

REINHART CEULEMANS

New manuscripts of the *catena Trium Patrum* ('B2') and of the commentaries by Theodoret of Cyrrhus and the Three Fathers ('B1') on the Song of Songs*

Abstract: The so-called *catena Trium Patrum* on the Song of Songs (also known as catena type CPG C 81 B2) gathers three sources: the commentary by Theodoret of Cyrrhus (CPG 6203); a commentary (CPG C 81 B1) that created on the basis of Gregory of Nyssa's homilies and Nilus of Ancyra's commentary and that carries the mark of Maximus the Confessor's theology; the exegetical poem on the Song by Michael Psellus. For some of those texts, this article identifies new manuscript witnesses (the B2 catena as a whole; Theodoret's commentary only; the B1 text's direct tradition).

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE TEXTS

Recently, the present author had the opportunity to review L. Bossina's excellent monograph *Theodoro restituito* (2008)¹. In this monograph, Bossina provides an innovative and highly learned treatment of the manuscript and printed traditions of the commentary of Theodoret of Cyrrhus (CPG 6203) on the Song of Songs. This exegetical treatise has not survived in direct tradition: the only way to retrieve its text is through recourse to the catena traditions on this Old Testament book. Luckily, one specific catena has preserved the complete text of Theodoret's commentary: the so-called *catena Trium Patrum* (CPG C 81), also known as catena type B2 (according to the terminology and classification used by M. Faulhaber in his seminal work on the catenae of the Solomonic books)².

Unfortunately, this catena's tradition has been stalked by a misleading description, for which Faulhaber is responsible. In his terms, this catena consists of two recensions, B1 and B2. In fact, as Bossina shows in his book, B1 must not be considered to be one of two recensions of the *catena Trium Patrum*. That chain has but one recension, namely the one labeled B2 by Faulhaber. This B2 catena gathers the exegesis of three sources:

- (1) the commentary by Theodoret of Cyrrhus, mentioned above;

* The author is a Postdoctoral Fellow of the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO). The verse numbering of the Song of Songs provided throughout this article is that of the Septuagint text, as printed in A. RAHLFS – R. HANHART, *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart 2006, II 260–271.

¹ L. BOSSINA, *Theodoro restituito. Ricerche sulla catena dei Tre Padri e la sua tradizione* (*Studi e Ricerche* 68). Alessandria 2008. This book is basically an updated collection of seven articles, authored by Bossina over the last decade, which all treat several aspects of the B2 catena and the various texts it contains (see below). For summaries of Bossina's most important findings and precise references to his book, the reader is kindly referred to the present author's review, published in *Byz 80* (2010) 506–516.

² M. FAULHABER, *Hohelied-, Proverbien- und Prediger-Catenen* (*Theologische Studien der Leo-Gesellschaft* 4). Wien 1902, 6–19. In the classification of G. KARO – I. LIETZMANN, which appeared in the same year as Faulhaber's study and also is of great importance to present-day research of the catena traditions on the Song, this catena is type IV. See their *Catenarum graecarum catalogus. Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse* (1902) 1–66, 299–350 and 559–620, here 317–318.

- (2) the poetical exegesis *In Canticum* of Michael Psellus: this is a poem that comments upon Cant 1,5–6,9 and relies to great extent on Gregory of Nyssa's homilies (on which see below);
- (3) a continuous commentary created on the basis of Gregory of Nyssa's fifteen homilies on the Song (CPG 3158)³ and Nilus of Ancyra's commentary on that book (CPG 6051). Both sources were not excerpted literally, but their exegesis was re-written in the spirit of Maximus the Confessor's theology (CPG 7711.4) – maybe the author of this commentary was a disciple of Maximus. With Bossina, therefore, one can characterize this commentary as relying upon two exegetical (Gregory and Nilus) and one theological source (Maximus). The fact that three sources can be identified behind this commentary prompted Faulhaber to label it as the B1 recension of the *catena Trium Patrum*. In fact, this is not correct: this B1 text, although indeed reaching back to three earlier sources, should not be considered a recension of that catena. First, one should not ignore that it offers one continuous running commentary, instead of providing different scholia: every biblical lemma is followed by one continuous fragment (in which materials of the three sources can be found), not by different scholia that each represent one author. Second, one should not be misled by the observation that the B1 commentary as well as the B2 catena draw from three sources. This prompted Faulhaber to hold both of them for a particular recension of the same *catena Trium Patrum*. In fact, as the overview provided above shows, the Three Fathers who the B1 commentary draws from are completely different from the three texts that are gathered in the B2 catena. In sum, this B1 text cannot be labeled 'the B1 recension of the *catena Trium Patrum*' (Faulhaber), but rather 'the B1 commentary' (which is the term that will be used throughout the following pages). It is not a *catena Trium Patrum*, but, if anything, a *commentarius Trium Patrum*. Within the actual *catena Trium Patrum* (i.e., the B2 catena), it is one of three sources, next to Theodoret and Psellus.

Faulhaber's misleading terminology (holding the B1 commentary for an alternative recension of the B2 catena whereas in fact it is one of its sources) was partly prompted by the observation that the B1 commentary is also transmitted on its own, independently from the B2 catena in which it can be found. In fact, this is not so surprising: Psellus's poem, another source of the B2 catena, is also transmitted both in the catena and in direct tradition, independent from the catena one. Similarly, the B1 commentary has been transmitted directly as well as through the B2 catena⁴.

Many of the findings formulated above are offered in Bossina's book. To a large extent, he is solely responsible for having laid bare the flaws in Faulhaber's descriptions. Not only did he correct them, but he also provided many new insights. Consequently, the summary the reader finds above relies heavily on Bossina's research⁵.

1.2 THE EDITIONS

Another major merit of Bossina's monograph is the identification it provides of the manuscripts that lie behind the editions of the B2 catena and of the patristic and Byzantine texts it compiles. With a single exception, all editions available today are pre-critical. It is only thanks to Bossina's research that present-day users of those editions and researchers of the catena traditions on the Song can assess their value (i.e., of those pre-critical editions). Bossina's conclusions can be summarized as follows.

³ In these homilies Gregory treated Cant 1,1–6,9 only (see below, n. 10).

⁴ As a matter of fact, stressing the existence of both a direct and a catena tradition of the B1 commentary is not without importance, for there are some remarkable differences between both traditions: see below, n. 13.

⁵ BOSSINA, Teodoro *passim*.

A critical edition of the B2 catena as a whole has not appeared⁶. Hitherto, editorial efforts have focused, and continue to do so, on editing its three sources separately. Until now, however, only one of them is in fact edited critically⁷:

- (1) Theodoret's commentary can be found in *PG* 81, 28–213, which reprints the edition prepared by J.L. Schulze (1769). Throughout his book, Bossina managed to show that Schulze had limited himself to copying J. Sirmond's edition (1642), which takes its text from the B2 manuscript *Vat. gr. 621* (s. XVI), and to comparing it to two other versions (namely the Greek text of another B2 witness, *Monac. gr. 559* [s. XVI], and the Latin translation of the B2 catena carried out in 1563 by P.F. Zini on the basis of *Vat. gr. 621*). Recently, Bossina himself provided a critical edition of Theodoret's commentary on Cant 8,14, including the evidence of B2's most important manuscripts⁸.
- (2) The text of Michael Psellus is available in a critical edition prepared by L. Westerink (1992), who collated manuscripts both from the direct and the B2 catena tradition⁹.
- (3) In its direct tradition, the B1 commentary is not yet edited, except for its closing part, i.e. the one that comments on Cant 6,9–8,14 (*PG* 87², 1756–1780)¹⁰. The *PG* text reprints the edition prepared by A. Mai (1834), who falsely ascribed the fragments to Procopius of Gaza¹¹. Faulhaber identified *Vat. gr. 728* (s. XVI) to be the source manuscript¹². The ca-

⁶ The following edition appears to be a non-critical one of the complete B2 catena: *Τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Θεοδορηίου ἐπισκόπου Κύρου εἰρμηνεῖα* [sic] *εἰς τὸ Ἄσμα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τοῦ σοφοῦ Σολομῶντος, μετὰ καὶ πινῶν ἐξηγήσεων εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν εἰρμηνεῖαν* [sic] *κατὰ παράφρασιν, τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου Νύσσης, τοῦ ἁγίου Νεῖλου τοῦ ἀσκητοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Μαξίμου τοῦ ὁμολογητοῦ, μεθ' ἑτέρας ἐξηγήσεως πάνν ὠραίας, διὰ στίχων πολιτικῶν, τοῦ ὑπερτίμου Ψελλοῦ*, νεωστὶ τυπωθὲν εἰς κοινὴν ὠφέλειαν, διὰ δαπάνης καὶ ἀναλωμάτων, τοῦ ἐν ἱερομονάχοις ὁσιωτάτου κυρίου Ἰεροθέου τοῦ Ἀββατίου, τοῦ ἐκ τῆς νήσου Κεφαλληνίας, καὶ διορθωθὲν παρὰ Ματθαίου ἱερέως Κιγῶλα τοῦ Κυπρίου. Προσετέθησαν δ' ἔτι, ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ βιβλίου καὶ τινες στίχοι τῆς Δεκαλόγου, καὶ κατὰ ἀλφάβητον, ἕτεροι συμβουλευτικοὶ πρὸς Νεόφυτον παῖδα, μετὰ καὶ τῶν τοῦ Γεωργίου Πισσιδίου, εἰς τὸν μάταιον βίον πρὸς τὸν οἰκουμενικὸν πατριάρχη, ἐν τῷ τέλει τοῦ βιβλίου. Ene-tiēsin 1639 (*non vidi*). The present author owes this reference to É. LEGRAND, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des grecs au dix-septième siècle*. Paris 1894, I 401–402, and É. LEGRAND (†) – H. PERNOT, *Bibliographie ionienne. Description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par les grecs des sept-îles ou concernant les îles, du quinzième siècle à l'année 1900*. Paris 1910, I 47. This edition was also included in the overview provided by P. MOORE, *Iter Psellianum. A Detailed Listing of Manuscript Sources for All Works Attributed to Michael Psellos, Including a Comprehensive Bibliography* (*Subsidia Mediaevalia* 26). Toronto 2005, 470.

⁷ Except for the part concerning the direct tradition of the B1 commentary, the following brief overview summarizes insights reached by BOSSINA, Teodoreto, *passim*. Bibliographical references to the editions and translations of Schulze, Sirmond, Zini and du Duc (mentioned below) are to be looked for in his book.

⁸ BOSSINA, Teodoreto 41–46.

⁹ L.G. WESTERINK, *Michaelis Pselli Poemata (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana)*. Stuttgartiae – Lipsiae 1992, x–xii and 13–67. Westerink included the evidence of the B2 catena in the form of one manuscript, namely *Vind. theol. gr. 314*, a witness dated to the first half of the fourteenth century. He (xii) labeled it the “*archetypus omnium codicum catenae B²*”. Later, Bossina confirmed its important position (Teodoreto, *passim*).

¹⁰ Various B1 manuscripts transmit this part only of the commentary (ad Cant 6,9–8,14): *Vat. gr. 728*; *Vat. Ottob. gr. 56*; *Rom. Casanat. 203* (all are sixteenth-century witnesses). See moreover the discussion below on *Athen. EBE 2410*. The reason for this partial transmission needs to be looked for in the size of Gregory's fifteen sermons on the Song, which do not run up to the Song's last verse, but end with Cant 6,9. Consequently, some manuscripts use the final part of other commentaries or catenae on the Song (in this case: the B1 commentary) to supplement the lacking exegesis of Cant 6,9–8,14. More than once does Bossina touch upon this phenomenon: see his Teodoreto 28–29, 105–106, 132.

¹¹ A. M[AI], *Classicorum auctorum e Vaticanis codicibus editorum tomus VI. Procopii Gazaei commentarium in Genesim usque ad cap. XVIII. Eiusdem fragmentum in Canticum Salomonis, Anonymi scholia in Matthaem et Marcum, Glossarium vetus Latinitatis*. Roma 1834, 348–378. FAULHABER, *Hohelied-Catenen* 19 and 28 n. 1, argued that Mai had ascribed the exegesis in question to Procopius of Gaza since it followed a catena on Proverbs (*CPG* 7445) that was written in the same hand and that is ascribed to the very same Procopius (in fact this attribution is spurious as well). These insights were ‘re-discovered’ by P. Nikolopoulos in a recent article, in which he also edited the B1 commentary ad Cant 6,9–8,5 as it is present in *Athen. EBE 2410*. See his *Εἶναι ἔργον τοῦ Γρηγορίου Νύσσης ἡ συνέχεια τῆς ἐρμηνείας εἰς τὸ ἄσμα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*; *EEBS* 53 (2007–2009) 467–502, discussed below.

¹² FAULHABER, *Hohelied-Catenen* 19 and 28 n. 1.

tena tradition of the B1 commentary (i.e., as it is transmitted in the B2 catena) is edited completely. This edition, too, is pre-critical. It can be found in *PG* 122, 537–685 (together with Psellus' text), which is a reprint of the edition prepared by F. du Duc (1624). The latter had edited the B2 catena (but without Theodoret's scholia) on the basis of *Vat. gr. 621*, as proven by Bossina¹³.

In sum, only Psellus' text has been edited critically. The B1 commentary and that of Theodoret still await a critical edition. It is precisely those editions that are in preparation by Bossina.

1.3 THE MANUSCRIPTS

With his book, Bossina paved the way for his forthcoming editions. This is not the time to point out its many qualities, nor to stress how much the present author has enjoyed reading it: this he has done repeatedly in the review referred to above (n. 1).

In that same review, the present author offered an overview of the known manuscript witnesses of the B2 catena, of Theodoret's text and of B1's direction tradition. This he did with the aim to offer a useful tool to those scholars who are interested in the manuscript tradition of those texts. Many of the manuscripts receive ample treatment in Bossina's book, some others are mentioned in passing and a few are ignored. In other words, that list was partly conceived as an addition to but mostly as a summary of some particular aspects of Bossina's book: astute as its author may have shown himself, nowhere has he provided an easily accessible list of the manuscript witnesses he examined or of those he is aware of. Under the impression that scholars of the catenae on the Song (a field of study that has received some attention in the past years) might benefit from a listing of all known manuscripts, the present author included such a list at the end of his review¹⁴.

2. ADDITIONAL MANUSCRIPT WITNESSES

To that list, this article wishes to add some other manuscript witnesses. After the completion of his review, the present author happened to run into some additional manuscripts, that have never been mentioned in previous secondary literature on Theodoret or on the *catena Trium Patrum*. Bossina does not mention them either – which does not mean that he is not aware of them¹⁵.

Intended to serve as an addition to the abovementioned overview of manuscripts of the B2 catena and related texts, this article lists a few manuscripts that secondary literature on this catena or its sources has never linked to those texts and of which the present author only recently found out the nature of their contents and their relevance to the study of those texts. The manuscripts in question

¹³ As mentioned earlier (n. 4), there are some significant differences between the version of the B1 commentary that is transmitted directly and that which is found in the B2 catena. In three cases, some folios in *Vind. theol. gr. 314* (s. XIV), a manuscript that stands at the top of the most numerously represented branch of B2's manuscript stemma (see n. 9), have been transposed: the exegesis offered by Theodoret and that of the B1 text have been switched. In two of those cases, this transposition has affected the entire subsequent manuscript tradition, which completely depends on *Vind. theol. gr. 314* (whether directly or indirectly): this resulted in errors that eventually ended up in the editions one finds in *PG* 122 and *PG* 81 (mentioned above): fragments of the B1 text have been printed as part of Theodoret's text and vice versa. This is clearly shown by a comparison between the exegesis of Cant 8,14 as found in the direct tradition of the B1 commentary (*PG* 87², 1777C2–1780A14), on the one hand, and in the B2 catena tradition of that text (*PG* 122, 685B6–D7), on the other hand. All of this was discovered and thoroughly discussed by Bossina (Teodoreto 3–52).

¹⁴ The need for such a list is illustrated by the frequency with which scholars keep referring to the old overviews provided by Karo – Lietzmann and Faulhaber (publication date: 1902; see the references in n. 2).

¹⁵ In that sense, this overview can serve a double goal. First and foremost, it should offer a useful tool to scholars of catenae on the Song. Second: in the event that Bossina (who does not mention all of the witnesses listed in the abovementioned review and none of those described in the present article) is not aware of the contents of those manuscripts, his forthcoming editions can benefit from the present author's listings.

can be grouped as additional witnesses (1) to the B2 catena as a whole, (2) to Theodoret's commentary only (but probably relying upon the B2 catena), (3) to the B1 commentary's direct tradition¹⁶.

2.1 THE B2 CATENA

To the list of manuscripts of the B2 catena listed in the abovementioned review, three witnesses can be added¹⁷.

(a) *Athon. Vatop. 9 (s.XVI)*

A detailed description of this manuscript can be found in the recent catalogue by E. Lamberz, who dated it to the third quarter of the sixteenth century¹⁸. The description offered there shows that this codex contains the B2 catena. Remarkably, the chain has not been transmitted as one sound unit, but in the form of two distinct parts. F. 115–223 contain the scholia of B1 and Theodoret; the text of Psellus can be found on f. 251–264^v. In between both parts, the manuscript contains the catena of Ps.-Eusebius on the Song (*CPG C 84*)¹⁹. On the basis of the handwriting, Lamberz identifies the copyist as Constantinus Rhesinus, who is known to have copied at least one other B2 manuscript (*Vind. suppl. gr. 201*²⁰).

In fact, *Athon. Vatop. 9* was already known to Westerink, who listed it in the introduction to his critical edition of Psellus' exegesis of the Song; he even mentioned it as a B2 catena witness²¹. Nevertheless, until now this manuscript was never correctly recognized as a full witness to this catena. Remarkably, Westerink does not seem to have noticed the contents of f. 115–223: he only mentioned Psellus' text of the manuscript (f. 251–264^v)²². His only reason for having arranged it among those catena manuscripts is the observation that v. 54 of Psellus' text is followed by another piece of the B2 catena (i.e., belonging to either the B1 commentary or Theodoret's exegesis). Hav-

¹⁶ The way in which the present author managed to identify the manuscripts in question is through his own research on the catena traditions on the Song of Songs and his consultation of catalogues and manuscripts. Additional guidance to certain catalogues and manuscripts was offered by Moore's listing of known witnesses to Psellus' *In Canticum* (see his *Iter Psellianum* 471–473) and by the very useful search engine *Pinakes*, created and maintained by the *Section grecque* of the Paris *IRHT* (available through <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/>, last accessed 08/09/10). Apart from the new catena containing materials of Theodoret (see below: *Hierosol. Secti. Sepulchri 370*), the present author did not see any of the manuscripts which are adduced here as unknown witnesses to the B2 catena, to Theodoret's commentary and to the B1 commentary: he identified them on the basis of the descriptions given in the respective catalogues.

¹⁷ In addition to the three extant manuscripts mentioned below, the present author draws attention to two lost codices that, as far as one can deduce from the descriptions gathered by G. de Andrés, seem to have contained the B2 catena: *Scorial. I.I.6 (deperd. 476)* and *Scorial. I.II.10 (deperd. 487)*. See his *Catálogo de los códices griegos desaparecidos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial. El Escorial 1968*, 204–206. The description of *Scorial. I.II.10 (deperd. 487)* also mentions the name of Eusebius, which is alien to the B2 catena. Maybe this indicates that the manuscript also contained another catena (or only its prologue) on the Song, which is erroneously ascribed to Eusebius (*CPG C 84*). The combination of this catena with that of B2 is attested in two other manuscripts (*Salmantic. 2716* and *Athon. Vatop. 9*, mentioned below).

¹⁸ E. LAMBERZ, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften des Athosklosters Vatopedi. Band I: Codices 1–102 (Katalogoi ellenikon cheirographon Agiou Orous 2)*. Thessaloniki 2006, 56–61.

¹⁹ In fact, as the present author will expound in a forthcoming article, the *Athon. Vatop. 9* is one of several unknown witnesses to this catena.

²⁰ See E. GAMILLSCHEG, *Eine neue Handschrift des Kopisten Konstantinos Rhesinos. Codices manuscripti 17* (1994) 54–58; E. GAMILLSCHEG, *Konstantinos Rhesinos und die Handschriften aus dem Besitz des Freiherrn Hoffmann von Strechau. Biblos 43* (1994) 27–32; H. HUNGER, unter Mitarbeit von CHR. HANNICK, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Teil 4: Supplementum graecum (Museion. Veröffentlichungen der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Neue Folge. Vierte Reihe: Veröffentlichungen der Handschriftensammlung 1.4)*. Wien 1994, 366–367.

²¹ WESTERINK, *Michaelis Pselli Poemata XII*.

²² WESTERINK, *Michaelis Pselli Poemata XII*: “scriba Athoi Batopedii 9, s. XVI, ff. 251^v [sic]–264^v versus Pselli solos excerptit”.

ing examined f. 251–264^v, Westerink concluded that *Athon. Vatop. 9* is an *apographon* of *Mutin. α S. 8. 7*, a B2 manuscript that itself was copied on the basis of *Vat. Reg. gr. 7* (another B2 witness) by Andreas Darmarius in 1560²³. In his opinion, the copyist of *Athon. Vatop. 9* (whom Lamberz identified to be Constantinus Rhesinus, as said above) excerpted only the verses belonging to Psellus from his B2 source manuscript (*Mutin. α S. 8. 7*).

In the present author's opinion, *Athon. Vatop. 9* should be regarded as a witness of full value to the B2 catena, although it separately transmits the scholia of the B1 text and Theodoret, on the one hand, and those of Psellus, on the other hand. Two observations prompt such a characterization. Firstly: although separated from the B1 and Theodoret scholia, Psellus' text is taken from the B2 catena, not from direct tradition. This is concluded by Westerink, as said earlier. Secondly: this is not the only manuscript in which one of B2's three sources is transmitted separately from both other ones. One comes across a similar setup in *Salmantic. 2716 (olim Matrit. Palat. 20)*, copied in the sixteenth century by Darmarius. The latter manuscript contains, on f. 49–78, the complete text of Psellus' poem and only further on, on f. 80–229, the commentaries of B1 and Theodoret, separated from Psellus' text²⁴. This set-up is similar, though not identical, to that of *Athon. Vatop. 9* (in which Psellus' text is written after the B1 and Theodoret scholia instead of before it). In fact, just like *Athon. Vatop. 9* does, *Salmantic. 2716* also contains the text of Ps.-Eusebius' catena. In the former (*Athon. Vatop. 9*, f. 224–250^v), it can be found in between the folios containing the B2 materials; in the latter (*Salmantic. 2716*, f. 1–48^v), it precedes them.

Could the remarkable parallel between both manuscripts alter the hypothesis concerning the source manuscript from which *Athon. Vatop. 9* was copied, as it was proposed by Westerink (and which is enfeebled by his quite limited identification of the manuscript, see above)? Already Faulhaber remarked that the set-up of *Salmantic. 2716*, differing from that of the other witnesses to the B2 catena known to him, would enable one to easily spot those manuscripts that are related to it²⁵. This makes one wonder whether *Salmantic. 2716* could be related to *Athon. Vatop. 9*.

The chances of the B2 texts in both manuscripts being copied one from the other are quite slim: if this would have been the case, then it would probably also have been so with regard to the catena of Ps.-Eusebius²⁶. As said earlier (n. 19), *Athon. Vatop. 9* is a witness to the latter catena that was not known earlier. As a consequence, it is not yet collated and its place in the manuscript tradition is unknown. Nevertheless, from the information provided in the respective catalogues one can deduce that it probably does not belong to the same branch of the stemma of Ps.-Eusebius' catena as *Salmantic. 2716* does: the latter manuscript transmits this chain up to Cant 8,14, whereas *Athon.*

²³ See V. PUNTONI, *Indice dei codici greci della Biblioteca Estense di Modena. SIFC 4* (1896) 379–536, here 482 (reprinted in: CHR. SAMBERGER et indicem adiecit D. RAFFIN, *Catalogi codicum Graecorum qui in minoribus bibliothecis Italicis asservantur in duo volumina collati et novissimis additamentis aucti [Catalogi codicum Graecorum lucis ope reimpressi]*. Lipsiae 1965, I 295–452, here 408) and BOSSINA, *Teodoreto 72–75*.

²⁴ CH. GRAUX – A. MARTIN, *Rapport sur une mission en Espagne et en Portugal. Notices sommaires des manuscrits grecs d'Espagne et de Portugal. Nouvelles archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires 2* (1892) 1–322, here 86–89; T. SANTANDER, *La Biblioteca de don Diego de Covarrubias y Leyva, obispo de Ciudad Rodrigo y de Segovia, y Presidente del Consejo de Estado (1512–1577). I. Manuscritos. Salamanca 2000*, 83–85. The remarkable set-up of *Salmantic. 2716* was also pointed out by FAULHABER, *Hohelied-Catenen 7–8*; he knew the manuscript as *Matrit. Palat. 20*: “Die Pselluserklärungen sind aus dem Corpus der Catene herausgenommen und vorangestellt”.

²⁵ FAULHABER, *Hohelied-Catenen 8*: “An der eigenthümlichen Reihenfolge der B²-Scholiasten [...] geben sich die Verwandten der Madrider Palasthandschrift [i.e., *Salmantic. 2716*] rasch zu erkennen”. It should be stressed that Faulhaber was speaking hypothetically: he himself was not aware of any such manuscript (i.e., a witness that exhibited the same remarkable set-up as that of *Salmantic. 2716*).

²⁶ As indicated above, the presence of this chain, together with that of B2, could be an argument in favor of a link between *Athon. Vatop. 9* and *Salmantic. 2716*. Then again, the sequence of these three texts (Psellus – Theodoret and B1 – Ps.-Eusebius) is not identical in both manuscripts.

Vatop. 9 only runs to Cant 6,9²⁷. In other words, Faulhaber's hypothesis does not seem to be correct.

It would rather be interesting to investigate whether *Salmantic. 2716* and *Athon. Vatop. 9*, which both are more or less equally old, both depend on the same source²⁸. As mentioned above, Westerink thought *Mutin. α S. 8. 7* to be the source from which Psellus' text in *Athon. Vatop. 9* was copied. Most likely, this reasoning also applies to the B1 text and Theodoret's commentary in the latter manuscript. One knows that *Mutin. α S. 8. 7* was copied by Darmarius in 1560 on the basis of *Vat. Reg. gr. 7* (see above). In 1561, Darmarius copied a second manuscript on the basis of the same *Vat. Reg. gr. 7*, namely *Vat. Barb. gr. 567*, but into the latter manuscript he inserted many changes²⁹. Since the same Darmarius also copied *Salmantic. 2716*, it would be interesting to collate its text against that of the manuscripts mentioned in this paragraph, to see whether it was copied from *Mutin. α S. 8. 7*, just as *Athon. Vatop. 9* was, or from *Vat. Barb. gr. 567*, *Vat. Reg. gr. 7*³⁰ or another manuscript. Such research, which surpasses the present article's, could shed light on the relationship, if any, between *Salmantic. 2716* and *Athon. Vatop. 9* with regard to the B2 catena.

(b) *Athon. Scetae Scti. Prodromi 4* (a. 1692)

A second witness to the B2 catena that has not been mentioned in secondary literature on that chain is *Athon. Scetae Scti. Prodromi 4*, a miscellany manuscript that was written in 1692 by Joseph of Sinope. The description provided in the catalogue by L. Politis and M. Manousakas, although not very clear, seems to show that f. 4–174^v of this manuscript transmit the B2 catena³¹. Since Joseph

²⁷ On the question of the precise range of the catena of Ps.-Eusebius, see R. CEULEMANS, A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of the Book of Canticles with Emphasis on their Reception in Greek Christian Exegesis. (Diss. doct) Leuven 2009, 163–167. A future collation of *Athon. Vatop. 9* needs to point out whether it contains the additional fifth prologue to Ps.-Eusebius' catena that can be found in no other witness than *Salmantic. 2716*. On this fifth prologue, which is taken from the prologue to the catena of Polychronius on the Song (*CPG C 83*) and supplements the four other ones that can be found in all manuscripts of Ps.-Eusebius' catena, see J.-M. AUWERS, L'interprétation du Cantique des cantiques à travers les chaînes exégétiques grecques (Epitomé de Procope, chaîne de Polychronios, chaîne dite d'Eusèbe, *Catena Barberiniana*), Dissertation présentée pour l'obtention du grade d'Agrégé de l'Enseignement Supérieur. Louvain-la-Neuve 2007, II 436.

²⁸ *Salmantic. 2716* is not dated precisely. On the dating of other manuscripts copied by Darmarius and having belonged to don Diego de Covarrubias y Leyva, see M. VOGEL – V. GARDTHAUSEN, Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance (*Beihefte zum Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 33). Leipzig 1909, 18–19, and SANTANDER, La Biblioteca 41–54 and *passim*.

²⁹ See BOSSINA, Teodoreto 77–79, 82–88.

³⁰ Westerink, who had not managed to track down *Salmantic. 2716*, supposed that it was copied from *Vat. Reg. gr. 7*. See his Michaelis Pselli Poemata xii.

³¹ L. POLITIS – M.I. MANOUSAKAS, Συμπληρωματικοί κατάλογοι χειρογράφων Ἁγίου Ὁρους (*Hell, Parartema* 24). Thessaloniki 1973, 240–242. f. 179–181^v contain another text treating the Song of Songs, which is entitled Νικήτα Σεΐδου, πατριάρχου Κ[ωνσταντιν]πόλεως Ὑπόθεσις τοῦ Ἄσματος τῶν Ἀσμάτων. This is a part of Nicetas Seides' (11th–12th century) synopsis of Holy Scripture, edited in P.N. SIMOTAS, Νικήτα Σεΐδου Σύνοψις τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς κατὰ τὸν ὑπ' ἀριθ. 483 κώδικα τῆς Ἐθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Ἑλλάδος. Εἰσαγωγή, κείμενον, σχόλια (*Analekta Blatadon* 42). Thessaloniki 1984, 252–257. This text is related to three other synopses of the Song, which are provided by Ps.-Athanasius (*PG* 28, 349C–357B), in the first prologue of Ps.-Eusebius' catena (mentioned above, n. 27) and in the manuscript *Vat. Barb. gr. 317* (s. XI), f. 174^v–184. As discovered by M. Harl and G. Dorival, the synopses of *Vat. Barb. gr. 317* and Ps.-Eusebius depend on that of Ps.-Athanasius. See M. HARL, Les trois livres de Salomon et les trois parties de la philosophie dans les Prologues des Commentaires sur le *Cantique des Cantiques* (d'Origène aux Chaînes exégétiques grecques), in: J. DUMMER – J. IRMSCHER – F. PASCHKE – K. TREU, Texte und Textkritik. Eine Aufsatzsammlung (*TU* 133). Berlin 1987, 249–269, here 261 n. 55 and 268; G. DORIVAL, Le document synoptique du *Barberinianus gr. 317* (III 36), in: G. DORIVAL C. BOUDIGNON – F. BOUET – C. CAVALIER, Qu'est-ce qu'un corpus littéraire? Recherches sur le corpus biblique et les corpus patristiques (*Collection de la Revue des Études juives* 35). Paris – Louvain – Dudley, MA 2005, 95–108. Recently, Auwers (L'interprétation II 411–424) confirmed the views of Harl and Dorival but he also laid bare and discussed various divergences between the various versions of the synopsis. In the introduction to his edition of Nicetas' synopsis (32–41), Simo-

operated in Athos at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, one could assume that the B2 text was copied on the basis of an (as yet unidentified) Athos manuscript³².

(c) *Samiacus Metropol. 60 (a. 1787)*

According to I.E. Anastasiou's catalogue, this manuscript (195 f.) contains the B2 catena in its entirety³³. It was copied in 1787 by Gregory the Hieromonk. It has no value whatsoever for the establishment of a critical text of the B2 catena, since it was copied from the anonymous printed edition that appeared in 1639³⁴.

2.2 THEODORET'S COMMENTARY

2.2.1 A new witness to the complete text

As enumerated in the list of manuscripts prepared by the present author in his review of Bossina's book (see n. 1), three manuscripts have hitherto been described by other scholars as transmitting (parts of) the text of Theodoret's commentary on its own, i.e. without it being part of the B2 (or any other) catena. Nevertheless, this transmission is only seemingly independent: in fact it does not give proof to a direct tradition of Theodoret's text, but it is excerpted from the B2 catena (as was argued convincingly by Bossina and stated briefly by Rahlfs, see below). In other words: although all three manuscripts mentioned in the abovementioned review contain Theodoret's text only and not the B1 commentary or Psellus' poem, they are believed by Bossina and Rahlfs to testify to the B2 catena tradition of Theodoret's commentary and not to that commentary's direct tradition.

The first manuscript (and undoubtedly the most important one, given its date and its position in Bossina's stemma of the B2 catena) has been identified by Bossina as an anthology of Theodoret's text: it is the thirteenth-century codex *Par. Coisl. 194*³⁵. Bossina argued that this manuscript draws

tas mentioned the unmistakable similarity between this version and that of Ps.-Athanasius, but he did not take into account any of the other versions mentioned above. In the present author's opinion, future study on this topic is necessary: a detailed comparison between all four of the versions mentioned above (Nicetas; Ps.-Athanasius; *Vat. Barb. gr. 317*; Ps.-Eusebius) needs to be carried out in order to identify the sources of the Constantinopolitan author. After all, a superficial comparison (as carried out by the present author) already reveals agreements between Nicetas' text and those of *Vat. Barb. gr. 317* and Ps.-Eusebius, against that of Ps.-Athanasius. Into such a study, the unedited synopsis of the Song that is ascribed to Chrysostom and that can be found in the manuscript *Neapol. II. A. 12* (s. XIV), f. 63–68^v needs to be included. On the latter text, see P. DE LAGARDE, *Septuaginta-Studien. IV. Eine neue Recension der Septuaginta, Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 38 (1892) 59–102, and G. DORIVAL, *L'apport des Synopses transmises sous le nom d'Athanase et de Jean Chrysostome à la question du corpus littéraire de la Bible*, in: DORIVAL – BOUDIGNON – BOUET – CAVALIER, *Qu'est-ce qu'un corpus* 53–93, here 55–70. See moreover below, n. 56.

³² A list of manuscripts known to have been copied by Joseph of Sinope can be found in L. POLITIS – M. POLITI, Βιβλιογράφοι 17^{ov}–18^{ov} αιώνας: Συνοπτική καταγραφή. *Δελτίο του Ιστορικού και Παλαιογραφικού Αρχείου* 6 (1994) 498–499. (The present author gratefully acknowledges that he owes this reference to one of the anonymous reviewers.)

³³ I.E. ANASTASIOU, Κατάλογος χειρογράφων κωδίκων I. Μητροπόλεως Σάμου (*Aristoteleion Panepistemon Thessalonikes. Epistemonike Epeteris Theologikes Scholes*, Parartema 17/13). Thessaloniki 1973, 47–48.

³⁴ See the reference in n. 6.

³⁵ The folios in question of *Par. Coisl. 194* (f. 117–144) are entitled Ἐρμηνεία τοῦ Ψελλοῦ εἰς τὸ Ἄσμα τῶν ἁσμάτων. In his description of this codex, R. Devreesse concluded that this title is erroneous, as no single fragment of Psellus can be found. Instead, so Devreesse, the folios contain an anthology of fragments of Theodoret, followed by an excerpt of the B1 commentary, taken from the B2 catena. See his *Bibliothèque Nationale, Département des manuscrits. Catalogue des manuscrits grecs. II. Le fonds Coislin*. Paris 1945, 173. His identification of that B1 fragment (proven by Bossina to be incorrect, see below) was picked up and exaggerated somewhat by S. LEANZA, *L'esegesi poetica di Michele Psello sul Cantico dei Cantici*, in: U. CRISCUOLO – R. MAISANO, *La poesia bizantina. Atti del terza Giornata di studi bizantini sotto il patrocinio della Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini (Macerata, 11–12 maggio 1993) (Italoellenika, Quaderni 8)*. Napoli 1995, 143–

from the B2 catena tradition: the anthology is based upon an unknown manuscript that belongs to that tradition.

For two other codices, which have been mentioned by A. Rahlfs (on the basis of descriptions offered in earlier catalogues)³⁶, their reliance upon the B2 catena has not been proven so clearly. The catena origins of both these manuscripts (*Lond. Addit. 10070* [s. XVII] and *Mosq. Synod. gr. 288 [Vladimir 44]* [s. XV], which only contains the incomplete fourth book of Theodoret's text), have been put forward by Rahlfs only in passing³⁷. Nevertheless, to the present author's knowledge, this hypothesis of his still stands up to the present³⁸.

To these three manuscripts, which contain (parts of) Theodoret's text without witnessing to a catena set-up, another one can now be added: *Bodl. Holkham gr. 48*, a manuscript dated to 1595³⁹. Its f. 201–260^v contain the complete text of Theodoret's commentary⁴⁰. If indeed all of the three known manuscripts containing Theodoret's text eventually reach back to the B2 catena tradition (as Rahlfs assumed for *Mosq. Synod. gr. 288 [Vladimir 44]* and *Lond. Addit. 10070* and as Bossina proved for *Par. Coisl. 194*), this could be the case for *Bodl. Holkham gr. 48*, as well. A future collation of this manuscript, however, is needed in order to assess the level of certainty behind that hypothesis.

2.2.2 Fragments in a new catena

As known ever since Faulhaber's and Karo – Lietzmann's writings, the B2 type is not the only catena on the Song to contain Theodoret's commentary. Fragments of this text can also be found in other catenae. However, those fragments (i.e., found in catena types other than B2) add up to only a very small percentage of the voluminous original⁴¹. Up to the present, three types of catenae are known to contain fragments of Theodoret's commentary on the Song. They are the following⁴²:

161, here 150. Finally, Bossina provided a necessary nuance to Devreesse's description, namely by concluding that the Paris anthology only contains excerpts of Theodoret's text, without any other materials. Also the passage deemed by Devreesse to be part of the B1 commentary (*PG* 122, 685CD) in fact belongs to Theodoret. This he discovered on the basis of a transposition of folios he managed to identify in *Vind. theol. gr. 314* (on which, see n. 13). Not only did Bossina provide the definitive identification of these folios' contents, he also concluded that the anthology of Theodoret's excerpts is compiled on the basis of the B2 catena. In fact, so Bossina, the *Par. Coisl. 194* is the only known witness to be situated in the second branch of that catena's stemma and to be independent from *Vind. theol. gr. 314*. Moreover, the former manuscript is closer to the catena's archetype than the latter. See BOSSINA, Teodoreto 3–52, esp. 33 and 41.

³⁶ A. RAHLFS, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 2)*. Berlin 1914, 424.

³⁷ RAHLFS, *Verzeichnis* 424, n. 1.

³⁸ In his book, Bossina did not comment upon *Mosq. Synod. gr. 288 (Vladimir 44)* or *Lond. Addit. 10070*.

³⁹ R. BARBOUR, *Summary Description of the Greek Manuscripts from the Library at Holkham Hall. The Bodleian Library Record* 6 (1957–1961) 591–613, here 601.

⁴⁰ F. 142–198^v of the same manuscript contain the epitome of Procopius of Gaza on the Song (*CPG* 7431).

⁴¹ Cf. BOSSINA, Teodoreto 5–6.

⁴² The epitome of Procopius (mentioned in n. 40) contains one scholion of Theodoret, but it belongs to his commentary on Psalms (*CPG* 6202), not to that on the Song. See J.-M. AUWERS, *Procopii Gazaei Epitome in Canticum canticorum*, Dissertation présentée pour l'obtention du grade d'Agrégé de l'Enseignement Supérieur. Louvain-la-Neuve 2007, scholion 29. (This edition will appear shortly in *CCSG*. Sincere thanks are due to Prof. Auwers for having granted the present author access to it.) According to M.A. Barbàra, the compiler of the epitome snuck one piece of Theodoret's commentary on the Song into one of the scholia on Cant 1,13, but this was doubted by Auwers, who suggested that the phrase in question could have been excerpted straight from the Bible and not from Theodoret's commentary. See M.A. BARBÀRA, *Origene. Commentario al Cantico dei Cantici (Biblioteca patristica 42)*. Bologna 2005, 340, and AUWERS, *L'interprétation*, II 255.

- (1) Various fragments can be found in the *catena Cantabrigiensis* (CPG C 85). Of the catenae mentioned here (i.e., catenae other than B2), this is the one to contain most materials of Theodoret⁴³.
- (2) F. 182–187^v of *Bodl. Auct. E. 2. 16 (Misc. 44)* (s. XII–XIII) contain a running commentary on Cant 1,1–2,17 (which precedes the catena of Polychronios [CPG C 83] to Cant 1,5–8,14 on f. 188–199^v of that manuscript⁴⁴). This anonymous text has received different characterizations⁴⁵ before being identified by M.A. Barbàra as an autonomous compilation that contains anonymous fragments taken from Theodoret and other authors (Philo of Carpsasia and Gregory of Nyssa)⁴⁶. The scholia are combined into a running commentary, which makes it hard to identify them⁴⁷.
- (3) A third (unedited) compilation that contains fragments of Theodoret’s commentary is an anonymous prologue to the Septuagint text of the Song that can be found in two manuscripts: *Patm. 209* (s. XIII), f. 65^v–66^v and *Par. gr. 2511* (s. XV), f. 252–256^v. For both witnesses, the description offered in the catalogues is very brief and sheds no light on the contents of this prologue⁴⁸. Recently, either of both manuscripts was mentioned briefly in the preface to a critical edition of a patristic commentary on the Song. In the preface to his 2004 edition of Nilus of Ancyra’s commentary on the Song, H.-U. Rosenbaum listed *Par. gr. 2511* as an excerpt of Procopius of Gaza’s epitome (CPG

⁴³ The entire text of this catena is preserved in two manuscripts: *Cantabrig. Trinit. Coll. O. 1. 54* (s. X–XI) and *Bodl. Auct. E. 2. 8 (Misc. 36)* (s. XVI), the latter being an *apographon* of the former. Only the codex from Oxford was known to Karo – Lietzmann (*Catenarum graecarum catalogus* 319: incorrectly listed as a witness to the catena of Ps.-Eusebius) and to Faulhaber (*Hohelied-Catenen* 65–69: identified as an individual catena type, related to Procopius’ epitome). Further investigations were carried out by A. SOVIĆ, *Animadversiones de Nili Monachi Commentario in Canticum Canticorum reconstruendo. Biblica* 2 (1921) 45–52, and by H. RINGSHAUSEN, *Zur Verfasserschaft und Chronologie der dem Nilus zugeschriebenen Werke*. (Diss. doct.) Frankfurt am Main 1967, who identified *Cantabrig. Trinit. Coll. O. 1. 54* as the *antigraphon* of *Bodl. Auct. E. 2. 8 (Misc. 36)*. For more recent characterizations of the catena, see M.-G. GUÉRARD, *Nil d’Ancyre, Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques (SC 403)*. Paris 1994, I 87–88; H.-U. ROSENBAUM, *Nilus von Ancyra, Schriften. Band I: Kommentar zum Hohelied (Patristische Texte und Studien 57)*. Berlin – New York 2004, 102*–148*; BARBÀRA, *Origene. Commentario al Cantico 127–129* (esp. 128 n. 179). The *catena Cantabrigiensis* is unedited. According to the descriptions referred to above, it contains fragments taken from Theodoret, Nilus of Ancyra, Gregory of Nyssa, Origen, Philo of Carpsasia, Cyril of Alexandria and Apollinaris of Laodicea. A summary of the scholarly discussion on the close relations between this catena and the manuscript *Genuensis, Biblioteca Durazzo-Pallavicini, Raccolta Durazzo A. I. 10* (s. IX–X), f. 281–296 can be found in CEULEMANS, *A Critical Edition* 126–128.

⁴⁴ On this manuscript as a witness to Polychronios’ catena, see KARO – LIETZMANN, *Catenarum graecarum catalogus* 314; FAULHABER, *Hohelied-Catenen* 41; BARBÀRA, *Origene. Commentario al Cantico 124–125* and n. 172; J.-M. AUWERS, *Manuscrits de la chaîne de Polychronios* (<http://sites.uclouvain.be/canticum/Mss3.html>, last accessed 08/09/10). (The folio numbers given by FAULHABER, *Hohelied-Catenen* 41, differ from the present ones: his f. 186–197^v are f. 188–199^v in the numbering one finds today in the manuscript).

⁴⁵ FAULHABER, *Hohelied-Catenen* 41: “eine eigene Erklärung zum hohen Liede 1¹–2¹⁷”, copied by RAHLFS, *Verzeichnis* 164 and 424. A similar identification can be found in U. HAGEDORN – D. HAGEDORN, *Die älteren griechischen Katenen zum Buch Hiob. Band I. Einleitung, Prologe und Epiloge, Fragmente zu Hiob 1,1–8,22 (Patristische Texte und Studien 40)*. Berlin – New York 1994, 10. Earlier, KARO – LIETZMANN, *Catenarum graecarum catalogus* 314, and H.O. COXE, *Bodleian Library. Quarto Catalogues. I. Greek Manuscripts*. Oxford 1969, 645–646, had taken the manuscript as a witness to only the catena of Polychronios, without having identified the different first part.

⁴⁶ BARBÀRA, *Origene. Commentario al Cantico 125* n. 172 and 132 n. 190. Further study of this commentary is lacking.

⁴⁷ This manuscript was mistakenly left out from the list of catenae containing fragments of Theodoret’s commentary that is provided by the present author in the review of Bossina’s book (see n.1). Moreover, the inclusion of the catena of Polychronios into that list is erroneous.

⁴⁸ I. SAKKELION, *Πατριακή βιβλιοθήκη ἤτοι ἀναγραφή τῶν ἐν τῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον Πάτμον γεραρᾶς καὶ βασιλικῆς μονῆς τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἀποστόλου καὶ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου*. Athina 1890, 116–117, and H. OMONT, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale. Seconde partie. Ancien fonds grecs: droit – histoire – sciences*. Paris 1888 (reprinted as the second part of his *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale et des autres bibliothèques de Paris et des Départements*. Paris 1898), 275–277.

7431)⁴⁹. He identified scholia of Gregory of Nyssa and Nilus of Ancyra. The other witness, *Patm. 209*, was mentioned by M.A. Barbàra, in the preface to her 2005 edition of the catena fragments of Origen's commentary on the Song (*CPG 1433*)⁵⁰. According to her brief description, it contains some scholia that can also be found in Procopius' epitome, some excerpts of Gregory of Nyssa's first homily and a passage from the preface to Theodoret's commentary.

In fact, both manuscripts testify to one and the same text, which is a compilation that draws from three sources. In both manuscripts, it counts 12 paragraphs. The first two of them contain fragments of Gregory of Nyssa, drawn from Procopius' epitome⁵¹. Paragraphs 3–5 also contain parts of Gregory's homilies, but this time they are drawn from their direct tradition⁵². The following paragraph contains a scholion of Nilus, again taken from Procopius' epitome⁵³. Paragraphs 7–12 correspond to the opening paragraphs of the first book of Theodoret's commentary⁵⁴. In sum, the compiler of this prologue combined elements that he took from Procopius' epitome, from the direct tradition of Gregory's homilies and from Theodoret.

(3bis) It is interesting to observe that a similar selection of sources can be found in some pages of a (lost?) manuscript that was used for the binding of *Athon. Iv. 1500* (a. 1514/5) and *Athon. Iv. 1561* (second quarter of the sixteenth century). As described in the catalogue⁵⁵, the cover at the end of each of both manuscripts contains a folio that originally belonged to one and the same manuscript. According to P. Sotiroudis, this manuscript was written in the sixteenth century and contained a catena on the Song. The fragments he identified in the cover of *Athon. Iv. 1500* and *Athon. Iv. 1561* belong to Theodoret, Gregory of Nyssa, Origen and Nilus – the latter two authors having been excerpted on the basis of Procopius' epitome. It would be interesting to take a closer look at the possible link between this manuscript and the prologue of *Patm. 209* and *Par. gr. 2511*, since that prologue as well as the fragments preserved in the covers of *Athon. Iv. 1500* and *Athon. Iv. 1561* seem to have been compiled on the basis of the same selection of sources. To the topic at hand, it is relevant to observe that each of those compilations contains materials of Theodoret's commentary.

As said above, the fragments transmitted in the abovementioned catenae only add up to a very small percentage of the complete text of Theodoret's commentary. Moreover, one can assume that their compilers changed, abbreviated and edited the text, which results in frequent differences between the catena fragments and the one that is transmitted in the B2 chain. These caveats notwithstanding, it is still worthwhile to point out the existence of one additional catena on the Song that contains fragments of Theodoret, which has not been identified up to the present.

The catena in question on the Song, containing fragments of Theodoret's commentary, is preserved in one manuscript, *Hierosol. Scti. Sepulchri 370* (s. XVI), f. 312^v–316^v. These folios contain

⁴⁹ ROSENBAUM, Nilus von Ancyra, Kommentar zum Hohelied 169* (The present author did not have access to the Serbo-Croatian article by Sović that is mentioned by Rosenbaum).

⁵⁰ See BARBÀRA, Origene. Commentario al Cantico 130 n. 184.

⁵¹ *PG 87²*, 1545A–1548A. These are scholia 1–3 in AUWERS, Procopii Epitome in Canticum.

⁵² H. LANGERBECK, Gregorii Nysseni In Canticum Canticorum (*Gregorii Nysseni opera* 6). Leiden 1960 [= 1986], 14,3–15,11; 27,16–18; 27,1–15; 30,8–31,9.

⁵³ *PG 87²*, 1548AB = scholion 4 in AUWERS, Procopii Epitome in Canticum. The text can also be reconstructed on the basis of the critical apparatus to ROSENBAUM, Nilus von Ancyra, Kommentar zum Hohelied 1–2.

⁵⁴ *PG 81*, 49A–53A.

⁵⁵ P. SOTIROUDIS, Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Ἰβήρων. Κατάλογος ἑλληνικῶν χειρογράφων. Τόμος ΙΑ' (1387–1568). Hagion Oros 2007, 196–197 and 264.

the Septuagint text of the Song, surrounded by marginal scholia⁵⁶. All of them are anonymous and most of them are not separated clearly one from the other, which hinders the identification of the various sources. The brief and rather vague description that A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus provided in his catalogue is not of any help either⁵⁷. According to the present author, many of the fragments are abbreviated excerpts taken from the catena of Polychronius. Nevertheless, they do not form a mere summary of that catena –which seems to be the case for Ecclesiastes, of which *Hierosol. Scti. Sepulchri 370* also provides marginal exegesis⁵⁸–, since they also contain a fair amount of materials taken from Theodoret’s commentary (which are absent from the catena of Polychronius)⁵⁹.

In sum, *Hierosol. Scti. Sepulchri 370* is a fourth non-B2 compilation in which fragments of Theodoret’s commentary can be found. Just as in the three catenae mentioned above, this manuscript transmits only a tiny percentage of Theodoret’s complete text.

2.2.3 Fragments in miscellanies

In addition, some fragments of Theodoret’s commentary can be found in two other manuscripts, which are not of the catena type but miscellanies.

The first one is *Vat. gr. 246*, a codex consisting of various excerpts from thirteenth- and fourteenth-century manuscripts. Its f. 137^v–138^v contain two fragments, which close a collection of *excerpta varia* written on six quaternions from a thirteenth-century manuscript and which have been identified by G. Mercati and P. Franchi de’ Cavalieri as being taken from Theodoret’s commentary on the Song⁶⁰. From the *incipit* and *desinit* those scholars offered in their catalogue for either of both fragments, one can deduce that the excerpts are taken from Theodoret’s exegesis of Cant 3,7 and 3,9–10 respectively, but that their wording differs somewhat from that of the original text. The latter observation urges one to consider the possibility that both excerpts are not taken

⁵⁶ The present author had the opportunity to consult photos of this manuscript at the *Section grecque* of the *IRHT* in Paris (spring 2010). The marginal catena on f. 312^v–316^v is preceded by an anonymous prologue (f. 310^v–312), which does not contain any materials taken from Theodoret. It is identified by the present author as consisting in (a) a synopsis of the Song that is related to those mentioned above (n. 31) and (b) a chaotic and abbreviated redaction of some of the prologue materials of the catena of Polychronius.

⁵⁷ A. PΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ βιβλιοθήκη ἤτοι κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου ἀποστολικοῦ τε καὶ καθολικοῦ ὀρθοδόξου πατριαρχικοῦ θρόνου τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ πάσης Παλαιστίνης ἀποκειμένων ἐλληνικῶν κωδίκων συναρθεῖσα μὲν καὶ φωτοτυπικοῖς κοσμηθεῖσα πίναξι. St. Petersburg 1891 (= Bruxelles 1963), I 388–393.

⁵⁸ See A. LABATE, Nuove catene esegetiche sull’Ecclesiaste, in: Ἀντίδωρον. Hommage à Maurits Geerard pour célébrer l’achèvement de la *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*. Wetteren 1984, I 241–263, here 262.

⁵⁹ More and detailed research of the compilation that is preserved in *Hierosol. Scti. Sepulchri 370* is required. The present author hopes to bring such a project to realization in the future. For example, it would be interesting to verify whether the fragments of Theodoret in *Hierosol. Scti. Sepulchri 370* are influenced by the redaction of Theodoret’s text as it is found in *Par. Coisl. 194* (next to its tradition in the other branch of the B2 catena that depends on *Vind. theol. gr. 314* and which was also known to the compiler of the catena in *Hierosol. Scti. Sepulchri 370*). A reason for supposing that a link between *Hierosol. Scti. Sepulchri 370* and *Par. Coisl. 194* is possible, is offered by the presence of a particular phrase in the prologue of *Hierosol. Scti. Sepulchri 370* (f. 312^v: “Ὑμνος ἐπιθαλάμιος εἰς θεὸν τὴν εἰρή[νην] ἡμῶν τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ὕμνων [ὕμνον cod.] ὑπερκείμενος) that cannot be found elsewhere, except in the opening words of the prologue that precedes the summary of Theodoret’s commentary in *Par. Coisl. 194* (f. 117–117^v: “Ὑμνος ἐπιθαλάμιος εἰς θεὸν τὴν εἰρήνην ἡμῶν τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ὕμνων, ὅσοι ἢ τὴν τῶν πολεμίων νίκην ἢ τὴν τῶν αἰχμαλώτων ἐλευθερίαν ὑπογράφουσι [cf. Theodoret in *PG* 81, 49B–52A], τὰ μείζω καὶ τελεώτερα διαγράφων | καὶ ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, δι’ ὧν κἀκεῖνοι εἰρηναῖοι, καὶ πρὸς ὧν αὐτοῖς ἡ ἀναφορὰ γίνεται. Πάντων γὰρ ἐκείνων οὗτός ἐστιν ὑπόθεσις καὶ κεφάλαιον καὶ τέλος ὡς περ τῶν ἁγίων τὰ ἅγια). This parallel deserves further research. (*Hierosol. Scti. Sepulchri 370* is not related to the redaction of the scholia of Theodoret as found in the *catena Cantabrigiensis* nor to that of *Bodl. Auct. E. 2. 16 [Misc. 44]*).

⁶⁰ I. MERCATI – P. FRANCHI DE’ CAVALIERI, Codices Vaticani graeci. Tomus I. Codices 1–329 (*Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codices manu scripti recensiti*). Romae 1923, 319–324. See also earlier G. MERCATI, Una citazione di Cherilo con due parole greche nuove. *Rendiconti del Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere. Serie II* 48 (1915) 952–955, here 952 reprinted in his *Opere minori*. Volume III [1907–1916] [*StT* 78]. Città del Vaticano 1937, 481–484, here 481).

from Theodoret's commentary itself (as transmitted in the B2 catena and printed in *PG* 81, 121C11–125A14), but from another catena or anthology that contains materials of that commentary and that has been mentioned above. On the basis of the *incipit* and *desinit* of both fragments, the present author (who did not have the occasion to consult *Vat. gr. 246* or any photos of it) concludes that they are not taken from the *catena Cantabrigiensis*⁶¹ nor from the catena preserved in *Hierosol. Scti. Sepulchri 370*⁶². But they are quite similar to the wording of Theodoret's exegesis of Cant 3,7 and 3,9–10 as it is found in *Par. Coisl. 194*⁶³. This observation prompts the hypothesis that the excerpts of Theodoret's commentary in the miscellany manuscript *Vat. gr. 246* are not taken directly from the B2 catena but that they witness to the same redaction as the one that is found in *Par. Coisl. 194*, a manuscript that is believed to have been written in the same century as *Vat. gr. 246*. Obviously, a comparison of the complete fragments is necessary in order to verify this hypothesis.

Finally, the catalogue by Politis and Manousakas mentions that f. 518–525 of *Athon. Scetae Scti. Prodromi 3* (a. 1709) contain an anthology of theological writings (ἀνθολογία θεολογικῶν κεφαλαίων, διατεταγμένων ἐν πολλοῖς ἀλφαβητικῶς), in which materials of Theodoret's exegesis of the Song can be found (Θεοδωρήτου ἐκ τῆς ἐρμηνείας εἰς τὸ Αἶσμα τῶν ἁσμάτων καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν)⁶⁴. Since the present author has not seen the manuscript, he has to limit himself to copying this information. It is not clear how many or even which fragments can be found. The catalogue does not contain an *incipit* or *desinit*⁶⁵. Since this manuscript is an anthology, compiled by Joseph of Sinope (on which, see above), one could perhaps suppose that the same text is also preserved in a (still unknown) earlier manuscript from Mount Athos.

2.3 THE B1 COMMENTARY

Theodoret's commentary is not the only text that is compiled in the B2 catena, to new manuscripts of which this article draws attention. Regarding the B1 text, too, one additional witness can be adduced here.

As indicated above, the B1 commentary is transmitted through the B2 catena but also in direct tradition (i.e., independently from the catena tradition). For the catena strand of transmission, some new B2 witnesses have been identified above. Now, towards the end of this article, one unknown manuscript of B1's direct tradition can be discussed: *Athen. EBE 2410* (s. XIII). In this manuscript, Gregory of Nyssa's fifteen sermons on Cant 1,1–6,9 (f. 230–285) are followed by the B1 text on

⁶¹ The opening and closing words of the second fragment in *Vat. gr. 246* cannot be compared to the *catena Cantabrigiensis*, since *Cantabrig. Trinit. Coll. O. 1. 54* (as well as its *apographon: Bodl. Auct. E. 2. 8 [Misc. 36]*, see above n. 43) has a lacuna due to which Theodoret's scholion ad Cant 3,9–10 in this catena has been lost. On this lacuna, see ROSENBAUM, Nilus von Ancyra, *Kommentar zum Hohelied* 139*–140* n. 460 and 464. On the basis of the *incipit* and *desinit* of the first excerpt, however, one can safely assume that *Vat. gr. 246* does not agree with the *catena Cantabrigiensis*' redaction of Theodoret's exegesis of Cant 3,7, as found in *Cantabrig. Trinit. Coll. O. 1. 54*, f. 44, which does not contain the *desinit* of the first fragment in *Vat. gr. 246* and in which the *incipit* of that fragment is formulated differently: κλίην δε αὐτοῦ λέγει τὴν γραφήν· ἐν ἐκείνῃ γὰρ κτλ.

⁶² The compilations preserved in *Bodl. Auct. E. 2. 16 (Misc. 44)*, in *Patm. 209/Par. gr. 2511* and in *Athon. Iv. 1500/Athon. Iv. 1561* only treat other segments of the Song, so comparison with *Vat. gr. 246* is impossible and unnecessary.

⁶³ Compare the opening and closing words of both excerpts in *Vat. gr. 246* as quoted in MERCATI – FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI, *Codices Vaticani graeci 321–322* with those of the corresponding fragments in *Par. Coisl. 194*, f. 124^v–125^v: Ἴδου ἡ κλίην τοῦ Σαλομῶν ... αἱ θεῖαι γραφαί· ἐν ἐκείναις γὰρ – καταγόντων τὸ γένος and τὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας – τὰ θεῖα λόγια.

⁶⁴ POLITIS – MANOUSAKAS, *Συμπληρωματικοὶ κατάλογοι* 236–240. It is this manuscript that is described by W. ELTESTER, *Bericht über eine neue Justinhandschrift auf dem Athos*, in: *Studien zum neuen Testament und zur Patristik* Erich Klostermann zum 90. Geburtstag dargebracht (*TU 77*). Berlin 1961, 161–176. It also contains (f. 246–247) a collection of some anonymous scholia on the Song, which is copied from *Athon. Iv. 555* (s. XIV), f. 261–263. See P. GEHIN, *Un nouvel inédit d'Évagre le Pontique: son Commentaire de l'Écclesiaste*. *Byz 49* (1979) 188–198, here 190 and P. GEHIN, *Évagre le Pontique, Scholies à l'Écclesiaste (SC 397)*. Paris 1993, 29–30 (and his n. 2).

⁶⁵ The mention of fragments on the Apocalypse by Theodoret, of whom no commentary on that book is known, is puzzling.

Cant 6,9–8,5 (f. 285–287^v). As in the case of various other B1 manuscripts, the B1 text of the Athens codex supplements that of Gregory, which ends with the exegesis of Cant 6,9⁶⁶. Undoubtedly, it originally provided the B1 text up to Cant 8,14, but now it ends mutilated ad Cant 8,5. To the present reviewer's knowledge, this manuscript has never been identified as a witness to the B1 text.

The manuscript was not known to H. Langerbeck, the editor of Gregory's text⁶⁷. Subsequent editors of some of Gregory's other writings did know the manuscript, but failed to notice the B1 addition at the end⁶⁸. In their catalogue of manuscripts, L. Politis and M. Politi described f. 230–287^v as one unit, containing Gregory's sixteen (*sic*) homilies on the Song⁶⁹. Some years later, U. and D. Hagedorn provided a different identification⁷⁰. Somewhat misguided by the observation that this manuscript contains a catena on Proverbs and Job, they described the text of f. 231–290 (*sic*) as a catena on Cant 1,6–8,6. This is not correct either. In fact, as stated above, the text of Gregory is followed by the final part of the B1 commentary.

Recently, P. Nikolopoulos devoted an article to those folios in *Athen. EBE 2410* that are relevant to the topic at hand⁷¹. In agreement with the description offered in the catalogue, he suggested that the text on f. 285–287^v (i.e., the B1 text on Cant 6,9–8,5), could be in fact a lost sixteenth homily of Gregory, in which he had completed his exegesis of the Song. Nikolopoulos' identification is incorrect and completely ignores almost all scholarship on the *catena Trium Patrum*. Nowhere does he cite Bossina's book or articles, or any of the relevant earlier secondary literature referred to by Bossina – one wonders in fact whether Nikolopoulos is aware of that literature. It is true that in the manuscript, the text of f. 285–287^v is identified as Gregory of Nyssa's sixteenth homily (f. 285: Τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἄσμα τῶν ἀσμάτων. Λόγος ιζ'), but this should be regarded as nothing more than an attempt by the manuscript's copyist to consolidate his use of the final part of the B1 commentary as a supplement to Gregory's homilies⁷². Ascribing far too much credit to this erroneous title, Nikolopoulos ignores all other manuscript evidence of the B1 catena as well as virtually all secondary literature and simply proposes to have found an unknown sixteenth homily of Gregory. That conclusion can easily be proven incorrect by raising the following objections:

⁶⁶ See above, n. 10.

⁶⁷ LANGERBECK, Gregorii Nysseni In Canticum X–LXI.

⁶⁸ See J. McDONOUGH – P. ALEXANDER, Gregorii Nysseni In inscriptiones Psalmorum, In sextum Psalmum, In Ecclesiasten homiliae (*Gregorii Nysseni opera* 5). Leiden 1962, 234–236.

⁶⁹ L. POLITIS – M.L. POLITI, Κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Ἑθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀρ. 1857–2500 (*Pragmateiai tes Akademias Athenon* 54). Athinaï 1991, 407–409. This description is remarkable, since Gregory's sermons, which comment on the text up to Cant 6,9, are fifteen in number.

⁷⁰ HAGEDORN – HAGEDORN, Die älteren griechischen Katenen 4.

⁷¹ NIKOLOPOULOS, Εἶναι ἔργον. The present author thanks Dr. Paul Géhin (Paris), for having brought this article to his attention.

⁷² See above, n. 10. A sixteenth homily of Gregory on the Song is also mentioned in the description of *Athon. Vatop. 236* (s. XI) one finds in the catalogue prepared by S. Eustratiades and Arcadius: see S. EUSTRATIADES – ARCADIIUS VATOPEDINUS, Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἱερᾷ Μονῇ Βατοπεδίου ἀποκειμένων κωδίκων (*Hagioreitike Bibliothekhe* 1). Paris 1924 (= Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the Library of the Monastery of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos [*Harvard Theological Studies* 11]. Cambridge, MA 1969), 52 (f. 30^v sq.: Γρηγορίου Νύσσης περὶ τοῦ ιζ' λόγου τοῦ εἰς τὸ ἄσμα ἀσμάτων θεωρίας). This identification was proven incorrect when M. Richard provided a more detailed description of the contents of this manuscript. As one can deduce from Richard's article, the fragments in *Athon. Vatop. 236* that belong to Gregory's homilies on the Song are two in number and are part of the manuscript's florilegium on the corruptible and the incorruptible attributed to Leonitius of Byzantium (*CPG* 6820): the first of them is taken from the opening part of Gregory's fourth homily, the second one (which is also excerpted in Severus of Antioch's treatise against Julian of Halicarnassus' apology – *CPG* 7030, preserved in Syriac) from the ending of the fourteenth homily. See M. RICHARD, Le florilège du cod. Vatopédi 236 sur le corruptible et l'incorruptible. *Le Muséon* 86 (1973) 249–273 (reprinted in his *Opera minora*. Turnhout – Leuven 1976, I, nr. 4), here 261 and 263. It is not clear what made the cataloguers mention a non-existing sixteenth homily. A more detailed table of the manuscript's contents is provided by A. DE SANTOS OTERO, Der Codex Vatopedi 236. *Kleronomia* 5 (1973) 315–326, here 320–326. Further bibliography on it can be found in J.H. DECLERCK, *Diversorum postchalconensium auctorum collectanea. I. Pamphili theologi opus (CCSG 19)*. Turnhout – Leuven 1985, 85–86.

- (1) Nikolopoulos fails to refer to any studies of the B1 text. Consequently, he does not manage to identify the only edited fragment of this text's direct tradition (i.e., the part ad Cant 6,9–8,14, edited by Mai under the name of Procopius of Gaza and reprinted in *PG* 87², 1756–1780)⁷³: he himself 're-discovers' the pseudepigraphic character of the attribution to Procopius of Gaza (which was already laid bare by Faulhaber in 1902)⁷⁴ and keeps on referring to this fragment as to that of Ps.-Procopius (or, repeatedly on p. 476–477 of his article, to that of 'Ps.-Porphyrius [*sic*] of Gaza'). He does not manage to provide further identifications.
- (2) He does not seem to be aware of the set-up (or even of the existence) of the B2 catena. Nowhere does he mention this chain, let alone that he names its three sources, i.e., B1, Theodoret, Michael Psellus. His erroneous identification of the B1 fragments in *PG* 122, 540–685 illustrates the problems this situation brings about. As stated above, du Duc only included two of B2's three sources into his 1624 partial edition of this catena (reprinted in the *PG* columns just mentioned), which makes this catena seem to consist of Psellus and B1 only. All of this has been discussed by Bossina with much clarity and in great detail, as already mentioned above⁷⁵. Nevertheless, Nikolopoulos does not seem to be aware of all of this. Instead, he believes the *PG* 122 text to be a reprint of J. van Meurs' 1617 edition of Psellus' exegesis of the Song⁷⁶ – the fact that van Meurs' text does not contain the B1 fragments that can be found in *PG* does not seem to bother him. Consequently, he incorrectly believes the B1 fragments of the B2 catena to be part and parcel of Psellus' text. According to him, Psellus himself rewrote pieces of exegesis of Gregory, Nilus and Maximus and included them into his own text. Throughout his article, Nikolopoulos refers to those fragments (i.e., B1 in the B2 catena) as belonging to Psellus⁷⁷.
- (3) For Cant 6,9–8,14, he 're-discovers' that (a) the B1 fragments in their direct tradition, edited by Mai and reprinted in *PG* 87² (which Nikolopoulos believes to be fragments of Ps.-Procopius, see [1]) are identical to (b) the B1 fragments in the B2 catena tradition, edited by du Duc and reprinted in *PG* 122 (which he thinks to be fragments of Psellus, see [2]). In fact, this identity has been known for a long time and has been pointed out more than once throughout Bossina's volume.
- (4) Nikolopoulos observes that those two texts ad Cant 6,9–8,14 are not only identical one to the other, but also to a third one, namely the one transmitted on f. 285–287^v of *Athen. EBE 2410* (which also starts with Cant 6,9 but ends mutilated with Cant 8,5 instead of continuing the exegesis up to Cant 8,14). As said above, this manuscript identifies the text as the sixteenth homily of Gregory of Nyssa. Nikolopoulos believes this attribution to Gregory to be more reliable than those to Ps.-Procopius and to Psellus (which he incorrectly imposes on the B1 fragments in their direct and B2 catena tradition, see [1] and [2]). Consequently, he suggests that the text on f. 285–287^v of *Athen. EBE 2410* could be Gregory's (in fact non-existing) sixteenth homily and that the corresponding texts printed in *PG* 87² and *PG* 122 should be identified in the same way. In fact, he should have followed the completely opposite line of reasoning and should have used the *PG* texts (and secondary literature on them) as a leverage to expose the title offered in *Athen. EBE 2410* as an in-

⁷³ See above, n. 11.

⁷⁴ See above, n. 12.

⁷⁵ Bossina also identified the source manuscript used by du Duc; ΝΙΚΟΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Εἰς τὰ ἔργα 472 does not know this.

⁷⁶ I. MEURSIUS, Eusebii, Polychronii, Pselli in Canticum canticorum expositiones graecae. Lugduni Batavorum 1617, 113–168.

⁷⁷ See ΝΙΚΟΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Εἰς τὰ ἔργα 472–473.

correct one and to identify the text as the direct tradition of the B1 commentary on Cant 6,9–8,5.

3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Throughout the previous pages, various manuscripts have been listed that are witnesses to three exegetical texts treating the Song of Songs but that have never been mentioned in relevant secondary literature.

- (1) In addition to the five extant witnesses (both complete and partial ones) to the direct tradition of the B1 commentary, listed by the present author in his review of Bossina's book, a sixth manuscript contains the part of this text that treats Cant 6,9–8,5: *Athen. EBE 2410*.
- (2) Furthermore, this article listed some witnesses in which (excerpts of) Theodoret's commentary can be found. In addition to one new manuscript containing the complete text (*Bodl. Holkham gr. 48*), attention has been drawn to fragments of this text that can also be found in a new catena type (witnessed in one manuscript: *Hierosol. Scti. Sepulchri 370*) and in two miscellany manuscripts (*Vat. gr. 246* and *Athon. Scetae Scti. Prodromi 3*).
- (3) Together with the poem *In Canticum* by Psellus, both those texts – Theodoret's commentary and that of the B1 type – make out the B2 catena on the Song. As described by the present author in the abovementioned review, the lists of manuscript witnesses to this catena compiled by Faulhaber and Karo – Lietzmann in 1902, have been corrected and supplemented by scholars such as Westerink, Leanza and especially Bossina, who all identified other manuscripts of this catena. The present article lists three additional witnesses: *Athon. Vatop. 9*; *Athon. Scetae Scti. Prodromi 4*; and *Samiacus Metropol. 60*.

Admittedly, most of the manuscripts this article brings under the attention are of limited (if any) value for establishing a critical edition of the B1 commentary or that of Theodoret: they are only recent and often incomplete witnesses⁷⁸. Then again, awareness of these hitherto unknown codices may be useful for one's appreciation of those texts' transmission history and for their reception in Byzantium and in the Renaissance.

⁷⁸ The thirteenth-century *Athen. EBE 2410*, however, is the second eldest extant witness to the B1 commentary, next to *Par. gr. 152* (s. XII).