AUGUSTINIANUM

SUMMARIUM

RECENSIONES:

Daniel Hombergen, *The second Origenist controversy. A new perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' monastic biographies as historical sources for sixth-century Origenism* (Manlio Simonetti). Yvette Duval, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne. Les premiers échos de la grande persécution* (Manlio Simonetti). Fabrizio Bisconti, *Mestieri nelle catacombe romane. Appunti sul declino dell'iconografia del reale nei cimiteri cristiani di Roma* (Massimiliano Ghilardi). *Materiali e tecniche dell'edilizia paleocristiana*, a cura di Margherita Cecchelli (Massimiliano Ghilardi). *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, a cura di Fabrizio Bisconti (Massimiliano Ghilardi). Gaetano Lettieri, *Il metodo della grazia: Pascal e l'ermeneutica giansenista di Agostino* (Eduardo Vadillo Romero). *Il latino e i cristiani. Un bilancio all'inizio del terzo millennio*, a cura di E. dal Covolo e M. Sodi (Vincenzo Di Muro).

QUOTATIONS OF THEODORET'S *DE SANCTA ET VIVIFICA TRINITATE* IN EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS' *PANOPLIA DOGMATICA*

Since the restoration to its original author, the two-part treatise of Theodoret of Cyrus, Περὶ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ζωοποιοῦ Τριάδος (*De sancta et vivifica Trinitate*, PG 75,1147-1190) and Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως (*De incarnatione Domini*, PG 75,1419-1478) has been subjected to scholarly attention.[1] Nevertheless, from among the two aforementioned works, mainly the second one (consecrated to Christology) was researched in detail, regarding both its theological significance and especially its textual tradition.[2] Various scholars have found excerpts from *De incarnatione* in the works of ancient and mediaeval authors including Marius Mercator, Severus of Antioch, Nicetas of Heracleia and Euthymius Zigabenus,[3] yet apart

---

[1] The works were preserved under the name of Cyril of Alexandria in one manuscript, *Vat. gr.* 841 fos. 176ᵛ-185ᵛ (=*De Trinitate*) and 185ᵛ-203ʳ (=*De incarnatione*). Editions: Angelo Mai, ed., *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*. Rome 1833, VIII, pp. 27-103; *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, Rome 1844, II, pp. 1-74 - reprinted still under the name of Cyril in PG 75,1147-1190 and 1419-1478.

[2] The first treatise (*De Trinitate*) was briefly analysed by Paul Bauchman Clayton, whereas a fuller account of its theological importance was provided most recently by the excellent paper of Jean-Noël Guinot. See P. B. Clayton, Jr., *Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, and the Mystery of the Incarnation in Late Antiochene Christology* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1985), pp. 198-203; Jean-Noël Guinot, *L'Expositio rectae fidei et le traité Sur la Trinité et l'Incarnation de Théodoret de Cyr: deux types d'argumentation pour un même propos?*, in *Recherches augustiniennes* 32 (2001), pp. 39-74. Some theological attention was given to *De Trinitate* by Günter Koch and Silke-Petra Bergjan, but neither of them entered the details of its textual tradition. See G. Koch, *Strukturen und Geschichte des Heils in der Theologie des Theodoret von Kyros, Eine dogmen- und theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung* [Frankfurter theologische Studien, 17], Frankfurt am Main 1974; Silke-Petra Bergjan. *Theodoret von Cyrus und der Neunizänismus. Aspekte der altkirchlichen Trinitätslehre* [Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 60], Berlin 1994).

[3] Albert Ehrhard, *Die Cyrill von Alexandrien zugeschriebene Schrift Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως ein Werk Theodorets von Cyrus*, in *Theologische*

from two short fragments quoted by Severus in his *Contra Grammaticum* of 519 no excerpts were found or published from Theodoret's *De Trinitate*.

The first sentence quoted by Severus and found by J. Lebon, which does not appear in *Vat. gr.* 841 and was probably at the beginning of *De Trinitate*'s Prooemium is the following: "Every writing requires time and tranquillity, together with a mind free of worries". Lebon's Latin translation from the Syriac: "Omnis scriptio otium requirit et tranquillitatem, mentemque curis liberatam". The other very brief passage consists of the first four lines of the Prooemium: ἔδει μὲν πάντας [...] τῆς τοῦ ποιμένος ἀκούειν φωνῆς (PG 75,1148A).[1]

Therefore, these two short excerpts are the only ones known so far to have been handed down to us from Theodoret's *De Trinitate* apart from the *Vat. gr.* 841 itself, the only surviving manuscript, which contains both works under Cyril's name. The narrow manuscript tradition of these texts and other evidences do not support the theory of a deliberate pseudepigraphy in the sixth century. Moreover, Nicetas of Heracleia cited the second work in the eleventh century still under the name of Theodoret.[5]

Albert Ehrhard - the restorer of both treatises to their author - already pointed out that Euthymius Zigabenus in his *Panoplia Dogmatica* had quoted passages from the second work (*De incarnatione*).[6] According to our present knowledge, Euthymius is the only

---

Quartalschrift, 70,2 (1888), pp. 179-243, 406-450, 623-653 (pp. 199-200 and 626-27); Eduard Schwartz, *Zur Schriftstellerei Theodorets*, in *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse*, 1 (1922), pp. 30-40 (pp. 33-38); Joseph Lebon, *Restitutions à Théodoret de Cyr*, in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 26 (1930), pp. 523-550 (pp. 529-531); Robert Devreesse, *Orient, antiquité*, in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 20 (1931), pp. 559-71 (p. 568); Marcel Richard, *Les citations de Théodoret conservées dans la chaîne de Nicétas sur l'Évangile selon Saint Luc*, in *Revue biblique* 43 (1934), pp. 88-96 (pp. 89-91).

[4] Joseph Lebon, ed., trans., *Severi Antiocheni Liber Contra Impium Grammaticum, Orationis Tertiae Pars Prior* [CSCO 94, Syri 46], Louvain 1929. Cf. Lebon, *Restitutions*, p. 529.

[5] Cf. István Pásztori-Kupán, *An unnoticed title in Theodoret of Cyrus' Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως*, in *Journal of theological studies* 53 (2002), pp. 102-11 (p. 110, note 18).

[6] Ehrhard, *Die Cyrill von Alexandrien zugeschriebene*, pp. 199-200.

author who knew and cited this treatise under the name of Cyril. The fact that all the excerpts found so far in the works of the two mediaeval authors (Nicetas and Euthymius) were exclusively from the second work, brings about the question: were *both* works known to the scholars of the Middle Ages - especially for Euthymius - or did they survive separately, the first one perhaps still under the name of Theodoret and the second one under the name of Cyril? Thus, did the pseudepigraphy - committed deliberately or by mistake - affect both works or only the second one? If so, were they separated for a while during the textual tradition to be linked again together in *Vat. gr.* 841 in the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries just because of their inherent connection with each other?[7] Although the presumption of both works being ascribed simultaneously to Cyril and thus being handed down and copied into *Vat. gr.* 841 is the more likely version, the question cannot be answered positively until more excerpts of *De Trinitate* - apart from those in Severus - are found either under the name of Theodoret or of Cyril.

As part of my research concerning the textual tradition of these treatises, I decided to recheck the entire *Panoplia* of Euthymius for further Theodoretian excerpts, which might have been overlooked by modern scholarship. The result exceeded my expectations, since I found five so far unidentified fragments of *De Trinitate* under the name of Cyril. They are the following:

---

[7] The link between the two treatises is created also by the introduction of *De incarnatione*, as follows: "We have completed the treatise on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity [περὶ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος], which is, in my opinion, appropriate for the congregation of the pious and those who accept the evangelical teachings. Now our aim is not to contradict the impious, but to expound faith for the disciples of the apostles [...]". See PG 75,1420A.

Euthymius Zigabenus: *Panoplia Dogmatica*	Theodoret of Cyrus: *De s. et v. Trinitate*
1) PG 130,653BD: Τοῦ αὐτοῦ [i.e. Κυρίλλου] ἐκ τοῦ περὶ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος λόγου. ὅτι δὲ τὰ αὐτὰ δύναται τῷ Πατρὶ [...] ἰσότης ἐν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ γνωρίζεται.	PG 75,1165AC The entire Chapter 13 of *De Trinitate*, without its title, but otherwise fully identical with the text of *Vat. gr.* 841.[8]
2) PG 130,656AD: καὶ τοῦτο. βαβαὶ πόση τῶν αἱρετικῶν ἡ παραπληξία [...] τῇ ἀναληφθείσης ἀνθρωπότητος τὴν ἀποστολὴν εἶναι.	PG 75,1168A-1169A Long fragment from Chapter 15 of *De Trinitate*, with minor textual variants.
3) PG 130,656D-657B: καὶ τοῦτο. Πάτερ, ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα [...] πῶς αἰτεῖ λαβεῖν ὃ ἔχει ἀεί;	PG 75,1173CD Almost the entire text of Chapter 17 of *De Trinitate*, with a few minor textual variants.
4) PG 130,657BC: καὶ τοῦτο. εἶτα δεικνὺς, ὡς οὐ δοξάζεται μόνον [...] τὸ κοινὸν τῆς ἐξουσίας παιδεύων.	PG 75,1176A More than half of the text of Chapter 18 of *De Trinitate*, with minor textual variants.
5) PG 130,669BC: Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ περὶ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος λόγου. ἵνα δὲ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ τὴν ἰσότητα δείξωμεν [...] ποίαν ἐνταῦθα χώραν ἔχει τὸ μεῖζον καὶ τὸ ελαττον;	PG 75,1161AB Fragment from Chapter 11 of *De Trinitate*, with minor textual variants.

These fragments provide us with sufficient evidence that Euthymius knew not only *De incarnatione*, but also *De Trinitate* as being written by Cyril. Thus, one cannot rule out the possibility of a pseudepigraphy preceding the twelfth century, which could affect

---

[8] Euthymius - in the same fashion as Nicetas of Heracleia did a century earlier - quotes fragments of Theodoret's work without the chapter titles. The only exception to this rule is the title of Chapter 16 of Theodoret's *De incarnatione* (PG 75,1444D) quoted by Euthymius in PG 130,925B, yet in that case the title is necessary in order to clarify the discussed theme. Thus, he does not quote the chapter titles of the above quotations either.

both tracts.[9] Since Cyril himself had written two works on the Trinity, it would be also interesting to know just in what fashion were these fragments known to Euthymius. Did he know them as being part of Cyril's other tracts - like the *Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate* and *De sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate* - or as a different Cyrilline treatise?[10]

It seems that based on the method by which Euthymius quotes these fragments we are able to give an answer to this question as well. One may observe that every time he quotes from Theodoret's *De Trinitate* under the name of Cyril, he uses the phrase Τοῦ αὐτοῦ [i.e. Κυρίλλου] ἐκ τοῦ περὶ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος λόγου, whereas when quoting from other (genuine) works of Cyril concerned with the Trinity, he omits the expression τῆς ἁγίας and merely says Τοῦ αὐτοῦ [i.e. Κυρίλλου] ἐκ τοῦ περὶ Τριάδος λόγου.[11] For the sake of example, let us examine the way Euthymius quotes from Cyril's *Thesaurus*:

Euthymius Zigabenus: *Panoplia Dogmatica*	Cyril of Alexandria
PG 130,625BC: Τοῦ αὐτοῦ [i.e. Κυρίλλου] ἐκ τοῦ περὶ Τριάδος λόγου. εἴπερ μὴ ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν [...] πῶς ὁ Υἱὸς ἀδελφός ἐστι τοῦ γεννήσαντος;	PG 75,41B: ἀντίθεσις ἑτεροδόξων. Fragment from Cyril's *Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate*.
PG 130,625C: ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου. εἴπερ ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν [...] δύναται οὐ ἐστι Λόγος;	PG 75, 41B: ἄλλο. Fragment from Cyril's *Thesaurus*.

---

[9] We do not know whether Nicetas and Euthymius were quoting from the same manuscript tradition or not. If they did, then the pseudepigraphy might be located between 1080 (when Nicetas wrote his *Catena of Luke*) and the twelfth century (when Euthymius composed his *Panoplia*), yet that remains an open question.

[10] These two early works of Cyril on the Trinity were themselves connected to each other, being dedicated to the same 'brother' Nemesius. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, Utrecht 1950-55, III, pp. 125-126.

[11] That is why I italicised the expression τῆς ἁγίας in Fragments 1 and 5 above.

PG 130,625CD: καὶ τοῦτο. οὐκ ἐκ τινος ἀρχῆς [...] ἀδελφότης ἐν τούτοις;	PG 75,41C: ἄλλο. Fragment from Cyril's *Thesaurus*.
PG 130,625D: καὶ τοῦτο. εἰ τέλειος ὁ Πατὴρ [...] πρὸ παντὸς εἶναι χρόνου,	PG 75,41CD: ἔτι περὶ ἀϊδιότητος. Fragment from Cyril's *Thesaurus*.
PG 130,625D-628C: καὶ τοῦτο. ἀντίθεσις οὐκ ἀληθὴς [...] λογισμῶν ἀσθενῶς εἰσφερόμενον.	PG 75, 44AD: ἄλλο. Fragment from Cyril's *Thesaurus*.
PG 130,628C: καὶ τοῦτο. εἰ φῶς ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς [...] σοφία ἐν θεῷ καὶ Πατρί.	PG 75,49D-52A: ἄλλα ἁπλᾶ καὶ ἀπόλυτα. Fragment from Cyril's *Thesaurus*.
PG 130,628CD: καὶ ταῦτα. εἰ ἐν Υἱῷ θεωρεῖται ὁ Πατὴρ [...] τὴν ἐμφέρειαν ἔχουσιν.	PG 75, 52A: ἄλλο. Fragment from Cyril's *Thesaurus*.

One may note the absence of τῆς ἁγίας before Τριάδος from the first fragment. Through his entire *Panoplia*, Euthymius is consistent in using the term τῆς ἁγίας [Τριάδος] exclusively whilst quoting from Theodoret's *De Trinitate*, and in omitting it when referring to Cyril's works, like the *Thesaurus*. I think we have sufficient reasons to believe that even if Euthymius knew only fragments of Theodoret's *De Trinitate* under Cyril's name from some patristic florilegia, yet he was aware that they were taken from a separate work, and not from any other tract of the Alexandrian patriarch. This is valid also for his quotations from *De incarnatione*, where Euthymius consistently mentions the most important element of the title (i.e. περὶ ἐνανθρωπήσεως)[12] as we know it from *Vat. gr.* 841: τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις

---

[12] The authenticity of the title is validated by Theodoret himself, who mentions these treatises on two occasions: in his *Letter to the people of Constantinople* (preserved in Latin) and in his *Letter* 113 *to Pope Leo* (preserved in Greek). In his *Letter to the people of Constantinople* written right after the council of Ephesus in early 432, Theodoret mentions the two works as *de sancta Trinitate et de divina dispensatione* (SCh 429, p. 150; cf. ACO I, 4, p. 81, line 7), whereas in his *Letter to Leo* of 449 (following the Latrocinium) he

Κυρίλλου ἐκ τοῦ περὶ ἐνανθρωπήσεως λόγου (PG 130,905D); τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ περὶ ἐνανθρωπήσεως λόγου (PG 130,925A). One cannot affirm that the entire text of both treatises was known to Euthymius, although this possibility cannot be totally excluded either. Nonetheless, it is certain that his manner of quoting both works leaves no doubt concerning Euthymius' knowledge of them as being individual tracts.

Thus, apart from discovering these fragments from Theodoret's virtually unquoted treatise on the Trinity, we might assume also that the two works of the Bishop of Cyrus were not separated from each other - at least within the branch of the manuscript tradition known to Euthymius, a branch which might be of common origin with the one of *Vat. gr.* 841[13] - but were ascribed concurrently to Cyril of Alexandria, although the exact time and the circumstances of this pseudepigraphy cannot be ascertained as yet.

---

speaks about περὶ θεολογίας καὶ τῆς θείας ἐνανθρωπήσεως (SCh 111, p. 64). Moreover, according to Glenn Melvin Cope, Theodoret seems to make a reference to his *De Trinitate* in the *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* written around 452-53 in the following manner: ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, κατὰ τῶν τῆς τούτου χάριτος ἐρήμων αἱρετικῶν, τρεῖς συνέγραψα λόγους (PG 83,457D). Cf. Glenn Melvin Cope, *An Analysis of the Heresiological Method of Theodoret of Cyrus in the* Haereticarum fabularum compendium (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Catholic University of America, Washington D. C., 1990), p. 232, note 84. Moreover, as it results from Marcel Richard's analysis, Theodoret composed other works before Ephesus concerning the Trinity and thus the Holy Spirit, including *Adversus Macedonianos* (or *De Spiritu Sancto*), *Expositio rectae fidei* (attributed to Justin Martyr), *Adversus Arianos et Eunomianos* (lost), which might explain the above reference to the "three works concerning the Holy Spirit". See Marcel Richard, *L'activité littéraire de Théodoret avant le concile d'Éphèse*, in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 24 (1935), pp. 83-106 (p. 103).

[13] The close connection between Euthymius's excerpts and the text of *Vat. gr.* 841 is notable both in the case of *De Trinitate* and *De Incarnatione*. All the Euthymian quotations present only minor textual variations, moreover: the text of Chapter 13 of *De Trinitate* (PG 75,1165AC) in *Vat. gr.* 841 is fully identical with his excerpt in PG 130,653CD. The same is valid for the long Chapter 18 of *De Incarnatione* (PG 75,1448C-1452D) quoted by Euthymius in PG 130,905D-909D, as well as for Chapters 17 and 19 of *De Incarnatione* (PG 75,1445B-1448B and 1452C-1453B), quoted by Euthymius in *PG* 130, 928AD and 909D-912C respectively. The other fragments are very close to the original also, most of the variations consisting in syntactical transpositions.

A YET UNIDENTIFIED EXCERPT OF THEODORET'S *QUAESTIONES IN EXODUM* IN NICETAS OF HERACLEIA'S *CATENA OF LUKE*

In his article concerning the quotations of Theodoret preserved in Nicetas' *Catena of Luke* Marcel Richard continued the list of excerpts begun by Eduard Schwartz. Whilst Schwartz had to use two codices, which did not contain the entire text of the *Catena*, namely *Vindobonensis theol. gr.* 71 and *Monacensis gr.* 473, the French scholar had access to the oldest and best surviving manuscript, namely *Vat. gr.* 1611.[14] Based on this codex, M. Richard was able to enhance the list of quotations commenced by Schwartz.[15]

From among the excerpts ascribed to Theodoret in the manuscripts of the *Catena* found by both scholars eight were unidentified.[16] At this time I succeeded to locate one of them. It is *Fragment* No. 30 found by Marcel Richard in *Vat. gr.* 1611.[17] The text connected to *Luke* 1,11 is to be found on the last two lines of fol. 4ʳ and on the first line of fol. 4ᵛ:

Θεοδωρήτου ἐκ τῶν ἀπόρων. ἰστέον μέντοι ὡς παχυτέροις οὖσι τοῖς τηνικαῦτα καὶ τῶν νοητῶν ἐφικέσθαι μὴ δυναμένοις, διὰ τῶν σωματικῶν συμβόλων ὁ πάνσοφος δεσπότης τὴν ὠφέλειαν ἐπραγματεύετο.

The fragment is in fact present in one of the manuscripts used by Schwartz also, namely in *Vindob. gr.* 71, fol. 4ʳ, lines 11-15, yet the reference to Theodoret Θεοδωρήτου ἐκ τῶν ἀπόρων is missing.[18] This

---

[14] *Vindobonensis theol. gr.* 71 (dating from the 12-13ᵗʰ centuries) contains the first part of the *Catena* from the beginning of Luke's gospel until Luke 6:21, whereas *Monacensis* 473 (14ᵗʰ century) contains the text from *Luke* 6:17 until 11:26. See Joseph Sickenberger, *Die Lukaskatene des Niketas von Herakleia* [Texte und Untersuchungen, 22. 4], Leipzig 1902, pp. 1-118 (p. 60). *Vaticanus gr.* 1611 is from the year 1116 and contains the entire text of the *Catena*.

[15] E. Schwartz, *Zur Schriftstellerei Theodorets*, pp. 30-40; M. Richard, *Les citations de Théodoret*, pp. 88-96.

[16] The two scholars marked the following fragments ascribed in the manuscripts to Theodoret as being unknown: No. 5, No. 6, No. 8, No. 22 and No. 28 (Schwartz); No. 29, No. 30, and the second part of No. 36 (M. Richard).

[17] M. Richard, *Les citations de Théodoret*, p. 90.

[18] Sickenberger had already noted that the lemmata were often absent from those folios of *Vindob.* 71, which were copied by the first scribe (i.e. fols 1-79ᵛ): "Lemmata fehlen im Vind., wie betont, beim ersten Schreiber sehr häufig". See Sickenberger, *Die Lukaskatene*, p. 51.

is why the German scholar could not locate it as being a Theodoretian excerpt despite the fact that its first word ἰστέον begins with an illuminated capital iota in both manuscripts.

The above quotation is from Theodoret's *Quaestiones in Exodum,* Cap. 29, Interr. 60 in PG 80,288AB. The only textual difference in comparison with the two quoted manuscripts of the *Catena* is the transposition of ὁ πάνσοφος δεσπότης and τὴν ὠφέλειαν.

ISTVÁN PÁSZTORI-KUPÁN