

Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople, the Author of Ps. Chrysostom, in Psalmum 92 (CPG 4548)?



C. Datema; P. Allen

Vigiliae Christianae, Vol. 40, No. 2. (Jun., 1986), pp. 169-182.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0042-6032%28198606%2940%3A2%3C169%3ALPOCTA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-V>

Vigiliae Christianae is currently published by Brill Academic Publishers.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/bap.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

**LEONTIUS, PRESBYTER OF CONSTANTINOPLE, THE
AUTHOR OF PS. CHRYSOSTOM, IN PSALMUM 92 (CPG 4548)? ***

BY

C. DATEMA AND P. ALLEN

Introduction

One of the most perilous problems which face us in the study of homiletic literature is the quest for the author of a homily whose attribution in the manuscript tradition is generally agreed to be wrong. This problem occurs particularly in the voluminous *corpus* of ps. Chrysostom writings. It is perfectly understandable that grave errors should have been made in attempts to discover the author of homilies which have been transmitted pseudonymously. A well-known example of this is a study by B. Marx, who, despite the intuitive power which he often exhibited, attributed numerous homilies of ps. Chrysostom to Proclus, basing himself largely on style and vocabulary.¹ In the past decades M. Aubineau, whose services to the study of Greek homiletic literature are great, has warned against such a *modus operandi* more than once, and has pointed out that a broader approach to the problem is essential.² His warning notwithstanding, a new example of this method has recently been made, where a scholar has taken exclusively as his guide-line similarities of style and vocabulary. The work in question is a book by M. Sachot, who incorporates into the homiletic oeuvre of Leontius, presbyter of Constantinople, fourteen homilies which have come down to us under such different names as Amphilocheus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Timothy, presbyter of Jerusalem, and Timothy, presbyter of Antioch.³ In so doing he has saddled us, the editors of Leontius' homilies,⁴ with the task of either giving these attributions a solid base or else proving that they are unfounded. In this article we shall treat one example in order to demonstrate how a method such as that adopted by Sachot can fall short of its goal. For our purposes we have selected a homily of ps. Chrysostom which bears the title *In psalmum 92*, inc. Ἐκ τῶν ἀρτίως ἡμῖν παραγνωσθέντων: PG 55,611-616 (CPG 4548, Aldama 102).

CPG 4548

This homily falls into two parts: in the first part (611-614,4) the homilist deals with the pericope which has just been read out, concerning the multiplication of the loaves, and Jesus, who walks over the water (Matth. 14,13-33); in the second part he treats Adam, who gives the animals in Eden a name, and the banishment of Adam and Eve from paradise (Gen. 2,18-3,24).

The attribution of CPG 4548 to Leontius is based by Sachot on the following grounds. In Leontius and CPG 4548 we find similar turns of phrase:

- (a) (ὅτι) ... ἤκουες ἀρτίως to introduce a biblical text
- (b) εὐκαιρον to introduce a biblical text
- (c) ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ φάσκον
- (d) τὸ φάσκον ῥητόν
- (e) ἄκουε συνετῶς
- (f) ἴστε γὰρ πάντες σαφῶς
- (g) ἔστι δὲ πάντως εἰπεῖν τινα
- (h) ὄντως used in justification
- (i) ὁ δεσπότης Χριστός

In addition Sachot points to a number of words which he finds characteristic of both Leontius and the author of CPG 4548 *μηνύειν*, *γνωρίζειν*, *προσαγορεύειν*, *μετέρχεσθαι*, *ἐρχεσθαι*, and *ἄπιθι*.⁵

Of almost all these expressions, however, it can be said that they are not unique for Leontius, and the verbs mentioned by Sachot can be disregarded altogether in this connection.⁶ Therefore on these grounds the attribution of CPG 4548 to Leontius cannot be justified. Furthermore, before a final verdict can be passed on the question of authenticity, a picture must be formed of the textual transmission, in order to be sure that one is not building on quicksand by having recourse only to the text printed in Migne. A consideration of the textual transmission is all the more obligatory now that it has become clear from the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* that there were several different versions of CPG 4548 in circulation.⁷

The number of manuscripts which transmit CPG 4548 in its entirety is limited: up to the present we have a tally of eight.⁸ Even a preliminary inspection of the manuscript tradition provides a clarification of the relationship between the two parts of which CPG 4548 is composed. The end of the first part and the beginning of the second run as follows

in PG 55, 614,2-11: Ἐγὼ τῷ Ἀδὰμ ὑπῆρέτησα ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ· ὃ ἐκεῖ μετῆλθον, καὶ ὧδε οὐ παραιτοῦμαι.

Ἔστι δὲ πάντως εἰπεῖν· τίνα καὶ πότε ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ἀδὰμ διακονίαν μετῆλθεν. Ἄκουε συνετῶς. Καλὸν γὰρ ἀποτίσαι τῆς ἕκτης ἡμέρας τῆς τελευταίας τοῦ θεοῦ δημιουργίας, ἐν ἣ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἐποιησάμεθα. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ τῷ Ἀδὰμ μόνῳ ὁ δημιουργὸς ὑπῆρέτησεν, ὁμοῦ καὶ δημιουργὸν καὶ κοινωνὸν αὐτὸν λαμβάνων τῶν ἑαυτοῦ κτισμάτων. Ἴστε πάντες σαφῶς ...

On the basis of this somewhat unfortunate text of Migne, we may visualise the following context: the homilist wants to keep a promise he made on the day when he preached on the sixth and last day of creation. Thus we can situate this homily at the beginning of Lent, in that during the Lenten period the Book of Genesis formed part of the regular readings.⁹ The abrupt transition from ἐποιησάμεθα to Διὰ τοῦτο is difficult, since the argumentation suggested by Διὰ τοῦτο is not to be found in the text; nor does Διὰ τοῦτο point to what follows. But with the help of the manuscript tradition we are in a position to bring about the necessary corrections. The sentences Ἔστι — ἐποιησάμεθα can be changed to: Ἔστι δὲ πάντως εἰπεῖν τίνα· «Καὶ πότε ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἀδὰμ διακονῶν μετῆλθεν;» Ἄκουε συνετῶς. Καλὸν γὰρ ἀποτίσαι τὸ χρέος τῆς ἕκτης ἡμέρας τῆς τελευταίας τοῦ θεοῦ δημιουργίας, ἐν ἣ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἐποιησάμεθα. The problem associated with Διὰ τοῦτο disappears if we follow the text of Vaticanus gr. 800, where the text after δημιουργίας runs: Εἶπεν ὁ θεός· «Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν.» Οὐδαμοῦ τὸ ἀνόμοιον, οὐδαμοῦ τὸ ἀνυπότακτον, οὐδαμοῦ τὸ ποίησον ἢ ποιῶ. Ποιήσωμεν εἶπεν· μία ἢ συμβουλία, ἐπειδὴ μία ἢ ἐξουσία καὶ μία ἢ ἀξία. Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν· μία ἢ εἰκὼν καὶ πῶς ἢ οὐσία παρηλλαγμένη; Ἐπὶ ἄλλης κτίσεως οὐκ εἶπεν τὸ ποιήσωμεν οὐδαμῶς. Ὅτε οὐρανὸς ἐκορυφούτο, οὐκ εἶπεν τὸ ποιήσωμεν οὐρανόν· ὅτε ἡ γῆ ἐκρηπιδούτο, οὐκ εἶπεν ποιήσωμεν γῆν — οὐδεμία γὰρ σύγκρισις οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς· ὅτε ὁ ἥλιος ἀρματιαζούτο, οὐκ εἶπεν ποιήσωμεν ἥλιον. Ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τοίνυν κεῖται τὸ ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον, ἐπειδὴ αὐτῷ μόνῳ ἐπιστεύθη τὸ τῆς θεομορφίας ἀκηλίδωτον ἔσοπτρον· τοῦτο καὶ τελευταῖον πάσης δημιουργίας τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁ δημιουργὸς παρήγαγεν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τῷ Ἀδὰμ μόνῳ ὁ δημιουργὸς ὑπῆρέτησεν, ὅμοιον καὶ δημιουργὸν καὶ κοινωνὸν λαμβάνων αὐτὸν τῶν ἑαυτοῦ κτισμάτων (ff. 79 bis^v-80).

Without a thorough-going study of the textual transmission of CPG 4548 it is difficult to assess the worth of the text offered by Vatic. gr. 800. Despite the numerous variants in the text of this manuscript, we still have the impression that the addition just cited is authentic, even

though it remains hard to explain why the addition is missing in all other manuscripts. A comparison with the other manuscripts has shown us that Vatic. gr. 800 is related to Hierosolymitanus S. Sabas 80, and belongs to the same family as Vindobonensis theol. gr. 10 and to that branch of the tradition from which BHG^a 25q (see below) also derives. It is worth noticing that Vaticanus gr. 800 is the manuscript in which CPG 4548 begins with the words "Ἀγαν αἰδέσιμον τράπεζαν παρέθηκεν ἡμῖν ὁ δαφιλῆς ἐστιάτωρ Χριστός, borrowed from the homily of ps. Chrysostom on the Transfiguration, edited by Sachot (CPG 4724), which must be ascribed to Leontius: "Ἀγαν αἰδέσιμον ἡμῖν ὁ δαφιλῆς ἐστιάτωρ Χριστός καὶ σήμερον προέθηκε τράπεζαν."¹⁰

Now that it is apparent that CPG 4548 is a homogeneous work it will be easier to define the place of BHG^a 25q, which Sachot thinks is perhaps an "extrait" of CPG 4548.¹¹ We are in a position to refine this suggestion by showing that BHG^a 25q is no more than the end of CPG 4548 (PG 55,614, 57-616,39), preceded by the following introduction, based on Gen. 2,15-17 Ἠκούσαμεν ἀρτίως ἀγαπητοί, τῆς θείας γραφῆς διὰ Μωϋσέως λεγούσης· Καὶ ἔλαβεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὃν ἔπλασεν, Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἔθετο αὐτὸν μετὰ τῆς Εὐᾶς εἰς τὸν παράδεισον τῆς τρυφῆς ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ φυλάττειν λέγων αὐτοῖς· Ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ φάγεσθε, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν οὐ φάγεσθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ· ἢ δ' ἂν ἡμέρα φάγητε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, θανάτω ἀποθανεῖσθε. Καὶ ἔλαβεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὃν ἔπλασεν, καὶ ἔθετο αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ φυλάττειν. Ἄλλ' ὄρα μοι ἀγαπητέ, τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἐν διαιτήματι τὸν παράδεισον ἔχοντα πῶς ἐξορισταῖον τοῦ παραδείσου παροικιζόμενον, ἵνα ἐννοῶν τὴν συμβουλίαν τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ ὄθεν ἐξῆλθεν, μὴ παύσηται μεμφώμενος αὐτῆς τὴν ματαιοβουλίαν. Τί γὰρ ἔπραττεν ὁ Ἀδὰμ ...

For the opening sentences of BHG^a 25q we do not need to look for a separate source, as Carter¹² wishes to do; these lines will have come from the pen of the author who included the end of CPG 4548 in a liturgical collection as a reading for the first Sunday in Lent. That BHG^a 25q is the conclusion of CPG 4548 is evident also from the text transmitted by the former. With respect to CPG 4548, BHG^a 25q exhibits three omissions which beyond doubt were made consciously. Two of the three omissions concern passages which for the redactor of BHG^a 25q did not seem relevant: 616,5-11 the rendez-vous which married women sometimes have with their admirers who near the graves of martyrs, and 616,21-26 where there is a reference to pericopes which recur annually. The third case, the omission of 616,13-15 is purely a shortening of the exemplar.

CPG 4548 and CPG 4562

Now that the relationship between CPG 4548 and BHG^a 25q has become clear, we can examine the similarities between CPG 4548 and a long homily of ps. Chrysostom *In Genesim*, PG 56, 525-538 (CPG 4562, Aldama 437). These similarities are also pointed out by Sachot, who admits that he cannot account for them. Following the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* and Aldama he assumes that CPG 4562 is an amalgam of three homilies, and, because of the occurrence in it of a few expressions which he considers characteristic of Leontius, he puts forward the supposition that one of the sources on which CPG 4562 is based is possibly one or more of Leontius' homilies on the same subject.¹³ This is all the more reason for us to explore carefully the relationship between the two homilies. We find the following similarities:

CPG 4548 (PG 55, 611-616)	CPG 4542 (PG 56, 525-538)
(1) 614, 49 ἄδου πυθμένα	= 532, 4-5
(2) 614, 50-51 ὡς γενέσθαι τὸν δεσπότην δοῦλον, <u>τὸν παντάρχη</u> ν <u>προσαιτῆν</u> ...	534, 47-48 τί τὸν <u>παντάρχη</u> ν κατέστησας <u>προσαιτῆν</u>
(3) 614, 52-54 τὸν φιλικῆ συντυχία καθ' ἐκάστην τῷ θεῷ συνδιατρίβοντα ὡς <u>κλέπτην</u> ὑπὸ δένδρον <u>κρυπτόμενον</u>	532, 13-14 ὁ φιλικῆ συντυχία τῷ θεῷ <u>διαλεγόμενος</u> ὡς <u>κλέπτης</u> ὑπὸ δένδρον <u>κρυπτόμενος</u>
(4) 614, 58-60 Τί γάρ ἕτερον <u>ἔπραττεν</u> ὁ Ἄδὰμ <u>ἔξω τοῦ παραδείσου</u> τὴν κατοίκησιν ἔχων, <u>σκάπτων</u> , <u>κάμνων</u> , <u>μεταλλεύων</u> , <u>βωλοστροφῶν</u> , <u>ιδρῶτι</u> πανταχόθεν <u>κατακλυζόμενος</u>	533, 55-57 Τί γάρ <u>ἔπραττεν</u> ὁ Ἄδὰμ <u>ἔξω τοῦ παραδείσου</u> <u>καθήμενος</u> ; Ἦν <u>σκάπτων</u> , <u>μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ</u> <u>ἐργαζόμενος</u> , <u>μετὰ στεναγμοῦ</u> , <u>ιδρῶτι</u> <u>περιρρέομενος</u>
(5) 614, 72-73 Ἔπιθι, <u>γύνοι</u>	534, 61-62 Ἔπιθι ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, <u>γύνοι</u>
(6) 614, 73 τί μου τὴν ἀθανασίαν ἐθέρισας	= 534, 46
(7) 614, 73-74 τί μου τὴν βασιλικὴν <u>στολὴν</u> ἔσχισας; ἦν οὐκ ὕφανας, <u>διέρρηξας</u>	534, 50-51 τί με τὴν <u>στολὴν</u> ἐξέδυσας, <u>ἦν οὐκ ἐξύφανας</u>

- | | | |
|------|---|---|
| (8) | 615, 4-5 <u>Πρὸ</u> τοῦ συναφθῆναι τὴν λύσιν <u>ζητῶ</u> | 534, 58 <u>πρὸ</u> τῆς συναφείας τὴν λύσιν <u>ἐπιζητῶ</u> |
| (9) | 615, 5-6 <u>Σὺ</u> μὲν ἀργῶς <u>μένουσα</u> οὐκ αἰσθάνη τῆς ὀδύνης (codd.) | 534, 71-72 <u>Σὺ</u> ἀεργῶς <u>μένουσα</u> οὐχ ὀρᾶς τὴν συμφορὰν |
| (10) | 615, 21 <u>ζωὴ</u> <u>προσαγορευθεῖσα</u> καὶ <u>θάνατος</u> <u>εὐρεθεῖσα</u> | 534, 52-53 τί <u>ζωὴ</u> <u>προσαγορευθεῖσα</u> <u>θάνατος</u> <u>μοι</u> γέγονας; |
| (11) | 615, 24 τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν σύστημα | = 536, 4 |
| (12) | 616, 9-11 Πολλάκις γὰρ καὶ κατὰ τῶν μαρτύρων ὁμνύουσι <u>μὴ</u> <u>ἀθετῆσαι</u> τὰς <u>ἀθемίτους</u> <u>πράξεις</u> | 536, 58-62 ὁμνύουσι ... τοῦ <u>μὴ</u> <u>ἀθετῆσαι</u> τὰς <u>μισσαρὰς</u> αὐτῶν <u>πράξεις</u>
538, 12 <u>πράξεις</u> <u>ἀθемίτους</u> |

Apart from the verbal similarities, we notice in particular that the conclusion of CPG 4548 is a résumé of the second part of the ending of CPG 4562. The homilist of CPG 4548 differentiates briefly (PG 55, 616,13-20) between modest, chaste women and licentious ones. As examples of the former group he cites the virgin Maria, Susanne, Sarah and Rebecca; the second group is represented by Eve, the Egyptian woman (i.e. the woman who tried to seduce Joseph; in CPG 4562 she is specified as such), Delilah and Jezebel. In CPG 4562 (PG 56, 536-538), which is much more copious than CPG 4548, all the names, with the exception of Jezebel, reappear.

In short, there can be no doubt that CPG 4562 was used as a model by the homilist of CPG 4548.

CPG 4548 and Leontius

The dependence of CPG 4548 on CPG 4562 teaches us at the same time that in the homilist of CPG 4548 we are dealing with someone who makes extensive use of a homily already in circulation. This is then a consideration which cannot be excluded *a priori* for other parts of CPG 4548 as well, and one which makes the use of stylistic criteria in the attribution of CPG 4548 especially perilous. In addition there are other questions to be asked. If this extensive use of an exemplar fits the author whom we have in mind, does it fit the chronology?

In the eleven homilies ascribed in the textual transmission to Leontius, presbyter of Constantinople—and there is no reason to call this ascription into question—we meet an author who is a homilist in his own right. Here and there similarities with earlier homilists can be detected, but this is no surprise in that Leontius is a link in the long tradition of homiletic literature.¹⁴ In CPG 4548, on the other hand—at least in the second half—an exemplar has been used intensively. For this reason alone one would need to be extremely cautious in attributing CPG 4548 to Leontius.

Place and date of CPG 4562

A question also to be asked concerns the place of CPG 4562 in homiletic literature. Can we find solid grounds for dating or localising this homily of ps. Chrysostom? In any case CPG 4562 is the *terminus post quem* for CPG 4548, a supposed homily of Leontius. Aldama proposes that CPG 4562 is an amalgam of three homilies; against this Marx believes that Proclus is the author of CPG 4562.¹⁵ To this example of “Proclomania”, however, we need pay no attention. But the question remains whether in CPG 4562 we have an original homily in its entirety, or a scissors-and-paste enterprise of a later date. The latter possibility rests on the fact that the various sections of CPG 4562 have been transmitted as separate homilies (cf. BHG^a 25p, 25pa, 25pb and 25pc). This fact should nonetheless not be allowed to misguide us, as there are several examples which can be given of this phenomenon—we have only to refer here to homily BHG^a 25q, mentioned above.¹⁶ In the case of CPG 4562, too, we shall have to judge the homily on the basis of its internal cohesion.

In the rich manuscript tradition we can distinguish the following recensions:

1. the homily in its entirety
2. the text as far as PG 56,528,59 (i.e. § 1)
3. the text as far as PG 56,535,9 (i.e. § 1-3, minus the last twelve lines)
4. the text from PG 56,528, 60-535, 7 or 535,8 or 535,9 (i.e. §§ 2 and 3 without the last twelve or fourteen lines).

If we look more closely now at the contents and construction of CPG 4562 we see that in § 1 (525-528,59) the homilist speaks of the value of fasting. He makes the transition to § 2 by referring to Adam, who ended

up in abject poverty because he did not keep the fast (528,55-59). In §§ 2 and 3 he treats the creation of the world, Adam and Eve, their fall and banishment from paradise (τὴν διήγησιν ταύτην ἐν ἐπιτόμῳ βούλομαι διεξελθεῖν 528,64-65). At the end of § 3 the homilist sums up the subjects which he has treated thus far in §§ 2 and 3: Ἠκούσατε, ὦ τέκνα, τοῦ Ἀδάμ τὴν διάπλασιν· ἐγνώκατε αὐτοῦ τῆς τιμῆς τὴν ἀξίαν· ἐμάθετε τὰ ἐκ θεοῦ δοθέντα αὐτῷ· ἐθεάσασθε αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς παραβάσεως τὴν ἐξέωσιν· ἐκλαύσατε αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀπαραμύθητον τραγωδίαν· ἐβλέψατε αὐτὸν ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου στυγρὸν καὶ κατηφῆ γεγονός (535,3-8). He continues with the question: Στήσομεν μέχρι τούτου τὸν λόγον ἢ διηγησόμεθα ἅπερ ἡ Εὐὰ κληρονομίαν ἐχθίστην κατέλιπε ταῖς μετέπειτα γενεαῖς (535,9-11). At once he answers with the words: Ἀναγκαῖον μηκῦναι τὸν λόγον (535,11). In § 4 the homilist talks of women who in their evil ways follow in the footsteps of Eve. This brings us to the conclusion that we cannot exclude the possibility that CPG 4562 is an organic whole, in which a continuous theme is recognisable. It seems more natural to think of an independent homilist, rather than of a redactor who would have fused three homilies into one—and whose efforts here we should have to pronounce remarkably successful. In the text itself, too, we find indications of one author. We may point to similarities in vocabulary in the various sections of CPG 4562, in which we refer to the separate sections § 1, §§ 2-3 and § 4 by I, II and III: ἐκ κατωτάτου στήθους: 525,4a.i.-3a.i. (I); 533,60-61 (II) ἀναφανδὸν βοᾷ 528,9 (I), cf. προεφήτευσεν ἀναφανδὸν 531,1 (II) θεοῦ παντοκράτορος 527,41 (I), cf. τοῦ παντοκράτορος 530,9 (II); 531,24 (II); 532,65 (II); ἀνωτέρω τοῦ λόγου 528,70 (I), cf. ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ λόγου 536,5-6 (III) ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν ὀλίγα 528,41-42 (I), cf. ὀλίγα ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν 536,15 (III) θρίαμβος ... τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ προέκειτο 526,8a.i.-7a.i. (I), cf. θρίαμβος τοῖς φίλοις καὶ τοῖς συγγενέσιν ἐποίησεν 538,7-8 (III).

It must be said immediately that the value of these similarities should not be overestimated; on the other hand they do not detract from the supposition that the text is homogeneous. The connection between I and II is admittedly closer than between III and what precedes it, but the homilist himself clearly regarded III as something thrown in for good measure, as we may deduce from his hesitation at the end of § 3 concerning whether to stop or continue. Against this looser connection between II and III, however, it has been seen that the words or phrases in CPG 4548 which are borrowed from CPG 4562 derive both from § 3 and § 4, from which we may conclude that the author of CPG 4548

had the complete text of CPG 4562 in front of him. This fact too points emphatically to the unity of CPG 4562.

A final question to be asked is whether it is possible to date CPG 4562. Within the homily itself we have found no reference which would make it possible to date the work more precisely within the fifth to the seventh centuries. From an unexpected quarter, however, a clue has presented itself. Halfway through his homily the writer of CPG 4562 makes Adam utter a lament directed against paradise (PG 56, 533, 35-534, 44), a passage which deserves close attention. This is followed by Adam's reproach to Eve, which the author of CPG 4548 used as his model. Of this *θρῆνος* uttered by Adam we find a poetical version in an old *Kontakion* on Adam, designated as *θρῆνος ᾿Αδάμ* and published by P. Maas with the title *Das verlorene Paradies*.¹⁷ The similarities between the homily and the *kontakion* allow no room for doubt—one is derived from the other. Here we shall cite first the section of the *kontakion* in question:¹⁸

Ἐκάθισεν ᾿Αδάμ τότε καὶ ἔκλαυσεν ἀπέναντι
 τῆς τρυφῆς τοῦ παραδείσου, χερσὶ τύπτων τὰς ὄψεις,
 καὶ ἔλεγεν· «Ἐλεῆμον, ἐλέησον τὸν παραπεσόντα.»

Ἰδὼν ᾿Αδάμ τὸν ἄγγελον ὠθήσαντα καὶ κλείσαντα
 5 τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κήπου θύραν, ἀνεστέναξε μέγα
 καὶ ἔλεγεν· «Ἐλεῆμον, ἐλέησον τὸν παραπεσόντα.

Συνάλησον, παράδεισε, τῷ κτήτορι πτωχεύσαντι
καὶ τῷ ἤχῳ σου τῶν φύλλων ἰκέτευσον τὸν πλάστην
μὴ κλείσῃ σε. Ἐλεῆμον, ἐλέησον τὸν παραπεσόντα.

10 Τὰ δένδρα σου κατάκαμψον ὡς ἔμφυχα, καὶ πρόσπεσον
τῷ κλειδούχῳ, ἵνα οὕτως μείνης ἀνωγγμένος
 τῷ κράζοντι· Ἐλεῆμον, ἐλέησον τὸν παραπεσόντα.

Ἵσφραίνομαι τοῦ κάλλους σου καὶ τήκομαι μνησκόμος
πῶς ἐν τούτῳ ἠὺφραινόμενην ἀπὸ τῆς εὐοσμίας
 15 τῶν ἀνθέων. Ἐλεῆμον, ἐλέησον τὸν παραπεσόντα.

Νῦν ἔμαθον ἃ ἔπαθον, νῦν ἔγνωκα ἃ εἶπέ μοι
 ὁ θεὸς ἐν παραδείσῳ, ὅτι Εὖαν λαμβάνων
 λανθάνεις με». Ἐλεῆμον, ἐλέησον τὸν παραπεσόντα.

Παράδεισε πανάρετε πανάγιε πανόλβιε,

- 20 δι' Ἀδὰμ πεφυτευμένη, δι' Εὐᾶν κεκλεισμένη,
πῶς κλάυσω σε; Ἐλεῆμον, ἐλέησον τὸν παραπεσόντα.
«Ῥερύπωμαί, ἠφάνισμαι, δεδούλωμαι τοῖς δούλοις μου·
ἐρπετὰ γὰρ καὶ θηρία, ἃ ὑπέταξα φόβῳ
πτοοῦσι με. Ἐλεῆμον, ἐλέησον τὸν παραπεσόντα.
- 25 Οὐκέτι μοι τὰ ἄνθηα προσάγουσιν ἀπόλαυσιν
ἀλλ' ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους ἡ γῆ μοι ἀνατέλλει,
οὐ πρόσσοδον. Ἐλεῆμον, ἐλέησον τὸν παραπεσόντα.
Τὴν τράπεζαν τὴν ἄμοχθον κατέστρεψα θελήματι·
καὶ λοιπὸν ἐν τῷ ἰδρῶτι τοῦ προσώπου μου ἐσθίω
30 τὸν ἄρτον μου. Ἐλεῆμον, ἐλέησον τὸν παραπεσόντα.
Ὁ λάρυγξ μου, ὃν ἤδυναν τὰ νάματα τὰ ἅγια
ἐπικράνθη ἀπὸ πλήθους τῶν ἀναστεναγμῶν μου
βοῶντός μου. Ἐλεῆμον, ἐλέησον τὸν παραπεσόντα.

We cite now the parallel passages from CPG 4562 in the order of the kontakion:

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1/2: 534,24 | οὐ φέρω <u>ἀπέναντι τῆς τρυφῆς σου</u> καθήμενος βλέπειν σε |
| 8: 534,33/4 | καὶ τῷ <u>ἤχῳ τῶν φύλλων σου</u> ἀνάκραξον ἐν ἰσχύϊ. |
| 10: 534,32/3 | <u>κατάκαμψον τὰ δένδρα σου καὶ πρόσπεσον τῷ</u>
<u>εὐσπλάγχνῳ</u> |
| 11: 534,38 | ἵνα <u>μείνης ἀνεωγμένος τῷ σὲ ἀγαπήσαντι</u> |
| 14/5: 533,68/9 | <u>πῶς εὐφραινόμενην ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τῶν ἀνθέων σου</u> |
| 19: 533,66 | <u>πανόλβιε παράδεισε</u> |
| 23/4: cf. 534,11 | τῶν θηρίων τὸ ἀνυπότακτον |
| 28: 533,70 | πῶς προέκειτό μοι ἡ ἄμοχθος τράπεζα |
| 31: 534,40/1 | ἰδοὺ καὶ ὁ <u>λάρυγξ μου</u> σιγῇ καταδέδεται |

The similarities in which a biblical citation form the basis (26 and 29) have not been noted.

The relationship between homily and kontakion, which has not been noticed previously, cannot be denied. However, we are once again confronted with the question of which text served as the model for the other: the homily or the kontakion? In so far as we are in a position to judge, it is rather the case that the kontakia shown to us from the sixth century, in particular those of Romanos Melodes, are inspired by homilies, than the other way around, although there are exceptions to

this rule.¹⁹ Thus it is probable that CPG 4562 should be dated before the *kontakion* on Adam, which P. Maas, followed by J. Grosdidier de Matons, assumes to be older than the *kontakia* of Romanos.²⁰ If the *kontakion* dates from the beginning of the sixth century, then we must date CPG 4562 to the fifth century, and in all probability to the end of the fifth century.

A terminus post quem for CPG 4548

With this date for CPG 4562 we have a *terminus post quem* for CPG 4548. Thus it would be chronologically possible to attribute CPG 4548 to Leontius, whom we situate in the sixth century,²¹ but the handful of stylistic points which Sachot would advance in favour of the attribution of CPG 4548 to Leontius are far from sufficient, if we are to justify the attribution to Leontius on the basis of such criteria alone. If we add to this objection the evident dependence of CPG 4548 on CPG 4562 for the final section of the former, and the fact that in his homilies Leontius comes across as a homilist in his own right, the attribution of CPG 4548 to Leontius cannot be justified.

The Corpus Timotheanum

In his *corpus Leontianum* Sachot has included five homilies, which, since the study of Dom Bernard Capelle in 1949, have usually been attributed to one and the same author, namely Timothy, presbyter of Jerusalem, whom Capelle places in the period between the sixth and eighth centuries.²² Père J. Paramelle believes that as well CPG 4704, a homily of ps. Chrysostom, *Homilia in lacum Genesareth et in s. Petrum apostolum* (PG 64,47-52), must be added to the *corpus* of Timothy of Jerusalem.²³ Sachot's assumption that this last-mentioned homily also forms part of Leontius' work comes as no surprise.²⁴ In any case, now that we do not attribute CPG 4548 to Leontius, we shall have to consider whether it perhaps belongs to the *corpus Timotheanum* which Sachot has included in Leontius' oeuvre.

Within this *corpus Timotheanum* we are faced with the same problematic as in Leontius: vocabulary and style will not suffice for a definitive attribution. Furthermore, with Timothy we find ourselves in an even more difficult position, because there are only two homilies which bear his name in their title.²⁵ In contrast with the works of Leon-

tius, in our examination of the *corpus Timotheanum* we shall have to start with but two homilies. One may guess that with a touchstone of only two homilies a *corpus Timotheanum* will always remain a flimsy construction, and one which it will remain difficult to assess properly, if Timothy is not a homilist in his own right but has borrowed extensively from the homilies of others. Caro, for instance, assumes that in CPG 2267 and 2269 Timothy has probably reworked parts of homilies of Amphilochius of Iconium, because he finds similarities between Timothy's work and Homilies II and III of Amphilochius.²⁶ These, however, are homilies which Sachot²⁷ ascribes to Leontius! Again, how can we make a clear division between the *corpora* of Timothy and Leontius, if Timothy has also been inspired by Leontius? To investigate these problems now would be to go beyond the scope of this paper; we intend to deal with them at a later date.

Conclusions

As far as CPG 4548 is concerned, the only points that can be made with certainty at present are that this homily comes from a homilist who has made extensive use of CPG 4562, and that the concluding passage of CPG 4548 was in circulation as a separate homily (BHG^a 25q). It is conceivable that an exhaustive analysis of the *corpus Timotheanum* will provide us with a better picture of the homilist who is behind CPG 4548.

What is true for CPG 4548 is also true for other cases: only an all-embracing analysis of a homily and its transmission will offer us the opportunity of formulating convincing hypotheses concerning its author and milieu. Arguments founded purely on vocabulary and style are no basis for a definitive attribution. Yet this is the direction Sachot has taken, doing thereby a disservice both to Leontius, presbyter of Constantinople, and to research dedicated to him. Moreover, a great deal of work will be necessary in order to assign a more appropriate place in homiletic literature to the homilies which have been attributed without due consideration to Leontius. But it is precisely through such work—and this is the other side of the coin—that we gain a better insight into the perils associated with demarcating certain *corpora* within homiletic literature.

NOTES

* This article grew out of a paper presented in 1984 by C. Datema at a seminar on Timothy of Jerusalem directed by Père J. Paramelle at the École Pratique des Hautes Études in Paris.

¹ B. Marx, *Procliana. Untersuchung über den homiletischen Nachlass des Patriarchen Proklos von Konstantinopel* (Münster i.W. 1940).

² We restrict ourselves here to a reference to an essay of M. Aubineau on methodology: "Trois types de procès d'authenticité" in M. Aubineau, *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*, Subsidia Hagiographia 59, vol. II (Bruxelles 1980) 608-614.

³ M. Sachot, *L'homélie pseudo-chrysostomienne sur la Transfiguration*. CPG 4724, BHG 1975 (Frankfurt am Main-Bern 1981) 465-483.

⁴ Our edition of the homilies of Leontius is about to appear in the *Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca*.

⁵ M. Sachot, *op. cit.*, 482-483.

⁶ For each turn of phrase we give here a number of parallels from other authors. In so doing, however, we do not intend to compile an exhaustive list. At the same time we shall indicate comparable turns of phrase in those homilies which Sachot wants to ascribe to Leontius simply on the basis of the occurrence of these expressions. Examples of the latter are designated by an asterisk.

(a) Cf. ps. Athanasius, PG 28,912A*; PG 28,945A*; 956A*; PG 28,1008D*; 1020D*; ps. Chrysostom or ps. Amphilochius (Aldama 565), ed. C. Datema CCSG 3, p. 252, 25-28*; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 343), PG 64,47,17^{a.i.}-16^{a.i.}*; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 574) PG 61,699. Similar expressions are found in Asterius the Sophist: ἀρτίως ἤκουσα ... λέγοντος (ed. M. Richard 34,19); Chrysostom (PG 50,667), ἠκούσατε αὐτοῦ καὶ σήμερον βοῶντος καὶ λέγοντος; PG 50,714 ὡς ἠκούσατε σήμερον λέγοντος; Severian (PG 49,323) ἠκούσατε ὡς ἀρτίως ἔλεγεν.

(b) Cf. Chrysostom, PG 59,360; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 144), PG 52,765; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 145), PG 52,793.

(c) Cf. Theodore of Heraclea, In Ioannem fragm. 353 (ed. J. Reuss, Johannes Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche (TU 89) (Berlin 1966) 157): ἐπλήρωσαν τὸ ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα ρητὸν τὸ φάσκον.

(d) Cf. ps. Athanasius, PG 28,945D*; PG 28,908B and D*; PG 28,1008A τὸ φάσκον θεῖον ῥητόν*; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 174), PG 52,836; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 23), PG 59,614; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 343), PG 64,47,24^{a.i.}*; ps. Chrysostom (CPG 4862), unedited; Timothy, PG 86,261B, τὸ φάσκον θεῖον ῥητόν*.

(e) Cf. ps. Athanasius, PG 28,776A; PG 28,912C*; PG 28,957*; PG 28,1005C*; 1008B*; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 170), PG 52,409; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 444), PG 55,562; ps. Chrysostom (= Leontius of Jerusalem; Aldama 457), PG 59,538; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 536), PG 60,725; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 343), PG 64,48,9^{a.i.}*; Proclus, ed. F. Leroy, p. 211.

(f) Cf. ps. Athanasius, PG 28,912C*; PG 28,949A*; PG 28,1001B*; 1005A*; Chrysostom, PG 51,50; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 170), PG 52,407; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 203); PG 62,763,764.

(g) Cf. ps. Athanasius, PG 28,1001A*; 1008B*; 1013D*; 1020C*; Amphilochius, p. 45, 66; 69,241 ed. C. Datema, CCSG 3*; ps. Chrysostom or ps. Amphilochius (Aldama 565), ed. C. Datema, CCSG 3, p. 258,151 and 159*. Compare the variation ἀλλ' ἔστιν εἰκὸς πρὸς τοῦτο τινὰς εἰπεῖν in Cyrill of Alexandria (PG 77,1044A).

(h) Cf. Proclus, PG 65,693B; 724C; 780A; Basil of Seleucia, SC 187,208 (ed. M. Aubineau); ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 318), PG 61,755.

(i) Cf. Chrysostom, PG 48,1048; PG 49,263; ps. Chrysostom (Aldama 456), PG 48,779; Proclus PG 65,696 (quater); 760 (bis); Basil of Seleucia, PG 85,49B; 264C; 365D; 373A; 453A; Cyril of Alexandria, PG 75,1428D; 1461B.

⁷ M. Geerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* II (Turnhout 1974) 555: *Variae extant recensiones, quae incipiunt: (a) Ἄγαν αἰδέσιμον ἡμῖν ὁ δαφιλῆς (b) Εὐκαιρον λέγειν ἡμᾶς τὰ τοῦ προφήτου. Cf.: M. Aubineau, CCG I, 4, n. 143 p. 459-466 (c) Ἠκούσαμεν ἀρτίως, ἀγαπητοί, τῆς θείας γραφῆς. Cf.: BHG^a 25q.*

⁸ Atheniensis gr. 455, s. XI, pp. 124-128, Hierosolymitanus S. Sab. 80, s. XIII, ff. 66-71; Messanensis S. Salv. 55, s. XIII, ff. 30-32^v (des. 614,17); Oxoniensis Bodl. Auct. E. 316, ff. 359-366 (exemplar Savillii); Oxoniensis Bodl. Barocc. gr. 55, s. X, ff. 303-309; Oxoniensis Bodl. Barocc. gr. 189, s. XVI, ff. 169^v-172; Sinaiticus gr. 529, s. XV, ff. 168-180; Vaticanus gr. 800, s. XV, ff. 79-82; Vindobonensis Theol. gr. 10, s. X, ff. 81-84.

⁹ This is evidenced by the series of homilies of John Chrysostom on Genesis (PG 53, 21-54,580); cf. also the series by Severian of Gabala (PG 56,429-500). Cf. M.-L. Guillaumin, "Bible et liturgie dans la prédication de Jean Chrysostom", in *Jean Chrysostom et Augustin. Actes du Colloque de Chantilly 22-24 septembre 1974 édités par Charles Kannengiesser* (Théologie Historique 35) (Paris 1975) 170.

¹⁰ M. Sachot, *op. cit.*, 292.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 474.

¹² Robert E. Carter, *Codices Chrysostomici Graeci V. Codicum Italiae pars prior* (Paris 1983) 239, n. 23a.

¹³ M. Sachot, *op. cit.*, 474.

¹⁴ For the stylistic characteristics of the author Leontius the reader is referred to the introduction to the edition of Leontius' homilies (n. 4 above). Previously we had challenged the supposition that Leontius was a compiler: cf. P. Allen-C. Datema, "Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople—a Compiler?", in *JÖB* 28 (1980) 9-20.

¹⁵ Cf. M. Geerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* II, 559.

¹⁶ Above, p. 172.

¹⁷ P. Maas, *Frühbyzantinische Kirchenpoesie. Anonyme Hymnen des V-VI Jahrhunderts* (Kleine Texte für Theologie und Philologie no. 52-53) (Berlin 1931²) 16-20.

¹⁸ We have incorporated in these lines the few modifications proposed by J. Grosdidier de Matons in his *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance* (Paris 1977) 30-31.

¹⁹ Cf. J. Grosdidier de Matons, *op. cit.*, 249-251.

²⁰ P. Maas, *op. cit.*, 17; J. Grosdidier de Matons, *op. cit.*, 28.

²¹ Cf. C. Datema, "When did Leontius, presbyter of Constantinople, preach?", *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 (1981) 346-351.

²² B. Capelle, "Les homélie liturgiques du prétendu Timothée de Jérusalem", in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 63 (1959), 5-26.

²³ This homily is registered as BHG^a 1488a.

²⁴ M. Sachot, *op. cit.*, 476.

²⁵ These homilies bear the numbers CPG 7405 and 7406.

²⁶ R. Caro, *La Homiletica Mariana Griega en el Siglo V*, vol. II (Marian Library Studies 4) (Dayton Ohio 1972) 462-466 and 536-537.

²⁷ M. Sachot, *op. cit.*, 479-481.