

Philologica Byzantina

John Duffy

I

IN A PASSAGE of the *Chronographia* of Theophanes, relating how the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431) annulled the actions of the Eastern bishops who had excommunicated Cyril of Alexandria and Memnon of Ephesus in a counter synod, the editor de Boor noticed something amiss in the text and suggested that the word *πραχθέντα* had been lost.¹ This certainly was a good choice in the context, but, as it turns out, the precise term employed by Theophanes was *λαληθέντα* and it came at a place in the sentence other than that proposed by de Boor. For the original is preserved for us by an anonymous treatise on church councils which occasionally borrows pieces from the chronicle.² In this document (fol. 316^v) the corresponding passage is: *καὶ τοῦτο δὲ διωρίσατο ὥστε τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἀνατολικῶν ἀθέσμως καὶ ἀκανονίστως ἐφ' ὕβρει τῶν ἁγιωτάτων τῆς ἐκκλησίας προέδρων Κυρίλλου καὶ Μέμνονος λαληθέντα ἰσχύν τινα μηδ' ὄλως ἔχειν.*

It could be argued that *λαληθέντα* is the conjecture of a Byzantine confronted, like de Boor, with a faulty text, but its claim to originality is more or less guaranteed by the version of Anastasius the Librarian in the *Chronographia Tripertita*: *tuncque synodus diffinivit, quae ab Orientalibus in iniuriam sanctissimorum ecclesiae praesulum Cyrilli et Memnonis prolata sunt, utpote sine lege et sine canone deprompta, nullam vim prorsus habere.*³

¹ *Theophanis Chronographia* I (Leipzig 1883) 91.3–5.

² This work, as yet unpublished, is to be found in *Sinaiticus gr.* 482 (1117), 14th cent., and two other manuscripts. In the Sinai copy (which is quoted here) the treatise takes up folios 311^r–324^v and has the title: *Συναγωγή καὶ ἐκθεσις τῶν ἁγίων πασῶν συνόδων οἰκουμενικῶν τε καὶ τοπικῶν, ὅπου τε καὶ πότε καὶ διὰ τί καὶ καθ' οἷας αἰρέσεως ἐκάστη συνηθοίσθη, καὶ τί σὺν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι διωρίσατο, ἐπὶ ποίων τε βασιλέων καὶ ἁγίων συνεκροτήθη πατέρων, συνοπτικῶς σαφηνίζουσα.* The date of composition is not known; but it must have been in or before the thirteenth century, since one of the manuscripts, *Escorialensis X.II.10*, dates from that period.

³ Printed by de Boor (*supra* n.1) II 101.22–25.

II

During his account of Emperor Justin I's reign, the chronicler George Cedrenus has occasion to describe a Constantinopolitan synod of the year 519 which was concerned with the monophysite problem and the Council of Chalcedon: ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τούτου Ὁρμίσδας ἐπίσκοπος Ῥώμης καταλαβὼν τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν, ἅμα πλείστοις ἐπισκόποις, τοὺς ἀνθισταμένους τῇ συνόδῳ Χαλκηδόνας καθήρεν Σεβήρον τὸν Ἀντιοχείας καὶ Φιλόξενον, βεβαιώσαντες τὴν αὐτὴν σύνοδον, καὶ περὶ τῶν δύο φύσεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὰ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας προσθέντες ῥήματα, “ὁ στατήρ ὁ νοητός, τὸ νόμισμα τὸ βασιλικόν, ὁ ἐν ἐνότητι ἀπλοῦς χαρακτήρ Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ πάντων προσκεκόμικεν εἰς ἀπάντων ζωῆς ἀντίλυτρον.”⁴ The same council is also the subject of a short notice in the so-called *Synodicon Vetus*: Ὁρμίσδας οὖν αὖθις ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει θείαν καὶ ἱερὰν ἐξαπέστειλε σύνοδον, καὶ τὰ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι δογματισθέντα ἐκύρωσε καὶ τὰ περὶ τῶν δύο φύσεων τοῦ μακαρίου Κυρίλλου προεκθέμενος “τὸν νοητὸν στατήρα, τὸ βασιλικόν νόμισμα, ᾧ ἐνενόητο διπλοῦς χαρακτήρ ὁ Χριστὸς” διεσάφησε.⁵

These two pieces share enough similarities to warrant the assumption that they ultimately come from the same source. As transmitted, however, each has its peculiarities. We shall confine ourselves here to the versions of the text quoted from Cyril of Alexandria, in which a numismatic metaphor is employed to explain the dual nature of Christ. The quotation is from a lost commentary on the Gospel of St Matthew of which a handful of fragments survive.⁶

In the recent edition of the *Synodicon Vetus* it was suggested that the author of that work may be more accurate than Cedrenus, at least for part of the quotation.⁷ It would have been truer, however, to say that neither has the full original; for it has come to light in the meantime that there is a third witness, Ephraim the Patriarch of Antioch (527–545),⁸ as preserved in the *Bibliotheca*

⁴ Ed. I. Bekker, vol. I (Bonn 1838) 683.7–14.

⁵ Ed. J. Duffy and J. Parker (Dumbarton Oaks Texts V [1979]) ch. 119.1–5.

⁶ Mainly in the florilegium *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi*, ed. F. Diekamp (Münster 1907).

⁷ *Supra* n.5: 101 n.137.

⁸ Professor G. M. de Durand of Montreal graciously answered my request for information with a complete list of sources where the text of Cyril is cited. This note could not have been written without his help. Incidentally, Fr. de Durand advises that the editor of the

of Photius.⁹ Here is Ephraim's version: ὁ στατήρ τοιγαροῦν ὁ νοητός, τουτέστι τὸ νόμισμα τὸ βασιλικόν, ὁ ἐν ἐνότητι διπλοῦς χαρακτήρ, ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ πάντων ὡς παρὰ πάντων προσκεκόμικε τῆς ἡμετέρας ζωῆς ἀντίλυτρον.

Clearly, then, as the third phrase Cyril wrote neither ᾧ ἐνενόητο διπλοῦς χαρακτήρ (*Synodicon*) nor ὁ ἐν ἐνότητι ἀπλοῦς χαρακτήρ (Cedrenus), but ὁ ἐν ἐνότητι διπλοῦς χαρακτήρ. For Cedrenus' ἀπλοῦς creates a doctrinal difficulty and destroys the imagery of two stamps on the one coin; moreover, it is flatly contradicted by another fragment of the Matthew commentary where the coin simile is again used: οὐκοῦν ὁ στατήρ ὁ ἀληθινός τε καὶ νοητός καὶ ὡς ἐν τύπῳ τῷ ἐξ ὕλης δηλούμενος αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός, διπλοῦς χαρακτήρ.¹⁰ As for ᾧ ἐνενόητο in the *Synodicon*, its origin in a scribe's misreading is easy to imagine.

More difficult to determine, from the three witnesses, are the exact words of the whole quotation. The *Synodicon* is of little help, its version being at once modified and curtailed, and the decision between the other two is anything but clear-cut. The problem will not be finally solved here, but a few suggestions will be offered. On first consideration one might be inclined to put more trust in a sixth-century author saved by Photius than in a twelfth-century chronicler. Still, a careful examination of the fifty extracts from Cyril cited by Ephraim reveals that, while the quoting tends to be accurate, there are not infrequent instances of small variants and slight shortening, and several cases where words have been added. Ephraim, then, need not be regarded as impeccable. Χριστός appears in Cedrenus and the *Synodicon* and is supported by the other passage from Cyril's Matthew commentary; it is, therefore, probably genuine. Ephraim's παρὰ πάντων is a problem; it may be a misplaced corruption of ἀπάντων which in turn brought about the addition of τῆς ἡμετέρας in the interest of sense.

The text tentatively put forward here is based on a blend of judgement and instinct; at best it might be closer to Cyril than any of his users; at worst it may be ignored: ὁ στατήρ τοιγαροῦν ὁ νοητός, τὸ νόμισμα τὸ βασιλικόν, ὁ ἐν ἐνότητι διπλοῦς χαρακτήρ

Bonn edition of Cedrenus (or the chronicler himself) definitely errs in attributing to Cyril the sentences following ἀντίλυτρον, because they are really a kind of comment by the synod on the words of Cyril.

⁹ Ed. R. Henry, vol. IV (Paris 1965) Codices 228 and 229; Cyril is quoted at 262 b41–263 a2.

¹⁰ Cited by Ephraim in tandem with the piece we are considering, 262 b38–40.

Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ πάντων προσκεκόμικεν ὡς ἀπάντων ζωῆς ἀντίλυτρον.¹¹

III

The fundamental study of the manuscripts of Photius' *Bibliotheca* was carried out by Edgar Martini.¹² He succeeded in demonstrating that the two oldest witnesses, A and M,¹³ were independent of each other and were, between them, responsible for all other existing copies. He did not, however, enter into the question of the relative merits of the two. That was to be undertaken by Albert Severyns who, in preparing to edit the *Chrestomathia* of Proclus, made a detailed comparison of A and M on the basis of the originals of some of the works reviewed by the Patriarch.¹⁴ The conclusions reached by Severyns were that A is by far the more reliable copy, while M represents a version that frequently bears the marks of an erudite, but impetuous, correcting hand.

In producing the recently completed, monumental edition of the *Bibliotheca*, René Henry naturally followed the results of his teacher Severyns and his text is firmly based on *Marcianus gr. 450* (A).¹⁵ By and large Henry's policy of accepting the text of A, failing a compelling reason to do otherwise, is a sound one. Nevertheless, there are more than a few signs that he leaned too heavily on the principle and sometimes passed over at least one means of deciding between the two manuscripts. I refer to places where Photius quotes directly from authors whose works survive apart from the *Bibliotheca*. In Codex 229 discussed above, an impressive number of times the text of Cyril of Alexandria, or other

¹¹ Ephraim does not specify the book of the Matthew commentary to which this extract or its companion belong, noting simply that one follows the other *μεθ' ἕτερα*. The companion piece, however, is included in the *Doctrina Patrum* p. 31 Diekamp, where it is said to come from the third book, which must also, then, be the home of the other.

¹² *Textgeschichte der Bibliothek des Patriarchen Photios von Konstantinopel* (Leipzig 1911).

¹³ A, *Marcianus gr. 450* (10th cent.); M, *Marcianus gr. 451* (12th cent.).

¹⁴ *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus I* (Liège and Paris 1938).

¹⁵ Vol. I xliv, "La confiance dans le manuscrit A est légitime; c'est pourquoi j'ai suivi au maximum son texte et les corrections qui proviennent du copiste lui-même (A¹). Je n'ai suivi M que là où A présente un texte déficient."

writers cited, supports the reading of **M** against **A**. Here are three examples:¹⁶

(a) 261 b16 *παρθένου* **M**: *ἀγίας παρθένου* **A**. The reading of **M** is backed by the text of Cyril in the *Patrologia Graeca*¹⁷ and by the quotation in the *Doctrina Patrum* (p.20 Diekamp). That *ἀγίας* is a pious Byzantine addition is shown also by the same Cyrillic phrase at 262 b34.

(b) 261 b27 *θατέρου* **M**: *θατέρα* **A**. Here **M** is vindicated not only by the complete text of Gregory of Nyssa (*PG* 45.1216A), but also by an earlier occurrence of the citation where both manuscripts are in agreement (256 a22–24).

(c) 263 a40–41 *τηροῦντες* **M**: *τηροῦσιν* **A**. This is a strange case. Perhaps the only possible explanation is that the form in **M**, supported by the original,¹⁸ is a leftover from the time before the text was mangled, as it was in several places,¹⁹ while **A**'s version is a commonsense effort to mend the mess.

If it is not an accident that there are many samples of this type in one section (Codex 229), it would mean that the reader of the *Bibliotheca* will have to keep a sharper eye out for the good points of *Marcianus gr.* 451.

IV

The rhetoric teacher known as George Monos²⁰ is attested by one work, a set of notes from his lectures on part of the Hermoge-

¹⁶ The rest, I discover, have already been pointed out by G. Chr. Hansen, *Gnomon* 39 (1967) 689–94. To an objection that **M** may present a text corrected with the aid of the originals, the research of Severyns (*supra* n.14) 82 gives the answer that “. . . les variantes dans **M** ont pour origine une inspiration personnelle de celui qui les y a introduites: en d'autres termes, ces variantes sont des conjectures d'un savant lecteur de Photius, mais n'appartiennent pas à la tradition des auteurs résumés par celui-ci.”

¹⁷ Migne, *PG* 74.1005A. In this case, it should be admitted, the text in *PG* is a collection of fragments; still, the evidence is independent.

¹⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *Schol. inc.*, Migne, *PG* 75.1385c (Schwartz, *ACO* I.5 p.222.31–33); cf. *Doctrina Patrum* p.53 Diekamp.

¹⁹ Among other mishaps, *εἰς ἄνθρωπον* has fallen out before *ἰδικῶς*¹ (line 38); *δεῖ φρονεῖν* has replaced *εἶναι* (line 39); *φαμεν* is out of position (line 39f).

²⁰ The most recent account of George is in Herbert Hunger's *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* I (Munich 1978) 82. In the past he was sometimes called Georgius Diaereta, the name used by Leo Allatius in his *Diatriba de Georgiis*, reprinted in

nic corpus, the second half of *Περὶ στάσεων*, traditionally called *Διαίρεσις*.²¹ George taught at Alexandria, probably in the fifth century,²² but beyond that we are in the dark. His surname has long been a puzzle for the few scholars who have had anything to do with him; some have tried to tease from it the Greek word for monk, but this attempt has been rightly rejected.²³ The purpose of this note is to explain Monos as something quite different.

The title of George's lectures in the Paris manuscript is: *Σχόλια σὺν θεῶ εἰς τὴν διαίρεσιν ἀπὸ φωνῆς τοῦ αὐτοῦ γεωργίου τοῦ μόνου σοφιστοῦ ἀλεξανδρείας*.²⁴ All along *μόνος* has been understood as part of the teacher's name and accordingly, when printed, it has been given a capital letter.²⁵ Its real connection, however, is with *σοφιστοῦ*; in other words, George is being described as *ὁ μόνος σοφιστής*, and *μόνος* is a laudatory epithet meaning 'the one and only', in the sense of 'the great' or the like.

Such adjectives expressing respect or admiration for teachers are common in lecture notes of the fifth and sixth centuries. I cite some examples from the many available:

*Σχόλια σὺν θεῶ εἰς τὸν Γοργίαν ἀπὸ φωνῆς Ὀλυμπιοδώρου τοῦ μεγάλου φιλοσόφου;*²⁶ *ὁ δὲ ἦρωσ Ἀμμώνιος ὁ Πρόκλου μὲν γεγωνῶς ἀκροατῆς, ἐμοῦ δὲ Ἀσκληπίου διδάσκαλος;*²⁷ *ὁ τρισευδαίμων σοφιστῆς Γέσιος;*²⁸ *triseudemone maximus noster sofista;*²⁹

Fabricius-Harless, *Bibliotheca Graeca* 12 (Hamburg 1809) 21, and by C. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci* VI (Stuttgart and Tübingen 1834) 505.

²¹ George's fifty-four lectures have never been printed, aside from the single one published by L. Schilling in his dissertation *Quaestiones Rhetoricae Selectae* (Leipzig 1903), the most complete study of George and his surviving product. The whole work is extant in two manuscripts, the earlier of which is the parchment *Parisinus gr.* 2919 (10th cent.).

²² As plausibly argued by Schilling (*supra* n.21) 692–93.

²³ By H. Rabe, "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften," *RhM* 63 (1908) 517–18, against Walz (following Allatius).

²⁴ Fol. 1^r. The *τοῦ αὐτοῦ* almost certainly speaks for a time when the lectures on *Διαίρεσις* were preceded in the manuscript tradition by those on *Μέθοδος*, the first half of *Περὶ στάσεων*. George's commentary on *Μέθοδος* has vanished without trace, but is often recalled to the students attending the lessons on *Διαίρεσις*; e.g., *ὡσπερ καὶ ἐν τῇ Μεθόδῳ ἐλέγομεν* (13^v) and *τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτο πλατύτερον εἰρήκαμεν ἐν τῇ Μεθόδῳ* (25^r).

²⁵ Schilling, for example, writes *Γεωργίου τοῦ Μόνου, σοφιστοῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας* (*supra* n.21, 667).

²⁶ The title of Olympiodorus' lectures on the *Gorgias* of Plato, ed. L. G. Westerink (Leipzig 1970).

²⁷ Asclepius on the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle, *Comm. in Arist. Graeca* VI.2 92.29–30.

²⁸ Stephanus of Athens on the *Aphorisms* of Hippocrates, ed. F. R. Dietz, Vol. II (Königsberg 1834) 343 n.4.

²⁹ John of Alexandria on *Epidemics* VI of Hippocrates, ed. C. D. Pritchett (Leiden 1975)

Δομνῖνος ὁ πολυμαθῆς ὁ ἐμὸς διδάσκαλος.³⁰

Even *μόνος* used in this way is not unattested, if the evidence be trusted. For one of the fifth-century law teachers in Beirut is referred to in a scholion on the *Basilica* as follows: *οὕτως γὰρ καὶ Πατρίκιος ὁ μόνος διδάσκαλος ἐξηγήσατο τὴν παροῦσαν διάταξιν*.³¹ Because it did not immediately make sense, this *ὁ μόνος* has been judged to be a mistake for *ὁ ἐμὸς* or *ὁ κοινός*.³² But it is the reading of the manuscripts and should not be dislodged without a better argument.

Less secure, though worth considering, is the case of the medical teacher John of Alexandria, whose lectures on *Epidemics* VI of Hippocrates have come down to us complete only in a mediaeval Latin version.³³ One of the witnesses begins thus: *Incipiunt epidimie divi Ypocratis et commentaria Johannis Alexandrini solius medici et sophiste super epidimias easdem*.³⁴ The word *solius* here can scarcely be anything but the translation of *μόνου*. But is the title itself genuine? That cannot be shown conclusively; however, there may be good support for it in the fact that at the end of the commentary four of the six witnesses have *Expliciunt commenta . . . a voce Johannis Alexandrini magni medici et sophiste*. And while it is conceivable that the title might have been fabricated from the ending, it would be difficult, in the present instance, to accept that *solius* replaced *magni*.³⁵

146a 1. The editor presents *triseudemon* as a proper name, but this is an error set straight long ago by Valentin Rose, "Ion's Reisebilder und Ioannes Alexandrinus der Arzt," *Hermes* 5 (1871) 205–15.

³⁰ *Basilicorum Libri LX*, SER. B VII, ed. H. J. Scheltema and D. Holwerda (Groningen 1965) 2775.4–5.

³¹ *Supra* n.30: 2774.31–32.

³² By Heimbach and Zachariae von Lingenthal respectively; see P. Collinet, *Histoire de l'École de Droit de Beyrouth* (Paris 1925) 133 n.6. Scheltema and Holwerda accept the transmitted text.

³³ Pritchett (*supra* n.29). There are extant a considerable number of Greek fragments which I am preparing for publication; the title is not among them.

³⁴ This witness is the so-called *Articella*, a collection of medical treatises printed in Venice in 1483. Of the five codices preserving John's work, one leaves out the phrase *solius medici et sophiste* and the rest omit the titular opening altogether.

³⁵ It may be of interest to append that Galen was once praised by Marcus Aurelius as *τῶν μὲν ἰατρῶν πρῶτον εἶναι, τῶν δὲ φιλοσόφων μόνον*: so the doctor himself in *Περὶ τοῦ προγιγνώσκειν*, ed. V. Nutton, CMG V.8.1 (Berlin 1979) 128.28. But this, as a referee has observed, is a variation on the ancient formula *πρῶτος καὶ μόνος* (Aeschin. 3.77; M. N. Tod, CQ 43 [1949] 111–12).

The evidence accumulated should be enough to prove that the rhetoric teacher George has not deserved his solitary sobriquet. If he is to be distinguished from his namesakes, he might be called George of Alexandria.

DUMBARTON OAKS AND THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
July, 1980