Materializing Unity: Catena Manuscripts as Vessels for Imperial and Ecclesial Reform

Clark R. Bates, University of Birmingham

Abstract: Ecclesial divisions following the christological controversies of the Council of Chalcedon in the fifth century and leading into the Council of Trullo in the seventh century provide a cultural backdrop for the creation of catenae and offer a potential explanation for how catenae were used in the development and promulgation of a syncretic Byzantine theology. During the reigns of both Justinian I (527–565) and Justinian II (685–695/705–711) attempts were made to unite the divisions within the Greek church—each for divergent purposes. Justinian I established a precedent in legal matters by consolidating the numerous Roman legal codes into a single volume, intended to supersede all previous tomes and become the singular reference source for all discussion. He expressed similar interests in seeking to unite the Byzantine church under a single christological perspective. By the first reign of Justinian II, the Council of Trullo was convened. Within the acts of the council, we read Canon 19, which declares that all clergy are to teach piety and defend the scripture only with the words of the orthodox divines and not from one's own intellect. This marks a second attempt to unite the church, but this time through the authority of the past. This paper will draw upon historical data to parallel the development of the New Testament catena manuscript tradition, proposing that these manuscripts served as a reference point for clergy, particularly post-Trullo, to preach piety and defend orthodoxy to the confessional community.

After the beginning of the great christological doctrinal disputes, the interest of the theologians of the Greek Church was concentrated on the dogmatic struggles, and independent exegetical research ceased at once, a condition which the 19th canon of the Trullanic Synod (692), with the decree that the exegesis of the fathers should be preferred to one's own research, made lawful and permanent. In the future, the compilers of the catena commentaries only excerpted the works of the orthodox exegetes as well as those of the heretics; they dug cisterns for the water of the fresh springs and let them dry up completely.[1]

While Josef Reuss overstates his case, academics and theologians in previous centuries generally had a negative opinion about catenae.[2] It is as if the manuscripts themselves represent

---

[1] Josef Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*, TUGAL 61 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 16, my translation.

[2] Manlio Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, trans. J. A. Hughes (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 76, 111; though Karl Staab held a contrasting view: *Die Pauluskatenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1926), 2; Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Rotterdam: Reinier Leers, 1685), 410–11.

a period of intellectual and theological decline. The living water of Nicene and Chalcedonian theological inquiry had run dry by the seventh century, and this manuscript tradition reveals the dregs, if you will. As a result, most research into catenae has only desired to catalog the artifacts and plunder the text in the hopes of finding a lost theological jewel previously unknown to the world. Catenae have often been viewed as nothing more than a repository of patristic comments in need of being matched to their original context.

In recent years, authors such as Giles Dorival and William Lamb have begun to examine catenae as something more.[3] To adopt the language of reception-history studies, the manuscripts are slowly becoming seen as their own layer of *Wirkunggeschichte* (lit. effectual history, i.e., tradition of use) with a *Sinnhorizont* (horizon of meaning) of their own, not reliant on the commentaries from which they were drawn but finding new meaning amid the *pastiche* of variant sources reproduced as a singular unit.[4] This is a welcome shift that opens the door for new questions about the text and history of catenae. In a broad sense, it is the ultimate question of "why?" Why do catenae exist at all? The answer to this question lies, in part, in the historical setting from which they emerged. This article offers an analysis of the theological method and developments in Byzantium in the centuries leading up to the emergence of catenae and explores the ways that these manuscripts reflect those circumstances.

The only way to answer questions of purpose in relation to manuscripts, particularly involving their content and apart from any scribal colophon explicitly detailing such matters, is to examine the events in the world from which they spring forth. For example, to understand the decline in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscript production in Constantinople, one would be aided by studying the fall of the Byzantine Empire in 1453 to the Ottomans. Similarly, the perceived origin of catenae in Gaza in the sixth century and the shift in production to regions around Constantinople in the following centuries might be explicable through the conquering of Gaza by Muslims in the seventh century. The practice of creating doctrinal, juridical, and classical anthologies is observed in the centuries prior to the creation of catenae, but, in the case of theological anthologies, this is separate from the biblical text.[5] With the

---

[3]   See Giles Dorival, "La postérité littéraire des chaînes exégétiques grecques," *Revue des études byzantines* 43 (1985): 209–26; Dorival, "L'intérêt pour les chaînes exégétiques grecques dans l'Europe de la Renaissance," in *L'humanisme italien de la Renaissance et l'Europe*, ed. Thea Picquet, Lucien Faggion, and Pascal Gandoulphe (Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 2010), 121–26; Dorival, "Biblical Catenae: Between Philology and History," in *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition: Papers from the Ninth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament in Association with the COMPAUL Project,* ed. H. A. G. Houghton (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2016), 65–81; William R. S. Lamb, *The Catena in Marcum: A Byzantine Anthology of Early Commentary on Mark* (Leiden: Brill, 2012); Lamb, "Catenae and the Art of Memory," in Houghton, *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition*, 83–98.

[4]   Robert Evans, *Reception History, Tradition and Biblical Interpretation: Gadamer and Jauss in Current Practice* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2014), 45; Also see Brennan W. Breed, *Nomadic Text: A Theory of Biblical Reception History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014), 116–41. In this sense, catenae exist as a layer of reception history working in tandem with the initial message penned by the author(s) of the biblical text. The original text represents the initial layer, transmitted from the author to its intended audience. A secondary layer is the commentary tradition of the biblical texts wherein a new audience interprets and applies the texts to a new cultural setting. Catenae, in their collecting and compiling of extracts into a single volume, creates yet another layer associated with the previous two but functioning independently as its own interpretational entity.

[5]   Robert Devreesse, "Chaînes exégétiques grecques," *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1928), 1084–86.

catenae, these streams of codicological practice seem to converge. This paper will therefore survey the imperial and ecclesiastical history of the region immediately following the Council of Chalcedon and ending in the ninth century. It will then examine three examples of scholia from catenae, mapping them onto the history of this period to reveal that, both in format and content, biblical catenae are a material illustration of the imperial efforts of Justinian I and II to reform the empire and unite the church, in part, by supporting a synthesized Byzantine theology moderated between the opposing theological schools of thought circulating in the post-Chalcedonian era.

Chalcedon to Photius I

Leading up to the Council of Chalcedon (451 CE), the two foci of theological thought were geographically located in the regions of Alexandria and Antioch. Their early opposition to one another centered on the proper interpretation of biblical texts—though not in the reductionistic binary of allegorical interpretation versus literal interpretation but on the proper place of the historical meaning and its influence on interpretation and Platonic, philosophical presuppositions applied to the interpretation of biblical allegory.[6] However, by the fifth century, the teaching of deification, first defined by Athanasius of Alexandria as the participation of humanity in the life of God, began to intersect with Antiochene Christology, creating a theological fissure between the two schools on the nature of the incarnation.[7] The dispute over the nature of Christ's humanity in relation to his divinity became the centerpiece for all physical and literary disputes, following the Council of Nicaea. The Council of Chalcedon modified Cyril of Alexandria's formula, μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη ("one nature of God the Word incarnated") into the decree, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν υἱὸν κύριον μονογενῆ ἐν δύο φύσειν ("one and the same Christ, son, Lord, only begotten in two natures"), an attempt to silence Origenist and Monophysite controversies over the nature of the incarnation and settle what would become Byzantine Christology. Though the council did establish the christological formula to be used in the church thenceforth, it did not silence opposition.

John Meyendorff lists four prevailing theological parties after Chalcedon: (1) The Monophysites, led by figures such as Severus of Antioch, opposed Chalcedonian definitions because Cyril did not use them and, as Severus repeatedly asserts, believed themselves to be the authentic Cyrillians.[8] They rejected the idea that the two natures of Christ *after* the incarnation retain in full their proper characteristics. (2) The Dyophysites, represented by Theodoret of Cyrrhus, accepted the conciliar definitions but still rejected the connection with Cyril of Alexandria's doctrine of theopaschism. (3) The Cyrillians, represented by John the Grammarian and Nephalius the Monk, accepted Chalcedon *and* its connection to Cyril. Finally, (4) the Origenists, represented by Leontius of Byzantium, opposed the conciliar decree on the belief that the Divine Logos possessed an intellect united essentially to the Logos prior to any incar-

---

6   John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), 21–22. While the Antiochenes did employ a type of allegory in their interpretations, it was governed by rules set forth by Diodore of Tarsus, wherein the authorial intent was the primary governing factor when determining an allegorical meaning. See Frederick G. McLeod, S.J., *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 21; and John Behr, *The Case against Diodore and Theodore: Texts and Their Contexts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 36.

7   Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 32–33.

8   Pauline Allen and C. T. R. Hayward, *Severus of Antioch*, TECF (New York: Routledge, 2004), 33–36.

nation.[9] These various groups regularly corresponded against one another, well into the sixth century.

Justinian I

Into this ecclesiastical milieu entered Emperor Justinian I in 527 CE. The Chalcedonian canons had only satisfied the moderates within Constantinople, while the Egyptian divines rejected it outright. Shortly, the Syrian monks joined the Egyptians and took up threatening positions against many of the Antiochenes.[10] Being fascinated by Rome's past, the emperor thought of himself as a "great unifier" and sought to implement his vision of οἰχουμένη.[11] Justinian's vision of church and state is best observed in the introduction of his sixth novella:

> There are two greatest gifts which God, in his love for man, has granted from on high: the priesthood and the imperial dignity. The first serves divine things, while the latter directs and administers human affairs; both, however, proceed from the same origin and adorn the life of mankind. Hence, nothing should be such a source of care to the emperors as the dignity of the priests, since it is for their (imperial) welfare that they constantly implore God. For if the priesthood is in every way free from blame and possesses access to God, and if the emperors administer equitably and judiciously the state entrusted to their care, general harmony will result, and whatever is beneficial will be bestowed upon the human race.[12]

For Justinian I, the church did not exist *sui generis* but as part of the unified body of church and empire. Resuming the work intended by Theodosius II in the previous century and his Codex Theodosianus, the emperor established his own Code of Justinian, ordering the notable Byzantine jurist Tribonian to create a new, single legislative text from the thousands of volumes of Roman legal opinions.[13] Where Theodosius only compiled primary sources of legal

---

9   John Behr (*Case against Theodore and Diodore*, 113–14) argues that Leontius was labeled an "Origenist" as a rhetorical device to turn followers away from him by opponents whom Leontius had previously unmasked as followers of Nestorius. In subtle disagreement is Brian Daley ("The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium," *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 [1976]: 337–69), who sees Leontius as an Origenist, but in a broad sense, rather than strictly a pupil of Evagrius's teachings.

10   Alexander Schmemann, *Historical Road of Eastern Orthodoxy*, trans. Lydia W. Keisch (London: Harvill, 1963), 138.

11   John Meyendorff, "Justinian, the Empire, and the Church," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 22 (1968): 49. For Justinian, this term encapsulated the nostalgic Roman world, a unified empire with church and state wed and under his control, and should be understood alongside Theodosius's reign wherein Constantinople was thought to be the new Rome and second city of the Roman Empire. See E. D. Hunt, "Imperial Law or Councils of the Church? Theodosius I and the Imposition of Doctrinal Uniformity," in *Discipline and Diversity: Papers Read at the 2005 Summer Meeting and the 2006 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical Historical Society*, ed. Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory, Studies in Church History 43 (Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007), 63.

12   David Miller and Peter Sarris, eds., *The Novels of Justin: A Complete Annotated English Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 1:97.

13   John F. Matthews, *Laying Down the Law: A Study of the Theodosion Code* (New York: Yale University Press, 2000), 10–18. For more on the identity and influence of Tribonian, see B. Kupisch, "Tribonian," in *Juristen: Ein biographisches Lexikon von der Antike bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Michael Stolleis (Munich: Beck, 2001), 633–34; and Simon Corcran, "The Codex of Justinian: The Life of a Text through 1,500 Years," in *The Codex of Justinian. A New Annotated Translation with Parallel Latin and Greek Text*, ed. Bruce Frier et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 1: xcvii–clxiv.

text, Justinian combined primary documents with their legal interpretations. In this juridical sphere, Justinian removed extracts from multiple legal interpretations (*iuris*) and had them combined into a single volume alongside the primary source texts (*leges*) to serve as the singular reference text for all legal matters in the empire.[14] At this same time, Justinian turned his focus to uniting the church.

Initially, he sought to impose the terms of Chalcedon through force, liquidizing dissident groups and heretics, while also limiting the civil rights of opposition groups too large to eradicate. However, the resilience and defiance of the Monophysites in particular led to a policy of compromise.[15] Justinian's forty-year reign represented the last attempt of an emperor to preserve the unity of a Roman universe and instigated the first great synthesis of Christian Byzantinism. Justinian believed himself to be the servant of God and executor of his will and that the well-being of the church was the defense of the empire.[16] The emperor dealt with the secular realm of his empire by synthesizing the legal code and sought to do the same in the spiritual realm by synthesizing religious dogma.

Justinian encouraged the theologians of the post-Chalcedonian era not to be content with a mere juxtaposition of opposing elements between Alexandria and Antioch but to find an inner coherence that would eventually be termed "neo-Chalcedonian" and the forerunner of the "Neo-Patristic synthesis" of modern Orthodoxy.[17] The definitions of Chalcedon were more closely aligned with Cyrillian theology rather than strictly Antiochene theology, and they became the predominant position of Constantinople, culminating in the decisions of the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553 CE. At the Fifth Council, the teachings of Origen that were anathema to the new orthodoxy were revised and enumerated, and both Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret of Cyrrhus were declared anathema to the teaching of right faith.[18] Though Justinian was unable to ultimately unite the East and West into a unified Byzantium, his impact on the state and on the orthodox church remained.

Justinian II and the Council of Trullo

Near the end of the seventh century, Justinian II became emperor at the age of sixteen. The young emperor spent considerable time and resources attempting to stamp out heresy. While he desired the same imperial unity his predecessors sought, he was busily engaged in conflict with the Bulgars and Slavs, while also repelling and/or appeasing the Muslims on his borders.[19]

---

[14] Mary Ann Glendon, *The Forum and the Tower: How Scholars and Politicians Have Imagined the World, from Plato to Eleanor Roosevelt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 49–51.

[15] Meyendorff, "Justinian, the Empire, and the Church," 46. On the importance of achieving ecclesiastical unity for political ends, see Francis Dvornik, "Emperors, Popes, and General Councils," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 6 (1951): 3–23; and Averil Cameron, "Enforcing Orthodoxy in Byzantium," in Cooper and Gregory, *Discipline and Diversity*, 1–24.

[16] Schmemann, *Historical Road of Eastern Orthodoxy*, 150–53.

[17] Andrew Louth, "The Patristic Revival and Its Protagonists," in *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*, ed. Mary B. Cunningham and Elizabeth Theokritoff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 188.

[18] Henry R. Percival, *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church: Their Canons and Dogmatic Decrees, Together with the Canons of All the Local Synods Which Have Received Ecumenical Acceptance* (Oxford: James Parker, 1900), 315–23; Richard Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553 with Related Texts on the Three Chapters Controversy* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press: 2009), 1:76–98.

[19] John B. Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire: From Arcadius to Irene (395 A.D. to 800 A.D.)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 2:320–22.

In 692 CE, Justinian II convened the Council of Trullo—also known as the Quinisext Council—reportedly from a desire morally to reform his subjects.[20] It would seem, at least to the emperor, that a decline in the moral life of the church had occurred amid the theological disputes of the previous centuries, and the emperor desired to "bring the Christian life into order."[21] Acknowledged within the canons of Trullo is the recognition that—presumably because of the decline in moral life—the clergy, particularly those who preside over a congregation every Sunday, are not to explain or expound upon a biblical text from their own mind but only by citing the fathers of the church. Canon 19 reads:

> It behooves those who preside over the churches, every day but especially on Lord's days, to teach all the clergy and people words of piety and of right religion, gathering out of holy Scripture meditations and determinations of the truth, and *not going beyond the limits now fixed, nor varying from the tradition of the God-bearing fathers. And if any controversy in regard to Scripture shall have been raised, let them not interpret it otherwise than as the lights and doctors of the church in their writings have expounded it*, and in those let them glory rather than in composing things out of their own heads, lest through their lack of skill they may have departed from what was fitting. For through the doctrine of the aforesaid fathers, the people coming to the knowledge of what is good and desirable, as well as what is useless and to be rejected, will remodel their life for the better, and not be led by ignorance, but applying their minds to the doctrine, they will take heed that no evil befall them and work out their salvation in fear of impending punishment.[22]

Justinian's political endeavors and military defeats resulted in his deposition in 695 CE—though he would return in 705 CE—and, contrary to Reuss's hyperbolic remarks, the Quinisext Council had presumably limited impact. However, the assertion of Canon 19 marks a second waypoint in the historical milieu from which catenae emerge.

Before the third and final historical waypoint in this discussion is to be examined, I must also point out that in the proceedings of the Sixth Ecumenical Council of 680–681 CE, in the letter defining the faith from Pope Agatho to the emperor, extracts from church fathers such as Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, and Gregory of Nazianzus, among several others, are cited—independent of their original context—in support of the letter's definitions.[23] This decontextual patristic extraction became a common feature in all councils post-Chalcedon that produced written proceedings and is reflective of the growing practice of collecting patristic citations to further a theological position. Similarly, in the preface to Πηγὴ τῆς Γνώσεως by John of Damascus (676–749 CE), we read that he "shall add nothing of [his] own but shall gather together into one those things which have been worked out by the most eminent of teachers and make a compendium of them."[24] The Damascene demonstrated deep concern with referring to the past fathers of the church but also found an internal coherence through them all. He melded Cappadocian trinitarianism with Chalcedonian Christology, clarified through the lenses of Maximus the Confessor and Dionysius. His doctrine of the incarnation alone was based on Chalcedonian dogma; however, he defined ὑπόστασις in a way similar to

---

20   Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2:326–27.

21   Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2:327.

22   Percival, *Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church*, 359, emphasis added.

23   Percival, *Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church*, 334–35; Philippe Labbé and Gabriel Cossart, *Sacrosancta Concilia ad regiam editionem exacta: Quae olim quarta parte prodiit auctior*, (Venice: apud Jo. Baptistam Albrizzi q. Hieron. et Sebastianum Coleti, 1728), 654.

24   John of Damascus, "The Fount of Knowledge," in *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, trans. Frederic H. Chase Jr. (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1958), 6.

the anathematized Origenist, Leontius of Byzantium, had done prior—and this he did in the decades immediately following Canon 19 of the Quinisext Council.

These historical waypoints—Justinian and the Council of Trullo—reveal that the ecclesiastical culture leading into the seventh and eighth centuries was intent on finding a new, coherent theology, one that was not Antiochene or Alexandrian but Byzantine. This practice mirrors the imperial efforts of Justinian I and others and was spurred forward by imperial reform as much as theological reform. And this quest to build theological unity occurred within an intellectual culture with a predilection for anthologizing texts—be they secular, administrative, or religious.

Byzantium in the Ninth–Eleventh Centuries

The last waymark in this historical survey comes at the close of the ninth century (886 CE). Emperor Basil I of Macedonia began an introduction to the Byzantine legal code, titled the Ἐπαναγωγή—also called the Εἰσαγωγὴ (τοῦ νόμου)—that would be completed by his successor Leo VI the Wise, based upon the prior Code of Justinian.[25] Much of the language in the introduction is reminiscent of Justinian's merging of empire and church. The emperor and the patriarch are to work toward the same ends with the same divine blessing. Yet, as concerns our present discussion, it also states that "the Patriarch alone must interpret the maxims of the ancients, the definitions of the Holy Fathers, and the statutes of the Holy Councils."[26] The patriarch at the time of Basil I was Photius of Constantinople, known for his *Amphilochia*, which responds to theological questions through extracted comments from patristic sources.[27] Centuries following Chalcedon, new disputes and doctrinal questions were to be answered by looking backward. The storehouse of the previous councils continued to be the repository of faith for the premedieval Greek church of the ninth century, and Patriarch Photius was the arbiter of their interpretation.

By the tenth century, under Emperor Leo VI, the palace of Constantinople was a center of intense intellectual activity, but the dominant interests were antiquarian, archaeological, and bibliographical. As with the previous centuries, the focus of the culture was backward facing. One historian would even write, perhaps hyperbolically, that "in this period we know of no authoritative name, nor any original composition."[28] It was an era of tradition and orthodoxy where nothing was to be added to what the ancients had already said.

---

[25] Andreas Schminck, "Epanagoge," in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium (Oxford:* Oxford University Press, 1991), online: https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195046526.001.0001/acref-9780195046526-e-1683; Averil Cameron, "Byzantium and the Limits of Orthodoxy," in *Proceedings of the British Academy* (London: The British Academy, 2008), 138.

[26] Schmemann, *Historical Road of Eastern Orthodoxy*, 215.

[27] In the twelfth-century Codex Bodleianus 173, two marginalia are found attached to this preface ascribing it reliably to Photius himself; therefore, any romanticized notions of theological and political unity should be measured against the reality that both emperor and patriarch often had ulterior motives for this unity. This is evidence even in Photius's deposition and insertion of abbots into the influential Stoudite monastery. See Joachim Scharf, "Photios und Die Epanagoge," *Byzantine Zeitschrift* 49 (1956): 389.

[28] Anonymously quoted by Schmemann, *Historical Road of Eastern Orthodoxy*, 227.

Catena Manuscripts in Light of the Historical Setting

Having established the general, historical setting, this section will detail how the compositional technique of catenae aligns with the historical setting. Three passages of Pauline catenae—Phil 2:6, Eph 4:1–4, and Eph 3:1, 8—exemplify this development. These passages of Pauline catenae are found in the largest corpus of Pauline catenae known as the Pseudo-Oecumenian tradition. The macro-level consistency of the Pseudo-Oecumenian extracts across the majority of its representative manuscripts generally allows one manuscript to be representative of most in the tradition, with few exceptions. The scholia used for this comparison are found in manuscripts GA 1919, GA 075, and GA 1982.

GA 1919: Phil 2:6

Philippians 2:6 introduces the well-known and often discussed *Carmen Christi*, in which Jesus is said to be in the "form of God" but took upon himself the "form of a servant" at the point of the incarnation. The primary source for the extracts contained here is John Chrysostom. The content pulls from the bishop's homily on Philippians, but the catenist has edited the original text in various ways, borrowing only those materials absolutely necessary for the present purposes. Chrysostom states:

> Ὅρα πῶς ἐκ τῶν ὀλίγων τούτων ῥημάτων τοῦ πνεύματος πᾶσαι καταλύονται αἱ αἱρέσεις. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὑπάρχων εἰπὼν τὸ συναΐδιον τῷ πατρὶ δεδήλωκεν καὶ καταβέβληκεν Ἄρειον εἶτα καὶ Μαρκίων αὐτὸν Ποντικόν. Εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, πῶς σὺ λέγεις ὅτι ἀπὸ Μαρίας ἤρξατο; Σὺν τούτῳ καὶ Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατεὺς καταλύεται, ὅς ἔφη ψιλὸν εἶναι τὸ κύριον ἄνθρωπον ἐνεργούμενον ὑπὸ θεοῦ.
>
> Καὶ γὰρ εἴποιμεν πρὸς αὐτόν, ὥσπερ ἦν φησι μορφῇ δούλου φύσις θεοῦ ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐνέργεια ἔστιν. Οὕτως καὶ μορφῇ θεοῦ φύσις θεοῦ ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐνέργεια ἐστιν. Συν τούτοις καὶ Μάρκελλος ὁ Γαλάτης, καὶ Σωφρόνιος καὶ Φωτεινὸς ἀνετράπησαν. Ὅρα δὲ καὶ Σαβέλλιον πίπτοντα· οὐχ᾽ ἁρπαγμόν φησιν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ἴσον γὰρ ἐπὶ ἑνὸς οὐ λέγεται προσώπου ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ δύο καὶ πλειόνων. Πῶς οὖν σὺ ψιλὰ φῆς ὀνόματα ἐπὶ μιᾶς ὑποστάσεως λεγόμενα τὸ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος;

> Look how, from the least of these words from the Spirit, all false teachings are put down. For first, in saying he was coeternal with the Father he revealed and struck down Arius as well as Marcion of Pontus. For if he was in the form of God, how do you say that he began from Mary? With this even Paul of Samosata is deposed, who said the Lord was merely a man being operated by God.

> For we also said to him, as it said he was "in the form of a servant," the nature is of God, but not the operations. As he was in the "form of God," the nature is of God but not the operations. With these statements both Marcellus of Galatia and Sophrinus and Photinus were overthrown. But look also how Sabellius falls: he says he did not "regard equality with God as something to be grasped," because "equality" is not said on the basis of one person but on the basis of two and more. Therefore, how do you speak of merely names on the basis of one hypostasis when what is meant is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit?[29]

Chrysostom uses the opening of the Christ hymn to address various heresies that argued that Jesus was a created being rather than eternally existent with the Father—the position of the Chalcedonian formula and that of the preceding councils. While Arius is the first to be

---

[29]   Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

named, he is followed immediately by Marcion of Pontus, who was accused of bifurcating the God of the Hebrew Bible from the person of Jesus.[30] The Goldenmouth also addresses Paul of Samosata and the Adoptionist assertion that Jesus had his origin in the womb of Mary rather than being the eternally preexistent Son. The source homily for this material is more detailed, but the catenist assumes a certain level of familiarity with the teachings of each individual, be it Arianism, Marcionism, or the Monarchianism of Paul of Samosata.[31]

Additionally, the scholion speaks to the distinction between "nature" (φύσις) and "operation" (ἐνέργεια) and "reality of a thing" (ὑπόστασις). Chrysostom's interpretation of these terms conforms in large part to that of his predecessors Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, yet these same terms are understood differently by Cyrillians and Monophysites.[32] In avoiding any clarifying definitions, the catenist allows readers to insert their own presuppositions to the terms, implying a terminological unity. These terms are particularly important here, regarding their connection to the epistle's use of μορφὴ and its interpretation in Sabellianism—preached by Marcellus of Galatia, Sophrinos, and Photinus.[33] This verse is explicitly cited by Marcellus in surviving fragments attributed to him and translated by Klaus Seibt in 1994.[34]

Recalling the words of Canon 19 of the Quinisext Council to clergymen, it reads that "*if any controversy in regard to Scripture shall have been raised, let them not interpret it otherwise than as the lights and doctors of the church in their writings have expounded it.*" In this example, of which there are many others, one sees a direct response to the documented use of a biblical passage by so-called heretics included within the scholia of the catena on Philippians. This format enables readers to have at hand a response to scriptural controversy in the words of the doctors of the church, incorporated into the biblical manuscript they are using. This design eliminates the need to locate a separate volume(s) of patristic commentary and enables the reader to instruct the audience *ex cathedra*.

---

[30]	Henry Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 90–91; Paul Foster, "Marcion: His Life, Works, Beliefs, and Impact," *ExpTim* 121.6 (2010): 270–71; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 1.19.2.

[31]	Apart from their obvious christological link, these heresies also grounded their positions in scriptural exegesis. See Stephen Waers, "Monarchianism and Two Powers," *VC* 70 (2016): 403.

[32]	While Edwards disputes calling Chrysostom "Antiochene," largely based on what he sees are divergences of Christology between Chrysostom and Theodore, he fails to distinguish the contexts of either's presentation. Theodore wrote commentaries within a monastery, while Chrysostom preached to a congregation. The homily necessarily calls for a broader approach to exegetical application than an academic commentary. Therefore, while Chrysostom may deviate from Theodore in allowing Old and New Testaments to present a unified picture of Christ, he still speaks of Jesus speaking from his "human nature" when he is ignorant of certain matters and from his "divine nature" when he appears to have godlike knowledge. This is clearly an Antiochene approach. See Robert Edwards, "The Gospel of John in Antiochene Christology: The Diverging Paths of Theodore of Mopsuestia and John Chrysostom," *Scottish Journal of Theology* (2021): 331. For the differences between Alexandrian and Antiochene use of similar christological terms, see John A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria the Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology, and Texts*, VCSup 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1994). For Monophysite Christology, see Aloys Grillmeier, SJ., *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604): The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, vol. 2.2 of *Christ in Christian Tradition*, trans. John Cawte and Pauline Allen (London: Mowbray, 1995).

[33]	Though this is clearly defined in the homily. The mention of Marcellus of Galatia here is an alternative to the more common Marcellus of Ankyra, a region located in the province of Galatia.

[34]	Klaus Seibt, *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra*, AKG 59 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 456.

GA 075: Eph 4:1–4

The next example is Eph 4:1–4 as found in GA 075, an alternating catena from the tenth century. Lectionary markings are found in the right margin of the manuscript, indicating that the reading to follow is scheduled for the twenty-fifth Sunday, suggesting that this manuscript was used as an Apostolos lectionary for Sunday readings.[35] As above, this scholion is an edited homily of John Chrysostom, though it follows extracts attributed to Oecumenius in the previous passage. The liturgical reading continues on to f.170r, where the customary τέλος mark is found, ending the liturgical reading for this section. It is immediately followed by a new reading noted in the margin of Eph 4:6. Unlike the previous example in Philippians, this text makes no mention of heretical dispute beyond the warning against "being friends with heretics":

Ὁ διὰ τὸν κύριον φησὶν δέσμιος. Βαβαὶ ὅσον τὸ ἀξίωμα τὸ δεδέσθαι διὰ τὸν Χριστόν. Καὶ αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ ἀπόστολος ταύτην προβάλλεται ὡς δι' αὐτὴν δυσωπήσων αὐτούς. Μεγάλη γὰρ ἡ κλῆσις καὶ ἐπὶ μεγάλοις. Ἐπὶ τῷ ἔχειν κεφαλὴν τὸν Χριστόν. Ἐπὶ τῷ εἰς υἱοὺς εἶναι θεοῦ. Τουτέστιν ἐν παντὶ πράγματι, ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου. Οὕτω γὰρ ἐστιν ἀξίως τῆς κλήσεως περιπατῆσαι· μετά ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πραότητος καὶ μακροθυμίας καὶ τοῦ ἀνέχεσθαι ἀλλήλων. Ἔνθα γὰρ ἐστιν ἀγάπη, πάντα ἐστιν ἀνεκτά. Καθάπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων σωμάτων ἐστὶ τὸ ἡμῶν πνεῦμα ἐνεργοῦν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς μέλεσι καὶ πάντα συνέχον, οὕτως καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἡμῖν ἐδόθη τοὺς γένει καὶ τρόπῳ καὶ ἤθεσιν διαλλάσσοντας ἑνοῦν καὶ ποιοῦν ἡμᾶς ἓν σῶμα. Ταύτην φυλάξωμεν τὴν ἑνότητα τὴν διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν πνεύματος, ἥτις φησὶ γίνεται διὰ τοῦ συνδέσμου τῆς εἰρήνης.

Γίνεσθε φησιν οὕτως ἡνωμένοι, οὕτως ἀλλήλων κηδόμενοι. Ἐκ τούτου γὰρ φησιν ἔσεσθε καὶ ἓν πνεῦμᾶ ἔχοντες, τουτέστιν ὁμότιμον τὴν χάριν τοῦ πενυματός, ἢ ὅτι ἔστιν μέν ἓν σῶμα εἶναι, οὐχ ἓν δὲ πνεῦμᾶ, ὡς ὅταν τις αἱρετικῶν φίλος ᾖ. Ἤ ὅτι τοῦ τό φησιν, ἓν πνεῦμᾶ λαβόντες οὐκ ὀφείλετε διχονοεῖν, ἀλλ' ἓν εἶναι σῶμα, ἢ ὅτι πνεῦμα ἐνταῦθα τὴν προθυμίαν καλεῖ. Ὁ θεὸς ἡμᾶς φησιν ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐκάλεσεν οὐδενὶ πλεῖον ἀπονείμας. Πᾶσιν ἀθανασίαν, πᾶσιν ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἐπηγγείλατο, πᾶσιν δόξαν ἀθάνατον, πᾶσιν ἀδελφότητα. Πᾶσιν κληρονομίαν ἐπηγγείλατο. Κοινὴ πάντων ἐγένετο κεφαλή. Πάντας ἤγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν. Εἰ τοίνυν φησιν ἐν τοῖς πνευματικοῖς τοσαύτην ἔχετε κοινωνίαν, ὀφείλετε καὶ ἓν σῶμα εἶναι ἐν τῇ τῆς ἀγάπης ἀνακράσει. Πάντα γὰρ τὰ εἰρημένα κοινή ἐστιν ἡμῶν ἐλπὶς ἐκ τῆς κλήσεως γενομένη.

"The prisoner" he says, on account of the Lord. Amazing! The great honor to be bound on account of Christ. For even the apostle himself states this to put them to shame on account of it. For the calling is great and on the basis of great things—having Christ as the head, being among the sons of God. This is to say in all things, to all people. For to walk in this way is worthy of the calling: "with humility and gentleness," and "patience," and to bear with one another. For where love is, everything is bearable. For just as our spirit is acting upon our bodies in all its limbs and holding everything together, so also the Holy Spirit was given to us by race and custom and abode, to unite and make us one body reconciled. Let us guard this "unity" given to us through the Holy Spirit, that he says is through the "bond of peace."

He says be united this way, being concerned for one another in this way. For from this, he says, you will also be having "one spirit." This means having equal grace of spirit, or to be "one body," but not "one spirit," as when one befriends heretics. Or he means that you who received "one spirit" ought not to be divided in mind, but to be "one body," or that here he calls zeal "spirit." God, he says, called us to the same things having imparted nothing more. He promised to all

---

35   For more information regarding the lectionary system of Apostolos manuscripts, see Samuel Gibson, *The Apostolos: The Acts and Epistles in Byzantine Liturgical Manuscripts*, TS 3.18 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2018).

immortality, to all eternal life, to all immortal glory, to all brotherhood. He promised to all an inheritance. He became the common head of everyone. He raised everyone and sat them with him. If therefore, he says, you have so many spiritual things in common, you ought also to be one body by the mixing of love with others. For every word is our shared hope, born from the calling.

The reading is made up of exhortations to love and unity based on the nature of the Trinity. As with the previous example, the opening words of Canon 19 of the Quinisext Council come to mind, which state that "it behooves those who preside over the churches, every day but especially on Lord's days, *to teach all the clergy and people words of piety and of right religion, gathering out of holy Scripture meditations and determinations of the truth, and not going beyond the limits now fixed, nor varying from the tradition of the God-bearing fathers.*" And as before, we have the very exhortations of the "God-bearing fathers" alongside a biblical passage encouraging right religion and piety. Here and in other catena manuscripts, we find lectionary markings in a different hand than that of the scribe, indicating that these were not likely found in the antegraph of this manuscript but were added later. That these liturgical marks have been added to an alternating catena strongly implies that both the biblical text and the comments were to be included in the public reading—something not as demonstrable in the frame format, where the biblical text sits wholly apart from the scholia and can be read as a separate unit.[36]

GA 1982: Eph 3:1 and 8

Both the Pauline and gospel catena traditions experience the same addition of an extra voice in numerous manuscripts after the ninth century. These scholia are called "Photiana" in honor of their attributed source, Photius I of Constantinople. Photius served both as patriarch and head of the University of Constantinople in the ninth century during the reign of Basil I of Macedonia, as stated earlier. The preface of Basil I's Ἐπαναγωγή reads that "*the patriarch alone* must interpret the maxims of the ancients, the definitions of the Holy Fathers, and the statutes of the Holy Councils." It should be of no surprise, then, to find manuscripts after the ninth century including the comments of the very patriarch spoken of in the emperor's preface.

The content in the scholia of Photius reflects his roles as a leader in the church and an educator in the university. He challenges heresy, as a patriarch would be expected to do, and addresses grammatical and syntactical issues within the biblical text, as one would expect from a docent of higher learning. In his scholia on Eph 3:8, he even remarks that the text of Eph 3:1–8 reminds him of similar wording in Thucydides and Demosthenes. It reads:

> Ἔστι γὰρ εἶναι μὲν δέσμιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Τουτέστι διὰ τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀμετάτρεπτον πίστιν δεδέσθαι καὶ κολάζεσθαι. Ἀλλ' οὐχὶ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐθνῶν, τουτέστι διὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα ὃ κηρύσσει τις ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὥσπερ πολλοὶ τῶν μαρτύρων. Οὐχ ὅτι γὰρ ἐδίδασκον τὰ ἔθνη ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐκ ἐξηρνοῦντο ἐκολάζοντο, ὁ δὲ Παῦλος διὰ ἀμφότερα καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐθνῶν … οὕτως καὶ Θουκυδίδης καὶ Δημόσθενης πολλαχοῦ.

> For he is to be a prisoner of Christ. In other words, because of his unalterable faith he is to be bound and punished. But not on account of the gentile, but rather on account of the teaching and the proclamation which he preached whenever he was among the gentiles, as to many wit-

---

36   Though she has not made the direct correlation to liturgical reading, Agnes Lorrain has made similar observations regarding the influence of catena layout on their use in reading. See Agnes Lorrain, "Autour du Vaticanus gr. 762: Notes pour l'étude des chaînes à présentation alternante," *Byzantion* 90 (2020): 68–74.

nesses. For it is not because the gentiles taught, but because they were not denying the faith that they were being punished, but Paul [endured these things] because of both Christ and the gentiles.… Thus both Thucydides and Demosthenes often say.

Photius marks an era of the church wherein the biblical text has ultimately become subservient to the patristic exegesis. By adding his voice to the others, a control mechanism is put in place as a guarantor of right belief. Catena manuscripts, as a material outpouring of this cultural climate, often place the biblical text or lemmata at the center of the page, but in practice it becomes marginalized in favor of the exegesis partnered with it.

What of the Use of Heretics?

The attempts at both creating unity and maintaining control over biblical interpretation in the Byzantine church raises the question of the use of so-called heretical voices within the catenae, most notably seen in the use of extracts drawn from the writings of Severus of Antioch, both in the Pauline catenae and the gospels, and to a lesser extent in anathematized figures such as Apollinarius and Theodore of Mopsuestia. In Codex Zacynthius (GA 040), Severus of Antioch is most often accompanied by the appellation "saint" (ἅγιος), while in the Pauline manuscripts often just his name is given.[37] Given the imperial opposition to Monophysitism throughout the reign of Justinian I and the hostility that remained by the time of the Quinisext Council, how can one like Severus be included in commentaries that are here argued to be meant to serve the church in matters of orthodoxy and piety?

First, one should consider the definition *heretic*. Let us not forget that Origen is found throughout the catenae of the Old and New Testament, yet he is condemned no fewer than fifteen times in the canons of the Fifth Ecumenical Council. Also, the most prolific source for catena extracts is John Chrysostom, who was condemned at the Synod of Oak in 403 CE by none other than Severian of Gabala, who is also found in the catenae. Theodoret is also condemned in the infamous "Three Chapters" at the close of the Council of Constantinople in 553 CE alongside Theodore of Mopsuestia, and, of course, Oecumenius himself was a Monophysite just as Severus was.[38] The standard pattern of selectively identifying one heretical commentator to the exclusion of others stems largely from the acceptance of orthodoxy as the obvious framework from which all else departs. As Averil Cameron has noted, doing so risks obscuring the true complexities of the religio-political reality of late antique Byzantine

---

[37]   H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker, *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Palimpsest, Lectionary*, TS 21 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2020), 65.

[38]   Whether Oecumenius is actually the author of the extracts ascribed to him or not is of lesser importance, given that the addition of his name and siglum to the extracts in the manuscripts proves that the users of these texts *believed* that he was. The identity of Oecumenius is part of an ongoing debate. Though originally thought to be the tenth-century bishop of Trikka, he is generally considered now to be the seventh-century author of a commentary on the Apocalypse. However, fragments of a Syriac letter attributed to Severus of Antioch refer to Oecumenius as a "careful and orthodox (see Monophysite) man." If this is the same Oecumenius as in the catenae and/or the author of the Apocalypse commentary, then he must have lived in the sixth century. For various views, see Adele Monaci Castagno, "I Commenti di Ecumenio e di Andrea di Cesarea: Due Letture Divergenti dell'Apocalisse," in *Estratto dalle Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, vol. 5.5 (Turin: Accadamia delle Scienze, 1981), 305–10; John C. Lamoreaux, "The Provenance of Ecumenius' Commentary on the Apocalypse," *VC* 52 (1998): 88–108; and A. Spitaler and J. Schmid, "Zur Klärung des Ökumeniusproblems," *OrChr* 3.9 (1934): 208–18.

culture.[39] The history of the church between Chalcedon and Justinian II is a constant volley of accusations and condemnations as the church and the empire move toward a singular Byzantine theology, and the catena tradition reflects this complexity.

Another answer to this challenge has been presented in the work of H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker on the preface of Codex Zacynthius.[40] The preface reads:

> The person who encounters this book ought to know that sections are inserted not just from many works of holy and orthodox fathers, but also from exegetes who were discredited and met the fate of heretics. These sections emerge as there are teachings in them unharmonious with church tradition, which were spoken by the heretics. I did not do this of my own accord, but I followed our most holy father, Archbishop Cyril of the great and Christ-loving city of Alexandria, who says in his Letter to Eulogius: "One ought not to avoid and refuse everything which heretics say. For, they grant many things which we also grant." I thought that it was indispensable to add this to the present introduction as a clarification and explanation for those who encounter it.[41]

The compiler of Zacynthius acknowledges that the sources found within are from holy and orthodox fathers as well as discredited exegetes but cites Cyril of Alexandria as a mediator for their inclusion. The use of this Cyrillian phrase is also found in the works of Severus of Antioch in defense of Monophysitism.[42] This use of Cyril appears again in the eighth-century preface to the catena of the Four Prophets originally attributed to John Drungarios, which reads in a remarkably similar fashion to Zacynthius:

> Let no one say against me that I have contradicted church tradition by including heretics' slogans. I refer to St. Cyril, our father, archbishop in the good Christian city of Alexander, who says in his letter to Eulogius that one should not assume heterodoxy behind every word of a heretic. "In many points they profess the same doctrine as we do."[43]

The use of Cyril cannot be understated, particularly given that the original context of his statement concerns the agreement of Alexandrian bishops with other aspects of Nestorian doctrine.[44] As was written above, it was Cyril's formula, $μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη$ ("one nature of God the Word incarnated") that became the impetus for the Chalcedonian Council. His language was moderate enough that both Severus and the Monophysites could claim to be true Cyrillians with Chalcedonian Dyophysites claiming the same.[45] It is also through an appeal of fidelity to Cyril that Justinian I sought to enforce unity within the church. Therefore, the use of Cyril in the preface of Zacynthius and in the catena on the Four Prophets is an appeal to an authority that all theological camps within the Eastern church would acknowledge, and, like Cyril himself, it is an appeal to moderation. Where the heretics are right, they are within the bounds of orthodoxy so defined and can be cited without conflict.

This mindset can be observed elsewhere, particularly in the anathemas of Origen. These anathemas related to specific doctrines associated with Origen, most of which can be traced, in some form to his work, *On First Principles*. This theology is not found in his surviving

---

[39]   Cameron, "Byzantium and the Limits of Orthodoxy," 140.

[40]   Houghton and Parker, *Codex Zacynthius*, 67.

[41]   H. A. G. Houghton, Panagiotis Manafis, and Amy Myshrall, *The Palimpsest Catena of Codex Zacynthius: Text and Translation*, TS 22 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2020), 24.

[42]   Allen and Hayward, *Severus of Antioch*, 74.

[43]   Michael von Faulhaber, *Die Propheten-Catenen nach römischen Handschriften* (Freiburg: Herder, 1899), 197.

[44]   McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria the Christological Controversy*, 349.

[45]   Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 33.

commentaries to great extent, and it is from the commentaries that many of the extracts are sourced. In fact, in the Acts of one of the very same councils that condemns him, Origen is appealed to as an opponent of Theopaschism and Monophysitism to justify the council's condemnation of both. Origen, though anathematized, was permissible wherever he might agree with the stated orthodoxy promoted by Constantinople. Lastly, the Christology of John of Damascus, as found in his *Dialectica*, adopts a definition for the incarnation from the infamous Origenist, Leontius of Byzantium.[46] Therefore, what are anathematized in the councils, when enumerated, are those teachings specifically deemed problematic, while in practice other teachings of the same individual were still viewed as acceptable and regularly used.

Conclusion

The world of Constantinople at the time of the sixth and seventh centuries, the era in which catenae were first composed, was one of reform and, in a sense, codification. It was Justinian I's attempt at forging a new Roman Empire through military and ecclesial might. It was the era of Justinian II's attempt at moral reform and restoration, in which the clergy were to be responsible for this change. The use of scholia in classical and legal texts preexisted the catenae and presented the template needed to create a vehicle for the transportation of these reforms from the emperor and the church to the people.

At this same time, a theological via media of the Byzantine church seeking to synthesize the opposing views from the regions of Alexandria and Antioch into a singular theology was on the rise. Catena manuscripts are the clearest visual and material representation of this effort. From the fifth to the seventh centuries, four christological factions dominated the ecclesial ecosystem of Byzantium: the strict Chalcedonians, the Monophysites, the Origenists, and the Neo-Chalcedonians. Each groups had direct representatives, or fathers influenced by their representatives, in the scholia of Old and New Testament catenae, creating a material-theological production that is exactly what one might expect in the *Okkasionalität* of the time.

It would be overly romantic to portray this era as one of unification and lasting peace, much less one of ecclesiastical harmony. Emperors and patriarchs often aligned themselves for individual motives, using violence when necessary. Though far from being the result of fair and reasonable inner-faith dialogue, catenae contain a synthesized, Constantinopolitan theology resulting from imperial encouragement and ecclesial cooperation. The most widespread catena tradition of the Pauline epistles is known as the Pseudo-Oecumenian catena. However, given the imperial and ecclesial desire to enforce a unity that was not necessarily a reality, one might also consider the entirety of the New Testament catena tradition to be *pseudo-oecumenical*.

---

46   John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought* (Crestwood, NY: Saint Vladimir's Press, 1987), 155; John of Damascus, *Dialectica* (PG 94:616).