

KARIN METZLER (ed.), Prokop von Gaza, *Eclogarum in libros historicos Veteris Testamenti epitome*. Teil 2: Der Exoduskommentar (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Neue Folge 27). Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter 2020. 402 S. – ISBN: 978-3-1106-9485-7; e-ISBN: 978-3-1106-9493-2 (€ 139.95)

KARIN METZLER (ed.), Prokop von Gaza, *Der Exoduskommentar*. Übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Neue Folge 28). Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter 2020. 382 S. – ISBN: 978-3-1106-9486-4; e-ISBN: 978-3-1106-9490-1 (€ 129.95)

- GIANMARIO CATTANEO, University of Eastern Piedmont, Vercelli (gianmario\_cattaneo@libero.it)

Five years after the publication of the *Commentary on Genesis* (henceforth *CommGen*) by Procopius of Gaza (465/470–526/530),<sup>1</sup> KARIN METZLER (henceforth M.) publishes the first critical edition of Procopius’s *Commentary on Exodus* (henceforth *CommEx*). The praise M. received for the edition of *CommGen* should be extended to this impressive work on *CommEx*. The first volume contains a long introduction and the Greek text of *CommEx*. This is the first edition of the whole *CommEx*, with a critical apparatus and a rich *apparatus fontium*. The second volume contains an annotated German translation. At the end of both volumes M. has inserted an index of the authors and the sources. I will now briefly examine the various sections of M.’s books, and I will propose some observations that were prompted by the stimulating reading of these volumes.

After a short note on the title that M. chose to give to the corpus of Procopius’s commentaries (*Eclogarum libros historicos Veteris Testamenti epitome*; pp. XIII–XIV), the first part of the introduction is devoted to Procopius of Gaza’s life and works (pp. XIV–XX). In the second part of the introduction, M. focuses on *CommEx* (pp. XXI–XLIII).

1. KARIN METZLER (ed.), Prokop von Gaza, *Eclogarum in libros historicos Veteris Testamenti epitome*. Teil 1: Der Genesiskommentar (GCS, NF 22). Berlin – Boston 2015; KARIN METZLER (ed.), Prokop von Gaza, *Der Genesiskommentar*. Übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen. Berlin – Boston 2016 (GCS, NF 23). On this edition, see in particular the review-article written by REINHART CEULEMANS, *The Transmission, Sources and Reception of Procopius’ Exegesis of Genesis: Observations in the Wake of the New Edition*. *VChr* 71 (2017) pp. 205–224.

As M. has already pointed out in the preface of *CommGen*, both Procopius and the compiler of the catenae on the Octateuch typus I–II KARO-LIETZMANN (CPG C1; typus I PETIT) essentially drew on a lost *Urkatene* on the Octateuch<sup>2</sup> as the main source for *CommEx* (pp. XXI–XXVII). It is probable that Procopius also used other sources (for instance, Philo of Alexandria’s *Vita Moysis*) to produce his commentaries.

After that, M. discusses the purpose and reception of Procopius’s commentaries (pp. XXVII–XXXII). She carefully investigates Procopius’s library and sources (pp. XXXII–XXXV), his method of exegesis (pp. XXXV–XXXVI), the structure of *CommEx* and the influence of Cyril of Alexandria’s *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate* on it (pp. XXXVI–XLI), the way Procopius developed his sources (pp. XLI–XLII) and the version of the Bible he used (pp. XLII–XLIII).

The third part of the introduction concerns the manuscript tradition and printed editions of *CommEx*. First, M. discusses the editions of *CommEx* (pp. XLIV–XLVII): in 1555, a Latin translation of the whole commentary on the Octateuch was published;<sup>3</sup> in 1772, the Greek monk Nikephoros included most of *CommEx* in his so-called *Catena Lipsiensis* (or *Catena Nicephori*), which was reprinted by abbot Migne in the *Patrologia Graeca* in 1860, together with the 1555 translation. The next section contains the

---

2. The existence of a *Urkatene* and the reconstruction of the relationships between Procopius and the different types of catenae were first formulated by FRANÇOISE PETIT in various publications: FRANÇOISE PETIT (ed.), *Catena Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum. I: Catena Sinaitica* (CChr, SG 2). Turnhout – Leuven 1977, pp. XIV–XXXVII; FRANÇOISE PETIT, *La tradition de Théodoret de Cyr dans les chaînes sur la Genèse. Vues nouvelles sur le classement de ces chaînes. Le Muséon* 92 (1979) pp. 281–286; FRANÇOISE PETIT (ed.), *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Édition intégrale. I: Chapitres 1 à 3* (TEG 1). Leuven 1992, pp. XIII–XXV.

3. Regarding the editions of *CommEx*, M. says (p. xliv): “Es gab im 18. Jh. ein nicht verwirklichtes Editionsprojekt”, and in the footnote: “Es wurde von Gottfried Olearius (1672–1715) geplant und begonnen”. I would add that, almost in the same period, another scholar expressed his doubts about the reliability of the 1555 Latin edition, and wanted Procopius’s Greek text to be published soon. The French biblist Richard Simon (1638–1712) devoted a chapter of the fourth volume of his *Bibliothèque critique* to Procopius’s Commentaries. In the preface he states (RICHARD SIMON, *Bibliothèque critique, ou recueil de diverses pièces critiques. Tome quatrième. Amsterdam* 1710, pp. 144–145): “Cet ouvrage dont nous n’avons qu’une version latine, a été imprimé à Zurich en 1555. Il seroit à souhaiter que quelque sçavant Aleman publiât l’original grec qui est dans la Bibliothèque d’Ausbourg. Il y a lieu de douter que l’interprète ait toujours bien entendu le sens de son auteur, qui est rempli de réflexions curieuses et critiques, principalement sur le Pentateuque”. In the following pages, Simon also discusses the Latin translation of *CommEx* 18.1, concerning Moses’s father-in-law Jethro.

description of the manuscripts of *CommEx* (pp. XLVII–LV): six of them are independent witnesses (A + m = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, gr. 358 + Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, O II 17a; K = Hagion Oros, Monê Koutloumousiou 10; a: al-Iskandariyya, Bibliothêkê tou Patriarcheïou, 57; b = Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Q 96 sup.; c = Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria, 1-1-5); three are complete or partial copies of the aforementioned codices (L = Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, BPG 50; O = Chicago, University of Chicago, Joseph Regenstein Library, 55; k = Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. II 105).

Regarding the manuscripts of *CommEx*, I would like to add a small detail about codex Salmanticensis c. M. says that it was copied in the 16th century, but we can date this more precisely. In fact, it has been shown that the entire manuscript was copied by the Cretan scribe Nicolás de la Torre (ca. 1535–1610), who worked as a copyist for the University of Salamanca between 1569 and 1573.<sup>4</sup> This manuscript, which is currently part of the “Fondo Antiguo” of the Salamanca University Library, was certainly copied by Nicolás during his stay at Salamanca from a manuscript owned by Diego Hurtado de Mendoza (the lost witness  $\Phi$ , which was the antigraph of b and c),<sup>5</sup> so it should be dated between 1569 and 1573.

In the fourth part of the introduction, M. focuses on the *recensio codicum* (pp. LV–LXXIX). First, she is able to find a series of archetypal errors which are present both in the catena and in *CommEx*. She reports some examples in which the catena on *Exodus* offers a better text than *CommEx* and vice versa. There are also some cases in which the original text that Procopius paraphrased can be used to correct mistakes of *CommEx*. Next, M. offers a list of the mistakes that allowed her to propose the *stemma codicum*. In summary the manuscript A + m and the lost witness  $\Psi$  were copied from an archetype  $\omega$ . A was the model of O,  $\Psi$  was the antigraph of K (from which k was copied) and X, which is the lost common ancestor of the codices a and, via the subarchetype  $\Phi$ , b and c.

In the following section (pp. LXXX–CVII), M. discusses the sources of *CommEx*. She first focuses on Origen’s treatises, homilies and commentaries (pp. LXXXII–XCIII). Then, she moves to the commentaries of the

4. See GREGORIO DE ANDRÉS, *El cretense Nicolás de la Torre, copista griego de Felipe II*. Madrid 1969, pp. 33–40; TERESA MARTÍNEZ MANZANO, *Historia del fondo manuscrito griego de la Universidad de Salamanca (Obras de referencia 37)*. Salamanca 2015, pp. 75–79.

5. See DE ANDRÉS, *El cretense Nicolás de la Torre*, p. 36.

Antiochene school (pp. XCIII–XCIV) and the other authors Procopius used (pp. XCIV–CV): Basil of Caesarea, Cyril of Alexandria, Didymus the Blind, Diodore of Tarsus, Epiphanius of Salamis, Eusebius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Emesa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, Philo of Alexandria, Severian of Gabala. The last part concerns the works Procopius did not use as sources, but which contain some noteworthy parallels (pp. CV–CVII): the *Collectio Coisliniana*, Išo‘dad of Merw’s *Commentaries on the Old Testament*, the Diyarbakir *Commentary on Exodus*, Origen’s *Homilies on Exodus*, Theodoret of Cyrus’s *Questions on the Octateuch*. The last chapter is devoted to the criteria M. followed in her edition (pp. CVIII–CXVI).

On the subject of the East-Syrian parallel sources of *CommEx*, M. only mentions the commentary of the manuscript (olim) Diyarbakir 22 (VIII c.) and Išo‘dad of Merw’s *Commentaries on the Old Testament* (IX c.). The relationship between these two Syrian commentaries has been discussed by several scholars. For instance, Lucas Van Rompay believes that, for the commentary on *Genesis*, the *Diyarbakir Commentary* was one of Išo‘dad of Merw’s main sources,<sup>6</sup> whereas CLEMENS LEONHARD has argued that they both drew independently from the lost *Commentary on Genesis* by Theodore of Mopsuestia (350 ca.–428 CE).<sup>7</sup> I am wondering if other parallels with *CommEx* could be found in another important commentary of the East-Syrian exegetical school, that is, Theodore bar Koni’s *Liber scholiorum* (792/793 CE), which covers both the *Old* and *New Testaments*.<sup>8</sup> In my opinion, whenever the East-Syrian biblical exegetes are mentioned as possible parallel sources, Theodore bar Koni should also be taken into account.

The section *Nachträge zum Genesiskommentar des Prokop von Gaza* (pp. CXVII–CXXVI) contains further research on *CommGen*. M. focuses on the possible reception of *CommGen* in the Canterbury exegetical school of Theodore and Hadrian (650–750 CE).<sup>9</sup> In particular it seems possible

6. See for instance LUCAS VAN ROMPAY (ed.), *Le commentaire sur Genèse-Exode 9, 32 du manuscrit (olim) Diyarbakir 22. I* (CSCO 483). Leuven 1986, pp. XLVII–XLVIII.

7. CLEMENS LEONHARD (ed.), *Ishodad of Merw’s Exegesis of the Psalms 119 and 139–147* (CSCO 585). Leuven 2002, p. 54.

8. Published in ADDAI SCHER (ed.), *Theodorus bar Kōnī, Liber Scholiorum. I–II* (CSCO 19). Paris 1910–1912, and translated in ROBERT HESPEL – RENÉ DRAGUET (eds), *Théodore bar Koni. Livre des scolies (recension de Séert). I–II* (CSCO 432–432). Leuven 1981.

9. On *CommGen* and the Canterbury school, see BERNHARD BISCHOFF – MICHAEL

that the anonymous glossae on the Octateuch produced by the Canterbury school partly drew on Procopius's *CommGen*. Finally, M. devotes a short chapter to codex k, a collection of extracts from Procopius's commentaries, which was produced in the 16th century by Pachomios Rousanos.<sup>10</sup>

On this subject, I would like to suggest a small correction to M.'s list of manuscripts of *CommGen*. Regarding manuscript v (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, gr. 1441; M., pp. LX-LXI), M. says that in the first folio it reads: "61 Procopii sophiste Christiani epitome in Genesim". This manuscript was once owned by Pope Marcellus II Cervini (1501–1555), and the number represents the shelfmark of this volume in his library. But, as ROBERT DEVREESE and SANTO LUCÀ have shown, the shelfmark written on the first folio is not 61, but 67.<sup>11</sup> This manuscript was later acquired by cardinal Guglielmo Sirleto (1514–1585), and then by Giovanni Angelo Altemps (1586–1620). Since Pope Paul V Borghese (1552–1621) confiscated manuscript v from Altemps library, Giovanni Angelo decided to produce a copy of it, in order to replace it in his library. This copy is codex x of *CommGen* (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ott. gr. 141). In fact, on the flyleaf of x it says: "Unus ex codicibus bibliothecae Altempianae a Paulo quinto manu regia exceptis nunc vero a Joanne Angelo ab Altaemps duce propriis sumptibus ex originalibus transumptis ut bibliotheca praedicta tanto honore iam decorata non careret".<sup>12</sup> In the edition of *CommGen*, M. clearly demonstrates that x was copied from y by comparing the two texts, and now the history of the two manuscripts confirms her reconstruction. Furthermore, since v was confiscated by Paul V and the copy x was realized by order of Giovanni Angelo Altemps, x was surely copied between 1605 (the beginning of Paul's papacy) and 1620 (Altemps's death). Another copy of v was made in the 18th century, y (London, British Library, Add. 10022-23). M. (p. LXII) says that written on the flyleaf is the phrase: "Purchased Feb. 1836 of Ihrs

---

LAPIDGE, *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 10). Cambridge 1995, pp. 227–229; CEULEMANS, *The Transmission*, pp. 208–210.

10. On this Venetian manuscript, see REINHART CEULEMANS, *A Post-Byzantine Reader of Prokopios of Gaza: Pachomios Rousanos in MS Venice, Marc. gr. II. 105 [Diktyon 70267]*. *ByzRev* 2 (2020) pp. 2–8.

11. See ROBERT DEVREESE, *Les manuscrits grecs de Marcello Cervini*. *Scriptorium* 22 (1968) p. 264; SANTO LUCÀ, *La silloge manoscritta greca di Guglielmo Sirleto. Un primo saggio di ricostruzione*, in *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae XIX* (StT 474). Città del Vaticano 2012, p. 335.

12. See the digital reproduction at [https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Ott.gr.141](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Ott.gr.141).

Rodd.”. Looking at the digital reproduction of the manuscript,<sup>13</sup> it seems that it says: “Purchased Feb. 1836. Of Tho<sup>s</sup> Rodd.”: Thomas Rodd the Younger (1794–1849), son of Thomas Rodd the Elder (1763–1822), was a famous English bookseller, who sold several books to the British Museum.

The last section of the introduction contains the explanation of the abbreviations (pp. CXXVII–CXXXI), the bibliography (pp. CXXXII–CLXII) and the list of *sigla* of the apparatuses (pp. CLXIII–CLXV).

The critical edition of *CommEx* (pp. 1–265) is truly a fine piece of scholarship, and M.’s work is astonishing in its accuracy and completeness. In particular, M. has done a remarkable job in reconstructing the relationships between *CommEx*, the catena on *Exodus* and the actual patristic sources of Procopius. I would change just one feature of her edition: in the margin of each page, M. reports the name of the authors Procopius drew from, but she uses “nicht identif.” for passages that are both connected with anonymous fragments of the catena on *Exodus*, and for passages that cannot be related to catenistic fragments or any other source. I think that the difference between these two kinds of passages should be highlighted somehow because, in one case, Procopius drew from the *Urkatene* whereas, in the other, his source is unknown.

I will now propose some observations about selected passages of *CommEx*: I will cite *CommEx* according to M.’s edition, and I will also report her German translation from the second volume.

2.11.77–80: εὐγνώμονες οἱ εὐσεβεῖς, οὐ μόνον διὰ γλώττης εὐχάριστοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῆς τῶν υἱῶν προσηγορίας ὥσπερ στήλην ἔγγραφον ἰστῶντες τὴν εἰς θεὸν εὐχαριστίαν, ὡς καὶ Ἰωσήφ ποιεῖ ἐν τῇ Γενέσει. M.’s translation reads: “Die Frommen sind dankbar, sie zeigen sich nicht nur durch die Zunge erkenntlich, sondern auch durch die Benennungen der Söhne, womit sie ihren Dank an Gott gleichsam als eine Stele mit Inschrift errichten, wie es auch Josef im Buch Genesis macht”. In the apparatus, M. says: “vgl. Gen 41,51f.”. It is worth adding that, when commenting this verse of *Genesis* in *CommGen*, Procopius uses almost the same words, and (most importantly) connects it with Ex 2.11: Εὐγνώμονες οἱ εὐσεβεῖς ὥσπερ στήλην ἔγγραφον ἰστῶντες τὴν εἰς θεὸν εὐχαριστίαν, ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν Ἐξόδῳ.

5.7.9–11: τὴν δὲ καλάμην καὶ τὸ ἐκ ταύτης ἄχυρον τότε θεῖον ἐρμήνευσεν εὐαγγέλιον καὶ Παῦλος ὁ μεγαλόφωνος πυρὸς ὕλην εἰπόντες M.’s translation: «Den Halm aber und das aus ihm entstehende Stroh legten damals

13. [http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=add\\_ms\\_10022\\_f001r](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=add_ms_10022_f001r).

das göttliche Evangelium und Paulus mit seiner gewaltigen Stimme aus, indem sie sie als Stoff des Feuers bezeichneten». M. decided to correct ἡρμήνευσεν of the manuscripts Kabc to ἐρμήνευσεν, the aorist indicative form without the augment. I think that here the reading of the manuscripts should be preserved, in particular because in *CommGen* M. always adopts the form with the augment (see *CommGen* 2.8.140–141; 3.10.15; 4.3.9–10; 31.1.26). The source of this passage (Greg. Nyss. v. Mos. 2.62) does not help in this situation: Ἡ δὲ καλάμη καὶ τὸ ἐκ ταύτης ἄχυρον [...] παρὰ τε τοῦ θεοῦ Εὐαγγελίου καὶ παρὰ τῆς ὑψηλῆς τοῦ Ἀποστόλου φωνῆς προσερμηνεύεται, ἀμφοτέρων ὁμοίως πυρὸς ὕλην τὸ τε ἄχυρον καὶ τὴν καλάμην ἐρμηνεύσαντων.

8.6(2).85–86: Ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ πρώτου σημείου «κατίσχυσεν», εἴρηται, «ἡ καρδία Φαραώ», ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου «ἐβαρύνθη». M.'s translation: “Beim ersten Wunderzeichen heißt es nun, dass das Herz des Pharaos stark wurde, beim zweiten, dass es schwer wurde”. In the apparatus it reads: “ἐβαρύνθη nach Ex 8,15(11) Mz.] βεβάρυνται Hss.”. So, M. corrects *CommEx* according to the Septuagint version of Ex 8.11: ἰδὼν δὲ Φαραῶ ὅτι γέγονεν ἀνάψυξις, ἐβαρύνθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ. Nevertheless, in this case it is very difficult to explain the genesis of the presumed scribal mistake (from ἐβαρύνθη to βεβάρυνται). Perhaps here Procopius is not referring to Ex 8.11, but to Ex 7.14. Rahlfs publishes this passage as follows: Εἶπεν δὲ κύριος πρὸς Μωσῆν Βεβάρηται ἡ καρδία Φαραῶ, but Wevers prints it as: Εἶπεν δὲ κύριος πρὸς Μωσῆν Βεβάρυνται ἡ καρδία Φαραῶ.<sup>14</sup> Since the variant reading βεβάρυνται is well attested in the tradition of the Septuagint, I think that Procopius's text should not be corrected.

19.9.5–6: φόβος γὰρ τοῖς ῥαθυμοῦσι χρήσιμος. M.'s translation: “Die Furcht ist nämlich für die Leichtsinnigen nützlich”. M. was not able to identify the source of this Greek aphorism, but it was presumably taken from Cyr. *Agg.* 1.12 (2.257 PUSEY): χρῆμά τε ἐστὶν οὐκ ἀνόνητον τοῖς ῥαθυμεῖν εἰωθόσιν ὁ φόβος, “Fear is not useless for those who are usually careless”. Cyril of Alexandria's *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets* are indeed one of Procopius's sources (see p. XCV), but M. states that Procopius probably just drew from the *Urkatene* rather than from the original work. Since this sentence does not appear in the catena on *Exodus*, perhaps Procopius used Cyril's *Commentaries* as a direct source.

14. See JOHN WILLIAM WEVERS (ed.), *Exodus* (Septuaginta 2.1). Göttingen 1991, p. 122. See also JOHN WILLIAM WEVERS, *Text History of the Greek Exodus* (AAWG.PH 192). Göttingen 1992, p. 74.

27.9.39–41: Ὅρα δὲ καὶ τοὺς «στύλους» ἐξ «ἀργύρου» νῦν δι’ ὅλου κεκοσμημένους, ἐπερηρισμένους «βάσεσι χαλκαῖς» καὶ περιαργύροις. M.’s translation: “Und sieh auch, dass die Säulen (sc. der Vorhangbahnen) aus Silber, jetzt ganz und gar geschmückt, auf Sockel aus Bronze mit Silberüberzug gestützt sind”. The corresponding fragment, which comes from Cyr. *ador.* 9 (PG 68.640–641), reads (825 PETIT): Ἀργύρω μὲν ἐκ κεφαλῆς εἰς πόδας καταγλαΐζεσθαι δεῖν εὖ μάλα φησί· βάσεσι γὰρ αὖ ὑπερηρεῖσθαι χαλκαῖς καὶ περιαργύροις, “It is said that (the pillars) should shimmer brightly with silver from top to bottom: moreover, they should be supported by bases of silver-plated bronze”. The biblical verse that Procopius and this fragment refer to is *Ex* 27.17: “All the pillars around the court shall be banded with silver; their hooks shall be of silver, and their bases of bronze” (transl. New Revised Standard Version). In the manuscripts, fragment 825 reads: βάσεσι γὰρ αὖ ὑπερηρεῖσθαι χαλκαῖς καὶ κεφαλίσιν ἀργυροῖς, “they should be supported by bronze bases and silver capitals”, and Petit corrected it to καὶ περιαργύροις on the basis of Procopius and Cyril of Alexandria’s texts. In fact the pillars cannot “be supported” by silver capitals (because the pillars support the capitals). So, this could be added to M.’s list of passages in which *CommEx* offers a better text than the *Catena in Exodum* (see pp. LVII–LVIII). Nevertheless, I think that this correction to the text of the catena is too bold. Perhaps a verb like καταγλαΐζεσθαι and ὑπερηρεῖσθαι is missing here (κοσμεῖσθαι?), so I would print the text this way: Ἀργύρω μὲν ἐκ κεφαλῆς εἰς πόδας καταγλαΐζεσθαι δεῖν εὖ μάλα φησί· βάσεσι γὰρ αὖ ὑπερηρεῖσθαι χαλκαῖς καὶ κεφαλίσιν ἀργυροῖς <...>.

In conclusion, I hope that M.’s edition of *CommEx* will soon be available in the *TLG online* corpus, so that everyone can read and fully appreciate M.’s work, which, just like her edition of *CommGen*, constitutes a fundamental tool for all scholars interested in Patristics and Biblical Exegesis.

#### Keywords

Procopius of Gaza; Exodus; biblical exegesis; catenae<sup>15</sup>

15. The editor of *The Byzantine Review* thanks Vasileios Marinis for suggestions and revisions.