ALESSANDRA BUCOSSI – EDITING A PATRISTIC ANTHOLOGY? HOW AND WHY?

In recent years, a significant number of Byzantine scholars have been concentrating their attention on anthologies, compilations and other more comprehensive writings, sometimes called encyclopaedias (although this term is still being debated), to penetrate and understand the very nature of the Byzantine mind, that cultural attitude that was rightly described by Paolo Odorico as the ‘culture of συλλογή’, expression that we could translate with ‘culture of collecting and gathering stockpiles of passages’. A culture based on the safeguard of previous scholarly, spiritual or theological wisdom by means of collections of passages that we can find listed under many different names: catena, arsenal, thesaurus, panarion, panoplia, excerpta patrum, florilegium, doctrina patrum and so on.

Amongst these kinds of collections the dogmatic florilegia played a significant role; indeed, starting with the most famous late antique theological discussions that led to the formulation of the Christian doctrine, the writings of the Fathers of the church were closely scrutinised, analysed word by word, selected, compiled and assembled in order to create armouries of quotations against the heretics; the first well known case is the collection assembled by Cyril of Alexandria in order to clarify the orthodox teaching of the Fathers and presented at the Council of Ephesus in 431 against Nestorius’ dogmatic position.

Since, borrowing a meaningful expression by Alexander Alexakis, we could say that during the theological discussions ‘dogmatic correctness was intertwined with philological accuracy’, because the texts were analyzed, scrutinized, collated and corrected, we should study the anthological texts with a more philological approach and give more space to the analysis of the relation between the original texts and the final anthological product.

This paper is not dedicated to patristic anthologies in general, but to a specific kind of patristic anthologies, the so called dogmatic florilegia and, in particular, my intervention today deals only with one florilegium: the anthology of patristic quotations on the procession of the Holy Spirit assembled during the twelfth century by a Byzantine nobleman called Andronikos Kamateros (1110-1180 circa) and inserted in his writing called Sacred Arsenal.

THE TEXT

The Sacred Arsenal was commissioned by emperor Manuel Komnenos (1143-1180) and written most probably between 1170 and 1175 by Andronikos Kamateros, a nobleman, a senior office holder, who lived between 1110 and 1180. The Sacred Arsenal is dedicated to the discussions that took place during the reign of Manuel Komnenos between the Greek Church and the Latin and the Armenian churches.

The text is clearly divided in two parts. The first part consisting of a dialogue and two anthologies is dedicated to the Latin Church. Kamateros claims the dialogue to be the verbatim transcription of a real encounter between Manuel Komnenos and some cardinals sent from Rome. The topics

---

under discussion cover only two points of disagreement between Catholicism and Orthodoxy: the primacy of the Roman Church and the procession of the Holy Spirit, the Filioque.

After the dialogue Kamateros introduces a patristic anthology dedicated to the procession of the Holy Spirit. Each quotation is followed by a brief comment. The anthology opens with six quotations from the New Testament. The followings 145 quotations are from 18 authors and 71 different writings. The most quoted are Athanasios (34), Cyril (24), Gregory of Nazianzos (18), Basil (16), and Gregory of Nyssa (10). Less numerous are the quotations from other patristic authors. Three Latin Fathers are included towards the end of the florilegium: Gregory the great (2), Augustine (1), Jerome (1). Two very recent authors close the anthology: Theophylaktos of Ochrid (1), Euthymios Zigabenos (1).

The patristic anthology is followed by a compilation of 42 syllogisms collected from five authors who wrote about the procession of the Holy Spirit between the ninth and the twelfth century (Photios, Eustratios of Nicaea, Theophylaktos of Ochrid, Niketas of Byzantium and Nicholas of Methone).

As far as I know, 10 manuscripts of the Sacred Arsenal have survived, but only two of them are almost complete, one from Munich and one from Venice. The anti-Latin part occupies the first 90 folia of the Monacensis Graecus 229 and the first 70 folia of the Venetus Marcianus Graecus 158.

The second half of the text occupies almost 200 folia of the two main manuscripts and is dedicated to the refutation of Christological heresies. The pattern of the second part follows the same structure of the first half. It begins with a proem, followed by a discussion between the emperor and the Armenian teacher Peter, and then comes a series of anthologies.

HOW AND WHY

I stated before that we would need a more philological approach to the study of dogmatic anthologies, therefore in order to change this general exhortation into a practical suggestion I would like to present here the case of the critical edition of the letters by Monk Jakovos published in 2009 in the Corpus Christianorum by Michael and Elizabeth Jeffreys, where the two scholars tested an additional critical apparatus entirely dedicated to the relation between a text and its patristic sources.

The two editors described their apparatus with these words: ‘A comparison of Iakovos’ text with the manuscript tradition of his sources. This apparatus is idiosyncratic, resulting from Iakovos’ almost exclusive reliance on previous writers. In most cases, the entries here indicate that the reading found in Iakovos’ text has not been accepted by the editor of the source’s standard edition, but does exist somewhere in its manuscript tradition. Occasionally the situation is complicated by coincidence between more than one readings in Iakovos’ manuscripts with readings of the manuscript tradition of his source. Where the source has been the subject of a critical edition, we have searched its critical apparatus cases where his reading appears as a varia lectio of the edited source.’

5 John (3), Acts (1), and two passages from Paul, letters ad Galatas and ad Titum.
6 John Chrysostom (6), Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (3), Maximos the Confessor (3), Sophronios of Jerusalem (1), Epiphanius (7), Gregory Thaumaturgos (7), John of Damascus (9), and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (4).
7 The anthology is published, together with Bekkos’ refutations of it, in John BEKKOS, Refutatio adversus Divi Andronici Camateri Vigiae Drungarii super scripto traditis testimoniis de Spiritu Sancto animadversiones, PG, 141, cols. 395-614.
8 E. JEFFREYS and M. JEFFREYS, Iacobi Monachi Epistolae (Turnhout, 2009), p. LXV.
This kind of apparatus has already proved its usefulness because starting from the research by Michael and Elizabeth Jeffreys, Carl Laga conducted a study dedicated to the ‘Library of Jacobus Monachus’, in which the scholar successfully identified the manuscript of Gregory of Nyssa’s *On the song of songs* that Jakovos quoted in his letters.\(^9\)

However, before facing more technical details, I would like to give you a second example of the possible usefulness of a critical apparatus containing the collation between the manuscript tradition of an anthology and the manuscript tradition of its patristic source, and this time the example comes from the *Sacred Arsenal*.

After the ecclesial union between Latin and Greek Churches promoted by the Byzantine emperor Michael VIII at the council of Lyon (1274) was repudiated, Bekkos, the former patriarch, great supporter of the union was condemned to confinement. In 1285, however, Bekkos succeeded in having his case re-examined and during the theological discussions that brought again his condemnation, the *Sacred Arsenal* by Andronikos Kamateros played a significant role.

The patriarch defended himself stating that the Greek Fathers had always supported the procession from the Father ‘and’ the Son, because in his opinion the prepositions ‘from’ and ‘through’ had the same meaning. In order to support his point of view, he quoted a sentence from John of Damascus who wrote, ‘The Father is the emitter, or producer, of the Spirit through the Son’.\(^10\) The reaction of the anti-unionists was very poor. In fact, not having a better confutation, the chartophylax George Moschabar even stated that the passage was spurious. It was quite clear to all that this reply was ridiculous and the megas logothetes Theodore Muzalon even rebuked him saying that that they would have appeared at least excessive by defending themselves in that poor way, since the same passage – word by word – was in the *Sacred Arsenal* and was attributed to John of Damascus.\(^11\)

I decided to mention this example, instead of enumerating a long list of authors who read Kamateros, quoted Kamateros, and most probably used Kamateros’ anthology to assemble their own compilations, because I think this is the most significant illustration of the fact that the *Sacred Arsenal* not only was an authority for the theological formulation of the dogma, but was also the authority that could testify to the originality of some patristic passages. Indeed, when a quotation was doubtful for one part or the other, the fact that this same quotation was included or not in the *Sacred Arsenal* could be a proof of its authenticity. It is in cases like this that philology meets history and that our tiring and time-consuming analysis of the different readings becomes important and exciting. Kamateros’ text was considered by both those who opposed and those who supported the Filioque a very reliable source, a reference book where to find the exact quotation, word by word, and this is the reason why I strongly believe that it deserves to be edited most carefully, providing the reader also with a critical apparatus dedicated only to the relation between the anthology of the *Sacred Arsenal* and its sources.

---


\(^10\) N. 141 in Kamateros Λόγου γεννήτωρ καὶ διὰ Λόγου προβολεὺς ἐκφαντορικοῦ Πνεύματος.

\(^11\) καὶ πως, ὥστε αὐτοίς ἑαυτοῖς λέγειν δόξαν δόξαν ὡς αὐτοὺς ἀπολογοῦμενοί; ἐπεὶ ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῆς Ἱερᾶς Ὁπλαθής κατὰ κέπται τὸ ὄνομα ὡς ἀγίου ὄνομα καὶ τοῦ μεγάλου Δαμασκηνοῦ ΡΑΧΥΜΕΡΕΣ, *De Andronico*, vol. II, p. 92, l. 14; *CFHB* 24/3, p. 107, ll. 2-3. Another mention of Kamateros, again in reference to the same discussion about John of Damascus, is in RACHYMERE, *De Andronico*, vol. II, p. 109, l. 1; *CFHB* 24/3, p. 125, l. 8-14.
The Comparison

When we analyze an anthology of patristic passages, we have four parts to take into accounts: the original source (which I am going to call 'Father Main Text'), the critical apparatus of the original source (which I am going to call 'Father Apparatus Criticus'), the main text of the anthology we are editing and its critical apparatus.

As you can see we have four relations (Father MT - Anthology MT, Father AC – Anthology AC, anthology MT – Father AC, Father MT – Anthology AC) and eight cases, because in each of these relations we can find either the same variant or a different variant, and therefore we will proceed in different ways.

Now we start from the two main texts, they can be both exactly the same or different, and their apparatus can be identical or different.

Cases 1 and 2

If the two texts are identical and the two apparatus are different (Case two), we stop here. There is nothing interesting to be analysed.

But if the two main texts are identical and the apparatus have some identical variants (Case one), we should consider carefully this case because it could be interesting, for example, to trace back the manuscript from which the compiler of the anthology copied. Therefore, I suggest to create a second critical apparatus, similar to the one adopted by Elizabeth and Michael Jeffreys, where we can indicate all the differences between the anthology and its sources. I propose to call this apparatus, apparatus criticus fontium (to be distinguished from the apparatus fontium where we usually indicate the sources), and different from the Jeffreys’ apparatus because we want to list all the possible identities and not only when the main text of the anthology appears as varia lectio of the edited source.

Case one:
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Father MT = Anthology MT // Anthology AC = Father AC

Greg. Nyss., Contra Eun., Book 1, 137, Section 377, l. 1-138, Section 378, l. 14

Ἐν ἦ Πατήρ μὲν ἀναρχὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος καὶ αἰὲ Πατήρ νοεῖται, ἐξ αὐτῶ δὲ κατὰ τὸ προσεχὲς ἀδαμαστάτως ὁ μονογενής Υἱὸς τῷ Πατρὶ συνεπινοεῖται, ὦ αὐτοῦ...

“For there, with the Father, unoriginate, ungenerate, always Father, the idea of the Son as coming from Him yet side by side with Him is inseparably joined; and through the Son...”

Anthology AC

ἔξ...συνεπινοεῖται] om. S (= Mosquensis Synodalis Graecus 239)

Apparatus Criticus Fontium

ἔξ...συνεπινοεῖται] om. Greg. Nyss. (ac)

CASES 3 AND 4

Cases three and four are certainly the most interesting cases, because in these cases the two main texts are different.

First of all, we will indicate in the ACF the reading accepted as original by the editor of the patristic source. Secondly, we will analyse the two apparatus critici, and here we can come across two possibilities (cases three and four):

1) The two apparatus are different, so we do not need any further action (case four)

2) Case three: the two apparatus are identical. What shall we do in this case? Is it interesting? Of course it depends on the variants. But we can consider that usually an editor tends to exclude very trivial variants from his apparatus and to insert only those meaningful readings that can be rightly described as plausible alternatives for the text. Therefore, if the two apparatus have significant readings, I think we should indicate them in our new apparatus criticus fontium.

Father MT ≠ Anthology MT // Anthology AC = Father AC

Io. Dam., Exp. fid., 16-17, Section 7, ll. 2-31

οὐτω γὰρ ἀν καθίσταται πρὸς ταπεινότητα τὸ μεγαλείον τῆς θείας φύσεως...

“It would be to drag down the greatness of the divine nature to the lowest depths of degradation...”

Anthology AC

καθίσταται Anthology main text] καθαιρεῖται V (Venetus Marcianus Graecus 158)

Apparatus Criticus Fontium

καθίσταται ] καθαιρεῖται Io. Dam. (main text) καθαιρεῖται Io. Dam (ac) = Anthology AC!

CASE 5 AND 6

In case five we find in the apparatus of the anthology a reading that is identical to the main text of the Father. First of all we should ask ourselves if we are sure that our choice for the main text of the anthology is plausible. After a careful analysis of our tradition, if we are reasonably convinced by our variant, we need to alert the reader about the fact that we are accepting a variant that is different from the one accepted by the editor of the source.

Father MT ≠ Anthology MT // Anthology AC = Father MT
οὔτε μὴν ἐπιτρέπομεν ἑαυτοῖς ἢ ἐτέροις ἢ λέειν ἀμείβαι τῶν ἐγκεκριμένων ἐκείς ἢ μίαν γούν παραβιάζειν συλλαβὴν μεμνημένος τοῦ λέγοντος ...

Cyril of Alexandria, CPG 5339, ACO 1, 1, 4, p. 19, ll. 20-26

“Nor we allow ourselves or others to change a word of those inserted there, or to add one syllable, remembering the saying ...”

Anthology AC

μεμνημένος] μεμνημένοι V (Venetus 158)

Apparatus Criticus Fontium

μεμνημένος] μεμνημένοι Cyr (main text and nothing in the AC)

Case six is not interesting because we do not have identical readings.

CASE 7 AND 8

In the seventh case we find a reading in the critical apparatus of the Father that is identical to the main text of our anthology. In this case we could even (as we have seen in the case of the letters of Iakovos) trace back our anthology to the original manuscript of the Father that our author consulted (if any, because we need also to remember that our author could have used one or many anthologies to compile his florilegium).

Father MT ≠ Anthology MT // Anthology MT = Father AC

Philosophas ephòi tois Nestoriono [βατταρίσματιν]12 ήγουν δυσφημίας και τοις ἄγαν ἁτιμελῶς εἰσημένος ἢ τῶν κεφαλαίων μάχεται δύναμις.

“I was the first to say that the power of the arguments fights against the nonsensical talks, or rather blasphemies of Nestorios, and those things said too carelessly.”

Cyril of Alexandria, ACO 1, 1, 6, pp. 134, l. 17-135, l. 22

Anthology AC

- 

Apparatus Criticus Fontium

[βατταρίσματιν] Cyr(apparatus criticus): [βατταρίσματις Cyr (main text)]

Case eight is not interesting because we do not have identical readings.

MOST INTERESTING CASES

1.

Father MT = Anthology MT

and

Father AC = Anthology ac ➔ Apparatus Criticus Fontium (ex. a very significant omission)

2.

Always to be inserted when Father MT ≠ Anthology MT ➔ Apparatus Criticus Fontium
To resume, there are five possible instances in which we should insert something in the ACF when the two main texts are different and four cases where we find a correspondence in the apparatus critici. This clearly means that we need to write an apparatus that must be clear enough to allow the reader to easily understand what we want to point out.

Certainly, we cannot use the sigla of the manuscripts of the patristic source because this would create an unbearable confusion. I propose a solution starting from the last example we have just seen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βατταρίσμασιν] Cyr(apparatus criticus): βατταρισμοῖς Cyr (main text)</td>
<td>I suggest to identify the main text only with the abbreviation of the name of the Father (here CYR), and then to use a sign after the abbreviation of the name to indicate each single case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My solution therefore would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or instead of καθίσταται ] καθαύρηται Io. Dam. (main text) καθαύρηται Io. Dam (AC) = Anthology AC</td>
<td>I would write καθαύρηται Io. Dam. (main text) καθαύρηται Io. Dam (AC) = Anthology AC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

It is clear that this kind of analysis has many drawbacks and amongst those the most important one is the fact that we can create a reliable ACF, only when we have a good critical edition of the patristic text. In fact when a patristic text is available only in the *Patrologia*, the ACF can list only the differences between the two main texts.

However, in order to draw some conclusions and to open the discussion I would like to repeat once more the main advantages offered by the kind of analysis.

1) The trial analysis conducted by Carl Laga have already proved that, thanks to the data collected during the collation with the patristic source, we can even, if we are lucky, identify the manuscript that the anthologist used.

2) If our author did not compose the florilegium, but built his own work starting from a previous anthology, with the help of the ACF we could identify more easily the model anthology from which he copied.

3) The ACF can unquestionably prove if our anthology is, and was, a reliable source of patristic passages.

4) Since the theological debates often based their discussions on the analysis of a patristic passage, an investigation that was more similar to our textual critique than to a theoretical argumentation, it is clear that our analysis would be of great help in understanding the historical sources dedicated to these events.

Aims of this paper were to highlight a problem, the relation between the manuscript tradition of an anthology and the manuscript tradition of its patristic sources, and to suggest a possible solution, i.e. the insertion of a critical apparatus entirely dedicated to the collation between an anthology and its sources where we can confront not only the two main texts but also their critical apparatus, and the crossed relations between the main text of the patristic source and the critical apparatus of the anthology and the reverse. Although it is clear that every single text has its own peculiar problems, I am sure that this kind of suggestion can help us to find a clearer way to present complex critical editions.