

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 Graeca*² 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).

⁴ *The Journal of Theological Studies* 35 (1984), 41–60.

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.⁶ 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.*⁷

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 ἦ ἄν] κἄν

8.5.13 διαφύγοιεν] διαφεύγοιεν

8.11.2 ἐκ] ὡς ἐκ

8.13.4 εἰκείσάν (π)ως] εἰκεί 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 γεννάω. H. Usener, *Der heilige Tychon* (Leipzig 1907), p. 49, n. 4, drew attention to this and other examples of the unaugmented pluperfect in Sophronius.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 238: "Tanto el texto griego como el latino recogido por Migne es el mismo que Mai publicó en el tomo III de su *Spicilegium Romanum*."

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: ἐπήλλακτο *P.G.*; 7.2.4 μὲν πρὸς μὲν Mai: μὲν πρὸς *P.G.*; 8.3.6 κυκλοῦντος Mai: κυκῶντος *P.G.*; 8.4.10 τούτοις Mai: τούτους *P.G.*; 8.5.13 ὄρηγν Mai: ὄρηγν *P.G.*

9.4.4 καὶ¹] Not in the ms.; an unnecessary addition by Mai.

9.4.5 ἀσθενέστερα σκεύη] ἀσθενεστέρω σκεύει. Here and elsewhere the iota subscript (not in the ms.) has been added by me.

9.10.5 τοσοῦτο] τοιοῦτο

10 title κώφησιν] κώφωσιν

10.1.1 προσποιήσωμεν] προσεποιήσωμεν (read προσεποιώσωμεν). Cf. below 24.1.1, 32.12.9 and *J.T.S.* 35 (above, note 4), 53–54.

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

10.4.5 ἀπέστραπτεν] ἀπήστραπτεν

10.4.6 ἐπλήρωτο] ἐπεπλήρωτο

10.4.8 σκωλήκων] καὶ σκωλήκων

10.5.1 ἔβλυσεν] ἔβλυεν. Sophronius very commonly uses the imperfect, when the aorist would be expected.

10.6.3 ἐστήκει] ἰστήκει (read εἰστήκει)

10.8.2 Μαρίαν] μαριὰμ

11 title ἀφ' ὕψους πεσοῦσης] 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 ἀφ' ὑψηλῆς θυρίδος πεσοῦσης (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 στερούμενον] στενοῦμενον. In later Greek (see examples in Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon* s.v. στενόω) 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 παιδικαῖς] παιδικοῖς

11.4.6 ἑρράπιζον] ἑρραπίζον (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 ἁγίου] ἅγιον (describing ποτήριον)

12.9.5–6 ἀποκαλούμενος] ἐπικαλούμενος

12.10.3 καὶ¹] τε καὶ

12.10.4 διήγγειλεν] διήγγελλεν

12.14.3 μηδενὸς] μηδενός σε

12.18.9 συνέτρεχεν] After this in the text is written ἐνὸς γὰρ βρώσει ταοῦ τῶν παρὰ (read περὶ) τὸν νεῶν εὕρισκομένων 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 ἀθρώως] ἀθρῶον (read ἀθρόον. Cf. 27.6.4, 48.4.6)

13.7.3 τῆς πηγῆς] τῇ πηγῇ

13.7.4 ἐπέλαβεν] ἀπέλαβεν

14.3.4 αὐτὸς] 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 λόγον ὄγκώσεσιν

20.3.9 νόσου] τῆς ν.

21.3.2 ἠνίσχοντο] ἠνίχοντο (read ἠνείχοντο)

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 προσαπήσωμεν] προσεπήσωμεν (read προσεποίσωμεν. Cf. 10.1.1 above)

24.2.1 ἔσχε] εἶχε

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. ἐκατέρα)
- 29.13.7 ἀπείληφε] ἀπείληψε (read ἀπήλειψε. Cf. Latin *diluit*)
- 30.4.10 διαδεδομένων] διαδιδόμενων
- 30.12.5 φθειρομένων] The ms. has φθημένων and the correction above the line appears to have been made by the later hand. Read φθιμένων (cf. Latin *qui consumpti sunt*).
- 31.2.3 ἐγίνωσκον] ἐγίγνωσκον
- 31.2.8 τὸν] καὶ τὸν
- 31.6.3 ἔνθα] Added above the line by the later hand; perhaps it would be better placed after τόπον (cf. Latin *ad locum in quo baptisterium erat*).
- 32.2.12 πετόμενα] This is followed in the ms. by θάλαττα καὶ τὰ τοῖς ὕδασιν ἐνδiciaτόμενα (read -όμενα); cf. Latin *mare et quae inhabitant in aquis*.
- 32.3.4–5 προσώπου] τοῦ π.
- 32.7.6 ὁ] ὃ
- 32.8.6 αὐτὸς] αὐτὸν
- 32.9.4 ὅς] ὃ δὲ
- 32.11.5 διάνοιαν] διάγνωιαν i.e. δι' ἄγνωιαν (cf. Latin *propter ignorantiam*).
- 32.12.6 and 9 δεκτικὰ] δηκτικὰ
- 32.12.9 προσποιήσαντες] πρὸσέποιήσαντες (read προσεποίησαντες. Cf. 10.1.1 and 24.1.1 above)
- 33.1.6 ἔχει] ἔχοι
- 33.7.3 πρὸς] καὶ πρὸς
33. 9.6 αὐτήν] αὐτὸν (referring to ὁ νῶτος)
- 33.10.2 εὐφήμισεν] εὐφήμησεν
- 34.2.13 λαχούσης] λαχούση. Read λαχοῦσι, agreeing with τοῖς παισίν (cf. Latin *cum nondum essent exercitatos animae sensus sortiti*).
- 34.2.14 καὶ] τε καὶ
- 34.5.1 ηῦξε] ἠύξει. 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 ἴσχυσε] ἴσχυε

35.1.5 εὐφραίνῃ] εὐφράνη

35.8.2 θήκης] θήβης (i.e. θίβης)

35.8.12 ταύτης] τὰ ταύτης (Latin *quae introrsus sunt eius*)

35.10.1 δυσσεβῆς] δυσήδες. Read *δυσειδῆς* (cf. Latin *foedam illam speciem*).

36.4.5 δεχόμενα] οὐ δ.

36.5.5–6 παραστράπτοντα . . . προσεδείκνυεν] προαστράπτοντα . . . προεδείκνυεν

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 διδασκαλία] The main scribe wrote -είας and the later hand changed this to -είαις (i.e. διδασκαλείαις), which should probably be accepted; cf. Latin *doctrinis*.

36.23.6 κοινωνῆσαι] κοινωνῆσαί με. This leaves με occurring twice in the sentence. If one has to be deleted, it should probably be the first, since με after κοινωνῆσαι 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 δ. (Latin *et serviens*)

37.8.7 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 συναριθμεῖσθαι, which gives a better rhythm and is closer to the Latin *connumerare*.

37.10.5 ἀνήρ] ἀήρ

37.10.6 τύφλοι] ὡς τ. Cf. 69.1.5 and Latin *quia caeci*.

- 37.10.11 τοῖς ὕμνοις] τοὺς ἀγίους τ. ὕ.
- 38.3.8 ἐπιδέδωκεν] ἐπέδωκεν
- 38.6.6 τὸ πρόην] τὰ πρόην (Latin *pristina*)
- 39.7.1 τῆς ὀδύνης] ταῖς ὀδύνες (i.e. -αις). Mai's correction is not needed, if we understand ὑπερβολῆ as an adverb; cf. Latin *doloribus nimium cruciatus*.
- 39.9.2 δράσαντες] ἐδράσαντες (read ἐδρ-)
- 39.10.9 βούλει] βούλη
- 39.11.1 αὐτοῖς] αὐτὸν, which should be corrected to αὐτῷ (cf. Latin *ei*).
- 43.2.4 οὐ] οὐ τὴν
- 43.3.3 ἐκ] ἢ ἐκ
- 43.3.3 τὸν] Not in the ms. and not needed.
- 44.4.4 ἐγγισάσης] ἐγγιζούσης
- 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] τὸν
- 48.4.6 λέγοντι] λήγοντι
- 48.5.5 ἐρχόμενοι] ἐρχόμενον (Latin *asportatum*)
- 49.7.5 μεταγινώσκοι] μεταγινώσκοι
- 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 θαυμαστὸς] θαύματος
- 51.6.7 αὐτῶν] αὐτὸν (Latin *hunc*)
- 51.8.9 δὲ] δ' αἰ
- 51.9.6 ὀρφανεία] -εῖαν (read -εῖαν)
- 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 ἐγχώριοι (read ἐγ-). Latin *alieni, extranei et compatriotae*.

53.4.3 αὐτῶ¹] -ῶν (Latin *eorum*)

53.4.6 ὀξέως] ὀξέως οἱ μάρτυρες

54.2.1 Μακεδῶν] μακεδόνων

54.3.9 συνεχῆς] σύνηθες

54.8.8 ἐβέβλητο] ἐβέβλατο. Read ἐβέβλαπτο (cf. Latin *erat laesa* and 54.6.8 βεβλάφθαι γὰρ τὴν Ἰουλίαν).

55.2.2 Ὑὸς . . . 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 ἐπιτρέπουσι for κελεύουσι. Cf. 57.3.3 Κρέα γὰρ μόσχεια λαβεῖν ἐπιτρέψαντες.

58.1.6 ὁ γένει καὶ φρονήσει κοσμούμενος] ὁ γένει κοσμούμενος ὁ 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 famosus*, the original may have been more like ὁ γένει κοσμούμενος καὶ ὁ φρονήσει περίφημος (for περίφημος = *famosus* cf. 55.1.5–6).

59 title σκολοπένδραν] σκολόπενδραν

59.5.5 τοῦτο (ἀν)ηρίθμοις] τοῦτο νηρίθμοις (See *J.T.S.* 35 [above, note 4], 59)

60.2.9 ἠύξε . . . συνῆύξε] ἠύξει . . . συνῆύξει. Cf. above 34.5.1.

61 title τοῦ²] τὸ

61.4.2 αὐτῶν] αὐτὸν

62.1.4 τοὺς] καὶ τοὺς

63.1.1 Ῥοδόπη] Ῥοδόπην (Latin *post Rhodopen*)

63.5.3 ἔπιεν] ἔπινεν

64.5.1 δὲ] δὲ καὶ

65.4.1 οὐ γρηγοροῦντι] οὐκ ἐγρηγοροῦντι

66.2.3 δὴ] δὲ

67.1.8 πραχθεῖσιν] πραχθεῖσαν

68.6.3 ἔμησεν] ἔμεσεν

69.4.3 Ἐπειδὴ] ἐπεὶ

69.5.4 ἀνίχνευε ἰατρ(ὸ)ν ἰατρῶν] ἰατρὸν ἀνίχνευεν ἰατρῶν

69.6.2 προεγίνωσκε] προεγίνωσκε

69.6.6 ἐκ] διὰ

70.3.2 ἀγίων] τῶν ἀγίων

70.4.6 Θεοῦ] τοῦ θεοῦ

70.11.6 τούτου] τοῦτο. Cf. Latin *hanc . . . figuram*.

70.13.5–6 εἶπε . . . εἶπεν] εἶπε . . . 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 πλῆθος] πλῆθος

70.27.8 Χριστῷ] $\overline{\chi\omega} \overline{\iota\upsilon}$ i.e. *χριστῷ ἰησοῦ* (Latin *Christo Iesu*)

University of Maryland

