

Article

Gregory of Nyssa's Hagiographic Homilies: Authorial Tradition and Hagiographical-Homiletic Collections. A Comparison

Matthieu Cassin | Paris – Aubervilliers

Introduction

Among Patristic authors, Gregory of Nyssa is one of the few who have benefited from a wide-scale process of critical edition. Today, all but one or two authentic texts of Gregory are published in the *Gregorii Nysseni opera* series. However, these editions have not been generally coordinated and sometimes offer contradictory conclusions about manuscripts;¹ moreover, they generally do not take into account the nature, content and history of manuscripts and proceed mainly from philological investigation. Fortunately for our research, the main exceptions concern the editions of hagiographical orations. Therefore, my task will be easier, thanks to the previous work of some scholars, in particular Andreas Spira, Friedrich Mann and Otto Lendle. I hope, however, to show that there is still much room left for investigation of this topic.²

I will first present a general overview of the transmission of hagiographical orations by Gregory of Nyssa, and then briefly investigate three test cases, *In Meletium*, *De s. Theodoro* and *In s. Stephanum protomartyrem*, to see what we can learn about hagiographical-homiletic collections thanks to the history of these texts by Gregory and how these collections conversely shed some light on the transmission of Gregory's texts, in particular on the question of the coherence of his corpus. In this paper, I will base my presentation on the distinction between manuscripts containing exclusively or mainly Gregory of Nyssa's texts (i.e. one author's corpus/manuscripts) on the one hand and hagiographical-homiletic collections on the other hand – with, of course, subdivisions and sub-classifications within each category.

¹ See, however, Hörner 1971, published long before the completion of the whole series.

² For an example of another and complementary way of investigating the circulation and usage of hagiographical-homiletic texts, see Cunningham 2011.

1. Collections of hagiographical-homiletic texts by Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory's texts in hagiographical-homiletic collections

1.1. *An old, lost panegyrikon made of texts by Gregory of Nyssa?*

There are indeed many of Gregory's texts in hagiographical-homiletic collections.³ But, unlike what happened with other authors, there is no preserved liturgical collection made exclusively from Gregory of Nyssa's homilies.⁴ However, Albert Ehrhard has proposed to recognise a trace of such a collection (Gregory of Nyssa's *Panegyrikon*, hereafter the 'Milan group', according to the current localisation of its main manuscript) in a group of Gregorian manuscripts that contain a given series of hagiographical texts.⁵ All these manuscripts contain only texts by Gregory of Nyssa (corpus) and are not at all hagiographical-homiletic collections. According to Ehrhard, the sequence of texts given in Table 1 below should be read according to the liturgical year, even if none of the manuscripts bears any indication of a liturgical date. Moreover, there is not even any asking for benediction (κύριε, ἐδόξησον) at the beginning of the texts in the 'Milan group', as is usual in manuscripts meant for liturgical use.

³ *Vita s. Macrinae* (CPG 3166; BHG 1012); *In diem luminum* (CPG 3173; BHG 1934); *In sanctum pascha* (CPG 3174); *De tridui... spatio* (CPG 3175); *In sanctum et salutare pascha* (CPG 3176); *In ascensionem Christi* (CPG 3178); *Oratio funebris in Meletium episcopum* (CPG 3180; BHG 1243); *Oratio funebris in Flacillam imperatricem* (CPG 3182; BHG 1548); *De s. Theodoro* (CPG 3183; BHG 1760); *De uita Gregorii Thaumaturgi* (CPG 3184; BHG 715); *In Basilium fratrem* (CPG 3185; BHG 244); *Encomium in s. Stephanum protomartyrem I* (CPG 3186; BHG 1654); *Encomium in s. Stephanum protomartyrem II* (CPG 3187; BHG 1655); *Encomium in XL martyres Ia-b* (CPG 3188; BHG 1206–1207); *Encomium in XL martyres II* (CPG 3189; BHG 1208); *De Spiritu sancto siue in Pentecosten* (CPG 3191); *De deitate Filii et Spiritus sancti* (CPG 3192; BHG 2354); *Oratio in diem natalem Christi* (CPG 3194; BHG 1915). I leave aside all pseudepigraphical texts.

⁴ See Ehrhard 1938, II, 208–242.

⁵ Ehrhard 1938, II, 214–215.

Table 1: Sequence of Gregory's texts.

<i>De deitate Filii et Spiritus sancti et in Abraham</i>	(CPG 3192 ; BHG 2354)	Sunday τῶν προπατόρων	
<i>Oratio in diem natalem Christi</i>	(CPG 3194 ; BHG 1915)	25 December	
<i>Encomium in s. Stephanum protomartyrem I</i>	(CPG 3186 ; BHG 1654)	27 December	
<i>In Basilium fratrem</i>	(CPG 3185 ; BHG 0244)	1 January	
<i>In diem luminum</i>	(CPG 3173 ; BHG 1934)	6 January	
<i>In illud: Quatenus uni (De pauperibus amandis II)</i>	(CPG 3170)	Sunday τῆς ἀποκρέω	Unattested elsewhere for this liturgical date
<i>De mortuis non esse dolendum</i>	(CPG 3168 ; BHG 2103mg)	Saturday τῆς τυροφάγου	Unattested elsewhere for this liturgical date
<i>De s. Theodoro</i>	(CPG 3183 ; BHG 1760)	1 st Saturday of Lent (or 17 February)	
<i>Oratio funebris in Meletium episcopum</i>	(CPG 3180 ; BHG 1243)	12 February	
<i>Encomium in XL Martyres Ia-b</i>	(CPG 3188 ; BHG 1206-1207)	9 March	
<i>De tridui spatio (In Christi resurrectionem I)</i>	(CPG 3175)	Easter Sunday (or around then)	
<i>Seuerus Antiochenus, In Christi resurrectionem (hom. cathedralis 77)</i>	(CPG 7035)	Easter Sunday (or around then)	
<i>In sanctum Pascha (In Christi resurrectionem III)</i>	(CPG 3174)	Easter Sunday (or around then)	
<i>In ascensionem Christi</i>	(CPG 3178)	Ascension	
<i>Ad Eustathium de s. Trinitate</i>	(CPG 3137)	Pentecost	Never attested in liturgical collections

So, Ehrhard has reconstructed liturgical dates on the basis of other testimonies of Gregory's orations and of the sequence of texts, without finding any indication in the manuscripts of the 'Milan group'. However, some dates are still without any clear parallel and based on mere *diuinatio*.

Here are the manuscripts – all Gregorian corpus – that follow the sequence discovered by Ehrhard ('Milan group'):

- Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, C 135 inf. (tenth century), fols 5–178;⁶
- Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (BSB), Cod. graec. 370 (eleventh century), fols 1–174;⁷
- *Codex Grimani*, now lost, known through *descripti* from the sixteenth century: Munich, BSB, Cod.graec. 107;⁸

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF), gr. 585⁹ (with few changes in the texts' order), 586;¹⁰ Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, 4758,¹¹ 4864 (with John Beccus, *De processione Spiritus sancti* inserted between *In illud: Quatenus uni* and *De mortuis*);¹²

- Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana (BNM), gr. Z 67 (middle of eleventh century), fols 3–95^v (and its *descripti*);¹³
- Same sequence (but only until *In sanctum Pascha*) in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB), theol.

⁶ Martini and Bassi 1906, II, 959–961.

⁷ Hardt 1810, IV, 92–101; Antonopoulou 2000, 10–11.

⁸ Molin Pradel 2013, 314–320.

⁹ Omont 1886, I, 99.

¹⁰ Omont 1886, I, 99–100.

¹¹ De Andrés 1987, 352–354.

¹² PG 141, 157–276. De Andrés 1987, 485–488.

¹³ Mioni 1981, 92–93; Anthonopoulou 2000, 3–8.

gr. 42 (second half of twelfth century), not at the beginning of the manuscript (fols 78–165^v).¹⁴

Two texts are unattested or extremely rarely preserved in liturgical collections. *In illud: Quatenus uni (De pauperibus amandis II)* and *De mortuis non esse dolendum* appear in only one hagiographical-homiletic collection, preserved in one manuscript, Mt Athos (Hagion Oros), Monē Ibērōn, gr. 26 (eleventh century), classified by Ehrhard as 'zweibändiges Homiliar, Typus B'.¹⁵ There is no indication of a liturgical date in this manuscript (see Fig. 1); however, its liturgical sequence can be reconstructed quite securely, thanks to parallels. Moreover, according to the editors of *De mortuis* and of *In illud: Quatenus uni*, Ibērōn, gr. 26 is an indirect parent of the 'Milan group'.¹⁶ However, it does not contain any of Gregory's texts other than these two. So, the reconstruction of a liturgical usage of *In Illud: Quatenus uni* and *De mortuis* on the sole basis of this manuscript (Ibērōn 26) and of Gregory's *Panegyrikon* is possible, but not ascertained.

The last text of Ehrhard's sequence is even more problematic, since it is not a homily at all – there is indeed a homily by Gregory for Pentecost: *De Spiritu sancto siue in Pentecosten* (CPG 3191), which is present later in the Ambr. C 135 inf. (fols 312–314^v) and in the Vienna manuscript (theol. gr. 42, fols 229^v–230^v). Moreover, in the 'Milan group', *Ad Eustathium* opens a series of doctrinal texts, followed by *Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dei*, *Ad Petrum fratrem de differentia essentiae et hypostaseos*, *Ad Hierium de infantibus praemature abreptis*, *Ad Simplicium de fide* etc. It seems that we have here a new coherent series that is based on a different principle, since all these texts are short treatises addressed to someone from Gregory's circles. Since it is not only the 'liturgical-homiletic' part of the manuscript that is arranged thematically, but also another part containing texts of a different genre, it is likely that the rationale behind the two arrangements is literary and thematic rather than liturgical, and that the same learned Byzantine man cared for the ordering of both groups of texts. The liturgical sequence is therefore unlikely to

be 'original'. It remains, however, that this learned Byzantine man seems to have been influenced by the liturgical year to organise the sequence of homilies, as well as by existing usage of some of Gregory's homilies in liturgical context, and perhaps by previously existing liturgical-homiletic collections of a single author. Moreover, we never find in any liturgical manuscript such a complete sequence or any significant group of Gregory's texts, but only the usage of a small number of his texts – generally one or two.

1.2. Gregory's hagiographic texts in hagiographic collections

Among Gregory's homiletic texts, almost every one that can fit into a hagiographic collection has been used in one of them, but to an extent that is extremely variable and in very different configurations. In this paper, I will leave aside the homilies for the movable feasts and the other feasts of Jesus Christ and focus only on hagiographic homilies. The most disseminated text of all is quite certainly *De uita Gregorii Thaumaturgi* (more than 150 manuscripts). This fact is due to the insertion of the *Vita* in the metaphrastic *menologion* on 17 November. The other seven hagiographic texts by Gregory (*On the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste* [mainly two homilies]; *On Basil*; *On Stephen the Protomartyr* [again two texts, of which the second is of disputed authorship and rarely attested];¹⁷ *On Theodore the Recruit*; *On Meletius, Bishop of Antioch*; *Life of Macrina*)¹⁸ have been inserted secondarily in various hagiographic-homiletic collections, and not on a regular basis.

I will not consider here some other funerary orations by Gregory of Nyssa, in particular on two women from the imperial family, Pulcheria and Flacilla, since the two women did not receive a proper cult. Therefore, these orations have not been inserted in the hagiographic collections and are known today only thanks to manuscripts transmitting Gregory's works; more than 30 manuscripts contain *On Pulcheria*, less than 30 *On Flacilla*. However, there is a rubric for Flacilla in the *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, on 14 September.¹⁹ And there is indeed one hagiographical-homiletic collection (Oxford, Bodleian Library [BL], Holkham gr. 25)²⁰ where the text is present; a large part of

¹⁴ Hunger and Kresten 1976, 80–82.

¹⁵ Ehrhard 1938, II, 277–278; Sōtēroudēs 1998, 39–43.

¹⁶ Heil 1967, 14–16 and stemma 21: a family other than the 'Milan group', but in the same branch of the stemma. Van Heck, in Heil et al. 1967, 86–87 and stemma 88: one of the manuscripts of *classis* B, together with other manuscripts from the 'Milan group'.

¹⁷ Masi 2015.

¹⁸ This last text is clearly a *vita*, not a homily.

¹⁹ Delehaye 1902, col. 46.

²⁰ Ehrhard 1952, III, 868–870.

that manuscript, including our text, was copied by Maximos Margounios at the very end of the sixteenth or at the beginning of the seventeenth century. He copied *On Flacilla* from one corpus of Gregory of Nyssa's texts, either Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, C.I.11 (second half of the twelfth century), or Athens, Ethnikē Bibliothēkē tēs Hellados (EBE), Metochion 773 (sixteenth century).²¹ The Holkham manuscript seems to be an attempt to gather hagiographic texts for the whole year, and in particular for saints who had no established liturgical text. So Gregory's text seems to be a decent choice for this female saint, even if there was no proper tradition of celebrating her through a homily or *vita* in liturgical context. The manuscript in question is a modern hagiographical and liturgical reconstruction, not a testimony of Byzantine liturgical usage. As the editor, Andreas Spira († 2004), put it, Flacilla had the bad luck to be celebrated on the day of the Feast of the Cross.²² However, Pulcheria, who had not been commemorated in the *Synaxaria*, was left aside by Margounios.

Now I will have a look at the manuscript tradition of three homilies, with different types of traditions and different insertions into hagiographical-homiletic collections. I aim at seeing which type of information these books offer on the transmission of the homilies, and conversely, which type of information the manuscript tradition of these homilies offers on the hagiographical-homiletic collections and on their manuscripts.

2. *Oratio funebris in s. Meletium*: 12 February

The first text belongs to the genre of the *orationes funebres* and was delivered by Gregory during the Council of Constantinople in 381, for Meletius, Bishop of Antioch and first Chair of the Council (*Melet.*). Andreas Spira edited this text, and he did consider the types of manuscripts in his classification.²³ Fewer than 50 manuscripts contain the homily. The editor distinguished four groups: two main families, α and β ; a supplementary family consisting of two manuscripts com-

ing from southern Italy;²⁴ and three manuscripts that transmit the text under the name of Basil of Caesarea.²⁵ He also isolated another group of manuscripts, viz. *menologia*.²⁶ The *menologia* sub-group clearly belongs to the β family, according to Spira. This family consists mainly of manuscripts we have already discussed earlier (the 'Milan group'): Ambr. C 135 inf, Marc. gr. Z 67, Monac. gr. 370 and the descendants of the *Codex Grimani*, plus some others.²⁷ Therefore, in the case of *Melet.*, it seems that there is a link between the learned tradition represented by the 'Milan group', probably coming from Constantinople, and the hagiographic collections, in particular the *menologia*.

How are the different *menologia* of this sub-group interrelated? The clearest group is constituted by three manuscripts of the *Imperial Menologion* (a *menologion* made of abbreviated or rewritten texts, produced on behalf of Emperor Michel IV, 1034–1041), 'Typus B' (Ehrhard) or 'Baltimore' (D'Aiuto).²⁸ In these manuscripts, *Melet.* has been thoroughly revised and slightly augmented. So these manuscripts not only share a common ancestor or filiation, they also attest to a new version of the text. Another manuscript is closely linked to this *Imperial Menologion* group. This is Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, F.V.29, which, according to Ehrhard, is an 'altes Jahrespanegyrikum, Typus A' dating from the twelfth century;²⁹ it offers the same textual form as the *Imperial Menologion*, but without the revisions and rewriting that characterises it. Therefore, it shares a common ancestor with the *Imperial Menologion*, but prior to its rewriting. This proximity may be of interest for the history both of the *Imperial Menologion* and of the collection contained in the Basel manuscript.

²⁴ Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV), Vat. gr. 448: Devreesse 1937, 197–199. Florence, Bibl. Medicea Laurenziana, plut. 5.10: Bandini 1764, I, 23–30.

²⁵ Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 37: Hunger and Kresten 1976, 67–70. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, plut. 4.9: Bandini 1764, I, 528–530. Berlin, SBB, Philipps 1467: Studemund and Cohn 1890, 20–21.

²⁶ Spira, in Heil et al., 1967, 375–382.

²⁷ See *supra*. p. 16.


²⁸ D'Aiuto 2012; D'Aiuto 2018. Hagion Oros, Monē Koutloumousiou, 23: Ehrhard 1943, III, 407–409; Lambros 1895, I, 276 (no. 3092). Bibl. tou Prôtatou, 47: Ehrhard 1943, III, 409–411; Lambros 1894, I, 7 (no. 47). Athens, EBE, 982: Ehrhard 1943, III, 409; Halkin 1983, 71.

²⁹ Ehrhard 1938, II, 45–49.

²¹ Spira, in Heil et al. 1967, 432–433, and personal investigations; both manuscripts have been used (Turin) or copied (Athens) by Maximos Margounios.

²² Spira, in Heil et al. 1967, 432.

²³ Spira in Heil et al. 1967, 345–416 and 439–457. See also *Pinakes*: <<http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/11203/>>.

Fig. 1: Mt Athos, Monē Ibērōn, gr. 26, fol. 72r (beginning of *De mortuis*).

Outside of this small group, there are only three other manuscripts in the *menologia* group of Spira: first, a rather well-known ancient *menologion*, Jerusalem, Patriarchikē bibliothēkē, Panaghiou Taphou 1 (tenth century), which comes from the St Gerasimos Lavra in Palestine.³⁰ Then, two manuscripts stemming from the Dionysiou Monastery on Mt Athos.³¹ According to Andreas Spira, the Moscow manuscript that comes from Dionysiou is not the 'father' of Dionysiou 145, but its 'brother'³²: this conclusion seems strange, though, since it implies that the model of both manuscripts should have been present in Dionysiou until the seventeenth century and disappeared only then; the relations between the two manuscripts should perhaps be reconsidered.

Therefore, we have, according to the editor, at least three different sub-groups of hagiographical-homiletic collections containing *Melet.* in Spira's *menologia* group, all coming from the same lost source, but with rather distinct origins. First, Taphou 1, which seems to be of Palestinian origin. Jacques Noret, in his edition of the *Vita* of St Maruta of Mayferqat, has shown that this is the only surviving testimony of this *Vita* (BHG 2265) and that it was used as a source for the redaction of the corresponding *Vita* in the *Imperial Menologion*, redaction A (BHG 2266).³³ The textual history of *Melet.* may suggest a similar relation between Taphou 1 and the *Imperial Menologion*, even if Spira has not gone so far as to suggest this on a textual basis. At least, Taphou 1 comes from the same source as the *Imperial Menologion*. The Moscow manuscript (coming from Dionysiou) – the main part of the manuscript, in which the text by Gregory of Nyssa is included – is dated between the end of the tenth century (Santo Lucà)³⁴ and the beginning of the eleventh century (Elina Dobrynina)³⁵. It is assigned either

to the Syro-Palestinian area (Lucà) or to Constantinople (Aksinia Džurova),³⁶ considering its script and decoration (*stile blu*). It may stem from the same place of origin as Taphou 1 or may be simply linked to the branch attested in Constantinople in the eleventh century.

These links, which are known thanks to the history of the manuscripts and the textual history, shed some light on the history both of *Melet.* and of some hagiographical-homiletic collections. The *menologia* tradition of Andreas Spira seems to come from Syria or Palestine or at least to be linked with this area in early times. It was disseminated through various types of books, since Gregory of Nyssa's *Melet.* was not the core text for the feast of St Meletius of Antioch in the Byzantine tradition. In fact, it seems to have never been part of the core of any given family of hagiographical-homiletic collections. The relationships between all these books should now be investigated more thoroughly, in order to confirm this first hypothesis.

Last, we shall add two more hagiographical-homiletic manuscripts to this group that Andreas Spira included in his β family, and not in the *menologia* group.³⁷ The first one is a well-known manuscript now kept in Venice, BNM stemming from the monastery of the Prodromos of Petra in Constantinople.³⁸ It represents one of the four volumes of the *panegyrikon* from this monastery; *Melet.* was introduced in this collection again from the β family, but independently from the *menologia* group. Some links exist between Marc. gr. VII. 25 and a manuscript from Mt Athos dating from 1227 that contains Ephrem's works and a small collection of hagiographical texts.³⁹ This decorated manuscript still awaits a detailed study.

In conclusion, a group of closely related hagiographic manuscripts was clearly established in Spira's edition: they all belong to family β and mainly form a subgroup (*menologia*) within this family. This group may stem from the corpus of Gregory's texts, forming an autonomous subgroup of it, or the origin of the β family for *Melet.* may come from hagiographical-homiletic collections. In the

³⁰ Ehrhard 1937, I, 567–570; Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1891, I, 1–8.

³¹ Moscow, State Historical Museum (GIM), Sinod. gr. 124 (Homilies, mainly Chrysostom, tenth–eleventh and eleventh century): *Melet.* is in the tenth century section: Fonkič and Poljakov 1993, 64; Vladimir 1894, I, 171–175. Mt Athos, Monē Dionysiou, 145 ('erweiterter Metaphrast', February to August, seventeenth century): Ehrhard 1943, III, 46–48; Lambros 1895, I, 344 (no. 3679).

³² Spira, in: Heil et al. 1967, 376–378.

³³ Noret 1973, 77–79. For the singularity of Taphou 1, see also Lampadaridi 2016, 38 and 44–45.

³⁴ Lucà 2011, 155–156.

³⁵ Dobrynina 2008, 486–488.

³⁶ Džurova 2011, 113.

³⁷ Spira, in Heil et al. 1967, 370–374.

³⁸ Venice, BNM, Marc. gr. VII.25, twelfth century: Ehrhard 1943, III, 501–504; Mioni 1960, 40–44.

³⁹ Hagion Oros, Monē Pantokratoros, 86: Ehrhard 1952, III, 1002; Lambros 1895, I, 86 (no. 1120); Pelekanidou et al. 1979, 152, 280–281.

present state, it is impossible to say whether the hagiographic tradition dates back long into the history of this text and gave birth, later, to one of the families of manuscripts within the Gregorian tradition, or if it derived from the main Gregorian tradition at a later stage.⁴⁰ The history of the manuscripts and their relation suggest a possible Syro-Palestinian origin,⁴¹ but their textual state also spread from Constantinople via its inclusion in the *Imperial Menologion*, probably later in the first half of the eleventh century. Another smaller group of hagiographic manuscripts, clearly inserted in the same β branch, contains only two manuscripts and may be linked to the Prodromos of Petra.

3. The *Encomium* of the megalomartyr Theodore Tyro

John P. Cavaros published in 1990 the first critical edition of the widespread *Encomium* of the megalomartyr Theodore Tyro, transmitted by around 100 manuscripts (*Theod.*).⁴² Unlike what happened with *Melet.*, there is no clear split for this text between the transmission within Gregory's corpus and the transmission in the hagiographical-homiletic collections, nor an unequivocal link between hagiographical-homiletic collections and one branch of the Gregorian tradition. The editor again distinguished two families, which, however, are exactly the opposite of the *Melet.* scheme: the α family is formed mainly of the 'Milan group',⁴³ while the β family gathers almost all the other manuscripts (see Fig. 2). The vast majority of hagiographical-homiletic manuscripts are found in the β family, so not in the family to which these collections belonged in the case of *Melet.*

The feast of St Theodore Tyro is celebrated on 17 February. However, Gregory's oration is generally not read at this date, with but a few exceptions. The homily is used on the first Saturday of Lent because of the later tradition regarding the Miracle of the *Kolyva* ('boiled wheat') linked

to Theodore,⁴⁴ even if there is no mention of this miracle in Gregory's panegyric of Theodore. So the suggestion by Louis Petit, even though condescending in its formulation, is probably right: the feast was transferred from 17 February to the first Saturday of Lent because of the *Kolyva Miracle* and the concurrence of the beginning of Lent with the usual liturgical date.

Let's now start with the α family (corresponding to the β family of *Melet.*, i.e. the 'Milan group'), which contains mainly two groups of manuscripts and fewer than 20 codices.⁴⁵ Among these two groups, John P. Cavaros identified three hagiographical-homiletic manuscripts (see Fig. 2): first, a metaphrastic *menologion* for the second half of January⁴⁶ that was completed by readings for the beginning of Lent, among them *Theod.*; this manuscript is a direct parent of Monac. gr. 370 and of the *Codex Grimani*. Then, a 'nachmetaphrastische, gemischte Sammlung',⁴⁷ where the text is subsumed under the 17 February; it is closely related to Ambr. C 135 inf. and Marc. gr. Z 67. Finally, a strange pre-metaphrastic annual collection without order, which also contains *Theod.* for 17 February, in a textual form close to the α family.⁴⁸ In this family, *Theod.* is used for both 17 February and the first Saturday of Lent, and it appears in three different types of hagiographical-homiletic collections.

In the β family (see Fig. 2), for which the editor distinguished six groups (c–h) with more than 60 manuscripts, there is no clear distinction between manuscripts of the Gregorian corpus proper and hagiographical-homiletic collections. The grouping of the witnesses based on textual criticism does not correspond to the classification according to the types of hagiographical-homiletic manuscripts (*menologia*, *panegyrika* and homiliaries). There are, however, some exceptions: group h⁴⁹ derives from a Moscow manuscript stemming from the Great Lavra on Mt Athos, an 'alte Jah-

⁴⁰ In the case of the *Vita Macrinae*, the editors have indicated that even in the Gregorian corpus, the text seems to come from a hagiographical-liturgical context: Maraval 1971, 118–119, with references to previous bibliography.

⁴¹ Unfortunately, the Syriac translation does not fit clearly in any of the two Greek families (see Spira, in Heil et al. 1967, 396–404), and so cannot help establishing the geographic origin of one or the other family.

⁴² Cavaros, in Heil et al. 1990, CXXXV–CLXXII, 59–71. See also *Pinakes* <<http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/3819/>>.

⁴³ Monac. gr. 370, *Codex Grimani's* sons, Ambr. C 135 inf. and Marc. gr. Z 67; see *supra*.

⁴⁴ Petit 1899, 324; Delehaye 1909, 16. Haldon 2016, 31–32; Efthymiadis 2011.

⁴⁵ Cavaros, in Heil et al. 1990, CXXXIX–CXL.

⁴⁶ Vatican City, BAV, Pal. gr. 308, eleventh-twelfth century, 'N': Ehrhard 1938, II, 553–554; Stevenson 1885, 172–174.

⁴⁷ Athens, EBE, 2560, eleventh century: Ehrhard 1952, III, 798; Halkin 1983, 145.

⁴⁸ Mt Athos, Monē Batopediou, 456, eleventh century, 'V': Ehrhard 1952, III, 728–729; Eustratiades and Arcadios Vatopedinos 1924, 91–92.

⁴⁹ Cavaros, in Heil et al. 1990, CLXII–CLXIII.




Fig. 2: Stemma of the manuscript tradition of *Theod.* (Cavarnos, in Heil et al. 1990, CLXVIII^{bis}).

ressammlung, Typus A'.⁵⁰ All the other manuscripts of this group are homiliaries or *panegyrika*, all coming from Mt Athos, too, and all probably direct or indirect copies of the Lavra manuscript, at least for *Theod.*

Group c is another interesting one.⁵¹ It includes two branches, one consisting of homiliaries, *panegyrika*⁵² and

two 'gemischte Sammlungen'⁵³. The other branch contains metaphrastic *menologia*, two from Mt Sinai⁵⁴ and two derived from them, now in Paris, both of the twelfth century.⁵⁵ Almost all the metaphrastic *menologia* that have preserved our text belong to the c group, and in particular to this last branch.

⁵⁰ Moscow, GIM, Sinod. gr. 26, eleventh century, 'Σ'; Ehrhard 1937, I, 194–195; Vladimir 1894, 577–578; Fonkič and Poljakov 1993, 126.


⁵¹ Cavarnos, in Heil et al. 1990, CXLIII–CXLVIII.

⁵² Paris, BnF, gr. 767, twelfth century, from the Prodomos of Petra: Omont 1886, I, 133–134. Oxford, BL, Roe 28, thirteenth–fourteenth century, 'R': Hutter 1977, 31–33 (no. 20); Hutter 1982, 325–326. Vatican City, BAV, Pal. gr. 245, twelfth–thirteenth century: Ehrhard 1938, II, 41–43; Stevenson 1885, 133–135.

⁵³ Paris, BnF, gr. 816, fourteenth century: Ehrhard 1952, III, 825; Omont 1886, I, 151–152. Mt Athos, Monē Batopediou, 451, seventeenth century: Ehrhard 1952, III, 887; Eustratiades and Arcadios Vatopedinos 1924, 90.

⁵⁴ Sinai, Monē Aikaterinēs, gr. 326, eleventh century: Ehrhard 1938, II, 602; Gardthausen 1886, 65. Gr. 515, twelfth century: Ehrhard 1943, III, 77–78; Gardthausen 1886, 126.

⁵⁵ Paris, BnF, gr. 1500: Ehrhard 1938, II, 598; Omont 1898, II, 68. Gr. 1529: Ehrhard 1943, II, 598–599; Omont 1898, II, 80–81.



However, we also find our text in at least two ancient *menologia*,⁵⁶ within families that contain both a corpus of Gregory's texts and various homiletic collections (families d and e). Therefore, the general type of manuscripts (here, *menologia*) is not a sufficient indication for grouping these manuscripts; it must be refined, at least by using Ehrhard's sub-categories.

Since the homily on St Theodore Tyro has generally not been included in the metaphrastic *menologia*,⁵⁷ and since it is not regularly included in any type of *panegyrikon* or homiliary, its transmission is nonlinear in terms of hagiographical-homiletic collections. There was obviously a

steady circulation between Gregory of Nyssa's corpus and hagiographical-homiletic collections or, rather, multiple derivations and borrowings, mainly from Gregorian corpus to hagiographic collections.⁵⁸ Strangely enough, we can also see that in the majority of manuscripts, there is no strict correlation between the textual families and the type of hagiographical-homiletic collections (with some exceptions). So we must use textual filiation in order to trace and verify the history of such hagiographical-homiletic collections: are they coherent groups of texts, or are they composed, inde-

⁵⁶ Vienna, ÖNB, hist. gr. 3, eleventh century, 'V^b': Hunger 1961, 2-4. Oxford, BL., Barocci 238, tenth century: Coxe 1969, col. 406-407.

⁵⁷ For some exceptions, see *supra*.

⁵⁸ There is one problematic occurrence the other way around, in family b, from Athens, EBE 2560 to Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 42. But this section of the manuscript is generally considered to be a direct copy of ms. Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, C 135 inf., after corrections (M²): see Heil et al. 1967, 150-151, 159, 174, 362-363; Heil et al. 1990, cxii-cxviii; Rhein et al. 1996, 20-21, 152-156, 276-279. So, J. P. Cavaros' conclusions (CXL1) should perhaps be submitted to revision on this point.




Fig. 4: Stemma of the manuscript tradition of *Steph. I*, family γ (Lendle, in Heil et al. 1990, cxc).

cated to the commemoration of Theodore and Theophanes Graptoi. However, *Steph. I* has often been added to metaphrastic *menologia* and is also present, but not as frequently, in *panegyrika* and other types of annual or semi-annual collections under 27 December. As in the case of *Theod.*, and perhaps even more so, the various (6) families reconstructed by the editor, Otto Lendle, include both Gregorian corpus and hagiographical-homiletic collections.⁶⁰ If we zoom in on smaller zones of the stemma, we can see again a coherence between types of collection and textual families, for example in the sub-family ζ7 (see Fig. 3):⁶¹ this group is composed

mainly of manuscripts transmitting the *panegyrikon* in four volumes, which is independent from the Metaphrast,⁶² and is closely related to a Lavra manuscript, Γ 117. Elsewhere, however, we see no coherence. For example, in the γ11 sub-group (see Fig. 4),⁶³ we find two ‘alte Jahrespanegyriken, Typus A’,⁶⁴ and two ‘alte Menologien’, one for two months⁶⁵

⁶⁰ Lendle, in Heil et al. 1990, CLXXXIII–CCXVI, 73–94; Lendle 1968.

⁶¹ Lendle, in Heil et al. 1990, CCII–CCVII; Lendle 1968, 244–247.

⁶² Ehrhard 1952, III, 509–513.

⁶³ Lendle, in Heil et al. 1990, CLXXXVIII–CXCI; Lendle 1968, 198–200.

⁶⁴ Meteora, Monē Metamorphōseōs, 549, tenth century: (Beēs) 1998, 551–557, 677. Paris, BnF, gr. 1478, eleventh century: Ehrhard 1938, II, 30–31; Omont 1888, II, 58–59.

⁶⁵ Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III, II C 26, eleventh century: Mioni 1992, 194–196.

and the other for four months.⁶⁶ These two *menologia* are closely related and seem to descend from a common model, now lost, for *Steph. I*. Was this a Gregorian corpus or already a hagiographic collection? It is possible that it was a Gregorian manuscript, since we have in the same family the *Codex Arsenii*, a well-known lost manuscript of the Gregorian corpus dated to October 912 and written by one Arsenios, disciple of Metrophanes of Smyrna.⁶⁷ Was the model of the two *menologia* a different, more ancient hagiographical-homiletic collection? This is also possible, since in this sub-group, and even in the whole γ family, all manuscripts that do not stem from the *Codex Arsenii* are hagiographical-homiletic collections. In this case, the compiler of the *Codex Arsenii* would have taken *Steph. I* from a hagiographical-homiletic collection. We also find in this γ family one of the most ancient manuscripts containing our text, a ninth-century non-menologic collection in majuscule, now on Mt Sinai.⁶⁸

For *Steph. I*, there is therefore no clear separation between a hagiographical-homiletic tradition versus a Gregorian tradition, but again multiple derivations and interrelations. Even within the given subgroups, it remains difficult to discover whether the origin of a given tradition is to be found in a corpus of Gregory's works or in a liturgical and hagiographical context.

Conclusion

We have examined three different cases of textual transmission among Gregory of Nyssa's hagiographic homilies: one in which the hagiographical-homiletic collections occupy a specific zone in the stemma, a clearly defined sub-group, with links of filiation between the manuscripts in question (*Melet.*), and a second case (*Theod.*) in which hagiographical-homiletic collections are located in both families but form the majority of one of them. In the last case (*Steph. I*), hagiographical-homiletic collections are scattered all over the stemma. Therefore, in these three cases at least, there is a real porosity leading from manuscripts of Gregory's corpus to hagiographical-homiletic collections; the converse rela-

tion (from hagiographical-homiletic collections to Gregory's corpus) is rarer and less easy to ascertain, even if we consider this possibility for the *Codex Arsenii* in the case of *Steph. I* and for the relation between the *menologia* group and the β family in the case of *Theod.*⁶⁹

We have also seen that the coherence of the filiations varies according to the integration of the text in the collections. When a text is marginal, not included in the core of the given collection but only added in such or such manuscripts, the nature of the collections is of no major importance in the filiations. The validity of this hypothesis should be tested on *De uita Gregorii Thaumaturgi*, the only text of Gregory that is regularly included in the metaphrastic *menologion*, and on specific subgroups of a given type of hagiographical-homiletic collections. Conversely, the groups of hagiographical-homiletic collections and their nature may be of major interest for constructing a stemma, but also for interpreting the history of transmission and reception of a patristic homily. When consideration of the nature and transmission of hagiographical-homiletic collections is articulated with the history of manuscripts, it can lead to important results concerning the history of the circulation of texts. We have seen that these indications confirm many of Ehrhard's hypotheses of links between manuscripts, at least in a narrow perspective, for small, well-defined groups of manuscripts. The history of manuscripts and hagiographical-homiletic collections may also help to solve some problems of the origins of collections, as suggested for the *Imperial Menologion* in connection with Syro-Palestinian manuscripts. However, there is still a long way to go in this field: even though Gregory of Nyssa is already a well-investigated author, perhaps even the best-investigated patristic author in terms of the edition of his texts, we are only at the beginning of the road...

⁶⁶ Paris, BnF, gr. 1451, eleventh century: Ehrhard 1937, I, 389–392; Omont 1888, II, 46.

⁶⁷ It is known thanks to a sixteenth-century copy: Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Gronov. 12: Declerck 2002, ccccx–ccccxxvi, with previous bibliography, and *Pinakes* <<http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/37783/>>.

⁶⁸ Sinai, Monē Aikaterinēs, gr. 493: Ehrhard 1937, I, 146–148; Gardthausen 1886, 120.

⁶⁹ However, Maraval 1971, 118–119, 121 (Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 42 as sole exception), has shown that the majority of witnesses of the *Vita Macrinae* tradition come from hagiographical-homiletic collections.

REFERENCES

- Antonopoulou, Theodora (2000), 'Two Manuscript Collections of the Works of Gregory of Nyssa and the Identification of a Manuscript of Bessarion', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 93: 1–22.
- de Andrés, Gregorio (1987), *Catálogo de los codices griegos de la Biblioteca nacional* (Madrid: Ministerio de cultura).
- Bandini, Angelo Maria (1764), *Catalogus manuscriptorum bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae uaria continens opera Graecorum Patrum*, vols 1–2 (Florence: Typis Caesareis).
- Beēs, Nikos A., edited by Leandros Branousēs and Dēmētrios Zach. Sophianos (1967, 1998²), *Tà Χειρόγραφα τῶν Μετεώρων: Κατάλογος περιγραφικὸς τῶν χειρογράφων κωδίκων τῶν ἀποκειμένων εἰς τὰς μονὰς τῶν Μετεώρων. Α΄: Τὰ χειρόγραφα τῆς μονῆς Μεταμορφώσεως* (Athens: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν).
- Coxe, Henry O. (1969), *Bodleian Library, Quarto Catalogues*, vol. 1: *Greek Manuscripts* (Oxford: Bodleian Library [reprint of the edition 1853]).
- Cunningham, Mary B. (2011), 'Messages in Context: The Reading of Sermons in Byzantine Churches and Monasteries', in Angeliki Lymberopoulou (ed.), *Images of the Byzantine World: Visions, Messages and Meanings, Studies presented to Leslie Brubaker* (Farnham, Burlington: Ashgate), 83–98.
- D'Aiuto, Francesco (2012), 'La questione delle due redazioni del "Menologio imperiale", con nuove osservazioni sulle sue fonti agiografiche', *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*, 49: 275–361.
- (2018), 'Il "Menologio Imperiale" un secolo dopo l'editio princeps (1911–1912) di Vasilij V. Latyšev (con il testo della Passio s. Barbarae BHG e Nov. Auct. BHG 216b)', in Antonio Rigo, with Michele Trizio and Elefterios Despotakis (eds), *Byzantine Hagiography: Texts, Themes, and Projects* (Turnhout: Brepols: Byzantios: Studies in Byzantine History and Civilization, 13), 55–114.
- Declerck, José (2002), *Eustathii Antiocheni, Patris Nicaeni, Opera quae supersunt omnia* (Turnhout, Leuven: Brepols, Leuven University Press; Corpus christianorum, series graeca, 51).
- Delehaye, Hippolyte (1902), *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* [Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris] (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes).
- (1909), *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires* (Paris: A. Picard et fils).
- Devreesse, Robert (1937), *Codices vaticani graeci*. vol. 2, *Codices 330–603* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana).
- Dobrynina, Elina (2008), 'Unknown "Stile Blu" Manuscripts of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries in Russian Collections', in Basilēs Atsalos and Niki Tsironi (eds), *Actes du VI^e Colloque International de Paléographie Grecque (Drama, 21–27 septembre 2003)*, vol. 2 (Athens: Helleniki Etaireia Bibliodesias; Vivlioamphiastis Annexe I), 481–488.
- Džurova, Aksinia (2011), *Le rayonnement de Byzance: Les manuscrits grecs enluminés des Balkans (VI^e-XVIII^e siècles), Catalogue d'exposition (XXII^e Congrès International d'Études Byzantines, Sofia, 22–27 août 2011)* (Sofia: Национална Галерия за чуждестранно изкуство).
- Efthymiadis, Stephanos (2011), 'Versi su s. Teodoro a proposito del miracolo dei "collivi" (BHG 1769): l'agiografia metrica al servizio della polemica antilatina', *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*, 48: 123–136.
- Ehrhard, Albert (1937–1952), *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs; Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 50–52).
- Eustratiades, Sophronios and Arcadios Vatopedinos (1924), *Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἱερᾷ Μονῇ Βατοπεδίου ἀποκειμένων κωδίκων* (Paris: H. Champion; Ἀγιορειτικὴ βιβλιοθήκη, 1).
- Fonkič, Boris L., and Fedor B. Poljakov (1993), *Греческие рукописи Московской Синодальной Библиотеки: палеографические, кодикологические и библиографические дополнения каталогу архимандрита Владимира (Филантропова)* (Moscow: Синодальная Библиотека).
- Gardthausen, Viktor (1886), *Catalogus codicum graecorum sinaiticorum* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Haldon, John F. (2016), *A Tale of Two Saints: The Martyrdoms and Miracles of Saints Theodore 'the Recruit' and 'the General'* (Liverpool: Liverpool UP; Translated Texts for Byzantinists, 2).
- Halkin, François (1983), *Catalogue des manuscrits hagiographiques de la Bibliothèque nationale d'Athènes* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes; Subsidia hagiographica, 66).
- Hardt, Ignatius (1806–1812), *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum graecorum Bibliothecae regiae Bavaricae*, vols 1–5 (Munich: J. E. Seidel).
- Heil, Gunther, Adrianus van Heck, Ernest Gebhardt, and Andreas Spira (1967), *Gregorii Nysseni Sermones*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill; Gregorii Nysseni Opera, 9).
- , Johan P. Cavaros, Otto Lendle, and Friedhelm Mann (1990), *Gregorii Nysseni Sermones*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill; Gregorii Nysseni Opera, 10.1).

- Hörner, Hadwig (1971), 'Über Genese und derzeitigen Stand der grossen Editionen der Werke Gregors von Nyssa', in Marguerite Harl (ed.), *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse, Actes du colloque de Chevetogne (22–26 septembre 1969)* (Leiden: Brill), 18–50.
- Hunger, Herbert (1961), *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, vol. 1: *Codices historici, codices philosophici et philologici* (Vienna: Georg Prachner).
- , and Otto Kresten (1976), *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, vol. 3.1: *Codices theologici 1–100* (Vienna: Brüder Hollinek).
- Hutter, Irmgard (1977), *Corpus der byzantinischen Miniaturenhandschriften*, vol. 1: *Oxford, Bodleian Library*, 1 (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann).
- (1982), *Corpus der byzantinischen Miniaturenhandschriften*, vol. 3.1: *Oxford, Bodleian Library*, 3 (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann).
- Lambros, Spyridon (1895), *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, vols 1–2 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP).
- Lampadaridi, Anna (2016), *La conversion de Gaza au christianisme: La Vie de S. Porphyre de Gaza par Marc le Diacre (BHG 1570)* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes; Subsidia hagiographica, 95).
- Lendle, Otto (1968), *Gregorius Nyssenus: Encomium in sanctum Stephanum Protomartyrem, Griechischer Text, eingeleitet und herausgegeben mit Apparatus criticus und Übersetzung* (Leiden: Brill).
- Lucà, Santo (2011), 'Doroteo di Gaza e Niceta Stetato: A proposito del Nea. gr. 7', in *Bisanzio e le periferie dell'Impero, Atti del Convegno Internazionale nell'ambito delle celebrazioni del Millenario della fondazione dell'Abbazia di San Nilo a Grottaferrata (Catania, 26-28 novembre 2007)* (Acireale: Bonanno), 145–180.
- Maraval, Pierre, ed. and trans. (1971), *Grégoire de Nysse, Vie de sainte Macrine* (Paris: Cerf; Sources chrétiennes, 178).
- Masi, Gianluca (2015), 'La Laudatio altera S. Stephani Protomartyris attribuita a Gregorio di Nissa (CPG 3187)', *Augustinianum*, 55: 559–604.
- Martini, Aemidio, and Domenico Bassi (1906), *Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae*, I–II (Milan: U. Hoepli).
- Mioni, Elpidio (1960), *Bibliothecae diui Marci Venetiarum Codices Graeci manuscripti*. vol. 2: *Codices qui in sextam, septimam atque octauam classem includuntur continens* (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato).
- (1981), *Bibliothecae diui Marci Venetiarum Codices Graeci manuscripti*, vol. 1: *Thesaurus antiquus, codices 1–299* (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato).
- Mioni, Elpidio (1992), *Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae nationalis Neapolitanae*, vol. 1.1 (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato).
- Molin Pradel, Marina (2013), *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*, vol. 2: *Codices graeci Monacenses 56–109* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Noret, Jacques (1973), 'La vie grecque ancienne de S. Maruta de Mayferqat', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 91: 77–103.
- Omont, Henri (1886–1898), *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale et des autres bibliothèques de Paris et des Départements*, I–IV (Paris: E. Leroux).
- Papadopoulos-Kérameus, Athanasios I. (1891–1915), 'Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ βιβλιοθήκη ἥτοι κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ ἀγιοτάτου ἀποστολικοῦ τε καὶ καθολικοῦ ὁρθοδόξου πατριαρχικοῦ θρόνου τῶν ἱεροσολύμων καὶ πάσης Παλαιστίνης ἀποκειμένων ἐλληνικῶν κωδίκων, vols 1–5 (ἐν Περουπόλει [reprint Brussels: Culture et civilisation, 1963]).
- Pelekanidou, Stylianos M. et al. (1979), *Οἱ θησαυροὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὁρους*, vol. 1: *Εἰκονογραφημένα χειρόγραφα*, vol. 3: *Μ. Μεγίστης Λαύρας, Μ. Παντοκράτορος, Μ. Δοχειαρίου, Μ. Καρακάλου, Μ. Φιλοθέου, Μ. Ἀγίου Παύλου* (Athens: Εκδοτικὴ Αθηνῶν).
- Petit, Louis (1899), 'La grande controverse des Colybes', *Échos d'Orient*, 2: 321–331.
- Pinakes | Πίνakes: Textes et manuscrits grecs* <<https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr>>.
- Rhein, Ernest, Friedhelm Mann, Dörte Teske, and Hilda Pollack (1996), *Gregorii Nysseni Sermones*, vol. 3 (Leiden, New York, Cologne: Brill; Gregorii Nysseni Opera, 10.2).
- Sōtēroudēs, Panagiōtēs (1998), *Κατάλογος Ἑλληνικῶν Χειρογράφων*, vol. 1: *(1–100)* (Hagion Oros: Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Ἰβήρων).
- Stevenson, Henry Senior (1885), *Codices manuscripti palatini Bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome: Typographia Vaticana).
- Studemund, Wilhelm, and Leopold Cohn (1890), *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, I (Berlin: A. Asher & Co.).
- Vladimir Archimandrit (1894), *Систематическое описание рукописей Московской Синодальной Библиотеки* (Moscow: Синодальная Типография).