The Miracles of Cyrus and John: New Old Readings from the Manuscript

JOHN DUFFY

The Miracles of Cyrus and John, an elaborate account of some seventy cases of miraculous cures at the shrine of these two saints at Menuthis in Egypt, was written around the year A.D. 610 by Sophronius the Sophist, later Patriarch of Jerusalem (634–638), who lavished on this work his abundant rhetorical talents and produced a piece of literature nearly as noteworthy for its form and style as for its contents. The Miracles is one of those texts whose survival has depended almost totally on one manuscript, in this case the Vaticanus graecus 1607, an expertly written parchment codex of the late tenth century, which was the basis for the first printed edition by Cardinal Angelo Mai.1 Mai’s Greek text and the Latin version were essentially reproduced in Migne’s Patrologia Graeca2 and no other edition appeared until the recent work of N. Fernández Marcos, who, by re-examining the Vatican copy, managed to eliminate a fair number of Mai’s oversights.3 In a recent article I discussed some of the rhetorical aspects of the Miracles and showed how attention to these and other factors could contribute further to the task of restoring and correcting a text which has obviously come down to us in quite a corrupted state.4 I also noted, on the basis of a partial collation, that Vaticanus gr. 1607 had still (even after the work of Mai and Fernández Marcos) not been fully deciphered.5 In the meantime I have gone through a photocopy of the manuscript and present here the results.

1 It appears in volume III of Mai’s Spicilegium Romanum (Rome 1840) along with an old Latin translation. The greater part of the Latin version is the work of the ninth-century scholar Anastasius Bibliothecarius, while the first twelve miracles were translated by a less well known figure of the seventh century, Bonifatius Consiliarius.
2 87(3) (Paris 1860), 3424–3676.
3 Los Thaumata de Sofronio (Madrid 1975).
5 Ibid., p. 48, n. 35.
In fairness it should be pointed out that not all of the instances given below represent misreadings on the part of the two previous editors. This applies especially to Mai; though he provides no critical apparatus, it is clear that he made a great number of silent corrections, many of them necessary, but not a few superfluous or misguided. Of Fernández Marcos—whose main concern was apparently not the critical edition, but the accompanying study of the Miracles—it may be said that he relies too heavily on Mai.

In the manuscript itself two correcting hands have been at work. The first belongs to the main scribe, who a few times corrects in the margin his own copying errors. The second, much later, hand has attempted in several places to better the text and some of these efforts are successful. Finally another, somewhat invisible, corrector must be mentioned. Fernández Marcos assumed that the Greek text printed by Migne was identical with that of Mai. However, when one compares the two, it becomes obvious that numerous changes have been made in the Patrologia Graeca version. Who the corrector was must for the time being remain a small mystery and one can only speculate; it could have been a scholar working directly for Migne or someone who happened to have entered emendations in the copy of Mai's edition which later came to be used for the P.G.

For the list that follows it should be understood that in my view the transmitted reading of the manuscript, unless otherwise indicated, is genuine and should be restored to the text. The text will be cited according to the miracle number, paragraph and line of the Fernández Marcos edition.

8.5.4 ἶ ἄν] κἂν
8.5.13 διαφύγοιεν] διαφεῦγοιεν
8.11.2 ἐκ] ὡς ἐκ
8.13.4 ἐοίκεισάν (π)ως] ἐοίκει σαφῶς. This is what the ms. has, perhaps as the result of a correction.
8.14.6 ἐκλύσεως] ἐκβλύσεως
8.15.3 γεγένητο] γεγέννητο, i.e. the pluperfect passive of γεγέννα. H. Usener, Der heilige Tychon (Leipzig 1907), p. 49, n. 4, drew attention to this and other examples of the unaugmented pluperfect in Sophronius.

7 Apart from the cases mentioned below (37.8.7; 55.2.2), it will be enough to cite examples from just two of the miracles: 7.2.2 ἐπελήλατο Mai: ἐπέλαθα P.G.; 7.2.4 μὲν πρὸς μὲν Mai: μὲν πρὸς P.G.; 8.3.6 κυκλοῦντος Mai: κυκώντος P.G.; 8.4.10 τοῦτοις Mai: τούτως P.G.; 8.5.13 ὥρμην Mai: ὥρμην P.G.
9.4.4 καὶ[1] Not in the ms.; an unnecessary addition by Mai.

9.4.5 ἀσθενεστέρα σκέυη] ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκέυει. Here and elsewhere the iota subscript (not in the ms.) has been added by me.

9.10.5 τοσοῦτο] τοιοῦτο

10 title κόψεσιν] κόψωσιν


10.1.9 ἐκτύχησε] The later hand in the ms. has added the letter upsilon above the line and εὐτύχησεν is a good correction.

10.4.5 ἀπεστραπτεν] ἀπήστραπτεν

10.4.6 έπιλήρωτο] ἐπεπιλήρωτο

10.4.8 σκωλήκων] καὶ σκωλήκων

10.5.1 ἐβλυσε] ἐβλυεν. Sophronius very commonly uses the imperfect, when the aorist would be expected.

10.6.3 εστήκει] ἵστηκε (read εἰστήκει)

10.8.2 Μαρί[αν] μαριᾶμ

11 title ἄφ' ὑπονε πεσούσης] This phrase is a supplement. It has been added in the margin by the later hand with an indication that it be inserted after the word διακόνου, a placing which would agree with the Latin version. However, the Latin wording, per fenestram altam ceciderat, suggests that the original may have had something more like ἄφ' υψηλῆς θυρίδος πεσούσης (cf. 11.3.2–3).

11.1.5 οὐδὲ πάντες] οὐδὲ πάντες ἰατροὶ καὶ πάντες

11.2.4 λινοῦ] λήνου, i.e. λίνου. Perhaps a further correction to λινέου is needed; cf. Latin lineo.

11.3.1 στενούμενον] στενοῦμενος. In later Greek (see examples in Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon* s.v. στενῶ) the passive of this verb can mean “be deficient,” “be in want,” a fact which strongly supports the manuscript reading here. It may also be suggested that the adjective ἔρημον, which seems a little tautologous in the sentence (and is not reflected in the Latin), is a gloss intended to bring out the special meaning of στενοῦμενον.

11.4.6 παιδικοῖς] παιδικοῖς

11.4.6 ἔρραπιζον] ἐρραπίζον (i.e. neuter present participle of ἐν-ραπίζω)

11.5.4 μάρτυσιν] τοῖς μ.
11.9.2 διδασκάλω] τῷ δ.
12.1.4 μὲν] μὴν
12.7.5 ἄγιον] ἄγιον (describing ποτήριον)
12.9.5–6 ἀποκαλούμενος] ἐπικαλούμενος
12.10.3 καὶ¹] τε καὶ
12.10.4 διήγειλεν] διήγειλεν
12.14.3 μηδενὸς] μηδενὸς σε
12.18.9 συνέτρεχεν] After this in the text is written ἐνός γὰρ βρῶσει ταῦτα τῶν παρὰ (read περὶ) τὸν νεὰν εὐρισκομένων ἐπράττετο. This picturesque detail was presumably passed over in silence by Mai because there is no sign of it in the Latin.
13.6.7 ἀθρόως] ἀθρόον (read ἀθρόον. Cf. 27.6.4, 48.4.6)
13.7.3 τῆς πηγῆς] τῇ πηγῇ
13.7.4 ἐπέλαβεν] ἐπέλαβεν
14.3.4 αὐτοῦς] αὐτὸ
15.4.1 πάθει] τῷ π.
15.6.6 δ] τὸ
16.4.7 οὐ] καὶ οὐ
19.4.3 καὶ¹] Not in ms.; superfluous addition by Mai.
20.3.7 ὑπὲρ λόγου ὄγκωσιν] ὑπὲρ λόγου ὄγκώσειν
20.3.9 νόσου] τῆς ν.
21.3.2 ἡνίχοντο] ἡνίχοντο (read ἡνείχοντο)
22.2.8 χαρίσασθαι] Corrected in the margin to κομίζεσθαι by the scribe himself, after χαρίσασθαι had been mistakenly repeated from the previous phrase.
24.1.1 προσεπτήσωμεν] προσεπήσωμεν (read προσεποίσωμεν. Cf. 10.1.1 above)
24.2.1 ἔσχε] ἔσχε
28.6.5 ἀπεσκόπευσε] ἀπεσκόπευε
29.7.2 ἤκουσεν] Corrected in the margin to εἶρηκεν by the main scribe (cf. Latin edixit)
29.13.1 ἐκάτερα] ἐκατέρα (i.e. ἐκατέρας)
29.13.7 ἀπείληφε] ἀπείληψε (read ἀπήλευσε. Cf. Latin diluui)
30.4.10 διαδεδομένων] διαδιδομένων
30.12.5 φθειρομένων] The ms. has φθημένων and the correction above the line appears to have been made by the later hand. Read φθημένων (cf. Latin qui consumpti sunt).
31.2.3 ἐγίνοσκον] ἐγίνοσκον
31.2.8 τὸν] καὶ τὸν
31.6.3 ἐνθο] Added above the line by the later hand; perhaps it would be better placed after τὸν (cf. Latin ad locum in quo baptisterium erat).
32.2.12 πετόμενα] This is followed in the ms. by θάλαττα καὶ τὰ τοῖς ὑδασιν ἑνδιατόμενα (read -όμενα); cf. Latin mare et quae inhabitant in aquis.
32.3.4–5 προσώπου] τοῦ π.
32.7.6 ὁ] ὁ
32.8.6 αὐτός] αὐτὸν
32.9.4 δὲ] δὲ
32.11.5 διάνοιαν] διάγνοιαν i.e. δι' ἂγνοιαν (cf. Latin propter ignorantiam).
32.12.6 and 9 δεκτικά] δηκτικά
32.12.9 προσποιήσαντες] προσεποίησαντες (read προσεποίησαντες. Cf. 10.1.1 and 24.1.1 above)
33.1.6 ἔχει] ἔχοι
33.7.3 πρός] καὶ πρός
33. 9.6 αὐτήν] αὐτὸν (referring to ὃ νῦν)
33.10.2 εὐφήμισεν] εὐφήμισεν
34.2.13 λαροῦσης] λαροῦση. Read λαροῦσι, agreeing with τοῖς παιοῖν (cf. Latin cum nondum essent exercitatos animae sensus sortiti).
34.2.14 καὶ] τε καὶ
34.5.1 ἡ τοῦ] ἡ τοῦ. Since the form occurs (in the manuscript) not only here, but also at 42.2.10 and twice at 60.2.9, it is probably no accident. Psaltes, Grammatik der byzantinischen Chroniken (Göttingen 1913), records an alternate, contracted form of the verb (αὐξῶ).
34.5.2 ἵσχυσε] ἵσχυνε
35.1.5 εὐφραίνη] εὐφράνη
35.8.2 θήκης] θῆβης (i.e. θήβης)
35.8.12 ταύτης] τὰ ταύτης (Latin quae introrsus sunt eius)
35.10.1 δυσσεβὲς] δυσήδες. Read δυσειδὲς (cf. Latin foedam illum speciem).
36.4.5 δεχόμενα] οὐ δὲ.
36.5.5–6 παραστράπτοντα . . . προσεδείκνυεν] προστράπτοντα . . . προσεδείκνυεν
36.8.10 δὲ] δὲ καὶ
36.12.6 εἰςδεξάμενοι] δεξάμενοι (Mai mistakenly repeated the last syllable of the preceding αἰτήσεις)
36.12.9 γοῦν] οὖν
36.13.8 διακόνου] διάκονος
36.16.1–2 τὸ τῆς . . . ἔλαιον] τῆς . . . τὸ ἔλαιον
36.20.10 διδασκαλίας] The main scribe wrote -ειας and the later hand changed this to -είας (i.e. διδασκαλίας), which should probably be accepted; cf. Latin doctrinis.
36.23.6 κοινωνήσαι] κοινωνήσαι με. This leaves με occurring twice in the sentence. If one has to be deleted, it should probably be the first, since με after κοινωνήσαι restores the proper rhythm and is reflected in the Latin version communicare me coegerunt. On the prose rhythm of Sophronius see J.T.S. 35 (above, note 4), 45–46.
37.6.3 ἐβούλετο] ἠβούλετο
37.7.9 δουλεύων] καὶ δὲ. (Latin et serviens)
38.8.7 συντάττεσθαι] This word is not in the ms. and, since it does not appear in Mai’s edition, we must assume that it was added by the unknown corrector in Migne’s Patrologia Graeca. A word of the original is definitely missing, but it may have been rather συναρθεῖσθαι, which gives a better rhythm and is closer to the Latin connumerare.
37.10.5 ἀνὴρ] ἄρ
37.10.6 τῷφλοι] ὡς τ. Cf. 69.1.5 and Latin quia caeci.
37.10.11 τοῖς ὑμνοις] τοῖς ἀγίοις τ. ὦ.
38.3.8 ἐπιδέδωκεν] ἐπέδωκεν
38.6.6 τὸ πρῶην] τὰ πρῶην (Latin pristina)
39.7.1 τῆς ὀδύνης] τοῖς ὀδύνες (i.e. -σις). Mai’s correction is not needed, if we understand ὑπερβολὴ as an adverb; cf. Latin doloribus nimium cruciatus.
39.9.2 δράσαντες] ἐδράσαντες (read ἐδρ-)  
39.10.9 βούλει] βούλη  
39.11.1 αὐτοῖς] αὐτῶν, which should be corrected to αὐτῷ (cf. Latin ei).
43.2.4 οὗ] οὗ τῆν
43.3.3 ἐκ] ἡ ἐκ
43.3.3 τῶν] Not in the ms. and not needed.
44.4.4 ἐγκυσάσθης] ἐγκυσάσθης
44.4.5 φέρονται] καταφέρονται
47.3.4 ἔρχεται] The later hand corrects this to ἐπανέρχεται, which should be considered, since it restores the rhythm.
48.4.2 τῶν] τῶν
48.4.6 λέγοντι] λήγοντι
48.5.5 ἔρχομενοι] ἐρχόμενον (Latin asportatum)
49.7.5 μεταγιγνώσκοι] μεταγιγνώσκοι
50.2.5 συμπεράσωμεν] σὺν περάνωμεν (read συμπεράνωμεν)
50.6.8 ἦ] καὶ (Latin et)
51.3.10 προλαβόντας] προκαμῶντας (read προκαμόντας)
51.6.3 θαυμοστός] θαῦματος
51.6.7 αὐτῶν] αὐτὸν (Latin hunc)
51.8.9 δὲ] δ᾽ αἵ
51.9.6 ὀρθονείς] -εῖς (read -εῖς)
51.10.4 Τοῦτο] τοῦτον (Latin hunc)
51.10.11 δὲ] Not in the ms. and not needed.
52.5.5 ἀλλότριοι] ἀλλότριοι ξένοι τε καὶ ἑνχώριοι (read ἐγ-). Latin alieni, extranei et compatriotae.

53.4.3 αὐτῶ[1] -ῶν (Latin eorum)
53.4.6 ὁξέως] ὁξέως οἱ μάρτυρες
54.2.1 Μακεδὼν] μακεδόνων
54.3.9 συνεχές] σύνθες
54.8.8 ἐβέβλητο] ἐβέβλατο. Read ἐβέβλαπτο (cf. Latin erat laesa and 54.6.8 ἐβεβλάφθαι γὰρ τῇ Ἰουλίαν).

55.2.2 Ἱος . . . κελεύουσι] This phrase is not in the ms.—where the later hand has signalled a lacuna with λείπ(ει)—but is a supplement by the anonymous corrector in the Migne edition. Because of the rhythm one should consider substituting ἐπιτρέποντι for κελεύουσι. Cf. 57.3.3 Κρέα γὰρ μόσχεια λαβεῖν ἐπιτρέπατες.

58.1.6 ὃ γένει καὶ φρονήσει κοσμούμενος] ὃ γένει κοσμοϋμενος ὃ φρονήσει κοσμούμενος. Mai took care of the anomaly in the ms. partly by dropping the first κοσμούμενος altogether. However, since the Latin version has prosapia ornatus et prudentia famous, the original may have been more like ὃ γένει κοσμούμενος καὶ ὃ φρονήσει περίφημος (for περίφημος = famous cf. 55.1.5–6).

59 title σκολοπένδραν] σκολόπενδραν
59.5.5 τοῦτο (ἐν)πρίθμοις] τοῦτο νηρίθμοις (See J.T.S. 35 [above, note 4], 59)
60.2.9 ἠὐξε . . . συνηὐξε] ἠὐξε . . . συνηὐξε. Cf. above 34.5.1.
61 title τοῦ[2] τὸ
61.4.2 αὐτῶν] αὐτὸν
62.1.4 τοὺς] καὶ τοὺς
63.1.1 Ῥοδόπης] Ῥοδόπην (Latin post Rhodopen)
63.5.3 ἐπιεν] ἐπινεν
64.5.1 δὲ] δὲ καὶ
65.4.1 οὗ γρηγοροῦντι] οὐκ ἐγρηγοροῦντι
66.2.3 δὴ] δὲ
67.1.8 πρακτείσιν] πρακτείσαν
68.6.3 ἐμησεν] ἐμεσεν
69.4.3 Ἐπειδή ἔπει
69.5.4 ἄνίχνευε ἵατρ(ό)ν ἵατρῶν] ἵατρῶν ἄνίχνευεν ἵατρῶν
69.6.2 προεγίνονσε [προεγίγνοσε
69.6.6 ἐκ] διὰ
70.3.2 ἁγίων] τῶν ἁγίων
70.4.6 Θεοῦ] τοῦ θεοῦ
70.11.6 τούτου] τοῦτο. Cf. Latin hanc . . . figuram.
70.13.5–6 εἶπε . . . εἶπεν] εἶπὲ . . . εἶπεν. It might be even better to follow the Latin (dixit . . . dic) and read εἶπε . . . εἶπε.
70.15.5 οὐκ] οὐ μὴ
70.20.5–6 ὁ πλήθος] πλὴθος
70.27.8 Χριστῷ] χῶ τι i.e. χρίστῳ ἰησοῦ (Latin Christo Iesu)
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