

## INTRODUCTION

### The Codex

Codex 573 of the Metamorphosis cloister (the Μεγάλον Μετέωρον, the Great Meteora) is a little token of the fate of old treasures of all kinds over the centuries. More specifically, it betokens the conflict waged in Greece in 1882, over preservation of extant manuscripts, shortly after Greece had become an independent state, after the annexation of Thessaly, while Northern Greece was still under the rule of Ottoman Turks. One facet of this battle was the enterprise by the newly independent state to bring all manuscripts that had remained after centuries of looting together for preservation in the National Library in Athens. This story I will relate shortly. Another facet of this battle is the one between scholars striving to capture the glory of originality in recording and cataloguing manuscripts. This story I will not relate, since this is the same everywhere in the world of scholars.

In the seventeenth century, a Cypriot monk called Athanasius had bought manuscripts from Meteora by weight. During the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, monks used to sell manuscripts to visitors from Western Europe. However disturbing to later locals the phenomenon may have appeared, this was the cause for many texts being saved and respected. When the government sent two savants to collect manuscripts for the National Library in Athens (in the late nineteenth century), this resulted in a real war between the peasants (including wives and children) and the state military force. Locals saw the removal of manuscripts from Meteora to the National Library of Athens as either a sacrilege, or appropriation of treasures belonging to the convents. Earlier still, the two savants, escorted by the same soldiers and faced with the resistance of the monks objecting to the removal of all extant books from the country to the capital, had taken by force all the books that were not hidden, and packed them in cases. However, the peasants who fell upon the military convoy, proved victorious. As a result, the government decided to yield to the will of the regional people, and only nine boxes with about 350 manuscripts were taken to Athens to be lodged in the

National Library. This was virtually nothing, when one considers that the monastery of Metamorphosis alone has more than six hundred manuscripts. Before this, the only scholarly investigation of which we know is the visits to Meteora paid by the French archaeologist Léon Heuzey (1858) and the Russian archimandrite Porfirij Uspenski (1859), who studied the archives.

This is the background against which N. Bées visited the Meteora in 1908 and 1909 to examine the manuscripts that had been withheld there following this uproar. A thorough investigation of the archival and manuscript treasures was carried out by Bées, later (1924) a professor at the University of Athens. He unearthed, pieced together, and assessed a vast number of manuscripts, for which he deserves the gratitude of scholars. His report is a stunning account of the situation he was faced with during his detective work.<sup>1</sup> The books which were shown to him by the monks were only one-fifth of those which he eventually discovered himself. He searched under roofs and floors, he unearthed ancient hiding-places of which the existence was unknown even to the monks themselves. However distressed he was, Bées was not frustrated at the monks laughing at this oddball who had set out to do such an eccentric job. In his report, Bées describes graphically the conditions under which he worked, struggling to overcome the mockery (and sometimes wrath) of monks aiming to demoralize him. He describes how he strove ‘to decode certain comments and insinuations made by monks to each other, which intimated the existence of secret old hiding-places’. He also wrote of the ‘utter awe’ he felt at finally discovering a secret crypt above and next to a vault, at entering this and unearthing innumerable manuscripts, ‘almost all of them in parchment’. For a moment, he felt as if he were seeing, ‘under the light of a candle’, ‘hallucinations, apparitions, ghosts, and the like’, due to the fact that the place was completely dark, shrouded in ‘heavy dust’ and amidst all kinds ‘of insects attacking with stings, as well as various germs’.

<sup>1</sup> N. Bées read his report on 1 February 1910 to the members of the Greek Society for Byzantine Studies: ‘Ἐκθεσις παλαιογραφικῶν

καὶ τεχνικῶν ἐρευνῶν ἐν ταῖς μοναῖς τῶν Μετεώρων κατὰ τὰ ἔτη 1908 καὶ 1909 (Athens 1910).

Bées' investigations resulted in a number of significant publications, not only of archival and cataloguing, but also of scholarly interest, like the publications of the works of Hippolytus and the one with the Scholia. He reported that he discovered 1,124 manuscripts in all of the Meteora monasteries. Of these, more than half (610 items) were found in the Great Meteoron, which is the alternative name for the monastery of Metamorphosis. One wonders whether a catalogue has ever been compiled under such hard and adverse circumstances. Today it is not easy to access the manuscripts, which for this reason are hardly studied and largely unpublished. I myself was at last able to see this codex only after my efforts of nearly two years had failed.

The text of Revelation and the Scholia are part of a cursive manuscript included in Codex 573, conserved in the monastery of Metamorphosis,<sup>2</sup> in Meteora, Thessaly.<sup>3</sup> This Codex is an exquisite piece of art: the 'Book of monk Cassian' is made of fine leafs of parchment; the binding is wood-plates covered with leather, whereas the clip keeping the book closed is also a fine bronze buckle. There are 290 folia (dimensions: 0,12 x 0,185), which also contain other noteworthy material, such as Hippolytus' *On the Blessings of Jacob* (ascribed to Irenaeus in the title of this MS).<sup>4</sup> The text of Revelation occupies folia 210r to 245r. The Codex is considered to be a tenth-century manuscript, yet my own assessment is that this is an early ninth-century one.<sup>5</sup>

Casper René Gregory and Kurt Aland designated the Revelation manuscript of this codex as 2329 (Kurt & Barbara Aland: Date: AD 950, Category II) (Hoskier's n°: 200). The Revelation text consisting of the passages

accompanying the ensuing Scholia are manuscript 2351 (Kurt & Barbara Aland: Date: 950 AD, Category III) (Hoskier's n°: 201). These manuscripts of the Revelation (2329: complete; 2351: partial) are two of the 286 cursive ones containing the Revelation text.

With folio 245v the Scholia appear, and they extend up to folio 290r, which is the end of the Codex. Folio 290v is blank, which means that the text of the Scholia did not end for want of room. The Scholia comment on the text of Revelation up to 14:5.

In folio 245r the scribe (a monk called Theodosius) wrote a prayer asking God (through the prayers of John the Evangelist) for mercy and forgiveness for all the scribal mistakes he had possibly committed during carrying out the task of transcribing the manuscript. This is one of the infrequent cases where the name of a scribe has been made known to us. Of all the tenth-century manuscripts in that cloister, this is one of only two names of scribes for the tenth century, of which we know.

The note by the scribe reads thus:

ἐπληρώθη ἡ αποκάλυψις τοῦ ἀγίου ἰωάννου τοῦ θεολόγου· | στιχῶν ,α':- | Κ(ύρι)ε δια πρεσβειών τοῦ ἀγίου ἰωαννού τοῦ θεολόγου· εὐγχώρησον | πατέρας μου τὰς ἁμαρτίας· καὶ ἔαν | ἐξφαλον ἔντινι ρηματι ἢ λέξει | ἢ αντιστοιχω ἢ τόνῳ ἢ λογῳ | ἢ ἄλλο τι κατα αγνοιαν ἢ κ(αὶ) γνώση·- | Θεοδοσιος ἁμαρτωλος ὑπερ πάντ(ας) | Κ(ύρι)ε ἔλεησον και τα | πν(ευματ)ικα μου τεκνα· | φιλους κ(αὶ) αδελφους· | AMHN:-

The Apocalypse comprising a thousand verses is now complete. Forgive all my sins, O Lord, through the intercession of John the Theologian. [Also, forgive my sin] should I have erred on writing either a verb or a word

<sup>2</sup> This was catalogued by N. Bées, in 1908, following earlier scholars who explored the treasures of the Meteora cloisters. These were Léon Heuzey (1858), the Russian archimandrite Porfirij Uspenski (1859), see Lambros (1894), J. Bogiadjes (c. 1900). For relevant publications, see Donald M. Nicol, *Meteora: The Rock Monasteries of Thessaly* (London 1963) pp. 191–99, with extensive bibliography.

<sup>3</sup> The *Catalogue of the Meteora Manuscripts* was published posthumously by the Centre for the Study of Medieval and Modern Hellenism at the Academy of Athens: *Tὰ Χειρόγραφα τῶν Μετεώρων, Κατάλογος περιγραφικὸς τῶν χειρογράφων κωδίκων τῶν ἀποκευμένων εἰς τὰς Μονὰς τῶν Μετεώρων ἐκ τῶν καταλοίπων τοῦ Νίκου Α. Βέη* (*The Manuscripts of Meteora: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts Conserved in the Monasteries of Meteora, Published from the Extant Work of Nikos A. Veis*), Ακαδημία Αθηνῶν, Κέντρον Ερεύνης τοῦ Μεσαιωνικοῦ καὶ Νέου Ελληνισμοῦ, Athens, 1998, Τόμος Α', Τὰ Χειρόγραφα τῆς Μονῆς Μεταμορφώσεως. Volume 1 of the catalogues published by

the Academy of Athens, pp. 598–601 and 681. See also, N. Bees, 'Die Kollation der Apokalypse Johannis mit dem Kodex 573 des Meteoronklosters', *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 13 (1912), 260–265, with plates.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. C. Diobouiotis–N. Weis, *Hippolyts Schrift über die Segnungen Jakobs*. C. Diobouiotis, *Hippolytus Danielcommentar in Handschrift No 573 des Meteoronklosters*. TU 38, 1 (Leipzig, 1911). The author wavers in the orthography of his name; whether Bees or Wies, he is the same person.

<sup>5</sup> The texts of this Codex, which are written by Cassian (folia 1r–118v, 209r–v) are published in the edition, P. Tzamalikos, *A Newly Discovered Greek Father, Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by 'John Cassian' of Marseilles, A Critical Edition from an Ancient Manuscript with Commentary and an English Translation* (Leiden 2012). The identity of the author is established in the monograph, P. Tzamalikos, *The Real Cassian Revisited, Monastic Life, Greek Paideia, and Origenism in the Sixth Century, A Critical Study of an Ancient Manuscript* (Leiden, 2012).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-02694-0 - An Ancient Commentary on the Book of Revelation: A Critical Edition of the Scholia in Apocalypsin

P. Tzamalikos

Excerpt

[More information](#)

or a corresponding letter or an accent or quotation, or anything of the like, out of ignorance, or not ignorance. Theodosius, the worst sinner of all [sinners]. O Lord, have mercy also on my spiritual children, on my friends, and on my brothers. Amen.

The prayer comprises sixty words. Of them only twenty-five are grammatically correct; thirty-five words have mistakes of the kind designated by the scribe himself (grammatical, accents, verbs, etc.). There are some abbreviated forms of sacred names (I count none of them as a mistake), according to the habit of iconographers writing on icons the name of either Christ or Mary with two letters (the first and the last; yet although κε for κ(ύρι)ε and κ for καὶ are normal, πνίκα for πνευματικὰ is not, although πνύμα for πνεῦμα could be a normal abbreviation). Anyway, this portion is a fatal seal showing how poorly Theodosius was educated. His elementary knowledge extends only to writing and reading, his Greek is by and large restricted to the language of liturgical books.

The codex is written by different hands and the handwriting varies. H. C. Hoskier believed that two different persons had written 2329 and 2351, and that Theodosius was only one of them and wrote 2329, as he himself tells us. The fact is, however, that Theodosius wrote both Revelation-texts, namely, 2329 and 2351. Of the latter, he wrote up to Scholion V, to be replaced by someone else, yet his handwriting reappears later.

The dimensions of the written part of each folio are normally 0,12 × 0,185. Each face of a folio has 21 verses. Capital letters are elegantly designed in both parts (that is, in the text of Revelation and certain Scholia). In folio 1r of the Codex there is a coloured decorative colophon, partially corrupt. There are also some capital letters artistically drawn in brown ink. A later reader (perhaps of the seventeenth century) made some corrections in the margins, obviously because he was unable to stand

some egregious misspellings. In 2351, the text of Revelation is divided into sections, each of which is followed by a Scholion. Following the point where a new scribe took over from Theodosius, he started each Scholion with 'Επ', which stands for Ερμηνεία. I have included all these indications in the edited text.

H. C. Hoskier was enthusiastic about this manuscript, which he hailed as one of a 'new type'. He believed that 'Theodosius did his best with the transcription of Apoc. 200 from a very ancient text'.<sup>6</sup> 'We can confidently say that one document directly underlies Apoc. 200 coeval with our oldest uncial witness.'<sup>7</sup> This means that Hoskier believed that Theodosius had copied from an exemplar as old as the oldest uncials of which we know. Actually, he went so far as to assert that 'in the whole range of our documents, there is none more important'.<sup>8</sup> J. Schmid made only a brief statement about this manuscript, which he cited regularly. What he believed of minuscules 2329, 1854, and 1611, which he (*viz.* Hoskier) regarded as witnesses to an ancient text, was that they 'stand beside or indeed before the standard ecclesiastical text, are similar to each other precisely at the points where they deviate from K'.<sup>9</sup>

As regards the text of Revelation in this codex (MS 2351), there is little to emend. I have only corrected egregious errors of spelling and added some commas where necessary. No more than this was called for, since the Greek language immediately evinces that the Greek scriptural text has been at points emended by an exceptionally erudite person, who wished to have as correct a Greek text as possible.

There are 303 manuscripts which contain the Book of Revelation (of these, 286 are cursive ones, as already noted). Some of these manuscripts contain only this scriptural book, others record more of the New Testament alongside Revelation.<sup>10</sup> It was Joseph Schmid who drew attention to a distinctive feature of this biblical

<sup>6</sup> As already noted, Apoc. 200 is the designation 2329 according to Hoskier.

<sup>7</sup> H. C. Hoskier, 'Manuscripts of the Apocalypse – Recent Investigations. I', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 7 (1922–23), 120–137 and 2 plates. This was revised in his *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse. Collations of all Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephens's Third Edition, together with the Testimony of Versions, Commentaries and Fathers*. 2 vols. (London, 1929), vol. 1, pp. 637–652. Vol. 2 contains the collations (p. 641).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* vol. 1, p. 636.

<sup>9</sup> J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes* (Münchener Theologische Studien), 1. Teil, *Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia* 2 vols. (Munich, 1956); 2. Teil, *Die alten Stämme* (Munich, 1955), pp. 9: 'Die Minuskein 2329, 1854 und 1611, die er als Zeugen eines alten, neben oder vielmehr vor dem "kirklichen Standardtext" stehenden Textes nennt, sind gerade dort, wo sie von K abweichen, mit P47 S und AC verwandt.'

<sup>10</sup> J. K. Elliott gives an account of the proportions: 'The distinctiveness of the Greek manuscripts of the Book of Revelation', *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS 48 (1997) 116–124.

book, namely that it is frequently complemented by commentary alongside the text. This pattern evidently results from the fact that authors or scribes felt that Revelation needed to be sanctified as a divinely inspired text. Comments could have been added at any later time, which means that quite often the decision to expand a codex by adding the text of Revelation was an afterthought.<sup>11</sup>

To further my discussion I have to avail myself of the work of an important New Testament scholar, namely J. Schmid, and his contributions to the study of the Greek text of Revelation. Studying the commentary on the Apocalypse by Andreas of Caesarea, Schmid came to establishing a new type of text, the *Av* text (*apud Ανδρέας*) alongside the other existing ones, which counts eighty-three witnesses, including three uncials.<sup>12</sup> He argued that all germane manuscripts go back to one archetype, which is posited to be the original of Andreas' commentary. However, the scriptural text which Andreas of Caesarea used is *older* than his commentary. Nevertheless, the Andreas-type is defined pretty solidly and, relying on Schmid, we can accept that this text was used in Andreas' commentary and in the manuscripts that depend on it. It was definitely not Andreas who had constructed or edited the text that he himself used. This had just reached him, and he used it with confidence. The text can already be found in the corrector **N<sup>a</sup>** to **N** (**S<sup>a</sup>**, according to Schmid's notation) of the fourth century. In addition, Andreas himself appears wary, and perhaps anxious, to keep with observing an already existing text rather than constructing one of his own. He therefore relied on an already existing text, and had no reason to create a new version of the Apocalypse. No doubt he was aware of the editor and clearly respected both him and the text he had produced.

His reference to the 'doctors of the Church' surely

includes Theodoret and Cassian, as the following evidence shows. Andreas refers to the 'doctors of the Church' (κατὰ τὸν διδασκάλον τῆς Ἐκκλησίας).<sup>13</sup> A closer exploration of the issues he deals with reveals that he has in mind Cassian, though he refrained from naming him.<sup>14</sup> Cassian had suffered the fate of all those who were immensely erudite yet suspected of heresy. The vast bulk of his writings went on to be ascribed to Christian celebrities of the past.

Andreas' only dissent was that he did not approve of much intervention in the simple and peculiar language of Revelation, even if such intervention was called for by a real need to correct its language.

διαμαρτύρεται ἡμῖν τοῖς ἀκούουσι, μήτε προσθεῖναι τι μήτε ἀφελεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὰ γραφικὰ ἰδιώματα τῶν Αἰτιῶν συντάξεων καὶ τῶν διαλεκτικῶν συλλογισμῶν ἥγεισθαι ἀξιοπιστότερα καὶ σεμνότερα, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν ἐκείνοις πολλά τις εὑρίσκων μὴ κανονιζόμενα ἐπὶ τὸ ἀξιόπιστον τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ποιητῶν καὶ συγγραφέων παραπέμπεται.<sup>15</sup>

'The expressions peculiar to scripture' (τὰ γραφικὰ ἰδιώματα) are therefore deemed more 'trustworthy'. In order to explain a passage, one should refer to another point of scripture, not embark on dialectical syllogisms about concepts, or on grammatical technicalities. More specifically, the book of Daniel is one of those which might serve to explain certain themes and images of Revelation.

Andreas' criticism of those who are fascinated by Attic structures of speech and syllogisms and regard them as 'more noble' than the scriptural language, leaves no doubt that he is hinting at Cassian. For one thing, it is natural for Andreas to have in mind someone who had already dealt with the text of Revelation. For another, expressions such as 'dialectical syllogism' (which means 'an argument' as well as the way for con-

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. p. 118.

<sup>12</sup> In broad terms, there are four main text-types in Revelation: (1) A C Oecumenius 2057 2062 2344. (2) **N<sup>a</sup>** Andreas of Caesarea. (3) Koine. (4) *P<sup>47</sup> N\**. All of these differ from the text-types identified for the rest of the New Testament. According to Schmid, all these types can be traced back to at least the fourth century.

<sup>13</sup> Andreas of Caesarea, PG.106.269.58 (those who entertained typological interpretation); PG.106.292.30 (ώς καὶ τισὶ τῶν διδασκάλων ἔδοξε, meaning those who identify the 'divine wrath with the devil', among whom are Origen, Theodoret, and Cassian in Scholion XXX).

<sup>14</sup> Andreas of Caesarea, PG.106.312.26–27: πολλοὶ τῶν διδασκάλων

ἐνόησαν. Among these doctors Theodoret is included, along with Hippolytus, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom. Michael Glycas says that 'this is the explanation by those who interpreted' Revelation – but who are they? Cf. Andreas of Caesarea, PG.106: 340; 393/6; 408 (καὶ τινα τῶν διδασκάλων εἰπεῖν εὑρίσκεσθαι ἐνίοις ζῶντας μετὰ τὴν Ἀντιχρίστου καθαίρεσιν). This 'doctor' is Oecumenius, who claims that Elias and Enoch will be present at the critical time. Cf. Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, p. 128. Theodoret, *intDan*, PG.81.1541.13f: στεφανώσει τοὺς ἄσυλον τῆς ὑπομονῆς τὸ κτῆμα φυλάξαντας. *Epistulae* 96–147: ἀντιχρίστου τὸν ὅλεθρον προθεσπίζουν.

<sup>15</sup> Andreas of Caesarea, PG.106.452.39–42.

structing one)<sup>16</sup> is simply an alternative to saying ‘Aristotelian scholars’. For Cassian was an erudite Aristotelian scholar indeed. By the same token, Andreas’ derision of the ‘Attic’ structures, once again points to Cassian, who used some extremely unusual Attic variations of terms, such as ἐφίσης.<sup>17</sup>

Therefore, this reference by Andreas may well point to Cassian and probably to the Antiochene mindset as a whole, where Aristotelian studies had flourished, first at Edessa, then at Nisibis. This remark could have included Theodoret, too. For although he was not one of those who had commented on Revelation, he had done so on the Book of Daniel, of which the imagery, vocabulary, and style stand very close to the ones of Revelation. As a matter of fact, since the text of Revelation owes obvious debts to the Book of Daniel, and Theodoret had commented on the Book of Daniel, he was evidently qualified to render a proper text of the Apocalypse.

It can then be surmised that Andreas had in front of him a certain text, from which he quoted the Apocalypse passage after passage, which presumably was a text of the fifth century originating in Theodoret’s lifetime and was used by Cassian too. Whereas Cassian’s text of Revelation opts for strict correctness of grammar, Andreas seems to be less rigid, allowing the scriptural text to develop its own style. As we have just seen, the only independent witness to this text is Κ<sup>a</sup> of the fourth century. Hence the *Av* text can be inferred to comprise two witnesses: Κ<sup>a</sup> and the codex which Andreas used.

There are also further significant conclusions to be drawn from Schmid’s remarkable work, notably his considerations of certain textual types. First, there is a group of witnesses which seems to be associated with Egypt, due to Origen and the Coptic version: this is *P*<sup>47</sup>, Κ, Origen, the Coptic versions, and a few minuscules.

Next, there are A, C, and Oecumenius supported by some minuscules, such as 2344. Here A appears to stand out. G. D. Kilpatrick wondered how it is possible for so good a text to have survived, when Origen two hundred years earlier had an inferior one. He subsequently makes a very significant remark: in the Gospels, A has the Antiochene text, whereas in the Epistles and Acts this is an Alexandrian one.<sup>18</sup> In his view, those two traditions would have converged in Constantinople in order to produce such a fine text. I myself believe, however, that A must have been written under the supervision of Theodoret improving on Origen’s text, along with additional witness to the Apocalyptic one. In order to sustain his point, Kilpatrick felt that he should show how a person of Constantinople could have obtained his text. But he bases his argument on the erroneous presumption that Oecumenius was from Thessaly, which is not the case. In fact he was from Asia Minor.<sup>19</sup> Neither does it seem plausible ‘that A was corrected from an earlier and uncorrected manuscript brought from Asia’.<sup>20</sup> The case is rather that a *corrected* text was brought from Asia Minor on the basis of which a new one was edited. My own conjecture is, therefore, that this corrected text originates in the exertions of Cassian. This squares with Kilpatrick’s hypothesis that a person from Constantinople played a role in this respect. This person is, I believe, Cassian himself, who spent years in Constantinople and who, I have argued, should be identified with Pseudo-Caesarius.<sup>21</sup>

If Andreas made some corrections of his own deviating from Cassian, he probably produced an inferior rather than superior text. He was suspicious of Cassian’s Greek erudition and was prone to believe that this Sabaite intellectual had introduced some corrections which resulted in the text being close to ‘Attic syntax’, which Andreas rejected as a method. On

<sup>16</sup> Cf. διαλεκτικός συλλογισμός and the meaning of it in Aristotle, *Analytica Priora et Posteriora*, 24a25; 46a9; 68b10; 81b19; *Metaphysica*, 1078b25; *Ars Rhetorica*, 1355a9; 1355b16; 1356b1; 1358a4 f.; 1395b25; 1396b24; 1402a5; *Sophistici Elenchi*, 170a39; 171b7; 171b9; 172a18; *Topica*, 100a22–30; 157a19; 158a14; 161a36; 162a16 f. The concept was received respectfully by Aristotelian commentators, such as Alexander of Aphrodisias, Ammonius of Alexandria, Syrianus, John Philoponus, Elias of Alexandria. The Christian author who disputed the authority of ‘dialectical syllogism’ as a means to reach truth was Clement of Alexandria. To him, this procures only a relative ‘human impression’, whereas ‘the supreme proof’ which is ‘scientific’ comes from scripture alone. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 2.11.49.2–4: ἡ δὲ δοξαστικὴ ἀπόδειξις

ἀνθρωπική τέ ἔστι καὶ πρὸς τῶν ῥητορικῶν γινομένη ἐπιχειρημάτων ἡ καὶ διαλεκτικῶν συλλογισμῶν. ἡ γάρ ἀνωτάτω ἀπόδειξις, ἣν ἡνιξάμεθα ἐπιστημονικήν, πίστιν ἐντίθησι διὰ τῆς τῶν γραψῶν παραθέσεώς τε καὶ διοίξεως ταῖς τῶν μανθάνειν ὀρεγομένων ψυχαῖς, ἥτις ἂν εἴη γνῶστις.

<sup>17</sup> I canvass this in *RCR*, pp. 271–72; *NDGF*, pp. 100; 160; 161.

<sup>18</sup> G. D. Kilpatrick, ‘Professor J. Schmid on the Greek text of the Apocalypse’, *Vigiliae Christianae*, 130 (1959), 1–13 (pp. 3–4).

<sup>19</sup> I hope this will be shown in a forthcoming work of mine on Oecumenius, Andreas, of Caesarea, and Arethas, canvassed in relation to the Scholia.

<sup>20</sup> Kilpatrick (n. 18 above)

<sup>21</sup> See *NDGF*, Appendix I.

this account, this is probably the sole point on which I could espouse a view of Harnack's, namely, his statement about the present text of the Apocalypse. 'Though it may not prove to be a rival of C, perhaps even not of A, it is at all events on a par with K and P, while it is certainly superior to the text of 046 and Andreas.'<sup>22</sup> Although I am hardly qualified to make such statements on my own, it seems to me that the facts make this statement plausible in view of the rest of my results.

I myself have been interested mainly in manuscripts used by the commentators on Revelation. In the critical apparatus, I have pointed out all the differences between 2329 and 2351, taking into account the specific points in the rest of the commentators, namely, Oecumenius, Andreas, Arethas, in juxtaposition to the modern reconstruction by Nestle–Aland. I take into account the text of Andreas as edited by both Schmid and Migne, and the text of Oecumenius as edited by both Marc de Groote and Migne.<sup>23</sup> It turns out that K stands very close to 2351, and it is my assumption that the latter was the source for the former.

R. H. Charles made a convincing point showing that the 2351-text of Revelation is simply different from that which Origen used.<sup>24</sup> It is clear that 2351 comes from the region of Syria and was the exemplar of K. 2329 is close mainly to A, and in the second place to K and A. This allows for the surmise that this might well be the text of Didymus. By contrast, 2329 is mostly dependent on A and K. Points showing 2329 and 2351 concurring in rare readings evince that Cassian consulted 2329, yet by and large he preferred his own text. When 2329 concurs with K, it normally does so with 2351, too.

There are points at which K differs from 2351: at these points, however, the latter concurs with Syriac versions, especially the *versio Heraclensis*. Heavy coincidence of uncommon points between 2351 and the *versio Harclensis* shows the latter to be the source of the

former. Hence I have focused mainly on points of 2329 that differ from 2351. It then turns out that 2351 has expressions that occur in a very limited number of manuscripts, the normal case being either Syriac or K codices: the former are the source, the latter (*viz.* 2351) is the result.

On the other hand, the reader can see for himself from the critical apparatus of Nestle–Aland that Arethas used mainly K, which in turn bears on 2351. All the emendations brought about to the text of Revelation by Cassian moved in one direction, namely to improve on the Greek. This is the tendency to which Andreas reacted, as already noted, remarking that the 'expressions peculiar to scripture' (γραφικὰ ἴδιωματα) are superior to 'Attic syntax and dialectical syllogisms' (τῶν Ἀττικῶν συντάξεων καὶ τῶν διαλεκτικῶν συλλογισμῶν).<sup>25</sup>

Only a very erudite person such as Didymus could have used the term βιβλάριον ('little book'), which appears in Rev. 10:10 of the text of 2329. As far as I know, the sole attestation of the term is in Diogenes Laertius,<sup>26</sup> relating the life of Antisthenes (445–360 BC), the founder of the Cynic school.

Furthermore, the genitive and dative case-forms of μάχαιρα (μαχαίρης, μαχαίρῃ respectively) in this text of Revelation (namely, 5351: Rev. 13:10 and 14) reveal specific authors behind this version of the text. Although these forms occur in both the Septuagint,<sup>27</sup> and the New Testament,<sup>28</sup> they are actually Homeric forms. In respect to the text of Revelation, the forms μαχαίρῃ, μαχαίρης,<sup>29</sup> occur in 2351, whereas 2329 (included in the present Codex, like 2351), Oecumenius, Andreas, and Arethas, have it μαχαίρας and μαχαίρᾳ.

Only specific Christian authors made use of the archaic forms μαχαίρῃ, μαχαίρης. These authors are Hippolytus, Didymus, Theodoret, Pseudo-Macarius, and the present edition which Cassian quoted, namely,

<sup>22</sup> K. Diobouniotis and A. Harnack, *Der Scholien-Kommentar des Origenes zur Apokalypse Johannis nebst einem Stück aus Ireneus, Lib. V, Graece*, TU, 38,3 (Leipzig, 1911), p. 81.

<sup>23</sup> Different renderings of Oecumenius by either Migne or M. de Groote are indicated as O.(M) and O.(G). Andreas' text by either Migne or Schmid is indicated as An.(M) and An.(S) respectively.

<sup>24</sup> R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1920), vol. 1, pp. clxxvi-clxxvii.

<sup>25</sup> Andreas of Caesarea (n. 9 above) (Schmid), Logos 24, chapter 72, section 22, 18–19.

<sup>26</sup> Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 6.3: πρός τε τὸ Ποντικὸν μειράκιον μέλλον φοιτᾶν αὐτῷ καὶ πυθόμενον τίνων αὐτῷ δεῖ, φησί, 'βιβλάριον καίνοῦ καὶ γραφείου καίνοῦ καὶ πινακιδίου καίνοῦ,' τὸν νοῦν παρεμφαίνων.

<sup>27</sup> Gen. 27:40; Ex. 15:9; Num. 21:24; 2 Reg. (*Samuelis ii in textu Masoretico*), 15:14.

<sup>28</sup> Matt. 26:52; Luke, 21:24; 22:49; Acts, 12:2; Heb. 11:34 and 37; Rev. 13:10 and 14.

<sup>29</sup> Rev. 13:10 and 14. Scholion XXXVIII, notes 61, 63 to the text of Revelation.

2351. Of them, Didymus quotes Rev. 13:10, yet he evidently uses another version of the text.<sup>30</sup> Hippolytus and Theodoret apply the dative μαχαίρη quoting an old Pythagorean maxim: Πῦρ μαχαίρῃ μὴ σκάλευε, which warns not to irritate an already angry person by further argument.<sup>31</sup> What is impressive about Theodoret is that he quotes the archaic form μαχαίρῃ, even though a series of writers, who provided him with the core of his erudition, had rendered this μαχαίρᾳ (so did Aristotle, Plutarch, Galen, Lucian of Samosata, Athenaeus, Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry). Hippolytus, Iamblichus, Theodoret, Cassian, and John Philoponus are the only authors to have rendered the maxim in its original Pythagorean language. I hardly need to note that this adherence to accuracy is one more token of the erudition of these authors. Therefore, the text of Revelation which Cassian uses is probably the one which Theodoret had handed down to posterity, into which he had presumably introduced his own emendations. It is characteristic that the rest of the commentators on Revelation, namely Oecumenius, Andreas, and Arethas, apply the word μαχαίρᾳ.

The specific text of Revelation stands out in respect to its correct Greek. This was probably the reason why Andreas declared that ‘the Scriptural language is superior to any Attic language’. My surmise is that Andreas had in mind Theodoret (probably alongside Cassian), whom he implicitly rebuffs for his emendations to the scriptural text. The fact that the form τῆς μαχαίρης appears in the Pseudo-Macarian corpus,<sup>32</sup> suggests that this version of the New Testament (or of Revelation, at least) was circulating at the monastery of the Akoiometoi in Constantinople, which was used both by the author of this corpus and Cassian himself.

It seems therefore that Cassian copied from Didymus’ commentary, while at the same time he used a Greek scriptural text of his own from a manuscript of Syriac provenance. In this scriptural text several points were emended with the purpose of producing a ‘more

correct’ Greek text, as it were. Whether the person who produced this version of the Greek scriptural text was Cassian himself, or this had reached him as a legacy from Theodoret or some other erudite Antiochene, is not easy to determine. I can only set forth my foregoing hypothesis, that this person was Theodoret, and his work served to produce some Syriac versions. In any case, there is a continuous line of the text from the Syriac version (*versio Heraclensis*)<sup>33</sup> to Antioch, where the 2351-version was produced to yield the K manuscripts.

The scribe of both 2329 and 2351 is the same person, namely Theodosius (up to Scholion V, yet evidently he took over again at a later point). This is why the same scribal errors occur in both 2329 and the text of the Scholia.

### The texts of the Book of Cassian

The colophon of this parchment codex which comprises 290 folios, advises that this is ‘The Book of Monk Cassian’ (not ‘the Roman’) (Κασσιανοῦ μοναχοῦ βιβλίον), which seems to designate the owner of this volume as a whole. Folios 1r–118v contain texts ascribed to Cassian himself, who on folio 1r, immediately below the colophon, has the heading ‘By monk Cassian the Roman’ (Κασσιανοῦ μοναχοῦ Ρωμαίου). His texts are the following:

1. By monk Cassian the Roman, To Bishop Castor, On the Rules and Regulations of the Coenobia in the East and Egypt (Κασσιανοῦ μοναχοῦ Ρωμαίου, Πρὸς Κάστορα ἐπίσκοπον περὶ διατυπώσεως καὶ κανόνων τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀνατολὴν καὶ Αἴγυπτον κοινοβίων, folios 1r–22r).
2. By monk Cassian, On the eight considerations [of evil] (Κασσιανοῦ μοναχοῦ περὶ τῶν ἦ λογισμῶν, folios 22v–56r).
3. By the same [monk Cassian], To abbot Leontius On the Holy Fathers at Scetis (Τοῦ αὐτοῦ Κασσιανοῦ, πρὸς Λεόντιον ἡγούμενον περὶ

<sup>30</sup> Didymus, *In Psalmos* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 85: πάντες οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν μαχαίρῃ ἀπολοῦνται. He makes the same quotation in *In Psalmos* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 247. In *In Zachariam*, 3.127, he quotes Exodus 15:9: ἀνελῶ τῇ μαχαίρῃ μου.

<sup>31</sup> Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* 6.27.3–4. Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, 8.1. Hippolytus nevertheless uses the word as one of his own (*op. cit.*, 9.30.8), and so does Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones*, Homily 7.3.

<sup>32</sup> Pseudo-Macarius, *Sermones*, Homily 7.3.

<sup>33</sup> In the year 508 the Monophysite bishop Philoxenus of Mabbug on

the Euphrates requested his suffragan bishop Polycarp to make ‘a translation’ (or edition) of the New Testament into Syriac. This recension is preserved in a later version made by Thomas of Heraclea in 616. This is the *versio Heraclensis*, and the standard name for that manuscript is *Codex Heraclensis*. It should be noticed that the production of Polycarp’s version of the New Testament was made when Cassian the Sabaite was a senior pupil of St Sabas, and was about to begin his scholarly production, perhaps had already begun composing some of his works.

τῶν κατὰ τὴν Σκῆπτριν ἀγίων πατέρων, folios 56v–80r).

4. First contribution by abba Serenus (*Συνεισφορὰ τοῦ ἀββᾶ Σερήνου πρώτη*, folios 80r–100v).

5. Contribution by Abba Serenus on the panaretus [wisdom] (*Συνεισφορὰ τοῦ ἀββᾶ Σερήνου περὶ τῆς παναρέτου*, folios 101r–118v).

In folios 210r–245r, there is a full text of the Revelation of John, which is followed by the *Scholia in Apocalypsin* (folios 245v–290r), for which there is no heading indicating either authorship or content. These Scholia were attributed to Origen by Adolf Harnack<sup>34</sup> in 1911, following the discovery of this Meteora-codex in 1908. This text is now published and its author has been identified as none other than Cassian himself, who cherished them in ‘his book’, that is, his personal companion.

The rest of the codex contains the ‘Blessings of Jacob by Irenaeus of Lugdunum’ (119r–200v) (in fact by Hippolytus), most of which deal with apocalyptic vision seen by Daniel. Also, texts by Hippolytus ‘on the captivity of King Johakim and the sons of Judah and of Jerusalem’ (156r), and ‘On the sundry visions by Daniel,’ (160r–200v). Also a text by Cyril of Alexandria ‘Exegesis on Melchisedek’ (201r–204v), followed by an interesting passage from the *Chronicon* by Hippolytus of Thebes (205r–207r).

The ensuing two folios (207v–208r) contain two texts ascribed to an obscure figure called ‘James the newly baptized’ (*Ιακώβου τοῦ νεοβάπτιστον*).<sup>35</sup> This is an alleged chronicle about the ‘birth of Joseph’, setting out to expound the genealogy of Joseph, the husband of ‘saintly Mary the theotokos’, explaining how Mary is a descendant of the tribe of Judah and of David himself.

Then an interesting text follows.<sup>36</sup> This has to do with astronomical considerations providing practical mathematical rules for calculating leap years (209r–v) and probably the Easter, but on this we can only speculate, since there are some folios missing at that point. These folios<sup>37</sup> record information for the personal use of the owner of the codex, namely Cassian himself,

which has to do with calendar reckoning, according to either ‘the Romans’ or ‘the Alexandrians’: how the days of the full moon can be determined; how the days of February during a leap year are counted; how the twenty-ninth day is determined, and so on. This is an illuminating text casting light on why 29 February was determined as Cassian’s feast day, which points to his scientific interest in astronomy. The same text also tells us that Cassian is probably the author on whom the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* drew heavily, at least as far as calculations and rules for determining the date of Easter are concerned.

### A Sabaite Codex

Codex 573 is a product of the milieu of the Monastery of St Sabas near Jerusalem. An investigation in the Patriarchal Library in Jerusalem (where the Sabaite manuscripts were transferred a hundred years ago) showed that no scribe named Theodosius appears. This name appears in the Meteora Codex 573 only. However, it turned out that the same hand wrote at least two more Sabaite codices (St Sabas 76 and 8).<sup>38</sup> This makes the scribe of the Jerusalem codices identifiable: he was the monk Theodosius. Nevertheless, philological exploration shows that the content of this ‘Book of Cassian’ was definitely known to the monastery of Studios and Theodore Studites himself. For it turns out that exquisite parallels to Cassian’s text occur frequently in the work of Theodore Studites. Theodore is the man who had built the most renowned scriptorium of his time in the monastery of Studios. This institution was in many respects the heir of the Akoiometoi, certainly the heir to their vast library, which was abundantly reproduced therein. Cassian was one of the Akoiometoi and, given the close contact between them and Palestine, his book should have been made available to them and reproduced in their library.

Colophons are an important source of information. The one in Codex 573 advises that this is ‘the book of monk Cassian’, in other words, his companion. The contents of this book in relation to its owner and his era afford some valuable knowledge, since there are

<sup>34</sup> According to his prologue, Harnack received the text in July 1911 and published this at the end of the same year, which means he made an all too hasty study and attribution of authorship to Origen, which never enjoyed universal acceptance by scholars. See K. Diobouiotis and A. Harnack, n. 22 above.

<sup>35</sup> This is the sole attestation of the term *νεοβάπτιστος* (‘newly baptized’) in Greek literature.

<sup>36</sup> This is now published for the first time in *RCR*, Appendix III.

<sup>37</sup> Approximately three folios are missing, since they were cut off before pagination was applied to the Codex.

<sup>38</sup> See and compare photos in *RCR*, pp. 529–48.

interesting interconnections which come to light once these small texts are explored. Although ‘James the newly baptised’ is an unknown figure, the question of the genealogy of Mary is explored by one author alone, namely the Sabaite John of Damascus.<sup>39</sup> Quite evidently, both Cassian and Damascenus found this work by ‘James the newly baptized’ at the library of the Great Laura in Palestine. Furthermore, the question about full moons and determination of specific days during February of a leap year is scarcely found in literature. Although we come upon this in two fourth-century authors (namely, Epiphanius of Salamis and the mathematician Theon of Alexandria),<sup>40</sup> it can be determined that the actual source is Ptolemy of Alexandria, the second-century astronomer, astrologer, mathematician, and philosopher.<sup>41</sup> The questions on which Cassian kept notes for his personal use are treated by Theon as a commentary to Ptolemy’s Προχείρους Κανόνας (‘easy tables’, actually meaning calendars), which was also recorded by a later Byzantine monk and theologian of Thessaloniki.<sup>42</sup>

Therefore, it is not only the colophon, which definitely determines that Cassian is the owner of the Codex: it is also the content of the book. In this book, he had works favoured by him transcribed (including some of his own), along with practical information which was valuable to him and to which he could have quick and easy access. His interest in the apocalyptic literature (which is evident from the text of Daniel therein that he cherished) culminates with writing down the entire text of John’s Revelation. And since there was more space available, he went on to compose some comments (the Scholia) on the Apocalypse, in order to prove that this book was indeed a divinely-inspired one and therefore was correctly regarded as canonical.

Consequently, there are interesting conclusions that follow from a study of the contents of this codex.

First, Cassian draws directly on Ptolemy, and had read not only his astronomical works (which he uses here), but also his astrological ones. He must have read other astrological works, too, since he uses the extremely rare colloquialism βίσεκτον for δίσεκτον for a leap year, which occurs in only a handful of instances throughout Greek literature. The leap year is normally called δίσεκτον (δίς [=twice]+ εξ [six]), but since this was introduced by Julius Caesar,<sup>43</sup> and the idea is a Roman one, people used to call this βίσεκτον (pronouncing *bis* for *δίς*).<sup>44</sup> Usage of this colloquial form was rare and these instances are all that can be found for the time being. It is then interesting that we find this colloquialism attested in the present Codex (folio 209v), as it is remarkable that Cassian is especially interested in determining 29 February and relevant information with respect to leap years: for this day was later stipulated as Cassian’s feast day.

Second, the fact that Cassian quotes a passage from Hippolytus of Thebes has important consequences. This unknown chronicler of Egypt was frequently confused with Hippolytus of Rome, especially when the name ‘Hippolytus’ appeared with no further specification in manuscripts. I deal with this person elsewhere. I only wish to note at this point that his appearance as part of this Codex makes him neither a seventh- nor an eighth-century figure (as Franz Diekamp had it), nor one later than the eleventh century, which is a prevailing opinion owing to specific misunderstandings. My own exploration has shown that not only was this Hippolytus earlier than Cassian’s times (which is plain), but indeed he was in all probability a fourth-century intellectual.

<sup>39</sup> John of Damascus, *Expositio Fidei*, 87. Beside Damascenus, only a Synaxarium explores this question, which otherwise was of no interest to authors. Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopoleos, *Synaxarium Mensis Septembri*, Day 8, section 1.

<sup>40</sup> Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, v. 3, p. 246. Theon of Alexandria, *Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸν Προχείρους Πτολεμαίου Κανόνας* (a commentary on Ptolemy’s ‘easy tables’, which provide quick calendar-solutions to the problems Cassian dealt with in those notes of his), pp. 257–276. Cf. Ptolemy of Alexandria (astronomer, astrologer, mathematician, philosopher second. cent.), *Προχείρων Κανόνων Διάταξις καὶ Ψηφοφορία*.

<sup>41</sup> Ptolemy’s presence in Cassian’s *Scholia in Apocalypsin* is impressive. Cf. Scholia, XV; XXIX; XXXI; XXXIII; XXXIV.

<sup>42</sup> Matthaeus Blastares (fourteenth cent.), *Collectio Alphabetica*, Alphabetic letter Pi, 7.

<sup>43</sup> Joel (chronicler, thirteenth cent.), *Chronographia Compendiaria*, p. 24. He also writes βίσεκτον for δίσεκτον.

<sup>44</sup> Matthaetus Blastares, *Collectio Alphabetica*, Alphabetic letter Beta, 13. Lemma: Περὶ βίσεκτου. He advises that ‘all Roman words have β instead of δ’. This is how he uses the word himself throughout. Likewise, Acta Monasterii Theotoci Euergetae (eleventh-twelfth cent.), *Synaxarium*, Month 6, day 28. John Camaterus (astronomer, astrologer, twelfth cent.), *Introductio ad Astronomiam*, line 51. Michael Glycas, *Annales*, p. 379. Also in the anonymous astrological works, *Περὶ τῆς τῶν Επτὰ Πλανητῶν Εὑρέσεως*, v. 10, p. 70; *Paraphrasis Carminis de Terrae Motibus*, v. 5, p. 159.

### The vernacular of the Codex

The colloquial συγγ-<sup>45</sup> (for συγγ-) occurs in Didymus.<sup>46</sup> This is also the vernacular of Pseudo-Caesarius<sup>47</sup> but of no other Christian author.

The colloquial ἐφ' ὕσης,<sup>48</sup> instead of ἐπίσης, is a very rare one and means ‘equally’. Lexicographer Hesychius of Alexandria (fifth/sixth century AD) seems to have been aware of this, but it is remarkable that it is used by a series of scholars related to the Laura of Sabas in one way or another, namely Cassian and his admirers Maximus Confessor, John of Damascus, and Theodore Studites. Similar instances of this vernacular form occur in the *Epistulae et Amphilochia* at two points, epistles 34 and 43, a fact that comes as further support for my argument that the epistles are wrongly attributed to Photius.<sup>49</sup> This form is also present in Pseudo-Caesarius, whom I have claimed to be Cassian himself. Two instances in Justinian’s dogmatic writings<sup>50</sup> also point to the Laura of Sabas and the circle of abbot Gelasius, who composed the imperial edict against Origen.

The colloquial σύνψηφοι<sup>51</sup> for σύμψηφοι, also appears in the magical papyri.

The spelling in the Codex ἀφελπίσης<sup>52</sup> is an interesting colloquialism, which appears, among others, in Didymus<sup>53</sup> and Pseudo-Caesarius.<sup>54</sup>

The colloquialism ἀφιδιάζειν<sup>55</sup> is used in a few instances, of which those in Cassian’s professed admirers John Climacus and Theodore Studites are of special interest.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, the rendering ἀπιδιάζειν is a peculiar word meaning ‘to conduct a life in seclusion’: it appears once in Gregory of Nyssa,<sup>57</sup> in Julian the Arian,<sup>58</sup> and in a spurious text,<sup>59</sup> all of which play an important role in the Scholia.

The colloquial κακχασμοῖς<sup>60</sup> (instead of καγχασμοῖς) is one more word occurring in the magical papyri and recorded by Hesychius of Alexandria.<sup>61</sup> Not strangely, John of Damascus used this term, too.<sup>62</sup>

The term Βεεζεβοὺλ<sup>63</sup> used by Cassian<sup>64</sup> occurs only in Didymus, who uses the name Βεεζεβούλ instead of Βεελζεβούλ.<sup>65</sup> This might well be owing to Didymus’ works having been transcribed in Palestine, especially the *Fragmenta in Psalmos altera*, the authorship of which I discuss presently.

### Christian authors and the Book of Revelation

Christian theologians have treated the book of Revelation as an authoritative one since early times. Justin Martyr was confident that the author of the book is ‘a man who is one of us, whose name is John, and was a disciple of Christ, to whom an apocalypse was

<sup>45</sup> Cassian the Sabaite, *Const.* p. Cod. p. 19r.

<sup>46</sup> Didymus, *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 17 (συνγένειαν); *commPs* 35–39, Cod. p. 240 (συνγένειαν). Likewise, *commJob* (1–4), Cod. p. 98 (συνγραφικοῦ); *commJob* (7.20c–11), Cod. p. 251 (συνγραφικόν); *commEccl* (1.1–8), Cod. p. 7 (συνγραφέως); *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 49 (συνγραφικόν); *commPs* 22–26.10, Cod. p. 73 (συνγράμμασιν); *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 204 (συνγνωστός); *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. p. 308 (συνγραψαμένους); *ibid.* Cod. p. 337 (συνγραφένς); *commEccl* (3–4.12), Cod. p. 91 (συνγίνονται).

<sup>47</sup> Caesarius, *QR*, 12.9 (συνγερατρούμενον); 191.24

(συνγερατρεῖσθαι); 11.43 and 163.15 (συνγραφέων); 139.61 (συνγραφένς); 218.374 (συνγραψάμενον); 218.440 (συνγράψας).

<sup>48</sup> See Cassian the Sabaite, *OctoVit.* Cod. p. 33v.

<sup>49</sup> See RCR, pp. 20; 21; 80 (n. 132); 92; 180 (n. 212); 192; 200 (n. 349); 232 (n. 95); 318; 319; 399. NDGF, 230 (n. 47); 241 (n. 75); 371 (n. 44); 381 (n. 35); 407; 481; 485; 523 (n. 485); 524 (n. 494); 568; 569; 587; 601 (n. 807); 603–5.

<sup>50</sup> Justinian, *Epistula contra Tria Capitula*, 63; *Edictum Rectae Fidei*, p. 150.

<sup>51</sup> Cassian the Sabaite, *ScetPatr*, p. 66v: Οὗτος τοίνυν ὁ ὄρος καὶ ἡ γνώμη τοῦ ἀγίου Ἀντωνίου, ὃν καὶ σύνψηφοι οἱ λ < οι > ποι πατέρες ἔγένοντο.

<sup>52</sup> Cassian the Sabaite, *ScetPatr*, p. 75v.

<sup>53</sup> Didymus, *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 26 (ἀφελπισθείς); *commPs* 20–21, Cod. p. 27 (ἀφελπίζουσιν); *commPs* 29–34, Cod. p. 142 (ἀφελπίζει).

<sup>54</sup> Caesarius, *QR*, 191 (ἀφελπίζων). See NDGF, App. I.

<sup>55</sup> Cassian the Sabaite, *ScetPatr*, p. 67r.

<sup>56</sup> Theodore Studites (eighth/ninth cent. AD), *Sermones Catecheseos Magnae*, Catechesis 62, p. 22 (ἀφιδιάζόμενος); *Parva Catechesis*, Catechesis 2 (ἀφιδιάζειν); Catechesis 71 (ἀφιδιάζειν, then ἀφιδιάζόμενος). *Vita Sancti Pauli Junioris*, *Laudatio Sancti Pauli Junioris*, 11 (τὴν ἀφιδιάζουσαν πολιτείαν). There is one instance of the form ἀπιδιάζειν in John Climacus, *Scala Paradisi*, 832, line 12 (τὸ μὴ ἀπιδιάζειν εὐσεβῶς).

<sup>57</sup> Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Eunomium*, 3.10.36 (ἀπιδιάσαντος).

<sup>58</sup> Julian the Arian, *In Job*, p. 316 (ἀπιδιάσει).

<sup>59</sup> *Enarratio in Prophetam Isaiam*, 14.284 (ascribed to Basil of Caesarea) (ἀπιδιαστικά).

<sup>60</sup> Cassian the Sabaite, *SerenPrim*, p. 90r.

<sup>61</sup> Hesychius of Alexandria (fifth/sixth cent. AD), *Lexicon*, Alphabetic letter kappa: entries 369 (κακχάζει); 1931 (κακχάζοι); 1940, (κακχάζει). *Papyri Magicae*, (Preisendanz) number 13: lines 164 (κακχάσαντος); 172: (κακχάσαι); 191: (κακχάσαντος); 192: (κακχάζον); 475: (κακχάσαντος); 486: (κακχάσαι).

<sup>62</sup> John of Damascus, *Passio Magni Martyris Artemii*, 59 (κατακακχάζειν). Cf. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, 14.5 (ἀνακακχασάντων). John Chrysostom, *De Babyla Contra Julianum et Gentiles*, 17 (ἀνακακχάζοντες).

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Matt. 12:24.

<sup>64</sup> Cassian the Sabaite, *De Panareto*, p. 108r.

<sup>65</sup> Didymus, *commJob* (12.1–16.8a), fr. 369; *commPs* 29–34, Cod. pp. 145; 147; *commPs* 40–44.4, Cod. pp. 294; 304; *frPs(al)*, fr. 662a.