The manuscripts inform us that, although being in essence a compilation, the exegesis of the Octateuch by Prokopios of Gaza was in the Greek world read as a continuous commentary instead of being mined for remains of this or that earlier work (which modern scholars have done). The survey of the manuscript tradition of the work of Prokopios published by Karin Metzler in her recent edition of the section on Genesis shows that all of the witnesses – the partial and youngest copies included – follow the sequence of the original text, without displacing or selecting passages.\(^1\)

In my review of that edition, I drew attention to an additional manuscript that might represent a different kind of reception.\(^2\) Without having seen the codex, I suggested that MS Venice, Marc. gr. II. 105 contains a collection of excerpts from Prokopios’s text, selected and put together by Pachomios Rousanos in the sixteenth century. I further suggested that Rousanos used either MS Munich, BSB, gr. 358 or MS Hagion Oros, Koutloumousiou 10.

I now confirm my tentative identification: ff. 35r–42r of MS Marc. gr. II. 105 (“M”) contain a selection of excerpts taken from the exegetical works

\(^{1}\) Metzler 2015, pp. XLII–LXVI. I thank Karin Metzler for our exchange on the MSS of Prokopios (January–February 2020). Independently from me, she also worked on MS Marc. gr. II. 105, identifying the excerpts on Genesis and Exodus and reaching the same conclusion on their dependence on MS Koutloumousiou 10. Her results will appear in the preface to her forthcoming edition, which she kindly shared with me before publication (see n. 12 below).

\(^{2}\) Ceulemans 2017, pp. 208–210. I suspected that a second possible case, that of an Anglo-Saxon commentary on Genesis written between c. 650–750, had to be pushed aside: a preliminary enquiry suggested that the link with Prokopios mentioned by the editors of the Canterbury commentary was fictional. My suggestion has now been confirmed by Karin Metzler (e-mail from 3 February 2020). Yet there might be other Greek manuscripts evidencing a form of reception comparable to that discussed in the following pages. That evidence, however, is either Western or very young: the respective catalogue descriptions suggest that MS Escorial, Real Bibl. B. VI. 3 (deperditus 141) from c. 1585 and MS Hagion Oros, Panteleimon 720 (Lambros 6227; non vidi) from the nineteenth century might (have) contain(ed) excerpts from Prokopios’s exegesis of the Octateuch.
of Prokopios on the Octateuch and on Kingdoms. I also confirm that the manuscript from which Rousanos excerpted the text of Prokopios is Hagion Oros, Koutloumousiou 10 (“K”; Diktyon 26035).

Almost all the variant readings of K noted by Metzler in the critical apparatus to the passages on Genesis retained by Rousanos, are shared by M. The only two times Rousanos offers the correct text against K are two cases where the copyist of K had changed an error and where Rousanos copied or built upon that correction. As it would fit a witness depending on K, a number of additional errors can be found in M. One may assume that these observations, formulated here for the section on Genesis, can be extrapolated to the sections on Exodus through IV Kingdoms.

These data confirm that Rousanos excerpted Prokopios’ work from K, a manuscript copied in Constantinople in the late eleventh or early twelfth century. Its consultation by Rousanos offers a terminus ante quem for its move to Mount Athos: one can safely assume that this consultation took place in the period 1536–44, when Rousanos lived on the Holy Moun-

3. My consultation of a reproduction of MS Marc. gr. II. 105, ff. 35r–42v was made possible with the much appreciated help of Matthieu Cassin and the Section grecque of the IRHT. The selection from Prokopios concludes on f. 42r, in the middle of the page (the lower half is blank). Folio 42v contains a number of citations from Ben Sira (7:2, 7:4–6, 11:28a.29, 13:1–4, 21:27–28, 31:20–21, in this order and preceded by the title Σοφίας Σιράχ). The selection is not related to the preceding pages and has nothing to do with Prokopios (against the description by Mioni 1967, p. 318).

4. I did not see K and consulted its section on Genesis indirectly, through Metzler 2015.

5. This includes the erroneous presentation of the genealogy of Japhet and Cham, a variant reading of several lines: Metzler 2015, pp. 224.9 υἱοὶ – 224.11 ἔθνος. This reading includes the variant γατοῦλοι for Γετοῦλοι (line 7). The entries for K in Metzler’s apparatus to lines 13 (lemma ἵωαν), 16 (lemma καππαδόκαι), 6 (lemma ἔθνος) and 6–8 (lemma ἔθνος – ρώμες<νοι>–) can or must be ignored: they either repeat or contradict the longer entry for 224.9 υἱοὶ – 224.11 ἔθνος.

6. 148.70 οὐ δέχεται M\ K*, corrected to οὐκ δέχεται by K1; 227.20 τὸ M\ τὸ K*, corr. K? (page and line numbers from Metzler 2015).

7. 148.79 οὐδὲ K\ + γάρ M; 148.85 ἢ K\ < M; 152.64 α´ K\ πρῶτον M; 205.30 τὰ K\ < M; 205.41 εὐχαριστητικῶς K\ εὐχαριστικῶς M; 223.1–2 καὶ Ἑλισά K\ < M; 223.3 ἀμμανοῦ K\ ἀμμανοῦ M; 223.4 ἐπὶ K\ ἀπὸ M; 223.5 ἐπί K\ ἀπὸ M; 223.10 γαβέρ M; 224.10 σεμαχθηνοί K\ σεμαχθηνοί M; 225.12 Μοσόχ K\ μεσόχ M; 225.16 Ἔκαστος K\ + ἔθνος M (page and line numbers from Metzler 2015; I interpret the absence of K in her apparatus as meaning that this witness has the edited text).
tain, frequented its monasteries, studied and copied manuscripts in their libraries. 8

The testimony of Rousanos is relevant: it shows us that K, mutilated today, was still complete when consulted by Rousanos in the mid-sixteenth century. 9 In this way, the selection in M allows us to know what the title that headed the work of Prokopios in K must have looked like. This codex is one of the two oldest and arguably most important witnesses, none of which has preserved an original title for the entire work. Even when both in K and M the section on Judges is immediately followed by those on Kingdoms, the title cited by Rousanos (and most probably reflecting that in K) singles out the Octateuch as a comprehensive unit. This confirms the suggestion to approach Prokopios’s writings of the Octateuch, on the one hand, and on Kingdoms and Chronicles, on the other hand, as two distinct works, even when their transmission runs parallel. 10

Surveying the selection made by Rousanos, one observes an interest in facts and concrete data: genealogies, the meaning of proper names, the location of geographical entities, lexical information. 11 In the course of his selection, the excerpts become increasingly shorter (which matches the general tendency in Greek exegesis of the Octateuch and Kingdoms). From Deuteronomy onwards, Rousanos as a rule first cites the biblical text to which an excerpt relates.

Here I survey and identify the contents of M, ff. 35r–42v, each time citing

8. This view agrees with that of Mousouras 2003, p. 140 n. 112, but goes against his later inclination that M was copied in the monastery of Saint George of Kremna at Zante (Mousouras 2005, pp. 231–232 and 239–241, proceeding from his identification of ff. 207r–213v as having been copied by Barlaam Beleti, a fellow monk of Rousanos at Zante). In any case the manuscript, together with much of Rousanos’s library, was later brought to the monastery at Zante and from there, eventually, to Venice (Zorzi 2018, pp. 203–204). Michael Grünbart kindly brought MS Batopediou 33 to my attention (Diktyon 18180): it shows that at least one manuscript copied by Rousanos on the Holy Mountain is still there today (e-mail from 8 April 2020).

9. The first excerpt retained by Rousanos is from a part of K that is lost today. In a later section on Genesis an uncertain variant of K (today consultable in only a very poorly readable reproduction: see Metzler 2015, pp. XLVIII–XLIX) is confirmed by the testimony of Rousanos: 223.8 ἐδούλευσαν ἐδούλευσε K(?) M.


11. A similar interest might have prompted Rousanos to copy the interpretation of some words of Leviticus in an earlier section of M (f. 7v: see Mioni 1967, p. 317). I have not seen those pages, but note that Leviticus is absent from the section under discussion here. For Rousanos as an excerptor, see also Ceulemans 2017, p. 208 n. 13.
the incipit and desinit (with tacit adjustment of some accents) and referring to a modern or easily available edition that allows further identification.

35r Εκ τῆς εἰς τὴν Ὀκτάτευχον ἐπιτομῆς τῶν ἐκλογῶν Προκοπίου σοφιστοῦ τοῦ Γαζαίου

Γενέσεως

Ὡςπερ δὲ φασὶ τὸ δένδρον … δηλονότι τυγχάνοντι.

Αλλ᾽ ἐπὶ τούτοις ζητητέον … [35v] … διὰ ξύλου καὶ ζωῆ. [36r]
Excerpt on Gen 3:18 (cf. METZLER 2015, pp. 147.50–148.85).

Οἱ δὲ ἀλληγοροῦντες … [36v] … ἐν τοῖς φθάσασι παρεθέμεθα.

Ζητεῖται δὲ διατί … εὐχαριστικῶς ἀπάρχεσθαι.
Excerpt on Gen 8:4 (cf. METZLER 2015, p. 205.27–41).

Ὅρας δὲ καὶ προφητεία … [37r–38v] … εὐρηκέναι τὴν ἀστρολογίαν.

Πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἐπὶ νότου … [39r] … ἀοράτῳ τροποῦται χειρί.

Εξόδου

Excerpt on Exod 6:3 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 180vv).13

12. For the sections on Exodus to Judges, no edition of Prokopios exists. To allow identification and contextualization of the excerpts, I refer the reader to the respective folio numbers in MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, a primary witness of the full text of Prokopios and available online (Diktyon 44806; https://daten_digitale-sammlungen_de/db/0010/bsb00109048/images/). I also refer to Nikephoros 1772–1773 when this edition contains text corresponding to the excerpts selected by Rousanos (available on http://medusa.libver.gr/handle/123456789/2506 and http://medusa.libver.gr/handle/123/1609; dependence on Prokopios is indicated by the attribution to Prokopios and the two preceding asterisks; Nikephoros used MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, but rearranged some fragments; parts of his edition were reprinted in PG 87). The first critical edition of Prokopios’s exegesis of Exodus, prepared by Karin Metzler, is in print in the GCS series.

13. See also (from the catenae on the Octateuch, with reference to Prokopios:) PETIT 2000, p. 150 (n° 177) and earlier Nikephoros 1772, I:6226-ε.
Αὐλαίας δὲ καλεῖ τὰ παραπετάσματα, καὶ Ῥωμαίων φωνῇ κορτίνας.
Excerpt on Exod 26:2 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 228v and Nikephoros 1772, I:847δ-ε).

Δευτερονομίου

Ὅθ προσθήσετε πρὸς τὸ ρῆμα. Καὶ μετ’ ὀλίγον ἐρεῖ ... αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς αὐτῶν.
Excerpt on Deut 4:2 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 342r-v and Nikephoros 1772, I:1437δ-ε).

Ἀριθμῷ μ´ μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτόν. Καὶ Ἰεζεκιήλ φησὶ μετὰ μ´ ἔτη ... ἐν πνεύματι περιτομὴν διαγαγόντως αὐτοῦς.

Ἰδοὺ σὺ κοιμᾶσαι μετὰ τῶν πατέρων σου. Σημειωτέον εἰ που κατὰ τὴν παλαιὰν ... πνευματικὴν νοητέον συγγένειαν.
Excerpt on Deut 31:16 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 368r).15

Ἡσοῦ

Καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Γαβαὼν ἤκουσαν. Προυχώρησεν αὐτοῖς τὰ τῆς μοιχα-νῆς ... |41r ...πρὸς νότον ἀπιόντων εἰς τὸν Δαρωμάν.
Excerpt on Ios 9:3 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 392r-v and Nikephoros 1773, II:56α and 56β-γ).16

"Εστι δὲ μεταξὺ Αἰλίας καὶ Διοπόλεως ... ὁ συγγραφεὺς ὡς νεώτερος. |41v Excerpt on Ios 10:41 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 393r and Nikephoros 1773, II:66ε-ζ, 67ζ and 68δ-ε).17

Κριτῶν

Ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τῶν φοινίκων. Ἡρωδούς φησί. Αραδ ὁ πόλις ... τῆς δὲ Χεβρών ἀπὸ εἰκοστοῦ.

14. Nikephoros included only the first half of the fragment.
15. See also Nikephoros 1772, I:1618 n. 2.
16. Nikephoros did not include the entire fragment, but (as separate fragments) two non-consecutive sections of it.
17. The entire excerpt can be read in the edition of Nikephoros, but dispersed over three different fragments.
Excerpt on Iud 1:16 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 401v and Nikephoros 1773, II:1248-ε).

Εἰς γῆν Χετιείν. Τὴν Κύπρον φησίν.
Excerpt on Iud 1:26 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 401v and Nikephoros 1773, II:126ε).

Κατοικοῦντας Αγχώ. Τὴν νη<σον> Πτολεμαΐδα φησίν.
Excerpt on Iud 1:31 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 401v and Nikephoros 1773, II:129γ-δ).

Οἴδε τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Δόρ. Μεθόριον γὰρ αὕτη τῶν δύο φυλῶν.
Excerpt on Iud 1:36 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 401v and Nikephoros 1773, II:129δ).

Ἐπάνω Ἀκραβίν. Ὅριον τοῦτο τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀνατολικὸν ... πόλις τοῦ Ἰδουμαίου.
Excerpt on Iud 1:36 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 401v and Nikephoros 1773, II:130γ-δ).

Ἐρράβδιζε πυροὺς ἐν ληνῷ. Τῷ μὴ φανερῶς ἀλοήσαι τολμᾶν.
Excerpt on Iud 6:11 (cf. MS Munich, BSB gr. 358, f. 407r and Nikephoros 1773, II:162δ).

Βασιλειῶν

Υἱὸς ἐνιαυτοῦ Σαοὺλ ἐν τῷ βασιλεύειν αὐτόν. Ὁ Σύμμαχος ἐξέδωκεν ...
Excerpt on I Regn 13:1 (cf. MEURSIUS 1620, pp. 34 and 37).

Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐλάλησεν ἐν ἐμοί. Αἰσχυνθήτωσαν Ἰουδαῖοι ... πῶς οὐ προφήτης;

Ἀριωθ. Οἱ λοιποὶ "ἀγριολάχανα".

18. To allow identification of the excerpts, I refer to the page numbers in MEURSIUS 1620 (available on proquest:ned-kbn-all-00003310-001; this is an edition from MS Leiden, Bibl. Rijksuniv., BPG 50, a younger copy of MS Munich, BSB gr. 358). The precise loci in MS Munich, BSB gr. 358 can easily be retrieved through the overview published by PETIT 2003, pp. XXXIV–LX (here XXXVI, XLI, LXI and LXIII).

19. A new edition of this fragment, from MS Munich, BSB gr. 358 and replacing Meursius’s, is available in PETIT 2003, p. 107 (n° 35).
Καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν τὸ ἁγίασμα καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον. Ἐν ταῖς Παραλειπομέναις ἔχει ... καθὰ προεῖπον ἀνόμαζον.  
Excerpt on IV Regn 11:12 (cf. MEURSIUS 1620, p. 305).

Τὴν Ἐλώμ. Τὴν νῦν ὀνομαζομένην Ἀϊλὰν ... ὃν ἐρυθρὰν προσαγορεύουσι θάλατταν.  
Excerpt on IV Regn 14:22 (cf. MEURSIUS 1620, p. 310).
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