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CHAPTER I
PROLEGOMENA

St. John Chrysostom, the great preacher and doctor of Antioch and Constantinople, was, after his death, one of the most influential and admired of the Greek Fathers. The holiness of his life, and the persecutions that led to his death, together with the stylistic excellence of his sermons and their moral earnestness, ensured him a high place among the leaders and writers of the Christian East and were doubtless responsible for the preservation of his extensive writings and their continued popularity down through the ages.

James Marshall Campbell, in his little introduction to The Greek Fathers, has observed of Chrysostom: "More of him has survived, he has been translated more frequently and more widely and has been published more extensively than any other Father of the Orient."¹ In Migne's Patrologia Graeca, his works fill eighteen volumes. These eighteen volumes contain, along with treatises like De Sacerdotio and letters, one of the most extensive and most admired collections of sacred oratory in the world.

One of the central works of this collection is the Homilies on Matthew, which are one of the great monuments of Chrysostom's exegetical oratory and which form the earliest complete commentary on the first Gospel preserved to us. These homilies, ninety in all, were probably delivered at Antioch in the

year 390, when Chrysostom was serving as preacher in the patriarchal church of that city. However, as Dom Chrysostomus Baur points out, these homilies have not come down to us in the form in which they were originally delivered. Baur summarises his position on the date and character of these homilies thus:

Soon after the sermons on Genesis [which Baur dates to the first half of 388] Chrysostom must have begun the explanation of St. Matthew's Gospel. The relatively small number of concrete characteristics makes it clear that this composition is simply a literary product. In the pulpit itself, the preacher may have introduced many penetrating observations which are lacking in the written text. The St. Matthew commentary is generally supposed to have been composed in the year 390, and this date may actually be the correct one.3

In these homilies, Chrysostom stresses the continuity between the Old Testament and the New against the Manichaeans and the unity of nature between the Father and the Son against the Arians.4 However, his main concern in these homilies, as in the great bulk of his works, is moral exhortation rather than dogmatic instruction or speculation.

The Homilies on Matthew, then, are significant in a number of ways. First, they are a major example of Chrysostom's oratorical skill and moral intensity. Second, they are one of the major surviving monuments of the Antiochene school of exegesis. Third, they occupy an important place in the history of exegesis as the first complete commentary on Matthew. Fourth, they


4 Quasten, III, 437.
are of central importance in determining the text of the New Testament as it was read by Chrysostom and his contemporaries. Fifth, they reflect the ordinary dogmatic teaching of the Antiochene church at a time which was relatively free from major doctrinal controversies. Sixth, they cast much incidental light on the customs, attitudes, and history of the late fourth century. Particularly interesting in this regard are Homilies 69 and 70, which describe contemporary monastic life. The importance and influence of the Homilies on Matthew in later ages can be estimated from the large number of manuscripts in which they are preserved either in whole or in part. Quasten estimates that there are at least 175 of these manuscripts, dating from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries.\(^5\) Because of their intrinsic value and their historical importance, the Homilies on Matthew are of continuing significance and justify the effort to establish a more exact text, which is undertaken in this thesis.

The Homilies on Matthew have appeared in the following editions:


\(^5\)Ibid., 438.
The edition of Commelin was based on manuscripts from the Palatine library and from libraries in Bavaria and Augsburg. Commelin confined his editing to reproducing the fullest reading found in his manuscripts and bracketing those words which did not occur in all of the manuscripts. After the appearance of Savile's edition, Commelin's edition was reissued unchanged with the date 1617, a fact which Field attributes to the publisher's desire to prevent the edition from appearing obsolete.

Commelin's edition was used by Sir Henry Savile (1549-1622) in the preparation of his edition of the complete works of Chrysostom. Though Field's edition of the Homilies on Matthew supersedes that part of Savile's work, Savile's edition still stands as a major accomplishment, which has been described as "the first work of learning on a great scale published in England." Field, however, points out the difficulties under which Savile labored in editing the Homilies on Matthew, particularly the lack of sound manuscripts with which to correct the readings of Commelin's edition. In his view, Savile

6 The bibliographical information for those works which I have not been able to consult (the editions of Commelin, Savile, and Pronto Ducaeus) has been taken from the preface to Field's edition and from Paul W. Harkins, "The Text Tradition of Chrysostom's Commentary on John," Theological Studies, XIX (1958), pp. 404-412.


had no complete, sound manuscript of the homilies of the second half of the commentary. Though I have not been able to consult Savile's edition, the readings of his text can be gathered from Field's *apparatus criticus*.

The edition of Fronto Ducaeus is of little value for establishing the text of the homilies since it simply reproduces the text of the Commelin edition. Actually, this edition has precious little to do with Fronto Ducaeus, a French Jesuit, who edited Chrysostom's homilies on the Old Testament, and whose name was then used by the printer Charles Morel to adorn the title page of the edition of Chrysostom's works which he published from 1636 to 1642, although Ducaeus had died in 1624. Field observes that this edition differs from Commelin's in no more than ten places; he used it rather than Commelin's in preparing his own edition and refers to it in his *apparatus criticus* as Morel's edition.

The edition of Montfaucon, though it long enjoyed the reputation of being the best edition, was actually a rather unsatisfactory product of the old age of that great scholar. Field's basic criticism of it is that, though Montfaucon professed to recognize the superiority of Savile's text to Commelin's, he actually based his own text on Commelin's and neglected Savile's. Field further observes that the second Benedictine edition, which reproduced Montfaucon's text with some alterations, did something to correct this by using Savile's edition more heavily, though not heavily enough.

---

9 Field, III, ix-x.
10 Harkins, p. 405.
11 Field, III, xii.
12 Ibid., xv.
The single most important edition of the *Homilies on Matthew*, however, is that of Frederick Field (1801-1885), an Anglican clergyman and fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, from 1824 to 1839. During this time he prepared his edition of the *Homilies on Matthew*, which appeared in 1839. William Greenhill observes of him: "In his own line of learning he was certainly not surpassed by any scholar of his age."¹³ His edition is a model of clear and precise scholarship and has become the standard text of the homilies, being reprinted by J. P. Migne in Volumes 57 and 58 of the *Patrologia Graeca*. It was used in the preparation of Prevost's translation of the homilies in the Oxford Library of Fathers.

In preparing his edition, Field used only 13 of the approximately 175 manuscripts of the homilies; and none of those that he uses contained all ninety of the homilies. Most of the major manuscripts contain either the first half of the commentary, which usually runs up to Homily 42, 44, or 45 inclusively, or the second half. Consequently, in preparing the text of Homily 46, Field was principally dependent on three manuscripts, which he designed as G, H, and K. G was a manuscript from the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, in *folio*, a parchment of the eleventh century, which contained Homilies 45 to 90. It had been somewhat damaged by moisture and lacked its last page. H and K were both eleventh-century parchments in *folio* from the "Royal Library of Paris. Field called H, which contained Homilies 45-90 complete, a "codex elegans et diligenter scriptus," and K, which con-

tained the same homilies, a "codex pulcherrimus et accurate descriptus." K unfortunately lacks one page, which runs from υπερίους on page 481C to ούχίως on page 482D in Homily 46. Field also makes reference to a "Codex Regius 688," or Codex P as he refers to it elsewhere, which contained homilies 43 to 90 complete. However he did not use it consistently to determine the text of Homily 46, though he does refer to it on one occasion in his apparatus criticus.

Field's means of determining the text were not limited, however, to these four manuscripts and to the previous editions. In determining the text of the New Testament citations in the homily, he was able to use Matthei's collation of the Moscow manuscripts. He was also able to use an Epitome of the entire commentary, which eliminated the Ethica or moral exhortations with which the homilies concluded and presented only Chrysostom's axegesis of the Biblical text in a compressed form, which, however, often preserved Chrysostom's own words. Field uses a manuscript in quarto of this Epitome from the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, a carefully written parchment of the early tenth century. He also consulted the commentaries on Matthew of Theophylactus and of Euthymius Zigabenus, which were derived from Chrysostom's commentary. He also uses the Latin translation of the Homilies on Matthew which Annianus of Celeda, a Pelagian deacon of the early fifth century, had undertaken. This translation included only the first twenty-

14 Field, III, xx.
15 Ibid., xxii.
16 Ibid.
five homilies and of these only the first eight have ever been printed. 17

For Homily 46, however, Field did have available the Latin translation made by Georgius Trapezuntius (1396-1435 or 1486) and revised by Philippus Montanus in an edition published at Paris in 1570. Since Georgius, a Greek humanist who had come to Italy in the early part of the fifteenth century, had incurred disgrace and expulsion from the papal court because of the infidelity of his translations, the value of this source is not what it might have been. 18 Field further made use of an Armenian translation of Homilies 1 to 53, edited by the Mechitarist Fathers at Venice in 1826. 19

The Codex Guelferbytanus 95 is a manuscript from the Ducal Library at Wolfenbuttel and is of particular interest in that it is the oldest manuscript of any of the writings of Chrysostom that we possess. Dom Chrysostomus Baur dated it to the seventh century. 20 Father Edgar Smothers, S.J., following Tischendorf and Gregory, dates it to the sixth century, 21 as does Heinemann in his catalogue of the Wolfenbuttel manuscripts. Heinemann described it thus in his catalogue:

Pergam. 33 x 27 cm. 186 Bll., in bezeichneten Lagen zu 8 Bll., zweispaltig 6. Jahrh. . . . Schöne griechische Uncial- und Kapitalhandschrift, mit rothen Ueberschriften, ohne alle

---


19 Field, III, xxv-xxvi.

20 Baur, II, 470.

Though Tischendorf used the Scriptural references and texts in the Codex Quelferbytamus in preparing his edition of the New Testament and Father Smothers edited four Greek hymns found in the margins of this manuscript, it has never been used in any edition of the Homilies on Matthew.

The Codex Quelferbytamus is, however, of special importance in the establishment of a sound text of the Homilies, not only because of its age but also because of the fact that, unlike the manuscripts that have been used in previous editions, it contains neither the first half of the complete Homilies nor the second half, but a selection of eighteen homilies from both halves of the commentary. Of these eighteen homilies, seventeen are preserved to us; the missing one is the ninth in the series. The quaternion containing it and the last part of the eighth homily, which is Homily 46 in the whole commentary and which is the subject of this thesis, has unfortunately disappeared.

After inspecting the homilies in this manuscript, I have been unable to arrive at any hypothesis as to why these particular eighteen homilies were chosen by the original editor of the collection. The homilies that he chose and their contents are given here in summary form:

33. Mt 10. 16-22. Christ's discourse on sending out the Twelve.

Ethicon: Chrysostom argues the superiority of the Apostles to the Greeks, insists on our weakness, and praises the patience of Job.

---

220. V. Heinemann, Die Handschriften der hersoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel (Wolfenbüttel, 1884), I, no. 95, cited by Smothers, p. 321.
35. Mt 10. 34-42. Christ's discourse on sending out the Twelve. Ethicon: Chrysostom insists on the necessity of almsgiving and replies to difficulties about whether or not the poor deserve alms.

36. Mt 11. 1-6. Christ speaks to a delegation sent by John the Baptist. Ethicon: Chrysostom discusses the problem of the salvation of those who died without knowing Christ and argues that our culpability is greater than that of the heathen.


41. Mt 12. 25-32. Jesus is accused of casting out devils in the name of Beelzebub. Ethicon: Chrysostom says that the threat of eternal punishment should lead us to afflict ourselves in this life by remembrance of our sins and repentance joined with good works.

42. Mt 12. 33-37. In reply, Jesus denounces the Pharisees. Ethicon: Chrysostom deplores our tendency to neglect our true spiritual welfare.

43. Mt 12. 38-45. Jesus denounces the unbelieving generation and offers it the sign of Jonah. In his exposition of the text, Chrysostom denounces the Marcionites, the Jews, and Julian the Apostate. Ethicon: Chrysostom insists on the reality of hell and the necessity of conversion.

46. Mt 13. 24-33. The parables of the wheat and the tares, of the leaven and of the mustard seed. Ethicon: Chrysostom exhorts us to imitate the Apostles in righteousness of life.

73. Mt 23. 14-28. Jesus denounces the Pharisees. Ethicon: Chrysostom engages in a denunciation of sexual immorality and an exhortation to
marry good women, adding a warning against marrying women for their money.

79. Mt 25.31-26.5 Christ proclaims that he will judge men according to their works of charity. Ethicon: Chrysostom exhorts us to forgiveness of enemies and speaks against revenge.

80. Mt 26. 6-16. A woman anoints the feet of Jesus at Bethany; Judas agrees to betray Jesus. Ethicon: Chrysostom warns us against covetousness and urges us to accept poverty.

85. Mt 26.67-27.10. The Jews mock Jesus; Peter denies him; Judas commits suicide. Ethicon: Chrysostom exhorts us to almsgiving and deplores the fact that priests are now obliged to attend to temporal concerns.

86. Mt 27. 11-26. Jesus is tried before Pilate; the Jews prefer Barabbas to Jesus. Ethicon: Chrysostom warns us against yielding to the passions, even to a small extent; for this gives a foothold to the devil.

87. Mt 27. 27-44. The way of the cross and the crucifixion. Ethicon: Chrysostom urges us to bear insults with self-control and without anger.

88. Mt 27. 45-61. The death and burial of Jesus. Chrysostom here refers to an eclipse of the sun "in our generation." Ethicon: Chrysostom urges us not to forsake Jesus in his members but to give them alms; he defends himself against criticism for always talking of almsgiving.

89. Mt 27.62-28.10. The priests set a guard over the tomb; Jesus rises from the dead. Ethicon: Chrysostom denounces the women who wear fine jewelry when they should give alms to the poor.

90. Mt 28. 11-20. The guards report the news to the priests; Jesus appears to the Eleven in Galilee. Ethicon: Chrysostom exhorts to poverty and almsgiving.
From this summary of the contents of the homilies, which are given in the order in which they occur in the manuscript, it can be seen that the editor generally chose groups of homilies for inclusion in his collection; Homilies 66 and 73 are the only isolated homilies found in the manuscript as it stands. He also seems to have had a preference for Chrysostom's expositions of the discourses of Christ rather than for his expositions of the miracles and of the narrative sections of the Gospel, with the exception of the narrative of the Passion and Resurrection. Five of the Ethica deal with poverty and almsgiving, and three treat of hell. Beyond this, few common threads can be discerned among the homilies that form this collection. The missing homily is one of those between Homily 66 and Homily 73 and may well have been either Homily 47 or Homily 72.

Apart from the absence of this one homily, however, the manuscript is well preserved. It is written in double columns in a clear, firm, and legible hand. The hand resembles that in the Vienna Dioscorides written for Juliana Anicia,23 though the down strokes of the phi, the rho, and the upsilon are not so long as in the Dioscorides, which is dated to the early sixth century. Enlarged letters mark the beginnings of paragraphs. There are no accents, breathings, or iota subscripts, and there is no division between words. The horizontal stroke is frequently used to indicate the omission of a final nu and also to form the customary contractions of the nomina sacra. Omicron is

frequently written on a much smaller scale than the other letters; less frequently this is the case with sigma, alpha, or other letters. The margins of the text of Homily 46 are generally clean. A small sign is placed in the margin at the beginning of each line of Biblical text both in the pericope and in the homily. Crosses occur in the margins at several points, but their occurrence does not seem to follow any rule. One section of the text, which is noted in the commentary, has been recopied in the margin in a hand probably belonging to the seventh century. The two corrections have been noted in their proper places in the commentary.

At this point it may be appropriate to indicate the general character of the Codex Guelferbytanus and its value for determining the text of Homily 46. In general, it may be said that the Codex Guelferbytanus confirms the text of this homily which has been established on the basis of later manuscripts. The scribe responsible for this manuscript was a careful workman who avoided gross blunders and who tried to provide a clear and readily intelligible text for his readers. He marred his work, however, by an excessive desire to avoid ambiguities and to make references clear; as a result, many glosses and explanatory notes have crept into the text, particularly in the section where Chrysostom discusses the treatment of heretics (482B3-D1). Despite this tendency to amplify the text, the scribe of the Guelferbytanus has done his job well. We are fortunate in possessing such an old and generally reliable witness to the text of this homily. However its authority is not, in my view, such that its readings should be preferred to Field's, which are based on a broad and generally sound tradition. For the value of the Codex Guelferbytanus lies not in reliability in matters of detail but in the general confirmation
that it provides for the text established by Field.

The pericope of Matthew which is found at the beginning of this homily gives a standard version of the text with no extraordinary variants; however, the value of this text in determining the history of the New Testament text lies outside the scope of the present thesis.

In preparing this edition of Homily 46 of the Homilies on Matthew, my basic task has been the establishment of a new text of the homily on the basis of my collation of the Codex Guelferbytanus and the editions of Montfaucon and Field. I have been particularly dependent on Field's edition, which is a model of clear and authoritative scholarship and incorporates the work of his predecessors which I was, for the most part, unable to consult. I have also prepared a translation of the newly established text in which I have tried to achieve an English version that would be intelligible, and natural, and at the same time faithful to the Greek text.

To the text and translation I have appended a short commentary in which I have indicated some of the considerations that were operative in my determination of the text. The commentary is not exhaustive. I have deliberately refrained from comment both in those cases where the reading given by Guelferbytanus is manifestly impossible and in those cases where the reading was determined purely on the greater authority of one source over another. In those where no considerations of grammar, sense, or paleography seemed decisively to favor any of the variants, I have retained the reading given by Field and have recorded that given by Guelferbytanus in the apparatus criticus. In those cases where the Guelferbytanus is not mentioned among the sources of variants, the reading of that manuscript may be understood to be identical with that of the
text. In the preparation of the *apparatus criticus*, I have retained Field's method of designating his sources, though I have not transcribed his apparatus *in toto*. Also, because the Codex Guelferbytanus breaks off before the end of the homily, I have not edited, translated, or commented on any part of the homily beyond the end of the homily as it is found in the Codex Guelferbytanus.

In the presentation of the text, I have retained in the margin the pagination given in the first Benedictine edition, which was retained in the margins of the second Benedictine edition and of Field's edition, though not in Migne's reprinting of Field. The numbering of the lines, however, which is found in the margins of the text and which is referred to in the commentary, I have taken from Field's edition.

I have omitted merely orthographical variants from the text and the *apparatus criticus*. The chief of these have been the presence or absence of the nu or sigma moveable, variant forms of Ω, failure to assimilate prefixes, failure to indicate elisions, variant forms of the imperative and second person plural endings, and the interchange of ι and ει.
### Sigla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arm.</td>
<td>Versio Armenica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.</td>
<td>Epitome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Codex G in editione Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge.</td>
<td>Versio Latina Georgii Trapesuntii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gu</td>
<td>Codex Guelferbytanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Codex H in editione Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Codex K in editione Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montf.</td>
<td>Editio Montfaucon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mor.</td>
<td>Editio Morel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosq.</td>
<td>Codices Mosquenses citatae a Matthei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sav.</td>
<td>Editio Savile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. 688</td>
<td>Codex P in editione Field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER II

TRANSLATION

Matthew 13. 24-30

4808 Ἀλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς,
λέγων. Ὑμοίωθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν
ἀνθρώπων ὑπείροντες καλὸν σπέρμα ἐν τῷ
ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ. Ἐν δὲ τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς
ἀνθρώπους, ἤθελεν αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρὸς, καὶ

C ἔσπειρε σιίδανια ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σίτου, καὶ
ἀπῆλθεν. Ὁτε δὲ ἐβλάστησον ὁ χόρτος,
καὶ παρὰν ἐποίησε, τότε ἐράνη καὶ ὁ
σιίδανια. Προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ σώλοι τοῦ

480C2 καὶ Φεῖτ θεμ. Field
οἰκοδεσπότου, εἰπόν αὐτῷ. Κύριε, οὐχὶ παλὸν
c5 σπέρμα ἔσπειρας ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ σου; πόθεν
οὖν ἔχει ἔδαρμα; Ὅ, ὅ, ἔργα ἀνθρώπου τοῦτο ἐποίησεν. Οἱ δὲ συνειολογοῦν εἰπόν αὐτῷ. Θέλεις οὖν ἀπεδήλουσας οὐλλε-
ξομεν αὐτῷ; Ὅ, ὁ, ἔργα, οὗ· μῆποτε οὐλλε-
γοντες τὰ ἔδαρμα, ἐκρήξατε ἀμα αὐτοῖς
tὸν σιτον. Ἀρετε οὖν συναυθάνεσθαι ἀμ-
φότερα μέχρι τοῦ θησιομοῦ, καὶ ἐν παρῳ
tοῦ θησιομοῦ ἔρω τοῖς θησιοταῖς. οὐλλέξα-
τε πρῶτον τὰ ἔδαρμα καὶ ἃτατε αὐτὰ

480C4 ὁ ἀγρῷ σου· σι ἀγρῷ Ἡ; om. σου Ἡ Ἡ
C7 ὁ ἀγρῷ σου· om. τὸν Χ λε
D1 αὐτοῖς· add. Ἡ Ἡ καὶ Ἡ om. αὐτοῖς Ἡ Ἡ Ἡ
μέχρι Ἡ Ἡ Ἡ Ἡ Ἡ Ἡ Ἡ Ἡ P3 Ἡ Π3 Π3 P3 καὶ ἐν παρῳ κ.π.λ.
Harm Naag· om. Field
eis ðéōmas ðròs ðò katakká̂sai autá, tôn ðè oîtòn suνaφárete eis ðèn ἀποβήκην ῶνου.

The Homily

Τί τò μέσον ταύτης καὶ τῆς πρò ταύτης παραβολῆς; Ἐκεῖ τοὺς μηδὲ ὅλως προσ-
δος ἐσχηκότας αὐτῶν φησίν, ἀλλ’ ἀποηδήσαν-
τας καὶ τὸν σπόρον προεμένουσ· ἐνταῦθα
δὲ τῶν αἵερτικῶν λέγει τὰ συστήματα.
"Ωνα μὴ μηδὲ τοῦτο τοὺς ραθητὰς θορυ-
βήσῃ. καὶ τοῦτο προέγει, μετὰ τὸ διδάξαν
διατέ ἐν παραβολαῖς ἐλαλεῖ· Ἐκεῖνη μὲν

480 D4 αὐτῶ: οὔτω δὲ D7 ἰθορυβήσῃ δὲ ἂν: θορυβή Pēlē  Ἐ1 ἐ  ἐλαλεῖ: ἐλαλεῖσ ESV
οὖν ἡ παραβολὴ φησίν ὅτι οὐκ ἐδέσαντο·
αὕτη δὲ, ὅτι καὶ ἡ φθορέας ἐδέσαντο. Καὶ γὰρ
καὶ τοῦτο τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου μεθοδείας, τῆς
ἀληθείας καὶ παρείσοψεν τὴν πλάνην,
πολλὰ ἐπιχειρηματικῶς αὐτὴ τὰ ὁμοιώματα
ὡσεὶ εὐκόλως κλέψας τοὺς εὐθειομαθῶς·
Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀλλο τι ἐπέρμα, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ
χάλευ ἀκολ. ὁ κατὰ τὴν ὁρίν ἐσικέ πως ἐν τῷ
σίτῳ. Εἶναι λέγει καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἐπι-
βουλῆς. Ἐν γὰρ τῶν καθεὑδεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώ-
πους, φησίν. Οὐ μικρὸν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἐν-
θροέας: ὁθορέας ὑπὸ Ε3 ὡς καὶ τῷ Ε4 ὡς
τῷ ἐπεισαγεῖν: παρείσοψεν ὑπὸ ἐπιχειρη-
ματικῶς ἐπιχειρηματικῶς Ε5 ἀντὶ τὰ ὁμοιώματα: αὐτῆς ὁμοιώματα ἐν
τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ
τεύθεν ἄπεικρημνᾶτα τὸν κίνδυνον, τοῖς μάλιστα
ΑΣ τῆς ἁρούρας τῆς φυλακῆς ἐμπεφυγμένοις
οὐ τοῖς ἄρχοντι δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς
ἀρχομένοις. Δείκνυσι δὲ καὶ τὴν πλάνην
μετὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὗσαν· ὅπερ καὶ ἡ τῶν
πραγμάτων ἐκβασις μαρτυρεῖ. Καὶ γὰρ μετὰ
tοὺς προφήτας, οἱ ψευδοπροφήται· καὶ μετὰ
tοὺς ἀποστόλους, οἱ ψευδαπόστολοι. καὶ
Ἄβα μετὰ τὸν Χριστὸν, ὁ ἀντίχριστος. Ἄν γὰρ
μὴ ἴδῃ τι μιμήση τὸ διάβολος, ἡ
τίσιν ἐπιβουλεύσῃ, οὐ̃γε τὸ μέρος ἐπὶ
χειρὶ, οὔτε οἷς τι πρᾶξῃ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς γινο-
μένοις ἐπιβουλεύει. Καὶ νῦν τοίνυν, ἐπεὶ δὴ

481-4 ἄπεικρημνὰ· ἄπεικρημνὰ· Ν Ἔμα ἄπεικρημνὰν
ἐν Ἁλ· οὐ γε τὸ... ἐπιβουλεύει· οὔτε ἐπιχεῖρει
οὔτε οἴδη πρεσβ.
οδεν, εις ο μεν ἐποίησεν ἐκατόν, δὲ
εἴκοσι, δὲ τριάκοντα, ἄλλην ἔρχεται
λοιπὸν τοῦ ὄντος. Ἐπει δὲ ἤρπασαν οὐκ
ηδονήθη τὸ φιλωθὲν, οὐδὲ ἀπονίκησαν, οὐδὲ
κατάκαυσαν, δι' ἄτερας ἀπάθεις ἐπιβουλεύεις,
παρεμβάλλων τὰ ἑαυτοῦ. Καὶ τί ἔφερον
οἱ καθεύδοντες, γης, τῶν ἐν τῇ ὄδον
μιμομένων; Ὅτι ἐκεῖ εὐθέως ἤρπασεν.
οὐδὲ γὰρ ῥίζωθην ἄρρηκτον ἐνταῦθα δὲ
πλείονος ἐδεήθη τῆς θηράνθης.
Ταῦτα δὲ λέγει ὁ Χριστὸς, παλικέων

48BL οδεν δὲ λευ: εἰδεν Field Β2 λοιπὸν: ποιτ
ἄλλην δὲ Επεὶ: εἰπει ήθη δι Β3 ῥήσθεν: ῥήσ
θεντακ B4 παρεμβάλλων: παρεμβάλλων δι Β5
τὰ ἑαυτοῦ Χ: τὰ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ Field: τὰ ἑαυτοῦ
πονηρὰ σὲ ρήματα δι Β7 ἡθῆς: μηχανής οὐ
ἐν δὲ πάντος ἐγγυηρέχειν. 'Ἔκαν γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἐπιστᾶν ἡ διαφύρησις τὰς βλάβας, ἵνα, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄνευ βλάβης. 'Οσοπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖ διὰ τῆς οὐδοῦ καὶ τῆς πέτρας καὶ τῶν ἰππῶν, οὕτω καὶ ὑνταῦθα διὰ τοῦ ὑπ' οὗ ἡ ἀπώλεια γίνεται. ὅτε δὲ σιγνέοις ρυθμικῆς δεί. Διὸ καὶ ἐλέγειν ὅ ὃ δὲ ὑπομεῖνας εἰς τέλος, οὕτως ὑσθήσεται. Τοιούτων τι πέρον καὶ παρὰ τῆν άρχην. Πολλοὶ γὰρ τῶν προεστῶτων πονηροὺς εἰς ἁγιοντες ἄνδρας ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, αἵρετον, ἄρχας ὑποκρυπτομένους πολλὴν εὐκολίαν τῆς τοιαύτης παρέσχεν ἐπιβουλῆ. Οὐδὲ γὰρ πονῶν ἔκαν γὰρ ἐκεῖνος: 'Αν ἐκεῖνος ἐς C1 ῥυθμικῆς ρυθμικῆς ὑπόκρυπτομένους ἐς cod. Montf.: κρυπτομένους Field C6 εἴπονοι: πονῶν ἐς
δει των διαβόλων λοιπόν, ὅταν ἔκεινος εἰς μέσον φυτεύσῃ. Καὶ πῶς δυνάτον μὴ καθεύδειν, φησί. Τὸν μὲν ἀὖν φυτικὸν ύπον, ὁ δὲ δυνάτον τὸν δὲ τῆς προαίρεσεως, δυνάτον. Αἰδὸ καὶ Παῦλος ἔληγε· γρηγορεῖτε, στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει. Εἶτα δείκνυσι καὶ περιττόν τὸ πράγμα, οὐχὶ βλαβερὸν μόνον. Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ γεωργῆθηναι τὴν ἁρουραν, καὶ μὴ χρείαν εἶναι μηδενὸς, τότε ἐπιστεύεις οὕτως· καθάπερ καὶ οἱ ἀφετικοὶ ποιοῦσιν. Αἰδὸ οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔτερον ἐὰν διὰ κενοδοξίαν ἐμβάλλουσι τὸν ἐαυτῶν ἰὸν. Καὶ πληροῦται ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ ἀποστολικὸν

481C8 οὖν ὅτι δι᾽ ἐριττοῦ καὶ
D1 περιττὸν γε ἐριττὸν δι’
D4 ἀφετικοὶ ἐρετικοὶ καὶ
D1 οὐδὲν γὰρ καὶ δι’
O1 δι’ οὐδὲν Fiel D5 ἐν
λόγιον τὸ λέγων, θέλοντες εἶναι γορμό ἐμω-ράνθησαν. Ὁ χόρτον μὲν οὐκ ἔντειθεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῶν μετὰ ταύτα μετὰ ἀκριβείας αὐ- 
τῶν ὑπογράφει τὴν σημνὴν ἀπάσαν. Αὐτὲς ἐ 
γὰρ ἐβλάστησε, ὑσίν, ὁ χόρτος, καὶ παρεν ἐποίησε, τότε ἐφανὴ καὶ τὰ σιθάνη-
διὸ ἐπερ καὶ οὗτοι ποιοῦσι. Παρά μὲν γὰρ ἐκ 
ἀρχὴν συνιάζουσιν ἑαυτούς. Ἐπειδὰν δὲ 
Ε ἐποίησε αὐτὸς τὴν παρρησίαν, καὶ λέγω 
tis αὐτοῖς μεταδῷ, τότε τὸν ἐκχέουσι.
Τίνος δὲ ένεκεν εἰσέχει τοὺς δούλους 
λέγων τὸ γεγενημένον; Ἰνα εἰπῇ ὅτι οὐ 
χρὴ ἄναπαυεῖν αὐτούς. Ἔχθρον δὲ ἀνθρώποιν

481 D7 "ΟΤΕ: 'Ὁ δὲ Δ' ὁ τῶν αὐτῶν αὐτῷ διὸ ἐπι-
δαν δὲ: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐὰν ὑπερέτας: ἐπίστασθαι ἐν 
τὴν ἀνθρώπων.
πολόν α' τὸν Ἐατανάν α' καλεῖ, ὅτι τὴν εἰς ἀνθρώπους βλαβήν ἀφωνίζεσθαι αὐτὸν. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐπηρεῖα καθ' ἡμῶν ἢ ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἐπηρείας ὀνει ἀπὸ τῆς εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ 482A τῆς εἰς θεὸν ἐχθράς ἐγένετο. Οἶδεν δὲν ὅτι μᾶλλον ο θεὸς ἡμᾶς πίλει ἢ ἡμεῖς ἐμαυτούς. Ὁρὰ δὲ καὶ ἐτέρῳθεν τοῦ διαβόλου τὴν παλαιάν. Οὐ γὰρ πρὸ τοῦτον ἐσπειρέσθη ἐπεὶ ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἠπαλάτας· αλλ' ὅτε ἦν Ἀ5 ἀπάντησεν ἐπηρεμένα, ἑνα ὑποκείμενα τοῦ γενροῦ, οὕτω πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἐξ- ὑποδώς ἐχθρόν πᾶντα ἐποίει. Ἐκπέλει δὲ καὶ τῶν οἰκείων τῇ ῥιλοστορφίᾳ. Καὶ γὰρ ἐπεὶ- 481E4 ὁ̓ τὸν Ἐατανάν Field E5 ὁ̓ τὸν Ἐατανάν Field 482A5 τῇ ὑποκείμενῃ τὴν ὑποκεί- μεν ἔκαρ & καὶ 482A ἐξ ὑποδώς ἐχθρόν ἕαν.
...
λέγοντες· Θελεις; Τί οὖν ὁ δеспότης; Κωλυει λέγων· ἀσὺτε αὕτα ἐῶς τοῦ θερίσμου·
μήπως ἐπρίβωστε ὅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σιτον. Τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε, κωλύων πόλεμος ρίονεμαι
καὶ αἷμα καὶ σφαγάς. Οὐ γὰρ δεῖ ἀναρεῖν ἀρετικὸν· ἐπεὶ πόλεμος ἀπονόος ἐμέλλει
εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην εἰσάγεσθαι. Δύο τοῖνυν
om. ἀσὺτε αὕτα ἐῶς τοῦ θερίσμου Field

πόλεμος. ρίονεμαι καὶ αἷμα καὶ σφαγάς;
πόλεμος ἐκ τούτου ρίονεμαι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς
ἀντιστασισμένοις καὶ σφαγάς καὶ αἷματών ἐκ-
χύσεις καὶ διωμοί διὰ 87 πόλεμος ἀπον-
dos; add. καὶ οὐχιτήτως βλάσφημοι ἐμὲ ἐμέ-
λεν· ἐμέλλον ἐμὲ ἐμέλλειν ὡς τοῖνυν Μοντ.
οιτοις αυτοις αληθευσει τοης λογισωποις. ενι "μεν τω μη των σιτων βλαβηναι. ετερω δε
ΒΙΟ των καταναλωσαν την χολασιν παντας αυτοις
και ανιατως νυσέιτας. η Ροτε ει βουδε, και κο-
λασιναι αυτοις, και χωρις της της σιτου
βλαβης, αναλεινων τον προσηκοντα χαιριν.
Τι δε εστι, μη εκριζωστε αημε αυτοις
των σιτων; "Η τοτο φησιν, οτι ει

182ΒΒ τοιοις αυτοις: τοιοις αυτοις εις ΒΒ κα-
τεχει η κατασχει εις ΒΒ τω: το εις ΒΒ Παντας:
Παντας Field ΒΒ αυτοις add. παρα του δεσποτου
εις ΒΒ ανιατως: ανιατα εις ΒΒ 9 νοσουντας: add.
και και αμας ενδικους του θεου γενεσθαι αυτων
μη υπακουοντιν εμαυν αλλα την δεσποτη την
περι των αυτων ιρεται προειν εις C2 h καιρουν: add.
ανταποδεοευς ηυ
νέλλοιτε κινείν ὁπλὰ καὶ κατασφάττειν τοὺς
65 αἵρετικοὺς ἀνάγχη πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν ἀγίων
συγκαταβάλλεσθαι: ἢ ὅτι ἄπαυ τῶν τῶν ὕβαν-
χῶν πολλοὺς εἰνός μεταβαλέσθαι καὶ γενέσθαι
ὁτον. Ἀν τοίνυν προλαβόντες αὐτοὺς ἐπριφώσατε
λυμαίνεσθε τῷ μέλλοντι γίνεσθαι σῶς ὡς
ἐγχώρη μεταβαλέσθαι καὶ γενέσθαι βελτίων
10 ἁναριστοῦντες. Οὐ τοίνυν κατέχειν ἀἵρετικοὺς
καὶ ἐπιστομίζειν καὶ ἐρχόμενοις αὐτῶν τῇ
482 ν. μέλλοιτε: μέλλετε ἡμῖν συγκαταβάλλεσθαι:
add. τῇ τῶν ἐρετικῶν ἐπιβολῇ καὶ 
6 μεταβαλέσθαι:
μεταβάλλεσθαι καὶ: add. ἀδιὰ τῆς ἦμῶν μετολὺς καὶ
didaskallias ἦτοι καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς καὶ 9 μετα-
βάλλεσθαι: μεταβάλλεσθαι καὶ 9 ἁναριστοῦντες: add.
πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Ὑσου ἐρείσὺς καὶ 10 ἐρχόμενοις:
ἐρχόμενοις Field
παρρησίαν, καὶ τὰς συνόδους καὶ τὰς ὀπολίς ἀλλού
λύειν κωλυέτε, ἵνα ἀναφέρετε καὶ κατασφάτετε.
Εὖ δὲ αὐτῶν σκόπελ ἡ ἡμερότητα, πῶς ὁὐκ
ἀποφαίνετε μόνον, ὡς ἐπιλέει, ἀλλὰ λογίσμοις
τίθητε. Τί οὖν, ἐὰν μέχρι τέλους μένῃ τὰς ἑβάν-
τας; Τὸτε ἐρῶ τοῖς δεριστᾶσι. οὐκ ἴσατε πρῶτον τὰ
ἐξέχασα καὶ ἔστατε αὐτὰ δεσμὰς πρὸς τὸ κατα-
καθαίρας αὐτὰ. Πάλιν ἀναμιμηνήσκει αὐτοὺς τῶν
Ἰωάννου ἑρμάτων τῶν κριτῶν αὐτῶν ἡ ἐσαροῦν.

τοῦ οπολίμ οὐ περιέχεται σπουδάζει διὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν οὐ τοῦ πρῶτον σκοπεῖ
εἰς δεσμὰς εἰς δεσμὰς ἡ πάλιν ὁ οὐκ ὑπο-
τὸν ἐρμάτων λογίσμη τῶν κριτῶν αὐτῶν πεδιλ
τῶν αὐτῶν κριτῶν ἐν τῶν κριτῶν αὐτῶν
καὶ ἐν τῶν κριτῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν τῶν κριτῶν αὐτῶν
εἰς ἐσαροῦν
καὶ φησίν, ὅτι ἐὼς μὲν ἐστήκασιν ἐγγὺς
tοῦ σιτοῦ ρείδεσθαι χρῆ· ἐγχωρεὶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς
καὶ σιτον ἑνέσθαι· ὅταν δὲ μηδὲν κερδανάντες
ἀπέλθωσι, τότε αὐτοῖς ἀναγκαίως ἦ ἀπαραιτητὸς διαδέχεται δίνη. Ἐρω γὰρ τοῖς
διείσταίς, φησὶ, οὐλοῦσεν πρώτον τὰ θεάναι.

Ε5 ἄνωτε πρώτον: Ἡμι μὴ φοβηθῶσιν ὅτι εἰς
cαὶ συναπαγωγένου ἀλα αὐτοῖς τού σιτοῦ. Καὶ
ὁσιστε αὐτὰ ἐστὶ: ὅτι ἀναγκαίοι αὐτὰ
tὸ σιτον συναγείρετε εἰς τὴν ἀποδήχην.

483A Ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέβηκεν ἀυτοῖς λέειν.

διείσταίς διαδέχεται καὶ E5 συναπαγωγένου
καὶ E5 ἀμα ὑπὸ E6 αὐτὰ: add. eis ὑπὲρ τὸν
σινάπεως. Έπειτα γὰρ εἶπεν ὅτι ἄπο τοῦ ὄπο-
ρου τρία μέρη ἀπόλαυται, καὶ σωζέται ἐν, καὶ ἐν ἀυτῷ πάλιν τῷ σωματίῳ τοσαῦτῃ γίνεται Ἄς βλάβη, ἵνα μὴ λέγωσιν τίνες καὶ πόσοι ἐσον-
ται οἱ πιστοί; καὶ τούτον ἔξαρεν τὸν φόβον,
διὰ τῆς παραβολῆς τοῦ σινάπεως ἐνάρμων εἰς πίσ-
τιν αὐτούς, καὶ δεικνύσι ότι πάντως ἐκταθήσ-
ται τὸ κήρυγμα. Αἱ τούτοι τοῦ λαχάνου τὴν
εἰκόνα εἰς μέσον ἤγαγε σφόδρα ἐν ἱκνιαν τῆς
Β ὑποθέζει: ὁ μικρότερον μὲν, ὥστε ἐστὶ
πάντων τῶν ὁπερμάτων. ὅταν δὲ αὐξηθῇ, μείζον
τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶ καὶ γίνεται δένδρον, ὡστε
ἐλθεῖν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατασκη-
νοῦν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ. Τοῦ γὰρ μεγεθοῦσ

483 AS 'λέγωσι: add. καὶ Riedl A8 Ἄρι τότε:
Αἱ τὸ δὲ B3 c ὡστὲ c
Βε τὸ τεκμήριον ἐνδείκται ἡ βουλήθη. Ὑμών ἡ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἤπειρον ἐστὶ, φησι. Καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀσθενέουτερον ὡς αἱ μάθηται, καὶ πάντων ἑδούτους ἀλλ' ὡμοίως, ἐπειδὴ μεγάλη ἢν ἡ ἐν αὐτοῖς δύνασθαι, ἐξηνεώθη πάνταχον τῆς οἰκουμένης.

Εἶτα καὶ τὴν ἑμένη ταύτην προσῳδοῦσα τῇ Β' ἡμέρᾳ, ἔγραψεν ὅπερ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἡμᾶς, ἢν λαβοῦσα γενὴ ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἱλεύρον ὡς τρίς, ἔως ὡς ἐγενόμηθη ἐδώρ. Καθάπερ γὰρ ἑαυτῇ τὸ πολὺ ἱλεύρον μεθαύσην εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἰσχὺν, ὅτι καὶ ὦμεῖς τὸν πάντα κόσμον μεταστῆσετε. Καὶ ὅρα πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀσθενεῖτερον ὡς ὡς αἱ μάθηται ἐν Β' ἡμέρᾳ ἐπειδή· ἐπεὶ ὡς Β' ὡς ἐνέκρυψεν ἐκρύψεν πρὸς Β' ἡμέρα ἑαυτῇ· ἡ ἑμένη μικρὰ ὡς ὡς
σύνεσιν. Τα γὰρ τῆς φύσεως παράγει, δεικνύει τί ὡσπερ ἐκεῖνα ἀνεξχώρητον μὴ γενέσθαι, οὕτω καὶ ταῦτα. Μὴ γὰρ μοι τοῦτο λέγει τις δυναμεῖ δύσεκε ἀνθρώποι εἰς πλῆθος ἐμπεσοντες τοσούτων; Καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο αὐτὸ μάλιστα ὑμῶν ποιεῖ τὴν ισχὺν ἐπιλάμβανε, τὸ ἐναμφίηναι τῶν πλήθει καὶ μὴ φυγεῖν. Ὡσπερ οὖν καὶ ἡ βία τότε τὸ φύραμα ἑσθιείς ἐπὶ ἅγιος γένηται τοῦ ἄλευρου, καὶ οὐκ ἀπλῶς

483 C3 σύνεσιν: add τοῦ ἰδιότοτον οὐνετίβοτα τοῦτος εαυτοῦ μαθήτας εἰς χόλην προθυμίαν ἐνάγων αὐτοὺς ἔτι. Τα: παρὰ δὲ C4 ἀνεξχώρητον ἁδινατον ἐκ: ἀνεξχειρητον ταῦτα: add πάντως γεννησοντας εἰς C5 τοῦτο λέγε: λέγε ὅτε δὲ C6 τοσούτων: τοσούτων δὲ C7 ἀκ. το: τῷ δὲ
εἴρησ, ἀλλ' οὕτως ὡστε καὶ μικρῶς οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν· τὸ δὲ ἔδηκεν ἀπλῶς, ἀλλ' ἐξηγοῦσεν· "οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν πολλὴσθε καὶ ἐνωθήτε τοῖς πολέμοιοιν ἵνα, τότε αὐτῶν περίστερε. Καὶ καθάπερ ἐξῆλθεν καταχώνυμεν μὲν, οὐκ ἀφανίζεται δὲ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μικρὸν πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἐμφανίζεται. Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ

483 C. η ὧ νὰ μὴν εἶπεν: διατί δὲ οὐκ εἶπεν οὐκ ἐν

δὲ ἔκρυψα: ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ὁ λόγος σαφεῖς εἶναι

τὸ φύμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐξήνευσαν διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς

τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ ρυθμὴν τε καὶ σῶμα καὶ τὸ

πνεῦμα καὶ οὕτως· αὐτῷ καὶ Δ' καταχώνυμεν:

καταχώνυμεν καὶ Δ' ἐστιν· ἐξεῖν καὶ ἀπαντᾷ:

πάντα καὶ μεταφορὰς: ἀλλ' οὕτως καὶ ο θεοῦ

λόγος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τῆς παρθένου τὴν ἑαυτου

σάρκωσιν διέπλαττεν εἰς ἡμᾶς· om. Field
ἐπὶ τοῦ κηρύγματος ὑμῖν. Μὴ τοίνυν,
ἐπεὶ δὴ πολλάς εἶπον εἶναι τὰς ἐπηρείας,
φρονήστε καὶ ἐὰν καὶ οὕτως ἐκλάμψετε,
καὶ ἀπάντων περιέσεσθε. Τρία δὲ σάτα ἐν
tαῦτα τὰ πολλὰ εἴρηκεν ὑμῖν οἶδε γὰρ τὸν
ἀριθμὸν τούτων ἐπὶ πάντων λαμβάνειν. Μὴ
Διὸ διαμάχοικα δὲ, εἰ περὶ βασιλείας, ἰδιερόμενος
κόκκου καὶ φύμας ἐρυθρότητα ἀνθρώποις γὰρ
diolegeto ἀπείρως καὶ ἰδιώταις καὶ δεσμόντες
αὐτὸς τούτων ἐνάγεσθαι. Οὕτω γὰρ ὅταν ἀρείεις,
ὡς καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πάντα δεῖλαν ἐρμηνεύειν

483 ΔΣ ἀπάντων: add. τοῦτω Field add. τοῦτον ἐπεὶ
27 ἀπάντων: πάντων add. 28 εἴρηκεν: add. τοῦ πάν-
tos ἐνδών κατασκευήν ὑμῖν οἶδε οἶδας τοῦ-
tov: add. καὶ ὑμῖν ΔΙΟ ἐμηρόβης ζημηρόνυμον ὑμῖν
πολίτης.

Ποῦ "τοίνυν" Ἐλλήνων παιδεύετε εἰς; Μανβαν-έτως τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν δύναμιν, ἐρώτησε τῶν πράγματων τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ ἐπατέρω
Ε5 θεόν αὐτὸν προσκυνείτωσαν, ὅτε καὶ προείπε πράγμα τοσοῦτον, καὶ ἐπλήρωσε. Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἔστιν ὁ τὴν δύναμιν ἐνθεὶς τῇ δόμη
484Α Διὰ τούτῳ καὶ ἀνεμίζε τῷ πλῆθει τοὺς αὐτῶν πιστεύεται, ἵνα μεταδῷμεν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῆς ἡμετέρας συνέσεως. Μηδεὶς τοίνυν ὁλι-
γότητα αἰτίας ὃς. Πολλή γὰρ τοῦ κερύγματος ἡ δύναμις καὶ τὸ βυθὰν ἀπεξε, ἀλλὰ γί-
483Ε2 τοίνυν: νῦν ἐν Ἕ3 ἀλήθειαν: δύναμιν ἐν
Ε4 αὐτῶν... τοσοῦτον: αὐτὸν πράγματος ὁ τοῦτον
μέγα ἐν Ἕ5 ἐπλήρωσε: αὕτη ἀπαντᾶ ἐν 484Α1
"μεταδῷμεν: μεταδίδωμεν ἐν"
ὅπερ ὀρθῶς ἦν ἐπιλαβηται ἐξόντων, τὰ ἡμᾶς κατακαυθέντα ποίημα τῆς φλογὸς προσβήκην, οὕτω τοῖς ἄλλοις ἑκεῖνοι οὕτω δὴ καὶ τῷ κήρυμα.

'Αλλ' οὐκ εἰς πόρον, ἀλλὰ σύμην. Τί δήποτε;

'Οτι οὐ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐστὶν ἐκεῖν τὸ ὄλον, ἀλλ' καὶ τῶν ἀναπτωμένων ἐξόντων. ἐνταῦθα δὲ τὸ ὄλον ἡ σύμη ἐφαρμέναι ἀπὸ ἑαυτῆς.

Εἰ δὲ ἄνθρωποι δώδεκα ἔτη τὴν ὀικουμένην

484 A 4 τῳ λοιπῷ ἔπειτα ἀπὸ τῶν κόσμων ἄν θ θ

φλογὸς τινὶ οὖσῃ καὶ τῷ κήρυμα τῆς εὐσεβείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ κήρυμα ἄν ἐκεῖ ἔκει θν. 48 Α 10 θ ἡ σύμη ἐκεῖν τῷ ὄλον ἄν ἀλλ'. 48 Θ ἐκ δὲ ἄνθρωποι δώδεκα οἶδε ἄνθρωποι οἱ δώδεκα

...
Τοπασάν ἔβγινον, ἐννόησον δὲν ἡμῶν ἡ
8 κακία, δὴν τοσοῦτοι ὄντες τοὺς ὑπολειπομένους μὴ συνηθῶμεν σιωπῆσαι, ὡς κυρίοις κοινοῖς ἄρχειν ἔχρην καὶ γενέσθαι βόμην. Αἱ ἐκεῖνοι, φησίν, ἀποστόλοι ἦταν. Καὶ τί τούτο; Οὐχὶ τῶν αὐτῶν τοι μετέσχον; οὐκ ἐν πόλεσιν ἑταρρήσαν; οὐ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπέλαυσαν; οὐχὶ τέχνας μεταχειρίσαντο; μὴ γὰρ ἀνθρεφοὶ ἦσαν; μὴ γὰρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατέβησαν; Αἰλᾶ τὰ σημεῖα, φησίν, εἶχον. Οὐ τὰ σημεῖα θυμάσθησί αὐτοὺς ἑποίησε. Ἔχρη̣

484 Α/12 ἐξήρυσαν: ἀπ. θα τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡγεῖς
8 έν Β2 ἄρχειν ἔχρην καὶ γενέσθαι βόμην: ἔχρην
ἀρχειν γενέσθαι έν Β3 μετέσχον: ἀπ. μυστηρίων; οὐχὶ ὁμοίοι ἡμῶν ἦσαν Β5 μεταχειρίσαντο: μεταχειρίσαν έν Β7 αὐτοὺς ἑποίησε ἐν
μεθα τὸς ἡμετέρας φαντάσιας τοῖς θαύμασιν ἐκείνοις. "Ἰδε τὸν χαρὸν τῶν ἐρήμων ὡς τοῖς
θαύμασιν ἐκείνοις λάμψατα." Πολλοί γὰρ
καὶ δαίμονας ἐκβάλλοντες, ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἀνο-
μίαν εἰρράσαντο, οὐν ἐγένοντο θαυμαστοὶ,
ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκολάσθησαν. Καὶ τι ποτ' ὃν ἐστὶν,
ῥησίν, ὁ μεγάλους αὐτοὺς ἔδειξε;
Τὸ χρημάτων καταρροζεῖν, τὸ δοξῆς ὑπερηφάν
CS ὑπὲρ τὰ πραγμάτων ἀπηλλάχθηκεν βιωτικῶν. Σὺς
ἐγεῖ μὴ ταύτα ἔχον, ἀλλὰ ὅσοι τῶν πα-
θῶν ἦσαν, εἰ καὶ μυρίους νεκροὺς ἴχειραν
484 B9 "Ἰδε τὸν χαρὸν κ.τ.λ. Say. Mar. Field:
om. cod. C1 ἐκβάλλοντες ὡς κ.τ.λ. ἐκβάλλοντες
Field C3 τι ποτ' ὃν: τι τοῦτο δι' CS τὸ
πραγμάτων ἀπηλλάχθαι βιωτικῶν: τὸ πάντων
ἀπηλλάχθαι τῶν βιωτικῶν δι"
ού μόνον ούδὲν ἂν ὑπέλησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπατε- wheel ἂν ἐνομίσασαν εἶναι. Οὔτως ὁ βίος ἐστίν ὁ πανταχοῦ λάμπων, ὁ καὶ τοῦ πνεύ-
ματος τὴν χέριν ἐπισπώμενος. Ποίον σημει-
ον ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐποίησεν, ὅτε πόλεις τοσάδις ἐ-
ἀρτήκατο; Ὅτι γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐθαμματούργησεν,
ἀκούσαν τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ λέγοντος· ὅτε Ἰω-
άννης μὲν ἐποίησε σημεῖον οὐδέν. Πάντων
δὲ θαυμαστὸς Ἰλίας ἐρένετο; Οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς
παρμοπίας τῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα; οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς
δὲ τῆς θλίψεως; οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς μηλιώσεως καὶ
τῶν οὐρανίων καὶ τῶν ὥρων; Ὅτα γὰρ σημεῖα
484 C10 σημεῖον: add. ὁ βαπτιστὴς ἐπὶ τοσά-
tas Field corr. eu: tautas la man. eu
πάντα μετά ταύτα ἐποίησε. Τὸν δὲ Ἰωβ ποίον ἥκεσιν ὀρῶν ποιοῦντα ἐξετάζη τὸ διάβολος; Ἡμεῖς μὲν οὐδὲν, βίον δὲ λάμπωντα καὶ ὑπομονήν ἀδάμαντος στερρότερον ἐπιδεικνύον μὲνον. Ποῖον ἥκεσιν ὁ Δαυὶδ ἐποίησεν, ἐτί νέος ὦν, ἦς ἐπείν τὸν θεὸν ἐν οὖρον Δαυὶδ ἔτοιμον τοῦ Ἰεσσαί ἄνδρα πατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου; ὁ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ποῖον νεκρὸν ἥρειραν; ποῖον δὲ λεπρὸν ἐκάθεραν; Οὐκ ᾔδει φτίς τὰ ποῖα ἥκεσιν, ἐὰν μὴ νήφημεν, καὶ βλάπτει πολλάκις; Οὕτως οὖν

484 126 πάντα μετά ταύτα διὰ μετά ταύτα ἀπάντα
Pield D10 στερρότερον: στερρότεραν Pield D10 τὸν
Θεόν αντε ἐπείν διὰ E2 ὀμ. δὲ διὰ E3 ἐκάθεραν; ἐκα-
thείραν διὰ E3 ὀἴδας διὰ τὰ δὲ διὰ E4 ὀἴδας δὲ τὰ δὲ διὰ E4
Ε5 πολλοί τῶν Κορινθίων ἀπεσχίσθησαν ἀπὸ ἄλληλον. οὕτω πολλοί τῶν Ρωμαίων ἀπεσχίσθησαν. οὕτω ξίμαν ἐξεβλήθη ὡσεὶς ὁ τῶν Χριστῶν τότε ἐπιδημήσας ἀπολοῦνται 185Α ἀπεδοκιμάθητο, ἀκούσας ὅτι αἱ ἄλληκες ρωσεύσ ἐχωνοι. τούτων γὰρ ἐπιστρέφει, ὁ μὲν χρημάτων, ὁ δὲ δόξας ἐφίξεμενος τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν σημείων, ἐξέπιπτον καὶ ἀπώλοντο. Βίον δὲ Α5 ἐπιμέλεια καὶ ἄρετὴς ἐρως οὐ μόνον οὐ δικεῖ τοιαύτην ἐπιθυμίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτων ἀναρέει.

484Ε6 ἐξεβλήθη· ἐξεβάλετο ἦν Ε7 τῶν Χριστῶν: τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἦν 485Α1 ἐχωνοι: add. καὶ ἓν πετείνα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασχισθείς Field; om. Υἱὸν εἰς
A2 τούτων: τούτω ην Α4 ἀπώλοντο ἦν: ἀπώλον- to Field ἄρετὴς: add. καὶ ἀνυποψίην πίστεως ἦν
Καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὅτε ἐνομοθέτηκε τοῖς ἑαυτῷ
μαθηταῖς, τί ἐλέης; ποιήσατε σημεῖα, ἵνα ἴδων
οἱ ἄνθρωποι; Οὐδὲν ἔδωκας τί; Λαμφάτω τὸ
φῶς ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἴδων
σιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα, καὶ δοξάσωσι τὸν πα-
θέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ
δὲ ὅπερ εἶπεν, εἰ πιλέις με, ποιεῖ σημεῖα; ἄλλα
ποιμαίνει τὰ πρόβατά μου. Καὶ πάντας δὲ αὐ-
τὸν προτιμῶν τῶν άλλων μετὰ Ἰωάννου καὶ
Ἰωάννου, πόθεν, εἰπὲ μοι, προετίμα; ἀπὸ τῶν ση-
μείων; Καὶ μὴν πάντες ὁροῖς ἐκάθαρον τοὺς ἑπ-
ροὺς, καὶ τοὺς νεφροὺς ἐχρείρου. Καὶ πᾶν ὁροῖς
τὴν ξανθήν ἐξέγειρε. Πόθεν οὖν εἶχον τὸ πλέον

485 A7 ἴδων; εἰδωλιν ἐκ A7 ὑμῶν προτὰ τὰ καλὰ
ἐκ B6 ἐχρείρον; ἐχρείραν ἐκ B7 τὸ πλέον αὐτῷ
εἶχον εἰ.
οὗτος; Ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ ρυχὴν ἀρετῆς. Ὁρᾶς ὅτι πανταχοῦ βίου χρεῖα καὶ τῆς διὰ τῶν ἔργων
ΒΙΟ ἐπεδείξεως; Απὸ τῶν παρπῶν ἂρ αὐτῶν, ἀργῶν,
ἐπηρμώσεσθε αὐτούς. Τί δὲ τὴν ομὴν συνέστησε
C τὴν ἑξετάζων; Ἄρα σημείων ἐπὶδείξεις ἡ πο-
λιτείας ἀρίστης ἀκρίβεια; Εὐδήλον ὅτι τὸ δεύ-
τερον. τὰ δὲ σημεία καὶ τὰς ἄρμας ἐντεῦθεν
ἐχεῖ καὶ εἰς τούτο καταλήφει τὸ τέλος.
"Ο τε γὰρ βίου ἄριστον ἐπιδεικνύομενος, ἔπι-
C5 σπάται ταύτην τὴν χάριν. ού τε λαμβάνων τὴν
485B8 βίου; add. καὶ πίστεως εἰδικρινοῦσι β9
ἄν γὰρ ποτν ἄπο τα C1 εἰπεδεῖξεις εἰπεδεῖξεις ὕπα
C3 ἐντεῦθεν ἐξεῖ καὶ εἰς τούτο καταλήφει τὸ
τέλος ἅπα. Ἡ Ῥέγ. 688 ὅπο τεῦθεν ἐχεῖ τὸ
tέλος καὶ εἰς τούτο καταλήφει Ἴονάμα. Ἡ Ἡλ.
tὸ τέλος om. Pheid
χάριν, διὰ τοῦτο λαμβάνει, ἵνα τὸν ἐτέρων διορθώσῃ βίον. Ἐπεί οὗ τὸ Χριστὸς διὰ τοῦτο τὰ Θύματα ἐκεῖνα ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἀξιόπιστος ρανεῖς ἐνεῴθη, καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐλκύσει, ἀρέτην εἰς τὸν βίον εἰσαγάγῃ. Αἱ δὲ καὶ τὴν πλείονα ὑπὲρ C10 τούτου ποιεῖται ὑποθυγήν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῖς σημείοις ἀρκεῖται μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ γέννων ἀπειλεῖ, καὶ βασιλείαν ἐπαγγέλλεται, καὶ τοὺς παραδόξους ἐκείνους τίθησι νόμους, καὶ πάντα ὑπὲρ τούτου πραγματεύεται, ἵνα ἐπαγγέλους ἐρράσηται. Καὶ τί λέγω, ὦτι τὸ Χριστὸς ἡ πάντα ὑπὸ τούτου ἐνεκεῖν

ποιεῖ; ἵνα γὰρ εἰς τὸν ἐδώκες, εἰπέ μοι, νεκρός ἀναστήσας ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ, ἵππα ὁ δὲ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἀποθανεῖν, τί ἂν ἔδειξα μηλικον; Οὐκ εὔδηδον οὖς τὸ δεύτερον; Καὶ μὴν τὸ μεν ρήματος ἐστι, τὸ δὲ ἑρρον
485 ὁ δὲ σοι: οὐ δὲν ὁ νεκρός: νεκρὼν καὶ νεκρῶν οὐ δε.
He proposed another parable to them, saying, "The kingdom of heaven is like a man who sows good seed in his field. But while his men slept, his enemy came and sowed darnel in the midst of the wheat and went away. But when the grain sprouted up and ripened, then the darnel appeared also. But the servants of the head of the house came to him and said, "Master, did not you sow good seed in your field? Whence then has come the darnel?" And he said to them, "A hostile man has done this." The servants said to him, "Do you wish that we go out and gather in the darnel?" But he said, "No, lest while gathering in the darnel, you uproot the wheat along with it. Therefore let them both alone to grow together until the harvest. And at the time of the harvest I shall say to the reapers, 'Gather together the darnel first and bind it in bundles for burning, and then collect the wheat into my barn.'"
at all but have turned away from him and have thrown away the seed; but here he is speaking of heretical sects. For in order that not even this may trouble the disciples, he foretells it, after he has taught them why he speaks in parables. The previous parable, then, says that they did not receive him; this one says that they have received seducers instead. For this too is part of the devil's craft, always to bring in error alongside the truth, painting on it deceptive likenesses so as to carry off with ease those who are ready to be deceived. For this reason he calls the seed darnel rather than any other seed because it looks rather like wheat.

Then he also mentions the manner of the plot. "While the men slept," he says. It is no small danger which he thus suspends over the rulers, who are especially entrusted with the keeping of the field; and not merely over the rulers but also over the ruled. He then shows also that error comes after truth, a fact which the outcome of events witnesses. For after the prophets, come the false prophets; and after the apostles, the false apostles, and after the Christ, the Antichrist. For unless the devil sees what he may imitate or whom he may plot against, nothing is in his power, nor does he know what to do; but he plots against what comes into existence. But now when he knows that one produced a hundred, and one sixty, and one thirty, he thereupon approaches another way. For since he was unable to snatch what had taken root or to choke it or to burn it up, he plots against it by another kind of deception and casts in alongside it his own seed. "But someone may ask, "how do those who are sleeping differ from those who
are like the road?" They differ in that there the devil immediately
snatched the seed, and did not allow it to take root; but here he needed
more craft.

So Christ says these things, instructing us always to be watchful.
For even if you escape those perils, he says there is yet another peril.
For just as in the previous parable destruction came from the road and
the rock and the thorns, so here destruction comes from sleep, so that
a continual watchfulness is necessary. Therefore he said, "He who en-
dures to the end will be saved." 1 Something of this sort happened even
at the beginning. Many of the superiors brought men into the churches
who were concealed heresiarchs and thus made such a scheme only too
easy. For the devil needs no toil thereafter, once he has planted
them in our midst. "But how," one may say, "is it possible to avoid
sleep?" It is indeed impossible to avoid physical sleep; but it is
possible to avoid the slumber of our commitment. Therefore St. Paul
says, "Be watchful, stand firm in the faith." 2 Then he points out that
this activity is not only harmful but is also superfluous. For after
the land has been cultivated and there is no need of anything, then
this enemy sows again, precisely as the heretics do. For they pour
forth their own shafts for no other reason than their vainglory. Not
from this only but also from the things that follow, he outlines with
accuracy all their imposture. "For when the blade had sprung and

---

1 Mt 13. 24
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brought forth fruit, then the darnel appeared also." This is just what these people do. For in the beginning they hide themselves in the shadows; but when they come to speak quite freely and someone gives them a share in preaching, then they pour out their poison.

For what purpose does he bring in the servants who report what has happened? In order that he may say that it is not necessary for them to destroy the darnel. He calls Satan himself a hostile man, because of his struggle to inflict harm on men. For although his insolent attack is against us, its source is not his enmity to us but his enmity to God. Therefore it is clear that God loves us more than we love ourselves. See then from another thing also the villainy of the devil. For he did not sow before this, since he had nothing to destroy; but when everything was completed, in order that he might mar the toil of the farmer. Thus he does everything because of his evil disposition towards him. See also the affection of the servants. For they hasten at once to root out the darnel, even if they do it indiscreetly. This shows their concern for the seed and that they look to one thing alone, not to the punishment of the enemy, but to the preservation of what has been sown. For that other is not the urgent consideration. Therefore they look to see how they may first remove the disease. And they do not seek even this absolutely. For they do not trust the matter to themselves but they await the decision of their master and ask, "Do you want us to?" And what does he answer? He forbids them and says, "Leave them until the harvest, lest you root up the wheat with them."
He said this to prevent wars and bloodshed and slaughter from occurring. For it is not proper to kill a heretic since an implacable war would then be brought into the world. He restrains them, then, with these two considerations: first, that harm to the wheat is to be avoided; second, that punishment will overtake all those who are incurably diseased. So, if you desire them to be punished, yet without damage to the wheat, wait for the suitable occasion.

What does this mean, "Lest you root up the wheat with them?"

Either he is saying that if you are about to take arms and to slaughter the heretics, many of the saints would necessarily be overthrown with them, or that many from among the darnel itself are likely to be changed and to become wheat. Now if you root them up beforehand, you ruin what was to become wheat by destroying those who could have been changed and made better. He does not then forbid our restraining heretics and muzzling them and cutting off their freedom of speech and dispersing their meetings and leagues, but only our killing and slaughtering them. But be careful to notice his gentleness, in that he does not merely give sentence or forbid, but he also gives reasons.

What then, if the darnel remains to the end? "Then I will say to the reapers, 'Gather together the darnel first and bind it in bundles for burning.'" He again reminds them of John's words which introduced him as judge, and he says, "So long as they stand beside the wheat, we must spare them, for it is possible for them to become wheat also; but

3 Mt 3. 12
when they have departed after having gained no profit, then must inexorable punishment overtake them." He says, "For, I will say to the reapers, 'Gather together the darnel first,'" Why first? "That these others may not be alarmed by the fear that the wheat be carried off along with them. And bind them into bundles, so as to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn."

"He proposed another parable to them, saying, 'The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed.'" For since he had said that three parts of the seed are lost and one saved, and that even in the saved part there occurs such damage, in order to prevent their asking who the faithful will be and how numerous they will be, he removes this fear also, leading them on to faith by means of the parable of the mustard seed and showing that in any event the Gospel will be spread abroad. For this reason he introduced into the midst of the discussion the image of this plant, which closely resembles the subject at hand. "It is smaller," he says, "than all other seeds; but when it has grown, it is greater than the plants and becomes a tree, so that the birds of the air come and nest in its branches." For he wanted to point out a sign of its greatness. "So also it will be in the case of the Gospel," he says. For indeed his disciples were weaker than all and less than all; but nevertheless, because the power within them was great, the Gospel has been unfolded in every part of the world.

And then he adds the leaven to this image and says, "The kingdom of heaven is like leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of flour, until the whole was leavened." For just as the leaven
changes the large quantity of flour to its own quality, so also you will convert the entire world. And see the intelligence of this step. For he brings in the things of nature, showing that just as it is impossible for them not to take place, so also it is impossible for these things not to take place. Do not then say this to me: "What shall we be able to do, twelve men falling in with so great a multitude?" For it is precisely this very thing that causes your strength to shine forth, namely mingling with the multitude and not fleeing. Therefore just as the leaven leavens the dough when it is brought next to the flour, and not merely next to it but in such a way as to be mixed in with it (for he did not say "put" merely, but "hid"), so also you, when you have been joined and united with those who war against you, will then have an advantage over them. And just as the leaven is hidden, yet is not obliterated and gradually transmutes the rest to its own condition, the case will be the same with regard to the Gospel. Do not be afraid now because I have said that the insolent attacks are many; for indeed in this way will you shine forth and overcome all. And in speaking of three measures, he meant a multitude; for he is accustomed to use this number to indicate a multitude.

Do not marvel, then, if in speaking of the kingdom, he mentioned seed and leaven, for he was speaking to inexperienced and unskilled men and to those who needed to be led on by these means. For they were so simple that even after all this, they stood in need of much explanation.

Where now are the children of the Greeks? Let them learn the power of Christ when they see the truth of the events. And for two
reasons let them adore him: both because he foretold so great a thing
and because he fulfilled it. For it is he who put power in the leaven.
For this reason he also mixed those who believe in him with the multi-
tude, that we may share our knowledge with others. Let no one then find
fault with our small numbers. For great is the power of the Gospel, and
what has once been leavened becomes in turn leaven for the rest. And
just as a spark, whenever it seizes on wood, causes the parts already
kindled to swell the flame and thus attacks the rest, so too the Gospel
works in this same way. But he did not speak of fire but of leaven.
Why did he do this? Because in that case the whole does not come from
the fire but also from the wood that has been kindled; but in this case
the leaven effects the whole by itself.

But if twelve men leavened the whole world, think how great our
wickedness is in that, though we are so numerous, we are not able to
set right those who remain, when we should be sufficient to be leaven
for ten thousand worlds. "But they," someone may say, "were apostles." 
And what does this mean? Did not they share the same things as you?
Were they not reared in cities? Did they not enjoy the same things?
Did they not practise trades? For they were not angels, were they?
They did not come down from heaven, did they? "But," he says, "they
had signs." The signs did not make them admirable. How long shall
we use those wondrous deeds as cloaks for our negligence? [Observe
that the choir of the saints did not shine with such miracles.] For
many who even cast out devils, since they had done evil, did not become
admirable, but rather were punished. Now what then, one may say,
showed them to be great? Their contempt for wealth, their looking down on glory, their being free from worldly affairs. Since, if they did not have these qualities but were slaves of their passions, even if they raised ten thousand dead, not only would they not have done any good, but they would have been considered to be deceivers. Thus it is their life, so resplendent on all sides, which attracts the grace of the Spirit.

What sort of sign did John perform that he attached to himself so many cities? In proof that he was no wonder worker, hear the evangelist, who says, "John performed no sign." For what was Elias admirable? Was it not from his bold speech to the king? Was it not from his zeal for God? Was it not from his poverty? Was it not from his sheepskin, his cave and his mountains? For he performed all his signs after these things. And as for Job, what sort of sign did he perform that the devil was astounded on seeing it? No sign but a life which shone and which displayed an endurance firmer than adamant. What sort of sign did David perform, while he was still young, so that God said, "I have found David, the son of Jesse, a man after my own heart." What dead body did Abraham and Isaac and Jacob raise? What leper did they cleanse? Do you not know that, unless we are sober and restrained, signs are frequently harmful. Thus many of the Corinthians were severed from each other. Thus many of the Romans lost their senses. Thus Simon was cast out. Thus the man who desired to follow Christ was rejected as unfit after he heard, "The foxes have their holes." For
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each of these men fell away and perished, the one aiming at the wealth and the other at the glory that came from signs. Care for one's life and love of virtue not merely do not give birth to such a desire but even destroy it when it exists.

And when Christ was making laws for his disciples, what did he say? "Perform signs that men may see them?" Not at all. But what did he say? "Let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and that they may glorify your father who is in heaven." And he did not say to Peter, "If you love me, perform signs," but "Feed my sheep." And since he everywhere honors him with James and John above the others, for what reason, I ask, did he do so? For their signs? But all alike cleansed the lepers and raised the dead, for he gave this power to all alike. For what reason then did these have the advantage? Because of the virtue of their souls. Do you see that everywhere there is need of a good manner of living and of the proof from work? "For by their fruits," he says, "you shall know them." What then commends our life? Is it a display of signs or is it the perfection of a good way of life? It is quite evident that it is the second. The signs have both their origin in the way of life and have their end in it. For he that displays an excellent manner of life, draws to himself this grace, and he that takes this grace takes it for the purpose of rectifying the manner of life of others. For this reason did Christ work his signs, in order that, having appeared to be worthy of belief and having drawn men to
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himself, he might bring virtue into our manner of life. Therefore also he puts the greater emphasis on the manner of life. For he is not satisfied with signs alone, but he also threatens hell and promises the kingdom and lays down those startling laws and undertakes everything for his object, that he may make us equal to the angels. Now why do I say that Christ does everything for this reason? For, tell me, if someone gave you the power to raise dead men in his name or to die for his name, which would you rather choose? Is it not evident that you would choose the latter. But the former is a sign, the latter a good deed.
CHAPTER IV

COMMENTARY

480D. Both in its readings in this pericope and in its continuation of the pericope to the end of v. 30, Gu is in agreement with H. It does not seem possible to determine clearly whether or not the pericope originally included all of v. 30; but Gu does provide valuable confirmation for the extended version, which is also found in H, in one of the Moscow codices cited by Matthei, and in the Armenian version. The variants found in this pericope are of no substantive significance and can only be judged in the light of one's general estimate of the value of the manuscripts that give them.

480D4. 

480E1. 

480E2. 

in the parable. It may, however, have been inserted for precisely those reasons.
480E4. παρείσηγεν is required if the sentence is not to become incoherent and grammatically inconsistent. It could easily have been changed to παρείσηγε. by a scribe who took this clause as coordinate with the first part of the sentence.

480E4. ἐπίξειρυννυτά is a blunder, but it does confirm the accusative here and thus G against H and K.

480E5. αὐτὴ seems preferable to αὐτής, given the word's position after ἐπίξειρυννυτά.

481All. The reading found in Guelferbytanus seems preferable, despite its vague and involved style. It is much more likely to have been simplified to the reading given by Field than to have been inserted.

481B4. τὰ ἐαυτοῦ is the proper reading. It is found in K and is supported by the occurrence of τὰ ἐαυτοῦ in Gu; ἡνηρα ὁ πέρματα in Gu is probably a gloss.

481Cl. ψυλαμῆς gives much the better sense.

481D4. οἱ is omitted in both G and Gu and should be omitted; ἦν then is in its natural position and should be read with Gu.

481D5. Here is the first case of a substantial addition to the textus.
receptus in Gu. In this case, the addition, which is the nature of a paren-
thetic remark, fits in well enough with its surroundings. However, this
remark is best looked on as a gloss which has crept into the text; otherwise,
if it is accepted into the text, its absence in other manuscripts is hard to
explain.

481D9. OsEO is well attested and gives much the better sense. The
demonstrative is needed here after the interruption in the train of thought
casted by the quotation from the Scriptural text.

481E4. ToV ΣατανάV might well be a gloss, but it is hard to see
why a scribe would insert ἀγωνιζόμενοI aVTOV. Explicit reference
to Satan brings out the significance and the paradox of calling him εξ θρόν
ἀνδρώπου ῶ "He calls Satan himself a hostile man." The use of
ἀγωνιζόμενοι in the orators may suggest the traditional image of
Satan as accuser (Lysias 98.14, Demosthenes 653.26). However, either text
is satisfactory. The interpolation, if any, was well done.

482A5. The dative has good manuscript support and is more likely to be
corrupted than the accusative.

482B4. The first part of the quotation from Mt 13.29-30 as given in Gu
was probably dropped because it was not in accordance with the text of Matthew
found at the beginning of the homily.
482B5. The reading in Guelferbytanus seems to be no more than an awkward expansion of the original text. The final διώμοι (sic) destroys whatever sense it had.

482B7. Καὶ συνεφηθείς θλάσφημοι is another example of Gu's tendency to amplify the text. συνεφηθείς is not a word appropriate to the violence which alone is directly forbidden in this passage.

482B10. παρὰ τοῦ δεσπότου is a misplaced gloss, which should precede ἠντίς αὐτοῦς if it comes anywhere. ἠντίς αὐτοῦς, given by Gu, is preferable to ἠντιῴς αὐτοῦς, which probably came in because of confusion with ἀντίτως. The passage in brackets is an interpolation found only in Gu. Introduction of any further reasons for tolerating the darnel expressly contradicts the author's statement that there are two such reasons. The insertion appears to have been made by an editor anxious to vindicate Chrysostom's position against any charges of softness on heretics.

482C2. Τὸς ἀντανοδόσεως is an interpolation characteristic of this text whose editor was anxious to specify vague or general references.

See 482C5, 06, 09, 41, 483H11, 483C3, 483D8, 483A7, and 484A12.

482C3-D1. Chrysostom's attitude on repression of heretics seems severe and incorrect to us today; however, it is important to remember that Chrysostom and his contemporaries had grown up in a world in which political coercion
of religious dissidents was accepted as a matter of course. Chrysostom's comments here are perhaps a defense of the repressive legislation imposed by the Emperor Theodosius, whose religious policy has been thus summarized by Philip Hughes:

From the beginning Theodosius was definite. The long domination of the little clique of Arian bishops, in whose influence at court lay the real cause of the troubles, came to an end. Catholicism was freed; and security for its future provided in the first code for the repression of heresy.... The churches of heretics of every sect, Anomeans, Arians, Apollinarians, Macedonians, are to be confiscated and handed over to the Catholics. Heretical assemblies are forbidden and heretics lose all power of making wills or inheriting. Six times in the next fifteen years these laws are renewed.

Chrysostom's attitude here is paralleled by the willingness of St. Augustine to use coercive measures against the Donatists. 1

482C5. The reading in Gu, even if it represents a corruption of τῶν αἰρετῶν ἐν Βουλή, is probably another gloss which the editor, in his anxiety for clarity, has put in the text.

482C6. Yet another explanatory interpolation in Gu. The editor may well have felt uncomfortable about Chrysostom's doctrine. He seems to have been particularly anxious to make it clear that this doctrine in no way countenanced the evil of heresy.

482C9. Here we have yet another example of the editor's desire to spell

everything out.

482D10. ἐνκόπτειν is comparatively rare, but it gives a good sense ("thwart," "block"), and its corruption can easily be explained. The form as given in Gu is ἐνκόπτειν.

482D11. σπανδάς ("pacts," "leagues"), though somewhat indefinite in its meaning, is the preferable reading. It may refer either to pacts of toleration between the state and heretical sects or at least to legal recognition of such sects, or perhaps to compacts existing among the heretics.

482D1. This is plainly a gloss put in by someone who thought the sentence unclear.

482D5. The reading in Field (without ἐνδ) is more likely to be corrupted than that in Gu, which seems to be a correction to harmonize with text of Matthew above.

482D7. Guelferbytana here supports the correction of G and Field in reading τῶν against G, H, and Monfaucon and supports Field in reading autov. ἁρπαγὴ should precede autov as in Field, since autov would more naturally be changed to ἀυτῶν after ἁρπαγὴ than before it.

482D8. The reading in Gu was probably altered to harmonize with the text of Matthew found at the beginning of the homily. See note on 482D5 above.
483A5. The first \( \text{καλ} \) in Field may have been inserted in an effort to make it clear that \( \text{Τίνες} \) was the subject of \( \text{ἐσοφναίς} \) rather than of \( \text{ὁμολογεῖ} \).

483B10. \( \text{ἐνέκρυψεν} \) is the form found Mt 13.33. The prefix is more likely to be omitted than inserted.

483B11. A gloss explicating the meaning of \( \text{αὐτῇ} \) has been incorporated into the text.

483C3. The first part of the variant given by Gu is another gloss, which the editor included to explain the elliptical \( \text{καὶ ὑπ'[...']} \). The second part, \( \text{εἰς πολλὴν προομίσθαι ἐνάρχῃ} \), belongs with the following sentence. The position of \( \text{ἡτ} \) makes it clear that this second part is also a gloss.

483C4. Here is another example of the need of the editor of Gu to fill out ellipses.

483D1. The extended variant given here by Gu is a theological interpolation out of character for Chrysostom. If we can presume that \( \text{αὐτῷ} \) was originally \( \text{εὐτῳ} \), then the scribe of Guelferbytanus or its archetype apparently read the preceding clause as a question rather than as a parenthetical remark and brought in the interpolation \( \text{ὡσαμπ} \ldots \text{περιέσεσθε} \) as a parallel to \( \text{εὐτῳ καὶ ὑμῖν} \ldots \text{περιέσεσθε} \).
483D4. There is a second Christological interpolation in Guelferbytanusch at this point. Like the previous one in 483DL, it occurs between the members of an extended comparison; it is probably from the same source as the interpolation in 483D and from a different source than the fussy corrections and simplifications found in 482C2-DL.

483D5. The reading in Gu (without τοῦτο) is clear enough; τοῦτο is more likely to have been inserted in order to supply a subject for όμοιος η δετα than dropped.

483D6. The reading in Gu is plainly a gloss explanatory of τοῦτον, which has rather awkwardly been inserted into the text.

483D7. Field's reading, άλευ, should be retained; for it is more to the point here: it is Christ's usage which is in question, not that of Chrysostom and his auditors.

483E4. The reading in Gu, dύναμιν, is a case of dittoography.

483E4. The reading in Gu is badly muddled; a verb or two seems to have disappeared.

484A4. ηομω is probably another bit of explanation that editor of Guelferbytanusch has incorporated into the text.
484.11. Field's reading (ἐὰν ἀνθρώπων ζῶδεν) should be preferred to that of Guelterbytanus (οἶδε ἄνθρωποι οἱ ζῶδένα) for three reasons. First, there is no reason to use the demonstrative here, since the Apostles are not referred to in what has gone before. Second, ἐννόησον, in Guelterbytanus, lacks a particle to connect it with the preceding independent clause, whereas in Field it is the apodosis of the condition. Third, ἐὰν ἦν was probably corrupted to οἶδε because of the proximity of ἀνθρώπων ζῶδένα and the scribe's failure to read the sentence through to the end. The οἷ preceding ζῶδένα was then inserted to regularize the position of ζῶδένα.

484.12. The reading in Guelterbytanus seems to be an unsuccessful attempt to improve the reading given by Field's manuscripts. The sentence is involved and liable to corruption.

484.13. The reading in Guelterbytanus is clear enough, but it is doubtful whether a reference to the Christian mysteries is appropriate here, where the point at issue is the ordinary humanity of the Apostles.

484.19. This sentence fits very well with the text, but manuscript authority for it is lacking.

484.3. Τί οὐ οὖν ἐστι is more likely to be corrupted to τὸ τοῦτο ἐστὶν than the reverse. Τοῦτο more normally refers to what precedes than to what follows.
484B6-9. These two sentences have been recopied at the bottom of the column in which they occur in a hand probably of the seventh century. The original had probably become dim at an early date, though it can be read even now. The original reading was copied exactly.

484C10. It is natural that there should have been a gloss at the first mention of John; and this has been incorporated into the text, though not in its natural position, which would be after Πώλων.

484C10. A later hand, probably of the ninth or tenth century, has corrected the original text of Gu here.

484D7. οτερρός is found with either τοῦ or three terminations. οτερρότερον (Gu) seems more liable to corruption than οτερρότεραν.

484E6. The scribe of Guelferbytanus apparently took τοῦ Χριστοῦ with ἐπίθεμῖος rather than with ἀπολογίος.

485A4. In view of the frequency of interpolations in Guelferbytanus, it seems unwise to accept this phrase into the text.

485B8. This is an interpolation of similar type to that in 485A4. Perhaps it was inserted in order to avoid any suspicion of Παλαγιανιασμός.

485C3. Guelferbytanus here lends decisive support to Reg. 688 and gives
a reading from which the two other readings can easily be derived, \textit{to telos}
being easily displaced or omitted because of its terminal position.

\textbf{485c4.} \textit{tuv} has been added in the left margin of the manuscript in
a hand smaller than the original but of the same general type.

\textbf{485c10.} \textit{πυγός} is probably a gloss.

\textbf{485d2.} \textit{οἰκῆιος} probably began its career as a gloss on
\textit{ιδιουέλειος}, which the scribe may have felt it necessary to explain.
It then supplanted \textit{ιδιουέλειος} in the text.
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