

AN UNNOTICED TITLE IN THEODORET
OF CYRUS' ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΠΡΙΟΥ
ΕΝΑΝΘΡΩΠΗΣΕΩΣ

THE texts of Theodoret's two treatises *De sancta et vivifica Trinitate* (PG 75, 1147–1190) and *De incarnatione Domini* (PG 75, 1419–1478) have been handed down to us under the name of Cyril of Alexandria in only one manuscript, Vaticanus gr. 841.¹ After Cardinal Angelo Mai and Jacques-Paul Migne had published them still under the name of the Alexandrian patriarch,² the two works were finally restored to their original author by Albert Ehrhard in 1888.³ In addition to the thoroughly convincing internal evidence, Ehrhard provided three Latin fragments of the second treatise *Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως* quoted by Marius Mercator, who ascribes them to Theodoret.⁴ These fragments had been published already by the great Jesuit scholar Jean Garnier in his *Auctarium Tomi IV Operum Theodoretī* under the title *θεωδορήτου Πενταλόγιον [περὶ] ἐνανθρωπήσεως*, as well as in his edition of Marius Mercator's works. The two codices used by Garnier were Codex Palatinus 234 (part of the *Collectio Palatina*) and Codex Bellovacensis. Garnier preferred to use Bellovacensis for his edition of Mercator.⁵

Using the same two codices as Garnier, Eduard Schwartz also edited these three fragments in *ACO* I, 5, 169–170, this time according to the *Collectio Palatina*. The German scholar did not raise any doubts concerning the attribution of these quotations

¹ Vat. gr. 841 fos. 176^v–185^v (= *De Trinitate*) and 185^v–203^r (= *De incarnatione*). In the same codex, on folios 213^r–216^v the Chapters 23–28 of *De Trinitate* and Chapters 1–2 of *De incarnatione* are reproduced.

² Angelo Mai (ed.), *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio* (Rome, 1833), VIII, 27–103; *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* (Rome, 1844), II, 1–74—reprinted in PG 75, 1147–1190 and 1419–1478.

³ Albert Ehrhard, 'Die Cyrill von Alexandrien zugeschriebene Schrift *Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως* ein Werk Theodorets von Cyrus', *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 70. 2 (1888), pp. 179–243, 406–450, 623–653.

⁴ A. Ehrhard, 'Die Cyrill v. Alex. zugeschriebene ...', p. 627. Cf. *PL* 48, 1075–1076 and *ACO* I, 5, 169–170.

⁵ *Beati Theodoretī Episcopi Cyri Operum Tomus V*, Nunc primum in lucem editus, Cura et Studio Joannis Garnerii, presbyteri e Societate Jesu, opus posthumum (Paris, 1684), 40–50. Repr. in PG 84, 65–88; *Marii Mercatoris S. Augustino aequalis Opera quaecumque extant*, Prodeunt nunc primum studio Joannis Garnerii Societatis Jesu presbyteri (Paris, 1673), Pars posterior, 272. Repr. in *PL* 48, 1075–1076.

to Mercator and their authenticity has not been questioned since in modern scholarship.

The only problem was that the chapter numbers of Mercator's second and third fragments did not match those Vat. gr. 841 printed by Mai and reprinted by Migne. These two excerpts in the *Collectio Palatina* are the following:

*Item eiusdem ex capitulo
sexto decimo:*

Convenienter, inquit, diabolus
Deo dicere poterat [...]
sed Deus qui pro homine
decertaret. (*PL* 48,
1075B–1076B; also
ACO I, 5, 169.)

De incarnatione Ch. 15 [quoted by
Mercator as 16] in *PG* 75, 1444:

καὶ εἴποι ἂν εἰκότως [...] ἀλλὰ θεὸς ὁ
ἄντι ἀνθρώπου παλαίων.

Item eiusdem ex capitulo

tricensimo (In Garnier's edition
vigesimo nono): Dei Filius
homini inseparabiliter adiunctus
[...] et appellationem naturae
eius assumens. (*PL* 48, 1076BC)

De incarn. Ch. 29 (quoted as 30 in
Palatinus and 29 in Bellovacensis)
in *PG* 75, 1469BC:

θεοῦ, ὅς ἀχωρίστως αὐτῷ συνημμένος
[...]
καὶ τὴν τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ προσηγορίαν
λαβών.

As Schwartz rightly pointed out, the copyist overlooked a new title within the text of Chapter 15. This title in the Greek text falls exactly between Mercator's first and second excerpt, as follows: ὅτι εἰ ὁ θεὸς Λόγος ἦν ἀντὶ νοῦ ἐν τῷ ληφθέντι, καὶ ὁ διάβολος δικαιολογίαις χρῆσασατο ἂν εὐλόγοις (*PG* 75, 1444A). Because of its obvious connection with the rest, the scribe did not observe this title, which was supposed to introduce Chapter 16. Consequently, the numbering of the second and third fragment in the *Collectio Palatina* is one ahead compared to Vat. 841, thus also to Mai's and Migne's version.⁶

We should deal also with the discrepancy between the chapter numbers of Mercator's third excerpt (30 in *ACO*, 29 in Garnier). Schwartz says in the preface of *ACO* I, 5 that he used the following codices: Palatinus 234 and Bellovacensis (the same two codices as Garnier). As we have already mentioned, Garnier preferred Bellovacensis to Palatinus at least according to his *Praefatio Generalis*.⁷

⁶ Eduard Schwartz, 'Zur Schriftstellerei Theodoret's', *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse*, 1 (1922), 30–40 (p. 31).

⁷ In his edition of Mercator's works, Garnier says, *Haec omnia excerpta sunt ex duobus antiquis codicibus, altero Vaticano, altero Bellovacensi, qui ambo sua sibi aetate fidem conciliant: ille ex Hidelbergensi [sic] bibliotheca in Vaticanam deportatus est;*

In the light of Schwartz's discovery of the first overlooked title within Chapter 15, the Codex Palatinus Bibliothecae Vaticanae 234—as reprinted in the *ACO*—seems to have preserved the correct chapter number, i.e. 30. Mercator was familiar with the Nestorian controversy, so his accuracy here is quite admissible. Nevertheless, according to both manuscripts he had quoted from *De incarnatione* as being part of Theodoret's so-called five books against Cyril and against the council of Ephesus. I am inclined to say that this was merely an impious fraud, since Mercator would not admit any positive contribution to Christology from the Antiochene side. Therefore, he tried to achieve the rejection of Theodoret's inoffensive little treatise on the incarnation together with his other works written in the same period.

How did the *vigesimo nono* occur then in Bellovacensis, replacing the initial *tricensimo*? The simple and most probable answer is that the chapter number was corrupted during copying. This must have been Schwartz's opinion also who—strangely enough—did not address this question in the critical apparatus or in the preface of *ACO* I, and did not reflect upon it in his 'Zur Schriftstellerei Theodorets'.

A very interesting amendment to the question of chapter numbering was furnished by Joseph Lebon, who noticed that Severus of Antioch in his *Contra Grammaticum* had quoted from Theodoret's *De Trinitate* and *De incarnatione* and also from *Expositio rectae fidei*, a work of Theodoret attributed to Justin Martyr.⁸ Lebon observed that the chapter numbers quoted by Severus from Theodoret's *De incarnatione* did not match the ones of Vat. 841. In one case at least, Severus himself is also inconsistent, as we see in Fragment 9 (Lebon, 'Restitutions', p. 530):

Et iterum, in capite *vicesimo primo*: 'Ita etiam beatus Paulus [...] tum unionem personae praedicat'⁹ = Chapter 22 of *De incarnatione*: οὗτως ὁ θεϊότατος Παῦλος [...] καὶ τοῦ προσώπου κηρύττει τὴν ἐνώσω (PG 75, 1460A).

Severus reproduced this quotation in the third book of his *Contra Grammaticum*, in Chapter 30 (British Library Addit.

iste asservatur apud venerabile capitulum insignis Ecclesiae Bellovacensis. Garnier considered Bellovacensis to be the better, and thus, his preferred one: [...] in codice Bellovacensi, qui Vaticano longe praestat, ut quid a nobis praestitum sit, facilius lector intelligat. See Marii Mercatoris S. Augustino aequalis Opera quaecumque extant, p. IX.

⁸ Joseph Lebon, 'Restitutions a Théodoret de Cyr', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 26 (1930), pp. 523–550.

⁹ Joseph Lebon (ed.), *Severi Antiocheni Liber Contra Impium Grammaticum. Orationis tertiae pars prior*, Corpus Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptorum Syri, Series 4, vol. v—Versio (Louvain, Marcel Istaș, 1929), p. 48, lines 17–19.

12157, fo. 145^v), introducing it with the following formula: *Itaque impius Theodoretus, in oratione, De inhumanatione Domini, eodem modo ac Leo unionem personae confitens in capitulo vicesimo haec dicit: THEODORETUS [...]*.¹⁰ This second quotation was not yet edited in 1930, but Lebon discussed it in his article.

Thus, according to Lebon's edition of *Contra Grammaticum* and to the above mentioned Syriac manuscript also found by the French scholar, Severus had quoted the same fragment from the current Chapter 22 of *De incarnatione* whilst ascribing it once to Chapter 21 (Lebon, *Severi Antiocheni ...—Versio*, p. 48) and then to Chapter 20 (BL Addit. 12157, fo. 145^v).

Before passing any verdict, we need take into consideration another Severan excerpt, namely Fragment 3 (Lebon, p. 529):

Ad eadem dogmata impia et profana devenit in capite vicesimo secundo secundae orationis, quam *De oeconomia sive de inhumanatione* inscripsit; in capite vero scripsit sic: THEODORETUS: 'Demonstratio ex epistula [...] et unum Filium demonstrantes'.¹¹

This fragment is the beginning of Chapter 21 of *De incarnatione*: ἀπόδειξις [...] καὶ τὸν ἕνα ὑποδεικνύσας υἷόν (PG 75, 1456A). Here the chapter number quoted by Severus is one more than that in Vat. 841, which—as Lebon observed—is in concordance with Schwartz's aforementioned discovery of the copying error in Chapter 15. This suggests that the above fragment 9, being undoubtedly from the current Chapter 22 of Vat. 841, ought to have been known to Severus as being from Chapter 23, and not from Chapter 20 or 21. Lebon's explanation is that Severus himself might have made a mistake or that such dissimilarities might have occurred during the translation of the treatise into Syriac, thus the error being committed either by the Greek copyist or by the Syriac translator.¹²

Even if we consider this puzzling fragment 9 as simply unreliable, we still have to deal with one last fragment of Severus, namely Fragment 10 (Lebon, p. 530):

Rursusque in capite tricesimo quarto: 'Sed et naturam Dei Verbi scimus [...] a magistris pietatis'¹³ = *De incarnatione*, Chapter 32: ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου τὴν φύσιν γνωρίζομεν [...] παρὰ τῶν διδασκάλων ἐκλήθη τῆς εὐσεβείας (PG 75, 1472D).

¹⁰ Lebon, 'Restitutions a Théodoret de Cyr', p. 531, n. 2.

¹¹ Lebon (ed.), *Severi Antiocheni Liber Contra Impium Grammaticum—Versio*, p. 46, lines 16–23.

¹² Lebon, 'Restitutions a Théodoret de Cyr', p. 532.

¹³ Lebon (ed.), *Severi Antiocheni Liber Contra Impium Grammaticum—Versio*, p. 48, lines 20–25.

Here Severus quotes a text from the current Chapter 32 (Vat. 841), saying that it came from Chapter 34. In order to explain this increased difference of two chapter numbers, Lebon concluded that the phenomenon indicated by Schwartz must have occurred once again somewhere between Chapters 21 and 32 in the Greek text of *De incarnatione*, but he did not give any further suggestions concerning its exact location.¹⁴

After a thorough reading of the text and comparing it with other available fragments and editions, I conclude that the second copying error must have occurred in Chapter 29. In the same fashion as in Chapter 15, the scribe overlooked an affirmation, which in fact was the title of a new chapter, namely: *Υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὁ προαιώνιος τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγος ἠδῶκεσεν ὀνομάζεσθαι* (PG 75, 1469C).

The main reasons I believe this must have been the second overlooked title are the following:

1. The sentence is from the current Chapter 29, thus between Chapters 21 and 32 of the Greek text, as Lebon established.
2. The third quotation of Marius Mercator in the *Collectio Palatina* finishes exactly before this fragment, although in the editions of Mai and Migne the sentence continues:

Mercator (*ACO* I, 5, 170—cf. *PL* 48, 1076BC):
Eiusdem ex capitulo tricesimo
 (in Garnier and in Migne:
vigesimo nono): Dei Filius
 homini inseparabiliter adiunctus [...]
 et appellationem naturae eius assumens.

De incarnatione Ch. 29 [30]
 (PG 75, 1469BC):
 θεοῦ, ὃς ἀχωρίστως αὐτῷ
 συνημμένος [...] καὶ τὴν τῆς
 φύσεως αὐτοῦ προσηγορίαν λαβὼν,
Υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὁ προαιώνιος τοῦ
θεοῦ Λόγος ἠδῶκεσεν ὀνομάζεσθαι.

Following Mercator's excerpt, the sentence in the Greek text has to end with *λαβὼν*. However, the text in *PG* continues with the statement I put in bold and consider was meant to be the title of the new chapter. The text of Vat. 841 seems to reinforce this, since on fo. 201^v, line 18 a μέση στιγμή i.e. a colon follows the word *λαβὼν*, not a comma, as edited by Mai and Migne.

As we see, Mercator's number is only one higher than of the Greek text, because of the copying error in Chapter 15, as Schwartz observed. This second one brings the numbers of Vat. 841 down by two, solving the difference between Chapters 32 and 34 respectively, as quoted above by Severus.

¹⁴ 'Le phénomène signalé par Schwartz devrait donc s'être reproduit entre les ch. XXI et XXXII du texte grec.' Lebon, 'Restitutions a Théodoret de Cyr', p. 533.

3. The next title—the one of the current Chapter 30—is in a close theological as well as grammatical connection with this one. The two titles in fact were meant to balance each other logically. Let us compare them:

The overlooked title within
the text of Ch. 29:
*Υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὁ προαιώνιος τοῦ
θεοῦ Λόγος ἠδδόκησεν ὀνομάζεσθαι*
*The eternal Word of God was
pleased to be named Son of Man*

The title of the current Ch. 30
(PG 75, 1469D):
*Ὅτι Υἱὸς ἦ τοῦ δούλου μορφῇ διὰ τῆν
συνάφειαν ὡσαύτως προσαγορεύεται*
*The form of the servant is called
similarly ‘Son’ because of the
conjunction*

The parallelism of the theological terms contained within the two statements is obvious. While the first title speaks of ‘the Word being called the Son of Man’, the second deals with ‘the form of the servant named Son [of God]’. Thus, *Υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* is matched with *Υἱὸς [θεοῦ]*, and *ὁ προαιώνιος θεὸς Λόγος* with *ἡ τοῦ δούλου μορφῇ*. The term *ὁ προαιώνιος* is the counterpart of *συνάφεια*: whilst the Word is timeless and *eternal*, His *conjunction* with the manhood happened in a certain moment of time. Thus, the ‘form of the servant’ is and can be called ‘Son’ only after this conjunction had been effected. The Logos as the sole subject within the Person of Christ is shown by the fact that whilst in the first title, He (i.e. the Word) ‘was pleased’ (*ἠδδόκησεν*) to be called Son of Man, in the second sentence the ‘form of the servant’ is simply ‘called’, ‘addressed’ or even ‘labelled’ (*προσαγορεύεται*) *similarly* ‘Son [of God]’ because of its conjunction with the Word. Theodoret speaks here about the union of a ‘Who’ with a ‘what’.

Furthermore, the adverb *ὡσαύτως* (in the title of the current Chapter 30) referring to the verb *προσαγορεύεται* implicitly suggests that there must have been a previous statement in the text which contained a synonym for ‘naming’. In my opinion, *ὡσαύτως* undoubtedly points back to the verb *ὀνομάζεσθαι* within the overlooked title.

Paul Bauchman Clayton labelled this aspect of Theodoret’s Christology the ‘communicatio onomaton’ of the bishop of Cyrus.¹⁵ Such structural parallelism is often encountered in the works of Theodoret, who always emphasized the existence of both natures within the single Person of Jesus Christ, the Word

¹⁵ Paul Bauchman Clayton, ‘Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, and the Mystery of the Incarnation in Late Antiochene Christology’ (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1985), pp. 239–240.

incarnate. In this case, the framework of the treatise had the role of evincing its twofold message.

The treatise *De incarnatione* itself is abundant in such examples. For example, the titles of Chapters 3, 4 and 5 are introduced with the same *διὰ τί* formula:

Ch. 3. *Διὰ τί τὸν ἄνθρωπον προσηγόρευσεν Ἀδάμ* (PG 75, 1421)

Ch. 4. *Διὰ τί τὴν γυναῖκα ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς ἐδημιούργησε* (col. 1421)

Ch. 5. *Διὰ τί νόμον αὐτῷ τέθεικεν* (col. 1424)

Again, the other unnoticed title within Chapter 15 found by Schwartz begins with the same *ὅτι* as the title of the current Chapter 15 and the next title of the current Chapter 16:

Ὅτι εἰ νοῦν οὐκ ἀνέλαβεν, οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἢ κατὰ τοῦ διαβόλου νίκη (title of Ch. 15: col. 1441)

Ὅτι εἰ ὁ θεὸς Λόγος ἦν ἀντὶ νοῦ ἐν τῷ ληφθέντι, καὶ ὁ διάβολος δικαιολογίας χρῆσαιτο ἂν εὐλόγοις (the title discovered by Schwartz: col. 1444A)

Ὅτι οἱ ἁμαρτάνοντες ἀπολογίαν ἔχουσιν, εἰ ὡς ἀσθενῆ τὸν νοῦν οὐκ ἀνέλαβεν ὁ θεὸς Λόγος (title of Ch. 16: col. 1444).

The consecutive titles of Chapters 17, 18 and 19 begin with three expressions following a logical algorithm: *κατασκευή—λύσις—ἀπόδειξις*. Similar links are created between other chapter titles either by the use of the same term or by their similar syntactical construction, such as: 19 and 20; 24 and 25 (*διήγησις*); 26, 27 and 28 (*πάθη*); 31 and 32. This parallel construction is a characteristic of Theodoret's writing style, since he either uses two analogue titles to express a double message (as shown above), or composes titles which contain already a balanced juxtaposition of two complementary phrases or clauses.

The titles belonging to this second group in *De incarnatione* are the following:

Ch. 7: *Διήγησις τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀχαριστίας, καὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κηδεμονίας* (col. 1424)

Ch. 12: *Ὡσπερ τῷ τοῦ Ἀδάμ θανάτῳ ἐκωνωνήσαμεν, οὕτω καὶ τῇ τοῦ Κυρίου ζωῇ* (col. 1436)

Ch. 21: *Ἀπόδειξις [...] τῆς τῶν φύσεων διακρίσεως, καὶ τῆς τοῦ προσώπου ἐνώσεως*¹⁶

Ch. 22: *Ὅτι Ἰησοῦς καὶ θεὸς Λόγος καὶ ἄνθρωπος λέγεται* (col. 1460)

¹⁶ We have deliberately quoted this title according to Severus' reading. The version *Λόγος* replacing *πρόσωπον* in the editions of Mai and Migne (PG 75, 1456A) is an erroneous rendering of the abbreviation in Vat. 841. The last line of fo. 196^v contains three letters resembling a sequence of *a*, *σ*, and *ω*, which might be a corruption of the word *πρόσωπον*, but certainly cannot be interpreted as *Λόγος*. Moreover, the Syriac text of Severus' *Contra Grammaticum* edited by Joseph Lebon contains the expression *parsopa* which is the equivalent of *πρόσωπον* (see Joseph Lebon (ed.) *Severi Antiocheni Liber Contra Impium Grammaticum*.

Our overlooked title in Chapter 29 is the counterpart of the following title, but in the same fashion as the next one, it contains this parallelism within itself also:

Υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὁ προαιώνιος τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγος ἠδδόκησεν ὀνομάζεσθαι (col. 1470)
Ch. 30: Ὅτι Υἱὸς ἢ τοῦ δούλου μορφῇ διὰ τὴν συνάφειαν ὡσαύτως
προσαγορεύεται (col. 1470)

Ch. 31: Ὅτι δύο μὲν εἰσὶ φύσεις, ἐν δὲ τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (col. 1472)

Ch. 32: Ὅτι οὐ κράσιν λέγειν ὄσιον, ἀλλ' ἔνωσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (col. 1472)

Ch. 34: Προτροπὴ εὐχαριστίας, καὶ ἀποτροπὴ περιουσίας (col. 1476)

Ch. 35: Ὅτι χρὴ θεοτόκον καὶ ἀνθρωποτόκον λέγειν (col. 1477)

4. Finally, if one makes now a similar comparison between the titles of the current Chapters 29 and 30, there is hardly any sensible coherence to be found between them, especially when one considers the primarily comparative function of ὡσαύτως, as follows:

The current title of Ch. 29
(PG 75, 1769A):
Ἀπόδειξις ἐκ τῶν Ἀποστόλου γραφῶν
περὶ τῆς τελείας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσεως

*Demonstration of the perfect
human nature from the Apostle's
writings*

The title of current Ch. 30
(PG 75, 1469D):
Ὅτι Υἱὸς ἢ τοῦ δούλου μορφῇ διὰ
τὴν συνάφειαν ὡσαύτως
προσαγορεύεται
*The form of the servant can
similarly be named 'Son'
because of the conjunction*

Thus, in this case, the adverb ὡσαύτως has indeed nothing to refer back to within the title of Chapter 29. Our *reductio ad absurdum* then is seemingly viable.

Orationis tertiae pars prior, Corpus Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptores Syri, Series 4, vol. v—Textus [Paris: Reipublicae, 1929], p. 66, line 3). Lebon's hypothesis concerning a deliberate alteration of the text motivated by doctrinal consideration in the ascription process of *De incarnatione* to Cyril of Alexandria was founded entirely on this difference. Based on the above manuscript evidence this hypothesis is untenable (cf. Lebon, 'Restitutions', pp. 534–535). Thus, we do not have any evidence supporting a so-called Neo-Chalcedonian alteration of the text in the sixth century as Lebon suggested. Furthermore, a Neo-Chalcedonian attempt to obscure two apparently 'Nestorian' chapter titles (i.e. the one found in Chapter 16 by Schwartz and the other in Chapter 29 by us) from the suspecting eyes of Monophysite readers by including them into the body of the text is hardly conceivable, if unprovable. Consequently, I would think we have no significant reason to doubt that these two phenomena were indeed copying errors. This could mean that they probably had not occurred in the sixth century, where the French scholar located both the alleged text alteration and the pseudepigraphy. Finally, Lebon's dating of the ascription to Cyril can also be questioned, but that is already a different issue, answerable only in a critical edition, which is still unavailable.

Our last question is the dating of the two copying errors. The Vat. 841 gives us the fourteenth or fifteenth century as *terminus ante quem*. Two mediaeval sources give us a hint concerning the *terminus post quem*. The first one is the Vatican manuscript of Nicetas of Heracleia's *Catena of Luke*, namely Vat. gr. 1611, dating from the year 1116. In the right column of fo. 75^r, line 13 Nicetas gives a quotation from Chapter 15 of Theodoret's *De incarnatione Domini*, which is identical with Mercator's first excerpt. It ends on line 20 where the title found by Schwartz should follow, but is missing. Only its second part is rendered in a summarized fashion in line 21, simply to fill gap in the reasoning. Thus, the text $\delta\tau\iota \epsilon\iota \delta \theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma \Lambda\delta\gamma\omicron\varsigma \eta\gamma \alpha\nu\tau\iota \nu\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\nu \tau\omega \lambda\eta\phi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\iota, \kappa\alpha\iota \delta \delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ is omitted entirely, and only the following summary is to be found: $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\iota\tau\omicron \delta' \grave{\alpha}\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$, then the fragment continues with the text of the current Chapter 15 (PG 75, 1444A). The same phenomenon happens in another twelfth–thirteenth-century manuscript of Nicetas' *Catena*, namely in Vindobonensis theol. gr. 71, on fo. 308^r, lines 1 to 13.¹⁷

Our second source is Euthymius Zigabenus. He is the only mediaeval writer who—apart from Vat. 841—speaks of *De incarnatione* as being a work of Cyril. In his *Panoplia Dogmatica* (PG 130, 925) he quotes from the same Chapter 15, again without the title found by Schwartz.

In evaluating these citations, it is important to note that Nicetas and Euthymius both regularly omit the chapter titles even if they render a longer passage composed of two or more consecutive chapters. Thus, their failure to quote the full wording of the chapter title identified by Schwartz in the current Chapter 15 is evidence that they knew it as a title, not as part of the text.¹⁸

¹⁷ Concerning the description and dating of Vindobonensis gr. 71 see Joseph Sickenberger, 'Die Lukaskatene des Niketas von Herakleia', *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 22. 4 (1902), pp. 1–118 (p. 49).

¹⁸ The omission of chapter titles by Nicetas and Euthymius might throw some light upon the time when the pseudepigraphy was committed. In his *Catena of Luke*, written in 1080, Nicetas still quotes from *De incarnatione* as from a work of Theodoret. Since a parallel manuscript tradition (starting from the sixth century) of the two treatises under the names of Theodoret and Cyril respectively is hardly conceivable, one may reconsider the affirmation of Eduard Schwartz once criticized by Lebon: 'Aus den Exzerpten ergibt sich zunächst mit Sicherheit, daß die im Vatic. 841 Cyrill zugeschriebene Schrift *Περὶ ἐνανθρωπήσεως* noch im 11. Jahrhundert unter dem Namen Theodorets ging' (Schwartz, 'Zur Schriftstellerei Theodorets', p. 38). Euthymius ascribes the work to Cyril in the twelfth century, so we cannot rule out the possibility that the pseudepigraphy might have occurred almost accidentally at the turn of the eleventh–twelfth centuries, or even

Finally, since the manuscript tradition of *Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως* is quite narrow, based on these two sources (dating from the twelfth–thirteenth centuries)¹⁹ one might say that the two copying errors probably occurred later, perhaps even during the copying of Vat. 841 in the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries.

Summary

Vatican 841, Mai, Migne	Severus (Lebon, 'Restitutions')	Mercator (Collectio Palatina and ACO)	Mercator (Bellovacensis and Garnier)	Observations
Current chapter numbers:	Ch. numbers quoted as being:	Ch. numbers quoted as being:	Ch. numbers quoted as being:	
1–14	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]
15. <i>PG</i> 75, 1441D <i>PG</i> 75, 1444 A12–C4		15. <i>ACO</i> I, 5, 169 16. <i>ACO</i> I, 5, 169	15. <i>PL</i> 48, 1075B, Garnier's edn. of Mercator, p. 272. 16. <i>PL</i> 48, 1075B–C, Garnier's edn., p. 272.	Schwartz found one overlooked title within Ch. 15. This explains the one-number difference here and in Severus' fragment 3 from Ch. 21.
16–20	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]
21. <i>PG</i> 75, 1456A	22. Fragment 3 in Lebon, 'Restitutions', p. 529.			Severus quotes Ch. 21 as Ch. 22—this is in accordance with Schwartz's discovery.
22. <i>PG</i> 75, 1460A <i>PG</i> 75, 1460A	21. Fragment 9 in Lebon, p. 530. 20.—Lebon, p. 531, footnote 2; Lebon, p. 532, footnote 2.			Severus here is not reliable (he gives the same fragment under two different chapter numbers). Moreover, he had to know this fragment as being from Ch. 23 according to his previous quotation.
23–28	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]
29. <i>PG</i> 75, 1469B		30. <i>ACO</i> I, 5, 170	29. <i>PL</i> 48, 1076B Garnier's edn., p. 272.	The second overlooked title follows exactly Mercator's excerpt in the text of Ch. 29: <i>PG</i> 75, 1469C.
30–31	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]
32	34. Fragment 10 in Lebon, p. 530.			If Severus' number is correct here, our argument concerning the overlooked title in Ch. 29 is fairly probable.
33–35	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]

ISTVÁN PÁSZTORI-KUPÁN

committed by Euthymius, who himself was 'a compiler', as Ehrhard says, rather than a critical arbiter determining the authorship of a work (Ehrhard, 'Die Cyrill v. Alex. zugeschr.', p. 199). As we have already mentioned in note 16, this question ought to be addressed by a future critical edition of *De incarnatione*.

¹⁹ Nicetas wrote his work in 1080. The oldest and best manuscript of his *Catena* is Vat. 1611, dating from 1116. The Vindob. gr. 71. belongs to the Byzantine group (Sickenberger, 'Die Lukaskatene', pp. 58–60). Zigabenus' compilation dates from the twelfth century (Ehrhard, 'Die Cyrill v. Alex. zugeschr.', p. 199).

With special thanks to Prof. Jean-Noël Guinot, Prof. David F. Wright, Prof. L. W. Hurtado, and Dr P. M. Parvis.