*, I: 3.16; 18.108; 19.113; 26.170; 32.238; 34.248; 37.269; II: 16.116; 25.162; 31.191; VI.6.41; X.31.199; XIII.6.36; XX: 28.246; 30.269; XXVIII.19.169; *exMar*, XXX; *deOr*, XXIX.16; *commMatt*, 11.17; 12.13; 15.27; *commEph*, 5; *selGen*, PG.12.96.44; *frPs*, 22, 5; 68, 23; 97, 5–6; *frJohn*, XVIII; X; *selPs*, PG.12.1264.3. Cf. ἐπίστησον, μή (or εἰ μή) in *Cels*, III.2; *commJohn*, I.34.248; II.16.116; *commMatt*, 11.17.

² Cf. ἐπίστησον εἰ in Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 149; *commJob*(7.20c-11), Cod. pp. 255; 307; *commJob*(12.1–16.8a), fr. 317; *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 210; *commZacch*, 1: 145; 298; 342; 369; 2: 49; 158; 244; 311; 323; 3.78; 4: 70; 83; 277; 5: 16; 75; 86; 104; 153; *frPs(al)*, frs. 53; 54; 85; 121; 199; 205; 277; 297; 493; 584; 783a; 808; 914; 929; 939; 951; 1063; 1074; 1215; 1256; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, pp. 14; 30. Cf. ἐπίστησον, μή (or, εἰ μή) in *commJob*(12.1–16.8a), frs. 371 and 384; *frPs(al)*, frs. 297; 635; 1065; 1074.

³ Eusebius, *DE*, 7.1.108: ἐπίστησον, μή.

⁴ Plutarch, *Platonicae Quaestiones*, 1001B: ἐπίστησον εἰ.

⁵ Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 3, p. 45: ἐπίστησον, μή.

⁶ Cf. *Scholia XIX, XXXIV*.

⁷ Aristotle, *Topica*, 148b19. Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Logica et Physica*, fr. 1023 (SVF, II.305.31).

⁸ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, pp. 425; 473; 474; 476.

⁹ Philo, *De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia*, 154; *De Confusione Linguarum*, 139.

¹⁰ Origen, *Cels*, I.24; (*Philocalia*, 17.1 and 2); *deOr*, XXIV.3.

¹¹ Cf. *COT*, pp. 16; 100. *PHE*, p. 5.

¹² Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 1.1.651; 2.1.174; 3.1.121; 3.9.22; *Ad Eustathium de Sancta Trinitate*, v. 3, 1, p. 13. Cf. rare

usage in Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.424.28; *Epistulae*, 189. Cyril of Alexandria, *De Incarnatione Unigeniti*, p. 680; *Contra Julianum*, 1.43.

¹³ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *commProphXII*, prophet Zachariah, 1.18–21 (line 5).

¹⁴ Didymus, *commZacch*, 4.6; *commPs*29–34, Cod. p. 195.

¹⁵ *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 15.300: καὶ ἐφαρμόζεσθαι τοῖς πράγμασι τὰ ἐν τοῖς ὀνόμασι σημαίνοντα. p. 295: ἐφαρμόσει τὸ ὄνομα. Cf. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 476: τοῖς μὲν ὀνόμασι δεῖ χρῆσθαι ὥς οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσι καὶ μὴ καινοτομεῖν, τοῖς δὲ πράγμασιν ἐφαρμόζειν τὰ ὀνόματα οὐχ ὥς οἱ πολλοὶ ἀλλ' ὥς οἱ σοφοί. Origen, *Cels*, I.24 (*Philocalia*, 17.1): Ὁ τοίνυν μεγαλοφύστερον κἂν ὀλίγην τούτων περίνοιαν εἰληφώς εὐλαβήσεται ἄλλα ἄλλοις ἐφαρμόζειν ὀνόματα πράγμασι. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 3.9.22: πῶς οἶδε κυρίως τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐφαρμόζειν τὰ ῥήματα. Proclus, *In Platonis Parmenidem*, p. 852; *In Platonis Cratylum Commentaria*, 16 (reporting Democritus' views): εἰ γὰρ τὰ ὀνόματα ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐν πράγμα ἐφαρμόσουσιν.

¹⁶ Dexippus, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, p. 34. Ammonius of Alexandria (fifth cent. AD), *In Aristotelis Librum De Interpretatione Commentarius*, pp. 41; 42; 156. Syrianus, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 162. Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, v. 8, pp. 28; 81; 101; v. 9, pp. 17; 295.

¹⁷ Porphyry, *Historia Philosophiae*, fr. 15. Iamblichus, *Theologoumena Arithmeticae*, p. 14. Proclus, *In Platonis Parmenidem*, p. 852; *In Platonis Cratylum Commentaria*, 16 (reporting Democritus' views); 110; 174; *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 2, pp. 145; v. 3, p. 167.

The adjective ἐμπαθής ('being overwhelmingly subject to passion') is the opposite of ἀπαθής ('free from passion'). It appears in literature hundreds of times, so what is important is not its presence, but either its absence from certain intellectuals, or its rarity in others. Although Plato used the word πάθος ('passion') recurrently, he did not do so with ἐμπαθής. Aristotle appears to have used this only once, merely in the sense of being under the influence of a certain passion.¹⁸ Plotinus made much of it at two significant points, contrasting the 'soul', which is 'subject to passion' (ἐμπαθής), from the mind, which is not subject to passion (ἀπαθής).¹⁹

It was Chrysippus who made ἀπάθεια ('freedom from passion') and ἐμπάθεια ('the state of one being bowled head over heels by passion') a Stoic technical term,²⁰ whereas Posidonius treated ἐμπαθία from his Middle Stoic point of view.²¹ There is a telling retort against Chrysippus by Posidonius. The latter declares himself unable to understand a certain contradiction that he finds inherent in the former's argument: how is it possible for the philosophers to proclaim ἀπάθεια, while they allow themselves to become full of the passion of yearning for what they regard as 'good', and to be subject to the passion of joy once they feel they have attained this?²²

In accordance with Plato, Philo did not make this

notion a point of note in his writings: he used it only once, in the same sense as Aristotle did, that is, being under the sway of a certain passion.²³

This is the sense in which the term appears in Christian literature with Justin, and with Irenaeus, in his exposition of the Gnostic tenets.²⁴

Clement of Alexandria used the notion more extensively than any other author did.²⁵ Origen possibly made use of it, but almost all the pertinent instances occur in catena-fragments, which may suggest that we are dealing with the catenist's vocabulary. I could hardly imagine Origen addressing Celsus, or writing *On Prayer* or *Exhortation to Martyrdom* and never having used the term ἐμπαθής. Still, beyond his homilies on Jeremiah, all instances seem to have been transmitted through catenists.²⁶ In this respect, we should take into account that Cassian himself used the term, though not heavily.²⁷

However, Didymus once again uses the idea of one being swayed by passion, which is both the origin and result of sin.²⁸ Once again, *De Trinitate* appears as a work alien to Didymus' phrasing: in contrast to the frequency of the term in Didymus' works, in *De Trinitate* it appears only once.²⁹

EN XVID: διὰ τὸ ἐκτεθηλυμένον

The use of the verb ἐκθηλύνεσθαι ('to become effeminate', hence 'feeble', when confronted with

¹⁸ Aristotle, *De Insomniis*, 460b7: καὶ ταῦτα ὅσφ' ἂν ἐμπαθέστερος ἦ, τοσοῦτ' ἀπ' ἐλάσσονος ὁμοιότητος φαίνεται.

¹⁹ Plotinus, *Enneades*, V.9.4: Εἰ δὲ διὰ καὶ ἐμπαθὲς ψυχὴ, δεῖ δὲ τὴν ἀπαθὲς εἶναι - ἢ πάντα τῷ χρόνῳ ἀπολεῖται - δεῖ τὴν πρὸ ψυχῆς εἶναι. Cf. IV.7.13: οὐδὲ ὁ ταύτης νοῦς ἐμπαθής.

²⁰ SVF, III: 125, 16; 128, 28-29, *apud* Galen, *Circa Doctrinas Hippocratis et Platonis*, 4.6.24: ἐπὶ τῶνδε τῶν ἐμπαθῶν ὡς περὶ ἐξεστηκότων. Ibid. 4.6.36: ὁμολογεῖ κἀνταῦθα βίαν τινὰ τὴν κινουσαν εἶναι πᾶσι τοῖς ἐμπαθέσιν ὁρμάς.

²¹ Cf. Posidonius, *Fragmenta*, fr. 441c: αἱ δὲ πραγματικαὶ βουλὰι καὶ κρίσεις καὶ δύνανται τῶν πολλῶν ἐμπαθεῖς οὔσαι δυσωδῖαν τῷ λόγῳ παρέχουσι καὶ δυσκολίαν. Fr. 416: ἀλλὰ διὰ ἀμαθίαν καὶ μοχθηροῦς ἐθισμοῦς ἐμπαθῶς ἀναγκάζεσθαι ζῆν τοὺς τοιοῦτους ἀνθρώπους.

²² Posidonius, *ibid.* fr. 409: τοιοῦτων δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χρυσίππου λεγομένων διαπορήσειεν ἂν τις πρῶτον μὲν, πῶς οἱ σοφοὶ μέγιστα καὶ ἀνυπερβλήτα νομίζοντες εἶναι ἀγαθὰ τὰ καλὰ πάντα οὐκ ἐμπαθῶς κινούνται ὑπὸ αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμούντες τε ὃν ὀρέγονται καὶ περιχαρεῖς γινόμενοι ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς, ὅταν τύχωσιν αὐτῶν.

²³ Philo, *De Plantatione*, 171: οὕτως οὖν καὶ ὁ ἄκρατος ἀναχθεῖς τὸν μὲν πάθει κεχρημένον ἐμπαθέστερον, τὸν δὲ εὐπαθείας εὐμενέστερον καὶ ἴλεω μᾶλλον ἀπειργάσατο.

²⁴ Justin Martyr, *Apologia*, 57.1: τοὺς ἀλόγως βιοῦντας καὶ ἐμπαθῶς ἐν ἔθει φαύλοις τετραμμένους. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*,

1.1.8: πρὸς τὸ γενέσθαι δύο οὐσίας, τὴν φαύλην τῶν παθῶν, τὴν τε τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς ἐμπαθῆ.

²⁵ Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*, 2.33; 10.89; *Paedagogus*, 1.8; *Stromateis*, 2.8.37; *et passim*.

²⁶ Origen, *homJer*, 14.10 (ψυχὴν ἐμπαθὴ καὶ ἁμαρτωλόν); *Homiliae in Leviticum*, p. 406 (ψυχὴ γὰρ ἐμπαθής); *exProv*, PG.17.248.3 (λογισμοὺς ἐμπαθεῖς); PG.17.245.54: (λογισμὸς ἐμπαθής); PG.17.180.20: (ἐμπαθεῖς λογισμοὺς); PG.17.172.15 (λογισμὸν ἐμπαθῆ); *selNum*, PG.12.581.36 (δοῦλος ἐστὶν ὁ ἐμπαθής); PG.12.241.2 (νοῦς ἀπαθής and νοῦς ἐμπαθής); *frPs*, 70, 1; 77, 48-51; *selPs*, PG.12: 1085.22; 1197.20; 1237.42; 1240.1; 1536.44; 1537.12; 1649.2; 1664.39; 1676.10.

²⁷ Cassian the Sabaite, *OctoVit*, p. 39v: τοὺς ἐμπαθεῖς καὶ φιληδόνους λογισμοῦς. Ibid. p. 40v: τῆς ἐμπαθοῦς διαθέσεως. Ibid. p. 43r: οἱ ἐμπαθεῖς ἄνθρωποι. *SereniPrim*, p. 82r: ἐμπαθής ἐτι ὃν καὶ ἀτελής. Pseudo-Caesarius, *Questiones et Responsiones*, 139: εἰ δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ δι' ἁμελεστέρου καὶ ἐμπαθοῦς βίου προσχωρήσωμεν. Ibid. 188: ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῆς ἐμπαθοῦς καὶ ὑλώδους [sc. ζώης].

²⁸ Didymus, *commJob* (12.1-16.8a), fr. 348; *commZacch*, 3.146; 4.4.; 4.8; *frPs* (al), frs. 65; 617a; 727a; 810; 816; 929; 963; 965; 978; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p.15; *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, pp. 8; 47; 80; *In Genesin*, Cod. pp. 137; 152; 157.

²⁹ Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT* (lib. 2.1-7), 3.26.

temptation and sin) comes from Philo, particularly in this perfect participial form. The notion appears also in Macc. 7:21, although not expressed by this verb.³⁰

The idea of a soul being ‘effeminate’ on account of wickedness was an old one. The historian Polybius of Megalopolis had used it, referring either to the soul or to both soul and body.³¹ The historians Diodorus of Sicily³² and Josephus also used the idea.³³ The perfect participle ἐκτεθληλυμμένη occurs in Philo, mainly referring either to a ‘womanish soul’ or ‘womanish gesture’ (or ‘music’ or ‘habits’).³⁴

The obloquy of one being ‘effeminate’ on account of ‘wickedness’ was transmitted in a continuous line through Clement of Alexandria,³⁵ Origen,³⁶ Eusebius,³⁷ Gregory of Nyssa³⁸ Chrysostom,³⁹ and Cyril of Alexan-

dria.⁴⁰ The association with depravity is clear in Didymus following Eusebius, as footnoted in the text of the Scholion (note 14).⁴¹

The text of *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam* makes a clear association between ‘masculine’ representing ‘virtue’ and ‘feminine’ standing for ‘wickedness’.⁴² This means that this work (which is actually Cassian’s) was written in a spirit similar to the work by Eusebius, which had the same topic, namely, his *Commentarius in Isaiam*.⁴³

The idea occurring in Proclus is one more instance of Proclus’ being influenced by Christianity, indeed by Didymus himself, as I have discussed in *RCR*.⁴⁴

Once again, therefore, this Scholion is a quotation from Didymus’ Commentary on Revelation.

³⁰ 2 Macc. 7:21: ἑκαστον δὲ αὐτῶν παρεκάλει τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ γενναίῳ πεπληρωμένη φρονήματι καὶ τὸν θῆλυν λογισμὸν ἄρσενι θυμῷ διεγείρασα.

³¹ Polybius of Megalopolis (third–second cent. BC), *Historiae*, 36.15.2: ἐκτεθληλυμένος καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ τῷ σώματι. 28.21.3: ψυχῆς ἐκτεθληλυμένης.

³² Diodorus of Sicily (historian, first cent. BC), *Bibliotheca Historica* (lib. 21–40), 30.17.1: ψυχῆς τελείως ἐκτεθληλυμένης.

³³ Josephus, *Antiquitas Judaica*, 4.291: τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῖς τεθληλυμένης.

³⁴ Philo, *De Posteritate Caini*, 166 (soul); *De Vita Mosis*, 2.184 (soul); *De Somniis*, 2.9 (habits); *De Specialibus Legibus*, 2.193 (music); *De Agricultura*, 35 (movement).

³⁵ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.18.81.4: βούλεται μήτε κατὰ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὰ ἔργα μήτε κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκθληλυμένους; ἡρρενῶσθαι γὰρ τὸν ἀληθείᾳ σχολάζοντα ἐν τε ὑπομοναῖς ἐν τε καρτερίαις κὰν τῷ βίῳ κὰν τῷ τρόπῳ κὰν τῷ λόγῳ κὰν τῇ ἀσκήσει. Ibid. 7.7.36.4: οὐδὲ τὰς πολυανθεῖς καὶ εὐώδεις πλοκάς ἐκθληλυνοῦσας δι’ αἰσθήσεως τὴν ψυχὴν.

³⁶ Origen, *frLam*, fr. 96: οὐ θυγατέρες οἱ ἐκτεθληλυμένοι.

³⁷ Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.31: δύναται δὲ ταῦτα μὴ περὶ μόνων γυναικῶν λέγεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ψυχῶν χαύνων καὶ τεθληλυμένων. See also note 14 to the Scholion text.

³⁸ Gregory of Nyssa, *In Sanctum Pascha*, v. 9, p. 267; *In Ecclesiasten*, v. 5, p. 311.

³⁹ John Chrysostom, *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.64.733.46–48. Ἔχει δὲ θυγατέρας καὶ οὐχὶ υἱούς· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀνδρεῖον, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν ἡδονὴν ἐκτεθληλυμένην· ἥδης, ἡ κακία, θυγάτηρ οὖσα τοῦ διαβόλου.

⁴⁰ Cyril of Alexandria, *De Adoratione*, PG.68: 300.47; 308.46; 320.19; *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 164; *Homiliae Paschales*, PG.77.621.47.

⁴¹ Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. pp. 353–354: οἱ ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι ‘ἄσματος’ εἰσιν ‘θυγατέρες’, ‘φωνῆς’ μόνης εἰσιν ‘θυγατέρες’, οὐ νοῦ, οὐ σοφίας, οὐκ ἐπιστήμης, οὐ φωτός. καὶ διὰ τὸ ἀνανδρον αὐτῶν καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐκτεθληλυμένον περὶ τὰ ‘πρόσκαιρα’ ἔχουσιν ‘θυγατέρες’ εἴρηται. ‘ταπεινωθήσονται’ οὖν αὐται.

⁴² *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 1.26: Διὰ τοῦτο δὲ ἄρρηνας ὡς ἀξίους τῶν θείων ὀφθαλμῶν προετίμησεν, ἐνδεικνύμενος ὅτι συντόνους ψυχᾶς παγίως καὶ κραταιῶς ἐπιτελοῦσας τὰ δόγματα, ἀλλὰ οὐχὶ ἀπαλὰς καὶ εὐκόλους καὶ ἐκτεθληλυμένας, ὁ λόγος ἐπιζητεῖ. Ibid. 1.48: φιλανθρωπίας τινὰς ἀπαιδεύτους καὶ συγχωρήσεις ἁμαρτημάτων ἀκρίτους, καὶ τοιαῦτα τινα κεχαρισμένα τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ τῶν ἀκουόντων διεξιόντες, ἐπὶ πλεῖον τῶν φιληδόνων τὰς ψυχὰς ἐκθληλύνουσιν.

⁴³ Cf. quotation in note 14 of the text of the Scholion, p. 125.

⁴⁴ See *RCR*, pp. 354–55

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XVII

EN XVIIa: χρόνος μακροθυμίας

The idea of God granting a grace period for sinners to repent was received by Cassian from both Chrysostom and Theodoret.

John Chrysostom, *In Genesin*, PG.53.181.38–42: Καὶ ὄρα μακροθυμίαν Δεσπότου, πρὸ πόσου χρόνου τὴν πρόρρησιν γενέσθαι ποιεῖ, ἵνα καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν ἐπιδείξηται φιλανθρωπίαν. Ibid. PG.53.191.17–19: Ἦν οὖν μάθωμεν καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀγανάκτησιν, καὶ τὴν ἀπειλήν, καὶ τὴν τοσαύτην τοῦ χρόνου μακροθυμίαν, ἣν εἰς μετάνοιαν αὐτοῖς δέδωκεν. Ibid. PG.53.191.25–27: Οὔτε ὁ τῆς τιμωρίας φόβος, οὔτε ὁ τῆς μακροθυμίας χρόνος ἀπέστησεν αὐτοὺς τῶν πονηρῶν πράξεων. Ibid. PG.53.192.55–193.2: Ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρήγαγον, τὴν γνῶσιν τῶν πρακτέων καὶ τῶν μὴ πρακτέων ἐνέθηκα τῇ φύσει, τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἐδωρησάμην, ἀφάτῳ τῇ μακροθυμίᾳ ἐχρησάμην, καὶ μετὰ τὸν πολὺν χρόνον ἐκεῖνον, καὶ τὴν ἀγανάκτησιν, καὶ τὴν ἀπειλήν, ἣν εἶπον, καὶ ἑτέραν προθεσμίαν ὥρισα, βουλόμενος αὐτοὺς εἰς αἴσθησιν ἐλθόντας τῶν οἰκείων παισμάτων ἀνακαλέσασθαι τὴν ἐμὴν ἀγανάκτησιν. *Fragmenta in Jeremiam*, PG.64.985.21–23: Ὅρᾳς τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροθυμίαν; τοσοῦτον ἡνέσχετο χρόνον αὐτῶν μετὰ τὴν ἀπόστασιν, καὶ τὸ παρασπονδήσαι.

Theodoret, *commIs*, 12: Πολὺν ἡνεσχόμεν χρόνον, πλείστη ἐχρησάμην μακροθυμία, ἥνεγκα καταφρονούμενος. *intDan*, PG.81.1368.14–19: Εἴτα καὶ σημαίνει τῆς θείας μακροθυμίας τὸν χρόνον· δυοκαίδεκα γὰρ διαδραμόντων μηνῶν, ἐδέξατο ἡ διὰ τῆς προρρήσεως ἀπειλή τῶν πραγμάτων τὸ τέλος. Καὶ τοσοῦτον χρόνον εἰς μεταμέλειαν εἰληφώς, κακῶς τὴν τῆς μεταμελείας ἀνάλωσε προθεσμίαν.

Nevertheless, the image involved in this Scholion was also expounded in detail by Didymus. The following passage runs in the same vein as [Scholion XXX](#), where the devil is identified with the ‘wrath of God’. The idea of God granting a grace period (θεοῦ μακροθυμία) to those who do not repent (κατὰ τῶν μὴ μετανοούντων) before they incur punishment has a parallel in Didymus, even though the expression of ‘a grace period’ (χρόνος μακροθυμίας) is not there.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 44: Παρίσταται καὶ ἐκ τούτων τῶν λέξεων ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία, οὐκ ἀποτόμως χρησαμένου κατὰ τῶν μὴ μετανοούντων τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ ἀλλὰ στυλβώσαντος αὐτήν· καὶ τὸ τόξον δὲ ἐνέτεινεν καὶ ἡτοίμασεν ἐπὶ τῷ βαλεῖν τὰ τῆς κολάσεως βέλη, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἀπέλυσεν πῶς τὰ βέλη καίτοι ἐξεργασάμενος αὐτὰ καὶ ἐτοίμως ἔχων πρὸς τὸ βαλεῖν. δυνατόν ἐν τόξῳ σκευὴ θανάτου ἡτοιμάσθαι εἰπεῖν τοὺς ὑπηρετοῦντας ταῖς κολάσεσιν σκευὴ ὀργῆς πολλαχοῦ ὀνομαζομένους· οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ πονηροὶ ἄγγελοι δι’ ὧν ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς καὶ θλίψις ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀξίους ἐκπέμπεται. εἰ δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐξεργασμένα τοῖς καιομένοις βέλη πληρωθέντα τοῦ δηλητηρίου φαρμάκου εἰσὶ τὰ σκευὴ τοῦ θανάτου, ἐπιστατέον.

EN XVIIb: μακροθυμία τοῦ κριτοῦ

Exploration of ‘the forbearance of the Judge’ reveals Cassian’s debts. Although this is a recurring theme in Chrysostom’s commentary on Genesis, a fuller exposition of the idea was afforded by Didymus, as the just quoted fragment 44 shows, which continues thus:

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 44: μακροθυμία τῇ ἐξ ἀγαθότητος τοῦ κριτοῦ γίνεται ὑπέρθεσις τῆς ἀνταποδόσεως· εἰ γὰρ δίκαιος κριτὴς καὶ ἰσχυρὸς ἦν μόνον, ἄρδην τὸ πᾶν ἀπώλλυτο, τῆς διανοίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιρρεπῶς ἐχούσης πρὸς τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν· τῷ δὲ ἔχειν πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις καὶ τὸ μακροθυμεῖν, ἀγαθὸς γὰρ οὐ καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ὀργὴν ἐπάγει, καίτοι ἐκάστοτε ἀσεβείας οὔσης καὶ ἁμαρτημάτων γινομένων. μακροθυμεῖ δὲ οὐχ ἵνα ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ κακίᾳ, ἀλλ’ ἵνα καιρὸν καὶ τόπον μετανόιας ἔχωμεν· βούλεται γὰρ τὴν μετάνοιαν τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ ἵνα ζῇ ὑπὲρ τὸν θάνατον ὃν δέχεται ἐπιμένων τῷ ἁμαρτάνειν, τὸ λεγόμενον ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν σε ἄγει.

For all its simplicity, the expression ‘the forbearance of the Judge’ (μακροθυμία τοῦ κριτοῦ) is a very rare one: apart from the Scholia, all Christian literature used it only in the following instances:

Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.208.1: τῇ τοῦ κριτοῦ μακροθυμίᾳ.

Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 233: Ἡ μακροθυμία οὖν καὶ ἀγαθότης τοῦ κριτοῦ.

Severianus of Gabala, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 215: διὰ τῆς τοῦ κριτοῦ μακροθυμίας.

EN XVIIIc: φύσεως ἀπολλυμένης

The entire Scholion is a rebuttal of the Gnostic tenet which urged the theory of predetermined ‘unchange-

able natures’. The idea of the Scholion is in fact Origen’s attack on the Gnostics. The expression φύσεως ἀπολλυμένης (‘wretched nature’) is typically his.¹ No one either before or after him used this so extensively. Cassian took it up in order to make this brief remark and wrote this Scholion under the influence of Theodoret and Chrysostom, while Didymus’ Commentary on the Apocalypse was still on his table.

¹ Origen, *Cels*, IV.60; V.61; *Princ.* III.1.8; III.1.18; *commJohn*, II.20.135; *Philocalia*, 16.3; 21.7; 21.17; 27.2; 27.12; *commEph*, 25; *frEx*, PG.12: 268.19; 273.35; 281.20; *Catena in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 342. Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, *In Dictum Evangelii: Cum Consummasset Jesus hos Sermones*, PG.36.297.26. Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 2.1–7)*, 6.9,3: οὐ γὰρ παρῆεν

ἀπολλυμένην τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν φύσιν· ἀλλ’ ἐφοίτησεν δι’ ἐαυτοῦ ὁδηγῆσαν, διδάξαν πᾶσαν ἀλήθειαν, ἀνακαινίσαν ἡμᾶς, καὶ τὰ θεϊκὰ χαρίσματα δωρησάμενον. Didymus in *Catena in Acta*, p. 295: Οὐ μόνον, φησὶν, οἱ κατ’ εὐσέβειαν ζῶντες δηλοῦνται γένος Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶς, διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἀπολλυμένης φύσεως.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XVIII

EN XVIIIa: τὰ θεϊκὰ ἔργα

The origin the notion of ‘divine works’ is Athanasian. *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.437.32: διὰ τί μὴ καὶ ἐκ τῶν θεϊκῶν ἔργων ἐπιγινώσκουσι τὸν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ Λόγον. *Ad Serapionem de Spiritu Sancto*, PG.26.673.6: ἔργα δὲ θεϊκὰ θεωροῦντες. *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.400.4: καὶ τὰ θεϊκὰ βλέποντας αὐτοὺς ἔργα τοῦ λόγου. The same passage appears in Pseudo-Athanasius, *Sermo Major*, fr. 101.

Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.732.1: Τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν θεϊκῶν ἔργων τὴν ἀγίαν Τριάδα δοξάζεσθαι.

Eusebius, *De Theophania*, fr. 6: μετὰ δὲ αὐτάρκη διδασκαλίαν ἐπειδὴ ἔδει καὶ θεϊκὸν ἔργον προστιθέναι τοῖς λόγοις ὠφέλιμον τοῖς ὁρῶσι.

Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, Homily 28.1.6: ἔργα θεϊκὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. Ibid. Homily 4.30.8: ἐργάζεσθαι ἔργον θεϊκόν. *Sermones*, Homily 4.1: ἐργάζονται γὰρ ἔργον θεϊκόν. Ibid. 8.3: εἰς τὸ ἔργον τὸ θεϊκὸν ἀόκνως καὶ σπουδαιοτέρως ἐργάζεται. *Homiliae vii*, Homily 55.2: ἀλλ’ ἵνα ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν θεϊκὸν ἔργον ἐπιτελέσῃ, ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων οἰκοδομῶν.

Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 2.1–7)*, 5.26: τὰ θεϊκὰ ἔργα ὑπὸ τῆς ἀρρήτου τριάδος ὁμοφρόνως γίνεται. *DT (lib. 2.8–27)*, PG.39.748.26: ἐπὶ θεϊκῶν ἔργων.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, Fr. 662a: θεϊκῶν γὰρ ἔργων ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ γινομένων.

EN XVIIIb: φῶς ὢν

There is a considerable difference of interpretation between this Scholion and the corresponding comment by Oecumenius. The latter regards the ‘morning star’ in its current Christian sense, notably, Lucifer. Accordingly, Rev. 2:28 is rendered as ‘receiving Satan under one’s power’.¹ The same author, however, dealing with the ‘morning star’ of Rev. 22:16, wavers as to whether this suggests Jesus (which is clearly stated

in Rev. 22:16) or the ‘star Lucifer’. Oecumenius ascribes this uncertainty to Cyril of Alexandria, whom he was supposed to quote.²

On the other hand, the author of this Scholion regards the ‘morning star’ as the Law and the prophets, who are the ‘light, acting before the rise of the sun of righteousness’.

It is strange that the expression ‘morning star’ (ὁ ἄσστηρ ὁ πρωῒνός, Rev. 22:16) did not receive any comment by Christian authors. Epiphanius of Salamis is the sole author to identify the ἄσστηρ ὁ πρωῒνός with the devil, confirming this by means of Isaiah 14:12.³

Against this, we have a unique text (which appeared under the name of Athanasius and is sometimes attributed to Didymus), where the expression is ascribed to Christ incarnate, according to the spirit and letter of the book of Revelation.

Pseudo-Athanasius, *Oratio Quarta Contra Arianos*, sections 28–29. Ἐξω οἱ κύνες καὶ οἱ φαρμακοί, καὶ οἱ πόρνοι, καὶ οἱ φονεῖς καὶ οἱ εἰδωλολάτραι καὶ πᾶς ποιὼν καὶ φιλῶν ψεῦδος. Ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς ἐπεμψα τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, μαρτυρῆσαι ὑμῖν ταῦτα ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ῥίζα καὶ τὸ γένος Δαβίδ, ὁ ἄσστηρ ὁ λαμπρός, ὁ πρωῒνός. Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ νύμφη λέγουσιν· ἔρχου· καὶ ὁ ἀκούων εἰπάτω· ἔρχου· καὶ ὁ διψῶν ἐρχέσθω· ὁ θέλων λαβέτω ὕδωρ ζωῆς δωρεάν.⁴ Εἰ τοίνυν τὸ γένος Δαβίδ ἐστὶν ὁ ἄσστηρ ὁ λαμπρός, ὁ πρωῒνός, δῆλόν ἐστι τὸ κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ σωτῆρος ἑωσφόρον εἰρῆσθαι, οὗ προὔπηρχε τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γέννημα, ὡς εἶναι τοιοῦτον τὸ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ· ἔξ ἑμαντοῦ σε γεγέννηκα πρὸ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα ἐπιφανείας. Τὸ γὰρ ‘πρὸ ἑωσφόρου’ ἴσον ἐστὶ τῷ ‘πρὸ τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ λόγου’. Ἔστιν ἄρα καὶ ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ φανερώς περὶ υἱοῦ κείμενα, εἰ καὶ περιττόν ἐστι περὶ τούτων ἀμφισβητεῖν.

Apart from Oecumenius,⁵ this is the sole instance in Christian literature where this passage from Revelation is quoted and commented upon in an explicit manner. This work deserves exploration as to its relation to Cassian’s pen. For the passage was quoted only by

¹ Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 56.

² Oecumenius, *ibid.* p. 255.

³ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 447.

⁴ Rev. 22:15–17. The portion is partially quoted only by Hippolytus, Oecumenius, and Andreas.

⁵ Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 253.

commentators on the Apocalypse, and Cassian is one of them. We should recall that we came upon this work also in [Scholion XI](#), canvassing the expression *δυνατὸν ἐκλαβεῖν* ('it is possible to interpret as'), which is characteristic of only a few theologians, and occurred in Palestine along with Alexandria.

EN XVIIIc: καταλάμπεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ
ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης

Applying the title 'sun of righteousness' to Christ is a recurring theme in Christian literature. Reference to the 'rise' of this 'sun' 'casting light' (*viz.* the 'sun of righteousness' glossed by the verb *καταλάμπειν*, 'to shine upon' or 'over') is characteristic of Didymus. As a matter of fact, this Scholion has parallels in Didymus, who used the expression 'being enlightened by the sun of righteousness' (*καταλάμπεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης*) in abundance, and almost exclusively.

Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 10: εἰ δὲ πρὸς ἀναγωγὴν νοοῖτο, λεχθεὶ ἂν ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος εὐγένειαν κτᾶται, οὐκ ἂν ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης' καταλαμπομένην.

commEccl (11–12), Cod. p. 327: αὐτοῖς γὰρ ἔσται φῶς αἰώνιον, ὃ ἡλίος τῆς δικαιοσύνης· αἰεὶ αὐτοὺς καταλάμπων. *op. cit.* Cod. p. 340: ὅσον ἐσμέν ἐν τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ καὶ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἀκόλυτον ἔχομεν, δυνάμεθα καταλάμπεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης' καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ 'φωτὸς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ' καὶ 'τῆς σελήνης καὶ τῶν ἀστέρων'.

commZacch, 1.161: Τί δὲ ἀγαθὸν καὶ σωτηριῶδες ἔψεται κατασκηνούντος τοῦ Κυρίου ἐν μέσῳ τῆς καλλιπόλεως, ἢ τὸ 'καταφυγεῖν ἔθνη πολλά' μετανοοῦντα 'ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ' τῇ ὑπὸ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης καταλαμπομένην.

commJob, PG.39.1120.35: Ὁ γὰρ δίκαιος εὐγένειαν κτᾶται, οὐκ ἂν ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης καταλαμπομένην.

commPs 20–21, Cod. p. 14: ἕκαστον δόγμα φωτίζον τὴν ψυχὴν, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης καταλαμπόμενον, ἡμέραν εἰρήκαμεν.

commPs 22–26.10, Cod. p. 80: δύναται δὲ ἡμέρα λέγεσθαι ὁλος ὁ χρόνος τῆς ζωῆς τῶν ἁγίων, ὅτι ἐν

φωτισμῷ εἰσιν αἰεὶ, καταλαμπόμενοι εἰσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ φωτὸς 'τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης'.

frPs(al), Fr. 1240: Ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ὑπὸ σοῦ φωτιζομένης ἡμέρας τυγχάνοντι καὶ ἀρξαμένῳ καταλάμπεσθαι ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σου ἀκουστόν μοι ποίησον τὸ ἔλεος.

The same notion is at times expressed by Didymus in an oblique manner, which nevertheless is couched in the characteristic vocabulary of the Scholia.

commZacch, 1.289: Δυνατὸν ἐν τούτοις ἐκλαβεῖν οἰκίαν τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ ζῶντος Θεοῦ, οἶκον αὐτοῦ τυγχάνουσιν, ἐν ᾗ οἱ παραμένοντες καὶ διατρίβοντες, κατὰ δόγματα αὐτῆς διακείμενοι, καταλάμπονται πρὸς τοῦ ἐπικειμένου τῇ λυχνία λύχνου, ἐξαπτομένου⁶ ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδεύοντος τοὺς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ διάγοντας κατὰ τοὺς θεσμούς καὶ κανόνας καὶ δόγματα τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς γνώμης.

Otherwise there are only the following instances of the use of this construction:

Basil of Seleucia, *Orationes*, p. 469: Ὡ λαμπρόν, καὶ τῷ ἡλίῳ τῆς δικαιοσύνης καταλαμπόμενον μαρτύριον!

Gregory Thaumaturgus, *In Annuntiationem Sanctae Virginis Mariae*, PG.10.1145.37–41 (the text is spurious and written in a style imitating Chrysostom): Σήμερον ἀγγελικῇ παρατάξει ὑμνωδίαί φαιδρύνονται, καὶ τὸ φέγγος τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας τοῖς πιστοῖς καταλάμπεται. Σήμερον τὸ ἱλαρὸν ἡμῖν ἔαρ, Χριστὸς ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡλῖος φαιδρῶ τῷ φωτὶ ἡμᾶς περιέλαμψε, καὶ τὰς τῶν πιστῶν ἐννοίας ἐφώτισε.

John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam i ad Corinthios Commentarius*, PG.61.111.31–34: Τοῦτο καὶ οὐρανοῦ λαμπρότερον ἦν τὸ ἱλαστήριον, οὐ ποικιλία ἄστρον καταλαμπόμενον οὐδ' ἀκτῖσιν ἡλιακαῖς, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἔχον ἐκεῖθεν ἀφίεντα τὰς ἀκτῖνας.

Cassian the Sabaite, *OctoVit*, Cod. p. 39a: θεάσασθαι τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης. Cod. p. 40r: τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης Χριστόν.

Theodore Studites, *Μεγάλη Κατήχησις*, Catechesis 100, p. 725: καὶ αἰεὶ ἔχειν τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης καταλάμποντα τὸν νοῦν ἡμῶν.

⁶ Cf. [Scholion IX](#): ἅπτεϊ λύχνον ὁ τὸν νοῦν ἑαυτοῦ προσάγων τῷ ἀληθινῷ φωτὶ κακεῖθεν οἷα λύχνον αὐτὸν ἅπτων. ἵν' οὖν ὀφελήσῃ τοὺς δυναμένους ὁ τὸν λύχνον ἅψας.

Symeon the New Theologos, *Capita Theologica*, 2.22: ὑπὸ τοῦ νοητοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης καταλάμπονται καὶ φαιδρύνονται.

The metaphor was used by Andreas of Caesarea in his own Commentary on the Apocalypse, which suggests that he was aware of Cassian's Scholia. Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentary in Apocalypsin*, Logos 7, chapter 20, section 7,14b-15: ἐκεῖ γὰρ νῦν οὐκ ἔσται, ἀλλὰ ἡμέρα μία ἀντὶ αἰσθητοῦ ἡλίου τῷ τῆς δικαιοσύνης καταλαμπομένη.

EN XVIIIId: οἱ δυνάμενοι φάναι

The expression is characteristic of Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.123: Σὺν τοῖς οὕτως ἡρμηνευμένοις ἀνθρώποις, κατακάρπως κατοικοῦσιν ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ οἱ δυνάμενοι φάναι περὶ τοῦ βασιλεύοντος τῆς ἐπουρανίου πόλεως Ἱερουσαλὴμ. Ibid. 1.240: μόνου καὶ παντὸς τοῦ σοφίαν δυναμένου λαλεῖν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις, τοῦ δυναμένου φάναι· Ἰησοῦν ἑώρακα· τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τῆς καρδίας μου πεφωτισμένοις πρὸς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ φωτός. Ibid. 5.179: μόνου ἀναβαίνουντος ἐπ' αὐτήν οἱ δυνάμενοι φάναι.

Didymus stands out in using this. There is only one attenuated parallel in Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 2, p. 104: οὐχ ὥς φάναι τι τυχὸν δυναμένοις. Cf. his phrase recorded in ACO, *Concilium Universale Ephesenum Anno 431*, 1,1,4, p. 59: τὴν δέ γε τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου γέννησιν ἦτοι τὸν τῆς γεννήσεως τρόπον τίς ὁ φάναι δυνάμενος;

EN XVIIIe: Commenting on Rom. 13:12 and Psalms 5:9 and 107:3

This Scholion concludes with an appeal to Rom. 13:12, and Psalms, 56:9 and 107:3, thus underlying the con-

formity of Revelation with both Testaments. It is then worth-exploring the Christian theologians who comment on both scriptural instances at the same point. It turns out that these authors are only Origen, Didymus, and Theodoret. A single instance of John Chrysostom appearing to comment on Psalm 107: 3 is spurious.

Origen's combined references to Psalms 56 and 107 appear only in catenae on the Psalms, which might involve a catenist couching this in the vocabulary of Didymus, although they expressing Origen's theology. We therefore have the following references:

Commenting on Rom. 13:12:

Origen, *Commentariorum Series in Evangelium Matthaei* (Mt. 22.34–27.63), p. 238; *commMatt*, 11.6; *selPs*, PG.12: 1605.42; 1681.8. Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 8a; *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 326; *commZacch*, 4.240; *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 23; *frPs(al)*, frs. 636; 1136. Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 12.54; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82: 197.12; 652.36.

Commenting on both Psalm 56:9 and Psalm 107:3 at the same point:

Origen, *frPs*, 56, 9; 107, 3. Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.274. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1749.38.

Theologians commenting at a single point on both Psalms 56:9 and 107:3 are rare. Only Eusebius⁷ presents such a case while all other instances appear in spurious texts.⁸ We are then left with Didymus and Theodoret.

Therefore, this Scholion was written by Cassian after Didymus. The fact that Theodore Studites reproduces the vocabulary of this Scholion (above, τὸν ἡλίον τῆς δικαιοσύνης καταλάμποντα τὸν νοῦν ἡμῶν) is instructive: since he normally reproduces Cassian's vocabulary heavily, he actually tells us that he had himself read the present comments on the apocalypse by Cassian the Sabaite.

⁷ Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23: 505.5; 513.24; 561.32; 1329.10.

⁸ Cf. the following *spuria*. Pseudo-Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.260.55; *Quaestiones ad Antiochum Ducem*,

PG.28.697.23. Pseudo-Epiphanius of Salamis, *Testimonia*, 76.3.

Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Psalmos 101–107*, PG.55.672.74. These all call for investigation as to their relation to Cassian's pen.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XIX

EN XIXa: αἱ μετουσίαι τοῦ πνεύματος

The expression μετουσία πνεύματος ('participation in the Spirit') in Origen occurs only in catena-fragments on the gospel of John and on the Psalms. These instances, however, at the points where μετουσία alone (but not 'participation in the Spirit') appears, are couched in the language of Didymus. By contrast, the term μετουσία in Didymus appears at more than fifty-five points, of which at least seven refer to 'participation in the Spirit'.¹ From both this usage by Didymus and its occurrence in Theodoret,² it can be inferred that Cassian wrote quoting from Didymus, while taking into account Theodoret, and certainly using his own vocabulary at the same time.

The notion of 'participation in the Spirit' recurs also in Gregory of Nyssa, but not in his namesake of Nazianzus, as well as in some other authors. The mysterious figure of Pseudo-Macarius champions the notion and expression μετουσία πνεύματος.³ One should notice that its employment is exclusive to Christian literature, even though the term μετουσία alone comes from very old times. As a matter of fact, this term is present in some of the best authors of Classical Greece,⁴ while it is not absent from the biblical glossary,⁵ not to mention its frequent occurrence in Philo. Nevertheless, the list of Christian authors using the notion of μετουσία τοῦ πνεύματος is rather short.⁶

Among the New Testament catenae, there is a text

purporting to relate 'Origen's exegesis on the notion according to God's foreknowledge' (Ὠριγένους ἐκ τῆς ἐρμηνείας εἰς τὸ κατὰ πρόγνωσιν Θεοῦ).⁷ The same Greek passage is also ascribed to Didymus.⁸ In this text, the expression 'having predestined them unto the adoption of children though participation in the Spirit of adoption' (προορίσας αὐτοὺς υἱοὺς εἶναι μετουσία τοῦ Πνεύματος τῆς υἰοθεσίας, which is the language of Eph. 1:5) is more likely to be Didymus' rather than Origen's.

Finally, it should be remarked that although μετουσία ('participation') is a traditional word in philosophical texts, the plural form of it (μετουσίαι) is a rather strange occurrence. It is extremely difficult to find this term in the plural. From Homer up until the fifth century AD, one can come upon no more than five instances where such a plural occurs. And yet, one of these five instances is ascribed to Didymus.⁹

Once again, I believe that it is after Didymus that Proclus summoned the courage to use this plural himself, which is in fact the last time this form ever was used. Whereas Proclus uses the singular number, namely μετουσία, dozens of times, he applies the plural μετουσίαι just once. I gather it was Didymus of Alexandria whom he had in mind: he refers to 'the theologians' who hold that 'there are venerated exchanges of powers as well as pertinent participations, which [powers] are believed to pervade divine [hypostases] with each other and to be permeated by each

¹ Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. pp. 46 and 62; *commJob*, PG.39.1141.16; *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 315. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 156; *ibid.* Cod. p. 204; *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 10.

² Theodoret, *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.512.10; the term μετουσία appears otherwise in Theodoret seventeen times in various contexts.

³ Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, Homilies 2.6.4; 36.3.3; 41.1.6; 43.1.2 and 5; 48.1.9; 51.1.4; 60.3.5; *Homiliae* I, 5; 37; *Sermones*, 26.2; 27.4 and 7; *Epistula Magna*, pp. 238; 239; 249; 291; 292.

⁴ Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae*, line 152; *Ranae*, line 443. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 8.5.24. Demosthenes, *De Rhodiorum Libertate*, 29; *De Corona*, 128; *In Midiam*, section 124; *In Aristocratem*, 40; 41; *In Aristogitonem*, 74; *Pro Phormione*, 32. Aeschines, *De Falsa Legatione*, 152. Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Moralia* (πρὸς μετουσίαν ἐλευθερίας), fr. 360 (SVF, III.88.7, *apud* Philo, *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit*, 47).

⁵ 4 Macc. 2:1: τὴν τοῦ κάλλους μετουσίαν.

⁶ Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), PG.39.700.26. Methodius of Olympus (third cent. AD), *Symposium*,

Oration 8.8. Gregory of Nyssa, *De Instituto Christiano*, v. 8.1, pp. 45; 59; *De Spiritu Sancto sive In Pentecosten*, PG.46.697.40. Athanasius, *Ad Serapionem de Spiritu Sancto*, PG.26.585.40. Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae*, 53.1. Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 66. Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo Asceticus*, p. 175; *Regulae ad Monachos*, pp. 307; 308; 319. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 1, p. 370; v. 2, pp. 566; 620; 695; 717; 720; 721; 722; 723; 731; v. 3, pp. 133; 135; *Dialogi de Sancta Trinitate*, pp. 532; 533; *et passim*. Theodore of Mopsuestia (fourth/fifth cent. AD), *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, pp. 133; 135; 140; 141; *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, pp. 180; 187. Oecumenius was clearly influenced by this notion of μετουσία πνεύματος. Cf. *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 65.

⁷ *Catena in Epistulam Petri i*, p. 42.

⁸ Cf. Didymus, *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 10.

⁹ Cf. Didymus referring to 'one being bound up with the Holy Spirit', and expressing this 'bond' by means of the term μετουσία in the plural (μετουσίαι). *Catena in Acta*, p. 333: ὡς αἱ μετουσίαι τῶν θείων τούτων δηλοῦνται τῷ ὀνόματι.

other'.¹⁰ Quite evidently, Proclus knew of the Christian teaching about the 'gifts by the Spirit',¹¹ as well as the Christian notion of 'participating in the Holy Spirit'.¹² Still, the phraseology in which he put it (namely, the plural μετουσίαι) is found in no author other than Didymus. Besides, this is not the first instance evincing influence by Didymus upon Proclus, as discussed in previous pages. The connection was of course his teacher Origen, as discussed in the Introduction.

EN XIXb: ἄσυντρόχαστον

The adjective ἄσυντρόχαστος means 'individually distinct', 'separate', 'incompatible with'. As it stands, this form appears for the first time in Origen,¹³ and then it was taken up by Didymus.¹⁴ Later, Simplicius used ἄσυντρόχαστον¹⁵ in his commentary on Aristotle's *Categoriae*. Quite oddly, though, he never used the relatively more common verb συντροχάζειν ('to run together' or 'to run with'). After Simplicius the adjective ἄσυντρόχαστος does not appear ever again.

Didymus did use the verb συντροχάζειν,¹⁶ which is scriptural,¹⁷ which also occurs in the deacon Olympiodorus of Alexandria,¹⁸ as well as in certain Greek writings, both pagan and Christian,¹⁹ plus some lexica.²⁰ Noteworthy among them is the usage by Hippolytus.²¹

We cannot know whether Simplicius had in mind some unknown text of Aristotle, apart from the *Categoriae*, where the discussion about homonyms appears.²² If such a text ever existed at all, Origen would probably have been aware of it, so he may have taken his theory of homonyms from there, since it is only

Hippolytus who refers to homonyms being considered in the *Categoriae*, and cites this Aristotelian work. In that case, Origen would have picked up the term ἄσυντρόχαστον from that text. My own guess, however, is that Origen recognized the significance of homonyms through his relation with Hippolytus, and only after he had studied the commentaries by Alexander of Aphrodisias.

It is important, though, that *in effect* Origen's theory and practice of applying homonyms to 'antithetical and irrelevant' states (which is a point that Simplicius ascribes to Aristotle) is consonant with the Aristotelian view.

It is not accidental that the term ἄσυντρόχαστον is so rare in literature, once Aristotle's passage was lost. It appears only four times, of which one is in Simplicius, another two in Origen and Didymus, plus the instance in the present Scholion. This means that Origen appears to be the first to have coined the term or, at least, that the term cannot be traced to any author before him. Once again, the Scholion seems to come from Didymus, along with additional evidence to be discussed later in this section.

EN XIXc: συμφώνως ἐκλαμβάνειν

The expression συμφώνως ἐκλαμβάνειν ('to consider accordingly') is peculiar to Didymus and appears rarely. This is analogous to his characteristic expression καταλλήλως λαμβάνειν, which was discussed in EN XIVg.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 78: συμφώνως τούτοις ἐκλήψεται καὶ τὸ περὶ τοῦ σωτήρος λεχθέν. Ibid. fr.

¹⁰ Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 1, p. 18: καὶ παρὰ τοῖς θεολόγοις μεταδόσεις εἰσὶ δυνάμεων ὑμνημέναι καὶ μετουσίαι, πληροῦντων τε ἄλληλα τῶν θείων καὶ πληρουμένων ὑπ' ἄλλήλων.

¹¹ 1 Cor. 12:4 and 9.

¹² Heb 6:4.

¹³ Origen, *deOr*, XXIV.2: τὸ τοίνυν τούτων τῶν ποιότητων ἴδιον καὶ ἄσυντρόχαστον πρὸς ἕτερον.

¹⁴ Didymus, *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 3: καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀπαγγελλόμενα περὶ τῆς θεότητος ἄσυντρόχαστά εἰσιν πρὸς ἄλλον τινὰ μονογενῆς γὰρ ἐστίν.

¹⁵ Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Categoriae Commentarium*, v. 8, p. 380: οὐ κατὰ μαχομένων μόνον καὶ ἄσυντρόχαστων τὴν ὁμωνυμίαν ἔταξεν.

¹⁶ Didymus, *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 4: ταῦτα τὰ ὀνόματα συντροχάζει καὶ εἰς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἀγγέλους. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 177: καρδίαν πρὸς καρδίαν συντροχάζει. Ibid. Cod. p. 178: δύσκολον οὖν ἐστὶν συντροχάζειν πρόσωπον προσώπῳ ἐν ὁμοιότητι. *op. cit.* Cod. p. 178: οὐ συντροχάζει οὖν καρδία πρὸς

καρδίαν. There are also instances where he simply uses the term of Eccl. 12:6: Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. pp. 361 and 362: καὶ συντροχάζει ὁ τροχὸς ἐπὶ τὸν λάκκον.

¹⁷ Ecclesiastes, 12:6.

¹⁸ Olympiodorus of Alexandria (the deacon), *commEccl*, PG.93.620.56–57.

¹⁹ Of the thirty-six instances appearing in Greek, seven are various forms of the verb συντροχάζειν used by Didymus; another eight instances appear in Eustathius of Thessaloniki, two in Hesychius of Alexandria, *Lexicon* (entries 2191 and 2733), and one in Plotinus, *Enneads*, II.4.8.

²⁰ Photius, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter sigma, p. 556. *Suda lexicon*, Alphabetic letter sigma, entry 1647. *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 736.

²¹ Hippolytus, *In Daniele*, 4.15.2: συντροχάζει.

²² Aristotle, *Categoriae*, 1a1; cf. *Physica*, 228a25; 248b9–13; 249a4; *Metaphysica*, 987b10; 991a6; 1059a14; *Politica*, 1253a25; 1079b1; *Topica*, 107a3–5; *De Caelo*, 276b2; *Fragmenta*, Category 2, title 20, fr. 117.

621a: εἰ δὲ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκλαμβάνεται ἡ φωνή, ἅγιος ἐν ᾧ λαλεῖ ὁ σωτὴρ ἂν εἴη συμφώνως τῷ Ὁ πατὴρ ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοὶ ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα. Ibid. fr. 665a: Δυνατὸν δὲ τὸν αἰῶνα τὸν ἐπ’ ἄπειρον ἐκλαβεῖν ἐκ τῆς προκειμένης λέξεως συμφώνως τῷ Κύριος βασιλεύων τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπ’ αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι. *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.39.1624.51–52: Συμφώνως τῷ στεφάνῳ, νοητῷ ὄντι, ἐκκληπτέον καὶ τὸν χρυσοῦν κλοιὸν ἐπιβαλλόμενον τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς τραχήλῳ.

There is also the structure συμφώνως λαμβάνειν (instead of ἐκλαμβάνειν), which Didymus himself also used,²³ as indeed other authors did,²⁴ some of whom were important for him, such as Alexander of Aphrodisias.²⁵ Socrates and Theodoret attest that the expression συμφώνως ἀντιλαμβάνόμενοι was used in a letter by Constantine.²⁶

EN XIXd: δυνατὸν ἀναφέρειν

(‘it is possible to refer’ one matter to another)

Cassian took this phrase up from Eusebius, the sole author who used it and indeed introduced the expression.

Eusebius, *DE*, 7.3.22: ὅτι γὰρ οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν Σολομῶνα οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τὸν τούτου διάδοχον ἀναφέρειν δυνατόν τὰ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ. Ibid. 10.8.13: καὶ σὺ δὲ παρὰ σαυτῷ βασανίσας ἐκάστην λέξιν τοῦ ψαλμοῦ, θέα εἰ δυνατόν ἐπὶ τὸν τυχόντα ἀναφέρειν τὰ θεσπιζόμενα. *Adversus Marcellum*, 2.3.19: πῶς οὖν δυνατόν ἐπὶ τὴν σάρκα ἀναφέρειν τὸ ‘πρὸ τοῦ τὰς ἀβύσσους ποιῆσαι’;

The verb ἀναφέρειν in this sense actually suggests an act of exegesis by the theologian who seeks to decipher a certain cryptic scriptural passage. It is not simply the case of the sacred text ‘making reference’ to someone or something. In that case, it was normal to use the middle voice (ἀναφέρεσθαι), as Eusebius²⁷ as well as Didymus did.²⁸ Using the active voice (ἀναφέρειν), however, is different: in effect it indicates resolving for a certain allegorical exegesis, and in this specific sense Didymus never used the active voice of this particular verb.

Therefore, this Scholion was written by Cassian following Didymus’ Commentary on the Apocalypse, but Cassian himself applied his own awareness of the writings of Eusebius.

²³ Didymus, *commEccl* (5–6), Cod. p. 175: συμφώνως πάλιν λαμβάνεις τὴν ἀναγωγὴν.

²⁴ Cf. Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhoniae Hypotyposes*, 2.136; *Adversus Mathematicos*, 11.76.

²⁵ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 9: τὰς κοινὰς καὶ φυσικὰς ἐννοίας ἃς ἔχομεν περὶ τῶν σοφῶν ἐκτίθεται, ἵνα ταύταις τὰ ἀκόλουθα ζητοῦντες συμφώνως λαμβάνωμεν τε καὶ τιθώμεν. The sixth-century philosopher Asclepius of Tralles, *In Aristotelis Metaphysicorum Libros A-Z Commentaria*, p. 15, quotes the same text of Alexander.

²⁶ Socrates, *HE*, 1.9. Theodoret, *HE*, p. 43.

²⁷ Eusebius, *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, 3.3.15: πῶς οὖν δυνατόν ἦν ἐπὶ τὴν σάρκα τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀναφέρεσθαι ταῦτα; Didymus, *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 29: οὐ γὰρ δυνατόν εἰς ἐκεῖνους ἀναφέρεσθαι ταῦτα.

²⁸ Didymus, *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 234: ἀναφέρεσθαι δὲ δύναται ταῦτα καὶ εἰς τὸν διάβολον αὐτὸν καὶ πᾶσαν πονηρὰν δύναμιν. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 160: δύναται καὶ εἰς τὸν ‘ὑπογραμμόν’ τῶν σφζομένων ἀναφέρεσθαι, τὸν κυριακὸν λέγω ἄνθρωπον. *frPs(al)*, fr. 564: Τὸ Ἐκεῖ φοβηθήσονται φόβον οὗ οὐκ ἦν φόβος δύναται ἀναφέρεσθαι εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα αἰῶνα. Ibid. fr. 573d: Τοῦτο ἀναφέρεσθαι δύναται ἐπὶ τὸ Ἰδοὺ ἐμάκρυνα φυγαδεύων καὶ ἠὺλίσθην ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XX

EN XXa: μὴ μετουσία, ἀλλ' οὐσία ('not by participation, but in essence', cf. EN XXIIa)

Didymus obviously took up this notion from Origen, who had read Alexander of Aphrodisias expounding the Pythagorean teachings and Numenius.

Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 124: ὁμοίως δὲ πάλιν καὶ τὰ ζῷα λαμβάνοντες καὶ φυτὰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα σώματα, ἐνὸς εὐρίσκοντες μετουσία ταῦτα οὐσίας ὄντα, ἰδέαν τινὰ καὶ ἐνάδα οὐσίας λαμβάνοντες τὴν αὐτοουσίαν, ὑπὸ μίαν ταύτην πάλιν ἀνήγαγον πάσας τὰς οὐσίας.

Ibid. p. 233: ἀναγκαῖον ἔδοξεν ἄλλας τινὰς οὐσίας θέσθαι ὧν ἐκάστη κυρίως οὐσία ἔσται, οὐ κατὰ μετουσίαν τινὸς οὐδὲ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς τὸ εἶναι τε καὶ ἔν ἐχούσας· κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς γὰρ ἔν τὸ τῷ εἶδει ἔν, ἀλλ' οὐ κυρίως. The same text was quoted later by the sixth-century philosopher Asclepius of Tralles, *In Aristotelis Metaphysicorum Libros A-Z Commentaria*, pp. 219–220.

It is doubtful that Athanasius, who was not too keen on pagan literature (to say the least), had ever read Alexander, but this phraseology and notion must have reached him by reading Origen. This would have been one of the reasons for Athanasius to praise Origen's orthodoxy. Athanasius was explicit in making the point about the Son being God in Himself, 'not by participation' in the Deity.

Athanasius, *Ad Episcopos in Africa*, PG.26.1044.14: ἃ γὰρ βλέπει τις ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, ταῦτα βλέπει καὶ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ· Υἱὸς δὲ οὐκ ἐκ μετουσίας, ἀλλὰ κατ' οὐσίαν. *De Synodis Arimini et Seleucia*, 48.3: ἔπειτα εἰ μὴ ἐκ μετουσίας ἔστιν ὁ υἱός, ἀλλὰ τῇ οὐσίᾳ λόγος ἔστι καὶ σοφία τοῦ πατρὸς, ἡ δὲ οὐσία αὕτη τῆς οὐσίας τῆς πατρικῆς ἔστι γέννημα καὶ ὁμοιότης αὐτῆς ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα τοῦ φωτός. Ibid. 48.5: ἀνάγκη λοιπὸν κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν νοεῖν καὶ τὴν υἱοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἐνότητα. τὰ μὲν γὰρ γενητά, κἂν συμφωνίαν ἔχη πρὸς τὸν πεποιηκότα, ἀλλ' ἐν κινήσει καὶ μετουσία καὶ νῶ ταύτην ἔχει, ἥνπερ ὁ μὴ φυλάξας ἐκβέβληται τῶν οὐρανῶν, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ὧν γέννημα τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἔν ἐστιν αὐτός καὶ ὁ γεννήσας. Ibid. 53.4: εἰ μὲν οὖν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐκ μετουσίας λέγετε, λεγέσθω μὲν παρ' ὑμῶν

ὁμοιοούσιος. οὐκ ἔστι μέντοι λεγόμενος οὕτως ἀληθείᾳ οὐδὲ ὅλως φῶς οὐδὲ φύσει θεός. τὰ γὰρ ἐκ μετουσίας οὐκ ἀληθείᾳ, ἀλλ' ὁμοιώσει τῆς ἀληθείας λέγεται ὅμοια, ὥστε καὶ μεταπίπτειν καὶ ἀφαιρεῖσθαι δύνασθαι ἀπὸ τῶν μετεχόντων τὴν μετάληψιν. τοῦτο δὲ πάλιν ἴδιον τῶν κτισμάτων καὶ ποιημάτων ἔστιν. οὐκοῦν εἰ τοῦτο ἄτοπον, οὐκ ἂν εἶη ἐκ μετουσίας, ἀλλὰ φύσει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ υἱός, φῶς, σοφία.

Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.620.21: Τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτῷ βούλεται ἢ τῆς μετουσίας ἀπαγόρευσις, ὥς ἀκοινωνήτου τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Μονογενοῦς ὑπαρχούσης.

Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.229: Ὅπου γὰρ Υἱοῦ μετέχοντες, τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς μετουσίας οὐκ ἐστερήμεθα, πῶς οὐκ ἔσται ταυτότης οὐσίας Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ; Ὅπου δὲ οὐσίας ταυτότης, ποῖον ἔξει τόπον ἢ ἀνομοιότης; *Quod Unus Sit Christus*, p. 729: Καὶ οὔτε δύο φαμέν υἱούς, οὔτε δύο κυρίους, ἐπειδὴ δὲ Υἱὸς κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος, ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὅπερ οὗτος συνημμένος τε καὶ μετέχων, κοινωνεῖ τῆς Υἱοῦ προσηγορίας καὶ τιμῆς, καὶ Κύριος κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος, ὃ συνημμένος οὗτος, κοινωνεῖ τῆς τιμῆς.

This idea about the Son being God by essence was also defended in these terms (οὐσία, μετουσία) by Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 1.1.285; 3.10.40. Didymus followed.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1195: Ὡσπερ εἰσὶ θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοὶ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τῷ πάντας τοὺς λεγομένους μετὰ τὴν τριάδα θεοὺς μετουσία θεότητος εἶναι τοιούτους· ἀλλ' ὁ σωτὴρ οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλ' ὧν κατ' οὐσίαν θεός· διὸ ποιεῖ θεούς.

The following text, which is attributed to Origen, renders his real thought, still it is expressed in terms of the foregoing phraseology of Didymus. Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1656.8–13: Τῶν δὲ δαιμόνων Θεός ἐστι κατὰ τὴν δημιουργίαν. Φησὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος· Εἴπερ εἰσὶ θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοὶ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· ἀλλὰ τοὺς λεγομένους μετὰ τὴν Τριάδα θεοὺς μετουσία θεότητος εἶναι τοιούτους· ὁ δὲ Σωτὴρ οὐ κατὰ μετουσίαν, ἀλλὰ κατ' οὐσίαν ἐστὶ Θεός.

Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 77 (speaking of ‘virtue’, which is Christ existing substantially with the Trinity, whereas ‘evil’ is non-existent): ὑπάρχει (sc. ἡ ἀρετή) γὰρ τῷ θεῷ οὐσιωδῶς τῇ τριάδι· μετουσία δὲ τῆς τριάδος ἔχουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν. *frPs(al)*, fr. 148: εἰ γὰρ ζωὴ ὁ υἱὸς οὐ μετουσία ζωῆς, ἀλλὰ ζωοποιῶν αὐτὸς τοὺς μετέχοντας αὐτοῦ, ζῇ δὲ καὶ ὁ πατήρ χορηγῶν ζωὴν κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ υἱῷ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐνεργείας ἀποδιδομένης. Ibid. fr. 399: τὴν μετοχήν οὐκ ἔχόντων κατὰ τὸ λελεγμένον ἐν εὐχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν· Μὴ παραδῶς τὸ σκήπτρόν σου τοῖς μὴ οὖσιν. ταύτης τῆς ὑπάρξεως μετασχεῖν ποθῶν εὐχεται καιρὸν αὐτῷ δοθῆναι τοῦ ἀναψύξαι τῇ μετουσίᾳ τοῦ ὄντος, ἵν’ ἀληθῶς ὑπάρξῃ. Ibid. fr. 860: μόνος γὰρ αὐτὸς ὡσαύτως τῷ πατρί ἐστι θεός, τούτων δὲ ἕκαστος μετουσία θεὸς γέγονε δεξάμενος τὸν θεὸν λόγον κατὰ τὸ Ἐκείνους εἶπε θεοὺς πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο. Ibid. fr. 896: τίς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὃς ζήσεται; θεῶν γάρ ἐστι τὸ τοιοῦτον, τῶν κατὰ μετουσίαν θεότητος θεῶν εἰρημένων· οὗτοι γὰρ μόνοι οὐκ ὄψονται θάνατον, ἐπεὶ περ ζῶσι μεταποιούμενοι τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς.

Didymus applies the idea to the Holy Spirit, too, and, by parity of reasoning, to the Son. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1243: ἐξ οὗ παρίσταται τὸ ἅγιον ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἅγιον εἶναι, ἀγαθὸν δὲ οὐ κατὰ μετουσίαν ἀγαθότητος ἀλλὰ τῷ κατ’ οὐσίαν εἶναι τοιοῦτον ὥσπερ καὶ ἅγιον. τοιοῦτος δὲ καὶ ὁ πατήρ· καὶ εἴρηται γοῦν περὶ αὐτοῦ Πάτερ ἅγιε, καὶ τὸ Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός. καὶ ὁ υἱὸς δὲ ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἀγίου ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἅγιος εἴρηται εἶναι.

By contrast, the idea of *participation* applies to creatures. In *Genesis*, Cod. p. 57: προεῖρηται κυρίως ἄνθρωπος εἶναι ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ· αὕτη μετέχουσα Θεοῦ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς μετουσίας εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ γίνεται, καθὼς λέγομεν εἰκονίζειν τὴν ἀρετὴν τὸν μετέχοντα αὐτῆς. In *Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 10: τότε προορίσας αὐτοὺς υἱοὺς εἶναι μετουσία τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς υἰοθεσίας. *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod.

p. 250: γέγονεν δὲ τὸ λογικὸν ζῶν, ἵνα δεκτικὸν ᾗ ἀρετῆς. τὸ δὲ δεκτικόν τινος οὐκ ἐστὶν κατ’ οὐσίαν τοιοῦτο. οὐ κατ’ οὐσίαν δὲ ἀγαθοὶ εἰσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκτίσθησαν, ἵνα γένωνται ἀγαθοὶ μετουσία τοῦ ἀληθῶς ἀγαθοῦ.

Theodoret concurred with both the vocabulary and the idea. *Eranistes*, p. 219: ΟΡΘ. Φαμέν· ἀλλὰ κυρίως ἀθάνατος ὁ θεός· οὐσία γὰρ ἀθάνατος, οὐ μετουσία· οὐ γὰρ παρ’ ἑτέρου τὴν ἀθανασίαν ἔχει λαβών.

Pseudo-Theodoret (or Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, p. 84: ἄλλο τὸ κατὰ μετουσίαν καὶ ἄλλο τὸ κατ’ οὐσίαν.

Maximus Confessor, *De Caritate*, 3.25: καὶ τῇ μὲν οὐσίᾳ τὸ ὄν καὶ τὸ ἀεὶ ὄν· τῇ δὲ γνωμικῇ ἐπιτηδειότητι τὴν ἀγαθότητα καὶ τὴν σοφίαν, ἵνα ἅπερ ἐστὶν αὐτὸς κατ’ οὐσίαν, γίνηται ἢ κτίσις κατὰ μετουσίαν. Διὰ ταύτην κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ λέγεται γεγενῆσθαι· καὶ κατ’ εἰκόνα μὲν, ὡς ὄν, ὄντος· καὶ ὡς ἀεὶ ὄν, ἀεὶ ὄντος.

Once again, the evidence shows Proclus following Didymus: the pertinent terminology, which was introduced during the second century as an analysis of Aristotle’s metaphysics, is now used as an elaboration of Platonic philosophy. The model for Proclus to draw on was evidently Didymus, not Alexander of Aphrodisias. In fact, he appears obsessive about the term *μετουσία*, which he uses at no fewer than one hundred and fifty points of his work.¹ It could be claimed that use of the pair *οὐσία/μετουσία* alone does not actually prove indisputable influence of Didymus over Proclus. The following evidence, however, should leave no doubt about this influence.

Eusebius reports that Numenius explaining Plato in his treatise *On the Good* (Περὶ τοῦ Ἀγαθοῦ) maintained that the Demiurge was unlike the world in terms of essence: the latter imitates the Good by participation in it (*μετουσία τοῦ καλοῦ*);² it is therefore ‘good’ only by participation. However, neither Eusebius nor subsequent theologians used the term, which they applied only once casually or twice.³

¹ Proclus, *In Platonis Cratylum Commentaria*, 144; 185; *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 1, pp. 4; 18; 51; 139; 140; 141; 211; 212; 222; 238; 332; 340; 354; 364; 366; 383; 389; 412; 421; 422; 423; v. 2, pp. 9; 80; 101; 103; 107; 111; 117; 119; 135; 231; 249; 303; v. 3, pp. 72; 82; 85; 100; 207; 220; 327; *In Primum Euclidis Elementorum Librum Commentarii*, pp. 99; 148; 354; *De Providentia*, 20; 22; *De Malorum Subsistentia*, 7; 44; *Excerpta e Platonica Procli Theologia*, p. 1248; *De Philosophia Chaldaica*, Fr. 1; et *passim*.

² Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelica*, 11.21.7f.

³ Cf. Eusebius, *DE*, 4.13.6. Epiphanius, *Panarion*, v. 3, pp. 358 and 403 (emulating the terminology from Aetius of Antioch, whom he had set out to rebut). Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Johannem*, v. 2, p. 722; *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.229.10–12.

Porphyrus applied the idea as follows: true Being is ‘one’ on account of its own substance, but this is manifold (indeed, it is ‘everything’) on account of the fact that everything participates in it (ἐν μὲν ὄν κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν, πάντα δὲ κατὰ τὴν μετουσίαν).⁴

In view of all this evidence, I insist that it was from Didymus that Proclus received the notion of something ‘participating’ in the ‘essence’ of an ontologically higher reality. No one had used the idea itself so heavily as Didymus did. Since this was largely a Pythagorean one transmitted via Numenius, it had not enjoyed any considerable currency. Didymus made the notion of ‘existence by means of participation’ (μετουσία τρόπῳ) a main motif of his theology, and the origin of this notion cannot be traced earlier than Didymus himself. The idea which he sets forth is a regular motif: the life of a creature is due to participation in real life, which is the Logos of God.⁵ This is, of course, the theory of Origen.⁶

Therefore, the notion of something existing ‘not by participation, but in essence’ originates in Didymus, as far as our evidence goes. A text ascribed to Macarius is actually a verbatim quotation from Ephraem (306–373).⁷ Then Proclus employs the expression, which was actually never used after him.⁸ There is no way to trace this language back to any one other than Didymus, who appears to be the source for Proclus. This, of course, raises some questions, which are, however, beyond my present scope. Such questions are whether not only the *De Trinitate*,⁹ but also Origen’s catena-fragments on the gospel of John,¹⁰ as well as the catena-fragments of Didymus on the Psalms, have been preserved for posterity through the vocabulary of the Laura of Sabas, where the idea of ‘participation’ was a patrimony received from Theodoret himself.

Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 219: κυρίως ἀθάνατος ὁ θεός· οὐσία γὰρ ἀθάνατος, οὐ μετουσία· οὐ γὰρ παρ’ ἐτέρου τὴν ἀθανασία ἐχει λαβών. Τοῖς δὲ γε ἀγγέλοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις, ὧν ἁρτίως ἐμνήσθης,

αὐτὸς τὴν ἀθανασία δεδώρηται. Εἰ τοίνυν ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν ὁ θεσπέσιος ὀνομάζει Παῦλος, καὶ μόνον τὴν ἀθανασία ἔχειν φησίν, πῶς αὐτῷ τὸ τοῦ θανάτου προσαρμόζετε πάθος; This is what Origen states in *commJohn*, II.17.123; II.18.124 and 125; *Dial*, 27.

Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 262: Ὁ θεὸς λόγος φύσει ἀθάνατος, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ φύσει θνητή. Γέγονε δὲ καὶ αὕτη μετὰ τὸ πάθος τῇ πρὸς τὸν λόγον μετουσία ἀθάνατος. Πῶς οὖν οὐ σκέτλιον, τὸν τῆς τοιαύτης ἀθανασίας δοτῆρα λέγειν μετείληχέναι θανάτου;

Likewise, Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 11.2 (εἰς μετουσίαν φιλοσοφίας); *Epistulae* 53–95, Epistle 73 (τῆς παιδείας ἢ μετουσία); *commIs*, 3 (ἀγαθῶν μετουσία); *ibid.* 6 (ἀγαθῶν μετουσία); *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.896.9 (ἐν μετουσίᾳ ζωῆς); *ibid.* PG.81.1097.48–49 (ἐν μετουσίᾳ ἁγιοσύνης); *intProphXII*, PG.81.1981.22 (ἀγαθῶν μετουσία); *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.176.7 (τῆς σωτηρίας τὴν μετουσίαν); *ibid.* PG.82.313.38 (τὴν μετουσίαν τῆς πίστεως); *ibid.* PG.82.785.35 (τὴν μετουσίαν τῆς χάριτος); *ibid.* PG.82.856.52 (τὴν μετουσίαν τῆς χάριτος); *Haeticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.512.9–10 (τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος δωρεᾶς τὴν μετουσίαν); *ibid.* PG.83.512.23 (μετουσία τῆς Δεσποτικῆς ἀναστάσεως). The following work is ascribed to both Theodoret and Pseudo-Justin, yet my assumption is that it is Cassian’s. Pseudo-Theodoret (or Pseudo-Justin), *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, p. 60 (ἀγαθῶν μετουσία); p. 84 (ἄλλο τὸ κατὰ μετουσίαν καὶ ἄλλο τὸ κατ’ οὐσίαν).

EN XXb: δι’ ἐκβάσεως

Didymus is the sole author ever to have used the expression δι’ ἐκβάσεως. Since ἐκβασις means ‘completion’ or ‘accomplishment’, the specific meaning of this is the ‘fulfilment’ of what was said in the OT and

⁴ Porphyry, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, Book 2, fr. 26. About Porphyry using the notion and terminology of participation to divine substance, see Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 3.37.32.

⁵ Didymus. *commZach*, 2.333: ἡ λογικὴ οὐσία, ἐκπεφυκυῖα ἐκ τῆς ἀμπέλου τῆς ἀληθινῆς μετουσίας τρόπῳ. εἰ δὲ ἕκαστος τῶν κολλωμένων τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν γίνεται πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅταν πολλοὶ ὅσιν οἱ κολλώμενοι αὐτῷ, τρόπῳ μετουσίας οἱ πάντες ἐν πνεύμα γίνονται.

⁶ Cf. *COT*, p. 44.

⁷ Ephraem Syrus, *Regulae ad Monachos*, p. 319: Τὸν δὲ τρόπον τῆς μετουσίας καὶ μεταλήψεως τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀκριβῶς

ὑπεσημειώσατο. The same text in Pseudo-Macarius, *Epistula Magna*, p. 249.

⁸ Proclus, *Theologia Platonica*, v. 1, p. 87: καὶ πάντα τρόπον τῆς τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μετουσίας ἀπολαύει, καθ’ ὅσον αὐτοῖς δυνατόν.

⁹ Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 1)*, 20.4: οὐδὲν δὲ κτιστόν, ὅσον ἀπὸ γραφῶν συνηθείας, μετουσίας τρόπῳ μετέχεσθαι δύναται ἢ πληροῦν οὐσιωδῶς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ μόνον τῶν τῆς ἑξέως τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἢ τῆς φαύλης.

¹⁰ Origen, *frJohn*, II: ἐπὶ τὸ ζῆν αὐτὰ προσλαβόντα αὐτὴν μετουσίας τρόπον.

was subsequently revealed in the course, and by means, of historical event.

Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 83: τότε δὲ λύεται, ὅταν πληρωθῇ τὰ προαναφωνηθέντα δι' ἐκβάσεως κατὰ τὸ 'ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν'. *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 218: τὸ ἐξελεῖν δὲ τὸ τέλος καὶ τὴν ἔκβασιν δηλοῖ, ὡς εἰ λέγομεν ὅτι αἱ ἅγιοι φωνήσεις αἱ γενόμεναι περὶ τῆς καθόδου τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐκβάσεως τετυχήκασιν. καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ 'ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν'. οἱ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑτεροδόξων κακοήθως ἢ κατὰ ἄγνοιαν νομίζουσιν τὸ πληρωθῆναι τοῦτο οὕτω λαβεῖν· πληρωθῇ, ἵνα μὴ κενὰ ᾖ. καὶ λέγουσιν ὅτι ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη κενὴ ἦν καθ' ἑαυτήν· πληρώματος ἕξωθεν ἔχρηζεν. οὐ τοῦτο δέ, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ ἐκβάσεως λέγει. *commZacch*, 1.274: Τούτου πληρωθέντος δι' ἐκβάσεως τοῦ προαναφωνηθέντος. Ibid. 2.311: Τότε γὰρ ἀληθῶς ἐπληρώθησαν τῶν ἔμπροσθεν προφητῶν οἱ λόγοι, ἐκβάσεως τετυχηκότων τῶν προθεσπισθέντων. Ibid. 4.76: Πότε δὲ τοῦτο πληρωθήσεται ἢ ὅταν ἐκβάσεως τύχη τὸ 'Εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ'; *frPs(al)*, fr. 116: τὸ ἐν αὐταῖς οὖν ὕδωρ, πρὶν ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ ἐκβάσεως καὶ σαφηνείας τυχεῖν, διὰ τὸ τοῖς πολλοῖς δυσθεώρητον σκοτεινὸν εἶναι λέγεται. Ibid. fr. 117: εἶδη δὲ κολάσεων διὰ τῶν προσηγοριῶν σημαίνεται καὶ τῶν περὶ Χριστοῦ προφητευομένων ἐκβάσεως τετυχηκότων. Ibid. fr. 704a: τὰ γὰρ περὶ μελλόντων λέγοντα ἀσθενεῖν δοκεῖ διὰ τὸ ἄδηλον τῆς ἐκβάσεως, τότε φωνὴν δυνάμεως λαμβάνοντα ὅταν πληρωθῇ. Ibid. fr. 900: ὅτε γὰρ οἱ λόγοι αὐτῶν ἐκβάσεως τετυχήκασιν. Ibid. fr. 930: ἐκβάσεως τεύξεται ἡ προφητεία. Ibid. fr. 949: Ἐκβάσεως τυχούσης τῆς προφητείας. *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 231: Καὶ τὸ 'κρινῶ δὲ ἐγὼ τὸ ἔθνος ᾧ ἂν δουλεύσωσιν' ἐκβάσεως τετύχηκεν κατὰ τὰ ἐν Ἐξόδῳ γεγραμμένα.

EN XXc: κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου

The expression 'according to the letter of the Law' (cf. Rom. 2:27, etc.) is very rare in literature, and it was surely used by Origen, who appears to have invented it. Didymus borrowed it, as indeed other followers of Origen did, too.

Origen, *commJohn*, XXVIII.12.95–96: ἀρχιερεῖς δὲ καὶ πᾶσα ἡ σωματικὴ ἐν Ἰουδαίοις λατρεία Φαρισαῖοι τε καὶ πᾶσα ἡ κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου διδασκαλία ἐπιβουλεύει Ἰησοῦ. *commMatt*, 10.14:

γραμματεὺς πᾶς ὁ μεμαθητευμένος τῇ κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου διδασκαλίᾳ ὀνομάζεται. *Commentarii in Romanos* (III.5–V.7), p. 134: Ἐοικεν οὖν πλείοσιν ῥητοῖς κεκρῆσθαι ἵνα διδάξῃ πῶς οἶδεν ἡ γραφὴ καὶ εἰ μὲν προτίθεται τις βιώσαι κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου, ἐν φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν· εἰ δὲ κατὰ τὸν πνευματικὸν νόμον, ἐν κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος ἂν τοιοῦτος λέγοιτο. Ibid. 198: ἢ λεγέτωσαν ἡμῖν οἱ μηδαμόθεν δικαιουῖσθαι θέλοντες τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἢ ἐκ τοῦ Μωσέως κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου. *frJohn*, LXXVIII: εἰς σωτηρίαν γὰρ οὐ τῶν πολλῶν κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου ἐντολῶν χρεία, ἀλλ' ὀλίγων, ἐν οἷς κρέματα ὅλος ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται, τῶν περὶ ἀγάπης νενομοθετημένων.

Eusebius, *Eclogae Prophetarum*, p. 194: Οἱ μὲν οὖν οἰκοδομοῦντες τὴν κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου οἰκοδομήν, τοῦτον ἀπεδοκίμασαν τὸν λίθον.

Gregory of Nyssa, *De Vita Mosis*, 2.149: Σημαίνει δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐν ὕψει τὰς χεῖρας ἔχειν τὸν Μωϋσέα τὴν διὰ τῶν ὑψηλοτέρων νοημάτων θεωρίαν τοῦ νόμου, τὸ δὲ εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐπικλίνειν τὴν ταπεινὴν τε καὶ χαμαίζηλον κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου ἐξήγησιν τε καὶ παρατήρησιν.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1260: Δυνατὸν τοὺς κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου βιοῦντας ἐπικαλουμένους τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου εἰπεῖν, τῶν τῇ καινότητι τοῦ πνεύματος ἀκολουθούντων, ἐπικαλουμένων αὐτὸν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἁρμοδίως τῷ προσκυνεῖν αὐτὸν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. *commZacch*, 3.142: Πρὸς τῇ νοήσει ταύτῃ, σημαίνονται διὰ τῆς λέξεως ἁμφότεροι οἱ κληθέντες λαοί, ὃ τε ἐκ περιτομῆς, ὑπεξευγμένος τῷ ζυγῷ τοῦ κατὰ τὸ γράμμα καὶ τὴν σκιὰν νόμου, καλουμένῳ βαρεῖ ζυγῷ, καὶ ὁ εὐθέως κληθεὶς ἀπὸ πάσης εἰδωλολατρείας. Ibid. 5.171: Ὁ τὴν νοητὴν σκηνοπηγίαν ἐορτάζων ἀναβαίνων τοῦτο πράττει, ὡς ὁ προκείμενος προφήτης δηλοῖ, κάτω καὶ ἐν ταπεινῷ ἀγόντων αὐτὴν τῶν κατὰ γράμμα καὶ σκιὰν τοῦ νόμου ἀγυριζόντων. *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 300: οὐ κατὰ τὸ γράμμα ἔζων, εἰ μὴ ὅτε ἐξέπεσαν τοῦ ὕψους τῶν γραφῶν· ἐπεὶ πῶς κατὰ τὸ γράμμα ἔζη τοῦ νόμου Ἱηρεμίας αἰτιώμενος τοὺς ἔχοντας τὴν περιτομήν τοῦ γράμματος λέγων· 'περιτμήθητε τῷ θεῷ', 'ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίας' ἐστέ. *frPs(al)*, fr. 529: Καθήμενος, ὃ οὐτε, περὶ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου καταλαλεῖς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τοῦ κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ νόμου φρονοῦντος καὶ πολιτευομένου.

Notwithstanding the simplicity of the expression ‘it no longer has any place’, the fact is that only a few authors used this. It appears to originate with Alexander of Aphrodisias,¹¹ and was subsequently taken up by Athanasius,¹² Eusebius,¹³ Basil of Ancyra,¹⁴ and Theodoret.¹⁵ Chrysostom used it most frequently of all authors.¹⁶ Didymus also has it,¹⁷ yet it seems that this closure of the Scholion is rather an expression of Cassian himself. For indeed he was aware of two sets of texts. One, the Acts of Ephesus,¹⁸ where Theodoret rebutted an anathema imposed by Cyril of Alexandria. Two, the works of his contemporary John Philoponus, who relished applying this elegant construction.¹⁹

The Codex text οὐκετι φυ ὑφεξεις τα λοιπα λαχθηναι was aptly restored by Harnack and was rightly retained. The sentence means this: once Jesus opened the minds of his pupils on their way to Emmaus and explained to them everything that had been written about him by Moses and David, he made it clear that the prophecies had been fulfilled in his own person. Therefore, ‘he shut

down the shadow of the Law’, since after his resurrection there is no shadow any more. The Jews, who did not believe in this abolition of the shadow, were cast ‘out of Jerusalem’, that is, out of the renewed life. They incurred this penalty because they stuck to the letter of the Law, although no precept could any longer be observed literally.

It is, in fact, Cassian, following Didymus, who added the last sentence of the Scholion, thus making his allegiance to Origen clear: the Logos always ‘opened the minds’ of those ‘pupils’ who were able to grasp the concealed truth of scripture. Nevertheless, scripture is still ‘sealed’ to those who are not yet able to understand its message during the present life.

The passage is an allusion to Origen’s notion of ‘eternal gospel’,²⁰ according to which full and clear knowledge is an eschatological prospect, which has been prefigured in the person of Jesus Christ. This knowledge is the state of seeing God ‘face to face’, not ‘through a glass, darkly’ as currently happens.

The expression ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ (‘during the present’ [life]) is then the normal distinction between this life, when full knowledge is not yet possible, and the future life, when complete knowledge will be attained. Accordingly, Cassian makes the clear distinction between ‘the present life’ and the ‘anticipated one’ (ἡ παροῦσα καὶ ἡ προσδοκωμένη ζωή).²¹

¹¹ Alexander of Aphrodisias *De Fato*, pp. 184–185: εἰ δὲ τὰ μὲν βουλευσαμένων ἡμῶν, τὰ δὲ καὶ μὴ βουλευσαμένων γίνεται, οὐκέτι χώραν ἔχει τὸ λέγειν τὸ τὰ διὰ τοῦ βουλευέσθαι γινόμενα ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ εἶναι τῷ μὴ δύνασθαι ἄλλως τι δι’ αὐτοῦ γίνεσθαι.

¹² Athanasius, *De Incarnatione Verbi*, 9.2 (the same phrase appears in a spurious work: Pseudo-Athanasius: *Sermo Major de Fide*, fr. 7): Καὶ αὕτη γὰρ ἡ ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ φθορὰ κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὐκέτι χώραν ἔχει διὰ τὸν ἐνοικήσαντα Λόγον ἐν τούτοις διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς σώματος.

¹³ Eusebius, *DE*, 1.9.14: Ἡ μὲν οὖν αἰτία τῆς τῶν πάλοι θεοφιλῶν ἀνδρῶν παιδοποιίας ἀνείρηται, ἣν οὐκέτι ἐφ’ ἡμῶν χώραν ἔχει λέγειν. *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, 2.6.2: ὁ ἐπὶ μὲν σωματίων χώραν ἔχει, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἀσωμάτου καὶ ἀλέκτου καὶ ἀνεκφράστου οὐσίας οὐκέτι.

¹⁴ Basil of Ancyra (fourth cent. AD), *De Virginitatis Integritate*, PG.30.732.46: οὐκέτι οὔτε ἀρνήσεως, οὔτε λογισμῶν χώραν ἔχοντες.

¹⁵ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.904.35: οὐδεμία λοιπὸν θεραπεία δοθῆσεται, οὐκέτι χώραν τῆς μετανοίας ἐχούσης. *Interpretatio in Ieremiam*, PG.81.561.44: Παρεγγυᾷ δὲ καὶ ταῖς γυναιξίν, ὥς οὐκέτι χώραν ἐχούσης τῆς εὐφροσύνης. *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.745.39–41: ἐπιφανήσεται πάλιν ἡμῖν, οὐκέτι τῆς ἁμαρτίας κρατούσης, ἀντὶ τοῦ, χώραν οὐκέτι ἐχούσης κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς ἁμαρτίας. *Eranistes*, p. 237: Καὶ αὕτη γὰρ ἡ ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ φθορὰ κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὐκέτι χώραν ἔχει διὰ τὸν ἐνοικήσαντα λόγον ἐν τούτοις διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς σώματος.

¹⁶ John Chrysostom, *In Acta Apostolorum Homiliae*, PG.60.244.47: οὐκέτι σοι αὕτη λοιπὸν ἡ πρόφασις χώραν ἔχει. Also, *In Epistulam ad Galatas Commentarius*, PG.61.615.6, et passim.

¹⁷ Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.62: Τοῦτον γὰρ γενομένου, οὐκέτι χώραν ἔχουσιν οἱ περιυβρίζοντες βουλόμενοι.

¹⁸ ACO, *Concilium Universale Ephesenum Anno 431*, 1.1.6, p. 128.

¹⁹ John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, v. 13.1, p. 146: ἐδείχθη ἐπὶ τινων πραγμάτων ἡ τοῦ ποιεῖν δύναμις χώραν ἔχουσα μόνον. *In Aristotelis Analytica Priora Commentaria*, v. 13.2, p. 19: οὐκέτι χώραν ἡ ἀπορία ἔξει. *In Aristotelis Analytica Posteriora Commentaria*, v. 13.3, p. 147: οὐκέτι ἔχει χώραν ἡ εἰρημένη παρ’ ἡμῶν ἀπορία. *In Aristotelis Libros De Generatione et Corruptione Commentaria*, v. 14.2, p. 86: οὐκέτι χώραν ἔχει τὸ κενόν. *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 16, p. 53: οὐκέτι χώραν ἔξει ἡ ἀντιστροφή.

²⁰ I have canvassed this in *PHE*, pp. 96–109.

²¹ Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.253.5. Cf. ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ζωῇ: Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1244.13; PG.12.1300.37; PG.12.1389.34. Didymus, *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 289. Pseudo-Theodoret (or, Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, p. 144. Cf. the expression ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ζωῇ in the following writers: Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.488.21. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.165.10. Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2269. Ephraem Syrus, *De Octo Cogitationibus*, p. 302. John Chrysostom, *De Lazaro*, PG.48.1003.9; *Ad Eos Qui Scandalizati Sunt*, 9.7; *In Genesin Sermones*, PG.53.49.44; PG.54.396.61. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *Homilia de Capto Eutropio*, PG.52.411.50; (ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ). Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Resurrectionem Domini*, line 6.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXI

EN XXIa: Στύλους

This juxtaposed quotation of Psalm 74:4 and Gal. 2:9 appears in Athanasius and Eusebius.¹ These authors, however, do not suggest that *anyone* may become a ‘pillar’. The theologian who did so was Gregory of Nyssa.² The point in the present Scholion is in essence an excerpt from the analysis of Didymus.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 780a: Στύλους δὲ αὐτῆς τῆς τακείσης γῆς τοὺς εὐτονον καὶ φρόνημα ἀληθὲς ἔχοντας λέγει· ἢ τοὺς κήρυκας τῆς ἀληθείας, οὓς στερεοὶ ὁ ἐν τάξει τῇδε οὐση, ἰδρῶν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήρ. Ibid. 781A: Στερεοὶ δὲ τῆς γῆς τῆς τακείσης τοὺς στύλους τοὺς εὐτονον βίον καὶ ἀληθὲς ἔχοντας φρόνημα· μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς ἀληθείας τοὺς κήρυκας, περὶ ὧν εἴρηται· Στύλοι οὐρανοῦ ἐπετάσθησαν, πτερωθέντες πτεροῖς οὐρανίοις, ὡς λέγεσθαι περὶ αὐτῶν· Οἶος ὁ ἐπουράνιος, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ ἐπουράνιοι. γέγραπται δὲ καὶ περὶ πάσης τῆς ἐνδόξου ἐκκλησίας ἥς παρέστησε Χριστὸς ἑαυτῷ Στύλος καὶ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας. πάντα οὖν τοὺς στύλους τούτους στερεοὶ ὁ ἐν τάξει τῇδε οὐση ἰδρῶν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήρ λέγων· Τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἁγίον μου θεμελιώσω.

EN XXIb: τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι

Of all Christian authors, it was Gregory of Nazianzus who used this Homeric idiom,³ which surprisingly did not appeal to pagan literature. The verb may be either in active (φέρειν) or middle voice (φέρεσθαι), which is the case with this Scholion.

Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 328: εἰσὶν ‘ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ’ τὰ πρωτεῖα φερόμενοι, οἷον ‘ἀπόστολοι, προφηταὶ’· εἰσὶν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἔχοντες, οἷον ‘χάρισμα ἰαμάτων, ἀντίλημψιν, κυβέρνησιν, γλῶτταν’· πάντα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐστίν· αὐτὸν γὰρ μιμούμενοι γίνονται ταῦτα. *frPs(al)*, fr. 891a: αὐτοῦ τοιγαροῦν ἐπικαλεσαμένου τὸν πάντων αἵτιον

πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ πατήρ τίθεται αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον τὰ πρωτεῖα φέροντα πάντων τῶν χρηματισάντων υἱῶν θεοῦ, οὐχ ὁμοίως αὐτῷ ἀνακραθέντων τῷ μονογενεῖ· μόνος γὰρ αὐτὸς γνήσιον ὄργανον καὶ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ἀναπέφεται.

Origen, *JesNav*, p. 455: ἡ τοῦ Ἰούδα τὰ πρῶτα φέρει τῶν φυλῶν.

Gregory of Nazianzus, *Funerbris in Laudem Caesarii Fratris*, 9.5: ὅτι πολλοστὸν τετάχθαι παρὰ Θεῷ κρεῖττον εἶναι δοκεῖ τε καὶ ὑψηλότερον ἢ παρὰ τῷ κάτω βασιλεῖ τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι. *De Vita Sua*, line 728: Τὰ πρῶτα μὲν δὴ καὶ φέρειν οἶος τε ἦν. Ibid. line 1035: ὁ Σώκρατες, τὰ πρῶτα μέχρι νῦν φέρεις.

Themistius, *Περὶ Προεδρίας εἰς τὴν Σύγκλητον*, p. 354d: εἰπὼν πολλάκις, ἀρκεῖ βιασθεῖς Ἰουλιανὸς τῆς οἰκουμένης καλέσαι πρεσβευτὴν ἄξιον, οὐ μόνον τῆς καλλιπλόεως, καὶ τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι φιλοσοφίας ἐν γράμμασιν ὁμολογήσας.

At the end of EN XXVκ, I discuss the reasons for my assumption that Theodoret received this expression from Lucian of Samosata, along with other points of influence.

EN XXIc: Psalm 74:4: ἐγὼ ἐστερέωσα τοὺς στύλους αὐτῆς

Comments on Psalm 74:4 (ἐτάκη ἡ γῆ καὶ πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐγὼ ἐστερέωσα τοὺς στύλους αὐτῆς), which had appeared before Didymus, were a tradition probably as old as Origen.

Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1060.4; *ibid.* PG.12.1533.51. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 781A. Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.340.16. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23: 868.52; 869.39. Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Hexaemeron*, 1.9; 3.4. Julian the Arian, *In Job*, p. 161. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 3, p. 130; *De Adoratione*, PG.68.268. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1468.39.

¹ Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.340.21. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.869.56.

² Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 416 and v. 6, p. 419; *De Vita Mosi*, 2.184.

³ Homer, *Ilias*, XXIII.538.

EN XXId: στῦλοι οὐρανοῦ ἐπετάσθησαν⁴

This is quoted by Didymus (see EN XXIa) and the following three authors: John Chrysostom, *In Job*, p. 145. Julian the Arian, *In Job*, p. 160. Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *commJob*, p. 222. The Scholion reproduces analyses of Didymus which also occur in other works of his.

EN XXIe: οὐκ ἐκβάλλεται ἔξω

Origen, *commJohn*, 10.XLII.295: νικῶν γάρ τις καὶ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχει στῦλος ἔσεσθαι ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, μὴ ἐξελευσόμενος ἔξω.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 200: Πρὸς σὲ ἔθνη ἥξουσιν ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς, καὶ Πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ὅσα ἐποίησας ἥξουσιν καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιόν σου. ταύτην γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐρχομένην τὴν γενεὰν οὐκ ἐκβάλλει ὁ λέγων σωτήρ· Τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς με οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλλω ἔξω. Ibid. fr.772a: Ἀποθεῖται ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἁμαρτάνοντα, ἐκείνου πρότερον ἀποσχοινίσαντος ἑαυτόν· Τὸν γὰρ ἐρχόμενον πρὸς με οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλλω ἔξω, εἶπεν ὁ κύριος.

Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae Fusius Tractatae*, PG.31: 1149.22; 1153.17; *Moralia*, PG.31.825.31. Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo Compunctorius*, p. 100; *Sermo in Secundum Adventum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi*, pp. 42; 45; *De Communi Resurrectione*; *De Paenitentia et Caritate*, p. 75; *Interrogationes et Responsiones*, pp. 106; 109; 223. John Chrysostom, *In Sanctum Joannem*, PG.59.253.53. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *De Pseudo-prophetis*, PG.59.566.6. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Joannem*, v. 1, pp. 480 and 481.

The interesting question which arises is why John 6:37 (which the author actually adduces) is relevant at this point. The obvious answer is that he wishes to make sure that the text of Revelation conforms to scripture. Furthermore, John, 6:37 is quoted at the end of an apocryphon, which has the same title, that is,

'Revelation of John'.⁵ What is interesting about this text is that it claims to be a revelation by 'Saint John the Theologian' (τὸν ἅγιον Ἰωάννην τὸν Θεολόγον) conversing with 'James, the brother of the Lord'.⁶ The very fact that John is styled 'theologos' should make this text at least two centuries later than the editor A. Vassiliev reckoned it to be: whereas he conjectured that it is a second-century text, the foregoing discussion (EN IVb) shows that it should be placed in the fourth century – and Cassian must have consulted this text too.

EN XXIf: γενάμενον (Cf. EN XXIXd)

I retain the spelling of the codex. Emending γενάμενον to γενόμενον was a mistake of Harnack. The participle γενάμενος is a perfectly acceptable form, since it enjoyed a remarkably wide currency. Didymus employed γενάμενος at no less than a hundred and fifty points,⁷ along with nearly four hundred instances of γενόμενος, which is more than one-third of all instances where this form of the participle appears in literature. The participle does not occur in *De Trinitate* at all. Likewise (and characteristically) γενάμενος is absent from all known works of Origen, who always used the normal form of the participle (which is γενόμενος), even though γενάμενος recurs in Hippolytus.⁸ This is somehow a personal seal of Didymus' upon the Scholion, in the same way as the verb συνκαταβαίνειν instead of συγκαταβαίνειν is.

This form may be of help as a key to identifying anonymous writings, since its use, though not rare, is restricted to specific authors. To cite an instance: it might well be that the writings by the so-called 'Pseudo-Macarius'⁹ turn out to be relevant to those of Didymus, since we come across this 'Pseudo-Macarius' time and again in the comparative philological study of the Scholia. Since I endorse the hypothesis of Rudolf Riedinger that the Pseudo-Macarian corpus had been produced at the monastery of the Akoimetoι in

⁴ Job, 26:11: στῦλοι οὐρανοῦ ἐπετάσθησαν καὶ ἐξέστησαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιτιμῆσεως αὐτοῦ.

⁵ *Apocalypsis Apocrypha Joannis (versio tertia)*, p. 322.

⁶ Ibid. p. 317.

⁷ Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. pp. 51; 94; 172; 174; et passim.

⁸ Hippolytus, *In Daniele*, 2.13.2; 2.18.1; 2.20.4; 2.28.5; 3.7.4; 3.14.5; 3.16.4; 3.19.4; 4.21.3; 4.58.3; *De Benedictionibus*, pp. 42; 48.

Pseudo-Hippolytus, *Ex Interpretatione Ruth*; line 23; Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 15.

⁹ Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones*, 3.3; 6.2; 7.6; 25.3.

Constantinople,¹⁰ this relevance may lie in the fact that the Antiochene monks of this monastery made abundant use of Didymus' works, as indeed Cassian himself does in these Scholia. The same participle appears in the Corpus Hermeticum,¹¹ the writings of the third-century BC geometrician Archimedes,¹² and profusely (thirty-seven instances) in Pseudo-Callisthenes' *Historia Alexandri Magni*. This form is heavily used in the first-century *Vitae Aesopi*.¹³ With regard to Patristic literature, we find it only in certain apocrypha,¹⁴ Amphilochius of Iconium,¹⁵ and Hippolytus.

Furthermore, Didymus is the sole author to use the compound participle προσγενάμενος.¹⁶ He also is alone in employing the participle περιγενάμενος,¹⁷ whereas the participle παραγενάμενος occurs in several authors.¹⁸

EN XXIg: έννοίας τοῦ πατρὸς

The term έννοια in this context has the specific meaning of 'comprehension', not of 'notion', which is

more common in literature.¹⁹ We know of έννοια meaning 'comprehension'²⁰ following Heb. 4:12.²¹ This is precisely the sense occurring in this Scholion and in the rest of Cassian's writings.²²

The phrase 'concept of the Father' quoted by Didymus²³ can be presumed to be scriptural.²⁴ Only the seventh-century monk Antiochus of Palestine also quoted it²⁵ for the last time. Antiochus draws heavily on Cassian's writings anyway. He actually had in mind this 'book of Cassian', namely Codex 573, since he was a Sabaite monk and lived not long after the abbot Cassian of the Laura of Sabas had died.²⁶

Nevertheless, there is an expression attributed to Chrysippus,²⁷ which may be regarded as old as Plato, even though Plato did not use this terminology himself.²⁸

The idea was applied in Christian literature, not only by Didymus,²⁹ but also by other theologians.³⁰ However, the plural used in this Scholion (έννοίας τοῦ πατρὸς) occurs only in Gregory of Nyssa³¹ and in

¹⁰ Rudolf Riedinger, 'Akoimeten', *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 2 (1978) 148–153. Also, 'Pseudo-Dionysios Areopagites, Pseudo-Kaisarios und die Akoimeten', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 52 (1959) 276–296. See my RCR, pp. 20; 29–30.

¹¹ Corpus Hermeticum, *Fragmenta*, frs. 24; 26.

¹² Archimedes, *Geometrica*, v. 1, pp. 156; 157; 164.

¹³ *Vitae Aesopi*, 9; 68; 72; 80; 81; 84; 85; 91; 111; 116.

¹⁴ *Evangelium Apocryphon Bartholomaei*, 4.17. *Protevangelium Jacobi*, 11; 34; 49. *Acta Apocrypha Philippi*, 45; 115; 139. *Acta Apocrypha Thomae*, 27; 71. *Apocalypsis Apocrypha Esdrae*, p. 24. *Testamentum Jobi*, 1.4.

¹⁵ Amphilochius of Iconium, *In Mulierem Peccatricem et Pharisaicum (orat. 4)*, lines 83 and 84. Anthony the Hagiographer, *Vita Symeonis Stylitae Senioris*, 7.

¹⁶ Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 358: ὅταν λυθῇ πάντα τὰ προσγενάμενα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. *Commentarii in Zachariam*, 5.7: τὰς προσγενάμενας βλάβας. *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 296: ἵνα ἀποπλύνηται τὴν προσγενάμενην ἀκαθαρσίαν.

¹⁷ Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.329; *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. pp. 104 and 107; *frPs(al)*, fr. 187. There is only one instance preceding Didymus using this form, namely, the second-century medical doctor Philumenus of Alexandria: *De Venetatis Animalibus Eorumque Remediis*, 1.4. This form of the participle was never used again.

¹⁸ Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones* lxiv, 18.6.9; *Sermones*, 2.4. *Evangelium Apocryphon Bartholomaei*, 1.28; 4.17; 4.63. *Acta Apocrypha Thomae*, 9. Ephraem Syrus, *Quod non Oporteat Ridere*, p. 204. Severus of Antioch, in *Catena in Matthaeum*, p. 247. *Vitae Aesopi*, Vita G, 10; 26; 27; 34; 45; 54; 107; 121; 123; 129; 136. *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum* (second cent. BC–third cent. AD), *Testamentum* 12.10.8. Also, the anonymous *Dialogus contra Iudaeos*, 3.7.

¹⁹ This meaning was recorded by Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter epsilon, p. 729: Ἐννοια. ἡ περὶ τινὸς τοῦ νοῦ κίνησις.

²⁰ Pseudo-Caesarius (Cassian the Sabaite), *Quaestiones et*

Responsiones, 1: ὑπερφέρεται τὴν ἐμὴν έννοιαν ἢ τῶν γραφῶν ἀκριβεστάτη διήγησις. 115: πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσιν οὖν ζῶν ἄνθρωπον ἡμῶν τὴν έννοιαν. 125: ἅπαγε οὖν ἀξιάγαστε τῆς τοιαύτης περὶ Χριστοῦ έννοίας. 138: τὸ ἀκατάληπτον καὶ ὑπὲρ έννοιαν τῆς δραστηκῆς αὐτοῦ σοφίας. 190: ὑπὲρ τὴν ἐμὴν φημι ὑπάρχειν έννοιαν. 191: τῇ ἀπαραβλήτῳ ὑπὲρ λόγον καὶ έννοιαν θεῖα φύσει. 209: Καλὴ μὲν καὶ ἡ ἀπλή καὶ πρόχειρος έννοια. 214: Καλὴ μὲν καὶ ἡ πρόχειρος έννοια. Also έννοια meaning the ability to comprehend properly. 214: ἡ μετὰ τὴν σωματικὴν αὐξήσιν καὶ τῆς έννοίας τελείωσιν. Meaning 'notion', *ibid.* 115: τὴν αὐτὴν φημι έννοιαν.

²¹ Cf. Heb. 4:12 quoted by Pseudo-Caesarius in chapters 146; 171.

²² Cassian the Sabaite, *SerenPrim*, Codex pp. 82b–83a: θελήσωμεν, τουτέστιν ὑψηλὰς έννοίας καὶ πρὸς Θεὸν ἀγοῦσας.

²³ Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.270.

²⁴ Proverbs 4:1. Didymus appears to be the sole author to use the expression as a scriptural quotation.

²⁵ Antiochus of Palestine (or Antiochus of Ancyra), *Pandecta Scripturae Sanctae*, Homily 82.

²⁶ In RCR, Appendix II, it turns out that his texts were copied verbatim from the texts of Cassian.

²⁷ Chrysippus *apud* Philo, *De Monarchia*, 1.216, SVF, II,301,13: μᾶλλον δὲ ἀναγκαίως έννοιαν λήψεσθαι δεῖ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ ποιητοῦ καὶ προσέτι ἡγεμόνος.

²⁸ Cf. Proclus, *Theologia Platonica*, v. 3, p. 76: τὴν θεολογικωτάτην έννοιαν τῆς δυνάμεως Πατρὸς.

²⁹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, frs. 137 and 172.

³⁰ Cf. Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, 10.33.2: τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς έννοίας. Origen, *commMatt*, 17.14: οἱ συγχέοντες πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ έννοιαν. Also, Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius of Salamis, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Theodoret.

³¹ Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 1.1.641: πάσαις ταῖς περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς έννοίαις.

Didymus (περὶ θεοῦ ἐννοίας),³² but in no other Christian theologian.³³

On the other hand, the expression ἔννοιαι πατρός was taken up later by Proclus. He made it a recurring motif, which can only be considered as one more instance of his following Christian usage. Purporting to interpret Parmenides and Plato, Proclus sees the divinity as a Triad, comprising ‘Father, Power, and Mind’ (Πατέρα, δύναμιν, νοῦν),³⁴ The ‘ideas’ within the mind of the Father are also called ‘gods’: they are identified with the ‘concepts of the Father’ resting in his

mind, and they are the causes for the world to be created. This is what Proclus calls ‘concepts of the father’ (ἔννοιαι τοῦ πατρός).³⁵ These are the ‘ideas’ (ὕφεστώσας ἰδέας) which exist in the mind of the Father: it is after them that we can comprehend the mystery of theology.³⁶ They are ‘perceptions not of anything else, but perceptions of their own selves’ (οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἄλλαι ἄλλων εἰσὶν αἱ ἐκεῖ νοήσεις, ἀλλ’ ὡς αὐταὶ ἑαυτῶν).³⁷

Writing [Scholion XXI](#) Cassian continues to quote from Didymus’ commentary on Revelation to the letter.

³² Didymus *Fragmenta in Psalmos*, fr. 96 (From *Catena in Acta*, p. 46): οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες δὲ περὶ θεοῦ ἐννοίας διηρθρωμένους. Fr. 725: πάντες γὰρ κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ καὶ εὐθεὶς γεγενημένοι ἐσπαρμένους ἔχουσι τὰς περὶ θεοῦ ἐννοίας. However, Didymus’ expression is somewhat different and comes from Chrysippus, Posidonius, Philo, Plutarch et al. It was thence taken up by Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria.

³³ Cf. also the rare plural, in *Epigrammata Oracula Chaldaica* (second cent. AD), Oracle 38: ἔννοιαι πατρὸς αἰδε.

³⁴ Proclus, *Theologia Platonica*, v. 3, p. 76.

³⁵ Proclus, *In Platonis Parmenidem*, p. 801: σαφὲς γὰρ οἱ θεοὶ εἰρήκασιν καὶ ὡς ἔννοιαι τοῦ πατρὸς εἰσὶ, μένουσι γὰρ ἐν ταῖς νοήσεσιν τοῦ πατρὸς· καὶ ὡς προέρχονται πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργίαν. Likewise, *ibid.* p. 895. Cf. the tenet about the Ideas being thoughts existing in God’s mind in Albinus, *Epitome*, 9.2–3.

³⁶ Cf. *ibid.* p. 895: Τὰς γοῦν ἐν ἐκείνῳ πρώτως ὕφεστώσας ἰδέας ἡμῖν ἐφερμηνεύοντα τὰ Λόγια κέκληκεν αὐτὰς ἐννοίας πατρικάς, ὡς οὕτως δημιουργικὰς νοήσεις διὰ τὴν τῶν νοήσεων πρὸς τὰ νοούμενα μίαν ὑπόστασιν.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXII

EN XXIIa: ἀληθείας μετέχειν
(‘participating in truth’, Cf. EN XXa)

The Son is said to be ἅγιος and ἀληθινός because he is so ‘in essence, not by participation’. The idea is ascribed to Origen by means of the vocabulary of Didymus.

Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1656.13: Εἴπερ εἰσὶ θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοὶ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· ἀλλὰ τοὺς λεγομένους μετὰ τὴν Τριάδα θεοὺς μετουσίᾳ θεότητος εἶναι τοιούτους· ὁ δὲ Σωτὴρ οὐ κατὰ μετουσίαν, ἀλλὰ κατ’ οὐσίαν ἐστὶ Θεός.

The idea of Trinitarian Persons being God in essence, whereas creatures can only *participate* in ‘truth’, or in ‘holiness’, or indeed in ‘divinity’, is a motif often occurring in Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 435: Ἐπεὶ φῶς ἀληθινὸν ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡ ἀλήθεια εἶναι φησιν, . . . οὐχ ἕτερον δὲ τὸ φῶς τῆς ἀληθείας κατ’ οὐσίαν (ἀμφοτέρω γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱός) ἀλλ’ ἐπινοία μόνη. Ibid. fr. 842: Εἰ καὶ ἄλλοι ὑψηλοὶ καὶ ὑψιστοὶ ἐκ θεοῦ γεγέννηται ἀρετῇ μετεωριζόμενοι καὶ ὑψούμενοι, ἀλλ’ οὐδεὶς ἐκείνων ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ κατ’ οὐσίαν ἐστὶ τοιοῦτος. μόνος γὰρ θεὸς ὑψιστος ὑψίστους ποιῶν ἀλλ’ οὐ γινόμενος· ὡς μόνος σοφός ἐστι καὶ μόνος ἀληθινὸς παρέχων σοφίαν καὶ ἀλήθειαν ἀλλ’ οὐ μετέχων, οὕτω μόνος ὑψιστος, κατὰ τοῦτο τοῦ ὑψίστου τὸ εἶδος καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ὑψίστου τυγχάνοντος. Ibid. fr. 882: αὐτὸς γὰρ μόνος κατὰ ἀλήθειαν γέννημα θεοῦ, οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι τῷ μετέχειν αὐτοῦ υἱοὶ θεοῦ καλοῦνται . . . οὐδεὶς κατ’ οὐσίαν υἱὸς θεοῦ ἢ μόνος ὁ σωτὴρ ἴδιος καὶ μόνος ὁμοούσιός ἐστι τῷ πατρί, ὁμοιωθήσονται δὲ αὐτῷ οὗτοι οἱ οὐ κατ’ οὐσίαν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ποιότητα. Ibid. fr. 884: Ἡ περὶ τὸν θεὸν ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἄλλη τυγχάνει τοῦ εἰπόντος . . . κυκλοῦται δὲ ὑπὸ ταύτης γεννῶν αὐτὴν καὶ μόνος ὢν θεὸς ἀληθινός· ὡς γὰρ μόνος σοφὸς οὐ μετέχων ἀλλὰ καὶ γεννῶν σοφίαν, οὕτω μόνος ἀληθινὸς καὶ κύκλω ἔχει τὴν ἀλήθειαν, οὐ μεταλαμβάνων αὐτῆς, ἀλλὰ συνὼν καὶ ἐτέροις αὐτὴν δωρούμενος. Ibid. fr. 1195: Ὡς περ εἰσὶ θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοὶ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τῷ πάντας τοὺς λεγομένους μετὰ τὴν Τριάδα θεοὺς μετουσίᾳ θεότητος εἶναι τοιούτους. ἀλλ’ ὁ σωτὴρ οὐχ οὕτως ἀλλ’ ὢν κατ’ οὐσίαν θεός· διὸ ποιεῖ θεοὺς τοὺς μετέχοντάς αὐτοῦ.

Didymus developed a similar line of argument in relation to the Holy Spirit. Ibid. fr. 1243: Ἐν τισὶ φέρεται ἀντὶ τοῦ Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν σου, Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγαθόν σου· ἐξ οὗ παρίσταται τὸ ἅγιον ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἅγιον εἶναι· ἀγαθὸν δὲ οὐ κατὰ μετουσίαν ἀγαθότητος ἀλλὰ τῷ κατ’ οὐσίαν εἶναι τοιοῦτον ὥσπερ καὶ ἅγιον. τοιοῦτος δὲ καὶ ὁ πατήρ· καὶ εἴρηται γοῦν περὶ αὐτοῦ Πάτερ ἅγιε, καὶ τὸ Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός. καὶ ὁ υἱὸς δὲ ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἀγίου ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἅγιος εἴρηται εἶναι.

By contrast, the notion of *participation* in either ‘truth’ or ‘holiness’ applies to creatures. *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 250: γέγονεν δὲ τὸ λογικὸν ζῶον, ἵνα δεκτικὸν ᾗ ἀρετῆς. τὸ δὲ δεκτικὸν τινος οὐκ ἐστὶν κατ’ οὐσίαν τοιοῦτο. οὐ κατ’ οὐσίαν δὲ ἀγαθοὶ εἰσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκτίσθησαν, ἵνα γένωνται ἀγαθοὶ μετουσίᾳ τοῦ ἀληθῶς ἀγαθοῦ.

EN XXIIb: τὸ πιστὸς ἀντὶ βεβαίου καὶ
ἀτρέπτου κεῖται

The expression comes from Philo, *De Confusione Linguarum*, 106: φήθη τι παρ’ ἑαυτῷ βέβαιον καὶ ἀσφαλές ἢ συνόλως παρά τινι τῶν γενομένων ἄτρεπτον ἰδρῦσθαι, τοῦ παγίως καὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχοντος. *De Mutatione Nominum*, 55: ἀλλὰ τὴν ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀμετάβλητον ἐμφαίνουσιν, ὁ δ’ οὐδέποτε ἐν ταῦτῳ βεβαίως ἰδρυμένος ἄλλοτε ἀλλοίας δέχεται μεταβολάς. *De Somniis*, 2.227–228: καὶ ἡ τοῦ ὄντος περὶ πάντα βεβαιότης. καὶ γὰρ τῷ ὄντι τὸ τῷ θεῷ συνεγγίζον οἰκειοῦται κατὰ τὸ ἄτρεπτον αὐτοστατοῦν. *De Decalogo*, 43: κἂν ἀτρέπτως καὶ βεβαίως παραμένῃ τὸ εὐτυχεῖν. *De Specialibus Legibus*, 1.311–312: μαραινόμενα τρόπον τινά, πρὶν ἀνθῆσαι βεβαίως. ὃ δὲ δὴ πάγιον καὶ ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀμετάβλητον ἀγαθὸν μεταδιώκωμεν.

EN XXIIc: Quoting 2 Tim. 2:13: εἰ
ἀπιστοῦμεν, αὐτὸς πιστὸς μένει

Only a few writers quoted this passage. Theodoret, *int-PaulXIV*, PG.82: 77.19; 841.22; *Epistulae* 96–147, Epistle 145; *Eranistes*, p. 197, *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 516. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Macedonianos*, v. 3, 1, p. 97. Ephraem Syrus, *Ad*

Ioannem Monachum, p. 191. John Chrysostom, *In Epistulam ii ad Timotheum*, PG.62: 623.61 and 625.57–59; *In illud: Filius ex se Nihil Facit*, PG.56.254.43.

However, Cassian's source is Didymus once again. For it is only he who set forth the idea that πιστός is tantamount to ἄτρεπτος, and he did so by appealing to the same scriptural passages, namely Deut. 32:4 and 2 Tim. 2:13.

Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), papyrus p. 352: 'πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία ἐν αὐτῷ.' καὶ πάλιν 'εἰ ἄρνησόμεθα, αὐτὸς πιστὸς μένει.' ἄτρεπτος γάρ ἐστιν καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος.

EN XXIIId: μένων ἀεὶ καὶ οὐ διαπίπτων

Didymus urged that the divine words are not subject to decline, since these words are steady, unchangeable, hence credible. There is a passage which simply and definitely tells us that the phraseology here is Didymus' own, since this is precisely what the Scholion says couched in different (and yet in essence similar) words. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1266: Θάρσησον τοῖνυν ὅτι καὶ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν ἐπαγγελίων τὴν ἀλήθειαν πιστοῦται· καὶ φυλάσσει εἰς τὸν σύμπαντα αἰῶνα τὰς ἑαυτοῦ ὑποσχέσεις, ὥς μὴ διαπίπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον καὶ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ὥς τοῖς οἰκείοις ἀνθρώποις ἐπηγγείλατο.

Nevertheless, the expression is characteristic of Athanasius, since no other author correlates πιστός with μένων along with οὐ διαπίπτων. *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.165.16–21: πιστὸς δέ, οὐ πίστεως μετέχων, οὐδὲ εἷς τινα πιστεύων ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς· ἀλλὰ πιστεύεσθαι ὀφείλων περὶ ὧν ἐὰν λέγῃ καὶ ποιῇ, καὶ ὅτι πιστὴν θυσίαν προσφέρει τὴν μένουσαν καὶ μὴ διαπίπτουσαν.

The expression οὐ διαπίπτειν indicating 'changelessness' (which is the sentiment of this Scholion) is characteristic of Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 76: οὔτε γὰρ ὡς θεὸς ταῦτα αἰῶνια, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ μὴ διαπίπτειν μένοντα ἀεὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ. *commEccl* (5–6), Cod. p. 195: ἔχομεν δὲ καθόλου τοῦτο εἰπεῖν, ὅτι διαπίπτει τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. *commPs* 20–21,

Cod. p. 19: οὐκ ἀμφίβολον ἔχει τὸ τέλος τοῦ σπουδαζομένου, ἀλλὰ ἐλπίζει ἀμεταθέτως· 'ἐν' γὰρ 'τῷ ἐλέει τοῦ ὑψίστου οὐ σαλεύεται'. οὐ διαπίπτει οὖν αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐλπίς.

EN XXIIe: πρὸς παράστασιν βεβαιότητος

Sextus Empiricus casually used the formula, 'in order to provide certitude'¹ a short while before Didymus. It is worth comparing the following passage, which expresses the same theological notion as that of the Scholion, which is the changelessness of God.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 881: Τὸ δὲ Ὡμοσα λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ βέβαιον τῆς πρὸς τὸν Δαυὶδ ἐπαγγελίας παρίστησιν· ὥς γὰρ ὁ ὁμνὺς ἀπαράβατον πρόθεσιν φυλάττει τῷ τὸν ὄρκον εἶναι λόγον ἐμπεδούμενον μετὰ θεοῦ παραλήψεως, οὕτως καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐφ' οἷς αἰωνίως καὶ βεβαίως χαρίζεται ὁμνύναί λέγεται οὐ κατ' ἄλλον.

The authors who used this phraseology are Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia.

John Chrysostom, *In Sanctum Joannem*, PG.59.255.9: Οὕτω καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ φαίνεται τὸ πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα ἴσον ἔτι βεβαιότερον παριστῶν. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 202, in *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 132: καὶ γὰρ τὸ θεὸς τὴν ἀνωτάτω σημαίνει φύσιν, καὶ ὁ θρόνος καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ τὸ ταύτης βέβαιον παρίστησιν. *expPs*, Psalm 32:14: καὶ τῆς εξουσίας τὸ βέβαιον παριστάς.

EN XXIIIf: ἀρχὴν δὲ τῆς κτίσεως εἶπεν αὐτόν. οὐχ ὡς κτίσμα

Although earlier theologians² often used the idea of the Son being 'a beginning', not a 'creature', the portion of this Scholion is actually a passage from Didymus. For he is the sole author that made this point by appealing to Rev. 3:14 during the first five centuries of Christianity, to be followed later only by Oecumenius and Andreas of Caesarea.

¹ Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos*, 8.261: καὶ τοσοῦτον ἀπέχει τοῦ δύνασθαι βεβαίως τι παριστῶν.

² Cf. ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως. Origen, *Cels*, VI.64; *commJohn*, I.27.188.

Athanasius, *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26: 285.25; 296.36. Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.736.35: ἀρχὴν τῆς τῶν ὅλων δημιουργίας.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.153–154: Ἀναντιρρήτως ἐν Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψει παντοκράτωρ ὁ Σωτὴρ ὁμολογεῖται, αὐτοῦ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ οὕτω λέγοντος· ‘Τάδε λέγει ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ.’ Παντοκράτωρ ὢν ὁ ταῦτα λέγων οὐ κτίσμα τυγχάνει, ἵνα μὴ καὶ ἑαυτοῦ κρατῇ. Παράλογον γὰρ τοῦτο, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι κτίζοντα καὶ κτιζόμενον ὑφ’ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύοντα καὶ κρατούμενον· εἰ καὶ λέγεται δὲ ἐν τῇ παραλημφθείσῃ φωνῇ ‘ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ’ ὁ θεολογούμενος, ὡς βασιλικῶς ἄρχων καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο παντοκράτωρ ὢν, ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως ἐστίν, βασιλεία δηλονότι ἡγεμονοῦσα καὶ ἡγουμένη πάντων κτισμάτων. *Fragmenta in Pro-verbia*, PG.39.1632.33–34: Καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ φησιν ὁ Κύριος· ‘Εγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ.’

If another source for the present Scholion should be detected (in terms of ideas, not phraseology), this is no doubt Gregory of Nyssa. Cf. *Catena in Epistulam ad Romanos* (cod. Monac. gr. 412), p. 274: οὕτω κἂν ὁ Υἱὸς πρῶτος λέγεται τῆς κτίσεως, οὐ πάντως ἐστὶ τῶν ποιημάτων εἷς. ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ ὁ Πατὴρ ἀρχὴν ἑαυτοῦ τῶν πάντων ἀποδεικνύων ἔλεγεν, ‘ἐγὼ εἰμι πρῶτος,’ οὕτω καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς πρωτότοκος τῆς κτίσεως λέγεται. δι’ αὐτοῦ γὰρ τὰ πάντα γέγονε, καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων ἀρχή, ὡς κτίστης καὶ δημιουργός.

This invites a question, to which I return again and again in this book. Gregory of Nyssa could hardly be the source for Didymus’ foregoing account, since he was far younger than the Alexandrian sage. Gregory was, however, the author who inspired Cassian most. It is likely then that the catena in which this passage of Gregory occurs was composed at the Laura of Sabas.

EN XXIIg: οἷα δημιουργός

The expression οἷα δημιουργός appears in Philo only and nowhere else in Greek literature. The word οἷα is an adverb in its own right and was made a lemma by Hesychius of Alexandria, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter omicron, p. 171, explained as ὥσπερ or καθάπερ.

Philo, *De Opificio Mundi*, 18: τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῇ τοὺς ἐκάστων δεξάμενος τύπους ἀγαλματοφορεῖ νοητὴν πόλιν, ἥς ἀνακινήσας τὰ εἰδωλα μνήμη τῇ συμφύτῳ καὶ τοὺς χαρακτηῖρας ἔτι μᾶλλον

ἐνσφραγισάμενος, οἷα δημιουργὸς ἀγαθός, ἀποβλέπων εἰς τὸ παράδειγμα τὴν ἐκ λίθων καὶ ξύλων ἄρχεται κατασκευάζειν.

De Fuga et Inventione, 26: αὐτοῖς, οὐκ ἐπιτηδεύμασι λέγω, τοῖς δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων ποιητικοῖς, τιμαῖς, ἀρχαῖς, ἀργύρῳ, χρυσῷ, κτήμασι, χρώμασι, σχήμασι διάφοροις, κάλλεσι, καὶ ὅταν ἐντύχῃς, οἷα δημιουργὸς ἀγαθὸς εἶδος ἄριστον ταῖς ὑλικάς οὐσίαις ἐγγάραξον καὶ ἐπαινετὸν ἀποτέλεσον ἔργον.

Nevertheless, this expression would be an adaptation from the foregoing expression of Gregory of Nyssa καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων ἀρχή, ὡς κτίστης καὶ δημιουργός.

EN XXIIIh: τῆς κτίσεως ἄρχων

The expression styling the Son ἄρχων τῆς κτίσεως is Didymus’. *commZacch*, 1.154: ὁ θεολογούμενος, ὡς βασιλικῶς ἄρχων καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο παντοκράτωρ ὢν, ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως ἐστίν.

Oecumenius followed Didymus, but he appealed to Gregory of Nazianzus. *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 64: τὸ γὰρ Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τοῦ νοερῶς ἐμψυχωμένου σώματος τοῦ Κυρίου, ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις ἐξείληφε Γρηγόριος ἐν τῷ Περὶ Υἱοῦ λόγῳ· τὸ δὲ γεννᾶ, ἐπὶ τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ. πάντων οὖν γέννησιν καὶ οὐ κτίσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς Λόγου καὶ Υἱοῦ δογματಿಸάντων, τί βούλεται τὸ ἐν τῷ παρόντι λέγεσθαι ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ; οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ ἄρχων τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ τὴν κατὰ πάντων ἀρχὴν ἔχων.

EN XXIIIi: μνήμην ἀποβάλλειν

Cassian drew this expression from Theodore of Mopsuestia, who is the sole author to associate the ‘memory (μνήμην) of a certain thing’ with the ‘disposition (διάθεσιν) toward it’.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, *expPs*, Psalm 55:13: Ὅσα ἐπηγγελάμην ἀποδοῦναι τύξων παρὰ τῆς παρά σου βοηθείας, ταῦτα καὶ ἀποδώσω. Ἐν ἐμοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐκ ἀπέβαλον τὴν μνήμην, οὐκ ἀπέβαλον τὴν διάθεσιν.

The expression μνήμην ἀποβάλλειν (‘to disown the memory’ of something, or of someone) is rare but present in certain authors, some of whom are relevant to the Scholia, particularly John Chrysostom.

John Chrysostom, *In Genesin*, PG.53.375.24: καὶ τὴν μνήμην τῶν ἤδη δοθέντων ἀποβάλλοντας.

Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Daniele*, PG.56.214.29: καὶ ταχέως τὴν μνήμην ἀπέβαλεν.

Maximus Confessor, *Quaestiones et Dubia*, 19: καὶ τὰς παρατραπείσας τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις τῇ παρατάσει τῶν αἰώνων ἀποβαλεῖν τὰς ἐντεθείσας αὐτῇ τῆς κακίας μνήμας.

The origin of the expression appears to be Plotinus, *Enneades*, IV.3.26: οὗ δὲ ἡ μὲν αἴσθησις οὕτω κοινὸν ἔργον λέγοιτο ἂν, ἡ δὲ μνήμη οὐκ ἀναγκάζοιτο τοῦ κοινοῦ εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς ἤδη παραδεξαμένης τὸν τύπον καὶ ἡ φυλαξάσης ἡ ἀποβαλοῦσης αὐτήν.

Damascius, *In Phaedonem* (versio 2), section 17: ἀλλὰ μὴν ἐκ τῶν νόσων τὴν μνήμην ἀποβάλλομεν, οὐ μόνον τόπων καὶ χρόνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων ὧν ἐμάθομεν.

In Didymus, the notion of a righteous man abiding by the ‘memory of God’ is a recurrent motif. He reminds his readers that in Hebrew the name ‘Zachariah’ means ‘memory of God’. *commZacch*, 1.4: μνήμης ἐπώνυμος ὢν πατὴρ τοῦ Ζαχαρίου. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1264: ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶς ὁ διὰ πάντων ὧν εὖ πέπονθε καὶ εὐεργετήθη τῆς θεοῦ ἀγαθότητος μνημονεύων Ζαχαρίας καθ’ Ἑβραίων φωνὴν καλεῖται, ἐρμηνευόμενος μνήμη τουτέστι θεοῦ. Ibid. fr. 108: Καὶ τῶν κεκρυμμένων σου ἐπλήσθη ἡ γαστήρ αὐτῶν· κεκρυμμένα δὲ θεοῦ τὰ ἀνάξια τῆς μνήμης αὐτοῦ. Ibid. fr. 866: εἰσὶ θεὸν ἐγνωκότες, ὧν μνημονεύει θεὸς ἀξιῶν τῆς μνήμης αὐτοῦ κριθέντων. Ibid. fr. 1012: ἐπιθυμήσαντες ἰδεῖν καὶ ἀκοῦσαι τὰ πρὸς Ἰησοῦ γινόμενα καὶ λαλούμενα, ἀξιοῦσι μνήμην αὐτῶν γενέσθαι ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν σωτηρίᾳ.

EN XXIIj: κακίας παχύτητα

The term *παχύτης* means ‘thickness’, or ‘fatness’, but the metaphor *κακίας παχύτης* indicates ‘grossness of vice’. The expression appears in Didymus, who seems to have borrowed it from Origen.³ In the following,

Didymus uses language which is remarkably like that of the Scholia, as the footnotes indicate.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 606a: Ὡς περ δὲ ὁ τηκόμενος κηρὸς ἀναιρεῖται, καθὸ τηκτὸς καὶ παχύτητα ἔχων τοῦ πρώτου ὑποκειμένου⁴ εἰς πῦρ μεταβαλόντος, οὕτως οἱ φαῦλοι⁵ κολάσεως πεπειραμένοι τὴν ἐκ μοχθηρᾶς ἕξεως⁶ παχύτητα τηκόμενοι ἀποβάλλουσι. πρὸ κολάσεως δ’ ἐστὶ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, τυγχάνον δικαιοσύνης ἡλίου.⁷ μετὰ γὰρ τὴν κόλασιν οὐχ οἶόν τε προσβάλλειν τῇ λαμπρόνι τοῦ νοητοῦ ἡλίου.⁸ ὅθεν ἐνταῦθα εἴρηται· ὥς ἄρα ἐπιπεσόντος τοῦ κολαστικοῦ⁹ φωτός, οὐκ εἶδον τὸν ἥλιον οἱ τῇ κολάσει περιπεσόντες. οἱ δὲ συνέντες τὰ ἴδια πάθη ἀλληγορικώτερον ἀκάνθας ὀνομαζόμενα, οὐ πειρασθήσονται κολαζούσης ὀργῆς,¹⁰ πρὸ τοῦ δὲ συνιέναι τὰς πνευματικῶς¹¹ λεγομένας ἀκάνθας. Ibid. fr. 780a: φαύλου τοιγαροῦν ὄντος τοῦ κατοικεῖν τὴν γῆν, παχύνεσθαι συμβαίνει ἐκ τοῦ φρονεῖν τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς, καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ κατηριθμημένα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔργα, καὶ τὸ ὑποκεῖσθαι τῷ φρονήματι αὐτῆς τυγχάνοντι ἔχθρα εἰς θεὸν διὰ τὸ κατοικεῖν τὴν γῆν. ταύτην τὴν ἐκ κακίας προσγενομένην παχύτητα, καθ’ ἣν ἐπαχύνθη ἡ καρδιά τοῦ ἐγκαλουμένου λαοῦ, ἐκτήκει ἡ διάπυρος τοῦ σωτήρος διδασκαλία, περὶ ἧς εἶπεν ὅτι Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. Ibid. fr. 781A: Τὴν δὲ τοιαύτην ἐκ κακίας παχύτητα ἐκτήκει ἡ διάπυρος τοῦ σωτήρος διδασκαλία εἰπόντος Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐκ προαιρέσεως ἀναλωθῆναι δεῖ τὴν κακίαν καὶ οὐκ ἐκ μόνου τοῦ τήκοντος. Ibid. fr. 637: Φέρεται δὲ καὶ ἑτέρα γραφή· Καὶ ἐτάκη ἡ σὰρξ μου· περὶ ἧς λεκτέον τάδε· ὅτε ἡ ψυχὴ μου πρὸς θεὸν διψᾷ, τήκεται ἡ σὰρξ ἀπολαβοῦσα παχύτητα τὴν ἐξ αἰσχυρῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν τε ἄλλων παθῶν συνισταμένην. Ibid. fr. 1109: ἐγὼ τὸν νόμον σου διὰ μελέτης ἔχων ἐσπούδαζον αὐτὸν νοεῖν, τῆς τούτου νοήσεως λυούσης οὐ μόνον τὴν ἀχλὺν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν παχύτητα τῆς ὑλικῆς διαθέσεως. Ibid. fr. 398: τοῖς γὰρ ὑπὲρ

³ Cf. Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1220.50: Στέαρ μὲν νοητὸν ἢ ἐκ τῆς κακίας ἐπισυμβαίνουσα τῷ ἡγεμονικῷ παχύτης. *Cels*, III.35: ἐπεὶ τῆς καθαρωτέρας οὐ δύναται ἐφάψασθαι χώρας καὶ θειοτέρας, ἐνθα μὴ φθάνουσιν αἱ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ μυρίων κακῶν παχύτητες.

⁴ *commZacch*, 3.97; *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 197; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 91. Cf. Origen, *selPs*, PG.12: 1093.21–35; 1096.4–7; 1097.14–24.

⁵ Cf. *Scholia VI* and *XV*.

⁶ Cf. *Scholia X* and *XV*.

⁷ Cf. *Scholion XVIII*.

⁸ Cf. *Scholion IX*.

⁹ Cf. *Scholion XXX*.

¹⁰ Cf. *Scholia XXX* and *XXXVII*.

¹¹ Cf. *Scholia XIV*, *XXIX*, *XXXI*, *XXXIV*.

ἀνομίας προσφερομένοις ἐλεγμοῖς παιδεύεται ἄνθρωπος, ἐκτηκομένης τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀποβαλεῖν πᾶσαν σαρκώδη παχύτητα. *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 401: ὥς γὰρ ἀκαταμάχητος χρῆται τῇ . . . ἀσπίδι χρησάμενος τῇ ταύτης παχύτητι καὶ τοῖς σαρκικοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν.

Gregory of Nyssa, *Dialogus de Anima et Resurrectione*, PG.46.113.43: ἐκεῖθεν δὲ διὰ κακίας τῶν πτερῶν ἐκπιπτόντων χαμαιπετεῖς πρόσγειοι γίνονται, τῇ παχύτητι τῆς ὕλικῆς καταμιγνύμεναι φύσεως.

Simplicius associates ‘thickness’ with ‘wickedness’, too. In *Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Com-*

mentaria, v. 9, p. 599: τοιγαροῦν ἀρετὴν μὲν ὕδατος τὴν κουφότητά φαμεν, κακίαν δὲ ἄερος τὴν παχύτητα.

My conclusion is that this Scholion was written by Cassian with Didymus’ commentary in front of him. Nevertheless, at points he used his own vocabulary, which points also to Gregory of Nyssa. Besides, the proof-texts revealing Didymus come from the specific collection of his fragments on the Psalms, that is, *frPs(al)*, which perhaps reflects some emendation by the catenist, who was probably Anastasius of Sinai or Olympiodorus, the daeicon of Alexandria, or indeed the former drawing on an anthology by the latter.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXIII

EN XXIIIa: ἐκ τούτων τῶν θείων φωνῶν

The expression appears in a considerable number of passages, but in a limited number of authors. Among them, Eusebius was followed by Theodoret,¹ as well by Gregory of Nyssa. In Didymus the expression does not appear, but it does in *De Trinitate*.² The opening of the Scholion, then, is a text by Cassian himself, probably influenced by Gregory of Nyssa.

EN XXIIIb: τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος πυρώσεως

There is no need to insist on tracing too many parallels in Didymus, although there is no shortage of them. For in fact this Scholion is a comment by Cassian seeking to establish his personal aim, namely the relevance of Revelation to both Testaments, which he urges by associating Jer. 6:7 with Pauline parallels.

Nevertheless, see Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 166: ἐπ' ἀρετὴν θερμὸς καὶ ζέων τῷ Πνεύματι τυγχάνων. *commZacch*, 1.124: ἵνα παρασκευασθῶσιν ζεῖν τῷ πνεύματι, περὶ ὧν γέγραπται· 'Ὡσεὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες.' Ibid. 5.7: ὅπως δι' ἐπιπόνου ἀγωγῆς ἀποβάλωσι τὰς προσγεναμένας³ βλάβας . . . διὰ πυρὸς τοῦ καθαίροντος καὶ 'ζέοντας τῷ πνεύματι' ποιούντος. *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 274: ἡ δὲ μελέτη καὶ ἡ θερμὴ τοῦ ἀγίου ἡ διάπυρος, ἡ γινομένη ὑπὸ τοῦ ζέοντος πνεύματος. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1008a: τοῦ λογίου τοῦ κυρίου πυρώσαντος ἐπὶ τῷ ζέειν τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐξημμένον αὐτὸ ἔχειν τῷ θείῳ φωτί, μεθ' ὃ καὶ τηρεῖν δυνατόν παραΐνεσιν λέγουσαν Τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε. Ibid. fr. 155: Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν θέρμην αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς οἶός τέ ἐστιν ἀποκρυβῆναι·

τοῦ γὰρ πυρὸς οὗ ἐλήλυθεν βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πάντες μεταλαμβάνουσιν, ὥς τινας τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντας γενέσθαι. Ibid. fr. 1278.

The following is a striking parallel to [Scholion XXVII](#). Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1133: Ὅθεν τὸ οὕτως πεπυρωμένον λόγιον σφόδρα παρά τινος ἀγαπηθὲν ποιεῖ αὐτὸν τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντα ἅτε δοῦλον ὄντα τοῦ θεοῦ. ὁ τοιοῦτος καὶ σαφηνιζομένων ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ τῶν γραφῶν ἐξάπτεται τὴν καρδίαν, ὥς φάσκειν κατὰ τοὺς περὶ τὸν· Κλεώπαν Οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, ὥς διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς;

There are only two instances (which are actually one) where the expression is used by authors who are relevant to the vocabulary of the Scholia. Pseudo-Macarius, *Homiliae* I, 25 and Ephraem Syrus, *Ad Renuntiantes*, p. 290 alike: ἔστι γὰρ πύρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος ἢ ἀναζωπυροῦσα τὰς καρδίας. There is one more case attributed to both Pseudo-Macarius and Ephraem Syrus alike (cf. the same phenomenon occurring in Pseudo-Macarius, *Epistula Magna*, p. 249 and Ephraem Syrus, *Regulae ad Monachos*, p. 319, which both use the idea of μετουσία τοῦ πνεύματος).

The distinction between ψῦξις and πύρωσις occurs in no other author, except for a passage in Gregory of Nyssa, which, however, has a different import: *Adversus Eunomium*, 1.1.517.

EN XXIIIc: τοῦ θείου Πνεύματος ἄμοιρος

The specific idiom suggesting anyone 'who is bereft of the Holy Spirit' is rare, but it was used by Irenaeus, if Basil's testimony is accurate.⁴ A catenist recording

¹ Origen, *Cels*, II.2; II.72. In Clement of Alexandria, Basil of Seleucia, Procopius of Gaza, Ephraem Syrus, and Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, there is casual usage at one point, while attribution to Athanasius is spurious, apart from one passage addressing the emperor. Usage ascribed to John Chrysostom is mostly spurious. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 1.1.130; 2.1.298; 3.4.6; 3.9.62; *Adversus Apollinarium*, v. 3.1, p. 189; *et passim*, amounting to more than sixty instances. Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.601.6; *Homiliae in Hexaemeron*, 2.7; *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.253.33 *et passim* (five instances). Eusebius, *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, 3.6.4; *DE*, 6.19.2, *et passim* (nine instances). Theodoret, *HE*, p. 117; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.737.40; *Historia Religiosa*, Vita 3.2; *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 126; *Eranistes*, pp. 209; 220; *De Providentia*, PG.83.612.4; *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*,

p. 597. Pagan usage occurs in Porphyry, probably drawing on Origen. Porphyry, *Quaestionum Homeriarum Liber* I, 96; 97; *Zetemata Codicis Vaticani*, p. 320, cols. 1 and 2.

² Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 1)*, 18.18: Εἰ δὲ βούλεσθε, γνώριμον ὑμῖν καὶ ἐκ θείας φωνῆς αὐθις τὸ κινούμενον ποιήσω. *DT (lib. 2.1–7)*, 2.2: 7.3,13: οἱ δὲ καὶ τῶν θείων φωνῶν τούτων ὀλιγοῦντες.

³ Cf. discussion of participle προσγεναμένας in [EN XXIf](#).

⁴ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, fr. 9 (*apud* Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto*, 29.72): διὰ τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἀγνῆς ἀναστροφῆς συντηρεῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ἄμοιροι τοῦ θείου Πνεύματος γενόμενοι ἀποτύχωμεν τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν.

Origen used this, too.⁵ I would not be surprised if the person who recorded Origen was Cassian himself, since he also recorded Theodoret⁶ and others, followed by his later Sabaites brother John of Damascus.⁷ The same locution recurs in several texts attributed to John Chrysostom,⁸ which probably suggests that this is a later idiom circulating among catenists of either the Laura of Sabas or the monastery of the Akoimetoi.

In Didymus the expression does not occur, yet we come upon it in *De Trinitate*, which once again suggests that Cassian is its author.

DT (lib. 2.1–7), 6.2.2: ‘πνεῦμα κυρίου πεπλήρωκεν τὴν οἰκουμένην, καὶ τὸ συνέχον τὰ πάντα γινώσιν ἔχει φωνῆς· ἀντὶ τοῦ περιέλαβεν τὴν ἀόρατον καὶ ὁρατὴν κτίσιν, τὴν νοητὴν καὶ αἰσθητὴν, καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν πάντων ἐστὶν ἄμοιρον τῆς αἰδίου ἐπιστασίας αὐτοῦ· τὸ γὰρ πάντα συνέχειν τοῦτο δηλοῖ. καὶ πάσης, φησὶν, ἐπακούει φωνῆς, ὡς θεὸς ἐν πᾶσιν πανταχοῦ ἀεὶ τυγχάνων, καὶ πᾶσαν ὑλικὴν ἀναρμοστίαν εἰς τάξιν περιάγων τὴν πρέπουσαν, καὶ τῶν πρὸς αὐτοῦ ποιηθέντων φειδόμενός τε καὶ ἐπιμελούμενος, ἅτε αὐτὸς τὴν φύσιν πρόνοια ὑπάρχων καὶ σοφία, δι’ ὧν διαπεφοιτηκυῖα, ὡς ὁ πατήρ.

Forms such as the participle διαπεφοιτηκυῖα in *De Trinitate* should not pass unnoticed: for it does not occur in Didymus, who does not use the term διαφοιτᾶν at all, which is, however, present in *Scholion XV* (διαφοιτήσας). This and similar forms occur in authors such as Alexander of Aphrodisias expounding

views of Chrysippus,⁹ as well as in others, most of whom are relevant to the vocabulary of the Scholia.¹⁰

EN XXIIIId: ἡ ψῦξις ἡ νοητὴ

The correlation between ‘iciness’ and ‘sin’¹¹ shows that the Scholion was written by Cassian himself also with Didymus and Origen in mind. In fact, it is only Didymus who makes much of this saying by Jeremiah, relating ‘iciness’ with ‘sin’.¹²

Didymus, *In Genesin*, Code. p. 44: Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν πρὸς τὸ ῥητόν· πρὸς δὲ ἀναγωγὴν ἡ κακία ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν ἀλληγορίας νόμῳ ὕδωρ εἴρηται, μάλιστα ὅτε παρετιθέμεθα. Ὑδωρ πολὺ οὐ δυνήσεται σβέσαι τὴν ἀγάπην· τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ συμβαίνει, ἀλλ’ ἀπ’ ἐκείνου ἀφ’ οὗ σπάνις ἀρετῆς εἶναι εἴρηται ἐκ τοῦ ‘διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν ψυγήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν’. Οὐκοῦν μὴ ἀνομία τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστὶ τὸ πειρώμενον σβέσαι τὴν διάθεσιν τὴν ἀγαπητικὴν;¹³ *commZacch*, 1.179: Σκεπάζει δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κρύους τῆς ἁμαρτίας περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· ‘Ὡς ψύχει λάκκος ὕδωρ, οὕτω ψύχει κακία αὐτῆς.’ *frPs(al)*, fr. 45: γέγραπται γὰρ περὶ ἁμαρτανούσης ψυχῆς· Ὡς ψύχει λάκκος ὕδωρ, οὕτως ψύχει κακία αὐτῆς. *Ibid.* fr. 1277: ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ διάπυρος ὑπάρχων παραβάλλεται πυρί, θερμαίνων καὶ ζέειν ποιῶν τοὺς ἀπεψυγμένους τῇ κακίᾳ ὧν ἡ ἀγάπη ἐψύγη διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς ἀνομίας. *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 193: εἰ γὰρ τις λογίσαιτο ὅτι τὰ ῥευστὰ τοῦ

⁵ Cf. Origen, *frLam*, fr. 83: τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, στερεάν τε οὖσαν καὶ σκοτεινὴν καὶ πνεύματος ἄμοιρον ἁγίου.

⁶ Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.133.19 and *Catena in Epistulam ad Romanos* (cod. Monac. gr. 412), p. 237: Ἐρημοὶ γὰρ εἰσι τῆς τιμῆς τῆς τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος, ἄμοιροι τυγχάνοντες χάριτος.

⁷ Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, PG.77.1128.52–53 (the same portion in John of Damascus, *Expositio Fidei*, 7): Καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἡμέτερος λόγος οὐκ ἄμοιρός ἐστι πνεύματος.

⁸ John Chrysostom, *De Baptismo Christi*, PG.49.367.47: Εἰ τοίνυν μήτε Πνεύματος ἁγίου ἄμοιρος ἦν ἡ σὰρξ ἐκείνη. *In Acta Apostolorum*, PG.60.36.2: Ἄλλως δὲ καὶ Πνεύματος ἄμοιρος ἦν ἔτι. *Fragmenta in Jeremiam*, PG.64.881.42 in *Catena in Acta*, p. 15: Ἐὼς μὲν οὖν Πνεύματος ἄμοιροι οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἦσαν, κλήρω τὰ πρᾶγματα ἐπέτρεπον. *In Acta Apostolorum*, PG.60.16.50 and *Catena in Acta*, p. 2: Τί οὖν; ἱστορία μόνον τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐστὶ καὶ Πνεύματος ἄμοιρος ὁ λόγος; *ibid.* p. 14: ἄλλος δὲ καὶ Πνεύματος ἄμοιρος ἦν. Cf. the single instance in Epiphanius of Salamis, *De Mensuris et Ponderibus*: ὥσθ’ ὑπολαμβάνειν ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἄμοιρους αὐτοὺς γεγενῆσθαι πνεύματος ἁγίου.

⁹ Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Logica et Physica*, fr. 473 (SVF, II.155.34, *apud* Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Mixtione*, p. 218); fr. 1044, (SVF, II.308.10, *apud* Alexander of Aphrodisias, *op. cit.* p. 225). Cf. Posidonius, *Fragmenta*, fr. 352.

¹⁰ Plutarch, *De Garrulitate*, 505F4; *Adversus Colotem*, 1108D5; *Fragmenta*, Fr. 134. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 5.14.133.9; *Fragmenta*, fr. 23. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Mixtione*, pp. 218; 225. Origen, *commJohn*, VI.39.194; VI.39.202. Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis*, 3.11 and 12. Gregory of Nyssa, *De Vita Gregorii Thaumaturgi*, PG.46: 929.31; 944.12 and 41. Cyril of Alexandria, *Dialogi de Sancta Trinitate*, p. 507; *In Isaiam*, PG.70.548.5. Cf. *DT* (lib. 2.1–7), 6.2.2; *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), PG.39.761.7.

¹¹ Cf. Jeremiah, 6:7: ὡς ψύχει λάκκος ὕδωρ, οὕτως ψύχει κακία αὐτῆς.

¹² Similar occasions are scarce. Cf. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.541.34–42. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Isaiam*, PG.70.1421.15–16 (copied by John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela*, PG.96.309.15–16). Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *Fragmenta in Jeremiam*, PG.93.641.25–28.

¹³ Cf. *Scholion X*.

βίου πράγματα ἀντὶ κατακλισμοῦ λαμβανόμενα, ὅτε πληθύνει, ψυχομένης τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ἀγάπης, συντέλεια ἔσται.

EN XXIIIe: ἐν οἰκείοις θεοῦ

This is an allusion¹⁴ to Eph. 2:19. Quotations of this scriptural passage are not frequent, yet the authors commenting on it are relevant to the Scholia, including Theodoret and Didymus.¹⁵

EN XXIIIff: τὴν ῥαδίαν μετάπτωσιν

The Codex's expression ῥαδίαν μετάκλησιν makes no sense whatsoever, neither has it ever been used, since it means nothing. However, A. Harnack let it stand. On the other hand, C. H. Turner deemed the 'emendation' to μετάκλινιν, which had been proposed earlier by a German scholar, 'an admirably simple and satisfactory' one. Although this is closer to making sense, it is a form hardly used: I know of one instance in Cyril of Alexandria, where this was applied in the present sense.¹⁶ Up until the fifth century, the term μετάκλινις occurs in a few instances (no more than five) in Gregory of Nazianzus, yet he was usually content with μετάπτωσις rather than μετάκλινις. As a matter of fact, in one of his poems¹⁷ referring to the volatile 'shifts' of the Euripus tide (the ebb and flow) in Chalkis, he uses μετάκλινις ('varying in direction'). However, he is apparently not content with doing so, and turns to the word μεταβολαί ('changes') in the same context.¹⁸ Then, he turns to μετάπτωσις in the same context, yet this time using the Euripus as a metaphor betokening volatile human activity.¹⁹

Although grammatically impeccable (in Modern Greek it is only a technical term of geology), μετάκλινις was a neologism on Cassian's day. The

verb μετακλίνειν was used by Philo following a single Homeric instance,²⁰ yet the noun μετάκλινις was never used during Classical times: it was unknown until the first century AD, when Josephus used it just once and then Galen once again. It was well after them that Gregory of Nazianzus applied this, only to abandon it later, apparently deeming it unsatisfactory.

Furthermore, Gregory used the correct noun μετάπτωσις and its cognates far more extensively, indeed in order to make the same point which Cassian does in this Scholion: he portrays the volatility of human life and action, which is always liable to alteration of its moral quality.

Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistulae*, 29.1: Ὁρᾷς οἷα τὰ ἡμέτερα καὶ ὅπως κύκλος τις τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων περιτρέχει πραγμάτων· νῦν μὲν τῶν,²¹ νῦν δὲ τῶν ἀνθούτων καὶ ἀπανθούτων, καὶ οὔτε τοῦ εὖ πράττειν ἐστῶτος ἡμῖν, οὔτε τοῦ δυστυχεῖν, ὃ δὴ λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ τάχιστα μετακινουμένου καὶ μεταπίπτοντος, ὥς αὔραις εἶναι μᾶλλον πιστεύειν καὶ γράμμασι καθ' ὕδατος ἢ ἀνθρώπων εὐετηρία.

Funebris in Laudem Caesaris Fratris, 10.5: ὥς εἶναι ἰδεῖν ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν τοῦ βίου μεταβολῶν, καὶ τῆς ἄνω καὶ κάτω μεταπιπτούσης εὐετηρίας.

De Spiritu Sancto, 15: ἡμεῖς τε γὰρ οὐ σύνθετοι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀντίθετοι καὶ ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ μιᾷ ἡμέρας οἱ αὐτοὶ καθαρῶς μένοντες, μὴ ὅτι τὸν ἅπαντα βίον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σώμασι καὶ ψυχαῖς αἰεὶ ῥέοντες τε καὶ μεταπίπτοντες.

De Pauperum Amore, PG.35.884.8–11: τὰ δὲ ἐστῶτα καὶ μένοντα, καὶ οὔποτε ὑποχωροῦντα, οὐδὲ μεταπίπτοντα, οὐδὲ σφάλλοντα τὰς τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἐλπίδας.

Ibid. PG.35.884.49–51: Χριστῷ συνίσταται, καὶ Χριστῷ συνανέρχεται, τῆς οὐκέτι μεταπιπτούσης ζωῆς οὐδὲ ἀπατηλῆς κληρονομίας.

¹⁴ Eph. 2:19: ἄρα οὐκ ἐστὶ ξένοι καὶ πάροιχοι, ἀλλὰ ἐστὲ συμπολιταὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ.

¹⁵ Origen, *Cels.* III.56; *comm1Cor*, 16; *commEph*, 12. Eusebius, *DE*, 7.2.33; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.87.80. Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 138; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.524.52. Basil of Caesarea, *Moralia*, PG.31.868.26; *De Baptismo*, PG.31.1564.21. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, frs. 1268; 1285. John Chrysostom, *In Lucianum Martyrem*, PG.50.525.12; *In Epistolam ad Ephesios*, PG.62: 37.50; 43.7–47. Cyril of Alexandria, *commPropXII*, v. 1, p. 630; v. 2, pp. 118; 510; *In Isaiam*, PG.70.321.42; *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.477.6–8.

¹⁶ Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarius in XII Prophetas Minores*, v. 2, p. 156: τὴν ἀπὸ γε τῶν αἰσχίωνων ἐπὶ τὰ ἀμείνω μετάκλινιν.

¹⁷ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmina de Se Ipso*, p. 1190: Εὐριπτοὶ λόγων παλιρροῦντες ἢ κλάδων μετακλίσεις.

¹⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Adversus Julianum Imperatorem*, PG.35.597.4: ἐπὶ ταῖς τοῦ Εὐρίπου μεταβολαῖς. *Supremum Vale*, PG.36.484.35: Εὐρίπων μεταβολαὶ τινες, ἢ ἀμπώτιδες.

¹⁹ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio Placabilis*, PG.35.745.46–748.3, quoted on p. 296.

²⁰ Homer, *Ilias*, XI.509: πολέμοιο μετακλινθέντος = 'in the turning of the fight'.

²¹ There is a word missing here, such as ἐστῶτων, which should have been an editorial emendation.

In Patrem Tacentem, PG.35.937.18–21: πολλάς στροφὰς ἐχούσης ἡμῶν τῆς κάτω ζωῆς, καὶ τοῦ τῆς ταπεινώσεως σώματος ἄνω καὶ κάτω κινουμένου καὶ μεταπίπτοντος.

In Aegyptiorum Adventum, PG.36.248.51–53: Τούτων δέ, ἡ μὲν ποιητικὴ τέ ἐστι, καὶ ἀρχική, καὶ ἀκίνητος· ἡ δὲ πεποιημένη, καὶ ὑπὸ χειρᾶ, καὶ μεταπίπτουσα.

In Sancta Lumina, PG.36.348.29–32: Πῶς γάρ; οὔτε τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἢ εἰς Πατέρα μεταπίπτοντος, ἢ εἰς Υἱόν, ὅτι ἐκπεπόρευται, καὶ ὅτι Θεός, κὰν μὴ δοκῇ τοῖς ἀθέοις· ἡ γὰρ ιδιότης ἀκίνητος. Ἡ πῶς ἂν ιδιότης μένοι, κινουμένη καὶ μεταπίπτουσα;

Likewise, never did Theodoret use the term μετὰκλισις, whereas he did use μετὰπτωσις, indeed he applied this in the same sense as this Scholion does.

Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 94: Τὸ γάρ, ‘Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο,’ οὐ μετὰπτωσιν τῆς φύσεως σημαίνει, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως. *De Providentia*, PG.83.628.35–37: Τούτου χάριν ὁλοφύρομενος ὁ Προφήτης, καὶ τραγῳδῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν εἰς ἀλογία μεταπτῶσιν, ἐβόα.

I now come to identifying the source of Cassian’s expression τὴν ῥαδίαν μετὰπτῶσιν (‘an easy [=swift] lapse’). It turns out that he had in mind Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, and some of the rest of his own reading.

Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio Placabilis*, PG.35.745.46–748.3: Καὶ γὰρ ὁρῶ κούφους καὶ ἀνοήτους οὐ τούτους ὑπολαμβάνομεν, οἱ ἂν κακῶ τιτι παραμένωσιν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ῥαδίως ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέρα φερομένους καὶ μεταρρέοντας, καθάπερ αὔρας μεταπιπτούσας.

Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae*, 26.1: Πάντως γάρ που εἰσῆει ἡμᾶς τοῦ βίου τὸ μάταιον καὶ ὥς οὐδὲν πιστὸν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων οὔτε πάγιον, οὕτω ῥαδίας ἐχόντων τὰς μεταπτῶσεις. But my constant point is that the epistles ascribed to Basil need further study,

and it is likely that a good number of them are actually Cassian’s.

John Chrysostom, *Ad Populum Antiochenum*, PG.49.93.43–44: Τοιαῦτα γὰρ τὰ μὴ φύσει προσόντα· ῥαδίαν δέχεται τὴν μεταβολὴν καὶ τὴν μετὰπτῶσιν. *In Ananiam*, PG.54.663.51–53: Ἡ μὲν γὰρ παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων δόξα, τῶν δοξαζόντων μιμεῖται τὴν εὐτέλειαν, ὅθεν καὶ μεταπίπτει ῥαδίως.

The expression μεταπίπτειν ῥαδίως was a theme occurring in Galen, *De Victu Attenuante*, 71; *Synopsis Librorum de Pulsibus*, v. 9, pp. 477 and 506.

Usage contemporary with Cassian is significant. One instance occurs in Simplicius,²² another in John Philoponus.²³

EN XXIIIg: κυβεῖα

This expression is Cassian’s, using Eph. 4:14 while having in mind Theodoret, who had made an analogous analysis of this passage of Paul.

Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.536.32–47: Ἵνα μηκέτι ὤμεν νήπιοι, κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ τῷ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας, ἐν τῇ κυβεῖα τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης. Ἴδιον τῶν ἔτι νηπίων τὸ τῆς γνώμης ὀξύρροπὸν τε καὶ κοῦφον.²⁴ Τοιοῦτοι, φησί, πρὸ τῆς κλήσεως ἤμεν, τῇδε κἀκεῖσε καθάπερ ὑπὸ κυμάτων φερόμενοι, καὶ τοῖς ἐξαπατῶσι πειθόμενοι. Κυβεῖαν δὲ τὴν πανουργίαν καλεῖ. Πεποιήται δὲ ἀπὸ κυβεύειν τὸ ὄνομα· ἴδιον δὲ τῶν κυβεύοντων τὸ τῇδε κἀκεῖσε μεταφέρειν τὰς ψήφους, καὶ πανούργως τοῦτο ποιεῖν.

This exegesis is characteristic of Theodoret, since other theologians vary in their rendering of the Pauline term κυβεῖα. No doubt Theodoret had received the substance of his remark from Origen, who deplored ‘indifferent souls’,²⁵ which is the core of *Scholion XXIII*.

²² Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 9, p. 667: τὰ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ σῆμα οὐδὲν κωλύει εἶναι, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μεταπίπτει ῥαδίως.

²³ John Philoponus, *De Opificio Mundi*, p. 152: καὶ τὴν πολλὴν ἀμφοῖν, ὕδατος τε καὶ ἀέρος, συγγένειαν καὶ τὴν εἰς ἄλληλα ῥαδίαν αὐτῶν μετὰπτῶσιν.

²⁴ The synonyms in the following lexicon that Cassian had definitely read (cf. *Scholia XXIII*; *XXV*; *XXIX*; *XXXI*; *XXXV*; *Post-Scholion XXIV* *Adnotatio*) associate this word κοῦφος, with those in his Scholion, namely ῥαδίος and μεταπίπτων. Cf. Julius Naucratis (or, Julius

Pollux, or Julius Polydeuces, second cent. AD), 6.121: Κοῦφος, ῥαδίος, εὐμετάβολος, εὐτρεπτός, εὐτράπελος, ὀξύρροπος, μεταπίπτων.

²⁵ Origen, *schCant*, PG.17.257.16–21 and *Cant*, p. 144: γυναῖκας δὲ τὰς μὴ καθαρὰς μηδὲ ἀδιαφόρους ψυχὰς λέγει· ἀμελοῦσα δὲ τῆς ἰδίας γνώσεως, γένοιτ’ ἂν κλυδωνιζομένη καὶ περιφερομένη παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβεῖα τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Origen expounds the same notion in *commJohn*, XXXII.5.60. Cf. *frJer*, 25; *Cels*, V.18; *commEph*, 17; *selEz*, PG.13.824.16. Didymus moved along a similar line: *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 208; *frPs(al)*, Frs. 5; 114.

Origen represents ‘unclean’ or ‘indifferent’ ‘souls’ as ‘women’, which is the analogy entertained by Cassian in [Scholion XVI](#), where an ‘effeminate’ character betokens a fatal inclination to sin. Cassian must have had in mind an analogous expression by Clement of Alexandria making this point in his *Stromateis*,²⁶ a

work from which he quoted verbatim the entire [Scholion V](#).

The present Scholion is a personal comment by Cassian having in mind not Didymus, but his readings of Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Theodoret.

²⁶ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 1.8.41.2–3: ματαιοπονίαν ἐζηλωκότεες, ἣν κυβείαν ἀνθρώπων ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐκάλεσεν καὶ πανουργίαν, ‘πρὸς τὴν μεθοδεῖαν τῆς πλάνης’ ἐπιτήδειον.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXIV

EN XXIVa: συγκαθεσθῆναι

The aorist infinitive *συγκαθεσθῆναι* is extremely rare. In the sense used in this Scholion, this occurs only in Cyril of Alexandria (or his catenist), and in Cassian's (Pseudo-Didymus) *De Trinitate*.¹

Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.344 (and *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 331). ὥρα γὰρ ὁμολογεῖν καὶ συγκαθεσθῆναι δύνασθαι τῷ Θεῷ τοὺς Ἀγγέλους καὶ συμβασιλεύειν αὐτῷ . . . οὐδὲν ἄρα κωλύει καὶ Ἀγγέλους δύνασθαι συγκαθεσθῆναι τῷ Θεῷ, εἰ καὶ μήτις αὐτῶν ἡξιώθη τοῦ πράγματος. . . . ὁ μὲν γὰρ δεσπότης, τὰ δὲ δοῦλα τυγχάνει. οὐχ ὁμογενὴς ἄρα τοῖς Ἀγγέλοις ἐστὶν ὁ τῷ Πατρὶ συμβασιλεύων καὶ συγκαθήμενος.

Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT* (lib. 2.8–27), PG.39.685: Νόει οὖν, τί ἐστὶν τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἅτε τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ναόν, ἡμᾶς, τῷ ὑψίστῳ Θεῷ συγκαθεσθῆναι καὶ συνδοξασθῆναι, καὶ συμβασιλεύσαι ποιεῖ, καὶ ὅτε μένει ἐπὶ τὸν μονογενῆ Θεόν· καὶ εἰ ὁσίως λέγουσιν αἰρετικοὶ μὴ συγκαθεζεσθαι αὐτό, καὶ συμπροσκυνεῖσθαι, καὶ συμβασιλεύειν τῷ Θεῷ Πατρί. Μὴ ὁμοίως δὲ ἡμῶν, τῶν κτιστῶν, καὶ ἐν τοσαύτῃ ἀγαθῶν ἔργων γυμνότητι τηλικαῦτα ἐλπίζοντων, νοηθεῖν τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ συγκαθεζεσθαι, καὶ συνδοξάζεσθαι, καὶ συμβασιλεύειν τῷ Θεῷ· ἀλλ' ὡς Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ φύσει Θεὸς καὶ Βασιλεὺς καὶ ἀϊδίως συγκαθεζόμενος, καὶ πλήρης ἀχράντου δόξης ὑπάρχων.

However, the notion is Origen's, since he had pioneered application of the two verbs, *συγκαθεζεσθαι* and *συμβασιλεύειν*, in apposition.

Origen, *exhMar*, XXVIII: πλὴν μανθάνομεν ὅτι συγκαθίσει καὶ συμβασιλεύσει καὶ συνδικάσει τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν βασιλευόντων ὁ πῶν τὸ ποτήριον ἐκεῖνο, ὅπερ ἔπιεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Ibid. XXXVII: καὶ οἱ μιμηταὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ αἰσχύνης καταφρονούντες

συγκαθεδοῦνται αὐτῷ καὶ συμβασιλεύουσιν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

The same idea appears in Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones* lxiv, Homily 7.10.1: ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον αὐτὸς διὰ παθημάτων καὶ σταυροῦ παρῆλθε καὶ οὕτως ἐδοξάσθη καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ, οὕτως χρὴ καὶ σὲ συμπαθεῖν καὶ συσταυρωθῆναι· καὶ οὕτως ἐξελεῖν καὶ συγκαθίσει καὶ συναφθῆναι τῷ σώματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πάντοτε συμβασιλεύειν ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ αἰῶνι· εἴπερ γὰρ συμπάσχετε, ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῆτε.

Pseudo-Macarius, *Homiliae* l, Homily 27: καὶ οὕτως ἐδοξάσθη καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτω χρὴ καὶ σὲ συμπαθεῖν καὶ συσταυρωθῆναι καὶ οὕτως ἀνελθεῖν καὶ συγκαθίσει καὶ συναφθῆναι τῷ σώματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πάντοτε συμβασιλεύειν ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ αἰῶνι, 'εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν, ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν'. ὅσοι γὰρ δυνηθῶσι περιγενέσθαι καὶ παρελθεῖν τοὺς θρίγγους τῆς κακίας, εἰσέρχονται εἰς τὴν ἐπουράνιον πόλιν, τὴν εἰρηνευομένην καὶ μεστήν.

In Cyril of Alexandria there is an interesting peculiarity attesting to his reliance upon Origen. Since during the first millennium the form *συγκαθεδόμενος* appears in less than a handful of instances, it could be hardly a coincidence that Cyril used it, unless he was aware of Origen's statement in *exhMar*. What is more, Cyril comments on the same scriptural instance as Origen does, namely, the prayer of Jesus in chapter 17 of the gospel of John.²

The author of *Scholion XXIV* makes specific allowance for the following views of Apollinaris: the saying of Psalm 109:1, about 'sitting at the right hand', is addressed 'by God' 'to the Saviour', that is, to the human nature of Christ, not the timeless Logos. This is indeed the idea presented in this Scholion by Cassian: in this Psalm, it is the Saviour that the Father addresses (εἰρηται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν σωτήρα). The point which Apollinaris made is that both the human

¹ In a literal sense this occurs in Josephus, *Antiquitas Judaica*, 13.84. Also, *Acta Apocrypha Thomae*, 69. John Chrysostom, *In Genesin*, PG.53.382.43. Palladius (fourth–fifth cent. AD), *Historia Lausiaca*, Vita 59.1. The commentary *In Psalmum* 100, PG.55.635.49, which was ascribed to John Chrysostom, runs in the same vein as this Scholion, but it is spurious.

² Origen, *exhMar*, XXXVII (*συγκαθεδοῦνται*). Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, p. 692 (*συγκαθεδόμενος*). Emperor Julian, *Symposium*, 37 (*συγκαθεδόμενος*). Libanius, *Orationes*, 18.154 (*συγκαθεδόμενος*).

and the divine nature exist ‘jointly’ in the ‘one person’ of Jesus and it is impossible to separate them (ἀχωρίστως ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ προσώπῳ).

Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p.186: Καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ σαρκώσεως λογιδίῳ πάλιν ταῦτα γέγραφε [sc. Apollinaris]. Τὸ μὲν οὖν, ‘Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,’ ὡς πρὸς ἄνθρωπον λέγει· οὐ γὰρ τῷ ἀεὶ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης καθὼς θεὸς λόγος εἴρηται μετὰ τὴν ἄνοδον τὴν ἐκ γῆς· ἀλλὰ τῷ νῦν εἰς τὴν ἐπουράνιον ὑψωθέντι δόξαν καθὼς ἄνθρωπος, ὡς οἱ ἀπόστολοι λέγουσιν· ‘Οὐ γὰρ Δαβὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς· λέγει δὲ αὐτός, Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου.’ Ἀνθρώπινον μὲν τὸ πρόσταγμα, ἀρχὴν τῇ καθέδρᾳ διδόν, θεῖον δὲ τὸ ἀξίωμα τὸ συγκαθῆσθαι θεῷ, ᾧ λειτουργοῦσιν αἱ χίλιαι χιλιάδες, καὶ παρεστήκασιν αἱ μύρια μυριάδες. (Καὶ μετ’ ὀλίγα.) Οὐ γὰρ ὡς θεῷ ὑποτάσσει τοὺς ἐχθρούς, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἄνθρωπῳ, ὥστε τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι καὶ θεὸν ὁρώμενον καὶ ἄνθρωπον. ‘Ὅτι δὲ ὡς ἄνθρωπῳ λέγεται τό, ‘Ἔως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου,’ διδάσκει Παῦλος ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τὸ κατόρθωμα λέγων κατὰ τὸ θεϊκὸν δηλαδή· ‘Κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, φησί, τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι ἑαυτῷ τὰ πάντα.’ ‘Ὅρα ἀχωρίστως ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ προσώπῳ θεότητα καὶ ἀνθρωπότητα.

EN XXIVb: σύμβολον βασιλείας θρόνος

The notion of a throne being ‘a symbol of kingship’ occurs in John Chrysostom and in Theodore of Mopsuestia. Once again, however, we should bear in mind that both are rendered by a catenist, which might have involved a third party’s vocabulary.

John Chrysostom, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.196.18–21 and *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 333: Ὡσπερ οὖν ὁ θρόνος τῆς βασιλείας σύμβολον, οὕτω καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος καὶ τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ τῆς δικαστικῆς ἐξουσίας. Ibid. PG.55.267.60–62: Ὅπου γὰρ θρόνος, βασιλείας σύμβολον· ὅπου θρόνος εἷς, τῆς αὐτῆς βασιλείας ἰσοτιμία. In *Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, PG.63.28.44–48: Πρὸς δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν φησιν· Ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. Ἴδου βασιλείας σύμβολον. Ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου. Ἴδου πάλιν καὶ ἄλλο βασιλείας σύμβολον.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 202, from the *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 132: καὶ θρόνος καὶ βασιλείας ῥάβδος, ἃ πάντα τῆς ἀνωτάτω τιμῆς τε καὶ ἀξίας σύμβολα· καὶ γὰρ τὸ Θεὸς τὴν ἀνωτάτω σημαίνει φύσιν, καὶ ὁ θρόνος καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων, καὶ τὸ ταύτης βέβαιον παρίστησιν.³

Theodoret suggests that the notion of various ‘tokens of kingship’ is a symbol of eschatological rewards that are to be granted by God.⁴

In pagan literature, both the expression and analogy were taken up by an anonymous author: θρόνος βασιλείας σύμβολον.⁵

This Scholion, therefore, is one more comment by Cassian himself. He was eager to introduce it with the statement, ‘Paul concurs with these words’, which shows his overall concern to demonstrate that the text of Revelation stands in harmony with the rest of scripture. While writing this Scholion, his mind was with the Antiochene doctors rather than with Didymus.

³ Likewise, in Theodore, *expPs*, Psalm 44:7b.

⁴ Theodoret, *Epistulae* 53–95, Epistle 74: καὶ τῆς ἀρρήτου καὶ θεοσδότου μεταλαχεῖν δωρεᾶς, ἥ τῶν ἐλπιζομένων ἀγαθῶν τοῖς προσιοῦσι τὰ σπέρματα χορηγεῖ, καὶ τῆς τέλους οὐ δεξιόμενης ζωῆς τε καὶ βασιλείας τὰ σύμβολα δίδωσιν.

⁵ *Scholia In Aelium Aristidem*, Treatise, 304.12: ὅτι μὴ κἄν εἰς τὸν θρόνον ἐγκαθίστοιμεν τὴν τοῦ θρόνου τιμὴν ἔχει, βασιλείας σύμβολον. Didymus does the same, although referring to ‘symbols of kingship’ apropos not of a ‘throne’, but of other objects, such as ‘rods’. *commZacch*, 2.253; 4.73.

EXPANDED NOTES TO ADNOTATIO POST SCHOLION XXIV

EN PSchXXIVa: ἐπιστημονικὰ λέγειν φασί

The expression ‘to speak in a scientific manner’ (ἐπιστημονικὰ λέγειν or ἐπιστημονικῶς λέγειν) is distinctive of Didymus, who had taken this up from Alexander of Aphrodisias.

Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 258: περὶ τῶν τῇ οὐσίᾳ ὑπαρχόντων ἐπιστημονικῶς τε καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν λέγειν. Ibid. p. 344: περὶ τούτων τὴν πρώτην φιλοσοφίαν ἐπιστημονικῶς λέγειν. Ibid. περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν διαλαμβάνουσα, λογικῶς μέντοι ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐπιστημονικῶς. *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 29: εἰ ἐπιστημονικῶς λέγοι περὶ αὐτῶν καὶ δεικνύοι ταῦτα.

Didymus, *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 19: οἷον ὁ λέγων ἐπιστημονικῶς. *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. pp. 342–3: καὶ νοεῖ ὀρθῶς καὶ θεωρεῖ τὰ ἐπιστημονικὰ καὶ λέγειν αὐτὰ δύναται διδασκαλικῶς.

Anonymi, *Prolegomena in Librum Περὶ στάσεων*, v. 14, p. 323: πῶς λέγετε ἐπιστήμην; τὸ ψιλῶς ἐπίστασθαι λέγειν ἀπλῶς ἢ τὴν ἐπιστήμην τὴν ἐπιστημονικῶς λέγουσαν; καὶ εἰ μὲν τὴν ψιλῶς ἐπισταμένην λέγειν φασί, οὐ μόνον τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς ῥητορικῆς φασί, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ ἐκάστης σχεδὸν

τέχνης. Ibid. ἐπιστημονικῶς λέγειν φασί, πάλιν κακῶς: ποιεῖτε γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐπιστήμην, πολὺ τῆς ἐπιστήμης διαφέρουσιν.

Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 1, p. 303: ἢ περὶ αὐτῶν μὲν λέγομεν, αὐτὸ δὲ ἕκαστον οὐ λέγομεν, καὶ ἐπιστημονικῶς μὲν δυνάμεθα λέγειν, νοερῶς δὲ οὐ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ εὐρεῖν, ὥσπερ εἴπομεν πρότερον.

EN PSchXXIVb: κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην

The expression κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην occurs in Aristotle,¹ and was echoed by his commentators.² Once again, Alexander of Aphrodisias must have supplied Origen³ with his vocabulary. Of the rest of Christian authors, it appears only in Clement,⁴ Eusebius,⁵ and Didymus.⁶

Likewise, the similar expression κατ’ ἐπιστήμην occurs as an alternative in Aristotle⁷ and his commentators.⁸ So it does also in Philo,⁹ Galen,¹⁰ Plotinus.¹¹ The expression would have been part of Christian vocabulary since the times of apologist Athenagoras,¹² yet never did it become a recurrent one, even though some instances can be traced in Clement of Alexandria,¹³ Origen,¹⁴ Didymus,¹⁵ and Basil of Caesarea.¹⁶

¹ Aristotle, *Analytica Priora et Posteriora*, 77b9; *De Anima*, 433a5; *Ethica Eudemia*, 1227a35; *Ars Rhetorica*, 1355a26; 1355b19; *Protrepticus*, Fr. 39.

² Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Anima*, p. 86; *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, pp. 10; 171; 586; 588; *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, pp. 4; 73; 398. Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, v. 8, p. 230; *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 10, pp. 1074; 1076. John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Libros De Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, pp. 58; 307; *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 17, p. 686. Also, in Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 1, p. 192; *In Platonis Alcibiadem i*, 188.

³ Origen, *homJer*, 16.1: κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην ἣν ἐδίδαξεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

⁴ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 7.1.3.6; 7.7.44.6.

⁵ Eusebius, *PE*, 1.5.4: τῶν μὲν κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην θεωρημάτων.

⁶ Didymus, *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 44: τὰ κατάλληλα θεάματα, τὰ ἐπιστημονικὰ θεωρήματα· ἐπιστήμην δὲ τὴν κατὰ θεὸν λέγω. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 149: ὡς ἂν τις διώκοι ἐπιστήμην ἵνα κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην καὶ θεωρῇ.

⁷ Aristotle, *Politica*, 1255b21; *Protrepticus*, fr. 66.

⁸ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Anima*, p.86; *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, pp.19; 136; 172; 372; 386; 697; *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p.28. John

Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Libros de Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, p. 58; 307; *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 17, p. 686.

⁹ Philo, *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, 130; *Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat*, 111; *Quod Deus Sit Immutabilis*, 93.

¹⁰ Galen, *De Arte Medica*, v. 1, p.353; *De Naturalibus Facultatibus*, v. 2, p. 125; *Circa Doctrinas Hippocratis et Platonis*, 2.5.97; 2.8.20; 7.2.5; *Ad Eugenianum*, v. 19, p. 54.

¹¹ Plotinus, *Enneades*, 6.9.4.

¹² Athenagoras, *Legatio*, 5.1. Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.233.30.

¹³ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.21.129.8; 4.5.22.5; 6.9.77.2; 7.12.69.7.

¹⁴ Origen, *Cels*, IV.86; *Philocalia*, 20, 13; *frPs*, 77, 3–6.

¹⁵ Didymus, *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 217; *commZacch*, 2.362; *Adversus Manichaeos*, PG.39.1101.50; *frPs(al)*, frs. 505; 805. Also in the anonymous text, Anonymi, *Commentarium in Librum Περὶ Ἰδεῶν*, v. 7, p. 947.

¹⁶ Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae Morales*, PG.31.865.28; *De Baptismo*, PG.31.1564.46. *Regulae Fusius Tractatae*, PG.31: 953.34; 1133.27; 1152.19; 1232.3. Finally, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 1.40 (bis); 14.278.

The following theologians cared to draw and comment on Isaiah 50:4.

Origen, *frLuc*, fr. 186; *commJohn*, VI.3.16; *Catena in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 42; *Ibid. Catena in Matthaeum*, p. 103. Eusebius, *Eclogae Prophetarum*, p. 213. Athanasius, *De Morbo et de Sanitate*, p. 7. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Apologetica*, PG.35.497.24–26. John Chrysostom, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.225.16–18; *In Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, PG.61: 58.35–36; 400.7–14; *In Isaiam*, 1.1. Theodoret, *commIs*, 16. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Isaiam*, PG.70: 1089.3–6 and 46–48. Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 39.

The exegesis of an ‘ear capable of listening to’, which betokens ‘prudence’ (σύνεσις), is borrowed from Apollinaris of Laodicea (a contemporary of Didymus), *Fragmenta in Joannem*, frs. 134 and 135, in *Catena in Joannem (codd. Paris.)*, p. 3789: καὶ τὸ περὶ τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως τοῦ ὀπίου, φαίην ἂν δηλοῦσθαι τὴν ὕστερον ἀποκατάστασιν τῆς συνέσεως. Cf. *ibid.* fr. 120.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 147; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 162; *commZacch*, 3.62 (this is a paraphrase of the text of Athanasius cited just above); 3.203.

Besides the footnoted text of Didymus,¹⁷ the following is the source for Cassian’s address to Didymus.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 912: Τίς οὐκ οἶδεν ὅτι ἐφορῶν τινα καὶ περὶ τίνος ἀκούων ὀφθαλμῷ καὶ ἀκοῇ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ὁρᾷ καὶ ἀκούει; ἀπαντητέον πρὸς ταῦτα οὕτω πονηρῶς εἰρημένα ὅτι διττὸν γένος αἰσθήσεω ἐστιν ἐν ἡμῖν, θνητὸν καὶ ἀθάνατον, κυρίως δὲ ἡμῶν τῶν λογικῶν τὸ ἀθάνατον τυγχάνον νοητόν. τὸ γὰρ θνητὸν οὐκ ἴδιον ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ κοινὸν καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα. ὅταν οὖν ἡ γραφὴ τὰς αἰσθήσεις τοῦ ἔσω ἀνθρώπου σημαίνει, ὀφθαλμὸν μου καὶ οὖς μου ὁρᾷ καὶ ἀκούειν λέγει ὡς ἐν τοῖς προκειμένοις.

At one point of his *commEccl* (1.1–8) (Cod. p. 24), Didymus probably expounds the same idea, although there are lacunae: [...] ἔχουσιν τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα [...] κατὰ νοητὸν κόσμον ἵνα [...] παρέχη [...] τὴν ἀκοήν.

Cassian writes having in mind pivotal exegeses by Origen.

Origen, *comm1Cor*, 8, from the *Catena in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 31: τῶν σοφῶν εἰσὶ διαφοραί, καὶ οἱ μὲν εἰσι σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα (1 Cor. 1:26).

Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 162: Ὡς γὰρ λόγος σοφίας δίδεται διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ λόγος γνώσεως κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα ... καὶ Ἡσαΐας ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κυριακοῦ, ἔστω δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου, φησὶν· ‘Προσέθηκέν μοι ὥτιον τοῦ ἀκούειν καὶ ἡ παιδεία Κυρίου διανοίγει μου τὰ ὄτα’· ἡ γὰρ πρὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ διδομένη ἀκοή καὶ παιδεία διανοίγει καὶ ταῦτα τὰ ὄτα πρὸς τὸ τὴν διάνοιαν θεϊότερον ἀκούειν.

Cassian is now going to write [Scholion XXV](#). After he had finished with the previous one, and before (or probably, while) he was writing [Scholion XXIV](#), he also wrote this comment, which is addressed to Didymus, and it is characteristically couched in Didymus’ own vocabulary, which Cassian himself had taken up extensively during this enterprise. The following text of Didymus shows what Cassian was reading and had in mind while writing his comment.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 3. 200–204 (comm. on Zach. 9, 14–15): (200): Ἐντείναντος Θεοῦ οἶα τόξον τὸν Ἰούδαν, βολίς ὡς ἀστραπὴ ἐξελεύσεται, τιτρώσκουσα καὶ πλήττουσα εἰς θεῖον ἔρωτα, ὡς φῶς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσθαι τὴν δυναμένην εἰπεῖν τελείαν ψυχὴν ἢ ἐνδοξον Ἐκκλησίαν· ‘Τετρωμένη ἀγάπης εἰμί.’ (201) Ὁ τιτρώσκων λόγος¹⁸ εἰς πόθον τοὺς τὰς κατ’ εἶδος ἀρετὰς ἀναλαμβάνοντας καὶ τὰ κατὰ μέρος δόγματα, βολίς ἐστὶν γενικῶς. ... Σεσαφηνίσται πρότερον ὅτι περὶ τοῦ ἀνατείναντος ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα¹⁹ Σωτῆρος ταῦτ’ ἀπαγγέλλεται ... (203) Ἐξελθούσης ὡς ἀστραπῆς τῆς θείας βολίδος ἐπὶ τῷ φωτισθῆναι τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας, Κύριος παντοκράτωρ σαλπιδί, διεγείρων καὶ τὴν ἔνδον ἀκοήν, ὡς τὸν αἰσθησιν λαβόντα τῆς ὑπαρξίας ὠφελείας ἀναφθέγγασθαι χαριστηρίως· Ἡ παιδεία Κυρίου

¹⁷ See note 1: *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 308.

¹⁸ Cf. [Scholion VI](#).

¹⁹ Cf. [Scholia XXVII](#) and [XVIII](#).

διανοίγει μου τὰ ὄτα', ἐπεὶ περ δέδωκέν μοι οὗς τοῦ ἀκούειν.²⁰ (204) Καὶ ὅρα εἰ μὴ κατ' ἐπίνοιαν²¹ ἄλλην καὶ ἄλλην τὸ παρὰ Θεοῦ διδόμενον σάλπιγγ²² ἐστὶν καὶ ἀστραπή. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀκουστὰ τυγχάνει τὰ σαφῶς καὶ διατόρως καὶ μεγαλοφώνως²³ ἀπαγγελλόμενα, σάλπιγγι ὁμοίωται, ἥ δὲ φωτίζει τοὺς νοῦν, ψυχῆς ὁφθαλμὸν ὄντα, ἀστραπῇ ἐοίκασιν.

It seems that, at this point, Cassian leaves Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse aside. He had not actually copied from it since [Scholion XXII](#). This is somehow a ceremonial confession of his debts to Didymus, expressed in a solemn, as well as cryptic, style of admiration and gratitude for the Alexandrian sage. Nevertheless, Cassian is going to return to this main source of his when writing [Scholion XXVI](#).

²⁰ Cf. post-Scholion XV comment.

²¹ Cf. [Scholion IX](#): κατὰ τὴν ἐπίνοιαν.

²² Cf. [Scholion XXV](#).

²³ Cf. [Scholia XXV](#) and [XXXVI](#).

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXV

EN XXVa: Φρονιμώτερον ἐντυγχάνειν

The expression, ‘one should study [scripture] in a more insightful manner’, was introduced by Origen and taken up only by Didymus, as footnoted (note 1) in the edited text.

Origen, *Cels*, II.9: ὅπερ ἔσται δῆλον τοῖς φρονίμως ἐντυγχάνουσι τῇ εὐαγγελικῇ γραφῇ. *frJohn*, LIII: πόσῳ μᾶλλον . . . ἔμελλον ἀπαταῖσθαι οἱ μὴ ἀκριβῶς καὶ φρονίμως ἐντυγχάνοντες τῇ περὶ τούτων ἱστορίᾳ. *frJohn*, L: τοῦτο δὲ πιστῶς καὶ φρονίμως ἐκλαβεῖν δεῖ.

Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 296: συνέσεως οὖν χρεία τῷ ἐντυγχάνοντι¹ τοῖς τοιούτοις ψαλμοῖς τοῖς οὕτως ἐπιγεγραμμένοις· καὶ ὥσπερ ‘προσέχειν’ δεῖ ‘τῇ ἀναγνώσει’ ‘τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς’, οὐ μόνῃς τῆς τῶν γραφῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ‘πάσης’, οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι μετὰ συνέσεως καὶ λέγεσθαι ὀφείλουσιν καὶ ἀκούεσθαι. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὸ τῆς συνέσεως ὄνομα πρὸς τῷ προχείρως² δηλούμεν καὶ ἄλλο δηλοῖ.

commJob (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 280: πιστῶς δὲ καὶ φρονίμως ἀκουστέον. *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 215: δεῖ γὰρ τὰ λεγόμενα περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φρονίμως ἀκούειν. Ibid. Cod. p. 280: πιστῶς δὲ καὶ φρονίμως ἀκουστέον τοῦ ‘πάντα δύνασαι’, ἵνα μὴ ὑποπέσωμεν τῇ τῶν δοκητῶν ἀνοίᾳ. *frPs(al)*, fr. 57: Ὅσιος καὶ φρονίμως καὶ ταύτης τῆς λέξεως ἀκοῦσαι προσήκει. Ibid. fr. 914: λογικῶς καὶ φρονίμως ἐταζόμενα καὶ γινωσκόμενα. Ibid. fr. 1105: ὀρθῶς καὶ φρονίμως ταῖς παρὰ σοῦ ἐντολαῖς προσελθὼν ἐπίστευσα αὐταῖς ὡς τηρῆσαι αὐτάς. *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 65: Εἴρηται γάρ· ‘Καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν’, ὅπερ φρονιμώτερον νοεῖν δεῖ. *commEccl*

(9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 281: καθ’ ἡμᾶς τοὺς θέλοντας φρονίμως παρατεθεῖσθαι τὴν γραφὴν καὶ ‘προσέχειν τῇ ἀναγνώσει’ αὐτῆς, οὐδὲν ἔστιν ὑπὸ ἁγίου πνεύματος [. . .], ὃ οὐκ ἔχει ἀναγωγὴν· εἰ γὰρ πνεύματος ἁγίου μαθήματά ἐστιν ταῦτα, πνευματικῶς γινῶναι δεῖ.

EN XXVb: μὴ γέλωτα ὀφλισκάνωμεν παρὰ τοῖς σοφοῖς τοῦ κόσμου

The specific phrase, meaning ‘not to make ourselves a laughing-stock’, is not frequent in literature. One should notice the preposition παρὰ followed by dative. This form appears only in Eusebius.³ Didymus uses exclusively the expression αἰσχύνῃν ὀφλισκάνειν (‘to deserve, or to bring shame upon oneself’),⁴ which is an expression that Theodoret also used.⁵ Cassian received this expression from eminent theologians, who, however, applied it rarely and only casually,⁶ perhaps because it was Plato that had introduced it into literature.⁷

οἱ σοφοὶ τοῦ κόσμου

This allusion to Paul writing about ‘the wise people of this world’ in his first epistle to the Corinthians did not enjoy the currency that one might have expected. Once again, this usage is restricted to authors whose vocabulary more or less bears on the Scholia.⁸

EN XXVc: ἀδύνατον τίθεσθαι

The peculiar expression, meaning ‘to postulate something as being impossible’, appears mostly in pagan intellectuals, and it became part of the Christian

¹ Cf. *Scholion XXV*.

² Cf. *Scholia III* and *XXV*.

³ Eusebius, *Laudatio Constantini*, 12.10: πλεῖον οὐδὲν ἢ μωρίας γέλωτα παρὰ τοῖς ἔμφορσιν ὀφλισκάνων. Also, in a spurious text: Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *De Paenitentia*, PG.59.763.14: Οὐ μισεῖς τὸ πρᾶγμα, ὅπερ ἀμελοῦμενον γέλωτα καὶ παρὰ τοῖς θεαταῖς ὀφλισκάνει; Beyond this spurious work, John Chrysostom himself definitely used the expression γέλωτα ὀφλισκάνειν more than once: *De Fato et Providentia*, PG.50.757.5. *In Epistolam ad Colossenses Commentarius*, PG.62.389.33.

⁴ Didymus, *commJob* (5.1–6.29), Cod. p. 177; *commZacch*, 3.269; 4.300; *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 295; *frPs(al)*, fr. 1186; *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 310; *commPs* 36.15–19, Cod. p. 249.

⁵ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1245.11.

⁶ Athanasius, *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.60.36. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Apologetica*, PG.35.501.29. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Usurarios*, v. 9, p. 200.

⁷ Plato, *Theaetetus*, 161e5.

⁸ Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Heresium*, 4.43.2. Origen, *homJer*, 16.8; *comm1Cor*, 8. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 275. Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Hexaemeron*, 1.11; 94; *Homiliae in Principium Proverbiorum*, PG.31.416.34–36. Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 332; *frPs(al)*, fr. 1177. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1224.30. Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, 14.33.1; *Homiliae I*, 42.8. Cyril of Alexandria, *Fragmenta in Epistolam i ad Corinthios*, p. 256; *Explanatio in Lucam*, PG.72.669.42.

vocabulary thanks to Origen's rebuttal of Celsus.⁹ It had its origin in a casual Platonic passage,¹⁰ but it was Alexander of Aphrodisias who made it an expression useful for scholarly discourse. This is indeed characteristic of Alexander but was never actually instilled into Christian literature. Its appearance in this Scholion reveals an erudite author, who was well aware of the writings of Alexander of Aphrodisias. Cassian knew that Eusebius thought very highly of Alexander and had quoted from his work at length.¹¹ No doubt, it was Alexander that Origen had in mind when he inserted this rhetorical structure into his polemic work against Celsus, thus implicitly demonstrating to his own opponent his familiarity with pagan philosophy.

Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 798: καὶ τίθησι τὰ ἐπόμενα ἀδύνατα τῷ τὰ γενικώτερα ἐναντία ἀρχὰς τῶν ὄντων τιθεμένῳ. Ibid. p. 805: τὸ δὲ ἄνισον δυσχεραίνουσι καὶ ἀποδοκιμάζουσι διὰ τὸ δεδιέναι τὰ συμβαίνοντα δυσχερῇ καὶ ἀδύνατα τοῖς τὸ ἄνισον τιθεμένοις· οἳ τινες (οἱ τὴν ἀόριστον δυνάδα δεύτερον μετὰ τὸ ἐν στοιχείῳ λέγοντες) μόνα τὰ συμβαίνοντα δυσχερῇ καὶ ἀδύνατα τοῖς τὸ ἄνισον τιθεμένοις διαδιδράσκουσιν. Ibid. p. 824: Ταῦτα εἰπὼν συμπεραίνεται λέγων· εἰ οὖν καὶ τὸ μὴ τιθέναι τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς μηδὲ λέγειν αὐτὰς ἀγαθὸν ἀδύνατον καὶ τὸ τιθέναι ἀδυνατώτερον, δῆλον ὅτι αἱ ἀρχαὶ οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἀποδίδονται οὐδὲ αἱ πρῶται οὐσίαι καλῶς ἀριθμοὶ λέγονται. *In Aristotelis Analyticorum Priorum Librum i Commentarium*, p. 389: ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς εἰς ἀδύνατον ἀπαγωγῆς μηδεμιᾶς ὁμολογίας γενομένης τῇ δεῖξει τοῦ ἀδυνάτου τίθεται τὸ ἀντικείμενον αὐτῷ διὰ τὴν τῆς ἀντιφάσεως ἀνάγκην. *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros*

Octo Commentaria, p. 501: οἷς μὲν οὖν τὸ ἀδύνατον ἔπεται τοῖς αὐτοῖς τιθεμένοις, πρόδηλον ὅτι ταῦτα ἕτερα.

Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 1, p. 155: πολλοῦ ἄρα δεῖ τὴν Ὁμήρου κρίσιν ἀτιμάζειν, τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν διαφωνίαν ἐν ἴσῳ τοῖς παντελῶς ἀδυνάτοις τιθέμενος. *Theologia Platonica*, v. 2, p. 4: Εἰ μὲν δὴ πολλὰ τὰ ὄντα, καὶ οὕτω δὴ πολλὰ καθάπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἶπομεν, ὥς μηδαμοῦ τοῦ ἐνὸς ὄντος, πολλὰ καὶ ἀδύνατα τίθεσθαι συμβαίνει.

EN XXVd: κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον
(cf. EN IIIId: προχείρως ἀκούειν)

The expression κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον ('on the face of it', 'according to a common approach') is absent from classical literature and appears for the first time in Aristotle's commentator Alexander of Aphrodisias.¹² It entered Christian phraseology with Origen,¹³ no doubt following Alexander. The immediate successors of Origen on this were the Cappadocian brothers, Basil of Caesarea¹⁴ and Gregory of Nyssa.¹⁵ Like Basil, Clement of Alexandria, used this only casually.¹⁶ Nevertheless, no author used the expression as frequently as Didymus did.¹⁷ Once again, the instances in Theodore of Mopsuestia should be pointed out.¹⁸

Although it was Alexander of Aphrodisias who introduced the notion, I believe that its occurrence in Proclus is due to Didymus' abundant usage.¹⁹ The Neoplatonist environment made much of the expression, mainly commenting on Aristotle.²⁰

Besides, the distinction κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον/κατὰ τὸ κεκρυμμένον appears in an attenuated sense in Didymus and Cyril of Alexandria.

⁹ Origen, *Cel*, VII.15: Ἐπεὶ δ' ἀδυνάτα τίνα καὶ ἀπρεπῇ θεῷ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν τιθεῖς φησιν.

¹⁰ Plato, *Leges*, 839b5: ὥς ἀνόητα καὶ ἀδύνατα τιθέντων νόμιμα.

¹¹ Cf. Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelica*, 9.9.1f.: Ἀλεξάνδρου Ἀφροδισιέως, ἀνδρὸς μάλα διαφανοῦς ἐν τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγοις.

¹² Cf. κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον in Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 616, meaning 'on the face of it'.

¹³ Origen, *frEx*, PG.12.280.47: ὑπολαμβάνουσι κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον τῆς λέξεως.

¹⁴ Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.381.41; *Quod Deus Non Est Auctor Malorum*, PG.31.337.11.

¹⁵ Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Ablabium Quod Non Sint Tres Dei*, v. 3,1, p. 39; *Adversus Apollinarianum*, v. 3,1, pp. 163; 184; *Adversus Eunomium*, 3.1.23; 3.1.32; 3.2.22; 3.5.10; *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 5; v. 6, p. 267; 359; *Encomium in Sanctum Stephanum*

Protomartyrem, p. 40; *Oratio Catechetica*, 31; *De Oratione*, pp. 248; 250; *De Beatitudinibus*, PG.44.1293.2. Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa, *De Occursu Domini*, PG.46.1180.56.

¹⁶ Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 1, pp. 485; 679.

¹⁷ Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.383; 3.60; *commJob* (1-4), Cod. pp. 71; 85; *commJob* (12.1-16.8a,), frs. 337; 406; *commJob*, PG.39.1148.38; *commEccl* (3-4.12), Cod. p. 99; *commEccl* (7-8.8), Cod. pp. 209; 219; 240; *commPs* 29-34, Cod. pp. 179; 197; *commPs* 35-39, Cod. pp. 236; 238; 240; *commPs* 40-44.4, Cod. p. 316; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 60.

¹⁸ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, pp. 128; 150; *Catena in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 97.

¹⁹ Cf. Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 1, p. 221.

²⁰ Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 9, pp. 71; 92; v. 10, p. 1165.

Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 316: ἐπιστήσαι καὶ τῷ καθ' αὐτὸν ὡς κεκρυμμένῳ καὶ μὴ προχείρως.

Cyril of Alexandria, *De Adoratione*, PG.68.980.47–48: Ὁ μὲν οὖν ἐν προχείρῳ λόγος, καὶ ἡ τοῦ πράγματος διασάφησις ἀποχρῶσαν ἔχει τὴν παράθεσιν. Ἀλλὰ φέρε λέγωμεν τὰ πνευματικά, καὶ τῶν εἰς νοῦν τε καὶ κεκρυμμένων ἐννοιῶν ἀπτώμεθα. *GraphPent*, PG.69.632.34: τὰ τε ἐν κατακαλύψει κεκρυμμένα, καὶ τὰ ἐμφανῆ καὶ πρόχειρα.

Pseudo-Caesarius (=Cassian the Sabaite), *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, 14: ἐκ τῆς προχείρου τοῦ γράμματος ἐξετάσεως. Ibid. 19: εἰ δὲ προχείρως πᾶν ἀγαθὸν θεοποιεῖτε. 85: ἀλλ' ἡμῖν αἱ ἀποτεταγμένοι τροφαὶ πρόχειροι καὶ πᾶσιν εὐγνώστοι. Ibid. 111: κατὰ τὴν πρόχειρον τῶν πολλῶν ὑπόνοιαν. Ibid. 193: τίς οὖν τούτων ἡ ἀναγωγή ἐκ τῆς προχείρου μεταφοῆς; Ibid. 209: καλὴ μὲν καὶ ἡ ἀπλὴ καὶ πρόχειρος ἐννοία.

EN XXVe: ἡ τῶν νοητῶν οὐσία

The parallels by Didymus footnoted in the Greek text leave no room for doubt that he is the main source who inspired this Scholion. Nevertheless, it is worth

exploring the idea of 'the essence of the intelligible things'. The notion was of Pythagorean provenance (they argued that the fundamental reality is the 'intelligible essence' of numbers) which occurs in a Platonic context,²¹ and much was made of this by all subsequent intellectuals venerating the Platonic tradition in one way or another.²² However, the philosopher who came up with an elaborate account of it was Aristotle.²³ To Plotinus, of course, the real essence is the intelligible one.²⁴ This is a point that no Aristotelian commentator could dissent from, despite the emphasis they laid upon concrete material objects.²⁵ Later, there was some dissension between Plato's students about classification or 'division' (διαίρεσις, mentioned in the Scholion). According to Xenocrates, there are three kinds of 'essence': 'the sensible, the intelligible, and the composite' one.²⁶ Speusippus, on the other hand, allowed that 'the intelligible essences are more than three' (πλείω τῶν τριῶν ἔλεγεν εἶναι τὰς οὐσίας τὰς νοητάς).²⁷

The notion of the 'essence of intelligible things' enters Christian literature with Hippolytus, who was aware of its Pythagorean provenance and expounded it to some extent.²⁸ Subsequently, Origen embraced it readily.²⁹ The erudite Eusebius extensively quotes for posterity the pertinent account by Numenius,³⁰ which

²¹ Plato, *Sophista*, 246b7: νοητὰ ἅττα καὶ ἀσώματα εἶδη βιαζόμενοι τὴν ἀληθινὴν οὐσίαν εἶναι. This is Plato's reply to the Atomists, possibly Aristippus who was a pupil of Socrates, too. Cf. Clement of Alexandria attesting to Pythagoras' tenet of νοητὴ οὐσία, *Stromateis*, 5.5.28.

²² Philo, *De Opificio Mundi*, 49; *De Abrahamo*, 69; *De Specialibus Legibus*, 2.57; 2.212. Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 372A2; *De Defectu Oraculorum*, 428B8–9; *De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo*, 1013B9; 1013C2. Albinus, *Epitome*, 1.2; 7.4; 14.2; 25.1; 25.5.

²³ Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, 1037a5: ἔστι γὰρ ὕλη ἡ μὲν αἰσθητὴ ἡ δὲ νοητὴ. δῆλον δὲ καὶ ὅτι ἡ μὲν ψυχὴ οὐσία ἡ πρώτη, τὸ δὲ σῶμα ὕλη, ὁ δ' ἄνθρωπος ἡ τὸ ζῶον τὸ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ὡς καθόλου. Ibid. 1072a26: ἀτὶδιον καὶ οὐσία καὶ ἐνέργεια οὐσα. *Physica*, 209a: ἔστι δὲ τὰ μὲν τῶν αἰσθητῶν στοιχεῖα σώματα, ἐκ δὲ τῶν νοητῶν οὐδὲν γίγνεται μέγεθος.

²⁴ Plotinus, *Enneades*, VI.5.2: τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ νοητὰς νοητῶν καὶ τῆς ἀληθινῆς οὐσίας ἔχομενας. Cf. Ibid. I.1.8; II.4.1; II.4.5; III.6.6; IV.1.1; IV.4.1; V.3.5; V.3.11; V.6.2; V.6.6; VI.1.2; VI.2.4; VI.3.1; VI.4.14; VI.6.13; VI.6.16; VI.7.40.

²⁵ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 694: τῆς οὐσίας πάλιν μάλιστα ἐστὶ νοητὴ ἡ ἀπλὴ καὶ κατ' ἐνέργειαν, ἥτις καὶ κυρίως νοητὴ καὶ κυρίως ὀρεκτὴ ἐστίν. ἐπεὶ δὲ εἶρηκε καθ' αὐτὴν νοητὴν οὐσίαν καὶ κατ' ἐνέργειαν πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν πάντως τινῶν νοητῶν, μὴ καθ' αὐτὸ δὲ νοητῶν μηδὲ ἐνεργείᾳ, ἅξιόν ἐστι μᾶλλον δ' ἀναγκαῖον εἰπεῖν, τίνα τὰ καθ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ νοητὰ καὶ τίνα τὰ μὴ τοιαῦτα.

²⁶ Xenocrates, *Testimonia, Doctrina et Fragmenta*, 83: 'intelligible essence' is the one of all things 'beyond the heavens'. Cf. fr. 259. Also, Sextus Empiricus attesting to Xenocrates, *Adversus Mathematicos*, 7.148. Also, Clement of Alexandria about Xenocrates, *Stromateis*, 2.5.24.1.

²⁷ Speusippus, *Fragmenta*, fr. 108. Cf. Posidonius, *Fragmenta*, frs. 309a and 391a.

²⁸ Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, 6.24.1: ἡ μία κεραία, πρώτη καὶ κυριωτάτη καὶ τῶν νοητῶν καὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν οὐσία, νοητῶς καὶ αἰσθητῶς λαμβανομένη. Ibid. 6.24.3: ἔχομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοητοῦ τὸν λόγον, ἵνα τῷ λόγῳ τὴν τῶν νοητῶν καὶ ἀσωμάτων καὶ θεῶν ἐποπτεύωμεν οὐσίαν.

²⁹ Cf. Origen, *Cels*, VII.45; *deOr*, XXVII.9. In *excPs*, we come across a formulation, which is identical with one in the Scholion. This might well be a rendering through the phrasing of Didymus, or of both Origen and Didymus rendered by Cassian, or another Sabaite: *excPs*, PG.17.108.33: Ἐκ τῶν καλλίστων τοῦτο δηλοῦται μερῶν ἐν τε τῷ Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ Θεὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω. Ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλαχοῦ τῆς θείας παιδεύσεως ἡ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία δηλοῖ τὴν νοητὴν οὐσίαν, ἐν ἣ μάλιστα Θεὸν προσήκει ζητεῖν. In *Cels*, VII.37, he rebukes the materialism of the Stoics, who dismiss the 'intelligible essences' (τοῖς ἀναιροῦσι νοητὰς οὐσίας Στωϊκοῖς). This is probably a view of Chrysippus' attested by Origen: Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Logica et Physica*, fr. 108 (SVF, II.33.27–30). Cf. fr. 359 (SVF, II.123.16–20) *apud* Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.4.15.3.

³⁰ Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelica*, 11.22.3f.

he did also for Philo³¹ and Plato,³² while he used the notion himself.³³ Gregory of Nyssa mostly employs the notion by quoting Eunomius, yet he uses this himself, too, at a few points.³⁴ It is interesting that the rest of the renowned Cappadocians, as well as Cyril of Alexandria, refrained from using the notion ‘intelligible essence’ (νοητὴ οὐσία) altogether, whereas John Chrysostom hardly did so.³⁵ Once again, the uninterrupted line from Origen to Gregory of Nyssa and Didymus, down to Cassian, is all too evident. Of them, Didymus made the most of the notion,³⁶ whereas Theodoret was the learned scholar who expounded the doctrines relating to this concept, as he generally did with the pertinent philosophical differences between pagans.³⁷

EN XXVf: ἡ οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία

The expression ‘the appellation *heaven*’ appears only a few times in Christian authors. Like so many other characteristic expressions that have been canvassed so far, this cannot be traced before Origen, who therefore appears to be the one who introduced it.³⁸ This is plausible, since all the authors who reproduced the terminology are Origen’s followers.

Origen, *excPs*, PG.17.108.30–33 (commentary on Ps. 13:2 and quoting Ps. 113:24): Ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλαχοῦ τῆς θείας παιδεύσεως ἡ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία δηλοῖ τὴν νοητὴν οὐσίαν, ἐν ᾗ μάλιστα Θεὸν προσήκει ζητεῖν.

The text of Didymus is almost identical: ‘heaven’ betokens ‘essence’, not anything spatial (τούτου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πόρρω που οὐ τόπῳ ἀλλ’ οὐσίας ιδιώματι τυγχάνει τὰ γενητά), which is a comment on Psalm 113:24, also quoted in the foregoing comment ascribed to Origen.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1065: ἀλλ’ ἐπίστησον ἀκριβῶς μὴ εἰς αἰσθητὰ κατενέγκης τὴν περὶ

τούτων νόησιν, οὐρανὸν τοπικὸν καὶ μετάβασιν ἐκεῖθεν κατὰ φορὰν γινομένην ὑπολαβὼν θεοῦ γὰρ προηγουμένην, ἵν’ οὕτως εἴπω, ὑπεροχὴν καὶ κατάστασιν δηλοῖ ἡ τοῦ διηγηθέντος οὐρανοῦ προσηγορία.

What is impressive about this text is that it is quoted in the *catenae*, yet it is ascribed not to Didymus, but to Theodoret.

Catena in Epistulam Petri i (cod. Oxon. coll. nov. 58), p. 45: The annotated title goes thus: Θεοδωρήτου Ῥητὰ Προκείμενα ‘ὁ Οὐρανὸς τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ’, which is Psalm 113:24. Then the text follows, which is the same one as the foregoing one ascribed to Didymus.

It is therefore my surmise that many such *catena*-fragments of Origen on the Psalms have been transmitted to us through the care (and vocabulary) of monks selecting invariably from Origen, Didymus, and Theodoret. In the Introduction I surmised that the collection from the Psalms that makes up Didymus’ *frPs(al)* is a work by Anastasius of Sinai, probably availing himself of previous work by Olympiodorus the deacon of Alexandria.

More specifically, the notion of the ‘opening of heavens’ (ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἠνεῶχθαι θύραν) is an influence of Theodoret,³⁹ whereas some *catena*-fragments suggest that the idea goes back to Origen,⁴⁰ who took the ‘gates of heaven’ to indicate ‘rational natures moving towards spiritual teaching’.⁴¹ Once again, we find Theodore of Mopsuestia applying the imagery of the ‘heavens being opened’,⁴² with this ‘opening’ signifying the creation of the universe (ἐσχημάτισεν τὸ πᾶν):⁴³ ‘heaven’ means ‘not this [visible] heaven, but the place which is above us’ and ‘befitting’ God (οὐρανοῦ δὲ λέγει, οὐκ αὐτοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς τόπου . . . ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς ὁ οὐρανός, τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς τόπον

³¹ Ibid. 11.23.12f.

³² Ibid. 11.21.6; 15.13.2; Cf. ibid. 3.9.14.

³³ Ibid. 14.4.11; *DE*, 4.6.1; 5.1.28; *et passim*.

³⁴ Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 3.8.14; 3.9.47 and 38; *De Vita Mosis*, 2.163; *Oratio Catechetica*, 6; *Dialogus de Anima et Resurrectione*, PG.46: 36.9–13; 44.5–6; *In Hexaemeron*, pp. 76; 84.

³⁵ Cf. John Chrysostom, appearing to make use of it only in his *De Prophetiarum Obscuritate*, PG.56.182.51.

³⁶ Didymus, *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 8; *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 86; *commPs* 20–21, Cod. pp. 34; 35; *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 239; *frPs(al)*, frs. 465; 595a; 635; 800a; 991; *Fragmenta in Joannem*, frs. 11col1; 11col2.

³⁷ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 5.17; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1693.14; *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 10; Cf. Pseudo-Theodoret, *QetR*, p. 83.

³⁸ Cf. discussion of this in Introduction, pp. 36–37.

³⁹ Cf. Psalm, 77:23, which Theodoret comments on in *commIs*, 1 and *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1489.26–35; he sees this as an imagery of ‘the divine grant’ (τὴν θεῖαν χορηγίαν). Likewise, Eusebius took the ‘opening of the heavens’ as a symbol of ‘divine actions’. *commPs*, PG.23.917.30–32.

⁴⁰ Origen, *frPs*, 77, 19–25.

⁴¹ Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1541.25–27.

⁴² Theodore of Mopsuestia, *expPs*, 67, 10.

⁴³ Ibid. 77, 23b.

πολλαχοῦ οὐρανὸν καλεῖ, ὥς αὐτῷ μᾶλλον προσήκοντα).⁴⁴

EN XXVg: κατὰ σαφήνειαν

The preposition κατὰ is followed by the noun σαφήνεια in the accusative (σαφήνειαν), which bespeaks the author's concern to be clear and accurate. The expression κατὰ σαφήνειαν should be paid attention, and the standard expression κατὰ διαίρεσιν would be read as the central one, and the context should read thus: τὴν σαφήνειαν κατὰ διαίρεσιν τῶν νοητῶν ἐκλαμβάνωμεν ('we should grasp the meaning of this, subsequent to a distinction of intelligible things').⁴⁵

Since 'heaven' means 'the intelligible things', the author suggests that in order to understand the notion of 'heavens having been opened', one should have a grasp of 'a clear classification of intelligible things', especially in the event that 'one of the saints is said to ascend up' to the heavens. Unless one has 'a clear comprehension of the classification of intelligible things', one cannot apprehend what the 'heavens having opened' means.

The father of 'division' (διαίρεσις) of scientific notions into classes and categories was, of course, Aristotle. Plotinus had criticized the Aristotelian classification of the 'ten categories' for not dealing with 'the classification of intelligible things': 'the Peripatetics claim that they classify all beings, yet beings par excellence have been left out of their classification.'⁴⁶ Plotinus seems to employ the polemic levelled against

Aristotle by the second-century Platonist Nicostratus, yet his criticism is anything but a learned one: the censure is carping and superficial, since Aristotle is treated as if he were a shallow Platonist, whereas all that Plotinus sees in Stoicism is a prosaic materialism.

Speaking of exploring something 'by means of division' (κατὰ διαίρεσιν) suggests a certain contrast of method. For it would be possible to build intellectual knowledge of reality 'by means of synthesis' (κατὰ σύνθεσιν). Ammonius of Alexandria defended Aristotle by arguing that the Stagirite explored 'all of truth' not only by means of those two methods, namely by either deduction (implied by διαίρεσις) or induction (implied by σύνθεσις). 'For what kind of either division or synthesis could possibly be applied to really existing beings, which happen to be the most simple of beings?' By 'simple' and 'really existing beings' Ammonius, of course, had in mind intelligible realities. This was in effect a reply to Plotinus, who had not grasped that not only Aristotle, but also Plato, had allowed for a certain kind of apprehension of the supreme reality that stands beyond those two kinds of cognitive approach, that is, beyond διαίρεσις and σύνθεσις.⁴⁷

The expression κατὰ διαίρεσιν, suggesting a deductive process in a classified and systematic way,⁴⁸ was a normal one for mathematicians (Archimedes, Euclides, Ptolemy, Pappus, Theon), yet it originated with Aristotle⁴⁹ and was applied by later thinkers, such as Posidonius,⁵⁰ Galen,⁵¹ Alexander of Aphrodisias,⁵² Iamblichus,⁵³ and the Christian Hippolytus.⁵⁴ Most of these authors are related to the Scholia-vocabulary. The expression at hand comes from Theodoret, not

⁴⁴ Ibid. That 'opening of heavens' suggests divine activity through the angels is a view of Theodore's *commProphXII*, Prophet Malachi, 3.1a.

⁴⁵ One should not be misled by a single portion in Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 291: ἐπεὶ γὰρ μακάριος ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν καὶ σύνεσιν ἔχει ἐπὶ πτωχὸν καὶ πένητα κατὰ πάσας τὰς ἀποδοθείσας σαφηνείας, καὶ πολλοὺς ἔχει τοὺς ἐφεδρεύοντας. In that case, σαφηνείας means 'the foregoing interpretations'.

⁴⁶ Plotinus, *Enneades*, VI.1.1: Ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν νοητῶν κατὰ τὴν διαίρεσιν οὐ λέγουσιν· οὐ πάντα ἄρα τὰ ὄντα διαιρεῖσθαι ἐβουλήθησαν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μάλιστα ὄντα παραλελοίπασιν.

⁴⁷ Ammonius of Alexandria, *In Aristotelis Librum De Interpretatione Commentarius*, p. 27: Δεῖ δὲ ἐφιστάνειν ὅτι μὴ πᾶσαν ἀλήθειαν ὁ φιλόσοφος περὶ σύνθεσιν ἔχειν ἢ διαίρεσιν ἀποφαίνεται. Ποία γὰρ ἂν εἴη σύνθεσις ἢ διαίρεσις ἐπὶ τῆς νοητῆς παρὰ Πλάτωνι καὶ αὐτῷ μέντοι τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει λεγομένης ἀληθείας τῆς κατὰ τὴν ὑπαρξίν τῶν ὄντως ὄντων ἀπλουστάτων ὄντων θεωρουμένης ἢ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νοεράν αὐτῶν ἀντίληψιν ὑφισταμένης πάσης

τε πρὸς τὸ ψεῦδος ἀντιθέσεως ἐξηρημένης, ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ Θεολογικῇ διείλεκται πραγματεία καὶ ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ βιβλίῳ τῶν Περὶ ψυχῆς.

⁴⁸ The literal meaning of κατὰ διαίρεσιν = 'by means of division' does not concern us here.

⁴⁹ Aristotle, *Analytica Posteriora*, 92a28; 97a36. Usage in the *Physica* falls into the meaning of 'division'. *Physica*, 204a7; 206b4; 206b17; 233a25 and 27.

⁵⁰ Posidonius, *Fragmenta*, frs. 268; 272 (*apud Philo, De Aeternitate Mundi*, 79; 80).

⁵¹ Galen, *Circa Doctrinas Hippocratis et Platonis*, 9.6.52; *Institutio Logica*, 3.5; 14.2; *Commentaria in Hippocratis De Natura Hominis*, v. 15, p. 20; v. 18b, p. 52.

⁵² Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 762.

⁵³ Iamblichus, *De Communi Mathematica Scientia*, 32; *De Mysteriis*, 1.10.

⁵⁴ Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, 7.21.2.

Didymus, although the latter was aware of its connotations.⁵⁵

Theodoret is the Christian who used the notion of ‘division’ in this specific sense, which otherwise remained common coin for Aristotelian commentators, and for some Platonists, too. In this, Theodoret actually followed Theodore of Mopsuestia. The specific instance in the Scholion, although by Cassian’s hand, is in fact a borrowing from Theodore.⁵⁶ Theodoret himself favoured the term διαίρεσις applied in the sense of ‘distinction’ or ‘systematic account’,⁵⁷ whereas Didymus was not keen on such a usage.⁵⁸ In other words, Cassian writes availing himself not only of the glorious Aristotelian patrimony that had been preserved by the great Schools of the region of Syria, as discussed in the Introduction, but also of his compatriot Damascius,⁵⁹ who expressly allowed for this method (namely κατὰ διαίρεσιν) during exploration of intelligible realities.⁶⁰

EN XXVh: διαίρεσις τῶν νοητῶν

The author of this Scholion is evidently aware of the criticism that Plotinus had levelled against Aristotle, and was also aware of the pertinent phraseology. He refers to ‘outsiders’ wishing to make the Christian doctrine of ‘open heavens’ a ‘laughing-stock’, yet he reminds them that, in order to comprehend this doctrine, one should have some idea about the ‘classifi-

cation of intelligible things’ – which Aristotle had not done within the framework of his philosophy. How could it be possible for a mindset that lacked the ability to comprehend such a ‘classification’ to be the self-appointed judge of this specific Christian notion? This is why and how the Book of Revelation retains its authority and its superiority over heathen thought, Cassian argues.

Clement of Alexandria had no inhibitions about instilling the idea of ‘classification of intelligible things’; in fact he averred that doing so is a token of ‘prudence’ (φρόνησις).⁶¹ Nevertheless, Christians refrained from using this notion. This they did with good reason, even though the erudite among them were aware of its possible implications.⁶² For an immediate consequence of διαίρεσις τῶν νοητῶν would be to divide the intelligible things into species regarded as parts of a genus. Since, however, the Trinity was the pre-eminent incorporeal reality, such an intellectual process was bound to result in catastrophic doctrinal formulations, such as those that had been produced by Arianism and Apollinarism.

In Aristotle’s view such a process was deemed to lack authority, since there is no actual correspondence between the notions introduced by the human mind, on the one hand, and the incorporeal reality, on the other. The main point of Plotinus’ criticism of Aristotle was that the latter had failed to make a ‘division’ of the beings par excellence.⁶³ This stricture against Aristotle

⁵⁵ Cf. Didymus, *commZacch*, 4.280, quoted in note 62 below.

⁵⁶ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *commProphXII*, Prophet Hosea, 5.8b-9a (κατὰ διαίρεσιν τὸ κοινὸν λέγει); so in *ibid.* Prophet Micah, 1.3-4; *ibid.* Prophet Habakkuk, 3.3b. *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 132 (κατὰ διαίρεσιν ἀναγνωστέον).

⁵⁷ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 6.36; *Eranistes*, pp. 139; 202; 247; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80: 1072.49; 1989.45; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82: 364.35 and 50; 377.24; 457.39.

⁵⁸ Didymus, *commJob* (7.20c-11), Cod. p. 280; *frPs(al)*, fr. 1231 (οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ δι’ ἐξετάσεως καὶ διαιρέσεως ὧν μετέρχονται λόγων κρίνοντες δῆθεν τὰ πράγματα); *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 9; *commEccl* (3-4.12), Cod. p. 88 (παρεῖς τὴν διαίρεσιν τῶν ὁρατῶν – φανερὰ γὰρ ἐστὶν – οὐκ ἔτεμεν αὐτὰ κατ’ εἶδος).

⁵⁹ Damascius, *De Principiis*, v. 1, pp. 105-6: ὥστε καὶ ἡ κατ’ ἐνέργειαν πρώτη ἀντιδιαίρεσις ἀπὸ τῆς τρίτης ἄρχεται τῶν νοητῶν διακοσμήσεων· ἐστὶ μὲν γὰρ ἡ πρώτη διαίρεσις καὶ διάκρισις πηγαία. *Ibid.* pp. 108-9: Πάλιν γὰρ ἂν εἴη διαίρεσις ἄλλη πρὸ ἀμφοῖν, καὶ ἔτι πρὸ πάντων ἔνθεσις ἐν τοῖς νοητοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνὸς καὶ περὶ τὸ ἐν οἷον πέπηγεν. *Ibid.* p. 275: καὶ ἀρκοῦμενοι ταύτῃ τῇ πτώσει ἐτολμήσαμεν κατηγορεῖσθαι τοῦ νοητοῦ τὴν τριχῇ διαίρεσιν, ἀναπαῦσαι βουλόμενοι τὰς ἡμετέρας ἐπιπλέον συναρρηθῆναι μὴ δυναμένας, ἀλλὰ μὴ δὲ

ἀπαλλαγῆναι δυναμένας τῆς περὶ τὸ νοητὸν θεωρίας, πόθω τῶν ἀρχαίων αἰτίων τῆς ὅλης φύσεως. *Ibid.* p. 276: Οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς οὐσίας ῥητέον ὡς κατὰ αἰτίαν ἢ ὥδινά ἢ ἔνωσιν ἀδιάκριτον ἐκεῖ, καὶ ταύτης προὑπαρχούσης· ἡ ἄρα διαίρεσις αὕτη ἔμφασίς ἐστι διαιρέσεως τῶν ἐκεῖθεν γεννωμένων· αὕτη δὲ τοῦ νοητοῦ ἢ ὑπαρξίς ἐστι τὸ ἡνωμένον καὶ ἀδιάκριτον, καὶ πᾶν εἴ τι τοιοῦτον. *In Parmenidem*, p. 30: τίς ἡ διαίρεσις τῆς δευτέρας νοητῆς τριάδος; *Ibid.* p. 126: Καὶ ὡς αὕτη ἐπιστρέφει τὴν νοερὰν διαίρεσιν εἰς τὴν συνοχικὴν ὁλότητα, οὕτω καὶ ἐκείνη εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα συνάγει τὴν νοητὴν διαίρεσιν.

⁶⁰ As I argue in Appendix II of *NDGF* (p. 509), Damascius actually builds on the notion following Proclus.

⁶¹ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 1.28.177.3: αὕτη γὰρ τῷ ὄντι ἡ διαλεκτικὴ φρόνησις ἐστὶ περὶ τὰ νοητὰ διαιρετικὴ, ἐκάστου τῶν ὄντων ἀμίκτως τε καὶ εἰλικρινῶς τοῦ ὑποκειμένου δεικτικὴ, ἢ δύναμις περὶ τὰ τῶν πραγμάτων γένη διαιρετικὴ, μέχρι τῶν ἰδικωτάτων καταβαίνουσα παρεχομένη ἐκάστον τῶν ὄντων καθαρὸν οἶον ἔστι φαίνεσθαι.

⁶² Cf. Didymus, *commZacch*, 4.280: Τόπον δ’ ἐν τούτοις ἐκκληπτέον οὐ τὸν περιγράφοντα καὶ περιορίζοντα σῶμα, ἀλλὰ τὸν διαιρούμενον εἰς προτάσεις καὶ προβλήματα.

⁶³ See above, note 46.

appeared officially with Plotinus,⁶⁴ but Alexander of Aphrodisias essayed to exonerate Aristotle from it. However, Alexander's writings allow for the inference that this criticism was circulating in pagan schools. His reply was that 'such a division applies to the human mind, not to the things actually involved' (ἡ διαίρεσις ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι),⁶⁵ since what Aristotle meant by beings par excellence were 'individual' (that is, material) substances, not incorporeal ones. As far as the latter are concerned, 'they are the topic of a different account'.⁶⁶ This notwithstanding, Plotinus was not deterred from criticizing both Aristotle and the other Peripatetics for failing to come up with an account on the issue.

It was only with Proclus that secular thought felt free to apply the idea of 'division' to intelligible realities.⁶⁷ Damascius and Simplicius were rather reluctant to do so, even though they both implicitly conceded that Plotinus' criticism of Aristotle was unfounded. Nevertheless, Damascius was loath to allow that such a 'division' of intelligible realities could possibly make sense. His formulations do not fail to suggest that this notion is only an intellectual abstraction,⁶⁸ which in effect suggests that he endorsed the apology for Aristotle formulated by Alexander of Aphrodisias. As a matter of fact, he conceded that once this 'division' is applied to higher realities, it could give rise to an all too precarious

notion. This is the lesson that Damascius had read in Parmenides.⁶⁹

Damascius was aware that Proclus confidently used the idea of such a 'division', yet he asserted that Proclus received this libertine teaching from 'the Egyptians', implying that Damascius himself did not endorse the borrowing.⁷⁰ This remark, nevertheless, is informative about the contact Proclus maintained with the intelligentsia of Egypt, which explains his debts to Didymus. The Alexandrian grammarian Orion was familiar with the wisdom of Didymus. Orion was the teacher of Proclus, yet he had another pupil, too: this was Eudocia, the wife of Emperor Theodosius II. In order to be a good teacher, Orion had to be aware of not only pagan, but also Christian thought. To this purpose, Didymus was the best, as well as closest, representative scholar of Christian learning.

Simplicius is equally sympathetic to Aristotle on the issue of refraining from introducing 'division' into intelligible realities. He calls upon his readers 'not to blame either Plato or Aristotle' for failing to consider any such a 'division', since division is concomitant only with things 'which come to being', not with eternal ones.⁷¹ He moves along the same line with Damascius by appealing to Parmenides, who had seen only *oneness* in intelligible things, whereas distinction is only a human action 'in theory' (εἰς τὴν νοερὰν διάκρισιν). Were a

⁶⁴ Cf. Plotinus, *Enneades*, VI.1.1 quoted in EN XXVg, note 46.

⁶⁵ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 458.

⁶⁶ Ibid. καὶ τὸ μὴ ὄν ὡς ψεῦδος θεωρῆσαι δεῖ, ὕστερον ἐπισκεπτέον. ἐπεὶ δ' ὡς δέδεικται, ἡ συμπλοκὴ ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ διαίρεσις ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι, συμπλοκὴν καὶ διαίρεσιν λέγων τὸ ἀληθὲς καὶ τὸ ψεῦδος, τὸ δ' οὕτως, ἦτοι τὸ ὡς ἀληθές, τὸ παρὰ σύνθεσιν καὶ διαίρεσιν, ἕτερον ὄν ἐστι τῶν κυρίως ὄντων, κυρίως ὄντα λέγων τὰς ἀτόμους οὐσίας, ὡς ἐν τῷ μετὰ τοῦτο βιβλίῳ ἐρεῖ: περὶ γάρ τῶν νοητῶν ἄλλος λόγος. εἴτα καὶ πῶς ἕτερόν ἐστι τὸ ὡς ἀληθὲς ὄν τῶν κυρίως ὄντων λέγει. ἢ γάρ, φησιν, ἡ διάνοια τὸ τί ἐστὶ καὶ οὐσίαν μετὰ οὐσίας συνάπτει ἢ διαίρει, ἢ πάλιν ποῖον μετὰ οὐσίας ἢ ποσὸν ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ τῶν κατηγοριῶν.

⁶⁷ Cf. Proclus conveniently making his own 'divisions'. *Theologia Platonica*, v. 4, p. 97: Τετράς γάρ ἦν ἐκεῖ μονάδι καὶ τριάδι διαιρουμένη, πρεπούσης τῇ τρίτῃ τάξει τῶν νοητῶν εἰδῶν τῆς τοιαύτης διαιρέσεως.

⁶⁸ Damascius, *De Principiis*, v. 1, p. 274: Ἐστω δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς προτέροις ἄλλως πῶς ὁρωμένη ἡ τριαδικὴ πρόοδος, ἐν δὲ τῷ νοητῷ καὶ ταύτην ἀδύνατον ἐμφανῆναι· ἀλλὰ νόει μοι καὶ ταύτης ὁδῖνα, τὴν ἐκεῖ λεγομένην τριχὴ διαίρεσιν. Ibid. v. 1, p. 275: καὶ ἀρκούμενοι ταύτῃ τῇ πτώσει ἐτολμήσαμεν κατηγορεῖσθαι τοῦ νοητοῦ τὴν τριχὴ διαίρεσιν. 'πάντα ἐστί' γάρ, 'ἀλλὰ νοητῶς', φησὶ τὸ λόγιον. Διὰ τί οὖν μὴ καὶ εἰς πάντα διαιρεῖται ἀναλόγως; ἢ οὐ

οὐδ' εἰς ταῦτα κατὰ ἀλήθειαν, ἔστι δὲ ὁμῶς πάντα ἐκεῖ τὸν ἀδιάκριτον τρόπον. Ibid. v. 1, p. 276: ἡ ἄρα διαίρεσις αὕτη ἐμφασὶς ἐστὶ διαιρέσεως τῶν ἐκεῖθεν γεννωμένων· αὕτη δὲ τοῦ νοητοῦ ἡ ὑπαρξὶς ἐστὶ τὸ ἡνωμένον καὶ ἀδιάκριτον, καὶ πᾶν εἴ τι τοιοῦτον.

⁶⁹ Damascius, *In Parmenidem*, p. 6: Μήποτε δὲ καὶ τὸ μὲν νοητὸν οὐ διαιρετέον εἰς ἐνάδα καὶ ὄν ταύτης ἐξηρητημένον· ἐν δὲ γὰρ ὅλον ὁμοῦ τὸ νοητὸν κατὰ Παρμενίδην, καὶ οὐ διέστη εἰς ἡγούμενον καὶ ἐπόμενον. Ibid. p. 53: ἐκεῖ μὲν οὐπω ἐδυνάστευσεν ἡ διαιρετικὴ δύναμις, ἐνταῦθα δέ, ὅλον δι' ὅλου νοητῶς καταδιήρηκεν τὸ ἐν ὄν.

⁷⁰ Damascius, *ibid.* v. 1, p. 324: ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ἐκεῖνο περὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ὅτι διαιρετικοὶ εἰσι πολλαχοῦ τῶν κατὰ ἔννοιαν ὑφεστώτων, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ νοητὸν διηρήκασιν εἰς πολλῶν θεῶν ιδιότητος, ὡς ἔξεστι μαθεῖν τοῖς ἐκείνων συγγράμμασιν ἐντυχούσι τοῖς βουλομένοις, λέγω δὲ τῇ Ἡρακλείου ἀναγραφῇ τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου καθ' ὅλον λόγου πρὸς τὸν Πρόκλον γραφείῃ τὸν φιλόσοφον.

⁷¹ Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 9, p. 148: λέγεται τὸ ὄν καὶ οὕτως πολλὰ ἔσται ἢ μοναχῶς, καὶ ἢ οὐσία ἢ συμβεβηκός. καὶ δὴλον ὅτι οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ νοητῷ προσήκει, ἐν τῇ γενέσει τῆς διαιρέσεως ταύτης ἀναφανομένης καὶ εἴπερ ἄρα κατ' αἰτίαν ἐν τῇ νοερᾷ διακρίσει προειλημμένης. μηδεὶς δὲ τῷ Πλάτῳ καὶ τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει μεμφέσθω πρὸς ἄλλας ἐννοίας ἀντιλέγοντι.

‘division’ to be applied to such (intelligible) things, this should result in different ‘genera’ which by definition are different from each other (τὰ γένη ἐναντία διαιρέσει ἐστὶ τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα).⁷²

Against this background, Cassian, following Proclus, was bold enough to dare to use the notion of ‘classification of the intelligible things’, both in the Scholia, as well as in his (Pseudo-Didymus) *De Trinitate*. For one thing, he was a learned person and knew what he was talking about. For another, his remark applies not to the Deity, but to the *activity* of the Deity, since Theodore of Mopsuestia had taught him what ‘heavens being opened’ actually means. This audacity of Cassian is his distinctive mark in the Scholion, allowing us to identify his own pen behind these lines, even though he drew on Didymus, albeit not heavily, at other points of this Scholion.

EN XXVi: οἷα σάλπιγγος

Harnack printed οἷα, which is not correct. What is needed at this point is not an adjective (οἷα), but an adverb (οἷα): ‘in the same way as a trumpet sounds’.⁷³ The palaeographic writing of the codex does not allow for a distinction to be made, but I should have thought

that the scribe got it right (a handwriting which looks like οἷα stands for οἷα).

EN XXVj: τὴν ἐννόησιν

The term suggests not simply ‘understanding’, but grasping the depth and enormity of a certain situation, or a concealed truth.⁷⁴ This is an extremely rare usage, and Cassian uses the idea after the vocabulary of Theodore of Mopsuestia.⁷⁵

EN XXVk: μεγαλοφωνία

The noun μεγαλοφωνία literally means ‘a loud utterance’, but in its metaphorical sense it suggests someone pronouncing lofty words. Ancient writers accorded the epithet to Homer, with Athenaeus alone ascribing it to Pindar.⁷⁶ Hippolytus⁷⁷ and Origen applied it in the sense of ‘a lofty utterance’⁷⁸ and so did Didymus.⁷⁹ Proclus took up the metaphor to declare that Socrates uttered a sublime teaching.⁸⁰

The term ‘loud voice’ suggests the magnificence inherent in the divine teachings or the quality of rendering them in a spirit befitting the grandeur of God. Origen’s reasoning was clear, and this was embraced by Didymus, too: since John and James are the ‘sons of

⁷² Simplicius, *ibid.* v. 9, p. 136: τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον ὃν οὐκ ἂν εἴη γένος, εἴπερ τὰ γένη ἐναντία διαιρέσει ἐστὶ τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα. καὶ κατὰ μίαν ιδιότητα περιγράφεται διακεκριμένα ἤδη ταῦτα ἀπὸ τῆς νοητῆς ἐνώσεως, ἐν ἣ πάντα ἐν ἡν, ὡς ὁ Παρμενίδης φησί, καὶ ὑπελθόντα πρῶτον μὲν εἰς τὴν νοερὰν διάκρισιν, ἀμερίστως μερισθεῖσαν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰσθητὸν διασπασμὸν καὶ μεταξὺ τούτων εἰς τὴν ψυχικὴν ἀλληλουχίαν.

⁷³ Cf. *Scholion IX*: κάκειθεν οἷα λύχρον αὐτὸν ἄπτων. *Scholion XXII*: ἀλλ’ ὥς αἰτία τοῦ ὑπάρχειν αὐτὴν οἷα δημιουργός. Cf. Origen, *selDeut*, PG.12.805.27: Κίνησις οὖν λέγεται ἡ προφητικὴ φωνή, οἷα παριστώσα τὰ ὑπὸ Θεοῦ εἰρημένα. *commLuc*, PG.17.357.13: νοητῶς δὲ πίπτει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, οἷα στρουθία.

⁷⁴ Cf. *Collectio Verborum e Rhetoribus et Sapientibus*, p. 219. *Suda*, lexicon, Alphabetic letter epsilon, entry 1069. Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter epsilon, p. 701. Critias of Athens (fifth cent. BC), *Fragmenta*, fr. 39, and Hyperides (fourth cent. BC), *Fragmenta*, fr. 65, both *apud* Galen, *Commentaria in Hippocratis de Medicina III*, v. 18b, p. 656. Damascius, *De Principiis*, v. 1, p. 151: πρὸ πάντων τῶν ἐννοήσεων. Marcus Aurelius, *Τῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν (Meditationes)*, 3.1.1: τὴν ἐννόησιν τῶν πραγμάτων.

⁷⁵ Theodore of Mopsuestia in *Catena in Epistulam ad Galatas*, p. 87: εἰς ἐννόησιν ἄγων αὐτὸν τῶν οἰκείων ἀμαρτημάτων.

⁷⁶ Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, 2.13: Πινδάρου τοῦ μεγαλοφωνοτάτου. 13.17: ὁ δὲ μεγαλοφωνότατος Πίνδαρος. Galen, *De Morbis Curandis*, v. 10, p. 12: ἀλλὰ τίς ἡμῖν οὕτω μεγαλόφωνος ποιητὴς ὃς ἔσεται ταῦτα; τίνος Ὁμήρου νῦν εὐπορήσομεν; Lucian of Samosata, *Muscae Encomium*, section 5: ἀλλ’ ὃς μεγαλοφωνότατος τῶν ποιητῶν Ὁμηρος. Porphyry, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria (fragmenta)*, Book 1, fr. 8: τίς γὰρ

Ὁμήρου μεγαλοφωνότερος; *apud* Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 1, p. 64. Themistius, *Εἰς Θεοδόσιον: τίς ἡ βασιλικωτάτη τῶν ἀρετῶν*. *Ibid.* p. 198c: καὶ τὸν Τυρταίου μεγαλοφωνότερον Ὁμηρον.

⁷⁷ Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, 8.12.1: τῆς τοῦ μεγαλοφώνου ποιητοῦ δόξης. Pseudo-Hippolytus, *De Consummatione Mundi*, 4: ἀκουσον καὶ τοῦ Ὡση ἐταυτα φωνούντος μεγαλοφώνως. I am not sure whether an isolated use by Philo was Hippolytus’ model: Philo, *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit*, 14: ἐκβοᾷν, οὐ στόματι καὶ γλῶττι . . . ἀλλὰ τῷ παμμούσῳ καὶ μεγαλοφωνοτάτῳ ψυχῆς ὄργανῳ.

⁷⁸ Origen, *Cels*, II, 73: παριστάντα τὴν Ἰησοῦ οὐκ ἐν λέξεσιν ἀλλ’ ἐν πράγμασι μεγαλοφωνίαν. *Ibid.* III, 58: τῆς λεληθυίας τοὺς πολλοὺς Χριστιανῶν μεγαλοφωνίας, περὶ τῶν μεγίστων καὶ ἀναγκασιότατων διαλαμβανόντων καὶ ἀποδεικνύντων καὶ παριστάντων. Also, *ibid.* VI.77; VIII.6; 58; *frJohn*, X; CXV; *Philocalia*, 15.18; *commMatt*, 12, 32: τῆς ‘βροντῆς υἱοί’ καὶ γεννώμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας τοῦ θεοῦ βροντῶντος καὶ μεγάλα οὐρανῶθεν βοῶντος. 12.33: καὶ τοῖς τῆς ‘βροντῆς’ υἱοῖς γεννηθεῖσιν ἀπὸ μεγαλοφωνίας τουτέστιν ἀπὸ βροντῆς, οὐρανόθεν χρήματος. *Ibid.* 16.5: ὡς χωρήσαντας τὴν μεγαλοφωνίαν αὐτῆς. *Ibid.* 16.10: καὶ πᾶσα αὐτῶν ἡ δοκοῦσα διὰ τὴν θεοσέβειαν μεγαλοφωνία. Cf. *PHE*, pp. 384; 404.

⁷⁹ Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 355; *frPs(al)*, frs. 117; 489; 908.

⁸⁰ Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 1, p. 62: ἀντικρὺς ἀθετεῖν δοκοῦσί μοι μὴδὲ τῆς ἐν Φαίδρῳ τοῦ Σωκράτους ἐψησθῆσθαι μεγαλοφωνίας.

thunder’,⁸¹ the voice of Rev. 4:1 is as loud as thunder. This ‘loudness’, however, is a figure of speech denoting the loftiness of the truths that are proclaimed.⁸²

Eminent Christian theologians emulated the metaphor, taking ‘loud voice’ as bespeaking the grandeur of proclaimed doctrines, normally the Christian ones. Athanasius refers to either the ‘loud voice’ of ‘Greek wisdom and philosophers’,⁸³ or that of ‘the pagan wise people’,⁸⁴ or the ‘loud voice of the soul’.⁸⁵

Basil of Caesarea mentions the ‘loud voice of the testimony by God Himself’⁸⁶ during the baptism of Jesus, also the one ‘of the Gospel’,⁸⁷ or the allegorical ‘loud voice’ which comes out of the hearts of those who pray.⁸⁸ In like manner, he makes reference to either ‘the loud voice of John’s’ theology,⁸⁹ or ‘the loud voice of the Spirit’.⁹⁰

The theologians who made the most of Origen’s (or Hippolytus’) innovation were Eusebius,⁹¹ Gregory of Nyssa,⁹² Didymus,⁹³ and Theodoret.⁹⁴ For all his tendency to grandiloquent style, John Chrysostom did

not pay this term the attention it deserved, and he seems to have used it only once.⁹⁵

Didymus used the term in the sense of a ‘sublime teaching’ associated with the notion of ‘thunder’,⁹⁶ that is, in precisely the same way as it is used in [Scholion XXXVI](#). Although literally meaning ‘loud voice’, he uses the term to indicate either the ‘sublimity’⁹⁷ of a doctrine, or the fervour of an entreaty addressed to God.⁹⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus reserved the term for his friend Basil of Caesarea.⁹⁹

At the end of the endnotes to the present Scholion, a final point is called for by textual evidence.

A coincidence may offer some evidence for Cassian’s readings. The expression γέλωτα ὀφλι-σκάνειν (above, [EN XXVb](#)) was a recurring motif in Lucian of Samosata.¹⁰⁰ This might be mere coincidence, but Lucian anticipates the notion of μεγαλοφωνία in its metaphorical sense, which is central to the vocabulary of this Scholion. I know of no pagan author before Lucian who used the noun μεγαλοφωνία to extol the

⁸¹ Mark 3:17.

⁸² Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 355: καὶ ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῆς αἰσθητῆς ‘φωνῆς’ δέος λαμβάνουσιν συνεχόμενοι, οὕτως ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγαλοφώνου θεοῦ λόγου, περὶ οὗ λέγεται ὡς ‘βροντῆς’: ‘ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης ἐβρόντησεν’ καὶ ἔτι ‘καὶ ἐβρόντησεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κύριος’. ταύτης τῆς ‘βροντῆς’ ἤκουσαν οἱ ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην· ἐξηρμήτισαν γὰρ ‘υἱοὶ βροντῆς’. καὶ ὡς Πέτρος διὰ τὸ στερεὸν τῆς πίστεως ἧς ἔσχεν ‘πέτρας’ καλουμένης παρωνομάσθη ‘Πέτρος’, οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας ἐξηρμήτισαν ‘υἱοὶ βροντῆς’.

⁸³ Athanasius, *De Incarnatione Verbi*, 47.5.

⁸⁴ Ibid. 50.3.

⁸⁵ Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.404.21.

⁸⁶ Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.289.44.

⁸⁷ Ibid. PG.29.292.17.

⁸⁸ Ibid. PG.29.377.44; cf. *ibid.* PG.29.485.43

⁸⁹ Ibid. PG.29.485.43.

⁹⁰ Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.633.24.

⁹¹ Eusebius, *PE*, 13.14.3: τὸ μέγα τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας ὕψος. *DE*, 7.1.1: Ὡςπερ ὁ θαυμάσιος εὐαγγελιστὴς Ἰωάννης μείζονι ἢ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον μεγαλοφωνίᾳ τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν θεολογῶν. *commPs*, PG.23.976.30–31: σάλπιγι χρῶμενοι, ταῖς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος μεγαλοφωνίαις.

⁹² Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 1.1.301: διὰ τῆς τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ μεγαλοφωνίας. Ibid. 2.1.119: ὁ τῆς βροντῆς υἱὸς Ἰωάννης ὁ τῇ μεγαλοφωνίᾳ τῶν κατ’ αὐτὸν δογμάτων ὑπερηχῆσας. Ibid. 3.1.108: Ταῦτα τοῖνον ἐκ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς μεγαλοφωνίας μαθόντες. Ibid. 3.2.23: ταῖς μεγαλοφωνίαις ὁ κῆρυξ τοῦτον λέγει τὸν θεόν. Ibid. 3.3.39: οὐκ οἶδα εἰ τῆς Παύλου μεγαλοφωνίας ὁ κατήγορος ἤκουσεν. Ibid. 3.9.16: τὴν τε τοῦ Ἰωάννου μεγαλοφωνίαν. Ibid. 3.9.28: συμπαραλαμβάνοντος δὲ εἰς μαρτυρίαν τοῦ δόγματος καὶ τὴν προφητικὴν μεγαλοφωνίαν. Ibid. 3.10.9: παρὰ τῆς τοῦ ἀποστόλου μεγαλοφωνίας. In *Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 41: κηρύσσων ἐν μεγαλοφωνίᾳ τὸν αἰεὶ ὄντα λόγον. Ibid. v. 6, p. 132: ἐκ τῆς τοῦ

Ἐκκλησιαστοῦ μεγαλοφωνίας. *De Beatitudinibus*, PG.44.1205.29: τῇ μεγαλοφωνίᾳ τοῦ κήρυκος.

⁹³ Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 356; *commZacch*, 3.6; 3.204; 3.209; 3.228; *frPs(al)*, frs 117; 489; 660a; 908; 966; 1289.

⁹⁴ Theodoret, *HE*, pp. 15; 304; *Epistulae* 53–95, *Epistles* 66; 67; 83; 222; *De Sancta et Vivifica Trinitate*, PG.75.1152.4; *De Incarnatione Domini*, PG.75.1448.45; *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80.533.16; *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.673.36; *Eranistes*, p. 234.

⁹⁵ John Chrysostom, *De Mutatione Nominum*, PG.51.149.8: Τοῦτο καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον ἐκάλεσεν, ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὸ κῆρυγμα μεγαλοφωνίας.

⁹⁶ Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 355: οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας ἐξηρμήτισαν ‘υἱοὶ βροντῆς’. ἀλλ’ ἴσως τις ἐνστήσεται πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὅτι ‘ναί, βροντᾷτω μέγала ὁ Ἰωάννης θεολογῶν καὶ λέγων “ἐν ἀρχῇ . . .”’

⁹⁷ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 117: διὰ τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας τῶν πληρουμένων λόγων ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ. Ibid. Fr. 489: εἰκεν τὴν μεγαλοφωνίαν καὶ τὸ διάτορον τῶν δογμάτων φωνὴ σάλπιγγος ὀνομάζεσθαι. *commZacch*, 3.204: Καὶ ὅρα εἰ μὴ κατ’ ἐπίνοιαν ἄλλην καὶ ἄλλην τὸ παρὰ Θεοῦ διδόμενον σάλπιγξ ἐστὶν καὶ ἀστραπή. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀκουστὰ τυγχάνει τὰ σαφῶς καὶ διατόρως καὶ μεγαλοφῶνως ἀπαγγελλόμενα, σάλπιγγι ὁμοίονται . . . (205) Ὡςπερ δὲ τοῖς εὐεργετουμένοις ἐκ προαιρέσεως καὶ τοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν φωτεινὰ καὶ μεγαλόφωνα ἅπαντα τὰ θεῖα.

⁹⁸ Didymus, *ibid.* fr. 908: κεκραγὼς δὲ τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς μεγαλοφωνίᾳ.

⁹⁹ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Funebris Oratio in Basilium Magnum*, 68.1: Ἐπεὶ δὲ θεολογίας ἐμνήσθην, καὶ τῆς περὶ τοῦτο τοῦ ἀνδρὸς μάλιστα μεγαλοφωνίας. The author of *DT* uses this in the spirit of Origen: *DT* (*lib.* 2.1–7), 6.4,6: πρόσχωσι τοῖνον, μετὰ ποίας μεγαλοφωνίας τὸ αἰώνιον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἀνεῖρηται. *DT* (*lib.* 3), PG.39.901: τὴν παρ’ ἡμῖν τῶν ἁγίων μεγαλοφωνίαν.

¹⁰⁰ Lucian of Samosata (second cent. AD), *Symposium*, 34; *Juppiter Tragoedus*, 27; *Revivescens*, 34; *Adversus Indoctum et Libros Multos Ementem*, 7; *Imagines*, 21; *Dialogi Mortuorum*, Dialogue 16.3.

grandeur and sublimity of a certain person, or of any kind of intellectual production, which Lucian did in reference to Homer, and to poetry in general.¹⁰¹ I should have thought it a possibility that Origen received the idea of the metaphorical usage of μεγαλοφωνία from Lucian. All Origen had to do (and he actually did so) was to associate this with scriptural authority, namely Mark 3:17. Besides, it was all too natural for Origen to have read Lucian. Along with Celsus, Galen, and Marcus Aurelius, Lucian (a Christian for a while) shared similar views about the Christians: the confidence that Christians displayed vis-à-vis pagans seemed to them incomprehensible, especially the Christians' willingness to die for the indemonstrable. Lucian made mention of Christians in a few instances, which in turn impelled eminent Christians to read his views of them. Critical minds, such as Origen and Cassian, could scarcely be indifferent to the charm and mordancy of

Lucian's spirit and writing. After all, Lucian was a person coming from the same region as Cassian, that is, Antioch. Facing a sarcastic writer who disdained any uncritical *forma mentis*, some Christian intellectuals probably received his influence on the grounds of philology. Besides, some of them believed that Lucian was a Christian all the way through, and that he died a martyr.

Furthermore, Lucian uses the expression τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι, which we encountered in [Scholion XXI \(EN XXIIb\)](#). It is remarkable that he does so in relation to the literal use of the epithet μεγαλόφωνος,¹⁰² which was just canvassed in this section.

In conclusion, [Scholion XXV](#) is a product of Cassian's own pen. He wrote it under the influence of Antiochean intellectuals. At the same time though, this comment attests to the author's remarkable Greek erudition.

¹⁰¹ Lucian of Samosata, *Muscae Encomium*, 5: ἀλλ' ὅς μεγαλοφωνότατος τῶν ποιητῶν Ὅμηρος. *Juppiter Tragoedus*, 6: τὸ κήρυγμα μέτροις τισὶ καὶ μεγαλοφωνία ποιητικῇ. *De Historia Conscribenda*, 8: ἡ ἱστορία δὲ ἦν τινα κολακείαν τοιαύτην προσλάβη, τί ἄλλο ἢ περὶ τὴν ποιητικὴν γίγνεται, τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας μὲν ἐκείνης ἐστερημένη; Cf. Lucian applying a literal sense: *Icaromenippus*, 17; 23; 30 (μεγαλοφωνία); *ibid.* 23

(μεγαλοφωνίας); *ibid.* 30 (μεγαλοφωνότατος); *Bis Accusatus*, 11 (μεγαλοφωνότερος); *De Mercede Conductis Potentium Familiaribus*, 23 (μεγαλοφώνω); *De Domo*, 16 (μεγαλοφωνία).

¹⁰² Lucian of Samosata, *Icaromenippus*, 30–31: καὶ οὗτος αὐτῶν τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι δοκεῖ ὅς ἂν μεγαλοφωνότατος τε ἦ καὶ ἰταμώτατος καὶ πρὸς τὰς βλασφημίας θρασύτερος. Cf. the expression τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι in [Scholion XXI](#).

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXVI

EN XXVIa: οὐσιωθῆναι

This infinitive form is extremely rare. No more than four instances can be identified prior to the fifth century AD. Among them, we find both Didymus¹ and Theodoret,² but definitive ascription should be cautious, since it may well be the vocabulary of a catenist rather than of the authors themselves. In addition, we encounter a characteristic usage such as this in Pseudo-Justin: hence the likelihood that Cassian was the real author of this text remains strong. I believe, therefore, that the present infinitive-form in the Scholion is Cassian's own.

EN XXVIb: κτίζον-κτιζόμενον

The distinction is made between the 'Being of the Creator himself' and that of 'rational beings', that is, creatures. The first half of this introductory period refers to the uncreated Logos, according to the common theological theme that the One who spoke throughout biblical history was God the Logos. He is also the same one who appeared in the apocalyptic vision of Revelation. The second half of the period refers to rational creatures, echoing Origen's doctrine of creation: the object of creation was the 'reasons': it was according and after them that actual creatures came into being. Thus οὐσιωθῆναι refers to the creation of the 'reasons' (λόγοι), according to which creation was produced, whereas κτισθῆναι points to the actual creation.³ The author remains faithful to Origen's distinction.

The expression of the Codex, τοῦτο ὃν κτίζεται, ἀλλὰ τὸ κτιζόμενόν ἐστι, which Harnack emended to οὐ τοῦτο τὸ ὃν κτίζεται, ἀλλὰ τὸ κτιζόμενόν ἐστι,

does not make sense either way. To solve this mystery, one has to see the parallel in Didymus actually commenting on the Book of Revelation, in both the same spirit and phraseology as the Scholia. According to Didymus, to style the Logos *Pantocrator* (which Revelation does) and to say that the Son is a creature, could only be self-defeating. Since *Pantocrator* means 'the One who has dominion over all creation', to style the Son a 'creature' could entail that the Son dominates over himself as a creature. In other words, the Son would become both the one who dominates and is dominated at the same time.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.154-5: Ἀναντιρρήτως ἐν Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψει παντοκράτωρ ὁ Σωτὴρ ὁμολογεῖται, αὐτοῦ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ οὕτω λέγοντος· 'Τάδε λέγει ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ.' Παντοκράτωρ ὢν ὁ ταῦτα λέγων οὐ κτίσμα τυγχάνει, ἵνα μὴ καὶ ἑαυτοῦ κρατῇ. Παράλογον γὰρ τοῦτο, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι κτίζοντα καὶ κτιζόμενον ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύοντα καὶ κρατούμενον· εἰ καὶ λέγεται δὲ ἐν τῇ παραλημφθείσῃ φωνῇ 'ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ' ὁ θεολογούμενος, ὡς βασιλικῶς ἄρχων καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο παντοκράτωρ ὢν, ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως ἐστίν, βασιλεία δηλονότι ἡγεμονοῦσα καὶ ἡγουμένη πάντων κτισμάτων.⁴

The same argument was advanced by Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sancta Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.249.28-32: Οὐκ ἄρα κτίσμα ἐστὶν ὁ Υἱός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, ἵνα μὴ τὸ αὐτὸ φαίνεται ποιοῦν καὶ ποιούμενον, κτίζον καὶ κτιζόμενον· Θεὸς δὲ μᾶλλον ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς.

¹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 976: ἅμα τῷ οὐσιωθῆναι αὐτὴν πεποίηκας· συμφώνως τῷ Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. Nevertheless, all four instances obtain in catena-fragments and the corresponding names of authors make it possible for all of them to have been produced by the same Sabaite or Akoimetan hand.

² Theodoret, *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 371: ἅμα τῷ οὐσιωθῆναι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μὴ ὄντας ἐποίησας τῇ ἐνεργητικῇ σου δυνάμει. The third instance is the one which transpires in this Scholion, and the fourth one, Pseudo-Justin, *Expositio Rectae Fidei*, p. 387. The concept of δύναμις ἐνεργητική used by Theodoret is a significant point, occurring in only in a few Christians. Normally theologians used δύναμις ἐνεργητική in two different senses: 1. the Logos of God. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 6.6.47.4. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 3.6.34. Didymus,

commPs 35-39, Cod. p. 252; *frPs(al)*, fr. 976. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 1, p. 327. 2. Human practical ability: Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio Catechetica*, 28. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 249.

Theodoret, *loc. cit.* Furthermore, Proclus employed the notion δύναμις ἐνεργητική in his discussion of the concept of time according to Plato. In *Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 3, p. 31: καὶ δύνανται ἐνεργητικῇ τῶν ποικίλων καὶ παντοδαπῶν κινήσεων. Once again, Proclus is under the influence of Didymus.

³ Cf. *COT*, pp. 119-164.

⁴ Cf. *Scholion XXII*: ἀρχὴν δὲ τῆς κτίσεως εἶπεν αὐτόν· οὐχ ὡς κτίσμα πρῶτον κτίσεως ἀρχὴ ἐστὶν αὐτῆς, ἀλλ' ὡς αἰτία τοῦ ὑπάρχειν αὐτὴν οἷα δημιουργός· ἀρχὴ γὰρ ποιημάτων ὁ ποιητής, τούτῃ τῆς κτίσεως ὁ κτίστης ἐστὶν αὐτῆς καὶ ἄρχων. *Scholion XXVI*: οὐ γὰρ κτίσμα τυγχάνει.

Athanasius, *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.192.33–35: Καὶ εἰ δι' αὐτοῦ κτίζει καὶ ποιεῖ, οὐκ ἔστι τῶν κτιζομένων καὶ ποιουμένων αὐτός· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τοῦ κτιζόντος Θεοῦ Λόγος ἐστίν.

Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, PG.77.1133.22–26: Γέννησις μὲν γάρ ἐστι, τὸ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ γεννῶντος προσάγεσθαι τὸ γεννώμενον, ὁμοιον κατ' οὐσίαν· κτίσις δὲ καὶ ποίησις, τὸ ἐξῶθεν, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ κτιζόντος καὶ ποιούντος γίνεσθαι τὸ κτιζόμενον καὶ ποιούμενον, ἀνόμοιον παντελῶς κατ' οὐσίαν. Save the last two words of this passage (viz. κατ' οὐσίαν), the section was copied word for word by John of Damascus in his *Expositio Fidei*, 8. There is a strong likelihood that this passage was authored by Cassian.

EN XXVIc: οὐσίωσις, κτίσις, καρδία καθαρὰ

This phraseology is attributed to Origen, but only in works filtered through the vocabulary of Didymus, probably by a Sabaite hand. Nevertheless, Athanasius used the same phraseology. In all probability, Didymus made much use of terms that Origen had used only casually at a couple of points.⁵

Origen, *frJohn* I: ἐν τῇ τούτων οὐσιώσει αὐτὸς ἦν κτίστης αὐτῶν . . . ἀρχὴ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸ εἶναι αἷτιος ὑπάρχων, ἀκολούθως ῥητέον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ πάντων οὐσιώσει . . . ὅτε δὲ ἐδημιούργησεν, ἐπεὶ μὴ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀποσταλεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς εἰς οὐσίαν ἔφερε τὰ πάντα. *selPs*, PG.12.1305.26–28: Ἡ μὲν γένεσις τὴν τῶν λογικῶν οὐσίωσιν δηλοῖ· ἡ δὲ κτίσις τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον μεταβολήν.

Cf. Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.165.18 speaking of 'substantialization' of 'creation' (οὐσιώσας τὴν κτίσιν). Likewise, *Contra Gentes*, 41.

This set of problems, as well such terms as οὐσίωσις, οὐσιῶν, is absent from Clement of Alexandria, and from any Christian or pagan author before him. There is a dubious passage ascribed to Hippolytus, about 'Christ who substantiated everything' (πάντα Χριστός οὐσιώσας), yet the text could be a much later one.⁶ This notion was put to use in order to rebut the Arian challenge.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 972: τὸ γὰρ τῆς κτίσεως ὄνομα οὐκ οὐσίωσιν ἀλλ' ἀλλοίωσιν ἢ μετασκευασμὸν σημαίνει. κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ σημαινόμενον καὶ τὸ Καρδίαν καθαρὰν κτίσον ἐν ἐμοί, ὁ θεός,⁷ λέλεκται· εἰ δὲ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πολλῶν τὸ σημαινόμενον, καὶ τὸ Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, οὐκ οὐσίωσιν σημαίνει τοῦ λέγοντος προσώπου· οὐ γὰρ καθάπαξ ἐκτίσθη, ἀλλ' εἰς ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν θεοῦ τῶν εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ· τὸ δὲ ἀρχὴν τινῶν κτισθῆναι σχέσιν ἀλλ' οὐκ οὐσίωσιν δηλοῖ. Ibid. fr. 886: κτίσας τοὺς δύο εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἐκ δύο ἓνα αὐτοὺς πεποίηκε· καὶ ἡ κτιζομένη δὲ καρδία καθαρὰ ἐξ οὗ καθαρὰ γεγένηται κτίζει δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐκτὸς τῆς πίστεως, ἵν' ἐν Χριστῷ καινὴ κτίσις γένωνται. Ibid. fr. 299: σημαίνει δὲ τὸ Ἐγενήθησαν τὴν οὐσίωσιν τῶν εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡγμένων· τὸ Ἐκτίσθησαν δὲ τὴν διακόσμησιν τὴν μετὰ τὴν οὐσίωσιν γεγεννημένην. εἰ δὲ εἰπόντος καὶ ἐντειλαμένου θεοῦ ἐγενήθη καὶ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα, ἐστὶν ὃ εἶπε καὶ ἐνετείλατο οὐκ ἄλλος παρὰ τὸν δημιουργικὸν λόγον· ἔστιν δὲ οὗτος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱός. Ibid. fr. 544 (referring to Ps. 50:12): σημειωτέον ὅτι ἡ ἔκτισεν φωνὴ οὐκ οὐσίωσιν σημαίνει, ἀλλὰ σχέσιν τινὰ ἐπιτεينوμένην οἷς ἂν παραγένηται.

Fragmenta in Proverbia, PG.39.1632: Ὅτι δὲ τὸ 'ἔκτισεν' οὐ δηλοῖ πάντως οὐσίωσιν, δηλοῖ λέγων ὁ Δαυίδ· 'Καρδίαν καθαρὰν κτίσον ἐν ἐμοί, ὁ Θεός.' Αἰτεῖ γὰρ οὐχ ὡς μὴ ἔχων λαβεῖν, ἀλλ' ὡς ῥυπώσας αὐτήν, ἀναλαβεῖν αὐθις κεκαθαρμένην. Καὶ Παῦλος δὲ λέγων τοὺς δύο κτίζεσθαι εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, οὐκ οὐσίωσιν ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἔνωσιν ἐξ ὁμονοίας δηλοῖ· ὥσπερ οἱ ἐρμηνεύσαντες Ἐκτίσατό με' ἐξέδωκαν.

Fragmenta in Epistolam ii ad Corinthios, p. 29 (comment. on 2 Cor. 5:17–19): κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ σημαινόμενον, κτίζει ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ σωτὴρ τοὺς δύο εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον. ἵν' οὖν τοῦτο ὑπαρχθῇ, τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ ὑπέβαλεν ἑαυτὸν κτισθῆναι λέγων· κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν εἰς ἔργα. οὐ δηλοῖ οὐσίωσιν τὸ κτισθῆναι ῥῆμα, ὡς ἐν ἄλλοις διὰ πλειόνων δέδεικται.

In Genesin, Cod. p. 59: Παῦλος μαρτυρεῖ προτρεπόμενός τινας προκόπτειν κατ' ἀρετὴν λέγων· Ἵνα γίνησθε κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος,

⁵ Cf. Origen, *Commentarii in Romanos* (III.5–V.7), p. 204: τοῦ ἡμᾶς οὐσιώσαντος καὶ μάλιστα λογικοὺς ποιήσαντος.

⁶ Pseudo-Hippolytus, *Adversus Beronem et Heliconem*, p. 325.

⁷ Psalm 50:12.

καίτοι ἤδη ὄντας οὕτω κατὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς οὐσιώσεως.

As for the expression κτισθῆναι καὶ εἶναι, the following are the only instances where these two verbs are used side by side. Both of them maintain the meaning they have in this Scholion.

Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 3.1.51: ὁ αἰὶ ὦν καὶ μηδὲν τοῦ κτισθῆναι πρὸς τὸ εἶναι δεόμενος.

Eriphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 7: εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἅμα οὐρανῷ καὶ γῇ καὶ ἄγγελοι ἐκτίσθησαν, οὐκ ἂν ἔλεγε τῷ Ἰωβ ὅτι ‘ὅτε ἐγενήθησαν ἄστρα, ἦνεσάν με πάντες ἄγγελοί μου φωνῇ.’ τὸ οὖν πρὸ ἐωσφόρου, ἵνα εἴπῃ πρὸ τοῦ εἶναι τι καὶ κτισθῆναι. ἦν γὰρ αἰεὶ ὁ Λόγος σὺν Πατρί· ‘δι’ αὐτοῦ γὰρ πάντα γέγονε, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν.’

EN XXVIId: κτίζεται ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς
(‘created unto good works’)

This is the language of Eph. 2:10, which is quoted by authors mostly relevant to the phraseology and outlook of the Scholia. Of the Cappadocians, only Basil is represented as quoting this,⁸ but I believe that of the works where it appears not a single one is actually his own. Likewise, the works that quote this passage and are ascribed to Athanasius and Gregory of Nyssa are spurious.⁹ There is occasional usage by Eusebius,¹⁰ Ephraem Syrus,¹¹ Cyril of Jerusalem,¹² and John Chrysostom.¹³ Authors quoting this passage, such as Pseudo-Macarius,¹⁴ Severianus of Gabala,¹⁵ Apollinaris,¹⁶ and Cyril of Alexandria,¹⁷ deserve special mention. Didymus is also one of the few authors quoting this Pauline statement.¹⁸ What is unique about him is that he does not quote it in passing, as all others do, but he makes an extensive analysis, which is in essence the same as the one in this Scholion.

Didymus, *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 179: διαφέρει ποίημα κτίσματος; διαφέρει. οὐσίωσιν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος σημαίνει τὸ ποιεῖν, οὐ διατύπωσιν δέ· τινὰ δὲ καὶ διακόσμησιν τοῦ γενομένου τὸ τῆς κτίσεως ὄνομα δηλοῖ. τὸ τῆς κτίσεως ὄνομα φθάνει καὶ ἐπὶ ἀψύχων· ‘ποιῶν εἰρήνην καὶ κτίζων κακά’. καὶ κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον μὲν τοῦτο λέγομεν . . . ‘αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν ποίημα, κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς’. ἐπὶ τοῦ ποιήματος οὐκ εἶρηκεν τὸ ‘ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς’, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τῷ εἶναι. κτίζονται δὲ ‘ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς’, ἵνα ἀγαθὰ ἔργα ποιῶσιν. . . ἵνα ἡ πλάσις ἀπὸ τῆς ποιότητος ᾗ; οὕτως ὡς εἰδὸς ἐστὶν καρδίας γὰρ ἡ οὐσία ἐπλάσθη. ἡ δὲ καρδία νοῦς ἐστὶν. τὸ δὲ τῆς κτίσεως ὄνομα παρατείνει καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν.

EN XXVIe: πρὸ τούτου ὦν θεοῦ ποίημα

The expression in the Scholion κτίζεται γὰρ τις ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, πρὸ τούτου ὦν θεοῦ ποίημα, suggests that *before* becoming a κτίσμα, one is a ποίημα, that is, a *logos* made by God. The distinction had been suggested by Philo,¹⁹ if not explicitly, and it was Origen who emphasized it.²⁰ Didymus made this a recurrent theme. There is a substantial difference, however. Unlike the Platonizing Didymus, who made the primeval man identical with ‘the soul’, never did Origen identify this originally created *logos* (that is, human nature) with the human soul.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 972 (quoted on p. 314). *commZacch*, 4.181: Ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ συνθέτου τοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, λέγει· ‘Αἱ χεῖρές σου ἐποίησάν με καὶ ἐπλάσαν με’. πλασθέντος τοῦ σώματος, ποιηθείσης τῆς ψυχῆς, ἦντινα πνεῦμα καλουμένην ἐπλάσεν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, μετασχοῦσαν ἐκ τῆς συνθέσεως

⁸ Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae*, 296.1; 318.1; *Regulae Fusius Tractatae*, PG.31.1045.49; *Sermones de Moribus*, PG.32.1153.30.

⁹ Pseudo-Athanasius, *Homilia de Passione et Cruce Domini*, PG.28.240.7; *De Incarnatione Contra Apollinarium*, PG.26.1128.8. Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa, *De Paradiso*, p. 83.

¹⁰ Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.660.42.

¹¹ Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo Asceticus*, p. 174.

¹² Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Illuminandum*, PG.33.409.28.

¹³ John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Ephesios*, PG.62.34.8 and 17.

¹⁴ Pseudo-Macarius, *Epistula Magna*, p. 284.

¹⁵ Severianus of Gabala, *Fragmenta in Epistolam ad Ephesios*, p. 308, in *Catena in Epistolam ad Ephesios*, p. 142.

¹⁶ Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Fragmenta in Matthaum*, Fr. 69.

¹⁷ Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 644; *Ad Tiberium Diaconum*, p. 590; *De Adoratione*, PG.68.997.50; *expPs*, PG.69.772.36; *Explanatio in Lucam*, PG.72.816.23.

¹⁸ Didymus, *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 179; *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 277.

¹⁹ Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*, 1.30: ὅτι θεὸς εἰς ἐστὶ καὶ κτίστης καὶ ποιητὴς τῶν ὄλων. *ibid.* 1.294: ὁ τῶν ὄλων κτίστης καὶ ποιητὴς.

²⁰ Origen, *Dial.* 15: Ὁ ἀνθρώπος τοίνυν κτιζόμενος πρότερον μὲν ἐκτίσθη ὁ ‘κατ’ εἰκόνα’, οὗ ὕλη οὐχ εὐρίσκεται· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐξ ὕλης ἐστὶν ὁ ‘κατ’ εἰκόνα’. *commJohn*, XX.22.182: τοῦ ἀρχὴν αὐτὸν εἶναι οὔτε πλάσματος οὔτε ποιήματος, ἀλλὰ πλάσματος θεοῦ.

αἰσθητικῆς δυνάμεως. *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 273: εὖ δὲ τὸ ‘αἱ χεῖρές σου ἐποίησάν με καὶ ἔπλασάν με’, ἵνα τὸ μὲν ‘ἐποίησαν’ ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς λαμβάνηται, τὸ δὲ ‘ἔπλασαν’ ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος. *commJob*, PG.39.1145.1–3: Διαφέρει δὲ τό, ἔπλασας, τοῦ, ἐποίησας. Πέπλασται μὲν γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἐξ ὑποκειμένης τῆς γῆς, ἥτοι τῆς γυναικός· πεποιήται δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ μὴ προὑποκειμένου τινός. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 179: διαφέρει ποίημα κτίσματος; διαφέρει. οὐσίωσιν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος σημαίνει τὸ ποιεῖν, οὐ διατύπωσιν δέ. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 177: διαστέλλεται ἐν τῇ γραφῇ τὸ ποιεῖν πρὸς τὸ πλάττειν· τὸν ‘κατ’ εἰκόνα’ γὰρ ‘καὶ ὁμοίωσιν’ ἑαυτοῦ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν ἄνθρωπον, ἔπλασεν δὲ τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ‘χοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἄνθρωπον’. καὶ ὁ Ἰωβ γοῦν ἀμφοτέρω ταῦτα λέγει· ‘αἱ χεῖρές σου ἔπλασάν με καὶ ἐποίησάν με.’ εἰ κυρίως ταύτην τὴν λέξιν λέγει, γίνεται ἂν ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, πλάττεται δὲ ὁ ἔξω. Ibid. Cod. p. 178: ὁ ‘κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν’ θεοῦ γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος οὐκ εἴρηται πεπλάσθαι, ἀλλὰ πεποιήσθαι. ὁ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πηλοῦ καὶ τῆς ὕλης γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος λέγεται πλάσμα θεοῦ εἶναι· ‘μνήσθητι ὅτι πηλὸν με ἔπλασας’. καὶ ἐπὶ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν δραστηρίων δυνάμεων τοῦ θεοῦ εἴρηται· ‘αἱ χεῖρές σου ἔπλασάν με καὶ ἐποίησάν με.’

EN XXVI: ἐκτίσατο or ἐκτίσατο?

The text of the Scholion should be restored according to Deut. 32:6. Nevertheless, C. H. Turner²¹ was wrong in arguing that ἐκτίσατο has nothing to do with κτίζειν.

There is a story to be told about this, the conclusion of which will be that the orthography at this particular point should be ἐκτίσατο, and, if the author of the Scholion had intended ἐκτίσατο, the meaning could be ‘created’. In that case, he would have drawn on Deut. 32:6 only partially: ἐκτίσατο should be an

allusion to biblical instances suggesting man being a creature by God, such as Deut. 4:32, or indeed Psalm 88:48; Wisdom of Solomon 2:23; Ecclesiasticus 17:1; 33:10; 49:16.

A passage ascribed to Didymus makes this clear.²² Centuries later, Michael Psellus explained that this aorist ἐκτίσατο was an innovation, which identified active and middle voices of the verb: ‘if a Hebrew wished to express this past tense, he would have opted for ἐκτίσατο rather than ἐκτισεν’ (‘ἐκτίσατο’ ἂν εἶπη ἢ ‘ἐκτισεν’). This is why later generations ‘changed the word’ (οὕτως γὰρ οἱ μεταγενέστεροι τὴν λέξιν μετωνομάκασιν) from the traditional aorist ἐκτισεν to the neologism ἐκτίσατο.²³ This is probably why there is at least one instance where Deut. 32:6 is rendered with the verb ἐκτίσατό (created) instead of ἐκτίσατο.²⁴

Michael Psellus explained that by κτίσις one should not feel impelled to mean ‘created’ invariably: this could also mean ‘giving birth to’ (οὕτως δεῖ καὶ τὴν κτίσιν μὴ πικρῶς ἐξετάζειν, ἀλλὰ παραλαμβάνειν ἀντὶ τῆς γεννήσεως). Here is how his text goes:

Michael Psellus, *Theologica*, Opusculum 10: Δεύτερον δὲ ἐκεῖνο ἂν εἴποιμι, ὅτι οἱ μεταμείβοντες πρὸς τὸν Ἑλληνισμὸν τὴν Ἑβραϊδα διάλεκτον, ἐκεῖνοι γεγόνασιν αἵτιοι τῆς τοιαύτης φωνῆς· ὁ γὰρ Ἑβραῖος, εἴ γε βούλοιτο τὴν ἑαυτοῦ λέξιν Ἑλληνικώτερον . . . εἰπεῖν, ‘ἐκτίσατο’ ἂν εἶπη ἢ ‘ἐκτισεν’· οὕτως γὰρ οἱ μεταγενέστεροι τὴν λέξιν μετωνομάκασιν· ‘κύριος γὰρ ἐκτίσατό με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ’· ὥσπερ δὴ ἔχει καὶ τὸ ‘ἐκτισάμην ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ’. οὐκ ἐμέλησε δὲ τοῖς πρώην τῆς ἀκριβείας, ὅτι μηδὲ φήθησαν τοιοῦτόν τι τοὺς πολλοὺς ὑπολήψεσθαι· ὅθεν ἢ περὶ τὴν λέξιν πολυπραγμοσύνη τὴν τοῦ ἐξελληνισμοῦ εὔρεν ἀκρίβειαν.

In any event, the aorist of κτίζειν in the middle voice, third-person singular, is ἐκτίσατο, which

²¹ C. H. Turner (above p. 87, n. 626) p. 396.

²² Didymus, *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.39.1632.26–28: τοὺς δύο κτίζεσθαι εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, οὐκ οὐσίωσιν ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ’ ἕνωσιν ἐξ ὁμονοίας δηλοῖ· ὥσπερ οἱ ἐρμηνεύσαντες ‘Ἐκτίσατό με’ ἐξέδωκαν.

²³ See quotation below.

²⁴ *Doctrina Patrum*, p. 320: ‘Ὅτι πατὴρ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἐν τῇ θεῇ γραφῇ ὀνομάζεται. Μωυσέως· ‘Οὐκ αὐτὸς οὐτός σου πατὴρ ἐκτίσατό σε καὶ ἐποίησέ σε καὶ ἔπλασέ σε’;

appears in a vast number of authors in a literal sense, namely, ‘built’.²⁵

EN XXVIg: Restoring the meaning

A. Harnack raised the question ‘desunt nonnulla?’ (‘are there some words missing?’). Once the thought of the Scholion is grasped, this point can be plausibly explained. The ideas involved are the following: 1. The Father created everything through the Son. 2. The world came into being out of nothing by God’s will. 3. The Son is not a creature, nor was he born out of God’s will. The meaning of the text (there is no lacuna) relates to the Father creating through the Son, which is an idea as old as Athanasius. *De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi*, 7.1 9; *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26: 105.14; 236.1; 340.41; 349.16–17; 421.13; *Ad Serapionem de Spiritu Sancto*, PG.26: 601.5; 625.18–20; *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.584.2. Pseudo-Athanasius, *Contra Macedonianos*, PG.28: 1309.53; 1328.21; 1129.22; 1209.38; 1212.7. *De Sancta Trinitate*, PG.28: 1240.28–32. *Sermo Major De Fide*, fr. 65. Marcellus of Ancyra, *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, p. 1001. Also, Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 2.1–7)*, 7.3,16.

Particular attention should be paid to the anti-Arian text of [Scholion XXVI](#), which reads thus: ‘one should not regard the being of the Saviour as dependent upon the will of the Father. For he [sc. the Saviour] is not a creature.’ The Scholion runs parallel to the following passages (italics are mine).

Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 37: ὅτι τοῦτ’ ἐποίησεν ὁ Υἱὸς ὅπερ ὁ Πατὴρ ὑποστήναι ἠθέλησεν.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1061: Ἔστι δὲ καὶ αἰτία πᾶσι τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἐπεὶ περ ὅσα ἠθέλησεν ἐποίησεν, ἄλλος ὢν παρὰ πάντα· διὸ οὐ

περιέχεται ὑπὸ πάντων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔξω πάντων καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχει κατὰ τὸν τῆς δημιουργίας καὶ προνοίας λόγον.²⁶ οὕτω γὰρ πληροὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. Εἰ δὲ πάντες οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἢ τε γῆ καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ, θελήσει θεοῦ εἰς οὐσίαν ἦλθεν, ἀσεβῶς σφόδρα διανοοῦμενοί τινες ἐξάπτουσι τὴν ὑπαρξιν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς θελήσεως, ἕνα ποιοῦντες αὐτὸν τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς θελήσει πατὴρ οὐσιωμένων· ἀλλὰ ἀκουέτωσαν οἱ δυσσεβεῖς ὡς τὴν κτίσιν μόνην ἐξήρησε τῆς βουλήσεως τοῦ θεοῦ· καταλλήλως γὰρ ἔχει τὸν ποιητὴν ἃ βούλεται δημιουργεῖν· ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Ἰάκωβος συνφδᾷ γράφων, Βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς, ἔφη λόγῳ θεοῦ, λόγῳ ἀληθείας εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἀπαρχὴν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων²⁷ καὶ ποιημάτων ἢ θέλησις τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσακτική. οὐ κτίσμα δὲ οὐδὲ ποίημα ὁ υἱός, οὐσίας ἀλλ’ οὐ βουλήσεως ἐστὶ γέννημα.

Origen, *commEph*, 1: ἐπιστήσεις δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ θελήματος τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰ δύνатаι τάσσεσθαι ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ· ἴν’ ὥσπερ ἐστὶ Θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία, οὕτως ἢ καὶ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, Θεοῦ ὑπόστασιν ἔχον αὐτόν.

EN XXVIh: σημειωτέον ὡς

The expression recurs in Didymus and is characteristic of him.

Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 39: σημειωτέον, ὡς οὐχ οὕτως νῦν ὁ διάβολος ἀποκρίνεται. *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 40: σημειωτέον, ὡς ἐν τοῖς φθάσασιν εἴρηται. *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 270: σημειωτέον, ὡς καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ, ὅτι πολύσημόν ἐστιν ὁ βίος ὄνομα. *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 43: Σημειωτέον ὡς οὐ λέγει περὶ τῶν κητῶν. *Ibid.* Cod. p. 138: Σημειωτέον ὡς οὐκ εἶπεν.

²⁵ Josephus, *Antiquitas Judaica*, 20.68: καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ πρότερον Μακεδόνες ἐκτίσαντο πόλιν Ἀντιόχειαν. Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2289: Τοιαύτην γὰρ ὑμεῖς οἰκοῦντες, τὸ μακάριον οὐκ ἐκτίσασθε, περὶ τὸν δόντα γεγονότες ἀγνώμονες. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Occursum Domini*, PG.77.1048.26–27: Ὡς ψευδῇ ἐκτίσαντο οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν εἰδῶλα, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς ὠφέλιμον. *In Isaiam*, PG.70.925.9: Ἐκτίσάμην γάρ, φησιν, οὐρανοῦς, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς. Suda, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter kappa, entry 2240: ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκτῆς, ἀφ’ ἧς ἡρπάγη, ναὸν ἐκτίσατο. *Ibid.* Alphabetic letter alpha, entry 1373, and *ibid.* Alphabetic letter delta, entry 1567, and *ibid.* Alphabetic letter eta, entry 511: ἐκ βόλου διψάδος ἐκτίσάμην. Michael Psellus, *Theologica*, *Opusculum* 48: ἡμῶν φύσιν καὶ οἶον παλαιωθεῖσαν καὶ ἀφανισθεῖσαν

ἀνεκτίσατο· κτίσιν γὰρ ἐνταῦθα τὴν ἀνάκτισιν οἰητέον, ἡγουν δευτέραν ἀναγέννησιν καὶ ἀνάπλασιν, ἥτις δὴ διὰ τε τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος. *Scholia in Euripidem*, (on *Phoenissae*, verse 683) τὸ δὲ ἐκτίσαντο ἀντὶ τοῦ ᾠκησαν. *Scholia in Nicandrum* (on *Alexipharmaca*, verse 182) Scholion 448e: τὸ δὲ ἐκτίσαντο ἀντὶ τοῦ κατεσκευάσαν. *Scholia in Pindarum*, scholion 70g(comm. on *Olympia*, ode 10, line 25): ἐκτίσαντο. ἡγουν ἐκ λίθων γεννηθέντα. *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos* (Athanasius against the Arians), p. 320: ὅταν ἐγχειρίσῃ αὐτῷ τὴν οἰκουμένην, τότε γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐκτίσατο πᾶσαν, ὅτε καὶ ἐγνώσθη. Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter alpha, p. 220: Ἀνεκτίσατο. ἀνέπλασεν.

²⁶ Cf. this expression in [Scholion XXVII](#).

²⁷ James, 1:18.

Casual usage occurs only in the following: Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.10. Porphyry, *Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem Pertinentium Reliquiae*, 10.67. Eustathius of Thessaloniki took up the wording much later.

A catena-fragment attests that Theodoret also used this idiom in his commentary on 1 Kings. *Catena in Acta*, p. 220: Σημειωτέον ὡς οὐδαμῶς αὐτολέξει ταῦτα τὰ ῥήτὰ κεῖνται ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῶν Βασιλειῶν. However, it was a catenist's hand that wrote this.

EN XXVII: ἐξάπτειν

The verb ἐξάπτειν has various meanings. In the metaphorical sense, which is used in the present Scholion (as well as at one more point of Didymus' work),²⁸ it means 'to consider, or to regard something as dependent upon something or someone'. The verb, both in active and passive voice (ἐξάπτειν, ἐξάπτεσθαι) is used both in this metaphorical ('to consider or regard something as dependent upon something or someone') and literal sense ('to set fire to').

The footnoted parallel passage of Didymus attests to his presence in this Scholion. In the foregoing quotation (fr. 1061, on p. 317), Didymus uses the verb ἐξάπτειν (ἐξάπτουσι) as a synonym to ἐξαρτᾶν (ἐξήρτησε), which is indeed accurate. Nevertheless, he also uses the verb ἐξάπτειν in the sense of 'setting fire to',²⁹ along with its figurative sense 'to kindle'.³⁰

The present Scholion presents the sole use of the

verbal-adjective ἐξάπτειν. Since Didymus used ἐξάπτειν in the sense of this Scholion (which is absent from Origen's extant writings), it follows that the Scholion was written by Cassian drawing on Didymus.

The literal usage of the verb ἐξάπτειν ('to set fire to') is only a rare exception in literature. Authors such as Josephus, Galen, Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, and John Philoponus used this in either sense, that of 'setting fire to' or 'aggravate' or 'irritate' (anger, or any passion), or else 'blaze up' (in anger), or 'be upset'. One instance of the verb used by Philo metaphorically is only an exception.³¹ No doubt the most common usage is the literal one, that is, 'set fire to' or 'kindle'. Hippolytus, Origen, and Clement of Alexandria employed the verb in the passive voice, and in its literal sense.³²

Intellectuals who used the sense found in this Scholion are Plutarch,³³ Eusebius,³⁴ Gregory of Nyssa,³⁵ Theodoret,³⁶ and later Proclus,³⁷ in whom the foregoing rare meanings recur.

Beyond those remarks, Cassian's (Pseudo-Didymus') *De Trinitate* informs us that the expression was in fact one used by Arianist polemical literature, which is quoted therein. *De Trinitate* (lib. 1), 9.16: ἦντε δοθῇ αὐτοῖς τὸ θέλων ἐγέννησεν ἐπάγουσιν· ἄρα ἡ γέννησις τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐξῆπται τῆς πατρικῆς θελήσεως, δημιουργικῶς ὑπαρξιν αὐτῷ παρεχούσης'. This passage only confirms that Cassian employed Didymus' rare sense of the verb ἐξάπτειν also in his *De Trinitate* along with the present Scholion.

²⁸ Didymus, *commJob* (7.20c11), Cod. p. 292: πολλοὶ γὰρ τῶν ἀμαρτανόντων λόγους ἐκ λόγων ἐξάπτοντες οἶονται κρύπτειν τὰ ἀμαρτήματα τῇ πιθανότητι τῶν λόγων.

²⁹ Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.289: λύχνου ἐξαπτομένου. *frPs(al)*, fr. 390: ἐξαπτομένου πυρός. Ibid. fr. 1074: ἐξάπτουσι πῦρ.

³⁰ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1133: τὸ οὕτως πεπυρωμένον λόγιον . . . ἐξάπτεται τὴν καρδίαν.

³¹ Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*, 4.138: ἡ γὰρ χεὶρ πράξεως σύμβολον, ἥς ἐξάπτειν καὶ ἐξαρτᾶν τὰ δίκαια προστάττει.

³² Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.6.26.2; *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 3.48.4; *Fragmenta*, 32. Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, 4.31.2. Origen, *Cels*, VI.5.

³³ Plutarch, *Numa*, 9.7: ἐξάπτουσι δὲ μάλιστα τοῖς σκαφεῖσι, ἃ κατασκευάζεται. *Aetia Romana et Graeca*, 278F7: ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἀπόρρησιν ἐξάπτουσι δεισιδαιμονίας. *De Defectu Oraculorum*, 433E3: ἐξάπτει γὰρ καὶ προάγεται καὶ συνεξορμᾷ τῆς αἰσθήσεως τὴν ὁρατικὴν δύναμιν οὗτος ὡς τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν μαντικὴν ἐκεῖνος.

³⁴ Eusebius, *PE*, 3.4.3: καὶ μόνοις τοῖς ἀστροῖς τὴν τῶν ὄλων ἀνετίθεσαν αἰτίαν, τὰ πάντα εἰμαρμένης ἐξάπτοντες. *Vita Constantini*, 4.19.1: μηδ' ἄλκῃ σωμάτων τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἐξάπτειν ἐλπίδας. *Laudatio Constantini*, 9.9: μηδ' ἄλκῃ σωμάτων τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐξάπτειν.

³⁵ Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 3.5.31: τὰ πάντα μὲν τῆς ποιητικῆς ἐξάπτων αἰτίας. In *Basilium Fratrem*, 11: καὶ πάντα τὰ μυστήρια τὰ προφητικά τοῦ τοιοῦτου ἐξάπτων χαρίσματος. *Dialogus de Anima Et Resurrectione*, PG.46.117.31–32: Καὶ μάτην τῆς θείας δυνάμεως οἱ τοιοῦτοι τὰ ὄντα ἐξάπτουσιν. *Contra Fatum*, p. 32: ἀλλὰ διὰ τίνος ἐξάπτων ἀνάγκης τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ζωὴν. Ibid. p. 33: πάντα τῆς αἰτίας ἐκεῖνης ἐξάπτων. Ibid. p. 40: τῆς ἐκεῖνου δυνάμεως ἐξάπτεις τὴν τῶν ὄντων σύστασιν τε καὶ διοίκησιν.

³⁶ Theodoret, *intDan*, PG.81.1292.9: τὰ δὲ σφῶν αὐτῶν αἰτήματα τῆς πάντα ἐφορώσεως προμηθείας ἐξάπτοντες.

³⁷ Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 1, p. 98: καὶ τῶν κακῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ γεγονότων τῆς δημιουργικῆς ἐξάπτειν προσήκει μονάδος. Ibid. v. 1, p. 146: τὸ τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπηρετεῖν καὶ τῆς τῶν κρειττόνων βουλήσεως ἐξάπτειν ἐαυτόν. Cf. Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 9, p. 617: τοῦτου γὰρ καὶ ἡ μονὰς τῆς τριάδος τῶν κόσμων ἐξάπτοιο ὡς κόσμος εἷς, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς τόπος τῶν κόσμων. Cf. Hermias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 64: πάσας ἐαυτῶν τὰς ἐνεργείας οἱ σπουδαῖοι τῆς προνοίας ἐξάπτουσιν.

EN XXVIj: The Son is not a ‘creature’

The expression κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα was a traditional one, used by the champions of the anti-heretical struggle during the Arian controversy, yet it originated with the vocabulary of Eunomius. Didymus used this, too,³⁸ and it was he who made the distinction between κτίσμα and ποίημα, which appears also in this

Scholion. The difference is that the former (κτίσμα) is the product of Actual creation, whereas the latter (ποίημα) denotes the Providential creation,³⁹ and Didymus made the distinction following Origen.⁴⁰

This Scholion has unique characteristics tallying with Didymus alone, which means that this is a plain quotation from his Commentary on the Apocalypse.

³⁸ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 1061: οὐ κτίσμα δὲ οὐδὲ ποίημα ὁ υἱός, οὐσίας ἀλλ’ οὐ βουλήσεώς ἐστι γέννημα. *commZacch*, 1.241: καὶ ἐκ τῆς λέξεως ταύτης ἀπατῶσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ προηπατημένοι, κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα λέγοντες εἶναι τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Υἱόν.

³⁹ Cf. *COT*, chapters 2–4.

⁴⁰ Cf. Didymus, *commJob*, PG.39.1145.1–3 and *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 178, both quoted in [EN XXVIe](#), p. 316.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXVII

EN XXVIIa: ὁ πᾶς λόγος τῆς προνοίας
(‘the entire teaching about providence’)

The idea that ‘providence’ (πρόνοια) is the force responsible for the ‘government’ (διοίκησις) of the world is a Christian borrowing from Stoicism,¹ which was treated by Origen, Gregory of Nazianzus,² and Didymus. This is also used in the Pseudo-Clementine writings.³ At a particular point where the ‘teaching about providence’ is discussed,⁴ one should notice that Didymus appears to copy Eusebius⁵ commenting on Psalm 103:13. In fact, however, this is actually an ascription to Didymus by later catenists. By the same token, both the idea and vocabulary occur in passages ascribed to Origen, yet the abundance of references is perhaps partially due to those (Didymus,⁶ Evagrius⁷) who inserted a specific formulations into excerpts from his work.⁸

EN XXVIIb: ἡδέα καὶ ἀηδῆ
(‘things either pleasant or unpleasant’)

The formula originates in Hellenistic literature. The first-century BC Alexandrian grammarian Philoxenus refers to the ancients who made a distinction between ἡδέα καὶ τερπνὰ, which are things ‘pleasant’ and ‘warm’ (ἀπὸ τῶν θερμῶν), distinguished from those

that are ἀηδῆ καὶ λυπηρά (‘cool’ and ‘depressing’, ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχρῶν).⁹ Galen classified all things that fall within the scope of the five senses into ἡδέα and ἀηδῆ,¹⁰ as Alexander of Aphrodisias also did.¹¹ Sextus Empiricus employed the same distinction, too.¹²

A passage of Eusebius where this distinction is used is in fact a quotation from the second-century philosopher Aristocles of Messene (Sicily).¹³ However, a catena-fragment represents Eusebius as having used this distinction on his own.¹⁴ Since we come upon the vocabulary used at this point of the Scholion,¹⁵ this must have been the passage that Cassian had in mind while writing this comment, even though this is actually a borrowing by Didymus from Eusebius. Otherwise, Christian usage is rare and casual.¹⁶

These considerations leave us with Didymus alone as the sole author, pagan or Christian, who constantly uses this idea and phraseology, thus revealing himself as the source of this Scholion.

Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 60: λέγουσιν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀηδῆ κακά, ἐπεὶ τὰ ἡδέα οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν εἶναι ἀγαθὰ. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 188: ὁ εὐχαριστῶν θεῷ οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡδέσιν μόνοις τοῦτο ποιεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀηδέσιν. *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 320: πολλοὶ πολλὰκις καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἡδέων ἐπιλανθάνονται τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐ μόνον ἐκ τῶν ἀηδῶν. Ibid. Cod. p. 322: κατὰ πάντας δὲ τοὺς τρόπους τῆς

¹ Cf. *SVF*, I.124.32; II.264.15; II.273.1; II.297.9; III.4.4 and 7; III.17.7; III.81.21.

² Gregory of Nazianzus, *De Moderatione in Disputando Servanda*, PG.36.205.29–31: καὶ πάντα εἰς ὅσα ὁ δημιουργικὸς λόγος καταμερίζεται, καὶ λόγους προνοίας καὶ διοικήσεως.

³ *Pseudo-Clementine*, Section 124 and Pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Homiliae*, Homily 15.4: ἐγὼ δὲ προνοία θεοῦ τὰ πάντα διοικεῖσθαι ἐκ τῶν περὶ σε γινομένων καὶ προνοίας εἶναι λέγω.

⁴ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 995 and Eusebius alike, *commPs*, PG.23.1273.36–37: καὶ ὁ λόγος δὲ ὁ περὶ τῶν ἔργων τῆς δημιουργίας καὶ προνοίας αὐτοῦ νοηθεὶς οἷα καρπὸς ἔργων θεοῦ τυγχάνων χορτάσει τὴν γῆν, φημὶ δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διατρίβοντας ἀνθρώπους.

⁵ Eusebius, *PE*, 6.6.22: οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τούτων τὸ αἴτιον οὐ τις ἄλογος ἀναδέξεται εἰμαρμένη, λόγος δὲ πάλιν ἄλλος τῆς τῶν ὄλων προνοίας ἀπηρητημένος. *Constantini Oratio ad Coetum Sanctorum*, 6.7: ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ὁ λόγος τῆς διατάξεως ἔργων προνοίας.

⁶ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 924: Πάσης τῆς γῆς περιδραττόμενος ὁ λόγος κατὰ τὸν τῆς προνοίας λόγον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἔχει τὰ λεγόμενα τῆς γῆς πέρατα.

⁷ Cf. Evagrius, *Ad Monachos*, 132; *Expositio in Proverbia*, pp. 87; 95.

⁸ Cf. Origen, *Homiliae in Job*, p. 363: ἀλλ’ ὅτι πάντα ἐν μέτρῳ διοικεῖ τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς τῆς αὐτοῦ προνοίας λόγοις. *frJohn*, L: ὑπὸ χεῖρα αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα τυγχάνει κατὰ τὸν τῆς δημιουργίας καὶ προνοίας λόγον. *Cels*, I.20; III.38; VII.7; *Philocalia*, 2.4; 18.2; 19.1. *commEph*, 14. *frPs*, 60, 7–8; 61, 13; 100, 2; 106, 21–22; 118, 151; 138, 14–16; *selPs*, PG.12: 1228.42; 1448.1; 1528.17–21; 1557.33; 1624.41; 1653.32; 1661.42–45; *excPs*, PG.17.108.27; *exProv*, PG.17: 161.25; 197.19–20; 205.50.

⁹ Philoxenus of Alexandria, *Fragmenta*, fr. 321. This text was also used in a lemma: *Etymologicum Gudianum*, p. 513 and *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 731.

¹⁰ Galen, commentaria in *Hippocratis Epidemiarum*, v. 17b, p. 140.

¹¹ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Librum de Sensu Commentarium*, p. 54.

¹² Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhoniae Hypotyposes*, 1.58; 2.55.

¹³ Eusebius, *PE*, 14.21.6 (Aristocles of Messene, *Fragmenta*, fr. 8).

¹⁴ Eusebius in *Catena Palestinae*, biblical verse 20, section d.

¹⁵ Cf. *ibid.* Τῆς σῆς καθόλου προνοίας καὶ διοικήσεως, ὁ Κύριε.

¹⁶ Only in Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae Fusius Tractatae*, PG.31.1168.24. John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Romanos Commentarium*, PG.60.472.44.

αἰχμαλωσίας τοῦτο ἔλεγον· ἐν ἀηδέσιν πολλοῖς . . . καὶ σοφοὶ ὄντες ἐν ἀμφοτέροις ἡδέσιν καὶ ἀηδέσιν, καὶ οὐκ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν λήθη θεοῦ ἐκ τούτου. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1092: συμβήσεται γὰρ ἐκ τούτου σωφρόνως καὶ γενναίως πάντα φέρειν, οὐ μόνον τὰ ἡδέα ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐπίπονα καὶ ἀηδῆ. *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 82: οὐδὲν οὖν ἐστὶν περιττὸν ἐν τοῖς ἀδιαφόροις. μόνον τὸ ἀγαθὸν περιττὸν τι περιποιεῖ τῷ ἔχοντι. ποιεῖ δὲ αὐτὸν κατεξάνιστασθαι τούτων, μὴ καταδύεσθαι, ἐάν τι ἀηδές. μία γοῦν τῶν ἀρετῶν ἡ λεγομένη μεγαλοψυχία ἕξις ἐστίν, καθ’ ἣν δυνατόν ἐστὶν καὶ ἀηδῆ καὶ ἡδέα ὁμοίως φέρειν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀτιμίαν καὶ νίκην καὶ ἥτταν. *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 274: οὐχ ὅτι καιρὸς ἡδέων ἐστίν, εὐλογῶ αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ κἂν ἐπίπονα καὶ ἀηδῆ ὑπάρξη, πάλιν εὐλογῶ εὐχαριστῶν εἰδὼς ὅτι ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἐμῆς τοῦτο γίνεται. *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 332: ὁ σοφὸς οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡδέσιν μόνοις χαίρει, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀηδέσιν γενναίως αὐτὰ φέρων.

EN XXVIIc: ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν

Origen is the second author known to quote this passage of Revelation¹⁷ after Hippolytus had done so. He used this in order to illustrate his theory of the ‘eternal gospel’ and the secret truths lying concealed behind the scriptural letter.¹⁸ So did Didymus, Gregory of Nyssa,¹⁹ and Epiphanius of Salamis.²⁰

Origen, *commJohn*, V.6.1 (*Philocalia*. 5.5): Τί δὲ καὶ τὸ βιβλίον ἐωρᾶσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου γεγραμμένον ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν, καὶ κατεσφραγισμένον, ὅπερ οὐδεὶς ἡδύνατο ἀναγνῶναι καὶ λῦσαι τὰς σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, ἡ ρίζα Δαβὶδ ὁ ἔχων τὴν κλεῖν τοῦ Δαβὶδ, καὶ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδεὶς κλείσει καὶ κλείων καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀνοίξει; Ἡ γὰρ πᾶσα γραφὴ ἐστὶν ἡ δηλούμενη διὰ τῆς βίβλου, ἔμπροσθεν μὲν γεγραμμένη διὰ τὴν πρόχειρον αὐτῆς ἐκδοχὴν,

ὀπισθεν δὲ διὰ τὴν ἀνακεχωρηκυῖαν καὶ πνευματικὴν.

commJohn, V.7.1 (*Philocalia*. 5.6): Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ ἐσθίων Ἰωάννης μίαν κεφαλίδα, ἐν ἣ γέγραπται ‘τὰ ὀπισθεν καὶ τὰ ἔμπροσθεν’, τὴν πᾶσαν νενόηκε γραφὴν ὡς βιβλὸν μίαν, ἡδίστην κατὰ τὰς ἀρχὰς νοουμένην, ὅτε τις αὐτὴν μασᾶται, πικρὰν δὲ τῇ ἐκάστου τῶν ἐγνωκότων συναισθήσει τῇ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἀναφαινομένην.

Philocalia, 2.1: Καὶ εἶδον ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον βιβλίον γεγραμμένον ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν, κατεσφραγισμένον σφραγῖσιν ἑπτὰ.

However, in excerpts from his Commentary on Psalms, the text ἔσωθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν is quoted from Revelation.²¹ Whereas Origen reads ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν,²² the author of the Scholion has it ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν, which happens to be the foregoing text of *Philocalia*, 2.1, which deviates from the rest of Origen’s quotations. This can only suggest that the second chapter of his anthology was emended by other hands. This ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν is also the quotation by both Hippolytus²³ and Gregory of Nyssa.²⁴ Didymus rendered Ezekiel 2:8–10 ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν, and quite plausibly this is how he read the Revelation text, which is also the quotation in the Scholion text. It is not likely that Origen used different manuscripts of Revelation. Rather, the text of *Philocalia* has reached us via another hand.

Didymus, *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 286: ‘τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον γέγραπται ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν.’ κατὰ τὰ πνευματικὰ καὶ νοητὰ ἔσω γέγραπται, κατὰ τὰ αἰσθητὰ καὶ προφανῆ ἔξω. πλὴν ὁ σοφὸς ἀμώτερα κατεσθίει καὶ εὐρίσκει συμφωνίαν τῶν τε συμβόλων καὶ τῶν πρωτοτύπων.

Therefore, if we focus on *Philocalia*, 2.1, it can be maintained that the Scholion reading ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν belongs to a version of the scriptural text used by Hippolytus, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Didymus.

¹⁷ Hippolytus, *In Daniele*, 4.34.2.

¹⁸ Cf. my discussion on the ‘eternal gospel’ in *PHE*, pp. 96–109.

¹⁹ Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita atque Encomium Ephraem Syri*, PG.46.836.8.

²⁰ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 415.

²¹ Cf. the extensive quotation of the Revelation text by Origen in *selPs*, PG.12.1077.11. Modern editions of the New Testament continue to disagree with each other, employing other ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν, or ἔσωθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν.

²² Origen reads the scriptural text of Ezekiel 2:8–10 in the same way, ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν, in *Cels*, VI.6; *selEz*, PG.13.773.7–19.

However, in *selEz*, PG.13.772.43, the text reads ‘ἔσωθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν’. Epiphanius (*loc. cit.*) also quotes ἔσωθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν. See Introduction, pp. 89–90.

²³ Hippolytus, *In Daniele*, 4.34.2.

²⁴ Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita atque Encomium Ephraem Syri*, PG.46.836.8. This is also his quotation from Ezekiel: *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 413.

Once again, the main sources used by Cassian in writing the Scholia are present.

EN XXVIII: ἐπιπορευόμενος

This present participle of the verb ἐπιπορεύεσθαι ('to travel', in the sense of 'reaching out') is a form peculiar to Didymus,²⁵ who had probably taken this up either from Heraclitus, through the testimony of Diogenes Laertius,²⁶ or from Plutarch. The participle was used abundantly by the historians Polybius (third–second cent. BC) and Diodorus of Sicily (first cent. BC), yet it was always followed by the accusative,²⁷ not the dative case, which Didymus mostly did, and which is also a usage characteristic of Plutarch. Eusebius used this participle with the accusative, too. The formula was followed to the letter by Cassian (Pseudo-Didymus) writing *De Trinitate*,²⁸ and definitely comes from Plutarch, who was a main source for both Origen and Didymus as much as he was for Cassian.

Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, 28.3: πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀγροῖς ἐπιπορευόμενοι τοὺς ῥωμαλεωτάτους καὶ κρατίστους αὐτῶν ἀνῆρουν. *De Tranquillitate Animi*, 470A6: καὶ κατὰ μέρος ἕκαστον ἐπιπορευόμενοι τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ τῇ ὄψει θεωρεῖν. *De Sollertia Animalium*, 961A4: καίτοι Στράτωνός γε τοῦ φυσικοῦ λόγος ἐστὶν ἀποδεικνύων ὡς οὐδ' αἰσθάνεσθαι τὸ παράπαν ἄνευ τοῦ νοεῖν ὑπάρχει· καὶ γὰρ γράμματα πολλάκις ἐπιπορευομένους τῇ ὄψει καὶ λόγοι προσπίπτοντες τῇ ἀκοῇ διαλανθάνουσιν ἡμᾶς καὶ διαφεύγουσι πρὸς ἑτέροις τὸν νοῦν ἔχοντας. (Cf. Porphyry, *De Abstinentia*, 3.21.)

An instance where Origen appears to have applied the verb ἐπιπορεύεσθαι with the dative is a catena-fragment, which must have passed through the hands of a Sabaite or Akoimetan.

Origen, *frJohn*, XXXVII: παντὸς τοῦ προσέχοντος τῇ ἀναγνώσει καὶ ἐρευνῶντος τὰς γραφὰς ἐν τῷ

νοεῖν αὐτὰς εἰδότος πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ λήγει ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ πνεύματος, ἣν ἐπιπορεύεται διὰ τῆς τῶν θεῶν λογίων παιδεύσεως.

All the instances in Didymus occur in the collection from his commentaries on the Psalms.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 799a: Ἐπεὶ ἐνοικεῖ καὶ ἐμπεριπατεῖ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις ὁ θεός, ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν ἁγίων ἔχει τὴν ἰδίαν ὁδόν, ἐπιπορευόμενος τῇ ἑκάστου αὐτῶν διανοίᾳ. Ibid. fr. 1138: καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ, καθ' ἃς ἐπιπορευόμενος τὴν ἐξ ἑτάσιν καὶ κρίσιν τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῶν ποιεῖται, ἀλήθειά εἰσιν. Ibid. fr. 1280: δίχα γὰρ τοῦ δημιουργικοῦ λόγου ἀθρόως τε τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον ἐπιπορευομένου καὶ τοῖς μέρεσιν αὐτοῦ ἐπιστατοῦντος, οὔτε χιὼν οὔτε πῦρ οὔτε κρύσταλλος οὔτε καταιγὶς οὔτε ἄνεμος ὑποσταίη ποτ' ἄν, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐνεργήσῃ ἔτι δίχα τῆς αὐτοῦ βουλῆς.

Ibid. fr. 1259: Ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ, αἷς ἐπιπορεύεται προνοῶν καὶ διοικῶν, κρίνων, εὐεργετῶν, χαριζόμενος, κολάζων, δίκαιος εὐρίσκεται· Θεὸς γὰρ πιστός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία. εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ λέγοι τις τὰς ἀρετὰς (φέρουσι γὰρ πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν πρακτικῶς καὶ διανοητικῶς ὁδεύοντα), καὶ ἐν ταύταις δίκαιος ἀναφαίνεται. οὐδεὶς γοῦν σπουδαίως καὶ κατ' ἀρετὴν βιῶν αἰτιᾶται τὴν πρόνοιαν, ἀλλ' εἴ τις φαῦλος ἔξω τῶν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ βεβηκώς. *frPs(al)*, fr. 980: Ἐκ παραλλήλου αἱ ἀρεταὶ καλοῦνται. ὁ γὰρ λέγων Τὰς ὁδοὺς σου, κύριε, γνώρισόν μοι, τὰς ἀρετὰς ἀξιοῖ φανεράς αὐτῷ γενέσθαι.

Notice the similarity of the following passages. Ibid. fr. 1206: Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου λέγει τις, καὶ ταύτας τις ὁδεύων ᾄδει ἐπινικίους ᾠδὰς κατὰ τῶν πάλαι τὴν κακίαν ἐνεργούντων ἐν αὐτοῖς. Cf. the foregoing expression ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ λέγει τις τὰς ἀρετὰς ('virtues' represented as sundry 'ways' toward God) in Origen, *expPron*, PG.17.172.15–18: Αὐται αἱ

²⁵ Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 79: 'καὶ τὰς τρίβους σου διδάξόν με'. ἦτοι ἃς τρίβουσιν οἱ πρὸς σὲ σπεύδοντες ἢ ἃς σὺ τρίβεις ἐπιπορευόμενος τοῖς ἔργοις τῆς χάριτός σου. See further on this page.

²⁶ Heraclitus, *Fragmenta*, fr. 45, *apud* Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 9.7: ψυχῆς πείρατα ἴων οὐκ ἄν ἐξεύροιτο, πᾶσαν ἐπιπορευόμενος ὁδόν· οὕτω βαθὺν λόγον ἔχει.

²⁷ This is also the scriptural syntax for the participle in the LXX. Cf. Leviticus 26:33; Ezekiel 39:14.

²⁸ Origen, *commGen*, PG.12.64 (*apud Philocalia*, 23.8): ἐπιβάλλον ὁ Θεὸς τῇ ἀρχῇ τῆς κοσμοποιίας, οὐδενὸς ἀνατίως γινομένου, ἐπιπορεύεται τῷ νῷ ἕκαστον τῶν ἑσομένων. Cf. Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 3)*, PG.39.777: Φωρᾶν ἔνεστι ταῦτα μὴ ἄλλως ἔχειν, ἐπιπορευόμενον τῷ νῷ, ὡς αὐτίκα τῷ τοιοῦτῳ ἐπιλάμπει καὶ συνεργεῖ ὁ ἐπιβεβηκὼς τοῖς ὅλοις Υἱὸς Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

πολλαὶ ὁδοὶ εἰς μίαν ἄγουσιν ὁδόν, τὴν εἰποῦσαν· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς· πολλὰς δὲ εἴρηκεν ὁδοὺς, τὰς ἀρετὰς τὰς φερούσας ἐπὶ τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

EN XXVIIe: σφίγγεται τὸ βιβλίον

The author has in mind a passage supposedly written by Origen. However, the catena-fragments on the gospel of John are couched in a vocabulary pointing to an Antiochene catenist, who filtered Origenism through Didymus.

Origen, *frJohn* XVIII (comm. on Psalm 17, 10): ἰμάς τοίνυν ὑποδήματος αὐτοῦ, τουτέστι τοῦ γνώφους τοῦ περὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, ὁ τῆς δυσκαταληψίας ἐστὶ λόγος, συσφίγγων καὶ συγκρατῶν τὸ ὑπόδημα περὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, ὥς λύσιν τοῦ ἱμάντος εἶναι τὸ σαφηνίσαι²⁹ καὶ παραστήσαι λόγῳ τίνα τρόπον θεὸς ἀνέλαβε σῶμα, σκεπάζων καὶ κρύπτων αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν πορευτικὴν δύναμιν.³⁰

The sole other parallel occurs in John Chrysostom using the verb in the sense of something being firmly sealed. *De Lazaro*, PG.48.1042.36–40: Ὡσπερ γάρ, ἐὰν βάλω χρυσίον εἰς βαλάντιον, σφίγγω καὶ σφραγίζομαι, ἵνα καὶ ἐμοῦ ἀπόντος ὁ ληστής μὴ λάβῃ, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης ποιῶ· τῇ συνεχείᾳ τῆς διδασκαλίας σφίγγω καὶ σφραγίδας ἐπιτίθημι.

This usage attests to remarkable erudition. For indeed the verb σφίγγω means ‘to utter certain words, behind which a certain meaning lies concealed’, according to a unique lemma, which goes far beyond the hackneyed meaning of the verb (which is, ‘to tie and hold together firmly’). The *Etymologicum Magnum* tells us that this is the verb which reveals the etymology of the Egyptian Sphinx, who was so called because she used to utter words which were ‘tightly held together

and hard to comprehend’. *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 738: Σφίγξ: Παρὰ τὸ σφίγγω, διὰ τὸ ἐσφιγμένα καὶ δυσνόητα λέγειν ῥήματα.

We have no instances of Didymus applying the verb in this sense, which therefore must be a usage by Cassian himself.

EN XXVIIIf: ἐνεστῶτος καιροῦ

Once again, we can trace the readings of the author: the expression recurs in Polybius, Diodorus of Sicily, and Galen. This may suggest either ‘the present time’,³¹ or the moment ‘when the appropriate time comes’, in the sense of the theological notion of καιρός.³² In this Scholion the expression is used in the latter sense and it is found in two instances, besides Didymus and Origen.³³ Didymus did use this expression along with ἡδέα τε καὶ ἀηδῆ (which does not occur in Origen), and this reveals his commentary on Revelation as the main source of this Scholion.³⁴ Yet Origen is once again present in the mind of Cassian.³⁵

EN XVIIlg: ἡδέα and σκυθρωπά

The distinction of ἡδέα and σκυθρωπά (‘things that are either pleasant or bleak’) appears only in Didymus.

Didymus, *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 26: ἔχει καὶ ἐπωφελῆ τινα, ἔχει δὲ καὶ σκυθρωπά. καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς τούτοις τοῖς ἀνθρωπίνους εἰσὶν ἡδέα, καὶ καλεῖται ταῦτα ‘ἡμέρα’, καὶ σκυθρωπά, ἃ ὀνομάζεται ‘νύξ’. τοῦτο οὖν λέγει· καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἡδέσιν καὶ λαμπροῖς πρὸς σε κρᾶζω, καὶ εἰσακούεις, καὶ ἐν νυκτὶ τοῦτο ποιῶ, καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἄνοιαν.

commPs 40–44.4, Cod. p. 299: οὐκ ἐπιπολαίως κλαίω οὐδ’ ἐν τοῖς ἡδέσιν ὥστε ὅτε μὲν τρυφῇ σχολάζειν ὅτε δε κλαυθμῷ μετανοίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς σκυθρωποῖς· καλεῖται γὰρ τὰ σκυθρωπά νύξ.

²⁹ Cf. *Scholion*. XXXVI: σαφηνίσαι.

³⁰ Cf. *Scholion* XV.

³¹ Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.28; *Eclogae Prophetarum*, p. 26; *commPs*, PG.23.1216.1. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Quadraginta Martyres*, PG.46.785.36. Evagrius, *Rerum Monachalium Rationes*, PG.40.1256.34. John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos*, PG.63: 25.4; 52.55. Cyril of Alexandria, *De Adoratione*, PG.68.801.4.

³² I have canvassed this in *PHE*, pp. 130–144.

³³ *Acta Apocrypha Thomae*, 45: διὰ τί βούλει ἡμᾶς ἀπολέσαι τοῦ καιροῦ ἡμῶν μηδέπω ἐνεστῶτος; Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, 61.2.4: ἐνεστῶτος τοῦ καιροῦ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως.

³⁴ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 121: δὲ ἂν κακώσεως καιρὸς ἐνστή. Ibid.

fr. 424: εὐχεται ἐνστήναι καιρὸν καθ’ ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁφθείη τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ. Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 171: ὁ καιρὸς ἥκει, ὅσπερ οὐκ ἂν ἐνστήσῃ, εἰ μὴ ἡμάρτανον. Ibid. Cod. p. 232: ἕως ὁ καιρὸς ἐνστή τῆς ἀνταποδόσεως.

³⁵ Cf. Origen, *exhMar*, XLI: ἐνέστη ἡμῖν καιρὸς Χριστιανοῖς καυχῆσεων. Ibid. XLIX: γέγονε γὰρ θλίψις καὶ διωγμὸς διὰ τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἐνέστη καιρὸς μεγάλου πειρασμοῦ. *frJohn*, XC: λέλεκται τὸ ‘Νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου’. ὥσανει ἔλεγεν· Ἐνέστη καιρὸς ἀναδείξεως τῶν κρινόντων τὸν κόσμον. *commJohn*, XIII.39.256: ὥστε ἐνεστηκέναι ἤδη τὸν πρὸ τετραμήνου τοῦ θερισμοῦ καιρὸν. *commMatt*, 11.1: τῷ τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῆς μηκέτι ἐνεστηκέναι. *homJer*, 1.3: ὁμῶς ὁ φιλόανθρωπος θεὸς ἐνεστηκότος τοῦ καιροῦ πέμπει καὶ τοῦτον τὸν προφήτην.

commZacch, 2.199: 'Ὅτι δὲ ἐπιστήμονος ἱατροῦ δίκην ἐπιφέρει ὁ πάντων ἀγαθῶν αἴτιος τὰ ἀηδὴ καὶ ἐπίπονα,³⁶ ὁ προφήτης θεολογῶν φάσκει· 'Καὶ αὐτὸς σοφὸς ἦγεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς κακά, καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ ἀθετηθῇ.' Εἰ ἔνεκα τοῦ μὴ ἀθετηθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ μόνου σοφοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπάγεται τὰ κακωτικά, οὐ πάθος ἢ τροπὴ ἢ ἐπακτική τούτων ὀργὴ Θεοῦ.³⁷

EN XXVIIh: ἐλάττωσις τῆς φύσεως

The expression 'diminution of nature' goes back to Classical Greece, namely Thucydides, if the expression occurring in comments on his work are actually his own.³⁸ In the main, this has a twofold meaning: either the 'diminution of nature' of Christ,³⁹ a notion that did not enjoy any considerable currency in theology,⁴⁰ or man's meanness because of sin, which is the sense that the anonymous commentator ascribed to Thucydides.

The sense in which the idiom is used in this Scholion can be traced to a text ascribed to Plutarch, where ἐλάττωσις τῆς φύσεως denotes a 'lower nature'. It also implies a notion of 'incompleteness', not only in ontological terms, but also in *ethical* ones: the latter is the defective nature that man incurs following sinful conduct. The expression was a novelty, which had no followers. Gregory of Nyssa is at this point a beacon more useful than usual in demonstrating Cassian's source.⁴¹ The rarity of this expression clears the landscape. It originates in Gregory's rebuttal of Eunomius for having 'diminished' the 'nature' of the Son. Whether Eunomius used the expression ἐλάττωσις τῆς φύσεως itself with reference to the Son cannot be determined, since there is no textual evidence for this. We only know that he had claimed the Son to be 'inferior' to the Father, since he is a 'creature' (τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἐλάττων ἐστί, ὡς

ποίημα).⁴² Gregory of Nyssa spoke of ἐλάττωσις τῆς φύσεως in order to rebut this specific doctrine of Eunomius.

Adversus Eunomium, 1.1.200: ἀλλ' οὐδέπω καὶ νῦν ταύτης ἀκηκόαμεν τῆς σοφίας, ἥ τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον ἔκ τινος ἀκολουθίας λεγόμενον εἰς τὴν τῶν ὑποχειρίων καὶ ὑποτεταγμένων ἀπωθεῖται τάξιν, ὅπερ οὗτος βούλεται, τὴν τῆς παραδόσεως τῶν προσώπων ἀκολουθίαν ἀξιωματῶν καὶ φύσεων ὑπεροχάς τε καὶ ἐλαττώσεις κατασκευάζων ἐνδείκνυσθαι.

Ibid. 1.1.315–16: οὕτως ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος διὰ τῆς ἀγίας γραφῆς ὁδηγούμενος ὑπερίθησι μὲν τῆς κτίσεως τὸν τε μονογενῆ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀπόφασιν ἐν τῇ μακαρίᾳ τε καὶ ζωοποιῷ καὶ ἀκτίστῳ φύσει θεωρεῖν διὰ πίστεως ὑποτίθεται· ὥστε τὸ ἄνω τῆς κτίσεως καὶ τῆς πρωτευούσης καὶ διὰ πάντων τελείας φύσεως εἶναι πιστευόμενον μηδενὶ τρόπῳ τὸν τῆς ἐλαττώσεως παραδέχεσθαι λόγον.

Cf. *Adversus Apollinarium*, v. 3.1, p. 216: ἕτερος γὰρ παντὶ τρόπῳ ὃ τε τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος λόγος καὶ οὐκ ἂν τις τὴν ἐλάττωσιν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ὅρον εἶναι τῆς θείας ὑπονοήσειε φύσεως.

Therefore, this specific expression of the Scholion actually originates with Gregory of Nyssa.

EN XXVIIIi: τὸν τῆς προνοίας λόγον διὰ κρίσεως καὶ διοικήσεως

Although Aristotle was heavily criticized by Christian authors for not accepting Providence fully (some authors, including Aetius, accused him of dismissing Providence altogether), it is he who espoused the idea that 'neither nature nor God' does anything 'in vain'.⁴³

³⁶ Cf. *Scholion XXXI*: τὰ ἐπίπονα.

³⁷ Cf. *Scholion XXX*: οὐ τὸ συμβεβηκὸς πάθος ὀνομάζεται, **θεοῦ ὀργὴ** καλούμενον, ἔξω ὑπάρχον αὐτοῦ. *Scholion XXXVII*: ἐπὶ τὸ λαβεῖν ἕκαστον ἐπαξίως τῶν βεβιωμένων. ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ συνίσταται.

³⁸ *Scholia In Thucydidem*, 1.127.2: αἱ τῆς φύσεως ἐλαττώσεις καὶ διαπτώσεις κακίαι πάντως εἰσὶ. This statement was included in the *Suda* lexicon as a kind of definition for 'calamity' (ζυμφοράν) as understood by Thucydides. *Suda*, lexicon, Alphabetic letter xi, entry 110.

³⁹ Cf. Philippians 2:7; Heb. 2:7 quoting Psalm 8:6.

⁴⁰ Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.644.46. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Apollinarium*, v. 3, 1, p. 216; *Adversus Eunomium*, 1.1.316. Ephraem Syrus, *Adversus Haereticos*, p. 147. Basil of Seleucia, *Orationes*, p. 352. Notice Theodore of Mopsuestia,

Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Hebraeos, p. 204: χωρὶς θεοῦ ἐγεύσατο τοῦ θανάτου, οὐδὲν πρὸς τοῦτο παραβλαβείσης τῆς θεότητος, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκείας φύσεως τὴν κατὰ βραχὺ τοῦτο ἐλάττωσιν ἐδέξατο, ὥστε φαίνεσθαι ἐντεῦθεν αὐτὸν καὶ τῆς τιμῆς μετέχοντα διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἕτερον συνάφειαν.

⁴¹ Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Apollinarium*, v. 3.1, p. 206.

⁴² Eunomius, *Apologia*, 26.

⁴³ Aristotle, *De Generatione Animalium*, 788b20–22: τὴν φύσιν ὑποτιθέμεθα, ἐξ ὧν ὁρῶμεν ὑποτιθέμενοι, οὐτ' ἐλλείπουσαν οὔτε μάταιον οὐθὲν ποιοῦσαν τῶν ἐνδεχομένων περὶ ἕκαστον. *De Caelo*, 271a33: Ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ ἡ φύσις οὐδὲν μάτην ποιοῦσιν. *De Respiratione*, 476a12–13: μάτην οὐδὲν ὁρῶμεν ποιοῦσαν τὴν φύσιν. Cf. Plotinus, *Enneades*, IV.4.9.

Nevertheless, it was Stoicism that elevated this pronouncement to the status of an ontological principle, indeed it was Chrysippus who provided Christians with their terminological apparatus.⁴⁴ Christian apologists employed the Stoic tenet since early times.⁴⁵

The extent to which Christians drew on the Stoic vocabulary varies. Those who were dedicated to scholarship appear happy to reproduce Chrysippus' idea along with his language: these are Clement of Alexandria,⁴⁶ Eusebius,⁴⁷ and Didymus.⁴⁸ Others, such as Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Seleucia, Ephraem Syrus, Cyril of Alexandria, and the verbose John Chrysostom, were rather reticent about using the Stoic locution, although they actually embraced the

idea itself.⁴⁹ Origen stands midway: he mentions the sources, but he is not always keen to express his theology through the Stoic technical vocabulary, notwithstanding his strong Stoic allegiances.⁵⁰

Theodoret was not only perfectly aware of the Stoic doctrine,⁵¹ but he also knew of the evolution of the idea within the Stoic school, from Zeno to Chrysippus.⁵² He must have been delighted to find that Eusebius emphasized the Stoic notion. At one point of his history, Theodoret quotes a letter addressed by Emperor Constantine to Eusebius personally, a letter which Eusebius himself quotes in his own *Ecclesiastical History*. One passage of it contains the Stoic idea, no doubt taught to the emperor by his close confidant Eusebius.⁵³

⁴⁴ Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Logica et Physica*, fr. 221: προνοία θεῶν διοικεῖται ὁ κόσμος. Fr. 527: τὰ ἄστρα καθίδρυται, τὰ τε ἀπλανῆ καὶ τὰ πλανώμενα, θεία τὴν φύσιν ὄντα καὶ ἔμψυχα καὶ διοικούμενα κατὰ τὴν πρόνοιαν. Fr. 913: Εἰμαρμένη ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ κόσμου λόγος ἢ 'λόγος τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ προνοία διοικουμένων'. Fr. 1185 (*apud* Origen, *Princ.* IV.1.7 and *Philocalia*, 1.7): καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς ἀποτέμενης τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου προνοίας ἔργων τινὰ μὲν ἐναργέστατα φαίνεται ἡ προνοίας ἐστὶν ἔργα, ἕτερα δὲ οὕτως ἀποκρύπτειται, ὥς ἀπιστίας χώραν παρέχειν δοκεῖν τῆς περὶ τοῦ τέχνης ἀφάτης καὶ δυνάμει διοικούντος τὰ ὅλα θεοῦ. *Fragmenta Moralia*, fr. 331: λέγεται γὰρ ἡ μὲν ἀρχὴ 'νόμιμος ἀνθρώπων διοικήσεις' καὶ 'πρόνοια ἀνθρώπων κατὰ νόμον'. Fr. 657: ὁ Χρῦσιππος, τὸ πάντα ἀγνοεῖν τὸν φαῦλον. εἰ δ' οὐδ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ᾗδεν ὅτι πάντα ἀγνοεῖ, πῶς περὶ πολλῶν δογματίζει, τιθεὶς τὸ ἕνα εἶναι κόσμον καὶ προνοία τοῦτον διοικεῖσθαι. Fr. 668: εἴτα προνοία θεῶν διοικεῖσθαι τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς. Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 7.138: Τὸν δὴ κόσμον διοικεῖσθαι κατὰ νοῦν καὶ πρόνοιαν, καθά φησι Χρῦσιππός τε ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ Περὶ προνοίας καὶ Ποσειδωνίου ἐν τῷ τρισκαιδεκάτῳ.

⁴⁵ Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolyicum*, 3.9: καὶ προνοία τὰ πάντα διοικεῖσθαι ἐπιστάμεθα, Ibid. 3.26: οὐδὲ ἀγέννητος ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶν καὶ αὐτοματισμός τῶν πάντων, καθὼς Πυθαγόρας καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ πεφλυαρήκασιν, ἀλλὰ μὲν οὖν γενητὸς καὶ προνοία διοικεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιήσαντος τὰ πάντα θεοῦ.

⁴⁶ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 1.27.173.5: δεῖ δὴ τὴν διοικοῦσαν πρόνοιαν κυρίαν τε εἶναι καὶ ἀγαθὴν. Ibid. 4.7.52.4: καλῶς πάντα τὴν θείαν διοικεῖν πρόνοιαν πέπεισται ἡ ἀγάπη. Ibid. 4.12.88.2: εἰ μὲν γὰρ μὴ εἴη τῆς θείας διοικήσεως, οἴχεται ἡ οἰκονομία τῶν καθαρσίων καὶ πέπτωκεν ἡ ὑπόθεσις αὐτοῖς. Ibid. 7.2.8.3: προσήκει γοῦν αἰεὶ τῷ κρείττονι κατὰ φύσιν ἡγεῖσθαι τοῦ χείρονος, καὶ τῷ δυναμένῳ καλῶς τι διέπειν ἀποδοδόναι τὴν ἐκεῖνου διοίκησιν.

⁴⁷ Eusebius, *PE*, 6.6.23; 6.6.53; 7.11.4; 7.11.13; *DE*, 3.4.33; 5.1.6; *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, 3.2.16 and 18; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.41; 2.28; *Eclologiae Prophetarum*, p. 98; *commPs*, PG.23: 180.25; 225.15; 228.37; 356.9; 457.29; 1304.53–54; 1377.1; PG.24.32.19.

⁴⁸ Didymus, *commJob* (7.20c11), Cod. p. 218: οὐχ ἔξει ὑπόστασιν μὴ τῆς προνοίας αὐτὰ διοικούσης. Ibid. Cod. p. 299: μέγα ἐστὶν τὰς τῆς προνοίας διοικήσεις καταλαβεῖν. *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 316: ἔλεγκτέον ἐκ τούτων τοὺς τὸ αὐτόματον εἰσάγοντας, ὅτι τάξει καὶ προνοία τὰ πάντα διοικεῖται. ἡ γὰρ σύνπνοια τοῦ παντὸς ἱκανὴ διδασκαλία τοῦ ἐφεστάναι τοῖς ὅλοις τὴν πρόνοιαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Ibid. fr. 327: εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς ζώσῃ, οὐκ ἔξει ἰσχὺν ὁ ζῶσθεός, ὥστε θεός ἐστιν ὁ καὶ ταῦτα τῇ ἑαυτοῦ προνοίᾳ

διοικῶν. Ibid. fr. 335: τῶν τιθεμένων πρόνοιαν καὶ λεγόντων θεὸν διοικεῖν τὰ ὅλα διαφορά φέρεται· οἱ μὲν γὰρ λέγουσι τὸ καθόλου διοικεῖν θεόν, οὐ μὴν τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα· ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ τοῦτο λέγομεν. *commEccl* (5–6), Cod. p. 148: ἔδει δὲ κατὰ γέννημα τὸ τῆς διοικούσης προνοίας ἐν πλήθει εἶναι καὶ τοῦ γενήματος, ὃ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἡ πρόνοια παρέχει, ἐπιθυμήσαι. *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 218: κατὰ γὰρ τὸν ἀληθῆ λόγον, ἐπεὶ προνοία θεοῦ τὰ πάντα διοικεῖται, καὶ τὰ δοκοῦντα ἀνθρωπίνως γίνεσθαι θεόδοτά ἐστιν. *commZacch*, 3.179: τοῦ φαινομένου κόσμου καὶ τῶν μερῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς διοικούσης αὐτὰ θείας προνοίας. *commEccl* (1.18), Cod. p. 6: τὰ αἰσθητὰ ὑπὸ προνοίας τοῦ θεοῦ διοικεῖται. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 229: καὶ πάλιν κύριός ἐστιν πάντων αὐτὸς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῖς παρασχὼν καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν πρόνοιαν ἑαυτοῦ διοικῶν αὐτούς. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1214: πάντα γὰρ τὰ πρὸς αὐτοῦ γεγεννημένα, ὅποι ποτ' ἐστὶ, ταγαῖς τῆς ἑαυτοῦ προνοίας διοικουμένα μοι ἰθύνεται. *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 84: προνοία δὲ ἐπάγεται· οὐκ ἀπρονοησίαν δογματίζομεν, οὐ γενέσει ἐπιγράφομεν τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἀλλὰ διοικήσει τοῦ θεοῦ.

⁴⁹ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Adversus Julianum Imperatorem*, PG.35.540.10; *De Moderatione in Disputationibus Servanda*, PG.36.205.32; *In Sanctum Baptisma*, PG.36.424.10. Basil of Seleucia, *Orationes*, p. 152. Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Julianum*, 2.15, 16, 17. Ephraem Syrus, *De Divina Gratia*, p. 183. John Chrysostom, *In Acta Apostolorum Homiliae*, PG.60.183.36. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Illud: Verumtamen Frustra Conturbatur*, PG.55.561.44. *In Psalmos* 101–107, PG.55.655.22.

⁵⁰ Origen, *Cels*, VII.68; *homJob*, p. 363; *commEph*, 6. Origen also testifies to this idea having been set forth by Numenius. *Cels*, V, 38. Cf. P. Tzamalikos, 'Origen and the Stoic View of Time', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 52 (4) (1991), 535–561.

⁵¹ Theodoret, *HE*, 59: ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν κοινῶν διοικήσεως θεοῦ τοῦ μεγίστου. Pseudo-Theodoret (or Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, p. 126. Ibid. p. 136: πρὸς ἐνδειξιν δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἀλόγῳ φορᾶ αὐτομάτως γίνεσθαι τὰ γινόμενα, ἀλλὰ θεία προνοία διοικεῖσθαι τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς, ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ εὐχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων.

⁵² Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 6.14: Ζήνων δὲ ὁ Κιτιεὺς δυνάμιν κέκληκε τὴν εἰμαρμένην κινητικὴν τῆς ὕλης, τὴν δὲ αὐτὴν καὶ Πρόνοιαν καὶ Φύσιν ὀνόμασεν. Οἱ δὲ τοῦτον διαδεξάμενοι τὴν εἰμαρμένην λόγον ἔφρασαν εἶναι τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ προνοία διοικουμένων.

⁵³ Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, 2.46.2: νυνὶ δὲ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἀποδοθείσης καὶ τοῦ δράκοντος ἐκεῖνου ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν κοινῶν διοικήσεως θεοῦ τοῦ μεγίστου. The same passage from the fully quoted letter, in Theodoret, *HE*, p. 59.

Theodoret, therefore, found in Eusebius full accounts of the Stoic notion, such as the following, where the terminology bears on the Scholia to some extent.

Eusebius, *PE*, 7.11.4: οὐχ ὥδε ἔρημον ὡς ὄρφανόν ὑπὸ πατρός καταλειφθέντα τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον ὑπὸ τοῦ συστησαμένου διδάσκει, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ ἀεὶ ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ προνοίας αὐτὸν διοικεῖσθαι,⁵⁴ ὡς μὴ μόνον δημιουργὸν εἶναι τῶν ὅλων⁵⁵ καὶ ποιητὴν τὸν θεόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σωτῆρα καὶ διοικητὴν καὶ βασιλέα καὶ ἡγεμόνα, ἡλίω αὐτῷ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις καὶ τῷ σύμπαντι οὐρανῷ τε καὶ κόσμῳ δι' αἰῶνος ἐπιστατοῦντα μεγάλῳ τε ὀφθαλμῷ καὶ ἐνθέῳ δυνάμει πάντ' ἐφορῶντα⁵⁶ καὶ τοῖς πᾶσιν οὐρανίοις τε καὶ ἐπιγείοις⁵⁷ ἐπιπαρόντα καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν κόσμῳ διατάττοντά τε καὶ διοικοῦντα.⁵⁸

Finally, a passage in *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam* should be accounted for. This is a work dubiously ascribed to Basil of Caesarea, but Cassian is its most likely author. In general, and for all his philosophical education, Basil did not make anything of the germane Stoic terminology. He was certainly aware of it, yet he evidently opted to eschew this pagan vocabulary. It would then have been curious for him to make an exception just at one point of this commentary on Isaiah. Besides, uncommon terms such as αὐτομάτως, establish a similarity with a relevant text of Didymus (τὸ αὐτόματον).⁵⁹ By the way, the term αὐτόματον and its cognates appear in Didymus some fifteen times, and more than forty times in Theodoret, particularly in his treatise on Providence.⁶⁰

Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam, 5, 172: Διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιστήσαντες τῇ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καταλήψει, οὔτε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ συντίθενται, οὔτε τὴν νύκτα ὁμολογοῦσιν· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ἀκολούθου καὶ εἰς ἀθεότητα

ἐκπίπτουσι, μήτε εἰ προνοία Θεοῦ διοικεῖται τὸ πᾶν, μήτε εἰ αὐτομάτως φέρεται συντιθέμενοι.

Cf. Didymus, *commJob* (12.116.8a), fr. 316, and Pseudo-Theodoret (or Pseudo-Justin, but indeed Cassian), *QetR*, p. 136, on notes 48 and 51 above.

EN XXVIIj: ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰούδα

The specific portion of Rev. 5:5, which has some bearing on Gen. 49:8, is quoted by only a couple of authors.⁶¹ The vocabulary of Didymus referring to Christ appearing 'from the race of Judas' is interlaced with the language of the Scholia. Here is the correlation of ideas showing Didymus' mind permeating this Scholion.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.34–39: Συνάδει τῷ προκειμένῳ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ Ἱερεμίᾳ ἔχον οὕτως· Ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ ἀναστήσω τῷ Δαυὶδ ἀνατολήν⁶² δικαίαν, καὶ βασιλεύων βασιλεύσει καὶ συνήσει καὶ ποιήσει κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ σωθήσεται Ἰούδας, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ κατασκηνώσει πεποιθώς, καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ὃ καλέσει αὐτὸν Κύριος, Ἰωσεδὲκ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις.⁶³ Ὁ γὰρ ἀνιστάμενος ἐκ τοῦ Δαυὶδ ἀνατολή⁶⁴ δικαία ὁ δεικνύμενός ἐστιν πρὸς τοῦ ἱεροφάντου ἐν τῷ Ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ, ἀνατολὴ ὄνομα αὐτῷ.⁶⁵ Τοῦτον αὐτὸν τὸν ἄνδρα ἀνατολήν προσαγορευόμενον διὰ τὸ δικαιοσύνης ἥλιον⁶⁶ ὑπάρχειν, ἐκ τοῦ Δαυὶδ ἀνατολὴ δικαία ἀναστᾶσα, οὐχ ἕτερον ὑπάρχειν φάμεν τοῦ γεναμένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα,⁶⁷ περὶ οὗ ὁ ἱεροκῆρυξ Ἡσαΐας προφητικῶς βοᾷ· Ἔσται ἡ ρίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν· ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἀνάπαυσις αὐτοῦ τιμὴ.⁶⁸

⁵⁴ Cf. *Scholion XXVII*.

⁵⁵ Cf. *Scholion VII*: οἶδε τὸν αὐτὸν ἀρχὴν τῶν ὅλων καὶ τέλος τῶν πάντων.

⁵⁶ Cf. *Scholion XV* (ἐφορον δύναμιν, ἐφόρου δυνάμεως); *Scholion XXX* (ἀγγέλους ἐφορῶντας).

⁵⁷ Cf. *Scholion XXVII*: οὐδεὶς γενητός, οὐκ ἐπουράνιος, οὐκ ἐπίγειος, ἄξιος εὐρηται.

⁵⁸ Cf. *Scholion XXVII*.

⁵⁹ The term αὐτόματον in relation to διοίκησις by Providence actually comes from Plotinus: *Enneades*, III.2.1 (quoted by Theodoret in *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 6.59); VI.8.14; VI.9.5.

⁶⁰ Theodoret, *De Providentia*, PG.83: 560.23 (αὐτομάτου); 576.19 (αὐτόματον); 581.3: (αὐτόματον); 637.51 (αὐτόματος); 692.19 (αὐτομάτως). Also in *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81: 829.34 and 38 and 39; 896.7; 960.4; 1012.38. *intDan*, PG.81:1349.45; 1513.3. *intProphXII*, PG.81.1684.47. *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.521.14. *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 2.14.15; 4.68.4; 6.16.5; 6.59.3; 9.71.6; 11.17.2;

12.15.9. *HE*, pp. 76; 199; 318; 344. *Historia Religiosa*, Vita 1.2. *Epistulae*, Epistles 3; 16; 24; 111. *commls*, 11, line 334; *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, pp. 115; 185. *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80: 609.38; 777.1; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80: 1492.7; 1537.1; 1720.47; PG.81.629.39. Pseudo-Theodoret (or Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, pp. 80; 136.

⁶¹ Hippolytus, *In Daniele*, 4.34.2. Origen, *commJohn*, V.6.1 (*Philocalia*, 5.5); *selPs*, PG.12.1077 (*Philocalia*, 2.1); *selEz*, PG.13.772. Severianus of Gabala, *In Genesin*, PG.56.521.

⁶² *Scholion XVIII*: πρὸ ἀνατολῆς τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡλίου.

⁶³ Jer. 23:5–6.

⁶⁴ Cf. *Scholion XVIII*.

⁶⁵ Zachariah 6:12.

⁶⁶ Cf. *Scholion XVIII*.

⁶⁷ Cf. *Scholion XXVII*: ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα.

⁶⁸ Isaiah 11:10; Rom. 15:12.

Referring to Moses attesting that the Saviour comes from ‘the tribe of Judah’, Didymus quotes Gen. 49:8.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 4.201: Ταύτης τῆς οἰκονομίας ἀπεργασθείσης, διανοίξει ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἑαυτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα, ὄντα Ἑκκλησίαν Θεοῦ ζῶντος, βασιλεύοντος αὐτῇ τοῦ ἀνατείλαντος Σωτῆρος ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, πρὸς ὃν οἱ θεόσοφοί φασιν· Ἰούδα, σὲ αἰνέσαισαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου· αἱ χεῖρές σου ἐπὶ νώτου τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου, καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν σοι οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς σου.⁶⁹ Ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τούτου τοῦ Ἰούδα διανοίγει τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς,⁷⁰ τὰς ἐφόρους καὶ ἐποπτικὰς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ,⁷¹ ὁ εὐεργέτης, ὡς ἕκαστον τῶν ἀντιλαμβανομένων τοῦ φωτισμοῦ⁷² καὶ τῆς χάριτος λέγειν εὐχῆς τρόπῳ· Ἐπίβλεψον ἐπ’ ἐμὲ καὶ ἐλέησόν με· Ἀπολαύουσι δὲ τῆς δωρεᾶς οἱ δίκαιοι πάντες, τοῦ παμβασιλέως ‘τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ἔχοντος ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰ ὅτα⁷³ εἰς τὴν δέξιν αὐτῶν’.

Ibid. 4.199–202: Ἐντείναντος Θεοῦ οἷα τόξον⁷⁴ τὸν Ἰούδαν, βολίς ὡς ἀστραπὴ ἐξελεύσεται, τιτρώσκουσα⁷⁵ καὶ πλῆττουσα εἰς θεῖον ἔρωτα, ὡς φῶς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσθαι τὴν δυναμένην εἰπεῖν τελείαν ψυχὴν ἢ ἑνδοξον Ἑκκλησίαν· Ἐτρωμένη ἀγάπης εἰμί· Ὅτι δὲ οὐκ ἐνταῦθα μόνον τὰ πεμπόμενα ἀπὸ τοῦ θείου τόξου φωτεινὰ τυγχάνει, καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἀμβακούμ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν λέγεται· Ἐἰς φῶς βολίδες σου πορεύονται εἰς φέγγος ἀστραπῆς ὀπλῶν σου.⁷⁶ Οὐ διαφέρει δὲ τὸ πληθυντικῶς καὶ ἐνικῶς εἰπεῖν· γενικῶς γὰρ λαμβάνομεν βολίδα ἐξελευσομένην ὡς ἀστραπὴν, ἥς εἶδη πολλὰ τυγχάνουσιν αἱ μερικαὶ βολαί. Ὁ τιτρώσκων λόγος εἰς πόθον τοὺς τὰς κατ’ εἶδος ἀρετὰς ἀναλαμβάνοντας καὶ τὰ κατὰ μέρος δόγματα, βολίς ἐστὶν γενικῶς, εἰδικῶν ὑπαρχόντων τῶν περὶ ἐκάστης ἀρετῆς⁷⁷ καὶ ἐκάστου δόγματος λόγων,

καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πληθυντικῶς ὀνομαζομένων βολίδων. Πλὴν καὶ ἡ μία βολίς ὡς ἀστραπὴ ἐξέρχεται καὶ αἱ πολλαὶ εἰς φῶς κατὰ τὸν Ἀμβακούμ, τῷ πάντα λαμπρὰ εἶναι βέλη⁷⁸ τὰ πεμπόμενα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνταθέντος τόξου ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο ὁ Ἰούδας. Σεσαφηνίσται πρότερον ὅτι περὶ τοῦ ἀνατείλαντος ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα Σωτῆρος ταῦτ’ ἀπαγγέλλεται.

Ibid. 3.60: ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ πασῶν τῶν γλωσσῶν αὐτῶν, μυρίων καὶ πολὺ ἀνθρώπων ὄντων, μόνους δέκα ἄνδρας κατὰ πρόχειρον⁷⁹ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ λαμβανομένου ἠκολουθηκέναι τῷ Ἰησοῦ· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθὺς Ἰουδαῖος⁸⁰ ἀνατείλας ἐκ τοῦ Ἰούδα.

EN XXVIIIk: πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας (‘prior to the Advent’)

The thought of this part of the Scholion is expounded by Didymus in a similar manner and phraseology:

Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 83: αἱ διαθῆκαι ὅτε εἰσὶν ἐσφραγισμέναι, οὐπω δὴ λάβουσιν τὰ ἐνγεγραμμένα τοῖς κληρονόμοις. οὐκ ἀεὶ οὖν μένει ἡ διαθήκη αὕτη ἐσφραγισμένη, ἀλλὰ λυθήσεται ποτε, ἵνα ἀποδοθῇ ἡ κληρονομία τοῖς ἐνγεγραφεῖσιν. δηλώσει οὖν αὐτοῖς. καὶ ἐπεὶ πολλαχοῦ λέγει τὸν θεῖον λόγον διαθήκην τὸν τε παλαιὸν καὶ καινόν, τὸν πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας⁸¹ καὶ μετ’ αὐτήν, δεῖ ταύτην τὴν διαθήκην δηλωθῆναι, δεῖ λυθῆναι. τότε δὲ λύεται, ὅταν πληρωθῇ τὰ προαναφωνηθέντα δι’ ἐκβάσεως.⁸²

It is interesting that this simple and apparently hackneyed expression πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας is not as common as one might have expected. It was never used before Origen, who applied it abundantly, mostly in relation to his conception of the philosophy of History.⁸³

⁶⁹ Gen. 49:8.

⁷⁰ Cf. *Scholia XV, XXVIII, XXX*.

⁷¹ Cf. *Scholion XV*: Τὴν ἐποπτικὴν καὶ ἔφορον τῶν ὅλων δύναιμι καὶ τὴν πορευτικὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῶν προκειμένων δηλοῖ . . . περὶ ταύτης τῆς ἐφόρου δυνάμεως γέγραπται. *Scholion XXX*: Ἐχομεν καὶ ἀγγέλους ἐφορῶντας.

⁷² Cf. *Scholion XIX*: φωτισμόν.

⁷³ Cf. *Scholion XXX*: ἐπὶ τῶν εὐχῶν τεταγμένα ὅτα.

⁷⁴ Cf. *Scholion XXXI*.

⁷⁵ Cf. *Scholion VI*: οἱ μὲν γὰρ φαῦλοι τιτρώσκουσι μαχαίρᾳ, γλώσσῃ δὲ σοφῶν ἰκόνται καὶ τιτρώσκουσιν ἀγάπῃ· τῇ ἀγάπῃ οὖν ἔτρωσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος.

⁷⁶ Cf. *Scholion VI*: ὅπλα δικαίων.

⁷⁷ Cf. ἀρετῇ. *Scholia X, XXI, XXXI*.

⁷⁸ Cf. *Scholion VI*.

⁷⁹ Cf. *Scholion III*: καὶ μὴ προχείρως ἀκούειν ἀλλὰ πιστῶς. *Scholion XXV*: ἐροῦμεν μὴ κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον ταῦτα γεγράφθαι.

⁸⁰ Cf. the distinction between κατὰ σπέρμα Ἰσραὴλ and τὸν ἀληθινὸν Ἰσραὴλ made in *Scholion XXXI*. Likewise in *Scholion XXXII*.

⁸¹ Cf. *Scholion XXVII*: πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας.

⁸² Cf. *Scholion XX*. EN XXb.

⁸³ Origen, *Cels*, I.51; I.53; VIII.54; *Princ*, IV.1.6; IV.2.3; *Philocalia*, I.6; I.10; *commJohn*, I.6.33; I.7.37; I.7.38; I.15.86; I.37.271; II.27.229; VI.4.17; XIII.44.295; XX.12.89; XX.12.91; *frJohn*, IX; LX; *homJer*, 9.1; 11.1; *homLuc*, 12, p. 75. *frLuc*, 146; *Cant*, p. 221; *Commentarii in Romanos* (III.5–V.7), p. 124; *selPs*, PG.12: 1232.20; 1265.11; 1501.21; 1564.29; *excPs*, PG.17.113.22; *expProv*, PG.17.229.30; *schCant*, PG.17: 264.38; 268.15; *deOr*, XX.1; *De Engastrimytho*, 9; *commMatt*, 13.1; 16.10.

Only Didymus⁸⁴ and Cyril of Alexandria match⁸⁵ Origen's usage.

Gregory of Nazianzus did not use this expression at all. He certainly used ἐπιδημία itself in a few (less than ten) instances, but he did not do so with the notion of 'before the advent', which is involved in biblical interpretation and philosophy of History.⁸⁶ Athanasius may have employed this at a couple of points,⁸⁷ while some instances occur in spurious texts ascribed to him. The same goes for Gregory of Nyssa,⁸⁸ while Basil of Caesarea and John Chrysostom never used this notion. Only Eusebius seems to have done so,⁸⁹ obviously after Origen.⁹⁰

The text of the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*⁹¹ is the exception, contributing to my assumption that this

work is not Basil's.⁹² Similar conclusions follow from the exploration of 'after the advent' (μετὰ τὴν ἐπιδημίαν), since the theologians who used this formula are the same as the foregoing ones: Origen, Didymus, Cyril of Alexandria (not as much as previously), Eusebius to a minor extent, Epiphanius, and Athanasius, yet not Basil of Caesarea, with the exception of the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, where the notion of μετὰ τὴν ἐπιδημίαν is applied at four points.⁹³ The two Gregories, as well as John Chrysostom, are absent.

Therefore, this Scholion by and large reproduces Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse, with Cassian applying his own vocabulary, which is partially borrowed from Gregory of Nyssa.

⁸⁴ Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 374; *commZacch*, 2.16; 3.73; 3.166; 4. 279; *commPs* 20–21, Cod. pp. 3; 4; 56; *commPs* 22–26. 10, Cod. p. 83; *commPs* 29–34, Cod. pp. 133; 196; *frPs(al)*, frs. 216; 306; 435; 460; 484; 670a; 745; 788a; 874; 1012; 1130; 1162; 1268; 1279; *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p.12; *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. pp. 317; 318; 319; *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 77; *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. pp. 274; 298; 310; *Adversus Manichaeos*, PG.39.1096.28.

⁸⁵ Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, pp. 61; 82; 86; 566; 659; 660; 681; 684; v. 2, pp. 150; 392; 499; 538; *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 1, pp. 181; 591; v. 2, p. 681; v. 3, p. 159; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 194; *Dialogi de Sancta Trinitate*, p. 590; *Commentaria in Matthaeum*, fr. 226; *De Adoratione*, PG.68: 268.47; 269.1; 800.30; 1004.16; 1008.53; 1049.22; *GlaphPent*, PG.69: 217.32; 233.24; 377.20; 396.44; 673.39; 676.21; *In Canticum Canticorum Commentarii*, PG.69.1281.2; *In Isaiam*, PG.70: 49.23 and 50; 61.53; 64.46; 77.2 and 17; 128.57; 176.41; 272.32; 309.22; 701.5; 829.28; 1193.25; 1408.54; *Explanatio in Lucam*, PG.72: 532.14; 705.2; 709.24; *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75: 213.53; 385.31; 388.22; 401.12; 424.38; *Explanatio in Lucam (in catenis)*, p. 104; *expPs*, PG.69: 764.22; 768.3; 1268.3.

⁸⁶ Cf. 'ἐπιδημία of Christ' in Gregory of Nazianzus: *De Filio*, 10; *Adversus Julianum Imperatorem*, PG.35: 564.16; *De Dogmate et Constitutione Episcoporum*, PG.35.1069.11; *In Laudem Magni Athanasii*, PG.35.1117.4; *In Theophania sive Natalia Salvatoris*, PG.36.316.2; *In Sancta Lumina*, PG.36: 344.26; 353.7.

⁸⁷ Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.396.53; PG.28.684.31.

⁸⁸ Gregory of Nyssa, *Encomium in Sanctum Stephanum Protomartyrem*, PG.46.728.24.

⁸⁹ We are then left only with the following instances: Evagrius, *Expositio in Proverbia*, p. 111; *Scholia in Proverbia*, 287B. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 1, p. 157; v. 3, p. 424, actually quoting Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.396.53; *Epistula ad Epictetum*, 8. Severianus of Gabala, *In Tentationem Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*, p. 70.

⁹⁰ Eusebius, *HE*, 6.33.1; *DE*, 4.16.59; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.33; *Constantini Oratio ad Coetum Sanctorum*, 19; *commPs*, PG.23:144.44; 981.25; 1292.16.

⁹¹ Cf. *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 7.206: πρὸ τῆς Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημίας. 9.229: πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ Λόγου.

⁹² Cf. Theodoret, *De Incarnatione Domini*, PG.75.1476.4–5: μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος αὐτῶν φιλοσοφοῦσιν ἐπιδημίαν.

⁹³ *Ibid.* 1.56; 2.96; 7.204; 7.226.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXVIII

EN XXVIIIa: μετὰ τὸ ἐγνώκέναι

The specific form, ‘after having learned’, appears only in Origen, *exhMar*, XXIII: τὰ γὰρ εἶδωλα τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμόνια. οἷον δέ ἐστι τὸ καταλιπόντα τὸν χρηστὸν Χριστοῦ ζυγὸν καὶ τὸ ‘ἐλαφρόν’ αὐτοῦ ‘φορτίον’ πάλιν ἑαυτὸν ὑποβαλεῖν ζυγῷ δαιμόνων καὶ φορτίον βαστάζει βαρυτάτης ἁμαρτίας μετὰ τὸ ἐγνώκέναι ἡμᾶς ὅτι ‘σποδὸς ἢ καρδία’ τῶν εἰδώλοις λατρευνόντων.

EN XXVIIIb: ἐπὶ τὸ λῦσαι

In order to denote a certain goal that is pursued or meant, the preposition ἐπὶ is naturally followed by the article τὸ and an infinitive. Turner was wrong to dispute this, while arguing for ἐπὶ τῷ. But this structure, once followed by an infinitive, actually means the *cause* of what the infinitive suggests. This is the equivalent of an English verb expressing a feeling *at* something having happened. This *at* is in fact the expression analogous to ἐπὶ τῷ. Alternatively, the same expression may mean *at* in the sense of ‘nearby’. Neither of these senses is relevant to this Scholion, where a *purpose* for doing something (‘to loose the seals’) is meant. Although it is abundantly present in Greek literature, I adduce only a few examples from Didymus, which do not exhaust his usage of the idiom.

Didymus, *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 234: μὴ προαίρετος ὄρμα ἐπὶ τὸ ὀμνύναι. *commZacch*, 3.44: Ἐπὶ τὸ οὕτως ἐκζητῆσαι τὸ πρόσωπον Κυρίου

παντοκράτορος ἤρχοντο οἱ πολλοὶ λαοὶ ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ. *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 32: ἐπὶ τὸ θανατῶσαι αὐτόν. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 130: ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ πράττειν. Ibid. Cod. p. 197: σπεύδουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ ἐγγίσει τῷ καλοῦντι. *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 231: πρῶτον δὲ συνκατατίθεται τῇ παρανομίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ πράττειν αὐτὴν ἔρχεται. *frPs(al)*, fr. 67: καὶ ἐπεὶ τούτων ἕκαστον ἐπὶ τὸ βλάψαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι προφέρει ὑπὸ τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ. Ibid. fr. 379: καὶ πολέμιους ἔσχον ῥέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἐκκλῖναι ἀπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι. Ibid. fr. 464: ἐπὶ τὸ πλειόνως αὐτὰ καὶ ἐξεργαστικώτερον ἀκοῦσαι καὶ ποθῆσαι.

EN XXVIIIc: οὐκ ἐπεικτόν

The Codex’s word ἐπειστός makes no sense at this point, let alone that it hardly appears in Greek. The only use of the term ἐπειστός appears as the form the verb ἐπίεσται, of which ἐπειστός is present participle: it simply means ‘being above’.¹

At this point of the Scholion, the term should be ἐπεικτόν (‘accessible to’, ‘to be within the power of’). This is a Homeric word recurring in both epic poems, and transpires in later authors and poets. In Homer it is used only in a negative clause. Gregory of Nazianzus was alone in using this Homeric word, in his poems.²

The term ἐπεικτός has different and interesting meanings: this may mean either ‘tolerable’,³ or ‘yielding’,⁴ or ‘ceaseless’,⁵ or indeed ‘permissible,

¹ In an oracle ascribed to the Pythia. Herodotus, *Historiae*, 1.47 (Anthologiae Palatinae Appendix, *Epigrammata Oracula*, Epigram 64). The form ἐπειστός is never attested in literature: it would be a perfect active participle (neuter) of ἐπιέννυμι. There is also the perfect participle ἐστός of the verb ἵσταμαι (middle voice), of which the normal participle is ἐστηκώς, ἐστηκυῖα, ἐστηκώς, alternatively ἐστός, ἐστόσα, ἐστός, and again the alternative to the neuter is ἐστός. But in that case, the verb should be ἐπίσταμαι, which means ‘know’.

² Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmina de Se Ipso*, p. 982: Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν κ’ ἐπεικτά.

³ Homer, *Odyssey*, VIII.306–9: Ζεῦ πάτερ ἦδ’ ἄλλοι μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἔοντες, δεῦθ’ ἵνα ἔργ’ ἀγέλαστα καὶ οὐκ ἐπεικτά (= not tolerable) ἴδῃσθε, ὥς ἐμὲ χολὸν ἔοντα Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη αἰὲν ἀτιμάζει. Likewise, Oppianus of Corycus or Anazarbis (Syria, second cent. AD), *Halieutica*, 1.526: ὁστέον οὐκ ἐπεικτόν.

⁴ Homer, *Iliad*, VIII.32: εὖ νυ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ὃ τοι σθένης οὐκ ἐπεικτόν. Cf. *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 638: ‘οὐκ ἐπεικτόν,’ ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐχ ὑποχωροῦν τινί, οὐ νικώμενον. Ibid. p. 1: Μητρός τοι μένος αἰὲν ἀάσχετον οὐκ ἐπεικτόν. Ἀκατάσχετον, ἀκατακράτητον, μέγα. Porphyry, *Zetemata Codicis Vaticani*, p. 311 and *Quaestionum Homericarum liber i*, 80: εἰπόντος Διός, εὖ νυ, φησί, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ὃ τοι σθένης οὐκ ἐπεικτόν. In fact the expression ‘unyielding might’ (σθένης οὐκ ἐπεικτόν) became something of a proverbial one. Procopius of Gaza, *Descriptio Imaginis*, 1: ἄλλ’ ὁ σεμνὸς καὶ ὑπατος καὶ ᾧ τὸ σθένης οὐκ ἐπεικτόν Σεμέλην τε ποθεῖ καὶ Ἥραν περιεργάζεται. John Galen (grammarian, Constantinople, twelfth cent. AD), *Allegoriae in Homeri Iliadem*, 4.1–4, p. 420: καὶ ᾧ περ τὸ σθένης οὐκ ἐπεικτόν.

⁵ Homer, *Iliad*, XVI.549: Ὡς ἔφατο, Τρῶας δὲ κατὰ κρῆθεν λάβε πένθος ἄσχετον, οὐκ ἐπεικτόν. *Iliad*, 5.892: μητρός τοι μένος ἐστὶν ἀάσχετον οὐκ ἐπεικτόν. *Odyssey*, 19.493: οἶσθα μὲν, οἷον ἔμὸν μένος ἔμπεδον οὐδ’ ἐπεικτόν.

befitting'.⁶ Cassian must have read this not only in Homer, but also in Lucian of Samosata, whom we discussed in EN XXVκ.

It is worth considering the equivalent (indeed synonymous) rare adjective ἀνύπεικτος used by Pseudo-Caesarius (=Cassian the Sabaite himself), *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, 14; 200; 202; 214 (καὶ τοῖς πάθεσιν ἀνύπεικτος); 218: it means 'unyielding', 'intractable', and seems to have been introduced by Gregory of Nyssa.⁷ Lexicographers made it a lemma almost immediately.⁸ No author other than Gregory and Caesarius did ever use this more frequently than once during the first Christian millennium. We come once again upon the medical doctor Paul of Aegina (seventh century), *Epitomae Medicae*, 2.43.1. Moreover, Arethas, *Scripta Minora*, Opus 28, p. 255. Although Eustathius of Thessaloniki naturally took this up in the twelfth century commenting on Homer, the epithet was thereafter abandoned altogether. Lexicographers apart, it was virtually only Gregory and Pseudo-Caesarius (=Cassian the Sabaite) that used it as part of their own vocabulary.

EN XXVIIIδ: The number 'seven' as a symbol of perfection (cf. EN IXδ)

A text ascribed to Alexander of Aphrodisias argued that, 'to Pythagoras, to mathematicians, and to musicians', 'the number seven is a perfect one by nature' (ὁ ἑπτὰ ἀριθμὸς τέλειός ἐστι τῇ φύσει).⁹

Origen did not regard the number 'seven' in the same way as Didymus did. In Origen's eschatology it is the 'Eighth Day' which is the 'Day of the Lord', and is valued along with number 'eight' itself. He seems to concede some value to the number 'seven' only in a

relative sense: 'seven' denotes 'perfection', yet not the absolute eschatological end, which is implied only through the (eighth) Day of the Lord.¹⁰

Origen, *frPs*, 118, 5: Ὅταν δὲ τελειώμεθα ἐν τοῖς στοιχείοις, ὁ ἑπτὰ ἀριθμὸς ἀτιμητέος¹¹ ἡμῖν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ τῇ ὕλῃ ἀνίεται οὗτος, εἴπερ ἐστὶν ὁ ἑπτὰ σημεῖον ὑλικῆς παχύτητος· ὁ δὲ ὀκτὼ ἀρχὴ τῆς ἀυλοτέρως μείζονος καταστάσεως.

The number 'seven' relates to 'rest' from concerns of this world, and is treated accordingly.

Origen, *schMatt*, PG.17.300.27–31: Ἐπεὶ ὁ μὲν ἕξ ἀριθμὸς ἐργατικὸς καὶ ἐν γενέσει κόσμου, ὁ δὲ ἑπτὰ ἀναπαύσεως· ὁ μὲν τὰ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ὑλικά ἀγαπῶν, ἐξαμαρτάνων τέλος ἔχει τὴν ἑβδομάδα· ὅπερ νοήσας ὁ Πέτρος, συγχωρεῖν θέλει ἐν τῷ ἑπτά.

Veneration of the number 'eight' obviously has some relevance to Gnosticism and Mithraism.¹² This predilection seems to have been sustained by Hippolytus, who, like Origen, placed the 'real rest' in an anticipated 'ogdoad', which they saw relevant to the Pentecost: this is the day following seven weeks, each of which comprises seven days.

Pseudo-Hippolytus, *Fragmenta in Psalmos*, fr. 9: Περιέχει δὲ ἡ πεντηκοντὰς ἑπτὰ ἑβδομάδας, σάββατα σαββάτων καὶ ἀρχὴν μετὰ τέλεια σάββατα ὑπὲρ τὰ σάββατα ἐν ὀγδοαδί ἀληθῶς καινῆς ἀναπαύσεως.

Clement of Alexandria took the number 'seven' as a symbol 'of the sensible world' (κόσμου ἐστὶ τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ σύμβολον) since the planets of the visible world are seven in number.¹³ Eusebius shares the view that the Pentecost comes on the day when 'seven perfect weeks' (ἐν ἑβδομάσιν ἑπτὰ τελείαις) have elapsed.¹⁴ This

⁶ Anonymi, *De Incredibilibus*, 15 (=Lucian of Samosata, *De Astrologia*, 15): Ἰκαρος οὐκ ἐπεικτὰ ζητῶν. Apollonius (sophist, first-second cent. AD), *Lexicon Homericum*, p. 4, and *Etymologicum Magnum*, p. 224: Ὁμηρος, Δεῦθ' ἵνα ἔργα ἀγέλαστα καὶ οὐκ ἐπεικτὰ ἴδῃσθε. (*Odyssey*, VIII.307). This expression, too, had become a proverbial one. It is quoted also in the *Commentaria in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, Scholia Londinensia, p. 480.

⁷ Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita atque Encomium Ephraem Syri*, PG.46: 832.32; 841.12; *De Hominis Opificio*, p. 244; *De Infantibus Praemature Abreptis*, p. 95.

⁸ Timaeus (sophist and grammarian, probably fourth century), *Lexicon Platonicum*, p. 979a. Hesychius of Alexandria, *Lexicon*,

Alphabetic letter alpha, entry 5566. *Suda*, lexicon, Alphabetic letter alpha, 2788.

⁹ Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Problemata*, 2.47. Alexander of Aphrodisias himself intimates this in his *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 38.

¹⁰ Origen, *commJohn*, XXXIX.270&272. *Cels*, VI.31. Cf. *PHE*, pp. 283–308.

¹¹ The editor's emendation προτιμητέος in *selPs*, PG.12.1588.5–6 is incorrect.

¹² Cf. Origen, *Cels*, VI.31.

¹³ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 5.6.37.1.

¹⁴ Eusebius, *De Solemnitate Paschali*, PG.24.700.24–26.

view is endorsed by Didymus, too.¹⁵ Gregory of Nazianzus explicitly maintains *seven* to be a perfect number (ἐπτὰ τὸν τέλειον ἀριθμόν),¹⁶ while a text ascribed to Epiphanius of Salamis devotes an entire chapter to demonstrating that this is ‘a perfect number’ (ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἐπτὰ τέλειος ἀριθμός).¹⁷ To Didymus, ‘seven’ denotes the ‘day of rest’ of God after he had created the world, which is why this figure should be honoured. The following text is pretty reminiscent of both [Scholia XXVII](#) and [XXVIII](#):

Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.51: ὁ γὰρ ἑβδομήκοντα ἀριθμός, ἐκ δεκάδων ἐπτὰ συνεστηκώς, τελείαν ἀνάπασιν ἐπιφέρει, παρέχοντος αὐτὴν τοῦ ἐληλυθότος ‘κηρῦσαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν’, ἀνατείλαντος ἐκ τοῦ Ἰούδα. Cf. *ibid.* 1.280.

This idea is widespread throughout his work: *frPs(al)*, fr. 823: Ἐπειδὴ ὁ ἐπτὰ ἀριθμός καταπαύσεως σύμβολον ἔχει, . . . ἀργίας δὲ σύμβολον ὁ σαββατικὸς ἀριθμός. In *Genesin*, Cod. p. 35–36: Λόγος τίμιος ὁ περὶ τὴν ἑβδομάδα ὦν (ἀμήτωρ¹⁸ γὰρ αὕτη καὶ ἀπάτωρ) ὑποβάλλει νόησιν ὅτι τῆς αὐτῆς εἰσι τῆς δυνάμεως οἱ ἅγιοι, κὰν εἰς ὑπάρχωσιν, θεῖον τι καθεστῶτες καὶ ὑπεράνθρωπον θεωρία καὶ βίω. *Ibid.* Cod. p. 56: Ταῦτα δὲ φαμεν οὐχ ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπτὰ αἰσθητοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντος, ἀλλὰ θηρεύοντες πῶς κατ’ εἰκόνα Θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐστίν· τὴν γὰρ τελείαν ἐποπτικὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν διὰ τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἐδήλωσεν ὁ λόγος καὶ δι’ ἧς ἔχει ἀρετὰς ὁ ἐπτὰ ἀριθμός, ὡς ἤδη προεῖρηται. *Ibid.* Cod. p. 183: [. . . τ]η ἑβδομάδι λέγω, κατέπαυσεν ὁ Θεὸς . . . [. . . .]. τὴν ἑβδομάδα· αὕτη γὰρ παρθέν[ος ἐστίν] καὶ ἀπάτωρ καὶ ἀμήτωρ. *Ibid.* Cod. p. 188: Εἰ δὲ καὶ

πρὸς ἀναγωγὴν τις ἐθέλοι, λέγοι ἂν ὅτι, ἐπεὶ ὁ ἐπτὰ ἀριθμός ἀναπαύσεώς ἐστι σύμβολον.

Along with Didymus, Cyril of Alexandria espoused the idea of *seven* being ‘a symbol of perfection’.¹⁹ Theodoret promptly embraced this view, which after all had been vested with such great authority. What is more, Theodore of Mopsuestia seems to have explicated and argued for the same opinion.²⁰ Later still, Oecumenius upheld the idea and used it in his own Commentary on the Apocalypse.²¹

EN XXVIIIe: Quoting Zachariah 4:10

(cf. Zachariah 3:9)

Only a few theologians quote this scriptural passage. Of them, Didymus is the sole one to expound its meaning in the spirit of [Scholion XXVIII](#), using a language which is generally relevant to the Scholia. Besides, he uses the expressions and notions of the ‘eyes’ of God ‘supervising’ the entire world, an idea that occurs in other Scholia, too.

Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 133: Πολλάκις γὰρ ὁ ἐπτὰ ἀριθμός ἐν τῇ γραφῇ ἀντὶ τελειότητος παρείλημπτai²² τοῦτο δηλοῦται ὑπὸ τοῦ λεγομένου· Ἐπτὰ ὀφθαλμοὶ εἰσιν ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ σῶμά ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ἵνα καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπτὰ ἀριθμόν²³ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ²⁴ αὐτοῦ τυγχάνωσιν, ἀλλὰ δῆλον ὡς τὴν ἐποπτικὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν²⁵ πληρεστάτην καὶ μεγάλην εἶναι διδάσκει.

commZacch, 1.331: Εἶναι ἐπτὰ ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶπεν, ἐφορῶντας²⁶ καὶ ἐπιβλέποντας²⁷ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, τότε μάλιστα ὅτε ἔμαθον ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην οἱ

¹⁵ Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. pp. 107–108: οὕτω γοῦν καὶ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ τῶν ἑβδομάδων ἡ πεντηκοστή ἄγεται ἢ κατὰ τὴν παλαιὰν διαθήκην καὶ τὴν νέαν· ἔχει γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν τῶν ἀποστόλων ὅτι· ‘ἐν τῇ’ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν πεντηκοστήν· ἡ δόσις τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος δέδοται, τὰ διάφορα χαρίσματα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιμετρήθη· ἔδει γὰρ ὑπερβεβηκέναι τὸν ἐπτὰ ἐπτὰ ἀριθμόν καὶ ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν ἄλλου τοιοῦτου ἀριθμοῦ καὶ οὕτω τελειωθῆναι. ὁ πεντήκοντα οὖν ἐπὶ πολλῶν παραλαμβάνεται μεγάλων. ὁ ἑβδομος μὴν πάλιν τέλειός ἐστιν. ἡ σκηνοποιία οὖν ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ μηνὶ γίνεται κατ’ Ἐβραίους.

¹⁶ Gregory of Nazianzus, *In Pentecosten*, PG.36.433.1.

¹⁷ Pseudo-Epiphanius of Salamis, *Tractatus de Numerorum Mysteryis*, PG.43.513.34.

¹⁸ Likewise Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 303: ὁ ἕξ ἀριθμός ἐλέχθη, πῶς τέλειός ἐστιν. ὁ ἐπτὰ δὲ ἐστὶν ἀδιάφορος καὶ παρθένος ἀμήτορι καὶ ἀπάτορι ἐοικώς· οὐδὲ γὰρ γεννᾶν ἐφόκεν

ὁ ἐπτὰ οὐδὲ γεννᾶσθαι. παρθένος ἐστὶν ἡ οὐ γεννᾶ, παρθένος ἀδιάφορος. About the number ‘seven’ being one ‘without a mother’ (ἀμήτωρ) and ‘a virgin’ (ὁ ἐπτὰ ἀμήτωρ καὶ παρθένος), cf. Iamblichus, *Theologoumena Arithmeticae*, p. 59.

¹⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, *De Adoratione in Spiritu et Veritate*, PG.68: 608.17; 641.44; 688.49; 764.49–50; 1037.20; *commProphXII*, v. 2, p. 322; *GlaphPent*, PG.69: 297.25–27; 632.9–11.

²⁰ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *commProphXII*, Prophet Micah, 5.5b–6a; Prophet Zachariah, 4.2b–3; 4.10c.

²¹ Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, pp. 76; 79; 100; 150.

²² Cf. [Scholion XXVII](#).

²³ Cf. [Scholia XIX](#), [XXVII](#), [XXXVI](#).

²⁴ Cf. [Scholia XV](#), [XXX](#).

²⁵ Cf. [Scholion XV](#).

²⁶ Cf. [Scholion XXX](#).

²⁷ Cf. [Scholia XV](#) and [XXVIII](#).

οικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορευόμενοι ἄωμοι καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι δικαιοσύνην. Ὅτι δ' οὗτοι ἐπιβλέπονται ὑπὸ Κυρίου, ἀπὸ τοῦ ψαλμοῦ μαθεῖν ἔστιν λέγοντος· Ὁφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους, καὶ ὅτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν.'

Origen discussed this briefly, in order to show that there can be no corporeal meaning attached to such expressions, since God is not corporeal.

Origen, *selGen*, PG.12.93.23–30: καὶ συνάγουσι μυρία ῥητὰ μέλη ὀνομάζοντα Θεοῦ. Πρὸς οὗς ἀγωνιστέον πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῆς λέξεως· ἀντιπαρβαλοῦμεν δὲ ῥητὰ τοῖς πλέον τοῦ γράμματος μηδὲν ἐπισταμένοις, ἐναντιούμενα αὐτῶν τῇ ὑπολήψει· ἐκ μὲν τοῦ Ζαχαρίου, ὅτι Ἑπτὰ ὀφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου οἱ ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. Εἰ δὲ ἑπτὰ ἔχει ὀφθαλμοὺς ὁ Θεός, ἡμεῖς δὲ δύο, οὐ κατ' εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ γεγόναμεν.

Maximus Confessor, *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, 54: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Ζοροβάβελ, ὁ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων λυτρωτής, ὁ ἔχων ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τὸν λίθον τὸν κασσιτήρινον, τὸν τοῖς ἑπτὰ τοῦ κυρίου κοσμούμενον ὀφθαλμοῖς, δι' ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἐπιβλέπει ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.

The same scriptural passage is simply quoted in a couple of spurious texts.

Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, PG.48.1091.28–30: Οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ πολλὰ εὔροι τις ἂν περὶ Πατρὸς λεγόμενα πρὸς τὴν παχύτητα τῶν ἀκουόντων· ὥσπερ, Ἑπτὰ ὀφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου ἐπιβλέποντες τὴν οἰκουμένην.

Pseudo-Epiphanius of Salamis, *Testimonia*, 13b.2: Καὶ Ζαχαρίας λέγει· Ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τὸν ἕνα ἑπτὰ ὀφθαλμοὶ εἰσιν, ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. *Tractatus de Numerorum Mysteriorum*, PG.43.516.11–18: Ἑπτὰ ὀφθαλμοὶ εἰσιν οἱ ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. Ἑπτὰ ἐπαρυστρίδας καὶ ἑπτὰ λύχνους ἑώρακε Ζαχαρίας, ὅτι ἑπτὰ πνεύματα παρὰ Θεοῦ. Ἑπτὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὰ χαρίσματα²⁸ πνεῦμα σοφίας, πνεῦμα συνέσεως, πνεῦμα βουλῆς, πνεῦμα ἰσχύος, πνεῦμα γνώσεως, πνεῦμα εὐσεβείας, πνεῦμα φόβου Θεοῦ.

This Scholion reproduces part of Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse. Nevertheless, some expressions are Cassian's own.

²⁸ This text agrees with both the Scholia and Oecumenius' account of the 'gifts granted by the Holy Spirit'. Cf. *Scholion XIX*: τὰ ζ' πνεύματα αἱ μετουσίαι τοῦ πνεύματος εἰσιν. Oecumenius,

Commentarius in Apocalypsin, p. 79: ἅτινα πνεύματα τούτέστιν πνευματικὰ χαρίσματα. Cf. p. 122.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXIX

EN XXIXa: εὐμούσως

There are only four instances where the use the terms εὐμούσως ('melodiously') and ἁρμονικῶς ('harmoniously') are used side by side. All of them are nearly contemporary. The grammarian Julius Naucratis (second cent. AD), who set forth the grammatically proper use of the word; Lucian of Samosata (second cent. AD); the sophist Aelian (second/third cent. AD);¹ and a text belonging to the anonymous *Scholia In Aelium Aristidem*.

We have already come upon both Julius Naucratis and Lucian of Samosata, which suggests that the expression in this Scholion originates in Cassian's having read these authors. We also came across the *Scholia In Aelium Aristidem* in [Scholion XXIV \(EN XXIVb\)](#).

Julius Naucratis (or Julius Pollux, or Julius Polydeuces), *Onomasticon*, 4.57: Μουσικῇ δὲ προσήκοι ἂν καὶ τὰ προειρημένα καὶ μουσικός, μουσουργός, μουσουργικός, μουσουργεῖν, καὶ εὐμουσία, ἁμουσία, εὐμούσως, ἁμούσως, μουσικῶς, εὐμουσος, ἁμουσος, καὶ μέλος, ἁμέλεια, ἁμελής, ἁμελῶς.

Lucian of Samosata, *De Saltatione*, 25: ὁ Σωκράτης δέ, σοφώτατος ἀνὴρ, εἴ γε πιστευτέον τοῦτο περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντι τῷ Πυθίῳ, οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τὴν ὀρχηστικὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκμαθεῖν αὐτὴν ἡξίου, μέγιστον νέμων εὐρυθμίᾳ καὶ εὐμουσίᾳ καὶ κινήσει ἁμελεῖ καὶ εὐσχημοσύνη τοῦ κινουμένου.

Aelian, *De Natura Animalium*, 10.32: Ἄκανθον τὸν ὄρνιν ἐκ τῶν τρεφουσῶν ἀκανθῶν λαβεῖν τὸ ὄνομα οἱ σοφοὶ τὰ ὀρνίθων φασί. φθέγγεται δὲ ἄρα ἁμελῆς καὶ εὐμουσον δεινῶς.

Scholia In Aelium Aristidem, Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων,

173.3: πάλιν δὲ ὁ Πᾶν λόγος, ἐπειδὴ Ἑρμοῦ ἐστίν, ὥς φασιν, υἱὸς πᾶς λόγος ἔντεχνος· ἦδε ὅτι ὁ Πᾶν μουσικός, πᾶς δὲ λόγος εὐμουσος καὶ ἁμελῶς σύγκειται.

A coincidence should not pass unnoticed: the much later grammarian John Galen used both the terms found in this Scholion.² This is the same person whom we met in [EN XXVIIIc](#) as one of the very few ever to have used the Homeric expression ἐπιεικτόν.

On the other hand, the term εὐμούσως and its cognates occur in a small number of authors, some of whom (Chrysippus, Plutarch) relate to the vocabulary of the Scholia.³

In conclusion, the fact that the term ἁμελῶς (discussed below, [EN XXIXb](#)) recurs in Lucian, while Plutarch used it at no less than twenty-six points, suggests them both as sources. The text is in any case a quotation from Didymus who used the term,⁴ as indeed Cassian himself did.⁵ Furthermore, we shall soon come upon Didymus' characteristic vernacular (γενναμένης, λημφθέντες).

EN XXIXb: ἁμελῶς

Since the context is about the 'thousands of thousands' of angels who 'sing a new song' around the throne of the Pantocrator (Rev. 5:11–12), the adverb needed here is one indicating *music*, and this should be not εὐμελῶς but ἁμελῶς. Against the rather rare use of the former, the adjective ἁμελής and its cognates were used in hundreds of instances by authors who influenced the vocabulary of the present author (Philo, Plutarch, Origen, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Dionysius of Halicarnassus⁶).

¹ Both Lucian and Aelian used ἁμελῶς. Lucian of Samosata (second cent. AD), *Demonax*, 9; 11; *Vitarum Auctio*, 27; *Rhetorum Praeceptor*, 19; *Pro Imaginibus*, 20; *Apologia*, 5. Aelian (sophist, second–third cent. AD), *Varia Historia*, 12.13; 12.51; 14.23; 14.31.

² John Galen (grammarian, Constantinople, twelfth cent. AD), *Allegoriae in Hesiodi Theogoniam*, p. 365: ὥς ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν Μοῦσαν εὐμούσως ἀνακρουσθείσης καὶ ἁρμονικοῖς λόγοις ἁμελῶς ἁρμολογείσης.

³ Plutarch, *Adversus Colotem*, 1119D8 (εὐμούσως). Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Logica et Physica*, fr. 387 (SVF, II.128.7: ἡ εὐμουσία). Plato, *Gorgias*, 486c5 (εὐμουσίαν).

⁴ Didymus, *Commentarii in Job* (1–4), Cod. p. 88 (ἁμελεῖς); *frPs(al)*, frs. 832 (ἁμελεῖ); 962 (ἁμελῶς); 1206 (ἁμελῶς and ἁμελεῖ); 1291 (ἁμελεῖ); *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 30.

⁵ Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 2.8–27)*, PG.39.605.1 (ἁμελεῖς).

⁶ See the distinction made by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De Compositione Verborum*, 11: εὐμελής is just a pleasant voice of someone who *speaks* (but not *sings*); ἁμελής is a voice vested with *music*.

It might well be that the phrase originates in the Old Testament expression ὁ δέσποτα κύριε.⁷ Certainly the association of Lord (δεσπότης) with the designation Saviour (σωτήρ) is a common motif in theology. Philo had introduced this to theology with an impressively subtle analysis.⁸ Some apocrypha transferred Philo's appellations from God himself to Jesus Christ.⁹ The reading ὁ δέσποτα σωτήρ of the Codex is strictly speaking incorrect, and it should be ὁ δέσποτα σῶτερ. However, it is this mistaken usage which reveals that the Scholion was written during later times, namely by Cassian. For indeed the technically erroneous ὁ δέσποτα σωτήρ is a version which was employed later, even though not correct. As a matter of fact, we can find only a couple of instances of the correct vocative,¹⁰ whereas the Codex's ὁ δέσποτα σωτήρ is the more frequent as well as the later one.¹¹ The same goes for the similar appellation Χριστὲ Σῶτερ,¹² which is correct, contrasted with Χριστὲ Σωτήρ, which appeared later.¹³ The appellative Σωτήρ turns out to be the natural one for Cassian to have used. For one thing, it was used during the sixth century by Romanus Melodus, who, like Cassian, was also of Syrian extraction. For another, this was the form used by the Studite monk and hymnographer Clement, and we know that

the Studios monastery cherished the patrimony of the Akoimetoι. Furthermore, the same appellative recurs in the Greek religious hymns, which betokens both the Sabaite and the Akoimetan spirit.¹⁴ All these connections and relations conduce to Cassian's having used this form, too, which means that the term in the Codex is the right one as it stands.

Certain later historians and chroniclers excerpted a passage from Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History*¹⁵ recounting the circumstances surrounding the ordination of Ambrose in Milan. They all duplicated σῶτερ correctly from Theodoret's original.¹⁶

The address, ὁ δέσποτα, accorded to Christ, appears in Didymus, but exclusively in the fragments of the collection we have come upon every now and then, which means it is rather a designation added by the catenist, since Didymus did not style Christ δεσπότης, which he reserved for God alone. *frPs(al)*, fr. 63: προσάγει τῷ σωτήρι λέγον Ἀνάστηθι, ὁ δέσποτα, κατάβηθι πρὸς ἡμᾶς. Ibid. fr. 825: ἦκε, ὁ δέσποτα, εἰς τὸ σῶσαι ἡμᾶς· οὐκ ἄλλως γάρ ἐστι σωτηρίας τυχεῖν ἢ σοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐληλυθότος. Ibid. fr. 1222: Τυγχάνων δὲ δύναμις τῆς σωτηρίας μου, ὁ δέσποτα, ἐπεσκίαςας ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν μου ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πολέμου.

Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.941.30: Τῆς παρὰ σοῦ, Δέσποτα, σωτηρίας ἀπολαῦσαι

⁷ Genesis 15:8; Judith 5:20; 11:10; Jonah 4:3; Jer. 1:6; 4:10; Daniel (translatio Graeca) 9:15.

⁸ Philo, *De Sobrietate*, 55–56: τοῦ μὲν γὰρ αἰσθητοῦ κόσμου δεσπότης καὶ εὐεργέτης ἀνείρηται διὰ τοῦ κύριος καὶ θεός, τοῦ δὲ νοητοῦ ἀγαθοῦ σωτήρ καὶ εὐεργέτης αὐτὸ μόνον, οὐχὶ δεσπότης ἢ κύριος· φίλον γὰρ τὸ σοφὸν θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ δοῦλον.

⁹ *Martyrium Prius Andreae* (second cent. AD), 1: ἡ μὲν χάρις τοῦ ἡμετέρου δεσπότης καὶ θεοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Acta Apocrypha Justiniani* (second–third cent. AD), 5.6: ἐπὶ τοῦ φοβεροῦ καὶ παγκοσμίου βήματος τοῦ δεσπότης ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος. *Acta Apocrypha Thomae*, 97: Κύριε θεέ, δέσποτα, πατήρ ἐλεήμων, σωτήρ Χριστέ.

¹⁰ Cf. δέσποτα σῶτερ in Ephraem Syrus, *De Timore Animarum*, p. 38: Ἰδε, Χριστὲ σῶτερ, πηγὰς δακρύων ἑμῶν. Pseudo-John of Damascus, *De Sancto Artemio*, PG.96.1312.22: Εὐχαριστῶ σοι, Δέσποτα Σῶτερ.

¹¹ See δέσποτα σωτήρ in *Vita Symeonis Stylitae Iunioris*, 78. Clement Studites (ninth cent.), *Canones Ceremoniales*, Canon 5, line 184. Typicon Magnae Ecclesiae, *Typicon Menaem* (ninth/tenth cent.), Month 5, p. 212. Theodore Metochites (thirteenth/fourteenth cent.), *In Abbatem Lucam*, Section 3. It is remarkable that two different editions of the same epigram have two different spellings, with neither of them being an editorial emendation. Cf. δέσποτα σῶτερ in Pectorius (second–third cent. AD), *Epitaphium*, whereas the same epigram in *Anthologiae Palatinae Appendix, Sepulcralia*, Epigram 718 has it δέσποτα σωτήρ.

¹² Χριστὲ Σῶτερ. Eusebius, *Constantini Oratio ad Coetum Sanctorum*, 11.3. Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo Compunctorius*, p. 389; *De Timore Animarum*, p. 38; *Quod Non Oporteat Ridere et Extolli*, p. 207; *Capita Viginti*, Chapter 20, lines 117 and 132. Nicholas the Mystic (Patriarch of Constantinople, ninth/tenth cent.), *Epistulae*, 23. Also in the acts of the monastery of Patmos, *Regula Sancti Christoduli*, 27.

¹³ Χριστὲ Σωτήρ. Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo Asceticus*, p. 173; *De Passionibus*, pp. 354; 361; *De Iudicio et Separatione Animae et Corporis*, p. 242; *Precationes e Sacris Scripturis Collectae*; Prayer 2, p. 299; Prayer 5, p. 323; Prayer 6, p. 334. *Lexicon Syntacticum*, Alphabetic letter kappa, p. 296. Romanus Melodus (of Syrian extraction, Constantinople, sixth cent.), *Cantica*, Hymn 24.23; *Cantica Genuina*, Hymn 58.18. *Analecta Hymnica Graeca, Canones Septembris*, (Day/Canon/Ode) 1.1, 1.8; 11.17.9; *Canones Januarii*, 11.21.5; *Canones Augusti*, 6.5, 2.4. Clement Studites, *Canones Ceremoniales*, Canon 4, line 127; Canon 7 lines 259 and 279 and 289.

¹⁴ This point is canvassed in *NDGF*, Appendix II, pp. 589–90.

¹⁵ Theodoret, *HE*, p. 219: χάρις σοι, δέσποτα παντοκράτωρ καὶ σῶτερ ἡμέτερε.

¹⁶ Cf. Theodoret Anagnostes (eighth/ninth cent. AD), *Chronographia*, p. 60. Theophanes Confessor (eighth/ninth cent. AD), *Chronographia*, p. 60. George Monachus (ninth cent. AD), *Chronicon*, p. 559, and *Chronicon Breve*, v. 110, p. 688. George Cedrenus (eleventh/twelfth cent. AD), *Compendium Historiarum*, v. 1, p. 546. Nicephorus Callistus (thirteenth/fourteenth cent. AD), *HE*, 11.32.

παρακαλῶ. Ibid. PG.80.1376.16: Καιρός, φησίν, ἀναστῆναί σε, Δέσποτα, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων πραγματεύσασθαι σωτηρίαν. Ibid. PG.80. 1405. 21: Μὴ ἀπαγορεύσης, φησί, Δέσποτα, τὴν ἐμὴν σωτηρίαν. Ibid. PG.80.1548.44: Τάχιστα, φησὶν δέ, ὦ Δέσποτα, τὴν σὴν ἡμῖν ἀγαθότητα δεῖξον, καὶ τύχωμεν τῆς σωτηρίας. Ibid. PG.80.1556.16: Ἐγὼ ἤλπισά σοι, Δέσποτα, σῶσον· δὸς τῇ ἐλπίδι τῆς σωτηρίας ἀντίδοσιν. Ibid. PG.80.1568.38: Σέ, Δέσποτα, Κύριον οἶδα τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας. Ibid. PG.80.1817.20: Καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον, ὦ Δέσποτα, παράσχου τὴν σωτηρίαν. Ibid. PG.80.1833.46: Ἦν ὑπέσχου, Δέσποτα, σωτηρίαν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς σου λόγοις παράσχου.

Of other authors, it is only Ephraem Syrus who stands close to this invocation. It should be taken into account that the expression that is identical to that of the present Scholion was probably rendered into Greek by Ephraem's Sabaite translators. *De Compunctione*, p. 384: καὶ πραγματευσάμενος τὴν καλὴν πραγματείαν ἐν τῷ σῶ ἄγρῳ, Σωτήρ, ἐπαίνου ἐπιτύχω παρὰ σοῦ, ὦ Δέσποτα. *Capita Viginti*, 20: Μεγαλυνῶ τὴν χάριν σου, Χριστὲ Σῶτερ· ἐν τῷ γὰρ μεγαλύνειν, μεγαλύνομαι ἐν αὐτῇ. Οὐ παύομαι ἐν γλώσσει μου ὑμνολογῶν τὴν χάριν σου, ὦ Δέσποτα. *De Timore Animarum*, p. 38: Αὐτὸς οἶδας, ὦ Δέσποτα, ἀπὸ πικροῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς ἐτόλμησα ταῦτα φθέγγεσθαι ἐνώπιόν σου. Ἴδε, Χριστὲ σῶτερ, πηγὰς δακρύων ἐμῶν.

A passage in Origen suggests once again that a Sabaite monk might have been his catenist. *frPs*, 85, 2: Ἐγὼ ἤλπισά σοι, δέσποτα, δὸς ἐλπίδι τῆς σωτηρίας ἀντίδοσιν. The invocation ὦ δέσποτα appears in any case only in the catena-fragments of Origen's commen-

taries on the Psalms: *frPs*, 103, 1; *selPs*, PG.12: 1172.31; 1233.46.

It was Athanasius who used this exclamation in abundance.¹⁷ Nevertheless, and although employed by theologians such as Didymus¹⁸ and Cyril of Alexandria,¹⁹ no Christian ever matched the frequency and total number of instances of this expression in Theodoret's work.²⁰

Therefore, this invocation to Christ turns out to be grammatically later and was written by Cassian himself.

EN XXIXd: γεναμένης

The striking colloquial aorist participle γεναμένης transpires also in [Scholion XXI](#) and was discussed at that point. A. Harnack emended this to γενομένης. C. H. Turner, however, argued in favour of this participle, on the grounds that this 'is a known form'.²¹ This is known indeed, being only a peculiar version of the aorist participle of the verb γίνεσθαι. Harnack was right on the grounds of strict grammar, yet Turner was also right to maintain a known form. What the latter did not do is cite some of the abundant instances where this participle occurs in order to prove the acceptability of this verb-form.²²

EN XXIXe: διάλεκτος and γλώσσα

Although Rev. 5:9 reads ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς καὶ γλώσσης (and so do Rev. 13:7 and 14:6), the author of the Scholion uses διαλέκτου instead of γλώσσης. The two terms are treated as interchangeable by Didymus,²³ who declares that he does not know the

¹⁷ Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27: 108.32; 212.22; 300.1; *et passim*, more than twenty instances, all of them in this work on the Psalms.

¹⁸ In Didymus, the expression ὦ δέσποτα appears almost exclusively in his fragments on the Psalms. Didymus, *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p 141; *frPs(al)*, Frs. 25; 63; 81; 91; 131; 159; 225; 733a; 825; 826; 869; 894; 900; 904; 920; 921; 976; 1094; 1183; 1222; 1229.

¹⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, pp. 200; 621; 678; v. 2, pp. 122; 147; 240; 494; 511; *De Adoratione*, PG.68.156.11; *GlaphPent*, PG.69: 116.45; 117.15; 256.57; *expPs*, PG.69: 725.39; 741.18; 772.39; 833.13 and 22; 836.24; 848.42; 965.18; 973.12; 993.36; 1033.11; 1140.47; 1209.26; 1237.33; 1260.37; *In Isaiam*, PG.70: 560.3; 580.44; 596.26; 772.18; 1029.11; 1168.47; 1397.27; *Explanatio in Lucam*, PG.72: 604.1; 756.14; 920.7.

²⁰ Theodoret, *De Incarnatione Domini*, PG.75.1445.8; *Interpretatio in*

Psalmos, PG.80: 900.29; 913.46; 916.45; 953.43; 965.41; 981.17; 1053.37; 1117.11; 1180.15; 1213.46; 1265.19; 1284.20; 1284.40; 1309.16; 1324.40; 1548.44; 1672.46; 1676.25; 1792.18; 1797.41; 1817.20; 1860.51; 1864.25; 1881.46; 1908.53; 1909.2; 1941.29; *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.53.40; *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.600.2; *intDan*, PG.81: 1325.15; 1329.47; *intProphXII*, PG.81: 1729.12; 1816.9; 1825.88; 1829.7; *De Providentia*, PG.83: 729.14; 729.12; 729.48.

²¹ C. H. Turner (above p. 87, n. 626).

²² See [EN XXIf](#).

²³ Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.198: διάλεκτου and διαλέκτων. Ibid. 3.60: γλωσσῶν. *frPs(al)*, fr. 391: γλώσσει. Ibid. fr. 833: γλωτταν τουτέστι διάλεκτον. Ibid. 1.198: κατὰ τινα μίαν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων διαλέκτων. Ibid. 1.198 (meaning simply 'human language'): κατὰ προφορὰν ἀνθρωπίνης διαλέκτου.

Hebrew language.²⁴ However, in the remaining occurrences γλῶσσα is used mainly in the scriptural sense, denoting either the organ of speech or speech itself. Paul's γλώσσαις (1 Cor. 13:1) is used only ad hoc, whereas at other points the word is adapted to the purpose of interpreting a particular passage.²⁵

This phrasing appears in a catena-fragment ascribed to Origen.²⁶ A similar point occurs in Eusebius.²⁷ Interestingly, Proclus used γλῶσσα in the sense of 'oral speech'.²⁸

In addition to this Scholion and Oecumenius,²⁹ this point of Rev. 5:9 received a comment by Hippolytus.³⁰

In cases where the two terms διάλεκτος and γλῶσσα are not treated as synonymous, the manner in which they are used leaves some room for a distinction to be made. The former (διάλεκτος) denotes the *peculiarity* of a dialect, therefore, the characteristics of a particular group of people. The latter (γλῶσσα) connotes the general phenomenon of communicating by means of a certain language.³¹ Apart from a quotation from Acts 2:8, Cyril of Alexandria did not use the term διάλεκτος at all. On the other hand, Theodoret did so extensively.³² The expression διάλεκτον γλώσσης appears in a quotation of Isaiah 33:19 by Symmachus, which Theodoret had probably read in Eusebius.³³

EN XXIXf: ἔτι μὴν ('furthermore', 'besides')

Although a simple expression (normally, but not always, used after either a semicolon or a full stop) some remarks are called for, since employment of simple expressions scarcely occurring in other authors may provide telling conclusions.

Of the thirty-seven examples in Didymus, twenty-five follow a comma, six follow a semicolon, and six follow a full-stop. I use a comma, since both the meaning and context call for this. Origen does not appear keen to use this expression. There is only one instance in his *commJohn* and another one in *frJohn* IX, whereas the relevant passages in *Cels* are in fact Celsus' own words.³⁴ Aristotle, Plato, Plotinus, and Philo did not use this at all, and Diogenes Laertius did so only once.³⁵ Clement of Alexandria and Basil of Caesarea did not employ the idiom either. In their extant writings, Hippolytus and Irenaeus did so sparingly.³⁶ Athanasius used it, but only two examples are certain, whereas another eight instances occur in spurious texts.³⁷ In the two Gregories and John Chrysostom there is only casual use at a couple of points.³⁸ Likewise, this expression scarcely occurs in Theodoret³⁹ and Theodore of Mopsuestia.⁴⁰ On the other hand, Eusebius uses it fairly

²⁴ Didymus, *commZacch*, 4.254: Φασὶν γὰρ οἱ τὴν ἑβραϊκὴν διάλεκτον ἠκριβωκότες. *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 10: οἱ τὴν [sc. ἑβραϊκὴν] διάλεκτον ἐπιστάμενοι ὑπὲρ πάντας δύνανται εἰπεῖν τί σημαίνει. Ibid. ταῦτα οὐκ ἡμῶν εἶδέναι, ἀλλὰ τὸν τῇ [sc. ἑβραϊκῇ] διαλέκτῳ ὁμιλησάντων. Ibid.: εἰ καὶ μὴ ἴσμεν τὴν διάλεκτον τὴν ἑβραϊκὴν, ἀλλ' ἠκούσαμεν, ὅτι ῥυθμὸν μουσικὸν σημαίνει κατὰ τὴν διάλεκτον τὴν ἑβραϊάν.

²⁵ Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 277, rendering Psalm 30:21: ὁ δὲ ἐν τῷ προκόπτειν ἐπιτυγχάνων χρῆζει σκεπάζοντος θεοῦ ἐν σκηνῇ τουτέστιν τῶν διαφόρων γλωσσῶν ἢ τοι διαφόρων ψευδοδοξιών.

²⁶ *Catena in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 250 (Origen, *comm1Cor*, 49): καὶ ὡς περ ἄλλη διάλεκτος παιδίων, καὶ ἄλλη τετρανωμένων τὴν φωνήν, οὕτως πᾶσα ἐν ἀνθρώποις διάλεκτος οἶονεῖ παιδίων ἐστὶν διάλεκτος.

²⁷ Eusebius, *DE*, 6.25.4: διὰ τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας τε καὶ κλήσεως τὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν συναγωγὰς ἐπ' ὀνόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ συγκροτουμένας, τὰς τε γλώσσας ἀπάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐν παντοίαις διαλέκτοις ἀνθρώπων τὸν ἕνα θεὸν καὶ κύριον ἐπικαλουμένας.

²⁸ Proclus, *In Platonis Parmenidem*, p. 663: διὰ γὰρ τῶν δαιμόνων πᾶσά ἐστιν ὁμιλία καὶ ἡ διάλεκτος τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς θεοῦ, ὡς φησιν ἡ Διοτίμα, καὶ ἐργηγορότων καὶ καθευδόντων.

²⁹ Oecumenius, p. 80f.

³⁰ Hippolytus, *In Daniele*, 4.34.2. Cf. Old Testament, Daniel (Theodotionis versio) 3:96, Πᾶς λαός, φυλή, γλῶσσα, on which Theodoret had commented in his *intDan*, PG.81.345.2.

³¹ Cf. Acts 1:199; 2:6; 2:8. Theodoret quotes the latter in *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.344.17.

³² Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 2.45: κατὰ τὴν Φοινίκων διάλεκτον. *intDan*, PG.81.1509.28: ἰδίωμα γάρ ἐστι τῆς ἑβραίων διαλέκτου. Pseudo-Theodoret (or Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, p. 91: Εἴρηται τῷ Ὁριγένει, ἀνδρὶ ἐπισταμένῳ τὴν τῶν ἑβραίων διάλεκτον.

³³ Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.5. Theodoret, *commIs*, 10: Τούτοις ἐπήγαγεν ὁ προφήτης· Ὡς οὐ συνεβουλεύσαντο οὐδὲ ᾗδει βαθύφωνον ὥστε μὴ ἀκοῦσαι. Τοῦτο δὲ οἱ Τρεῖς οὕτως ἡρμήνευσαν· 'Οὐκ ὄψει λαὸν βαθὺν χεῖλεσιν ὥστε μὴ ἀκοῦσαι διάλεκτον γλώσσης.' Ἀντὶ τοῦ· ὁμόγλωττοὶ σοῦ εἰσιν οἱ κήρυκες τῆς ἀληθείας, ἑβραῖοι τὸ γένος, ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ τραφέντες, τὴν αὐτὴν σοὶ γλώτταν ἔχοντες, ἀλλ' ἐκὼν οὐκ ἐπαῖεις τῶν λεγομένων. Procopius of Gaza also used this: *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2300.

³⁴ Origen, *commJohn*, XIII.34.223; *frJohn*, IX.

³⁵ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 9, 73.

³⁶ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, 1.10 and 11. Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, 6.53.7.

³⁷ Athanasius, *De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi*, 33.16; *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.288.16.

³⁸ John Chrysostom, *Orationes Adversus Iudaeos*, PG.48.849.13;

In illud: Messis Quidem Multa, PG.63.519.8; *In Isaiam* 6.1.

Gregory of Nazianzus, *In Sanctum Pascha*, PG.36.641.27. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Arium et Sabellium de Patre et Filio*, v. 3, 1, p. 79.

³⁹ Theodoret, *HE*, p. 53.

⁴⁰ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 120; *In Sanctum Joannem*, fr. 1.

often.⁴¹ Then Didymus comes on the scene, using the term abundantly.⁴²

Finally, let me note the appearance of the term in Cassian's *De Trinitate*,⁴³ in Pseudo-Macarius,⁴⁴ and in the Apologist Theophilus of Antioch,⁴⁵ the author we came upon in EN XVIII, who shows himself familiar with the Stoic terminology about 'administration of the word by divine providence'.

This means that Cassian continues quoting from Didymus here.

EN XXIXg: διαφορὰν λαβεῖν
(‘to determine the difference’ between
two things or notions)

This idiomatic wording comes from Classical Greece,⁴⁶ and was reproduced by Speusippus, Theophrastus, Dexippus, yet mainly by Alexander of Aphrodisias,⁴⁷ as well as by Neoplatonists, such as Plotinus⁴⁸ and Proclus.⁴⁹ Plutarch also employed it,⁵⁰ though not extensively, and so did Sextus Empiricus.⁵¹ Both Origen⁵² and Didymus employed the construction, too.⁵³ Later still, Simplicius obviously drew on Alexander of Aphrodisias and the expression makes an occasional appearance in his writings.⁵⁴

It thus turns out that, of all Christian theologians, only Origen and Didymus put this terminology to use,

which means that Didymus is once again present in this Scholion.

EN XXIXh: φάσκοντα ὡς [ὅτι]

The verb φάσκειν (‘to say’) introducing a dependent sentence with either ὡς or ὅτι is an interesting point to explore. Didymus uses both constructions in order to introduce indirect speech by means of either the verb φάσκειν or similar verbs denoting ‘saying’, ‘declaring’, or ‘narrating’.

1. φάσκειν introducing a sentence with ὡς:

Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 85: τῇ πρώτῃ διανοίᾳ ἐπόμενος οὐδὲν ἔξει ἐπικομπάζον φάσκων, ὡς οὐ πάντες οἱ τελευτῶντες ἐν ἀναπαύσει γίνονται. *commJob* (5.1–6.29), Cod. p. 116: εὖ παρέχοι τὸν ἀπολογισμὸν φάσκων, ὡς ἅπερ οἱ ἀσεβεῖς συνάγουσιν, οἱ δίκαιοι φάγονται. *frPs(al)*, fr. 99: Ἀλαζονεῖαν καταψηφίζονται τινες τοῦ εὐχομένου φάσκοντες ὡς τῶν μετρίων τὸ ἦθος. Ibid. fr. 709a: καὶ φάσκει ὡς οὐκ ἔγνω τι περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ὥρας τῆς κρίσεως. *In Genesis*, Cod. p. 97: τὴν πῶσιν αὐτοῦ ὁ λόγος ἐρμηνεύει φάσκων ὡς γῆνα αὐτῷ ἔσται τροφή, οὐδὲν θεῖον ἢ ἀνηγγέμενον ἔχοντι. Ibid. Cod. p. 152: Εἰσὶ δ’ οἱ φάσκοντες ὡς δαίμονες δι’ ἡδυπαθείας ὀργάνῳ χρῶνται φαύλοις ἀνθρώποις.

⁴¹ Eusebius, *PE*, 1.10; 15.32; *HE*, 6.13; 8.9; 9.9; *DE*, 2.3; 9.13; 10.5; *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, 3.17; *Epistula ad Caesarienses*, 16; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.35; 2.25; 2.47; *Vita Constantini*, 1.40; *Laudatio Constantini*, 5.7; *commPs*, PG.23: 445.8&27; 644.33; 697.54; 840.13&27; 877.15.

⁴² Didymus, *commZacch*, 1: 107; 125; 243; 2.253; 4.231; *Adversus Manichaeos*, PG.39.1105.12; *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 8; *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 108; *frPs(al)*, frs. 19; 101; 240; 256; 555; 738a; 874; 882; 1074; 1229; 1263; 1268; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, pp. 18; 28.

⁴³ Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 1)*, 34.19; *DT (lib. 2.1–7)*, 1.6. Ibid. 3.24; 6.6,5, 6.13,2; *DT (lib. 2.8–27)*, PG.39: 633.12; 39.661.5; 712.8; 716.28; 764.14; 789.32; 852.12; 888.33; 992.19.

⁴⁴ Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, 18.5.4; 18.6.10; *Sermones*, 2.4.

⁴⁵ Theophilus of Antioch (second cent. AD), *Ad Autolycum*, 1.13; 2.3; 2.5; 2.6; 2.6; 2.8; 2.12; 2.16; 2.18; 2.25; 2.25; 2.38; 3.3; 3.4; 3.8; 3.12; 3.14; 3.17; 3.21; 3.23; 3.27; 3.29; 3.30.

⁴⁶ Plato, *Theaetetus*, 208d6. Aristotle, *De Generatione Animalium*, 763b29; 778b15; *De Partibus Animalium*, 643b17.

⁴⁷ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 65: καθ’ ἐκάστην γὰρ κατηγορίαν ἔστι καὶ γένος καὶ διαφορὰν λαβεῖν· ἐν αἷς γὰρ κατηγορίαις ἔστι τὰ λαμβανόμενα γένη περὶ ὧν ὁ λόγος, ἐν ταύταις καὶ αἱ τῶν γενῶν τούτων διαφοραί, ὡς ἐν ἄλλοις ἡμῖν εἴρηται. Likewise, Ibid. pp. 220; 314; 315; 317; 351; 446; 447; *In Aristotelis Meteorologicorum*

Libros Commentaria, p. 34. Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Quaestiones et Solutiones*, pp. 78; 79.

⁴⁸ Plotinus, *Enneades*, IV.3.2; IV.4.31; V.7.3.

⁴⁹ Proclus, *In Platonis Parmenidem*, p. 1049: τὴν τῶν ἀσωμάτων οὐσιῶν διαφορὰν λαμβάνομεν. Likewise, *Hypotyposis Astronomicarum Positionum*, 3.39; *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 2, p. 172.

⁵⁰ Plutarch, *De Virtute Morali*, 443C7; *Adversus Colotem*, 1110C2.

⁵¹ Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos*, 7.226: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡμεῖς οὐ δυνάμεθα χωρὶς ζυγοῦ τὴν τῶν βαρέων καὶ κούφων ἐξέτασιν ποιῆσθαι, οὐδὲ ἄτερ κανόνος τὴν τῶν εὐθέων καὶ στρεβλῶν διαφορὰν λαβεῖν, οὕτως οὐδὲ ὁ νοῦς χωρὶς αἰσθήσεως δοκιμάσαι πέφυκε τὰ πράγματα.

⁵² Origen, *Dial*, 9: τὴν γὰρ διαφορὰν τούτων οὕτω λαμβάνομεν. Once again, Origen turns out to be a student of Alexander of Aphrodisias.

⁵³ Didymus, *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 55: τοῦτο διαφόρως ἐκλαβεῖν δεῖ. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 131: τὴν διαφορὰν λαμβάνομεν κατὰ τὰ σωματικώτερα. *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 232: ὅμως τὸ πραττόμενον ἐν καὶ ταῦτόν ἐστιν. ἐκ τῆς προαιρέσεως καὶ διαθέσεως τοῦ ἐνεργούντος τὴν διαφορὰν λαμβάνω ὥστε ὅτε μὲν ἀνομίαν, ὅτε δὲ παρανομίαν καλεῖσθαι.

⁵⁴ Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Quattuor Libros de Caelo Commentaria*, v. 7, pp. 33–34: κἂν αἱ ὁλότητες οὖν τῶν στοιχείων ἢ μένουσιν ἢ κύκλῳ κινούνται, ἀλλ’ ἄρκεῖ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν μερῶν αὐτῶν τὴν κατὰ φύσιν διαφορὰν λαβεῖν.

2. φάσκειν introducing a sentence with ὅτι:

Didymus, *commJob* (7.20c-11), Cod. p. 218: ἐκ παραβολῆς αὐτὸ παρασκευάζει φάσκων ὅτι ὡς ἄνευ ὕδατος πάπυρος οὐ θάλλει. Ibid. Cod. p. 221: εἰ δέ τις καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τοῦτο λέγοι φάσκων ὅτι καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἄνθρωποι ἐκ σπουδῆς κτῶνται. *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 385: ἄρχεται τῶν λόγων φάσκων ὅτι σοφοῦ ἐστὶν μετὰ συνέσεως ἀποκρίνεσθαι. Ibid. fr. 386: φάσκων ὅτι ‘ἐκ τῶν σεαυτοῦ ἐλεγχθήσεται λόγων’. *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 357 (lacunae notwithstanding): καὶ ἐφάσκομεν τότε ὅτι τότε μάλιστα τὸ . . . ἐφάνη τῆς ἀληθείας.

Theodoret introduced a dependent sentence with ὡς,⁵⁵ which is the syntax universally practised in the Scholia, where ὡς is used.⁵⁶

Scholion I: τὸ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ὁμολογούμενον περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς εἰσι δοῦλοι τοῦ κυρίου . . . ἀλλ’ οὖν αὐτοὶ εὐγνώμονες ὄντες ὁμολογοῦσιν ὡς τυγχάνουσι δοῦλοι. **Scholion XXII:** εἴρηται δὲ ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ὁ ἀληθινὸς πρὸς παράστασιν βεβαιότητος, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐστὶν τὸ ἀμήν. **Scholion XXIII:** Παιδευόμεθα ἐκ τούτων τῶν θείων φωνῶν ὡς ὁ πάντη ψυχρὸς καὶ τῆς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος πυρώσεως ἅμοιρος . . . βελτίων ἐστί. **Scholion XXV:** πιστώσεις δὲ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ γεγράφθαι ὡς ἕτερόν τινα ἀνάλαβε τὸν Ἰωάννην ὥσπερ τὸν Ἡλίαν. **Scholion XXVI:** σημειωτέον ὡς καὶ τὰ κτίσματα τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ γεγονέναι φησίν. **Scholion XXVII:** Λέξει τις περὶ τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου, ὡς εἶη ὁ πᾶς λόγος τῆς προνοίας . . . εἶτα δηλοῦνται ἐκ τῶν ἐπομένων, ὡς οὐδεὶς γεννητός, οὐκ ἐπουράνιος, οὐκ ἐπίγειος, ἄξιος εὔρηται. **Scholion XXIX:** αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὁμολόγησαν, ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἠγοράσθησαν καὶ ἐξελέγησαν. **Scholion XXX:** ὁμοίως δὲ τοῦναντίον τῶν πατέρων ἀπολογουμένων ὡς μηδὲν παραλειπόντων. **Scholion XXXV:** δηλοῦντα, ὡς προσκυνοῦσιν τινες τὰ δαιμόνια.

There is only one point where ὅτι introduces a

dependent sentence. **Scholion IV:** τοῦτο ἐπιστάμενος ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης ἐνταῦθά φησιν ὅτι ὁ σωτήρ ἐστὶν ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

EN XXIXi: ἐκ τῶν καθάρων καὶ σοφῶν

This belongs to the vocabulary of Theodoret,⁵⁷ drawing on Plutarch,⁵⁸ whom he mentions or cites frequently. At a certain point, Plutarch actually quotes from Porphyry, where καθάριος means ‘decent’, which is how the adjective is used in the Scholion.

Many authors (starting with Aristotle)⁵⁹ applied καθάριος in its literal sense, which is ‘clean’. In Plutarch, this has a metaphorical (moral) sense. Plutarch also happens to be the author who uses two words relative to this Scholion, namely, ἐμμελής and καθάριος.⁶⁰

Didymus did not use the adjective καθάριος, yet there is no doubt that he did use the notion in similar terms. Besides, he employed the Origenistic thesis that moral ‘cleanness’ is concomitant with ‘wisdom’. Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), p. 320: ἡ γὰρ σοφία καθαρθείσης τῆς ψυχῆς προσγίνεται. *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 316: δεῖ τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον μετὰ τὸ καθάρισον τῆς ψυχῆς αἶρεσθαι ὡς τὸ ‘ἐπιθυμήσας σοφίαν διατήρησον ἐντολάς, καὶ κύριος χορηγήσει σοὶ αὐτήν’. πρῶτον καθάρισον δέχη, καθάρισόν σου τὴν ψυχὴν. *commZacch*, 1.82: σοφῶν καθαρῶν ἀσκόπων ὀφθαλμῶν.

Given Cassian’s proclivity to astrological and astronomical studies,⁶¹ it is highly likely that he took up the formula from Ptolemy, the second-century mathematician of Alexandria, explaining a certain human type on astrological grounds. *De Apotelesmaticis*, 2.3.33–34: διόπερ οἱ ταύτας ἔχοντες τὰς χώρας σέβουσι μὲν Δία καὶ Ἥλιον, πλουσιώτατοι δὲ εἰσι καὶ πολύχρυσοι περὶ τε τὰς διαίτας καθάριοι καὶ εὐάγωγοι, σοφοὶ δὲ περὶ τὰ θεῖα καὶ μάγοι καὶ τὰ ἥθη δίκαιοι καὶ ἐλεύθεροι καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς μεγάλοι

⁵⁵ Theodoret, *HE*, p. 332: ἐκεῖνον δὲ λέγοντος ὡς χρῆ καὶ αὐτὸν εὐκτήριον ἔχειν οἶκον. *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1644.16–17: δέος ἄλογον προβαλλόμενοι, καὶ δειλίαν φάσκοντες, ὡς αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀναιρεθήσονται. When the main verb is a similar one, such as λέγειν or εἰδέναι, the instances amount to hundreds.

⁵⁶ Cf. **EN Ia**.

⁵⁷ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 1.27–28: Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐνέκοπτεν αὐτῷ τοῦτο πρὸς σοφίαν πρὸς ὀλίγον χρόνον ἐργασθέν. Εἰ δὲ δὴ ἐρμολύφος ἦν, καὶ μᾶλλον καθάριος γὰρ ἡ τέχνη καὶ οὐ πρὸς ὀνειδούς.

⁵⁸ Plutarch, *De Esu Carnium i*, 994E2: Ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν ἡμᾶς δυσωπεῖ, οὐ χροᾶς ἀντηρὸν εἶδος, οὐ φωνῆς ἐμμελοῦς πιθανότης, οὐ πανουργία ψυχῆς, οὐ τὸ καθάριον ἐν διαίτῃ καὶ περιττόν. Cf. Plutarch, *Fragmenta*, fr. 147 *apud* Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 4.18a.10: ἔστι δ’ ὢν τὴν πιθανότητα καὶ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν καὶ τὸ καθάριον ἀγαπῶντες ἐκμανθάνουσι καὶ περιέπουσιν.

⁵⁹ Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica*, 1416a23.

⁶⁰ Plutarch, *Non Posse Suaviter Vivere Secundum Epicurum*, 1095F5: εἴτ’ οὐκ ἐμμελέστερον ἀποφαίνουσι τὸν Σκύθην Ἀτέαν, . . . τί σεμνὸν καὶ καθάριον ἀσπάζονται καὶ ἀγαπῶσιν;

⁶¹ See, *NDGF*, Appendix III.

καὶ γενναῖοι. Plotinus used the adjective only once, but it is noteworthy that, in the relevant passage, we once again come across a term related to ‘music’.⁶² It is remarkable that the form *καθαρίων* (genitive plural) occurs in no instance other than this Scholion.

EN XXIXj: τῶν χυδαιοτέρων καὶ πολλῶν

The notion was definitely employed by Origen following Posidonius, of whom we know from Strabo.⁶³ Although Origen had used the idea of *hoi polloi* identified with vulgarity,⁶⁴ and Porphyry followed suit,⁶⁵ Didymus is the sole author to make ad hoc analyses of the notion of *hoi polloi* (οἱ πολλοί) at different points.

Didymus, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, pp. 20–21: Οὐ προσεκτέον τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἑτεροδόξων λέγουσιν, ὅτι οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐν Χριστῷ διδάσκοντες κατεναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἑτέρου παρὰ τὸν πατέρα τοῦ σωτῆρος, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ἐναντία αὐτῷ φθεγγόμεθα. πολλοὺς δὲ λέγει τοὺς ἀπατῶντας διὰ τὸ χυδαῖον. καὶ γὰρ αὕτη ἡ φωνή, λέγω δὲ οἱ πολλοί, ὁμώνυμος οὕσα σημαίνει πλείονα· λέγεται γὰρ ποτε ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘τινές’, ὡς ὅταν ὁ κύριος λέγῃ· πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν πρὸς ὀλίγους διαστελλομένων, ὡς ἐν τῷ πολλοὶ μὲν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί. δηλοῖ ἡ λέξις καὶ τοὺς πάντας, ὡς ἐν τῷ ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ (21) ἐνὸς ἁμαρτωλοῦ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί· πάντες γὰρ ἄνθρωποι παρακούσαντος τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν εἰσίν. δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ τοὺς χυδαίους, ὡς ἐν τῷ προκειμένῳ καὶ τῷ μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί· σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τοὺς ὅπως ποτὲ πλείονας ὄντας, καθάπερ ἐν τῷ πολλοὶ ἐπ’ ἐμέ, καὶ πολλοὶ λέγουσι τῇ ψυχῇ μου. ἐν τῇ ἐκκειμένῃ φωνῇ τῇ οὐκ ἔσμεν ὡς τινες καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ἐξυδαροῦντες αὐτὸν διὰ ψυχρολογίας καὶ μωρᾶς ἐξηγήσεως, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐξ εἰλικρινείας ἀδόλως καὶ καθαρῶς αὐτὸν προσφερόμεθα.

In *Genesis*, Cod. p. 150 (comm. on Gen. 6, 1): Τὸ

‘πολλοί’ δυνατὸν καὶ ἐπὶ πλήθους, ἐφ’ οὗ μάλιστα καὶ κυριόλεκτον, ἐκλαμβάνεσθαι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ χυδαίου. Καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἐξόδῳ γὰρ εἴρηται· ‘Καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ χυδαῖοι ἐγένοντο.’ Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ‘Πολλοὶ λέγουσι τῇ ψυχῇ μου’ ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘χυδαῖοι’· οὐ γὰρ σπουδαῖα ἐπιφέρουσιν ῥήματα. Καὶ Παῦλος δὲ λέγων· ‘Οὐ γὰρ ἔσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου’, τοὺς ἡμελημένους δηλοῖ.

commZacch, 3.108: Ἡ πολλὴ ἐν τέκνοις ἡσθένησεν, πολλῶν τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς γεγεννημένων οὐ τοσοῦτον ἀριθμῷ ὅσον χυδαιότητι. Δηλοῦται γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τῆς λέξεως καθὼς ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ πολλοὶ εἶναι λέγονται οἱ τὴν εὐρύχωρον ὁδὸν ὁδεύοντες, τέλος ἔχουσιν ἀπώλειαν. Τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ υἱοὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ τυράννου τῆς νοητῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀρχόμενοι, πολλοὶ καὶ ‘χυδαῖοι σφόδρα’ γεγέννηται.

frPs(al), fr. 739: καὶ ἐπεὶ φαῦλοι εἰσὶν ἡμῖν οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα διανοούμενοι καὶ λέγοντες, εἰκότως οὐ καθάπαξ εἶπεν τέρας ἀλλὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς γεγενέσθαι τουτέστι τοῖς χυδαιοτέροις καὶ φεύγουσι τὴν ἀρετὴν.

Didymus identified the notion of a ‘people’ (λαός) with that of being ‘vulgar’ (χυδαῖος), as shown in footnote 24 to the Greek text. Although we know of no other author that did so, it seems that this was a common identification, or at least one held by those who had read Homer. For as late as the twelfth century, Eustathius of Thessaloniki commenting on *Ilias*, XXIII.651 (πολὺν καθ’ ὅμιλον) tells us that ‘those who wrote after Homer’ identified ‘multitude’ with ‘vulgar people’. *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, v. 4, p. 806: ‘Ὅρα δὲ τὸ ‘πολὺν καθ’ ὅμιλον’. ἐκ τούτου γὰρ οἱ μεθ’ Ὁμηρον πολὺν ἄνθρωπον καὶ πολὺν λαὸν τὸν χυδαῖόν φασιν. Cf. *ibid.* (commentary on *Ilias*, V.676), v. 2, p. 170: τὸν μέγαν μὲν ἕνα λέγεσθαι, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ πληθὺν τὸν χυδαῖον λαόν. It is remarkable that the notion has a unique parallel in a text which I hold to be Cassian’s, namely *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 7.205: τὸν πολὺν καὶ χυδαῖον λαόν.

⁶² Plotinus, *Enneades*, III.4.2: Τοὺς δὲ φιλομούσους μὲν, καθαρῶς δὲ τὰ ἄλλα (= those who loved music, but were otherwise decent).

⁶³ Posidonius, *Fragmenta*, fr. 16 *apud* Strabo, *Geographica*, 3.1.5: Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν οὕτως ἔχειν ἐγχωρεῖ, καὶ δεῖ πιστεύειν· ἃ δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ χυδαίοις ὁμοίως εἴρηκεν, οὐ πάνυ. The same in Posidonius, *Fragmenta*, fr. 45.

⁶⁴ Origen, *commMatt*, 10.24: κεχῆνασι γὰρ περὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν καὶ χυδαιοτέρων ἔπαινον.

⁶⁵ Porphyry, *Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem Pertinentium Reliquiae* (*Iliad*, II.212): καὶ μάλιστα τῆς ἄγνοιας ἐν τῷ χυδαίῳ πλήθει γεγονυίας . . . ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν ἔδει καὶ χυδαίων γενέσθαι τὴν μέμψιν . . . ἅπαξ δὲ ἐκ τῶν χυδαίων ὀφειλοῦσης γενέσθαι τῆς ἀταξίας . . . εἰδὼς δὲ ὅτι ὄργαι χυδαίων καὶ πλήθους ἀνοήτου ἢ φόβῳ κρατοῦνται.

The first part of [Scholion XXIX](#) is by and large a quotation from Didymus. Cassian even maintained Didymus' vernacular, yet he also put his own Antiochene seal thereon, such as the designation δεσπότης for Christ and the technically incorrect yet current appellation σωτήρ. The latter reveals not only Antiochene extraction, but also connection with the

Akoimetan community. The second part is a remark by Cassian himself, essaying to affiliate the specific passage of Revelation (Rev. 5:8) with both Testaments, which he actually does by quoting 1 Peter, 2:5 and Malachi, 1:11. This was the general principal aim for Cassian while composing these Scholia.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXX

EN XXXa: ἔστιν εὑρεῖν . . . ὥς or ὅτι
(‘it is possible to find out that’)

This form of ὥς introducing the object of ‘finding’ (εὑρεῖν), that is, ὥς not introducing an exegetical clause, is extremely rare in literature.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p.211, in *Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p.266: ἔστι μέντοι καὶ τοῦτο εὑρεῖν, ὥς οὐκ ἀνόνητα αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ δάκρυα ἐγένετο.

Later, Evagrius Scholasticus, *HE*, p. 13: Ἐν ἐκείνοις γὰρ ἔστιν εὑρεῖν ὥς ἐπειδὴ μὴ τῆς δεούσης ἔτυχεν ἐπεξελεύσεως, ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσις αὐτὸν ἐκδεξαμένη αἰχμαλωσία τῇ πάντων ἐλεεινοτάτῃ.

On the other hand, since this opening passage comes from Didymus, we have the exegetical sentence introduced with ὅτι, as quoted in footnote 1 to the Greek text. Likewise, Gregory of Nyssa used the same syntax. *Ad Simplicium*, v. 3, 1, p. 66: ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν ἔστιν ἀποδείξεις εὑρεῖν. So did Gelasius of Cyzicus, *HE*, 2.18.7: καὶ πολλὰ ἔστιν εὑρεῖν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν.

EN XXXb: ὥσπερ σῶμα θεοῦ <οἱ>
ἁγιοί, ἁγιάι εἰσὶ τινες <δυνάμεις>

The idea of the ‘holy powers’ comprising ‘the body of God’ is Didymus’, who inferred this from 1 Cor. 12:27. He is also the author who made the most use of the idea, particularly of the notion of ‘the feet’ of God bespeaking or announcing punishment, following the narrative of Genesis about the apprehensive Adam hearing the ‘feet’ of God approaching, after the sin had been committed.

Didymus, *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 155: δυνατόν δὲ καὶ οὕτως· ὥσπερ πάντες οἱ τῇ πίστει προσεληλυθότες ‘σῶμα Χριστοῦ’ εἰσιν ‘καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους’, οὕτω καὶ τῶν θείων δυνάμεων, τῶν λογικῶν τὸ συμπλήρωμα σῶμα θεοῦ ἔστιν. καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ μελῶν λέγομεν ὅτι οἱ διορατικοὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ λέγονται, οἱ δὲ πρακτικοὶ χεῖρες, οἱ ‘τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροὶ’ πόδες.

commZacch, 2.28: Πάντες οἱ πιστεύοντες σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη τυγχάνουσιν· εἴρηται γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς συμπληροῦντας τὸ ἄθροισμα τῆς

Ἐκκλησίας· Ὑμεῖς ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους.’ Τούτων τῶν μελῶν τοῦ σώματος οἱ μὲν πρακτικοὶ χεῖρες τυγχάνουσιν, πόδες ‘οἱ τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροὶ’, ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ κατὰ τὸν νοῦν διορατικοί, κεφαλὴ οἱ νομίμως ἐπιστατοῦντες ἄρχοντες ὥς δεῖ.

There is a text ascribed to Basil of Caesarea which is strikingly similar to that of the Scholion and was composed as a comment on Psalm 33:16. *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.376.40–377.11: Ὡσπερ οἱ ἅγιοι σῶμα εἰσι Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους, καὶ ἔθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τοὺς μὲν ὀφθαλμοὺς, τοὺς δὲ γλώσσας, ἑτέρους τὸν τῶν χειρῶν, καὶ ἄλλους τὸν τῶν ποδῶν ἐπέχοντας λόγον, οὕτω καὶ αἱ ἅγαι δυνάμεις αἱ πνευματικαὶ καὶ περὶ τὸν οὐράνιον οὔσαι τόπον, αἱ μὲν ὀφθαλμοὶ λέγονται, τῷ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἡμῶν πιστευθῆναι, αἱ δὲ ὄτα, τῷ παραδέχεσθαι ἡμῶν τὰς δεήσεις. Νῦν οὖν τὴν ἐποπτικὴν ἡμῶν δύναμιν, καὶ τὴν τῶν εὐχῶν ἀντιληπτικὴν, ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶπε καὶ ὄτα. Ὁφθαλμοὶ οὖν Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους, καὶ ὄτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν. Ἐπειδὴ πᾶσα πρᾶξις τοῦ δικαίου ἀξία τῆς θεωρίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ πᾶν ῥῆμα, τῷ μηδὲν ἀργῶς λέγεσθαι παρὰ τοῦ δικαίου, ἐνεργόν ἐστι καὶ ἔμπρακτον, διὰ τοῦτο ἀεὶ ἐφορᾶσθαι καὶ ἀεὶ εἰσακούεσθαι τὸν δίκαιον ὁ λόγος φησί.

However, this point is an isolated and casual one in Basil (if the text is actually his own), which means he did not use it as a main, or even a recurrent, theme. The idea was set forth vigorously by Didymus. In fact, this is distinctly associated with Didymus, not Basil. On that account, there is a text ascribed to either author by two different catenae. In the *frPs(al)* a comment on Psalm 33:15–16 is ascribed to Didymus. However, in another catena, the same text is ascribed to Basil and reads thus:

Ἐπεὶ αἱ ἐπιβλέπουσαι τὸ πᾶν τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεις τροπικῶς ὀφθαλμοὶ λεγόμεναι ἐπιβλέπουσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς δικαίους, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ὄτα αὐτοῦ ἔτοιμα εἰς τὸ δέξασθαι τὴν δέησιν αὐτῶν, τούτου χάριν φησὶν· εἰ θέλετε τούτων ἀπολαῦσαι, ἐκκλίναντες ἀπὸ κακοῦ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιήσατε.

This passage is ascribed to Didymus,¹ as well as to Basil of Caesarea.² The fact is, however, that the

¹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 317.

² *Catena in Epistulam Petri i*, p. 63.

notions which are central to this passage are recurrent in Didymus and almost non-existent in Basil. In other words, since this phenomenon is a recurrent one, it is highly likely that ‘non-heretical’ texts of the ‘heretic’ Didymus were subsequently attributed to Basil.

Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 133: Πολλάκις γὰρ ὁ ἑπτὰ ἀριθμὸς ἐν τῇ γραφῇ ἀντὶ τελειότητος παρείλημται· τοῦτο δηλοῦται ὑπὸ τοῦ λεγομένου· Ἐπτὰ ὀφθαλμοὶ εἰσιν ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ σῶμά ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ἵνα καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν ἑπτὰ ἀριθμὸν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ τυγχάνωσιν, ἀλλὰ δῆλον ὡς τὴν ἐποπτικὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν πληρεστάτην καὶ μεγάλην εἶναι διδάσκει. Ibid. Cod. p. 160: Ἐὰν γὰρ περὶ χειρῶν καὶ ποδῶν καὶ ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ ὠτῶν ἐν τῇ γραφῇ μεταφέρεται, οὐ δεῖ οἶεσθαι ἀνθρωπίνως ἐσχηματῖσθαι τὸν Θεόν, ἀλλὰ δῆλον ὡς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ δραστικὰς τὰς χειρὰς καὶ τὸ ἀναπόδραστον ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ οὕτως ἕκαστον ὡς περὶ δυνάμεως ἐκκλημψόμεθα Θεοῦ . . . εἰ καὶ καθ’ ἑτέραν διάνοιαν τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διορατικοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς πρακτικοὺς χειρὰς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὁμοίως.

frPs(al), fr. 75: αἱ δὲ ἐποπτικαὶ καὶ ἔφοροι τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεις ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ καλούμεναι. Ibid. fr. 270: χειρὰς δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἄλλας τῶν προνοητικῶν καὶ σκεπαστικῶν αὐτοῦ δυνάμεων ἐκδεκτέον. Ibid. fr. 278: εἶπα Ἀπέρριμμαι ἄρα ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου, τουτέστιν μακρὰν ἔδοξα εἶναι τῶν ἐποπτικῶν καὶ ἐπισκοπευτικῶν σου δυνάμεων.

commZacch, 3.129–130: Λέγει γοῦν ὁ εὐεργέτης καὶ πάσης μακαρίου σωτηρίας αἴτιος· ‘Διὰ τοῦτο μηκέτ’ εἶναι ἐξελαύνοντα νῦν, ὅτι ἑώρακα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μου, ταῖς ἐποπτικαῖς δηλονότι δυνάμεσιν, περὶ ὧν ὁ Ἀπόστολος γράφει οὕτως· ‘Πάντα γυμνὰ καὶ τετραχλησιμένα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ’ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ. Ῥητέον δευτέρως ὁρῶντας Θεοῦ ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶναι τοὺς ἐπιστατοῦντας τῶν ἀνθρώπων πραγμάτων ἐφόρους ἀγγέλους, περὶ ὧν ὁ ὕμνωδός φησιν· ‘Οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἐπιβλέπουσιν.’ Οὐκ ἀπεικὸς δὲ καὶ τοὺς θεωρητικοὺς ἄνδρας, ὧν ὁράσεις θεῖαι ἀνεγρά-

φησαν, ὀφθαλμοὺς Θεοῦ φάναι· πάσης γὰρ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῶν σωζομένων σώματος Χριστοῦ τυγχανούσης, οἱ διορατικοὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑπάρχουσιν, ὡς ἡ ἀποστολικὴ φανεροὶ λέξις. Ὅρωντων τοιγαροῦν τῶν κατὰ πάσας τὰς ἀποδόσεις τοῦ ῥητοῦ ἡρμηνευμένων ὀφθαλμῶν τοὺς ἐπισκοπούμενους ἐκποδὼν οἰχήσεται πᾶς ἐξελαύνων. Ibid. 4.202: Ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τούτου τοῦ Ἰούδα διανοίγει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, τὰς ἐφόρους καὶ ἐποπτικὰς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ.

commJob, PG.39.1121: Χεῖρα Θεοῦ διαφόρως ἐκκληπτέον, ἢ τὴν κολαστικὴν καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ὑπηρετικὴν δύναμιν, ἢ τις καὶ σκευὸς ὀργῆς λέγεται.

Here is how Theodoret followed Didymus. *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.141.24–30: Οὐκοῦν ἐκ πολλῶν μελῶν ἡ Ἐκκλησία συγκειμένη ἐν σῶμα πληροῖ· νοήσωμεν τοῖνυν, τινὰς μὲν αὐτῆς εἶναι ὀφθαλμοὺς, τινὰς δὲ ἀκοάς, τινὰς δὲ χεῖλη· διὸ καὶ ὁ νυμφίος φησὶν αὐτῇ· Κηρίον ἀποστάζει χεῖλη σου νύμφη· Μέλι καὶ γάλα ὑπὸ τὴν γλῶσσάν σου. Δηλοῖ δὲ ἐνταῦθα τοὺς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας διδασκάλους, τὴν εὐσεβῆ διδασκαλίαν προσφέροντας.

Cassian, therefore, definitely received this idea from Didymus’ *commZacch*, 3.129–130, as quoted already in the left column.

John of Damascus quotes from Basil of Caesarea abundantly and cites him as either ‘the divine Basil’ or the ‘great Basil’ or ‘the holy father Basil’. However, he does not mention his name in the following text, obviously because he knew that he himself had received this from Didymus, not Basil.

John of Damascus, *Expositio Fidei*, 11: Ὅσα τοῖνυν περὶ θεοῦ σωματικώτερον εἴρηται, συμβολικῶς ἐστὶ λελεγμένα, ἔχει δὲ τινα ὑψηλοτέραν διάνοιαν· ἀπλοῦν γὰρ τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον. Ὁφθαλμοὺς μὲν οὖν θεοῦ καὶ βλέφαρα καὶ ὄρασιν τὴν τῶν ἀπάντων ἐποπτικὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν καὶ τὸ ἀλάθητον τῆς αὐτοῦ γνώσεως ἐννοήσωμεν.

The notion which does occur in Basil is that ‘contemplative ability’ (ἐποπτικὴ δύναμις) is granted by God so that humans can contemplate the divine things.³

³ Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto*, 18.47: αὐτοῦ που πάρεστιν ἀχωρίστως τὸ τῆς γνώσεως Πνεῦμα, τὴν ἐποπτικὴν τῆς εἰκόνης δύναμιν ἐν ἑαυτῷ παρεχόμενον τοῖς τῆς ἀληθείας φιλοθεάμοισιν,

οὐκ ἔξωθεν τὴν δεῖξιν ποιούμενον, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰσάγον πρὸς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν.

This was adopted by Gregory of Nyssa,⁴ as well as by Didymus obliquely at a certain point.⁵ Nevertheless, Didymus may have taken up this idea from Eusebius⁶ rather than Basil.

EN XXXc: κολαστικὸν ἢ πόδες
(the ‘punishing feet’ of God)

I wrote κολαστικοὶ instead of emending ἀπελαστικοί, since the author says that he is ‘going to speak about the wrath of God’ and punishments inflicted thereby. Only a handful of instances of the term ἀπελαστικός can be traced,⁷ but the real point is its meaning, not the frequency of usage: this adjective means ‘someone who drives something or someone away’, which is entirely irrelevant to our context. Didymus is the author who associated the ‘punishing feet of God’ with his ‘wrath’. This is precisely the sentiment and aim of this Scholion.

The adjective κολαστικός is of Aristotelian provenance.⁸ It occurs in Clement, at the point where he makes the specific analysis,⁹ from which Cassian excerpted his *Scholion V*. Therefore, we have Cassian recalling at the same time both Clement and Didymus. Nevertheless, his guide was Didymus’ Commentary on the Apocalypse.¹⁰ The expression κολαστικὸν καὶ τιμωρητικὸν attributed to Origen¹¹ actually belongs

to the vocabulary of Eusebius, who is quoted next to that passage of the catena. Perhaps the relevant vocabulary in some passages in the catenae originates with the catenists, rather than the authors themselves who are excerpted.¹²

Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 22 (so in *commJob*, PG.39.1121.49–53): χειρὰ αὐτοῦ καλεῖν ἐκκλημπτόν . . . διαφόρως ἢ τὴν κολαστικὴν καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ὑπηρετικὴν δύναμιν, ἅπερ ‘σκεύη ὀργῆς’ ἢ θεία γραφή ὀνομάζειν εἴωθεν, ἢ τὴν σκεπαστικὴν καὶ φρουρητικὴν δύναμιν.

commPs 29–34, Cod. p. 150: φοβουμένους δὲ ὧδε λέγει τοὺς τὸν κολαστικὸν φόβον ἔχοντας. Ibid. Cod. p. 200: πρόσεχε, δύο εἴρηται, ἐπαινετὸν καὶ ψεκτόν· ἐπαινετὸν δὲ τὸ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τὰ ὧτα εἰς τοὺς δικαίους εἶναι, κολαστικὸν δὲ τὸ πρόσωπον κυρίου ‘τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἐκ τῆς γῆς τὸ μνημόσυνον’.

commPs 40–44.4, Cod. p. 309: ‘ἡ χεὶρ σου’ οὖν ‘ἔθνη ἐξωλόθρευσεν’. ἡ κολαστικὴ σου δύναμις. δύνανται καὶ οἱ ὑπηρετοῦντες ταῖς κολάσεσιν ἄγγελοι χειρὲς τοῦ θεοῦ λέγεσθαι, ὡς λέγομεν χειρὰ βασιλέως, καὶ οὐ δῆπου τὸ μέλος τοῦ σώματος διὰ τούτων σημαίνομεν. καὶ ὁ Ἰωβ δὲ περὶ τῆς κολαστικῆς δυνάμεως (αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ διάβολος ἦν) ἔλεγεν· ‘ἀπόστειλον τὴν χεῖρά σου’. τοῦτο οὖν λέγει· ‘ἡ χεὶρ σου’ ἥτοι ἡ κολαστικὴ δύναμις ἥτοι

⁴ Gregory of Nyssa, *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, pp. 40–41: Ἀλλὰ μὴν ἴδιον ἐστὶ τῆς θεότητος ἡ ἐποπτικὴ τῶν ὄντων δύναμις τε καὶ ἐνέργεια. οὐκοῦν ὁ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχων ὅπερ ἐπόθησε, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐποπτικός γίνεται καὶ τὴν τῶν ὄντων διασκοπεῖται φύσιν . . . ὁ τοίνυν ὑψηλὸς τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ οἷον ἀπὸ τινος σκοπίας ἐξεχούσης τοῖς ἀφεστηκόσι τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐπεκτείνων εἶδεν ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶ τῆς κακίας πρὸς τὴν ἀρετὴν τὸ διάφορον, ὅτι ἐκ τῶν ἐσχάτων, οὐκ ἐκ τῶν παρόντων ἡ τούτων γίνεται κρίσις. τῇ γὰρ ἐποπτικῇ τε καὶ διορατικῇ τῆς ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμῷ.

⁵ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 137: ὁ ταῦτα δὲ λέγων, ἀναιρήσας τὰς ὀφιώδεις κακίας καὶ τὰς ἐνεργησάσας αὐτὰς πονηρὰς δυνάμεις, ὑπὸ θεοῦ τοὺς τοῦ ἔσω ἀνθρώπου πόδας (τουτέστιν τὰς πορευτικὰς δυνάμεις) κατηρτισμένους ἔχει.

⁶ Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.1: Ὅρασιν δὲ οὐ κοινὴν λέγει οὐδὲ σωματικοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑποπίπτουσιν, ἀλλὰ προφητικὴν τῶν μακροῖς ὕστερον χρόνοις συμβησομένων ἐποπτικὴν.

⁷ Cf. Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 4.1.9; *commPs*, PG.23.1073.49. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 249; *De XII Gemmis*, 1.7; John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos*, PG.63.208.4.

⁸ Aristotle, *De Vitiis quae Opposita sunt Virtutibus*, 1251a6; 1251b31: κολαστικὸν καὶ τιμωρητικόν. Cf. the two terms used in apposition by only three Christian authors. Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.21: τῆς τιμωρητικῆς καὶ κολαστικῆς δυνάμεως. Ibid. 2.7: ταῖς κολαστικαῖς ἢ τιμωρητικαῖς δυνάμεσι. Ibid. 2.58: θυμὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ αἱ κολαστικαὶ καὶ αἱ τιμωρητικαὶ δυνάμεις εἰώθασιν

ὀνομάζεσθαι. *commPs*, PG.23.173.29: Δυνάμεις τοίνυν τιμωροὶ καὶ κολαστικαί. *Fragmenta in Lucam*, PG.24.588.33: αἱ τιμωρητικαὶ καὶ κολαστικαὶ δυνάμεις. Theodore of Heraclea (fourth cent. AD), *Fragmenta in Joannem*, frs. 258 and 259: δυνάμις κολαστικὴ καὶ τιμωρητικὴ. John Chrysostom, *Commentaria in Job*, p. 108. Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 3.1.194. Proclus, *In Platonis Cratylum Commentaria*, 181.

⁹ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 4.25.156.2: δύο δὲ καὶ οἱ τρόποι τῆς ἐπανορθώσεως, ὁ μὲν διδασκαλικός, ὁ δὲ κολαστικός, ὃν καὶ παιδευτικὸν εἰρήκαμεν.

¹⁰ The scribe possibly made the mistake because the two terms might be regarded as sometimes occurring jointly: the power of God not only ‘punishes’, but also ‘drives away’ any evil power. Punishment is sometimes the means for expelling evil power.

¹¹ Origen, *frPs*, 8, 1.

¹² Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1480.34: ὅπως πάσης κολαστικῆς τιμωρίας ἐξω γένοιτο. Ibid. PG.12.1565.28: Χεῖρα λέγει τὰς κολαστικὰς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεις, which is an idea characteristic of Didymus. *Commentarii in Job* (1–4), Cod. p. 22; *Commentarii in Job*, PG.39.1121.50; *commPs*, Cod. p. 309; *frPs(al)*, fr. 284. Also in the dubious work, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 5.181.; 9. 230. No other author until Didymus entertained this exegesis about the ‘hand of God’ through this vocabulary. Later, this was reproduced only by Procopius of Gaza compiling an exegesis, which consisted of excerpts from commentaries on Isaiah by authors before him. *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 1928.

ἡ δραστήριος τῶν ἐπιπόνων ἦτοι ἡ διακονοῦσα δύναμις σου.

commEccl (1.1–8), Cod. p. 24: οὐ γὰρ ‘πονηρὸν ὁ θεὸς δίδωσιν’ τὸ ἐναντίον τῷ ἀγαθῷ, ἀλλὰ τὸ κολαστικόν.

commEccl (11–12), Cod. p. 339: πρὶν ‘ἔλθῃ’ ἡ κόλασις, ἡ ‘κακία’, ποιήσον ἃ λέγω σοι, ἵνα ‘ἐλθοῦσα’ ἡ κάκωσις ἡ κολαστικὴ μὴ εὕρῃ σε ὑπεύθυνον. Ibid. Cod. p. 339: αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ‘κακία’ ἡ ‘ἐρχομένη’, οὐ χειρίστη ἕξις οὖσα, ἀλλὰ κολαστικὴ, σφοδρὸτάτη οὖσα κάκωσις.

commZacch, 3.95: Ὅμως κἂν ἐπὶ πολὺ ἀντιτείνουσα ἡ Τύρος ἀντικειμένως ὁδεύῃ, πειραθῆσεται πυρὸς κολαστικοῦ. Ibid. 4.165: Τίς δὴ μάχαιρα ἡ ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονα καὶ ὀφθαλμὸν τοῦ ὑπαιτίου ποιμένος, ἡ ὁ κολαστικὸς λόγος; Ibid. 4.169: Ἡ προειρημένη κολαστικὴ μάχαιρα γεναμένη ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονα καὶ ὀφθαλμόν, τοῦτ’ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τὴν πρακτικὴν δύναμιν καὶ τὴν θεωρητικὴν, τοῦ κολαστέου ποιμένος. Ibid. 5.22: Ἡμέρας τοῦ Κυρίου λέγει καθ’ ἧς ἐπιφέρεται τοῖς ὑπαιτίοις τὰ ἐπίπονα¹³ καὶ κολαστικά.

frPs(al), fr. 284: ἐν πολλοῖς τόποις τῆς γραφῆς ἡ κολαστικὴ τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμις χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὀνομάζεται. Ibid. fr. 580: διὸ καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα τὴν κολαστικὴν ἀπέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὡς φθάσαι ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς τὴν ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ εἰς τέλος. Ibid., fr. 606a: ὅθεν ἐνταῦθα εἴρηται· ὡς ἄρα ἐπιπεσόντος τοῦ κολαστικοῦ φωτὸς οὐκ εἶδον τὸν ἥλιον οἱ τῇ κολάσει περιπεσόντες.

In Genesin, Cod. p. 115: ῥομφαίαν, ὅπερ σημεῖον ἐστὶ κολαστικῆς δυνάμεως. Ibid. Cod. p. 193: ἀπώλετο ὑπὸ τοῦ κολαστικοῦ ὕδατος.

Theodoret used the adjective κολαστικὸς and its cognates abundantly,¹⁴ and so did Theodore of Mopsuestia.¹⁵

In conclusion, I opt for the word κολαστικοί, since the author of the

Scholion remarks that the text of Revelation is ‘about to refer to the wrath of God’. The notion is associated with ‘the feet of God’ (πόδες), and it is analogous to Adam having been ‘punished’ following disobedience. This is explicated in the following passage, which is indeed written in the spirit of Genesis: Adam was terrified at hearing the sound of the feet of God approaching him.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.39–40: Τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ παραβάς ὁ Ἀδὰμ ἤκουσεν τὴν φωνὴν τῶν ποδῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ δειλινὸν αἰσθησιν λαβὼν ἐγκαταλιπόντος καὶ βαδίσαντος ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ συνόντος πρότερον καὶ συνομιλοῦντος.

This Scholion mentions the book of 2 Kings. Origen yields the exegesis about the ‘feet of God’ in a pertinent commentary. *Fragmenta in Librum Primum Regnorum*, fr. 4: Ὡς περ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπων μὲν χεὶρ καὶ ποὺς καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ οὖς, καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ὀνομάζεται, σημαντικὰ τῶν μελῶν τοῦ ἡμετέρου σώματος ἐστὶν, ἐπὶ δὲ θεοῦ χεὶρ μὲν τὸ δημιουργικόν, ὀφθαλμοὺς δὲ τὸ ἐποπτικόν, καὶ οὖς μὲν τὸ ἀκουστικόν, ποὺς δὲ τὸ τῆς παρουσίας ὅταν ἐνεργῇ τι.

The word ἀπελαστικός was in fact used in literature, and so was the word ἀπελατικός. They are synonymous: either usage is dependent on how an author heard the word, or how a scribe transcribed this rare term. Characteristically, lexicographers present the lemma in one form or the other.¹⁶ The term appears twice in Eusebius in both forms, but we need to know the real spelling of the manuscripts.¹⁷ Otherwise, ἀπελατικός appears rarely in literature: until the fifth century, no more than four instances can be traced, one of which is ascribed to Theodoret writing about ‘driving daemons away’. It is only much later that the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus appears obsessed with the adjective ἀπελατικός. Yet, beyond the forty-five instances of this occurring in his book *De Caerimoniis*, the term appears only in the philosopher

¹³ Cf. *Scholion XXXI*: Σκυθρωπῶν μελλόντων ἐπιφέρεισθαι, ὑπηρετῶν τις ἄγγελος θεοῦ φωνεῖ πρὸς τοὺς ἐγχειρισθέντας τὰ ἐπίπονα.

¹⁴ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.901.47 (κολαστικῶς); PG.80.977.17 (κολαστικῷ πυρί); 1697.2 (τὴν κολαστικὴν ἐνέργειαν); *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.92.15 (τὴν κολαστικὴν χάριν); PG.81.92.26 (τῆς κολαστικῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως); PG.81.201.29 (τῆς κολαστικῆς ἀπειλῆς); *intDan*, PG.81.1348.21 (ῥάβδον κολαστικὴν); *intProphXII*, PG.81.1829.18 (τοῖς κολαστικοῖς ὅπλοις); PG.81.1832.21 (ὅπλων κολαστικῶν); PG.81.1865.16 (τὴν κολαστικὴν δύναμιν); *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.317.46 (κολαστικὴν ψήφον).

¹⁵ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Joannem*, fr. 258 (δύναμις κολαστικὴ καὶ τιμωρητικὴ); fr. 259 (τὴν κολαστικὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν).

¹⁶ *Suda* lexicon, Alphabetic letter epsilon, entry 749 and Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter epsilon, p. 686: Ἐλάτειραν: ἀπελαστικὴν. But in the lexicon, *Collectio Verborum e Rhetoribus et Sapientibus*, Alphabetic entry epsilon, p. 215: ἐλατήρα: ἀπελατικὴν.

¹⁷ Eusebius, *PE*, 4.1.9 (ἀπελαστικά); *commPs*, (ἀπελατικόν): PG.23.465.34. Still, there is always the possibility either of a scribal error or an editorial emendation having taken place.

Hermias of Alexandria (fifth century AD) and in a text attributed to either Pseudo-Justin or Theodoret.¹⁸ Likewise, ἀπελαστικός is equally rare and was used sparingly by only a few Christian authors.¹⁹

EN XXXd: οὐ τὸ συμβεβηκὸς πάθος
(‘not the accidental passion’)

The expression is definitely Origen’s,²⁰ which he derived from Aristotle²¹ and Alexander of Aphrodisias.²² John Philoponus also employed it. Christians borrowed the terminology, starting with Origen, Eusebius,²³ Theodoret,²⁴ Julian the Arian,²⁵ and Cyril of Alexandria,²⁶ who appears perfectly aware of its philosophical implications. The expression also occurs in the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*.²⁷ Didymus made extensive analyses in order to establish the notion involved in this Scholion: God is beyond any notion of ‘passion’, therefore, the scriptural ‘wrath’ should not be understood in a manner excluding the ordinary sense of human passion. This is one of the most recurrent themes in his writings.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.196: Οὐχ οὕτω δὲ Θεὸς ὀργίζεται, ἀπαθὴς ὑπάρχων, ἀλλ’ ἐπάγων τὰ κακωτικά ὑπὲρ βελτιώσεως τοῖς τούτων δεομένοις βοηθήματος δίκην. Ibid. 2.199: οὐ πάθος ἢ τροπὴ ἢ ἐπακτική τούτων ὀργὴ Θεοῦ. Ibid. 2.200: Ὅργη δ’ ἐξαποστελλομένη ἵνα καταφάγῃ τοὺς δι’ ἀκαρπία ἀποδειχθέντας καλὰμην, οὐκ ἔστιν ὀρεξίς παθητικὴ ἔχουσα τὸ εἶναι ἐν τῷ ἀγανακτοῦντι, ἀφανιζομένη ὅταν ἔξω γένηται τοῦ ὀργιζομένου.

διὸ ἡ ἐκπεμπομένη οὐ πάθος ἐστίν, ἀλλ’ ἐπίπονος ἀγωγή. Ibid. 2.195: 1: Ταῦτα περὶ Θεοῦ τῶν γραφῶν λεγουσῶν, μὴ εἰς τοσαύτην ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἡλιθιότητα πέσοιμεν ὥς ἀνθρώπινα πάθη προσάψαι τῷ λέγοντι. ‘Οὐκ ἡλλοίωμαι’, πρὸς ὃν οἱ θεολόγοι φασίν, ὃ μὲν ‘Σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ’.

The idea of the Scholion (the wrath of God is the devil) is definitely Origen’s (taken up by Theodoret, too), not Didymus’, since according to the latter wrath, like any other passion, ‘exists within the soul and is non-existent outside this’ (ἔχει γὰρ τὸ εἶναι ἐν μόνῃ τῇ θυμικῇ τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμει, ἧς ἔξω γενομένη οὐδ’ ὅλως ὑφίσταται).²⁸ At most, the devil is ‘the punishing power’ of God.²⁹

This is the old Stoic thesis of ‘passion’ being an impulse which is both ‘against nature’ (παρὰ φύσιν)³⁰ and ‘disobedient to reason’ (ἀπειθὴς τῷ λόγῳ).³¹ Nevertheless, this is always an event that takes place within the soul,³² not outside it. This is also an unfortunate ‘alteration’ (τρέπομενον καὶ μεταβάλλον) of the soul’s principal part (ἡγεμονικόν),³³ or indeed of the ‘spirit’ (αἶ περὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τροπαί), if we are to believe a rather awkward expression of Diogenes Laertius, referring to the Stoics.³⁴ Passion is a failure of right judgement (κρίσεις ἡμαρτημέναι).³⁵ Ultimately, this is an irrational movement directed to the object which caused a passion in the first place. Whether an emotive impulse causing passion is positive (for example, joy) or negative (such as spite) is not of main importance: what matters (negatively) is the indulgence of the soul in the appetites of its irrational part, in which

¹⁸ δαιμόνων γίνεται ἀπελατικόν. Pseudo-Theodoret (or, Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, p. 111.

¹⁹ Eusebius, *PE*, 4.1.9; *commPs*, PG.23.1073.49. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 249; *De XII Gemmis*, 1.7. John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos*, PG.63.208.4.

²⁰ Origen, *commJohn*, XX. 24.206: ὃ συμβέβηκε τὸ πάθος.

²¹ Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, 989b; 1010b; 1015b; 1030a; 1065a; 1088a; *Ars Poetica*, 1454a13; *De Sensu et Sensibilibus*, 443b21; *De Memoria et Reminiscentia*, 320a and 450a.

²² Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Mixtione*, p. 229; *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, pp. 68; 229; 242; 397–8; 458; 472; 476; 484; 666; 738; 800; 827; *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 50–51.

²³ Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.384.23: τὰ συμβεβηκότα πάθη τῷ λαῶ.

²⁴ Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 98: τὸν δὲ Βενιαμὴν λύκον ἄρπαγα κέκληκε, διὰ τὸ συμβεβηκὸς πάθος τῇ τούτου φυλῇ. *Epistulae* 1–52, Epistle 14: Εἰ μὲν μόνην τοῦ συμβεβηκότος ὑμῖν πάθος ἐλογιζόμεν τὴν φύσιν.

²⁵ Julian the Arian, *In Job*, p. 303: διὰ τὸ συμβεβηκὸς πάθος.

²⁶ Cyril of Alexandria, *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.144.25–31: Ἡ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὁμοειδέσι διαφορὰ περὶ τὰ συμβεβηκότα ἐστὶ καὶ ταῦτα, ὥς ἐπὶ πλεῖστον, ἐκ πάθους γίνεται, ἡ ἐξ ἐτέρας τινὸς αἰτίας, οὐκ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς οὐσίας κείμενα, καθ’ οὗπερ ἂν κατηγοροῖτό τι τῶν συμβεβηκότων. Ibid. PG.75.144.34: Τὰ δὲ συμβεβηκότα ρίζαν ἔχει τὸ πάθος. Ibid. PG.75. 172.34; *GlaphPent*, PG.69.273.7–8; *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 1, p. 106 (τὸ ἐκ πάθους συμβεβηκός); v. 3, p. 90.

²⁷ *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 5.181: Οὐ γὰρ πάθος Θεοῦ, οὐδὲ τῇ αὐτῇ τῇ οὐσίᾳ αὐτοῦ συμβεβηκός· ἀλλὰ ἡ περὶ ἡμᾶς τοιάδε ἐνέργεια θυμὸς προσηγόρευται.

²⁸ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 32, quoted below.

²⁹ See quotation above, from *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 309: καὶ ὁ Ἰὼβ δὲ περὶ τῆς κολαστικῆς δυνάμεως (αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ διάβολος ἦν).

³⁰ SVF, I.50.21; III: 92.11; 93.35; 95.14; 99.32; 113.14; 126.25.

³¹ SVF, III: 94.4–6; 114.36; 127.18.

³² SVF, I.50.7; III.92.12; III.111.32.

³³ SVF, III.111.32.

³⁴ SVF, II.215.15, *apud* Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 7.158.

³⁵ SVF, I: 50.11; 51.16; cf. III: 92.21; 95.3; 99.31; 111.32.

of course passions of the body are included. Joy may not be a sin, such as wrath is; but it is a passion.

This alteration within the soul is a result caused by a certain external agent, which makes 'passion' an *event* of the world of becoming. Passion is therefore concomitant with the world of mutability and corruptibility, a characteristic of such passible beings as man, with physical death being the ultimate passion. Since God is impassible (*ἀπαθής*), he is exempt from such characteristics as passibility.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 773A: Ὁργὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θυμὸν μὴ καθ' ἡμᾶς νόμιζε· ἄπαγε τῆς ἀτοπίας. περὶ γὰρ τὸν θεὸν οὐδὲν πάθος ἀνθρώπινον ἀλλὰ τὴν υπερβάλλουσιν ἀποστροφὴν διὰ τῶν εἰρημένων αἰνίττεται λέξεων ἣν ὑπομένειν φησὶ πρόβατα νομῆς αὐτοῦ. νομὴ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ λόγια τοῦ πνεύματος, νόμος οἶον καὶ προφηταί, ἐν οἷς καθάπερ ποιμὴν πρόβατα τοὺς δικαίους νέμει. Ibid. fr. 808: Ἐπίστησον εἰ οἱ διακονοῦμενοι ταῖς ἐκ θεοῦ κολάσεσι σκεύη τυγχάνοντες ὀργῆς, ὁμωνύμως ἢ ὑπηρετοῦνται ὀργῇ καλοῦνται. Ibid. fr. 850: Μανθάνομεν δὲ ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ἐντεῦθεν μὴ πάθος εἶναι θεοῦ τὴν λεγομένην αὐτοῦ ὀργήν. διὰ γὰρ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ὑποστῆναι οἰκονομεῖται ὧν καταλυθέντων καὶ ἠφανισμένων καὶ αὐτὴ αὐτοῖς συναπέρχεται. εἰ δὲ φαίνονται οἱ τῇ ὀργῇ ὑπηρετούμενοι σκεύη ὀργῆς καλούμενοι ὁμωνύμως αὐτῇ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργὴ προσαγορευόμενα, βέλτιον ἐπισκέψη. Ibid. fr. 878: Ῥηθεῖεν δ' ἂν ὀργαὶ καὶ φοβερισμοὶ θεοῦ αἱ ὑπηρετούμεναι ταῖς κολάσεσι δυνάμεις, ὀργῆς σκεύη τυγχάνουσαι.

The idea is expounded in literature, but not to the extent that one would have expected. We find this neither in authors prior to Origen, nor in Athanasius or the Cappadocians. A text ascribed to Basil by Migne is actually Eusebius',³⁶ who used the idea abundantly.

Origen, *Cels*, IV.72: Ὁργὴν μὲν οὖν ὀνομάζομεν θεοῦ, οὐ πάθος δ' αὐτοῦ αὐτὴν εἶναι φαμέν, ἀλλὰ τι παραλαμβανόμενον εἰς τὴν διὰ σκυθρωποτέρων ἀγωγῶν παιδεύειν τοῖς τὰ τοσάδε καὶ τοιάδε ἡμαρτηκόσιν. Ibid. οὐ πάθος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ὀργή, ἀλλ' ἕκαστος αὐτῷ ταύτην δι' ὧν ἁμαρτάνει κατασκευάζει. *Fragmenta in Librum Primum Regnorum*, fr. 4: οὕτω καὶ θυμὸς μὲν θεοῦ λέγεται παιδεία ἢ κατὰ τῶν πταιόντων, οὐ πάθος θεοῦ, μεταμέλεια

δὲ ἢ ἀπὸ πράγματος εἰς πρᾶγμα μετάθεσις τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκονομίας. *homJer*, 18.6: ἐὰν ἀκούσης θυμὸν θεοῦ καὶ ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ, μὴ νόμιζε τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ τὸν θυμὸν πάθη εἶναι θεοῦ. *frPs*, 77, 65: Πλὴν καθάπερ ἡ κραιπάλη, τουτέστιν ἡ μέθη, ἐπέισακτον πάθος ἐστίν, οὐκ ἔμφυτον, οὕτως ἡ ὀργὴ πάθος οὐκ ἐστὶ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τιμωρία δικαία τοῖς πλημμελοῦσιν ἐπαγομένη. Μηδέποτε οὖν ἀναγινώσκων περὶ Θεοῦ ταῦτα τὰ ἀνθρωποπρεπῆ, ὑπολάμβανε τὸν Θεὸν ἐν πάθει εἶναι· ἀπαθὴς γάρ ἐστι παντὶ τρόπῳ. *frJohn*, LI: οὐ γὰρ νομιστέον πάθος εἶναι θεοῦ τὴν ὀνομαζομένην αὐτοῦ ὀργήν. πῶς γὰρ δυνατόν πάθος εἶναι περὶ τὸν ἀπαθῆ; ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ μὴ πάσχει θεὸς ἀναλλοίωτος ὢν.

Here is the rather limited extent, to which the idea was expounded:

Asterius of Antioch, *commPs*, 12.11: Θυμὸς δὲ καὶ ὀργὴ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστὶ πάθος θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ δικαία κρίσις καὶ ἄμυνα τοῦ θεοῦ.

Diodorus of Tarsus, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 106: Ὁργὴν ὀνομάζει τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τιμωρίαν, οὐχ ὡς κατὰ πάθος συμβαίνουσιν τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ῥαδίως νοήσειαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐκδίκησιν γινομένην παρὰ θεοῦ, μὴ τὴν συνήθη τῆς ὀργῆς ὀνομασίαν ἀκούσαντες.

Eriphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 69: ἐπιφέρων δὲ τὴν ὀργὴν κατὰ τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων μὴ ὑποληφθῇ πάθει συνεχόμενος. ἡ γὰρ καθ' ἑκάστου τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων παρὰ θεοῦ ὀργὴ οὐκ ἀπὸ πάθους ὀρμαῖται· ἀπαθὴς γὰρ τὸ θεῖον, ἐπιφέρει δὲ τὴν ὀργὴν κατὰ ἀνθρώπων οὐ πάθει ληφθὲν ἀγανακτήσεως οὐδὲ ὀργῇ ἡττηθὲν καὶ κρατούμενον. δείκνυσι γὰρ τὸ ἀπαθὲς ὁ θεός.

Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.55: οὐ τοῦ θεοῦ παθητικῶς ὀργιζομένου. *commPs*, PG.23.92.23: Ὅτι δὲ μὴ πάθος Θεοῦ ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός, ὁ μακάριος ἐδήλωσε Παῦλος. Ibid. PG.23.1000.43: Ἐδίδαξε δὲ διὰ τούτων ὁ λόγος, ὅτι ἡ καταιγὶς καὶ ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ πάθος τυγχάνει τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ibid. PG.23.928.34–41: Ἡ γὰρ τῶν κακούντων ἀγγέλων ἐπαποστολὴ ὡς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἐνομιζέτο θυμὸς εἶναι καὶ ὀργὴ Θεοῦ. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ πάθος εἶναι ὀργῆς περὶ τὸν Θεὸν προσήκει νομίζειν· τὰς δὲ κατὰ τῶν ἁσεβῶν τιμωρίας κρίσει δικαία Θεοῦ δι' ἀποστολὴν ἀγγέλων τῶν εἰς τοῦτο τεταγμένων γινομένας

³⁶ See below, the passage quoted from PG.23.340.22–28 (falsely ascribed to Basil of Caesarea, PG.30.85.30–40).

ὀργήν καὶ θυμὸν καλεῖσθαι. Ibid. PG.23.340.2–8: Πολλάκις δὲ εἴρηται, ὡς ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς Θεοῦ λεγόμενα ἐν ταῖς θεοπνεύστοις Γραφαῖς οὐ πάθη περὶ τὸν Θεὸν σημαίνει, παντὸς γὰρ πάθους ἀλλότριον τὸ Θεῖον· κατὰ μεταφορὰν δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα εἶωθεν ὀνομάζειν ὁ τῆς Γραφῆς λόγος, ὡς καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς Θεοῦ, καὶ ὄτα καὶ χεῖρας καὶ δακτύλους, καὶ πόδας καὶ τὰ λοιπά. The same passage has been included (in Migne, too) in a spurious text attributed to Basil of Caesarea: *Homilia in Psalmum* 37, PG.30.85.

John Chrysostom, *Ad Theodorum Lapsus*, 4 (the same, in John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela*, PG.96.113): Εἰ μὲν πάθος ἦν ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καλῶς ἂν τις ἀπέγνω, ὡς οὐ δυνάμενος λοιπὸν σβέσαι τὴν φλόγα, ἣν διὰ τῶν τοσούτων ἀνῆψε κακῶν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀπαθὲς τὸ θεῖον, κἂν κολάζῃ, κἂν τιμωρῇται, οὐ μετ' ὀργῆς τοῦτο ποιεῖ, μετὰ φιλανθρωπίας δὲ καὶ κηδεμονίας. *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.90.8: Ὅργη γὰρ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ πάθος, ἀλλὰ τιμωρία καὶ κόλασις. In *Epistolam ad Romanos Commentarius*, PG.60.425.13: Ἵνα γὰρ μή, ἀκούσας ὀργήν, νομίσις πάθος.

Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *commJob*, p. 311: θυμὸν δὲ καὶ ὀργήν ὅταν ἀκούσης περὶ Θεοῦ, μὴ πάθος ἐννοήσης περὶ τὴν θεῖαν ἵστασθαι φύσιν· ἀπαθὲς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἀοργήτως τιμωρεῖται.

EN XXXe: ὀργὴ Θεοῦ ὁ διάβολος

The notion of the 'devil' portrayed as 'the wrath of God' is Origen's, with Eusebius following.

Origen, *Cels*, IV.72: Ὅργην μὲν οὖν ὀνομάζομεν Θεοῦ, οὐ πάθος δ' αὐτοῦ αὐτὴν εἶναι φαμέν, ἀλλὰ τι παραλαμβανόμενον εἰς τὴν διὰ σκυθρωποτέρων ἀγωγῶν παιδεύειν τοῖς τὰ τοσάδε καὶ τοιάδε ἡμαρτηκόσιν. Ὅτι γὰρ παιδεύει ἡ καλουμένη ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ὁ ὀνομαζόμενος θυμὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦτ' ἀρέσκει τῷ λόγῳ, δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ ἐν μὲν ἔκτῳ ψαλμῷ εἰρήσθαι· Κύριε, μὴ τῷ θυμῷ σου ἐλέγξῃς με, μηδὲ τῇ ὀργῇ σου παιδεύῃς με· ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἱερεμίᾳ· Παῖδυσον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, πλὴν ἐν κρίσει καὶ μὴ ἐν θυμῷ, ἵνα μὴ ὀλίγους ἡμᾶς ποιήσῃς. Ἀναγνοὺς δὲ τις ἐν μὲν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῶν Βασιλειῶν

‘ὀργήν’ Θεοῦ, ἀναπείθουσιν τὸν Δαυὶδ ἀριθμῆσαι τὸν λαόν, ἐν δὲ τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν Παραλειπομένων τὸν ‘διάβολον’, καὶ συνεξετάζων ἀλλήλοις τὰ ῥήτὰ ὄψεται ἐπὶ τίνος τάσσεται ἡ ὀργή, ἥς καὶ ‘τέκνα’ πάντας ἀνθρώπους γεγονέναι φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος λέγων· Ἡμεθεα τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποί. Ὅτι οὐ πάθος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ὀργή, ἀλλ’ ἕκαστος αὐτῷ ταύτην δι’ ὧν ἁμαρτάνει κατασκευάζει.

Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.40: ὁ παραβάλλει τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἀμφιβλήστῳ τοῦ διαβόλου περιβληθέντας· διὸ καὶ τῷ θυμῷ παρεδόθησαν. ὅθεν ὁ Σύμμαχος ἐπιλέγει· οἱ πλήρεις ὀργῆς κυρίου, ἐπιτιμήσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Eusebius based this notion mostly on Psalm 77:49. The idea comes from Philo via Origen³⁷ expounding the idea of demons serving to the wrath of God and visiting this upon sinners.

Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.928.33–38: Ἡ γὰρ τῶν κακούντων ἀγγέλων ἐπαποστολὴ ὡς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἐνομίζετο θυμὸς εἶναι καὶ ὀργὴ Θεοῦ. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ πάθος εἶναι ὀργῆς περὶ τὸν Θεὸν προσήκει νομίζειν· τὰς δὲ κατὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν τιμωρίας κρίσει δικαίᾳ Θεοῦ δι’ ἀποστολὴν ἀγγέλων τῶν εἰς τοῦτο τεταγμένων γιγνομένων ὀργήν καὶ θυμὸν καλεῖσθαι.

Commentarius in Isaiam, 1.89: ἐπὶ τούτῳ γὰρ τὴν ὀργήν ἐπάξιν εἴρηται ὁ Θεός, ὀργῆς ἐνταῦθα ὀνομαζομένης τῶν ταῖς κολάσεσι διακονουμένων ‘ἀγγέλων’· ὡς γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐλέγετο· ἀπέστειλεν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ὀργήν καὶ θυμὸν καὶ θλίψιν, ἀποστολὴν δι’ ἀγγέλων πονηρῶν, οὕτως καὶ νῦν ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

commPs, PG.23.340.22–28 (falsely ascribed to Basil of Caesarea, PG.30.85.30–40): Ἡδὲ καὶ οἱ τὰς κολάσεις διακονούμενοι κατὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν πονηροὶ δαίμονες, αἱ τε ὑπηρετικαὶ δυνάμεις τοῦ Θεοῦ αἱ τοιαίδε, ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς ὀνομάσθησαν. Οὕτω γοῦν εἴρηται ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς δεκαπλήγου τῆς κατ’ Αἰγυπτίων ἐπαχθείσης λόγῳ τό· Ἀπέστειλεν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς θυμὸν καὶ ὀργήν, ἀποστολὴν δι’ ἀγγέλων πονηρῶν.

Ibid. PG.23.917.24–28: Καὶ εἰκὸς γε ἦν διὰ μὲν πονηρῶν δυνάμεων τὰς κατ’ Αἰγυπτίων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι πληγὰς κατὰ τὸν φάσκοντα λόγον·

³⁷ Philo, *De Gigantibus*, 17–18. Origen, *Cels*, VIII.32; *Commentarii in Epistolam ad Romanos* (I.1–XII.21), 5; *frPs*, 77, 48–51.

Ἀπέστειλεν εἰς αὐτοὺς ὀργὴν καὶ θυμόν, θλίψιν καὶ ἀποστολὴν δι' ἁγγέλων πονηρῶν. Ibid. PG.23.928.19–21: Ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς αὐτοὺς ὀργὴν θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ, θυμόν καὶ ὀργὴν καὶ θλίψιν, ἀποστολὴν δι' ἁγγέλων πονηρῶν.

Ibid. PG.23.928.26–34: Πρὸς τοῖς λεχθεῖσι καὶ ταῦτα κατὰ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας τοῦ λαοῦ ὁ Θεὸς εἰργάζετο· Ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς αὐτοὺς ὀργὴν θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ, θυμόν καὶ ὀργὴν καὶ θλίψιν. Πολλαχού δὲ τῆς ὀργῆς ὀνομαζομένης καὶ τοῦ θυμοῦ, ὁ παρὼν λόγος τὴν διάνοιαν ἐρμηνεύει τῆς τοιαύτης φωνῆς ἐξῆς ἐπιλέγων· Ἀποστολὴν δι' ἁγγέλων πονηρῶν.

Cf. *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 13.25916–20: Τάχα δὲ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα γίγαντας ὠνόμασε σαφέστερον ὁ Ψαλμὸς ἁγγέλους πονηροὺς, λέγων· Ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς αὐτοὺς ὀργὴν θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ, θυμόν καὶ ὀργὴν καὶ θλίψιν, ἀποστολὴν δι' ἁγγέλων πονηρῶν.

The following analysis by Theodoret agrees with his statement quoted by Cassian in the present Scholion, according to which he had argued that the 'wrath of God' stands for 'the devil'.

Theodoret, *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80.660.35–661.33 (full text quoted in EN XXXi). Also, *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.732.1–14. Ἀκοὴν ἤκουσα παρὰ Κυρίου, καὶ ἁγγέλους εἰς ἔθνη ἀπέστειλε· συνάχθητε, καὶ παραγένεσθε ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ἀνάστητε εἰς πόλεμον ἐπ' αὐτήν. Τὸ δέ, 'ἁγγέλους εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀπέστειλεν', ἀντὶ τοῦ 'ἐκέλευσε' τέθεικεν· εἰκὸς δὲ καὶ τῷ θεῷ προστάγματι διακονοῦντας ἁγγέλους διεγείρειν τοὺς πολεμίους· καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς λέγει Δαβίδ· Ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς αὐτοὺς ὀργὴν θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ· θυμόν, καὶ ὀργὴν, καὶ θλίψιν, ἀποστολὴν δι' ἁγγέλων πονηρῶν.' Πονηροὺς δὲ καλεῖ, οὐχ ὡς φύσει τοιούτους, ἀλλ' ὡς τιμωρίας χάριν ἐκπεπομένων. Κακὰ γὰρ καλεῖν εἰώθαμεν καὶ τὰς ἐπαγομένας συμφοράς.

intProphXII, PG.81.1904.47–1905.1: Διδάσκεται τοίνυν ὁ προφήτης, ὡς ταῖς ἀοράτοις δυνάμεσιν ὑπουργοῖς κεχρημένος ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεὸς καὶ τὰ ἀγαθὰ χορηγεῖ, καὶ τὰ λυπηρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐπάγει. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ μακάριος λέγει Δαβίδ· 'Παρεμβαλεῖ ἄγγελος Κυρίου κύκλῳ τῶν φοβουμένων αὐτόν, καὶ ῥύσεται αὐτούς.' Περὶ

δὲ τῆς τιμωρίας ἐν ἐτέρῳ ψαλμῷ φησιν· Ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς αὐτοὺς ὀργὴν θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ· θυμόν καὶ ὀργὴν, καὶ θλίψιν, ἀποστολὴν δι' ἁγγέλων πονηρῶν.'

EN XXXf: τὸν ἀναπεύθοντα ἁμαρτάνειν

The expression was taken up from John Chrysostom, who in all probability received it from Philo using the vocabulary of Jer. 36:8.

Philo, *Legum Allegoriarum libri i-iii*, 3.213: ἐπεὶ ζῶν γε ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ φιλήδονος τρόπος ἐν ἡμῖν γεγεθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν ἀναπεῖθαι ἐφ' οἷς ἁμαρτάνει. *De Decalogo*, 141: καὶ τοὺς κυρίους τῆς ψήφου συνεξαμαρτάνειν ἀναπεύθοντες.

Cassian must have had in mind a passage of Chrysostom discussing 'the passion of wrath' (τὸ τῆς ὀργῆς πάθος). John Chrysostom, *In Sanctum Joannem (homiliae 1–88)*, PG.59.45.27: οὐ μόνον ἀναπεύθουσα ἁμαρτάνειν. *In Illud: Salutate Priscillam et Aquilam*, PG.51.206.58–59: τὸν ἁμαρτάνειν ἀναπεύθοντα. *De Virginitatis Integritate*, 44: τὴν πολλὰ πολλὰκις ἀναπεύθουσιν καὶ ἀναγκάζουσιν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἄκοντας ἁμαρτάνειν γυναῖκα.

Both Theodoret, whose text Cassian actually quotes, and Cassian himself, used the notion.

Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 3.62 (οὐδ' ἐκ τῶν συμβόλων μόνον ἀναπειθόμενοι); 12.56–57 (τὰ ἀναπεύθοντα μὴ πεινῶντας ἐσθίειν); *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.649.13 (quoting Jer. 36:8); *De Providentia*, PG.83.636.18.

Cassian the Sabaite, *Const*, p. 6a: καὶ τοῦτο δεῖγμα καθολικὸν καὶ προφανὲς τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου λέγουσιν εἶναι τέχνης οἱ πατέρες τὸ ἀναπεύθειν αὐτὸν τοὺς μαθητευομένους ἀπὸ τῶν πατέρων κρύπτειν τοὺς ἰδίους λογισμοὺς ἰδίᾳ ὑπεροψία. *OctoVit*, p. 33v: τὴν πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ἔχειν εἰς τὸ ἐργόχειρον ἀναπεύθει.

EN XXXg: κατημαξευμένης

The Codex has κατημαξευμένης. Harnack emended to καθημαξευμένης,³⁸ Turner agreed with that (p. 6), whereas Dyobouniotis wanted καταμεμαξευμένης, which, however, is a non-existent word: in fact this is

³⁸ The word ἁμαξα takes a smooth breathing and acute ("). The perfect-participle (feminine, genitive) could be καθημαξευμένης only if

ἁμαξα had rough breathing and acute ("), which is not quite the case. The 'later Attic' pronunciation of it was scarcely employed (see p. 349).

plain wrong on grounds of grammar, since the verb is καταμαζεύεσθαι, a compound made of the preposition κατά and the noun ἄμαξα ('coach', with smooth breathing). Quite evidently Diobouniotis was not aware of the etymology of the word. In the following discussion all propositions (Codex, Harnack, Turner) are contested. The perfect participle κατημαξυμένη, which I propose, means 'hackneyed'. The simile of a road which has been repeatedly trodden, or has been used times by an ἄμαξα ('coach'); hence κατημαξυμένη also denotes the 'hackneyed meaning' of a word.

The Codex's reading κατεμαξυμένης appears once (in accusative) in Hesychius' *Lexicon*,³⁹ and is rightly interpreted as κατατετριμμένην. Harnack's conjecture (καθημαξυμένης) appears just once in authors who are either significant to the Scholia (Origen, Eusebius),⁴⁰ or later erudite ones, such as Photius and Eustathius of Thessaloniki, as well as in the *Suda* lexicon.⁴¹ This form is based on the assumption that the noun ἄμαξα should be written with a rough breathing (that is, ἄμαξα), as Photius has it.⁴² Herodian had explained that, as a rule, the letter α standing before one μ or two should always take a smooth breathing, except for ἄμα and cognates (he gives the examples, ἄμαρτη, ἄματροχία). According to Herodian, to write ἄμαξα with a smooth breathing was an ad hoc rule 'set forth by our ancestors' (τὸ δὲ ἄμαξα εἰς ἰδιότητα ἐνίλωσαν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν), even though the 'modern people of Attica' maintain their general predilection for rough breathing (*De Prosodia Catholica*, 3,1, p. 341). Eminent grammarians and lexica alike maintained this grammatical rule favouring smooth breathing: Philoxenus of Alexandria (first cent. BC, *Fragmenta*, frs. 18; 153; 413; 431; 468); Orion of Alexandria (fifth cent. AD, *Etymologicum*, p. 612); Stephanus Byzantius (sixth cent. *Ethnica* (epitome), p. 830). *Etymologicum Genuinum*, p. 604. *Etymologicum Symeonis*, v. 1; p. 386. Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, p. 147. Eustathius of Thessaloniki, *Commentary ad Homeri Iliadem*, v. 4, p. 595.

Following this, there is one more option to be considered, which is κατημαξυμένης. This is the correct perfect participle of the verb καταμαζεύεσθαι (indicating a road having been used too much by a coach or ἄμαξα). The word ἄμαξα has an acute accent and smooth breathing, not acute accent and rough breathing. This means that in the perfect participial form of the verb καταμαζεύεσθαι (= κατά + ἄμαζεσθαι), the letter τ of the preposition κατά should not change to θ. In other words, the correct participial form (feminine) is κατημαξυμένη, not καθημαξυμένη.

Therefore, this is the right word for the Scholion-text. In contrast to the isolated occurrences in both Eusebius and Origen, this participle is used in far more instances by authors, including the foregoing ones, along with others such as Didymus. Besides, this orthography is the closest to the Codex, needing only one letter to be emended (ε changing to η): the Codex κατεμαξυμένης⁴³ should be emended to κατημαξυμένης. Here are some important instances where this form of the participle occurs, including authors relevant to the vocabulary of the Scholia.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (first cent. BC), *Antiquitates Romanae*, 10.41.2 (κατημαξυμένας); *De Oratoribus Antiquis*, 4 (κατημαξυμένα); *De Thucydide*, 11 (κατημαξυμένα).

Philo, *De Confusione Linguarum*, 143 (τὸ πρόχειρον καὶ κατημαξυμένον, which is the language for 'πρόχειρος grasp of scripture', as discussed in *Scholia III* and *XXV*); *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit*, 279 (κατημαξυμένων).

Origen, *Princ*, IV.1.7 (*Philocalia*, 1.7) (κατημαξυμέναι); *commGen*, PG.12.56.11 (*Philocalia*, 23.2) (κατημαξυμένου); *commJohn*, XIX.15.93 (κατημαξυμένα, κατημαξυμένους).

Eusebius, *HE*, 6.16.1 (κατημαξυμένας).

Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistulae*, Epistle 249.13 (κατημαξυμένων), or Gregory of Nyssa, *Epistulae*, Epistle 1.13 (κατημαξυμένων). The text is the same one,

³⁹ Hesychius of Alexandria, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter kappa, entry 1626.

⁴⁰ Origen, *homJer*, 14.3 (καθημαξυμένον). Eusebius, *PE*, 6.11 (καθημαξυμένου).

⁴¹ Eustathius of Thessaloniki, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, v. 4, p. 228 (καθημαξυμένα); *Commentarius in Homeri Odysseam*, v. 1, p. 13 (καθημαξυμένως). *Suda* lexicon, Alphabetic letter kappa, entry 82 (καθημαξυμένως, καθημαξυμένον).

⁴² Photius, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter alpha, entry 1197. According to Herodian of Alexandria (grammarian and rhetor, Alexandria, Rome, second cent. AD) (or Pseudo-Herodian) this way of writing (ἄμαξα)

was a habit of 'modern people of Attica' (Ἀττικοὶ οἱ νεώτεροι), *De Prosodia Catholica*, v. 3,1, p. 341. So says the sophist and lexicographer Aelius Dionysius (second cent. AD): *Lexicon Atticum*, Alphabetic letter alpha, entry 98; Alphabetic letter kappa, entry 3. This is what Photius actually reports. But there are no authors of note using this version, save the participial form καθημαξυμένου, which probably has to do with scribes or modern editors rather than the authors themselves.

⁴³ Although not a correct form, Hesychius of Alexandria (fifth–sixth cent. AD) included κατεμαξυμένη in his *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter kappa, entry 1626.

yet two different editors have ascribed it to two different Gregories. To resolve this issue is beyond my scope.

Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 59 (κατημαξευμέναι).

Cyril of Alexandria, *De Adoratione*, PG.68.388.47 (κατημαξευμένον).

Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, v. 8, p. 424 (κατημαξευμένον).

Elias of Alexandria (sixth cent. AD), *In Porphyrii Isagogen*, p. 45 (κατημαξευμένα).

Photius, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter kappa, p. 149 (κατημαξευμένος).

Suda lexicon, Alphabetic letter omega, entry 182 (κατημαξευμένας); Alphabetic letter pi, entry 2930 (κατημαξευμένον).

Hesychius, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter kappa, entry 1261 (κατημαξευμένην); Alphabetic letter kappa, entry 1760 (κατημαξευμένα).

Etymologicum Magnum, p. 497 (κατημαξευμένα).

Michael Psellus, *Poemata*, 2 (κατημαξευμέναις); 6 (κατημαξευμένην); 54, (κατημαξευμένω).

Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, 1 (κατημαξευμένω).

Eustathius of Thessaloniki (twelfth cent. AD), *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, v. 4, p. 228 (κατημαξευμένον); *ibid.* v. 4, p. 595 (κατημαξευμένον).

These citations do not exhaust all the instances found in literature. There are also other authors using this form. The alternative pronunciation ἄμαξα (acute, with rough breathing) was urged by the *Etymologicum Gudianum* (p. 106) following the fanciful etymology ὁμοῦ+ἄγουσα.

EN XXXh: Quoting Ex. 15:7

Didymus is the sole Christian who quoted this passage⁴⁴ of the Old Testament repeatedly, along with a fragment ascribed to Origen. The present Scholion comments on this in the same spirit. Besides, this is one

more indication that the catena-fragments on John that are currently ascribed to Origen were filtered through Didymus' vocabulary. We came across the same fragment LI in EN XXXd, where the notion of 'wrath' is explained to be 'not a passion of God'.

Origen, *frJohn*, LI: Πολλαχοῦ τῶν γραφῶν αἱ κατὰ τῶν φαύλων τιμωρίαι ὀργή λέγονται θεοῦ· ὡς τὸ λεχθὲν περὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ὑπὸ Μωϋσέως· Ἐξαπέστειλας τὴν ὀργὴν σου, καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτοὺς ὥσεί καλᾶμην.' καὶ Παῦλος περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων γράφει· Ἐφθασεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος', ὀργὴν λέγων τὰς ἐπελθούσας ἐπ' αὐτοὺς θεηλάτους τιμωρίας. ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸν καταφρονοῦντα τῆς χρηστότητος καὶ μακροθυμίας φησί· 'Κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς.' οὐ γὰρ νομιστέον πάθος εἶναι θεοῦ τὴν ὀνομαζομένην αὐτοῦ ὀργὴν. πῶς γὰρ δυνατόν πάθος εἶναι περὶ τὸν ἀπαθῆ; ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ μὴ πάσχει θεὸς ἀναλλοίωτος ὢν, ἐρμηνευτέον τὴν λεγομένην αὐτοῦ ὀργὴν καθ' ἃ εἴρηται.

This is an elaboration of the idea that on no account does 'God's wrath' betoken passion. Cassian's source in writing of this part of the Scholion, namely Theodoret, argues thus: 'that which is sent by someone is in itself distinct from him who sends it' (Πᾶν γὰρ τὸ ἀποστέλλομενον ὑπὸ τινος ἑτερόν ἐστιν τοῦ ἐξαποστέλλοντος). What he means is this: anger is a sentiment, which may exist only within the soul of an angry person. It cannot be 'sent', because there is no way for a passion to exist 'outside' the soul, of which anger is a passion. Once therefore God is said to 'have sent' his 'anger', this can only suggest that this anger is in essence something different from the well-known human passion, which is of an 'accidental'⁴⁵ character.

There is a fundamental difference between Didymus and Theodoret, however. Didymus identifies either the 'wrath' of God with punishments themselves,⁴⁶ or 'the devil' with the 'punishing power' of God,⁴⁷ not with

⁴⁴ Exodus, 15:7 (Septuagint, *Odae*, Ode 1.7): ἀπέστειλας τὴν ὀργὴν σου, καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτοὺς ὡς καλᾶμην.

⁴⁵ Cf. Scholion text: συμβέβηκεν, συμβεβηκός.

⁴⁶ Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 91: Ἐξαπέστειλας γὰρ τὴν ὀργὴν σου', ὃ ἐστιν τὰ ἐπίπονα. *frPs(al)*, fr. 32: εἴρηται δὲ τὰ ἐπίπονα τὰ καθαπτόμενα τῶν πονηρῶν. *Ibid.* fr. 32: Ὅτι δὲ οὐ πάθος θεοῦ ἐκ τούτων τῶν λέξεων παρίσταται, μανθάνομεν καὶ ἐκ τῶν Μωϋσέως πρὸς τὸν θεὸν λόγων φερομένων οὕτως· Ἀπέστειλας τὴν ὀργὴν σου καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτοὺς ὥσεί καλᾶμην. εἴρηται δὲ τὰ ἐπίπονα τὰ καθαπτόμενα τῶν πονηρῶν ἐν τούτοις ὀργῇ θεοῦ κρίσει αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς ἀξίους ἐρχόμενα.

οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ ὀργὴ τὸ πάθος τῶν ἐξαποστελλομένων ἐστίν· ἔχει γὰρ τὸ εἶναι ἐν μόνῃ τῇ θυμικῇ τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμει, ἥς ἔξω γενομένη οὐδ' ὅλως ὑφίσταται· ἐστὶ γὰρ τῶν ἐν ἄλλοις τὸ εἶναι ἐχόντων. *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 286: ὀργὴν δὲ ἐνταῦθα οὐ πάθος ἐκλαβεῖν δεῖ, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐπίπονον ἀγωγὴν, καθὰ καὶ Μωσῆς πρὸς θεὸν φησιν· Ἐξαπέστειλας τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτοὺς ὡς καλᾶμην.' Also, in *commZacch*, 2.199 quoted above.

⁴⁷ Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 309: καὶ ὁ Ἰῶβ δὲ περὶ τῆς κολαστικῆς δυνάμεως (αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ διάβολος ἦν). See full quotation above.

God's 'wrath'. By contrast, Theodoret identifies this wrath with 'the devil', not with any feelings. In other words, this wrath is personified: it is not just a state of things during punishment. Hence, the phraseology is congruent with that of Didymus, yet the shift in Cassian's understanding effected by Theodoret is evident as well as crucial. The bishop of Cyrrhus, of course, maintained Origen's notion of God's impassibility using virtually the same phraseology.

Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 38: δῆλον γὰρ οἶμαι τοῖς τὰ θεῖα πεπαιδευμένοις ὡς οὐδὲν ἐκ μεταμελείας ποιεῖν εἴωθε ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεός· τοῦτο γὰρ δὴ τὸ πάθος ἴδιον τῶν τρεπτὴν ἐχόντων τὴν φύσιν, καὶ νῦν μὲν τούτοις, νῦν δὲ ἐκείνοις ἀρεσκομένων, καὶ τὸ μέλλον ἔσεσθαι παντάπασιν ἀγνοούντων. ὁ δὲ τῶν ὅλων Θεὸς ἄτρεπτον μὲν ἔχει τὴν φύσιν· οἶδε δὲ ὡς ἡδὴ γεγενημένα τὰ μήπω γεγενημένα.

As a matter of fact, the idea of identifying the 'wrath of God' with 'the devil' occurred to Theodoret facing the need to explain the discrepancy between 2 Kings 24:1 and 1 Paralipomenon 21:1. The extensive quotation from his *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon* (*Quaestio* XLV: PG.80.660.8–664.4) is illuminating and identifies him as the author of this specific part of the present [Scholion XXX](#). As already noted, Theodoret found this question treated by Origen himself.⁴⁸ Likewise, the use of the same term ἐξαποστελλόμενον is quite telling. The comment is virtually the same as the foregoing fragment ascribed to Origen, yet the passage is Theodoret's, who identifies himself through the phrase 'as we have taught' (ὡς ἐδιδάξαμεν).

There is one more point to be made. Didymus applies the verb ἐξαπέστειλας, which is not the precise one used in the Old Testament (viz. ἀπέστειλας). Although the verb is slightly modified, the meaning remains intact. This is understandable, since Didymus quoted from memory, and used this verb invariably at all points where he quoted the scriptural passage. How-

ever, in the case of Origen's fragment LI on John, this is not understandable. Origen modified scriptural passages only in his homilies, not in any commentary, where the scriptural text was available to him to check and write out without the pressure of an oral speech. The only plausible conclusion, therefore, is that Origen's fragment LI on John is a rendering via Didymus. On the other hand, the passage of Didymus quoted above, namely, *frPs(al)*, fr. 32 (which has Ἀπέστειλας), might well be part of a rendering of Didymus' comments on the Psalms by a catenist.

Of course it is always possible that Didymus used a passage of Origen, particularly since the expression above is reminiscent of Origen's πᾶν γὰρ τὸ ποιοῦν πρεσβύτερον τοῦ πεποιημένου,⁴⁹ which was also quoted by Eusebius.⁵⁰ Theodoret was perfectly aware of this work of Origen, since he had used it in his collection *Quaestiones in Genesin*, in which one can see that Theodoret agrees with Origen in rejecting astrology.⁵¹

EN XXXi: ὡς ἐδιδάξαμεν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης τῶν Παραλειπομένων

Theodoret is the sole Christian author to have written a commentary on 1 Paralipomenon, as far as extant writings are concerned. The germane text is quoted below. It is interesting that he quotes 1 Paralipomenon 21:1, not from the LXX, but from the Hebrew text, where the Hebrew has the equivalent of Καὶ ἀνέστη Σατᾶν ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ, corresponding to the LXX Καὶ ἔστη ὁ διάβολος ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ. Christian authors did not quote this Hebrew version, with the exception of Photius, five centuries after Theodoret.⁵²

There are authors who seem to have written on books of Paralipomenon, but the text of the Scholion refers to the *first* book of Paralipomenon. Cyril wrote a commentary on the *second* book only.⁵³ It is therefore Theodoret alone that remains as the one who refers to himself as having written such a treatise.

⁴⁸ Origen, *Cels*, IV.72, quoted above.

⁴⁹ Origen, *commGen*, PG.12.69.41–42 (*apud Philocalia*, 23.14).

⁵⁰ Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelica*, 6.11.56.

⁵¹ Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Genesin*. PG.80.96, commenting on Gen. 1:14.

⁵² Photius, *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, epistle 302. In this epistle Photius implicitly avails himself of Theodoret's analysis. So he does also in Epistle 301, where the notion of 'wrath of God' is developed in close

relation to the analyses of [Scholion XXX](#). However, I should remind the reader that I have argued that many epistles of this collection are like Cassian and unlike Photius, which calls for serious reconsideration of these texts. See RCR and NDGF, *passim*.

⁵³ A spurious work makes reference to Cyril's book on 2 Paralipomenon. Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria, *Collectio Dictorum Veteris Testamenti*, PG.77.1261.1. Theodoret had written a treatise on the same book: PG.80.820.

Photius is a valuable witness to Theodoret, whom he admired not only for his erudition, but also for his style. To him, Theodoret is an exegete far more intuitive ‘than Hippolytus and the others’ with regard ‘to exegesis of the prophets’.⁵⁴ Photius commented on Theodoret’s erudition, as well as on his lucidity, clarity, wit, disinclination to parade erudition and unpretentiousness, and his comments are more than enthusiastic.⁵⁵ Among others, Photius advises us that he had read the commentary of Theodoret on Daniel, which is a text similar to John’s Revelation. According to Photius, Theodoret drew on Hippolytus’ commentary on Daniel. However, Photius goes on, the exegeses which Theodoret furnished on his own are the best part of this commentary.⁵⁶ Furthermore, Photius expresses his admiration for the qualities of Theodoret for an additional reason: he is the exegete that had struggled to yield exegeses ‘on the difficult points of scripture’, among which ‘the books on Kings and Paralipomenon are included’.⁵⁷

Photius also tells us that the question concerning 2 Kings 24:1 had been handled by Cyril of Alexandria in response to a certain ‘most pious Christophorus’ (so addressed by Cyril), who had submitted to the bishop of Alexandria a catalogue with questions on scriptural points for him to unravel. Cyril resolved to have recourse to homonymy: the appellation ‘Lord’ of 2 Kings 24:1 may bespeak either God or the devil.⁵⁸ However, Photius remarks that the exegesis that ‘Theodoret and other holy men’ furnished on the same point was far better than that of Cyril.⁵⁹ Who these ‘holy men’ were is difficult to determine.⁶⁰ Photius is nevertheless clear in regarding Theodoret as the leading figure on the question of the specific exegesis – which is the exegesis expounded in both this Scholion and in Theodoret’s commentary on 1 Paralipomenon.

This testimony by Photius suggests that Theodoret’s exegesis had a strong impact upon later thinkers. Since

his commentary on the book of Paralipomenon became almost legendary, he must be the person who writes of himself in the present Scholion (which Cassian quotes from Theodoret), ‘as we have taught apropos of the book of 1 Paralipomenon’ (ὡς ἐδιδάξαμεν). We know of no other theologian who wrote on this Scriptural book.

I therefore quote from Theodoret, and the reader can see for himself that the reference of the Scholion to the previous work on 1 Paralipomenon is in fact the following text. The sole difference is that in the commentary on 1 Paralipomenon Theodoret quotes from the Hebrew text, whereas in [Scholion XXX](#) Cassian cites the LXX.

Theodoret, *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80.660.8–664.4: Τί δῆποτε τοῦ Δαβίδ ἀριθμήσαντος, ὁ λαὸς τὴν τιμωρίαν ἀνεδέξατο; . . . Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἡ ἱστορία διδάσκει· ‘Καὶ προσέθετο ὀργὴ Θεοῦ, τοῦ θυμωθῆναι ἐν Ἰσραήλ.’ Οὐκ εἶπεν, Ἐν Δαβίδ, ἀλλ’, Ἐν Ἰσραήλ’. Τοιγάρτοι πρόφασις ἦν τῆς τιμωρίας ὁ γενόμενος ἀριθμός· Ἐπέσεισε γάρ, φησι, τὸν Δαβίδ εἰς αὐτούς, λέγων, Πορεύθητι, ἀριθμήσον τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τὸν Ἰούδαν.’ Ἀλλ’ οὐ διὰ λόγων ἐκελεύσθη· ἡ γὰρ ἂν εὐθύνας τῆς ἀριθμήσεως εἰσπραττόμενος εἶπεν, ὡς Αὐτὸς ἐκέλευσας ἀριθμηθῆναι. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν οὐκ ἔφη· πεπλημμεληκέναι δὲ ὁμολόγησεν. Οὐ τοίνυν λόγῳ προσέταξε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἀριθμῆσαι, ἀλλ’ ἐνδέδωκε τοῦτῳ χρήσασθαι τῷ λογισμῷ τὸν Δαβίδ. Ἰλεως γὰρ ὢν ὁ Δεσπότης καὶ Θεός, ἐμποδὼν γίνεται τοῖς συνοίσειν οὐ μέλλουσι λογισμοῖς. Καὶ γὰρ βουλευσαμένῳ τὸν θεῖον οἰκοδομῆσαι νεῶν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ναθάν δεδήλωκε μηδὲν τοιοῦτον βουλεύσασθαι, ἀλλὰ τῷ παιδί τὴν τῆς οἰκοδομῆς φυλάξαι φροντίδα. Ὅτι δὲ οὐκ ἐξ ἐνεργείας, ἀλλ’ ἐκ συγχωρήσεως ὁ τοιοῦτος αὐτῷ γέγονε λογισμός, σαφέστερον ἢ τῶν Παραλειπομένων

⁵⁴ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 203, p. 164a: Μακρῷ μὲν οὗτος ὁ σοφὸς ἀνὴρ οὐχ Ἱππολύτου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῶν ἄλλων τῇ τῶν προφητικῶν ῥημάτων ἀναπτύξει τε καὶ διακαθάρσει κρατεῖ.

⁵⁵ Ibid. pp. 164a–b.

⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 164b: Ἔστι μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ περὶ τὸν θεσπέσιον Δανιὴλ ἀναπτύξει κατ’ ἑνια τῷ μάρτυρι συμφερόμενος Ἱππολύτῳ, πλείω δὲ πρὸς ἃ φέρεται τὴν ἐτέραν, ὧν τὰ ἐπιφανέστερα ταῦτα.

⁵⁷ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 203, p. 164b: εἰς τὰ ἄπορα γὰρ χρηματίζει τῆς Γραφῆς· ἐν οἷς ἐστὶ καὶ εἰς τὰ τῶν Βασιλειῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ Παραλειπόμενα.

⁵⁸ In 2 Kings 24:1, it is written that it is ‘the Lord’ (Κύριος), but in 1 Paralipomenon 21:1, it is ‘the devil’ (ὁ διάβολος) who incites David to count Israel.

⁵⁹ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 230, p. 282b: Αὐτὸς μὲν οὕτω δοκεῖ πως διὰ τῆς ὁμωνυμίας τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν ἐπιλύεσθαι· ἄμεινον δὲ μοι δοκεῖ Θεοδωρήτῳ τε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἱεροῖς ἀνδράσι (Cassian?) πραγματευθῆναι τῆς προκειμένης ἀπορίας τὴν ἐπίλυσιν.

⁶⁰ A testimony in the *Suda* lexicon attests that Diodorus of Tarsus wrote a treatise entitled *On the Questions About the Books of Paralipomenon* (Εἰς τὰ ζητούμενα τῶν Παραλειπομένων). *Suda* lexicon, Alphabetic letter delta, entry 1149.

ἐδίδαξε βίβλος. Λέγει δὲ οὕτως· ‘Καὶ ἀνέστη Σατὰν ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἐπέσεισε τὸν Δαβὶδ, τοῦ ἀριθμῆσαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ.’ Καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, Ἀνέστη Σατὰν ἐπὶ Δαβὶδ, ἀλλ’, ‘ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ’. Σατὰν δὲ τὸν ἀντικείμενον, ἢ ἀποστάτην, ἢ Ἑβραίων γλῶττα καλεῖ. Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ἐναντίος ταῖς θεαῖς ἐπαγγελίαις ὁ τοιοῦτος ἦν λογισμὸς (τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ὁ τῶν ὄλων ἔφη Θεός, ‘Ποιήσω τὸ σπέρμα σὸν ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τὴν παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης, ἥτις οὐκ ἀριθμηθήσεται ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους’), τούτου χάριν Σατὰν τὸν τοιοῦτον ὠνόμασε λογισμὸν, ὡς ἐναντίον τῇ ὑποσχέσει τῇ θεαῖ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ τιμωρίαν ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐγένετο λογισμὸς· ‘Ἀνέστη γάρ, φησιν, Σατὰν ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἐπέσεισε τὸν Δαβὶδ, τοῦ ἀριθμῆσαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τὸν Ἰούδα.’ Οὕτω κἀνταῦθα, ‘Προσέθετο ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ θυμωθῆναι ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ’· καὶ ἐπέσεισε τὸν Δαβὶδ εἰς αὐτούς, λέγων, ‘Πορεύθητι, ἀρίθμησον τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τὸν Ἰούδα.’ Εἰ δὲ αὐτὸς προσέταξε, τί δήποτε χαλεπαίνει; Οὐκοῦν τὴν θεῖαν συγχώρησιν διὰ τούτων δεδήλωκεν. Εἰ δὲ ὁ Δεσπότης Θεὸς τοῦτο προσετείχετο γενέσθαι, τί δήποτε μεταμελεῖται ὁ Δαβὶδ τὴν θεῖαν πεπληρωκῶς ἐντολήν; Ἐπάταξε γάρ, φησιν, ἡ καρδιά Δαβὶδ αὐτὸν μετὰ ταῦτα, ὅτι ἠρίθμησε τὸν λαόν· καὶ εἶπε Δαβὶδ, Ἠμάρτηκα τῷ Κυρίῳ τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο. Καὶ νῦν, Κύριε, περίελε τὴν ἀδικίαν τοῦ δούλου σου, ὅτι ἑματαιώθη σφόδρα.’ Δῆλον τοίνυν, ὡς τὴν συγχώρησιν ἐκάλεσεν ἐντολήν· ἐπειδὴ κωλύσαι δυνάμενος οὐκ ἐκώλυσε, παιδεῦσαι διὰ τούτου τοὺς παρανόμους βουλόμενος. Καὶ πρῶτον μὲν αὐτοὺς ἠθέλησε τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας γεγεννημένης ἐπαγγελίας ἀναμνησθαι, καὶ δεῖξαι ταύτης τὸ ἀληθές· ἔπειτα διδάξαι, ὡς ἐξ ἐνὸς τοῦ Ἰακώβ τοσαῦται μυριάδες ἐγένοντο, καὶ ὅτι τοσαύτης τετυχηκότες εὐεργεσίας ἀεὶ πονηρὰν ἐπεδείξαντο γνώμην. Τούτου χάριν ἀριθμηθῆναι συνεχώρησε πρῶτον· εἴθ’ οὕτως ἐκόλασεν.

The instances of 1 Paralipomenon, 21:1 being quoted in literature are scarce. In effect it is only Theod-

oret who came up with a coherent exegesis.⁶¹ Besides, the problem of this Scholion, namely whether David was guilty of sin once he had been bidden to count Israel, is the same as the one expounded by Theodoret in the foregoing passage.

The expression ὡς ἐδιδάξαμεν, in the first person, is almost non-existent in literature. It is remarkable that this appears in three instances only, in authors related to Theodoret’s education.⁶²

Finally, a major witness to Theodoret is Michael Glycas, who clearly attests that he studied Theodoret’s commentary on 1 Paralipomenon.⁶³

EN XXXj: Quoting 1 Tim. 1:20

Quotation of Paul’s phrase as in 1 Tim. 1:20 is extremely rare. All in all, the instance of the expression is quoted only in the following: Origen, *homJer*, 1.3; 19.14; *frJer*, 48; *frPs*, 118, 121; *frEx*, PG.12.276.40 (*Philocalia*, 27.8). Severianus of Gabala, *In Justum et Beatum Job*, PG.56.572.18. John Chrysostom, *In Job*, p. 15; *In Principium Actorum*, PG.51.96.6; *In Epistolam i ad Timotheum Commentarius*, PG.62.528.17. Theodoret, *Interpretatio xiv Epistularum Sancti Pauli*, PG.82.796.41; *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.385.15.

EN XXXk: ἐφορῶντες ἄγγελοι

The expression ‘overseeing angels’ originates in Clement and does not occur in Origen.

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 7.2.12.5: τοῦ ἐφορῶντος μεγάλου κριτοῦ διὰ τε τῶν προσεχῶν ἀγγέλων.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 718a: οὔτε ἀγγέλους τοὺς πάλαι αὐτὴν ἐφορῶντας.

Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.24.37.37: θείων ἀγγέλων καὶ λειτουργῶν Θεοῦ ἐφορῶντων.

John of Damascus, *Laudatio Sanctae Barbarae*, PG.96.796.54: ἀγγέλων τε τῶν τὴν σὴν ἄθλησιν ἐφορῶντων.

⁶¹ Theodoret, *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80.661: 13–15 and 25–28. Maximus Confessor, *Quaestiones et Dubia*, 161. The author tries to deal with the old question of squaring 2 Kings 24:1 (the subject of the verb ἐπέσεισε is God) with 1 Paralipomenon 21:1 (the subject of the verb ἐπέσεισε is the devil). On this Photius reports that Cyril had recourse to homonymy, but with little success or inspiration. In John of Damascus this is nothing more than a quotation: *Sacra Parallela*, PG.95.1405.7–8.

⁶² Galen, *In Hippocratis Prognosticum Commentaria iii*, v. 18b, p. 164. Alexandrer of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, p. 57. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, PG.24.576.39.

⁶³ Michael Glycas (chronicler, twelfth cent. AD, Constantinople), *Annales*, p. 335. He refers to Theodoret more than any other author. Cf. *ibid.* pp. 27; 37; 63; 128; 151; 152; 201; 242; 249; 330; 331; 339; 349; 353; 358; 359; 369; 392; 428; 483; 488; 502.

The expression about God ‘overseeing’ (ἐφορῶν) occurs in both Didymus and Theodoret, probably drawing on a Homeric Lexicon so styling Zeus: Apollonius (sophist, first second cent. AD), *Lexicon Homericum*, p. 79: εὐρύοπα, ἐπίθετον Διός, ἦτοι τὸν μεγάλως ἐφορῶντα.

This last part of the Scholion is in fact one by Cassian himself, who had used the idea of a superintending God. Cassian the Sabaite, *OctoVit*, p. 44r: ὁ Θεὸς ἐφορᾷ. *ScetPatr*, p. 60r: τὸν τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας ἐφορῶντα.

The notion appears in *Scholion XV*, too.⁶⁴ Eusebius employed this in combination with the Stoic term of ‘administration of the world’ (διοίκησις), which is the vocabulary of *Scholion XXVII* (διοικήσεως).

Eusebius, *PE*, 7.11.4–5: ἀλλ’ εἰς τὸ αἰεὶ ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ προνοίας αὐτὸν διοικεῖσθαι, ὡς μὴ μόνον δημιουργὸν εἶναι τῶν ὅλων καὶ ποιητὴν τὸν θεόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σωτῆρα καὶ διοικητὴν καὶ βασιλέα καὶ ἡγεμόνα, ἡλίω αὐτῷ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις καὶ τῷ σύμπαντι οὐρανῷ τε καὶ κόσμῳ δι’ αἰῶνος ἐπιστατοῦντα μεγάλῳ τε ὀφθαλμῷ καὶ ἐνθάφ δυνάμει πάντ’ ἐφορῶντα καὶ τοῖς πᾶσιν οὐρανίοις τε καὶ ἐπιγείοις ἐπιπαρόντα καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν κόσμῳ διατάττοντά τε καὶ διοικοῦντα.

Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.173.37: τὸν πάντα ἐφορῶντα δεσπότην. Ibid. PG.27.289.13: ὅτε Δεσπότης καὶ πάντα ἐφορῶν.

Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 514: ὡς οὖν ἐφορῶντος τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ibid. v. 2, p. 322: Χριστόν, τὸν πολλοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐφορῶντα τὰ πάντα. τὸ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ τελείως ἔχοντος αἰεὶ πῶς ἐστὶ σημαντικόν. στεῖρα γοῦν λέγεται τεκεῖν ἐπτά. ὅτι δὲ μυρίοις ὄμμασιν ἐφορᾷ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐπισκέπτεται τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἢ θεία τε καὶ ἀπόρρητος τοῦ Υἱοῦ φύσις, οὐκ ἂν ἐνδοιάσειέ τις. In *Isaiam*, PG.70.41.34–35: τοῦ πάντα εἰδότος τε καὶ ἐφορῶντος Θεοῦ.

Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 14: ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντα ἐφορῶντος ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ γιγνωσκόμενος. *commZacch*, 1.331: Εἶναι ἐπὶ τὰ ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶπεν, ἐφορῶντας καὶ ἐπιβλέποντας πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 86: οἱ γὰρ ὀφθαλμοὶ θεοῦ ἐφορῶντες φωτίζουν τοὺς

ἐπιβλεπομένους. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 182: ἐπεὶ ταῦτα ἐγνώμεν ὅτι εἰσὶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐφορῶντες τοὺς φοβουμένους αὐτόν.

Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 6.24: μάλα εἰκότως οὗτος τὸν πάντα ἐφορῶντα ἐπέδειξεν ὀφθαλμὸν καὶ τὴν ἐσομένην προηγόρευσε κρίσιν. *HE*, p. 85: ἀλλ’ ὁ πάντα ἐφορῶν ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἴασεν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον λαθεῖν τὸν Ἀρσένιον. Ibid. p. 183: τὸν μέντοι πάντα ἐφορῶντα ὀφθαλμὸν οὐ διέφυγον, ἀλλ’ ἔδοσαν ἀξίας τοῦ τολμήματος δίκας. *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1121.2: Αἴτιον δὲ τῆς τοιαύτης ἀναληγσίας, τὸ μὴ δεδιέναι τὸν πάντα ἐφορῶντα Δεσπότην.

EN XXXI: κρίσις καθολικὴ

The term ‘universal judgement’ is characteristic of Eusebius, from whom Didymus took it up. In turn, a casual statement by Justin Martyr may have inspired Eusebius himself.⁶⁵ The author of the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam* evidently reproduced Eusebius’ account, and so did Procopius of Gaza. Olympiodorus the deacon of Alexandria, whom we have come across at many points, also reproduced the expression.⁶⁶

Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.28: σαφῶς γὰρ διὰ τούτων καθολικὴν εἰσάγει κατὰ πάντων τῶν ἀσεβῶν κρίσιν . . . ἐπεὶ μὴ περὶ τοῦ ἐνεστώτος καιροῦ ταῦτα ἐθέσπισεν, περὶ δὲ τῆς καθολικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσεως.

The following section is in fact a borrowing from the foregoing passage of Eusebius.

Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam, 3.119: Ἐπεὶ οὖν οὐ μακρὰν ἐστὶν ὡς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὁ ὠρισμένος τῆς κρίσεως καιρὸς, ἐπὶ τὴν καθολικὴν κρίσιν ἀναφέρεσθαι τὸ Νῦν ἐξειλήφμεν. Καταστήσεται δὲ εἰς κρίσιν, ἐξαπλῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, καθ’ οὓς ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἔργοις δικαίαν ποιεῖται τῶν τοιῶνδε κολάσεων τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς καταδικαζομένους συντίθεσθαι τὴν κατ’ αὐτῶν ἀποφανθεῖσαν κρίσιν ὡς δικαιωτάτην.

Cf. Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.65: περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσεως διδάσκων. Ibid.

⁶⁴ Cf. *Scholion XV*: Τὴν ἐποπτικὴν καὶ ἔφορον τῶν ὅλων δύναμιν and περὶ ταύτης τῆς ἐφόρου δυνάμεως γέγραπται. Cf. *EN XVb*.

⁶⁵ Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 81.4: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν

καθολικὴν καί, συνελόντι φάναι, αἰωνίαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅμα πάντων ἀνίστασιν γενήσεσθαι καὶ κρίσιν.

⁶⁶ Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *Fragmenta in Jeremiam*, PG.93.680.5: Ταῦτα δὲ ἀρμόζει νοεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς καθολικῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίσεως.

ἐπειδὴν δὲ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνηριον ἐπιστῇ καὶ ἡ καθολικὴ κρίσις, ἐν ἣ κρινεῖ ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων. Ibid. εἷς τε γενικὸν λόγον τὸν περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς κρίσεως. Ibid. 1.66: Τὰ προλεχθέντα περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσεως. Ibid. ἐν καιρῷ τῆς καθολικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσεως. Ibid. 1.68: τοῦτον καὶ ἀπετέλεσε τὸν τρόπον τῆς κατὰ πάντων καθολικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσεως. . . . καὶ φόβον ἡμᾶς ἄγων τῆς περιμενούσης ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους καθολικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσεως. Ibid. 1.84: σαφῶς διδάσκουσα περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς κρίσεως εἰρησθαι τὰ λελεγμένα. Ibid. 1.85: Πληρώσας ὁ λόγος τὴν περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσεως προφητείαν. Ibid. 1.86: τὸ διαδεχόμενον αὐτὸν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς καθολικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσεως τέλος. Ibid. 1.89: ἐνταῦθα καὶ ὁ περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς κρίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος περιγράφεται. Ibid. 1.90: περιγραφείσης τῆς προφητείας, δι' ἧς τὰ περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς κρίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ διελαλεῖτο. Ibid. 1.100: ταῦτα προφήσας ὁ λόγος ἐπισυνάπτει τὰ προκείμενα ἡρτημένα τῆς καθολικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσεως. Ibid. 2.1: τῆς καθολικῆς κρίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ μέσου μνημονεύσας ὁ λόγος. Ibid. 2.7: τὴν περιμένουσιν ἅπαντας καθολικὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσιν. Ibid. 2.22: ἐξαγγέλλων τὰ περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς κρίσεως τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ παρασκευάζεσθαι τοὺς πάντας εἰς τὴν μέλλουσιν τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσιν. διὸ λέλεκται· κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει. *commPs*, PG.23.988.13: ὅτι πάντων ἔσται συντέλεια καὶ μεταβολὴ ἐπὶ τῇ καθολικῇ κρίσει τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Procopius of Gaza, in his commentary on Isaiah (which is in fact a compilation of previous commentaries), refers implicitly to Eusebius and draws on him: Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiaam Prophetam*, p. 2077: Τινὲς δὲ [*viz.* Eusebius] τὰ προειρημένα ῥητά, διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι τῇ οἰκουμένη πάσῃ κακά, τοῦτον ἐξηγοῦνται τὸν τρόπον. Μέλλων γάρ, φασίν, [again, reference to Eusebius] ὁ λόγος μερικὴν ἀπειλὴν κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος ποιήσασθαι,

περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προεκτίθεται κρίσεως.

Again, Procopius refers to Eusebius implicitly. *In Isaiaam Prophetam*, p. 2088: Οἱ περὶ καθολικῆς κρίσεως εἰρησθαι τὰ προλαβόντα νομίσαντες, ἐντεῦθεν ἰδιάζειν τὰ περὶ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων φασίν. Likewise, *ibid.* p. 2181: Νυνὶ δὲ οὐ προθεσπίζουσι μόνον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἐκάστην διάζων φέρεται τρόπος θεοσεβείας προσήκων· ὡς ἐν τῷ προλέγειν τὴν Βαβυλῶνος καθαίρεσιν, περὶ καθολικῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ διείλεκται κρίσεως. Ibid. p. 2233: Κἀνταῦθα ὁ περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίσεως περιγράφεται λόγος. Ibid. p. 2344: Οὕτως ἄρα κἀν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ μερικὴ κρίσις ἐστὶ, καὶ καθολικὴ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

EN XXXm: ὡς φησιν . . . γάρ φησι

Turner was not right in urging that since the verb appears twice ‘the second verb is redundant’.⁶⁷ The author of the Scholion refers to Eusebius, and to his idea of κρίσις καθολικὴ. It is to him that the first φησὶν refers. Moving on, he uses the same verb once again, yet this time he refers not to Eusebius, but to the prophet Micah, whom he actually quotes at that point.

EN XXXn: Quoting Micah, 6:1–2.

Quotation of Micah 6:1–2 is rare. There is only one instance in Cyril of Alexandria (out of three quotations of this scriptural passage) which could be said to stand close to the sentiment of this Scholion.⁶⁸ Otherwise, the passage enjoyed quotation and analysis only by a few authors, who all happen to be relevant to the Scholia.⁶⁹

EN XXXo: ἐγκεχειρισμένοι δυνάμεις

The expression is very rare. It originates in Josephus⁷⁰ and was put to theological use by Origen and Eusebius:

⁶⁷ Turner (above, p. 87 n. 626), p. 7.

⁶⁸ In Cyril of Alexandria, there are two passages where ‘mountains’ are said to bespeak the ‘impiety’ and ‘insensitivity’ of Israel, which is not actually the spirit of the Scholion. There is one instance, however, where the ‘mountains’ are identified with angels, as it happens in this Scholion. Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 692: ὁρῶ γάρ που δὴ τάχα καὶ βουνοὺς τὰς νοητὰς ὀνομάζει δυνάμεις, αἱ τότε τὸ σύμπαν περιέπουσι κατὰ βούλησιν Θεοῦ, τὰς τῶν δαιμόνων πλεονεξίας ἀποσοβοῦσαι τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

⁶⁹ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *intProphXII*, Prophet Micah, 6.1–2.

Theodoret evidently read the prophet with Theodore’s analyses in mind. Theodoret, *intProphXII*, PG.81.1773.46–1776.3. Later, the prophetic proclamation was quoted by Procopius of Gaza in his compilation, *In Isaiaam Prophetam*, p. 1828.

⁷⁰ Josephus, *Antiquitas Judaica*, 7.390: οὕτως ἀρίστῳ ἀνδρὶ γεγεννημένῳ καὶ πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἔχοντι καὶ τοσοῦτων ἔθνῶν σωτηρίαν ἐγκεχειρισμένῳ βασιλεῖ.

it points to ‘powers charged with’ carrying out the divine will, that is, angels.⁷¹ In the sense used in the Scholion (*viz.* referring to heavenly powers), it occurs in Origen, Didymus, John Chrysostom,⁷² and Apollinaris of Laodicea.⁷³ The instances in Origen are strikingly reminiscent of the present Scholion. The first one is introduced precisely by means of the text of Revelation, which refers to the ‘angel of Ephesus’: this was the angel ‘charged with’ certain duties.⁷⁴ Besides, the notion of certain men being superior to angels (who are also subject to judgement, according to 1 Cor. 6:3) is akin to the specific part of the current Scholion.⁷⁵

A final note: In view of the scarce use of the specific expression, its appearance in the Commentary on the Apocalypse by Andreas of Caesarea is in all probability borrowed from this Scholion.⁷⁶

EN XXXp: μηδέν ἐλλελοιπέναι

The expression is very rare, yet the few authors who used it treated it as a conventional one.

Demosthenes, *De Falsa Legatione*, 178: οὐδὲν ἐλλελοιπότα μοχθηρίας. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, 7.10: μηδέν ἐλλελοιπῶς αἰσχροκερδείας. Libanius, *Epistulae*, Epistle 808.5: καὶ ἅμα ἐδόκει μοι μηδέν εἰς αὐτὸν εὐνοίας ἐλλελοιπέναι. *Declamationes*, 17.1.64: ἀλλ’ εἰ μὲν αὐτὸς οὐδὲν τῶν προσηκόντων ἐλλέλοιπας, σφῶζου.

Gregory of Nyssa, *In Ecclesiasten (homiliae 8)*, v. 5, p. 333: τὸ μηδέν ἐλλελοιπέναι τῶν τοιούτων συνενεδείξατο.

Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae*, 73.3: οὐδὲν ἐπαχθείας οὐδὲ ὕβρεως ἐλλέλοιπε. 74.2: μηδέν τῶν εἰς δύναμιν ἡκόντων ἐλλελοιπότι.

Cyril of Alexandria, *GlaphPent*, PG.69.537.49–50: ὡς ἐλλελοιπέναι δοκεῖν τῇ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἀφηγήσει

μηδέν. *Explanatio in Lucam*, PG.72.797.49–50: ἵνα μηδέν ὁρῶτο τὸ ἐλλελοιπὸς τῇ ἐτέρᾳ πληθύϊ. *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 99: ἐλλέλοιπε δὲ παντελῶς οὐδὲν τῶν ὅσα φωτίζειν οἶα τε τοὺς ἐσκοτισμένους. *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, p. 603: φαίνεται γὰρ τῶν εἰς ὠφέλειαν τελούντων ἐλλελοιπῶς οὐδέν. *Ibid.* v. 3, p. 100: ἐλλελοιπὸς γὰρ οὐδὲν τοῖς ἐκείνων ἀνοσιουργήμασι κατίδοι τις. *In Isaiam*, PG.70.140.40–41: Ἐλλελοιπότος γὰρ ὅλως οὐδενὸς αὐτῷ.

John Chrysostom, *In Genesin Sermones*, PG.53.203.18: Τέλειος, οὐδὲν ἐλλελοιπῶς, ἐν οὐδενὶ χωλεύων.

EN XXXq: τὸ δὲ ὅμοιον νόει

No author other than Origen did use this idiom, which remained characteristic of him. In effect, Cassian emulates Origen’s style and actually employs the vocabulary of Origen, which he did also in the second paragraph of this Scholion. The possibility that Cassian wrote this part of the Scholion by quoting from a now lost text of Origen cannot be excluded.

Origen, *Commentarii in Romanos (III.5–V.7)*, p. 130: Τὸ δ’ ὅμοιον καὶ νόει περὶ ἄλλων δογμάτων ἐν οἷς τρία γένη ἀγαθῶν εἶναι λέγεται, τὰ μὲν περὶ ψυχῇ, τὰ δὲ περὶ σῶμα, τὰ δὲ περὶ τὰ ἐκτός. *commJohn*, I.20.121: Τὸ δ’ ὅμοιον ἔστι νοῆσαι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. *commMatt*, 11.17: Τὸ δ’ ὅμοιον νοήσεις καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν κατὰ τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα. *Ibid.* 16.29: τὸ δ’ ὅμοιον νοήσεις καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς χαρᾶς.

In conclusion, this Scholion is divided into four parts. The first paragraph is an introduction to the question of theodicy urging that there are ‘certain holy powers’ assigned with inflicting punishments upon

⁷¹ Eusebius, *DE*, 4 (table of contents, 8): Ὡς μόνους τοὺς κατ’ οὐρανὸν φωστῆρας τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἔσεβον, ἀγγέλοις τιςιν ἐγκεχειρισμένα. *De Theophania*, fr. 8: ‘ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕψιστος ἔθνη, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων’· ἀγγελοι θεοῦ ἦσαν . . . ἐπὶ γῆς ἐγκεχειρισμένοι.

⁷² Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. pp. 194–195: ὅπερ ἢ τὸ βούλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ εἴη ἡ θεία δύναμις τοῦτο ἐγκεχειρισμένη. John Chrysostom, *In Heliam et Viduam*, PG.51.337.45: αἱ τὰς πύλας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐγκεχειρισμέναι δυνάμεις. *In Sanctum Matthaeum*, PG.58.579.43–45: Καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων πάλιν τῶν ἐγκεχειρισμένων αὐτοὺς τοὺς εὐτελεῖς ἀδελφοὺς αἰδεσίμους ποιεῖ.

⁷³ Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum*, fr. 91: Οἱ

σύνδουλοι οἱ καὶ μηνύοντες τὸν ἀπηνῶς χρησάμενον τῷ συνδούλῳ ἀγγελοῖ τέ εἰσι καὶ ἄνθρωποι τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἐγκεχειρισμένοι.

⁷⁴ Origen, *homLuc*, Homily 12, p. 75: Οἷον ἐν Ἐφέσῳ εἰκός, ὅτι διὰ μὲν τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας ἀγγελὸς τις ἦν ἐγκεχειρισμένος τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντα διὰ δὲ τοὺς πιστευόντας, ὅτι ἀγγελὸς τις ἦν τῆς Ἐφεσίων ἐκκλησίας.

⁷⁵ *commMatt*, 10.13: τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων εἰσὶ κρείττους οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ἐν Χριστῷ σφωζόμενοι . . . Ταῦτα δὲ φαμεν οὐκ ἀγνοοῦντες τινῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν μὴ τοιαύτην οἰκονομίαν ἐγκεχειρισμένων – ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τούτων πάντων· διαφέρειν τοὺς ἐν Χριστῷ σωθησομένους ἀνθρώπους.

⁷⁶ Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 277.

human beings, following ad hoc divine judgement. This part draws on Didymus. In the second paragraph, 'since' the text of Revelation 'is going to make reference to the *wrath of God*', Cassian draws on Origen, who had taught that this notion of divine wrath should not be taken in the ordinary human sense, namely, as an 'accidental passion'. The third paragraph introduces the question of human freedom in relation to personal responsibility, which is a quotation from Theodoret.

The last paragraph was written by Cassian himself drawing on Eusebius' notion of 'universal judgement' and on the tenet which has it that God judges both angels and men: angels will be judged as to whether they carried out the task of superintending humans properly, or not. Cassian's vocabulary at this point is a characteristically Origenistic one, indeed this is so to such an extent that he may have quoted from a non-extant work of Origen.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXXI

EN XXXIa: σκυθρωπῶν μελλόντων

The idiom referring to ‘gloomy things that are about to be inflicted upon’ (σκυθρωπὰ τὰ μέλλοντα, suggesting impending punishment) comes from Josephus,¹ from whom Didymus must have borrowed it. The expression is scarce and distinctive of Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p.93: δύο εἰσὶν ἄρχαι ἀναντίρρητοι τῶν ἐπιφερομένων ἀνθρώποις σκυθρωπῶν. The same idiom occurs also in the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*. The second instance in this work (the prospect of ‘Babylon’) has been examined in relation to the notion of ‘universal judgement’ καθολικὴ κρίσις (EN XXXI).

Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam, 4.135: τὸ δὲ ἔρχεται νύξ, περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος εἴρηται, διὰ τὸ σκυθρωπὸν καὶ ἐπίπονον τῶν ἐν ἁμαρτίαις εὐρισκομένων τῆς προσηγορίας ταύτης ἀξιουμένου. Ibid. 13.256: Ὡστε γὰρ μὴ ὀλιγοψυχεῖσθαι αὐτούς, μήτε ἀπογνῶναι τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προνοίας, ὡς ἐγκαταλιπούσης αὐτούς, προλαβὼν τῇ προφητείᾳ ὁ Ἡσαΐας τὰ μέλλοντα ἀπαντήσεσθαι σκυθρωπὰ τῇ Βαβυλῶνι διηγεῖται, ἵνα μὴ καταποθῶσιν ὑπὸ τῆς λύπης τῶν παρόντων.

In Gregory of Nyssa,² the expression appears only incidentally, but it recurs in Theodoret, *Epistulae* 53–95, Epistle 79: Δι’ ἐκεῖνο τὸ δικαστήριον φορητὰ ἡμῖν τοῦ παρόντος βίου τὰ σκυθρωπά. *commIs*, 11: ἔδει τοίνυν αὐτὸν καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐγγόνων, ἐφ’ ὧν ἔμελλεν ἔσεσθαι ἐκεῖνα τὰ σκυθρωπά, προσενεγκεῖν ἱκετείαν τῷ φιλανθρωπῷ δεσπότῃ. *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.148.5–11: Εἰ δέ τίς μοι προὔτεινε τά τε παρόντα σκυθρωπὰ καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα, τὸν πρόσκαιρον θάνατον καὶ τὸν αἰώνιον, καὶ τὴν ἐν γεέννῃ μακροτάτην κόλασιν, μετὰ τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν ἀγάπης ἀσπασίως ἂν ταῦτα καὶ προθύμως ἐλοίμην, ἢ ἐκεῖνα τὰ λαμπρὰ καὶ μεγάλα. Ibid. PG.82.413.20–21: Οὐ γὰρ ἤρκεῖτο τοῖς ἔξωθεν ἐπιφερομένοις αὐτῷ σκυθρωποῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπενόει παιδαγωγίαν τῷ σώματι, οὐ μόνην τὴν νηστείαν καὶ τὴν ἀγρυπνίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τῶν χειρῶν ἐργασίαν· τοῦτο γὰρ λέγει, ἐν κόποις.

Also, Pseudo-Caesarius (= Cassian) 218, lines 315–16: καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀσθενῆσαι αὐτοὺς βοηθηθήσονται βοηθείαν μικρὰν (Daniel [*Theodotionis versio*], 11, 34), δηλονότι μεταξὺ τῶν σκυθρωπῶν καὶ ἀλγεινῶν. Ibid. lines 362–363: ἐν ἣ καθαρὴ ἡ νίκη γέγονεν καὶ παντελὴς ἡ τῶν σκυθρωπῶν ἀπαλλαγὴ.

Finally, let me quote passages which evince a striking similarity of style and a close philological affinity of the Scholia with both Didymus and Theodoret. The peculiar syntax goes thus: the participle or infinitive along with the object is placed at the very beginning of the sentence, the main verb is put at the end, or almost so.

Didymus, *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 237: τοῦτο οὖν ὁ θεὸς ἀπόστολος ἐπιστάμενος λέγει. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1044: Μέλλων δὲ ὁ ἅγιος ἀπαγγέλλειν τὰ ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν ὅλων γερόμενα ὑπὸ κυρίου προαναφωνεῖ τὰς ἐκκειμένας φωνάς.

Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.685.5–6: Μέλλων ὁ θεσπέσιος προφήτης τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἄλωσιν ἐξηγεῖσθαι τῆς πόλεως, διδάσκει πρῶτον. Ibid. PG.81.653.10–14: Δεῖξαι βουλόμενος ὁ Δεσπότης Θεὸς τὴν τῆς προφητείας ἀλήθειαν συγγραφῇ παραδοῦναι, τῷ προφήτῃ κελεύει τάς τε περὶ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας, τάς τε περὶ τῆς ἀνακλήσεως γεγενημένας προρρήσεις. Πρῶτον μέντοι προλέγει τὰ σκυθρωπά.

Scholion IV: Τοῦτο ἐπιστάμενος ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης ἐνταυθὰ φησιν ὅτι ὁ σωτὴρ ἐστὶν ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. Τὸ ὢν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐνεστώτα ἀναφέρει, τὸ ἦν ἐπὶ τὸν παρεληλυθότα, τὸ ἐρχόμενος ἐπὶ τὸν μέλλοντα. τοιαῦτα περὶ τοῦ Λόγου νοήσας, Χριστὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιστάμενος, ὁ ἀπόστολος φησιν.

Scholion XXXI: Σκυθρωπῶν μελλόντων ἐπιφέρεσθαι, ὑπηρετῶν τις ἄγγελος θεοῦ φωνεῖ πρὸς τοὺς ἐγχειρισθέντας τὰ ἐπίποννα.

Scholion XXV: Κρίνας ὁ θεὸς, πληγαῖς υποβάλλειν τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς, ἀπειράτους τῶν πληγῶν τούτων ἐνίους ἀνθρώπους «εἶασεν».

Cassian was definitely influenced by this style. I have quoted passages from the rest of his works of

¹ Josephus, *Antiquitas Judaica*, 10.247: κἄν ἡ σκυθρωπὰ τὰ μέλλοντα συμβαίνειν.

² Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *De Beatitudinibus*, PG.44.1221.11: τῶν σκυθρωπῶν τῆς μελλούσης κρίσεως.

similar style in note 3 to the Greek text of [Scholion IV](#), whereas the same construction occurs in his *De Trinitate*, too.³

EN XXXIb: ὑπηρετῶν ἄγγελος⁴

The expression ‘a serving angel’ originates in Philo,⁵ and only a few Christian authors employed it, namely, Didymus, Theodoret, and Gennadius I of Constantinople.

Didymus, *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 309: ‘ἡ χεὶρ σου’ οὖν ‘ἔθνη ἐξωλόθρευσεν’. ἡ κολαστική σου δύναμις. δύνανται καὶ οἱ ὑπηρετοῦντες ταῖς κολάσεσιν ἄγγελοι χεῖρες τοῦ θεοῦ λέγεσθαι. *frPs(al)*, fr. 44: δυνατὸν ἐν τόξῳ σκεύη θανάτου ἡτοιμάσθαι εἰπεῖν τοὺς ὑπηρετοῦντας ταῖς κολάσεσιν σκεύη ὀργῆς πολλαχοῦ ὀνομαζομένου· οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ πονηροὶ ἄγγελοι.

Theodoret followed both the idea and terminology of Didymus. *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 6.79: Οὕτω δὲ ὕστερον πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις προσενεγκεῖν ἐθελήσας τὰ σωτήρια φάρμακα, οὐκ ἄγγελοις ὑπηρεταῖς οὐδ’ ἀρχαγγέλοις ἐχρήσατο. *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.45.50–51: Διό μοι δοκεῖ τὰ σὺν τῷ νυμφίῳ τάγματα ἀγγέλων εἶναι τοῖς τοῦ νυμφίου νεύμασιν ὑπηρετοῦντων, καὶ τὴν νύμφην πάσης κηδεμονίας ἀξιούντων. *intProphXII*, PG.81.1961.19: Τούτου χάριν ἑαυτὸν ἄγγελον προσηγόρευσεν, ὥς τοῖς θεοῖς λόγοις ὑπηρετοῦντα.

Besides them, there is only one other author, not really related to the Scholia. Gennadius I of Constantinople⁶ (fifth cent. AD), *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 385, in *Catena in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 155: Ἀγγέλους δὲ καὶ ἀρχὰς καὶ δυνάμεις, τὰς ἀοράτους οὐσίας, αἱ τοῖς διαφοροῖς τούτοις ὀνόμασι καταλλήλως αἷς ὑπηρετοῦνται χρεῖαις προσαγορεύονται.

Note on text

It is not easy to dissent from the Codex’s construction τῇ θεοῦ φωνῇ since the notion of ‘voice’ of God is a recurrent theme in the Scholia. Besides, ‘serving the

voice of God’ (which is the Codex’s phrase) could be read in the light of the opening of [Scholion XXX](#), which we should recall: There are ‘saints’ who are designated by names of human parts or limbs: their action serves to make ‘God’s voice’ heard all over the world. This is the sense in which ‘Adam heard the voice of the feet of God’. Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.39: Τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ παραβὰς ὁ Ἀδὰμ ἤκουσεν τὴν φωνὴν τῶν ποδῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ δειλινόν, αἰσθησιν λαβὼν ἐγκαταλιπόντος καὶ βαδίσαντος ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ συνόντος πρότερον καὶ συνομιλοῦντος.

Besides, we have the notion of ‘God’s voice’ recurring in different Scholia:

[Scholion XXV](#): φησὶ δὲ τὸν προτρεψάμενον φωνῇ μεγάλῃ οἷα σάλπιγγος εἰρηκέναι αὐτῷ τὰ προκείμενα. [Scholion XXX](#): καὶ δοκεῖ ἐν τούτοις προστάσσεσθαι ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ κρίνεσθαι μετὰ τῶν ἐγκεχειρισμένων τὰ ἀνθρώπινα δυνάμεων. [Scholion XXXVI](#): Ὅτι οἱ μεγάλοι λόγοι σαφηνιζόμενοι βρονταὶ εἰσι τοῖς δικαίοις, καὶ ὁ προφήτης τάχα μὲν δηλοῖ φάσκων· φωνὴ τῆς βροντῆς σου ἐν τῷ τροχῷ. ἤκουσα γάρ, φησι, βροντῶν ἑπτὰ καὶ ὅσα ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἑπτὰ βρονταὶ ἔμελλον γράφειν, καὶ ἐλέχθη μοι· μὴ γράψης, ὅσα ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἑπτὰ βρονταὶ . . . ἐὰν ταῦτα λαλουσῶν ἀκούσω τῶν βροντῶν, δύναμαι γράφειν, οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸν τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία ἀπὸ φωνῆς τῶν ἁγίων βροντῶν τῶν λαλουσῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

Therefore, [Scholion XXXI](#) is about a ministering angel serving to make God’s ‘voice’ an actual historical reality.

Nevertheless, I opt for the construction φωνεῖ πρὸς for a serious reason related to grammar. The verb ἐντέλλεται should have a dative dependent on it: the expression then should be τοῖς ἐγχειρισθεῖσι τὰ ἐπίπωνα . . . ἐντέλλεται . . . μὴ ἐπάγειν. As it stands, however, the expression is πρὸς τοὺς ἐγχειρισθέντας τὰ ἐπίπωνα . . . ἐντέλλεται . . . μὴ ἐπάγειν. It would be awkward to write ἐντέλλεται πρὸς, which is an egregious mistake that no erudite author could have ever made. Besides, as it stands, the phrasing of the Codex leaves the following sentence with no verb at

³ See *NDGF*, Appendix I, p. 416.

⁴ Cf. [Scholion XXX](#), note 3.

⁵ Philo, *Quod Deus Sit Immutabilis*, 157–9: τότε μὲν διὰ τινος ὑπηρετοῦντος τῶν ἀγγέλων, ὃν οἰνοχοεῖν ἡξίωσε.

⁶ Gennadius I was patriarch of Constantinople (458–471), an anti-Cyrrillian theologian who wrote (431–432) against the anathemas of Cyril. He also authored two books addressed *To Parthenius*, a person sympathizing with Nestorius.

all, running thus: τοῦτο αὐτὸ λέξεσιν ἑτέραις ἐν Ἰεζεκιήλ τῷ προφήτῃ. This would be too eccentric an expression, yet still this is how it stands in Harnack's edition. Therefore, my solution is the same as that of Turner, who, however, did not essay to argue for it.

EN XXXIc: τοὺς ἐγχειρισθέντας τὰ ἐπίπωνα

This is one of the most decisive points showing Didymus to be the author whom Cassian was reading while writing this Scholion. The combination ἐγχειρίζεσθαι τὰ ἐπίπωνα does not appear in any other author. All we have are two instances, namely, this Scholion and a passage of Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 70: διὰ τὴν ἡμῖν ἐγχειρισθεῖσαν ἐπίπονον οἰκονομίαν.

No doubt, the idea was received from Origen, who used the verb ἐγχειρίζεσθαι in order to denote a certain duty assigned to someone, especially duties of carrying out the divine *oikonomia* assigned to angels by God.

Origen, *commJohn*, X.39.269: Τὴν δὲ περὶ τούτων οἰκονομίαν καὶ λειτουργίαν ἐγχειρισθήσονται ἄγγελοι θεοῦ. *commMatt*, 14.13: καὶ τάχα εἰς τίς ἐστιν τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν βασιλείαν ἐγχειρισθεῖς τινα οἰκονομίαν μεγάλην καὶ μὴ καλῶς αὐτὴν διοικήσας, ἀλλὰ διασκορπίσας τὰ ἐγχειρισθέντα, ὥς ὀφειλέτην αὐτὸν γενέσθαι πολλῶν ταλάντων ὧν ἀπολώλεκεν.⁷

Therefore, Didymus received the usage of the expression σκυθρωπὰ καὶ ἐπίπωνα from Origen, *Cels*, V.15: τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν σκυθρωπῶν καὶ ἐπιπόνων ἐπαγόμενον τοῖς ἀλγοῦσι τέλος.⁸

EN XXXId: σκυθρωπὰ ἐπάγειν

The infinitive ἐπάγειν ('to bring about') normally denotes a penalty or punishment inflicted by God. Didymus employs this in combination with the adjective σκυθρωπά, which is a very rare case: *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 28: ἤλπισαν, καὶ ἐρύσω αὐτούς· πρὸς σὲ ἐκέκραξαν καὶ ἐσώθησαν. οὐ τῷ μηδὲν σκυθρωπὸν ἐπάγειν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ταῖς θλίψεσιν νικᾶν.

Beyond this Scholion, there are only a few parallel instances, and they all occur in authors relevant to the Scholia.

Origen, *Cels*, V.15: τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν σκυθρωπῶν ἐπαγόμενον τέλος.

Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.340.10–13: Οὕτως οὖν καὶ τὰς ἐπαγομένας τιμωρίας τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι κατὰ Θεοῦ κρίσιν, σκυθρωπὰς οὕσας καὶ ἀλγεινὰς τοῖς πάσχουσιν, ὥσανεὶ ἐξ ὀργῆς καὶ θυμοῦ ἐπαγομένας ὑποτυποῦται.

This passage of Eusebius has been spuriously ascribed to Basil of Caesarea. Cf. Pseudo-Basil of Caesarea, *Homilia in Psalmum* 37, PG.30.85.16–19. We have previously encountered this inaccurate attribution of this Homily (p. 347).

Theodoret, *Historia Religiosa (Philotheus)*, Vita 31.8: κἂν ἐπαγάγῃ διὰ ταύτην τὰ σκυθρωπά, ἐπέραστά μοι φανεῖται, καὶ λίαν ἐράσμια.

Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2017: Ἔχομεν τοίνυν τὴν αἰτίαν, δι' ἣν τὰ σκυθρωπὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐπάγεται.

EN XXXIe: Quoting Ezekiel 9:5–6

The author of the Scholion modifies the quotation slightly (φείδεσθέ τι). Once again, those who quoted this scriptural passage are relevant to the vocabulary of the Scholia.

Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1165.33–35. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.561.4–10. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.889.21–26. Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 128; *Homiliae Paschales*, PG.77.600.29031; *In Isaiam*, PG.70: 296.29–34; 544.37–42. Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2192. Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *De Caelesti Hierarchia*, p. 35. John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela*, PG.96.368.26–33.

EN XXXIf: τὴν προσοῦσαν δικαιοσύνην

The participle τὴν προσοῦσαν (feminine, present participle of the verb πρόσσειμι = 'belong to someone,

⁷ Cf. ἐγχειρίζεσθαι, *Cels*, VIII.57; *commMatt*, 14.14; *Commentariorum Series in Evangelium Matthaei* (Mt. 22.34–27.63), p. 138; *frPs*, 104, 22; *selPs*, PG.12.1609.43; *schMatt*, PG.17.301.43.

⁸ Cf. the adjective ἐπίπωνα used in relation to divine punishment and pedagogy: Origen, *commJohn*, I.36.261; VI.58.299 and 300; *Cels*,

IV.99; *frJer*, 45; *homJer*, 12.2; *Philocalia*, 20.26; 26.8; *Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos* (I.1–XII.21), 6; *Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos*, fr. 15; *frPs*, 2, 5; 37, 1–2; 41, 10–11; 72, 3–4; 77, 3–4; 77, 48–51; 118, 71; *selPs*, PG.12: 1112.53; 1113.5; 1148.50; 1161.56; 1288.49; 1309.12; 1368.14; 1480.17; *excPs*, PG.17.136.41; *selEz*, PG.13.813.18.

or to something, as a characteristic attribute'), followed by the name of a certain attribute (either a virtue or a vice) bespeaks a quality which is firmly established in a holy man. This is characteristic of Cassian's vocabulary taken up from Didymus. The expression τὴν προσοῦσαν δικαιοσύνην is rare, and seems to originate in the apologist Athenagoras, *De Resurrectione*, 20.3: εἰ δὲ φθείροιτο μὲν τὸ σῶμα καὶ χωροίη πρὸς τὸ συγγενὲς τῶν λελυμένων ἕκαστον, μένοι δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ὡς ἄφθαρτος, οὐδ' οὕτως ἔξει χώραν ἢ κατ' αὐτῆς κρίσις, μὴ προσοῦσης δικαιοσύνης. Likewise, Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 335: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ δικαιοσύνην. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *Oratio de Epiphania*, 7: τῇ γὰρ προσοῦσιν δικαιοσύνη θαρρῶν.

A similar expression which should also be explored is διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν ἀρετὴν, since the sentence which follows is a gloss on the prior one. Didymus used the expression τὴν προσοῦσαν ἀρετὴν at eight points, which seems to originate in Josephus, *Antiquitas Judaica*, 3.97: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν ἀρετὴν.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.64 and 2.347: διὰ προσοῦσας ἀρετάς. *Adversus Manichaeos*, PG.39.1100.10: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ τότε ἀρετὴν. *frPs(al)*, fr. 456: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν ἐν ἀναμαρτησίᾳ ἀρετὴν. *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 228: ἔχων τὴν ἀρετὴν, ὡς προεῖρηται, οὐχ ὡς ἀποκληρωτικῶς αὐτῷ προσοῦσαν.

Cassian the Sabaite took up the wording. *Const*, p. 13r: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ πολιτείαν. *ScetPatr*, 67v: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ μεγάλην ἀρετὴν. *SerenPrim*, 80r: διὰ τὰς προσοῦσας αὐτῷ ἀρετάς.

John Chrysostom, *Ad Populum Antiochenum*, PG.49.178.30: τῆς ἀρετῆς προσοῦσης. *In Genesin Sermones*, PG.53.200.58: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ ἀρετὴν. *In Ibid.* PG.54.590.3: τῆς τῶν ἔργων ἀρετῆς μὴ προσοῦσης.

Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.588.46: Αὕξει δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν ἔπαινον ἢ προσοῦσα πενία. *De Providentia*, PG.83.757.49: καὶ διδάξεις ἅπαντας τοῖς προσοῦσιν ἀρκεῖσθαι. *HE*, p. 29: κατὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν σοὶ θεόθεν χάριν. Pseudo-Theodoret (or, Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, p. 47: τῆς προσοῦσης αὐτοῖς νεκρώσεως.

Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 481: πῶς γὰρ ἂν μεμπτέον ἐδύνατο τὸ σῶμα κατὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ φύσιν βιοῦν εἶναι;

Michael Glycas, the admirer of Theodoret, in *Annales*, p. 271: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ ἀρετὴν.

The participle προσοῦσα does not occur in either Irenaeus or Hippolytus or Clement of Alexandria. In texts ascribed to Origen it appears only in two catena-passages. All these passages suggest a rendering via the vocabulary of Didymus, in whom the term προσοῦσα occurs abundantly.

Origen, *frJohn III*: ἐκ τῆς προσοῦσης ἀγνοίας. *selPs*, PG.12.1477.16: ἀπὸ τῆς προσοῦσης αὐτοῖς ἰσχύος.

Didymus, *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 294: εἰ δὲ τὴν τῷ λογικῷ προσοῦσαν ζωὴν. *commZacch*, 2.260: τῆς προσοῦσης διττῆς ὑπεροχῆς. *Ibid.* 3.107: διὰ προσοῦσαν ἀφθαρσίαν τε καὶ ἀγνείαν. *Ibid.* 3.162: διὰ προσοῦσαν καλοκάγαθίαν. *Ibid.* 3.196: διὰ προσοῦσαν σκοτεινὴν ἀγνοίαν καὶ πονηρίαν. *Ibid.* 5.118: διὰ προσοῦσαν μιαιρότητα. *commJob*, PG.39.1152.4: πάσης τῆς προσοῦσης δυναστείας. *Ibid.* PG.39.1153.9: τῆς προσοῦσης εὐεξίας. *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 35: ἀπὸ τῆς πολλῆς προσοῦσης θλίψεως. *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 264: ἐκ τῆς προσοῦσης ταλαιπωρίας. *Ibid.* Cod. p. 275: τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ τιμὴν. *frPs(al)*, fr. 35: τῆς προσοῦσης ἀσθενείας. *Ibid.* fr. 60: δι' ἀγαθότητα οὐσιωδῶς προσοῦσαν. *Ibid.* fr. 77: τῆς προσοῦσης αὐτοῖς εὐπραγίας. *Ibid.* fr. 78: δι' ἀσθένειαν προσοῦσαν. *Ibid.* fr. 134: τῆς προσοῦσης αὐτοῖς ἀσθενείας. *Ibid.* fr. 208: διὰ πολλὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἀγάπην. *Ibid.* fr. 476: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῇ ἀναμαρτησίαν. *Ibid.* fr. 573b: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτοῖς ἀλαζονείαν. *Ibid.* fr. 608: διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν ὁμότητα. *Ibid.* fr. 785a: διὰ προσοῦσαν ἀτυφίαν. *Ibid.* fr. 789a: διὰ προσοῦσαν ἀγαθότητα. *Ibid.* fr. 825: ἀπὸ τῆς προσοῦσης αὐτοῖς σοφίας. Didymus treats προσοῦσα as a synonym with σύμφυτον ('congenital', 'cognate') at two points. *Ibid.* 3.104: τὴν προσοῦσαν, τὴν σύμφυτον ἰσχὺν αὐτῆς. *frPs(al)*, fr. 1039: τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ σύμφυτον ἀρχήν.

EN XXXIg: ἀπὸ τῆς συν ἀρετῇ παρρησίας

Plutarch had used the idiom, which was put to use by both Didymus and Theodoret alike.

Plutarch, *Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae*, 822F3: ἂν παρρησίαν ἀπ' ἀρετῆς καὶ πίστιν ἔχωσι.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 25: διὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας παρρησίαν λέγειν θαρρούντων. Ibid. fr. 112: Πολλὴν δὲ παρρησίαν ἀπὸ καθαρᾶς συνειδήσεως ἢ εὐχή.

Theodoret, *Historia Religiosa (Philotheus)*, Vita 13.5: Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ἐν κεφαλαίῳ καὶ τὸν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐδείξαμεν χαρακτῆρα, φέρε καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς αὐτοῦ δείξωμεν παρρησίαν. *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1853.47: καὶ ταῦτα βασιλεὺς ὢν καὶ προφήτης, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς παρρησίαν ἔχων.

EX XXXIh: Quoting Psalms 4:7 and 59:6

The authors who drew on Psalm, 4:7, were Origen, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, Didymus, Pseudo-Macarius, Diodorus of Tarsus, John Chrysostom, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Diadochus of Photike, Nilus of Ancyra, Procopius of Gaza, Oecumenius, and John of Damascus.

In regard to Psalm 59:6, the following authors either quoted or referred to it: Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Basil of Caesarea, Didymus, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Alexander Monachus (possibly sixth cent.), Maximus Confessor, and John of Damascus. So did the anonymous author of the *Dialogus Contra Iudaeos*, 3.6.

This Scholion is one instance where both Psalms are quoted in the same context. It then turns out that the authors who commented on both Psalms were Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Didymus, and Theodoret. Later, John of Damascus added himself to the catalogue.

EN XXXIi: εἰ δυνάτὸν

Since the Codex's reading τὸν makes no sense, I emend to δυνάτὸν. The author poses the rhetorical question whether it would be possible to find 144,000 virgin men among the people of Israel during John's lifetime, that is, at the time when he wrote Revelation. I did so not

only because the expression δυνάτὸν ('it is possible') occurs in *Scholia XI, XVII, XIX, XX (bis)*, but mainly because it was used by a philosopher whom all Antiochenes studied in order to learn Aristotle's philosophy, namely, Alexander of Aphrodisias. In *Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 744: Οὐ τοῦτο δὲ ζητητέον, ἀλλ' εἰ δυνάτὸν εἶναι τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς ἐν τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ὡς στοιχεῖα. Besides, during Cassian's lifetime, another Aristotelian commentator used the same phraseology, namely, Olympiodorus, the philosopher of Alexandria, In *Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, p. 143: Ζητητέον ἐνταῦθα εἰ δυνάτὸν τὸ ἄρτιον καὶ τὸ περιττὸν εἰς ἄλληλα μεταβάλλειν.

Cf. Didymus, usage, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 351; *commZacch*, 1.392; 5.75; 5.86; *frPs(al)*, Frs. 8; 333; 737a; 929; 932.

EN XXXIj: The 144,000 'virgin men'

Didymus refers his readers to earlier analyses of his, in reference to the *anagoge* applied on the number of 'virgin men', that is, the number 144,000.⁹ Origen urged that the narration about the 'virgin men', who were not 'defiled with women', is susceptible of anagogical interpretation, which however he did not furnish.¹⁰ It is possible that he had already expounded this in another work of his, since he says that he 'has proven earlier' that the two gatherings of 144,000 mentioned at two different points of Revelation¹¹ are the same ones.¹²

Didymus is silent about this question, on which later commentators (Oecumenius, Andreas, Arethas) had comments to make, actually dissenting from Origen. Nevertheless, he expounded his view of how the anagogical interpretation intimated by Origen should go, indeed he applied his exegesis at different points. These points show that the analysis offered in this Scholion is identical with that of Didymus. The present Scholion couches the same ideas in slightly

⁹ Didymus, *commZacch*, 3.73: Σαφήνεια δὲ ἀναντίρρητος περὶ τούτων γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως τοῦ Ἰωάννου. See full quotation below.

¹⁰ Origen, *commJohn*, I.1.8. Οὐκ ἀγνοητέον δέ, ὅτι ὁ περὶ τῶν ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τεσσάρων χιλιάδων παρθένων λόγος ἐπιδέχεται ἀναγωγὴν. Περιττὸν δὲ νῦν καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὸν προκείμενον λόγον τὸ παρατίθεσθαι λέξεις προφητικὰς ταῦτον περὶ τῶν ἐξ ἔθνων ἡμᾶς διδασκούσας. Cf. the Latin translation,

In *Exodum Homiliae*, I.2: 'Quod utique cum dicitur, nec qualiscunque vel inepta potest esse suspicio, quin ad istas tribus Iudaeorum . . . posit revocari. Ad quos igitur patres iste numerus virginum referendus sit, tam aequalis, tam integer tamque compositus . . . ego quidem progredi ultra inquirendo non audeo, sed et hactenus paene cum aliquo discrimine incedo.'

¹¹ Rev. 7:4 and 14:3.

¹² Origen, ὡς προαπεδείξαμεν. *commJohn* I.1.7.

different words and thus guides us to impressive parallels from Didymus.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.383 ('although it is possible to apply allegory to the number 144,000, it is nonetheless possible to take the passage literally'): 'Ὅλας γὰρ πολλὰς χιλιάδας παρθένων ἀνδρῶν μὴ μολυνθέντων μετὰ γυναικὸς ὁ Ἰωάννης εἶδεν ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἀνάγεται τὰ περὶ τῶν παρθένων τῶν συμπληρούντων τὸν ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρα ἀριθμόν, ἀλλ' οὖν ἀγνῆς καὶ σώφρονος διαγωγῆς ἕνεκα, οὐ λυπεῖ ἐκδέξασθαι τὸ ῥητὸν κατὰ πρόχειρον.

commZacch, 2.273–274 (urging allegorical exegesis of the number 144,000): Παρθένοι ἀπενεχθησόμεναι ὀπίσω τῆς νυμφαγωγηθείσης ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ τῷ Χριστῷ Ἐκκλησίας, πνεύματι καὶ σώματι εἰσιν ἀδιάφθοροι γνώμη καὶ πράξει ἀγνεύουσαι. (274) Ὡς ἐλέχθη ὡς τὰ παιδάρια προηγουμένως κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν ἄρρενα, ἀλλὰ οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὸ σῶμα τυγχάνουσιν, ὁμοίως αἱ ἐν γνώμῃ καὶ πράξει ἀγιότητα ἔχουσαι παρθένοι οὐκ ἐξ ἀνάγκης θηλυκὸν ἔχουσι σῶμα. Ἐν γοῦν τῇ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψει αἱ ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες τῶν παρθένων οὐ τῷ σώματι ἦσαν τοιαῦται· ἐπηνέχθη γὰρ· 'Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ μετὰ γυναικὸς οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν· παρθένοι γὰρ εἰσιν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν ὁ λόγος· ἄμωμοι γὰρ εἰσιν.'

Ibid. 3.66–73 ('it is impossible to take the number 144,000 literally'): 'Ὅπως δὲ ἀβίαστος φανῇ ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ θεωρία τῶν ἀριθμῶν καὶ κατὰ τὴν θεόπνευστον γραφὴν, πολλὰ μὲν ἔστιν παραγαγεῖν· ἀρκεῖ δ' ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος συγχρησασθαι λέξεσιν Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἡγαπημένου ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαθητοῦ. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ῥωμαίοις γράφει τὸν Θεὸν εἰρηκεναί· 'Κατέλιπον ἑμαυτῷ ἑπτακισχιλίους ἄνδρας οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ', ὃ δὲ 'ἔπεσθαι τῷ ἀρνίῳ', δηλαδὴ τῷ Σωτῆρι, 'παρθένων ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδας, μετὰ γυναικῶν μὴ μεμολυσμένων'. (67) Οὐ γὰρ δυνατόν ταῦτα ἐπὶ ἱστορίας λαβεῖν· πῶς γάρ, τοσούτου πλήθους καταλιπόντος θεοσεβῶν ἀνδρῶν, ὁ μέγας προφήτης Ἡλίας ἡγνόμενός, ὡς φάναι· 'Ἐγὼ ὑπολέλειμμαι μόνος καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου

τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτήν'; Πῶς δὲ καὶ τοσαύτας χιλιάδας παρθένων μάλιστα ἀνδρῶν ἐπὶ ῥητοῦ ἔστι λαβεῖν, τότε μάλιστα ὅτε τὰ τῆς ἀναλήψεως τοῦ Σωτῆρος οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ ἐγγέγονει, ὡς τὸν Ἰωάννην ἀκμὴν ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἶναι; (68) Ἀλλὰ μὴν ἕκαστον τούτων ἀληθῶς γέγονεν οὐ πάντως τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἐπὶ αἰσθήσεως λαμβανομένων. Ἐπτάκις μὲν γὰρ χίλιοι ἄνδρες μὴ κάμψαντες γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ τυγχάνουσιν οἱ μυστικῶς ὑποκείμενοι τῷ σαββατισμῷ τῷ ἀποκειμένῳ τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ,¹³ ἔχοντες οἰκειότητα πρὸς τὴν χιλιάδα καὶ τὴν ἀπ' αὐτῆς συνισταμένην ἑβδομάδα. Πολλαχοῦ γὰρ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν τὸν χίλια ἀριθμὸν θεοπρεπῶς μνημονευόμενον, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ Θεοῦ ἀπαγγελλομένῳ οὕτως· 'Εμνήσθη εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διαθήκην λόγου αὐτοῦ, οὐ ἐνετείλατο τῷ Ἀβραάμ εἰς χιλίας γενεάς.' Κατ' οὐδὲν γὰρ τῶν σημειομένων χίλια ὑπάρξουσιν γενεαὶ μέχρι τῆς τοῦ κόσμου συντελείας, ὡς ἐντελέστερον προηγουμένως ἐν ἄλλοις ἀποδεδεικται. (69) Ἐκ ταύτης οὖν τῆς μυστικῆς χιλιάδος ἑβδομάς συνίσταται, καθ' ἣν οἱ γνησίως θεοσεβοῦντες μόνον τὸν τῶν πάντων αἴτιον γονυπετοῦσιν. (70) Ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντες παρθένοι μετὰ γυναικὸς οὐ μεμολυμένοι ὑπόκεινται τῷ ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρες ἀριθμῷ τῶν χιλιάδων. (71) [The following is in fact the same statement as the one made in the present Scholion] Ἐτι δὲ μάλιστα τὸ ἀπίθανον τῆς ἱστορίας φανεροῦται ἐκ τοῦ τεταγμένως ἀφ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ δώδεκα χιλιάδας παρθένων ἀνδρῶν συμπληροῦσθαι· τάχα οὐδὲ ἐκ πάσης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τοσοῦτον ἀριθμὸν οἶόν τε συμπληροῦσθαι διὰ Χριστὸν ἀγαμούντων ἔτι τοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐπὶ γῆς διατρίβοντος. (72) Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ τῆς λέξεως ἀδυνάτως ἔχει, φανερὸν τοσαύτας εἶναι χιλιάδας τῶν ἀμολύντων καὶ ἀμώμως βιούντων διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν τὴν προσοῦσαν τῷ ἀριθμῷ· ἔστι γὰρ τετράγωνος, οὐ πᾶσα πλευρὰ δωδεκάς ἔστιν χιλιάδων, πολλῆς καὶ τούτου τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ προνομίας οὔσης, ὡς τῷ ἀναλέξαντι ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ἔσται δῆλον. (73) Σαφὴνεια δὲ ἀναντίρρητος περὶ τούτων γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως τοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους Παύλου ἐπιστολῆς, ἅπερ ὁ ἀναγνούς

¹³ Cf. τῷ σαββατισμῷ τῷ ἀποκειμένῳ τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, in Origen: *Cels*, V.59; *commJohn*, II.33.198; *deOr*, XXVII.16; *selEx*, PG.12.289.20; *excPs*, PG.17.144.34.

ὄψεται τὰ περὶ τῶν ἀριθμῶν θεῖα θεωρήματα ἐπεσπαρμένα τῇ γραφῇ, τῇ τε πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ Σωτῆρος, αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ἡ καλουμένη παλαιὰ διαθήκη, καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν δεῦρο τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἄφιξιν, προσαγορευομένη καινῇ.

Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 36: Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγων ρμδ' χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν ἐπεσθαι τῷ ἄρνιῳ, ὃ ἐστὶν ὁ Σωτήρ, καὶ ταῦτα παρθένων μετὰ γυναικῶν μὴ μολυνθέντων, δείκνυσιν ὅτι λόγος τις περὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦτον τίμιός ἐστιν· οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτω τοσοῦτο πλῆθος παρθένων ἔτι τοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐν βίῳ ὄντος εἴποι τις ἂν ἐκ τῶν πεπιστευκότων συνῆχθαι, τάχα μὴδὲ αὐτῶν τοσοῦτων ὄντων.

EN XXXIk: κατὰ πνευματικὴν ἀκολουθίαν
(‘following spiritual interpretation’)

This expression attests to readings that point to Epiphanius of Salamis¹⁴ and Gregory of Nazianzus¹⁵ exclusively, since it occurs in no other author, save one specific case.¹⁶ The expression κατὰ πνευματικὴν ἀκολουθίαν suggests what Origen and Didymus had declared, namely that this particular point of the Apocalypse might *also* be interpreted in an anagogical sense. Origen says that this passage of Revelation ‘is susceptible of anagogical interpretation’ (ἐπιδέχεται ἀναγωγὴν).¹⁷ Didymus has it that it is not impossible to understand this literally in the first place (οὐ λυπεῖ ἐκδέξασθαι τὸ ῥητὸν κατὰ πρόχειρον)¹⁸. He mentions his analyses of this passage of Revelation in the same work (Book 3), where he appears to have slightly altered his opinion, and deems the literal meaning as an ‘unlikely’ one,¹⁹ whereas right after this he considers this as ‘impossible’.²⁰ What should be noticed is a certain evolution in the views of Didymus. He eventually opted for a totally anagogical interpretation, urging that the truth can be discovered in the spiritual meaning only. This is also the thesis of *Scholia XXXI* and *XXXII*. On this point, therefore, one can notice a development in the thought of Didymus according to the following statements:

¹⁴ Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 163: τῶν δὲ μειζόνων ἐπιμελεῖται, κατὰ τὸ μείζον εἶδος τῆς πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθίας.

¹⁵ Gregory of Nazianzus, *De Pace* 1, PG.35.721.28: ἀκολουθίας πνευματικῆς εἶναι ὑπελάμβανον. *Funeris Oratio in Patrem*, PG.35.1004.23–24: ὅπερ δὴ νόμος ἀκολουθίας πνευματικῆς.

¹⁶ Cf. Marcus Eremita (monk in Egypt and Palestine, fourth–sixth

In *commZacch*, 1.383, ‘it would be acceptable to interpret this literally’: οὐ λυπεῖ ἐκδέξασθαι τὸ ῥητὸν κατὰ πρόχειρον.

Ibid. 2.274, ‘the virgin men are to be understood to be so not in a physical sense’: Ἐν γοῦν τῇ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψει αἱ ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες τῶν παρθένων οὐ τῷ σώματι ἦσαν τοιαῦται.

Ibid. 3.66–68, ‘it is impossible to interpret this narration literally’; for ‘how could it be possible to find so many virgin men at the time when John was still alive?’²¹

Ibid. 3.71–73, ‘it would be impossible to find so many virgin men, not only among the race of Israel, but also in the whole of humanity’; which means that ‘this narratve is impossible once taken in a literal sense’. These points, Didymus informs us, ‘have been clearly shown in our scholia on the Apocalypse’.

Finally, in *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 36, the argument is much the same: during John’s lifetime it would have been impossible to find that large number of ‘virgin men’, indeed it would have been impossible to find a total of faithful Christians amounting to one hundred and forty-four thousand people.

Therefore, from Book 1 to Book 3 of Didymus’ *commZacch* there are differences. In Book 3, Didymus mentions his pertinent analyses made in his lost Commentary on the Apocalypse. Thus, in the beginning of his *commZacch* he leaves some room for a literal interpretation, probably following Origen, who seems to allow for this possibility, too. Didymus however recants this allowance later in the same work. This decision for anagoge to the exclusion of all literal interpretation must have been his final thesis, which is also expressed in *Scholia XXXI* and *XXXII* drawing on Didymus’ lost Commentary on the Apocalypse.

EN XXXII: Quoting John 1:47.

This occurs in Origen’s *frJohn*, XXVII: ἐστὶ γὰρ Ἰσραηλῆτης ἀληθῶς καὶ οὐ ψευδωνύμως, ἐπεὶ παντὸς δόλου καθαρεύων ἀληθείας φίλος ὑπάρχει.

cent. AD), *De Baptismo*, 5, line 281: κατὰ τὴν πνευματικὴν ἀκολουθίαν, ἣν προειρήκαμεν.

¹⁷ *commJohn*, 1.1.8.

¹⁸ *commZacch*, 1.383.

¹⁹ Didymus, *commZacch*, 3.71: τὸ ἀπίθανον τῆς ἱστορίας.

²⁰ Ibid. 3.72: τὰ τῆς λέξεως ἀδυνάτως ἔχει.

²¹ See passage quoted above.

Origen cited this notion of ‘real Israelite’ at the opening of his *commJohn*, I.1.1. Besides, he used the idea of Rom. 2:29 abundantly, which is in effect the same one: the ‘real Israelite’ (John 1:47) and the one who is ‘secretly a Jew’ (Rom. 2:29) betoken the same idea.²² This concept is central in the opening of *commJohn*, which is virtually a commentary on Revelation, and happens to incorporate the ideas which make up both *Scholia XXXI* and *XXXII*. This part of *Scholion XXXI* refers to Rom. 2:29. Didymus quoted John 1:47 at certain points.²³

Surprising as it might appear, quotation of John 1:47 did not enjoy much currency.²⁴ Apart from the casual instance in Origen, it is absent from Athanasius, Nazianzen, Basil of Caesarea, Theodoret, and Maximus Confessor. However, the author’s debts are revealed by the phrase preceding this quotation: τὸν ἀληθινὸν Ἰσραήλ. This shows Origen guiding the author’s pen, even though in reality all Origen did was to elaborate on a point made by Justin Martyr.

Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 11.5: Ἰσραηλιτικὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀληθινόν, πνευματικόν, καὶ Ἰούδα γένος καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἀβραάμ, τοῦ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει μαρτυρηθέντος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εὐλογηθέντος καὶ πατρὸς πολλῶν ἔθνων κληθέντος, ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν. Ibid. 135.3: οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ λατομηθέντες Ἰσραηλιτικὸν τὸ ἀληθινόν ἐσμεν γένος.

Origen, *frJer*, 28: εἷς οὖν ὁ πᾶς Ἰσραηλίτης κατὰ τὴν συγγένειαν τὴν ἀληθινήν, ‘οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐν σῶμά ἐσμεν καὶ εἷς ἄρτος καὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς μετέχομεν πνεύματος’. *commMat*, 12.28: ἀπὸ τούτων δὲ ὁ δυνάμενος ἐξεταζέτω εἰ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἄλλαγμα δίδοται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ‘ῥυομένου τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτοῦ’. Ibid. 17.32: ὅτε ἐλήλυθεν ὁ νόμος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου· παρὰ γὰρ τῷ

ἀληθινῷ Ἰσραὴλ τηρεῖται καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ προτέρου. *selPs*, PG.12.1636.20–22: Λεγέτω δὴ τό, ‘Εἰ μὴ ὅτι Κύριος ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν’, οὐχ ὁ τυχών, ἀλλ’ ὁ ἀληθινὸς Ἰσραὴλ. *selEz*, PG.13.824.43–47: Αἴγυπτος ἐν πολλοῖς νοεῖται ἐπὶ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου καὶ τοῦ ἐπιγείου τούτου, ἐξ οὗ ἐξίστασιν οἱ ἀληθινοὶ Ἰσραηλιταί, καὶ ὁδεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἁγίαν γῆν. *excPs*, PG.17.147.54–55 and *frPs*, 77, 44: Πίνει γὰρ ὁ Ἰσραηλίτης τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὕδωρ, οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸ εἶδος τῆς ἀπάτης ἐπιστρεφόμενος. Cf. Latin texts: *In Genesin Homiliae*, XVI.6; *In Exodum Homiliae*, I.2; *Homiliae in Jesu Nave*, IX.5; *Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos*, 8.12.6.

Notwithstanding his attack on Origen, Methodius of Olympus emulated the notion in his *Symposium*, Oration 9.1: ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἑορτὴν τῆς σκηνοπηγίας τῆς ἀληθινῆς τοὺς ἀληθινοὺς Ἰσραηλίτας.

Gregory of Nyssa, *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 138: ὁ διδοὺς ἐκ Σιών τὸ σωτήριον τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηρῶς διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἡμᾶς αἰχμαλωτίσαντος πάλιν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐπιστρέφων, ὅτε γίνεται ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ ἀγαλλιάματι ὁ ἀληθινὸς Ἰσραηλίτης καὶ ὁ πνευματικὸς Ἰακώβ. *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, pp. 198–199: ὡς μακάριον τὸ ἐν τούτοις εὐρεθῆναι ἢ παιδίον ἢ ὀπλίτην ἢ ἀληθινὸν Ἰσραηλίτην γενόμενον, ὡς μὲν Ἰσραηλίτην ἐν καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ τὸν θεὸν ὀρῶντα. Ibid. v. 6, p. 434: διὸ καὶ μαρτυρεῖται παρὰ τοῦ λόγου γνήσιος εἶναι καὶ οὐχὶ νόθος Ἰσραηλίτης ἐν τῷ ἀδόλῳ τῆς προαιρέσεως καθαρὸν ἐφ’ ἑαυτοῦ δεικνὺς τοῦ πατριάρχου τὸν χαρακτῆρα. Ἴδε γάρ, φησιν, ἀληθινὸς Ἰσραηλίτης ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἔστιν.

Eusebius emphasized the notion, thus serving as an exemplar to Didymus, as Origen himself was also.

Eusebius, *DE*, 2.3.121: τρόπος δὲ τοιῶνδε ψυχῶν

²² *Princ*, IV.3.6, *apud Philocalia*, 1.22; *commJohn*, I.1.1; I.35.259; XIII.17.103; *frJohn*, VIII; *frLuc*, 171; *Philocalia*, 1.23; *Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos* (I.1–XII.21), 46; *Commentarii in Romanos* (III.5–V.7), pp. 134; 168.

²³ Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.188; 5.205; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 219. He does so also in the Latin translation of his *De Spiritu Sancto* by Jerome (section 57). In a description of the pious who ‘circumcise their heart through the Spirit’ (‘Qui cor spiritu circumcidunt’), he designates them as ‘those really circumcised in spirit’ (‘vere spiritu circumcisi’) and ‘in occulto Judaei et veri Israelitae, in quibus non est dolus’. They are those who ‘being real worshippers, transcend the shadows and symbols of the Old Testament and worship God in spirit and truth’ (John 4:23) (‘Qui transcendent umbras et imagines Veteris Testamenti, cultores veri adorant Patrem in spiritu et veritate’).

²⁴ The following authors quote John 1:47: Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 6.14.108.1. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 434. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 266. Asterius of Antioch, *commPs*, Homilies 26.13; 27.17. Amphilochius of Iconium, *Adversus Haereticos*, line 999. John Chrysostom, *In Diem Natalem*, PG.49: 353.42–43 and 51–52; *In Sanctum Matthaeum*, PG.57.347.20–21; *In Sanctum Joannem*, PG.59.125.25–26 and 61–62. Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 2, p. 142; *Commentarii in Joannem*, v. 1, p. 198; *expPs*, PG.69: 916.17–21; 949.28–30; 1053.20–22; *In Isaiam*, PG.70.41.52–54; *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.541.22–23. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentarii in Joannem*, Fr. 16. Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 1852.

τὸν ἀληθινὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ δείκνυσιν. *op. cit.* 7.3.45: πάντες οἱ ‘τὸν ἐν κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖον’ καὶ τὸν ἀληθινὸν Ἰσραὴλ, τὸν κατὰ διάνοιαν ‘ὀρῶντα θεόν’, ἀποσφύζοντες. *Eclogae Prophetarum*, pp. 145–46: Μετὰ τὴν τῆς διασπορᾶς τοῦ πνευματικοῦ καὶ ἀληθινοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπισυναγωγὴν, καὶ μετὰ τὴν εὑρεσιν τῶν ἀπολωλότων προβάτων οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ. *Quaestiones et Solutiones Evangelicae ad Stephanum*, PG.22.917.23–25: οὐκέτι γὰρ ἐν ἀλλοφύλοις καταλεγισόμεθα, οὐδ’ ἐξ ἀλλοφύλων χρηματίσομεν, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ κλήρου τοῦ Θεοῦ. *commPs*, PG.23.837.26–29: Παρέστηκε γὰρ τίς εἶη ὁ Ἰσραὴλ, ἐπισυνάψας καὶ εἰπὼν, τοῖς καθαροῖς τὴν καρδίαν. Οὗτοι γὰρ εἰσιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Ἰσραὴλ. *Ibid.* PG.23.876.39–44: Παιδεύει δὲ διὰ τῶν προκειμένων ὁ λόγος δόγμα βαθύτατον, ὡς ἂν εἰδείμεν τίς ποτὲ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Ἰσραὴλ. *Ibid.* PG.23.877.15–23: ἔτι μὴν ἐπιστήσας τό, Βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα, ὡς ἐτέρου ὄντος τοῦ μὴ κατὰ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀληθινοῦ Ἰσραὴλ· τούτοις μεμαθητευμένος, τὸν ἀληθινὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκδέξεται εἶναι τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πράγματος σημαίνόμενον. Μεταλαμβάνεται γοῦν τοῦνομα εἰς τὸν ὀρῶντα τὸν Θεόν· τὸν διορατικὸν τοίνυν καὶ γνωστικὸν καὶ ἐπιστημονικὸν ἄνδρα μόνον εἶναι τὸν ἀληθινὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἀποφανεῖται. *Ibid.* PG.23.880.9–12: Οὐκ ἂν δὲ ἀμάρτοις Ἰουδαίαν εἶναι λέγων πᾶσαν τὴν θεόπνευστον καὶ Ἰουδαϊκὴν Γραφήν, κτῆμα οὖσαν καὶ ὡς περίχωρον τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, διὰ τὸ τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ περιέχεσθαι. Οὕτω μὲν οὖν ἡ ἀληθινὴ Ἰουδαία καὶ ὁ ἀληθινὸς Ἰσραὴλ νοηθήσεται κατὰ τὸν ὁμοῖον τρόπον. *Ibid.* PG.23.957.24–26: Ὁ λεγόμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος Κύριος καὶ Θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων, αὐτὸς ἦν ἐκεῖνος ὁ ποιμαίνων τὸν ἀληθινὸν Ἰσραὴλ. *Ibid.* PG.24.3629–30: ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομὴ καὶ ἀληθινὸς Ἰσραὴλ.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.205: Χαναναῖος δ’ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀλλότριος ἐκ μήτρας ὡς ἐκτός, εἶναι τῆς εὐσεβείας· οὐκ ἔσται δέ, ἥτοι μεταβάλλων εἰς τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ‘τὸν ἀληθινὸν τὸν δόλον οὐκ ἔχοντα’. *Ibid.* 5.206: Χαναναῖον δεκτέον ἀλληγορικῶς καὶ τὸν ἔξω τῆς ἰσραηλιτικῆς καταστάσεως φθάσαντα.

frPs(al), Fr. 705a: ἵνα τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν αὐτοῦ χωρῆσαι δυνηθεῖτε ἀληθινὸς Ἰσραὴλ γεγεννημένοι διὰ καθαρότητα καρδίας θεὸν ὀρῶντες. *Ibid.* fr. 888: ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ ὀρῶντος ἁγιὸς ἐστίν.

Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, Homily 24.1.10: καὶ ἐβασίλευσε τῆς ἀληθινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, αὐτῆς τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. *Homiliae I*, Homily 44: καὶ οὕτως δυνήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἐπουράνιον ἐκκλησίαν τῶν ἀγίων τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria, *Collectio Dictorum Veteris Testamenti*, PG.77.1277.40–41: ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ὀρῶντος Θεόν, ὅσον ἐφικτόν.

Basil of Caesarea does not show in this exploration. This is one more evidence that the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam* is not his work. Cf. *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 9.228: Λόγον οὖν ἀπέστειλε Κύριος ἐπὶ Ἰακώβ. Οἶδας τὸν Λόγον, τὸν ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντα, τὸν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὄντα; Τοῦτον ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Πατὴρ ἐπὶ Ἰακώβ. Ἐγνώρισε δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Ἰσραὴλ, αἱ ψυχὰι αἱ διορατικώτεραι.

EN XXXIm: τὸ νοητὸν τοῦτο ἔθνος

As already discussed, this notion was introduced by Justin²⁵ and adopted by Origen.²⁶ Followers formulated it through the phrase ὁ νοητὸς Ἰσραὴλ, or πνευματικὸς Ἰσραὴλ, which was used later by Cyril of Alexandria, as well as by others.

Origen, *Princ*, IV.3.6: νοητέον ὅτι, ὥσπερ Ἰουδαίων σωματικῶν ἐστὶ γένος, οὕτω τῶν ‘ἐν κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαίων’ ἐστὶ τι ἔθνος. *Ibid.* IV.3.7 (*Philocalia*, 1.23): οἱ δὲ νοητοὶ Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν τύπος ἦσαν οἱ σωματικοί.²⁷

Eusebius also employed the notion of ὁ νοητὸς Ἰσραὴλ. *Eclogae Prophetarum*, pp. 120, 147. Also, πνευματικὸς Ἰσραὴλ. *Ibid.* p. 139: τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ, ἥτις ἐστὶν ὁ πνευματικὸς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ. p. 145: Μετὰ τὴν τῆς διασπορᾶς τοῦ πνευματικοῦ καὶ ἀληθινοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπισυναγωγὴν.

Didymus, *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 7: νοητὸς

²⁵ Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 11.5, quoted on p. 365.

²⁶ Origen, *commJohn*, I.1.1–8.

²⁷ Cf. *Princ*, IV.3.9 (distinguishing σωματικοὶ Ἰσραηλῖται from

νοητοὶ Ἰσραηλῖται); so *ibid.* IV.3.9 (*Philocalia*, 1.23 and 25); *commJohn*, II.3.26; XIII.22.133; in *Princ*, IV.3.6, Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα. Cf. ὁ νοητὸς Ἰσραὴλ in *frLuc*, 45b; *selPs*, PG.12.1461.20.

Ἰσραήλ. *commEccI* (11–12), Cod. p. 320: καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν ‘βρεχόντων’ τὸν πνευματικὸν ‘ἀμπελῶνα’, τὸν ‘τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οἶκον’ ‘ἐντολή’ δέδοται. *commZacch*, 1.172: Ἄγια δὲ νέφη οὐ τὰ ὕοντα τὸν αἰσθητὸν ὄμβρον εἰσίν, ἀλλὰ τὰ φέροντα τὸν πνευματικὸν ὑετόν, κατὰ τὸ ἐν Ἡσαΐα λεχθὲν περὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ἀλληγορίας τρόπῳ ἀμπελῶνος καλουμένου. Likewise, Procopius of Gaza, *Catena in Ecclesiasten*, 1.1 (ascription to Didymus); *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2444.

An anonymous catena-fragment which involves the notion of νοητὸς Ἰσραήλ can be identified as written by Didymus. The fragment is entitled ‘from a work of which the title is missing’ (Ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου) and reads thus:

Catena in Acta (cod. Oxon. coll. nov. 58), p. 48: Ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου. Ἐν πολλοῖς τόποις τῆς θείας γραφῆς, ἀντὶ βασιλείας, θρόνος²⁸ ὀνομάζεται· ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ προκειμένῳ, καὶ ἐν τῷ ‘ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.’ ἐβασίλευσε γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐπὶ τὸν νοητὸν Ἰσραήλ. This is the idea presented in [Scholion XXIV](#): σύμβολον γὰρ βασιλείας θρόνος.²⁹

Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 144; v. 2, pp. 28; 452; 475; *GlaphPent*, PG.69.233.13; *In Isaiam*, PG.70: 128.4; 265.13; 517.33; 1000.55; *expPs*, PG.69.1160.47: ὁ τοῦ πνευματικοῦ Ἰσραὴλ Θεός. Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria, *Collectio Dictorum Veteris Testamenti*, PG.77.1184.26.

Hesychius of Jerusalem (fifth cent.) (νοητὸς Ἰσραήλ), *Commentarius*, Psalm 67:35; Psalm 82:16; Psalm 113:2; Psalm 135:22.

Theodoret was definitely aware of the notion of ‘spiritual Israel’: *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.305.25–27 and *Catena in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 194: Κατὰ σάρκα δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκάλεσε, τὸν τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ προσμείναντα, ὡς τῶν πεπιστευκότων πνευματικοῦ Ἰσραὴλ χρηματιζόντων.

Origen and Cyril were probably the authors who inspired Oecumenius writing the specific point of his

Commentarius in Apocalypsin, p. 51: οἱ οὖν ἀληθεῖς Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ ὁ νοητὸς Ἰσραὴλ εἶησαν ἅν οἱ Χριστῷ ἐξομολογούμενοι, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ οἱ τὸν Θεὸν ὀρῶντες. Ibid. p. 60: ὥσπερ ὁ Δαυὶδ τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐβασίλευσεν, οὕτως ἐγὼ πρὸς τῷ αἰσθητῷ καὶ τοῦ νοητοῦ. Ibid. p. 238: Ἰσραὴλ ἐστιν μὲν αἰσθητῶς οἱ ἐξ Ἰακώβ τοῦ πατριάρχου γεννηθέντες· ἔστι δὲ νοητῶς οἱ στοιχοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ.

Finally, the ‘spiritual Israel’ (πνευματικὸς Ἰσραὴλ) should be noticed in two texts which interest us. First, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 14.278: Τὸ μὲν γὰρ Ἰακώβ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔτι στοιχειουμένου καὶ σωματικοῦ λαμβάνεται, τὸ δὲ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τοῦ κρείττονος καὶ πνευματικοῦ.

Likewise, the *Anonymi Dialogus cum Judaeis* (cod. Vatoped. 236), chapter 5, lines 71f: Ταῦτα παρὼν καὶ ἀκούων Μωσῆς εὐθὺς ἀνέκραξε μέγα βοήσας· Ἐμὰ τὰ ῥήματα οὐκ εἰσίν, ἄνθρωπε· θεοῦ εἰσὶν ἄντικρυς κελεύσαντός μοι ταῦτα τὸν πνευματικὸν ἐκδιδάξει Ἰσραὴλ, τὸν συνιέντα τῶν λεγομένων τὴν δύναμιν.

EN XXXIn: ἁρμονίαν καὶ συμφωνίαν (‘harmony and agreement’)

As discussed in [EN XXXIp](#), Didymus was aware of the definition of a ‘square number’ as expounded by the second-century mathematician and philosopher Theon of Smyrna.³⁰ Besides, he knew the science of mathematics, as we know from the historian Socrates.³¹ The expression ἁρμονία καὶ συμφωνία, used in this Scholion, was a standard expression of wide currency, particularly related to music, with which Didymus was familiar, also according to the testimony by the same historian Socrates. By analogy with music, the phrase also had a moral import, which Arius Didymus had pointed out.³² The expression ἁρμονία καὶ συμφωνία has a Platonic provenance³³ and was favourite of

²⁸ The gloss ‘to speak of a throne instead of kingship’ is characteristic of, and exclusive to, Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 327: ὅτι δὲ ὁ θρόνος ἀντὶ βασιλείας πολλάκις παραλαμβάνεται, εἰ καὶ ἐσθότε ἀντὶ διδασκαλίας, δηλον. *frPs(al)*, fr. 75: ἐσημειωσάμεθα καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρότερον ἀντὶ βασιλείας τὸν θρόνον λαμβάνεσθαι.

²⁹ See [EN XXIVb](#), p. 299.

³⁰ Theon of Smyrna (second cent. AD), *De Rerum Mathematicarum Utilitate*, p. 49: ὁ δὲ περιπατητικὸς Ἀδραστος, γνωριμώτερον περὶ τε ἁρμονίας καὶ συμφωνίας διεξιὼν, φησί. Ibid. p. 65:

ἐπαρκεῖ πρὸς τὸ σφῆξιν τὴν οἰκείαν ἁρμονίαν τε καὶ συμφωνίαν.

³¹ Cf. Socrates referring to Didymus, *HE*, 4.23: Ἐλθὼν δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ φιλόσοφα θαυμαστῶς πῶς καὶ τὴν διαλεκτικὴν ἐξέμαθε, καὶ ἀριθμητικὴν τε καὶ μουσικὴν.

³² Arius Didymus (first cent. BC), *De Sectis Philosophorum* (epitome apud Stobaeum), p. 91: τὴν δ’ ἀμφοῖν ἁρμονίαν καὶ συμφωνίαν, ἀρετὴν· τοῦ μὲν ἄγοντος ἐφ’ ὃ δεῖ, τοῦ δ’ ἐπομένου πειθιγνῶς.

³³ Cf. Plato, *Cratylus*, 405d; *Symposium*, 187a–b; *Respublica*, 430e; 531a; 591d.

Philo.³⁴ Theodoret was aware of this tradition.³⁵ There is, therefore, a continuous line from Origen³⁶ to Theodoret, including Eusebius³⁷ and Didymus,³⁸ which reveals once again the pagan inheritance that inspired them all, prominent among which were the works of Plutarch.³⁹

EN XXXIo: βεβαίως δὲ στάσεως
σύμβολον τὸ τετράγωνον σχῆμα

The notion that the square is ‘a symbol betokening a steadfast standing’ was advanced by the Pythagorean Nicomachus of Gerasa.⁴⁰ Plutarch echoed this idea in a figure of speech,⁴¹ and was quoted verbatim by Iamblichus,⁴² almost two centuries later. Iamblichus also wrote a commentary on Nicomachus’ work.⁴³

The author who paid attention to all the three notions (τετράγωνος, ἑδραῖος, πάγιος) was Procopius of Gaza.⁴⁴ Since his commentary on the Song of Songs was only a compilation, he presumably borrowed this from Didymus, whose name features in Procopius’ title as one of the authors from whose work he excerpted in order to compose his work. This was no doubt the source for Oecumenius in writing the germane point of

his commentary, probably following some research into works by mathematicians as well. There is evidence that Gregory of Nyssa knew of the metaphor, yet he did not make much of it.⁴⁵ Olympiodorus of Alexandria, the deacon and exegete who is heavily relevant to the vocabulary of the Scholia, had yielded an indisputable theological account, which dealt with the ideas of the ‘specialists’, too.⁴⁶ The analogy eventually came to be a lexicon lemma.⁴⁷

The idea that the τετράγωνον (‘square’) is βέβαιον (‘steadfast’) does not appear in Origen, but it recurs in Didymus. The sentiment of Scholion XXXI has a clear parallel in his *commZacch*, 3.72 (quoted in footnote 25 to the Greek text, p. 167). Besides, this theory is expounded at the following points:

Didymus, *In Genesis*, Cod. p. 184: σημαίνει μὲν τὸ τετράγωνον βεβαιότητα. Ibid. Cod. p. 195: Εἰ δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τις ἐθέλοι τεχνολογεῖν, εἴποι ἂν ὅτι τὸ βέβαιον δηλοῦται δὲ αὐτοῦ τῆς θείας ἐκκλησίας· τετράγωνος γὰρ οὗτος, ὁ δ’ αὐτὸς καὶ κύβος· τρις τρία γὰρ τρις εἴκοσι ἐπτά. Ibid. Cod. p. 197: Τὸ δὲ ἐβδόμη καὶ εἰκάδι πεπαῦσθαι τὴν βεβαιότητα σημαίνει· τετράγωνος γὰρ ὁ ἀριθμὸς καὶ κύβος. Ibid. Cod. p. 250: Ὁ ἑκατὸν ἀριθμὸς

³⁴ Philo, *De Confusione Linguarum*, 58; 150; *De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia*, 16; *De Vita Mosis*, 2.48; 2.119; 2.140; *De Specialibus Legibus*, 1.93; 1.342; 2.130; 4.102; *De Virtutibus*, 74; *De Praemiis et Poenis et De Exsecrationibus*, 145; *De Aeternitate Mundi*, 75; *Quaestiones in Genesim* (fragmenta), Book 2, fr. 34b; Book 4, fr. 174.

³⁵ Theodoret, *De Providentia*, PG.83.581.45–48: Πῶς δ’ ἂν εἰς κοινωνίαν καὶ σχέσιν τὰ διεστῶτα συνήγαγεν, ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ, ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα, καὶ μίαν ἐκ πάντων ἁρμονίαν καὶ συμφωνίαν εἰργάσατο, ὁ προνοεῖν οὐ δυνάμενος;

³⁶ Origen, *commMatt*, 14.1: ἀκόλουθόν ἐστι τῇ ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἁρμονίᾳ τὸ ὄνομα καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἀπολαβεῖν τῆς συμφωνίας εἰς εὐχὴν. Ibid. 14.16: καὶ ὅπου γε ὁμόνοια καὶ συμφωνία καὶ ἁρμονία ἀνδρός ἐστι πρὸς γυναῖκα καὶ γυναικὸς πρὸς ἄνδρα. *frPs*, 80, 3: Ψαλτήριον πάλιν τὸ σῶμα φησι διὰ τὴν γενομένην ἁρμονίαν καὶ συμφωνίαν πρὸς αὐτῷ τῆς ψυχῆς.

³⁷ Eusebius, *PE*, 14.13.5; *commPs*, PG.23: 189.24; 788.44 and 53; 1264.30. Further usage is scarce. Cf. Asterius of Antioch, *commPs*, Homily 27.5. John Chrysostom, *In Acta Apostolorum Homiliae*, PG.60.286.

³⁸ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 265: Τὸ σωματικὸν κάλλος ἐμφαίνεται ἐπὶ συμμετρίᾳ καὶ ἀναλογίᾳ μελῶν συγκείμενον, τὸ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν ἁρμονίᾳ καὶ συμφωνίᾳ τῶν κατορθομένων ἀρετῶν πασῶν τῶν κατὰ λόγον ἐνεργειῶν συμμετρίαν καὶ ἀναλογίαν ἔχουσῶν ἢ καὶ τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεων ἁρμονίως ἀναλογουσῶν. Ibid. fr. 1232: εἰ γὰρ καὶ διεσκορπίσθη τὰ δεστὰ ἐκάστου ἡμῶν παρὰ τὸν ἄδην, ἀλλ’ οὖν ἐλπίζω ὅτι συνάξας ἀποκαταστήσεις αὐτὰ τῇ οἰκείᾳ συμφωνίᾳ καὶ ἁρμονίᾳ.

³⁹ Plutarch, *De Amicorum Multitudine*, 96E; *Apophthegmata Laconica*, 238B; *De Fraternali Amore*, 479A; *Platonicae Quaestiones*, 1003A; 1007e; *De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo*, 1030B.

⁴⁰ Nicomachus of Gerasa, *Theologoumena Arithmeticae*, p. 69.

According to Syrianus (*In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 151), Nicomachus and Moderatus belong to the ‘recent’ generations of Pythagoreans (τῶν νεωτέρων δὲ Μοδεράτους καὶ Νικόμαχος). Nicomachus was the author who composed ‘a compilation of Pythagorean doctrines’ (συναγωγὰι τῶν Πυθαγορείων δογμάτων), according to Syrianus, *ibid.* p. 103. Iamblichus wrote a commentary on Nicomachus’ *Introduction to Arithmetic* (Iamblichus, *In Nicomachi Arithmeticae Introductionem*, comprising 135 sections). So did the philosopher Asclepius of Tralles, *In Nicomachi Introductionem Arithmeticae Commentarius*, in two books). Photius dismissed any trace of value in Nicomachus’ *Theologoumena Arithmeticae*: Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 187, pp.142b f.

⁴¹ Plutarch, *Aetia Romana et Graeca*, 288D.

⁴² Iamblichus, *Theologoumena Arithmeticae*, p. 69.

⁴³ Iamblichus, *In Nicomachi Arithmeticae Introductionem*, pp. 58–59 and 74.

⁴⁴ Procopius of Gaza, *In Canticum Canticorum*, p. 1628: Τῷ ἐξήκοντα δὲ προσαγορεύονται ἀριθμῷ, τέλειοι κατὰ πάντα γεγεννημένοι, καὶ βεβηκότες ἑδραίως καὶ παγίως· κύβος γὰρ καὶ τετράγωνος ἀριθμὸς, ὁ ἐξήκοντα, ἴσος πᾶσι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πάντοθεν μέρεσι καὶ ἀσάλευτος.

⁴⁵ Gregory of Nyssa, *De Vita Mosis*, 2.199: Τὸ δὲ τετράγωνον σχῆμα ἐνδεικίς σοι ἔστω τῆς ἐν τῷ καλῷ παγιότητος.

⁴⁶ Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *commJob*, p. 344: κύβος δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐκ τετραγώνου κατὰ τὴν βάσιν ἢ κυκλοτεροῦς εἰς δὲ τὴν λήγων, ἵνα εἴπῃ ὅτι· σταθερὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἑδραῖον ἀπειργασάμην.

⁴⁷ *Suda* lexicon, Alphabetic letter tau, entry 386: Τετράγωνος· εὐσταθής, ἑδραῖος.

συντελεῖται ἐκ δέκα τῶν δέκα· οὗτοι δ' οἱ ... κυλιόμενοι ἐλέχθησαν εἶναι τετράγωνοι, τὸ δὲ τετράγωνον σχῆμα βέβαιόν ἐστιν. *commZacch*, 1.18: Ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ λδ' κατὰ σύνθεσιν τῶν μερῶν αὐτοῦ τετράγωνός ἐστιν· ἐξάκι γὰρ ἑξ. Οὐδὲν δὲ οὕτω βέβαιον τῶν σχημάτων ἐστὶν ὡς τὸ τετράγωνον. *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 107 (on the number 'fifty'): ἐστὶν δὲ ὁ ἀριθμὸς οὗτος δευτέρου τετραγώνου ἀριθμοῦ ἀρχή. τετράγωνός ἐστιν ὁ ἰσάκις μετρούμενος, δις δύο, τρίς τρεῖς. οὗτος οὖν ἐπτάι ἐπτά ἐστιν· καὶ λοιπὸν ἡ προσθήκη τῆς μονάδος ἀρχὴν ἄλλου καταβάλλεται ... τετράγωνός ἐστιν ὁ ἐπτάι ἐπτά. οὗτος δὲ πλευρὰς ἔχει ἀγίας· ἡ γὰρ ἑβδομάς πολλάκις ἡμῖν ἀποδέδεικται ὅτι πάντοθεν ἐστὶν εὐλογημένη. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 156: τὸ πέντε πέντε τετράγωνός ἐστιν. τετράγωνός ἐστιν ὁ ἰσάκις ἴσος. οὗτοι οὖν προστεθέντες οἱ ἀριθμοὶ πεποίηκαν κατάλληλον τῇ παλινγενεσίᾳ· δεῖ γὰρ ἐκ τελείου ἀριθμοῦ ἔχειν τὴν σύνστασιν καὶ ἐκ τετραγώνου διὰ τὸ βέβαιον ... ἔδει οὖν βεβαιότεραν εἶναι τὴν δευτέραν γένεσιν. ἔχει τὸ βέβαιον ἐκ τοῦ τετραγώνου, ἔχει καὶ τὸ τέλειον ἐκ τοῦ ἑξ τῷ ἀνενλιπῇ εἶναι τὸν ἀριθμὸν τὸν ἐκ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ μερῶν συντιθέμενον καὶ ἀπαρτιζόμενον. καὶ τοῦτο δὲ λεκτέον· εἰ καὶ τετράγωνός ἐστιν ὁ εἰκοσιπέντε, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ αἰσθητῶν ἔχει τὴν ἐπικύλισιν τὰ γὰρ αἰσθητὰ πέντε τυγχάνει, τὸ ὁρατόν, τὸ ἀκουστόν, τὸ γευστόν, τὸ ὀσφρητόν, τὸ ἀπτόν. ὅμως καὶ ἐν τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ἐστὶν τελειότης καὶ βεβαιότης· δίδεται γὰρ τὸ ἐπαινετὸν καὶ αἰσθητῶς, τελειοῦται δὲ διὰ τῆς ἑξάδος, διὰ τῆς τελειότητος. *frPs(al)*, fr. 372: Διὸ καὶ ὁ ψαλμὸς οὗτος ἐν οἰκείῳ ἀριθμῷ τῶν λεγομένων ἐν αὐτῷ τέτακται. ἔστιν γὰρ τριακοστός ἕκτος. οὗτος δὲ ὁ ἀριθμὸς ὁμοῦ τρίγωνος καὶ τετράγωνός ἐστιν. χρώμενος μὲν ἡ τρίγωνός ἐστιν πλευρὰ τῇ ὀγδοάδι, ἔστι δὲ ἡ ὀγδοὰς ἀναστάσιμος τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμέρα. ἡ δὲ τετράγωνος πλευρὰν ἔχει τὸν ἑξ ὄντα ἀριθμὸν τέλειον· ἐξάκις γὰρ τριάκοντα ἑξ. τρίγωνος δὲ κατὰ τοῦτο· εἰ γὰρ ἀπὸ μονάδος ἑξῆς ἕως ὀγδοάδος ἀριθμήσεις, οὐκ ἄλλον τούτου εὐρήσεις ἀριθμόν.

Cf. Cebes (philosopher, first cent. AD), *Cebetis Tabula*, 18.3: Τί δὲ ἔστηκεν ἐπὶ λίθου τετραγώνου αὕτη; Σημεῖον, ἔφη, ὅτι ἀσφαλῆς τε καὶ βεβαία ἡ

πρὸς αὐτὴν ὁδός ἐστι τοῖς ἀφικνουμένοις καὶ τῶν διδομένων ἀσφαλῆς ἢ δόσις τοῖς λαμβάνουσιν.

The *ethical* idea involved was expounded by Philo. *De Confusione Linguarum*, 87–88: ἀλλὰ πεπηγότα βεβαίως, τῇ τοῦ τετραγώνου σχήματος οἰκειούμενα φύσει – ἀκράδαντον γὰρ τοῦτό γε –, ἵνα πλίνθου τινὰ τρόπον ἀκλινῶς ἐρηρυσμένα βεβαίως καὶ τὰ ἐποικοδομούμενα δέχεται. *De Opificio Mundi*, 51: πρὸς δὲ τούτοις οὐδ' ἐκεῖνο ἀγνοητέον, ὅτι πρῶτος ἀριθμῶν ὁ τέτταρα τετράγωνός ἐστιν ἰσάκις ἴσος, μέτρον δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἰσότητος. *De Decalogo*, 28–29: καὶ τὸν τετράγωνον, τὸν τέσσαρα, τὸν ἰσάκις ἴσον, καὶ μὲν δὴ τὸν κύβον, τὸν ὀκτώ, ὅς ἐστιν ἰσάκις ἴσος ἰσάκις, καὶ τὸν τέλειον, τὸν ἑξ, ἰσούμενον τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μέρεσι, τρισὶ καὶ δυσὶ καὶ ἐνί. Also, *Περὶ ἀριθμῶν* (fragmenta), frs. 22; 25a; 90b.

The idea itself is, of course, a Pythagorean one, to which Plutarch adduced opulent testimony. Plutarch, *De Defectu Oraculorum*., 428D3: ὁ μὲν γε κύβος ἐμφανῶς στάσεως οἰκεῖόν ἐστι σῶμα διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐπιπέδων ἀσφάλειαν καὶ βεβαιότητα. *Fragmenta*, fr. 110: ἐπιπέδῳ δ' ἡ τριάς, δῆλον ὡς τῷ στερεῷ προσήκοι ἂν ἡ τετράς· εἰκότως οὖν ἐπιτηδεῖα πρὸς σύμπηξιν τῶν νεῶν. εἰ δὲ καὶ πρώτη τὸ ἰσάκις ἴσον ἔχει καὶ πρώτη πάντας τοὺς ἁρμονικοὺς περιέχει λόγους. *Theseus*, 36.6: ἡ γὰρ ὀγδοὰς κύβος ἀπ' ἀρτίου πρῶτος οὔσα καὶ τοῦ πρώτου τετραγώνου διπλασία, τὸ μόνιμον καὶ δυσκίνητον οἰκεῖον ἔχει.⁴⁸

EN XXXIρ: ἰσάκις ἴσος κυλισθ^{εῖς}

Didymus was aware of the definition of a square number. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 156: τετράγωνός ἐστιν ὁ ἰσάκις ἴσος. *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 107: τετράγωνός ἐστιν ὁ ἰσάκις μετρούμενος.

Cf. the definition of τετράγωνος in the following:

Theon of Smyrna (philosopher, second cent. AD), *De Rerum Mathematicarum Utilitate*, p. 26: ἐπειδὴν ἴσος ἐπὶ ἴσον πολλαπλασιασθεὶς γεννήσῃ τινὰ ἀριθμόν, ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἰσάκις τε ἴσος καὶ τετράγωνός ἐστιν.

Scholia in Hesiodum (*scholia vetera*), section-verse 770b: τετράγωνος δὲ ἀριθμός ἐστιν ὁ ἰσάκις ἴσος

⁴⁸ Likewise, Plutarch, *Aetia Romana et Graeca*, 288D–E; *De Iside et Osiride*, 370E; 374A; 383E; *De E apud Delphos*, 391A; *De Defectu*

Oraculorum., 429E; *De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo*, 1018C; 1019B; 1020D.

μετρούμενος, ἥτοι ὑπὸ δύο ἴσων ἀριθμῶν, ὥς τὸ δις δύο τέσσαρα. κύβος δὲ ὁ ἰσάκις ἴσος ἰσάκις.

The definition enjoyed considerable currency in Late Antiquity, although this was present already in Plato.

Plato, *Theaetetus*, 147e: Τὸν ἀριθμὸν πάντα δίχα διελάβομεν· τὸν μὲν δυνάμενον ἴσον ἰσάκις γίγνεσθαι τῷ τετραγώνῳ τὸ σχῆμα ἀπεικάσαντες τετράγωνόν τε καὶ ἰσοπλευρον προσείπομεν.

One should notice the absence of Christian intellectuals from this kind of mathematical philosophy, which otherwise was known not only to mathematicians, but also to lexicographers and philosophers.⁴⁹ Therefore, Didymus appears to be the sole Christian author who was aware of this theory, which is consonant with the testimony of the historian Socrates (see [EN XXXIm](#), p. 367, n. 31) about Didymus' mathematical learning. This is also one more sign of his influence upon the Scholia and shows Cassian once again being impressed by his ideas. We should recall that Cassian was interested in mathematical calculations, which had to do with astronomy, as noted earlier.

EN XXXIq: κυλισθεῖς

Although Didymus' definition of a square number is a traditional one for the most part, this term does not appear in those who introduced it, mainly mathematicians. The normal expression was ἰσάκις ἴσος μετρηθεῖς, not ἰσάκις ἴσος κυλισθεῖς, which is peculiar to Didymus. The answer as to why that is so should probably be sought in Didymus' own apprehension of reality. More specifically, it has to do with the physical representation of a number and its multiplication, carried out by a man deprived of the sense of sight. He seems to have held a natural conception of numbers by means of the length of the circumference of a circle, indeed of a cylinder. Therefore, the natural conception of a number being multiplied by itself was 'how many times' should such a cylinder be rolling, each time counting the length of its circumference. A number 'rolling' as many times as the total length of its circumfer-

ence produced its square number. Genius that he was, Didymus had created his own ways for conceiving of natural, as well as abstract, realities. The invention of reading through engraving letters on the surface of wood, and recognizing them by touch, makes him the precursor of Louis Braille (he had also lost his vision in infancy, at the age of three), who invented the system of reading embossed dots by touch.

There is something important beyond this, however. Footnote 48 to the Greek text quotes a telling passage from Didymus' *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 225. In this, Didymus describes the action of mind in its highest level of comprehension, by understanding the mind as 'rotating'. This is one of the most stunning moments for any student of Didymus. For he actually comments on Aristotle and evinces knowledge that no known commentator before him ever seems to have had an inkling of, not even Alexander of Aphrodisias. By reference to 'those from without', who made 'comprehension a kind of rotating wheels' (καὶ τινες τῶν ἔξω εἰρήκασιν, ὅτι αἱ νοήσεις ὥσπερ τροχοὶ εἰσιν καὶ κύκλοι στρεφόμενοι, see full quotation below), Didymus actually comments on Aristotle's *De Anima*, where the act of comprehension by mind is described as a 'circle'.

Aristotle, *De Anima*, 407a19–26: ἀναγκαῖον δὲ τὸν νοῦν εἶναι τὸν κύκλον τοῦτον· νοῦ μὲν γὰρ κίνησις νόησις κύκλου δὲ περιφορά· εἰ οὖν ἡ νόησις περιφορά, καὶ νοῦς ἂν εἴη ὁ κύκλος οὗ ἡ τοιαύτη περιφορά νόησις. ἀεὶ δὲ διὰ τί νοήσῃ (δεῖ γάρ, εἴπερ ἀϊδιος ἡ περιφορά); τῶν μὲν γὰρ πρακτικῶν νοήσεων ἔστι πέρατα (πᾶσαι γὰρ ἑτέρου χάριν), αἱ δὲ θεωρητικαὶ τοῖς λόγοις ὁμοίως ὀρίζονται· λόγος δὲ πᾶς ὀρισμὸς ἢ ἀπόδειξις.

No Christian author ever made such a learned reference. Besides, we have no evidence of Aristotelian commentators prior to Didymus having commented on this point. Hence Didymus' reference to 'those from without'⁵⁰ actually refers to Aristotle's point of departure, which was Plato's discussions in the *Timaeus* and *Phaedrus*.⁵¹ Proclus commented on this,

⁴⁹ Nicomachus of Gerasa, *Introductio Arithmetica*, 1.19.19; 2.17.6; 2.20.5. Julius Naucratis (Julius Pollux, or Julius Polydeuces, grammarian, second cent. AD), *Onomasticon*, 4.164. Theon of Smyrna (philosopher, second cent. AD), *De Rerum Mathematicarum Utilitate*, pp. 28; 32; 36; 95. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 836. Iamblichus, *Theologoumena*

Arithmeticae, p. 36. John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Libros de Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, p. 177. John Laurentius Lydus, *De Mensibus*, 2.9. Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 9, pp. 58; 456.

⁵⁰ See below [EN XXXVIa](#). Cf. Plotinus, *Enneades*, III.2.3.

⁵¹ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 247d; *Timaeus*, 37c.

too.⁵² The passage of the *Timaeus* received some comment by Plutarch, of which no doubt Didymus was aware.⁵³ Nevertheless, there were intellectuals subsequent to Didymus who paid considerable attention to this Aristotelian point, which they peruse in conjunction with Plato's accounts in the *Timaeus* and *Phaedrus*. In any event, the present point reinforces my hypothesis that there was indeed a certain intellectual relation between Didymus (c. 310–398) and Proclus (410–485).

Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 2, p. 160: ὅτι μὲν οὖν αἱ ψυχαὶ καὶ ὀχήμασιν χρώμεναι κινουμένοις κατὰ τόπον καὶ αὐταὶ καθ' αὐτὰς μόνας τοῖς τε διανοήμασι καὶ θεωρητικαῖς ἐνεργείαις κινούνται, φανερόν, ὅτε καὶ δοκοῦσιν ἅπασαι ποιεῖν τῶν νοήσεων ἢ τῶν φαντασιῶν ἢ τῶν αἰσθήσεων τὸν κύκλον.

In Platonis Parmenidem, p. 808: ἐφίεται δὲ τὴν ἀθρόαν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ νοῦ περιλαβεῖν, ὀρεγομένη τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ τελειότητος καὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἐκείνου καὶ ἀπλοῦ τῆς νοήσεως εἶδους περιθεῖ τε αὐτὸν καὶ περιχορεύει κύκλῳ. Ibid. p. 1152: διὰ μὲν οὖν τῆς προτάσεως τὴν ἀθρόαν καὶ μόνιμον ἐνέργειαν τοῦ νοῦ μιμούμενος, διὰ δὲ τῆς ἀποδείξεως τὴν πρόοδον τὴν εἰς τὸ πλῆθος τῶν νοήσεων ἑαυτὴν ἀνελίττουσαν, διὰ δὲ τοῦ συμπεράσματος τὴν κατὰ κύκλον ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ νοῦ στροφὴν καὶ τὴν μίαν τελειότητα πάσης νοεῖας ἐνεργείας. Ibid. p. 1161: Ὁ δὲ δὴ Τίμαιος εἰς κύκλους κατακάμψας τὴν κατὰ μῆκος πρόοδον τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ τὸν μὲν ἔσω, τὸν δὲ ἔξω τοῖν κύκλοις ποιήσας.

In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria, v. 2, p. 72: διὸ καὶ τὸ ἡμέτερον ὄχημα σφαιρικὸν ἀποτελεῖται καὶ κινεῖται κυκλικῶς, ὅταν διαφερόντως ὁμοιωθῇ πρὸς τὸν νοῦν ἢ ψυχὴ· μιμεῖται γὰρ τὴν νοεράν ἐνέργειαν ἢ τε τῆς ψυχῆς νόησις καὶ ἡ κυκλοφορία τῶν σωμάτων, ὥσπερ τὰς ἀνόδους καὶ καθόδους τῶν ψυχῶν ἡ κατ' εὐθείαν κινήσεις. Ibid. v. 2, p. 279: καὶ κύκλῳ ἢ νόησις. Ibid. v. 2, p. 312: εἴη ἂν οὖν λογιστικὸν τὸ τῷ λογισμῷ τῆς ψυχῆς περιληπτόν, οὗ δὴ προειληφὸς ἐκεῖνο τὴν αἰτίαν ὁμωνύμως τούτῳ προσείρηται λογιστικόν. εὐτροχὸν δὲ τὸ

νοερὸν καὶ ἐν τῇ μεταβάσει τὸ ἀνεμπόδιστον ἔχον καὶ τὸ κυκλικὸν ἐν τῷ μεταβαίνειν καὶ τὸ ἀκμαῖον ἐν ταῖς νοήσεσι, τὸ τέλειον, τὸ περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἐνεργοῦν, τὸ ἀγαθοειδές, τὸ περὶ τὸ νοητὸν ὡς κέντρον φερόμενον.

Anonymous, *In Platonis Cratylum Commentaria*, 110: νοεῖ δ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐπέστραπται πρὸς τὰ ἐν ἑαυτῷ νοητά, καὶ τὴν νόησιν αὐτοῦ ταύτην περιφορὰν ὁ Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Φαίδρῳ προσείρηκεν· ὡς γὰρ τὸ κύκλῳ κινούμενον περὶ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ κινεῖται κέντρον.

Hermias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 107: Οἰκειότερον μὲν οὖν ἀποδοίη τις ἂν τὴν μὲν περιφορὰν ταῖς θεαῖς ψυχαῖς, τὴν δὲ φορὰν ταῖς ἡμετέραις· ἴδοις δ' ἂν καὶ ἐν ταῖς θεαῖς ἀμφοτέρας τὰς κινήσεις· εὐθείας γὰρ, φησί, λαβὼν ὁ δημιουργὸς εἰς κύκλον κατέκαμψε· δηλὸν οὖν ὡς οὐκ ἄνευ τοῦ εὐθέος ἡ κυκλικὴ ἐστὶ κάμψις καὶ νόησις τῶν ψυχῶν· τὸ γὰρ καθαρῶς κύκλῳ κινεῖσθαι μόνῳ ἀπονέμει τῷ νῷ. Ibid. p. 153: Τὸ δὲ ἔως ἂν κύκλῳ ἢ περιφορὰ εἰς ταῦτο περιενέγκῃ (*Phaedo*, 247d4) ἀντὶ τοῦ· ἔως ἂν συμπεριενεχθῶσι τῇ νοήσει τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οὐχ ὡς καὶ αὐτοῦ μεταβατικῶς ἐνεργοῦντος, ἀλλ' ὡς τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ἐκείνου νόησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν ἐν χρόνῳ δεχομένης, ὥσπερ δὴ καὶ ὁ ἐνταῦθα κάτοχος ἐν χρόνῳ φθέγγεται, τοῦ θεοῦ ἀχρόνως ἐνεργοῦντος. Τὸ μὲν οὖν κύκλῳ ἴδιον τῆς ψυχικῆς περιόδου· τὸ δὲ τῆς περιφορᾶς τῆς οὐρανίας νοήσεως.

Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Libros De Anima Commentaria*, v. 11, p. 46: Ἀναγκαῖον δὲ τὸν νοῦν εἶναι τὸν κύκλον τοῦτον. Καὶ οὔτε ὡς ἐντελέχειαν αὐτοῦ οὔτε ὡς ὄργανον χρώμενον οὔτε ἔτι μᾶλλον ὡς πάντη χωριστόν, εἶγε κατ' αὐτὸν ἢ τοῦ κύκλου περιφορὰ ἐστὶν ἢ νόησις, οὐ παντὸς δηλαδὴ ἀλλὰ τούτου, ὃν φησι σχισθέντα καὶ κατακαμφθέντα περιάγεσθαι. πόθεν οὖν συλλογίζεται τὸν κύκλον τοῦτον νοῦν εἶναι; ἐπειδὴ ὢν αἱ ἐνέργειαι αἱ αὐταί, τούτων καὶ αἱ οὐσίαι. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἡ τοῦ κύκλου περιφορὰ νόησις· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ τοῦ νοῦ ἐνέργεια νόησις ὁμολογημένως. ὢν δὲ μία ἡ ἐνέργεια, καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ

⁵² Proclus, *Theologia Platonica*, v. 5, p. 130. See NDGF, Appendix II, pp. 509–10; 583–86.

⁵³ Cf. a comment on this point of Plato by Plutarch, *De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo*, 1023F; *Epitome Libri de Animae Procreatione in Timaeo*, 1031D. Similar comments on the same issue were made by Themistius, *In Aristotelis Libros de Anima*

Paraphrasis, v. 5,3, p. 96: Πλάτων μὲν γὰρ κύκλοις ἀφομοιοῖ τὰς ἐνεργείας τοῦ νοῦ τῷ τε εὐτρόχῳ καὶ τῷ ὀρθῷ. Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 2, pp. 312; 314. Hermias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 124; 229. Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 1.49.28; 1.50.41.

αὐτά· νοῦς ἄρα καὶ ὁδε ὁ κύκλος τὰ αὐτά. ὅπως δὲ ἐνδεικτικῶς διὰ τῶν μαθημάτων ταῦτα γέγραφεν ὁ Τίμαιος, ἤδη ἡμῖν διήρθρωται.

John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Libros De Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, p. 127: ταύτην οὖν τὴν δόξαν πρόκειται νῦν τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει ἐλέγξει. τί γὰρ λέγω, φησίν, ὅτι οὐχ οἷόν τε τὸν νοῦν καὶ κύκλον εἶναι; ὅλως γὰρ μέγεθος αὐτὸν εἶναι τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἐστὶ· μέγεθος γὰρ ὄντα νοῆσαι τι τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἐστί. πρόεισι δ' ὁ ἐλεγχος ἐκ διαιρέσεως τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον. εἰ ὁ νοῦς, φησί, κύκλος ὢν τῷ κινεῖσθαι ἐφάπτεται τε τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ ταύτη νοεῖ (μέγεθος γὰρ ὢν οὐκ ἄλλως γινώσκεται ἢ τῷ ἐφάπτεσθαι τοῦ νοητοῦ), ἀνάγκη πᾶσα ἢ κατὰ σημεῖον ἐφαπτόμενος νοεῖ ἢ κατὰ μόριον. καὶ εἰ κατὰ σημεῖον, ἦτοι καθ' ἓν σημεῖον νοεῖ ἢ οὐ καθ' ἓν. εἰ μὲν οὖν καθ' ἓν μόνον σημεῖον νοοίη, περιττὰ τὰ ἄλλα· τίς οὖν χρεῖα τῆς κύκλω κινήσεως ἢ ὅλως μεγέθους; εἰ γὰρ ἓν σημεῖον ἄρκει εἰς νόησιν, περιττὴ ἢ τοῦ μεγέθους ὑπόθεσις εἰς μηδὲν τῷ νῷ συντελοῦντος· εἰ γὰρ ὁ νοῦς τῷ νοεῖν νοῦς εἶναι λέγεται, τὸ δὲ ἓν σημεῖον μόνον νοεῖ, τοῦτο ἂν εἴη νοῦς. εἰ δὲ μὴ καθ' ἓν μόνον σημεῖον νοεῖ, ἦτοι κατὰ πλείονα ἢ κατὰ πάντα νοήσκει.

Ibid. v. 15, p. 128: ἕκαστον πάντα νοεῖ, ἄπειρα δὲ τὰ σημεῖα, πολλάκις, φησίν, ἢ ἀπειράκις νοήσκει τὸ αὐτό· νῦν δὲ φαίνεται καὶ ἄπαξ ἐνδεχόμενον· δυνατὸν γὰρ τι προσάπαξ νοήσαντα μηκέτι νοῆσαι ἢ ἐπιλαθόμενον ἢ μηκέτι τῇ διανοίᾳ προχειρισάμενον. εἰ τοίνυν ἐνδέχεται μὲν ἄπαξ τι νοῆσαι, ἕκαστου δὲ τῶν σημείων πάντα νοοῦντος καὶ τοῦ κύκλου τῇ περιφορᾷ ἀεὶ τῶν νοητῶν ἐφαπτομένου ἀνάγκη τὸ αὐτὸ ἀπειράκις νοεῖν, ψευδὴς ἄρα ἢ τοιαύτη ὑπόθεσις. ἄλλως τε εἰ ἄπειρα τὰ σημεῖα, τὰ δὲ ἄπειρα ἐκπεριελθεῖν τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἐστίν, οὐδέποτε καθ' ὅλον ἑαυτὸν ὁ νοῦς νοήσκει, ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ νοητὸν τὸ μὲν τι τοῦ νοῦ νοήσκει, τὸ δὲ οὐ νοήσκει.

Ibid. v. 15, p. 130: *Εἰ δὲ ἱκανὸν θιγεῖν ὅτρωδ' τῶν μορίων, τί δεῖ κύκλω κινεῖσθαι ἢ ὅλως μέγεθος ἔχειν;* Τουτέστιν εἰ ὁποῖον δὴ ποτε μόριον τοῦ κύκλου δύναται θιγὼν ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τοῦ νοητοῦ, τίς χρεῖα τῆς κύκλω κινήσεως; καὶ ἰστάμενον γὰρ ἀντιλήψεται. τί γὰρ αὐτῷ πρὸς ἀντίληψιν τὸ κύκλω κινεῖσθαι συμβάλλεται; οὐδὲν δὲ αὐτῷ οὐδὲ τὸ μέγεθος εἰς νόησιν συντελεῖ, εἰ ὅτρωδ' τῶν μορίων νοεῖ. εἰ γὰρ τι διαιρούμενον μένει μηδὲν ἔλαττον ἀπαθὲς εἶναι ἐκ τῆς διαιρέσεως διαμένον,

ἕτερον τοῦτο ἐστὶ παρὰ τὸ διαιρούμενον καὶ καθ' αὐτὸ ἀδιάστατόν τέ ἐστὶ καὶ ἡμέρες· οἷον διαιρουμένης ἀεὶ τῆς ἐπιφανείας ἢ λευκότης ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν μορίων ἢ αὐτὴ φυλάττεται, καὶ τὸ μὲν ποσὸν ὑπὸ τῆς διαιρέσεως πάσχει καὶ μειοῦται (ἀντὶ τοῦ δίπηχυ εἶναι φέρε εἰπεῖν γίνεται πηχυαῖον), τὸ μέντοι λευκὸν ὡσαύτως ἔχει· ἄλλο ἄρα ἐστὶ τὸ λευκὸν παρὰ τὸ διαιρούμενον. οὕτως ἄρα εἰ ὅτινι οὖν τῶν μορίων τοῦ κύκλου ὁμοία ἢ νόησις γίνεται, καὶ ἐν τῷ μεγίστῳ μορίῳ καὶ τῷ ἐλαχίστῳ, ἄλλο ἄρα ἐστὶ τὸ νοοῦν παρὰ τὸ μέγεθος. οὐδὲν ἄρα συμβάλλεται εἰς νόησιν τὸ μέγεθος, εἴ γε καὶ τὸ μεῖζον καὶ τὸ ἔλαττον μόριον ὡσαύτως νοεῖ.

Εἰ δ' ἀναγκαῖον νοῆσαι τῷ ὅλῳ κύκλῳ θιγόντα, τίς ἐστὶν ἢ τοῖς μορίοις θίξις; Τῆς διαιρέσεως ἐχούσης ὅτι ἦτοι μορίῳ ἑαυτοῦ νοεῖ ὁ κύκλος ἢ τῷ ὅλῳ, μορίῳ δὲ ἢ τῷ κατὰ μέγεθος ἢ τῷ κατὰ στιγμήν, ἐκθέμενος τὰ συμβαίνοντα ἄτοπα τῇ ὑποθέσει τῇ κατὰ μόριον νοεῖν λεγούσῃ νῦν τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκτίθεται, λέγω δὴ τὸ ὅλῳ νοεῖν τῷ κύκλῳ. εἰ γὰρ οὐ πρότερον νοήσκει, πρὶν ἐκπεριέλθαι ὁ κύκλος, τί ποιεῖ ἕκαστον τῶν μορίων; εἰ γὰρ μὴ νοεῖ περιερχόμενα τὰ μόρια, ἢ δὲ τοῦ ὅλου κύκλου θίξις κατὰ μόρια γίνεται, οὐδ' αὐτὸς ἂν νοήσκει· οὐ γὰρ ἄλλῳ τινὶ ἐφάπτεται τοῦ νοητοῦ ἢ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μέρεσι. λείπεται λέγειν ὡς ἕκαστον μὲν τῶν μερῶν μέρος γινώσκει τοῦ νοητοῦ, ὁ δὲ ὅλος κύκλος τὸ ὅλον.

Ibid. v. 15, p. 131: ὅπως δὲ ὁ νοῦς ἡμερὴς ὢν νοεῖ πάντα, ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ βιβλίῳ λέξει. ἄλλως ὡς ἐπὶ ἐτέρου ἐπιχειρήματος τούτου ἀκουστέον κοινῶς πάσαις ταῖς εἰρημέναις ὑποθέσεσιν ἁρμόζοντος. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ θίξει νοῶν ὁ κύκλος ἢ κατὰ σημεῖον θιγγάνει ἢ κατὰ μόριον, εἰ μὲν οὖν κατὰ σημεῖον θιγγάνων νοεῖ, πῶς νοήσκει τὰ μεριστά, λέγω τὰ σώματα; οὐ γὰρ ἐφαρμόζει σημεῖον μεγέθει· πῶς οὖν νοήσκει μὴ ἐφαρμόζον; οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἔθιγεν, οὐδὲ νοήσκει τοῦτο. εἰ δὲ κατὰ μόρια νοεῖ, πῶς νοήσκει τὰ ἡμερῇ;

Ibid. v. 15, p. 132: *Ἀναγκαῖον δὲ τὸν νοῦν εἶναι τὸν κύκλον τοῦτον. νοῦ μὲν γὰρ κινήσεις νόησις, κύκλον δὲ περιφορά. εἰ οὖν ἡ νόησις περιφορά, καὶ νοῦς ἂν εἴη ὁ κύκλος, οὗ ἢ τοιαύτη περιφορά νόησις.* Ἵνα μὴ τις εἴποι ὅτι οὐκ ἔλεγε κύκλον αἰσθητὸν ὁ Τίμαιος τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀλλὰ τὸν καθόλου κύκλον καὶ τὸν τοῦ κύκλου λόγον, ὃς ἡμετέρης ἐστὶ καὶ ἀσώματος, παντὶ γοῦν ἐφαρμόζει κύκλῳ ὁμοίως μικρῷ τε καὶ

μεγάλω, καὶ τοῦτο διὰ τούτων κατασκευάζει. πᾶσα γὰρ ἀνάγκη, φησὶν, ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων αἰσθητὸν κύκλον τὸν νοῦν ὑπολαμβάνειν λέγειν τὸν Τίμαιον. τὸ γὰρ τοῦτον δεικτικὸν τὸ αἰσθητὸν αὐτῷ σημαίνει· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ δεικνύμενον. πόθεν οὖν ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν; ὁ καθόλου κύκλος οὐ κινεῖται· λόγος γὰρ ἐστίν. ὃν δὲ λόγον ἔχει ὁ νοῦς πρὸς τὴν νόησιν, τοῦτον ἔχει καὶ ὁ κύκλος πρὸς τὴν περιφορὰν· κίνησις γὰρ ἐκάτερον, τὸ μὲν τοῦ νοῦ, τὸ δὲ τοῦ κύκλου. οὐκοῦν καὶ ἐναλλάξ ὃν λόγον ἔχει ἡ νόησις πρὸς τὴν περιφορὰν, τοῦτον καὶ ὁ νοῦς πρὸς τὸν κύκλον. εἰ τοίνυν ἡ νόησις περιφορὰ, καὶ ὁ νοῦς ἄρα κύκλος. εἰ δὲ ἡ περιφορὰ αἰσθητοῦ ἐστὶ κύκλου (ὁ γὰρ καθόλου κύκλος οὐ περιάγεται) καὶ ὁ νοῦς ἄρα αἰσθητὸς ἐστὶ κύκλος.

Ibid. v. 15, p. 133: ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ πᾶσα ψυχὴ, καὶ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς εἴπης, μεταβατικὴν ἔχει τὴν νόησιν ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ νοητοῦ ἐπ' ἄλλο μεταβαίνουσα, διὰ μὲν τὸ ἀεικίνητον ἀεὶ τι νοήσῃ, διὰ δὲ τὸ αἰδιδιον ἀνάγκη διὰ τὴν ἀπειρίαν τοῦ χρόνου εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ πάλιν ἀνακάμπτειν καὶ ταύτῃ κύκλον μιμεῖσθαι· οὐκ ἄπειρα μέντοι νοήσῃ, ἐπειδὴ μηδὲ τὰ νοητὰ ἄπειρα. μήποτε οὖν τοῦτό φησι ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸ ἀεὶ νοήσῃ τῷ μηδέποτε ὄλον νενοηκέναι· ἡ γὰρ ὁμοία καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχουσα περιφορὰ περὶ ταῦτοῦ τινος ἔσται. δεήσει οὖν τοιοῦτον εἶναι τὸ νοούμενον, ὃ οὐδέποτε νενοημένον ἔσται.

Ibid. v. 15, p. 136: ὁ γὰρ ἀπορῶν ἐν πολλῇ ταραχῇ καὶ κινήσει ἐστίν, ὁ μέντοι εὐρῶν, ταῦτόν δὲ εἰπεῖν νενοηκῶς ἐν ἡρεμίᾳ λοιπὸν ἐστὶ καὶ γαλήνῃ, ὅθεν καὶ ἐπιστήμη καλεῖται διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ στάσιν ἄγειν τὴν ψυχὴν. καὶ ὁ συλλογισάμενος δέ τι καὶ δι' ἀποδείξεως εὐρῶν λοιπὸν ἡρεμεῖ. εἰ μὲν οὖν αὐτὴν τὴν νόησιν καὶ τὸ συμπέρασμα τοῦ συλλογισμοῦ τὴν κυκλοφορίαν εἶναί φασι, μᾶλλον ἡρέμησις αὕτη, οὐ κίνησις· εἰ δὲ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἐπὶ τὴν νόησιν φασιν εἶναι τὴν κυκλοφορίαν, ἥξομεν ἐπὶ τοὺς πρότερον λόγους.

Meletius of Tiberiopolis (medical doctor, probably seventh cent.), *De Natura Hominis*, p. 142: ψυχῆς δὲ ἐνέργειαι γνωστικαὶ καὶ ζωτικάι, ὅτι σύμφυτος ἡ ζωὴ τῇ ψυχῇ· τῷ σώματι δὲ κατὰ μέθεξιν· ὄργανον γὰρ τῇ ψυχῇ τὸ σῶμα· ὑποκείμενον δὲ τοῦ σώματος ἡ ψυχὴ· κινήσεις ψυχικάι· αἰσθησις· νόησις· ἐνέργεια· κινεῖται δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ κυκλικῶς, ἐλικοειδῶς, καὶ κατ' εὐθεῖαν· νοῦς ἐστὶ κατὰ γνώμην ἄπταιστος, πρώτης προσβολῆς τῶν πραγμάτων

ἀπτόμενος, καὶ κρεῖττον ἢ κατὰ ἀπόδειξιν ἀπαλαμβάνων τὰ πράγματα· δι' ὧν ἐστὶ συνιδεῖν πῇ τοῦ πορευόμεθα, ὁδὸν ζητοῦντες τῆς ἀποδείξεως.

Finally, let me quote a few Christian instances, which may have relevance to the Platonic and Aristotelian point, if in a rather attenuated sense, with the exception of Didymus, who clearly knew what he was talking about.

Didymus, *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 225: ἡ καρδία πολλάκις ἤδη εἴρηται ὅτι τὸν νοῦν σημαίνει. ὁ νοῦς δὲ οὐ λοξῶς οὐδὲ εἰς εὐθεῖαν χωρεῖ, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἑαυτὸν στρέφεται. αὐτίκα γοῦν καὶ τινες τῶν ἔξω εἰρήκασιν, ὅτι αἱ νοήσεις ὥσπερ τροχοὶ εἰσιν καὶ κύκλοι στρεφόμενοι. ὅταν γὰρ ὁ νοῦς περὶ τὰ ἔξω τείνῃ ἑαυτὸν καὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν θέλῃ φαντασίαν δέχεσθαι, οὐκ ἔστιν περὶ ἑαυτόν, οὐ στρέφεται περὶ ἑαυτόν. ὅταν δὲ νοῇ καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἐπιστάνῃ, αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ τὸ νοοῦν καὶ τὸ νοούμενον. ὁ γὰρ κατ' ἐνέργειαν νοῦς ἀεὶ τὸ νοεῖν ἔχει, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε χεῖται ἐπὶ τὰ ἔξω.

frPs(al), fr. 503 (on Psalm 47:13–15): Τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς γνώμης σκοπευτικῆς τῆς ἀληθείας τυγχανούσης καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Σιών καλουμένης, τῇ φρονήσει περιλαβεῖν αὐτὴν προσήκει, ἵνα περινοήσαντες τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας δόγματα ὡς ἐν κύκλῳ περιγράψωμεν αὐτὰ τῇ ἑαυτῶν νοήσει.

Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 1)*, 15.52: ὅτι γὰρ παντὸς χρόνου, ὃν ἂν νοήσῃ τις πολλὰ κυκλεύσας τῇ διανοίᾳ.

Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1441.1: Καὶ οἱ νοήσαντες τὴν Σιών κυκλοῦσιν αὐτήν, καὶ περιλαμβάνουσιν αὐτήν.

Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *commEccl*, PG.93.572.27–31: Ὁ σοφὸς κύκλῳ συνάγων τὸν ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν περὶ τὴν νόησιν, καὶ ἑαυτὸν θεωρῶν, καὶ τὸ νοούμενον, οὔτε διεστραμμένα κατανοεῖ, οὔτε κατ' εὐθὺ βλέπων πρὸς τὰ αἰσθητὰ ἀφορᾷ. But Olympiodorus had in mind the phraseology of *Eccl*. 7:25, rather than Aristotle.

EN XXXIr: βεβαία στάσις

The expression comes from Plutarch, *De Amicorum Multitudine*, 97B: ἀλλ' ἡ φιλία στάσιμόν τι ζητεῖ καὶ βέβαιον ἦθος καὶ ἀμετάπτωτον. *De Defectu Oraculorum*, 428D: ὁ μὲν γε κύβος ἐμφανῶς στάσεως οἰκειὸν ἐστὶ σῶμα διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐπιπέδων ἀσφάλειαν καὶ βεβαιότητα. *De Primo Frigido*,

946B11: καὶ τὸ στάσιμον αὐτῷ καὶ δυσκίνητον οὐκ ἄργόν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἐμβριθὲς καὶ βέβαιον.

Didymus employed this idiom more extensively than any other author. *commZacch*, 1.232: κατὰ ἀγιότητα ἰδρύμενοι, στάσιν μόνιμον κατὰ πίστιν ἀπειληφότες. *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 43: οὐκ ἔχουσιν δὲ τὸ στάσιμον, τὸ βέβαιον. *frPs(al)*, fr. 272: τῷ βεβαιότητι αὐτῷ καὶ στάσιν ἐν τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ ὀρέξαντι. Ibid. fr. 479: Σιωπῶντος θεοῦ βεβαιότητα καὶ στάσιν ἔχειν δοκεῖ τὰ γήϊνα καὶ ὑλικά πράγματα, κλονούμενα θεοῦ φωνὴν δεδωκότος. Ibid. fr. 1234: στάς λοιπὸν ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ βεβαίως ἔρει. In *Genesin*, Cod. p. 136: τοῦ ἐναρέτου βεβαίου ὑπάρχοντος, διὰ τὸ στάσιν ἔχειν ἰσχυράν.

Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 2.14: οὐδὲ γε ἐκεῖνοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἀλλ' εὖ πάνυ φυλάξουσιν τὸ μηδὲν βέβαιον εἶναι, μήτε ἐν λόγῳ μήτε ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν ψυχαῖς, ἡγούμενοι, ὥς ἔμοι δοκεῖ, αὐτὸ στάσιμον εἶναι. *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.868.1–4: Μακαρίζει τοίνυν τὸν μήτε τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν ὁδοῦ κοινωνήσαντα, μήτε βεβαίαν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν δεξάμενον τὴν βουλήν· τοῦτο γὰρ δὴ στάσιν ἐκάλεσεν· καὶ τὴν μόνιμον τῶν λοιμῶν φυγόντα διαφθοράν. *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.837.7–9: ἀλλ' ἐστὼς ἄκουε τῶν παρ' ἑμοῦ λεγομένων, μὴ περιτρεπόμενος, ἀλλὰ τῇ στάσει σημαίνων τὸ βέβαιον.

Once again, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam* turns out to be not a work of Basil, who did not use the expression. A passage in Procopius of Gaza ascribes this to 'certain ones' (τινές) and there is no ground on which this could be taken to suggest Basil, who is never mentioned by Procopius, in contrast to the two Gregories who are not only mentioned, but also included in his catenae. Procopius included passages of Didymus in two of his catenae, namely, *In Canticum Cantocorum* and *In Ecclesiasten*.

Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam, 6.191 (= Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 1949): ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι Σπέρμα ἅγιον ἐν τῇ στάσει καὶ βεβαιότητι ἑαυτῶν.

In his text Procopius of Gaza adds an important phrase to the previous passage: *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 1949: Συνάγονται δὲ οὗτοι, ὥς τερέβινθος τε καὶ βάλανος, ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι σπέρμα ἅγιον ἐν τῇ στάσει καὶ βεβαιότητι αὐτῶν, κατὰ τὴν προσθήκην Θεοδοτίωνος. Τινὲς δὲ οὕτως ἐννόησαν.

Who are those τινές? The previous discussion

evinces that this is Didymus. It cannot be Basil, who never used this idiomatic wording. Exploring further usage, again and again we come upon authors closely related to the phraseology of the Scholia.

Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 14.4.4: μηδὲν βέβαιον εἶναι . . . ἡγούμενοι, ὥς ἔμοι δοκεῖ, αὐτὸ στάσιμον εἶναι. *DE*, 6.18.17: τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ στάσιν τε καὶ βεβαίωσιν.

Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 134: ἵνα τὸ πάγιόν τε καὶ στάσιμον τῇ κατ' ἀρετὴν πολιτείας βεβαιώσει τῷ ὑποδείγματι. *Adversus Eunomium*, 2.1.78: τί τὸ φυλάσσειν ἔχει ἐν τῷ βεβαίῳ τὴν στάσιν;

John Chrysostom, *In Genesin*, PG.53.25.6: ἡ εὐημερία πᾶσα τοῦ παρόντος βίου, οὐδὲν βέβαιον ἔχουσα; οὐδὲν στάσιμον, οὐδὲν πάγιον. *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.460.2: ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων οὐδὲν βέβαιον, οὐδὲ στάσιμον, ἀλλὰ πάντα παράγει καὶ παρέρχεται.

Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Psalmum 118*, PG.55.676.1: Ὁδὸς γὰρ παρὰ τῷ προφήτῃ ὁ παρὼν βίος εἴρηται, διὰ τὸ μηδὲν στάσιμον ἢ βέβαιον ἔχειν.

Severianus of Gabala, *In Justum et Beatum Job*, PG.56.565.1: ἀλλ' ἡ προαίρεσις τῶν εὐσεβούντων ὀφείλει στάσιμον καὶ βεβαίαν ἔχειν τὴν γνώμην.

Methodius of Olympus, *Symposium*, 5.2: εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον ἐλάσας, ἄρχεται στάσιν καὶ βεβαιότητα τῶν θυρῶν ὁ νοῦς.

Diodorus of Tarsus, *commPs*, I-L, Psalm 35:13b: ὥστε αὐτοὺς μήτε στάσιν ἔξιν μήτε βεβαιότητα.

Philosophers took up the idiom, too.

Hermias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 81: τὸ στάσιμον καὶ βέβαιον τοῦ νοητοῦ κάλλους.

Proclus, *In Platonis Alcibiadem i*, 87: καὶ τὰ ἀόριστα ὀρισμένως καὶ τὰ ἄστατα στασίμως καὶ βεβαίως οἱ τε θεοὶ γινώσκονται καὶ οἱ δαίμονες.

Olympiodorus of Alexandria, the philosopher (sixth cent. AD), *Prolegomena*, p. 4: ἀλλ' εἰ μέλλοι, φασίν, ἐφαρμόζειν τὸ γινῶσκον τῷ γινωσκομένῳ, δεῖ στάσιμον εἶναι καὶ βέβαιον καὶ ἀεὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχον τὸ γινωσκόμενον.

The expression appears as a lexicon lemma fairly early, that is, in the second century AD, with the grammarian Julius Naucratis, *Onomasticon*, 1.40; 5.169. Likewise, Hesychius of Alexandria, *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter mu, entries 286; 1610; 1611; 1612; 1645.

In conclusion, this Scholion is a quotation from Didymus' commentary on Revelation. In his *comm-Zacch*, 3.66–73, he offered the same analysis in identical terms, adding that he had already expounded those ideas in his commentary on Revelation. In all prob-

ability, Cassian quoted this part of Didymus' lost commentary word for word, since he returns to make his own comment on the same theme of Revelation, which is the text of the following [Scholion XXXII](#).

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXXII

EN XXXIIa: παρακατιών

This participle means ‘moving on with one’s exposition’. Technically it is a present (as well as future) participle of the verb παρακατέρχομαι (or, παρακάτειμι = going down to the next point). But this compound verb (παρὰ + κατὰ + εἶμι) has never actually been used in any other form than this participle, which became a standard usage for any other author stating that he ‘moves forward’ with his analysis. This is a term used by Cassian himself following his indisputable reading of Athenaeus,¹ and probably of Porphyry.² It appears in catenists³ and commentators,⁴ particularly Aristotelian ones, some of whom were his contemporaries, such as John Philoponus⁵ and Olympiodorus, the philosopher of Alexandria.⁶

The telling exception of Theodore of Mopsuestia apart,⁷ no Christian author shows this usage, at least not until Andreas of Caesarea used the participle in his own Commentary on the Apocalypse.⁸ One instance in Cosmas Indicopleustes is of special importance, once my analysis about a certain contact between him and Cassian is taken into account: it would be extravagant to see this as mere coincidence.⁹

The much later cases that are worth mentioning are those by Michael Glycas¹⁰ and Eustathius of Thessaloniki. The latter used the participle no less than forty-seven times in his commentaries on Homer. Likewise, the fact that this participle appears in the constitu-

tion of a monastery that copied extensively from Cassian will hardly be a mere coincidence.¹¹

Since this comment was written by Cassian himself, and he has shown himself to be aware of Philoponus’ work, he presumably received this from the Aristotelian commentator.

EN XXXIIb: φυλαὶ μὴ σωματικάι

The author reproduces Origen’s idea about ‘the spiritual Israelites’, which was canvassed in the previous Scholion. Although many authors mentioned this notion, as we have seen, it was only Origen who made reference not only to the ‘spiritual Israel’, but also to the ‘spiritual tribes of Israel’. This he did at two points: First, in *Princ.* Second, at the beginning of *commJohn*: this work begins not with comments on the Gospel of John, but with ones on the Book of Revelation, which is taken for granted as a work written by the Evangelist himself.

Origen, *Princ.* IV.3.7 (*Philocalia*, 1.23): ἄρ’ οὖν οἱ μὲν σωματικοὶ Ἰσραηλῖται τὴν ἀναγωγὴν ἔχουσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς δημάρχους, καὶ οἱ δήμαρχοι πρὸς τοὺς πατριάρχας, οἱ δὲ πατριάρχαι πρὸς τὸν Ἰακώβ καὶ τοὺς ἔτι ἀνωτέρω· οἱ δὲ νοητοὶ Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν τύπος ἦσαν οἱ σωματικοί, οὐχὶ ἐκ δῆμων εἰσὶ, τῶν δῆμων ἐκ φυλῶν ἐληλυθότων, καὶ τῶν φυλῶν ἀπὸ ἐνός τινος, γένεσιν οὐ τοιαύτην σωματικὴν ἔχοντος ἀλλὰ τὴν κρείττονα.

¹ Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, 11.24.

² Porphyry, *Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem Pertinentium Reliquiae*, Book 13.18. *Quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam Pertinentium Reliquiae*, Book 3.236.

³ *Catena in Joannem* (codd. Paris. Coislin. gr. 23), p. 366; *Catena in Acta* (cod. Oxon. coll. nov. 58), pp. 310; 380; 386; *Catena in Epistulam ad Romanos* (cod. Monac. gr. 412), p. 321; *Catena in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios* (catena Pseudo-Oecumenii), pp. 358; 403; 431; *Supplementum et Varietas Lectionis ad Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 470; *Catena in Epistulam Joannis i* (cod. Oxon. coll. nov. 58), p. 140.

⁴ See παρακατιών in Sopater of Athens (rhetor, fourth cent.), *Scholia in Hermogenem*, v. 5, pp. 9; 98; 144. Hermias of Alexandria (fifth-cent. Neoplatonist), *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 203, and his son Ammonius of Alexandria, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarius*, p. 67. Also, Pseudo-Syrianus of Athens, *Praefatio in Hermogenis Librum Περὶ ἰδεῶν*, p. 111.

⁵ John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Analytica Priora Commentaria*, v. 13.2, p. 52; *In Aristotelis Analytica Posteriora Commentaria*,

v. 13.3, pp. 4; 36; *In Aristotelis Libros De Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, pp. 493; 519 (bis); 522; 563; *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 17, p. 749.

⁶ Olympiodorus of Alexandria (the philosopher, sixth cent. AD), *In Aristotelis Meteora Commentaria*, pp. 30; 122; 181; 281; 306; 308; 312; 319; 334.

⁷ Theodore of Heraclea (fourth cent. AD), *Fragmenta in Joannem*, fr. 191. The context makes it clear that παρακατιών is used by Theodore of Heraclea himself, not by the catenist.

⁸ Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, PG.106: 228.34; 229.33; 405.16.

⁹ See NDGF, Appendix III, pp. 632–33.

¹⁰ Michael Glycas, *Annales*, pp. 36; 406; *Quaestiones in Sacram Scripturam*, ch. 4, pp. 24; 57; ch. 8, p. 112; ch. 29, pp. 306; 310; ch. 94, p. 452.

¹¹ *Constitutio Monasterii Prodromi τοῦ Φοβεροῦ*, chapter 16, p. 28. This constitution copied extensively from the works of Cassian the Sabaite. See parallel texts in RCR, Appendix I.

commJohn, 1.1.1–8: “Ὁν τρόπον οἶμαι ὁ πάλαι ‘λαός’ ἐπικληθεὶς ‘θεοῦ’ εἰς φυλὰς διήρητο δυοκαίδεκα καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τὰς λοιπὰς φυλὰς τάξιν λευϊτικὴν, καὶ αὐτὴν κατὰ πλείονα τάγματα ἱερατικὰ καὶ λευϊτικὰ τὸ θεῖον θεραπεύουσιν, οὕτως νομίζω κατὰ ‘τὸν κρυπτὸν τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπον’ πάντα τὸν Χριστοῦ λαόν, χρηματίζοντα ἐν κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖον καὶ ἐν πνεύματι περιετμημένον, ἔχειν τὰς ιδιότητας μυστικώτερον τῶν φυλῶν· ὥς ἔστι γυνώτερον ἀπὸ Ἰωάννου ἐκ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως μαθεῖν, οὐδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν προφητῶν τοῖς ἀκούειν ἐπισταμένοις τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀποσιωπῶσαντων . . . Ὅτι δὲ ταῦτα παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ περὶ τῶν εἰς Χριστὸν πεπιστευκότων λέγεται, καὶ αὐτῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀπὸ φυλῶν, κἂν μὴ δοκῇ τὸ σωματικὸν αὐτῶν γένος ἀνατρέχειν ἐπὶ τὸ σπέρμα τῶν πατριαρχῶν, ἔστιν οὕτως ἐπιλογίσασθαι.

EN XXXIIc: ἐζηλωμένην

This is one more simple participle (feminine, perfect of the verb ζηλοῦσθαι), which was also not dignified with any wide usage. It was always used in the feminine gender. The instances where it occurs are less than a handful; actually there is only one usage per author. Once again, all authors whom we have encountered in relation to the phraseology of the Scholia are absent. Never-

theless, employment of such verbal forms is in itself a token of the given author’s erudition.¹²

Quite evidently, then, Cassian had in mind the work of Diodorus of Sicily, whom Theodoret had also studied assiduously and commended him by name.¹³ The authors who mention Diodorus are not many, and still fewer are Christians. Of them, only two mention him knowledgeably, and they both happen to be historians: Eusebius¹⁴ and Theodoret. Plutarch probably referred to him, too.¹⁵ Later, Diodorus was referred to by historians or chroniclers drawing on him,¹⁶ or by such systematic scholars recording previous literary production as Photius¹⁷ or the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus.¹⁸ Reference by scholars of such stature was a serious reason for Diodorus to be eventually dignified by his name becoming a lemma in the *Suda* Lexicon.¹⁹

EN XXXIIId: Quoting Psalm 44:16 and 1 Cor. 7:35

The idea involved is Origen’s, now expounded by Cassian. Whereas in *Scholion* XXXI he quoted from Didymus, he now makes his own comment, drawing exclusively on Origen’s idea about ‘incorporeal tribes of Israel’. He quotes 1 Cor. 7:35 and Psalm 4:14. As a matter of fact, only a few authors quoted 1 Cor. 7:35, among whom Origen and Didymus do not appear. Theodoret is there, however, along with Eusebius.²⁰

¹² Cf. Hecataeus of Abdera (historian, fourth-third cent. BC), *Fragmenta*, fr. 25, *apud* Diodorus of Sicily, *Bibliotheca Historica*, 1.81.4: ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων ἐζηλωμένης παρ’ αὐτοῖς τῆς περὶ ταῦτα σπουδῆς. Eustathius of Thessaloniki, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, v. 1, p. 126. A fragment ascribed to the (probably fourth cent. BC) comic writer Nicolaus completes the list of the rare employment of the participle: Nicolaus (comic), *Fragmenta*, fr. 1 *apud* Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 3.14.7.

¹³ Theodoret, *Græcarum Affectionum Curatio*, 1.21; 2.95; 3.6; 3.23; 3.28; 3.45.

¹⁴ Eusebius mentions Diodorus of Sicily respectfully: ὁ σικελιώτης Διόδωρος, γνωριμώτατος ἀνὴρ τοῖς Ἑλλήνων λογιωτάτοις. *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 1.6.9; 1.8.19; 2. Praefatio.6; 2.2.35; 3.2.7; 10 (table of contents).1; 10.8.1 (quoting D.); 10.10.4 (quoting D.); 10.10.8; *Laudatio Constantini*, 13.8. Also, Julius Africanus (second-third cent.), the correspondent of Origen, *Chronographia*, fr. 22. Pseudo-Justin styled Diodorus the ‘most glorious of all historians’ (among the gentiles): *Cohortatio ad Gentiles*, p. 10. Cf. pp. 15; 24; on p. 26, Diodorus is deemed ‘the most glorious historian’ in general (ὁ τῶν ἱστοριογράφων ἑνδοξότατος). In the present book, as well as in both NDGF and RCR, I have pointed out strong indications that conduce to identification of Pseudo-Justin with Cassian the Sabaite.

¹⁵ Plutarch, *Fragmenta*, fr. 213. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, 12.59; *Deipnosophistae* (epitome), v. 2, p. 58. Porphyry, *De Regibus*, frs. 1; 3.

¹⁶ Cassius Dio, *Historiae Romanae*, p. 235. Evagrius Scholasticus, *HE*, pp. 29; 218. Agathias Scholasticus, *Historiae*, pp. 64; 74. George

Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica*, pp. 229; 440. John Laurentius Lydus, *De Magistratibus Populi Romani*, p. 76. John Malalas, in his *Chronographia*, p. 54, regards Diodorus as a ‘most wise’ historian (Διόδωρος ὁ σοφώτατος); p. 68 (Διόδωρος ὁ σοφώτατος); p. 236 (Διόδωρος ὁ σοφώτατος χρονογράφος), which is also quoted in the *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 80.

¹⁷ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 70, p. 35a.

¹⁸ Constantine Porphyrogenitus (emperor, tenth cent. AD), *De Legationibus*, pp. 2; 80; 396. *De Vitiis quae Opposita sunt Virtutibus*, v. 1, pp. 2; 206. *De Insidiis Contra Reges*, pp. 190; 212.

¹⁹ *Suda* Lexicon, Alphabetic letter delta, entry 1151 (biography of Diodorus); Alphabetic letter lambda entry 865 (quoting Diodorus).

²⁰ Eusebius, *DE*, 1.9.7. Basil of Caesarea, *Moralia*, PG.31.857.43–46. Basil of Ancyra, *De Virginitatis Integritate*, PG.30.784.12–14. Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Fragmenta in Matthaëum*, fr. 95. Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.284.29–32; *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.536.7–9. Theodore of Mopsuestia, in *Catena in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p.151. Epiphanius, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 27. John Chrysostom, *In Epistolam i ad Corinthios Commentarius*, PG.61: 159.31–33; 563.16–18; *De Virginitatis Integritate*, 75; 76. *De Non Iterando Coniugio*, lines 206–208. Oecumenius, *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 438, in *Catena in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 151. John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela*, PG.96.244.58–61. Pseudo-John of Damascus, *Commentarii in Epistolas Pauli*, PG.95.625.35–38. Arethas, *Scripta Minora*, opus 9, p. 101; opus 76, p. 130.

Quotation of Psalm 44:16 is likewise rare. Nevertheless, we come upon the authors already found to be relevant to our analysis.²¹

The authors who appear to quote both scriptural passages are Eusebius, Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret. Accordingly, Cassian seeks to quote from both Testaments, in order to show the inherent relevance of this Book to the rest of the canon.

[Scholion XXXII](#), therefore, is a personal note by Cassian, following (and commenting on the same subject as) the previous one, which was entirely a quotation from Didymus. This comment is one more token attesting to Cassian's having studied not only Eusebius and Theodoret, but also John Philoponus.

²¹ Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 38.5. Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1432.34–38. Methodius of Olympus, *Symposium*, Oration 7.9. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.404.29–30. Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29: 412.48–50; 413.2. Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.272. Diodorus of Tarsus, *commPs I-L*, Psalm 44:16a. John Chrysostom,

Expositiones in Psalmos, PG.55.202.5–9 and 23–24. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *expPs*, Psalm 44:16. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1197.1–4; *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81.65.13–16.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXXIII

EN XXXIIIa: φοίνικας ἐν ταῖς χερσίν
κατέχουσιν, σύμβολον τῆς νίκης

Although commonly accepted, the idea of the ‘palm’ being ‘a symbol of victory’ is not frequent in literature. Cicero appears to offer the oldest testimony, Philo made use of the idea,¹ and the notion appears in Evagrius of Pontus. An ascription to John Chrysostom is spurious,² but Oecumenius comments in a manner strikingly reminiscent of this Scholion.³ The theme became a common lemma in lexicis reproducing it to the letter.⁴ It appears also in the *Anonymus Dialogus cum Judaeis*, a work which we have encountered.⁵

This simple (and today hackneyed) simile never enjoyed much currency. In later times, only Patriarch Germanus I of Constantinople (seventh-eighth cent. AD) applied it,⁶ to be reproduced only by Michael Glycas in the twelfth century, who actually did so simply by quoting Germanus and mentioning him by name.⁷

EN XXXIIIb: διὰ μαρτυρίου καὶ ὁμολογίας
(‘through martyrdom and confession [of faith]’)

The authors who inspired the vocabulary of the Scholia are here once again. Especially noteworthy is the presence of Severianus of Gabala, since it is from him that the author of the Scholion draws this phraseology, alongside his main sources of inspiration, Origen, Eusebius, and Gregory of Nyssa.

Origen, *exhMar*, XXX: ὁ κρατῶν τῆς ὁμολογίας καὶ πληρῶν πάντα ἀριθμόν, ὃν ἀπαιτεῖ ὁ τοῦ μαρτυρίου λόγος;. Ibid. XXXIV: πῶς γὰρ δυνατόν

ἀναιρεθῆναι ψυχὴν ὑπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς ὁμολογίας ζωοποιηθεῖσαν; ἀντιμαρτυροῦντος αὐτῇ τοῦ προτρεπομένου ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὸ μαρτύριον ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα. Ibid. XI: ἀρνήσεως ἢ διψυχίας ἢ τινος πιθανότητος προκαλουμένης ἐπὶ τὰ ἐχθρὰ τῷ μαρτυρίῳ καὶ τῇ τελειότητι, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτ’ εἰ μηδὲ λόγῳ ἀλλοτρίῳ τῆς ὁμολογίας ἑαυτοὺς μαινοίμεν. *commatt*, 12.24: περὶ δὲ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ μαρτυρίας καὶ ὁμολογίας. Ibid. 16.27: καρπούς, φέρ’ εἰπεῖν ἐν διωγμῷ τὴν ὁμολογίαν καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον.

Acta Apocrypha Justinii (recensio A): 6.1: ἐτελείωσαν τὸ μαρτύριον ἐν τῇ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὁμολογίᾳ. But *ibid. (recensio B)*: ἐτελείωσαν αὐτῶν τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐν τῇ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὁμολογίᾳ.

Eusebius, *HE*, 7.32.25: τοὺς τε κατὰ τὸν διωγμὸν ἐν διαφόροις ὁμολογίαις ἀγῶνας αὐτοῦ καὶ ὃν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀνεδήσατο τοῦ μαρτυρίου στέφανον. Ibid. 8.11.2: ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῦτοις διαπρέψας τοῖς ἐν θεοσεβείᾳ κατορθώμασιν καὶ ταῖς εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ὁμολογίαις, τῷ τοῦ μαρτυρίου διαδήματι κατεκοσμήθη. The same in his *Antiquorum Martyrum Collectio (fragmenta)*, PG.20.1532.22–25. *De Martyribus Palaestinae (recensio prolixior)*, 11.5: ὃς δὲ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ μαρτυρίου διὰ καυχῆρων ὑπομονῆς τὸν τῆς ὁμολογίας ἀγῶνα διηθλήκει.

Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Cantorum*, v. 6, p. 405: οἱ μεγάλοι τῆς πίστεως πρόμαχοι διὰ τῆς ἀγαθῆς ὁμολογίας κατὰ τὸν τῆς μαρτυρίας καιρόν.

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Illuminandum*, 18.30: διὰ μαρτυρίου καὶ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ὁμολογίας. Ibid. 13.21: τῆς ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ γινομένης ὁμολογίας ἐν τε φωτίσματι καὶ μαρτυρίου καιροῖς.

¹ For the palm as a prize or symbol of victory material is collected by Steier, *RE* XX 401.17–402.64; Cicero’s testimony: *alter plurimarum palmarum vetus ac nobilis gladiator habetur* (S. Rosc. 17). Cf. Philo, *Quod Deus sit Immutabilis*, 137–138: ὅς ὅταν ἀποτέκη, τὰ κατὰ τῶν ἀντιπάλων αἴρεται βραβεῖα καὶ νικηφόρος ἀναγράφεται σύμβολον ἐπιφερομένη φοῖνικα τῆς νίκης· Θάμαρ γὰρ ἐρμηνεύεται φοῖνιξ.

² Pseudo-John Chrysostom *In Martham; Mariam et Lazarum*, PG.61.703.28–30: Ἀσπάζομεν οὖν τὰ τῆς νίκης σύμβολα, οὐ τύμπανα χειροκρατούμενα, ἀλλὰ καὶ βαῖα φοινίκων βλαστήματα.

³ Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 100: τὸ δὲ γε περιβεβλησθαι αὐτοὺς στολὰς λευκὰς δεῖγμα τῆς κατὰ τὸν βίον αὐτῶν ὑπάρχει καθαρότητος. οἱ δὲ γε φοινίκες, νίκης

ὑπάρχοντες σύμβολον, ἐπαγύλλεσθαι αὐτοὺς τῇ Χριστοῦ νίκῃ τῇ κατὰ τε τῶν νοητῶν ἐχθρῶν καὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ὑπερβαίνουσιν.

⁴ Orion (grammarian, fifth cent. AD), *Etymologicum*, Alphabetic letter beta, p. 32: «Βραβευταί», κυρίως οἱ τὴν ράβδον ἀπὸ φοίνικος ἢ τινος ἄλλου διδόντες σύμβολον τῆς νίκης. The same in *Etymologicum Genuinum* (ninth cent.), Alphabetic letter beta, entry 234. *Etymologicum Gudianum*, Alphabetic entry beta, p. 284. *Etymologicum Magnum* (twelfth cent.), p. 211.

⁵ *Anonymus Dialogus cum Judaeis*, 8, line 55: καὶ φοίνικας ἔχων, νίκης δὲ τὸ φυτὸν τοῦ φοίνικος σύμβολον.

⁶ Germanus I of Constantinople, *Orationes*, oration 8, column 364, lines 39–40.

⁷ Michael Glycas, *Quaestiones in Sacram Scripturam*, chapter 22, p. 260.

John Chrysostom, *De Sancta Pelagia Virgine et Martyre*, PG.50.582.52–53: ἐπειδὴ μαρτυρίῳ, καὶ ὁμολογίᾳ, καὶ παρθενίᾳ ἀντὶ ἱματίων χρυσῶν ἑαυτὴν ἀμφιάσασα, ἀπῆλθεν ἡ μάρτυς. *Ad Olympiadem*, 17: ἐπὶ τὸν λαμπρόν ἔδραμον τοῦ μαρτυρίου στέφανον τῇ τῶν ῥημάτων ὁμολογίᾳ.

Hesychius of Jerusalem, *In Sanctum Stephanum* (*homilia* 9), 28. τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας, τῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς τοῦ πηλοῦ, τῆς ἄνω μεταθέσεως, μαρτυρίου νίκης, ὁμολογίας τῆς εἰς σὲ καὶ παρὰ σοῦ.

Severianus of Gabala, *De Tribus Pueris*, PG.56.594.46–48: καὶ τῇ ἀπειλῇ τοῦ πυρὸς ἄσβεστον τὴν τῶν μαρτύρων ὁμολογίαν ἐπειδεικνυμένην.⁸

EN XXXIIIc: περιστάσεις ἐπάγειν
(‘to bring difficulties upon someone’)

Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae*, 219.1: Ὅ πάντα μέτρον καὶ σταθμῷ ὀρίζων ἡμῖν Κύριος, καὶ τοὺς πειρασμοὺς ἐπάγων μὴ ὑπερβαίνοντας ἡμῶν τὴν δύναμιν, ἀλλὰ δοκιμάζων μὲν διὰ τῆς περιστάσεως τοὺς ἀγωνιστὰς τῆς εὐσεβείας.

John Chrysostom, *De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, Homily 4, line 490: κἂν περιστάσεις πραγμάτων, κἂν ἐπήρεια, κἂν συκοφαντία, κἂν ἄλλο ὅτιοῦν ἐπάγεται δεινὸν ἡμῖν.

Cf. the expression πληγὰς ἐπάγει κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἡ ἑτέρας περιστάσεις, in Dorotheus of Sidon (astrologer, first cent. BC–first cent. AD), *Fragmenta Graeca*, p. 401, *apud* Hephaestion of Thebes (astrologer, fourth cent. AD), *Apotelesmatica*, p. 289 and *Apotelesmatica* (*epitomae quattuor*), pp. 26; 313.

EN XXXIIId: οἱ πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι
τε καὶ δαίμονες

Although used by Christians, the expression originates in non-Christian sources, namely, in the historian Josephus (first cent. BC) and the sophist Dio Chrysostom (first second cent. AD).

Josephus, *De Bello Judaico libri vii*, 7.185: τὰ γὰρ καλούμενα δαιμόνια, ταῦτα δὲ πονηρῶν ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων πνεύματα τοῖς ζῶσιν εἰσδυόμενα καὶ κτείνοντα τοὺς βοηθείας μὴ τυγχάνοντας.

Dio Chrysostom, *Orationes*, Oration 4.79–80: λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν οὕτως περὶ δαιμόνων, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσιν ἔξωθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ πονηροὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ δαίμονες, οἱ τὰς συμφορὰς καὶ τὰς εὐτυχίας φέροντες αὐτοῖς, ὁ δὲ ἴδιος ἐκάστου νοῦς, οὗτος ἐστὶ δαίμων τοῦ ἔχοντος ἄνδρός, ἀγαθὸς μὲν ὁ τοῦ φρονίμου καὶ ἀγαθοῦ δαίμων, πονηρὸς δὲ ὁ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

The expression was taken up by early theologians, such as Justin and Irenaeus.

Justin Martyr, *Apologia ii*, 12.3: ἤδη καὶ τοῦτο ἐνήργησαν οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες διὰ τινων πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων πραχθῆναι.

Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* (*libri* 1–2), 1.18.1: Δύο γὰρ γένη τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων πεπλάσθαι ἔφη, τὸν μὲν πονηρὸν τὸν δὲ ἀγαθόν· καὶ ἐπειδὴ οἱ δαίμονες τοῖς πονηροῖς ἐβοήθουν, ἐληλυθέναι τὸν Σωτῆρα ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῶν φαύλων ἀνθρώπων καὶ δαιμόνων, ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν.

Subsequently, the notion occurs in Origen’s writings, yet expressions of this kind may have been actually inserted by scribes.

Origen, *frPs*, 118, 78: οἱ πονηροὶ δαίμονες ἢ καὶ ἄνθρωποι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθροί. *selNum*, PG.12.577.30–34: Οἱ γὰρ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι συμπράττουσι τοῖς δικαίοις εἰς τὰ σωτήρια καὶ ἀγαθὰ ἔργα, καὶ οἱ πονηροὶ δαίμονες τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν ἁμαρτωλοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς τὰ πονηρὰ καὶ βλαβερὰ τῆς σωτηρίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔργα. *expProv*, PG.17.216.34–36: τὰς ὀχυρωθείσας καὶ κατακρατηθείσας ψυχὰς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀσεβῶν δαιμόνων καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Julius Africanus, *Cesti*, 1.8: Καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπους πονηροὺς ἔδειξαν μόνον· πίστευσον λέγοντι, ὁρῶσι καὶ δαίμονας.

Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.341.12–14: Τίνες δὲ ἂν εἶεν οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἢ οἱ ἀντικείμενοι τοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώποις πονηροὶ δαίμονες; *Ibid.* PG.27.493.35–36: τότε οἱ πονηροὶ δηλαδὴ δαίμονες καὶ ἄνθρωποι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθροὶ αἰσχυνθήσονται.

Didymus, *commEccl* (7–8.8), *Cod.* p. 234: ἀναφέρεσθαι δὲ δύναται ταῦτα καὶ εἰς τὸν

⁸ Severianus’ portion is important, since it is in him that the unique parallel τὰς περιστάσεις τὰς διὰ Χριστὸν is found, as pointed out in footnote 10 to the Greek text.

διάβολον αὐτὸν καὶ πᾶσαν πονηρὰν δύναμιν. τὰ γὰρ περὶ ἀνθρώπων λεγόμενα ὡς κακῶν, ὡς πονηρῶν, ῥηθεῖν ἂν καὶ περὶ τῶν δαιμόνων καὶ τοῦ διαβόλου. *commZacch*, 1.347: 'Ὅταν γὰρ 'οἱ πονηροὶ καὶ γόητες ἄνθρωποι' καὶ σὺν τούτοις οἱ ἀλιτῆριοι δαίμονες πολέμιοι καὶ στασιώδεις δι' ἣν ἔχουσιν ὁμότητα τυγχάνωσιν. *frPs(al)*, fr. 189: ἀλλὰ γε θεωροῦσα τὸν διάβολον μετὰ πάσης τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων φάλαγγος καὶ τοῦ στίφους τῶν ἀντικειμένων ἐνεργειῶν καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Ibid.* fr. 288: καταδιώκουσι γὰρ με δαίμονες ἀλιτῆριοι καὶ ἄνθρωποι πονηροί. *Ibid.* fr. 921: δαίμονες δὲ οὗτοι καὶ ἄνθρωποι πονηροί. *Ibid.* fr. 1245: τρῶσαι τοὺς τῆς κακίας καὶ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως προστάτας ἀνθρώπους τε πονηροὺς καὶ δαίμονας. *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 12: ὅθεν πολλοὺς εἶχε τοὺς ἀντικειμένους δαίμονας ἀλητηρίους καὶ ἀνθρώπους γόητας καὶ ἀπαταλῶνας.

Theodoret did not use the expression, save at one point. *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.1161.49–52: 'Καὶ ἀφανιῶ θηρία πονηρὰ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.' Καὶ τῶν πονηρῶν δαιμόνων τὰ στίφη, καὶ τοὺς θηριωδῖαν νοσοῦντας ἀνθρώπους.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 174: ἄρχοντας δὲ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου λέγει τὰς πονηρὰς δυνάμεις. εἰ δὲ οὗτοι ἠγνόησαν, πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ ἄνθρωποι δι' ὧν οἱ δαίμονες τὸν κύριον ἐσταύρωσαν.

Later still, both the notion and expression were employed by John Philoponus, *De Opificio Mundi*, pp. 52–53: κόσμον λέγων τὸ σύστημα τῶν πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων τε καὶ δαιμόνων, ὧν εἰσὶ τινες πονηροὶ κοσμοκράτορες.

EN XXXIIIe: τὸ ἀδιάστατον τῆς θεραπείας

The term ἀδιάστατος ('continuous', 'uninterrupted') is found in Origen and Didymus, but not in Hippolytus and Irenaeus. Although it would appear that the instance in Didymus is stronger, the opposite is the case. As a matter of fact, the expression in this Scholion refers to 'perpetuity' in offering praise and service to God (τὸ ἀδιάστατον τῆς θεραπείας). Such a reference to

someone 'being stable in offering praise and service to God' appears only once in literature, namely, in Philo.

Philo, *De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia*, 134: τοιγάρτοι τοῖς ἐχομένοις καὶ ἀδιαστάτως θεραπεύουσιν ἀντιδίδωσι κλῆρον αὐτόν.⁹

Both Origen and Didymus mentioned Philo by name, yet it is only Didymus who made reference to this specific work of Philo.¹⁰

Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 235: τούτῳ καὶ Φίλων χρώμενος ἐν ἑτέροις πράγμασιν ἀνήγαγεν τὴν μὲν Σάραν εἰς τὴν τελείαν ἀρετὴν καὶ φιλοσοφίαν. *Ibid.* Cod. p. 236: Εἰς μὲν οὖν τὴν τελείαν ἀρετὴν καὶ πνευματικὴν ἡ Σάρα ἀνάγεται, ἡ δὲ Ἀγάρ ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ Αἰγυπτία παρὰ μὲν Φίλωνος τὰ προγυμνάσματα σημαίνειν εἴρηται, παρὰ δὲ Παύλῳ τὴν σκιάν.

In the foregoing passage, Didymus refers to the following point of Philo's *De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia*, 24: ὃν δὴ λόγον ἔχει δέσποινα μὲν πρὸς θεραπαινίδα, γυνὴ δὲ ἀστὴ πρὸς παλλακὴν, τοῦτον ἔξει τὸν λόγον ἀρετὴ Σάρρα πρὸς παιδείαν Ἀγαρ· ὥστ' εἰκότως τοῦ θεωρίαν καὶ ἐπιστήμην ἐξηλωκότος, Ἀβραάμ ὄνομα, γένοιτ' ἂν ἡ μὲν ἀρετὴ, Σάρρα, γυνή, παλλακὴ δὲ Ἀγαρ, ἡ ἐγκύκλιος μουσικὴ πᾶσα. ὅτι μὲν οὖν φρόνησις ἐκ διδασκαλίας περιγίνεται, τὴν Ἀγαρ οὐκ ἂν ἀποδοκιμάζοι· πάννυ γὰρ ἀναγκαία ἡ τῶν προπαιδευμάτων κτήσις. εἰ δὲ τις τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἀρετῆς ἄθλους ἐγνωκὼς διαπονεῖν μελέταις χρῆται συνεχέσιν ἀνεन्दότως ἔχων πρὸς ἄσκησιν, δύο μὲν ἀστάς, παλλακάς δὲ τὰς ἴσας, τῶν ἀστῶν θεραπαινίδας, ἄζεται.

Didymus refers to Philo by name at some other points, too.¹¹

On the other hand, this reference to Philo also appears in Origen, although the Jewish Alexandrian is not mentioned by name. Origen uses the term προπαιδεύματα, which is the noun appearing in the title of Philo's work *De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia* (= *Περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὰ Προπαιδεύματα Συνόδου*), and Didymus (using his astonishing memory) calls this προγυμνάσματα, which is virtually the same word as προπαιδεύματα. The *Suda* lexicon explains the lemma προπαιδεύματα by reference to Origen. He is said to have never ceased to teach 'geometry and arithmetic

⁹ Cf. Deut, 10:9 and 18:2.

¹⁰ The Greek title of this work is, *Περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὰ Προπαιδεύματα Συνόδου*.

¹¹ Didymus, *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 276; *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 300 (he mentions also Philo's *De Vita Mosis*); *In Genesin*, cod. pp. 118; 119; 147; 235.

and the other προπαιδεύματα (= knowledge which is preliminary to philosophy and theology)'.¹²

Origen, *selGen*, PG.12.116.5–9: Ἐπίτηδες οὐκ ἐσαφηνίσθη τὸ ὑπὸ τίνος, ἵνα ἡμεῖς ζητήσαντες εὕρωμεν, ὅτι πέφυκεν ἀτιμάζεσθαι ἀρετή, ἥνικα τὰ προπαιδεύματα γεννήσῃ· οὐ πάντως ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, ἀλλ' ἦτοι ὑπὸ τῆς παιδίσκης, ἢ τῶν χαιρόντων πρὸ τῆς γενέσεως τῶν κρειττόνων τοῖς γεννήμασιν αὐτῆς.

Both Origen and Didymus used the term ἀδιάστατος. However, this adjective and its cognates are characteristic of Philo, who used it abundantly, although the term was almost non-existent before him (whether the fifth-century BC sophist Antiphon actually ever used this is doubtful, whereas an attribution to Chrysippus is couched in Philo's vocabulary). This became a word employed by grammarians (Aristonicus, Harpocration, Apollonius Dyscolus). On the other hand, Sextus Empiricus applied it in its strict literal sense, namely, ἀδιάστατος meaning 'dimensionless', which was also how mathematicians (Heron, Nicomachus, Theon), as well as Alexander of Aphrodisias, used it.

Clement of Alexandria applied both meanings. Gregory of Nyssa, Basil of Caesarea, Eusebius, Cyril of Alexandria, too, saw in the term mainly the notion of steadfastness, which is the usage followed by Didymus. The term does not appear in Theodoret, but it does so in Theodore of Mopsuestia.¹³

We have therefore a specific wording originating with Philo. As a matter of fact, there is no instance in literature other than Philo and this Scholion where ἀδιάστατον and θεραπεία (virtually meaning 'incessant and unfailing worshipping') are used side by side in order to make the specific point.

EN XXXIII^f: χρόνος τεμνόμενος

The idea of time 'divided' into 'parts' has been approached in various ways. In EN IVa, I have canvassed the notion of a tripartite time. At this point, we see the author regarding time as 'divided into day and night' (χρόνος τεμνόμενος εἰς ἡμέραν καὶ

νύκτα). This phraseology is anything but common. It was Galen who considered 'all time as comprising day and night' and 'divided' into twenty-four hours.

Galen, *De Crisibus*, v. 9, p. 621: οὕτως δ' ἄκουέ μου διὰ παντὸς ὅλον τὸν ἐξ ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς χρόνον εἰς τέτταρας ἐπὶ ταῖς εἴκοσιν ὥραις τεμνόμενον.

A similar phraseology occurs in the commentaries on the *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax, from which I have quoted also in EN IVa. Likewise, in the anonyma *Commentaria In Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, *Scholia Londinensia* (partially excerpted from Heliodorus), p. 559: Χρόνοι τρεῖς. Φασὶ δὲ ὡς εἰς χρονικὰ διαστήματα διεῖλε τοὺς χρόνους ὁ Διονύσιος, ὡς εἴ τις εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ μῆνα καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ ὥραν τέμνει τοὺς χρόνους· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεστῶτά φησιν, ἦτοι ὡς πρὸς μῆκος ἐνιαυτοῦ ἢ μηνὸς ἢ ἡμέρας ἢ ὥρας· καὶ γὰρ φαμεν ἐνεστῶτα ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ μῆνα καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ ὥραν. Χρόνοι τοίνυν φυσικώτατοι μὲν τρεῖς.

The same idea was used later by John Philoponus, *De Aeternitate Mundi*, p. 115: οὐχ ὡς ὁ χρόνος τμήμασι διαφοροῖς τεμνόμενος, ἐνιαυτοῖς φημι καὶ μηνὶ νυξί τε καὶ ἡμέραις.

Normally, authors regarded time as 'divided' into either three or two parts, that is, past/present/future,¹⁴ or simply past and future.¹⁵ The idea of time comprising 'days' and 'nights', which are styled 'parts of time', was Plato's.

Plato, *Timaeus*, 37e: ἡμέρας γὰρ καὶ νύκτας καὶ μῆνας καὶ ἐνιαυτούς, οὐκ ὄντας πρὶν οὐρανὸν γενέσθαι, τότε ἅμα ἐκείνῳ συνισταμένῳ τὴν γένεσιν αὐτῶν μηχανᾶται· ταῦτα δὲ πάντα μέρη χρόνου.

Diogenes Laertius (expounding Plato's concept of time) described 'day', 'night', etc. as 'parts of time'. *Vitae Philosophorum*, 3.73: Χρόνον τε γενέσθαι εἰκόνα τοῦ αἰδίου. κακεῖνον μὲν αἰεὶ μένειν, τὴν δὲ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ φορὰν χρόνον εἶναι· καὶ γὰρ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ μῆνα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πάντα χρόνου μέρη εἶναι. διόπερ ἄνευ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου φύσεως οὐκ εἶναι χρόνον.

¹² *Suda* lexicon, Alphabetic letter pi, entry 2557.

¹³ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *expPs*, Psalm 71:17b: ἀδιαστάτως καὶ συνεχῶς προσευκτέον.

¹⁴ Cf. discussion in EN IVa.

¹⁵ Theophrastus, *Fragmenta*, fr. 6.6: Ὅστε δὶχα τέμνεται ὁ πᾶς χρόνος. John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros*

Octo Commentaria, v. 17, p. 702 (expounding the Aristotelian argument of time ostensibly non-existent): δύο γὰρ ταῦτα τοῦ χρόνου μέρη, τὸ παρεληλυθὸς καὶ τὸ μέλλον. Cf. *ibid.* p. 707. *Ars, Excerpta de Arte Ars Rhetorica*, v. 6, p. 31: εἰ δὲ περὶ πράγματα, τέμνεται εἰς δύο χρόνους, εἰς μέλλοντα καὶ εἰς παρεληλυθότα.

John Philoponus (also expounding Plato's theory of time), *De Aeternitate Mundi*, p. 110: ἐνιαυτοὶ γὰρ καὶ μῆνες ἡμέραι τε καὶ νύκτες, ἅτινὰ ἐστὶν χρόνου μέρη. Ibid. p. 141: ἡμέρας γὰρ φησὶν καὶ νύκτας καὶ μῆνας καὶ ἐνιαυτούς, ἅπερ ἐστὶν χρόνου μέρη.

Philo wrote of 'time' (in general) consisting 'of days and nights'.¹⁶

Philo, *De Opificio Mundi*, 56: τοῦ δὴ σύμπαντος χρόνου διανεμηθέντος εἰς δύο τμήματα, ἡμέραν τε καὶ νύκτα. *De Specialibus Legibus*, 1.90: ἡμέρας δὲ καὶ νύκτας μὴνάς τε καὶ ἐνιαυτούς καὶ συνόλους χρόνον τίς ἀνέδειξεν ὅτι μὴ σελήνης καὶ ἡλίου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀστέρων αἱ ἐναρμόνιοι καὶ παντὸς λόγου κρείττους περιφοραί;¹⁷

Aelius Aristides (second cent. AD), *Eis Aía*, p. 7: ὁ πᾶς χρόνος εἰς ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα μερισθεῖς.

It was only Basil of Caesarea (replying to Eunomius) who made the acute remark: 'days and nights' are simply 'measures of time', not 'parts' of it. *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.560.17–27: Ἀλλ' ἔοικεν ἐκ πολλῆς ἀγχινοίας ἡμέραν μὲν καὶ νύκτα ἐν τῇ ποιᾷ τῶν ἀστέρων κινήσει νομίζειν γίνεσθαι, ταῦτα δὲ εἶναι τοῦ χρόνου μέρη· ὅθεν τὸν χρόνον ποίαν τινα κίνησιν ἀστέρων ἀπεφήνατο, οὐδὲ αὐτὸ τοῦτο συνεῖς ὅ τι λέγει. Οὐ γὰρ ποίαν, ἀλλ' εἴπερ ἄρα, ποσὴν, μᾶλλον ἢν εἰπεῖν οἰκειότερον. Ἀλλὰ τίς οὕτω παῖς παντελῶς τὴν διάνοιαν, ὥστε ἀγνοεῖν, ὅτι ἡμέραι μὲν, καὶ ὥραι, καὶ μῆνες, καὶ ἐνιαυτοί, μέτρα τοῦ χρόνου εἰσὶν, οὐχὶ μέρη; Χρόνος δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ συμπαρακτείνόμενον τῇ συστάσει τοῦ κόσμου διάστημα.¹⁸

The author of this Scholion appears not to take Basil's distinction seriously. His expression of 'our time' being 'divided into day and night' (ὁ παρ' ἡμῖν χρόνος τεμνόμενος εἰς ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα) suggests that 'our time' is distinguished from eternity, the state in which

there are neither days nor nights.¹⁹ Besides, the participle τεμνόμενος ('divided into') actually denotes 'days and nights' as *parts* of time, not measures of it, as Basil would have had it. As a matter of fact, there is a point in a codex of Didymus' work, where the text is desperately fragmentary and lacunose, still an expression can be read: ὁ χρόνος ἐξ ἡμερῶν καὶ νυκτῶν συνίσταται ('times consists of days and nights').²⁰ Of course, one could surmise that a negative clause might have proceeded, which would make the statement mean quite the opposite. However, there are points where Didymus explicitly speaks of time as consisting of 'days'.²¹ Besides, a text in the Catenae considers time to consist of days and nights.

Catena in Epistolam ad Romanos (typus Monacensis) (e cod. Monac. gr. 412), p. 494: Δᾶ (sic). Χρὴ δὲ γινώσκειν ὅτι τὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ὄνομα, πολὺσημόν ἐστι. πλεῖστα γὰρ σημαίνει. αἰὼν γὰρ λέγεται καὶ ἡ ἐκάστου ζωὴ. λέγεται πάλιν αἰὼν καὶ ὁ τῶν χιλίων ἐτῶν χρόνος. πάλιν λέγεται αἰὼν, ὅλος ὁ παρὼν βίος. καὶ αἰὼν, ὁ μέλλων· ὁ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἀτελεύτητος. λέγεται πάλιν αἰὼν, οὐ χρόνος, οὐδὲ χρόνου τί μέρος, ἡλίου φορᾶ καὶ δρόμῳ μετρούμενον, ἡγουν δι' ἡμερῶν καὶ νυκτῶν συνιστάμενον, ἀλλὰ τὸ συμπαρακτείνόμενον τοῖς αἰδίοις. οἷον τι χρονικὸν κίνημα καὶ διάστημα. ὅπερ γὰρ τοῖς ὑπὸ χρόνον ὁ χρόνος, τοῦτο τοῖς αἰδίοις αἰών.

The name of the author of this passage in the manuscript is indicated through the abbreviation Δᾶ, instead of a full name. Since the very same text appears in the doctrinal exposition of Christian faith by John of Damascus²², the abbreviation Δᾶ stands for Δαμασκηνοῦ. According to this author, 'time' is 'composed of days and nights' (δι' ἡμερῶν καὶ νυκτῶν συνιστάμενον), which are styled 'parts' of time

¹⁶ On the other hand, Epicureans regarded days and nights as 'symptoms' of time, in accordance with their view that time *per se* does not really exist and it is simply a mere 'symptom of movement'. Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos*, 10.224: συμπτώματα οὖν ταῦτ' ἐστὶν οἷς χρόνος παρέπεται, φημί δὲ τὴν τε ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα καὶ ὥραν καὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ τὰς ἀπαθείας, κινήσεις τε καὶ μονάς. Ibid. 10.244: ἀλλ' ἔστω γε ἡμέραν εἶναι καὶ νύκτα ὑπάρχειν καὶ ὥρας. οὐκοῦν ἐπεὶ ταῦτά ἐστι χρόνος, ὁ δὲ Ἐπίκουρος συμπτώματα φησὶν αὐτῶν εἶναι τὸν χρόνον.

¹⁷ Although he does not mention him by name, Philo actually draws on Aristotle. The latter, however, had spoken of 'days and nights' as *periods* of time: *De Generatione Animalium*, 777b: οἱ χρόνοι καὶ τῶν κηρύσεων καὶ γενέσεων καὶ τῶν βίων μετρεῖσθαι βούλονται κατὰ φύσιν περιόδους, λέγω δὲ περίοδον ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα καὶ

μῆνα καὶ ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ τοὺς χρόνους τοὺς μετρομένους τούτοις, ἔτι δὲ τὰς τῆς σελήνης περιόδους.

¹⁸ I have canvassed Basil's debts to Origen in *COT*, p. 227.

¹⁹ Cf. *Scholion IX*.

²⁰ Didymus, *commEccl* (3–4.12), 65: ὁ χρόνος ἐξ ἡμερῶν καὶ νυκτῶν συνίσταται, ἀλλὰ ἡ παρέκτασις τη[. . .].

²¹ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 626a: ὁ ἐξ ἡμερῶν συμπληρούμενος χρόνος. Ibid. fr. 985: κατὰ γὰρ τὴν ἐνυλὸν καὶ μετὰ σαρκὸς ζῶν ἡμέρας τινὰς ἔχομεν τὰς συμπληρούσας ἡμῖν τὸν παρεκτείνοντα χρόνον τῆς μετὰ σαρκὸς ζωῆς.

²² John of Damascus, *Expositio Fidei*, section 15 (entitled, Περὶ αἰῶνος), expounding different meanings of αἰών. Cf. discussion of this account of Damascene in *COT*, pp. 262–66. Didymus explores the different denotations of αἰώνιος in his *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 76.

(χρόνου τί μέρος). But the text which Damascenus uses has its own history. This is actually a quotation from Gregory of Nazianzus,²³ which the Cappadocian had taken up from Origen.²⁴

We see, therefore, that authors did not adhere to any strict terminology of the ontology of time proper. Instances where this locution occurs (such as the present Scholion) show a rather loose use of terms, even if this deviates from Basil's accurate account.²⁵ One can see this in Theodoret: he was aware of when terms should be used in either a strict or loose sense. Hence, in one single passage, he speaks of time being both 'made of' and 'counted by' 'days and nights'.

Theodoret, *De Sancta et Vivifica Trinitate*, PG.75.1152.44–48: Εἰ δὲ τοῦ Υἱοῦ οἱ αἰῶνες ποιήματα, οὐ προϋπάρχουσι τοῦ ποιήσαντος· αἰώνων δὲ μὴ ὑπαρχόντων, εὐδηλον ὡς οὐδὲ ὁ

χρόνος, ὃν ἡμέραι τε καὶ νύκτες ποιοῦσι καὶ μετροῦσιν· ἡμέρας δὲ καὶ νύκτας ἢ τοῦ φωτὸς ἀνατολὴ καὶ δύσις ἐργάζεται.

Likewise, 'days and nights' are in fact produced by the sun, and, by the same token, days 'count time'. *De Incarnatione Domini*, PG.75.1421.14–16: ἡλίον τε ἀνίσchein κελεύσας, καὶ δύεσθαι, καὶ ποιεῖν ἡμέρας καὶ νύκτας, καὶ τῷ δρόμῳ τὸν χρόνον μετρεῖν. So in *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1924.50–55.

The phraseology of [Scholion XXXIII](#) is the product of Cassian's pen. It stands closer to Philoponus, the Aristotelian commentator who was his Christian contemporary. Following [Scholion XXXII](#), Cassian carries on with another comment of his own, while Didymus' Commentary on the Apocalypse was still wide open on his table, providing him with some items of his Alexandrian vocabulary.

²³ Gregory of Nazianzus, *In Theophania*, PG.36.320.14–17.

²⁴ Origen, *frEph*, section 9; *expProv*, PG.17.189.6–9. Cf. *COT*, pp. 260–271. P. Tzamalikos, 'Origen: The Source of Augustine's Theory of Time', *Philosophia, Yearbook of the Research Center for Greek Philosophy at the Academy of Athens*, (17–18) 1989, 396–418.

²⁵ Philo himself was aware of this nature of 'days' etc. long before Basil made the point. Cf. Philo, *De Aeternitate Mundi*, 19: ἡμέραι καὶ νύκτες καὶ ὥραι καὶ ἐνιαυτοὶ σελήνη τε καὶ ἥλιος, οἱ χρόνου μετρήσεως φύσιν ἔδειξαν. However, there are formulations, which, although standing close to those of Didymus, are not accurate once studied in their context. *Legum Allegoriarum*, 1.2: πᾶς χρόνος ἡμερῶν καὶ νυκτῶν ἐστὶ σύστημα.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXXIV

EN XXXIVa: ἀναβεβηκότων

The word ἀναβεβηκότων prefixed by various prepositions (such as ἐπὶ) suggests ‘elevation’ to a higher level (either existential, or one of higher understanding, contemplation, moral status, etc.). This is abundantly used by Didymus, who received it from Origen. I should have thought that Plotinus took it up from Origen, too. Origen could well have developed this in an allegorical sense from the term ἀναβεβηκότες appearing in Judith 4:3 (ὅτι προσφάτως ἦσαν ἀναβεβηκότες ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας). Nevertheless, Origen’s debts to Alexander of Aphrodisias can never be discounted. In *Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 210: τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ τὰ ἐπαναβεβηκότα γένη μᾶλλον ἀρχαὶ τῶν εἰδῶν ἔσονται. The usual followers (Athanasius, Eusebius, Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom) took up both the term and the idea. However, none of them used the notion as massively as Didymus did.

Origen, *Cels*, VI.48 (ἀναβεβηκότες); VI.62 (ὑπερναβεβηκότων); VII.46 (ἀναβεβηκότων ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν τηλικούτων γνῶσιν); VIII.4 (πάντων τῶν ἀναβεβηκότων πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεόν); *commJohn*, XIII.6.35 (τὰ ἐπὶ καρδίαν δὲ ἀνθρώπου μὴ ἀναβεβηκότα); *schLuc*, PG.17.344.25 (ἐπαναβεβηκότα λόγον); PG.17.344.37 (τῶν ἐπαναβεβηκότων ἔργων); *frJohn*, II (τῶν ἐλαττόνων ... τῶν ὑπερναβεβηκότων); *homJer*, 16.3 (ἐπαναβεβηκότων ἀγίων ἀγγέλων); *commMatt*, 10.14 (ἐπαναβεβηκότως νοηθέν); *Ibid.* 12.37 (ἐπαναβεβηκότων ἔργων); *Ibid.* 13.19 (ἐπαναβεβηκότως).

Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.152.37 (ἐπαναβεβηκότως). Cf. the entire text attributed to (or, copied by) Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae super Psalmos*, PG.29.288.30: Δυνατὸν δὲ αὐτὴν ἔτι ἐπαναβεβηκότως νοῆσαι τὴν ἐπουράνιον διαγωγὴν.

Eusebius, *DE*, 1.6.62 (ἐφ’ ὑψηλοτάτης ἀκρωρείας ἀναβεβηκότα); *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.35 (τὸν ἐπαναβεβηκότα τρόπον);

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 845 (ἀναβεβηκότες); *Ibid.* fr. 971 (οἱ ὑπερναβεβηκότες); fr. 1062 (τῶν ὑπερναβεβηκότων θεωρία); fr. 1067 (ἐμὲ ὥς

ὑπερναβεβηκότα); fr. 1186 (τὸν ὑπερναβεβηκότα βίον); fr. 1256 (ὑπερναβεβηκότως βιοῦντας); *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, p. 45 (ὑπερναβεβηκότα); *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 6 (τὰ ὑπερναβεβηκότα); *ibid.* Cod. p. 9 (πρὸς τοὺς ἀναβεβηκότες ... οἱ ὑπερναβεβηκότες); *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 90 (τὰ αἰώνια καὶ ὑπερναβεβηκότα); *commEccl* (5–6), Cod. p. 194 (ὑπερναβεβηκότες); *commEccl* (9.8–10.20), Cod. p. 315 (ὑπερναβεβηκότα ἄγγελον); *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 322 (ὑπερναβεβηκότες); *Ibid.* Cod. p. 333 (τῶν ὑπερναβεβηκότων); *commZacch*, 2.16 (ὑπερναβεβηκότων πραγμάτων); *Adversus Manichaeos*, PG.39.1097.29–31 (τοῖς ὑπερναβεβηκόσιν ... τὰ ὑπερναβεβηκότα τάγματα); *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 275 (τὰ ὑπερναβεβηκότα καὶ τέλεια); *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 36 (ὑπερναβεβηκότες); *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 13A (ὑπερναβεβηκότα); *ibid.* p. 39 (ὑπερναβεβηκότες); 223 (μυσικώτερον καὶ ὑπερναβεβηκότως εἰπεῖν).

John Chrysostom, *In Genesin*, PG.54.385.12 (τὴν ἄκραν κορυφὴν ἀναβεβηκότα); *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.389.7 (ἀγίων καὶ ἀναβεβηκότων); *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos*, PG.63.24.31 (ὑπερναβεβηκότα).

Plotinus, *Enneades*, I.4.7 (ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀναβεβηκότος πρὸς τὸ ἀνωτέρω ἀπάντων τούτων); *ibid.* IV.4.5 (εἴ τις ἀνάγων αὐτοῦ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐπὶ τινος ὑψηλῆς σκοπιᾶς ὁρῶν ἃ μὴδεὶς τῶν οὐ σὺν αὐτῷ ἀναβεβηκότων); *ibid.* VI.9.5 (ἐπαναβεβηκότα τῇ ψυχῇ); *ibid.* VI.9.11 (οὐ θυμός, οὐκ ἐπιθυμία ἄλλου παρὴν αὐτῷ ἀναβεβηκότι).

EN XXXIVb: προτεθεωρημένα

This perfect participle of the verb προθεωροῦμαι does not occur in Origen, but in Didymus it does. The genitive absolute τούτων προτεθεωρημένων (‘these points having been considered’) was a standard expression, particularly among mathematicians. However, the number of authors using this is limited, and the influences upon Didymus can be determined. The authors most likely to have inspired him are

Alexander of Aphrodisias, Galen, Eusebius, and Gregory of Nyssa.¹

Didymus, *commZacch*, 3.59 (τούτων προτεθεωρημένων); *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 84 (μενόντων τῶν προτεθεωρημένων). Eusebius, *DE*, 4.15.65 (τούτων δῆτα προτεθεωρημένων).

Didymus, thus confirming Theodoret's² testimony to his mathematical learning, also used the principle προτεθεωρημένα.³ This was normally employed to denote a strictly scientific and systematic examination, which is why mathematicians used it frequently,⁴ whereas philosophers, scientists,⁵ and theologians⁶ did so only casually.

EN XXXIVc: ἄφθαρτα καὶ πνευματικά
(bodies that are 'incorrupt and spiritual')

Although one might have thought that the Pauline account in 1 Cor. 15:42–44 would make this wording a recurrent theme, this is only characteristic of Didymus.

Didymus, in Catenae, *Catena in Acta*, p. 46: ἀλλ' οὖν εὐσεβῶς διάκεινται φάσκοντες τὴν σάρκα ἀνίστασθαι ἐπὶ τὸ εἶναι ἄφθαρτον καὶ πνευματικὸν σῶμα· ὥς γὰρ ὁ ἐγειρόμενος νεκρὸς μετὰ ἀνάστασιν ζῶν καὶ οὐ νεκρὸς ἐστίν, οὕτως ἡ ἐγειρομένη σὰρξ μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν πνευματικὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον σῶμα ἐστί.

Idem, in *Catena Palestinae* (post fifth cent. AD), biblical verse 81, section c, lines 7f: ὅταν δὲ αὐτοῦ μεταλάβῃ ζωῆς καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ πνευματικὸν ἐξ ἀναστάσεως ἀναλάβῃ τὸ σῶμα, τὸ πάλαι αὐτῇ συνεζευγμένον φθαρτὸν καὶ ψυχικὸν ψυχῇ τυγχανούσῃ, νοῦς καὶ πνεῦμα γενήσεται. *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 330: ἀλλὰ ἐξαλλαγῆς τοῦ αὐτοῦ σώματος, ἐπεὶ ἐκ φθαρτοῦ ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἐκ

ψυχικοῦ πνευματικὸν γέγονεν. *frPs(al)*, fr. 497: ἵνα κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀναστάσεως καιρὸν ἄφθαρτα ἰσχυρὰ ἐπίδοξα πνευματικὰ ἐκ φθαρτῶν ἀσθενῶν καὶ ἀτίμων καὶ ψυχικῶν γένηται. *Ibid.* fr. 1076: καὶ τὰ σώματα τῶν δικαίων σκηνὰς αὐτῶν ἐρεῖς ἀφθάρτων καὶ πνευματικῶν ἀποδοθειςτῶν αὐτοῖς. *Ibid.* fr. 1113: ὅταν δὲ αὐτοῦ μεταλάβῃ ζωῆς καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ πνευματικὸν ἐξ ἀναστάσεως ἀναλάβῃ τὸ σῶμα. *Ibid.* fr. 1290: ἡ ψυχὴ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, ἀντὶ φθαρτοῦ καὶ ἀσθενοῦς καὶ ἀτίμου καὶ ψυχικοῦ σώματος ἄφθαρτον δυνατόν ἐνδοξον πνευματικὸν ἀναλαβοῦσα τὸ σῶμα. *Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, p. 6: ὅμως, εἰ καὶ τὸ τεθνεὸς σῶμα ἀνίσταται, ἀλλ' ἄφθαρτον καὶ πνευματικόν. *Ibid.* p. 10: ὅταν δὲ λέγωμεν σῶμα ἄφθαρτον, οὐ πέμπτην οὐσίαν λέγομεν, ὥς τινες περὶ τῶν ἄστρον ὑπενόησαν ἦν ἀεὶ φαμεν ἄφθαρτον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἄφθαρτον λέγομεν τὸ ἐκ φθαρτοῦ γεγονὸς ἄφθαρτον χάριτι θεοῦ. Likewise, *commEcc* (11–12), Cod. pp. 348; 353; *commZacch*, 3.183; 5.175; *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 259; *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 328.

Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 11.59; *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.516.8–9. The following passage is noteworthy, since its vocabulary is close to that of the Scholion. Pseudo-Macarius, *Homiliae* I, Homily 20: θείας δυνάμεως ψυχὴ ἡ μὴ φοροῦσα καὶ ἡμφιεσμένη τὸ ἄρρητον καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ πνευματικὸν ἔνδυμα.

The notion was taken up much later by Anastasius of Sinai (seventh cent.), to whom abundant reference was made by Michael Glycas, the great admirer of Theodoret. He normally styled the abbot of Sinai 'the most divine Anastasius' (ὁ θειότατος Ἀναστάσιος).

Michael Glycas, *Quaestiones in Sacram Scripturam*,

¹ Cf. Euclid (third cent. BC), *Fragmenta*, p. 256. Heron of Alexandria (prob. first cent. AD), *De Pneumaticis*, 1.1. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Fato*, p. 191. Ptolemy of Alexandria, *Syntaxis Mathematica*, v. 1, 1, p. 149. Pappus of Alexandria (mathematician, fourth cent. AD), *Collectio*, Book 2, p. 18; Book 4, p. 224; Book 7, pp. 708; 716; 888. Proclus, *In Primum Euclidis Elementorum Librum Commentarii*, p. 246. John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Libros de Generatione et Corruptione Commentaria*, v. 14.2, p. 45. Asclepius of Tralles, *In Nicomachi Introductionem Arithmeticae Commentarius*, 2.20. Scholia in Euclidem, *Scholia in Euclidem*, 1.37.

² Theodoret, *HE*, p. 269.

³ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 157. Cf. Ptolemy of Alexandria, *Syntaxis Mathematica*, v. 1, 1, pp. 133; 376; 413; v. 1, 2, p. 456.

⁴ Heron of Alexandria, *De Pneumaticis*, 1.1. Ptolemy of Alexandria, *Syntaxis Mathematica*, v. 1, 1, pp. 133, 149; 376; 413; v. 1, 2, p. 456. Serenus of Antinoeia (geometrician, fourth cent. AD), *De Sectione Cylindri*, p. 96.

⁵ Galen (second cent. AD), *De Anatomicis Administrationibus*, v. 2, p. 400. John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Libros de Generatione et Corruptione Commentaria*, v. 14.2, p. 45; *In Aristotelis Libros de Anima Commentaria*, v. 15, p. 302.

⁶ Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.1048.2. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 88; *In Canticum Canticorum*, v. 6, p. 191; *De Vita Mosis*, 2.242; 2.292; *Oratio Catechetica*, 5. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 1, p. 436 (τοῖς ἡδὴ προτεθεωρημένοις).

ch. 7, p. 79: τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν . . . ὡς ἄφθαρτον γεγονός, ἔσται πάντως πνευματικόν. Ibid. ch. 7, p. 83: σχῆμα γὰρ καὶ διάπλασιν ἀφθάρτου καὶ πνευματικοῦ σώματος οἶδεν οὐδεὶς. Ibid. ch. 84, p. 350: ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθεῖσα καὶ ἄφθαρτος ἠγέρθη, καθὼς ἐδιδάχθημεν, καὶ λεπτή καὶ κούφη καὶ πνευματική. Ibid. ch. 92, p. 419: τοιαῦτα κατὰ φύσιν ἀναστῆναι μέλλουσι, πνευματικὰ δηλονότι καὶ ἄφθαρτα (subsequent to this, he appeals to Anastasius of Sinai). Ibid. ch. 92, pp. 423 and 456 : Καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ἦν, οὐκ ἂν οὕτως ἔλεγεν καὶ ὁ θεῖος Ἀναστάσιος

‘ἀφθάρτου καὶ πνευματικοῦ σώματος ποιότητα καὶ κρᾶσιν οἶδεν οὐδεὶς.’ Ibid. ch. 92, p. 425: τὸ δὲ πνευματικὸν ἐκεῖνο καὶ ἄφθαρτον σῶμα οὐκ ἐξ αἵματος καὶ σπορᾶς διαπλάττεται. Ibid. ch. 92, p. 429: τὸ τοῦ Κυρίου σῶμα κατὰ φύσιν ὁρᾶν ἄφθαρτον, ὡς εἴρηται, καὶ πνευματικὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέν.

In conclusion, [Scholion XXXIV](#) is couched in phraseology distinctively characteristic of Didymus, which means that this is a quotation from his Commentary on the Apocalypse.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXXV

EN XXXVa: ἀπείρατος

Although used in a handful of passages by Pindar¹ and once by the orator Demosthenes in the sense of ‘untested’,² the adjective ἀπείρατος, meaning ‘one who has not experienced’ a certain condition (such as sexual intercourse, anger, etc.), does not belong to the vocabulary of Classical Greek. In the latter sense it appears no earlier than Diodorus of Sicily (first century BC), to be followed two centuries later by Josephus, Plutarch, Arrian, and Lucian of Samosata. It also appears in many of the authors who are of interest to us. Beyond rare and occasional usage occurring in some Christians (including Didymus),³ the authors who employed this are Gregory of Nyssa, Theodoret, and Cyril of Alexandria. No doubt, Theodoret used the term following his readings of Josephus, Diodorus of Sicily, Plutarch, and Lucian of Samosata.⁴ Still, his initial inspiration came from the poet Pindar and the orator Demosthenes. As a matter of fact, Theodoret treated Pindar with respect and quoted from his poems in order to make his case against paganism,⁵ and so he did with Demosthenes, whom he also respected⁶ and quoted with commendation in one of his epistles.⁷

Gregory of Nyssa, *In Ecclesiasten*, v. 5, p. 365; *Adversus Eunomium*, 1.1.142; *De Virginitatis Integritate*, 8.1; *De Beatitudinibus*, PG.44.1228.38; *De Vita*

Gregorii Thaumaturgi, PG.46.912.42; *De Hominis Opificio*, pp. 216; 229.

Theodoret, *Epistulae* 1–52, Epistle 47; *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.589.15; *intDan*, PG.81.1356.30; *intProphXII*, PG.81: 1680.49; 1805.11; *De Providentia Orationes Decem*, PG.83: 693.43; 701.50.

Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 72; v. 2, pp. 134; 230; *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 1, pp. 634; 636; v. 2, pp. 65; 549; v. 3, p. 169; *Dialog de Sancta Trinitate*, pp. 444; 447; *Homiliae Paschales*, PG.77.480.5; *Glaph-Pent*, PG.69: 520.51 and 53; 521.5; 629.4, 9, 19; 648.24 and 31; *expPs*, PG.69.864.38; *In Isaiam*, PG.70.1208.41; *Explanatio in Lucam*, PG.72.629.8.

Of Neoplatonists, it was only Proclus who used the adjective,⁸ which should be taken into account, all the more so since this was employed by Pseudo-Dionysius.⁹

Finally, this adjective appears twice in the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 3.103: Ἄρ’ οὖν ὁ ὁπωσοῦν τῆς προεδρίας ἀξιώθεις καὶ ἐγκαταλεγείς τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ, οὗτος πρεσβύτερος; ἢ ὁ φέρων τὸν χαρακτῆρα τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου ἀνεγκλήτως,¹⁰ μάλιστα μὲν ἀπείρατος γυναικός; *ibid.* 7.202: Ἴσον οὖν δύναται εἰπεῖν, ἐβόησεν ἢ παρθένος, καὶ ἐβόησεν ἢ νεάνις. Καὶ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ τῶν Βασιλειῶν, ἢ Σωμανίτις,¹¹ ἢ συνθάλπουσα¹² τὸν Δαβίδ, παρθένος οὕσα καὶ ἀνδρὸς ἀπείρατος, νεάνις προσαγορεύεται.

¹ Pindar, *Olympia*, ode 8 (ἀπειράτων); ode 11 (ἀπειράτων); *Nemea*, ode 1, (ἀπειράτοι); *Isthmia*, Ode 3 (ἀπειράτων).

² Demosthenes, *De Corona*, section 249 (ἀπειράτων).

³ Athenagoras, *De Resurrectione*, 18.5. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*, 10.91.1. Eusebius, *PE*, 2.2.41; *commPs*, PG.23.256.24. Athanasius, *De Actis Arianorum*, 42.1; 58.3. Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.248.22. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistulae*, 77.1. Didymus, *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 23; *commJob*, PG.39.1128.2. John Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio*, 5.8. Pseudo- John Chrysostom, *In Psalmum* 118 PG.55.704.36; *Precatio*, PG.64.1064.6. Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *De Hierarchia Ecclesiastica*, p. 131.

⁴ Josephus, *De Bello Judaico*, 3.63; 3.307; 5.365; 7.262; 7.334. Diodorus of Sicily, *Bibliotheca Historica*, 1.1.3; 3.58.4; 17.107.2. Plutarch, *Mulierum Virtutes*, 259F; *Quaestiones Convivales*, 681C. Pseudo-Plutarch, *Ad Apollonium*, 119F. Lucian of Samosata, *Nigrinus*, 15; *De Amicitia*, 3; *De Saltatione*, 5; *Hermotimus*, 45.

⁵ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 1.115; 6.25; 8.35; 12.25.

⁶ *Ibid.* 1.21; 8.2; 8.25.

⁷ Theodoret, *Epistulae* 1–52, Epistle 12.

⁸ Proclus, *In Platonis Alcibiadem* i, 58; *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 1, pp. 117; 156.

⁹ Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *De Hierarchia Ecclesiastica*, p. 131:

πρὸς ἕξιν ἱερὰν ἡξουσιν πάσης ἀποτελούμενα πλάνης καὶ ἀνιέρου ζωῆς ἀπείρατα. *Ibid.* καὶ ἀνάδοχον ἱερὸν ἔχων ἕξιν αὐτῶ τῶν θείων ἐμποιοῦντα καὶ φυλάττοντα τῶν ἐναντίων ἀπείρατον.

¹⁰ The adjective ἀνεγκλήτως appears only once in Didymus and eleven times in Theodoret.

¹¹ About Σωμανίτις, see 3 Kings, 1:3; 15; 17; 2:17; 21; 4:12; 25; 36. Cf. Theodoret, *Historia Religiosa*, Vita 14.3; *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80: 613; 753; 764; 768. There is no such reference in Didymus.

¹² The participle συνθάλπουσα is derived from the verb συνθάλλειν. In its sundry forms this appears only in Plutarch, Galen, Pseudo-Caesarius (= Cassian the Sabaite), and in the present work. Cf. one more instance in *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 16.302: πρὸς τὸ ἐν νυκτὶ συνθάλλεσθαι. There are only two plus one Christian texts of this verb being used. One is the just mentioned *Enarratio*, which is Cassian’s work, as I hope to show in a future work of mine. The other occurs in Pseudo-Caesarius (=Cassian), *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, 20.57 (ref. to 3 Kings, 1:4, where the LXX-verb used is θάλλειν, not συνθάλλειν); 54.7; 69.29; 139.97. The additional instance occurs in the *Analecta Hymnica Graeca*, which I have associated mainly with the Antiochene tradition of hymnology surviving in both the Laura of Sabas and the monastery of the Akoimetoι (see RCR, Introduction): *Canones Januarii*, 10.20.2, line 17.

The terms were used by Homer¹³ and some other authors. Apart from archaic usage occurring in Hesiod, Pindar, and taken up by Sophocles, the terms also appear in authors whom we have come upon, namely Strabo, Diodorus of Sicily, Julius Naucratis, and Athenaeus. The adjective χρύσεος (though not ἀργύρεος) appears in certain scriptural writings.¹⁴ Abundant usage occurs in Josephus,¹⁵ as well as in Lucian of Samosata¹⁶ and Plutarch.¹⁷

Christian use of this terminology is limited: it occurs in biblical quotations, erudite intellectuals,¹⁸ as well as in quotations from Greek literature.¹⁹ Origen did not use this terminology himself; he simply quoted from Celsus at two points, or used the language of Proverbs.²⁰ Gregory of Nazianzus employed the Homeric terms to a considerable extent,²¹ and so did Gregory of Nyssa.²² Eusebius did so, too, quoting from either classical literature or scripture, or using them on his own.²³ Didymus also used them as a recurrent theme.²⁴ In Theodoret we merely have a quotation from Classical Greece.²⁵ John Chrysostom has only one instance.²⁶

EN XXXVc: ἀγάλματα and δαιμόνια

Following the Psalmist, Didymus associates ‘statues’ (ἀγάλματα) with ‘daemons’ (δαιμόνια).

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 800a: θεοὺς δὲ λέγει οὐ τὰ

ἀγάλματα οὐδὲ τὰ δαιμόνια (ἐκάτερα γὰρ ταῦτα θεοὶ λέγονται), ἀλλ’ ἐκείνους πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ γενόμενος ἐθεοποίησεν αὐτούς. οὐ γὰρ θεότητος οὗτοι παρεκτικοὶ ἀλλὰ μέτοχοι. Ibid. fr. 931: γλυπτὰ γὰρ ὁλολύξαντα οὐ τὰ ἄψυχα (ἐμψύχου γὰρ τὸ ὁλολύζειν) ἀλλὰ τὰ διὰ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀγαλμάτων δηλούμενα δαιμόνια ἐκδεκτέον. Ibid. fr. 517: Θεοὺς φησιν οὐ τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ τοὺς δαίμονας ἀλλὰ τοὺς μετέχοντας ἀνθρώπους τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγων· ἐκείνους γὰρ θεοὺς εἶπε πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο. Ibid. fr. 860: Θεοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐνταῦθα λέγεσθαι οὐ τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ τοὺς δαίμονας ληπτέον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους. *commZacch*, 4.287–288: Δυνατὸν καὶ περὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀφιδρυμάτων καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὰ δαιμόνων εἰρῆσθαι ἐξολεθρεύεσθαι αὐτὰ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. Ὅτι δὲ τὰ ἀγάλματα δηλοῦνται τῇδε τῇ προσηγορίᾳ, ὑπὸ τοῦ ὕμνωδοῦ μαθεῖν ἔστιν λέγοντος· ‘Τὰ εἰδῶλα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον, πόδας ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐ περιπατοῦσιν’, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. (288) Ὅτι δὲ ὁμωνυμοῦσιν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐμφωλεύοντα τοῖς σηκοῖς αὐτῶν δαιμόνια, ὁ προφήτης Ἡσαΐας διδάσκει. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 190: τὴν θεοῦ προσηγορίαν κατασπῶσιν τινες ἐπὶ ἄψυχον ὕλην, ὡς τὰ ἀγάλματα θεοὺς ὀνομάζουσιν. τρόπον τινὰ ταπεινοῦσιν τὴν θεοῦ ὀνομασίαν.

Cf. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* (epitome), v. 2,1, p. 70. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*, 1.7.5; 3.44.3; 4.51.6; 4.52.1; 4.53.1; 4.57.2. Origen, *Cels*, V: 5; 38; VI.5; VII: 41; 64; 65; 69; VIII: 11; 18; 41. Eusebius, *PE*,

¹³ Homer, *Odyssey*, IV.128 (ἀργυρέας); X.355 (τραπέζας ἀργυρέας, χρύσεια κάνεια); *Ilias*, XVIII.598 (χρυσείας ἐξ ἀργυρέων τελαμώνων); *et passim*.

¹⁴ 2 Macc. 5:3 (χρυσέων); Prov. 1:9 (χρύσειον); Song of Songs 3:10 (χρύσειον); Ecclesiasticus 6:30 (χρύσειος); 26:18 (χρύσειοι).

¹⁵ Josephus, *Antiquitas Judaica*, 11.187 (χρυσέων καὶ ἀργυρέων); 3.109 (κιονόκρανα ἀργύρεα); 7.108 (χρύσεια καὶ ἀργύρεα καὶ χάλκεα); 8.90 (χρύσεια, ἀργύρεα). Likewise, *ibid.* 8.91; 9.92; 11.15; 13.243; *et passim*.

¹⁶ Lucian of Samosata, *De Syria Dea*, 49 (χρύσεια καὶ ἀργύρεα); 60 (ἀργύρεα, χρύσεια); *Navigium*, 39, *et passim*.

¹⁷ Plutarch, *Sertorius*, 22.3 (χρύσεια τρόπαια); *Quomodo Quis Suos in Virtute Sentiat Profectus*, (χρυσέα κρητίς); *De Unius in Republica Dominatione, Populari Statu, et Paucorum Imperio*, 826B (χρυσέα κρητίς); *De Pythiae Oraculis*, 403B (ἀργυρέα); *Apothehgmata Laconica*, 224A (χρύσειά τε καὶ ἀργύρεα), *et passim*.

¹⁸ Clement of Alexandria is one of them. Cf. *Protrepticus*, 2.17.2; 2.35.2; 4.52.2; 5.58.1; *et passim*. Ibid. 6.70.2, the text is similar to that of *Scholion XXXV*, and so is a passage in Hippolytus, *In Danielelem*, 2.27.10.

¹⁹ Cf. a casual usage by Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 20.4 (μύσχον τὸν χρύσειον).

²¹ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistulae*, 9.1 (χρυσέας); 204.5 (χρυσέας, quoting Pindar); *Funebris Oratio in Basilium Magnum*, 20.1 (χρυσέας κίονας); *Carmina Moralia*, p. 588 (χρύσεια); likewise, on p. 901 (χρύσεια); *Poemata Quae Spectant ad Alios*, pp. 1470; 1539; 1543. Moreover, ἀργύρεος and cognates, *Carmina Moralia*, pp. 668; 1369; *Poemata Quae Spectant ad Alios*, pp. 1494; 1519.

²² Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Ablabium Quod non Sint Tres Dei*, v. 3,1, pp. 53; 54; *Adversus Evagrium*, v. 9, p. 332; *Adversus Eunomium*, 1.1.40; *In Canticum Cantorum*, v. 6, pp. 19; 44; 82; 208; *De Vita Mosis*, 1.52; 1.54; 2.170; 2.192; 2.201.

²³ Eusebius, *PE*, 1.10.30; 2.3.23; 3.9.2; 3.9.8; 5.29.3; 5.36.1; 12.6.17; *et passim*; *Onomasticon*, p. 114; *Adversus Hieroclem*, pp. 385; 388; *Vita Constantini*, 3.54.4.

²⁴ Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 343 (χρύσεια σκεῦη and ἀργύρεα); *ibid.* Cod. p. 343 (χρύσεια καὶ ἀργυρᾶ); *frPs(al)*, fr. 146 (σκεῦη χρυσέα ἢ ἀργυρέα); *commZacch*, 1.205 (ἀργυρέοις); 2.21 (ὁ χρύσειος κλοιός); *ibid.* 1.205 (ἀργυρέοις καὶ χρυσέοις σκεῦεσι); *ibid.* 2.18 (ἀνάκλιτον χρύσειον); *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.39.1624.55 (κλοιὸς χρύσειος).

²⁵ Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 2.31 (χρυσέω).

²⁶ Cf. John Chrysostom, only *In Sanctum Joannem*, PG.59.28.11 (χρύσειον); *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.64.664.17 (κλοιὸν χρύσειον); a couple of other instances are spurious.

2.6.1; 10.4.26; *DE*, 1.5.4; 6.20.18; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.45.171; 2.55.88. Ephraem Syrus, *Encomium in Gloriosos Martyres; Qui in Toto Mundo Martyrium Sunt*, p. 168. Severianus of Gabala, *De Tribus Pueris*, PG.56.598.48. Pseudo-Justin *QetR*, 405D (or, Pseudo-Theodoret, *QetR*, p. 43). Theodoret, *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80.793.9; *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 7.46. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Isaiam*, PG.70.469.31. Pseudo-John of Damascus, *De Sancto Artemio*, PG.96.1300.5. Once again, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 5.158; 10.237.

EN XXXVd: ἐφεδρεύοντα πνεύματα ('the spirits which dwell in')

This is a formulation by Origen,²⁷ but it was Eusebius who made much of it.²⁸ Otherwise, usage among Christian authors is almost non-existent,²⁹ except for Didymus, who employed the idea abundantly by means of the verb ἐφεδρεύειν.

Didymus, *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 85: εἰ καὶ ἐφεδρεύουσιν μοι οἱ παγιδευταὶ καὶ θηρευταὶ λαβεῖν θέλοντες καὶ τὸν πόδα μου ὥσπερ εἰς τὴν παγίδα βροχίσαι, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ διὰ παντὸς ἔχων πρὸς τὸν κύριον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς οὐ πάσχω τοῦτο. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 142: μὴ γὰρ εἰς πειρασμός. ἂν τις οὖν παρακαλέσας ῥυσθῇ ἀπὸ τινος ἢ ἀπὸ τινων, πάλιν ὁρᾷ ἄλλα ἐφεδρεύοντα, καὶ πάλιν περὶ ἐκείνων εὐχεται· θλίβουσιν γὰρ αὐτὸν τὰ προσδοκώμενα. *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 291: πολλοὺς ἔχει ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐχθρούς, πολλοὺς ἐφεδρεύοντας ἔχει . . . καὶ πολλοὺς ἔχει τοὺς ἐφεδρεύοντας· ῥύσεται γὰρ αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν. *frPs(al)*, fr. 91: οὕτως γὰρ ἀβλαβῶς διατελέσαι δυνήσομαι, μυρίων ἐφεδρευόντων ἐχθρῶν ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων. *Ibid.* fr. 904: Ὁ ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῆς γνώσεως τῆς ἀληθείας κατορθῶν πολλοὺς τοὺς ἐφεδρεύοντας

ἐπιβουλευτικῶς ἔχει, ἀλλὰ πάντων αὐτῶν περιγίνεται ἐνδυσάμενος τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. *In Genesin*, Cod. p.222: Ὅπουποτε γὰρ ἂν ἦ ὁ ἅγιος, καὶ ἐν τελειότητι, ἐφεδρεύουσιν ἔχει τὴν ζάλην καὶ τῆς γεννητῆς φύσεως τὸ τρεπτόν.

Once again, Theodore of Mopsuestia's language runs parallel to that of the Scholia.³⁰

EN XXXVe: Psalm 95:5

Christian authors laid a great deal of emphasis on Psalm 95:5, where 'pagan gods' are said to be 'dae-mons'. Most of them, including Theodoret and Didymus, had a comment to make on this.

Justin Martyr, *Apologia*, 41.1; *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 55.2; 73.2; 73.3; 79.4; 83.4. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*, 4.62.4. Origen, *Cels*, III.2; III.37; IV.29; VII.65; VII.69; VIII.3; *homEx*, p. 226. Eusebius, *PE*, 1.4.2; 4.16.20; *DE*, 1.4.2; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.20; 2.21; *commPs*, PG.23.148.44. Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.416.29. Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae*, 8.3; 189.5. Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Eustathium de Sancta Trinitate*, v. 3,1, p. 9; *In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, v. 5, p. 170; *Adversus Eunomium*, 24; *De Engastrimytho*, p. 105. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, p. 668; *expPs*, PG.69.1244.48–51. John Chrysostom, *In Principium Actorum*, PG.51.73.23–24. Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.94; *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 324; *frPs(al)*, frs. 613a; 762; 931; *Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, p. 23. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1645.31; *Epistulae* 96–147, Epistle 147. Pseudo-Theodoret (or Pseudo-Justin), *QetR*, p. 130. Pseudo-Justin, *Martyrium Ignatii*, 2.4.

Quoting Psalms 113:12 and 134:15

The authors that did so are fewer than those quoting Psalm 95:5.

²⁷ Origen, *Cels*, VIII.18: δαιμόνων λίχνων ἐφεδρευόντων τοῖς ἀνύχοις. *frLuc*, fr. 197 in *Catena in Lucam*, p. 104: ἐφεδρεύειν τοὺς πολέμιους ὄντας . . . πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας. Cf. Methodius of Olympus, *Symposium*, oration 6.1: Διὸ δὴ καὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐρῶσιν αὐτῆς καὶ ἐφεδρεύουσι.

²⁸ Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.69: ἐν τε τοῖς ὑμετέροις ἱεροῖς τε καὶ ναοῖς καὶ ὡς δὴ θεοὶ ἐφεδρεύοντες πονηροὶ δαίμονες. *Ibid.* 1.70: σημαίνει γὰρ διὰ τούτων τὸν ἐφεδρεύοντα τῷ ἔθνει δαίμονα πονηρόν. *Vita Constantini*, 1.49.1: ἐφεδρεύειν ἀπηγγέλλετο θῆρ, τοῦ πονηροῦ δαίμονος ὥσπερ ἀμιλλωμένον τοῖς παρὰ τῷ θεοφιλεῖ πραττομένοις τάναντία κατεργάζεσθαι.

²⁹ To those cited only Basil of Ancyra should be added. *De Virginitatis Integritate*, PG.30.737.52–53: φυλάττεσθαι δεῖ τὰς τῶν δαιμόνων ἐπηρείας, ἀοράτως ἐφεδρευούσας ἡμῖν. An interesting (and much later) instance of Arethas using this rare expression should be noticed. *Scripta Minora*, Opus 4, p. 40: ἀπὸ τε τοῦ ἀποκτέννοντος γράμματος καὶ τῶν ἐφεδρευόντων δαιμόνων ταῖς προσβολαῖς ἀπομάχεται.

³⁰ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Catena in Epistulam ii ad Timotheum (cod. Paris. Coislin. 204)*, p. 61: διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐπιβουλεύοντων καὶ ἐφεδρευόντων δαιμόνων.

Origen, *frPs*, 113, 13; 134, 15–18. Athanasius, *Contra Gentes*, 14; 45. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.1356.35–42. John Chrysostom, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55: 310.14–21; 398.21–26. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Isaiam*, PG.70.929.13–15. Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *De Trinitate* (lib. 3) (quoting Psalm 113:12), PG.39.940.4–11. Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 10.105; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80: 1793.41–45; 1917.47–52.

As canvassed in EN XXXi, Theodoret is the sole author known to have written a treatise on 1 Paralipomenon (or 1 Chronicon). In fact, Psalm 95:5 (ὅτι πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμόνια, ὁ δὲ κύριος τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἐποίησεν) has a parallel in 1 Paralipomenon 16:26 (ὅτι πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰδῶλα, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν οὐρανὸν ἐποίησεν) (which in turn has a parallel in Wisdom of Solomon, 15:15). In Psalm 95:5, the deities of the nations are ‘daemons’, in 1 Paralipomenon 16:26, they are ‘idols’. Otherwise, the passages are identical.

Cf. Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.525.35–40; *Epistula ad Epictetum*, 1. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.1005.31–34; PG.24.32.39f. Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Fragmenta in Psalmos*, frs. 72; 270. Theodoret (on Psalms 113:12 and 134:15), *Queastiones in Octateuchum*, p. 33; *commIs*, 9; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1917.42–43; *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.1000.42–46. Clement of Alexandria quotes, ‘all gods of the nations are idols or daemons’, *Protrepticus*, 4.62.4.

The recurring references in Revelation to ‘idols’, ‘idolaters’, and ‘idolothytes’ (‘meats sacrificed unto idols’),³¹ impels relevant comments, which we indeed come upon in Scholia XIII, XVI, and in the present one.

In this Scholion, Didymus is no more involved than any other author. The rhetorical style of the opening of the comment is reminiscent of Cassian (discussed in Scholion IV, note 3 to the Greek text, and in EN XXXIa). This is therefore one more Scholion written by Cassian himself.

EN XXXVf: βιβλαρίδιον

The term has a unique parallel in Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 6.3: βιβλαρίου καινοῦ. Apart

from the Book of Revelation, the only instance where the word βιβλαρίδιον is used is that by Hermas (*Pastor*, 5.3 and 8.3) indicating a book given from on high and presumed to contain a revealed truth. Eusebius assures that Irenaeus ‘not only knew, but also accepted’ the authority of the *Pastor*. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* (liber 4), fr. 8, *apud* Eusebius, *HE*, 5.8.7. Eusebius, though styling this book a ‘controversial’ one (τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων. . . καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς μὲν τινῶν ἀντιλέλεκται, *HE*, 3.3.6), adds that the greetings that Paul sent to Hermas (Rom. 16:14) refer to the author ‘of the book entitled *Pastor*’. Clement of Alexandria unreservedly draws on, or quotes from, Hermas (*Stromateis*, 1.17.854; 1.29.181.1; 2.1.3.5). Origen used the *Pastor* extensively, but there is some evolution in the degree of authority he granted it. In his early works, such as *Princ*, he quotes from the book unreservedly, but he changed Hermas’ word βιβλαρίδιον to βιβλίον. He rebukes implicitly those ‘who despise this book’. *Princ*, IV.2.4 (*Philocalia*, 1.11): Διὰ τοῦτο ἡμεῖς καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ ὑπὸ τινῶν καταφρονουμένῳ βιβλίῳ, τῷ Ποιμένι, περὶ τοῦ προστάσσεσθαι τὸν Ἑρμᾶν ‘δύο γράψαι βιβλία’, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα αὐτὸν ‘ἀναγγέλλειν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις τῆς ἐκκλησίας’ ἃ μεμάθηκεν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος, οὕτω διηγούμεθα. ἔστι δὲ ἡ λέξις αὕτη ‘γράψεις δύο βιβλία, καὶ δώσεις ἐν Κλήμεντι καὶ ἐν Γραπτῇ. καὶ Γραπτὴ μὲν νουθετήσῃ τὰς χήρας καὶ τοὺς ὀρφανούς, Κλήμης δὲ πέμψῃ εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις, σὺ δὲ ἀναγγελεῖς τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις τῆς ἐκκλησίας’. Throughout his *commJohn* (written in both Alexandria and Palestine), Origen draws on the book as a matter of course, regarding this as an additional source of authority alongside the Old Testament: *commJohn*. I.17.103: ἔξ οὐκ ὄντων τὰ ὄντα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, ὡς ἡ μήτηρ τῶν ἐπὶ μαρτύρων ἐν Μακκαβαϊκοῖς καὶ ὁ τῆς μετανοίας ἄγγελος ἐν τῷ Ποιμένι ἐδίδασκε. Ibid. XXXII. 16.187–188: ἐκθήσομεν σαφηνείας ἕνεκεν τοιαῦτα. Πρῶτον πάντων πίστευσον ὅτι εἷς ἔστιν ὁ θεός, ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας καὶ καταρτίσας καὶ ποιήσας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα. Cf. Origen: *frOs*, PG.13.828 (*Philocalia*, 8.3): καὶ ἐν τῷ Ποιμένι δὲ τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ πύργου, διὰ πολλῶν μὲν λίθων οἰκοδομουμένην, ἐξ ἐνός δὲ λίθου φαινομένην εἶναι τὴν οἰκοδομὴν, τί ἄλλο ἢ τὴν ἐκ πολλῶν συμφωνίαν καὶ ἐνότητα σημαίνει ἢ

³¹ Cf. Rev. 2:14 (εἰδωλόθυτα); 2:20 (εἰδωλόθυτα); 9:20 (εἰδῶλα); 21:8 (εἰδωλόατραις); 22:15 (εἰδωλόατραι).

γραφῇ; Only toward the end of his life did Origen concede that it takes ‘some boldness’ to quote from this book, which ‘is not universally accepted as a sacred one within the churches’. *commMatt*, 14.21: εἰ δὲ χρὴ τολμήσαντα καὶ ἀπὸ τινος φερομένης μὲν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις γραφῆς, οὐ παρὰ πᾶσι δὲ ὁμολογουμένης εἶναι θείας, τὸ τοιοῦτον παραμυθήσασθαι, ληφθεῖη ἂν τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ποιμένου. Athanasius quoted from this book unreservedly (*De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi*, 18.3; *De Incarnatione Verbi*, 3.1): he believed that it is a ‘most beneficial book’ (διὰ τῆς ὠφελιμότητος βίβλου τοῦ Ποιμένου· *De Incarn. loc. cit.*). Nevertheless, Athanasius relates that, during the Council of Nicaea, all those who supported the Arianizing views of Eusebius used the foregoing passage from Hermas (‘Πρῶτον πάντων πίστευσον, etc.) in

order to argue that not only the Son, but also everyone and everything in the world, is ‘from God’ (*Ad Episcopos in Africa*, PG.26.1037, quoted also by Theodoret, *HE*, p. 35). Didymus appeals to the book and quotes from it without a hint of reservation, regarding it as a Patristic text of equal authority with the *Epistle of Barnabas* (*commZacch*, 4.312; *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 262). Didymus seems to be the last Christian author to make use of the *Pastor*. Nevertheless, unlike Origen, who substituted the word βιβλαρίδιον for βιβλίον, Didymus maintained Hermas’ term βιβλαρίδιον in the relevant points of Revelation, which probably was the noun used by the author of Revelation himself. Alternatively, different MSS use terms such as βιβλίον, βιβλιδάριον, βιβλάριον.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXXVI

EN XXXVIa: φωνή τῆς βροντῆς σου
ἐν τῷ τροχῷ (Psalm 76:19)

A problem with earlier editions by Harnack and Turner is that some of their emendations result in a hardly intelligible text. A case in point is the following. Notwithstanding his own conjectural restoration of the text, Turner states that he nonetheless ‘cannot translate it as it stands’. His following remark shows his approach to this text (and its limitations):

‘What is the relation of “wheel” and “thunder”? I can only answer by recalling that one I knew well, who always loved thunder, used to call it “the noise of the chariot-wheels of God upon the mountains”. Only in the movement of the wheel can the resemblance to thunder be found. But how the “great words” come in I cannot say, unless the movement of the wheel is parallel to the utterance of the thought. I do not pretend that the emendation I offer is more than an attempt to get the idea of the passage: it is not near enough to the *ductus litterarum* to claim to restore the exact wording.’¹

However, the text *can* be restored, once clear parallels are discovered. It is a common practice of some ancient Christian theologians to repeat themselves using the same phraseology. We should be grateful that Didymus employed this methodology (or habit) in abundance. In any event, concerning this point of the Scholion, the ideas involved can be traced back to earlier theologians. Granted, Didymus’ text was not known at the time when Turner wrote his foregoing remark. However, it can be shown by argument that the specific point was introduced by Origen.

The notion of ‘wheel’ is par excellence one that fits neatly into Origen’s thought, particularly his philosophy of History. His tenet of recurrent worlds could make the cosmic ‘cycles’ analogous to a ‘wheel’. As I have canvassed extensively in my book about his

cosmology and ontology of time, cosmic periods are consummated at the same moment when divine Judgement takes place. Considering the crucial cosmological and existential consequences of this Judgement, it is at that moment that the ‘voice’ of God is most clearly heard. The ‘thunder’, which betokens the ‘voice’ of God, is indeed loudly heard upon consummation of a cosmic period, which is the beginning of the next cosmic ‘cycle’. In view of this underlying context, it is all but a coincidence that the next [Scholion XXXVII](#) deals with the issue of Judgement.

Following this, the notion of ‘rolling’ expresses the volatile and precarious processes of History. ‘Wheel’ (τροχός) is the *medium* through which the knowledge of God is imparted and becomes accessible to human beings. What is this *medium*? What else could it possibly be other than *space-time*?² The spatio-temporal reality, within which God acts and speaks to rational creatures, is the ‘wheel’, whose volatility and precariousness Origen expressed in the clearest terms, espousing the notion of *dramatic* time.³

The ‘voice’ of God is heard only within the milieu of History, since nowhere else does God speak.⁴ In order to manifest Himself and to administer His will within History, God makes use of what is available within this world: the mutable and fleeting things, which make up human life in its historical course. It is through this ‘wheel’ of fleeting historical things and circumstances that God makes Himself known. The various manifestations of this ‘wheel’ (viz. historical occurrences) are the means through which God can only be seen ‘through a glass darkly’. Origen made this idea clear at another point, where τροχός is taken to indicate divine judgement and punishment.⁵ By the same token, ‘wheel’ denotes the ‘divine fire’.⁶ Since the reasons for God’s action are ineffable, it was natural for the ‘wheels’ seen by Ezekiel to have been described as ‘the divine mysteries’.⁷

¹ Turner (above, p. 87 n. 626), p. 13.

² I have canvassed this in *PHE*, chapters 10 and 11.

³ *COT*, pp. 371–76. Cf. Didymus, *frPs(al)* (‘wheel’ suggesting ‘volatility’), fr. 841.

⁴ *PHE*, pp. 399–400.

⁵ Origen, *expProv*, PG.17.213.15–18, commenting on Prov. 20:26 (λικμήτωρ ἄσεβων βασιλεὺς σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιβαλεῖ αὐτοῖς τροχόν). The comment goes thus: Λικμήτωρ ἄσεβων ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν· ἐπιβαλεῖ δὲ τοῖς ἄσεβέσιν ὥσπερ λέων θήρας· τροχός δέ,

ἄλωνος χωρίζων τὰ ἄχυρα ἀπὸ τοῦ σίτου· ἢ τροχὸν ἐπιβαλεῖ τὴν ἀναπόδιστον τιμωρίαν.

⁶ Origen, *frPs*, 49, 3, ‘wheel’ as the ‘divine fire’: Πάντα καὶ ὁ μακάριος ἐθεάσατο Δανιήλ· Ποταμὸς γὰρ προσεῖλκε ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ φλόξ πυρός, καὶ τροχός αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον.

⁷ Origen, *Dial*, 28: Ἰεζεκιήλ βλέπων τὰ Χερουβίμ, βλέπων τοὺς τροχοὺς, τὰ ἀπόρρητα μυστήρια. Cf. *selEz*, PG.13.804.3.

Following this, there should be no difficulty in accepting a certain catena-fragment recording Origen's exegesis of Psalm 76:19: 'wheel' is either 'human life, according to Ezekiel', or 'this aeon', or 'this sensible world'.⁸ Each of these exegeses is an illustration which portrays salient features of Origen's philosophy of History.

It would have been easier for Turner to understand this passage of *Scholion XXXVI*, had he read the *Suda* lexicon, where an ad hoc lemma explains this Psalmic verse, namely, Psalm 76:19.⁹ The intervention of God in History is understood from a Hebraic point of view, which intimates the crossing of the Red Sea and God's miraculous action. The sea was turned into a whirlpool causing the death of the Egyptians and the salvation of the Jewish people, which is also a point proposed as an alternative exegesis by Origen in the foregoing passage: he understood both the passage of the Red Sea and God's acts surrounding the event by means of this notion of 'wheel' (τροχός).

The fact that the *Suda* included this lemma reflects a particular interest in that verse of the Psalms in Christian antiquity. This exegesis had been produced by Theodoret: the text of the *Suda* lemma is in fact a quotation from him.¹⁰ Notwithstanding the fact that the *Suda* was a later composition, when Cassian was writing this *Scholion*, he had a clear grasp of what the notion of 'wheel' meant, which he duly put into use. Theodoret was a favourite authority of lexicographers, not only on theology, but also on Greek grammar and syntax.¹¹ His treatise *On the Providence* was used not only for theological reasons, but also for confirming an authoritatively correct syntax in Greek.¹² For that reason, lexicographers took account of Theodoret in several ways, but in the meantime intellectuals such as Cassian took advantage of them.

This passage of the Psalms did not invite the attention of many Christian authors. Those who dealt with it, however, are by no means minor ones: Athanasius of Alexandria, Basil of Caesarea, and Olympiodorus the deacon of Alexandria. Even the recently identified mysterious figure of Julian, the fourth-century Arian, concerned himself with producing an exegesis of this passage. Above all, however, it was Eusebius of Caesarea who dealt with this Psalmic passage, and furnished illuminating accounts of it. No author other than Eusebius ever yielded such a comprehensive explanation of the notion of 'wheel', which appears barely intelligible to modern scholars. The following text is the source for more than one *Scholion*, and especially the present one.

Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.897-900: Φωνή τῆς βροντῆς σου, φησὶν, ἐν τῷ τροχῷ· βροντὴν δὲ ἐνταῦθα τὸ κήρυγμα τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν αἰνίττεται. Ὡς γὰρ φωνὴ βροντῆς οὐράνιος τυγχάνει βοή, καὶ πᾶσαν ἀνθρωπίνην ὑπερβάλλουσα δύναμιν, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν κήρυγμα,¹³ οὐράνιον τυγχάνον, οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνην περιεἶχεν ἰσχύν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκ θνητῆς βουλῆς ὠρμάτω· σὺν θεϊκῇ δὲ δυνάμει τὸν σύμπαντα ἐπλήρου κόσμον. Διὸ καὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους αὐτοῦ ὁ Σωτὴρ βοανῆργες ὠνόμαζεν, ὅπερ ἐρμηνεύεται υἱοὶ βροντῆς. Οὐκοῦν καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν εἰρηται· Φωνὴ τῆς βροντῆς σου ἐν τῷ τροχῷ. Τροχὸν δὲ σημαίνει τὸν σύμπαντα βίον· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἑζεκιήλ τροχὸς ἐν τροχῷ λέλεκται ὁ σύμπας τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος.¹⁴ Ἔστι μὲν οὖν τροχὸς ὁ κόσμος σφαιροειδὴς ὢν, κυκλοφορητικῶς τε κινούμενος. Ἐνταῦθα δὲ τροχὸς ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ βίος, ἅπανστον τὴν στροφὴν ποιούμενος· διὸ καὶ τροχὸς ἐν τῷ τροχῷ εἴρηται. Κατὰ δὲ τὸν Ἀκύλαν, Φωνὴ βροντῆς σου ἐν τῷ τροχῷ· κατὰ δὲ τὸν

⁸ Origen, *frPs*, 76, 18-19: διὸ καὶ τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν υἱὸν βροντῆς ἐπεκάλεσε. Τροχὸν δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν βίον, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Ἑζεκιήλ ἔστι μαθεῖν. Ἄλλος δὲ φωνὴν ἐν τῷ τροχῷ, ἡνίκα ἐνέδησε τοὺς ἄξονας τῶν αἰγυπτίων ἀρμάτων. *selPs*, PG.12.1540.40-42: Ὁ τροχὸς ἢ τὸν αἰῶνα σημαίνει τοῦτον, ἢ τὸν κόσμον τὸν αἰσθητόν.

⁹ *Suda* lexicon, Alphabetic letter tau, entry 1074: Τροχός· Δαβὶδ· φωνὴ τῆς βροντῆς σου ἐν τῷ τροχῷ. περὶ τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης· φησὶ γὰρ ἡ ἱστορία, ὅτι νότου πνεύσαντος διηρέθη τὸ πέλαγος, τοῦ δὲ ἄερος συστρεφομένου καὶ τῶν νεφῶν συνισταμένων ὁ ἄνεμος τίκεται. Cf. *ibid.* Alphabetic letter phi, entry 656.

¹⁰ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1481.16-20: Νότου γάρ, ὡς φησιν ἡ ἱστορία, βιαίου πνέοντος, διηρέθη τὸ πέλαγος· τοῦ

δὲ ἄερος συστρεφομένου, καὶ τῶν νεφῶν συνισταμένων, ὁ ἄνεμος τίκεται.

¹¹ See quotations in Introduction, p. 70, note 531.

¹² *Lexicon Syntacticum*, Alphabetic letter alpha, p. 18, lemma 70: ἀνέχομαι, ὅτε σημαίνει τὸ καταφρονῶ, ὡς τὸ 'ἀνέχομαι σου τοῦ θράσους'· καὶ παρὰ τῷ Θεοδωρήτῳ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τῆς προνοίας λόγοις αἰεὶ γενικῇ. *Ibid.* Alphabetic letter alpha, p. 25, lemma 323: ἀφαιροῦμαι σε χρημάτων καὶ χρήματα· καὶ παρὰ Θεοδωρήτῳ, λόγῳ ἔκτῳ Περὶ προνοίας· 'τὸν πλοῦτον ὁ ληστής μόνον ἀφαιρεῖται τὸν κεκτημένον', ἀλλὰ καὶ 'ὁ συκοφάντης ἀφείλετό σε τῶν δεσμών'.

¹³ Cf. *Scholion XXXVI*.

¹⁴ See above, Origen, *selPs*, 76, 18-19.

Σύμμαχον, *Ἦχος βροντῆς σου ἐν τῷ τροχῷ*· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Θεοδοτίωνα, *Φωνὴ βροντῆς σου ἐν τῷ τροχῷ*. Καὶ θέα ὅπως κατὰ πάντας τοὺς ἐρμηνευτὰς *τροχὸς* ὠνόμασται· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡ Ἑβραϊκὴ λέξις *βαγγελλ* περιέχει, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ *τροχῷ*· οὕτω δὲ ὠνόμασται καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἑζεκιήλ. Ἐνθα γενόμενος, παρασημειώσῃ, ὥς καὶ ἡ θεία Γραφή τὸ περιέχον τροχὸς οἶδε. Διὸ σφαιροειδῇ φασιν εἶναι τὸν κόσμον. Ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἑσδρα ὁ Ζοροβάβελ τὰ νικητήρια ἀπηνέγκατο παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ εἰρηκῶς· *Μέγας ὁ οὐρανός, καὶ μέγας ὁ ἥλιος, ὅτι στρέφεται ἐν τῷ κύκλῳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἐπανέρχεται εἰς τὸν ἴδιον τόπον ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ*. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν κατὰ φυσικὴν θεωρίαν. Τὰ δὲ προκείμενα θεσπίζει τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς θεοφανείας τὴν δύναμιν· καὶ ὥς δι' αὐτῆς τὰ πλήθη μὲν τῶν ἔθνων τὸν Θεὸν ἐπέγνω, αἱ δὲ ἄβυσσοι ἐταράχθησαν, αἱ δὲ προλεχθεῖσαι νεφέλαι ἔδωκαν φωνήν, καὶ ὥστε τὰ βέλη αὐτοῦ διεπορεύθη, καὶ ὥς φωνὴ τῆς βροντῆς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν ἐν τῷ τροχῷ.

Therefore, according to Eusebius, ‘wheel’ denotes ‘human life’ (ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος), which is an ‘incessant’ course, indeed a ‘wheel’ which ‘does not cease to rotate’ (ἄπαυστον τὴν στροφὴν ποιούμενος). He remarks that ‘the Holy Scripture knows of wheel as a receptacle’ (καὶ ἡ θεία Γραφή τὸ περιέχον τροχὸς οἶδε). Consequently, the author of the Scholion says, ‘once you have grasped the meaning of *wheel*, then you shall also grasp the meaning of *thunder*’. In other words, ‘thunder’ is the voice of God heard within the historical process.

Therefore, the author of this Scholion knew of the foregoing analysis by Eusebius, and he undoubtedly was aware of Origen’s accounts in the first place. This is all the more probable, since a passage of *Cels* (where Origen refers to ‘thunder’) has the word *μεγαλοφώνων*¹⁵ in association with βροντή,¹⁶ which is the word used at this point of *Scholion XXXVI*. Didymus also has this combination,¹⁷ no doubt following Origen.

Furthermore, the author of *De Trinitate*, who is none other than Cassian himself, uses this exegesis expressly. *De Trinitate* (lib. 2.8–27), PG.39.684.6–8: διὰ δὲ τῆς βροντῆς τὴν πανταχοῦ φθάσασαν καὶ μετὰ φόβου ὑποδεχθεῖσαν χάριν τοῦ βαπτίσματος αἰνίττεται· διὰ δὲ τοῦ τροχοῦ, τὸν ἄστατον καὶ ἀλλόκοτον βίον.

What is unique about Didymus is that he returns to this notion of ‘wheel’ at different points of his work, whereas other authors dealt with it only in passing.

Didymus, *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 225: ἡ καρδία πολλάκις ἤδη εἴρηται ὅτι τὸν νοῦν σημαίνει. ὁ νοῦς δὲ οὐ λοξῶς οὐδὲ εἰς εὐθεῖαν χωρεῖ, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἑαυτὸν στρέφεται. αὐτίκα γοῦν καὶ τινες τῶν ἔξω εἰρήκασιν, ὅτι αἱ νοήσεις ὥσπερ τροχοὶ εἰσιν καὶ κύκλοι στρεφόμενοι. ὅταν γὰρ ὁ νοῦς περὶ τὰ ἔξω τείνῃ ἑαυτὸν καὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν θέλῃ φαντασίαν δέχεσθαι, οὐκ ἔστιν περὶ ἑαυτόν, οὐ στρέφεται περὶ ἑαυτόν. ὅταν δὲ νοῇ καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἐπιστάνῃ, αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ τὸ νοοῦν καὶ τὸ νοούμενον. ὁ γὰρ κατ’ ἐνέργειαν νοῦς ἀεὶ τὸ νοεῖν ἔχει, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε χεῖται ἐπὶ τὰ ἔξω.

This passage manifests the amazing memory and learning of Didymus. Using remarkable Aristotelian terms (such as τὸ νοοῦν καὶ τὸ νοούμενον), his remark about ‘those from without’ (τινὲς τῶν ἔξω), who expounded this theory of knowledge, actually points to Aristotle reflecting after Plato, as already discussed on pp. 370–73. In fact Didymus refers to the *Timaeus*, having in mind a passage from *Phaedrus* as well.¹⁸ This passage of the *Timaeus* had received a comment by Plutarch, of which Didymus was no doubt aware.¹⁹ When, therefore, he refers to ‘those from without’, he had in mind Plato and Plutarch, as much as his contemporary Proclus.²⁰ The Aristotelian vocabulary is simply his own, and Theodoret, as well as Cassian himself, treasured this exegesis of the Alexandrian master. It then hardly comes as a surprise that Theodore of Mopsuestia produced an exegesis of the same Psalmic

¹⁵ The characteristic term *μεγαλοφώνια* was discussed in *EN XXV*k.

¹⁶ Origen, *Cels*, VI.77: καὶ εἰ τινες εἰσὶν ἐκ λόγων τὴν γένεσιν λαβόντες *μεγαλοφώνων*, οἵτινες οὐδὲν ἀποδέουσι νοητῆς ‘βροντῆς’.

¹⁷ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 993: Βροντῆς ἀκούοντα τὰ ὄρη τουτέστιν τὸν κατὰ τὴν πρόνοιαν *μεγαλοφώνως* γινόμενον λόγον δειλιᾷ.

¹⁸ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 247d; *Timaeus*, 37c. See *EN XXXI*q.

¹⁹ Cf. a comment on Plato by Plutarch: *De Animae Procreatione in*

Timaeo, 1031D. Cf. similar comments on the same point by Themistius, *In Aristotelis Libros de Anima Paraphrasis*, v. 5,3, p. 96: Πλάτων μὲν γὰρ κύκλοις ἀφομοιοῖ τὰς ἐνεργείας τοῦ νοῦ τῷ τε εὐτρόχῳ καὶ τῷ ὀρθῷ. Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 2, pp. 312; 314. Hermias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, pp. 124; 229. Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, 1.49.28; 1.50.41.

²⁰ See discussion above, *EN XXXI*q.

passage, urging that ‘wheel’ bespeaks the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea.²¹

C. H. Turner declared himself unable to translate, indeed to understand, this passage. Once however Origen’s cosmology and concept of time are recalled, along with the specific analyses of Eusebius, this point is not difficult to interpret. Τροχός (‘wheel’) is the volatile human activity making up the drama of History. Βροντή (‘thunder’) is the voice of God, which was heard at the various epiphanies of the Logos at critical moments of biblical history.

This Scholion does indeed draw on Eusebius’ analysis interpreting ‘thunder’ as ‘the preaching of the gospel’.²² The ensuing remarks of the Scholion, on ‘wheel’ and ‘cycle’, evince Eusebius to be the source Cassian draws on, while he also has Didymus in his mind.

EN XXXVIb: *υἱὸς βροντῆς κεκλημένους*
διὰ τὴν μεγαλοφωνίαν

Only a few identifiable authors used this idiom.

Origen, *commMatt*, 12.32: ἡ τῆς ‘βροντῆς υἱοί’ καὶ γεννώμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας τοῦ θεοῦ βροντῶντος καὶ μέγала οὐρανόθεν βοῶντος τοῖς ἔχουσιν ὧτα καὶ σοφοῖς. Ibid. 12.33: ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς τῆς ‘βροντῆς’ υἱοῖς γεννηθεῖσιν ἀπὸ μεγαλοφωνίας τουτέστιν ἀπὸ βροντῆς, οὐρανίου χρήματος.

Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 2.1.119: καὶ μοι δοκεῖ ὁ τῆς βροντῆς υἱὸς Ἰωάννης ὁ τῇ μεγαλοφωνίᾳ τῶν κατ’ αὐτὸν δογμάτων ὑπερηχήσας τὰ προλαβόντα κηρύγματα.

Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.292.15–20: Δυνατὸν δέ σοι καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν λόγον τὴν μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα γινομένην ἐκ τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς τῶν ἡδὴ τελειουμένων παράδοσιν βροντὴν ὀνομάζειν. Ὅτι γὰρ βροντὴ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, δηλοῦσιν οἱ παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου μετονομασθέντες μαθηταὶ καὶ υἱοὶ βροντῆς.

Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 355: οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας ἐχρημάτισαν ‘υἱοὶ βροντῆς’. *frPs(al)*, fr. 117: ὁ θεὸς εὐθὺς οὐρανόθεν βροντᾷ, ἥτοι διὰ τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας τῶν πληρουμένων λόγων ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ.

Eriphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 278: ἀλλὰ γε πρὸς τοῦτου Ἰωάννης, ὁ υἱὸς ὄντως βροντῆς, τῇ οἰκείᾳ μεγαλοφωνίᾳ.

Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 234: Πέρας γοῦν ὁ προφήτης Ἡσαΐας αὐτὰ μὲν τὰ τῶν παθῶν αὐτοῦ διεξιὼν ἵχνη πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπιφέρει καὶ τοῦτο μεγαλοφωνοτέρᾳ βοῇ τό· ‘Καὶ εἶδομεν αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὔτε κάλλος’. *HE*, p. 15: σύμφωνα γοῦν τούτοις βοᾷ καὶ ὁ μεγαλοφωνότατος Παῦλος. Ibid. p. 304: τὰ κατὰ τοῦ μεγαλοφώνου κήρυκος τῆς ἀληθείας τολμώμενα. *Epistulae* 53–95, *Epistle* 66: Ἀπόστολοι δὲ οὗτοι καὶ προφῆται, Παλαιᾶς καὶ Καινῆς Διαθήκης μεγαλόφωνοι κήρυκες. Ibid. 67: οἱ μεγαλόφωνοι τῆς ἀληθείας ἀφίκοντο κήρυκες. Ibid. 83: Ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ παρὰ τῆς θείας Γραφῆς ἐδιδάχθημεν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ταύτην ἡρμηνευκῶτων Πατέρων, Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ἀθανασίου τῶν μεγαλοφώνων κηρύκων τῆς ἀληθείας. Ibid. 146: οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας μεγαλόφωνοι κήρυκες. *De Sancta et Vivifica Trinitate*, PG.75.1152.4–5: Ἡμεῖς οἱ τῆς Τριάδος ἐρασταὶ καὶ προσκυνηταὶ καὶ κήρυκες μεγαλόφωνοί τε καὶ μεγαλόφρονες, *De Incarnatione Domini*, PG.75.1448.45–46: τὸν μεγαλοφώνωτατον κήρυκα τῆς θεολογίας, τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Ἰωάννην. *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80.533.14–15: τὴν τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησιν, καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν κηρυγμάτων τὸ μεγαλόφωνον. *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.673.34–36: Οἱ γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν τὰς γλώττας κινοῦντες, τί οὐκ ἂν τολμήσαιεν κατὰ τῶν εὐνῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ μεγαλοφώνων τῆς ἀληθείας κηρύκων;

We have therefore Cassian writing, with Origen and Theodoret in mind.

²¹ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *expPs*, Psalm 76:19: Βροντὴν γάρ φησιν ἐπαφείς μεγίστην, συνεπόδισας τοὺς τροχοὺς καὶ τὰ ἄρματα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, ὥστε μηδὲ βραχὺ δυνηθῆναι προβῆναι, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τῶν ὑδάτων ἅπαντας καταποντωθέντας ἀπολέσθαι. Cf. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1481.16–20, quoted on p. 393, n. 10.

²² So does Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27.348.40–45: *Φωνὴ τῆς βροντῆς σου ἐν τῷ τροχῷ*. Βροντὴν τὸν εὐαγγελικὸν λόγον φησί, τὸν κατακυττήσαντα τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανόν. Διὸ καὶ τὸν

εὐαγγελιστὴν υἱὸν ἀπεκάλεσε βροντῆς. Τροχὸν δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν βίον φησίν· ὥς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰεζεκιήλ ἐστι μαθεῖν. Likewise, Pseudo-Athanasius, *De Sancta Trinitate*, PG.28.1249.10–14. In like manner, Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *commEccl*, PG.93.621.5–8 (‘wheel is human life’). Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.292.23. Julian the Arian, *In Job*, p. 163.

The author explains that even if a voice is heard through ‘real speech’, it may be possible to write down what is heard, but impossible to write down its meaning. In regard to this, considering Paul’s vision in 2 Cor. 12:4, there are two cases, which Didymus had considered .

1. The case of hearing ‘unspeakable words’, which means that they are ‘spoken only to the mind, since God makes them intelligible’ (ἐν νῶ μόνῳ ὁμιλοῦνται καὶ θεὸς ἐνίησιν αὐτὰ τῇ διανοίᾳ). These ‘words’ are called ‘ineffable’ (ἄρρητα), since they are not pronounced ‘through syllables’ (οὐ λεγόμενα διὰ συλλαβῶν), and are impossible to write down (οὐχ οἷα τε ὄντα γραφῆναι καὶ χαραχθῆναι).

2. Words pronounced through actual sounds, which can be heard physically (διὰ ἐνάρθρου φωνῆς). In that case it is possible for one to make out *words*: although each one of them has a certain meaning commonly understood, it may be impossible to grasp the *message* conferred thereby. In this case, the words are indeed spoken and heard, yet their ‘meaning’ is ‘ineffable’. Although these words communicate ordinary sounds, their meaning is impossible to grasp (τὸ μέντοι νόημα, ὃ οὐχ ὑποβάλλει ἡ φωνή, ἄρρητον ῥῆμα ἐστίν).²³

Following this, the present Scholion means that the thunders uttered two kinds of words: on the one hand, words that it was possible to commit to writing; and, on the other, words that it was impossible to write down. Nevertheless, they were all pronounced by means of ‘an articulate voice’.²⁴

The meaning of the Scholion is that John heard a real voice, that is, real utterances ‘in syllables’. It was not simply a message ineffably imprinted in his mind,

or a non-discursive notion implanted to him. However, to hear these words and comprehend them was one thing, to communicate them was quite another: the latter was subject to God’s determining which of these ‘words’ were allowed to be communicated to others by being committed to writing in the text of Revelation, which John was bidden to write.

EN XXXVIId: ἀλλὰ μήποτε

Once again we have an expression which belongs to Origen’s characteristic vocabulary,²⁵ which he had taken up from Philo²⁶ and Alexander of Aphrodisias.²⁷ This means, ‘and see whether this is the case that’, or ‘perhaps’, which actually bears a sentiment of the author appearing to favour (sometimes as an alternative option) the idea he introduced. Harnack was wrong to omit μήποτε, since the word actually exists in the Codex. Turner was right to retain it.

Didymus used μήποτε repeatedly (more than fifty instances), so did Theodoret (more than thirty instances), but neither of them ever used the idiom ἀλλὰ μήποτε. Its usage among Christians, albeit including some eminent ones, is rather rare.²⁸

The expression ἀλλὰ μήποτε comes from two sources. One is scriptural,²⁹ the other is pagan, namely, Xenophon.³⁰ The latter is to all appearances the origin of its pagan usage, which occurs in Neoplatonists and Aristotelian commentators alike.³¹

EN XXXVIe: Isaiah, 11:1–3

This scriptural portion was commented on by a good number of authors. Of them, Theodoret made the

²³ Didymus, *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 237.

²⁴ ἐνάρθρου φωνῆς. The expression was too common in Late Antiquity to trace any debts by Cassian.

²⁵ Origen, *commJohn*, I.38.283; VI.48.249; X.40.277; XX.35.312; XXXII.14.154; *homLuc*, Homily 14, p. 88; *commMatt*, 11.10; 15.22; 16.5; 17.7; *comm1Cor*, 74; *comEph*, 24; *Commentarii in Romanos* (III.5–V.7), p. 130; *selGen*, PG.12: 113.25; 124.15; *selPs*, PG.12.1116.18.

²⁶ Philo, *Legum Allegoriarum*, 3.40; 3.252; *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, 137; *De Posteritate Caini*, 18; 172; *De Plantatione*, 55; *De Confusione Linguarum*, 119; *De Somniis*, 1.65; *Legatio ad Gaium*, 215.

²⁷ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, pp. 795; 825.

²⁸ Asterius of Antioch, *commPs*, 13.22. Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.384.3. Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogiae*, Catechesis 5.17. Ephraem Syrus, *Ad Imitationem Proverbiorum*, p. 256. John Chrysostom, *In Sanctum Matthaeum*, PG.57.317.36; *In*

Epistolam i ad Corinthios Commentarius, PG.61.258.6. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *Eclogae ex Diversis Homiliis*, PG.63.751.27. Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones* lxiv, 49.4.8. Also, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 2.85.

²⁹ Gen. 38:23.

³⁰ Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 5.3.7.

³¹ Plotinus, *Enneades*, VI.3.7. Porphyry, *De Abstinencia*, 3.5. Stobaeus, (recording Porphyry), *Anthologium*, 3.21.27. Ammonius of Alexandria, *In Aristotelis Librum de Interpretatione Commentarius*, p. 244. Damascius, *De Principiis*, v. 1, pp. 14; 30; 68; 69; 70; 73; 135; 137; *In Parmenidem*, pp. 55; 180; 278; 283; 286; *In Philebum*, 190; *In Phaedonem (versio 2)*, 62; 78; 80. Syrianus, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, pp. 140; 174. Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Quattuor Libros de Caelo Commentaria*, v. 7, pp. 234; 235; 333; 389; *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, v. 9, pp. 170; 173; 183; 778; v. 10, pp. 859; 1246.

most use of it. Justin Martyr is present once again, as he was in the previous Scholion maintaining the Psalmic idea about pagan gods being daemons. He comments on the passage of Isaiah in *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 87.2 and 4. Furthermore, we come upon the following authors.

Hippolytus, *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, fr. 15. Origen, *commJohn*, I.23.147; *homJer*, 8.5; *commMatt*, 13.2; *selPs*, PG.12.1109.7–12. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 11. Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa, *Delecta Testimonia Adversus Judaeos*, PG.46.205.37–42. Eusebius, *DE*, 7.3.28; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.31; 1.62; 2.51. Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29: 761.53–764.4; 772.37–38. Gregory of Nazianzus, *De Spiritu Sancto*, 29; *In Pentecosten*, PG.36.441.33–34. Pseudo-Epiphanius of Salamis, *Testimonia*, 5.23b; *Tractatus de Numerorum Mysteriis*, PG.43.516.14–18. PG.43.516.14–18. Asterius of Antioch, *commPs*, 13.19. John Chrysostom, *Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.64.680.6–9. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Sanctum Pascha* (*sermo* 6), 35.1; *Oratio de Nativitate*, line 70.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.254; 1.256; 1.281; *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 133.

Theodoret, *Eranistes*, p. 85; *commIs*, 4; 19; *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.81: 60.8–13; 96.48–53; *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.501.19–24; *Oratio ad Eos Qui in Euphratesia et Osrhoena Regione*, PG.83.1428.40–45.

Cyril of Alexandria, *In Isaiam*, PG.70: 309.24f; 313.14–16; 316.9–11; *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, p. 44.

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Illuminandorum*, catecheses 16.30; 17.5. Proclus of Constantinople (archbishop, fifth cent. AD), *De Incarnatione Domini*, lines 178–181. Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2040. Maximus Confessor, *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, 54; 63. In producing his exegesis Oecumenius followed this Scholion, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, pp. 79 and 122. *Anonymus Dialogus cum Judaeis*, 5. *Dissertatio Contra Judaeos*, 10.

Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT* (*lib.* 2.1–7), 3.8; 7.9.1; *DT* (*lib.* 2.8–27), PG.39.701.47–52; *DT* (*lib.* 3), PG.39.869.30–34. Cf. the passage in *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 4.134.

Didymus correlated his exegesis of Isaiah with the Book of Revelation. *commZacch*, 1.278 and 281: (278) Εὐρίσκομεν οὐ πολλαχοῦ τῆς γραφῆς ὡς τὰ νοητὰ ὀνόματι τοῦ χρυσοῦ σημαίνεται· τάχα οὖν ἡ νοητὴ λυχνία ὁ πνευματικὸς οἶκος καὶ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τυγχάνει, ὡς ἐν Ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννου λέγεται, ὅτε φησὶν ὁ δεικνὺς τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῷ μυσταγωγούμενῳ· ‘Αἱ ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι ἃς ὀφθαλμῷ ψυχῆς εἶδες ἑπτὰ λυχνίαι εἰσὶν.’ . . . (281) Πῶς γὰρ οὐ χρυσῇ ὅλη λυχνία αὕτη, ἁμαρτίαν μὴ ποιήσασα μηδὲ γνοῦσα αὐτήν, ἣ ἐπὶ κείται ἑπτὰ λύχνοι, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς θείας βουλῆς, καὶ ἰσχύος, καὶ γνώσεως, καὶ εὐσεβείας, καὶ φόβου Θεοῦ;

This Scholion has all the characteristics of an independent text written by Cassian, notwithstanding influences upon him.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXXVII

EN XXXVIIa: Quoting 2 Cor. 5:10.

Didymus memorized the passage of Paul in a slightly different phrasing: he quotes τῷ βήματι instead of ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος. He repeats this at three points,¹ whereas he quotes Paul accurately twice.² This Scholion has the latter formulation. However, the case is not one of misquotation, since there are a vast number of Christian authors who conveniently quote τῷ βήματι instead of ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος, which means that there must have been manuscripts with this reading.³ The version known to us today was evidently available to Origen. He quotes this version (τῷ βήματι) once,⁴ but against this point there are numerous ones where Paul is quoted accurately (ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος).⁵

Theodoret invariably quotes τῷ βήματι,⁶ save one instance,⁷ which means that Cassian was reading the same version of the New Testament as Theodoret.

EN XXXVIIb: λαβεῖν ἕκαστον ἐπαξίως τῶν βεβιωμένων

The notion of eschatological judgement in relation to one's action is the most commonplace Christian doctrine, hence what matters at this point is the phraseology rather than the doctrine itself. Didymus' vocabulary does not fall near that of the Scholion at this point,⁸ which turns out to be a comment by Cassian inspired by Gregory of Nyssa.⁹ Besides, both the phraseology and notion appear in the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*.¹⁰

A fragment of Origen's¹¹ suggests that he was the original source for the structure here. His vocabulary was, in turn, extensively borrowed by Gregory of Nyssa,¹² who uses similar phrasing to our Scholion in relation to 2 Cor. 5:10, which has just been discussed.¹³ Part of the Scholion then, derives from Gregory, just as some similar expressions used by the other Cappadocians do likewise.¹⁴ Severianus of

¹ τῷ βήματι. Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 80; *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 314; *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. pp. 349 and 360. Cf. *frPs* (al), fr. 75: Ὁ Χριστός ἐστὶν οὗ τῷ βήματι φανερωθῆναι πάντας δεῖ.

² ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος. Didymus, *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 321; *commZacch*, 5.75.

³ Cf. τῷ βήματι. Polycarp of Smyrna, *Epistula ad Philippenses*, 6.2. Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.84; *commPs*, PG.23.124.52; *Fragmenta in Daniele*, PG.24.525.10; *DE* (*Fragmenta Libri xv*), fr. 3. Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae*, 197. Gregory of Nyssa, *De Beatitudinibus*, PG.44.1260.48; *In Sanctum Pascha*, v. 9, p. 264. Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo Compunctorius*, p. 98; *Sermo in Secundum Adventum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi*, p. 20; *Interrogationes et Responsiones*, p. 83; *Sermo Paraeneticus de Secundo Adventu Domini*; *et de Paenitentia*, p. 210; *Quomodo Latro Ante Resurrectionem in Paradisum Intravit*, line 6. Amphilochius of Iconium, *Epistula ad Synodum*, line 91. John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria quote both alternatives abundantly. Clement of Alexandria and Athanasius quote only ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος.

⁴ Origen, *deOr*, XXVIII.5.

⁵ Origen, *Princ*, III.1.21; *Philocalia*, 21.20; *frLuc*, fr. 228; *commMatt*, 12.30; 13.30; 14.8; *homJer*, 20.3; *comm1Cor*, 18; 27.

⁶ Theodoret, *De Providentia*, PG.83.740.16; *Haeticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.520.10–11; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1664.24; *Epistulae*, Epistles 91; 102; 147; *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 12.18; *commIs*, 14; *intPaulXIV*, PG.83.520.34–35.

⁷ Theodoret, *intPaulXIV*, PG.82.408.39.

⁸ Didymus, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 83: ἀλλὰ γε διαδέχονται αἱ διὰ τὰ βεβιωμένα κολάσεις. *In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, p. 33: εἰ πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν ὄντων θεοῦ οἴκου ἡ ἐξέτασις τῶν βεβιωμένων γίνεται, τί χρηρ νομίζειν τέλος τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ θεοῦ;

⁹ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.1145.35: ἀλλὰ δώσει δίκας τῶν βεβιωμένων ἀξίας. *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 1.118: Τοῖς γὰρ δὴ μετασχούσι τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ταύτης ἀξίως βεβιωκόσιν οὐρανὸς εὐτρεπῆς καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐνδιατήματα.

¹⁰ *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 1.22: Τοῦτο οὖν τὸ σπέρμα, τοὺς ὅσους ἐπὶ τῇ ἀξίᾳ τῶν βεβιωμένων ὀφείλοντας παθεῖν τὰ Σοδόμων.

¹¹ Origen, *frPs*, 74, 8: κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τῶν βεβιωμένων ἑκάστω.

¹² Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 3.3.36–37: κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν βεβιωμένων ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως ἐποιήσει τὴν ψήφον τοῖς κρινομένοις. *In Illud: Quatenus Uni ex His Fecistis Mihi Fecistis*, v. 9, p. 111: καὶ μέχρι τῆς φοβερᾶς ἐμφανείας ἐκεῖνης εὐρισκομένων ἀθροίζοντά τε πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τῶν βεβιωμένων ἑκάστω τὴν κρίσιν ἐπάγοντα. *De Infantibus Praemature Abreptis*, p. 73: ὑφέξει τῶν βεβιωμένων τὴν κρίσιν, λήψεται τὴν κατ' ἀξίαν ἀντίδοσιν.

¹³ Gregory of Nyssa, *In Sanctum Pascha*, v. 9, p. 264: πάντες παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς ὑπ' ἐκείνῳ κριτὴ τὰς πρὸς ἀξίαν ἁμοιβὰς τῶν βεβιωμένων κομίσασθαι. *De Infantibus Praemature Abreptis*, p. 73: ὁψεται ἅρα κἀκεῖνη ἡ ψυχὴ τὸν κριτὴν; παραστήσεται μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων τῷ βήματι; ὑφέξει τῶν βεβιωμένων τὴν κρίσιν;

¹⁴ Basil of Caesarea, *Quod Deus Non Est Auctor Malorum*, PG.31.329.45–47: Εἰ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐπισκοπῶν, εἰ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἀντιδιδούς ἑκάστω κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τῶν βεβιωμένων. *Homiliae in Hexaemeron*, 1.4: καὶ κριτὴν δίκαιον, τὴν ἀξίαν τοῖς βεβιωμένοις ἐπάγοντα. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ad Julianum Tributorem Exaequatorem*, PG.35.1061.13–16: Ἐκεῖ πάντες ἐγγραφησόμεθα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἥδη γεγράμμεθα κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν ἐνταῦθα βεβιωμένων ἕκαστος.

Gabala, who also quotes Rev. 2:5, uses similar vocabulary.¹⁵

EN XXXVIIc: ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ συνίσταται

In the first place, the expression is an adaptation of the vocabulary of Rom. 3:5. However, further discussion is called for. The strict literal sense of the verb συνίστασθαι is indeed the most rare one. Derived from the preposition σύν and the verb ἵστασθαι, this was normally used in the specific instance of standing before a court facing an opponent, in order for both to be judged. This is the meaning of the expression συνίστασθαι τὴν δίκην.¹⁶ In general, this verb has the sense ‘standing before a court’, or the like.¹⁷

Thus, the expression ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ συνίσταται means precisely what the literal sense of the verb indicates: on the ‘day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgement of God’ (Rom. 2:5), this ‘wrath’ stands vis-à-vis each rational creature. Each and every one of them shall receive a reward or punishment, in accordance with what everyone has ‘treasured up to oneself’. The expression, therefore, is about the divine judgement, on the one hand, and the quality of human action, on the other.

There is only one parallel for this phraseology, which occurs in the *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaïam*, 13.270: ἐπειδὴν συμπληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι τῶν ἀποστατησάντων καὶ ἔλθῃ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀνταποδόσεως, θυμοῦσθαι λέγεται καὶ συνδιανίστασθαι ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

EN XXXVIIId: Quoting Rom. 2:5

Origen is the author who made the most of it,¹⁸ and Theodoret followed.¹⁹ From Rom. 2:5, Didymus normally quotes ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς, but not the phrase καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ.²⁰ Only a few authors made this scriptural passage a theme to quote and comment upon, namely, Basil of Caesarea,²¹ Cyril of Alexandria,²² and John Chrysostom.²³ Furthermore, we come upon some (already familiar) dubious texts. Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxi*, 49.4.8; *Homiliae I*, Homily 4, line 306 (which is the same text as the previous one). Also, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaïam*, 16.307.

EN XXXVIIe: φοβουμένων τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ

To regard εὐλάβεια indicating fear (φόβος) is a Stoic interpretation, which incurred some criticism.

Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Moralia*, fr. 411 (SVF, III.99.22–25) *apud* Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.7.33.2: ἀλλ’ εἰ σοφίζονται τὰ ὀνόματα εὐλάβειαν καλούντων οἱ φιλόσοφοι τὸν τοῦ νόμου φόβον, εὐλογον οὖσαν ἔκκλινιν. Ibid. fr. 431 (SVF, III.105.16–24) *apud* Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 7.116: εἶναι δὲ καὶ εὐπαθείας φασὶ τρεῖς, χαράν, εὐλάβειαν, βούλησιν. καὶ τὴν μὲν χαρὰν ἐναντίαν φασὶν εἶναι τῇ ἡδονῇ, οὖσαν εὐλογον ἔπαρσιν, τὴν δὲ εὐλάβειαν τῷ φόβῳ, οὖσαν εὐλογον ἔκκλινιν· φοβηθήσεσθαι μὲν γὰρ τὸν

¹⁵ Severianus of Gabala, *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, p. 215: ἐκάστου κατ’ ἄξian τῶν βεβιωμένων αὐτῷ τυγχάνοντος.

¹⁶ *Suda* lexicon, Alphabetic letter alpha, entry 4509: ἀποτίσαι τὴν ζημίαν καὶ συνίστασθαι τὴν δίκην πρὸς τὸν ἀντιποιούμενον. The same in *Collectio Verborum e Rhetoribus et Sapientibus*, Alphabetic entry alpha, p. 167. Lexica Segueriana, *Glossae Ars Rhetoricae*, Alphabetic entry alpha, p. 214: καὶ ἀναγκάζει αὐτὸν συνίστασθαι τὴν δίκην πρὸς τοὺς ἀμφισβητοῦντας.

¹⁷ *Suda* lexicon, Alphabetic letter delta, entry 1236: Διῳμotos. διωμότους συνίστασθαι τοῖς διαφερομένοις ἐκέλευε τοὺς ῥήτορας. Ibid. Alphabetic letter pi, entry 319: Παραγραφή: ὅταν λέγῃ τις ὅτι τὸ πρᾶγμα, περὶ οὗ τὸ ἐγκλημᾶ ἐστιν, εἰσῆχθη πρότερον εἰς δικαστήριον, καὶ γεγένηται περὶ αὐτοῦ γνῶσις. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο φησι μὴ δεῖν εἶπε περὶ αὐτοῦ συνίστασθαι κρίσιν.

¹⁸ Origen, *Princ.* III.1.6; III.1.11; *Cels.* IV.72; *Philocalia*, 21.5; 21.10; 27.10; *homJer.* 20.4; *Commentarii in Romanos* (cod. Athon. Laura 184 B64), 2.5; *expProv.* PG.17.193.1f. Cf. Evagrius of Pontus, *Expositio in Proverbia*, p. 93; *Scholia in Proverbia*, 134. Eusebius,

Commentarius in Isaïam, 2.58; *commPs.* PG.23: 260.55f; 340.14f; 340.34–35; 1216.54–57. Gregory of Nyssa, *De Vita Mosis*, 2.86.

¹⁹ Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, pp. 107; 149; 309; *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80: 1224.1f; 1237.7f; *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.1032.45–50; *intDan.* PG.81.1368.20f; *intProphXII.* PG.81.1597.15f; *intPaulXIV.* PG.82.68.40f.

²⁰ Didymus, *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 217; *commZacch.* 2.187; 5.22; *frPs(al)*, frs. 66; 1042; *commEccl* (11–12), Cod. p. 340.

²¹ Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.313.40f; *Moralia*, PG.31.701.7f.

²² Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 2, p. 594; *In Isaïam*, PG.70: 32.7; 160.7; *De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.457.2.

²³ John Chrysostom, *De Lazaro*, PG.48.998.32; *Ad Populum Antiochenum*, PG.49.134.52; *In Genesin*, PG.53.221.28; *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.482.17; *In Epistolam ad Romanos Commentarius*, PG.60.425.11; *In Epistolam i ad Corinthios Commentarius*, PG.61.296.20.

σοφὸν οὐδαμῶς, εὐλαβηθήσεσθαι δέ.²⁴ Ibid. fr. 439 (SVF, III.107.20–31) *apud* Plutarch, *De Virtute Morali*, 449A: Οἷς καὶ αὐτοὶ [viz. the Stoics] τρόπον τινὰ διὰ τὴν ἐνάργειαν ὑπεῖκοντες ‘αἰδεῖσθαι τὸ αἰσχύνεσθαι καλοῦσι καὶ τὸ ἡδεσθαι χαίρειν καὶ τοὺς φόβους εὐλαβείας’.

Plutarch criticized the Stoics for the euphemism (viz. using εὐλάβεια for φόβος) in their terminology, and he points out inconsistency in their usage. Clement records the same criticism which was levelled against the Stoics, ascribing it to Critolaus, who had styled them ‘name-abusers’ (ὀνοματομάχους) due to their resolute euphemism.²⁵ It is therefore puzzling that K. Müller ascribed these ideas to Posidonius,²⁶ who is not mentioned at all in this specific foregoing work of Plutarch, whereas Chrysippus is, actually not only in 449c, but also in other passages (441A, 448A, 450C and D), as is Zeno (441, 443A).

Further in his *Stromateis*, Clement endorses this criticism of the Stoics: to him, a real ‘gnostic’ is free of passions: one of them is εὐλάβεια, which is almost tantamount to ‘fear’. *Stromateis*, 6.9.74.1–2: ἐργάζεται, οὐ μετριοπάθειαν· ἀπάθειαν γὰρ καρποῦται παντελὴς τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐκκοπή. ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἐκείνων τῶν θρυλουμένων ἀγαθῶν, τουτέστι τῶν παρακειμένων τοῖς πάθεσιν παθητικῶν ἀγαθῶν, μεταλαμβάνει ὁ γνωστικός, οἷον εὐφροσύνης λέγω (ἥτις παράκειται τῇ ἡδονῇ) καὶ κατηφείας (αὕτη γὰρ τῇ λύπῃ παρέξευκται) καὶ εὐλαβείας (ὑπέσταλκεν γὰρ τῷ φόβῳ).

The present *Scholion XXXVII* is written in the same spirit. To ‘fear the name of God’ is concomitant with εὐλάβεια, which is the stage of incipient believers. Real piety, which is befitting ‘saints’, is to fear God Himself, not only His name.

Although εὐλάβεια (meaning cautious fear out of reverence) came to be one of the most hackneyed terms of Christianity, only learned men such as Clement and Didymus were actually aware of its philosophical implications. Besides, despite εὐλάβεια having

generally been regarded as a virtue within the Christian mindset, these intellectuals qualified this approbation by restricting this ‘cautious fear’ to a quality befitting only the incipient faithful. To feel εὐλάβεια betokens lack of insightful contemplation and of *theoria*, which can be attained to only once one has advanced in knowledge.

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 6.17.155.3: καὶ ἐπειδὴν μὲν ἐπιβάλλῃ τοῖς πρώτοις αἰτίοις, νόησις καλεῖται, ὅταν δὲ ταύτην ἀποδεικτικῶς λόγῳ βεβαιώσῃται, γνῶσις τε καὶ σοφία καὶ ἐπιστήμη ὀνομάζεται, ἐν δὲ τοῖς εἰς εὐλάβειαν συντείνουσι γινομένη καὶ ἄνευ θεωρίας παραδεξαμένη τὸν ἀρχικὸν λόγον κατὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐξεργασίας τήρησιν πίστις λέγεται.

In this context, εὐλάβεια is an almost inescapable (and perhaps necessary) ‘passion’ (πάθος) of the beginner.²⁷ Didymus was the theologian who realized the need to mitigate the concept of εὐλάβεια as a virtue, since fear is incompatible with enlightened faith. Of course, he did not go so far as to play down this attitude to an unnecessary extent: he only essayed to dissociate the εὐλάβεια of the learned from this attitude manifested in the form of a blind ‘passion’. His evident aim was to make reverent ‘awe’ a conscious attitude of man venerating God.

Didymus, *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 88–89: ἡ προηγουμένη διδασκαλία τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ εἰς εὐλάβειαν καὶ φόβον ἄγουσα ἢ κατὰ τὰς κοινὰς ἐννοίας ἐστίν. *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 196: καὶ οὐκ ἐστίν γε παθητικός, ὡς εἶπον, ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ φόβος, ἀλλὰ σεβασμῷ ἴσος, εὐλαβείᾳ ἴσος. ὅταν φαντασίαν θεοῦ λάβωμεν, εὐθέως φόβος ἐπαύξεται, εὐλάβεια παραγίνεται· οὐ γὰρ οὕτω φοβούμεθα ὡς δεδιττόμενοι αὐτόν, οὐχ ὡς μορμολυκεῖόν τι, ἀλλ’ ὡς σεβάσμιον ὑπερβάλλον.

The notion of ‘fearing the name of God’ is scriptural, but in the New Testament it appears only in the Book of Revelation.²⁸ In the Old Testament, however, the notion is widespread.²⁹ Origen and Hippolytus men-

²⁴ Diogenes Laertius (*Vitae Philosophorum*, 7.111) says that he quotes from Chrysippus, *De Passionibus*. This definition of εὐλάβεια was eventually quoted by the *Suda* lexicon, alphabetic letter epsilon, entry 3633. So in entry 3552. However, in entry 3551, the lexicon advises that ‘in Sophocles εὐλάβεια means *notion* and *thought*’, adding that this author ‘does not take this word to mean fear’.

²⁵ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.7.33.1: ὀνοματομάχους τούτους οὐκ ἀπὸ τρόπου ὁ Φασηλίτης ἐκάλει Κριτόλαος.

Chrysippus, *Fragmenta Moralia*, fr. 411. Critolaus of Phaselis (Lycia, second cent. BC), *Fragmenta*, fr. 24.

²⁶ Posidonius, *Fragmenta*, fr. 441d.

²⁷ Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.20.126.1: χρὴ τοίνυν συνασκεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς εὐλάβειαν τῶν ὑποπιπτόντων τοῖς πάθεσι.

²⁸ Rev. 11:18 and 15:4

²⁹ Deut. 2:25; 28:58; Esdras (*Ezra et Nehemias in textu Masoretico*) 11:11; Psalms 60:6; 85:11; 98:3; 101:16; 110:9; Micah 6:9; Malachi 2:5; 3:16; 3:20; Isaiah 59:19; Baruch 3:7.

tion this³⁰ only in relation to Malachi 3:20. The distinction between ‘fearing the name of God’ from ‘fearing God Himself’ is said to ‘have been made many times’ before (πολλάκις εἴρηται). This comment is in fact the springboard for [Scholion XXXVII](#).

Origen, *selPs*, PG.12.1481.51f. (comm. on Psalm 60: 6): Ἐδωκας κληρονομίαν τοῖς φοβουμένοις, κ. τ. ἐ.: Πλούσιος γὰρ ὢν, φησί, καὶ μεγάλας δωρεὰς παρέχεις· μᾶλλον δὲ χαριζόμενος τοῖς τελείοις ἀνθρώποις τὸ γενέσθαι σου υἱούς, κληρονομίαν αὐτοῖς δέδωκας· εἰ γὰρ καὶ προσδοκᾶται δοθησομένη μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι· ἀλλὰ γε τῷ ἤδη ηὔτρεπίσθαι δέδοται τοῖς εἰς αὐτὴν κατὰ καιρὸν τὸν δέοντα ἀχθησομένοις. Καὶ ἔτι³¹ τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς κληρονομίαν ἔδωκεν. Ἐάν τις ἦ διαφορὰ φοβουμένων τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, πιστευόντων αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, ἐπεὶ πολλάκις εἴρηται, ὑποδεεστέρους εἶναι τοὺς οἰκειωθέντας τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ προσηγορίᾳ, τῶν ἐνωθέντων αὐτῷ τῷ Θεῷ· ὅρα ὥς καὶ τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸν Θεὸν δέδοται ἡ κληρονομία· εἰ γὰρ τοῖς ὑποδεεστέροις ὑπῆρκται ἡ χάρις αὕτη, πολλῷ πλέον τοῖς ὑπερاناβεβηκόσιν.

The expression πολλάκις εἴρηται (‘it has been said many times’) appears only in Origen’s catena-fragments,³² abundantly in Didymus, but never in Theodoret. This is one more indication that several catena-fragments, although conveying Origen’s voice, are couched in the vocabulary of Didymus’ rendering of Origen’s theology.³³ With regard to this, in the following passage Didymus appears to copy the foregoing passage of Origen verbatim (except for one word, ἔτι/ἐπί,

owing to a scribe no doubt). However, in all probability a text of Didymus was attributed to Origen by a catenist.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 624a (also comm. on Psalm 60:6): Πλούσιος γὰρ ὢν, φησὶν, καὶ μεγάλας δωρεὰς παρέχεις, μᾶλλον δὲ χαριζόμενος τοῖς τελείοις ἀνθρώποις τὸ γενέσθαι σου υἱούς κληρονομίαν αὐτοῖς δέδωκας. εἰ γὰρ καὶ προσδοκᾶται δοθησομένη κατὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι, ἀλλὰ γε τῷ ἤδη ηὔτρεπίσθαι δέδοται τοῖς εἰς αὐτὴν κατὰ καιρὸν τὸν δέοντα ἀχθησομένοις. Καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς κληρονομίαν ἔδωκεν. ἐάν τις ἦ διαφορὰ φοβουμένων τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, πιστευόντων αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, ἐπεὶ πολλάκις εἴρηται ὑποδεεστέρους εἶναι τοὺς οἰκειωθέντας τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ προσηγορίᾳ τῶν ἐνωθέντων αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ, ὅρα ὥς καὶ τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸν θεὸν δέδοται ἡ κληρονομία· εἰ γὰρ τοῖς ὑποδεεστέροις ὑπῆρκται ἡ χάρις αὕτη, πολλῷ πλέον τοῖς ὑπερاناβεβηκόσιν.³⁴

Hence we have the same text ascribed to both Origen and Didymus. The expression ὥς πολλάκις εἴρηται is a debt of Didymus to his normal sources: Aristotle,³⁵ Galen,³⁶ Alexander of Aphrodisias.³⁷

Nevertheless, the case may well have been that different catenists ascribed the same Origenistic text to either Origen or Didymus. The same goes for the following passage, which is ascribed to Didymus: we are actually dealing with catenists rather than the Alexandrian theologians themselves. Nevertheless, this analysis recurs in texts ascribed to Didymus.

Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 971 (comm. on Psalm 101:16–17): Εἰσαγομένων³⁸ τὸ φοβεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα

³⁰ Hippolytus, *De antichristo*, 61. Origen, *JesNav*, p. 413.

³¹ In Didymus’ text this is ἐπί.

³² Origen, *frJohn*, CXXXVIII; *frJer*, 48; *frPs*, 148, 13–14; *selPs*, PG.12: 1280.39; 1481.53; 1600.18.

³³ Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.187; *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 41; *commPs* 20–21, Cod. pp. 9; 35; *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 96; *commPs* 35–39, Cod. pp. 231; 240; *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 301; *frPs(al)*, Frs. 428; 624a; 962; 1156; 1220.

³⁴ About the participle ὑπερاناβεβηκόσιν, see [EN XXXIVa](#). Also, Origen, *Cels*, V.44 (ὑπερاناβεβηκέναι); VI. 4 (ὑπερاناβεβηκέναι); VI.19 (ὑπερاناβεβηκόσι); VI.62 (ὑπερاناβεβηκότων); VIII.16 (ὑπερاناβεβηκέναι); *frJohn*, II, (ὑπερاناβεβηκότων); *homJer*, 18.2 (ὑπεραναβέβηκε).

³⁵ Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea*, 1175b26; 1165a12; 1176b25; *De Partibus Animalium*, 643a27; *Ars Poetica*, 1454b17; *Politica*, 1337b31. Cf. Speusippus, *Fragmenta*, fr. 67. Theophrastus, *Historia Plantarum*, 7.15.3; 8.7.7; *Fragmenta*, frs. 4; 9; *De Causis Plantarum*, 3.1.6; 3.6.9.

³⁶ Galen, *De Usu Partium*, v. 4, p. 257; *Circa Doctrinas Hippocratis et Platonis*, 9.1.16; *De Sanitate*, v. 6, p. 403; *De Symptomatum Differentiis Liber*, v. 7, pp. 54; 238; 706; 783; *De Affectis Locis*, v. 8, p. 266; *De Pulsuum*, v. 8, p. 667; *De Pulsibus*, v. 8, p. 905; *De Praesagitione ex Pulsibus Libri*, v. 9, p. 323; *De Crisibus*, v. 9, p. 719; *De Morbis Curandis*, v. 10, pp. 933; 945; *De Simplicium Medicamentorum Facultatibus Libri*, v. 11, pp. 506; 524; 538; 573; 705; *De Compositione Medicamentorum ii*, v. 12, p. 614; *In Hippocratis de Victu Acutorum*, v. 15, pp. 606; *In Hippocratis Prorrheticum*, v. 16, pp. 713; 717; *Commentaria in Hippocratis Aphorismos*, v. 18a, p. 27; *In Hippocratis de Fracturis*, v. 18b, p. 613; *In Hippocratis Librum de Officina Medici Commentarii*, v. 18b, p. 846.

³⁷ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, pp. 440; 454; 459; 479; 483; 498; 510; 521; 535; 546; 563; 564; 685; 754; 780; 801; 812; 822; 835.

³⁸ Cf. this word εἰσαγομένων of fr. 971 with εἰσαγόμενοι in [Scholion XXXVII](#).

κυρίου, τελειωθέντων δὲ τὸ αὐτὸν φοβεῖσθαι τὸν δεσπότην (Οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ ὑστέρημα τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν), ἀμέλει καὶ τῆς θεοσεβείας ἀρχόμενοι πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.³⁹ μετὰ γὰρ τὴν εἰς τὴν προσηγορίαν αὐτοῦ πίστιν αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ⁴⁰ πιστεύουσι καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ αὐτοῦ, πίστιν εἰς δικαιοσύνην λελογισμένην καθ' ἣν ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθήσεται τις πᾶς προπιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἔστιν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται. τέλειον δὲ τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ γεγεννηθῆναι· διὸ καὶ ἀναμαρτησία ἔπεται τῇ ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννήσει.

Τῶν δὲ ἐθνῶν φοβηθέντων τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου, οἱ ὑπεραναβεβηκότες⁴¹ τὰ ἔθνη, νοητῶς τυγχάνοντες βασιλεῖς τῷ ἀπολεληθέναι ἀφροσύνην ἵνα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα βασιλεύσωσι, φοβοῦνται τὴν δόξαν τοῦ κυρίου πλεῖον⁴² οὐσαν ἢ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ὡς εἶναι μεταξὺ τῶν φοβουμένων τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου καὶ τὸν κύριον αὐτὸν τοὺς φοβουμένους τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ βασιλεῖς κατὰ αὐτὰ βασιλεύοντας Κορινθίους οἷς γράφει ὁ Παῦλος· Χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε· καὶ ὀφελὸν γε ἐβασιλεύσατε, ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν συμβασιλεύσωμεν.

Ibid. fr. 1069 (comm. on Psalm, 115:6): Εἰ δὲ τῶν ἐλαττόνων εἰρήκαμεν τὸ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου, τελείων δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν κύριον, μή σε ταραττέτω νῦν ἐπὶ τοῦ οὕτως τελείου παραλαμβανόμενον· οἱ γὰρ ἅγιοι δι' ἀτυφίαν ὄντες ἑαυτῶν ἐλαττωτικοὶ⁴³ τὰ ἐλάττονα ἑαυτοῖς διδόασιν ὧν ἔχουσιν.

Scholion XXXVII, therefore, draws throughout on what Cassian knew as the 'Origenistic tradition'. It makes little difference whether the specific words had been pronounced by Origen or Didymus. The notion of 'difference between fearing either God Himself or His name' (διαφορὰ φοβουμένων τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ) has reached us as a legacy of Origen.

This verse of Psalm 33:10 is quoted by a few authors, all of whom are significant to the vocabulary of the Scholia.⁴⁴

EN XXXVIII: ὄρα εἰ ('consider whether')

Origen, followed by Didymus, frequently used a formula introducing a modest assertion. It comes from Plato,⁴⁵ but Aristotle never used it. In Christian literature this is a distinctive mark of Origen, Didymus, and Eusebius. Didymus uses the expression εἰς εὐλάβειαν in relation to 'introduction' into feeling 'fear for God', which is the theme at this point.⁴⁶ The expression ὄρα εἰ also occurs in Lucian of Samosata.⁴⁷ No author seems to have used the expression ὄρα εἰ more extensively than Origen did,⁴⁸ with Didymus⁴⁹ following. Eusebius⁵⁰ followed suit, but Clement, Athanasius, and the Cappadocians never used it. A significant point should be made: as happens with the expression ἀλλὰ μήποτε (in the previous Scholion), we again find this expression in two Greek authors,

³⁹ 'Those who are incipient in revering God believe in His name'. See above.

⁴⁰ Cf. αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ in this (fr. 971) with αὐτόν καὶ μὴ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ in Scholion XXXVII.

⁴¹ Cf. above, τοῖς ὑπεραναβεβηκόσιν.

⁴² Cf. ἐπὶ πλεῖον in Scholion XXXVII.

⁴³ Cf. Scholion I (EN Ie): ἐλαττωτικοὶ γὰρ ἑαυτῶν δι' ἀτυφίαν ὑπάρχοντες.

⁴⁴ Cf. authors quoting or interpreting Psalm 33:10. Origen, *selPs*, PG.12: 1116.15; 1308.37f. Eusebius, *commPs*, PG.23.296.35f; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2.49. Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29: 365.20f. 369.27. Diodorus of Tarsus, *commPs*, Psalm 33:10. Theodore, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1105.18f. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *expPs*, Psalms 33:10a; 11; 12. Diadochus of Photike (fifth cent. AD), *Capita Centum de Perfectione Spirituali*, 16. Cyril of Alexandria, *expPs*, PG.69.888.30f. Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2613. Didymus made pretty much of the Psalm-verse: *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 345; *commEccl* (7–8.8), Cod. p. 218; *commZacch*, 3.103; *commPs*, Cod. pp. 47; 82; 101; 150; 195; 196; *frPs(al)*, frs. 854; 971.

⁴⁵ Plato, *Phaedo*, 105c6; 118a9; *Symposium*, 213c6; 214e6; *Charmides*, 176a1; *Protagoras*, 331b7; *Gorgias*, 476d2; 513a4; *Meno*, 83a3; *Respublica*, 358d6; 613e4.

⁴⁶ Didymus, *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 88: ἡ προηγούμενη

διδασκαλία τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ εἰς εὐλάβειαν καὶ φόβον ἄγρουσα ἢ κατὰ τὰς κοινὰς ἐννοίας ἔστιν.

⁴⁷ Lucian of Samosata, *Timon*, 38; *De Mercede Conductis Potentium Familiaribus*, 25; 4; *Dialogi Mortuorum*, 24.1; 25.4.

⁴⁸ Origen, *Cels*, II: 63; 74; III.35; IV.38; V: 26; 28; 37; VI: 7; 46; VII: 21; 55; 60; VIII.10; *commJohn*, II: 7.56; 17.121; 17.123; 30.183; V.5.1; X.24.140; XX: 4.23; 35.317; 38.352; 43.402; XIII. 53.360; XIX.19.119; 20.134; 22.145; 22.148; XXVIII: 21.183; XXXII: 3.41; 15.171; 16.196; *frJohn*, LXXI; XCV; *homLuc*, Homilies 23, 142; *frLuc*, frs. 184; 198; *Philocalia*, 5.4; 7.7; 15.10; 22.2; 22.4; 23.11; 27.7; *homJer*, 1.8; 16.1; 16.5; 20.4; *Homiliae in Leviticum*, p. 406; *commMatt*, 11.15; 11.19; 11.42; 15.31; 15.32; 16.13; 17.7; 17.26; 17.31; 17.32; 17.35; *comm1Cor*, 48; *commEph*, 2; 16; *Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos* (I.1–XII.21), 52; *commGen*, PG.12.69.8; *frEx*, PG.12.268.43; *frPs*, 3, 5; 105, 7; *selPs*, PG.12: 1292.50; 1533.21; 1540.30; *selEz*, PG.13: 773.46; 792.18; *schLuc*, PG.17.353.56; *Fragmenta de Principiis*, fr. 30.

⁴⁹ Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.116; 1.284; 1.333; 1.338; 1.387; 1.392; 2.237; 2.272; 3.53; 3.81; 3.204; 3.299; *frPs(al)*, frs. 36; 75; 85; 100; 635; 639a; 913; 1019.

⁵⁰ Eusebius, *PE*, 6.11.51; *DE*, 3.7.9; 5.3.3; 6.18.44; 4; 8.1.3; 10.8.32; *Epistula ad Alexandrum Alexandrinum*, 3.3; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.64; 2.50; *Eclogae Prophetarum*, pp. 18; 175; 186; *Quaestiones et Solutiones Evangelicae ad Stephanum*, PG.22.893.33; *commPs*, PG.23: 468.47; 576.35; 781.30; 1004.52; 1285.19; 1317.20.

namely, Xenophon and Alexander of Aphrodisias.⁵¹ As regards other authors, the expression appears in Porphyry⁵² and Plotinus,⁵³ which is an additional indication of the relation of them both with Origen, which is the topic of another work of mine.

EN XXXVIIg: πολλοὶ ἅγιοι ὄντες οὐ
προφητεύουσιν

The author makes the point that a saint is superior to a prophet. A prophet has to be saintly, but a saint does not have to be a vatic figure; indeed, to be the mouthpiece of God is not the sole function of saintliness.

Didymus refers to ‘everyone who participates in holiness’, making clear that a ‘prophet’ is only a part of the holy-man concept. *frPs(al)*, fr. 621a: Θεὸς λαλεῖ ἐν παντὶ μετέχοντι ἁγιότητος. οὕτω γοῦν καὶ ἐν Παύλῳ ἀγίῳ ὄντι ἐλάλει Χριστὸς καὶ ἐν παντὶ προφήτῃ.

The Holy Spirit grants not only the gift of prophecy, but also all benefaction toward existential renewal, various divine gifts, and comprehension of divine mysteries. There are ‘many men who have been reported to be saints’, yet among them there are those who are ‘saints’ without being prophets at the same time.

Didymus, *commZacch*, 5.6: ἐξ οὗ πολλοὶ ἄνδρες ἀνεγράφησαν ἅγιοι, ὧν ἐστὶν ὁ σαφηνιζόμενος προφήτης Ζαχαρίας, Δανιήλ τε καὶ οἱ ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἀζαρίαν, Ἰεζεκιήλ ὁ προφήτης καὶ ὁ τοῦ Ἰωσεδέκ ἱερεὺς μέγας Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἕτεροι πλείονες, ἡθικῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ τῆς γνώσεως τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ μεταποιούμενοι.

The Logos of God who came upon the prophets is the same one who came unto the rest of the holy men of biblical history. Thus a ‘prophet’ (τὸν προφήτην) belongs to a specific group, which is only part of the ‘holy men’ (τοὺς ἁγίους ἄνδρας).⁵⁴

We can trace some influence by Basil of Caesarea upon the present scholion. At a certain point, he refers to the Book of Proverbs, in order to point out that what a proverb says is one thing, but what it signifies is quite another. We know that Origen furnished a definition of what a proverb is,⁵⁵ but the author writes after Basil, who pointed out that Solomon, the writer of Proverbs, was a saint, but he was not a prophet.⁵⁶ Cassian makes the same point in the same terms in his *De Trinitate*.⁵⁷

For all the partial affinities that we have traced, this Scholion has a standing of its own and was written by Cassian himself drawing on Origen, as well as his reception by Didymus and Gregory of Nyssa, which was also communicated to Cassian.

⁵¹ Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 5.4.33. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Librum de Sensu Commentarium*, pp. 26; 154. Besides, Demosthenes, *De Corona*, 195.

⁵² Porphyry, *De Abstinencia*, 3.8; *In Aristotelis Categorias*, v. 4.1, pp. 63; 74.

⁵³ Plotinus, *Enneades*, V.5.7; V.5.10.

⁵⁴ Didymus, *commZacch*, 2.1: Οὐχ ἕτερος δὲ ὁ γινόμενος πρὸς τὸν προφήτην λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου ὑπάρχει, ὅστις γίνεται μὲν πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους ἄνδρας, ἀγγέλους τε καὶ ἀρχὰς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ θρόνους καὶ κυριότητας, πρὸς τὸν γεννήσαντα αὐτὸν Πατέρα ὧν αἰεῖ.

⁵⁵ Origen, *Expositio in Proverbia*, PG.17.161.20: Παροιμία ἐστὶ λόγος ἀπόκρυφος δι’ ἑτέρου προδήλου σημαινόμενος. Basil of Caesarea produced a definition of his own. *Homilia in Principium Proverbiorum*, PG.31.388.30–34: Παρὰ δὲ ἡμῖν παροιμία ἐστὶ λόγος ὠφέλιμος, μετ’ ἐπικρύψεως μετρίας ἐκδεδομένος,

πολὺ μὲν τὸ αὐτόθεν χρήσιμον περιέχων, πολλὴν δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ βάθει τὴν διάνοιαν συγκαλύπτων. The *Suda* draws on Basil as much as it does on Origen, having both definitions in the same lemma. *Suda* lexicon, Alphabetic letter pi, entry 733.

⁵⁶ Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29.704.29–32: Ἄλλως τε καὶ οὐδὲ προφήτης ὁ εἰπὼν, ἀλλὰ Παροιμιστής. Αἱ δὲ παροιμίαι εἰκόνες ἑτέρων, οὐκ αὐτὰ τὰ λεγόμενα. Cf. *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.212.1–4: Ἄλλα μὲν οὖν προφηταὶ παιδεύουσι, καὶ ἄλλα ἱστορικοί, καὶ ὁ νόμος ἕτερα, καὶ ἄλλα τὸ εἶδος τῆς παροιμιακῆς παραινέσεως. Maximus Confessor recalls this in *Quaestiones et Dubia*, 108.

⁵⁷ Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 3)*, PG.39.813.34–37: ἀλλὰ καὶ Παροιμία ὄνομα τῇ βίβλῳ, ὥς οὐ πάντως αἰεὶ τὸ φαινόμενον, ἀλλ’ ὅτι μάλιστα δι’ ἑτέρου πράγματος, ἢ προσώπου ἑτέρον σημαινούση, καὶ ὅτι Σολομὼν παροιμιαστής, ἀλλ’ οὐ προφήτης.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXXVIII

EN XXXVIIIa: ὁρμή and πόλεμος

The notions of ὁρμή and πόλεμος are Cassian's seal upon the Scholia. Although initially a Homeric correlation,¹ these terms are juxtaposed in the authors whom we have come across at many points so far. Historians such as Polybius,² Diodorus of Sicily,³ Josephus,⁴ and the biographer Plutarch,⁵ are intellectuals whose vocabulary resulted in the opening of this Scholion as it stands. In Christian literature, the juxtaposition is almost non-existent. Apart from an instance in Basil of Caesarea,⁶ we come upon Theodoret, though his usage is rather attenuated compared to this Scholion.⁷ The fact is, however, that both Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia⁸ had employed the ancient phraseology. Diodorus mentioned the 'war' waged by the adversary power against humans, which is the same context as that of the Scholion and that of Psalm 3:3, on which Diodorus comments.⁹

In view of the fact that Diodorus and Theodore made the same point as the Scholion, a relevant usage ascribed to Pseudo-Macarius should be considered, which contributes to that set of texts being the product of the Akoimatoi.¹⁰ At all events, it is plain that Cassian draws on his Antiochene background.

EN XXXVIIIb: Reference to Rev. 12:4 (and 20, 2)

Methodius of Olympus made some reference to Rev. 12:4 in his *Symposium*, Oration 8.4f. Oecumenius¹¹ dissenting from Methodius without mentioning him, Andreas of Caesarea¹² (mentioning Methodius), and Arethas¹³ (reviewing Methodius, Oecumenius, and Andreas), followed.

Didymus is the Christian who commented on Rev. 12:4: *commPs* 20–21, Cod. pp. 55–56: εἰσὶν γὰρ κατασπασθέντες τῇ οὐρᾷ τοῦ δράκοντος, ὡς ἐν Ἀποκαλύψει λέγεται· 'τῇ οὐρᾷ ἑαυτοῦ ὁ δράκων τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσυρεν'· εἴρηται γὰρ· ἐν διδασκαλίᾳ καὶ προφητείᾳ 'διδάσκων ἄνομα, οὗτος ἡ οὐρά'. οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ οὐρά ὁ ὀρθὸς διδασκαλός· κεφαλὴ ἔστιν. ὁ δὲ ἐκπίπτων τῆς ὀρθῆς διδασκαλίας καὶ προφητείας οὐρά ἔστιν· ἐπακολούθημα γὰρ ἔστιν τὸ κακὸν τῷ ἀγαθῷ.

Didymus is also the sole author who commented on the 'ancient Satan' (Rev. 12:9 and 20:2), indeed he did so at two different points: *commZacch*, 1.191: Περὶ τοῦ οὕτω λεγομένου λέοντος καὶ δράκοντος, ἐν τῇ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψει λέγεται ὡς εἴη 'ὁ ἀρχαῖος Σατανᾶς'. Ἐκ παραλλήλου δόξει εἰρῆσθαι ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ θεωρίᾳ διάβολος καὶ Σατανᾶς ὁ αὐτός, ἐβραϊκῇ δ' οὕσα ἡ Σατανᾶς φωνὴ 'ἀντικείμενος' σημαίνει τῇ Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ. *frPs(al)*, fr. 907:

¹ Homer, *Ilias*, IV.335: ὁρμήσειε καὶ ἄρξειαν πολέμοιο. VI.338: ὁρμησ' ἐς πόλεμον. *Odyssey*, XVIII.376: καὶ πόλεμόν ποθεν ὁρμήσειε.

² Polybius, *Historiae*, 1.78.1: πλήρης ὁρμῆς πολεμικῆς. 3.6.13: ὁρμὴν ἔσχε καὶ προέθετο πολεμεῖν. 3.51.10: ἐποιήσαντο τὴν ὁρμὴν οἱ πολέμοιοι. 4.50.2: κατὰ τὴν προειρημένην ὁρμὴν πολεμῶν. 5.1.3: πόλεμον ἀνειληφώς, ὁρμήσας. 5.48.3: αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀλόγως ὁρμήσαντες εἰς τοὺς πολέμοιους. 6.55.3: οἱ μὲν πολέμοιοι τῆς ὁρμῆς ἐκώλυθησαν. 1839.4: ὁρμήση καὶ τρίβειν τὸν πόλεμον.

³ Diodorus of Sicily, *Bibliotheca Historica*, 11.50: τῆς περὶ τὸν πόλεμον πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ὁρμῆς. 11.76: πρὸς τὴν κατάλυσιν τῶν πολέμων ὁρμήσασαι. 12.79: πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ὁρμήσαι. 31.43: πρὸς τὴν εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ὁρμὴν.

⁴ Josephus, *Vita Iosephi*, 287: ὁρμήσειν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον. *De Bello Judaico*, 4.5: τὸ δ' ἀπερίσκεπτον ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ τῆς ὁρμῆς μανιῶδες. 4.409: ἐφ' οὗς ὁρμήσειαν ὡς ἐν πολέμῳ καταληφθέντας. 4.441: εἰς τὴν ὁρμὴν τοῦ πολέμου.

⁵ Plutarch, *Pyrrhus*, 19.5: ὁρμὴ παρέστη πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον. *Lucullus*, 24.1: ἐχώρει πόλεμον, ὁρμὴ τινι. *Comparatio Nicias et Crassi*, 4.2: τὸν Παρθικὸν ὁρμήσας πόλεμον.

⁶ Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.245.37: τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον ὁρμὴν.

⁷ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.985.13: τῶν δὲ πολέμων ἐπέδυσας τὴν ὁρμὴν. *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81: 692.7: τοὺς δὲ πολέμοιους ὁρμήσαι. 744.12–13: μάχαιραν δὲ τοὺς πολέμοιους· καὶ κελεύει κατ' ἐκείνων ὁρμήσαι.

⁸ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *expPs*, Psalm 58:5b: εἰπὼν ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τοῖς τῶν πολέμοιους ἀπαντῶντων πολλάκις καὶ ἐκκοπτόντων αὐτῶν τὴν ὁρμὴν. *Commentarius in XII Prophetas Minores*, Prophet Joel, 2:7–8a: ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον τὴν ὁρμὴν ποιοιμένων. Prophet Amos 3:4: ἐνδέχεται καὶ τὸν πόλεμον τὸν ὑμέτερον τῇ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ὀργῇ χρῆσασθαι. Likewise, *ibid.* 12b; also, Prophet Nahum, prologue, section 1; Prophet Zachariah, 12.12. In Prophet Hoseah, 5:10b the relevant phraseology refers to God punishing the adverse powers.

⁹ Diodorus of Tarsus, *commPs I–L*, Psalm 3:3: πικρὸν ὁ ἀπ' αὐτῶν πόλεμος, ὡς ἡ ὑπόνοια τῆς ὁρμῆς.

¹⁰ Pseudo-Macarius, *Homiliae I*, Homily 26: Ἐρώτησις: εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς μέτρῳ ἐπαφίεται ἢ ὡς θέλει πολέμει; Ἀπόκρισις: αὐτοῦ ἡ ὁρμὴ οὐ μόνον εἰς τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τοὺς εἰδωλολάτραις καὶ εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον.

¹¹ Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, PG.106.138f.

¹² Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin* PG.106.321f.

¹³ Arethas, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, PG.106.661f.

δύναται καὶ ἐκ παραλλήλου λέων καὶ δράκων εἶναι ὁ ἀντίδικος ἡμῶν διάβολος· Ὡς γὰρ λέων περιπατεῖ ζητῶν τίνα καταπίει· αὐτὸς ὢν καὶ ὁ ὄφις καὶ ὁ δράκων, ὁ ἀρχαῖος σατανᾶς, κατὰ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν.

Reference to the ‘ancient Satan’ did not attract any particular attention by exegetes. Alongside Didymus it was only Cyril of Alexandria who had a few words to say about the scriptural reference: he refers to ‘certain ancient exegetes’, without mentioning any names.

Cyril of Alexandria, *In Sanctum Joannem*, v. 2, pp. 94–95: τινὲς μὲν γὰρ τῶν παλαιοτέρων ἐξηγητῶν τὰ ἐν τῷ προκειμένῳ διαλαμβάνοντες, τὸν μὲν ἀρχαῖον ἐκεῖνον σατανᾶν, ὃς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων δαιμονίων πρωτοστάτης νοεῖται, δεδέσθαι φησὶ τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμει, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐρρίφθαι τὸν τάρταρον τὰς ἐφ’ οἷς εἰς Θεὸν πεπαρώνηκεν εὐθύνας ὑφέξοντα,

Beyond Cyril of Alexandria, no author made much of this passage of Revelation referring to the ‘ancient Satan’, not even Oecumenius, who simply quoted the scriptural text upon coming across it in the course of his exposition.¹⁴ In the foregoing passage, Cyril does not mention the ‘ancient exegetes’ by name. Andreas of Caesarea treating the relevant point mentions Papias, quoting his own words about the primeval fall.¹⁵ Probably Cyril also had Papias in mind. Arethas, coming upon the same passage of Revelation, opted to take it as pointing to the primeval Fall, but the opinion is his own: he did not mention any names of earlier exegetes, nor did he quote from Andreas, as he normally did.¹⁶

EN XXXVIIIc: συναποστῆναι

Both Harnack and Turner emended the Codex’s συναποστατηκέναι to συναπεστατηκέναι. This is, however, a mistake. The tense which is needed at this point is aorist. The verbal form συγκατενεχθῆναι is an aorist infinitive of the verb συγκαταφέρωμαι. Obvious demand for correct sequence of tenses makes it imperative that the verb συναποστατᾶν, too, should be also in the same form, that is, aorist infinitive. This might be συναποστατῆσαι (aorist infinitive of the verb συναποστατεῖν), which might appear to be what the author of the Scholion intended.

However, it is more reasonable to use the form συναποστῆναι (aorist infinitive of the verb συναφίστασθαι).

As a matter of fact, Oecumenius used the same form, commenting on the same point. M. de Groote emended Hoskier’s συναποστῆσαι to συναποστατῆσαι. However, he changed the verb arbitrarily. Oecumenius used the verb συναφίστασθαι and Hoskier’s mistake was that he should have emended the aorist infinitive συναποστῆσαι to the correct συναποστῆναι (συναποστῆσαι is simply a scribal mistake, since this is the aorist infinitive of the active voice συναφίστασθαι, which has a different meaning). This scribal error aside (it would have been impossible for Oecumenius himself to make such a mistake), the correct verb had indeed been used by Oecumenius in the first place.

Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 116: τὸν ἀποστάτην ἄγγελον-φημὶ δὲ τὸν Σατανᾶν καὶ τοὺς συναποστάντας αὐτῷ. p. 140: καὶ τῇ οὐρᾷ αὐτοῦ φησι σύρει τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἄστρον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν. συγκατέβαλε γὰρ ἑαυτῷ πλειστήν ἄγγελλον μοῖραν συναποστῆναι¹⁷ πείσας Θεοῦ καὶ πεποίηκε χθονίους τοὺς οὐρανίους, καὶ σκότος τοὺς λαμπροὺς ὡς ἀστέρας.

The examples supporting use of the verb συναφίστασθαι instead of συναποστατεῖν are abundant, yet I quote only a few of those which are most relevant to the context of the Scholion.

Origen, *Cels*, IV.65: καὶ πῶς γεγένηται διάβολος καὶ τίς ἡ αἰτία τοῦ συναποστῆναι αὐτῷ τοὺς καλουμένους αὐτοῦ ἄγγελους. Ibid. I.8: ἀποστῆναι τοῦ δόγματος. Ibid. I.30: Ἐπεισε γὰρ οὐθ’ ὡς τύραννος συναποστῆναι αὐτῷ τινὰς τῶν νόμων οὐθ’ ὡς ληστής κατ’ ἀνθρώπων ἀλείφω τοὺς ἐπομένους. Ibid. I.30: τῆς μὲν ἀπάτης ἀποστῆναι καταγνῶναι δὲ τοῦ ἀπατήσαντος. Ibid. I.36: μὴ ἔχειν ἀφορμὰς ἀποστῆναι εἰς τὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν πολυθεότητα. *frLam* (quoting Daniel, 3:29), fr. 81: ἡμάρτομεν καὶ ἠνομήσαμεν ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ σοῦ. *Philocalia*, 2.5 (*selPs*, PG.12.1081.42): οἱ γοῦν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι μετὰ τὸ ἀποστῆναι τοῦ κτίσαντος τὸν κόσμον. *selDeut*, PG.12.813.49: αὕτη δὲ ἦν τὸ ἀποστῆναι μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

¹⁴ Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, pp. 142 and 213.

¹⁵ Andreas, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, PG.106.325.38f.

¹⁶ Arethas, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, PG.106.665.7f.

¹⁷ Hoskier, *συναποστῆσαι*. O(G.), p.176, *συναποστατῆσαι*. I wrote, *συναποστῆναι*.

Pseudo-Basil of Caesarea, *Orationes sive Exorcismi*, PG.31.1680.4: καὶ τοὺς συναποστάτας αὐτῶ ἀγγέλους δαίμονας γινομένους.

Didymus, *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 82: τοὺς συναποστάντας ἀγγέλους αὐτῶ. *frPs(al)*, fr. 829: τοσαύτη βελτίωσις περὶ ἡμᾶς ἔσται ὥς μὴ ἀποστῆναί σου. Ibid. fr. 851: Ζωοὶ ὁ θεὸς ζωὴν παρέχων τούτοις, οἱ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπέστρεφον ἀποστάντες αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀποστραφέντες αὐτόν. Ibid. 1258: Καταπίπτοντες δὲ εἶεν ἂν οἱ ἁμαρτάνοντες μὲν ἐν ἡθικοῖς, περιεχόμενοι δὲ τοῦ χριστιανισμοῦ, καταρραχθέντες δὲ οἱ ἀποστάντες αὐτοῦ. *In Genesin*, Cod. p. 82: τῆς δι' ἀγαλμάτων εἰδωλολατρείας, αἰνιττόμενος τοὺς συναποστάντας ἀγγέλους αὐτῶ. Ibid. Cod. p. 89: Ἐκρύβησαν οὖν ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποστάντες τῆς περὶ Θεοῦ καθαρᾶς νοήσεως, οὐχ ὡς Κάϊν.

Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1673.16–17: Εἰ δέ τις τῶν συνόντων πονηρίᾳ χρώμενος ἀποστῆναι τῆς ἐμῆς ἠθέλησε συνουσίας. *HE*, p. 189: ἀποστῆναι τῆς εὐσεβείας. *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, p. 222: κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα Βαλαάμ, τοῦ ἀποστῆναι καὶ ὑπεριδεῖν τὸ ῥῆμα Κυρίου ἔνεκεν Φογῶρ. *De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80: 780.39–40 and 849.42–43 (quoting 2 Paralipomenon [Chronicles] 28:19): Καὶ προσέθηκεν Ἀχαζ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου. *Commentarius in Visiones Danielis Prophetiae*, PG.81.1393.2 (quoting. Heb. 3:12): ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ζῶντος. *IntPaulXIV* PG.82.388.20–21: παντελῶς ἀποστῆναι τῆς πίστεως. Ibid. PG.82.700.50 (quoting. Heb. 3:12): ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ζῶντος. Ibid. PG.82.844.4–6: καὶ τινες ἐξηπάτησαν τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἀποστῆναι διδασκαλίας.

Cyril of Alexandria, *expPs*, PG.69.1224.24–25: καὶ βασιλίσκος νοηθεῖν ἂν αὐτός τε ὁ Σατανᾶς, καὶ οἱ συναποστάντες αὐτῶ ἄγγελοι πονηροί.

By contrast, although the term ἀποστάτης is used later in this Scholion,¹⁸ the verb ἀποστατεῖν is almost never used by either Origen or Didymus, whereas Theodoret admitted it only in verbatim biblical

quotations.¹⁹ The reasons for this are quite plain. For one thing, scripture frequently uses ἀποστάτης, whereas the verb ἀποστατεῖν in various forms is rare²⁰ and quite irrelevant to the notion of the Fall. Only Psalm 118:118 applies to the case in a rather attenuated (moral) sense (ἐξουδένωσας πάντας τοὺς ἀποστατοῦντας ἀπὸ τῶν δικαιωμάτων σου). For another thing, all three scholars, namely Origen, Didymus, and Theodoret, were highly learned in the Greek language and opted for a more appropriate verb, namely, συναφίστασθαι.

Furthermore, the manuscript of the Scholia makes it plain that the scribe was not actually rewriting a text that was open before him. Rather, he wrote a text from dictation that was probably taken down by more than one scribes at the same time. The mistakes we have come across establish this beyond doubt. They also make plain that the scribe Theodosius (to whom reference was made in the Introduction) was hardly an educated person. The mistakes are far too many and have been pointed out throughout our discussion.²¹ The egregious errors of orthography make it plain that the scribe barely understood what he was writings down. He was just hearing sounds by a person reading the text and then he wrote words or expressions which were homonymous with what he had heard, yet sometimes the words he wrote were either wrong or nonsensical.

I believe, therefore, that the scribe heard the expression συναποστῆναι αὐτῶ καί, but he wrote, συναποστατηκεῖναι αὐτῶ καί. Writing down what he was hearing, he confounded the sound συναποστῆναι αὐτῶ καί (taking this to be an infinitive) and wrote the non-existent word συναποστατηκεῖναι.

A retrospective personal note is perhaps needed at this point. The exploration of authorship of those Scholia resulted in another book, which contains the first part of Cassian's writings in Codex 573. Subsequent study showed that Cassian should be identified with both Pseudo-Caesarius and the author of (Pseudo-Didymus) *De Trinitate*. Both works treat the question of the primeval Fall in an identical manner, but it is important to notice Caesarius' text, which later

¹⁸ That section is no longer part of our Scholia, since the actual author is Irenaeus. Cf. below ἀποστατικῶν πνευμάτων and δυνάμεις ἀποστατικῆς.

¹⁹ An exception is Julian the Arian, *In Job*, p. 78: καὶ τοὺς συναποστάτας δαίμονας ἀγγέλους ὄντας κατὰ τὴν φύσιν.

²⁰ 2 Esdras 12:19; 16:6; 1 Macc. 13:16; 2 Macc. 5:11.

²¹ Just for example, cf. *Scholion XXIX*: τίμιον δότε was written for τιμὴ δέδοται. Also, ἀπόθεσις for ὑπόθεσις. *Scholion XXX*: αἰρεῖν was written for ἐρεῖν. Besides, ἐπι was written for ἐπεῖ. Likewise, ενοῇ was written for ἐν τῇ, and εφη was written for ἐφ' ἧ.

confirmed my emendation at this point. As a matter of fact, Caesarius used the same verb (aorist participle συναποστήσας) which I have suggested in order to make the same point. Pseudo-Caesarius (= Cassian the Sabaite), 44: ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον τραπεῖς ἀρχέκακος διάβολος συναποστήσας αὐτῷ ἱκανοὺς τῶν ἀγγέλων, οὐ φύσει ἀλλὰ γνώμη τραπέντας.

Finally, let me note that the perfect infinitive συναπεστατηκέναι, which both Harnack and Turner introduced, is a technically correct form. This would have been the perfect infinitive of the verb συναποστατεῖν. The fact is, nevertheless, that no author ever used this form, indeed no author ever used the perfect tense of this verb (which would be συναπεστάτηκα) in any form at all.

EN XXXVIIIId: Isaiah, 14:12

Exploring quotation, usage, or comment on this passage of Isaiah, we come across the authors whom we have met over and over as relevant to the vocabulary of the Scholia.

Hippolytus, *De antichristo*, 17. Origen, *Princ*, IV.3.9; *exhMar*, XVIII. Eusebius, *PE*, 7.16.4; *DE*, 4.9.4; *commPs*, PG.23.988.56f. *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.68. Gregory

of Nyssa, *De Tribus Diebus Inter Mortem et Resurrectionem Domini Nostri Jesu*, v. 9, p. 282. Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 2, p. 447. Athanasius, *Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.341.26f. Pseudo-Athanasius, *Homilia de Passione et Cruce Domini*, PG.28: 232.32f; 240.25f. Didymus, *commZacch*, 1.94; *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 235; *frPs(al)*, fr. 838. Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones lxiv*, 2.2.3. Julian the Arian, *In Job*, p. 284. John Chrysostom, *De Virginitate*, 3; *Homilia Habita Postquam Presbyter Gothus Concionatus Fuerat*, PG.63.505.45f; *Fragmenta in Job*, PG.64.521.36–37. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *In Sanctum Pascha (sermo 6)*, 55.2. Theodoret, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 5; *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.1097.4f; *Commentarius in Visiones Danielis Prophetarum*, PG.81.1352.20f. Also, Theodoret's great admirer, Michael Glycas, *Annales*, p. 203. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Isaiam*, PG.70: 37343f; 552.29f. Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, p. 2193. Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *commJob*, p. 15. Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 56. Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, PG.106: 241.37f. 293.6–7. Arethas of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin* (obliquely), PG.106.548.1–2. Also, *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 14.279.

EXPANDED NOTES TO SCHOLION XXXIX

With [Scholion XXXVIII](#), and following an introductory comment by Cassian, there is a shift to Irenaeus, since Cassian himself was not inclined to produce a detailed exegesis of the ‘number of the beast’. His own ‘Book’, namely Codex 573, contains a text whose title is ascribed to Irenaeus, although it is currently attributed to Hippolytus (‘On the Blessings of Jacob’).

To a monk (like many modern readers who are intrigued by eschatological scenarios made out of Revelation), the ‘name of the beast’ needed to be clarified, and possibly to be identified with contemporary historical circumstances. Irenaeus was an author who emphasized this eschatological aspect. But his account was a notably Millenarist one, on the basis of a simplistic argument: since ‘one day is a thousand years to the Lord’ (2 Peter 3:8), the duration of the world counts as many millennia as the days during which the world was made. Six thousand years is therefore the entire duration of the world. Consequently, the name of the beast is made of the number ‘six’ repeated thrice. In early Christianity such accounts resulted in a widespread corollary: since the Incarnation had taken place in the year 5500, there was a period of only five hundred years remaining for the world to exist. Origen had rebutted any idea that there is a determined time until the final judgement, and it is remarkable that his comment was used to the letter by Theodoret.¹ This assumption nevertheless does not occur in the specific account of Irenaeus, although this is a necessary corollary.

The text of [Scholion XXXIX](#) runs parallel to Irenaeus.² If however one reads Andreas of Caesarea carefully, it appears that he ascribes this part of Irenaeus’ text to Hippolytus: all the names which make up the guess about the ‘name of the beast’ are ascribed to Hippolytus. This is strange, since Andreas mentions

both authors by name: he mentions Irenaeus at eleven points, whereas reference is made to Hippolytus at five. And yet, despite various quotations from Irenaeus, on the question we are discussing now, Andreas ascribed the possible names of the beast (found in Irenaeus’ Latin translation) to Hippolytus.³

The specific account emphasizing 2 Peter 3:8 does not appear in the Latin text of *Adversus Haereses*,⁴ but was attached to it by the seventeenth-century scholar Jean Cotelier.⁵ Irenaeus was seeing himself as the adamant great inquisitor, always vigilant to decry any doctrinal aberration. He always took for granted that sound doctrine could only be pronounced by episcopal lips. What modern editors did not consider is whether this bishop could ever have written certain specific expressions. As a matter of fact, some expressions in [Scholion XXXIX](#), in their specific phraseology, could hardly have been a text by Irenaeus.

This passage at best uses an idea supposedly set forth by Irenaeus: the idea that any endeavour to determine the name of the beast is futile. To put it clearly, only an erudite scholar could have used such vocabulary, not a fanatic inquisitor who was never condemned for his Millenarist ideas, even though his modern spiritual followers are.

There are parallels to the Scholion vocabulary in the Latin: we find ‘certius et sine periculo’ for ἀσφαλές-τερον καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον, we see ‘divinare’ for ὑπομαντεύεσθαι (καταμαντεύεσθαι in Migne), and ‘non propter inopiam nominum’ for οὐ δι’ ἀπορίαν ὀνομάτων. However, it is beyond my scope to trace the manuscript tradition of the Latin text so as to determine whether these passages are later interpolations. What I do know is this: Codex 573, folio 290r, concludes with the expression, οὐ δι’ ἀπορίαν ὀνομάτων. There is one more folio left, namely 290v, which is blank. For all the

¹ Origen, *frPs*, 122, 2: οὐ ῥητὴ δὲ χρόνῳ ταύτην τὴν ἐλπίδα περιορίζομεν, ἀλλὰ προσμένομεν ἕως ἂν ἀζιωθῶμεν τοῦ οἰκτειρήσαι ἡμᾶς. Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.1884.14–16: ‘Ἔως οὐ οἰκτειρήσαι ἡμᾶς.’ Οὐ ῥητὴ γὰρ χρόνῳ τήνδε τὴν ἐλπίδα περιορίζομεν, ἀλλὰ προσμένομεν ἕως ἂν ἀζιωθῶμεν φειδοῦς. Cf. *PHE*, pp. 287; 351.

² Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses*, ed. A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau and C. Mercier, *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies, livre 5*, vol. 2, Sources chrétiennes 5,153 (Paris, 1969).

³ Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, logos 13, chapter 38.

⁴ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, V.28. He emphasized the number of the beast in *ibid.* V.29–30.

⁵ Jean-Baptiste Cotelier (1629–1686), *SS patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, Barnabae, Clementis, Hermiae, Ignatii, Polycarpi, Opera edita et inedita, vera et suppositicia, graece et latine, cum notis*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1724; orig. 1672), v. II, *Notae in Epistulam Barnabae*, 15. Migne (PG.7.1200) incorporates the passage noting that he simply follows Cotelier.

space available, evidently in the original sixth-century codex Cassian did not go ahead with the text – which would have been the Greek text of Irenaeus corresponding to the one currently available in Latin. This means that Cassian did not care to follow the speculation of Irenaeus in surmising or inventing names corresponding to the name of the beast, which hardly squares with the same author's assertion that this job should not be undertaken at all.

Andreas of Caesarea was certainly aware of Irenaeus' work and mentioned him by name at twelve points in his Commentary on the Apocalypse. However, as already noted, he ascribed the speculation about possible names corresponding to the number of the beast to Hippolytus. This could suggest that Hippolytus rather than Irenaeus fathered this specific point.⁶ Besides, Andreas refers 'to certain doctors' of the Church, who espoused the idea that if God intended to reveal this name, then John could have seen and revealed it. But Andreas mentions no names of these 'doctors'.

EN XXXIXa: ἀσφαλέστερον
καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον

The expression could have been used only by an author who was familiar at first hand with the texts of Greek literature: not many persons of this kind can be found among authors of early Christianity, particularly bishops. As a matter of fact, this is a Platonic expression. Only someone with Cassian's background could have used an expression occurring only in Plato, Alexander of Aphrodisias, and Heron.

Plato, *Phaedo*, 85d2: εἰ μὴ τις δύναίτο ἀσφαλέστερον καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον ἐπὶ βεβαιότερου ὁχήματος, ἢ λόγου θείου τινός, διαπορευθῆναι.

Later, Damascius used a paraphrased quotation in order to comment on the specific point of the *Phaedo*. Damascius, *In Phaedonem (versio 1)*, 392: Τίς ὁ ἀσφαλέστερος καὶ ἀκινδυνότερος καὶ βεβαιότερος καὶ θεῖος λόγος; Οὐ δῆπου, ὡς φασιν, ὁ θεόθεν ἐκδοθείς, δοξαστικὸς γὰρ ὁ γε τοιοῦτος· ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁ εἰρημένος αὐτοπτικὸς νοῦς ὁ θεῷ τῷ ὄντι συνών, ὡς ἐν Φαίδρῳ.

Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Fato*, p. 191: ποτέρῃ δόξῃ πείθεσθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀσφαλέστερόν τε καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον.

Heron, *De Automatis*, 1.7: ἔστι δὲ ἡ τῶν στατῶν αὐτομάτων ἐνέργεια ἀσφαλεστέρα τε καὶ ἀκινδυνότερα. 21.1: ποίησις ἀσφαλεστέρα τε καὶ ἀκινδυνότερα.

EN XXXIXb: τὴν ἑκβασιν τῆς προφητείας
(‘the fulfilment of the prophecy’)

The notion is not Irenaeus', not even Origen's. This was in fact a point made by Eusebius⁷ to be followed by Didymus,⁸ Chrysostom,⁹ and Theodoret.¹⁰

The expression ἑκβασις τῆς προφητείας was casually used by Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 1.18.88.5; it appears in two catena-fragments ascribed to Origen, *frLam*, frs. 56; 156. It also appears in Cyril of Alexandria, *commProphXII*, v. 1, p. 658. Apart from two attributions to Irenaeus,¹¹ we have only occasional usage, normally in catenae.¹²

The notion is attributed to Didymus, but all instances are in the collection of fragments from the commentary on the Psalms, which in all probability was sometimes filtered through the vocabulary of the catenist.¹³

One could hardly imagine an author such as

⁶ Cf. Hippolytus, *De antichristo*, 50.

⁷ Eusebius, *DE*, 4.16.6; 6.13.16; 7.1.56; 8.2.84; *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 1.43; 1.72; 1.77; 2.57; *commPs*, PG.23: 1101.14; 1321.5.

⁸ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, fr. 900: τότε γὰρ ἀληθῆ προαναφώνοντες οἱ προφηταὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀνεδείχθησαν ὑποπεύεσθαι ἴσως δυνάμενοι πρὶν πληροῦσθαι αὐτῶν τὰς προφητείας. ὅτε γὰρ οἱ λόγοι αὐτῶν ἐκβάσεως τετυχήκασιν τῆς θεοῦ δεξιᾶς γνωρισθείσης, φανεροὶ γεγέννηται ὡς ἄρα εἶναι πεπαιδευμένοι τῇ θεοῦ σοφίᾳ. Ibid. fr. 930: τῶν γὰρ ἀποστόλων εὐαγγελιζομένων ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ, ἐκβάσεως τεύξεται ἡ προφητεία. Ibid. fr. 949: Ἐκβάσεως τυχούσης τῆς προφητείας λεγούσης. Ibid. fr. 1130: τοῦτο μὲν ἐκβάσει πληρῶν τὰς προφητείας. It should be noticed that all instances occur in catena-fragments, which might suggest the pen of Cassian or that of another monk.

⁹ John Chrysostom, *Orationes Adversus Iudaeos*, PG.48.890.21; *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.266.53; *De Prophetiarum Obscuritate*, PG.56.177.38; *In Sanctum Matthaeum*, PG.57.339.9; *In Epistolam i ad Corinthios Commentarius*, PG.61.240.55.

¹⁰ Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.677.1; *IntProphXII*, PG.81: 1857.34; 1888.30; 1921.12.

¹¹ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses (liber 4)*, fr. 12; *ibid. (liber 5)*, fr. 25 (the phrase of *Scholion XXXIX*).

¹² Severianus of Gabala, *Fragmenta in Epistolam i ad Corinthios*, p. 269. Procopius of Gaza, *In Isaiam Prophetam*, pp. 2181; 2461. Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria, *Fragmenta in Jeremiam*, PG.93.681.27.

¹³ Didymus, *frPs(al)*, frs. 900; 930; 949; 1130.

Irenaeus being shy about prying into the name of the beast and striving to disclose it, once it was he himself who quite boldly had sought to fix a date for the end of the world. The argument allegedly set forth by him ('had God wished to disclose the name of the beast, he could have revealed this to John, and through him to us') could hardly have been one by the author who had posited 'seven heavens' (to be rejected by Origen), and had overlooked one of the most explicit scriptural injunctions warning Christians against determining the eschatological times: 'It is not for you to know the times or the seasons' (Acts 1:7).

EN XXXIXc: ἀπομαντεύεσθαι

The meaning of the verb is not simply 'to guess', far less is it 'to obtain an oracle through divination', as the Latin of Irenaeus' text in Migne has it. This actually means 'to guess by extrapolation', or to do so 'by arbitrary assumptions', which are presumed to be wrong. When the verb ἀπομαντεύεσθαι is used in connection with interpretation of a certain text, it means 'to try to render the author's mind', but the implication is that there is a lot of extrapolation involved in such a reconstruction.

The verb occurs in two Christian works only:

Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 9.1: οὐ γὰρ οἶδας ὃ λέγεις, ἀλλὰ πειθόμενος τοῖς διδασκάλοις, οἳ οὐ συνίασι τὰς γραφάς, καὶ ἀπομαντευόμενος λέγεις ὃ τι ἂν σοι ἐπὶ θυμὸν ἔλθοι.

Cassian the Sabaite (Pseudo-Didymus), *DT (lib. 3)*, PG.39.984.17: Πρῶτον, ὅτι ἀπομαντεύονται ἐν πρόσωπον εἶναι τῶν τριῶν θεῶν ὑποστάσεων.

Its origin can be traced back to Plato and was taken up by later authors, mostly Neoplatonists. Plato, *Sophista*, 250c; *Lysis*, 216d; *Respublica*, 505e; 516d. Galen, *De Instrumento Odoratus*, 5.7; *Adversus Erasistratum*, v. 11, p. 151; *De Compositione Medica-mentororum per Genera Libri vii*, v. 13, p. 473; *In Hippocratis Prognosticum Commentaria iii*, v. 18b, p. 296. Plotinus, *Enneades*, IV.4.27; VI.7.29. Iamblichus, *Protrepticus*, p. 80. Proclus, *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, v. 1, pp. 271; 273; 287; *Theologia Platonica*, v. 1, p. 102; *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, v. 3, p. 123. Damascius, *De Principiis*, v. 1, p. 136; *Vita Isidori*, fr. 88 (*Suda*, Lexicon, Alphabetic

letter alpha, entry 1588; *apud Photius, Bibliotheca, Codex 242*, p. 338a). Hermias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, p. 208. Michael of Ephesus, *In Ethica Nicomachea Commentaria*, p. 538. Ammonius of Alexandria, *In Aristotelis Librum de Interpretatione Commentarius*.

EN XXXIXd: οὐ περ ἡττωμένη αὕτη ἡ ζήτησις

The participle ἡττωμένη is derived from the verb ἡττάομαι, in its common sense 'give way, yield; to be overcome by someone or something'. Translate: 'this inquiry cannot be overcome.' This phrase has a congruous parallel in Migne's Latin, PG.7b.1205–1206: 'et nihilominus quidem erit haec eadem quaestio' ('and this very same question remains nonetheless'). This Greek rendering in Codex 573 is a contribution to the non-extant Greek text of Irenaeus, for which we are largely dependent on John of Damascus' *Sacra Parallela*.¹⁴ The specific expression nevertheless does not exist in this Greek compilation. There are also minor differences between Codex 573 and the *Sacra Parallela*. Cf. Codex 573: ἀσφαλέστερον καί. *S. Parall.* ἀσφαλέστερον οὖν καί. Codex 573: ἀπομαντεύεσθαι ὀνόματα τυχόντα. *S. Parall.* ἀπομαντεύεσθαι ὀνόματος: τυχὸν δέ. Codex 573: δυναμένων ἐχόντων τὸν προειρημένον ἀριθμόν. *S. Parall.* δυναμένων τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀριθμοῦ. Codex 573: ἔχοντα τὸν ἀριθμόν. *S. Parall.* ἔχοντα τὸν αὐτὸν ἀριθμόν. Codex 573: ζητήσεται (so Irenaeus in Latin: 'quaeritur'). *S. Parall.* ζητηθήσεται. Codex 573: ὅτι δὲ οὐ δι' ἀπορίαν ὀνομάτων, has no Greek parallel, but in Latin we have, 'Quoniam autem non propter inopiam nominum'. Harnack rendered καὶ οὐκ αἰνιττομένη αὕτη ἡ ζήτησις, which makes no sense and is a gross misreading of the Codex. The edition of Irenaeus' fragments has καὶ οὐδὲν ἡττον μενεῖ αὕτη ἡ ζήτησις (fr. 25), which is not a precise Greek rendering from the Latin, but one of the editor's own making.

The great service of Codex 573 is that it preserves an accurate rendering not noticed so far. First, the handwriting is quite clear, and there is no room to doubt it. The expression 'to be defeated by an inquiry' was used by Aristotle once, referring to those of the Eleatic school

¹⁴ Karl Holl, *Die Sacra Parallela des Johannes Damascenus* (Leipzig, 1896).

who had been ‘defeated’ (meaning: confounded) by the inquiry (sc. into the notion of cause of change in the world). Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, 984a29–31: ‘But some of those who maintained that everything is one thing, being defeated, as it were, by this inquiry, say that the one thing [sc. the whole physical world] is immovable’ (ἀλλ’ ἐνιοί γε τῶν ἐν λεγόντων, ὥσπερ ἡττηθέντες ὑπὸ ταύτης τῆς ζητήσεως, τὸ ἐν ἀκίνητόν φασιν εἶναι). Alexander of Aphrodisias, commenting on this passage of Aristotle, says that the master actually ‘refers to Xenophanes, Melissus and Parmenides’, that is, to the Eleatic school, who ‘had postulated that everything is one’ (οὗτοι γὰρ τὸ ἐν τὸ πᾶν ἀπεφώνησαντο). Aristotle says that they were ‘defeated by this inquiry’ (ἡττηθῆναι δὲ αὐτοὺς φησιν ὑπὸ ταύτης τῆς ζητήσεως).¹⁵ Hence not only do we have a clear witness to the real text in the present Codex, but

also this exegesis makes sense and has a traceable history of its own.

This expression reveals an author who had an exceptional knowledge of Aristotle’s writings. I myself do not wish to advance the question about the authorship of this specific point any further, nor am I ready to go so far as to ascribe this to Cassian himself, since his phrase καὶ μεθ’ ἕτερα (‘and after some text, [he says]’) clearly suggests that he quotes from another author. I then take the text by convention as being quoted from Irenaeus, and only note that this passage is absent from Migne’s Greek text. I deem the point as actually moot, while believing that the alleged text of Irenaeus is not the one which the bishop of Lyon actually wrote. If Irenaeus was indeed the author of some of this text, interpolations must have taken place throughout the centuries.

¹⁵ Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, pp. 29–30.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Acta Apocrypha Barnabae*, ed. M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, vol. 2.2, Hildesheim, 1972, pp. 292–302
- Acta Apocrypha Joannis*, ed. M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, vol. 2.1, Hildesheim, 1972
- Acta Apocrypha Justini*, ed. H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford, 1972, pp. 42–52
- Acta Apocrypha Philippi*, ed. M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, vol. 2.2, Hildesheim, 1972
- Acta Apocrypha Thomae*, ed. M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, vol. 2.2, Hildesheim, 1972
- Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (ACO), ed. E. Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, vols. 1–3, Berlin, 1924–1940
- Canones xv* (against Origen and the Origenists), ed. E. Schwartz and J. Straub, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, vol. 4.1, Berlin, 1971, pp. 248–249
- Concilium Lateranense A. 649 Celebratum*, ed. R. Riedinger, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum. Series secunda, volumen primum*, Berlin, 1984, pp. 2–28, 34–108, 114–174, 180–244, 250–402, 404–420
- Concilium Universale Chalcedonense Anno 451*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, vol. 2.1.1–2.1.3, Berlin, 1962–1965
- Concilium Universale Constantinopolitanum Tertium (680–681)*, Concilii Actiones I–XVIII, ed. R. Riedinger, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum. Series secunda, volumen secundum*, parts 1–2, Berlin, 1990–1992
- Concilium Universale Ephesenum Anno 431*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, vol. 1.5.1, Berlin, 1963
- Sententia Synodica contra Theodorum Mopsuestenum*, ed. E. Schwartz and J. Straub, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, vol. 4.1, Berlin, 1971, pp. 239–240
- Synodus Constantinopolitana et Hierosolymitana Anno 536*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, vol. 3, Berlin, 1965
- Aelian. De Natura Animalium*, ed. R. Hercher, *Claudii Aeliani De Natura Animalium Libri xvii, Varia Historia, Epistolae, Fragmenta*, vol. 1, Graz, 1971
- Varia Historia*, ed. R. Hercher, *Claudii Aeliani De Natura Animalium Libri xvii, Varia Historia, Epistolae, Fragmenta*, vol. 2, Graz, 1971
- Aelius Aristides. Εἰς Αἴα*, ed. W. Dindorf, *Aristides*, vol. 1, Hildesheim, 1964, pp. 1–11
- Aeneas of Gaza. *Theophrastus*, ed. M. E. Colonna, *Enea di Gaza. Teofrasto*, Naples, 1958
- Aeschines. *De Falsa Legatione*, ed. V. Martin and G. de Budé, *Eschine. Discours*, vol. 1, Paris, 1962, pp. 110–169
- Aeschylus. *Agamemnon*, ed. G. Murray, *Aeschyli tragoediae*, Oxford, 1960, pp. 207–274
- Fragmenta*, ed. M. L. West, *Iambi et elegi Graeci*, vol. 2, Oxford, 1972, p. 29
- Agathangelus of Armenia. *Historia Armeniae (versio Graeca)*, ed. G. Lafontaine, *La version grecque ancienne du livre Arménien d'Agathange* (Publications de l'institut orientaliste de Louvain 7), Louvain-la-Neuve, 1973, pp. 173–345
- Agathias. *Historiae*, ed. R. Keydell, *Agathiae Myrinaei Historiarum Libri Quinque* (Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae 2), Berlin, 1967
- Albinus. *Epitome*, ed. P. Louis, *Albinos. Épitomé*, Paris, 1945
- Alexander of Aphrodisias. *De Anima*, ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter Commentaria Scripta Minora* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, suppl. 2.1), Berlin, 1887, pp. 1–100
- De Fato*, ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter Commentaria Scripta Minora* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, suppl. 2.2), Berlin, 1892, pp. 164–212
- De Mixtione*, ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter Commentaria Scripta Minora* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, suppl. 2.2), Berlin, 1892, pp. 213–238
- Fragmenta*, ed. P. Moraux, *Alexandre d'Aphrodise*, Paris, 1942, pp. 207–212, 214, 216–220
- In Aristotelis Analyticorum Priorum Librum I Commentarium*, ed. M. Wallies, *Alexandri in Aristotelis Analyticorum Priorum Librum I Commentarium* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 2.1), Berlin, 1883
- In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, ed. M. Hayduck, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 1), Berlin, 1891
- In Aristotelis Meteorologicorum Libros Commentaria*, ed. M. Hayduck, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis Meteorologicorum Libros Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 3.2), Berlin, 1899
- In Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, ed. M. Wallies, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis Topicorum Libros Octo Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 2.2), Berlin, 1891

- Alexander of Aphrodisias. In *Librum de Sensu Commentarium*, ed. P. Wendland, *Alexandri in Librum De Sensu Commentarium* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 3.1), Berlin, 1901
- Ammonius of Alexandria (presbyter, prob. fifth/sixth cent.). *Fragmenta In Sanctum Joannem*, ed. J. Reuss, *Johannes-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Texte und Untersuchungen 89), Berlin, 1966, pp. 196–358
- Ammonius of Alexandria (the son of Hermias, fifth cent. AD). In *Aristotelis Categorias Commentarius*, ed. A. Busse, *Ammonius in Aristotelis Categorias Commentarius* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 4.4), Berlin, 1895
- In *Aristotelis Librum De Interpretatione Commentarius*, ed. A. Busse, *Ammonius in Aristotelis De Interpretatione Commentarius* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 4.5), Berlin, 1897
- Amphilochius of Iconium. *Adversus Haereticos*, ed. C. Datema, *Amphilochii Iconiensis Opera*, Turnhout, 1978, pp. 185–214
- Epistula ad Synodum*, ed. C. Datema, *Amphilochii Iconiensis Opera*, Turnhout, 1978, pp. 219–221
- Iambi ad Seleucum*, ed. E. Oberg, *Amphilochii Iconiensis Iambi ad Seleucum* (Patristische Texte und Studien 9), Berlin, 1969
- In *Mulierem Peccatricem et Pharisaicum*, ed. C. Datema, *Amphilochii Iconiensis Opera*. Turnhout, 1978, pp. 107–126
- Anastasius of Sinai. *Viae Dux*, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, *Anastasius Sinaïtae Viae Dux* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 8), Turnhout, 1981
- Andreas of Caesarea. *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, ed. J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*, 1. Text, Einleitung (Münchener theologische Studien 1), Munich, 1955
- Therapeutica*, ed. F. Diekamp, *Analecta patristica* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 117), Rome, 1962, pp. 165–168
- Anonymus. *Commentaria in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam, Scholia Londinensia* (partially excerpted from Heliodorus), ed. A. Hilgard, *Grammatici Graeci*, vol. 1.3, Leipzig (rpt. Hildesheim), 1965, pp. 442–565
- Commentarium in Aristotelis De Interpretatione*, ed. L. Tarán, *Anonymous Commentary on Aristotle's De Interpretatione* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 95), Meisenheim am Glan, 1978
- Commentarium in Hermogenis Librum Περὶ Στάσεων*, ed. H. Rabe, *Syriani in Hermogenem Commentaria*, vol. 2, Leipzig, 1893
- Commentarium in Librum Περὶ Ἰδεῶν*, ed. C. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 7.2, Osnabrück, 1968, pp. 861–1087
- Commentarium in Librum Περὶ Εὐρέσεως*, ed. C. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 7.2, Osnabrück, 1968, pp. 697–860
- De Incredibilibus* (apud Lucian of Samosata, *De Astrologia*, 15), ed. S. Stephens and J. Winkler, *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*, Princeton, 1995, pp. 150–152
- Dialogus contra Judaeos*, ed. G. Bardy, *Les trophées de Damas, controverse judéo-chrétienne du VII siècle* (Patrologia Orientalis 15,2), Paris, 1920
- Dialogus cum Judaeis*, ed. J. H. Declerck, *Anonymus Dialogus cum Iudaeis Saeculi ut videtur Sexti* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 30), Turnhout, 1994, pp. 3–111
- Epitome Artis Rhetoricae*, ed. C. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 3, Stuttgart, 1968, pp. 610–612
- Excerpta de Arte Rhetorica*, ed. C. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 6, Osnabrück, 1968, pp. 30–32
- In *Aristotelis Sophisticos Elenchos Paraphrasis*, ed. M. Hayduck, *Anonymi Paraphrasis* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 23.4), Berlin, 1884
- In *Artem Rhetoricam Commentaria*, ed. H. Rabe, *Anonymi et Stephani in Artem Rhetoricam Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 21.2), Berlin, 1896
- In *Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, ed. A. Hilgard, *Grammatici Graeci*, vol. 1.3, Hildesheim, 1965, pp. 10–67
- In *Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam Commentariolus Byzantinus*, ed. A. Hilgard, *Grammatici Graeci*, vol. 1.3, Hildesheim, 1965, pp. 565–586
- In *Ethica Nicomachea Commentaria*, ed. G. Heylbut, *Eustratii et Michaelis et Anonyma in Ethica Nicomachea Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 20), Berlin, 1892, pp. 122–255
- In *Ethica Nicomachea Paraphrasis*, ed. G. Heylbut, *Heliodori in Ethica Nicomachea Paraphrasis* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 19.2), Berlin, 1889
- Περὶ τῶν ὀκτὼ μερῶν τοῦ ρητορικοῦ λόγου*, ed. C. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 3, Osnabrück, 1968, pp. 588–609
- Anthologiae Palatinae Appendix, Epigrammata Oracula*, ed. E. Cougny, *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et Appendice Nova*, vol. 3, Paris, 1890, pp. 464–533 (Epigr. 6.1–106, 111–323)
- Sepulcralia*, ed. E. Cougny, *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et Appendice Nova*, vol. 3, Paris, 1890, pp. 94–224
- Anthony the Hagiographer. *Vita Symeonis Stylitae Senioris*, ed. H. Lietzmann, *Das Leben des heiligen Symeon Stylites* (Texte und Untersuchungen 32.4), Leipzig, 1908
- Antiochus of Palestine (or Antiochus of Ancyra or Antiochus Strategius). *Pandecta Scripturae Sacrae*, PG.80: 1857–1866 and 1428–1849
- Apocalypsis Apocrypha Enochi*, ed. M. Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. (Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 3), Leiden, 1970
- Apocalypsis Apocrypha Esdrae*, ed. C. Tischendorf, *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, Leipzig, 1866, pp. 24–33

- Apocalypsis Apocrypha Joannis*, ed. A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, vol. 1, Moscow, 1893
- ed. C. Tischendorf, *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, Leipzig, 1866
- Apollinaris of Laodicea. *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 57–82
- Fragmenta in Matthaeum*, ed. J. Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Texte und Untersuchungen 61), Berlin, 1957, pp. 2–54
- Fragmenta in Psalmos*, ed. E. Mühlenberg, *Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung*, vol. 1. (Patristische Texte und Studien 15), Berlin, 1975, pp. 3–118
- Fragmenta In Sanctum Joannem*, ed. J. Reuss, *Johannes-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Texte und Untersuchungen 89), Berlin, 1966, pp. 3–64
- Apollonius Dyscolus. *De Adverbiis*, ed. R. Schneider, *Grammatici Graeci*, vol. 2.1, Hildesheim, 1965, pp. 119–210
- De Syntaxi*, ed. G. Uhlig, *Grammatici Graeci*, vol. 2.2, Hildesheim, 1965, pp. 1–497
- Apollonius of Ephesus. *Fragmenta adversus Montanistas*, ed. M. J. Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, vol. 1, Hildesheim, 1974, pp. 467–472
- Apophthegmata Patrum* (systematic order), PG.65.72–440 (systematic order, 1–9), ed. J.-C. Guy, *Les apophthegmes des pères. Collection systématique, chapitres i–ix* (Sources chrétiennes 387), Paris, 1993, pp. 92–448 (systematic order, 10–16), ed. J.-C. Guy, *Les apophthegmes des pères. Collection systématique, chapitres x–xvi* (Sources chrétiennes 474), Paris, 2003, pp. 14–416
- Archedemus of Tarsus. *Fragmenta*, ed. J. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, vol. 3, Stuttgart, 1968, pp. 262–264
- Archimedes. *Geometrica*, ed. C. Mugler, *Archimède*, vol. 1, Paris, 1970, pp. 152–252
- Arethas of Caesarea. *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, PG.106.487–786
- Scripta Minora*, ed. L. G. Westerink, *Arethae Archiepiscopi Caesariensis Scripta Minora*, vols. 1–2, Leipzig, 1968–1972
- Aristides Quintilianus. *De Musica*, ed. R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Aristidis Quintiliani De Musica Libri Tres*, Leipzig, 1963
- Aristocles of Messene. *Fragmenta*, ed. H. Heiland, *Aristoclis Messenii reliquiae*, Giessen, 1925
- Ariston of Ceos. *Fragmenta*, ed. F. Wehrli, *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Die Schule des Aristoteles, vol. 6), Basel, 1968, pp. 32–44
- Aristophanes, ed. V. Coulon and M. van Daele, vols. 2 and 4, Paris, 1967 and 1969
- Aristotle. *Analytica Posteriora*, ed. and tr. H. P. Cooke and H. Tredennick, *Aristotle, Posterior Analytics, Topica*, Cambridge, Mass., 1989
- Analytica Priora*, ed. and tr. H. P. Cooke and H. Tredennick, *Aristotle, Categories, On Interpretation, Prior Analytics*, Cambridge, Mass., 1983
- Ars Poetica*, ed. R. Kassel, *Aristotelis De Arte Poetica Liber*, Oxford, 1968
- Ars Rhetorica*, ed. and tr. J. H. Freese, *Aristotle, Art of Rhetoric*, Cambridge, Mass., 1982
- Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, ed. and tr. H. Rackham, *Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, Eudemian Ethics, Virtues and Vices*, Cambridge, Mass., 1992
- Categoriae*, ed. and tr. H. P. Cooke and H. Tredennick, *Aristotle, Categories, On Interpretation, Prior Analytics*, Cambridge, Mass., 1983
- De Anima*, ed. and tr. W. E. Hett, *Aristotle, On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, Cambridge, Mass., 1986
- De Caelo*, ed. and tr. W. K. C. Guthrie, *Aristotle, On the Heavens*, Cambridge, Mass., 1986
- De Generatione Animalium*, ed. and tr. A. L. Peck, *Aristotle, Generation of Animals*, Cambridge, Mass., 1990
- De Insomniis*, ed. and tr. W. E. Hett, *Aristotle, On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, Cambridge, Mass., 1986
- De Interpretatione*, ed. and tr. H. P. Cooke and H. Tredennick, *Aristotle, Categories, On Interpretation, Prior Analytics*, Cambridge, Mass., 1983
- De Lineis*, ed. and tr. W. S. Hett, *Aristotle, Minor Works*, Cambridge, Mass., 1993
- De Memoria et Reminiscentia*, ed. and tr. W. E. Hett, *Aristotle, On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, Cambridge, Mass., 1986
- De Partibus Animalium*, ed. and tr. A. L. Peck and E. S. Forster, *Aristotle, Parts of Animals, Movement of Animals, Progression of Animals*, Cambridge, Mass., 1993
- De Respiratione*, ed. and tr. W. E. Hett, *Aristotle, On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, Cambridge, Mass., 1986
- De Sensu et Sensibilibus*, ed. and tr. W. E. Hett, *Aristotle, On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, Cambridge Mass., 1986
- De Virtutibus et Vitiis*, ed. and tr. H. Rackham, *Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, Eudemian Ethics, Virtues and Vices*, Cambridge, Mass., 1992
- Ethica Eudemia*, ed. and tr. H. Rackham, *Aristotle, Athenian Constitution, Eudemian Ethics, Virtues and Vices*, Cambridge, Mass., 1992
- Aristotle. *Ethica Nicomachea*, ed. and tr. H. Rackham, *Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics*, Cambridge, Mass., 1990
- Fragmenta*, ed. V. Rose, *Aristotelis Qui Ferebantur Librorum Fragmenta*, Stuttgart, 1967
- Magna Moralia*, ed. and tr. Hugh Tredennick and G. Cyril Armstrong, *Aristotle, Metaphysics, X–XIV, Oeconomica, Magna Moralia*, Cambridge, Mass., 1990

- Metaphysica*, ed. and tr.: v. I, Hugh Tredennick, *Aristotle, Metaphysics, I–IX*; v. II, Hugh Tredennick and G. Cyril Armstrong, *Aristotle, Metaphysics, X–XIV, Oeconomica, Magna Moralia*, Cambridge, Mass., 1989–1990 (reprints)
- Physica*, ed. and tr. P. H. Wickstead and F. M. Cornford: v. I: *Aristotle, Physics, Books I–IV*; v. II: *Aristotle, Physics, Books V–VIII*. Cambridge, Mass., 1980 (rpts.)
- Politica*, ed. and tr. H. Rackham, *Aristotle, Politics*, Cambridge, Mass., 1990
- Protrepticus*, ed. I. Düring, *Aristotle's Protrepticus*, Stockholm, 1961
- Sophistici Elenchi*, ed. and tr. E. S. Forster, *Aristotle, On Sophistical Refutations, On Coming-to-Be and Passing Away, On the Cosmos*, Cambridge, Mass., 1992
- Topica*, ed. and tr. H. P. Cooke and H. Tredennick, *Aristotle, Posterior Analytics, Topica*, Cambridge, Mass., 1989
- Arius Didymus. *De Sectis Philosophorum*, ed. F. W. A. Mullach, *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum*, vol. 2, Paris, 1968, pp. 53–101
- Asclepius of Tralles. In *Aristotelis Metaphysicorum Libros A-Z Commentaria*, ed. M. Hayduck, *Asclepii in Aristotelis Metaphysicorum Libros A-Z Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 6.2), Berlin, 1888
- In *Nicomachi Introductionem Arithmeticam Commentarius*, ed. L. Tarán, *Asclepius of Tralles. Commentary to Nicomachus' Introduction to Arithmetic* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. 59.4), Philadelphia, 1969
- Aspasius. *Commentaria in Ethica Nicomachea*, ed. G. Heylbut, *Aspasi in Ethica Nicomachea Quae Supersunt Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 19.1), Berlin, 1889
- Asterius of Amasea. *Homiliae*, ed. C. Datema, *Asterius of Amasea. Homilies i–xiv*, Leiden, 1970
- Asterius of Antioch. *Commentaria in Psalmos*, ed. M. Richard, *Asterii Sophistae Commentariorum in Psalmos Quae Supersunt* (Symbolae Osloenses, suppl. 16), Oslo, 1956
- Athanasius. *Ad Episcopos in Africa*, PG.26.1029–1048
- Ad Marcellinum in Interpretationem Psalmorum*, PG.27.12–45
- Ad Serapionem*, ed. H. G. Opitz, *Athanasius, Werke*, vol. 2.1, Berlin, 1940, pp. 178–180
- Ad Serapionem de Spiritu Sancto*, PG.26.524–676
- Adversus Arianos*, PG.26.12–468
- Contra Gentes*, ed. R. W. Thomson, *Athanasius. Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*, Oxford, 1971
- De Actis Arianorum*, ed. H. G. Opitz, *Athanasius, Werke*, vol. 2.1, Berlin, 1940, pp. 183–230
- De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi*, ed. H. G. Opitz, *Athanasius, Werke*, vol. 2.1, Berlin, 1940
- De Incarnatione Verbi*, ed. C. Kannengiesser, *Sur l'incarnation du Verbe* (Sources chrétiennes 199), Paris, 1973
- De Morbo et De Sanitate (fragmenta)*, ed. F. Diekamp, *Analecta Patristica* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 117), Rome, 1962
- De Synodis Arimini et Seleucia*, ed. H. G. Opitz, *Athanasius, Werke*, vol. 2.1, Berlin, 1940, pp. 231–278
- Epistula ad Epictetum*, ed. G. Ludwig, *Athanasii Epistula ad Epictetum*, Jena, 1911
- Epistula Festiva 39* (fragment), PG.26.1176–80 and 1436–40; with additional Coptic fragments, ed. L. Th. LeFort, S. Athanase: *Lettres Festales et Pastorales en Copte* (CSCO), Louvain, 1995, v. 150, pp. 15–22 and 58–62; v. 151, 31–40
- Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27: 60–545, 548–589
- Fragmenta*, PG.26: 1224, 1233–1249, 1252–1260, 1293–1296, 1313, 1320–1325
- Vita et Conversatio Antonii*, PG.26.835–976
- Athenaeus. *Deipnosophistae*, ed. G. Kaibel, *Athenaei Naucrati-tae Deipnosophistarum Libri xv*, 3 vols., Stuttgart, 1965–1966
- Deipnosophistae* (epitome), ed. S. P. Peppink, *Athenaei Dipnosophistarum Epitome*, 2 vols., Leiden, 1937–1939
- Athenagoras. *De Resurrectione*, ed. W. R. Schoedel, *Athenagoras. Legatio and De resurrectione*, Oxford, 1972
- Legatio*, ed. W. R. Schoedel, *Athenagoras. Legatio and De resurrectione*, Oxford, 1972
- Barsanuphius and John. *Epistulae* (Epistles 224–616), ed. F. Neyt and P. de Angelis-Noah, *Correspondance*, v. II, *Aux cénobites*, Tome I, *Lettres 224–398*; Tome II, *Lettres 399–616* (Sources chrétiennes 450, 451), Paris, 2000
- Basil of Ancyra. *De Virginitatis Integritate*, PG.30.669–809
- Basil of Caesarea. *Adversus Eunomium*, PG.29: 497–669, 672–768
- Contra Sabellianos, et Arium, et Anomoeos*, PG.31.600–617
- De Baptismo*, PG.31.1513–1628
- De Gratiarum Actione Homilia*, PG.31.217–237
- De Humilitate*, PG.31.525–540
- De Spiritu Sancto*, ed. B. Pruche, *Basile de Césarée. Sur le Saint-Esprit* (Sources chrétiennes 17 bis), Paris, 1968
- Epistulae*, ed. Y. Courtonne, *Saint Basile. Lettres*, 3 vols., Paris, 1957–1966
- Homilia adversus Eos Qui Irascuntur*, PG.31.353–372
- Homiliae in Hexaemeron*, ed. S. Giet, *Basile de Césarée. Homélies sur l'hexaéméron* (Sources chrétiennes 26 bis), Paris, 1968
- Homiliae in Principium Proverbiorum*, PG.31.385–424
- Homiliae in Psalmos*, PG.29.209–494
- Moralia*, PG.31.692–869
- Quod Deus Non Est Auctor Malorum*, PG.31.329–353
- Regulae Fusius Tractatae*, PG.31.901–1305
- Sermones Viginti Quattuor de Moribus* (compiled by Symeon Metaphrastes), PG.32.1116–1381

- Basil of Seleucia. *Homilia in Sanctum Andream*, PG.28.1101–1108
- Orationes*, PG.85.28–474
- Bessarion, John. *De sacramento Eucharistiae*, ed. L. Mohler, *Aus Bessarions Gelehrtenkreis: Abhandlungen, Reden, Briefe von Bessarion, Theodoros Gazes, Michael Apostolios, Andronikos Kallistos, Georgios Trapezuntinos, Niccolò Perotti, Niccolò Capranica (Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann: Funde und Forschungen*, vol. 3), Paderborn, 1967
- Cassian the Sabaite. *Ad Castorem Episcopum De Canonicis Occidentalis et Aegyptionis Coenobiorum Constitutionibus*, ed. P. Tzamalikos, *A Newly Discovered Greek Father, Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles*, Leiden, 2012, pp. 19–75
- Ad Castorem Episcopum De Octo Vitiosis Cogitationibus*, ed. P. Tzamalikos, *A Newly Discovered Greek Father, Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles*, Leiden, 2012, pp. 77–165
- Ad Leontium Hegumenum De Scetae Sanctorum Patrum*, ed. P. Tzamalikos, *A Newly Discovered Greek Father, Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles*, Leiden, 2012, pp. 167–246
- Contributio Sereni Abbatis De Panareto*, ed. P. Tzamalikos, *A Newly Discovered Greek Father, Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles*, Leiden, 2012, pp. 311–372
- Contributio Sereni Abbatis Prima*, ed. P. Tzamalikos, *A Newly Discovered Greek Father, Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles*, Leiden, 2012, pp. 247–309
- Cassius Dio. *Historiae Romanae*, ed. U. P. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum Quae Supersunt*, 3 vols, Berlin, 1955
- Catena in Acta*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 3, Hildesheim, 1967
- Catena in Epistulam ad Ephesios*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 6, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 96–225
- Catena in Epistulam ad Galatas*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 6, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 1–95
- Catena in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 7, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 112–127 and 279–598
- Catena in Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 4, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 1–529
- Catena in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 5, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 1–344
- Catena in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 5, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 345–444
- Catena in Epistulam ii ad Timotheum*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 7, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 52–82
- Catena in Epistulam Jacobi*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 8, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 1–40
- Catena in Epistulam Joannis i*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 8, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 105–145
- Catena in Epistulam Petri i*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 8, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 41–83
- Catena in Lucam*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 2, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 3–174
- Catena in Matthaeum*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 1, Hildesheim, 1967
- Catena in Sanctum Joannem*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 2, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 177–413
- Catena Palestinae*. ed. M. Harl, *La chaîne Palestinienne sur le Psaume 118 (Origène, Eusèbe, Didyme, Apollinaire, Athanase, Théodoret)* (Sources chrétiennes 189), Paris, 1972, pp. 182–472
- Cebes. *Cebetis Tabula*, ed. K. Prächter, *Cebetis tabula*, Leipzig, 1893
- Chronicon Paschale*. ed. L. Dindorf, *Chronicon paschale, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, Bonn, 1832 (rpt. 2010)
- Clement Studites. *Canones Ceremoniales*, ed. M. A. Magri, *Clemente innografo e gli inediti canoni cerimoniali*. (Testi e Studi 12), Rome, 1979, pp. 77–210
- Clement of Alexandria. *Eclogae Prophetarum*, ed. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, and U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. 3 (GCS 17), Berlin, 1970, pp. 137–155
- Excerpta ex Theodoto*, ed. F. Sagnard, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Extraits de Théodote* (Sources chrétiennes 23), Paris, 1970
- Fragmenta*, ed. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, and U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. 3 (GCS 17), Berlin, 1970, pp. 195–202, 212, 216–230
- Paedagogus*, ed. H.-I. Marrou, M. Harl, C. Mondésert, and C. Matray, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Le pédagogue*, 3 vols. (Sources chrétiennes 70, 108, 158), Paris, 1960–1970
- Protrepticus*, ed. C. Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Le protreptique* (Sources chrétiennes 2), Paris, 1949
- Quis Salvetur Dives*, ed. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, and U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. 3. (GCS 17), Berlin, 1970, pp. 159–191
- Stromateis*, ed. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, and U. Treu, *Clemens*

- Alexandrinus*, vols 2³ and 3² (GCS 52 (15), 17), Berlin, 2, 1960; 3, 1970
- Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta*, Concilium Constantinopolitanum 381, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, Turnhout, 2006
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Emperor. *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. G. Moravcsik, (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 1). Washington, D.C., 1967
- De Caerimoniis*, ed. J. J. Reiske, *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris de caerimoniis aulae Byzantinae libri duo* (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae), Bonn, Weber, 1829, pp. 386–807
- De Caerimoniis*, ed. A. Vogt, *Le livre des cérémonies*, 2 vols., Paris, 1967
- De Insiidiis Contra Reges*, ed. C. de Boor, *Excerpta Historica Iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti Confecta*, vol. 3, *Excerpta De Insiidiis Contra Reges*, Berlin, 1905
- De Legationibus*, ed. C. de Boor, *Excerpta Historica Iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti Confecta*, vol. 1, *Excerpta De Legationibus*, Berlin, 1903
- De Virtutibus et Vitiis*, ed. T. Büttner-Wobst and A. G. Roos, *Excerpta Historica Iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti Confecta*, vol. 2, *Excerpta De Vitiis quae Opposita Sunt Virtutibus*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1906–1910
- Constitutio Monasterii Prodromi τοῦ Φοβεροῦ*, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Noctes Petropolitanae*, Leipzig, 1976
- Constitutiones Apostolorum*, ed. M. Metzger, *Les constitutions apostoliques*, 3 vols. (Sources chrétiennes 320, 329, 336), Paris, 1985–1987
- Corpus Hermeticum, *Fragmenta*, ed. A. D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum*, vols. 3 and 4, Paris, 1972
- Cosmas Indicopleustes. *Topographia Christiana*, ed. W. Wolska-Conus, *Cosmas Indicopleustès. Topographie chrétienne*, 3 vols. (Sources chrétiennes 141, 159, 197), Paris, 1968–1973
- Critias. *Fragmenta*, ed. B. Snell (Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta 1), Göttingen, 1971, pp. 171–184
- Critolaus of Phaselis. *Fragmenta*, ed. F. Wehrli, *Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler* (Die Schule des Aristoteles 10), Basel, 1969, pp. 51–58
- Cyril of Alexandria. *Ad Tiberium Diaconum*, ed. P. E. Pusey, *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium*, vol. 3, Brussels, 1965, pp. 577–602
- Commentaria in Matthaeum*, ed. J. Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Texte und Untersuchungen 61), Berlin, 1957, pp. 153–269
- Commentarii In Sanctum Joannem*, ed. P. E. Pusey, *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium*, 3 vols, Brussels, 1965
- Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam*, PG.70.9–1449
- Contra Julianum*, ed. P. Burguière and P. Évieux, *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Contre Julien*, tome 1, livres 1 et 2 (Sources chrétiennes 322), Paris, 1985
- De Adoratione in Spiritu et Veritate*, PG.68.132–1125
- De Incarnatione*, ed. G. M. de Durand, *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Deux dialogues christologiques* (Sources chrétiennes 97), Paris, 1964, pp. 188–300
- De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.75.9–656
- Dialogi De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, ed. G. M. de Durand, *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Dialogues sur la Trinité*, 3 vols. (Sources chrétiennes 231, 237, 246), Paris, 1, 1976; 2, 1977; 3, 1978
- Epistola ad Euoptium*, PG.76.385–452
- Explanatio in Lucam*, PG.72.476–949
- Explanatio in Psalmos*, PG.69.717–1273
- Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, ed. P. E. Pusey, *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium*, vol. 3, Brussels, 1965, pp. 249–318
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, ed. P. E. Pusey, *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium*, vol. 3, Brussels, 1965, pp. 320–360
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, ed. P. E. Pusey, *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium*, vol. 3, Brussels, 1965, pp. 362–423
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. P. E. Pusey, *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium*, vol. 3, Brussels, 1965, pp. 173–248
- Fragmenta in Jeremiam*, PG.70.1452–1457
- Glaphyrorum in Pentateuchum*, PG.69.9–677
- Homiliae Paschales*, PG.77.401–981
- In Canticum Canticorum Commentarii Reliquiae*, PG.69.1277–1293
- In Occursum Domini*, PG.77.1040–1049
- In XII Prophetas*, ed. P. E. Pusey, *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII Prophetas*, 2 vols, Brussels, 1965
- Solutiones Dogmaticae*, ed. P. E. Pusey, *Sancti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium*, vol. 3, Brussels, 1965, pp. 549–566
- Unus sit Christus*, ed. G. M. de Durand, *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Deux dialogues christologiques* (Sources chrétiennes 97), Paris, 1964, pp. 302–514
- Cyril of Jerusalem. *Catecheses Illuminandorum*, ed. W. C. Reischl and J. Rupp, *Cyrilli Hierosolymorum Archiepiscopi Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*, 2 vols., Munich, 1848–1860 (rpt. 1967)
- Catecheses Illuminandorum II*, PG.33.409–424
- Damascius. *De Principiis*, ed. C. É. Ruelle, *Damascii Successoris Dubitationes et Solutiones*, vol. 1, Brussels, 1964
- In Parmenidem*, ed. C. É. Ruelle, *Damascii Successoris Dubitationes et Solutiones*, vol. 2, Brussels, 1964

- In Philebum*, ed. L. G. Westerink, *Damascius. Lectures on the Philebus Wrongly Attributed to Olympiodorus*, Amsterdam, 1982
- In Platonis Phaedonem (version 1)*, ed. L. G. Westerink, *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo*, vol. 2, Amsterdam, 1977, pp. 27–285
- In Platonis Phaedonem (version 2)*, ed. L. G. Westerink, *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo*, vol. 2, Amsterdam, 1977
- Vita Isidori*, ed. C. Zintzen, Hildesheim, 1967
- David of Alexandria. *In Porphyrii Isagogen Commentarium*, ed. A. Busse *Davidis Prolegomena et in Porphyrii Isagogen Commentarium* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 18.2), Berlin, 1904
- Demosthenes. *Demosthenis Orationes*, ed. Mervin R. Dilts, 4 vols., Oxford, 2002–2009
- Dexippus. *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, ed. A. Busse (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 4.2), Berlin, 1888
- Diadochus of Photike. *Capita Centum de Perfectione Spirituali*, ed. J. Rutherford, *One Hundred Practical Texts of Perception and Spiritual Discernment from Diadochos of Photike* (Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations 8), Belfast, 2000
- Didache Apostolorum*, ed. J. P. Audet, *La Didachè. Instructions des Apôtres*, Paris, 1958, pp. 226–242
- Didymus. *Adversus Manichaeos*, PG.39.1085–1109
- De Spiritu Sancto* (Latin translation by Jerome and French translation), ed. L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Aveugle. Traité du Saint Esprit* (Sources chrétiennes 386), Paris, 1992
- Fragmenta*, PG.91: 725, 813, 821, 944, 948, 965, 968 (Pseudo-Maximus Confessor)
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933
- Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933
- Fragmenta in Job*, PG.39.1120–1153
- Fragmenta in Proverbia* PG.39.1621–1645 (Ex *Didymi In Proverbia Salomonis Commentariis*)
- Fragmenta in Psalmos*, ed. E. Mühlenberg, *Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung*, 2 vols. (Patristische Texte und Studien 15 and 16), Berlin, 1975–1977
- Fragmenta in Sanctum Joannem*, ed. J. Reuss, *Johannes-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Texte und Untersuchungen 89), Berlin, 1966
- In Ecclesiasten (cap. 1.1–8)*, ed. G. Binde and L. Liesenborghs, *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes*, pt. 1 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 25), Bonn, 1979
- In Ecclesiasten (cap. 3–4.12)*, ed. M. Gronewald, *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes*, pt. 2 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 22), Bonn, 1977
- In Ecclesiasten (cap. 5–6)*, ed. J. Kramer, *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes*, pt. 3 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 13), Bonn, 1970
- In Ecclesiasten (cap. 7–8.8)*, ed. J. Kramer and B. Krebber, *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes*, pt. 4 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 16), Bonn, 1972
- In Ecclesiasten (cap. 9.8–10.20)*, ed. M. Gronewald, *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes*, pt. 5 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 24), Bonn, 1979
- In Ecclesiasten (cap. 11–12)*, ed. G. Binder and L. Liesenborghs, *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes*, pt. 6 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 9), Bonn, 1969
- In Epistulas Catholicas Brevis Enarratio*, ed. F. Zoepfl, *Didymi Alexandrini in Epistulas Canonicas Brevis Enarratio* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 4.1), Münster, 1914
- Didymus. *In Genesin*, ed. P. Nautin and L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Aveugle. Sur la Genèse*, 2 vols. (Sources chrétiennes 233, 244), Paris, 1976–1978
- In Job (cap. 5.1–6.29)*, ed. A. Henrichs, *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zu Hiob*, pt. 2 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 2), Bonn, 1968
- In Job (cap. 7.20c–11)*, ed. U. Hagedorn, D. Hagedorn, and L. Koenen, *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zu Hiob*, pt. 3 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 3), Bonn, 1968
- In Job (cap. 12.1–16.8a)*, ed. U. Hagedorn, D. Hagedorn, and L. Koenen, *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zu Hiob*, pt. 4.1 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 33.1), Bonn, 1985
- In Psalmos 20–21*, ed. L. Doutreleau, A. Gesché, and M. Gronewald, *Didymos der Blinde. Psalmenkommentar*, pt. 1 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 7), Bonn, 1969
- In Psalmos 22–26.10*, ed. M. Gronewald, *Didymos der Blinde. Psalmenkommentar*, pt. 2 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 4), Bonn, 1968
- In Psalmos 29–34*, ed. M. Gronewald, *Didymos der Blinde. Psalmenkommentar*, pt. 3 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 8), Bonn, 1969
- In Psalmos 35–39*, ed. M. Gronewald, *Didymos der Blinde. Psalmenkommentar*, pt. 4 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 6), Bonn, 1969
- In Psalmos 36.15–19*, ed. M. Gronewald, *Didymos der Blinde. Psalmenkommentar* (Nachtrag der Seiten 248/49

- des Tura-Papyrus), *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 46 (1982), 98–110
- In *Psalmos 40–44.4*, ed. M. Gronewald, *Didymos der Blinde. Psalmenkommentar*, pt. 5 (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 12), Bonn, 1970
- In *Zachariam*, ed. L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Aveugle sur Zacharie*, 3 vols. (Sources chrétiennes 83, 84, 85), Paris, 1962
- Dio Chrysostom. *Orationes*, ed. J. von Arnim, *Dionis Prusaensis Quem Vocant Chrysostomum Quae Exstant Omnia*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1962
- Diodorus of Sicily. *Bibliotheca Historica* (books 1–20), ed. F. Vogel and K. T. Fischer, 5 vols., Stuttgart, 1964
- Bibliotheca Historica*, ed. F. R. Walton, *Diodorus of Sicily*, vols. 11–12, Cambridge, Mass., 1967 (rpt. 1968)
- Diodorus of Tarsus. *Commentarii in Psalmos I–L*, ed. J.-M. Olivier, *Diodori Tarsensis Commentarii in Psalmos. I. Commentarii in Psalmos I–L*, vol. 1 (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 6), Turnhout, 1980
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 83–112
- Diogenes Laertius. *Vitae Philosophorum*, ed. and tr. R. D. Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1995
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Antiquitates Romanae*, ed. K. Jacoby, 4 vols., Stuttgart, 1967
- De Oratoribus Antiquis*, ed. H. Usener and L. Radermacher, *Dionysii Halicarnasei Quae Exstant*, vol. 5, Stuttgart, 1965
- De Thucydide*, ed. H. Usener and L. Radermacher, *Dionysii Halicarnasei Quae Exstant*, vol. 5, Stuttgart, 1965, pp. 325–418
- Dioscorides Pedanius (or Tarsenus). *De Materia Medica*, ed. M. Wellmann, *Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei De Materia Medica Libri Quinque*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1958
- Dissertatio Contra Iudaeos*, ed. M. Hostens, *Anonymi Auctoris Theognosiae Dissertatio contra Iudaeos* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 14), Turnhout, 1986
- Doctrina Patrum*, ed. F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum De Incarnatione Verbi*, Münster, 1907
- Dorotheus of Sidon. *Carmen Astrologicum*, ed. D. Pingree, Leipzig, 1976
- Elias of Alexandria. In *Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, ed. A. Busse, *Eliae in Porphyrii Isagogen et Aristotelis Categorias Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 18.1), Berlin, 1900), pp. 107–255
- In *Porphyrii Isagogen*, ed. A. Busse, *Eliae in Porphyrii Isagogen et Aristotelis Categorias Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 18.1), Berlin, 1900
- Ephraem Syrus. *Ad Imitationem Proverbiorum*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 1, Thessaloniki, 1995, pp. 185–280
- Ad Ioannem Monachum*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 6, Thessaloniki, 1995, pp. 173–195
- Ad Monachos Aegypti*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 3, Thessaloniki, 1990, pp. 36–294
- Ad Monachum Novitium*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 2, Thessaloniki, 1989, pp. 209–251
- Ad Novitium Monachum de Virtute*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 2, Thessaloniki, 1989, pp. 77–110
- Ad Renuntiantes*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 5, Thessaloniki, 1994, pp. 282–299
- Adversus Haereticos*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 6, Thessaloniki, 1995, pp. 131–172
- Capita Centum*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 2, Thessaloniki, 1989, pp. 280–362
- Capita Viginti*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 2, Thessaloniki, 1989, pp. 267–279
- De Abstinento*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 5, Thessaloniki, 1989, pp. 224–230
- De Caritate*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 5, Thessaloniki, 1989, pp. 118–128
- De Communi Resurrectione*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 4, Thessaloniki, 1992, pp. 47–75
- De Compunctione*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 1, Thessaloniki, 1995, pp. 375–384
- De Divina Gratia*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 5, Thessaloniki, 1994, pp. 176–186
- De Iudicio et Separatione Animae et Corporis*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 4, Thessaloniki, 1992, pp. 234–244
- De Iuliano*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 6, Thessaloniki, 1995, pp. 119–130
- De Ludicris Rebus Abstinencia*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 5, Thessaloniki, 1994, pp. 239–250
- De Mortis Recordatione*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 4, Thessaloniki, 1992, pp. 245–255
- De Octo Cogitationibus*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 3, Thessaloniki, 1990, pp. 295–304
- De Paenitentia et de Caritate*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 4, Thessaloniki, 1992, pp. 47–75
- De Passionibus*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 1, Thessaloniki, 1995, pp. 354–361
- De Patientia*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 4, Thessaloniki, 1992, pp. 320–332.
- De Secundo Aduentu Domini*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Έφραιμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 4, Thessaloniki, 1992, pp. 206–222.

- De Timore Animarum*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 2, Thessaloniki, 1989, pp. 34–43
- In Illud: Attende Tibi Ipsi*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 2, Thessaloniki, 1989, pp. 142–198
- In Pretiosam Crucem; et in Secundum Adventu*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 4, Thessaloniki, 1992, pp. 129–154
- Laudatio in Martyres*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 7, Thessaloniki, 1998, pp. 176–186
- Laudatio in Petrum, Paulum et Andream*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 7, Thessaloniki, 1998, pp. 112–130
- Precationes ad Matrem Dei*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 6, Thessaloniki, 1995, pp. 54–413
- Precationes Sacrae Scripturae*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 6, Thessaloniki, 1995, pp. 280–353
- Quaestiones et Responsiones*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 6, Thessaloniki, 1995, pp. 218–242
- Quod Non Oporteat Ridere*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 2, Thessaloniki, 1989, pp. 199–208
- Quomodo Latro Ante Resurrectionem in Paradisum Intravit*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 7, Thessaloniki, 1998, pp. 83–85
- Regulae ad Monachos*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 5, Thessaloniki, 1994, pp. 300–370
- Sermo Asceticus*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 5, Thessaloniki, 1994, pp. 166–175
- Sermo Compunctorius*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 1, Thessaloniki, 1995, pp. 96–121 and 385–390
- Sermo in Secundum Adventum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi*, ed. K. Phrantzoles, *Όσίου Εφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου Έργα*, vol. 4, Thessaloniki, 1992, pp. 9–46
- Epiphanius of Salamis. *Ancoratus*, ed. K. Holl, *Epiphanius, Band 1, Ancoratus und Panarion* (GCS 25), Leipzig, 1915
- De XII Gemmis*, ed. C.É. Ruelle, *Les lapidaires de l'antiquité et du Moyen Age*, vol. 2.1, Paris, Leroux, 1898
- De Mensuris et de Ponderibus*, ed. E. Moutsoulas, 'Τὸ Περὶ Μέτρων καὶ Σατθμῶν τοῦ Επιφανίου τοῦ Σαλαμῖνος', *Θεολογία* 44 (1973), 157–198
- Liturgia Praesantificatorum*, ed. D. N. Moraites, *Ἡ Λειτουργία τῶν Προηγιασμένων*, Thessaloniki: University of Thessaloniki, 1955, pp. 53–77
- Panarion*, ed. K. Holl, *Epiphanius, Bände 1–3, Ancoratus und Panarion* (GCS 25, 31, 37), Leipzig, 1915–1933
- Euclid. *Fragmenta*, ed. J. L. Heiberg, *Euclidis Opera Omnia*, vol. 8, Leipzig, 1916, pp. 227, 236–284
- Eunomius. *Apologia*, ed. R. P. Vaggione, *Eunomius The Extant Works*, Oxford, 1987
- Euripides. ed. J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae*, vol. 3, Oxford, 1994
- Fragmenta*, ed. A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig (rpt. Hildesheim), 1964
- Eusebius of Caesarea. *Adversus Hieroclem*, ed. C. L. Kayser, *Flavii Philostrati Opera*, vol. 1, Hildesheim, 1964
- Adversus Marcellum*, ed. E. Klostermann and G. C. Hansen, *Eusebius Werke, Band 4, Gegen Marcell. Über die kirchliche Theologie. Die Fragmente Marcells* (GCS 14), Berlin, 1972
- Eusebius of Caesarea. *Antiquorum Martyriorum Collectio* (fragments), PG.20.1520–1533
- Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG.23.66–1396; PG.24.9–76
- Commentarius in Isaiam*, ed. J. Ziegler, *Eusebius, Werke, Band 9, Der Jesajakommentar* (GCS 11), Berlin, 1975
- Constantini Oratio ad Coetum Sanctorum*, ed. I. A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke, Band 1, Über das Leben Constantins. Constantins Rede an die heilige Versammlung. Tricennatsrede an Constantin* (GCS 7), Leipzig, 1902
- De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, ed. E. Klostermann and G. C. Hansen, *Eusebius Werke, Band 4, Gegen Marcell. Über die kirchliche Theologie. Die Fragmente Marcells* (GCS 14), Berlin, 1972
- De Martyribus Palaestinae*, ed. G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 3 (Sources chrétiennes 55), Paris, 1967
- De Solemnitate Paschali*, PG.24.693–706
- De Theophania* (fragments), ed. H. Gressmann, *Eusebius Werke, Band 3.2, Die Theophanie* (GCS 11.2), Leipzig, 1904
- Demonstratio Evangelica* (fragments) ed. I. A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke, Band 6, Die Demonstratio evangelica* (GCS 23), Leipzig, 1913
- Eclogae Propheticae*, ed. T. Gaisford, Oxford, 1842
- Epistula ad Alexandrum Alexandrinum*, ed. H. G. Opitz, *Athanasius, Werke*, vol. 3.1, Berlin, 1934, pp. 14–15
- Epistula ad Caesarienses*, ed. H. G. Opitz, *Athanasius, Werke*, vol. 2.1, Berlin, 1940, 28–31
- Fragmenta in Danielelem*, PG.24.525–528
- Fragmenta in Lucam*, PG.24.529–605
- Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, 3 vols. (Sources chrétiennes 31, 41, 55), Paris, 1967
- Laudatio Constantini*, ed. I. A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke, Band 1* (GCS 7), Leipzig, 1902
- Onomasticon*, ed. E. Klostermann, *Eusebius Werke, Band 3.1* (GCS 11.1), Leipzig, 1904
- Praeparatio Evangelica*, ed. K. Mras, *Eusebius Werke, Band 8* (GCS 43.1 and 43.2), Berlin, 1954–1956
- Quaestiones ad Marimum (excerpta)*, PG.22.984–1005

- Quaestiones et Solutiones Evangelicae ad Stephanum*, PG.22.880–936
- Vita Constantini*, ed. F. Winkelman, *Eusebius Werke*, Band 1.1 (GCS 7.1), Berlin, 1975
- Eusebius of Emesa. *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Galatas*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 46–52
- Eustathius of Antioch. *De Engastrimytho Adversus Origenem*, ed. M. Simonetti, *Origene, Eustazio, Gregorio di Nissa, La maga di Endor*, Florence, 1989, pp. 94–206
- Eustathius of Thessaloniki. *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, ed. M. van der Valk, 4 vols., Leiden, 1971–1987
- Commentarius in Dionysii Periegetae Orbis Descriptionem*, ed. K. Müller, *Geographi Graeci minores*, vol. 2, Hildesheim, 1965, pp. 201–407
- Commentarius in Homeri Odysseam*, ed. G. Stallbaum, 2 vols. in 1, Hildesheim, 1970
- De Thessalonicae Capta*, ed. S. Kyriakidis, *Eustazio di Tessalonica. La espugnazione di Tessalonica* (Testi e Monumenti, Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici. Testi, 5), Palermo, 1961
- Eustratius of Nicaea. *In Aristotelis Analyticorum Posteriorum Commentarius*, ed. M. Hayduck, *Eustratii in Analyticorum Posteriorum Librum Secundum Commentarium* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 21.1), Berlin, 1907
- In Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea Commentarii*, ed. G. Heylbut, *Eustratii et Michaelis et Anonyma in Ethica Nicomachea Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 20), Berlin, 1892, pp. 256–406
- Orationes*, ed. A. Demetrakopoulos, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 1, Hildesheim, 1965
- Evagrius of Pontus. *Ad Monachos*, ed. H. Gressmann, *Nonnenspiegel und Mönchsspiegel des Evagrius Pontikos* (Texte und Untersuchungen 39.4), Leipzig, 1913, pp. 153–165
- De Oratione*, PG.79.1165–1200 (under the name of Nilus of Sinai)
- Expositio in Proverbia*, ed. C. Tischendorf, *Notitia Editionis Codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici*, Leipzig, 1860, pp. 76–122
- Rerum Monachalium Rationes*, PG.40.1252–1264
- Scholia in Proverbia* (fragmenta), ed. P. Géhin, *Évagre le Pontique. Scholies aux Proverbes* (Sources chrétiennes 340), Paris, 1987
- Evagrius Scholasticus. *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia*, New York, 1979
- Evangelium Apocryphon Bartholomaei*, ed. N. Bonwetsch, 'Die apokryphen Fragen des Bartholomäus', *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1897, pp. 9–29
- Facundus Episcopus Hermianensis. *Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum Concilii Chalcedonensis Libri XII ad Justinianum Imperatorem*, PL.67.527–852
- Gaius. *Fragmenta*, ed. M. J. Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, vol. 2, Hildesheim, 1974
- Galen. *Ad Epigenem de Praenotione*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 14, Hildesheim, 1965
- Ad Eugenianum*, ed. J. Marquardt, I. Müller, and G. Helmreich, *Claudii Galeni Pergameni Scripta Minora*, vol. 2, Amsterdam, 1967
- Ad Pisonem*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 14, Hildesheim, 1965
- Adversus Erasistratum*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 11, Hildesheim, 1965
- Circa Doctrinas Hippocratis et Platonis*, ed. P. De Lacy, *Galen On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato* (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 5.4.1.2, pts. 1–2), Berlin, 1978
- Commentaria in Hippocratis Aphorismos*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vols. 17.2 and 18.1, Hildesheim, 1965
- Commentaria in Hippocratis de Medicina* ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 18.2, Hildesheim, 1965
- Commentaria in Hippocratis De Natura Hominis*, ed. J. Mewaldt, *Galen in Hippocratis De Natura Hominis Commentaria Tria* (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 5.9.1) Leipzig, 1914
- Commentaria in Hippocratis Epidemiarum Librum VI*, ed. E. Wenkebach, *Galen in Hippocratis Sextum Librum Epidemiarum Commentaria I–VI*, (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 5.10.2.2), Leipzig, 1940
- Commentaria in Hippocratis Prognosticum*, ed. J. Heeg, *Galen Commentaria in Hippocratis Prognosticum* (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 5.9.2), Leipzig, 1915
- De Alimenterum Facultatibus*, ed. G. Helmreich, *Galen De Alimenterum Facultatibus* (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 5.4.2), Leipzig, 1923
- De Anatomicis Administrationibus*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 2, Hildesheim, 1964
- De Arte Medica*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 1, Hildesheim, 1964
- De Causis Symptomatum I*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 7, Hildesheim, 1965
- De Compositione Medicamentorum I*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 13, Hildesheim, 1965
- De Compositione Medicamentorum II*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vols. 12–13, Hildesheim, 1965
- De Crisibus*, ed. B. Alexanderson, *Galenos, Περὶ κρίσεων* (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 23), Göteborg, 1967
- De Differentia Pulsuum*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 8, Hildesheim, 1965

- De Instrumento Odoratus*, ed. J. Kollesch (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, supplementum 5), Berlin, 1964
- De Affectis Locis*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 8, Hildesheim, 1965
- De Morbis Curandis*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 10, Hildesheim, 1965
- De Naturalibus Facultatibus*, ed. J. Marquardt, I. Müller, and G. Helmreich, *Claudii Galeni Pergameni Scripta Minora*, vol. 3, Amsterdam, 1967
- De Praesagitione Pulsuum*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 9, Hildesheim, 1965
- De Pulsibus*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 8, Hildesheim, 1965
- De Pulsuum Causis*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 9, Hildesheim, 1965
- De Sanitate*, ed. K. Koch, *Galenus De Sanitate* (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 5.4.2), Leipzig, 1923
- De Simplicium Medicamentorum*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vols. 11–12, Hildesheim, 1965
- De Temperamentis*, ed. G. Helmreich, *Galenus De Temperamentis*, Stuttgart, 1969
- De Usu Partium*, ed. G. Helmreich, *Galenus De Usu Partium Libri xvii*, Amsterdam, 1968
- De Victu Attenuante*, ed. K. Kalbfleisch (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 5.4.2), Leipzig, 1923
- In Hippocratis de Fracturis*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 18.2, Hildesheim, 1965
- In Hippocratis de Victu Acutorum*, ed. G. Helmreich, *Galenus In Hippocratis De Victu Acutorum* (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 5.9.1), Leipzig, 1914
- In Hippocratis Prorrheticum*, ed. H. Diels, *Galenus In Hippocratis Prorrheticum* (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 5.9.2), Leipzig, 1915
- In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria* (fragments), ed. H. O. Schröder, *Galenus In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria (Fragments)* (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, supplementum 1), Leipzig, 1934
- Institutio Logica*, ed. K. Kalbfleisch, Leipzig, 1896
- Synopsis Librorum de Pulsibus*, ed. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, vol. 9, Hildesheim, 1965
- Gelasius of Cyzicus. *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. M. Heinemann and G. Loeschke, *Gelasius. Kirchengeschichte, der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (GCS 28), Leipzig, 1918
- Gennadius I, patriarch of Constantinople. *Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 352–418
- George Cedrenus. *Compendium Historiarum*, ed. I. Bekker, *Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae ope*, 2 vols. (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae), Bonn, 1838–1839
- George Monachus. *Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1978
- Chronicon Breve*, PG.110.41–1260
- George Syncellus. *Ecloga Chronographica*, ed. A. A. Mosshammer, Leipzig, 1984
- Germanus I, patriarch of Constantinople, *Orationes*, PG.98.221–381
- Gregory of Nazianzus. *Ad Julianum Tributorum Exaequatorem*, PG.35.1044–1064
- Adversus Julianum Imperatorem*, PG.35.532–720
- Apologetica*, PG.35.408–513
- *Carmina Moralia*, PG.37.521–968
- De Dogmate et Constitutione Episcoporum*, PG.35.1065–1080
- De Filio*, ed. J. Barbel, *Gregor von Nazianz. Die fünf theologischen Reden*, Düsseldorf, 1963, pp. 128–168
- De Moderatione in Disputationibus Servanda*, PG.36.173–212
- De Pauperum Amore*, PG.35.857–909
- De Se Ipso et ad Eos Qui Ipsum Cathedram Constantinopolitanam Affectare Dicebant et de Populi Alacritate*, PG.36.265–279
- De Spiritu Sancto*, ed. J. Barbel, *Gregor von Nazianz. Die fünf theologischen Reden*, Düsseldorf, 1963, pp. 218–276
- De Theologia*, ed. J. Barbel, *Gregor von Nazianz. Die fünf theologischen Reden*, Düsseldorf, 1963
- De Vita Sua*, ed. C. Jungck, Heidelberg, 1974, pp. 54–148
- Epistulae*, ed. P. Gallay, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Lettres*, 2 vols., Paris, 1964–1967
- Exhortatio ad Patientiam, ed. A. Guida, 'Un nuovo testo di Gregorio Nazianzeno', *Prometheus* 2 (1976) 222–226
- Funeris Oratio in Basilium Magnum*, ed. F. Boulenger, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours funèbres en l'honneur de son frère Césaire et de Basile de Césarée*, Paris, 1908
- Funeris Oratio in Laudem Caesaris Fratris*, ed. F. Boulenger, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours funèbres en l'honneur de son frère Césaire et de Basile de Césarée*, Paris, 1908
- Funeris Oratio in Patrem*, PG.35.985–1044
- In Aegyptiorum Adventum*, PG.36.241–256
- In dictum Evangelii, Cum Consummasset Jesus Hos Sermones*, PG.36.281–308
- In Laudem Magni Athanasii*, PG.35.1081–1128
- In Patrem Tacentem*, PG.35.933–964
- In Pentecosten*, PG.36.428–452
- In Sancta Lumina*, PG.36.336–360
- In Sanctum Baptisma*, PG.36.360–425
- In Sanctum Pascha*, PG.36.624–664
- In Theophania*, PG.36.312–333
- Oratio Placabilis*, PG.35.721–752
- Poemata Historica de Se Ipso*, PG.37: 969–1029, 1166–1452
- Poemata Quae Spectant ad Alios*, PG.37.1451–1577
- Prima de Pace (Oratio VI)*, PG.35.721–752
- Supremum Vale*, PG.36.457–492
- Tertia de Pace (Oratio XXIII)*, PG.35.1152–1168

- Gregory of Nyssa. *Ad Ablabium*, ed. F. Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 3.1, Leiden, 1958, pp. 37–57
- Ad Eustathium*, ed. F. Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 3.1, Leiden, 1958, pp. 3–16
- Ad Hierium De Infantibus*, ed. H. Horner, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 3.2, Leiden, 1986, pp. 67–97
- Ad Simplicium*, ed. F. Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 3.1, Leiden, 1958, pp. 61–67
- Ad Theodorum Martyrem*, PG.46.736–748
- Adversus Apollinarium*, ed. F. Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 3.1, Leiden, 1958, pp. 131–233
- Adversus Arium et Sabellium*, ed. F. Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 3.1, Leiden, 1958, pp. 71–85
- Adversus Eos Qui Differunt Baptismum*, PG.46.416–432
- Adversus Eunomium*, ed. W. Jaeger, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vols. 1.1 and 2.2, Leiden, 1960
- Adversus Evagrium*, ed. E. Gebhardt, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9.1, Leiden, 1967, pp. 331–341
- Adversus Fornicarios*, ed. E. Gebhardt, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9.1, Leiden, 1967, pp. 211–217
- Adversus Macedonianos*, ed. F. Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 3.1, Leiden, 1958, pp. 89–115
- Adversus Usurarios*, ed. E. Gebhardt, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9.1, Leiden, 1967, pp. 195–207
- Contra Fatum*, ed. J. McDonough, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 3.2, Leiden, 1986, pp. 31–63
- De Anima et Resurrectione Dialogus*, PG.46.12–160
- De Beatitudinibus*, PG.44.1193–1301
- De Beneficentia*, ed. A. van Heck, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9.1, Leiden, 1967, pp. 93–108
- De Engastrimytho*, ed. H. Horner, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 3.2, Leiden, 1986, pp. 101–108
- De Exercitio Christiano*, ed. W. Jaeger, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 8.1, Leiden, 1963, pp. 40–89
- De Hominis Opificio*, PG.44.124–256
- De Mortuis*, ed. G. Heil, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9.1, Leiden, 1967, pp. 28–68
- De Oratione*, ed. F. Oehler, *Gregor's Bischof's von Nyssa Abhandlung von der Erschaffung des Menschen und fünf Reden auf das Gebet*, Leipzig, 1859, pp. 202–314
- De Perfectione*, ed. W. Jaeger, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 8.1, Leiden, 1963, pp. 173–214
- De Tribus Diebus Inter Mortem et Resurrectionem Domini Nostri Jesu*, ed. E. Gebhardt, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9.1, Leiden, 1967, pp. 273–306
- De Virginitatis Integritate*, ed. M. Aubineau, *Grégoire de Nysse. Traité de la virginité* (Sources chrétiennes 119), Paris, 1966
- De Vita Beati Gregorii*, PG.46.893–957
- De Vita Mosis*, ed. J. Daniélou, *Grégoire de Nysse. La vie de Moïse* (Sources chrétiennes 1 ter), Paris, 1968
- Encomium in Sanctum Stephanum Protomartyrem*, ed. O. Lendle, *Gregorius Nyssenus. Encomium in Sanctum Stephanum Protomartyrem*, Leiden, 1968
- Epistula Canonica Ad Letoium*, PG.45.221–236
- Epistulae*, ed. G. Pasquali, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 8.2, Leiden, 1959, pp. 3–95
- In Basilium Fratrem*, ed. J. Stein, *Encomium of Saint Gregory Bishop of Nyssa on His Brother Saint Basil*. Washington, D.C., 1928
- In Canticum Cantorum*, ed. H. Langerbeck, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 6, Leiden, 1960
- In Ecclesiasten*, ed. P. Alexander, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 5, Leiden, 1962, pp. 277–442
- In Hexaameron*, PG.44.61–124
- In Illud, Quatenus Uni ex His Fecistis Mihi Fecistis*, ed. A. van Heck, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9.1, Leiden, 1967, pp. 111–127
- In Illud, Tunc et Ipse Filius*, ed. J. K. Downing, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 3.2, Leiden, 1986
- In Inscriptiones Psalmorum*, ed. J. McDonough, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 5, Leiden, 1962, pp. 24–175
- In Quadraginta Martyres*, PG.46.773–788
- In Sanctum Pascha*, ed. E. Gebhardt, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9.1, Leiden, 1967, pp. 245–270
- In Sextum Psalmum*, ed. J. McDonough, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 5, Leiden, 1962, pp. 187–193
- Oratio Catechetica*, ed. J. Srawley, *The Catechetical Oratio of Gregory of Nyssa*, Cambridge, 1956
- Oratio de Spiritu Sancto*, PG.46.696–701
- Oratio Funebris in Flacillam Imperatricem*, ed. A. Spira, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9.1, Leiden, 1967, pp. 475–490
- Oratio in Diem Natalem Salvatoris*, ed. F. Mann, *Die Weihnachtspredigt Gregors von Nyssa. Überlieferungsgeschichte und Text*, Münster, 1976, pp. 263–292
- Vita atque Encomium Ephraem Syri*, PG.46.820–849
- Hecataeus of Abdera. *Fragmenta*, ed. F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 264, Leiden, 1954–1969
- Heliodorus. *Aethiopica*, ed. R. M. Rattenbury, T. W. Lumb, and J. Maillon, *Héliodore. Les Éthiopiennes (Théagène et Chariclée)*, 3 vols, Paris, 1960
- Hephaestion of Thebes. *De Apotelesmaticis*, ed. D. Pingree, *Hephaestionis Thebani Apotelesmaticorum Libri Tres*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1973–1974
- Heraclitus. *Fragmenta*, ed. H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1, Dublin/Zurich, 1966, pp. 150–182
- Hermas. *Pastor*, ed. M. Whittaker, *Die apostolischen Väter I. Der Hirt des Hermas* (GCS 48), Berlin, 1967
- Hermias of Alexandria. *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, ed. P. Couvreur, *Hermeias von Alexandrien, In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, Hildesheim, 1971

- Herodian of Alexandria. *De Orthographia*, ed. A. Lentz, *Grammatici Graeci*, vol. 3.2, Hildesheim, 1965, pp. 407–611
- De Prosodia Catholica*, ed. A. Lentz, *Grammatici Graeci*, vol. 3.1, Hildesheim, Olms, 1965
- Herodotus. *Historiae*, ed. Ph.-E. Legrand, *Hérodote. Histoires*, 9 vols. Paris, 1963–1970
- Heron of Alexandria. *De Automatis*, ed. W. Schmidt, *Heronis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1899, pp. 338–452
- De Pneumaticis*, ed. W. Schmidt, *Heronis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1899
- Hesychius of Jerusalem. *Commentarius*, V. Jagic, *Supplementum Psalterii Bononiensis. Incerti Auctoris Explanatio Graeca*, Vienna, 1917
- Encomium in Sanctum Andream*, ed. M. Aubineau, *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*, vol. 1. *Les homélies i–xv* (Subsidia hagiographica 59), Brussels, 1978, pp. 240–260
- Encomium in Sanctum Stephanum*, ed. M. Aubineau, *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*, vol. 1. *Les homélies i–xv* (Subsidia hagiographica 59), Brussels, 1978, pp. 328–350
- In Conceptionem Joannis Praecursoris*, ed. M. Aubineau, *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*, vol. 2. *Les homélies xvi–xxi* (Subsidia Hagiographica 59), Brussels, 1980, pp. 668–704
- Hierocles of Alexandria. *In Aureum Carmen*, ed. F. G. Köhler, *Hieroclis in Aureum Pythagoreorum Carmen Commentarius*, Stuttgart, 1974
- Hippiatrica*, ed. E. Oder and K. Hoppe (Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum 2), Stuttgart, 1971
- Hippolytus. *Chronicon*, ed. R. Helm, *Hippolytus Werke*, vol. 4 (GCS 46), Berlin, 1955, pp. 6–69, 128–134
- Contra Noetum*, ed. R. Butterworth, London, 1977
- De antichristo*, ed. H. Achelis, *Hippolyt's kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften* (GCS 1.2), Leipzig, 1897, pp. 1–47
- De Benedictionibus*, ed. M. Brière, L. Mariès, and B.-C. Mercier, *Hippolyte de Rome. Sur les bénédictions d'Isaac, de Jacob et de Moïse* (Patrologia Orientalis 27), Turnhout, 1954
- De Mundo* (fragment *apud* John Philoponus, *De Opificio Mundi*), ed. P. A. de Lagarde, *Hippolyti Romani Quae Feruntur Omnia Graece*, Osnabrück, 1966
- Fragmenta in Proverbia*, ed. H. Achelis, *Hippolyt's kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften* (GCS 1.2), Leipzig, 1897, pp. 157–167, 176–178
- In Danielelem*, ed. K. Diobouniotis and N. Weis, *Hippolytus Schrift über die Segnungen Jakobs. Hippolyts Danielcommentar in Handschrift No 573 des Meteoronklosters* (TU 38, 1), Leipzig, 1911
- Hippolytus. *In Danielelem*, ed. M. Lefèvre, *Hippolyte. Commentaire sur Daniel* (Sources chrétiennes 14), Paris, 1947
- Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, ed. M. Marcovich (Patristische Texte und Studien 25), Berlin, 1986
- Historia Alexandri Magni* (or Pseudo-Callisthenes), ed. A. Lolos and V. L. Konstantinopulos, *Ps.-Kallisthenes. Zwei mittelgriechische Prosa-Fassungen des Alexanderromans*, 2 vols. (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 141 and 150). Meisenheim am Glan, 1983
- Recensio K, ed. K. Mitsakis, 'Διήγησις περὶ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶν μεγάλων πολέμων', *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 20 (1970) 263–290
- Recensio R, ed. D. Holton, *Διήγησις τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου. The tale of Alexander. The Rhymed Version* (*Βυζαντινὴ καὶ Νεοελληνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*), Thessaloniki, 1974, pp. 103–185
- Recensio V, ed. K. Mitsakis, *Der byzantinische Alexanderroman nach dem Codex Vind. Theol. gr. 244* (Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia 7), Munich, 1967, pp. 21–87
- Homer. *Ilias*, ed. and tr. A. T. Murray, *Homer, The Iliad*, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1985–1988 (rpts.)
- Odyssey*, ed. and tr. A. T. Murray, rev. G. E. Dimock, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1988 (rpts.)
- Hypatius of Ephesus. *Fragmenta in Prophetas Minores*, ed. F. Diekamp, *Analecta Patristica* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 117), Rome, 1962, pp. 130–151
- Hyperides. *Orationes*, ed. C. Jensen, *Hyperidis Orationes Sex*, Stuttgart, 1963
- Iamblichus. *De Communi Mathematica Scientia*, ed. U. Klein, Stuttgart, 1975
- De Mysteriis*, ed. É. des Places, *Jamblique. Les mystères d'Égypte*, Paris, 1966
- De Vita Pythagorica*, ed. U. Klein, *Iamblichi de Vita Pythagorica Liber*, Stuttgart, 1975
- In Nicomachi Arithmeticam Introductionem*, ed. U. Klein, *Iamblichi in Nicomachi Arithmeticam Introductionem Liber*, Stuttgart, 1975
- Protrepticus*, ed. H. Pistelli, *Iamblichi Protrepticus ad Fidem Codicis Florentini*, Stuttgart, 1967
- Theologoumena Arithmeticae*, ed. V. de Falco, Leipzig, 1922
- Ignatius of Antioch. *Epistulae*, ed. P. T. Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche, Polycarpe de Smyrne. Lettres. Martyre de Polycarpe*, 4th edn (Sources chrétiennes 10), Paris, 1969
- Irenaeus. *Adversus Haereses (libri 1–2)*, ed. W. W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis Libri Quinque Adversus Haereses*, vol. 1, Cambridge, 1857
- Adversus Haereses (liber 4)*, ed. A. Rousseau, B. Hemmerdinger, L. Doutreleau, and C. Mercier, *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies, livre 4* (Sources chrétiennes 100), Paris, 1965
- Adversus Haereses (liber 5)*, ed. A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau,

- and C. Mercier, *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies, livre 5* (Sources chrétiennes 153), Paris, 1969
- Fragmenta, ed. W. W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus haereses*, vol. 2, Cambridge, 1857, pp. 470–511
- Jerome. *De Viris Illustribus*, PL.23.597–720
- John Chrysostom. *Ad Eos Qui Scandalizati Sunt*, ed. A.-M. Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome. Sur la providence de Dieu* (Sources chrétiennes 79), Paris, 1961
- Ad Olympiadem*, ed. A.-M. Malingrey, *Lettre d'exil à Olympias et à tous les fidèles* (Sources chrétiennes 103), Paris, 1964
- Ad Populum Antiochenum*, PG.49.15–222
- Ad Stagirium Ascetam a Daemone Vexatum*, PG.47.423–494
- Ad Theodorum Lapsam*, ed. J. Dumortier, *Jean Chrysostome. A Théodore* (Sources chrétiennes 117), Paris, 1966
- Adversus Ebriosos*, PG.50.433–442
- Catecheses Baptismales*, ed. A. Wenger, *Jean Chrysostome. Huit catéchèses baptismales* (Sources chrétiennes 50 bis), Paris, 1970
- Cohabiti Suspiciosi*, ed. J. Dumortier, *Saint Jean Chrysostome. Les cohabitations suspectes*, Paris, 1955
- De Baptismo Christi*, PG.49.363–372
- De Davide et Saule (homiliae tres)*, PG.54.675–708
- De Fato et Providentia*, 1–3, PG.50.749–774
- De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, ed. A.-M. Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome. Sur l'incompréhensibilité de Dieu* (Sources chrétiennes 28 bis), Paris, 1970
- De Lazaro*, PG.48.963–1054
- De Mutatione Nominum*, PG.51.113–156
- De non Iterando Conjugio*, ed. G. H. Ettlinger and B. Grillet, *Jean Chrysostome. A une jeune veuve. Sur le mariage unique* (Sources chrétiennes 138), Paris, 1968, pp. 160–201
- De Paenitentia* (nine homilies, of which 7–9 are spurious), PG.49.277–350
- De Prophetiarum Obscuritate*, PG.56.163–192
- De Sacerdotio*, ed. A.-M. Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome. Sur le sacerdoce* (Sources chrétiennes 272), Paris, 1980
- De Sancta Pelagia Virgine et Martyre*, PG.50.579–584
- De Sanctis Martyribus Sermo*, PG.50.645–654
- De Virginitatis Integritate*, ed. J. Dumortier, *Saint Jean Chrysostome. Les cohabitations suspectes*, Paris, 1955
- De Virginitatis Integritate*, ed. H. Musurillo and B. Grillet, *Jean Chrysostome. La virginité* (Sources chrétiennes 125), Paris, 1966
- Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.55.39–498
- Fragmenta Commentariorum in Jeremiam*, PG.64.740–1037
- Fragmenta in Beatum Job*, PG.64.505–656
- Fragmenta in Epistulas Catholicas*, PG.64.1040–1061
- Fragmenta in Salomonis Proverbia*, PG.64.660–740
- Homilia Habita Postquam Presbyter Gothus Concionatus Fuerat*, PG.63.499–510
- In Acta Apostolorum Homiliae* (fifty-five homilies), PG.60.13–384
- In Annam*, PG.54. PG.54.631–676
- In Diem Natalem D.N. Jesu Christi*, PG.49.351–362
- In Diodorum Tarsensem*, PG.52.761–766
- In Epistolam ad Colossenses Commentarius*, PG.62.299–392
- In Epistolam ad Ephesios Commentarius*, PG.62.9–176
- In Epistolam ad Galatas Commentarius*, PG.61.611–682
- In Epistolam ad Hebraeos*, PG.63.9–236
- In Epistolam ad Romanos Commentarius*, PG.60.391–682
- In Epistolam ad Titum Commentarius*, PG.62.663–700
- In Epistolam i ad Corinthios Commentarius*, PG.61.9–382
- In Epistolam i ad Thessalonicenses Commentarius*, PG.62.391–468
- In Epistolam i ad Timotheum Commentarius*, PG.62.501–600
- In Epistolam ii ad Corinthios Commentarius*, PG.61.381–610
- In Epistolam ii ad Thessalonicenses (homiliae 1–5)*, PG.62.467–500
- In Epistolam ii ad Timotheum Commentarius*, PG.62.599–662
- In Genesin Sermones*, PG.53.1–386; PG.54.385–630
- In Heliam et Viduam*, PG.51.337–348
- In Illud, Filius ex Se Nihil Facit Nisi Quod Viderit Patrem Facientem*, PG.56.247–256
- In Illud, Habentes Eundem Spiritum*, PG.51.271–302
- In illud, Messis Quidem Multa, Operarii Autem Pauci*, PG.63.515–524
- In Illud, Salutate Priscillam et Aquilam (et quae sequuntur)*, PG.51.187–208
- In Illud, Vidi Dominum (homiliae 1–6)*, ed. J. Dumortier, *Jean Chrysostome. Homélie sur Ozias* (Sources chrétiennes 277), Paris, 1981
- In Isaiam*, ed. J. Dumortier, *Jean Chrysostome. Commentaire sur Isaïe* (Sources chrétiennes 304), Paris, 1983
- In Job*, ed. U. Hagedorn and D. Hagedorn, *Johannes Chrysostomos. Kommentar zu Hiob* (Patristische Texte und Studien 35), Berlin, 1990
- In Lucianum Martyrem*, PG.50.519–526
- In Paralyticum per Tectum Demissum*, PG.51.47–64
- In Principium Actorum*, PG.51.65–112
- In Proditionem Judae*, PG.49.373–392
- In Sanctum Joannem Apostolum et Evangelistam Commentarius*, PG.59.23–482
- In Sanctum Matthaeum Evangelistam Commentarius*, PG.57.13–472; PG.58.471–794
- Orationes Adversus Judaeos*, PG.48.843–942
- John Climacus. *Scala Paradisi*, PG.88.631–1161
- John Galen. *Allegoriae in Homeri Iliadem*, 4 vols., ed. H. Flach,

- Glossen und Scholien zur hesiodischen Theogonie, Osnabrück, 1970, pp. 420–424
- John Laurentius Lydus. *De Magistratibus Populi Romani*, ed. A. C. Bandy, Ioannes Lydus. *On Powers or the Magistracies of the Roman State*, Philadelphia, 1983
- De Mensibus*, ed. R. Wünsch, Stuttgart, 1967
- John Malalas. *Chronographia*, ed. L. Dindorf (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae), Bonn, 1831
- John of Damascus. *Adversus Jacobitas*, ed. B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 4 (Patristische Texte und Studien 22), Berlin, 1981, pp. 109–153
- Adversus Manichaeos*, ed. B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 4 (Patristische Texte und Studien 22), Berlin, 1981, pp. 351–398
- Adversus Nestorianos*, ed. B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 4 (Patristische Texte und Studien 22), Berlin, 1981, pp. 263–288
- De Fide*, ed. B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 2 (Patristische Texte und Studien 12), Berlin, 1973, pp. 3–239
- De Haeresibus*, ed. B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 4 (Patristische Texte und Studien 22), Berlin, 1981, pp. 19–67
- De Imaginibus*, ed. B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 3 (Patristische Texte und Studien 17), Berlin, 1975
- In Transfigurationem Salvatoris*, ed. B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 5 (Patristische Texte und Studien 29), Berlin, 1988, pp. 436–459
- Laudatio Sanctae Barbarae Martyris*, PG.96.781–813
- Sacra Parallela*, PG.95.1040–1588; PG.96.9–544
- John Philoponus. *De Aeternitate Mundi*, ed. H. Rabe, Ioannes Philoponus. *De Aeternitate Mundi contra Proclum*, Hildesheim, 1963
- De Opificio Mundi*, ed. W. Reichardt, Joannis Philoponi *De Opificio Mundi Libri VII*, Leipzig, 1897
- In Aristotelis Analytica Posteriora Commentaria*, ed. M. Wallies, Ioannis Philoponi in Aristotelis Analytica Posteriora Commentaria cum Anonymo in Librum ii (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 13.3), Berlin, 1909
- John Philoponus. *In Aristotelis Analytica Priora Commentaria*, ed. M. Wallies (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 13.2), Berlin, 1905
- In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, ed. A. Busse (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 13.1), Berlin, 1898
- In Aristotelis Libros de Anima Commentaria*, ed. M. Hayduck (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 15), Berlin, 1897
- In Aristotelis Libros de Generatione et Corruptione Commentaria*, ed. H. Vitelli (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 14.2), Berlin, 1897
- In Aristotelis Meteorologicorum Librum Primum Commentarium*, ed. M. Hayduck (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 14.1), Berlin, 1901
- In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, ed. H. Vitelli, 2 vols. (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 16 and 17), Berlin, 1887–1888
- In Libros de Generatione Animalium Commentaria*, ed. M. Hayduck (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 14.3), Berlin, 1903
- Josephus. *Antiquitas Judaica*, ed. B. Niese, Flavii Iosephi Opera, 4 vols. Berlin, 1955
- De Bello Judaico*, ed. B. Niese, Flavii Iosephi Opera, vol. 6, Berlin, 1955
- Vita Iosephi*, ed. B. Niese, Flavii Iosephi Opera, vol. 4, Berlin, 1955
- Julian, Emperor. *Symposium*, ed. C. Lacombrade, L'empereur Julien. *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 2.2, Paris, 1964, pp. 32–71
- Julian the Arian. *In Job*, ed. D. Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian* (Patristische Texte und Studien 14), Berlin, 1973.
- Julius Africanus. *Cesti*, ed. J.-R. Vieillefond, Les 'Cestes' de Julius Africanus, Florence, 1970
- Chronographia*, ed. M. J. Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, vol. 2, Hildesheim, 1974, pp. 238–308
- Justin Martyr. *Apologia* (I and II), ed. E. J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* Göttingen, 1915
- Dialogus cum Tryphone*, ed. E. J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten*, Göttingen, 1915, 90–265
- Justinian. *Adversus Monophysitas*, ed. M. Amelotti, R. Albertella, and L. Migliardi, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Iustinians, Legum Iustiniani imperatoris vocabularium* (Subsidia 2), Milan, 1973
- Leontius of Constantinople (Byzantius). *In Mesopentecosten*, ed. C. Datema and P. Allen, *Leontii Presbyteri Constantinopolitani Homiliae* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 17), Turnhout, 1987
- Leontius of Neapolis. *Vita Sancti Symeonis*, ed. A.-J. Festugière and L. Rydén, Léontios de Néapolis, Vie de Syméon le Fou et Vie de Jean de Chypre (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 95), Paris, 1974
- Libanius. *Declamationes*, ed. R. Foerster, *Libanii Opera*, vols. 5–7, Hildesheim, 1997
- Epistulae*, ed. R. Foerster, *Libanii opera*, vols. 10–11, Hildesheim, 1997
- Orationes*, ed. R. Foerster, *Libanii opera*, vols. 1–4, Hildesheim, 1997
- Lucian of Samosata. *Adversus Indoctum*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 3, Cambridge, Mass., 1969, pp. 174–210
- Alexander*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 4, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, pp. 174–252

- Apologia*, ed. K. Kilburn, *Lucian*, vol. 6, Cambridge, Mass., 1968, pp. 192–212
- Bis Accusatus*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 3, Cambridge, Mass., 1969, pp. 84–150
- De Amicitia*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 5, Cambridge, Mass., 1972, pp. 102–206
- De Historia Conscribenda*, ed. K. Kilburn, *Lucian*, vol. 6, Cambridge, Mass., 1968, pp. 2–72
- De Domo*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 1, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, pp. 176–206
- De Morte Peregrini*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 5, Cambridge, Mass., 1972, pp. 2–50
- De Saltatione*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 5, Cambridge, Mass., 1972, pp. 210–288
- De Syria Dea*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 4, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, pp. 338–410
- Demonax*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 1, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, pp. 142–172
- Dialogi Deorum*, ed. M. D. Macleod, *Lucian*, vol. 7, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, pp. 240–352
- Dialogi Meretricii*, ed. M. D. Macleod, *Lucian*, vol. 7, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, pp. 356–466
- Dialogi Mortuorum*, ed. M. D. Macleod, *Lucian*, vol. 7, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, pp. 2–174
- Hermotimus*, ed. K. Kilburn, *Lucian*, vol. 6, Cambridge, Mass., 1968, pp. 260–414
- Icaromenippus*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 2, Cambridge, Mass., 1960, pp. 268–322
- Imagines*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 4, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, pp. 256–294
- Juppiter Tragoedus*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 2, Cambridge, Mass., 1960, pp. 90–168
- Muscae Encomium*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 1, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, pp. 82–94
- Navigium*, ed. K. Kilburn, *Lucian*, vol. 6, Cambridge, Mass., 1968, pp. 430–486
- Nigrinus*, ed. M. D. Macleod, *Luciani opera*, vol. 1, Oxford, 1972, pp. 31–45
- Pro Imaginibus*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 4, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, pp. 298–334
- Revivescences*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 3, Cambridge, Mass., 1969, pp. 2–80
- Rhetorum Praeceptor*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 4, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, pp. 134–170
- Symposium*, ed. M. D. Macleod, *Luciani opera*, vol. 1, Oxford, 1972, pp. 144–163
- Timon*, ed. M. D. Macleod, *Luciani opera*, vol. 1, Oxford, 1972, pp. 310–336
- Vitarum Auctio*, ed. A. M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 2, Cambridge, Mass., 1915, pp. 450–510
- Macarius of Magnesia. *Μονογενής*, ed. R. Goulet, *Macarios de Magnésie, Le monogénès*, vol. 2, Paris, 2003
- Marcellus of Ancyra. *Fragmenta*, ed. E. Klostermann and G. C. Hansen, *Eusebius Werke*, vol. 4 (GCS 14), Berlin, 1972, pp. 185–215
- Marcus Aurelius, *Meditationes*, ed. and tr. C. R. Heines, *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus to Himself (Τὰν εἰς ἑαυτόν)*, Cambridge, Mass., 1987
- Martyrium Ignatii*, ed. F. X. Funk and F. Diekamp, *Patres Apostolici*, vol. 2, Tübingen, 1913, pp. 324–338
- Martyrium Prius Andreae*, ed. J.-M. Prieur, *Acta Andreae* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum 6), Turnhout, 1989, pp. 684–703
- Maximus Confessor. *De Caritate*, ed. A. Ceresa-Gastaldo, *Massimo confessore. Capitoli sulla carità*, Rome, 1963
- In Ecclesiasten*, ed. S. Lucà, *Anonymus in Ecclesiasten Commentarius Qui Dicitur Catena Trium Patrum* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 11), Turnhout, 1983
- Mystagogia*, ed. R. Cantarella, *S. Massimo Confessore. La mistagogia ed altri scritti*, Florence, 1931, pp. 122–214
- Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, ed. C. Laga and C. Steel, 2 vols. (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 7 and 22), Turnhout, 1980–1990
- Quaestiones et Dubia*, ed. J. H. Declerck (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 10), Turnhout, 1982
- Meletius. *De Natura Hominis*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Anecdota Graecae codicibus manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, vol. 3, Amsterdam, 1963
- Melito of Sardis. *Fragmenta*, ed. O. Perler, *Méliton de Sardes. Sur la Pâque et fragments* (Sources chrétiennes 123), Paris, 1966
- Menander. *Fragmenta*, ed. T. Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*, vol. 3, Leipzig, 1888
- Methodius of Olympus. *Symposium*, ed. V.-H. Debidour and H. Musurillo, *Méthode d'Olympe. Le banquet* (Sources chrétiennes 95), Paris, 1963
- Michael Attaliates. *Diataxis*, ed. P. Gautier, 'La diataxis de Michel Attaliat', *Revue des études byzantines* 39 (1981) 17–130
- Michael Glycas. *Annales*, ed. I. Bekker (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae), Bonn, 1836
- Dicta et Interpretationes Paraboliarum Evangelii* (chapters 3–40), ed. S. Eustratiades, *Μιχαήλ τοῦ Γλῡκᾶ, Εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας τῆς Θεείας Γραφῆς*, Athens, 1906
- Dicta et Interpretationes Paraboliarum Evangelii* (chapters 41–98), ed. S. Eustratiades, *Μιχαήλ τοῦ Γλῡκᾶ, Εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας τῆς Θεείας Γραφῆς*, Alexandria, 1912
- Michael of Ephesus. In *Ethica Nicomachea Commentaria*, ed. G. Heylbut, *Eustratii et Michaelis et anonyma in Ethica Nicomachea commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 20), Berlin, 1892), pp. 461–620
- In *Libros de Partibus Animalium Commentaria*, ed. M. Hayduck, *Michaelis Ephesii in Libros De Partibus Animalium, De Animalium Motione, De Animalium Incessu*

- Commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 22.2), Berlin, 1904
- In *Librum Quintum Ethicorum Nicomacheorum Commentarium*, ed. M. Hayduck (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 22.3), Berlin, 1901
- Michael Glycas. *Quaestiones in Sacram Scripturam*, ed. S. Eustratiades, *Μιχαὴλ τοῦ Γλυκᾶ, Εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας τῆς Θείας Γραφῆς*, Alexandria, 1912
- Michael Psellus. *Poemata*, ed. L. G. Westerink, Stuttgart, 1992
- Theologica*, ed. P. Gautier, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1989
- Nemesius of Emesa. *De Natura Hominis*, ed. M. Morani, Leipzig, 1987
- Neophytus Inclusus. *Πανηγυρική Βίβλος*, ed. Th. Giagkou and N. Papatriantafyllou-Theodoridi, in D. Karabidopoulos, C. Oikonomou, D. G. Tsames, and N. Zacharopoulos (eds.), *Ἁγίου Νεοφύτου τοῦ Εγκλείστου Συγγράμματα*, vol. 3, Paphos, 1999, pp. 111–542
- Nerses of Lambron. *Commentary on the Revelation of Saint John*, tr. from Armenian by R. W. Thomson, Leuven, 2007
- Nestle, E. and K. Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart, 1993
- Nestorius. *Fragmenta*, ed. F. Loofs, *Nestoriana. Die Fragmente des Nestorius*. Halle, 1905, pp. 173–180
- Sermones* (fragments), F. Loofs, *Nestoriana. Die Fragmente des Nestorius*, Halle, 1905
- Nicephorus I of Constantinople. *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, *Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula Historica*, New York, 1975, pp. 81–135
- Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos. *Historia Ecclesiastica*, PG.145.560–1332; 146.9–1273; 147.9–448
- Nicetas of Paphlagonia. *Orationes*, ed. F. Lebrun, *Nicétas le Paphlagonien. Sept homélies inédites*, Louvain, 1997
- Nicetas Choniates (or Nicetas Acominatus). *Thesaurus Orthodoxiae Fidei*, PG.139.1087–1444
- Nicetas Seides. *Synopsis Scripturae*, ed. P. N. Simotas, *Νικήτα Σεΐδου Σύνοψις τῆς Ἀγίας Γραφῆς* (Analecta Vlatadon 42), Thessaloniki, 1984, pp. 55–295
- Nicholas the Mystic. *Epistulae*, ed. R. J. H. Jenkins and L. G. Westerink, *Nicholas I, Patriarch of Constantinople, Letters* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 6). Washington, D.C., 1973
- Nicolaus. *Fragmenta*, ed. T. Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*, vol. 3, Leipzig, 1888, pp. 383–384, 386
- Nicomachus of Gerasa. *Enchiridion*, ed. K. Jan, *Musici Scriptores Graeci*, Hildesheim, 1962, pp. 236–265
- Introductio Arithmetica*, ed. R. Hoche, Leipzig, 1866
- Theologoumena Arithmeticae*, ed. V. de Falco, *Iamblichi Theologoumena Arithmeticae*, Leipzig, 1922, pp. 17–30, 42, 56–71
- Oecumenius. *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, ed. H. C. Hoskier, *The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse*, Ann Arbor, 1928
- Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, ed. M. De Groote, Louvain, 1999
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Galatas*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 446–448
- Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 432–443
- Olympiodorus, the deacon of Alexandria. *Commentarii in Ecclesiasten*, PG.93.477–628
- Commentariorum in Jeremiam*, PG.93.628–725
- In *Job*, ed. U. Hagedorn and D. Hagedorn, *Olympiodori Diakon von Alexandria. Kommentar zu Hiob* (Patristische Texte und Studien 24), Berlin, 1984
- Olympiodorus, the philosopher of Alexandria. In *Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, ed. A. Busse, *Olympiodori Prolegomena et in Categorias Commentarium* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 12.1), Berlin, 1902
- In *Aristotelis Meteora Commentaria*, ed. G. Stüve (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 12.2), Berlin, 1900
- In *Platonis Gorgiam Commentaria*, ed. L. G. Westerink, *Olympiodori in Platonis Gorgiam commentaria*, Leipzig, 1970
- Prolegomena*, ed. A. Busse, *Olympiodori Prolegomena et in Categorias Commentarium* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 12.1), Berlin, 1902
- Oppian of Corycus or Anazarbis. *Halieutica*, ed. A. W. Mair, *Oppian, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus*, Cambridge, Mass., 1963, pp. 200–514
- Oracula Chaldaica*, ed. É. des Places, *Oracles chaldaïques*, Paris, 1971
- Oribasius of Pergamum. *Collectiones Medicae*, ed. J. Raeder, *Oribasii Collectionum Medicarum Reliquiae*, 4 vols. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 6.1.1–6.2.2), Leipzig, 1928–1933
- Origen. *Adnotationes In Genesin*, PG.17.12
- Adnotationes in Josuam*, PG.17.36–37
- Commentaria in Matthaeum*, ed. E. Klostermann (GCS 10), Leipzig, 1935.
- Commentaria in Evangelium secundum Matthaeum*, PG.13.836f.
- Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. and tr. Th. Heither, 5 vols., Freiburg in Breisgau, 1990–1996
- Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. K. Staab, ‘Neue Fragmente aus dem Kommentar des Origenes zum Römerbrief’, *Biblische Zeitschrift* 18 (1928) 74–82
- Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos (I.1–XII.21)*, ed. A. Ramsbotham, ‘Documents. The Commentary of Origen on the Epistle to the Romans,’ *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 and 14 (1912) 210–224, 357–368

- Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis* (Books I, II, IV, V, VI, X, XIII), ed. C. Blanc, *Origène. Commentaire sur saint Jean*, 3 vols. (Sources chrétiennes 120, 157, 222), Paris, 1966–1975
- Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis* (Books XIX, XX, XXVIII, XXXII), ed. E. Preuschen, *Origenes, Werke*, vol. 4 (GCS 10), Leipzig, 1903, pp. 298–480
- Commentarii in Genesin*, PG.12.45–92
- Commentarii in Romanos*, ed. H. Bammel, *Origenes, Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes, Kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins*, 3 vols., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1990–1998
- Commentarii in Romanos*, ed. O. Bauernfeind, *Der Römerbrieftext des Origenes nach dem Codex von der Goltz* (Texte und Untersuchungen 44.3), Leipzig, 1923; pp. 91–119
- Commentarii in Romanos*, ed. J. Scherer, *Le Commentaire d'Origène sur Rom. III.5–V.7, d'après les extraits du Papyrus n 88748 du Musée du Caire et les fragments de la Philocalie et du Vaticanus graecus 762. Essai de reconstitution du texte et de la pensée de tomes V et VI du 'Commentaire sur l'Épître aux Romains'* (Bibliothèque d'Étude 27), Cairo, 1957
- Commentarii in Romanos*, (Lat.), PG.14.833; Greek fr. from *Philocalia* 25, PG.14.841; from *Philocalia* 9, PG.14.1076; H. Ramsbotham, *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1912) 210, 357; *ibid.* 14 (1912) 10
- Commentariorum in Jeremiam*, ed. E. Klostermann, *Origenes, Werke*, vol. 3 (GCS 6), Leipzig, 1901, pp. 199–232
- Commentariorum Series in Matthaeum*, ed. E. Klostermann and E. Benz (GCS 11), Leipzig, 1933 (*Series Veteris Interpretationis Commentariorum Origenis in Matthaeum*), PG.13.1599
- Commentariorum Series in Evangelium Matthaei* (Mt. 22.34–27.63), ed. E. Klostermann, *Origenes, Werke*, v. 11 (GCS 38.2), Leipzig, 1933
- Commentarium in Evangelium Matthaei* (Books 10–11), ed. R. Girod, *Origène. Commentaire sur l'évangile selon Matthieu*, v. 1 (Sources chrétiennes 162), Paris, 1970
- Commentarium in Evangelium Matthaei* (Books 12–17), ed. E. Klostermann, *Origenes, Werke*, v. 10.1–10.2 (GCS 40.1–40.2) Leipzig, 1935–1937
- Contra Celsum*, Books 1–4, ed. P. Koetschau (GCS 1), Leipzig, 1899, pp. 51f, PG.11.641f. Books 5–8, GCS 1, p. 1f., PG.11.1181f.
- De Engastrimytho*, ed. E. Klostermann, *Origenes, Werke*, v. 3 (GCS 6), Leipzig, 1901, pp. 283–294. Also, PG.12.1012f.
- De Oratione*, ed. P. Koetschau, *Origenes, Werke*, v. 2 (GCS 3), Leipzig, 1899, pp. 297–403. PG.11.416f.
- De Principiis* (Lat. with Greek frs.), ed. P. Koetschau, (GCS 5, 1913). PG.11.115
- Dialogus cum Heraclide*, ed. J. Scherer, *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide* (Sources chrétiennes 67), Paris, 1960, pp. 52–110
- Epistola ad Africanum*, PG.11.48–85
- Excerpta in Psalmos*, PG.17.105–149
- Exhortatio ad Martyrium*, ed. P. Koetschau, *Origenes, Werke*, v. 1 (GCS 2), Leipzig, 1899, pp. 3–47
- Fragmenta De Principiis*, ed. H. Görgemanns and H. Karpp, *Origenes vier Bücher von den Prinzipien*, Darmstadt, 1976
- Fragmenta ex Commentariis in Epistulam ad Ephesios*, ed. J. A. F. Gregg, 'Documents. The commentary of Origen upon the epistle to the Ephesians', *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1902) 234–244, 398–420
- Fragmenta ex Commentariis in Exodum* (In illud: Induravit dominus cor Pharaonis), PG.12.264–281
- Fragmenta ex Commentariis in Genesin*, PG.12.45. (*commGen.1*, *apud* Eusebius Caesariensis, *Preparatio Evangelica* 7.20; *commGen.* 2, *ibid.* 6.11; *commGen* 3.12, 13, in *Philocalia*, 23, 19 and 20, PG.12.50)
- Fragmenta ex Commentariis in i Cor.*, ed. C. Jenkins, *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1908) 232, 353, 500; *ibid.* 10 (1908) 29
- Fragmenta in Evangelium Joannis*, ed. E. Preuschen, *Origenes, Werke*, v. 4 (GCS 10), Leipzig, 1903, pp. 483–574
- Fragmenta in Evangelium Matthaei*, ed. E. Klostermann and E. Benz, *Zur Überlieferung der Matthäuserklärung des Origenes* (Texte und Untersuchungen 47.2), Leipzig 1931
- Fragmenta in Lamentationes*, ed. E. Klostermann, *Origenes, Werke*, v. 3. (GCS 6), Leipzig, 1901, pp. 235–279
- Fragmenta in Librum Primum Regnorum*, ed. E. Klostermann (GCS 3), Leipzig, 1901
- Fragmenta in Lucam*, ed. M. Rauer, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 9 (GCS 49 (35)), Berlin, 1959
- Fragmenta in Proverbia*, PG.13.17–33
- Fragmenta in Psalmos 1–150*, ed. J. B. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi Parata*, vols. 2 and 3, Paris, 1883 (rpt. Charteston, S.C., 2008)
- Hexapla*, ed. F. Field, v. I, Hildesheim, 1964
- Homiliae in Exodum* (Lat.) (GCS 6), p. 145. (The same in PG.12.297). Greek frs. GCS 6, pp. 217–218, 221–230. (The same in PG.12.353–354)
- Homiliae in Ezechielem*, ed. W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes, Werke*, vol. 8 (GCS 33), Leipzig, 1925, pp. 319–320, 323, 327–329, 336–337, 340, 354–355, 378, 390, 396, 426–427, 434–435, 450–452
- Homiliae 1–16 in Genesin* (Lat.), ed. W. A. Baehrens (GCS 6), Leipzig, 1922, p. 1. PG.12.145; Greek fr. of *Hom. 2 in Gen.* GCS 6, p. 23. PG.12.161; *apud* Procopius of Gaza, *Commentarium in Octateuchum* (Gen. 5:14–15), PG.87.273

- Homiliae in Job*, ed. J. B. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi Parata*, v. 2. Farnborough, 1966, pp. 361–391
- Homiliae in Job* (or *Enarrationes in Job*), PG.12.1032–1049
- Homiliae in Job* (or *Selecta in Job*), PG 17.57–105
- Homiliae in Josuam*, ed. W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes, Werke*, v. 7 (GCS 30), Leipzig, 1921. Also, ed. A. Jaubert, *Origène, Homélie sur Josué* (Sources Chrétiennes 71), Paris, 1960
- Homiliae in Leviticum*, ed. W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes, Werke*, vol. 6 (GCS 29), Leipzig, 1920, pp. 332–334, 395, 402–407, 409–416
- *Homiliae in Leviticum 1–16*, Greek fr. of *homLev* 5, GCS 6, pp. 332–334, PG.12.421B; of *homLev* 8, GCS 6, p. 395, PG.12.493. PG.87.733–40. Also, Gr. fr. ed. W. A. Baehrens, *Homiliae in Leviticum* (GCS 6), pp. 402–407, 409–416
- Homiliae in Librum Jesu Nave* (addendum), ed. W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes, Werke*, v. 7 (GCS 30), Leipzig, 1921
- Homiliae in Lucam*, ed. M. Rauer, *Origenes, Werke*, v. 9 (GCS 49 (35)), Berlin, 1959
- In Canticum Canticorum* (fragments), ed. W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes, Werke*, vol. 8 (GCS 33), Leipzig, 1925
- In Jeremiam* (homilies 1–11), ed. P. Nautin, *Origène. Homélie sur Jérémie*, vol. 1 (Sources chrétiennes 232), Paris, 1976
- In Jeremiam* (homilies 12–20), ed. E. Klostermann, *Origenes, Werke*, vol. 3 (GCS 6), Leipzig, 1901
- In Jesu Nave Homiliae XXV* (fragmenta), ed. W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes, Werke*, vol. 7 (GCS 30), Leipzig, 1921
- In Oseam*, PG.13.825–828
- Philocalia*, ed. J. A. Robinson, *The Philocalia of Origen*, Cambridge, 1893
- Scholia in Canticum Canticorum*, PG.17.253–288
- Origen. *Scholia in Lucam*, PG.17.312–369
- Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG.17.289–309
- Selecta in Deuteronomium*, PG.12.805–817
- Selecta in Exodum*, PG.12.281–297
- Selecta in Ezechielem*, PG.13.768–825
- Selecta In Genesin*, PG.12.92–145
- Selecta in Josuam* (*Selecta in Jesum Nave*), PG.12.820–824
- Selecta in Numeros*, PG.12.576–584
- Selecta in Psalmos*, PG.12: 1053–1320, 1368–1369, 1388–1389, 1409–1685
- Palladius of Helenopolis. *Historia Lausiaca*, ed. G. J. M. Bartelink, *Palladio. La storia Lausiaca*, Verona, 1974
- Papias of Hierapolis. *Fragmenta*, ed. K. Bihlmeyer and W. Schneemelcher, *Die apostolischen Väter*, Tübingen, 1970
- Pappus of Alexandria. *Collectio*, ed. F. Hultsch, *Pappi Alexandrini Collectionis Quae Supersunt*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1876–1878
- Paul of Aegina. *Epitomae Medicae*, ed. J. L. Heiberg, *Paulus Aegineta*, 2 vols. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 9.1 and 9.2), Leipzig, 1921–1924
- Pectorius. *Epitaphius*, ed. J. Quasten, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima*, vol. 1 (Florilegium patristicum tam veteris quam medii aevi auctores complectens 7.1), Bonn, 1935
- Philo, ed. F. H. Colson, G. Whitaker, and R. Marcus, 10 vols. and 2 suppl., London/New York, 1924–1962
- Philostratus. *Heroicus*, ed. C. L. Kayser, *Flavii Philostrati Opera*, vol. 2, Hildesheim, 1964, pp. 128–219
- Philoxenus of Alexandria. *Fragmenta*, ed. C. Theodoridis, (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 2), Berlin, 1976
- Philumenus of Alexandria. *De Venenatis Animalibus Eorumque Remediis*, ed. M. Wellmann (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 10.1.1), Leipzig, 1908
- Photius. *Bibliotheca*, ed. R. Henry, *Photius. Bibliothèque*, 8 vols., Paris, 1959–1977
- Epistulae et Amphiloquia*, ed. B. Laourdas and L. G. Westerink, 6 vols., Leipzig, 1983–1988
- Homiliae*, ed. B. Laourdas, *Ἑλληνικά*, 12 (Appendix), Thessaloniki, 1857–1866
- Pindar. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, ed. H. Maehler, Leipzig, 1971
- Plato, ed. J. Burnet, *Platonis opera*, vol. 3, Oxford, 1967–68
- Plotinus. *Enneades*, ed. P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzler, 3 vols., Oxford, 1977–84
- Plutarch. *Moralia* (*Ἠθικά*), vol. 1, ed. and tr. E. David, vol. 2, ed. and tr. L. I. Philippides, Athens, 1975
- Vitae Parallelae* (*Βίοι Παράλληλοι*), 7 vols., ed. and tr. A. I. Pournaras, Athens, 1975
- Polybius of Megalopolis. *Historiae*, ed. and tr. W. R. Paton, Cambridge, Mass., 1995–2000 (rpts.)
- Polycarp of Smyrna. *Epistula ad Philippenses*, ed. K. Bihlmeyer and W. Schneemelcher, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 3rd edn, Tübingen, 1970, pp. 114–120
- Porphyry. *Ad Marcellam*, ed. W. Pötscher, *Πορφύριος πρὸς Μαρκέλλαν*, Leiden, 1969
- De Abstinencia*, ed. A. Nauck, *Porphyrii philosophi Platonici Opuscula Selecta*, Leipzig (rpt Hildesheim), 1963, pp. 85–269
- De Regibus*, ed. K. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. 3, Paris, 1841–1870
- Historia Philosophiae* (fragments), ed. A. Nauck, *Porphyrii Philosophi Platonici Opuscula Selecta*, Leipzig, (rpt. Hildesheim), 1963, pp. 4–16
- In Aristotelis Categorias*, ed. A. Busse, *Porphyrii Isagoge et In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 4.1), Berlin, 1887, pp. 55–142
- In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria* (fragments), ed. A. R. Sodano, Naples, 1964
- Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem Pertinentium Reliquiae*, ed. H. Schrader, Leipzig, 1882
- Quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam Pertinentium*

- Reliquiae*, ed. H. Schrader, *Porphyrii quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam pertinentium reliquias*, Leipzig, 1890
- Quaestionum Homericarum liber I*, ed. A. R. Sodano Naples, 1970
- Zetemata Codicis Vaticani*, ed. H. Schrader, *Porphyrii quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquias*, Leipzig, 1882, pp. 281–335
- Posidonius. *Fragmenta*, ed. W. Theiler, *Posidonios. Die Fragmente*, vol. 1, Berlin, 1982
- Priscianus of Lydia. *Metaphrasis in Theophrastum (et Solutionum ad Chosroem liber)*, ed. I. Bywater, *Prisciani Lydi quae extant* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, suppl. 1.2), Berlin, 1886
- Proclus. *De Malorum Subsistentia*, ed. H. Boese, *Procli Diadochi tria opuscula*, Berlin, 1960, pp. 173–191, 211–265
- De Philosophia Chaldaica*, ed. É. des Places, *Oracles chaldaïques*, Paris, 1971, pp. 206–212
- De Providentia*, ed. H. Boese, *Procli Diadochi tria opuscula*, Berlin, 1960, pp. 5–108
- Elementa Theologica*, ed. E. R. Dodds, *Proclus. The Elements of Theology*, Oxford, 1977
- Excerpta e Platonica Procli Theologia*, ed. V. Cousin, *Procli Philosophi Platonici Opera Inedita*, pt. 3, Paris (rpt. Hildesheim), 1961, pp. 1243–1258
- Hypotyposis Astronomicarum Positionum*, ed. C. Manitius, *Procli Diadochi Hypotyposis Astronomicarum Positionum*, Leipzig, 1974
- In Platonis Alcibiadem I*, ed. L. G. Westerink, *Proclus Diadochus. Commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato*, Amsterdam, 1954
- In Platonis Cratylum Commentaria*, ed. G. Pasquali, *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Cratylum Commentaria*, Leipzig, 1908
- In Platonis Parmenidem*, ed. V. Cousin, *Procli Philosophi Platonici Opera Inedita*, pt. 3, Paris (rpt. Hildesheim), 1961, pp. 617–1244
- In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii*, ed. W. Kroll, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1965
- In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, ed. E. Diehl, *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, 3 vols., Amsterdam, 1965
- In Primum Euclidis Elementorum Librum Commentarii*, ed. G. Friedlein, Leipzig, 1873
- Theologia Platonica*, ed. D. Saffrey and L. G. Westerink, *Proclus. Théologie platonicienne*, 5 vols., Paris, 1968–1997
- Proclus of Constantinople. *De Incarnatione Domini*, ed. N. Constatas, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity*, Leiden and Boston, 2003, pp. 164–179
- Mystagogia in Baptisma*, ed. F. J. Leroy, *L'homilétique de Proclus de Constantinople* (Studi e Testi 247), Vatican City, 1967, pp. 188–194
- Procopius of Caesarea. *De Aedificiis*, ed. G. Wirth, *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia*, vol. 4, Leipzig, 1964
- De Bellis*, ed. G. Wirth, *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia*, vols. 1–2, Leipzig, 1962–1963
- Procopius of Gaza. *Catena in Ecclesiasten*, ed. S. Leanza, *Procopii Gazaei catena in Ecclesiasten necnon Pseudo-Chrysostomi Commentarius in eundem Ecclesiasten* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 4), Turnhout, 1978
- Descriptio Imaginis*, ed. P. Friedländer, *Spätantiker Gemäldezyklus in Gaza* (Studi e Testi 89), Vatican City, 1939, pp. 5–18
- Epistulae*, ed. A. Garzya and R.-J. Loenertz, *Procopii Gazaei Epistolae et Declamationes* (Studia patristica et Byzantina 9), Ettal, 1963
- In Canticum Canticorum*, PG.87b.1545–1753
- In Isaiam Prophetam*, PG.87b.1817–2717
- Proteuangelium Iacobi*, ed. É. de Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du protévangile de Jacques*, Brussels, 1961, pp. 64–190
- Pseudo-Anastasius of Sinai. *De Haeresibus*, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, 'Die dem Anastasios Sinaites zugeschriebene Synopsis de haeresibus et synodis', *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 14 (1982), pp. 77–86
- Quaestiones et Responsiones*, ed. J. A. Munitiz and M. Richard (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 59), Turnhout, 2006
- Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias. *De Anima*, ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter Commentaria Scripta Minora* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, suppl. 2.1), Berlin, 1887, pp. 101–186
- De Quaestionibus Moralibus*, ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter Commentaria Scripta Minora* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, suppl. 2.2), Berlin, 1892
- Problemata*, ed. J. L. Ideler, *Physici et Medici Graeci Minores*, vol. 1, Berlin (rpt. Amsterdam), 1963
- Quaestiones et Solutiones* ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter Commentaria Scripta Minora* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, suppl. 2.2), Berlin, 1892
- Pseudo-Athanasius. *Ad Antiochum Principem*, PG.28.597–700
- Compendium Scripturae Sacrae*, PG.28.284–437
- Contra Macedonianos*, PG.28.1292–1337
- De Incarnatione Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, contra Apollinarium*, PG.26.1093–1165
- *De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, PG.28: 1116–1173, 1201–1249, 1265–1285
- Dicta et Interpretationes Parabolarum Evangelii*, PG.28.712–773
- Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG.27: 60–545 and 548–589

- In Passionem et Crucem Domini*, PG.28.185–249
- Oratio Quarta Contra Arianos*, ed. A. Stegmann, *Die pseudoathanasianische 'IVte Rede gegen die Arianer' als κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγος ein Apollinarisgut*, Rottenburg, 1917, pp. 43–87
- Quaestiones Aliae*, PG.28.773–796
- Sermo Major de Fide*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Der s.g. sermo maior de fide des Athanasius* (Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 6), Munich, 1925, pp. 5–37
- Pseudo-Basil of Caesarea. *Constitutiones Monasticae*, PG.31.1320–1428
- Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, ed. P. Trevisan, *San Basilio. Commento al profeta Isaia*, 2 vols., Turin, 1939
- Homilia in Psalmum 37*, PG.30.81–104
- Orationes sive Exorcismi*, PG.31.1677–1684
- Pseudo-Basil of Seleucia. *De Vita et Miraculis Sanctae Theclae*, ed. G. Dagron, *Vie et miracles de sainte Thècle* (Subsidia hagiographica 62), Brussels, 1978
- Pseudo-Caesarius. *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, ed. R. Riedinger, *Pseudo-Kaisarios. Die Erotapokriseis* (GCS), Berlin, 1989; PG.38.852–1190
- Pseudo-Clement of Rome. *Homiliae*, ed. B. Rehm, J. Irmscher, and F. Paschke, *Die Pseudoklementinen I. Homilien* (GCS 42), Berlin, 1969
- Pseudo-Clementina*, ed. A. R. M. Dressel, *Clementinorum Epitomae Duae*, Leipzig, 1873
- Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria. *Collectio Dictorum Veteris Testamenti*, PG.77.1176–1289
- De Sacrosancta Trinitate*, PG.77.1120–1173
- Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem. *Mystagogiae*, ed. A. Piédagnel and P. Paris, *Cyrille de Jérusalem. Catéchèses mystagogiques* (Sources chrétiennes 126), Paris, 1966, pp. 82–174
- Pseudo-Didymus (=Cassian the Sabaite). *De Trinitate (liber 1)*, ed. J. Hönscheid, *Didymus der Blinde. De Trinitate, Buch 1* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 44), Meisenheim am Glan, 1975
- De Trinitate (liber 2.1–7)*, ed. I. Seiler, *Didymus der Blinde. De Trinitate, Buch 2, Kapitel 1–7* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 52), Meisenheim am Glan, 1975
- De Trinitate (liber 2.8–27)*, PG.39.600–769
- De Trinitate (liber 3)*, PG.39.773–992
- Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. *De Coelesti Hierarchia*, ed. G. Heil and A. M. Ritter, *Corpus Dionysiacum II, Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De Coelesti Hierarchia, De Hierarchia Ecclesiastica, De Mystica Theologia, Epistulae* (Patristische Texte und Studien 36), Berlin, 1991
- De Divinis Nominibus*, ed. B. R. Suchla, *Corpus Dionysiacum I, Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De Divinis Nominibus* (Patristische Texte und Studien 33), Berlin, 1990
- De Hierarchia Ecclesiastica*, ed. G. Heil and A. M. Ritter, *Corpus Dionysiacum II, Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De Coelesti Hierarchia, De Hierarchia Ecclesiastica, De Mystica Theologia, Epistulae* (Patristische Texte und Studien 36), Berlin, 1991
- Epistulae*, ed. G. Heil and A. M. Ritter, *Corpus Dionysiacum II, Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De Coelesti Hierarchia, De Hierarchia Ecclesiastica, De Mystica Theologia, Epistulae* (Patristische Texte und Studien 36), Berlin, 1991
- Pseudo-Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Ars Rhetorica*, ed. H. Usener and L. Radermacher, *Dionysii Halicarnasei Quae Exstant*, vol. 6, Stuttgart, 1965
- Pseudo-Epiphanius of Salamis. *De Laudibus Mariae Deiparae Oratio*, PG.43.485–501
- De xx Hearesibus*, ed. K. Holl, *Epiphanius, Bände 1–3, Ancoratus und Panarion* (GCS 25, 31, 37), Leipzig, 1915–1933
- Oratio in Divini Corporis Sepulturam Domini*, PG.43.440–464
- Testimonia*, ed. R. V. Hotchkiss, *A Pseudo-Epiphanius testimony book*. Missoula, Mont., 1974
- Tractatus de Numerorum Mysteriori*, PG.43.507–517
- Pseudo-Eustathius of Antioch. *Commentarius in Hexaemeron*, PG.18.708–793
- Pseudo-Galen. *Ad Gaurum Quomodo Animetur Fetus*, ed. K. Kalbfleisch, *Die neuplatonische, fälschlich dem Galen zugeschriebene Schrift Πρὸς γαῦρον περὶ τοῦ πῶς ἐμψυχοῦνται τὰ ἔμβρυα* (Abhandlungen der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Philol.-hist. Kl) Berlin, 1895
- Pseudo-Gregory of Nazianzus. *Liturgia Sancti Gregorii*, PG.36.700–733
- Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa. *De Creatione Homini*, ed. H. Hörner, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, suppl., Leiden, 1972
- De Occursu Domini*, PG.46.1152–1181
- De Paradiso*, ed. H. Hörner, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, suppl., Leiden, 1972, pp. 75–84
- Delecta Testimonia Adversus Judaeos*, PG.46.193–233
- Inventio Imaginis in Camulianis*, ed. E. Dobschütz, *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende* (Texte und Untersuchungen 18), Leipzig, 1899
- Pseudo-Gregory Thaumaturgus. *In Annuntiatione Sanctae Virginis Mariae*, PG.10.1145–1169
- Pseudo-Hermogenes. *Progymnasmata*, ed. H. Rabe, *Hermogenis Opera*, Stuttgart, 1969
- Pseudo-Hesychius of Jerusalem. *Encomium in Sanctum Lucam*, ed. M. Aubineau, *Les homélies festales d'Hésy-*

- chius de Jérusalem*, vol. 2. *Les homélies xvi–xxi*. (Subsidia hagiographica 59), Brussels, 1980, pp. 936–950
- Pseudo-Hippolytus. *Adversus Beronem et Heliconem*, ed. F. Diekamp, *Doctrina patrum de incarnatione verbi*, Münster, 1907, pp. 321–326
- De Consummatione Mundi*, ed. H. Achelis, *Hippolyt's kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften* (GCS 1.2), Leipzig, 1897
- Ex Interpretatione Ruth*, ed. H. Achelis, *Hippolyt's kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften* (GCS 1.2), Leipzig, 1897
- Fragmenta in Psalmos*, ed. H. Achelis, *Hippolyt's kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften* (GCS 1.2), Leipzig, 1897
- Pseudo-Ignatius of Antioch. *Epistulae Interpolatae et Epistulae Suppositiciae (recensio longior)*, ed. F. X. Funk and F. Diekamp, *Patres Apostolici*, vol. 2, Tübingen, 1913, pp. 83–268
- Pseudo-John Chrysostom. *Ascetam Facetiis Uti non Debere*, PG.48.1055–1060
- De Caritate*, PG.60.773–776
- De Paenitentia*, PG.59.757–766
- De Patientia et De Consummatione Huius Saeculi*, PG.63.937–942
- De Perfecta Caritate*, PG.56.279–290
- De Pseudopropheta*, PG.59.553–568
- De Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*, PG.48.1087–1096
- Eclogae ex Diversis Homiliis*, PG.63.567–902
- Encomium in Sanctum Joannem Evangelistam*, ed. Hippolytus Monachus, Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν', *Νέα Σιών* 17 (1922) 665–667, 725–728
- In Daniele*, PG.56.193–246
- In Exaltationem Sancti Crucis*, PG.59.679–682
- In Genesin*, PG.56.519–526
- In Illud, Attendite ne Eleemosynam Vestram Faciatis Coram Hominibus*, PG.59.571–574
- In Illud Propheticum, Verumtamen Frustra Conturbatur Omnis Homo Vivens*, PG.55.559–564
- In Infirmos*, ed. A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, vol. 1, Moscow, 1893, pp. 323–327
- In Laudem Sancti Joannis Theologi*, PG.61.719–720
- In Martham, Mariam et Lazarum*, PG.61.701–706
- In Psalmos 101–107*, PG.55.635–674
- In Psalmum 75*, PG.55.593–598
- In Psalmum 100*, PG.55.629–636
- In Psalmum 118*, PG.55.675–708
- In Resurrectionem Domini*, ed. C. Datema and P. Allen, 'Text and tradition of two Easter homilies of Ps. Chrysostom', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 30 (1981) 94–97
- In Samaritanam*, PG.59.535–542
- In Sancta Lumina*, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, *Die Pseudo-Chrysostomische Predigt In Baptismum et Tentationem* (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse 3), Heidelberg, 1994
- In Sanctum Joannem Apostolum*, PG.59.609–614
- In Sanctum Pascha (sermo 2)*, ed. P. Nautin, *Homélies pascales*, vol. 2 (Sources chrétiennes 36), Paris, 1953
- In Sanctum Pascha (sermo 6)*, ed. P. Nautin, *Homélies pascales*, vol. 1 (Sources chrétiennes 27), Paris, 1950
- In Sanctum Pascha (sermo 7)*, ed. F. Floëri and P. Nautin, *Homélies pascales*, vol. 3 (Sources chrétiennes 48), Paris, 1957
- Interpretatio Orationis Pater Noster*, PG.59.627–628
- Oratio de Epiphania*, ed. A. Wenger, 'Une homélie inédite (de Sévérien de Gabala?) sur l'épiphanie', *Analecta Bollandiana* 95 (1977) 81–90
- Oratio de Nativitate*, ed. R. F. Regtuit, J. M. Tevel, and K.-H. Uthemann, *Homiliae Pseudo-Chrysostomicae*, vol. 1, Turnhout, 1994
- Synopsis Scripturae*, PG.56.313–386
- Pseudo-John of Damascus. *Commentarii in Epistolas Pauli*, PG.95.441–1033
- De Sancto Artemio*, PG.96.1252–1320
- Vita Barlaam et Joasaph*, ed. G. R. Woodward and H. Mattingly, Cambridge, Mass., 1983
- Pseudo-Justin. *Cohortatio ad Gentiles*, ed. J. C. T. Otto (Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi 3), Wiesbaden, 1971
- Expositio Rectae Fidei*, ed. J. C. T. Otto (Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi 4), Jena, 1880 (rpt. Charleston, S.C., 2011)
- Quaestiones et Responsiones*, ed. J. C. T. Otto, Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi, 5 Wiesbaden, 1969
- Pseudo-Macarius. *De Custodia Cordis*, PG.34.821–841
- Epistula Magna*, ed. W. Jaeger, *Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature, Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius*, Leiden, 1954, pp. 233–301
- Homiliae vii*, ed. G. L. Marriott, *Macarii Anecdota* (Harvard Theological Studies 5), Cambridge, Mass., (rpt. New York), 1969
- Homiliae l*, ed. H. Dörries, E. Klostermann, and M. Krüger, *Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (Patristische Texte und Studien 4), Berlin, 1964
- Preces*, PG.34.445–448
- Sermones (i–xxii and xxiv–xxv)*, ed. E. Klostermann and H. Berthold, *Neue Homilien des Makarius/Symeon* (Texte und Untersuchungen 72), Berlin, 1961
- Sermones lxiv*, ed. H. Berthold, *Makarios/Symeon Reden und Briefe*, 2 vols. (GCS), Berlin, 1973
- Pseudo-Origen. *De Pascha*, ed. B. Witte, *Die Schrift des*

- Origenes 'Über das Passa' (Arbeiten zum spätantiken und koptischen Ägypten 4). Altenberge, 1993, pp. 88–148
- Pseudo-Plutarch. *Ad Apollonium*, ed. F. C. Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia*, vol. 2, Cambridge, Mass., 1962
- De Liberis Educandis*, ed. F. C. Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia*, vol. 1, Cambridge, Mass., 1969
- Regum Apophthegmata*, ed. W. Nachstädt, *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 2.1, Leipzig, 1971
- Pseudo-Syrianus of Athens. *Praefatio in Hermogenis Librum Περὶ Ἰδεῶν*, ed. H. Rabe, *Syriani in Hermogenem Commentaria*, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1892
- Pseudo-Theodoret. *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Θεοδορήτου Ἐπισκόπου Πόλεως Κύρρου, Πρὸς τὰς Ἐπεξεχθείσας αὐτῷ ἐπερωτήσεις παρὰ τινος τῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐπισκόπων Ἀποκρίσεις*, St Petersburg, 1895
- Pseudo-Theodosius of Alexandria. *Περὶ Γραμματικῆς*, ed. K. Göttling, *Theodosii Alexandrini Grammatica*, Leipzig, 1822, pp. 1–197
- Ptolemy. *Syntaxis Mathematica*, ed. J. L. Heiberg, *Claudii Ptolemaei Opera Quae Exstant Omnia*, vols. 1.1–1.2, Leipzig, 1898–1903
- Regula Sancti Christoduli*, ed. F. Miklosich and J. Müller, *Acta et Diplomata Monasteriorum et Ecclesiarum Orientis*, vol. 3 (Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi Sacra et Profana 6), Vienna, 1890, pp. 59–80
- Romanus Melodus. *Cantica Genuina*, ed. P. Maas and C. A. Trypanis, Oxford, 1963, pp. 276–280, 294–311, 447–453, 487–510
- Cantica*, ed. J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vols. 1–5 (Sources chrétiennes 99, 110, 114, 128, 283), Paris, 1964–1981
- Scholia ad Hermogenis Librum Περὶ Στάσεων*, ed. C. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 4, Osnabrück, 1968, pp. 39–846
- Scholia in Aelium Aristidem*, ed. W. Dindorf, *Aristides*, vol. 3, Hildesheim, 1964
- Scholia in Nubes*, ed. W. J. W. Koster, *Prolegomena de Comoedia. Scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes* (Scholia in Aristophanem 1.3.2), Groningen, 1974, pp. 199–465
- Scholia in Clementis Protrepticum et Paedagogum*, ed. O. Stählin and U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. 1 (GCS 12), Berlin, 1972, pp. 295–340
- Scholia Demosthenica*, ed. M. R. Dils, 2 vols. Leipzig, 1983–1986
- Scholia in Euclidem*, ed. E. S. Stamatis, *Euclidis Opera Omnia*, vol. 5, Leipzig, 1977
- Scholia in Euripidem*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Scholia in Euripidem*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1966
- Scholia in Hesiodum*, ed. A. Pertusi, *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*, Milan, 1955
- Scholia in Nicandrum*, ed. M. Geymonat, *Scholia in Nicandri Alexipharmaca*, Milan,
- Scholia in Pindarum*, ed. E. Abel, *Scholia recentia in Pindari epinicia*, vol. 1, Berlin, 1891
- Scholia in Sophoclem*, ed. O. Longo, *Scholia Byzantina in Sophoclis Oedipum tyrannum*, Padua, 1971
- Commentaria in Thucydidem*, ed. K. Hude, *Commentaria in Thucydidem ad optimos codices collata*, New York (rpt.), 1973
- Serenus of Antinoeia (or, Antioupolis), *De Sectione Cylindri*, ed. J. L. Heiberg, *Sereni Antinoensis opuscula*, Leipzig, 1896
- Sergius Stissus. *Epistula ad Joannem Lascarin, apud É. Legrand, Cent-dix lettres grecques de François Filelfe*, Paris, 1892, pp. 363–366
- Severianus of Gabala. *De Caeco Nato*, PG.59.543–554
- De Tribus Pueris Sermo*, PG.56.593–600
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Ephesios*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 304–313
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 213–225
- Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 225–277
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ii ad Corinthios*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 278–298
- Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Timotheum*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 336–341
- In Genesin (sermo In Illud, Gen. 1.31)*, PG.56.519–522
- In Illud, Quando Ipsi Subiciet Omnia*, ed. S. Haidacher, 'Drei unedierte Chrysostomus-Texte einer Baseler Handschrift', *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 31 (1907) 150–167
- In Justum et Beatum Job*, PG.56.563–582
- In Tentationem Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*, ed. R. Carter, 'A Greek homily on the temptation (CPG 4906) by Severian of Gabala', *Traditio* 52 (1997) 56–70
- Severus of Antioch, ed. and tr. E. W. Brooks, *A Collection of Letters from Numerous Syriac Manuscripts*. (Patrologia Orientalis 14), London, 1904, letters 1–61
- Sextus Empiricus. *Adversus Mathematicos*, ed. and tr. R. G. Bury, *Sextus Empiricus, Against the Professors*, Cambridge, Mass., 1995

- Pyrrhoniae Hypotyposes, ed. and tr. R. G. Bury, *Sextus Empiricus, Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, Cambridge, Mass., 1993
- Simplicius. In *Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, ed. K. Kalbfleisch (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 8), Berlin, 1907
- In *Aristotelis Libros de Anima Commentaria*, ed. M. Hayduck (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 11), Berlin, 1882
- In *Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Octo Commentaria*, ed. H. Diels, 2 vols. (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 9 and 10), Berlin, 1882–1895
- In *Aristotelis Quattuor Libros De Caelo Commentaria*, ed. J. L. Heiberg (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 7), Berlin, 1894
- Interpretatio in Epicteti Enchiridion*, ed. F. Dübner, *Theophrasti Characteres*, Paris, 1842
- Socrates Scholasticus. (fourth–fifth cent. AD), *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. W. Bright, *Socrates' Ecclesiastical History*, Oxford, 1893
- Solon. *Fragmenta*, ed. M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, vol. 2, Oxford, 1972, pp. 120–144
- Sopater of Athens. *Scholia in Hermogenem*, ed. C. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 5, Osnabrück, 1968
- Sophocles. *Oedipus Coloneus*, ed. A. Dain and P. Mazon, *Sophocle*, vol. 3, Paris, 1967, pp. 78–152
- Sophonias. In *Libros Aristotelis De Anima Paraphrasis*, ed. M. Hayduck (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 23.1), Berlin, 1883
- Sozomenus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen (GCS 50), Berlin, 1960
- Speusippus. *Fragmenta*, ed. L. Tarán, *Speusippus of Athens* (Philosophia Antiqua 39), Leiden, 1981
- Stephanus Byzantius. *Ethnica* (epitome), ed. A. Meineke, Graz, 1958
- Stobaeus. *Anthologium*, ed. C. Wachsmuth and O. Hense, *Ioannis Stobaei anthologium*, 5 vols., Berlin, 1958
- Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, ed. J. von Arnim, 4 vols., Stuttgart, 1968
- Strabo. *Geographica*, ed. A. Meineke, *Strabonis geographica*, 3 vols., Graz, 1969
- Supplementum et Varietas Lectionis ad Epistulam II ad Corinthios*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 5, Hildesheim, 1967, pp. 469–477
- Symeon the New Theologian. *Capita Theologica*, ed. J. Darrouzès, *Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Chapitres théologiques, gnostiques et pratiques* (Sources chrétiennes 51 bis), Paris, 1996, pp. 40–186, 191
- Synesius of Cyrene. *Epistulae*, ed. R. Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci*, Amsterdam, 1965, pp. 638–739
- Syrianus of Athens. In *Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, ed. W. Kroll (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 6.1), Berlin, 1902
- Teles. *De Impassibilitate*, ed. O. Hense, *Teletis Reliquiae*, Hildesheim, 1969
- Testamenta XII Patriarcharum*, ed. M. de Jonge (Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 1), Leiden, 1970
- Testamentum Jobi*, ed. S. P. Brock (Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 2), Leiden, 1967
- Themistius. *Analyticorum Posteriorum Paraphrasis*, ed. M. Wallies, *Themistii analyticorum posteriorum paraphrasis* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 5.1), Berlin, 1900
- Eis Θεοδοσίον· τίς ἡ βασιλικωτάτη τῶν ἀρητῶν*, ed. H. Schenkl and G. Downey, *Themistii orationes quae supersunt*, v. 1, Leipzig, 1965
- In *Aristotelis Libros de Anima Paraphrasis*, ed. R. Heinze, *Themistii In Libros Aristotelis de Anima Paraphrasis*. Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 5.3, Berlin, 1899
- In *Parva Naturalia Commentarium*, In *Parva Naturalia Commentarium*, ed. P. Wendland, *Themistii (Sophoniae) In Parva Naturalia Commentarium* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 5.6), Berlin, 1903
- Περὶ Προεδρίας εἰν Σύγχλητον*, ed. H. Schenkl, G. Downey, and A. F. Norman, *Themistii Orationes Quae Supersunt*, v. 2, Leipzig, 1971
- Quae Fertur in Aristotelis Analyticorum Priorum Librum i Paraphrasis*, ed. M. Wallies, *Themistii Quae Fertur in Aristotelis Analyticorum Priorum Librum i Paraphrases* Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 23.2), Berlin, 1884
- Theodore Anagnostes, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. G. C. Hansen (GCS Neue Folge 3), Berlin, 1995
- Theodore Metochites. In *Abbatem Lucam*, ed. I. Sevcenko, 'Theodore Metochites, the Chora, and the Intellectual Trends of His Time', *The Kariye Djami*, vol. 4, ed. P. A. Underwood (Bollingen Series 70), Princeton, 1975, pp. 58–82
- Theodore of Heraclea. *Fragmenta In Sanctum Joannem*, ed. J. Reuss, *Johannes-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Texte und Untersuchungen 89), Berlin, 1966, pp. 67–176
- Theodore of Mopsuestia. *Commentarii In Sanctum Joannem* (fragmenta), ed. R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste* (Studi e Testi 141), Vatican City, 1948, pp. 305–419
- Commentarius in xii Prophetas*, ed. H. N. Sprenger (Göttinger Orientforschungen. V. Reihe, Biblica et Patristica 1). Wiesbaden, 1977
- Explanatio in Psalmos*, ed. R. Devreesse, *Le commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes I-LXXX* (Studi e testi 93), Vatican City, 1939
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Hebraeos*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus*

- Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 200–212
- Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 113–172
- Fragmenta in Epistulam i ad Corinthios*, ed. K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*, Münster, 1933, pp. 172–196
- Theodore Studites. *Epistulae*, ed. G. Fatouros, 2 vols. (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 31), Berlin, 1992
- Μεγάλη Κατήχησις*, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Theodoros Studites, Μεγάλη κατήχησις*. St Petersburg, 1904
- Parva Catechesis*, ed. E. Auvray, Paris, 1891
- Theodoret of Cyrrhus. *Commentarius in Duodecim Prophetas*, PG.81.1545–1988
- Commentarius in Isaiam*, ed. J.-N. Guinot, 3 vols. (Sources chrétiennes 276, 295, 315), Paris, 1980–1984
- Commentarius in Visiones Danielis Prophetiae*, PG.81.1256–1546
- De Incarnatione Domini*, PG.75.1420–1477
- De Providentia Orationes Decem*, PG.83.556–773
- De Quaestionibus Ambiguis in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon*, PG.80.528–858
- De Sancta et Vivifica Trinitate*, PG.75.1148–1189
- Epistulae 1–52*, ed. Y. Azéma, *Théodoret de Cyr. Correspondance I* (Sources chrétiennes 40), Paris, 1955
- Epistulae 53–95*, ed. Y. Azéma, *Théodoret de Cyr. Correspondance II* (Sources chrétiennes 98), Paris, 1964
- Epistulae 96–147*, ed. Y. Azéma, *Théodoret de Cyr. Correspondance III* (Sources chrétiennes 111), Paris, 1965
- Eranistes*, ed. G. H. Ettlinger, Oxford, 1975
- Explanatio in Canticum Cantorum*, PG.81.28–213
- Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, ed. P. Canivet, *Théodoret de Cyr. Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques*, 2 vols. (Sources chrétiennes 57), Paris, 1958
- Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG.83.336–556
- Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. L. Parmentier and F. Scheidweiler (GCS 44), Berlin, 1954
- Historia Religiosa*, ed. P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen, *Théodoret de Cyr. L'histoire des moines de Syrie*, 2 vols. (Sources chrétiennes 234, 257), Paris, 1977–1979
- Theodoret of Cyrrhus. *Interpretatio in Ezechielem*, PG.81.808–1256
- Interpretatio in Jeremiam*, PG.81.496–805
- Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG.80.857–1997
- Interpretatio xiv Epistularum Sancti Pauli*, PG.82.36–877
- Oratio ad Eos Qui in Euphratesia et Osrhoena Regione, Syria, Phoenicia et Cilicia Vitam Monasticam Degunt* (epistle cxi), PG.83.1416–1433
- Quaestiones In Genesin*, PG.80.77–226
- Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, ed. N. Fernandez Marcos and A. Saenz-Badillos (Textos y Estudios ‘Cardenal Cisneros’ 17), Madrid, 1979
- Quod Unicus Filius Sit Jesus Christus*, PG.83.1433–1440
- Theodotus of Ancyra. *In Jesu Christi Diem Natalem*, ed. M. Aubineau, ‘Une homélie de Théodote d’Ancyre sur la nativité du Seigneur’, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 26 (1960) 224–232
- Theognostus of Constantinople. *De Orthographia*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, vol. 2, Amsterdam, 1963
- Theon of Smyrna. *De Rerum Mathematicarum*, ed. E. Hiller, *Theonis Smyrnaei Philosophi Platonici Expositio Rerum Mathematicarum ad Legendum Platonem Utilium*, Leipzig, 1878
- Theophanes Confessor. *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, *Theophanis chronographia*, Hildesheim, 1963
- Theophilus of Antioch. *Ad Autolycum*, ed. R. M. Grant, Oxford, 1970
- Theophrastus of Eresus. *De Causis Plantarum liber i*, ed. R. E. Dengler, Philadelphia, 1927
- De Causis Plantarum libri ii–vi*, ed. F. Wimmer, *Theophrasti Eresii Opera, Quae Supersunt, Omnia*, Frankfurt am Main, 1964
- Fragmenta*, ed. F. Wimmer, *Theophrasti Eresii Opera, Quae Supersunt, Omnia*, Frankfurt am Main, 1964, pp. 364–410, 417–462
- Historia Plantarum*, ed. A. Hort, *Theophrastus. Enquiry into Plants*, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1961–1968
- Tryphon of Alexandria. *De Tropis*, ed. L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 3, Frankfurt am Main, 1966, pp. 191–206
- Typicon Magnae Ecclesiae (typicon ecclesiae sanctae Sophiae)*, *Typicon Menaeum*, ed. J. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, vol. 1, *Le cycle des douze mois* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 165), Rome, 1962
- Vita Symeonis Stylitae Junioris*, ed. P. van den Ven, *La vie ancienne de S. Syméon Stylite le jeune (521–592)* (Subsidia Hagiographica 32), Brussels, 1962
- Vitae Aesopi*, Vita G, ed. B. E. Perry, *Aesopica*, vol. 1, Urbana, 1952, pp. 35–77
- Xenocrates. *Testimonia, Doctrina et Fragmenta*, ed. M. I. Parente, *Senocrate-Ermodoro. Frammenti*, Naples, 1982
- Xenophon. *Cyropaedia*, ed. E. C. Marchant, *Xenophontis Opera Omnia*, vol. 4, Oxford, 1970
- Zacharias Scholasticus. *Ammonius*, ed. M. Minniti Colonna, *Zacaria Scolastico. Ammonio. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione, commentario*, Naples, 1973

Ancient and Byzantine Lexica of Greek Language

- Aelius Dionysius. *Lexicon Atticum*, ed. H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika* (Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Philosoph.-hist. Kl.), Berlin, 1950, pp. 95–151
- Apollonius Sophista. *Lexicon Homericum*, ed. I. Bekker, Hildesheim, 1967
- Collectio Verborum e Rhetoribus et Sapientibus* (Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίων), ed. L. Bachmann, *Anecdota Graeca*, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1828
- ed. C. Boysen, *Lexica Graeca minora*, ed. K. Latte, Hildesheim, 1965, pp. 16–38
- De Syntacticis*, ed. I. Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, v. 1, Graz, 1965
- Etymologicum Genuinum*, ed. F. Lasserre and N. Livadaras, *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum. Symeonis Etymologicum una cum Magna Grammatica. Etymologicum Magnum Auctum*, 2 vols., Rome, 1976–Athens, 1992
- Etymologicum Gudianum*, ed. A. de Stefani, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1965
- ed. F. W. Sturz, *Etymologicum Graecae Linguae Gudianum et Alia Grammaticorum Scripta Codicibus Manuscriptis nunc primum Edita*, Hildesheim, 1973
- Etymologicum Magnum*, ed. T. Gaisford, Amsterdam, 1967
- Etymologicum Parvum*, ed. R. Pintaudi (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 42), Milan, 1973
- Etymologicum Symeonis*, ed. F. Lasserre and N. Livadaras, *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum, Symeonis Etymologicum una cum Magna Grammatica. Etymologicum Magnum Auctum*, vol. 1, Rome, Ateneo, 1976; vol. 2, Athens: Parnassos Literary Society, 1992
- Eudemus. *De Verbis Rhetoricis*, ed. B. Niese, 'Excerpta ex Eudemi Codice Parisino n. 2635', (Philologus, suppl. 15), Leipzig, 1922, pp. 145–160
- Harpocration. *Lexicon in Decem Oratores Atticos*, ed. W. Dindorf, Groningen, 1969
- Hesychius of Alexandria. *Lexicon*, ed. K. Latte, *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, 2 vols., Copenhagen, 1953–1966
- Julius Naucratis (or Julius Pollux or Julius Polydeuces). *Onomasticon*, ed. E. Bethe, *Pollucis onomasticon*, 2 vols. (Lexicographi Graeci 9), Stuttgart, 1967
- Lexicon Artis Grammaticae*, ed. L. Bachmann, *Anecdota Graeca*, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1828, pp. 425–450
- Lexicon Atticum Anonymum*, ed. I. Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, vol. 1, Graz, 1965, pp. 75–116
- Lexicon in Hexabiblos Aucta*, ed. M. T. Fögen (Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte 17), Frankfurt am Main, 1990, pp. 162–214
- Lexicon rhetoricum Cantabrigiense*, ed. E. O. Houtsma, *Lexica Graeca minora* (ed. K. Latte and H. Erbse). Hildesheim, 1965, pp. 69–86
- Lexicon Syntacticum*, ed. J. A. Cramer, *Anecdota Graecae*

Codicibus Manuscriptis Bibliothecarum Oxoniensium, vol. 4, Amsterdam, 1963, pp. 275–307

- Lexicon Vindobonense*, ed. A. Nauck, Hildesheim, 1965
- Moeris. *Lexicon Atticum*, ed. I. Bekker, *Harpocration et Moeris*, Berlin, 1833, pp. 187–214
- Orion. *Etymologicum*, ed. G. H. K. Koës, Hildesheim, 1973, pp. 185–192
- Photius. *Lexicon*, ed. Chr. Theodoridis, *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1982–2012
- Phrynichus. *Eclogae*, ed. E. Fischer, *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 1), Berlin, 1974, pp. 60–109
- Pseudo-Zonaras. *Lexicon*, ed. J. A. H. Tittmann, *Iohannis Zonarae Lexicon ex Tribus Codicibus Manuscriptis*, 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1967
- Suda lexicon*, ed. A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon*, 4 vols. (Lexicographi Graeci 1), Stuttgart, 1967–71

Modern Sources

- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. R. A. Kraft and G. Krodel from the 2nd German edn (1934), Philadelphia, 1971
- Bees, N. 'Die Kollation der Apokalypse Johannis mit dem Kodex 573 des Meteoronklosters', *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und Kunde der Älteren Kirche*, 13 (1912) 260–66
- Ἐκθεσις παλαιογραφικῶν καὶ τεχνικῶν ἐρευνῶν ἐν ταῖς μοναῖς τῶν Μετεώρων κατὰ τὰ ἔτη 1908 καὶ 1909, Athens, 1910
- Τὰ Χειρόγραφα τῶν Μετεώρων, Κατάλογος περιγραφικὸς τῶν χειρογράφων κωδίκων τῶν ἀποκειμένων εἰς τὰς Μονὰς τῶν Μετεώρων ἐκ τῶν καταλοίπων τοῦ Νίκου Α. Βέη (The Manuscripts of Meteora, a descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts conserved in the monasteries of Meteora, published from the extant work compiled by Nikos A. Vees), Athens, 1998
- Boysson, A. de. 'Avons-nous un commentaire d'Origène sur l'Apocalypse?' *Revue Biblique Internationale*, NS 10 (1913) 555–567
- Canivet, P. *Histoire d'une entreprise apologétique au V^e siècle*, Paris, 1957
- Charles, R. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1920
- Clayton Jr., Paul. *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, Oxford, 2007
- Cotelier J.-B. *Sanctorum Patrum Qui Temporibus Apostolicis Floruerunt, Barnabae, Clementis, Hermae, Ignatii, Polycarpi, Opera Edita et Inedita, Vera et Suppositicia, Graece et Latine, cum Notis*, 2 vols., Antwerp 1672; v. II, notae in Epistulam Barnabae, 15
- Diekamp, F. Review of the edition of the Scholia by K.

- Diobouniotis and A. Harnack, *Theological Review*, 11 (1912) 51–55
- Diobouniotis, K. and A. Harnack. *Der Scholien-Kommentar des Origenes zur Apokalypse Johannis nebst einem Stück aus Irenaeus, Lib. V, Graece* (Texte und Untersuchungen 38,3), Leipzig, 1911
- Elliott, J. K. 'The distinctiveness of the Greek manuscripts of the Book of Revelation', *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS 48 (1997) 116–124
- Funk, F. X. 'Le pseudo-Justine et Diodore de Tarse', *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique* (1902) 947–971
- Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian tradition*, v. I, *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, tr. J. S. Bowden, rev. edn., London, 1975
- Guérard, O. 'Note préliminaire sur les papyrus d' Origène découverts à Toura', *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 131 (1946) 85–108
- Gumerlock, Francis X. 'Patristic commentaries on Revelation', *Kerux*, 23 (2008) 3–13
- Heither, Th. *Translatio Religionis, Die Paulusdeutung des Origenes in seinem Kommentar zum Römerbrief* (Bonner Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte 16), Cologne, 1990
- Hoskier, H. C. 'Manuscripts of the Apocalypse – Recent Investigations. I', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 7 (1922–1923), 120–37 and 2 plates. Revised in his *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse. Collations of All Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephens's Third Edition, together with the Testimony of Versions, Commentaries and Fathers*, 2 vols., London, 1929
- Junod, E. 'À propos des soi-disant scholies sur l'Apocalypse d'Origène', *Rivista di storia della letteratura religiosa* (Firenze), 20 (1984) 112–121
- Kilpatrick, G. D. 'Professor J. Schmid on the Greek text of the Apocalypse', *Vigiliae Christianae* 13 (1959) 1–13
- Klostermann, E. 'Des Origenes Scholien-Kommentar zur Apokalypse Johannis', *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 37 (1912) 73–74
- Lejay, Paul. 'Janus Lascaris', lemma in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 9, New York, 1913
- Mercati, G. *Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica* (Studi e Testi 5), Rome, 1901
- Nautin, P. *Origène*, Paris, 1977
- Nicol, Donald M. *Meteora: The Rock Monasteries of Thessaly*, London 1963
- Places, E. des. 'Le Platon de Théodoret, les citations des *Lois* et de l'*Epinomis*', *Revue des Études Grecques*, 68 (1955) 171–84
- 'Le Platon de Théodoret, les citations du *Phédon*, de la *République* et du *Timée*', in *Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni*, vol. I, Milan, 1956, pp. 325–36
- Quasten, J. *Patrology*, 4 vols., Allen, Tex., 1975
- Richard, M. 'Les citations de Théodoret conservées dans la chaîne de Nicéas sur l'évangélisme selon saint Luc', *Revue Biblique* 43 (1934) 88–96
- Riedinger, Rudolf. 'Akoimeten', *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, vol. 2, 1978, pp. 148–153
- 'Pseudo-Dionysios Areopagites, Pseudo-Kaisarios und die Akoimeten', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 52 (1959) 276–296
- Roberts, Alexander and James Donaldson. 'Introductory Note to Clement of Alexandria', in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 2, Grand Rapids, 1983
- Robinson, A. 'Origen's Comments on the Apocalypse', *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1912) 295–297
- Schmid, J. *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes* (Münchener Theologische Studien 111–112), 1. Teil, *Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia* (2 vols., Munich, 1956); 2. Teil, *Die Alten Stämme*, Munich, 1955
- Siniossoglou, N. *Plato and Theodoret*, Cambridge, 2008
- Skard, Seuls. 'Zum Scholien-Kommentar des Origenes zur Apokalypse Joannis', *Symbolae Osloenses*, 15–16 (1936) 204–208
- Strathmann, D. 'Origenes und die Johannesoffenbarung', *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 34 (1923) 228–236
- Turner, C. H. 'The text of the newly discovered Scholia of Origen on the Apocalypse', *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1912) 386–397
- 'Document. Origen Scholia in Apocalypsin', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 25 (1923) 1–16
- Tzamalikos, P. *A Newly Discovered Greek Father, Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles, A Critical Edition from an Ancient Manuscript with Commentary and an English Translation*, Leiden, 2012
- 'Creation *ex nihilo* in Origen: rebuttal of a tragic historical bias', *Papers in Honour of Professor Emeritus G. Nitsiotas*, Thessaloniki 1994, 1157–1208
- 'Origen and the Stoic view of time', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 52 (1991) 535–561
- Origen: Cosmology and Ontology of Time*, Leiden, 2006
- 'Origen, the source of Augustine's theory of time', *Philosophia: Yearbook of the Research Center for Greek Philosophy at the Academy of Athens* 17–18 (1989) 396–418
- Origen: Philosophy of History and Eschatology*, Leiden, 2007
- 'The autonomy of the Stoic view of time', *Philosophia: Yearbook of the Research Center for Greek Philosophy at the Academy of Athens* 19–20 (1989–1990), 352–369
- 'The concept of *accidental being* in Aristotle and its significance for Patristic Thought', *Proceedings of the International Conference on Aristotle's Metaphysics held at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki*, 9 and 10 October 1997, Thessaloniki, 1999, pp. 171–185

- ‘The concept of space-time in Origen’, *Diotima: Review of Philosophical Research* 24 (1996) 144–149
- The Concept of Time in Origen*, Bern, 1991
- ‘The concept of ὕλη (matter) in Plato’s *Timaeus*’, *Philosophia, Yearbook of the Research Center for Greek Philosophy at the Academy of Athens*, 27–28 (1997–1998) 131–141
- The Real Cassian Revisited, Monastic Life, Greek Paideia, and Origenism in the Sixth Century, A Critical Study of an Ancient Manuscript*, Leiden, 2012
- Wohlenberg, G. ‘Noch einiges zu dem Scholien-kommentar (des Origenes) zur Offenbarung Johannis’, *Theologisches Literaturblatt* 33 (1912) 217–220
- Zuberi, Masarrat Husain. *Aristotle 384–322 BC and Al Gazali 1058–1111AD*, Karachi, Pakistan, 1986

INDEX OF AUTHORS CITED IN THE SCHOLIA

- Acta Apocrypha Barnabae*, VII
Acta Apocrypha Justini, XXXIII
Acta Apocrypha Philippi, XXI
Acta Apocrypha Thomae, XXI, XXIV, XXIX
Acta Ioannis, IV
Aelian (sophist, second/third cent. AD), XXIX
Aelius Aristides (second cent. AD), XXXIII
Aelius Dionysius (lexicographer, second cent. AD), XXX
Aeschines (orator, Athens, fourth cent. BC), I, XIX
Aeschylus (tragic poet, Athens, sixth-fifth cent. BC), XIII, XXXV
Aetius of Antioch, (Arian Christian, fourth cent. AD), XX
Agathangelus of Armenia, (Christian historian, fifth cent. AD), IV
Agathias Scholasticus (historian, Constantinople, sixth cent. AD), XXXII
Albinus (philosopher, Smyrna, second cent. AD), XXI, XXV
Alexander Monachus (Cyprus, possibly sixth cent. AD), XXXI
Alexander of Aphrodisias (philosopher, second/third cent. AD), I, III, IV, IX, X, XI, XIV, XV, XVI, XIX, XX, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXIV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXIX, Post-Scholion, XXIV Adnotatio
Ammonius of Alexandria (philosopher, fifth cent. AD), XVI, XXV, XXXII, XXXVI, XXXIX
Ammonius presbyter of Alexandria (probably fifth/sixth century), XIV
Amphilochius of Iconium (fourth cent. AD), VI, VII, XI, XIV, XXI, XXXI, XXXVII
Anacreon (lyric poet, sixth cent. BC), XXXV
Anastasius of Sinai (seventh cent. AD), XXIII, XXV, XXXVI
Andreas of Caesarea (sixth/seventh cent. AD), VII, XXX, XXXII, XXXVIII, XXXIX
Anonymus. See *De Trinitate*; *Scripta anonyma*
Anonymus, *Commentarium in Aristotelis De Interpretatione*, IV
Anonymus, *Commentarium in Librum Περὶ Εὐρέσεως*, IV
Anonymus, *Commentarium in Librum Περὶ Ἰδεῶν*, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
Anonymus, *Dialogus cum Iudaeis*, XIII, XXXI, XXXIII, XXXVI
Anonymus, *Epitome Artis Rhetoricae*, IV
Anonymus, *Excerpta de Arte Rhetorica*, XXXIII
Anonymus, *In Aristotelis Artem Rhetoricam Commentaria*, I, IV
Anonymus, *In Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*, I, X
Anonymus, *In Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea Paraphrasis*, X
Anonymus, *In Aristotelis Sophisticos Elenchos*, XIII
Anonymus, *In Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, IV; VII; XXXIII
Anonymus, *Prolegomena in Librum Περὶ στάσεων*, IV, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
Anonymus, *In Hermogenis Librum Περὶ στάσεων*, XIII
Anonymus, *Περὶ τῶν ὀκτὼ μερῶν τοῦ ῥητορικοῦ λόγου*, IV
Anthologiae Palatinae Appendix, *Epigrammata Oracula*, XXVIII
Anthologiae Palatinae Appendix, *Sepulcralia*, XXVIII
Antiochus of Palestine (monk, seventh cent. AD, also known as Antiochus of Ancyra), IV, XXI, XXXII
Apocalypsis Apocrypha Enochi, IX
Apocalypsis Apocrypha Esdrae, XXI
Apocalypsis Apocrypha Ioannis, IV, XXI
Apollinaris of Laodicea (fourth cent. AD), XIX, XXVI, XXX, XXXII, XXIV, XXXV, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
Apollonius (sophist, first/second cent. AD), XXVIII, XXX
Apollonius Dyscolus (grammarian, Alexandria, second cent. AD), XV
Apophthegmata Patrum, XXVI
Archedemus of Tarsus (Stoic philosopher, second cent. BC), IV
Archimedes (geometrician, Syracuse, third cent. BC), XXI
Arethas of Caesarea (also, of Patras, ninth/tenth cent. AD), VII, XIV, XXVIII, XXXI, XXXII, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVIII
Aristides Quintilianus (doctor of music, third cent. AD), XV
Aristocles of Messene (philosopher, second cent. AD), XXVII
Ariston of Ceos (Peripatetic philosopher, third cent. BC), XV
Aristophanes (comic poet, Athens, fifth/fourth cent. BC), XIX
Aristotle (fourth cent. BC), I, V, VII, X, XI, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XIX, XX, XXV, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXIII, XXXVII, XXXIX, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
Arius Didymus (doxographer, first cent. BC), X, XXXI
Asclepius of Tralles (philosopher, sixth cent. AD), XI, XIII, XIX, XX, XXXI, XXXIV
Aspasius (philosopher, second cent. AD), X
Asterius of Amasea (Christian theologian, fourth/fifth cent. AD), IV, XI
Asterius of Antioch, the sophist (Arian Christian theologian, fourth cent. AD), IV, VI, VIII, XI, XIII, XIV, XV, XXVII, XXX, XXXI, XXXVI
Athanasius (fourth cent. AD), II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, X, XI, XIII, XIV, XV, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
Athenaeus Naucratis (the writer of *Deipnosophistae*, second/third cent. AD), XXX, XXXII, XXXV
Athenagoras of Athens (apologist, second cent. AD), XIII, XXXI, XXXV, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
Bacchylides (poet, fifth cent. BC), XXXV
Barsanuphius and John, XXXI
Basil of Ancyra (fourth cent. AD), XI, XX, XXII, XXXII, XXXV
Basil of Caesarea (fourth cent. AD), IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, X, XI, XII, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
Basil of Seleucia (fifth cent. AD), I, III, IV, IX, XIV, XV, XVI, XXVII, XVIII, XX, XXI, XXIII, XXVII, XXX, XXXI
Cassian the Sabaite (monk, sixth cent. AD), I, III, IV, X, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XXI, XXIX, XXX, XXXI
Cassius Dio (historian, Nicaea, second/third cent. AD), XXXII
Cebes (philosopher, first cent. AD), XXXI
Celestinus, pope of Rome (fifth cent.), I
Chronicon Paschale (seventh cent. AD), IV, XXII, XXXII
Chrysippus (the Stoic philosopher, third cent. BC), V, X, XIV, XV, XVI, XIX, XXI, XXIII, XXV, XXVII, XXIX, XXXVII
Clement of Alexandria (second–third cent. AD), I, III, IV, V, VI, X, XI, XII, XIV, XV, XVI, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXV, XXXVII, XXXIX, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
Clement of Rome (first cent. AD), VI, XXVII
Clement Studites (ninth cent.), XXIX
Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (emperor, Constantinople, tenth cent. AD), XXX, XXXII
Constitutio Monasterii Prodromi τοῦ Φοβεροῦ, XXXII
Constitutiones Apostolorum (fourth cent. AD), XIII
Corpus Hermeticum, XXI
Council of Chalcedon (451), I, IV, V
Council of Constantinople (local, 536 AD), IV
Council of Ephesus (431), I, IV
Critias of Athens (poet, fifth cent. BC), XXV
Critolaus of Phaselis (Peripatetic philosopher, Lycia, second cent. BC), XXXVII

- Cyril of Alexandria (fourth–fifth cent. AD), I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XIII, XV, XVI, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- Cyril of Jerusalem (fourth cent. AD), III, IV, VIII, XI, XIV, XIX, XXVI, XXXIII, XXXV, XXXVI
- Cyril of Scythopolis (Christian biographer, sixth cent. AD), VI
- Damascius (philosopher, Alexandria, Athens, fifth–sixth cent. AD), IV, XI, XIII, XXII, XXV, XXVI, XXXI, XXXVI, XXXIX
- David of Alexandria (Neoplatonist philosopher, Alexandria, sixth cent. AD), XIII
- De Trinitate*, I, III, IV, V, VII, VIII, XI, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXIX
- Demosthenes (orator, Athens, fourth cent. BC), I, III, XIX, XXX, XXXV, XXXVII
- Dexippus (philosopher, fourth cent. AD), VII, XVI, XXIX
- Diadochus of Photike (theologian, Epirus, fifth cent. AD), XXXI, XXXVII
- Didymus (fourth cent. AD), I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- Dio Chrysostom (sophist, Prusa, first–second cent. AD), III, XXXIII
- Diodorus of Sicily (historian, first cent. BC), I, XVI, XX, XXVII, XXXII, XXXV, XXXVIII
- Diodorus of Tarsus (bishop, fourth cent. AD), VI, XV, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXVII, XXXVIII
- Diogenes Laertius (biographer, third cent. AD), I, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, XXXIII, XXXV, XXXVII
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus (historian, rhetor, first cent. BC), I, XIII, XXVI, XXX, XXXVI
- Dioscorides (medical doctor, first cent. AD), XXXVI
- Dissertatio Contra Iudaeos*, IV, XXIX, XXXI, XXXVI
- Doctrina Patrum* (seventh–eighth cent. AD), XXVI
- Dorotheus of Sidon (astrologer, first cent. AD), XXXIII
- Elias of Alexandria (philosopher, Aristotle's commentator, sixth cent. AD), X, XIV, XXX
- Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, III, VI, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- Ephraem Syrus (fourth cent. AD), IV, VI, VII, IX, X, XI, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII
- Epiphanius of Salamis (Cyprus, fourth cent. AD), III, IV, VI, VII, VIII, IX, XI, XIII, XV, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXVI, XXXVIII
- Epigrammata Oracula Chaldaica* (second cent. AD), XXI
- Euclid (geometrician, third cent. BC), XXXIV
- Euripides (tragic poet, Athens, fifth cent. BC), VI, XIII, XXXV
- Eusebius of Caesarea (fourth cent. AD), I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- Eusebius of Emesa (fourth cent. AD), XV
- Eustathius of Thessaloniki (bishop, philologist, twelfth cent. AD), III, IV, XIII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXII, XXXV, XXXVI
- Eustratius of Nicaea (eleventh/twelfth cent. AD), X
- Evagrius of Pontus (fourth cent. AD), V, VI, IX, XXXIII
- Evagrius Scholasticus (Church historian, Antioch, sixth cent. AD), XIII, XXVII, XXX, XXXII
- Evangelium Apocryphon Bartholomaei*, XXI
- Galen (or, Claudius Galenus, medical doctor, Pergamum, second cent. AD), I, IV, V, XI, XIII, XIV, XVI, XX, XXIII, XXV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXX, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXIII, XXXVII, XXXIX, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- Gelasius of Cyzicus (fifth cent.), XXX
- Gennadius I (patriarch, Constantinople, fifth cent. AD), XXXI
- George Cedrenus (monk, historian, Constantinople, eleventh/twelfth cent. AD), XXVI, XXIX, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- George Monachus (or Georgius Hamartolus, or Georgius Peccator, Alexandria, ninth cent. AD), XXVI, XXIX
- George Syncellus (abbot, chronicler, Constantinople, eighth/ninth cent. AD), XX, XXXII
- Germanus I, patriarch of Constantinople (seventh/eighth cent. AD), XXXIII
- Gregory of Nazianzus (fourth cent. AD), III, IV, V, VI, VII, IX, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVII, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXIII, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- Gregory of Nyssa (fourth cent. AD), IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- Gregory Thaumaturgus (third cent. AD), V, XVIII
- Hecataeus of Abdera (historian, fourth–third cent. BC), XXXII
- Heliodorus (novelist, Emesa, probably third cent. AD), XIII
- Hephaestion of Thebes (astrologer, fourth cent. AD), XXXIII
- Heraclitus of Ephesus (the Presocratic philosopher, sixth/fifth cent. BC), XXVII
- Hermas (the author of *Pastor*, second cent. AD), XXXV
- Hermias of Alexandria (Neoplatonist philosopher, fifth cent. AD), VII, IX, X, XIII, XXVI, XXXI, XXXII, XXXVI, XXXIX
- Hermogenes of Tarsus (rhetor, second/third cent. AD), IV
- Herodian (grammarian, rhetor, Alexandria, Rome, second cent. AD), I, XIII, XXX
- Herodotus (historian, Halicarnassus, fifth cent. BC), XIII, XXVIII, XXXV, XXXVIII
- Heron of Alexandria (mechanical engineer, first cent. AD), XXXIV, XXXIX
- Hesiod (epic poet, possibly eighth/seventh cent. BC), XXXV
- Hesychius of Alexandria (lexicographer, fifth–sixth cent. AD), V, XIV, XV, XXVIII, XXX, XXXI
- Hesychius of Jerusalem (Christian presbyter, fifth cent. AD), IV, VI, XIII, XIV, XXXI, XXXIII
- Hierocles of Alexandria (Neoplatonist philosopher, fifth cent. AD), XX
- Hippolytus (second/third cent. AD), II, III, IV, VIII, IX, XI, XII, XIV, XIX, XX, XXI, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX
- Homer (epic poet, eighth cent. BC), XIII, XXI, XXIII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXXV, XXXVIII
- Hyperides of Athens (orator, fourth cent. BC), XXV
- Iamblichus (philosopher, Chalcis in Syria, third/fourth cent. AD), IX, XI, XIV, XVI, XXXIII, XXV, XXVIII, XXXI, XXXIX, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- Ignatius of Antioch (Apologist, first/second cent. AD), XXXVIII
- Irenaeus (bishop of Lyon, second cent. AD), IV, X, XI, XII, XVI, XXIII, XXIX, XXXIII, XXXV, XXXVIII, XXXIX
- Isocrates (orator, Athens, fifth/fourth cent. BC), I
- John I, patriarch of Antioch (fifth cent.), IV
- John of Damascus (seventh/eighth cent. AD), III, IV, VI, XI, XXII, XXIII, XXVI, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXV, XXXIX
- John Chrysostom (fourth cent.), I, III, IV, VI, VII, VIII, IX, XI, XIII, XIV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- John Climacus (sixth/seventh cent. AD), III, XVII, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- John Galen (grammarian, Constantinople, twelfth cent. AD), XXVIII, XXIX
- John Laurentius Lydus (historian, Constantinople, sixth cent. AD), XXXI, XXXII
- John Malalas (chronicler, Antioch, fifth/sixth cent. AD), IV, XXVII, XXXII

- John Philoponus (philosopher, grammarian, Christian Monophysite, Alexandria, sixth cent. AD), [IV](#), [V](#), [VII](#), [IX](#), [X](#), [XI](#), [XIII](#), [XX](#), [XXIII](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#), [XXXIII](#), [XXXIV](#), Post-Scholion [XXIV](#) Adnotatio
- Josephus (first cent. BC), [X](#), [XVI](#), [XX](#), [XXIV](#), [XXVI](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXIII](#), [XXXV](#), [XXXVIII](#)
- Julian, emperor (fourth cent. AD), [XXIV](#)
- Julian the Arian (theologian, fourth cent. AD), [XI](#), [XXI](#), [XXVI](#), [XXX](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXVIII](#)
- Julius Africanus (chronicler, Alexandria, Jerusalem, second/third cent. AD), [XXXII](#), [XXXIII](#)
- Julius Naucratis (Julius Pollux, or Julius Polydeuces, grammarian, second cent. AD), [XXIII](#), [XXV](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXV](#), Post-Scholion [XXIV](#) Adnotatio
- Justin Martyr (second cent. AD), [XI](#), [XVI](#), [XX](#), [XXIX](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#), [XXXIII](#), [XXXV](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXIX](#)
- Justinian, emperor, [IV](#)
- Leontius of Constantinople (Byzantium, presbyter, fifth/sixth cent. AD), [IV](#)
- Leontius of Cyprus (bishop, hagiographer and ecclesiastical author, seventh cent.), [XXXI](#)
- Libanius (sophist, rhetor, Constantinople, Antioch, Nicomedia, fourth cent. AD), [I](#), [XXIV](#), [XXX](#)
- Lucian of Samosata (sophist, second cent. AD), [V](#), [XIII](#), [XXI](#), [XXV](#), [XXVIII](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXV](#), [XXXVII](#)
- Lysias (orator, Athens, fifth/fourth cent. BC), [I](#), [III](#)
- Marcellus of Ancyra (bishop, fourth cent. AD), [XI](#), [XXVI](#), [XXXVI](#)
- Marcus Aurelius (emperor, Rome, second cent. AD), [I](#)
- Marcus Eremita (monk in Egypt and Palestine, fourth/sixth cent. AD), [XXXI](#)
- Martyrium Ignatii (Martyrium Antiochenum)*, [XXXV](#)
- Martyrium Prius Andreae*, [XXIX](#)
- Maximus Confessor (Constantinople, sixth/seventh cent. AD), [IV](#), [IX](#), [X](#), [XI](#), [XIII](#), [XX](#), [XXII](#), [XXVIII](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXVI](#)
- Meletius of Tiberiopolis (medical doctor, prob. seventh–ninth cent.), [XXXI](#)
- Melito of Sardis (apologist, bishop, second cent.), [XXIX](#)
- Memnon of Ephesus (bishop. fifth cent.), [IV](#)
- Menander (comic poet, Athens, fourth/third cent. BC), [VI](#)
- Methodius of Olympus (third cent. AD), [XIX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#), [XXXV](#), [XXXVIII](#)
- Michael of Ephesus (philosopher, Aristotle's commentator, eleventh/twelfth cent. AD), [I](#), [X](#), [XX](#), [XXXIX](#)
- Michael Glycas (chronicler, Constantinople, twelfth cent. AD), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#), [XXXIII](#), [XXXIV](#), [XXXVIII](#)
- Michael Psellus (polymath, Constantinople, eleventh cent. AD), [XXVI](#), [XXX](#)
- Moderatus (Pythagorean philosopher, first cent. AD), [XXXI](#)
- Nemesius of Emesa (bishop, fourth cent. AD), [IV](#), [X](#)
- Nestorius, [I](#), [XXXI](#)
- Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos (historian, theologian, Constantinople, thirteenth/fourteenth cent. AD), [XXIX](#), [XXXVIII](#)
- Nicholas the Mystic (ninth–tenth cent.), [XXIX](#)
- Nicolaus (comic-poet, prob. fourth cent. BC), [XXXII](#)
- Nicomachus of Gerasa (mathematician, second cent. AD), [X](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXV](#)
- Nilus of Ancyra (abbot, fifth cent. AD), [XXXI](#)
- Numenius of Apamea (philosopher, second cent. AD), [XX](#), [XXV](#)
- Oecumenius (sixth cent. AD), [I](#), [IV](#), [VII](#), [IX](#), [XVIII](#), [XIX](#), [XXII](#), [XXVIII](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#), [XXXIII](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXVIII](#), Post-Scholion [XXIV](#) Adnotatio
- Olympiodorus (deacon, Alexandria, sixth cent. AD), [IX](#), [X](#), [XI](#), [XIII](#), [XIX](#), [XXI](#), [XXIII](#), [XXV](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXVIII](#), [XXXIX](#)
- Olympiodorus (philosopher, Alexandria, sixth cent. AD), [IV](#), [X](#), [XIII](#), [XIX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#), [XXXV](#)
- Oppian of Anazarbis in Cilicia (poet, second cent. AD), [XXVIII](#)
- Oribasius of Pergamus (medical doctor, fourth cent. AD), [X](#)
- Origen, [I](#), [II](#), [III](#), [IV](#), [V](#), [VI](#), [VII](#), [VIII](#), [IX](#), [X](#), [XI](#), [XII](#), [XIII](#), [XIV](#), [XV](#), [XVI](#), [XVIII](#), [XIX](#), [XX](#), [XXI](#), [XXII](#), [XXIII](#), [XXIV](#), [XXV](#), [XXVI](#), [XXVII](#), [XXVIII](#), [XXIX](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#), [XXXIII](#), [XXXIV](#), [XXXV](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXVII](#), [XXXVIII](#), Post-Scholion [XXIV](#) Adnotatio
- Orion of Egypt (Thebes, Alexandria, grammarian, fifth cent. AD), [XIX](#), [XXXIII](#)
- Palladius of Helenopolis (monk, chronicler, fourth/fifth cent. AD), [VI](#), [XXIV](#), Post-Scholion [XXIV](#) Adnotatio
- Papias of Hierapolis (second cent. AD), [XXXVIII](#)
- Pappus of Alexandria (mathematician, fourth cent. AD), [XXIX](#), [XXXIV](#)
- Parmenides of Elea (fifth cent. BC), [XXV](#)
- Paul of Aegina (medical doctor, seventh cent. AD), [XXVIII](#)
- Pectorius (second/third cent. AD), [XXIX](#)
- Philo of Alexandria (first cent. BC/first cent. AD), [I](#), [III](#), [IV](#), [IX](#), [X](#), [XI](#), [XII](#), [XIV](#), [XVI](#), [XIX](#), [XXII](#), [XXV](#), [XXVI](#), [XXIX](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXIII](#), [XXXVI](#), Post-Scholion [XXIV](#) Adnotatio
- Philostratus, Flavius (sophist, Lemnos, second–third cent. AD), [III](#)
- Philoxenus (Alexandrian grammarian, first cent. BC.), [XXVII](#)
- Philumenus of Alexandria (medical doctor, second cent. AD), [XXI](#), [XXIII](#)
- Photius of Constantinople (patriarch, ninth cent. AD), [IX](#), [XIX](#), [XXIII](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#), [XXXIX](#)
- Pindar (Thebes in Boeotia, lyric poet, sixth/fifth cent. BC), [XXXV](#)
- Plato (fifth/fourth cent. BC), [V](#), [XIII](#), [XIV](#), [XXV](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXIII](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXVII](#), [XXXVIII](#), [XXXIX](#)
- Plotinus (Alexandria, Rome, Lycopolis, third cent. AD), [V](#), [XI](#), [XIII](#), [XV](#), [XVI](#), [XIX](#), [XXII](#), [XXIV](#), [XXV](#), [XXVII](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXIV](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXVII](#), [XXXIX](#), Post-Scholion [XXIV](#) Adnotatio
- Plutarch of Chaeronea (biographer, philosopher, first–second cent. AD), [I](#), [III](#), [IV](#), [V](#), [X](#), [XI](#), [XII](#), [XIII](#), [XIV](#), [XV](#), [XVI](#), [XX](#), [XXIII](#), [XIV](#), [XXV](#), [XXVI](#), [XXVII](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#), [XXXV](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXVII](#), [XXXVIII](#)
- Polybius of Megalopolis (historian, third/second cent. BC), [XVI](#), [XX](#), [XXVII](#), [XXXVIII](#)
- Polycarp of Smyrna (bishop, first–second cent. AD), [XXXVII](#)
- Porphyry (philosopher, Rome, Tyre, third cent. AD), [I](#), [X](#), [XI](#), [XVI](#), [XX](#), [XXIII](#), [XXVI](#), [XXVII](#), [XXVIII](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXII](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXVII](#)
- Posidonius (Apamea, Rhodes, second/first cent. BC), [I](#), [III](#), [V](#), [XVI](#), [XXIII](#), [XXV](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXVII](#)
- Priscianus of Lydia (philosopher, sixth cent. AD), [X](#)
- Proclus (Athens, fifth cent. AD), [VII](#), [X](#), [XIII](#), [XIV](#), [XV](#), [XVI](#), [XIX](#), [XX](#), [XXI](#), [XXV](#), [XXVI](#), [XXIX](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXIV](#), [XXXV](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXIX](#), Post-Scholion [XXIV](#) Adnotatio
- Proclus of Constantinople (archbishop, [XXXVI](#); fifth cent. AD), [VI](#), [XXXVI](#)
- Procopius of Caesarea (historian, sixth cent. AD), [IV](#)
- Procopius of Gaza (Christian sophist and rhetorician, fifth–sixth cent. AD), [V](#), [VI](#), [XI](#), [XIII](#), [XIV](#), [XV](#), [XX](#), [XXIII](#), [XXVIII](#), [XXIX](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXV](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXVII](#), [XXXVIII](#), [XXXIX](#)
- Protevangelium Jacobi*, [XXI](#)
- Pseudo-Caesarius, [IV](#), [XI](#), [XV](#), [XVI](#), [XVIII](#), [XX](#), [XXI](#), [XXV](#), [XXVI](#), [XXVIII](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXV](#), [XXXVIII](#)
- Pseudo-Callisthenes, [XXI](#)
- Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, [IV](#), [VII](#), [XI](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXV](#)
- Pseudo-Justin, [IX](#), [XI](#), [XX](#), [XXVI](#), [XXVII](#), [XXIX](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#), [XXXV](#), [XXXVI](#)
- Pseudo-Macarius (or Symeon, or Macarius-Symeon, fourth cent. AD, Mesopotamia), [III](#), [IV](#), [VIII](#), [X](#), [XI](#), [XIV](#), [XVIII](#), [XIX](#), [XX](#), [XXI](#), [XXIII](#), [XXIV](#), [XXV](#), [XXVI](#), [XXVII](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXIV](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXVII](#), [XXXVIII](#)
- Ptolemy (mathematician, Alexandria, second cent. AD), [XV](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXIII](#), [XXXIV](#)
- Scholia In Aelium Aristidem*, [XXIV](#), [XXIX](#)
- Scholia in Aristophanem*, *Scholia in Nubes*, [XVII](#)
- Scholia In Demosthenem*, [I](#).
- Scholia in Euclidem*, *Scholia in Euclidem*, [XXXIV](#)
- Scholia In Hesiodum*, [XXXI](#)
- Scholia in Sophoclem*, [XVII](#)
- Scholia In Thucydidem*, [XXVII](#)
- Scripta Anonyma Adversus Judaeos*, *Dialogus contra Judaeos*, [III](#), [XXI](#)

- Scripta Anonyma Adversus Judaeos, *Dissertatio Contra Judaeos*, XXXI
- Serenus of Antinoeia (geometrician, fourth cent. AD), XXXIV
- Severianus of Gabala (bishop, fourth/fifth cent. AD), III, IV, X, XI, XIV, XV, XVII, XXVI, XXVII, XXX, XXXI, XXXIII, XXXV, XXXVII, XXXIX
- Severus of Antinoeia, XXXIV
- Severus of Antioch (patriarch, Monophysite, fifth/sixth cent. AD), IV, XI, XXI
- Sextus Empiricus (second/third cent. AD), IX, X, XIII, XV, XIX, XXII, XXV, XXXV, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, XXXIII, XXXV
- Simplicius of Cilicia (Neoplatonist commentator on Aristotle, sixth cent.), III, IV, X, XI, XIII, XIV, XVI, XIX, XX, XXII, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXVI, Post-Scholio, XXIV Adnotatio
- Socrates Scholasticus (historian, Constantinople, fourth/fifth cent. AD), IV, XIII, XIX, XX, XXXI, Post-Scholio, XXIV Adnotatio
- Solon (lawmaker, poet, Athens, seventh/sixth cent. BC), X
- Sopater of Athens (rhetor, fourth cent. AD), IV, XIII, XXXII
- Sophocles (tragic poet, Athens, fifth cent. BC), XIII, XXXV
- Sozomenus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- Speusippus (philosopher, Athens, fourth cent. BC), X, XXV, XXIX, XXXVII
- Stobaeus (anthologist, Macedonia, fifth cent. AD), III, X, XI, XV, XX, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXVI
- Strabo (geographer, Amasea, first cent. BC–first cent. AD), XIII, XXV, XXIX, XXXV
- Synesius of Cyrene (philosopher, bishop, fourth–fifth cent. AD), X
- Syrianus (philosopher, Aristotelian commentator, fifth cent. AD), XIII, XVI, XXXI, XXXII, XXXVI
- Syrianus (rhetor and Neoplatonic philosopher, fifth cent. AD), IV, XIII
- Teles (philosopher, probably of Megara, third cent. BC), XI
- Testamenta XII Patriarcharum* (second cent. BC/third cent. AD), XXI
- Testamentum Jobi*, XXI
- Themistius (philosopher, Constantinople, fourth cent. AD), X, XI, XIII, XX, XXI, XXXI, XXXVI
- Theodore Anagnostes (historian, Constantinople, fifth–sixth cent. AD), XXVII, XXIX, XXXVI
- Theodore of Mopsuestia (fourth–fifth cent. AD), IV, VI, IX, XI, XV, XVI, XIX, XX, XXII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVIII
- Theodore Metochites, XXIX
- Theodore Studites (eighth/ninth cent. AD), III
- Theodoret (bishop of Cyrrhus, fourth/fifth cent.), I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, Post-Scholion XXIV Adnotatio
- Theodosius (grammarian, Alexandria, fourth/fifth cent. AD), IV
- Theodotus, of Ancyra (bishop, fourth/fifth cent. AD), XXXII
- Theognostus (grammarian, Constantinople, ninth cent. AD), IV
- Theon of Alexandria (mathematician, fourth cent. AD), XXIX
- Theon of Smyrna (philosopher, mathematician, second cent. AD), XXXI
- Theophanes Confessor (Constantinople, Samothrace, abbot in Cyzicus, eighth/ninth cent. AD), XXIX
- Theophilus of Antioch (apologist, second cent. AD), XXVII, XXIX
- Theophrastus of Eresus, Lesbos (philosopher, fourth/third cent. BC), XIII, XXIX, XXXIII, XXXVII
- Vitae Aesopi*, XXI, XXXIII
- Timaeus (sophist and grammarian, prob. fourth cent. AD), XXVIII
- Tryphon of Alexandria (grammarian, first cent. BC), XV
- Xenocrates of Chalcedon (philosopher, fourth cent. BC), XXV
- Xenophon (historian, Athens, fifth/fourth cent. BC), XIX, XXXVI, XXXVII

INDEX OF NAMES IN THE SCHOLIA

Αἰγύπτιοι, [XXX](#)

Βαλαάμ, [XII](#)

Βοανεργές, [XXXVI](#)

Δαβίδ, [XX](#), [XXIV](#), [XXVII](#); [XXX](#)

Δευτέρα τῶν Βασιλειῶν (scriptural book), [XXX](#)

Διαθήκη (καινή), [XIV](#)

Διαθήκη (προτέρα), [XXVII](#)

Ἑβραῖοι, [XXXI](#)

Ἕλληνες, [XXXI](#)

Ἡλίας, [XXV](#)

Ἡσαΐας, [XXVII](#), [XXXVIII](#)

Ἰάκωβος (apostle), [XXXVI](#)

Ἰάκωβος (brother of Jesus), [I](#), [XXI](#)

Ἰεζάβελ, [XVI](#), [XVII](#)

Ἰεζεκιήλ, [XXXI](#)

Ἰερουσαλήμ, [XX](#)

Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐπουράνιος, [XXI](#)

Ἰησοῦς, [IV](#), [XXIV](#), [XXXIII](#), [XXXVI](#)

Ἰουδαῖοι, [XIV](#), [XX](#), [XXXI](#)

Ἰούδας, [XXVII](#), [XXVIII](#), [XXX](#)

Ἰσραήλ, [XXIV](#), [XXIX](#), [XXX](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#)

Ἰσραήλ ὁ ἀληθινός, [XXXI](#)

Ἰωάννης, [III](#), [IV](#), [VII](#), [XXI](#), [XXV](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXVI](#), [XXXVIII](#)

Καῖν, [XXI](#)

Κηφᾶς, [XXI](#)

Κλεόπας, [XX](#)

Κορίνθιος (whom Paul handed over to Satan), [XXX](#)

Μεγάλη Ὡδὴ (Ode 1.7, in Exodus 15:7), [XXX](#)

Μωσῆς, [XIV](#), [XXII](#)

Μωϋσῆς, [XXVII](#)

Νικολαῖται, [XII](#), [XVI](#)

Πατήρ (ὁ), [XXIV](#), [XXVI](#), [XXVII](#)

Παῦλος, [I](#), [XXI](#), [XXIV](#), [XXX](#)

Περγαμηνοί, [XII](#)

Πρώτη τῶν Παραλειπομένων (scriptural book), [XXX](#)

Τιμόθεος, [XXII](#)

Χριστός, [XXXI](#), [XXXIII](#)

Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, [XXIV](#), [XXXVI](#)

Χριστοῦ διδασκαλία, [XXIX](#)

Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημία, [XXIX](#)

INDEX OF TERMS IN THE SCHOLIA¹

ἀγαθαὶ πράξεις, XXIX
 ἀγαλλιασθέντες, IX
 ἀγαλλίας, XXXII
 ἀγάματα, XXXV
 ἀγάπη, VI, X, XXI
 ἀγαπητική διάθεσις, X
 ἄγγελος ἐφορῶντες, XXX
 ἄγγελος, XXXI, XXXVIII
 ἄγεσθαι ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν, XXIX
 ἄγευστος, XXXV
 ἁγία βασιλεία καὶ εὐλογημένη, XXVIII
 ἁγία βίβλος, XXX
 ἅγιοι βρονταί, XXX
 ἅγιοι δυνάμεις, XXX
 ἅγιος, XX, XXV, XXIX, XXX, XXXVII
 ἅγιος καὶ εὐλογημένος, IX
 ἀγνώμονες Ἰουδαῖοι, XIV
 ἕδειν, XXIX
 ἀδιάδοχος (Καινή Διαθήκη), XIV
 ἀδιάστατον τῆς θεραπείας, XXXIII
 ἀδικεῖσθαι (ὕπὸ τοῦ θανάτου), XI
 ἀδικία, XXII
 ἀδικῶς, XXX
 ἀδύνατον, (ἀ. εἶναι), XXI; (ἀ. ἐκλαβεῖν), XI;
 (ἀ. τίθεσθαι), XXV; (τὸ ἀ. εἶναι), XXXI
 ἀεὶ, VII, XIV, XXII
 ἀηδὴ, XXVII
 αἵρεσις (Gnosticism), XVI
 αἰρετικοί, XIII
 αἰσθάνεσθαι, XXXV
 αἰσθήσεως τῆς ἀκουστικῆς ὄργανον, Post-Sch. XXIV
 αἰσθητά (αἰ. γράμματα), VII; (ἄνω πατὸς αἰσθητοῦ), XIV; (αἰ. πράγματα), XXVII;
 (αἰ. διοίκησιν), XXXI; (αἰ. ἀγάματα), XXXI
 αἰτία (γενέσθαι ἐν αἰτίᾳ), XXX; (αἰ. τῶν ἀπάντων ὁ Λόγος), VII; (αἰ. τῆς κτίσεως ὁ Λόγος), XXII; (αἰ. τῆς ἁμαρτίας), XXX
 αἰτιᾶσθαι, XXX
 αἴτιος (τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν), XXX
 αἰὼν ὁ ἐνεσθηκός, IX
 ἀκοή, XXXV
 ἀκολουθία πνευματική, XXXI
 ἀκούειν, Post-Sch. XXIV, XXXII, XXXVI
 ἀκούειν τοῦ πνεύματος, Post-Sch. XXIV
 ἀκούοντες, III, VI, IX
 ἀκουόντων σωτηρίαν, VI
 ἀκουστέον, III
 ἄκρα τῶν στοιχείων (= τὸ α καὶ τὸ ω), VII
 ἀλήθεια εἶναι, XXII
 ἀληθείας μετέχειν, XXII
 ἀληθής, XXXI
 ἀληθινός, XX, XXII
 ἀληθῶς, XVIII
 ἀλλαχού, IX, XXX
 ἄλογα (τά), Post-Sch. XXIV

ἁλλοιούμενος, XXVIII
 ἁμαρτάνειν, XXX
 ἁμαρτήμα, XXX
 ἁμαρτία, VI, XI, XXX, XXXI
 ἁμαρτωλοί, XXX, XXXV
 ἀμέλεια, XXX
 ἀμετακίνητος, XXI
 ἁμοιρος, XXXIII
 ἀμφιβάλλειν, VI
 ἀναβαίνειν, XXV
 ἀναβεβηκότες, XXXIV
 ἀναγινώσκοντες, III, XXIX
 ἀναγκαίως ὑπάρχειν, X
 ἀνάγκη, XXXI
 ἀνάγκη ἐστίν, XXXVII
 ἀναγωγή (ἀνακτέον, XIII; κατ' ἀναγωγήν, XIII)
 ἀναιρεῖν τὰ φαῦλα, XV
 ἀναληφθεὶς, VIII
 ἀνάληψις, XXVIII
 ἀναλοῦν, XV
 ἀναμαρτησία, XI
 ἀνάξιοι θεοῦ, XXX
 ἀναπεθεῖν, XXX, XXXVIII
 ἀνασεύειν ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίαν, XXX
 ἀνάστασις, XXVIII; (ἀ. τοῦ κυρίου), XXVII
 ἀνατροφή, XXX
 ἀναφέρειν, IV, XIX
 ἀνεθεῖσα, X
 ἀνεξερεύνητος, XXVII
 ἄνεσις, X
 ἀνηγμένως νοεῖν, VII
 ἄνθρωπος (τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπον πραττόμενα), XXVIII
 ἀνοίγειν (the scriptures), XX
 ἀνοίγειν τὰ κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου, XX
 ἄνοιξις εἶναι, XXVII
 ἀντιστρέφειν, XXXVII
 ἀνωτέρω παντὸς αἰσθητοῦ ἀνάγεσθαι, XIV
 ἄξιον καὶ μέγιστον, I
 ἄξιος, XXVII, XXIX
 ἀξιώματα θνητῶν, I
 ἀπαγγεῖλαι, II; ἀπαγγέλλεσθαι διδασκαλίαν, XIX
 ἀπατεῶνες, XIII
 ἀπείρατος, XXXV
 ἀπερισπάστως ἐνοῦσθαι, V
 ἀπιστῆσαι, V
 ἀποβάλλειν τὴν ἀγάπην, X
 ἀποδίδοσθαι, XXXVII
 ἀποκάλυψις, XIII, XXXVII
 ἀπολείπεσθαι, XXXV
 ἀπολογεῖσθαι, XXX
 ἀπολύεσθαι περισπασμοῦ, XI
 ἀποστελλόμενον (πᾶν τὸ ἀ. ἕτερόν ἐστι τοῦ ἐξαποστέλλοντος), XXX
 ἀπόστολοι (πάντες), XXIV

ἀπόστολος (Ἰωάννης), III, XIII
 ἀπόστολος (Παῦλος), IV, XXII, XXXIII
 ἄπρακτος, XXXIII
 ἄπτειν, IX
 ἄπτεσθαι, IX
 ἀργύρεος, XXXV
 ἀρετή, XXI, XXXI; κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργεῖν, X
 ἀριθμεῖν, XXX
 ἀριθμός, XXIX, XXXI; (ἀ. ἰσάκις ἴσος κυλισθεῖς), XXXI; (ἀ. θεῖος), XXVII;
 (ἀ. μυστικός), IX
 ἀρμόζεσθαι, XXIX
 ἁρμονία, XXXI
 ἁρνίον (ἀ. ἐσφαγμένον), XXVII; (σφαγὴν ἀ.), XXXIII; (ἀ. ἐσθηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον), XXVIII
 ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι, XXIV
 ἀρχή, ἡ ἄνωθεν, V
 ἀρχή (ὁ Λόγος, ἡ ἐν ἀρχῇ), VII
 ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος (τὰ ἄκρα τῶν στοιχείων ἐλήφθησαν), VII
 ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως οὐχ ὡς κτίσμα πρῶτον, XXII
 ἀρχὴ τῶν ἀπάντων ὁ Λόγος, VII
 ἀρχὴ τῶν ὅλων καὶ τέλος τῶν ἀπάντων ὁ Λόγος, VII
 ἀρχὴ τῶν ποιημάτων ὁ Λόγος, XXII
 ἄρχων, XXII; XXX
 ἄσφακτοι ψευδομάντις, XIII
 ἀσάφεια τῆς προτέρας Διαθήκης, XXVII
 ἀστέρων τὸ τρίτον, XXXVIII
 ἄστρα, θεῖαι δυνάμεις, XXXVIII
 ἀσυντρόχαστος μετοχή, XIX
 ἀτεχνῶς γίνεσθαι, V
 ἄτρεπτος, XXII
 ἀτυφία (τῶν ἀποστόλων), I
 αὐθαίρετος (οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν), XXXII
 ἄφθαρτος, XXXIV
 ἄχραντος, XXXIII
 ἄψυχα μορφώματα, XXXV
 βάλλεσθαι κάτω, XXXVIII
 βασιλεία, XXIV, XXVIII
 βασιλεύειν, XXIV
 βδελύσσειν, XXII
 βεβαία στάσις, XXXI
 βέβαιος (καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ σωτήρ), XXII
 βέλη ἐκλεκτά, VI
 βῆμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, XXXVII
 βιβλία, XXXVI
 βιβλίον, XXVII, XXVIII
 βίβλος ἁγία, XXXI
 βίος (τῷ βίῳ περιεῖναι), XXXI
 βλάπτεσθαι (ὕπὸ τοῦ θανάτου), XI
 βλασφημεῖν, XXX
 βοηθοῦντες ἄγγελοι, XXX
 βούλεσθαι, XXX

¹ The text of Irenaeus (most of Scholion XXXVIII and Scholion XXXIX) is not included.

βουλή, XXXVI
 βουνοί, XXX
 βρονταὶ ἅγιοι, XXXVI
 βροντή, XXXVI
 βρόχος, τῆς παρθενίας, XXXII

γεγραμμένα, I
 γέλωτα ὀφλισκάνειν, XXV
 γεναμένη, XXIX; γενάμενος, XXI
 γενητός, XXVII
 γῆ, VI, VIII, XV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXX
 γίνεσθαι, V, XIX, XXVI
 γινώσκειν, XIV, XXVIII
 γινώσκεισθαι, X
 γνησίως εὐχεσθαι Χριστῷ, XXIX
 γνώμη, XVI, XXXI
 γνώριμοι τοῦ σωτήρος, I
 τὰ γνωσθέντα, II
 γνώσις, XXXVI
 γράμμα τοῦ νόμου, XX
 γράμματα, VII
 γραφαί, (γ. κεκλεισμένοι, before the Incarnation; γ. πληρούμενοι), XX, XXX
 γράφειν, I, VII, XXI, XXVII, XXXVI
 γράφεσθαι, VI, XIV, XXII, XXIV, XXV, XXVII, XXXII, XXXVI
 γραφή (scripture), (θεία) III; (θεόπνευστος) XXV; (πολλαχού τῆς γ.) XXVII; (ἐάν προσχῆς τῇ γ.) XXXVI
 γυνή, XVI, XXXII

δαιμόνια, XXXV
 δαίμονες, XXXIII
 δέκα παρθένοι, IX
 δεκτικός τινος, XI
 δεσπότης θεός, I; δεσπότης σωτήρ, XXIX
 δεύτερος θάνατος, XI
 δέχεσθαι τὸ κτισθῆναι, XXVI
 δηλωτικά γεγραμμένα, I
 δημιουργός (Christ), XXII
 διάβολος (is the 'wrath of God'), XXX
 διαιρεῖσθαι, XXXI
 διαίρεσις, XXXI
 διαίρεσις τῶν νοητῶν, XXV
 διάκρισις (λόγος διακρίσεως και διοικήσεως), XXVII
 διάνοια, XV
 διανοίγειν τὰς γραφάς, XXVII
 διάστασιν λαμβάνειν, V
 διαστήναι, V
 διαφοιτᾶν τῷ παντί, XV
 διαφορὰν λαμβάνειν, XXIX
 διαφωνεῖν, X
 διδασκαλία, IX, XII, XIX
 διδάσκαλοι, XXX
 διδάσκειν, XXXII
 διεγερτικός, XV
 διήγησις αἰσθητή, XXXI
 δίκαιοι, XXXI, XXXVI
 δικαιοσύνη (στρατεύεσθαι τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῇ δ.), VI; (ἡλιος δικαιοσύνης), XVIII; (διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτοῖς δ.), XXXI
 δικαίως, XXX
 διοίκησις, XXVII
 διστάσαι, V
 δόγματα (ψευδῆ) VI, (μεγαλόφωνα) XXXVI
 δόλος, XXXI

δόξα, VII, XXXVI
 δοῦλοι (τοῦ κυρίου), I; (θεοῦ), XXXI
 δράκων, XXXVIII
 δυνάμεις, V
 δυνάμεις ἐγκεχειρισμένοι τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, XXX
 δυνάμενοι (τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ἐκκλησίας φέρεσθαι), XXI
 δύναιμι, XXVII; XXIX
 δύναμις, ἐποπτική τῶν ὅλων, XV
 δύναμις, ἔφορος τῶν ὅλων, XV
 δύναιμι, πορευτική τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, XV
 δύνασθαι, XXXIII, XXXVI
 δύνασθαι γινῶναι ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ζωῇ (partial apprehension of scripture in this life), XX
 δύνασθαι φάναι, XVIII
 δυνατὸν (εἰπεῖν), XI; (ἀναφέρειν), XIX; (ἔστι), XVII; (ἀνθρώποις νοῆσαι), XX
 δώδεκα (δ. θρόνοι), XXIV; (δ. χιλιάδες), XXXI; (δ. χιλιάδες), XXXII
 δωδεκάκις, XXXI
 δωρούμενος, I

ἐάν, XXXV
 ἐγγίζειν, XXXI
 ἐγκαλεῖσθαι, X
 ἐγκλημα, XXX
 ἐγχειρίζεσθαι (τὰ ἀνθρώπινα), XXX; (τὰ ἐπίπονα), XXXI
 ἔθνος νοητόν, XXXI
 ἔθνους καὶ λαοῦ διαφορά, XXIX
 εἰδωλολατρεία, XIII
 εἰθισμένος, Post-Sch. XXIV
 εἰκότως, XII, XXXVI
 εἰλούμεναι (αἱ δυνάμεις), V
 εἶναι (τό), XXVI
 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, XXIV
 εἰς χρεῖαν κατατάσσεσθαι, XXX
 εἰσαγόμενοι εἰς εὐλάβειαν, XXXVII
 εἰσηγεῖσθαι, XIII
 ἐκ δεξιῶν, XXIV
 ἕκαστος (τὰ περὶ ἕκαστον), XXVII
 ἐκατέρωθεν, XII
 ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρα (ρμδ'), XXXI, XXXII
 ἐκβάλλεσθαι ἔξω, XXI
 ἔκβασις (δι' ἐκβάσεως πληρῶσαι τὰς γραφάς), XX
 ἐκκλησία, IX, XIX; (ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος) XXI, XXXII
 ἐκκλησίαι ἑπτὰ, IX
 ἐκλαμβάνειν, X, XIX, XXV; (κατὰ πνευματικὴν ἀκολουθίαν), XXXI
 ἐκλέγεσθαι, XXIX
 ἐκούσιος ὁρμή, XXV
 ἐκπορευομένη (δίστομος ῥομφαία), XII
 ἐκτεθηλυμένον (ἐμπαθεῖς καὶ ἔ.), XVI
 ἐκτὸς θανάτου εἶναι, XI
 ἐλάττωσις (ἀνεῖσις καὶ ἔ.), X; (τῆς φύσεως), XXVII
 ἐλαττωτικός ἑαυτοῦ, I
 ἐλέγχεσθαι, XXX
 ἐλλείπειν, XXX
 ἐμέσσειν, XXII
 ἐμμελῶς, XXIX
 ἐμμένειν, XXXV

ἐμπαθεῖς, XVI
 ἐμφέρεσθαι, XXVII
 ἐν, V
 ἐν ὧς ἐν, V
 ἐν αἰτία γίνεσθαι, XXX
 ἐν ἁμαρτήμασι γίνεσθαι, XXX
 ἐν οἰκείῳ τετάχθαι θεοῦ, XXXIII
 ἐνανθρωπεῖν (τοῦ Λόγου ἐνανθρωπήσαντος), VII
 ἐναρθρος φωνή, XXXVI
 ἐνέργειαι ἀρετῆς, XXI
 ἐνεργεῖν, XVIII; ἐνεργεῖν (ἐ. κατ' ἀρετήν), X
 ἐνεστικός (τό), IV
 ἐνεστώς (χρόνος), IV; (καιρός), XXVII
 ἐννόησις τῆς μεγαλοφωνίας, XXV
 ἐννοιαὶ τοῦ πατρός, XXI
 ἐνούμεναι (αἱ δυνάμεις), V
 ἐνοχος, XXX
 ἐνταῦθα, III, IV, XIII
 ἐντέλλεσθαι, XXVI, XXXI
 ἐξαποστέλλειν, XXX
 ἐξαπτεόν, XXVI
 ἐξεγείρεσθαι ὄρθρου, XVIII
 ἐξέρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ, XXI
 ἐξετάζειν, XXXVI
 ἔξις (τελεία ἔ.), X; (μοχθηρὰ ἔ.), XV
 ἐξουσία τοῦ χείρονος, XXX
 ἐξουσίαι, XXIV
 ἐξουσίαν λαμβάνειν, XVIII
 ἔξω, XX; XXI
 ἔξωθεν, XXVII
 ἐπάγειν, XXXI, XXXIII
 ἐπάγεσθαι, XXVII
 ἐπαθλόν, XXIV
 ἐπαξίως τῶν βεβιωμένων. XXXVII
 ἐπιβλέπειν, XV, XXVIII
 ἐπίγειος, XXVII
 ἐπιδημία, XX, XXVII
 ἐπεικτόν, XXVIII
 ἐπιπλείων, XXXVII
 ἐπίπονα, XXXI
 ἐπιπορεύεσθαι, XV, XXVII
 ἐπισείειν, XXX
 ἐπισκοπεῖν, XXVIII
 ἐπίσκοποι, XXX
 ἐπίσταμαι (ἐπιστάμενος), IV; (ἐπίστησον), XVI; (ἐπίστησον), XIX; (ἐπίστησον), XXXIV
 ἐπιστήμη, Post-Sch. XXIV
 ἐπιστημονικά λέγειν, Post-Sch. XXIV
 ἐπιστολαί (by the apostles), I
 ἐπιφέρεισθαι, XXXI
 ἐπιταγή, XXXII
 ἐπόμενος, XXVII
 ἐποπτικοὶ ὀφθαλμοί, XXX
 ἐπουράνιος, XXIV, XXVII
 ἑπτὰ (number seven), IX; XXXVI; (ἐ. ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑ. ἐκκλησιῶν), XIX; (ἐ. ἀστέρες), XIX; (ἐ. βρονταί), XXXVI; (ἐ. ἐκκλησίαι), XIX; (ἐ. θεῖος ἀριθμός), XXVII (ἐ. κέρατα, XXVIII; (ἐ. ὀφθαλμοί), XXVIII. (ἐ. πνεύματα), XIX, XXVIII; (ἐ. σφραγίδες), XXVII; ἐργάζεσθαι, XXXV
 ἔργα, XVI, XXVI
 ἐρριζωμένος, XXI

ἔρχεσθαι, XXXIII
 ἔσθωθεν, XXVII
 ἑτερόδοξοι, XII
 ἕτερος, XXXI
 εὐ πράττειν, XXX
 εὐαγγέλια, (τά), XII
 εὐαγγελιστής, III
 εὐγνώμονες, I
 εὐμούσως, XXIX
 εὐρίσκειν, XXX, XXXII, XXXVI
 εὐρίσκειν ὀνομαζομένους, XXI
 εὐρίσκεισθαι, XXVII
 εὐσέβεια, XXI, XXXVI
 εὐφροσύνη, XXXII
 εὐχαί, XXX
 ἐφαρμόζει τὸ ὄνομα, XVI
 ἐφεδρεύοντα πνεύματα, XXXV
 ἐφεξῆς, XX
 ἔχειν (θεὸν δεσπότην), I; ἔχειν (ᾧ τα
 ἀκούειν), Post-Sch. XXIV
 ἐχθροί, XXIV
 ἑωσφόρος, XXXVIII
 ζηλοῦσθαι, XXXII
 ζητητέον, XXXI
 ζωή, VII, VIII
 ἦ, Post-Sch. XXIV
 ἡγεμονικόν, XXIX
 ἡγόρασεν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, XXIX
 ἡγούμενοι, I
 ἡδύ, XXVII
 ἡλιος, IX; (ἡ. ἀληθινός), IX; (ἡ. τῆς
 δικαιοσύνης), XVIII
 ἡμέρα, (ἡ. τοῦ σωτήρος), IX, XVIII, XXXIII;
 (ἡ. ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως
 δικαιοκρισίας), XXXVII
 ἦχον ποιεῖν, XV
 θάνατος, (ᾧ δίδναι τοῦ θ.), VII; (πρῶτος θ.,
 δεύτερος θ.), XI
 θεία, (θ. διδασκαλία), XII; (θ. γραφή), III;
 (θ. παίδεσις), IX
 θεῖα καὶ μέγала, III
 θεῖται (θ. φωναί), XXIII; (θ. γραφαί), VI
 θεϊκόν, XV
 θεῖον πνεῦμα, XXIII
 θέλειν, XXVI
 θέλημα, XXVI
 θέλησις, XXVI
 θεόθεν, Post-Sch. XXIV
 θεολόγος Ἰωάννης, IV, VII
 θεόπνευστος γραφή, XXV
 θεός, I, VI, X, XV, XXI, XXII, XXVI, XXX,
 XXXI, XXXV, XXXVII
 θεοῦ ποιήμα, XXVI
 θεραπεία, XXXIII
 θεωρία, VII
 θησαυρίζειν, XXXVII
 θλίβεσθαι, XXXVIII
 θλίψις, XXXIII, XXXIV
 θνητοί, I
 θρόνος, XXIV, XXVIII; (θ. τοῦ πατρός), XXIV
 θυμίαμα, XXIX
 θυμιαμάτων φιάλαι, XXIX
 θύρα, XXV
 θυσία καθαρά, XXIX

ἱκανῶς ἀκονίζειν γλώσσας, VI
 ἰσοδυναμεῖν, XI
 ἱστορικῶς γεγενημένα (τά), XIII
 ἰσχύς, XXXVI
 καθάπαξ, X
 καθάριος, XXIX
 καθίσαι μετὰ τοῦ πατρός, XXIV
 καθόλου, III
 καίεσθαι, XXVII
 Καινὴ Διαθήκη, XIV
 καινὴ ᾠδή, XXIX
 καινός, XIV
 καιρός (κ. τῶν νεκρῶν), XXXVII; (κ.
 συντελείας), XXXVII; (καιρὸν ἔχειν), IX
 κακίας (κ. βλαστήματα), XII; (κ. παχύτης),
 XXII
 κακόν, VI
 καλεῖν, XXV
 καλεῖσθαι, XXX, XXXVI
 καρδία (κρυπτόν τῆς κ.), XIV; (κ. καθαρά),
 XXVI; (κ. καιομένη), XXVII
 κατ' ἐπίνοιαν, IX
 κατὰ γῆν διαιτώμενοι, XXX
 κατὰ καινὴν στάσιν, XXVIII
 κατὰ κεκρυμμένον, XXV
 κατὰ πνεῦμα σοφοί, Post-Sch. XXIV
 κατὰ πνευματικὴν ἀκολουθίαν
 ἐκλαμβάνειν, XXXI
 κατὰ σάρκα εἶναι, XXVII
 κατὰ σάρκα Ἰσραήλ, XXXI
 κατὰ σαφήνειαν, XXV
 κατὰ σπέρμα Ἰσραήλ, XXXI
 κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον, XXV
 κατὰ χρόνον, VII
 καταλαμβάνεσθαι, XXVIII
 καταλήλων λαμβάνειν, XIV
 καταρτίζεσθαι, XXXI
 κατασκευάζεσθαι, XXXV
 κατασπᾶν, XVI
 καταυγάζεσθαι, IX
 καταφρονεῖν, XXX
 κατέχειν, XXVII
 κατημαζευμένη, XXX
 κατορθοῦσθαι, X
 κελεύειν, XXX
 κιθάρα, XXIX
 κλείειν (the scriptures), XX
 κλείς, XX
 κλονεῖσθαι, XV
 κοιμώμενοι, XV
 κοινὸς θάνατος, XI
 κολάζειν, XXX, XXXI
 κόλασις, XI, XXX
 κολαστικοὶ πόδες, XXX
 κόπτειν, XXXI
 κόσμος, XXXIII, XXXVI
 κρίμα, XXVII
 κρίνειν, XXVII, XXXV
 κρίνειν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς,
 XXIV
 κρίνεσθαι, XXX
 κρίσις (θεοῦ), XXVII; (κ. καθολική), XXX;
 (κ. Κυρίου), XXX; (κ. λαοῦ μετὰ τῶν
 ἐπισκόπων), XXX; (κ. μανθανόντων μετὰ
 τοῦ διδασκάλου), XXX; (κ. υἱῶν μετὰ τοῦ
 πατρός), XXX

κριτής, XVII
 κτᾶσθαι, XXVI
 κτίζειν, XXVI
 κτίζεσθαι, XXVI
 κτίσις, XXII
 κτίσμα, XXVI
 κτίσματα, XV
 κυβεία, XXIII
 κύκλος (πασῶν τῶν δυνάμεων), V; (τροχὸν
 καὶ κ. δυνάμεων), XXXVI
 κύριος (ὁ), VI, XIV, XXII
 λαλεῖν, XXXV, XXXVI
 λαμβάνειν (καταλήλως λ.), XIV; (λ. τὸ
 βιβλίον), XXIX; (λ. τὰς φυλάς) XXXII,
 XXXIII, XXXI, XXXVII
 λανθάνειν, XXX
 λαός, XXIX, XXX
 λείπεσθαι (τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ ἡλίου), IX
 λευκαὶ στολαί, XXXIII
 λευκαίνειν, XXXIII, XXXIV
 λευκὴ ψήφος, XIV
 λέγειν, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXXII
 λέγεσθαι, XIII, XXIX, XXXII, XXXVI
 λέξις, XXXI
 λέων, XXVII, XXVIII (ἡ προ κειμένη λ.),
 XXIX
 λοιπόν, XXVIII
 λόγος (teaching) περὶ πνευματικῶν,
 XIV; ὁ λόγος τῆς προνοίας, XXVII;
 ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (a divine utterance),
 XXX
 Λόγος (Χριστός), IV; (Λ. αἰτία τοῦ
 ὑπάρχειν τὴν κτίσιν, οἷα δημιουργός),
 XXII; (Λ. ἀνοίγων τὰς γραφάς), XX; (Λ.
 ἀρχὴ κτίσεως), XXII; (Λ. ἀρχὴ
 ποιημάτων ὡς ποιητής), XXII; (Λ. ἀρχὴ
 τῶν ὅλων καὶ τέλος τῶν ἀπάντων), VII;
 (Λ. ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ἐπάγων), VII; (Λ.
 διδάξας παρθενίαν), XXXII; (Λ.
 γενόμενος νεκρὸς περιέγραψεν τὴν ἐπὶ
 γῆς αὐτοῦ ζῶην), VIII; (Λ. γενόμενος
 υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου), VI; (Λ. ἐκλείσεν τὴν τοῦ
 νόμου σκιάν), XX; (Λ. ἔξω τῆς
 Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐποίησεν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους),
 XX; (Λ. ἑαυτὸν ὥριστο ζῶην εἶναι), VII;
 (Λ. ἐνανθρωπήσας), VII; (Λ. ἐστιν τὸ
 ἄμην), XXII; (Λ. ζῶη οὐ γέγονε, ἀλλ'
 εἶναι διεβεβαιώσατο), VII; (Λ. ζῶη ὦν
 κατὰ φύσιν, νεκρὸς δι' ἡμᾶς ἐγένετο),
 VII; (Λ. ζῶν ἐστιν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας), VII;
 (Λ. ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ), VII; (Λ. θεός), VII, XX;
 (Λ. νεκρὸς γεγενῆσθαι ὁμολόγησεν), VII;
 (Λ. οὐ κτίσμα), XXII; (Λ. πληρώσας τὰς
 γραφὰς δι' ἐκβάσεως), XX; (Λ. πρῶτος
 κτίσεως), XXII; (Λ. πρῶτος οὐ χρόνον,
 ἀλλὰ τιμὴ), VII; (Λ. σὰρξ γέγονε), XX;
 (Λ. τῆς κτίσεως ὁ κτίστης ἐστὶν καὶ
 ἄρχων), XXII; (Λ. τὸ Α καὶ Ω εἴρηται), V;
 (Λ. τὸ ἄλφα, ἀρχὴν καὶ αἰτίαν τῶν
 ἀπάντων), VII; (Λ. τὸ ω εἶναι εἴρηται,
 καὶ πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος), VII; (Λ.
 τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους περιεἰλθεν),
 IV
 λόγῳ ἐκτέμνειν καὶ ἀναιρεῖν, XII
 λύειν, XXVII, XXVIII
 λυχνία, IX

λυχνιαῖον φῶς, IX
 λύχνος, IX

 μαθηταί, XXX, XXXIII
 μακαρίζειν, III
 μακαριζόμενος, III
 μακαριοποιεῖν, III
 μακροθυμία (τοῦ κριτοῦ), XVII
 μάλιστα, XXV
 μανθάνειν, III, XXIX
 μάντις, XII
 μαρτυρία, II
 μαρτύριον, XXXIII
 μάχαιρα, (μ. ἐπαινετή), VI; (μ. ὀξεῖα), VII
 μαχόμενόν ἐστιν, X; μάχεται, I
 μεγάλοι λόγοι, XXXVI
 μεγαλοφωνία, (ἐννοήσεως μ.), XXVI; (μ.
 τῶν νοημάτων), XXXVI
 μέγιστον (ἄξιον καὶ μ.), I
 μέλλειν, XXXI, XXXVI
 μέλλον, IV
 μέλλον (χρόνος), IV
 μένειν αἰεὶ, XXII
 μερισθῆναι, V
 μέσα, (στοιχεῖα of the alphabet), VII
 μεσότης (ἡ ἄπρακτος), XXIII
 μετὰ σαφηνείας γίνεσθαι, XXV
 μετανοεῖν, XVII
 μετάνοια, XXXV
 μετάπτωσις, XXIII
 μετεωρίζεσθαι, XXI
 μετουσίᾳ εἶναι, XX
 μετουσίᾳ τοῦ πνεύματος, XIX
 μετοχὴν ἔχειν, XIX
 μέτωπον, XXXI
 μὴ χωρεῖν, XXII
 μήποτε, XXXI
 μικρὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα, III
 μισθὸν λαμβάνειν, XXXVII
 μνήμην ἀποβάλλειν, τὴν περὶ τινος, XXII
 μολύνεσθαι, XXXII
 μοναδικὸν γενέσθαι, V
 μυστικός (ἀριθμός), IX

 ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, XXI
 νεκρότης, VII
 νικᾶν, XXIV, XXVIII, XXXIII
 νίκη, XXXIII
 νοεῖν (ν. καὶ ἀγαπᾶν Χριστόν), XXIX, XXX,
 XXXIII, XXXVI
 νοήματα, XXXVI
 νοητὰ πράγματα, XXVII
 νοητόν, XXX
 νοητός, XXIII
 νοῦς (ἐνὶ νοῖ καταρτίζεσθαι), XXXI; (νοῦν
 ἀκονίζειν), VI; (ὁ τὸν νοῦν ἑαυτοῦ
 προσάγων) IX
 νυκτερινὴ κατάστασις, IX
 νύξ, IX, XVIII, XXXIII

 ξηραίνει τὰ φαῦλα, XV
 ξύλινος, XXXV

 ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, IV
 ὁδοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, XXVII
 ὄνομα (ὁ. τοῦ τελειωθέντος), XIV; (ὁ., ἀεὶ
 καινόν), XIV; (ὁ., τὸ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν

γραφόμενον), XIV; (ὁ. τῆς πόλεως τοῦ
 ζῶντος θεοῦ), XXI; (ὁ. τοῦ πατρός), XXI;
 (ὁ. τοῦ θεοῦ), XXIX; (φοβεῖσθαι τὸ ὁ. τοῦ
 θεοῦ), XXIX
 ὄθεν, XXVI
 οἶεσθαι, XI
 οἰκεία ποιότης, XIV
 οἰκονομεῖν, XXVII
 οἶκος Ἰακώβ, XXIV
 ὅμοιον (τὸ ὁ. νόει), XXX
 ὁμολογεῖν, XXIX
 ὁμολογία, XXXIII
 ὁμολογοῦσιν, I
 ὄν, τό, XXVI
 ὀνομάζεσθαι, XV, XXX
 ὅπλα δικαίων, VI
 ὄρα εἰ, XXXVII
 ὀργὴ θεοῦ, XXX
 ὀργὴν τοῦ θεοῦ συνίστασθαι, XXXVII
 ὀρμὴ πολεμεῖν, XXXVIII
 ὄρος, XXX
 οὐ διαπίπτων, XXII
 οὐδαμοῦ, V
 οὐκ ἀπογνωστέον, XIII
 οὐκέτι, XX, XXVIII
 οὐρανός, XXI, XXV, XXXVIII
 οὐσία (ἡ τῶν νοητῶν ο.), XXV; οὐσίᾳ εἶναι
 ἀληθινός, XXII; οὐσίᾳ εἶναι, XX; ὄψις,
 XXXV
 οὐσιοῦσθαι, XXVI

 παιδεύεσθαι, XXIII, XXX
 πάλη, XXIV
 πάντα, (π. γίνεται ὁ υἱός), V
 πάντες υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων, VI
 παραβάλλεσθαι, XV
 παραβολή, IX
 παράδειγμα, XXX
 παραδίδοσθαι, XXX
 παρακατιῶν, XXXII
 παράλειψις τῶν ἐπιβαλλόντων, XXX
 παράστασις βεβαιότητος, XXII
 παραστατικός, XIV
 παρεληλυθὸς (χρόνος), IV
 παρέρχεσθαι, XIV
 παρθενία, XXXII
 παρθένος, XXXI, XXXII
 παριστᾶν, XXX
 παρηγία, XXXI
 πᾶσα διάλεκτος ἀνθρώπων, XXIX
 πᾶσα λογικὴ φύσις, XI
 πᾶσα φυλὴ Ἰσραήλ, XXIX
 πᾶσαι (αἱ δυνάμεις), V
 πάσχειν, XXXI
 πάσχειν ταραχὴν, XI
 πατέρες, XXX
 πείθειν ἐπὶ τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν, XXX
 πείθεσθαι, XXX
 πείρα ἔχειν, XXVII
 πειρᾶσθαι, XVI
 περιβάλλεσθαι, XXXIII
 περιέχειν, VII
 περίκεισθαι, XXXIII
 περίστασις, XXXIII
 πετάζεσθαι, XXI
 πίπτειν, XXXVIII
 πιστεῦσαι, V

πίστεως μετέχειν, XXII
 πιστός, XXII
 πιστοῦσθαι, XXV, XXIX
 πιστῶς (ἀναγινώσκειν καὶ ἀκούειν), III
 πίστωσης, XXV
 πλάσσειν, XXVI
 πληγαί, XXXV; πληγαῖς ὑποβάλλειν, XXXV
 πληθός, XXXI
 πληθυντικῶς, Post-Sch. XXIV
 πλύνειν, XXXIII, XXXIV
 πνεύματα, XXVIII
 πνευματικὰ σώματα, XXXIV
 πνευματικαὶ θυσίαι, XXIX
 πνευματικὴ ψῆφος, XIV
 πνευματικὸν ὄτιον, Post-Sch. XXIV
 ποθεῖν τὸν θεόν, XXX
 ποιήματα, XXII
 ποιητής, XXII
 ποιότης, XIV
 πολλὰ ὡς μέρη, (γίνεται) ὁ υἱός, V
 πονηρός, VI, XXXIII
 πορεύεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, XXVIII
 πορνεία, XIII, XVI
 πόδες (υἱοῦ), XV, XXIV, XXX
 πρᾶξις, XXXIII
 πράττειν, I, X, XXVII
 πρεσβύτεροι, XXVIII
 πρόθεσις, XXXIII
 προθεωρεῖν, XXXIV
 προκείμενα (τά), III, XV, XXV, XXXI
 προκειμένη λέξις, III
 προκείμενον (τό), XXXI
 προκοπή, XIV
 προνοητικαὶ κινήσεις, XV
 πρόνοια θεοῦ, XXX
 προνοίας λόγος, XXVII
 προσάγειν, IX
 προσάπτεσθαι, XVI
 προσέρχεσθαι, XXXI
 προσευχαί τῶν ἁγίων, XXIX
 προσευχή, XXIX
 προσέχειν, XXXVI
 προσηγορία, XIV, XXV
 προσκείμενον (τό), X
 προσκυνεῖν, XXXV
 προσοῦσα (τινὶ τῇ), XXXI
 προστάσσεσθαι, XXV, XXX
 προστίθεσθαι, Post-Sch. XXIV
 πρόσωπον (of God), XXXI
 προτρέπεσθαι, XXV
 προφηταί, XXXVII
 προφητεία, III
 προφητεύειν, XXXVII
 προφήτης (π. David), XXXVI; (π. Ezekiel),
 XXXI; (π. John the Evangelist), III;
 προφήτης (π. Malachi), XXIX
 προφορικὸς λόγος, IX
 προχεῖρος ἀκούειν, III
 πρωϊνὸς ἀστήρ, XVIII
 πρῶτος θάνατος, XI; Τά πρῶτα φέρεσθαι,
 XXI
 πταῖσμα, XXX
 πτερά, XXI
 πύρωσις τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, XXIII

 ῥαδία μετάπτωσις, XXIII
 ῥαθυμία, XXX

ῥεῦσαν αἷμα, [XXIX](#)
ρίζα Δαυίδ, [XXVII](#), [XXVIII](#)

σάλπιγξ, [XXV](#)
σάρξ, [XX](#)
σαφή γίνεσθαι, [XXVII](#)
σαφηνίζεσθαι, [XXXVI](#)
σαφῶς, [XXVI](#)
σεσωσμένοι, [XXIX](#)
σημαίνειν, [XIV](#), [XIX](#), [XXV](#), [XXXI](#)
σημαινομένα, [τά, XI](#)
σημεῖον, [XXXI](#)
σημειοῦσθαι, [XXXI](#)
σημείωσις, [XXXI](#)
σημειωτέον, [XXVI](#)
σιωπᾶν, [I](#)
σκυθρωπῶν, [XXVII](#), [XXXI](#)
σοφία, [XXXVI](#)
σοφιστικά ἀπάται, [XII](#)
σοφοὶ ἄνθρωποι, [XXIX](#); σοφοὶ (τοῦ κόσμου), [XXV](#)
σπέρμα, [XXVII](#)
σπουδαῖος, [XXX](#)
σταυροῦσθαι, [XXIX](#)
σταυρωθεὶς Χριστός, [XXIX](#)
στολή, [XXXIII](#), [XXXIV](#)
στόμα (τοῦ σωτήρος) [VI](#), [XII](#); (οὐχ εὐρέθη ψεῦδος ἐν τῷ στόματι τῶν παρθένων) [XXXII](#); (σ. αἰσθητῶν ἀγαλμάτων), [XXXV](#)
στρατευόμενοι, [VI](#)
στρέφεσθαι περὶ ἑαυτόν, [XXXI](#)
στῦλοι, τῆς ἐκκλησίας, [XXI](#)
συγκαθέζεσθαι, [XXIV](#)
συγκαθίζειν, [XXIV](#)
συγκαταφέρεισθαι, [XXXVIII](#)
σύζυγος, [III](#)
συμβασιλεύειν, [XXIV](#)
συμβεβηκὸς πάθος, [XXX](#)
σύμβολον [XXIV](#), [XXVIII](#), [XXXI](#), [XXXIII](#)
συμπληροῦν, [XXXI](#)
συμφωνεῖν, [XXIV](#)
συμφωνία, [XXXI](#)
συνάδειν, [XXVIII](#)
συναφίστασθαι, [XXXVIII](#)
συνβαδίζων, [XX](#)
συνεγείρειν, [XXIV](#)
συνέσεως ὅτιον, [Post-Sch. XXIV](#)
σύνεσις, [XXXVI](#), [Post-Sch. XXIV](#)
συνετῶς ἀναγινώσκειν, [III](#)
σύνθετον ζῶον, [XI](#)
συνκαταβαίνειν, [XV](#)
συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων, [VII](#)
σύρειν, [XXXVIII](#)
σφαγή, [XXIX](#)
σφίγγεσθαι, [XXVII](#)
σφραγίδες, [XXVIII](#)

σφραγίζεσθαι, [XXVII](#)
σφραγίς, [XXVII](#), [XXXI](#)
σῶμα, [XXXIV](#)
σῶμα θεοῦ ἁγίων, [XXX](#)
σωματικὴ φυλή, [XXXII](#)
σωτήρ, [I](#), [IV](#), [XII](#), [XVIII](#), [XXI](#), [XXII](#), [XXIV](#), [Post-Sch. XXIV](#), [XXVI](#)
σωτηρία, [VI](#), [VII](#)

τὰ ἐπιβάλλοντα σπουδαίῳ ἄρχοντι, [XXX](#)
τὰ λογικά, [XXVI](#)
τάγματα τρία, [XXXVII](#)
ταράττεσθαι, [XI](#)
τεθεμελιωμένος, [XXI](#)
τελευτᾶν, [V](#)
τέλος, [V](#), [VII](#), [XVIII](#); (τ. ἐπάγειν), [VII](#)
τέμνειν, [XII](#)
τέσσαρα ζῶα, [XXXVIII](#)
τετράγωνον σχῆμα [XXXI](#); τετράγωνος ἄριθμός, [XXXI](#)
τέως, [XXXI](#)
τιρεῖν τὰ θεϊκὰ ἔργα, [XVIII](#)
τίθεσθαι, [XXXI](#)
τιμή, [I](#), [VII](#); τιμὴ δίδοσθαι, [XXIX](#)
τιμητικός, [XII](#)
τόξον, [XXXI](#)
τόπον ἔχειν, [XXXV](#)
τρεῖς χρόνοι, [IV](#)
τροχός, [XXXVI](#)
τῷ βίῳ περιεῖναι, [XXXI](#)

υἱοὶ τῆς βροντῆς (James and John), [XXXVI](#)
υἱός (γίνεται ἐν), [V](#); υἱός, ἔχων ῥομφαίαν ὀξείαν ἐν τῷ στόματι, [VI](#); υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ, [XV](#); υἱός, ὡς πάντα ἐν, [V](#), [XXVI](#)
ὔλη, [XXXV](#)
ὕλικόν, [XV](#)
ὑπαρξίς, [XXVI](#)
ὑπάρχειν, [XXII](#), [XXV](#)
ὑπὲρ ἑνὸς ἔθνους, [XXIX](#); ὑπὲρ μέρους, [XXIX](#)
ὑπεροχή, [I](#)
ὑπηρετεῖν, [XXXI](#)
ὑπηρετικαὶ χεῖρες, [XXX](#)
ὑπόθεσις, [XXIX](#)
ὑποκείσθαι, [XXXI](#)
ὑποπόδιον, [XXIV](#)
ὑποχείριον λαμβάνειν, [XXX](#)
ὑστέρημα, [XXXVII](#)

φανεροῦν, [XXVII](#)
φανεροῦσθαι, [XXXVII](#)
φανερῶσαι λόγον, [II](#)
φάσκειν, [IV](#), [XXIX](#), [XXXVI](#)
φαῦλοι, [VI](#)
φείδεσθαι, [XXXI](#)

φέρειν, [XXXI](#)
φέρεσθαι, [XXXI](#)
φοβεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ, [XXXVII](#)
φοβεῖσθαι τὸν θεόν, [XXXI](#), [XXXVII](#)
φόβος, [XXXVI](#)
φοῖνιξ, [XXXIII](#)
φορεῖν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου, [XXI](#)
φρονήματα ψευδοδοξίας, [XII](#)
φρονημώτερον ἐντυγχάνειν, [XXV](#)
φυλάττεσθαι, [XX](#)
φυλή, [XXXI](#), [XXXII](#)
φύσις ἀπολλυμένη, [XVII](#)
φωνεῖν, [XXXI](#)
φωνή, [XXX](#), [XXXVI](#); φωνὴ μεγάλη, [XXV](#)
φῶς, [XVIII](#), [XXXI](#)
φῶς ἀληθινόν, [IX](#)
φωτίζειν, [IX](#)
φωτίζεσθαι ὑπὸ λύχνου, [IX](#)
φωτισμός (ἐκκλησίας τινός), [XIX](#)
φωτοειδές, [XIV](#)

χαλκός, [XV](#)
χαρακτήρ, [XXXI](#)
χάριν ὁμολογεῖν, [XXXI](#)
χεῖρ, [XXXIII](#)
χιλιάδες, [XXXI](#)
χλιαρόν, [XXIII](#)
χρεία, [IX](#)
χρῆσθαι, [XII](#); (χ. παραδείγματι), [XXX](#)
χρησις εἰδωλοθύτων, [XVI](#)
χρόνος (τρεῖς χρόνοι), [IV](#); (οὐ κατὰ χρόνον), [VII](#); (χ. μακροθυμίας), [XVII](#); (χ. τεμνόμενος εἰς ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα), [XXXIII](#)

χρύσεος [XXXV](#)
χυδαιότεροι καὶ πολλοί, [XXIX](#)
χώραν ἔχειν, [XX](#)
χωρεῖν (οὐκ ἔστιν χωρῆσαι τὰ βιβλία τοῦ κόσμου), [XXXVI](#); (μὴ χωροῦντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ), [XXII](#)
χωρητέον ἄνω παντὸς αἰσθητοῦ, [XIV](#)

ψαλμοί, [XXXV](#)
ψαλμός νς', [VI](#)
ψεκτά τὰ λεγόμενα, [VI](#)
ψευδῆ δόγματα, [VI](#)
ψευδομάντις, [XIII](#)
ψεῦδος, [XXXII](#)
ψῦξις ἡ νοητή, [XXIII](#)
ψυχρός, [XXIII](#)

ὥς ἔτυχεν, [III](#)
ὄτα, [XXX](#)
ὀτίον, [Post-Sch. XXIV](#)
ὠφελεῖν τοὺς δεομένους, [IX](#)

BIBLICAL CITATIONS IN THE SCHOLIA

OLD TESTAMENT		<i>Psalms</i>			
		2:1	VI: 106–107	22:17	PSchXXIV: 141–142
<i>Genesis</i>		4:7	XXXI: 166–167	26:17	IX: 111–112
2:2	XXXVIII: 191–192	5:12–13	VI: 106–107	39:6	PSchXXIV: 141–142
2:3	IX: 111–112	32:9	XXVI: 146–147	39:28	XXXVII: 186–187
4:16	XXI: 134	33:10	XXXVII: 186–187	43:17	XXXVI: 184
20:5–6	XXVI: 146–147	36:30	XXXVI: 184	47:14	PSchXXIV: 141–142
49:8	XXVII: 149–151	37:13	VI: 106–107	<i>Amos</i>	
<i>Exodus</i>		44:16	XXXII: 169	9:10	XXXVI: 184
12:16	IX: 111–112	48:4	XXXVI: 184	<i>Michah</i>	
13:16	IX: 111–112	50:12	XXVI: 146–147	6:1	XXX: 159–161
15:7	XXX: 159–161	56:5	VI: 106–107	<i>Zephaniah</i>	
19:19	XXXVI: 184	56:9	XVIII: 129	1:12	XXXVI: 184
25:22	XXXVI: 184	59:6	XXXI: 166–167	<i>Zachariah</i>	
29:42	XXXVI: 184	60:6	XXXVII: 186–187	4:10	XXVIII: 152–153
31:3	PSchXXIV: 141–142	74:4	XXI: 134	<i>Malachi</i>	
31:15	IX: 111–112	76:19	XXXVI: 184	1:11	XXIX: 155–156
35:31	PSchXXIV: 141–142	77:49	XXX: 159–161	4:2	XVIII: 129
35:35	PSchXXIV: 141–142	85:11	XXXVII: 186–187	<i>Isaiah</i>	
<i>Leviticus</i>		89:4	XXXVIII: 191–192	1:14	XXII: 136–137
23:3	IX: 111–112	94:7	PSchXXIV: 141–142	7:12	XXXVI: 184
23:8	IX: 111–112	95:5	XXXV: 179	8:18	I: 97–98
<i>Numbers</i>		98:3	XXXVII: 186–187	9:5	XXXVI: 184
12:6	XXXVI: 184	99:2	XXXII: 169	10:13	PSchXXIV: 141–142
28:25	IX: 111–112	101:16	XXXVII: 186–187	11:1–3	XXXVI: 184
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		103:7	XXXVI: 184	11:2	PSchXXIV: 141–142
10:17	XXXVI: 184	103:32	XV: 123–124	14:12	XXXVIII: 191–192
13:9	XXXVI: 184	104:43	XXXII: 169	21:9	XXXV: 179
15:7	XXXVI: 184	107:3	XVIII: 129	29:6	XXXVI: 184
28:65	XXXVI: 184	109:1	XXIV: 140	29:11	XXVII: 149–151
32:4	XXII: 136–137	113:12–15	XXXV: 179	34:6	VI: 106–107
32:6	XXVI: 146–147	118:73	XXVI: 146–147	44:26	XXXVI: 184
32:17	XXXV: 179	134:16–18	XXXV: 179	49:2	VI: 106–107
34:9	PSchXXIV: 141–142	138:12	IX: 111–112	50:4	PSchXXIV: 141–142
<i>2 Kings</i>		140:2	XXIX: 155–156	53:7	XXIX: 155–156
24:1	XXX: 159–161	148:5	XXVI: 146–147	65:17	XXXVI: 184
<i>3 Kings</i>		149:6	XII: 118–119	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
5:26	XXXVI: 184	<i>Proverbs</i>	VI: 106–107	6:7	XXIII: 138–139
<i>4 Kings</i>		12:18	VI: 106–107	12:12	VI: 106–107
2:11	XXV: 143–144	24:22c	VI: 106–107	26:10	VI: 106–107
<i>1 Paralipomenon</i>		<i>Ecclesiastes</i>	XI: 116–117	29:6	VI: 106–107
16:26	XXXV: 179	1:13	XI: 116–117	36:8	XXX: 159–161
21:1	XXX: 159–161	4:8	XI: 116–117	<i>Barcuch</i>	
<i>Tobit</i>		5:13	XI: 116–117	3:7	XXXVII: 186–187
11:14	IX: 111–112	<i>Song of Solomon</i>	VI: 106–107	<i>Lamentations</i>	
13:2	VIII: 110	2:5	VI: 106–107	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
<i>Job</i>		5:8	VI: 106–107	1:7	XXI: 134
7:10	XXXVI: 184	<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	XVIII: 129	9:5–6	XXXI: 166–167
10:8	XXVI: 146–147	5:6	XXXV: 179	10:1–19	XXI: 134
11:13	XXVI: 146–147	12:10	XXXV: 179	10:12	XXXVI: 184
12:13	XXXVI: 184	15:15–17	XXXV: 179	10:16–17	XXI: 134
15:2	PSchXXIV: 141–142	<i>Ecclesiasticus (Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach)</i>	PSchXXIV: 141–142	37:14	XXXVI: 184
20:3	PSchXXIV: 141–142	1:19	PSchXXIV: 141–142	39:7–8	XXXVI: 184
26:11	XXI: 134	3:23	PSchXXIV: 141–142	<i>Daniel (translatio Graeca)</i>	
33:3	XXVI: 146–147	15:3	PSchXXIV: 141–142	3:52	IX: 111–112
37:5	XXXVI: 184	17:7	PSchXXIV: 141–142	4:32	XXXVI: 184
		21:3	XII: 118–119		

7:11	XXXVI: 184	1:14	VII: 108–109; XX: 132–133	<i>Ephesians</i>	
8:19	XXXVII: 186–187	1:47	XXXI: 166–167	2:6	XXIV: 140
9:26	XXXVII: 186–187	3:12	XXVII: 149–151	2:10	XXVI: 146–147
9:27	XXXVII: 186–187	5:35	IX: 111–112	2:19	XXIII: 138–139
10:19	XXXVI: 184	6:32	XIV: 121–122	3:17	XXI: 134
11:35	XXXVII: 186–187	6:37	XXI: 134	4:3	V: 105
12:4	XXVII: 149–151; XXXVII: 186–187	8:56	IX: 111–112	4:12	XXX: 159–161
12:7	XXXVII: 186–187	12:29	XXXVI: 184	4:13	V: 105
<i>Daniel (Theodotionis versio)</i>		13:33	I: 97–98	4:14	XXIII: 138–139
6:27	VIII: 110	13:36	XXV: 143–144	5:5	XIII: 120
9:22	XXXVI: 184	14:6	VII: 108–109; XXII: 136–137	6:6	I: 97–98
9:27	XXXVII: 186–187	15:13–15	I: 97–98	6:12	XXIV: 140
12:4	XXXVII: 186–187	15:15	I: 97–98	6:17	VI: 106–107
		16:33	XXXIII: 171–172		
<i>Susanna</i>		21:25	XXXVI: 184	<i>Philippians</i>	
44/45	PSchXXIV: 141–142	<i>Acts</i>		1:1	I: 97–98
62	PSchXXIV: 141–142	2:24	VII: 108–109	1:29	V: 105
<i>Esther</i>		4:24	I: 97–98	2:10	XXVII: 149–151
1:1d	XXXVI: 184	4:25	VI: 106–107	4:8	XXI: 134
<i>1 Maccabees</i>		6:10	XXXVI: 184	<i>Colossians</i>	
15:34	IX: 111–112	8:32	XXIX: 155–156	1:16	V: 105
		10:43	V: 105	1:20	V: 105
<i>2 Maccabees</i>		18:25	XXIII: 138–139	1:24	XXX: 159–161
2:2	XXXV: 179	<i>Romans</i>		2:2	PSchXXIV: 141–142
<i>4 Maccabees</i>		1:1	I: 97–98	2:17	XXX: 159–161
18:24	XXXVI: 184	1:3	XXVII: 149–151	4:12	I: 97–98
		2:27	XX: 132–133	<i>1 Thess.</i>	
		2:5	XXXVII: 186–187	1:3	X: 114
		6:9–10	VIII: 110	<i>2 Thess.</i>	
		6:13	VI: 106–107	2:4	XXXVIII: 191–192
<i>Matthew</i>		6:17	XXXVI: 184	2:10–11	XXXVIII: 191–192
2:11	XV: 123–124	11:33	XXVII: 149–151	2:11	XXXVIII: 191–192
3:9	PSchXXIV: 141–142	11:36	V: 105	3:5	X: 114
5:15	IX: 111–112	12:11	XXIII: 138–139		
10:28	XI: 116–117	13:12	XVIII: 129	<i>1 Timothy</i>	
10:34	VI: 106–107; XII: 118–119	13:13	IX: 111–112	1:5	XXVI: 146–147
11:15	PSchXXIV: 141–142			1:15	XXII: 136–137
13:42	XXXVIII: 191–192	<i>1 Corinthians</i>		1:20	XXX: 159–161
13:43	PSchXXIV: 141–142	2:6–7	XXXVI: 184	3:1	XXII: 136–137
13:50	XXXVIII: 191–192	3:12	XV: 123–124	3:13	XXIX: 155–156
19:28	XXIV: 140	3:17	XI: 116–117	3:15	XXI: 134
24:21	XXXVIII: 191–192	3:19	XXV: 143–144	4:9	XXII: 136–137
25:1	IX: 111–112	5:10–11	XIII: 120	4:13	III: 100–101
25:46	XI: 116–117	6:3	XXX: 159–161	6:11	X: 114
		6:9	XIII: 120		
<i>Mark</i>		6:15	XXX: 159–161	<i>2 Timothy</i>	
3:17	XXXVI: 184	7:6	XXXII: 169	2:11	XXII: 136–137
10:24	I: 97–98	7:22	I: 97–98	2:12	XXIV: 140
12:33	PSchXXIV: 141–142	7:23	XXIX: 155–156	2:13	XXII: 136–137
		7:35	XXXII: 169	2:22	XXVI: 146–147
<i>Luke</i>		8:6	V: 105	3:10	X: 114
1:32–33	XXIV: 140	8:7	XVI: 125	3:16	XXV: 143–144
8:8	PSchXXIV: 141–142	8:10	XVI: 125	4:8	XXXVIII: 191–192
8:16	IX: 111–112	15:49	XXI: 134	4:18	XXXVI: 184
11:33	IX: 111–112	15:52	XXXIV: 176		
11:36	IX: 111–112	15:58	XXI: 134	<i>Titus</i>	
12:4	I: 97–98			1:1	I: 97–98
12:35	IX: 111–112	<i>2 Corinthians</i>		2:2	X: 114
14:35	PSchXXIV: 141–142	2:17	XXXVI: 184	3:8	XXII: 136–137
15:8	IX: 111–112	5:10	XXXVII: 186–187		
20:45	XX: 132–133	6:7	VI: 106–107	<i>Hebrews</i>	
22:20	XXIV: 140	8:8	XXXII: 169	1:3	VIII: 110
24:13	XX: 132–133	12:19	XXXVI: 184	1:8	VIII: 110
24:32	XX: 132–133; XXVII: 149–151			1:13	XXIV: 140
		<i>Galatians</i>		2:13	I: 97–98
<i>John</i>		1:10	I: 97–98	3:7	PSchXXIV: 141–142
1:1	VII: 108–109; XX: 132–133	2:9	XXI: 134	3:15	PSchXXIV: 141–142
1:9	IX: 111–112	6:10	IX: 111–112	4:7	PSchXXIV: 141–142

4:12	VI: 106-107; XII: 118-119	4:2	XXIV: 140	10:4	IX: 111-112; XXVII: 149-151;
9:27	XI: 116-117	4:3	XXIV: 140		XXXVI: 184
10:1	XX: 132-133	4:4	XXIX: 155-156	10:6	VIII: 110
12:17	XXXV: 179	4:4	XXIV: 140	10:7	XXXI: 166-167
12:22	XXI: 134	4:5	IX: 111-112	11:2	XX: 132-133
13:8	IV: 102-103	4:5	XXXVI: 184	11:8	XXII: 136-137
13:12	XXXVI: 184	4:6	XXVIII: 152-153	11:13	IX: 111-112
<i>James</i>		4:8	IV: 102-103	11:15	XXVIII: 152-153
1:1	I: 97-98	4:8	XXII: 136-137	11:16	XXIX: 155-156
1:15	XI: 116-117	4:9	VII: 108-109	11:18	IX: 111-112; XXX: 159-161;
<i>1 Peter</i>		4:9	XXIV: 140		XXXI: 166-167; XXXVII: 186-187
		4:9-10	VIII: 110	11:19	XXXVI: 184
2:9	XXI: 134	4:10	VII: 108-109	12:1	IX: 111-112
2:5	XXIX: 155-156	4:10	XXIV: 140	12:3	IX: 111-112
4:11	XXXVI: 184	4:10	XXIX: 155-156	12:4	XXXVIII: 191-192
<i>2 Peter</i>		4:11	VII: 108-109	12:7	XXXVIII: 191-192
1:1	I: 97-98	4:11	XXII: 136-137	12:9	XXXVIII: 191-192
1:3	XXI: 134	4:11	XXVI: 146-147	12:12	IX: 111-112
1:5	XXI: 134	5:1	XXIV: 140	12:14	IX: 111-112
3:8	XXXVIII: 191-192	5:1	IX: 111-112	12:18	XXXVIII: 191-192
<i>1 John</i>		5:2	XXVIII: 152-153	13:1	IX: 111-112
		5:5	IX: 111-112	13:2-8	XXXVIII: 191-192
4:18	XI: 116-117	5:5	XXIV: 140	13:8	XXVII: 149-151; XXXIII: 171-172
<i>Jude</i>		5:5	XXVII: 149-151	13:14	XXXVIII: 191-192
4	I: 97-98	5:5	XXVIII: 152-153	13:17-18	XXXVIII: 191-192
<i>Revelation</i>		5:6	IX: 111-112	13:18	XXXIX: 195
1:1	I: 97-98	5:6	XXXIII: 171-172	14:1	XXI: 134
1:3	III: 100-101; IX: 111-112	5:6	XXVII: 149-151	14:2	XXXVI: 184
1:4	IV: 102-103; IX: 111-112;	5:7	XXVIII: 152-153	14:3	XXVIII: 152-153
	XIX: 130-131	5:7	XXIV: 140	14:3-4	XXXII: 169
1:5	XXII: 136-137	5:7	XXVII: 149-151	14:4	XXIX: 155-156
1:6	XXIV: 140; XXVIII: 152-153	5:8	XXVIII: 152-153	14:4-5	XXXII: 169
1:8	IV: 102-103; VII: 108-109;	5:9	XXIX: 155-156	14:7	XXII: 136-137
	XXII: 136-137	5:9	XXXII: 169	14:10	XXX: 159-161
1:9	XXVIII: 152-153	5:10	XXVIII: 152-153	15:1	IX: 111-112; XIX: 130-131
1:11	IX: 111-112; XIX: 130-131	5:12	VII: 108-109	15:3	XXXI: 166-167
1:12	IX: 111-112	5:12	XXVII: 149-151	15:6	IX: 111-112
1:16	IX: 111-112; XII: 118-119;	5:12	XXXIII: 171-172	15:7-8	XIX: 130-131
	XIX: 130-131	5:13	VII: 108-109	15:8	IX: 111-112
1:18	VII: 108-109; VIII: 110	5:13	XXII: 136-137	16:1	IX: 111-112; XIX: 130-131
1:20	IX: 111-112; XIX: 130-131;	5:13	XXIV: 140	16:9	XXI: 134
	XXVII: 149-151	5:13	XXVI: 146-147	16:18	XXXVI: 184
2:1	IX: 111-112; XIX: 130-131	6:1	IX: 111-112	16:19	XXX: 159-161
2:2	X: 114	6:1	XXVII: 149-151	17:1	IX: 111-112; XIX: 130-131
2:4	X: 114	6:1	XXXVI: 184	17:3	IX: 111-112
2:6	XII: 118-119; XVI: 125	6:16	XXIV: 140	17:7	VIII: 110; IX: 111-112
2:10	XXVIII: 152-153	6:16-17	XXX: 159-161	17:13	XVI: 125
2:11	XI: 116-117	7:3	XXXI: 166-167	17:14	XXII: 136-137
2:12	XII: 118-119	7:4	XXXII: 169	17:15-16	XVI: 125
2:14	XIII: 120	7:9	XXXII: 169	17:17	XVI: 125
2:15	XII: 118-119; XVI: 125	7:10	XXIV: 140	17:18	XXI: 134
2:17	XIV: 121-122; XXI: 134	7:12	VII: 108-109	18:8	XXII: 136-137
2:20	XIII: 120; XVI: 125; XXXI: 166-167	7:14	XXXIII: 171-172	18:23	IX: 111-112
2:26	XVIII: 129	7:14	XXXIII: 171-172	19:4	XXIV: 140; XXIX: 155-156
3:1	IX: 111-112	7:14	XXXIV: 176	19:5	XXXI: 166-167
3:1	XIX: 130-131	7:15	XXIV: 140	19:6	XXII: 136-137; XXXVI: 184
3:7	XX: 132-133	7:15	XXXIII: 171-172	19:12	XXI: 134
3:12	XX: 132-133	8:2	IX: 111-112	19:15	XXX: 159-161
3:12	XXI: 134	8:2	XIX: 130-131	19:16	XXII: 136-137
3:14	XXII: 136-137	8:5	XXXVI: 184	19:20	XXXVIII: 191-192
3:14	XXIII: 138-139	8:6	IX: 111-112	20:4	XXIV: 140
3:16	XXIII: 138-139	8:9	XXVI: 146-147	20:6	XI: 116-117
3:21	XXIV: 140	9:20	XXXV: 179	20:14	XI: 116-117
3:21	XXIV: 140	10:1	IX: 111-112	21:2	XXI: 134
3:21	XXVIII: 152-153	10:3	IX: 111-112	21:4	XIV: 121-122
4:1	XXV: 143-144	10:3-4	XXXVI: 184	21:5	XXIV: 140

21:6	V: 105	21:26	VII: 108–109	22:9	XXVII: 149–151
21:8	XI: 116–117; XIII: 120	22:3	XXXI: 166–167	22, 10	IX: 111–112; XXVII: 149–151
21:9	IX: 111–112; XIX: 130–131	22:4	XXI: 134	22:13	V: 105; VII: 108–109
21:10	XXI: 134	22:5	IX: 111–112	22:15	XX: 132–133
21:22	XXII: 136–137	22:5–6	XXII: 136–137	22:15	XIII: 120
21:23	IX: 111–112	22:6	XXXI: 166–167	22:18	XXVII: 149–151
21:25	IX: 111–112	22:7	XXVII: 149–151		

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Aland, Kurt, 2, 6
 Alberigo, Giuseppe, 24
- Bardy, G., 30
 Barsoum, Ignatius Aphram, 85
 Bauer, Walter, 26
 Béés, N., 1, 2, 83
 Bethe, E., 54
 Bogiadjedes, J., 2
 Bowden, J. S., 73
 Boysson, A. de, 86
- Canivet, Pierre, 11, 48, 49
 Cellier, R., 30
 Charles, R. H., 6, 87, 88
 Clayton, Jr. Paul, 73
- Diekamp, Franz, 9, 36, 86
 Diobouniotis, C., 2, 6, 8, 86, 87
 Donaldson, James, 47
 Doutreleau, L., 71
- Elliott, J. K., 3
- Funk, F. X., 72
- Galland, A., 74
 Gregory, Caspar René, 2
 Grillmeier, Aloys, 73
 Groote, Marc de, 6
 Guathin, H. M., 30
 Gumerlock, Francis X., 88
- Harl, M., 50
- Harnack, Adolf von, 6, 8, 37, 57, 70, 72, 86, 87, 88
 Heuzey, Léon, 1, 2
 Hoskier, H. C., 3, 138, 406
- Junod, E., 88
- Kelly, J. F. T., 86
 Kilpatrick, G. D., 5
 Klostermann, E., 86
 Kraft, R. A., 26
 Krodel, G., 26
- Legrand, É., 58
 Lejay, Paul, 57
 Leroy-Molinghen, A., 49
 Loofs, F., 3
- Mercati, G., 52, 71
 Moosa, Matti, 85
 Mühlenberg, E., 50
- Nautin, P., 87, 88
 Nestle, E., 6
 Nicetas, bishop of Heraclea, 72
 Nicol, Donald M., 2
- Otto, J. C. T., 72
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A., 72
 Pirandello, Luigi, 14
- Quasten, J., 86
- Richard, M., 72
 Roberts, Alexander, 47
 Robinson, A., 86
 Rousseau, A., 71
- Schermann, T. 87
 Schmid, Joseph, 3, 4, 86
 Schulze, J. L., 52
 Siniosoglou, N., 48
 Stählin, O. 11, 87
 Stephanides, B., 30
 Strathmann, D., 86
- Thomson, Robert W., 20;
 Turner, C. H., 57, 70, 86, 87, 88
 Tzamalikos, P., *COT*, 31, 32, 39, 105, 147, 148, 162, 172, 211, 213, 219, 268, 281, 313, 319, 383, 384, 393. *PHE*, 28, 31, 32, 34, 40, 55, 57, 64, 65, 105, 112, 120, 139, 141, 144, 146, 162, 172, 174, 226, 253, 254, 256, 265, 268, 283, 310, 321, 323, 330, 393, 409. *NDGF*, 2, 5, 10, 12, 24, 25, 35, 53, 67, 72, 73, 90, 93, 97, 124, 133, 178, 204, 215, 259, 308, 338, 351, 359, 371, 376, 377. *RCR*, 2, 5, 8, 10, 22, 32, 36, 39, 56, 68, 69, 72–75, 125, 147, 169, 178, 215, 225, 228, 238, 267, 270, 286, 351, 376, 377, 388
- Uspenski, Porphirij, 1, 2
- Wohlenberg, G., 86
- Zuberi, Masarrat Husain, 29

GENERAL INDEX

- Academy of Athens, persecuted by Justinian, 45
- Acarnania, 52
- Actia Nicopolis, 52, 53
- Actian Games, 52
- Actium, 52, 53
- Aelian (Claudius Aelianus, sophist and teacher of rhetoric, c. 175–c. 235), 333
- Aelius Aristides (Greek orator, AD 117–118), 383
- Aelius Dionysius (lexicographer, rhetorician, Halicarnassus, fl. 117–138), 349
- Aeneas of Gaza, 35
- Aeschines (orator, statesman, Athens, 389–314 BC), 98, 276
- Aeschylus, 69
- Aetius (doxographer and Eclectic philosopher, second century BC), 60, 324
- Aetius of Amida (Byzantine physician and medical writer, fl. mid fifth century to mid sixth century), 138
- Aetius of Antioch (Arian Christian, fourth century AD), 29, 280
- Agathangelus of Armenia (Christian historian, fifth century AD), 137, 217
- Agathias Scholasticus (historian, poet, Constantinople, c. AD 530–582/594), 377
- Akoimetoï, ix, x, xiii, xvi, 7, 8, 19, 22, 24, 75, 90, 91, 137, 178, 216, 239, 285, 294, 334, 388, 405
- Albinus (Platonist philosopher, Smyrna, teacher of Galen, fl. c. AD 150), 287, 305
- Alcman, 60
- Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, 26
- Alexander, Patriarch of Alexandria, 30
- Alexander Monachus (monk, Cyprus, possibly sixth century AD), 123, 362
- Alexander of Aphrodisias (Aristotelian commentator, second/third century AD), 29, 31, 58, 73, 84, authorizing ‘dialectical syllogism’, 5; influence on Origen, 40, 67, 88; method of commenting on Aristotle, 62; his presence in the Scholia, 66, 70; respected by Eusebius, 41; studied by Didymus, Theodoret, Cassian, 89
- Alexander Severus, emperor (222–235), son of Mamaea, 52
- Alexandria, xiii, xiv, xvi, 20, 22, 26, 27, 31, 36, 45, 50, 55, 57, 73, 92–94
- Alexandrian text of Rev. 5
- allegory, 28, 42–43, 55, 57, 63, 91; seen as a ‘Greek method’, 56
- Alogoi, 16
- Amelius (pupil of Plotinus, third century AD), 60
- Ammonius (presbyter, Alexandria, probably fifth/sixth century), 26, 263
- Ammonius (son of Hermias, Neoplatonist philosopher, Alexandria, c. 440–c. 520), 268, 307, 376, 397, 411; authorizing ‘dialectical syllogism’, 5; method of commenting on Aristotle, 62
- Amphilochius of Iconium (c. 339/40–394/403), 19, 57
- Anacreon (lyric poet, 582–485 BC), 178
- anagogical exegesis, 42, 57, 93, 87
- Anastasius, Monophysite emperor, 47
- Anastasius of Sinai, 35, 36, 84, 89
- Andreas of Caesarea, 4–7, 11, 14, 16, 17, 20, 53, 54, 62
- Antioch, xii–xvi, 19, 22, 23, 26, 27, 74; Cassian an offspring of Antioch, xiv; and the Akoimetoï, xvi; introduced the antiphonal chanting, 24–25; composed Origen’s catena-fragments, 28; was the true heir to Origen’s work, 30–32; school of, 30, 36, 55, 66, 71, 73, 92, 93, 94; antagonism of, with Alexandria makes little sense, 31; and allegory, 43; cherished Aristotelian studies, 27, 46; language peculiar to, 90
- Antiochus of Palestine (a Sabaite monk of the seventh century), 54, 90
- antiphony, 24–25
- Antisthenes (445–360 BC, founder of the Cynic school), 6
- Antoninus Caracalla (188–217, Roman emperor, AD 198–217), 52, 53
- apokatastasis, 42, 43, 44, 90
- Apollinaris of Laodicea (‘the Younger’, bishop, allegedly taught heretical doctrines, died 390), 38, 41–42, 45, 46, 276, 298, 299, 301, 315, 356, 377, 391
- Apollinarism, 34, 42, 45, 308
- Apollo Actius, 52
- Apollonius (sophist, he wrote a Homeric lexicon, first/second century AD), 330, 354
- Apollonius Dyscolus (grammarian, Alexandria, fl. second century AD), 265, 382
- Apollonius of Ephesus (an anti-Montanist Greek ecclesiastical writer, fl. 180–210), 12, 16
- Apollonius Rhodius (poet of the *Argonautica*, fl. first half of third century BC), 57
- Aquila, 32, 33, 49–53, 84
- Arabic translations of Aristotle, 29
- Arabs, xii, 29, 44
- Archedemus of Tarsus (Stoic philosopher, fl. c. 140 BC), 213
- Archimedes (geometrician, mathematician, physicist, engineer, inventor, astronomer, Syracuse, c. 287–c. 212 BC), 286, 307
- Arethas of Caesarea (or, of Patras, born in c. AD 860; was still alive in AD 932), 5–7, 11, 40, 53, 62, 70
- Arianism, xii, 15, 30, 31, 35, 41, 63, 73, 92
- Arians, xii, 92, 24, 45
- Aristides Quintilianus (doctor of music, third century AD), 265
- Aristion, a disciple of Jesus, 15
- Aristippus of Cyrene (the founder of the Cyrenaic school of philosophy; initially a pupil of Socrates, c. 435–c. 356 BC), 305
- Aristocles of Messene (Peripatetic philosopher, Sicily, probably second century AD), 69, 320
- Ariston of Ceos (Peripatetic philosopher, fl. c. 225 BC), 123
- Aristonicus of Alexandria (grammarian, c. 60 BC–c. AD 20), 382
- Aristophanes (Athenian comic, c. 446–c. 386 BC), 69, 74, 137, 276
- Aristotelian commentators, xvi, 5
- Aristotelian logic, 29
- Aristotelism, xii, 29, 53, 69, 80
- Aristotle (philosopher and scientist, a student of Plato, 384–322 BC), xii, xvi, 7, 31, 40, 69, 84; supposed to stand in harmony with Plato, xvi; beings availed of in the Scholia, 66, 70, 74; communicated by Alexander of Aphrodisias to Late Antiquity, 70; criticizing Plato, 27; his moral philosophy, 58; his reception by Late Antiquity, 68; influenced Didymus, 67; his works translated into Syriac, 30; methods of his commentators, 62; notoriously obscure, 62; on dialectic syllogism, 5; quoted by Theodoret, 60; cherished by Antioch, 28, 29; taught at Nisibis, 31; was studied by Didymus, Theodoret, Cassian, 89
- Arius Didymus (Stoic philosopher and teacher of Augustus, doxographer, Alexandria, fl. first century BC), 240, 367
- Arius of Alexandria (Christian priest, then heretic, c. 250/256–336), 29, 45, 46, 63
- Artemon (an Adoptionist Christian teacher in Rome, fl. c. AD 230), 29, 32
- Asclepius of Tralles (sixth century AD), 58, 242, 253, 278, 279, 368
- Asia, 12
- Asia Minor, 5, 19, 30
- Aspasius (a Peripatetic philosopher, second century AD), 58, 84, 238
- Asterius of Amasea (bishop, theologian, c. AD 350–c. 410), 214, 242
- Asterius of Antioch (sophist, Arian Christian theologian from Cappadocia, died c. AD 341), 150, 218, 223, 228, 247, 259, 262, 264, 265, 346, 365, 368, 397, 398
- Athanasius, a Cypriot monk, 1
- Athanasius of Alexandria (bishop, c. 296/298 – died 373), xii, 12, 22, 38, 45, 53, 74
- Athenaeus of Naucratis (rhetorician and grammarian, fl. c. end of the second and beginning of the third centuries AD), 7, 10, 74
- Athenagoras of Athens (apologist, c. AD 133–190), 259, 300, 361, 388
- Athens, 1, 69
- Attic syntax, 5, 6, 53

- Atticus, Bishop of Synada, 27
- Bacchylides (lyric poet, fifth century BC), 178
- Baghdad, 31
- Bardaisan (poet, orator and educator, born c. 154), 30
- Barsanuphius of Palestine (or Barsanuphius of Gaza, a hermit of the sixth century), 166
- Basil of Ancyra (fourth century AD, died by execution under Julian the Apostate in 362), 244, 283, 377, 390
- Basil of Caesarea, xii, 10–12, 19, 21, 22, 39, 55, 73, 80, 101, 108, 117, 147, 159, 178, 200, 206, 210, 218, 220, 223, 228, 230, 236, 237, 239, 241, 243, 244, 246–248, 254, 262, 268, 273, 276, 279, 284–286, 289, 293, 295, 296, 300, 303, 304, 311, 315, 320, 324, 326, 328, 336, 341, 342, 346, 347, 356, 360, 362, 366, 377, 378, 380, 382, 383, 385, 388, 390, 394–400, 403–407; following Origen, 36; corresponding with Diodorus of Tarsus, 41; deprecating allegory, 55; his moral philosophy, 58, studied philosophy, 59; praised Eusebius, 61; Cassian's works probably attributed to B., 79; co-compiler of *Philocalia*, 90
- Basil of Seleucia, 21, 201, 206, 215, 216, 230, 246, 261, 262, 274, 293, 324, 325
- Basilides, the Gnostic (Alexandria, taught from 117–138), 29, 368
- Benedict, St, xv; Benedictine Rule, xv; Benedictine monastic order, xv, 75
- Bessarion, Basil (a Greek, who became a Roman Catholic Cardinal Bishop, 1403–1472), 58
- Book of Cassian, ix, xv, xvi, 2, 7, 8, 64, 74, 76, 83, 85, 286
- Byzantine society, xvi
- Caesarea in Palestine, 19, 26
- Callimachus, 57
- Cappadocians, xiv, 14, 19, 73, 90, 91, 93, 147, 166, 209, 306, 315, 345, 399, 403
- Caracalla, emperor, 51, 52
- Carpus, bishop of Smyrna, 12
- Carpus, one of seventy apostles, 12
- Cassian the Sabaite (Sabaite monk and abbot, (c. 475–20 July 20 548), xii, xiv, 7; reason for his Scholia to be anonymous, xvi; 'doctor of the Church', 4; identified with Pseudo-Caesarius, 5; an Aristotelian scholar, 5; his text of Revelation, 6, 7; using Homeric forms, 6, 7; was one of the Akoimetoï, 8; author of *De Trinitate*, 12; his reliance on Eusebius' writings, 15; an Antiochene among the Akoimetoï, 22; knew the work of Lucian of Samosata, 30; an Antiochene and true heir of Origen, 31; Theodoret's pupil, 42; culling from Didymus' commentary on Revelation, 44; contemporary of John Philoponus, 46; wrote in original Greek, 50; erudite scholar, 54; on dialectical syllogism, 54; on 'anagogical sense', 57; an heir to Origen's patrimony, 60; method of commenting on Revelation, 62, 63, 64, 66; a monk, a scholar and a theologian, 65; his Aristotelian learnedness, 66; a student of Alexander of Aphrodisias and Plutarch, 67; influenced by Greek intellectuals of old, 69; an Antiochene intellectual, 71, 72, 25, 39; the author of *QetR*, 72; following Theodoret and Gregory of Nyssa alike, 73; he is not 'John Cassian', 74; abbot of the Great Laura of Sabas, 75; his personal style, 78; rare terms common with Simplicius and Damascius, 89; he studied Aristotle, 89; using the language of Ephesus, 90; practised allegory, 91; the last great scholar of Eastern Christianity, 94
- Cassius Dio (Roman consul and historian who wrote in Greek, Nicaea, c. AD 150–235), 377
- Castor, bishop, Cassian the Sabaite's addressee, 76
- Cebes of Thebes (philosopher, disciple of Socrates, c. 430–350 BC, his *tabula* is spurious of the first century AD), 369
- Celestinus I (Pope of Rome from 422 to 432), 201
- Celsus, against the Christians, 59
- Celsus, Bishop of Iconium, 27
- Cerinthus (was a Gnostic, c. AD 100), 14, 34
- Chalcedon, 26, 41, 47, 72, 201, 214, 216, 217, 219
- Christ, 'God the Logos', xiii, 28; styled 'Lord', xii, xiii, 71, 92, 200; Christ Pantocrator, 17, 39, 61, 62, 211, 313, 333; divided in two persons, 23; his oneness, 25; two natures of, xiii, 26; in Antiochene and Cyrillian theology, 46; 'the creative hand' of God, 55; accorded the title 'Lord', 79
- Christianity, relation with Hellenism, 49
- Christology, xii, xiii, 22–27, 34, 45, 46, 72, 73, 91, 92, 201
- Chronicon Paschale* (seventh century AD), 8, 22, 35, 41, 47, 137, 215, 377
- Chrysippus of Soli (c. 279–c. 206 BC, was a Stoic philosopher), 68, 69, 73, 97, 199, 220, 236, 238, 262, 265, 269, 269, 276, 286, 287, 294, 305, 325, 333, 382, 400, 401; quoted by Theodoret, 60; his reception by Late Antiquity, 68; was studied by Didymus, Theodoret, Cassian, 89
- Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–c. 215), xii, xiv, 11, 12, 21, 29, 32, 40, 84; disputing 'dialectical syllogism', 5; allegedly master of Catechetical School of Alexandria, 26; remained a suspect of Platonism, 47; availed of by Theodoret, 48; a source to Theodoret, 59; influence on the Scholia, 66, 67, 71, 74, 80, 91; attr. of *Scholion V*, 86, 87, 88
- Clement of Rome, 20, 22
- Clement Studites (monk in Studios monastery, ninth century), 334
- Cleopatra (69–30 BC, the last pharaoh of Ancient Egypt), 52
- communicatio idiomatum*, xiii, 23
- conception, meaning of, 79
- conjunction (συνάφεια), of natures in Christ, 23–26, 52, 53, 72, 278, 325
- Constantine (emperor, c. 272–337), 26, 52
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus (emperor, 905–959), 344, 350, 377
- Constantinople, xiv, xvi, 5, 23, 24, 41, 45, 66, 71, 72, 75, 89
- Convent of Chariton, 75
- Coptic versions of Rev., 5
- Corpus Hermeticum* (second and third centuries AD), 286
- Cosmas Indicopleustes (sixth-century Alexandrian Nestorian author), 15, 19, 35
- Critias of Athens (poet, 460–403 BC), 310
- Critolaus of Phaselis (Peripatetic philosopher, Lycia, c. 200–c. 118 BC), 401
- Cyriacus, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch (793–817), 86
- Cyril of Alexandria (c. 378–c. 444), xiii, 8, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31, 35, 38, 39, 84, 101, 120, 123, 124, 137, 151, 156, 161, 166, 201, 214, 216–220, 222, 223, 225, 228, 230, 231, 240–247, 253–259, 265–270, 275, 276, 279, 283–286, 294, 295, 298, 301–306, 313–317, 323, 325, 328, 331, 335, 336, 345, 350–356, 360, 362, 365–367, 382, 386, 388, 390, 391, 398–400, 403, 406, 407, 410; a prophet of Monophysitism, 23; defending his anathemas, 47; above all a theologian, 49; against Nestorius, 71; drew on Josephus, 50; his animosity against Diodorus of Tarsus, 44; wrote against Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, 45; his Christology, 46; ref. to 'Fifth Edition' of scripture, 51; referring to translators of scripture, 51; his emphasis on the divinity of Christ, 72; his text in 'the Book of Cassian', 76; identified Jesus Christ with the Logos, 73; influence on Cassian's style, 78; mentioning the Fifth Edition, 54; sanctioned the Book of Revelation, 60; opposed by Theodoret, 77
- Cyril of Jerusalem (bishop, c. 313–386, 'doctor of the Church'), 4, 12, 100, 130, 178, 201, 214, 228, 243, 244, 262, 315, 379, 397, 398
- Cyril of Scythopolis, 75, 76, 124, 223
- Damascius (Neoplatonist, c. 458, died after AD 538), x, xvi, 34, 68, 89, 147, 166, 213, 242, 253, 291, 308–310, 397, 410, 411
- David, the Psalmist, styled 'melodist', 24–25
- David of Alexandria (Neoplatonist philosopher, Alexandria, sixth century AD), 253
- Delphic oracles, 63
- Demetrius (189–231), Bishop of Alexandria, 26
- Demosthenes (orator, 384–322 BC), xvi, 48, 59, 60, 69, 98, 199, 209, 276, 356, 388, 404
- Dexippus (philosopher, a pupil of Iamblichus, fl. AD 350), 225, 268, 337
- Diacrinomenus, John (Monophysite chronicler, fifth–sixth-century Constantinople, he wrote a chronicle of the period from the Council of Ephesus, AD 431, to about 515), 31

- Diadochus of Photike (theologian, ascetic, Epirus, c. AD 400–c. 486), [362](#), [403](#)
- Diagoras of Melos (Greek poet and sophist of the fifth century BC, generally regarded as an atheist), [60](#)
- dialectical syllogism, [5](#), [6](#), [54](#), [67](#)
- Didymus the Blind (theologian, Alexandria, c. 310–c. 398), [21](#), [22](#), [38](#), [39](#); his attitude to Revelation, [17](#), [18](#); accused of heresy by his excerptor, [34](#), [36](#); common language with Theodoret, [37](#); considering Christ as *Pantocrator*, [40](#), [62](#); on the symbolism of numbers, [43](#); did not use the term θεοτόκος, [46](#); condemned, [47](#); above all a theologian, [49](#); citing translators of scripture, [50](#); on dialectical syllogism, [54](#); spoke of ‘the laws of allegory’, [55](#); an erudite Aristotelian, [60](#), [89](#); cherished the legacy of Origen, [61](#); Aristotelian scholar, [63](#); his commentary on Revelation, [66](#), [67](#), [92](#); his influence upon Proclus, [10](#), [68](#), [69](#), [125](#), [225](#), [238](#); influence on the Scholia, [70](#), [71](#), [74](#), [79](#), [80](#), [81](#), [82](#), [83](#), [91](#), [93](#); influence on Cassian, [75](#), [78](#); rendering text of Ezekiel, [90](#); ref. to the Gnostics, [85](#); a dangerous allegiance to declare during the 530s and 540s, [77](#); colloquial language, [87](#); influence by Origen, [88](#)
- Didymus the grammarian, published by Janus Lascaris, [57](#)
- Dio Chrysostom (sophist, orator, philosopher, historian of the Roman Empire, Prussa, c. AD 40–115), [206](#), [310](#), [380](#)
- Diocletian (emperor, AD 244–311), [52](#), [53](#)
- Diodorus of Sicily (historian, wrote between 60 and 30 BC), [60](#), [69](#), [98](#), [143](#), [191](#), [270](#), [322](#), [323](#), [377](#), [388](#), [389](#), [405](#)
- Diodorus of Tarsus (bishop, 378–390), [xiv](#), [23](#), [24](#), [30](#), [32](#), [39](#), [41](#), [42](#), [44](#), [93](#), [124](#), [201](#), [217](#), [223](#), [346](#), [352](#), [362](#), [374](#), [378](#), [403](#), [405](#); Cassian an offspring of, [xiv](#); ‘condemned’ intellectual, [xvi](#); his rhetorical aptitude, [41](#); allowing for the doctrine of apokatastasis, [42](#); opposing Apollinaris, [42](#); admired by Emperors Theodosius I and II, [45](#); attacked by Cyril, [46](#); condemned in 499; branded a ‘Nestorian’, [44](#), [47](#); influence on the Scholia, [66](#); teacher of Nestorius, [71](#); an instructor to Cassian, [72](#); a dangerous allegiance to declare during the 530s and 540s, [77](#)
- Diogenes Laertius (biographer of Greek philosophers, fl. c. third century AD), [6](#), [7](#), [84](#), [97](#), [322](#), [325](#), [336](#), [345](#), [382](#), [401](#)
- Diogenianus of Heraclea (grammarian, philosopher, fl. c. AD 117–138), [60](#)
- Dionysius of Alexandria (Patriarch of Alexandria, from 248 until his death in 265), [14](#); rejected Revelation, [65](#)
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus (historian, rhetor, c. 60–after 7 BC), [98](#), [147](#), [184](#), [259](#), [333](#), [349](#)
- Dioscorides (physician, pharmacologist, botanist, c. AD 40–90), [183](#)
- Dioscorus (Patriarch of Alexandria, from 444), [45](#)
- Docetism, [xii](#); revived by Apollinaris, [41](#); attacked by Cassian, [63](#), [92](#), [150](#)
- Domitian (emperor, AD 51–96), [11](#)
- Dorotheus of Sidon (astrologer, c. AD 75), [380](#)
- Dyophysite doctrine (‘two natures of Jesus’), [30](#)
- Easter, determining the date of, [8](#)
- Edessa, [xii](#), [5](#), [27](#), [30](#), [31](#), [240](#)
- Egypt, [5](#), [7](#), [9](#), [19](#), [26](#), [28](#), [45](#), [46](#), [74](#), [76](#), [309](#), [364](#)
- Elias, the prophet, [18](#)
- Elias of Alexandria, [5](#), [122](#), [240](#), [350](#)
- Elissaeus, the prophet, [18](#)
- Ephesus, [xii](#), [xiii](#), [11](#), [14](#), [15](#), [23–25](#), [45](#), [47](#), [56](#), [65](#), [77](#), [90](#), [115](#), [201](#), [214](#), [216](#), [219](#), [244](#), [283](#), [356](#), [449](#)
- Ephraem Syrus (Syrian deacon and theologian, c. 306–c. 373), [12](#), [19](#), [30](#), [90](#), [97](#), [108](#), [201](#), [215](#), [216](#), [218](#), [222](#), [223](#), [234](#), [236](#), [243](#), [244](#), [246](#), [273](#), [281](#), [283](#), [285](#), [286](#), [288](#), [293](#), [315](#), [324](#), [325](#), [334](#), [335](#), [390](#), [397](#), [399](#)
- Epiphanius of Salamis (bishop, c. 310/20–403), [9](#), [12](#), [16](#), [19](#), [26](#), [29](#), [30](#), [35](#), [51](#), [52](#), [89](#), [130](#), [150](#), [160](#), [200](#), [209](#), [218](#), [228](#), [231](#), [242–244](#), [246](#), [247](#), [253](#), [256](#), [265](#), [273](#), [280](#), [286](#), [294](#), [303](#), [315](#), [321](#), [328](#), [331](#), [343](#), [345](#), [346](#), [353](#), [361](#), [362](#), [364](#), [365](#), [377](#), [396](#), [398](#), [408](#)
- Epirus, [52](#)
- Epitome of John Cassian, a concocted myth, [xv](#)
- Euclid of Alexandria (mathematician, active in Alexandria during the reign of Ptolemy I, 323–283 BC), [29](#), [386](#)
- Eudocia (or Aelia Eudocia Augusta, empress, c. 401–460, the wife of Theodosius II), [69](#)
- Euelpis, a layman preacher, [27](#)
- Euhemerus of Tegea (Greek mythographer, 4th/3rd century BC), [60](#)
- Eunomius (died c. 393, a leader of the extreme or *anomoean* Arians), [29](#); Eunomianism, attacked by Cassian, [73](#)
- Euphrates, [7](#)
- Euripides (c. 480–406 BC, one of the three great Athenian tragedians), [57](#), [69](#), [178](#), [223](#), [259](#)
- Europe, [ix](#), [1](#), [58](#)
- Eusebius of Caesarea (theologian, historian, c. 265–c. 339/40), [11–16](#), [19](#), [21](#), [26](#), [27](#), [29](#), [30–33](#), [35–41](#), [44–49](#), [93](#), [97](#), [98](#), [100](#), [108](#), [109](#), [117](#), [125](#), [142](#), [143](#), [147](#), [150](#), [156](#), [160](#), [166](#), [181](#), [184](#), [187](#), [192](#), [193](#), [200](#), [201](#), [209](#), [218](#), [220](#), [222](#), [223](#), [228](#), [234](#), [237](#), [239](#), [240](#), [242](#), [244](#), [247](#), [248](#), [251](#), [254](#), [256](#), [259](#), [262–270](#), [273](#), [275](#), [278](#), [280–286](#), [293](#), [295](#), [300–306](#), [311](#), [315](#), [318](#), [320](#), [322](#), [325](#), [326](#), [328](#), [330](#), [333–337](#), [343–349](#), [351–357](#), [360](#), [362](#), [365](#), [366](#), [368](#), [374](#), [377–379](#), [382](#), [385](#), [386–400](#), [403](#), [408](#), [410](#); on Lucian of Samosata, [30](#); a true heir of Origen, [31](#); following Origen as editor, [33](#), [44](#); allegedly built on Didymus, [36](#), [37](#); associated with Didymus, [37](#); mentioning
- Herophilus, [40](#); he respected Alexander of Aphrodisias, [41](#); used the term θεοτόκος, [46](#); respected by Theodoret, [47](#); availed himself of Theodoret, [48](#); cited translators of scripture, [51](#); reporting discovery of translations of scripture by Origen, [52](#); shared Origen’s textual concerns, [54](#); spoke of ‘the laws of allegory’, [55](#); styled polymath, [58](#); a source to Theodoret, [59](#); an exemplar to Theodoret, [60](#); respected by Cassian, [61](#), [92](#); inchoate attitude towards Revelation, [63](#); his presence in the Scholia, [65](#), [66](#), [70](#), [74](#), [80](#), [82](#); an eminent Origenist, [71](#); influence by Origen, [88](#); mentioned in the *Philocalia*, [90](#)
- Eusebius of Emesa (bishop, a pupil of Eusebius of Caesarea, c. AD 300–c. 360), [265](#)
- Eusebius of Nicomedia (Arian bishop, died 341), [30](#), [35](#)
- Eustathius of Antioch (patriarch, fourth century AD), [28](#), [84](#)
- Eustathius of Thessaloniki, [58](#), [178](#), [181](#), [206](#), [207](#), [212](#), [254](#), [257](#), [277](#), [318](#), [330](#), [339](#), [349](#), [350](#), [376](#), [377](#)
- Eustratius, of Nicaea (philosopher and bishop, c. 1050/1060–c. 1120), [50](#), [58](#), [84](#), [238](#)
- Eutycheanism, [xiii](#), [25](#)
- Eutyches, [45](#)
- Evagrius of Pontus (monk and ascetic, AD 345–399), [x](#), [xiv–xvi](#), [21](#), [31](#), [47](#), [61](#), [70](#), [75](#), [77](#), [93](#), [107](#), [150](#), [220](#), [234](#), [245](#), [247](#), [253](#), [320](#), [323](#), [328](#), [341](#), [377](#), [379](#), [400](#)
- Evagrius Scholasticus (Syrian Church historian, Antioch, sixth century AD), [150](#), [253](#), [341](#), [377](#)
- Facundus, bishop of Hermiane in Africa (sixth century AD), [41](#), [45](#)
- Fifth Edition of scripture, [33](#), [51–54](#)
- Flavian II, of Antioch (patriarch, dies 518), [24](#), [47](#)
- Florence, [57](#)
- France, [57](#)
- Francesco Filelfo (humanist, 1398–1481), [58](#)
- Gaius (Roman theologian, third century), [14](#)
- Galen of Pergamon (physician, philosopher, AD 129–c. 200/c. 216), [xvi](#), [7](#), [40](#), [60](#), [69](#), [73](#), [84](#), [97](#), [143](#), [160](#), [199](#), [212](#), [220](#), [242](#), [246](#), [254](#), [262](#), [269](#), [295](#), [296](#), [300](#), [307](#), [310](#), [312](#), [318](#), [320](#), [353](#), [382](#), [386](#), [388](#), [402](#), [411](#); respected by some Christian theologians, [29](#); availed of in the Scholia, [66](#), [70](#), [74](#); was studied by Didymus, Theodoret, Cassian, [89](#)
- Gelasius (abbot of the Laura of Sabas from 537 until 546), [10](#), [75](#), [76](#)
- Gelasius of Cyzicus (church historian, fifth century), [341](#)
- Gennadius I (Patriarch of Constantinople, AD 458–471), [359](#)
- Gennadius of Marseilles (priest and historian, fifth century), [74](#)
- George (abbot of the Laura of Sabas in 547), [76](#)

- George Cedrenus (monk, historian, Constantinople, eleventh-twelfth century AD), 52, 141, 147, 334
- George Monachus (or, Georgius Hamartolus, or Georgius Peccator, Christian chronicler, Alexandria, ninth century AD), 147, 334
- George Syncellus (chronicler, eighth–ninth century, Constantinople), 12, 377
- Germanus I (Patriarch of Constantinople AD 715–730), 379
- Gnosticism, xii, 48, 49; attacked by Cassian, 63, 92, 269, 272, 330
- Gnostics, 17, 29, 30, 85, 120, 128
- Goths, xii, 92
- Great Laura of Sabas, ix, x, xii, 8, 9, 10, 31, 40, 50, 74, 75, 76, 86, 90, 136, 169, 215, 216, 239, 281, 286, 290, 294, 388, 400
- Great Meteoron (Metamorphosis), ix, xii, xv, xvi, 1, 2
- Greece, 1, 52; Classical, 276, 324, 327, 337, 388, 389
- Greek colloquialism, xiv, 9, 10, 37, 74, 89, 93, 124, 133, 146, 186, 217, 218, 335
- Greek *paideia*, ix, x, xvi, 57, 60
- Greeks: ‘the lies of the G.’, 56; Origen and Theodoret countered the Greeks, 57; ‘the maladies of the Greeks’, 68; distinguished, 147; Clement criticizing the Greeks, 261
- Gregory of Nazianzus, 11–13, 20, 21, 29, 40, 44, 45, 56, 90, 137, 146, 200, 201, 206, 209, 214–218, 220, 222, 225, 231, 242, 247, 253–256, 259, 26, 262, 266, 272, 284, 290, 295–297, 301, 303, 311, 318, 320, 325, 328, 329, 331, 336, 349, 364, 384, 388, 389, 398, 399; styled Theologos, 11, 20, 71; on ‘laudable weapons’, 44; influence on Scholia, 81; using Origen’s language, 90, 91
- Gregory of Nyssa, 10, 12, 13, 20, 22, 23, 29, 35, 36, 38, 93, 127, 141, 142, 150, 156, 178, 181, 200, 201, 205, 214, 215, 218, 220, 222, 225, 228, 231, 236, 239–242, 244–248, 251, 253, 254, 256, 257, 262, 264–270, 276, 279, 282, 284, 286, 288, 290, 292–294, 297, 303–306, 311, 313, 315, 318, 321, 323, 324, 328, 330, 333, 336, 341, 343, 349, 356, 358, 362, 365, 368, 374, 379, 382, 386, 388–390, 396, 398–400, 404; a true heir of Origen, 31; falsely thought to criticize Origen, 34; following Origen, 44; an eminent Origenist, 71; an instructor to Cassian, xiv, 72–73; influence on Scholia, 65, 66, 70, 74, 79, 80, 81, 82; on Christology, 73; influenced by Origen, 88; rendering text of Ezekiel, 90
- Gregory Thaumaturgus, 46, 220, 274
- Harpocraton of Alexandria (grammarian, fl. probably second century AD), 382
- Hebrew text of scripture, 33, 40, 351
- Hebrews, converted to Christianity, 13
- Hecataeus of Abdera (historian and Sceptic philosopher, fl. in the fourth century BC), 69, 377
- Hector (of Homer’s *Iliad*), 11
- Helenopolis of Bithynia, 30
- Heliodorus of Emesa (fiction-and-epigram-writer, possibly third century AD), 259, 260, 382
- Hellenism, x, xvi, 49, 58, 69
- Hellenistic philosophy and literature, 29, 90, 320
- Hephaestion of Thebes (astrologer, fourth century AD), 380
- Heptapla*, 33
- Heraclitus of Ephesus (Presocratic philosopher, c. 535–c. 475 BC), 69, 322
- Hermas (the author of *Pastor*, second century AD), 391, 392, 410
- Hermias of Alexandria (Neoplatonist philosopher, c. AD 410–c. 450), 34, 225, 231, 237, 240, 253, 318, 345, 371, 374, 376, 395, 411
- Hermogenes (Christian heretic, late second/early third centuries), 14
- Herodian (Aelius Herodianus, grammarian and rhetor, Alexandria, Rome, second century AD), 97, 260, 349
- Herodotus (historian, c. 484–425 BC), 69, 178, 190, 259, 329
- Heron of Alexandria (mathematician, mechanical engineer, c. AD 10–70), 382, 386
- Herophilus (physician, born in Chalcedon, fl. in Alexandria, 335–280 BC), 40
- Hesiod (poet, fl. around 750 and 650 BC), 69
- Hesychius of Alexandria (grammarian, lexicographer, fifth/sixth century AD), 10, 124, 220, 261, 265, 277, 290, 330, 349, 374.
- Hesychius of Jerusalem (Christian presbyter, exegete, fifth century AD), 124, 137, 214, 222, 259, 261, 367, 380
- Hexapla*, 33, 36, 49, 52
- Hierocles of Alexandria (Neoplatonist, fl. c. AD 430), 34, 35
- Hippocrates of Kos (physician, c. 460–c. 370 BC), 60, 84
- Hippolytus of Rome (theologian, c. 170–c. 236), 2, 6–9, 12, 20, 21, 53, 60, 147, 181, 184, 190, 200, 201, 205, 209, 215, 216, 218, 224, 228, 230, 243, 244, 248, 251, 253, 259, 262, 266, 273, 277, 285, 286, 303, 305, 307, 310, 311, 314, 318, 321, 326, 330, 336, 352, 361, 381, 389, 398, 401, 402, 408–410; H.’s works in Codex 573, 2; ‘doctor of the Church’, 4, 11, 16; using Homeric forms, 6, 7; against the Gnostics, 29; sanctioned the Book of Revelation, 60; on ‘the number of the beast’, 64; his text in ‘the Book of Cassian’, 76; rendering text of Rev., 90
- Hippolytus of Thebes (chronicler, almost unknown), 8, 9
- Holy Eucharist, 58
- Holy Spirit, 30, 64; does not give birth to offspring, 72, 91, 109, 200, 215, 263, 276; participation in the Holy Spirit, 277, 280, 288, 293, 332, 404
- Homer (poet, c. eighth/ninth century BC), xvi, 11, 56, 57, 58, 69, 178, 190, 254, 259, 276, 284, 295, 310, 312, 329, 330, 333, 339, 376, 389, 405; Homeric forms, 6;
- interpreted allegorically, 56; present in Scholia, 74
- Hypatius of Ephesus (metropolitan, died after 537), 48, 54
- Hyperides (speech-writer, c. 390–322 BC), xvi, 310
- hypostasis*, 23, 27
- hypostatic union, 24
- Iamblichus of Apamea (or, of Chalcis, in Syria: Neoplatonist philosopher, c. 245–c. 325), 7, 141, 231, 242, 262, 268, 294, 307, 331, 368, 370, 411
- Ibas of Edessa (Nestorian bishop c. 435–457, born in Syria), 30; pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 45; condemned, 47
- Ignatius (c. 797–877, Patriarch of Constantinople 847–858 and 867–877), 12
- Ignatius Chortasmenus (Bishop of Selymbria, fifteenth century), 58
- Ignatius of Antioch (bishop, c. 35/50–98/117), 11, 24
- Irenaeus of Lugdunum (c. 140–202), xii, 8, 11–14, 16, 20, 22, 29, 32, 34, 91; sanctioned the Book of Revelation, 60; ‘the number of the beast’, 64; his presence in the Scholia, 66, 71, 74, 80, 82, 83; his text in ‘the Book of Cassian’, 76
- Isaac the Saved, Metropolitan of Cyprus, 85
- Isocrates (orator, 436–338 BC), xvi, 57, 98
- Italy, 57
- Ithaca, 70, 74, 76
- James the newly baptized (Ἰάκωβος ὁ Νεοβάπτιστος), 9
- Janus Lascaris (Greek scholar, 1445–1535), 57, 58
- Jericho, 41, 51–53
- Jerome (priest, theologian, historian, c. 347–420): praised Apollinaris, 12; testifying to Lucian of Samosata, 30; testifying to Melito of Sardis, 32; once an admirer of Origen, 45; eulogized Clement of Alexandria, 47; his biographies, 74; his Vulgate, 102; translator of Didymus, 365
- Jerusalem, 8, 69, the second temple of, 24
- Jesus Christ, 18; identified with the Logos, 25; his two natures, 23–25; history of his life explored, 27; Origen followed the footprints of, 28; taught in parables, 64; identified with the Logos by Cyril of Alexandria, 73
- Jews: demolished the walls of Jericho, 41; persecuted by Justinian, 45; certain Jews discovered a translation of scripture, 52, 53; in biblical history, 56; ‘the hard-hearted Jews’, 122; cast out of Jerusalem, 133, 283; who came to Christ, 168; did not deem virginity as a virtue, 169–170; Clement on the Jews, 261
- Joel (chronicler, thirteenth century), 9
- John I (Patriarch of Antioch 429–441, a moderate supporter of Nestorius, pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia), 45, 201, 214, 217

- John Cassian, [xii](#), [xiv](#); a product of forgery, [xv](#); a phantasmal figure, [xvi](#); the Scythian of Marseilles, [74](#), [75](#)
- John Chrysostom (Archbishop of Constantinople, born in Antioch, AD 345–407), [xii](#), [19](#), [10](#), [12](#), [21](#), [23](#), [24](#), [53](#), [58](#), [59](#), [69](#), [75](#), [84–85](#); ‘doctor of the Church’, [4](#); Diodorus’ pupil, [41](#); against allegory, [56](#), [57](#); using anagoge, [57](#); indifferent to the book of Revelation, [60](#); dismissed Revelation, [61](#); in spuria, [78](#); influence on Scholia, [80](#); using language peculiar to Antioch, [90](#)
- John Climacus (monk at the monastery of Mount Sinai, sixth/seventh century AD), [127](#), [141](#), [210](#); Cassian’s professed admirer, [10](#); influenced by Cassian the Sabaite, [80](#)
- John Galen (grammarian, Constantinople, twelfth century AD), [329](#), [333](#)
- John Italus, [50](#)
- John Laurentius Lydus (Byzantine administrator, historian, Constantinople, sixth century AD), [370](#), [377](#)
- John Malalas (Greek chronicler, Antioch, c. AD 491–578), [150](#), [214](#), [377](#)
- John of Damascus (Syrian monk and priest in the Laura of Sabas, c. 645/676–749): on NT canon, [22](#); admirer of Cassian, [10](#); influenced by Cassian the Sabaite, [80](#); using Sabaite colloquialisms, [10](#), [90](#); was a Sabaite monk, [9](#), [294](#), [107](#), [124](#), [136–138](#), [201](#), [210](#), [215](#), [219](#), [244](#), [314](#), [342](#), [347](#), [353](#), [360](#), [362](#), [377](#), [383](#), [411](#)
- John of Palestine (a hermit of the sixth century in Palestine), [166](#)
- John Philoponus (Christian and Aristotelian commentator, AD 490–570), (condemned by the Church), [xv](#), [5](#), [7](#), [31](#), [37](#), [46](#), [50](#), [73](#), [86](#); quoting Revelation, [20](#); a guide to Aristotle for Cassian, [70](#); influence on Scholia, [80](#), [82](#); method of commenting on Aristotle, [62](#); respecting Theodoret, [47](#)
- John the Evangelist, [15](#), [16](#), [19–22](#), [76](#), [93](#), [65](#); ‘a prophet’, [13](#); styled ‘theologian’, [xiii](#), [2](#), [20](#), [65](#), [102–103](#), [108–109](#), [211](#), [214](#), [217](#), [285](#)
- John the presbyter of Ephesus, alleged author of Revelation, [15](#), [16](#)
- Josephus (Jewish historian, 37–c. 100), [49](#), [50](#), [69](#), [147](#), [178](#), [183](#), [237](#), [270](#), [295](#), [298](#), [317](#), [318](#), [355](#), [358](#), [361](#), [380](#), [388](#), [389](#), [405](#)
- Julian the Apostate (emperor, 331/332–363), [59](#), [298](#); dreaded Diodorus’ rhetorical aptitude, [41](#)
- Julian the Arian (theologian, fourth century AD), [10](#), [147](#), [161](#), [242](#), [284](#), [285](#), [345](#), [394](#), [396](#), [407](#), [408](#); a dangerous allegiance to declare during the 530s and 540s, [77](#)
- Julius Africanus (chronicler, Alexandria, Jerusalem, second/third century AD), [33](#), [377](#), [380](#)
- Julius Caesar (Roman general, statesman, consul, 100–44 BC), [9](#)
- Julius Naucratis (or Julius Pollux, or Julius Polydeuces, grammarian, second-century AD), [40](#), [54](#), [69](#), [70](#), [141](#), [296](#), [333](#), [370](#), [374](#), [377](#), [380](#), [389](#)
- Justin Martyr (Christian apologist, AD 100–c. 165), [10](#), [11](#), [14](#), [32](#), [72](#), [90](#), [143](#), [156](#), [184](#), [242](#), [269](#), [354](#), [365](#), [366](#), [378](#), [380](#), [389](#), [390](#), [398](#), [411](#)
- Justinian (emperor, AD 482–565), [x](#), [10](#), [31](#), [41](#), [47](#), [75](#); persecutor of the Akoimatoi, [xvi](#); against Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, [45](#), [214](#); his dogmatic writings, [10](#); he valued Cyril of Alexandria, [77](#)
- Koile Syria, [74](#)
- leap year, [ix](#), [8](#), [9](#)
- Leontius Byzantius (an Origenist monk and priest, c. 485–c. 542), [xiv](#); addressee of Casian the Sabaite, [7](#), [75](#); cherished the legacy of Origen, [61](#); close friend of of Casian the Sabaite, [77](#); followed Origenism, [93](#), [215–215](#)
- Leontius of Constantinople (presbyter, fifth–sixth centuries AD), [215](#)
- Leontius of Cyprus (bishop, iconographer, ecclesiastical author, seventh century), [165](#)
- Libanius (sophist, rhetor, Constantinople, Antioch, Nicomedia, c. 314–c. 394), [69](#), [98](#), [143](#), [298](#), [356](#)
- Local Synod of Constantinople (AD 536), [ix](#), [44](#), [75](#), [76](#), [219](#)
- London, [57](#)
- Lord Christ (δεσπότης Χριστός), [xii](#), [xiii](#), [25](#), [71](#), [200](#)
- Lorenzo de Medici (*see also* Pope Leo X), 1475–1521, [57](#)
- Lucian of Samosata (sophist, rhetorician, satirist, c. AD 125–180), [xvi](#), [7](#), [30](#), [40](#), [52–54](#), [57](#), [70](#), [178](#), [220](#), [259](#), [284](#), [310–312](#), [330](#), [333](#), [388](#), [389](#), [403](#)
- Lysias (orator, logographer, Athens, c. 445–c. 380 BC), [98](#), [101](#)
- Macedonia, [12](#)
- Macedonians, [xii](#), [92](#)
- Mamaea (mother of Emperor Alexander Severus, 222–235), [45](#), [52](#)
- Maraba I (Nestorian scholar, mid-sixth century), [31](#)
- Marcellus of Ancyra (bishop, opponent of Arianism, accused of Sabellianism, died c. AD 374), [184](#), [244](#), [317](#), [362](#)
- Marcionites, [xii](#), [90](#), [92](#)
- Marcus Aurelius (emperor AD 161 to 180, Rome, AD 121–180), [203](#), [310](#), [312](#)
- Marcus Eremita (monk in Egypt and Palestine, fourth–sixth century AD), [364](#)
- Mark, the apostle, [26](#)
- Mark Antony (Marcus Antonius, 83–30 BC, Roman politician and general), [52](#)
- Matthaeus Blastares (Byzantine monk and theologian of Thessaloniki, who opposed reconciliation with Rome, fourteenth century), [9](#)
- Maximian, emperor (286–305), [52](#), [53](#)
- Maximinus, emperor (311–313), [30](#)
- Maximus Confessor, [11](#), [51](#), [90](#), [143](#), [212](#), [217](#), [218](#), [230](#), [240](#), [244](#), [254](#), [256](#), [280](#), [291](#), [332](#), [353](#), [362](#), [365](#), [398](#), [404](#); admirer of Cassian, [10](#); ignoring Revelation, [20](#)
- Megethius, a Marcionite, [90](#)
- Meletius of Tiberiopolis (medical doctor, probably seventh–ninth century), [373](#)
- Melitas, abbot, first successor of Sabas, [76](#)
- Melitene, [86](#)
- Melito of Sardis, [11](#), [14](#), [155](#); claiming that God is corporeal, [32](#)
- Memnon of Ephesus (bishop, fifth century), [216](#), [217](#)
- Menander (comic writer, Athens, c. 341/42–c. 290 BC), [223](#)
- Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople, [75](#)
- Meteora, [ix](#), [xii](#), [xiv](#), [xv](#), [1](#), [2](#), [8](#), [87](#), [88](#)
- Methodius of Olympus, [11](#), [13](#), [15](#), [20](#), [276](#), [365](#), [374](#), [378](#), [390](#), [405](#)
- Michael Attaliates (a ‘patrician and pro-consul’ of Constantinople, and historian, eleventh century), [22](#)
- Michael Glycas (chronicler, twelfth-century Constantinople), [4](#), [9](#), [353](#), [361](#), [376](#), [379](#), [386](#), [408](#)
- Michael of Ephesus (Aristotelian commentator, eleventh–twelfth century), [58](#), [203](#), [238](#), [240](#), [411](#)
- Michael Psellus (Byzantine monk, writer, philosopher, politician and historian, c. 1017–c. 1078/1096), [62](#), [316](#), [317](#), [350](#); his method of commenting on Aristotle
- millenarism, [16](#), [19](#), [34](#), [64](#), [83](#), [219](#), [409](#)
- Mithraism, [330](#)
- Moderatus of Gades (Pythagorean philosopher, first century AD), [368](#)
- Monarchian theology, [xii](#), [25](#)
- Monastery of Metamorphosis (the Great Meteoron), [xii](#), [xv](#), [1](#), [2](#)
- Monastery of Studios, [8](#), [334](#)
- monophysitism, [xiii](#), [23](#), [25](#), [26](#), [30](#), [31](#), [35](#), [44](#), [45](#), [46](#), [47](#), [77](#), [86](#)
- Moses, [28](#), [35](#), [102](#), [122](#), [137](#), [151](#), [210](#), [215](#), [283](#), [327](#); allegedly the source of Judaeo-Christian wisdom, [47](#), [59](#)
- Musaeus (legendary polymath and an early poet), [57](#)
- Narses, an Aristotelian teacher at Edessa, [31](#)
- Nemesius of Emesa (bishop, fourth century AD), [239](#)
- Neo-Origenists, [45](#), [75](#); persecuted by Justinian, [45](#)
- Neon, Bishop of Laranda, [27](#)
- Neophytus Inclusus (the Recluse, Cyprian monk and presbyter, 1134–1214), [62](#)
- Neoplatonism, [x](#), [68](#), [69](#), [125](#), [225](#), [238](#)
- Neoplatonists, [68](#), [226](#), [337](#), [388](#), [397](#), [411](#)
- Nerses of Lambron, [20](#)
- Nestorianism, [xii](#), [24–26](#)
- Nestorians, [19](#), [30](#), [31](#), [44](#), [72](#), [217](#)
- Nestorius (Archbishop of Constantinople, 428–431), [xiii](#), [xvi](#), [22–29](#), [44](#), [45](#), [77](#), [201](#), [359](#); influence on Cassian, [xvi](#), [xvi](#); the right wing of Antioch, [28](#); pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia, [45](#); not a hideous heretic to Theodoret and Cassian, [71–72](#);

- echoes of his ideas in Cassian, 72;
defended by Theodoret, 72, 77; his affinity
with the Cappadocians, 73
- New Laura, 75
- Nicene theology, 13, 15, 25, 44
- Nicephorus I of Constantinople (eighth/ninth
century), 22
- Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos (the last
Greek church historian, fl. c. 1320), 24, 27,
30, 32, 52, 192, 193, 334
- Nicetas Choniates (Byzantine historian,
c. 1155–1215), 24, 25,
- Nicetas of Paphlagonia (or Nicetas David
or Nicetas the philosopher, bishop,
ninth-tenth century), 11, 12, 13, 19
- Nicetas Seides (theologian, Constantinople,
1040–1120), 20, 21, 22
- Nicholas I the Mystic (Patriarch of
Constantinople, AD 901–907 and
912–925), 334
- Nicodemus of Athos, 75
- Nicolaitans, 14, 119, 125–126
- Nicolaus (comic-writer, probably fourth
century BC), 377
- Nicomachus of Gerasa (mathematician, c. AD
60–c. 120 AD), 237, 368, 370, 382
- Nicomedia, 30, 52, 53
- Nicopolis, 52, 53
- Nilus of Ancyra (abbot, fifth century AD),
362
- Nisibis, xii, 5, 27, 31, 240
- Northern Greece, 1
- Notion*, meaning of it, and difference from
Ónnoia, 79
- Numbers: symbolism of, 17, 42, 43, 83;
intelligible essence of, 305; natural
conception of, 370; number ‘seven’, 111,
112, 152, 231, 232, 330
- Numenius of Apamea (philosopher,
Neopythagorean, forerunner of the
Neoplatonists, fl. latter half of the second
century AD), 60, 69, 279, 280, 281, 305,
325
- Octapla*, 33, 52
- Octavian, Augustus (first emperor of the
Roman Empire, 63 BC–AD 14), 52
- Odysseus, 70
- Oecumenius (scholar, sixth century), x, 4–7,
14, 17, 21, 22, 53, 199, 214, 217, 230,
232, 273, 276, 289, 290, 301, 331, 336,
362, 367, 368, 377, 379, 398, 404, 406,
406, 408; method of commenting on
Revelation, 62; not from Thessaly, 5; *et in
aparrat. crit*
- Oenomaus of Gadara (Cynic philosopher,
second century), 60
- Olympiodorus, the Deacon of Alexandria,
124, 204, 231, 242, 244, 254, 285, 293, 294,
306, 347, 354, 368, 373, 394, 396, 408, 410;
an erudite scholar, 54; possible catenist of
Didymus, 34, 35, 36; possible compiler of
Disymus, 89; referring to translators of
scripture, 51
- Olympiodorus, the philosopher of Alexandria
(Olympiodorus the Younger, sixth century),
34, 36
- Oppian of Corycus or Anazarbis in Cilicia
(poet, second century AD), 329
- Oracula Chaldaica* (second century AD),
287
- Oribasius of Pergamum (a Greek medical
writer and the personal physician of
Emperor Julian the Apostate, c. 320–400),
237
- Origen (theologian, Alexandria, Caesarea,
Tyre, third century), 13, 39, 84, 88;
condemned by the Church, xv, interpreting
2 Kings 24:1 and 1 Paralipomenon 21:1,
xiv; ‘condemned’ intellectual, xvi; a source
of Cassian, xvi; on divine wrath’, 4; his text
of Rev. 5, 6; was falsely attributed the
Scholia, 8, 86, 87; edict against O., 10; on
the ecclesiastical canon, 15; admired by
Eusebius, 16; on the historical character
of divine revelation, 18; Origen, ‘the not
yet tested’, 20; his legacy, 23; ordained
presbyter in Caesarea, 26; the founder of
Christian Philosophy of History, 27, 28;
accused of literalism, 28; allegedly master
of Catechetical School of Alexandria, 26;
not a Platonist, 31; his fragments on the
Psalms, 31; philosophy of History, 32; a
gifted editor, 33; followed by Gregory of
Nyssa, 35; characteristic vocabulary, 36;
followed by Didymus and Theodoret, 37;
excerpts from the conn. on were Psalms
compiled in Palestine, 40, 92; linked with
Theodoret through Diodorus of Tarsus and
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 42; on pious
people, 44; admired by Mamaea, 45;
condemned in 553, 45; used the term
θεοτόκος, 46; condemned, 47; respected
by Theodoret, 47; concerned with the
relation between Hellenism and
Christianity, 49; citing translators of
scripture, 50, 51; discovered unknown
editions of scripture, 52; his presence at
Actia Nicopolis, 53; his laboriousness, 54;
beyond ‘Alexandria’ and ‘Antioch’, 55;
practised allegory, 55; polemical work
against Celsus, 59; sanctioned the Book of
Revelation, 60; rejecting millenarian ideas,
64; his aura radiated upon the Scholia, 65;
establishing the coherence of scripture, 62;
influence on Scholia, 66, 70, 71, 81, 82; a
student of Alexander of Aphrodisias and
Plutarch, 67; was a dangerous allegiance
to declare during the 530s and 540s, 77;
his influence, 88; rare terms common
with Simplicius, 89; held up to obloquy, 90;
his alleged dialogue against the
Marcionites, 90; accused of practising
allegory, 91; followed by Theodoret in
exegesis, 43, 93; Theodoret was the true
heir to Origen’s doctrinal concerns, 94;
et in aparrat. crit
- Origenism, ix, x, xii, 2, 43, 75, 82, 88, 91, 102,
128, 208, 245, 253, 323, 338, 357, 402, 403
- Origenistic controversy, 75
- Origenists, x, 45, 71, 75, 76, 90, 100
- Orion of Alexandria (or of Thebes,
grammarians, fifth century), 69, 124, 225,
277, 309, 349, 379
- Ottoman Turks, 1, 57
- ousia*, 27
- Palestine, 10, xv, xii, 8, 9, 19, 20, 22, 27, 50,
66, 74, 75, 117, 124, 274, 364, 391
- Palladius of Helenopolis (monk, chronicler,
fourth–fifth century AD), 141, 223,
298
- Pamphilus of Caesarea (presbyter of
Caesarea, latter half of the third
century–309), 45
- Pantaenus (theologian, allegedly master of
Catechetical School of Alexandria, fl. c. AD
180), 26
- Pantocrator*, applied to Christ, 17, 39, 40; in
Revelation, 61
- Papias of Hierapolis (apologist, bishop, fl.
c. first third of the second century), 11, 15,
406
- Pappus of Alexandria (mathematician, c. AD
290–c. 350), 155, 307, 386
- Paris, 57
- Parmenides of Elea (Presocratic philosopher,
fl. early fifth century BC), 60, 69, 79, 287,
309, 412.
- Patmos, 11, 12, 14, 20, 22, 334
- Patriarchal School of Constantinople, 20
- Paul, the apostle, 12, 13, 18, 22, 28, 56, 58,
81, 98, 102, 105, 134, 140, 160, 162, 202,
207, 211, 215, 217, 261, 296, 299, 303, 391,
399
- Paul of Aegina (medical doctor, seventh
century), 330.
- Paul of Emesa (Antiochene bishop, fifth
century), 214, 217.
- Paul of Samosata, (AD 200–275, Bishop of
Antioch, 260–268, an Adoptionist), 29
- Paulinus, a layman preacher, 27
- Peripatetic philosophy, 29, 46, 307, 309
- Persia, xii, 29
- Persians, 44
- Peter, the apostle, 13, 22, 29
- Peter I, Patriarch of Jerusalem (524–552), 75
- Philo of Alexandria (Jewish philosopher, c. 20
BC–AD 50), 10, 28, 40, 88, 101, 118, 147,
202, 210, 211, 231, 237, 238, 242, 245,
251, 262, 268, 269, 270, 276, 286–288,
290, 295, 300, 305, 307, 310, 315, 318,
333, 334, 336, 347, 348, 359, 368, 369,
379, 381–384, 397.
- Philo of Byblos (or Herennius Philo, historian,
grammarians, lexicographer, c. AD 64–141),
60
- Philostratus (Lucius Flavius Philostratus, a
Greek sophist, Lemnos, Athens, c. AD 170/
172–247/250), 206
- Philoxenus of Alexandria (grammarians, first
century BC), 320, 349
- Philoxenus of Mabbug (or Philoxenus of
Hierapolis, Monophysite bishop, died AD
523), 7
- Philumenus of Alexandria (medical doctor,
second century AD), 138, 286
- Photinus (a Christian heretic, Bishop of
Sirmium in Pannonia, died 376), 248
- Photinus, a friend of Emperor Julian the
Apostate, 41

- Photius (Patriarch of Constantinople, 858–867 and 877–886, and scholar), 10, 12, 19, 27, 35, 39, 40, 44, 71, 84, 138, 161, 166, 219, 230, 277, 349–353, 368, 377, 411; criticized Cosmas Indicopleustes, 19; reviewing Theodore of Mopsuestia, 44; reporting discovery of translations of scripture by Origen, 52, 53; praised Theodoret, 66, 68, 82; defining ‘interpretation’, 84; mentioning a certain ‘monk Theodosius’, 86
- Phrygia, 16
- Phrygian Montanists, 12
- physis*, 27
- Pindar (lyric poet from Thebes, c. 522–443 BC), xvi, 178, 310, 388, 389; quoted by Theodoret, 59; respected by Theodoret, 69; present in Scholia, 74
- Plato (philosopher, mathematician, student of Socrates, founder of the Academy in Athens, 428/427–348/347 BC), xvi, 27–29, 31, 55, 60, 69, 259, 261, 269, 280, 286, 287, 303–307, 309, 313, 333, 336, 337, 367, 370, 371, 382, 395, 403, 410, 411; supposed to stand in harmony with Aristotle, xvi; cherished in Alexandria, 27; allegedly appropriated the arcane wisdom, 47; quoted by Theodoret, 48; rare vocabulary to Christian scholars, 54; suspicious of Homer, 56; allegedly usurped and misappropriated the Jewish lore, 59; his vocabulary influenced Didymus, 67; lending his reception by Late Antiquity, 68; present in Scholia, 74; his meaning of ‘notion’, 79
- Platonism, x; imbued the spiritual life of Alexandria, 27; Clement remained suspect of, 47; influence of Christian thought, 69
- Plotinus (philosopher, founder of Neoplatonism, c. AD 204/5–270), 60, 69, 73, 199, 220, 245, 253, 267, 269, 277, 291, 300, 305–307, 309, 324, 326, 336, 337, 339, 370, 385, 397, 404, 411
- Plutarch of Chaeronea (historian, biographer, essayist, c. AD 46–120), xvi, 7, 34, 40, 60, 69, 73, 97, 98, 143, 147, 178, 191, 199, 205, 206, 213, 220, 237, 238, 246, 251, 259, 262, 266–268, 287, 294, 305, 318, 322, 324, 333, 337, 338, 361, 368, 369, 371, 373, 377, 388, 389, 395, 401, 405; being availed of in the Scholia, 66, 70, 74, 79, 81; respected by Theodoret, 69; influenced Origen, 67, 88; studied by Didymus, Theodoret, Cassian, 89
- Polybius of Megalopolis (historian, c. 200–c. 118 BC), 270, 322, 323, 405
- Polycarp, suffragan Bishop of Philoxenus of Mabbug, 7
- Polycarp of Smyrna (bishop, AD 69–155), 12, 399
- Pope Leo X (Giovanni di Lorenzo di Medici, 1475–1521, pope since 1513), 57
- Porphyry of Tyre (philosopher, student and biographer of Plotinus, c. AD 234–c. 305), 7, 34, 60, 69, 203, 237, 246, 268, 281, 293, 310, 318, 322, 329, 338, 339, 376, 379, 397, 404; against the Christians, 59; interpreted Homer allegorically, 56; published by Janus Lascaris, 57; taught at Nisibis, 31
- Posidonius of Apamea (or, of Rhodes, c. 135–51 BC), Stoic philosopher, politician, astronomer, geographer, historian and teacher), xvi, 199, 206, 220, 269, 287, 294, 305, 307, 339, 401
- Post-Nicene Christianity, xii, 92
- Priscianus of Lydia (Neoplatonist philosopher, fl. sixth century AD, died after 532), 240
- Proclus (Neoplatonist philosopher, AD 412–485), xvi, 34, 124, 125, 141, 166, 218, 225, 238, 253, 254, 263, 265, 268, 270, 276, 277, 280, 281, 286, 287, 300, 304, 308–310, 313, 318, 336, 337, 343, 370, 371, 374, 386, 388, 395, 398, 411; influenced by Didymus, 68; pupil of Orion of Alexandria, 69; using Origen’s vocabulary, 90
- Proclus of Constantinople (Archbishop, theologian, fifth century AD, died 446/447), 218, 398
- Procopius of Caesarea (Byzantine historian, from Palaestina Prima, c. AD 500–c. 565), 214, 261
- Procopius of Gaza (a Christian sophist, rhetorician, catenist, c. 464–528), 20, 27, 38, 51, 54, 55, 143, 161, 178, 181, 220, 222, 223, 242, 254, 257, 264, 265, 267, 283, 293, 317, 329, 336, 343, 354, 355, 360, 362, 365, 367, 368, 374, 398, 403, 408, 410.
- Promised Land, 28
- prosoyon*, 23, 27
- Pseudo-Caesarius (= Cassian the Sabaite), 5, 10, 24, 39, 78, 124, 133, 147, 155, 215, 242, 269, 286, 305, 330, 358, 388, 407, 408
- Pseudo-Callisthenes, 286
- Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (an Akoimetan monk of Thracian extraction), x, 12, 20, 21, 184, 215, 218, 226, 244, 246, 286, 360, 388
- Pseudo-Macarius, 6, 7, 19, 21, 209, 218, 228, 236, 244, 246, 262, 273, 276, 281, 285, 286, 293, 298, 303, 315, 323, 337, 362, 366, 386, 397, 400, 405, 408
- Ptolemy of Alexandria (Claudius Ptolemaeus, mathematician, astronomer, geographer, astrologer, c. AD 90–c. 168), astronomer, astrologer, mathematician and philosopher, 9, 58, 265, 307, 338, 386
- Ptolemy of Ascalon (grammarian, end of first century BC), 9
- Pythagoras of Samos (philosopher, mathematician, religious leader, c. 570–c. 495 BC), 60, 231, 205, 330; Pythagorean maxims and language, 7; life, 141; teaching, 279; Pythagoreanism, 17, 43, 231, 281, 305, 330, 369; Pythagoreans, 368
- Qiore, director of the School of Edessa, 30
- Rabbula (bishop of Edessa from AD 411 to 435, Ephraem Syrus’s successor, he opposed the views of Theodore of Mopsuestia and those of Nestorius), 30, 44
- Raphael Cartoons, 57
- Red Sea, 28, 394, 396
- Renaissance, 57, 58
- Romania, xv
- Rome, 29, 53, 57, 260.
- Rufinus of Aquileia (monk, historian, theologian, translator of Greek patristic texts into Latin, especially the work of Origen, AD 340/345–410), against Origen’s detractors, 45
- Sabas (St Sabbas the Sanctified, a Cappadocian-Greek monk, priest and saint, founder of the Great Laura, 439–532), 7, 75, 93; his dead body found incorrupt after sixteen years, 76; tutor of Cassian, ix, xiv
- Samaritans, persecuted by Justinian, 45
- Scythopolis, ix, 74, 75
- Seleucus, correspondent of Amphilochius of Iconium, 19
- Serenus of Antinoeia (or of Antinoupolis, Greek mathematician and geometrician, AD 300–c. 360), 386
- Sergius Stissus (fifteenth/sixteenth century), 57, 58
- servants of Christ, xii, servants of God, xii
- Seventh Edition of scripture, 52, 53
- Severianus of Gabala (Bishop of Gabala in Syria, preacher in Constantinople, born before 380, possibly died after 408), 26, 124, 171, 209, 212, 218, 244, 247, 261, 272, 315, 326, 328, 353, 374, 379, 380, 390, 400, 410; a dangerous allegiance to declare during the 530s and 540s, 77; influence on the Scholia, 66; respected by Theodoret and Cassian, 69
- Severus of Antioch (Patriarch of Antioch, the champion of Monophysitism, c. AD 465–c. 538/542), xiii, xvi, 25, 26, 31, 35, 50, 216, 231, 243, 286
- Sextus Empiricus (physician, philosopher, reported to have lived in Alexandria, Rome, Athens, c. AD 160–210), 160, 178, 230, 240, 254, 266, 278, 289, 305, 320, 337, 382, 383
- Simplicius of Cilicia (one of the last Neoplatonists, persecuted by Justinian, c. 490–c. 560), x, xvi, 89, 122, 147, 166, 167, 209, 213, 238, 240, 242, 254, 268, 277, 292, 296, 300, 304, 309, 310, 318, 337, 350, 370, 371, 397; method of commenting on Aristotle, 62; not influenced by Didymus as Proclus was, 68
- Sixth Edition of scripture, 33, 52, 53, 54
- Socrates (philosopher, c. 469–399 BC), 60, 78, 79, 305, 310
- Socrates Scholasticus (Church historian, Constantinople, born c. 380, date of birth unknown), 24, 141, 218, 254, 260, 278, 367, 370
- Solomon (biblical king, reigned allegedly between 970 and 931 BC), 42, 43, 404
- Solon of Athens (statesman, lawmaker, poet, c. 638–558 BC), 69, 237
- Sopater of Athens (rhetor, fourth century), 376
- Sophocles (tragic poet, Athens, c. 497/6–406/5 BC), 69, 178, 259, 389, 401

- Sophonias (Byzantine monk and Aristotelian commentator, thirteenth/fourteenth century, fl. c. 1300), 62
- Souka monastery (in Palestine), 75
- Sozomenus (Salminius Hermias Sozomenus, a Church historian, c. 400–c. 450), 24, 141
- Speusippus (philosopher, Plato's nephew by his sister Potone, c. 408–339/8 BC), 69, 240, 305, 337, 402
- Stobaeus, John (compiler of Greek authors, fifth century AD), 34, 206, 210, 237, 238, 240, 242, 246, 265, 281, 338, 343, 371, 377, 395, 397
- Stoicism, influence upon Christian thought, 28, 69, 73, 159, 325–326, 337, 354; allegorical method, 56; influence on Scholia, 67, 77, 81, 122, 156, 211, 236, 246, 262, 265, 269, 320, 345, 400–401; materialism rebuked by Origen, 305; rebuked by Plotinus, 307
- Strabo (geographer, philosopher, historian, Amasea in Pontus, 64/63 BC–c. AD 24), 147, 254, 339, 389
- Symmachus (translator of the Old Testament, fl. late second century), 32, 33, 49, 50–53, 84, 336
- Synesius of Cyrene (philosopher, Bishop of Ptolemais in the Libyan Pentapolis, c. 373–c. AD 414), 237
- Syria, 6, 29, 31, 46, 71, 83, 89; Syriac versions of Rev., 6, 71, *et in apparat. crit.*; Syriac fathers, 23–24, 85; Syriac antiphonal chanting, 25; Syriac versions of scripture, 31; Syriac, adopted by Nestorian preachers, 29; literature, 30
- Syrianus of Athens, Neoplatonist philosopher (head of Plato's Academy in Athens after Plutarch of Athens, since 431/432, he died c. 437), 5, 58, 254, 268, 368, 397.
- Tarsus, 11
- Teles (philosopher, probably of Megara, third century BC), 246
- tertium quid*, 46
- Tertullian (Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus, early Christian author from Carthage, c. AD 160–c. 225), 46
- Tetrapla*, 33
- Thales of Miletus (pre-Socratic Greek philosopher, c. 624–c. 546 BC), 60
- Themistius (317, Paphlagonia–c. AD 390, Constantinople, a statesman, rhetorician, philosopher), method of commenting on Aristotle, 62, 167, 238, 240, 246, 253, 284, 310, 371, 395
- Theoctistus, Bishop of Caesarea (third century), 26
- Theodore Anagnostes (historian, theologian, Constantinople, fifth/sixth century), 47, 150, 183, 334
- Theodore Metochites (Byzantine statesman, author, philosopher, patron of the arts, 1270–1332), XXIX
- Theodore of Cyrrene mathematician, fifth century BC, mentioned in three of Plato's dialogues), 60
- Theodore of Mopsuestia (bishop, c. 350–428), 23–25, 30, 31, 39, 41, 54, 93, 103, 124, 156, 201, 217, 219, 223, 231, 232, 244, 268, 276, 289, 290, 299, 304, 306, 308, 310, 324, 331, 336, 341, 344, 355, 362, 365, 376, 377, 378, 381, 382, 390, 395, 396, 403, 405; Cassian was one of his offsprings, xiv; 'condemned' intellectual, xvi; taught at Nisibis, 31; opposing Apollinaris, 42; his doctrine of universal restoration, 44; condemned in 553, 45, 47; influence on the Scholia, 66, 80; attacked by Cyril, 46; teacher of Nestorius, 71; an instructor to Cassian, 72; a dangerous allegiances to declare during the 530s and 540s, 77
- Theodore Studites (Byzantine Greek monk and abbot of the Stoudios monastery in Constantinople, AD 759–826), xiv, 8, 210, 274, 275, 334; admirer of Cassian, 10; a layman preacher, 27; influenced by Cassian the Sabaite, 80; about Origen and Origenism, 90–91
- Theodoret of Cyrillus (c. 386–died after 457), xiii, 7, 15, 21–25, 38, 39, 53, 85, 100, 107, 111, 117, 129, 132, 141, 142, 147, 150, 156, 160, 161, 166, 169, 178, 181, 183, 184, 190, 199–206, 209, 213, 215, 216–225, 228–240, 243–248, 254–265, 268, 271–288, 293–311, 31, 318, 325–342–368, 374–410; his view of Christ as Lord (δεσπότης), xiii; flower and shining star of Antioch, xiv, 94; nearly condemn by the Church), xv; condemned intellectual, xvi; doctor of the Church, 4; on divine wrath, 4; commentator of book of Daniel, 5; using Homeric forms, 6, 7; his text of Rev., 5, 7; a Hellenized Syrian, 25; blackmailed at Chalcedon, 26; shared Origen's concerns, 28, 31, 40, 50, 54, 66; on Lucian of Samosata, 30; praising Origen, 32; following Origen as editor, 33; quoting Origen, 34; not antipathetic to Eusebius, 35; possible catenist of Didymus, 36; common language with Didymus, 37; his admiration of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 41–42; linked with Origen through Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, 42; against Docetism and Arianism, 42; on the Song of Songs, 43; on symbolism of numbers, 43; following Origen, 44; the 'Three Chapters' left a tincture upon him, 45; attacking Arianism, 46; admired Diodorus, 45; condemned, 47; his debts to Clement and Eusebius, 48; concerned with the relation between Hellenism and Christianity, 49; did mention Clement of Alexandria, 49; cited translators of scripture, 51; edited by Migne, 52; indulged in allegory, 55, 91; spoke of 'the laws of allegory', 55; influence on Cassian, xvi, 55, 66, 70, 71, 74, 78, 81, 80, 82; condemning Greek allegory, 56; on allegory and tropology, 57; his treatise 'on gods', 58; respected in sixteenth-century Europe, 58; considered as the last great scholar of Late Antiquity, 59; indifferent to the book of Revelation 60; rejecting millenarian ideas, 64; recounting the life of Didymus, 67; a sedulous exegete, 68; mentioned Greek intellectuals of old, 69; not the author of *QetR*, 72; an instructor to Cassian, 72; on Christology, 73; theologically suspect during the 530s and 540s, 77; studied Aristotle, 89; using language peculiar to Antioch, 90; strove to convert heretics, 92
- Theodosius, monk and scribe, 2, 3, 7, 8, 83, 85, 86, 86, 105, 139, 152, 155, 407,
- Theodosius I (emperor, 347–395), 45
- Theodosius II (emperor, 401–450), 45, 69, 309, 391, 400
- Theodosius of Alexandria (grammarian, purported to have lived about the time of Emperor Constantine), 212
- Theodosius the Coenobiarch (a monk, abbot, of Cappadocian ancestry, ascetic companion of St Sabas, c. 423–529), xiv, 75, 93
- Theodotion, 32, 33, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 84; *Theodotionis versio*, 110, 184, 186, 336, 358
- Theodotus of Ancyra (bishop, at first friend then an enemy of Nestorius, fourth–fifth century AD), 169
- Theodotus of Byzantium (a Christian heretic, end of second century), 32
- Theognostus the Grammarian (Constantinople, ninth century AD), 212
- Theon of Alexandria (a Greco-Egyptian scholar and mathematician, the father of Hypatia, c. 335–c. 405), 9, 155, 307
- Theon of Alexandria (a medical doctor, reviewed by Photius), 138
- Theon of Smyrna (a Greek philosopher and mathematician, influenced by Pythagoreanism, fl. c. AD 100), 367, 369, 370, 382
- Theophanes Confessor (monk and chronicler, Constantinople, Samothrace, Abbas in Cyzicus, c. AD 758/760–817/818), 334
- Theophilus (Patriarch of Alexandria, died 412), 32
- Theophilus of Antioch (apologist, patriarch during c. 170, died in c. 183/185), 14, 24, 325, 337.
- Theophrastus (philosopher, from Eresos in Lesbos, the successor to Aristotle in the Peripatetic school, c. 371–c. 287 BC), 29, 60, 69, 253, 337, 382, 402
- Theory of Ideas, by Plato, 27, 79
- Thessaly, 1, 2, 5
- Thomas of Heraclea, producer of the *versio Heraclensis* of NT, 7
- Three Chapters, 45, 47, 77
- Timaeus (sophist and grammarian, probably fourth century), 330
- Timaeus of Locris (Pythagorean philosopher, c. 420–380 BC, featuring in Plato's *Timaeus*), 60
- Tome of Leo, xiii, 25
- Toura, 68, 70
- tragic poets, of Athens (Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides), xvi
- Trajan (emperor, AD 53–117), 12
- Trinitarian doctrine, taught at Nisibis, 31

- Trinitarian God, [xii](#), [25](#), [31](#), [45](#), [63](#), [92](#), [150](#), [288](#)
- Trinity (Τριάς), the term originated in Antioch, [24](#)
- tropology, [42](#), [55](#), [57](#), [93](#), [254](#)
- Tryphon of Alexandria (grammarian, c. 60–10 BC), [123](#)
- Turks, [1](#), [57](#)
- typology, [4](#), [55](#), [56](#), [63](#), [133](#)
- Tyre, in Phoenicia, [52](#)
- Valentinus, early Christian Gnostic theologian, c.100–c.160), [29](#)
- Veroe, in Thrace, [12](#)
- Veroia, in Macedonia, [12](#)
- Veroia, in Syria, [89](#)
- Victor I of Rome, pope (c. 189–c. 200), [29](#), [32](#)
- Victoria and Albert Museum, [57](#)
- Western Greece, [52](#)
- Western monasticism, [xv](#)
- wrath of God (interpreted allegorically), [xiv](#)
- Xenocrates of Chalcedon (philosopher, mathematician, c. 396/5–314/13 BC, scholarch of the Platonic Academy from 339/8 to 314/13 BC), [60](#), [69](#), [305](#)
- Xenophon (historian, soldier, mercenary, philosopher, c. 430–354 BC), [60](#), [69](#), [276](#), [397](#), [404](#).
- Zacharias Scholasticus (or Zacharias of Mytilene, or Zacharias Rhetor, born c. 465, Gaza, died after 536; bishop, rhetor, theologian, ecclesiastical historian), [90](#)
- Zafaran, [85](#)
- Zeno (c. 425–491, Byzantine Emperor 474–475 and 476–491), [31](#)
- Zeno of Citium (the founder of the Stoic school of philosophy, c. 334 BC–c. 262 BC), [123](#), [325](#), [401](#)
- Zouga monastery, [75](#)

