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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.

In these homilies, Chrysostom stresses the continuity between the Old Testament and the New against the Manichaens and the unity of nature between the Father and the Son against the Arians. 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. 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:


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. 7

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." 8 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. 401-412.


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.

---

9Field, III, ix-x.
10Harkin, p. 405.
11Field, III, xii.
12Ibid., 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 alegans 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 ἐνειόνοις on page 481c to συναξεῖσατε 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 Matthew'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 exegesis 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. For Homily 46, however, Field did have available the Latin translation made by Georgius Trapezuntius (1396-1485 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. 

Field further made use of an Armenian translation of Homilies 1 to 53, edited by the Mechitarist Fathers at Venice in 1826. 

The Codex Guelferbytianus 95 is a manuscript from the Ducal Library at Wolfenbittel 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. Father Edgar Smothers, S.J., following Tischendorf and Gregory, dates it to the sixth century, as does Heinemann in his catalogue of the Wolfenbittel manuscripts. Heinemann described it thus in his catalogue:

Pergam. 33 x 27 cm. 186 Bll., in bezeichneten Lagen zu 8 Bll., zweispaltig d. 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 Quelferbytanus 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 Quelferbytanus 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. Heinsmab, 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.

37. Mt 11. 7-24. Jesus speaks to the people about John. He curses the cities of Galilee. **Ethicon:** Chrysostom denounces the theater and its sinful spectacles.

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 Ethics 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 subscriptsi, 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 Guelpherbytanus and its value for determining the text of Homily 46. In general, it may be said that the Codex Guelpherbytanus 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 Guelpherbytanus 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 Guelpherbytanus 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 Gualterbytanus 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 Gualterbytanus. 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 ϝ, failure to assimilate prefixes, failure to indicate elisions, variant forms of the imperative and second person plural endings, and the interchange of ℓ and εℓ.
### Sigla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigla</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 editio 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 editio Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Codex K in editio Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montf.</td>
<td>Editio Montfacon</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 editio Field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER II

TRANSLATION

Matthew 13. 24-30

4808 Ἀλλὰν παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων· ὑμοίωθεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἄνθρωπος οπείρονει καλὸν σπέρμα ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ αὐτοῦ. Ἐν δὲ τῷ καθευδεῖν τοὺς ἄνθρώπους, ἢλθεν αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρός, καὶ ἐσπειράσατο ἑταῖραν ἀνά μέσον τοῦ σίτου, καὶ ἀπήλθεν. Ὄτε δὲ ἐβλάστησεν ὁ χόρτος, καὶ παρρόν ἐποίησεν, τότε ἐφάνη καὶ ἐὰν ἑταῖραν. Προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δουλοί τοῦ

480C2 καὶ ἦν θεoīom. Field
οικοδομήτοι, εἰπον αὕτω: κύριε, οὐχὶ παλὸν
c5 σπέρμα ἔσπειρας ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ σου; πόθεν
οὖν ἔχει θηβάνια; ὦ δὲ ἔργα αὐτοῖς. ἔχρος
ἀνθρώπος τούτο ἐποίησεν. Οἱ δὲ δουλοί
eἰπον αὕτω: θελεῖς οὖν ἀπεδίωντες συλλέ-
ξομεν αὕτα; ὦ δὲ ἔρη, οὕτω μὴ ποτε συλλέ-
γοντες τα θηβάνια, ἐκριβώσχετε αὐτά αὐτοῖς
tον οἶτον. Ἀρετε οὖν συναναγένναλ ἄμ-
φότερα μέχρι τοῦ θερισμοῦ, καὶ ἐν παρῳ
tοῦ θερισμοῦ ἔρω τοῖς θερίσταισ. συλλέξα-
τε πρῶτον τα θηβάνια καὶ ἔσωτε αὐτά

480C4 ἀγρῷ σου: ἐν ἀγρῷ ἦ; om. σου ἢ καὶ
ce συλλέξομεν: συλλέξωμεν læman. & d
D1 αὐτοῖς: add. ἦ; καὶ d om. οὐν ἦ; καὶ ἦ; ἦ; c
μέχρι ἦ; καὶ: ἦ; καὶ Field D2 ¹ καὶ ἐν παρῳ κ.π.λ.
Ν Arm Moag: om. Field
eis δέσμας πρὸς τὸ κατακαύσας αὐτὰ, τὸν
de oἰτον συναγάρετε eis tὴν ἀποθήκην
μου.

The Homily

Τι τὸ μέσον ταύτης καὶ τῆς πρὸ ταύτης
παραβολῆς; Ἐκεῖ τοὺς μηδὲ ὅλος προσ-
δέσχηκοτας αὐτῷ φησίν, ἀλλὰ ἀποπηδήμα-
tας καὶ τὸν σορόν προεμένους ἐν ταύθα
δὲ τῶν άφρετικῶν λέγει τὰ συστήματα.

"Ανα πρὸς μηδὲ τοῦτο τοὺς ῥαβδητὰς ὄρο-
βῆσι, καὶ τοῦτο προέλεγε, μετὰ τὸ οἰδάξαλ
διατὶ ἐν παραβολαις λαλεῖ. Ἐκεῖνη μὲν

480.04 αὐτῆς: οὕτω ἐν D7 ὄροβησθηκαί ἐν Ἰ.
ὅροβης Field El λαλεῖ: λαλεῖσθε ἐν
όνη παραβολή φησίν διὰ οὐκ ἐδέξαντο· 
αὕτη δὲ, διὰ καὶ ἂφορέας ἐδέξαντο. Καὶ γὰρ 
καὶ τὸ τοῦ διαθέλου μεθοδεύεις, τὴ 
ἄληθεία ἐξ ἐκεί παρεισάρξειν τὴν πλάνην, 
πολλὰ ἐπιχρωνυμόντα αὐτὴ τὰ ὀμοιώματα 
ώστε εὐκόλως κλέψαι τοὺς ἐνεξαπατήτους. 
Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀλλο τι σπέρμα, ἀλλὰ ἐφάνε 
ἐγὼ καλέσα, ὡς κατὰ τὴν ὀρθὴν ἐσικέ πως 
σήμερ. Εἰςα λέγει καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἐπι-
βουλῆς. Ἐν γὰρ τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς ἄνθρω-
πους, φησίν. Οὐ μικρὸν τοῖς ἀρχοῦσιν ἐν-

480ε2 ἂφορέας: ἄφορέας ἐν Ε3 ἐν. καὶ ἐν Ε4 κ
ἐπιχρωνυμόντα ἐπιχρωνυμόντας ΗΠ: ἐπιχρωνυμόντας Ε5 
αὕτη τὰ ὀμοιώματα: αὕτης ὀμοιώματα ἐν
τευθέν ἐπικρημνα τὸν κίνδυνον, τοῖς μάλιστα ἀσ ἑς ἀροῦρας τὴν φυλακὴν ἐμπεσίστευμένοις οὐ τοῖς ἄρχουσι δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄρχομένοις. Δείκνυοι δὲ καὶ τὴν πλάνην μετὰ τὴν ἀληθείαν ὀφειλὲν ὦ νερὲ καὶ ἢ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκβασίας μαρτυρεῖ. Καὶ γὰρ μετὰ τοῖς προφήταις, οἱ ψευδοπροφῆται. Καὶ μετὰ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, οἱ ψευδαπόστολοι. καὶ Ἀντὶ μετὰ τὸν Χριστὸν, ὁ ἀντίχριστος. Ἄν γὰρ μὴ ἴδῃ τι μιμήσεως ὁ διάβολος, ἡ τίσιν ἐπιβουλεύσῃ, οὐ λέγεται τὸ μέρος ἐπὶ χειρὶ οὔτε οὐδὲ τί πράξῃ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς γενομένοις ἐπιβουλευεῖ. Καὶ νῦν τοῖς, ἐπειδὴ

481 ἐπικρημνα: ἐπικρημα Ἡ Μαρ ἐπικρημναν ἐν Αὐλ ὧ ν γε τὸ ἐπιβουλευεί: οὔτε ἐπιχειρεῖ οὔτε οἴδε ῾Ιεῆδ
οἶδεν ὅτι ὁ μὲν ἐποίησεν ἑκατόν, ὁ δὲ ἐξήκοντα, ὁ δὲ τριάκοντα, ἄλλην ἔρχεται ἐν λοιπὸν ὑδόν. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἤρπασαν οὐκ ἠδυνήθη τὸ πίσωθεν, οὐδὲ ἐπονίζατο, οὐδὲ κατακαύσατο, οἱ ἄτεροι ἁπάνης ἐπιβουλεύει, τὰ παρεμβάλλων ἑτᾶ ἑαυτοῦ. Καὶ τὰ ἔμφερον ὁι καθεύδοντες, ἃς τῶν ἐκ τῆς ὑδόν μημομένων; Ὁτι ἐκεῖ εὐθέως ἤρπασαν, οὐδὲ γὰρ πίσωθεν ἀρχήν· ἐν ταύτα δὲ πλείονος ἐδεήθη τῆς ἰησοῦς ἡμῶν. 

Ταῦτα δὲ λέγει ὁ Χριστὸς, παλιεύων.
δεῖ τῷ διαβόλῳ λοιπὸν, ὅταν ἔκεινος εἰς μέσον φυτεύσῃ. Καὶ πῶς δυνατὸν μὴ καθεύδειν, φησί. Τὸν μὲν οὖν ψυχικὸν ύπόν, οὐ δυνατὸν τὸν δὲ τῆς προαίρεσεως, δυνατὸν. Αἰῶνιος χρόνος ἐλέγε τῆς Παύλου, ἀργορεῖτε, στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει. Εἰτα δεῖξατε καὶ περιττὸν τὸ πράγμα, εἰσὶ βλαβερῶν μόνον. Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ γεγονός τὴν ἄρομαν, καὶ μὴ Χριστόν εἶναι μηδενὸς, τὸτε ἐπισπείρει οὗτος· Καθά περὶ τὸν καθά περὶ τὸν άρετικὸν ποιοῦσιν. Αἰῶνιος ὑπὸ τὰ διὰ κενοδοχείαν ἐμβάλλουσι τὸν ἑαυτῶν ἰόν. ἐκάπηλον εἰς αὐτοῖς τὸ ἀποστολικὸν πληροῦσαι τὸν ἀποστολικὸν πολέμον.
λόγου τὸ λέγον, θέλοντες εἶναι σοροὶ ἐμωρφώθησαν. Ὅπως ἐντεῦθεν δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα μετὰ ἀκριβείας αὐτῶν ὑπογράφει τὴν σημνὴν ἀπασχόλε. ἦτε ὑπὸ ἔβλαστησε, ἡσιών, οἱ χόρτος, καὶ παρεὼ ἐποίησε, τότε ἔρανη καὶ τὰ θησάμων.

διὸ ὅπερ καὶ οὗτοι ποιοῦσι. Παρὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχὴς συνῆκαρον ἑαυτούς· ἐπειδὰν δὲ εἰ ἔπολην λάβασον τὴν παρρησίαν, καὶ λόγον τῆς αὐτῶν μεταδίδῃ, τότε τὸν ἓκχεουσί.

Τίνος δὲ ἐνεκεν εἰσάγει τοὺς σοῦ οὕτως λέγοντας τὸ γεγενημένον; "ἶνα εἶπη ὅτι ὅθεν ἄναπαλτεῖν αὐτοὺς. Ἐξῆλθον δὲ ἀνθρώπουν

481D7 Ὅτε: 'Ὁ δὲ δὴ ὅτι: αὐτοὶ δὲ τί νοοῦσιν ἐπὶ-

δὲ: ἐπεί δὲ ἐὰν δὲ· Εἶ ὅτι: λάβωσι· λάβωσι· ἐν

ἐκ τῆς εἰς ἀναπαλτεῖν: ἄνερεῖν ἔσο.
αὐτὸν αὖ τὸν Ξατάναν καλεί, διὰ τὴν εἰς ἀνθρώπους βλαβὴν ἀγρινίζεσθαι αὐτὸν. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐπηρεῖα καὶ θὰ ἤμων. ἢ δὲ ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐπηρείας αὐτῇ ἀπὸ τῆς εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ 482Α τῆς εἰς θεὸν ἔχθρας ἐγένετο. Ὕψον ἐκδον ὁτι μᾶλλον ο θεὸς ἡμᾶς ρίξει η ἡμείς ἐαυτοῦ. Ὄρα δὲ καὶ ἐτέρωθεν τοῦ διαβόλου τὴν παγορίαν. Ότι γὰρ πρὸ τοῦτον ἐσπευρη ἐπειδὴ μηδὲν ἔχειν ἀπολέσασι: ἀλλ' ὅτε ἢν 481ΕΤ ἄπαντα πεπλημμένα, ἵνα τῇ σοφοῖς ἐμφανίσῃ τοῦ γεωργοῦ: οὕτω πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἐκ ἐξωθῶς ἐχὼν πάντα ἐποίει. Ἐκτόπει δὲ καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων τὴν ρίλοστῳρίαν. Καὶ γὰρ ἐπεί-

τονταν ἴδῃ τὰ ἐπίγονα ἀνασπάσας, εἰ καὶ μὴ
dιεσπερμένως ποιοῦσιν ὥσπερ δείκνυσι τὴν
ὑπὲρ τοῦ σπόρου μέριμναν αὐτῶν, καὶ πρὸς
A10 ἐν μόνον βλέποντας, οὐχ ὡπως ἐκεῖνος ὅπερ
διήνη, ἀλλ' ὡστε ἐκεῖνος ἔπαλλαξις μὴ ὀπο-
λέσθαι. οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ κατεχεῖ
B γον. Αἰσχρὸς ὡσπερ τὸ νόσημα τέως ἐξέλω-
σε, ὑποπότρυν. Καὶ εὐθὺς τοῦτο ἄλλως
ἔτοιμος ὧν γὰρ ἔστω ἐπιστρέφοντι,
ἀλλὰ τοῦ δεσπότου τὴν γυνὴν ἀκορεῖνον

482A7 ἀπὸ διεσπερμένως ποιοῦσιν: διεσχέφθαι ποιη-
ήσαι τοίς τοῦ σπόρου: τοῦτοι δὲ A10 ὡπως:
ὡς δὲ ἐκεῖνος ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνο δέσποτα εἰνὲ ᾗ ἐκ
τὰ δέ τιμ. γὰρ δὲ AII ἐστὶ: ἀποθεῖσθαι ἐν
B2 τέως ἐξέλωσε: ἐξέλωσε τέως ἐπὶ ἐξέλωσε τοῦτο
λέγοντες· θέλεις; Τί οὖν ὁ δεσπότης; Κυλλή
ei λέγων· ἀφετε αὕτα ἕως τοῦ θερισμοῦ.

μήπως ἔπρεποντε ἄμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σιτὸν.

Τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε, κυλλών πόλεμος γίνεσθαι καὶ αἵματα καὶ σφαγάς. Οὐ γὰρ ἐδει ἀναρεῖν ἀρετικὸν· ἐπεὶ πόλεμος ἄποντος εἴμεθ' eis tìn oikoumènìn eiságèrathai. Δύο τοῖνυν

48284 a om. ἀφετε αὕτα ἕως τοῦ θερισμοῦ Field B5 πόλεμος. γίνεσθαι καὶ αἵματα καὶ σφαγάς: πόλεμος ἐκ τούτου γίνεσθαι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἀντιτασομένοις καὶ σφαγάς καὶ αἵματων ἐκ-

χύσεις καὶ δισμοὶ. Στὰ 87 πόλεμος ἄπον-
dos: add. καὶ οὐκηθῆσεις βλάσφημοι δι' ἐμὲ-

λεν· ἐμέδειλον καὶ ἐμέδειλεν ποιη οἰκουμένην Mont.
τούτων αὐτοὺς ἀλ. δὲ τοῖς λόγιοισίν· εὐν µὲν τῷ µὴ τὸν σῖτον βλαβῇναν, ετέρῳ δὲ 

βιο τῷ καταλήψεως τῆς πόλεως πάντας αὐτοὺς

καὶ ἀνιάτως νοσοῦντας. Ἡ δέ εἰ ὀδηγεῖ, κἂν πολλοὶ εἰς αὐτοὺς, κἂν χωρίς τῆς τοῦ σιτοῦ

βλάψις, ἀναμείνων τὸν προσήκοντα καιρόν. Υ

Τί δέ ἐστι, µὴ ἐκρίζωςτε ἀµή αὐτοῖς

τὸν σῖτον; Ἡ τούτῳ φθοιν, ὅτι εἰ

182 B 8 τούτων αὐτοὺς· τοῦτος αὐτοὺς ἄν. B 8 κατ-

έχει: κατάσχει δὲ B 9 τῷ τῷ δὲ B 10 πάντας:

πάντως Field B 10 ἀὐτοὺς add. ἀρὰ τοῦ σεισμοῦ

ἔν B 10 ἀνιάτως ἀνιάτα δὲ B 10 καιρὸν: add.

καὶ καὶ ἡµᾶς ἐκδίκως τοῦ θεοῦ γενέσθαι αὐτῶν

µὴ ὑπακούοντως ἡµῶν ἀλλὰ τῷ σεισμῷ τῇ

περὶ τούτων ἁρεται κρίσιν δὲ C 2 καιρὸν: add.

ἀνταποδόσεως δὲ
μέλλοιε μινείν ὀπλα καὶ κατασφάττειν τοὺς
CS αἱρετικοὺς ἀνάγκη πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων
ουκ ἐμπαθάλλεθαί γραπτά ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὕτως οἷος ἐμπαθά¬
ποὺς πολλοὺς εἰνοῖς ἐμπαθάλλεσθαι καὶ γενέσθαι
ἐπὶ τὶν. Ἄν τοῖνοι προλαβόντες αὐτοὺς ἑπριώσατε
λυμαίνωσθε τῇ μέλλωσιν γίνεσθαι σώσθεν ὅσιος
ἐγχώρει μεταβάλλεσθαι καὶ γενέσθαι πειστίους
CS ἀναιροῦντες. Ὡ τοῖνοι κατέχειν αἱρετικοὺς
καὶ ἐπιστομίζειν καὶ ἐκπόντειν αὐτῶν τὴν
482 γὶ μέλλοιε: μέλλετε εἰς CS υποκαταβάλλεσθαί
ἀπὸ τὴν ἑρετικὴν ἐπίβουλη ἐν CS ἐμπαθάλλεσθαί
μεταβάλλεσθαί καὶ: ἀπὸ τὴν ἑρετικὴν ἐπίβουλη καὶ
διδασκαλίας ὅτι καὶ ἀναστροφὴς ἐν CS ἐμ-
παθάλλεσθαί μεταβάλλεσθαί καὶ CS ἀναιροῦντες: ἀπὸ
πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίσεως ἐν CS ἐκπόντειν:
ἐκπόντειν Pheid
παρρησίαν, καὶ τὰς συνόδους καὶ τὰς ὁποίδ' ἔλυσιν πωλοῦσι, ἀλλ' ἀναίρεῖν καὶ κατασφάττειν.
Εὖ δὲ αὐτῶν οἰκόπελ ἡ ἡμερότητα, πῶς οὖν ἀπορρίνεται μόνον, οὐδὲ πωλοῦσι, ἀλλ' σωματικός ἡ δήσοι. Τί οὖν, ἐν μέχρι τέλους μένῃ τὰ ζησάν-15 ἢ; Τὸτε ἔφη τοῖς θερισταῖς· συλλέξατε πρῶτον τὰ ἔτι ποὺ καὶ ἐβάλετε αὐτὰ ἐναθάν τοῖς ἱδρούς πρὸς τὸ κατα-πώς ταὐτά. Πάλιν ἀναρκιμήσεις αὐτοὺς τῶν Ἰωάννου ἡμῆς τῶν κρίνων αὐτῶν ἐκεῖνον.
των, καὶ φησιν, ὦτε ἐώς μὲν ἐστήκασιν ἐγγὺς
tου σιτου ψείδοσαν Χρή. ἔχωρει γὰρ αὐτοῖς
καὶ σιτου γενέσθαι. Ἐπεὶ δὲ μηδὲν κερδαν-
tες ἀπέλθωσι, τότε αὐτοῖς ἀναγκαῖαι ἢ ἀπα-
ραίτητος διαδέχεται δίκη. Ἐρώ γὰρ τοῖς
δερεταῖς, φησὶ, συλλέξατε πρῶτον τὰ γείτονα.

Ε5 Δικτὶ πρῶτον; Ἡν μὴ φοβηθῶσιν ὅτι, ὡς
ἔσυναμαγωγένων ὑμᾶς αὐτοῖς τοῦ σιτοῦ. Καὶ
ὁδηγάτε αὐτὰ ἐσφραγίστε καὶ ἑταμαῖνατε αὐτά
τῶν δὲ σιτοῦ συναράγετε εἰς τὴν ἀποδήκην.

483Α Ἀλλήν παραβολὴν παρέβηκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων
ὅμοια ἤστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν κόσμων

482Ε7 "κερδάντες: κερδήνοντες ἐκ Ε3 διαδέξε-
tει: διαδέχεται ἐκ Ε5 συναναγωγένων: συναγωγένων
ἐκ Ε5 ὑμᾶς ἐκ Ἐ6 αὐτὰ: αδέσπ. ἐκ τῇ ὑστε:

πρὸς τὸ βεν
σινάπεως. Ἑπεὶ ἀρείν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁπό-
ποτοῦ τρίτω μέρη ἀπόλαυτον, καὶ σώβηται ἐν. καὶ
ἐν αὐτῷ πάλιν τις σκοτεινὰς τοσάτης γίνεται
Α5 βλάβη, ἵνα μὴ δέσμωτιν καὶ πόθι ἐσον-
ται οἱ πιστοί; καὶ τούτων ἐξαιρεῖ τὸν φόβον,
διὰ τῆς παραβολῆς τοῦ σινάπεως ἐνάργνω ἐις πίσ-
τιν αὐτούς, καὶ δεικνύει ὅτι πάντως ἐκτὸς ἒ-
ται τὸ κήρυγμα. Αἰώ τούτῳ τοῦ λαχάνου τῆν
εἰκόνα εἰς μέσον ἡγαπή σφόδρα ἐκινήσαν τῇ
8 ὑποθέτεις: ὁ μικρότερον μὲν, φησίν, ἐστὶ
πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων ὅταν δὲ αὔξηθη, μείζον
τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶ καὶ γίνεται δέντρον, ὡστε
ἐδείκτην τὰς πέτεινα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατασκή-
νοῦν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ. Τοῦ ἂρμ μεγαλῶς

483 AS τῶν: add. καὶ Riedl A8 b Αὐτὸ τούτῳ:
Αἰώ τὸ ἔσος B3 c καὶ om. deu

LEWIS TOWERS
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
Β' τὸ τεκμῆρον ἐνδείκνυται ἰδιότητι. Οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πηρώματος ἔσται, φησὶ. Καὶ γὰρ ἀπάντων ἀσθενέστερον ἦν αὐτῶν οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ πάντων ἔδιδον οὖν ὑμῖν, ἐπεὶ ἡ μεγάλη ἢ ἡ ἐν αὐτοῖς δύναμις ἐξηπλώθη πάνταχον τῆς οἰκουμένης.

Εἶτα καὶ τὴν σύμην ταύτη προστίθησι τῇ Β' εἰκόνι, λέγων· ὅροι ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν συμφ., ἂν λαβοῦσα μιᾷ ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἄλλου ὑπάρχῃ τρίδα, ἐν σοὶ ἑορτάζῃ ἐδών. Καθὼς γὰρ αὕτη τὸ πολὺ ἄλλου μεθίστησιν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἴσχυν, οὕτω καὶ ὑπείς τῶν πάντων κόσμων μεταστησετε. Καὶ ὁρᾷ

983Β' ἀσθενέστερον πρωτ ἦσαν δὲ δ' ἐπεὶ δὴ ἐπεί τοι β' ἐνέκρυψεν· ἐκρύψεν τειλεῖ δ' ἐπεὶ δὲ β' όρα, αὕτη· ἡ σύμη μικρὰ ὅσα τῇ
σύνεσιν. Τά γάρ τῆς φύσεως παράγει, δεικνύων ὅτι ὑπὲρ ἐκείνην ἀνεχώρητον μὴ γενότα, οὕτω καὶ ταῦτα. Μὴ γάρ μοι τοῦτο λέγει τί δισομεδῶς δύσεον ἄνθρωποι εἰς πλῆθος ἐμπεσοῦσθε τοσοῦτον; Καὶ γάρ τοῦτο αὐτὸ μάλιστα ὑμῶν ποιεῖ τὴν ἱσχὺν ἐκλάμψα, τὸ τενακριβῆς τῶν πλῆθες καὶ μὴ φυγεῖν. "Ὁσπέρ οὖν καὶ ἡ ζύμη τότε τὸ φύραμα εὑρότι, ὅταν ἔγραψε γένηται τοῦ ἀλεύρου, καὶ οὐχ ἀπλῶς

483 C3 σύνεσιν: add τοῦ ἔσχατον σουετιβοῦτα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς εἰς πολλὴν προθυμίαν ἐνάργους αὐτοὺς ἡ λα. Τά: παρὰ δὲ 1 C4 ἀνεχώρητον: ἀδιέννατον ἡ: ἀνεχώρητον. Ταῦτα: add πάντως γενηθοῦσαν εἰς C5 τοῦτο λέγει λέγει ὅτι ἦν C6 τοτοῦτον: τοτοῦτων ἴνα C7 το: τεῦ ἴνα
εἰρήν[ος, ἀλλ' οὖτως ὡστε καὶ μηδὲνι οὐ γὰρ εἰπεν ὃ ἐξῆκεν ἀλλ' ἐξηρυθυμεν. οὖτω καὶ οὕεις, ὅταν κολληθήτε καὶ ἐνοθήτε τοῖς πολεμοῦσιν ὑμῖν, τότε αὐτῶν περιέσθε. Καὶ ἐαν εἰσὶν καταχώνυντα ἡ μὲν, ὦτε ἀφανίζεται δὲ, καὶ ἐκ κατὰ μικρὸν πρὸς τὴν ἐαυτῆς ἑξειν ἀπαντᾷ μεταμοιοί. τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ τρόπου καὶ ὃν ἐπεξεργάζεσθε διατί δὲ οὐκ εἴπεν αὐτῷ ὡς ὦτε ἐξηρυθυμεν ὥστε τὸ φύράμα τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐξήρυθεν διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς τῆς βούτητος αὐτοῦ ρυχὴν τε καὶ σώμα καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ οὕτω αὐτῶ καὶ οὕτω καταχώνυντα καταχωνεύτω καὶ ἐξειν ἐξειν ἀπαντᾷ πάντα καὶ δὲ μεταμοιοί. αὐτῷ ὡς ὦτε καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τῆς Παρθένου τὴν ἐαυτῆς εὐχήνους διεπλάττετε ἦν δὲ οἱ: om. Field
ἐπὶ τοῦ κεφάλασ α υμβήσεται. Μὴ τοίνυν,
ἐπεὶ δὴ πολλὰς εἶπον εἶναι τὰς ἐγγερείας,
φοβηθεὶτε καὶ ἂρ παὶ οὕτως ἐκλάμψετε, καὶ ἀπάντων περιέσοσθε. Τρία δὲ σάτα ἐν-
ταῦθα τὰ πολλὰ εἴρηκεν εἰδὲ ἂρ τὸν
ἀριθμὸν τούτων ἐπὶ πλῆθος λαμβάνειν. Μὴ
τοῖο ὑμάς ὑπὲρ εἰς ἑυσίδειας, ἰδαλπόμενος
κόκκου καὶ βύθης ἑκνήσῃ ἄνθρωποι ἂρ
διελέγετο ἀπείροις καὶ ἰδιώταις καὶ ἀδιακός
ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνάγεσθαι. Οὕτω ἂρ ὧν ἄρειες,
ὡς καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πάντα δεϊκνύει εἰρή

483 D5 Κήρυξας: add. τοῦτο Τήληd add. τοῦτον ἔφη
27 ἀπάντων: πάντων ἐν 28 εἴρηκεν: add. τοῦ δὲ
τούτου γεων κατασκευὴν ἐν ἀεὶ: ἐδαρεμένα τοῦ-
τον: add. καὶ ὑπὸ D10 ἑμνήσθη: ἐμνήρονυσεν δὲ
πολλῆς.

Ποῦ τοῖνυν Ἐλλήνων παιδέας εἰσί; Μακαβαν-έτωσαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν δύναμιν, ἐρώτετε τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Καὶ ἐπιτέρων E5 θεὶν οὖν προσκυνεῖτοςαν, ὡς καὶ προείπε πράγμα τοσοῦτον, καὶ ἐπήρωσε. Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἔστιν ὁ τὴν δύναμιν ἐνθεὶς τῇ βίβλῳ. 

484Α Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἀνεμίζε τῷ πλῆθει τοὺς αὐτῶν πιστεύοντας, ἵνα μεταδῷ μεν τοῖς ἄνδροις τῆς ἡμετέρας ομνέσεως. Μηδεὶς τοῖνυν ὀλιγότητα αἰτιάσω. Πολλὴ γὰρ τοῦ κηρύγματος η δύναμις καὶ τὸ βυθὼν ἁπαξ, τῇ μήτῃ φί-

483Ε2 τοῖνυν: νῦν ἔως E3 άληθείαν: δύναμιν ἐν Ε4 αὐτὸν... τοσοῦτον: αὐτὸν πράγματος ὁ τούτων μέγα ἔως E5 ἐπήρωσε: ἀπάντα ἔως 484Α1 μεταδῶμεν: μεταδιδῶμεν ἔως
ἐσται τῷ λοιπῷ ὅπλιν. Καὶ μεθάνηρ ὁ σπινθὲρ ὅταν ἐπιδιαβήται ἑύλων, τὰ ἡμὴ κατανεῦε ὅταν ποιήσας τὸν φλεγόμενον ἑύλος ἑκεῖνα, οὕτως ἐκεῖνα, καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα. Ἀλλ' οὐκ εἶπεν πόρο, ἀλλὰ ζύμην. Τί δή ποτε; Ὄτι ὁ ὑπὸ πυρὸς ἔστιν ἐκεῖ ἐκ τὸ ὅλον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀναπτομένων ἑύλων. ἐνταῦθα δὲ τὸ ὅλον ἡ ζύμη ἐρράθεται ἐκ ἑαυτῆς.

Εἰ δὲ ἀνθρώποι δύδηται τὴν ὄμοιομὲν

484A4 τῷ λοιπῷ: ἀλλὰ κόμμα καὶ Ἄβο φλεγόμενον: φλεγόμενον ἐν Ἀβ ὑπὸ τὸ κήρυγμα, τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ κήρυγμα ἐκ Ἄβ οἷον ἐκεῖ δὲ Ἀδωνὶς ἡ ζύμη ἀντὶ τὸ ὅλον ἐκ Ἀδωνὶς. Εἰ δὲ ἀνθρώποι δύδηται οἴδε ἀνθρώποι οἱ δύδηται
ἀποκάλυψαν ἐφημυσάν, ἐννόησαν ὡσθ' ἡμῶν ἡ θεία ἀκίνητη. Μην ὅλον τοὺς ὑπολειπόμενους μὴ δυνηθῶμεν διορθῶν, ὡς μικροῖς ξυποθῶμεν ἀρρεν ἐχρῆν καὶ γενέθθαι δύμην. Ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνοι, φησίν, ἀποστολοὶ ἦσαν. Καὶ τί τούτο; Οὐχὶ τῶν αὐτῶν τό μετέχεσαν; οὐχὶ ἐν πόλεσιν ἔτράφησαν; οὐ πάντων ἄπελαυσαν; οὐχὶ τεχνιῶν μετεχειρίσαντο; μὴ ράρ ἄρρεν ἦσαν; μὴ ράρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατέβησαν; Ἀλλ' τὰ σημεῖα, φησίν, εἶχον. Οὐ τὰ σημεῖα θαυμαστοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐποίησε. Μέχρι πότε προκαλύμμασι κεχρῆσαν; αὕτη ἡ ἐννόησαν: ἀδήμονα τῶν Χριστοῦ χώρον. ἐν Β. ἀρκεῖν ἐχρῆν καὶ γενέθθαι δύμην: ἐχρῆν ἀρκεῖν γενέθθαι καὶ Β. μετέχεσσον: ἀδὴμοτρήτω. Οὐχὶ ὅμοιοι ἡμῶν ἦσαν. Β. μετεχειρίσαντο: μετεχειρίσαντες ὑπὸ Β. αὐτοῖς ἐποίησε δ'
μεθα τὸς ἡμέτερας ῥαδιμίας τοῖς θαύμασιν ἔκεινοι. Ο Ἴδε τὸν χορὸν τῶν ἄριστων οἳ τοῖς
θαύμασιν ἔκεινοι λάμβαντα]. Πολλοὶ γὰρ
καὶ δαίμονες ἐκβάλλοντες, ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἀνο-
μίαν εἰρράσαντο, οὐν ἐγένοντο θαυμαστοί,
ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκολάσθησαν. Καὶ τί ποτ' οὐν
ἔστι, ηὗτοι, οἱ μεγάλους αὐτοὺς ἔδειξε;
Τὸ χρημάτων καταρρονεῖν, τὸ δεότι ὑπερεῖν
τὸ πραγμάτων ἀπηλλάχθαι βιωτικῶν. οὐ
εἶχε μὴ ταύτα εἶχον, ἀλλὰ σῶλοι τῶν πα-
θῶν ἦσαν, εἰ καὶ μυρίους νεκροὺς ἱέραν

484 B9 ο Ἴδε τὸν χορὸν κ. τ. λ. Δαν. Μαν. Field:
omn. cod. C1 ἐκβάλλοντες δι η ἐκβάλλοντες
Field C3 τί ποτ' οὖν τί τοῦτο δι οὐ
πραγμάτων ἀπηλλάχθαι βιωτικῶν: τὸ πάντων
ἀπηλλάχθαι τῶν βιωτικῶν δι
οὐ μόνον οὐδὲν ἂν ἔρειςαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπατε- 
ώνες ἂν ἔνομισθεν εἶναι. Οὕτως ὁ βίος ἐστὶν ὁ πανταχοῦ λάμπων, ὁ καὶ τοῦ πνεύ-
cIon ματος τὴν χέριν ἐπισπώμενος. Ποῖον σημεῖ-
on τῷ Ἰωάννης ἐποίησεν, ὅτι πόλεις Τουαύτας
δ' ἀναρτήσατο; Ὅτι μάρ οὐδὲν ἐθαυματούργησεν,
ἀκούσαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίστου λέγωντος· ὅτι
Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐποίησε σημεῖον οὐδέν. Πάθεν
dὲ θαυμαστὸς Ἡλίας ἐγένετο; Οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς
παρρησίας τῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα; οὐκ ἀπὸ ὅπως
DS τοῦ γέλου τοῦ πρὸς τὸν θεόν; οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς
ἀκτημοσύνης; οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς μηλίστης καὶ
toῦ σπηλαίου καὶ τῶν ὄψεων; Ἡ γὰρ σημεῖα
484 C10 οὐ σημεῖον; add ὁ βαπτιστὴς καὶ τοιαῦ-
tas Field corr. eu: ταύτας la man. eu
πάντα μετὰ ταύτα ἔποιησε. Τὸν δὲ ἵωβ ποίον σημεῖον ὅρων ποιοῦντα ἑξεκλάρη ὁ διάβολος; Ἐπειταὶ μὲν οὐδὲν, βίον δὲ λάμποντα καὶ ὑπομονήν ἀδάμαντος στερρότερον ἐπίδεικνύουν μὲνον. Ποίον σημεῖον ὁ Δαυὶδ ἐποίησεν, ἔτι νέος ὡς ἐπείν τὸν θεόν· εὐρον Δαυὶδ Ἐ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ ἄνδρα πατὰ τὴν καρδιάν μου; ὁ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ποῖον νεκρὸν ἥρειραν; ποῖον λέπρον ἐκάθεραν; ὡς τὸ ὀφθαλμὸν τῆς καρδίας, ἐὰν μὴ νήσωμεν, καὶ διάπεσεν πολλάκις; Οὕτως οὖν

484.6 [pάντα μετὰ ταύτα ἐπ: παῖντα ταύτα ἐπαντά Field ὀφθαλμὸν τῆς καρδίας, ἐὰν μὴ νήσωμεν, καὶ διάπεσεν πολλάκις; Οὕτως οὖν

Field D9 στερρότερον: στερρότετον Field D10 τὸν θεόν αὐτοῖς ἐπειν θὰ E2 ὅμ. δὲ θὰ E3 ἐκάθεραν: ἐξαφερεῖσθαι θὰ E3 ὁ θεόν ὁ θὰ θὰ ὁ θὰ E4 ὁ θὰ θὰ θὰ E5 ὁ θὰ θὰ θὰ E
Ε5 πολλοί τῶν Κορινθίων ἀπεχέσθησαν ἀπ' ἀλήθειαν. οὕτω πολλοί τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀπενοθήσαν. οὕτω ξίμων ἐξεβληθη· οὕτως δὲ τῶν Χριστῶν τότε ἐπιθυμήσας ἀπολογείται 185Α ἀπεδοκιμάθητο, ἢπούς ὡς οἱ αἱ ἀλληκές ῥωσίους έχουσι· τούτων γὰρ ἑκατὸς, οἱ μὲν χρημάτων, ο ὡς δόξης ἐφίεμενος τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ονείων, ἐξέπιπτον καὶ ἀπώλειτο. Βίον δὲ Α5 ἐπιμείλεια καὶ Ἰρέτης ἐρως οὐ μόνον οὗ τίκτει τοιούτην ἐπιθυμίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτων ἀναρεῖ.
Καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὡτε ἐνομοθέτει τοῖς ἐαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς, τί ἔλεγε; ποιήσατε σημεῖα, ἵνα ἴδωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι; Οὐδὲν ὅλα τί; Λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθέν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα, καὶ δοξάσωσι τὸν πα-βέτα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ δὲ οὐκ εἶπεν, εἰρίθεις με, ποιεῖ τοῖς ἀλλὰ ποιμαίνει τὰ πρόβατά μου. Καὶ πάνταχον δὲ αὐτὸν προτιμῶν τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ Ἰωάννου καὶ Ἰωάννου, πόθεν, εἰπέ μοι, προετίμα; ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς-βέτα μείνων; Καὶ μὴ πάντες ὑμοὶ ἐκάθαροι τοὺς λεπτο-ρούς, καὶ τοὺς νεφρώδεις ἐχειροῦ. Καὶ πάντιν ὑμῶν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἐδώκες. Πόθεν οὖν ἐίχων τὸ πλέον 485 ἰδουν: εἰδὼν δὲ Α7 ὑμῶν πρὸς τὰ καλὰ ἐν Β6 ἐχειροῦ: ἐχειροῦ δὲ Β7 ὅ το πλέον αὐτὸ ἐίχον δὲ
οὕτω; Ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ ρυχὴν ἁρετῆς. Ὁρᾶς ὅτι πανταχοῦ βίου χρεία καὶ τῆς διὰ τῶν ἔργων εἰπεῖς; Ἀπὸ τῶν παρθένων ἥραν αὐτῶν, ἤρθεν, ἐπιμωσάθη αὐτοὺς. Τέ δὲ τὴν βυθὴν συνέστησεν σὺν τὴν ἑυτέραν; Ἀρα σημείων ἐπίδειξις ἡ πολιτείας ἁρίστης ἀκρίβειας; Εὐδῆλον ὅτι τὸ δεύτερον τὰ δὲ σημεῖα καὶ τὰς ἀριστικὰς ἐντευθεὶν ἔχει καὶ εἰς τοῦτο καταλήγει τὸ τέλος. ὁ τε γὰρ βίου ἁριστῶν ἐπίδεικνύομενος, ἐπιστάται ταύτην τὴν ἡρίνην. ὁ τε λαμβάνων τὴν

485 B8 ἀν: add. καὶ πίστεις εἰδικρινώσθησαι Β 9

νὰ προέλθῃ αὐτὸν Δ 1 ἐπίδειξις: ἐπίδειξις Δ 2

C 3 ἐντευθεὶς ἔχει καὶ εἰς τοῦτο καταλήγει τὸ τέλος εἰς. Ἐκ Λόγ. 688 ἐν: ἐντευθεὶς ἔχει τὸ τέλος καὶ εἰς τοῦτο καταλήγει Καλλικ. Η Ματ. τὸ τέλος om. Field
χάριν, διὰ τοῦτο λαμβάνει, ἵνα τὸν ἐτέρων αἰωρβώσης βίων. Ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς διὰ τοῦτο τὰ Θεοματα ἐκεῖνα ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡξιόπιστος ὁ ἴθεις ἐνεῶθεν, καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐλκύσας, ἵνα εἰς τὸν βίων εἰσαγάγῃ. Διὸ καὶ τὴν πλείονα ὑπὲρ τοῦτον ποιεῖται σοφίαν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῖς σημείοις ἢμεῖς τὸ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ γενναν ἀπείθει, καὶ βασιλεύειν ἐναργεῖται, καὶ τοὺς παραδόχους ἐκεῖνος τίθηται νόμον, καὶ πάντα ὑπὲρ τοῦτον πραγματεύεται, ἵνα ἐναργέλους ἐφάγηται. Καὶ τί λέγω, ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς ἡ πάντα τοῦτον ἐνεκεν.
ποιεῖ: "Εςι, γὰρ εἰς τὶς ἐσόμενος, εἰπὲ μοι, νεκρῶς ἀναγεννησάς ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ, ἡ δὲ δὲ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἀνακάθει, τί ἂν ἔδεξεν μάλιστα; Οὐκ εὔδησθον ὅτι τὸ δεύτερον; Καὶ μὴν τὸ μὲν εἰρημένον ἐστι, τὸ δὲ ἐρρέειν

485 ἰς τοι: οὐ δὲν τὸ νέκρους: νέκρων καὶ νεκρῶν ἦν ἡ θε.
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.'"

The Homily

What is the relationship between this parable and the one before it? There he speaks of those that have not devoted themselves to him
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 endures 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
² 1 Cor 16. 13
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,³ 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 ad-
vantage over them. And just as the leaven is hidden, yet is not obli-
terated 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 be-
cause 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 num-
ber 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."

---
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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 works? "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

7 Mt 5. 16  
8 Jn 21. 16  
9 Mt 7. 16
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. ἀνυπατούν could easily have been corrupted to οὐτω by a scribe who read the word with ὑσίν.

480E1. ἄνεισ ὅτα occurs perhaps because of a reminiscence of Mt 13.10, where the second person is used.

480E2. ἀρτομεῖα fits better with the reference to τοῦ διαβόλου in the following sentence and with the use of the singular (ὁ ἐξορός) in the parable. It may, however, have been inserted for precisely those reasons.
480E4. Παρείσαγεν is required if the sentence is not to become incoherent and grammatically inconsistent. It could easily have been changed to Παρείσαξε by a scribe who took this clause as coordinate with the first part of the sentence.

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

480E5. αὐτὴ seems preferable to αὐτῆς, given the word's position after ἐπίξειρππνύτα.

481A1. The reading found in Gualterbytanus 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 ἑαυτῶ is the proper reading. It is found in K and is supported by the occurrence of Τὰ ἑαυτῶ in Gu; Ποιημάτα ὁ πέρματα in Gu is probably a gloss.

481C1. ζυλαίμησ gives much the better sense.

481D4. ο💵 is omitted in both G and Gu and should be omitted; ἔφε 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. Ὁ ἄνθρωπος is well attested and gives much the better sense. The
demonstrative is needed here after the interruption in the train of thought
caused by the quotation from the Scriptural text.

481E4. τὸν Σατανᾶν might well be a gloss, but it is hard to see
why a scribe would insert ἅγιον ἐσχάτον ἄνθρωπον. Explicit reference
to Satan brings out the significance and the paradox of calling him ἔξωθεν
ἀνθρώπον: "He calls Satan himself a hostile man." The use of
ἀγιός ἐσχάτων 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 Guelferbytansus seems to be no more than an awkward expansion of the original text. The final Δώρος (sic) destroys whatever sense it had.

482B7. Και συνετήσεις βλάσφημοι is another example of Gu’s tendency to amplify the text. συνετήσεις is not a word appropriate to the violence which alone is directly forbidden in this passage.

482B10. παρὰ τοῦ δεσμότου is a misplaced gloss, which should precede θάντας αὐτοὺς if it comes anywhere. θάντας αὐτοὺς, given by Gu, is preferable to θάντας αὐτοὺς, which probably came in because of confusion with διδάσκαλος. The passage in brackets is an interpolation found only in Gu. Introduction of any further reasons for tolerating the damnel 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. ἡς διδασκαλία is an interpolation characteristic of this text whose editor was anxious to specify vague or general references. See 482C5, 06, 09, 01, 483B11, 483C3, 483D8, 483A7, and 484A12.

482C3-DL. 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, Anomans, 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 αἱρετικῶν ἐπισκοπῶν, 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.

482C10. \(\gamma\nu\kappa\omega\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon\) 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 \(\gamma\nu\kappa\omega\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon\).

482C11. \(\sigma\pi\alpha\omicron\nu\delta\alpha\varsigma\) ("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 \(\varepsilon\omicron\varsigma\)) is more likely to be corrupted than that in Gu, which seems to be a correction to harmonize with text of Matthew above.

482D7. Guelferbytanus here supports the correction of G and Field in reading \(\tau\omicron\nu\upsilon\) against G, H, and Monfaucon and supports Field in reading \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\).\(\kappa\rho\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\) should precede \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\) as in Field, since \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\) would more naturally be changed to \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\) after \(\kappa\rho\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\) than before it.

482D6. 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 ἢον in Field may have been inserted in an effort to make it clear that ἔνερευς was the subject of ἔσοντας rather than of Ἰδέων.

483H10. ἐνέκρυψεν is the form found Mt 13.33. The prefix is more likely to be omitted than inserted.

483H11. A gloss explicating the meaning of ἀυτῇ 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 καὶ ὀρα τὸν ἄνευς. The second part, εἰς πολλὴν προσωπίαν ἐνίαγων, belongs with the following sentence. The position of γὰρ 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 ἀυτῷ was originally ὁτῷ, 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 ὡς ἢ ᾧ ἄνευς οὐκ ἦν ἀνακούσας ἀπόκρις ἡ τῆς σκέψεως.
483D4. There is a second Christological interpolation in Guelferbytanus at this point. Like the previous one in 483D1, it occurs between the members of an extended comparison; it is probably from the same source as the interpolation in 481D and from a different source than the fussy corrections and simplifications found in 482C2-D1.

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

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

483D8. Field's reading, δη, 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, δυναμίν, is a case of dittoography.

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

484A4. ΠΟΣΙ is probably another bit of explanation that editor of Guelferbytanus has incorporated into the text.
48411. Field's reading (εἰ ἔν άνδρῳν οἰ ἰδεν) should be preferred to that of Guelferbytanus (οἶδε άνδρων οἱ ἰδεκ) 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, εννόησον, in Guelferbytanus, lacks a particle to connect it with the preceding independent clause, whereas in Field it is the apodosis of the condition. Third, εἰ ἔν was probably corrupted to οἶδε because of the proximity of άνδρων οἱ ἰδεκ and the scribe's failure to read the sentence through to the end. The οἱ preceding ἰδεκ was then inserted to regularize the position of ἰδεκ.

48482. The reading in Guelferbytanus seems to be an unsuccessful attempt to improve the reading given by Field's manuscripts. The sentence is involved and liable to corruption.

48483. The reading in Guelferbytanus 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.

48489. This sentence fits very well with the text, but manuscript authority for it is lacking.

48403. ἔν οὐν εἴρετι is more likely to be corrupted to τοῦτο οὕτως 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 Ἰωάννιος.

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

484D7. οὐκός is found with either τὸν or three terminations. οὐκότερόν (Gu) seems more liable to corruption than οὐκότερόν.

484E6. The scribe of Guelerbytanus apparently took τοῦ Χριστοῦ with ἐπιθυμήσας rather than with ἀπολογίας.

485A4. In view of the frequency of interpolations in Guelerbytanus, 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 Pélagianism.

485C3. Guelerbytanus here lends decisive support to Reg. 688 and gives
a reading from which the two other readings can easily be derived, ῶτὸ τέλος
being easily displaced or omitted because of its terminal position.

485C4. Τὴν has been added in the left margin of the manuscript in
a hand smaller than the original but of the same general type.

485C10. Πυρὸς is probably a gloss.

485D2. Ἰόυς τελείος probably began its career as a gloss on
Іούς τελείος, which the scribe may have felt it necessary to explain.
It then supplanted Іούς τελείος in the text.
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