

The *Inedita* Homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (BHGⁿ 1980a): A compilation using Proclus of Constantinople

**Author:**Radu Gârbacea¹ **Affiliation:**¹Faculty of Orthodox Theology, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Sibiu, Romania**Corresponding author:**Radu Gârbacea
radu_garbacea@yahoo.com**Dates:**

Received: 11 Oct. 2021

Accepted: 26 Nov. 2021

Published: 11 Feb. 2022

How to cite this articleGârbacea, R., 2022, 'The *Inedita* Homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (BHGⁿ 1980a): A compilation using Proclus of Constantinople', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 78(4), a7185. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v78i4.7185>**Copyright:**© 2022. The Authors.
Licensee: AOSIS. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.**Read online:**

Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

In his inventory of the manuscript tradition of the homilies on the Transfiguration, Maurice Sachot stated that folios 46r–55r of the codex *Parisinus graecus 1611* contain the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (BHGⁿ 1980a). He also stated that this text is unedited and that it is most probably a recension of the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (CPG 5807; BHG 1980) attributed to Proclus of Constantinople. To date, however, this homily has remained unpublished and unstudied. After a brief presentation of the codex *Parisinus graecus 1611*, this article brings to light a surprise that emerges from examining folios 46r–55r of the Parisian manuscript.

Contribution: The article proves that the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (BHGⁿ 1980a) is not a recension of the homily on the Transfiguration (CPG 5807; BHG 1980), but a compilation for which the beginning of the homily on the Transfiguration attributed to Proclus of Constantinople was used.

Keywords: *In transfigurationem Domini*; Proclus of Constantinople; CPG 5807; BHG 1980; BHGⁿ 1980a; the Transfiguration.

Introduction

At the end of the 19th century, in his brief description of manuscript 1611 in the Greek collection of the Paris Library,¹ Henri Omont drew attention to the fact that folios 46r–55r contain the homily on the Transfiguration by Patriarch Proclus of Constantinople ('Procli, CP. Patriarchae, homilia in Transfigurationem'), but without giving any information on the *incipit* or *desinit* (Omout 1888:106). In 1968, François Halkin also gave a brief description of the manuscript *Parisinus gr. 1611*, noting next to folios 46r–55r 'transfiguratio, oratio Procli BHGⁿ 1980a' (Halkin 1968:226). Although he stated that folios 46r–55r contain the homily on the Transfiguration attributed to Proclus of Constantinople, already inventoried in the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* (BHG) with the inventory number 1980, Halkin proposed another inventory number, namely 1980a. In the augmented version of the BHG published in 1969, namely *Auctarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae* (BHG^a), Halkin reproduced the *incipit* and *desinit* of the homily (Δεῦτε, φίλοι, καὶ τήμερον... συνεῖναι αὐτῷ διαπαντὸς ἐρίμενοι) and drew attention to the fact that this manuscript was omitted by the Jesuit François-Joseph Leroy (1967:100–105) in his inventory of the manuscript tradition of the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (CPG 5807; BHG 1980) (ed. Halkin 1969:324). The editors of the third volume of the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (CPG) placed the number BHGⁿ 1980a alongside the number BHG 1980 for the homily on the Transfiguration listed among the works of Proclus of Constantinople (CPG 5807) (Geerard 1979:136; Geerard & Noret 2003:136). They equate the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (CPG 5807; BHG 1980) with the homily on the Transfiguration transmitted by the Paris manuscript.² In *Novum Auctarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae* (BHG^a), published in 1984, Halkin did not provide any further information about this text, merely reproducing what he had supplied in the earlier editions (ed. Halkin 1984:378). Three years later, in his inventory of the manuscript tradition of the homilies on the Transfiguration, Sachot stated that the homily BHGⁿ 1980a is an unedited text belonging to Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople, and that it is most probably a recension of BHG 1980 ('Il doit s'agir très vraisemblablement d'une recension de BHG 1980') (Sachot 1987:110). In 1993, Costas N. Constantinides and Robert Browning, although providing a detailed description of the Parisian codex in their work on dated Greek manuscripts from Cyprus, tell us only that folios 46r–55r contain the homily on the Transfiguration of 'Proklos, patriarch of Constantinople', and reproduce the *incipit* of the text (1993:328).

1. A digital copy of the manuscript is available online at *Grec 1611 | Gallica* (<https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b107234374/f57.item>).

2. As of 07 September 2021, the *Pinakes* database, managed by the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes (IRHT), lists the manuscript *Parisinus gr. 1611* among the direct manuscript witnesses of the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (CPG 5807; BHG 1980). *Pinakes* | Πίνακες – Notice: Proclus Constantinopolitanus, Hom 8: *In transfigurationem Domini* (<https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/6924/>).

As far as the present author has been able to ascertain, this is all that is publicly known to date about the text preserved in folios 46r–55r of the manuscript *Parisinus gr. 1611*. In what follows, I intend to provide a brief introduction to the codex *Parisinus gr. 1611*, to place the codex among the great collections of manuscripts according to the typology adopted by Albert Ehrhard and generally preserved in hagiographic and liturgical studies and to shed some light on the uncertainty that persists to this day about the contents of folios 46r–55r, which are suspected of either preserving the entire homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (CPG 5807; BHG 1980) or a recension of it.

The codex *Parisinus gr. 1611*: Its provenance

A comprehensive description of the codex *Parisinus gr. 1611* did not appear until 1993. Prior to this, the codex had been very briefly described in works on large manuscript collections. For example, Henri Omont, who provided the first information on the origin and content of this codex in his description of the Greek manuscript collection held in the French national library, lists the works preserved in the manuscript and tells us that the manuscript was copied in 1553 by a priest named Demetrius,³ that it is a codex on paper, containing 445 folios, and that in the manuscript collection of Jean-Baptiste Colbert,⁴ it was inventoried under number 4719 (Omont 1888:106). Further details were to appear in 1950, in an article by Jean Darrouzès on Cypriot manuscripts in the French national library. Jean Darrouzès wrote:

At the same time, it should be observed that in folio 438 the same Demetrius gave the date of his ordination in 1550 and the date of his brother's death in 1557. It is not the same hand that wrote the colophon. Demetrius could be none other than a companion or the one who commissioned the manuscript. The volume became the property of John Logaras, according to folio Ar, and later became the property of the monastery of Arakos [in Cyprus], according to folio Av (Darrouzès 1950:191) (*Author's own translation*).

Costas N. Constantinides and Robert Browning were to describe the contents of the manuscript in detail, providing the *incipit* of each individual text and the number in the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* (Constantinides & Browning 1993:327–329). Also, by carefully reading the colophon in red at folio 437v, they were able to clarify the question of the manuscript's origin. According to this colophon, 'the precise date of the completion of the volume is Wednesday, 07 June 1553' and the priest Demetrios Demetrakes is not the scribe of the volume, but the sponsor of the manuscript (Constantinides & Browning 1993:329). Apart from folios 31v–33v, because of an anonymous hand, the volume has been copied by 'ἀναγνώστης Peter Blabestes' (Constantinides 2000:272; Constantinides & Browning

3. Erroneous information, as we will see below.

4. Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619–1683), former minister to King Louis XIV (1643–1715) during the years 1661–1683. With regard to the question of when the codex came into Colbert's possession, Donald Jackson has provided some information. According to him, the manuscript arrived from Cyprus in Paris on 23 November 1677 (Jackson 2010:53). Jackson relies on the arrival lists of Colbert's manuscripts, published by Omont in the second volume of his *Missions* (1902:975–977). It passed to the Royal Library in 1732 and thus later became part of the *Bibliothèque Nationale* of France.

1993:329). Constantinides and Browning (1993:331) also supply details of the manuscript illuminations, binding, quire composition and later notes.

The codex *Parisinus gr. 1611*: Its place in the great manuscript collections

Concerning the place of this codex among the great manuscript collections, we find information on this in the fourth volume of Ehrhard's work on the Tradition of the hagiographic and homiletic literature of the Greek Church (Ehrhard 1952). This codex is listed by Ehrhard in the category of 'mixed collections' (*die gemischten Sammlungen*) (1952:792–874) of the large group of 'post-metaphrastic collections' (*die nachmetaphrastischen Sammlungen*) (1952:789–894). The 'post-metaphrastic collections', together with the 'pre-metaphrastic collections' (*die vormetaphrastischen Sammlungen*), are the two parts of what Ehrhard called 'non-menological collections' (*die nichtmenologischen Sammlungen*), which he defines as those hagiographic or homiletic manuscripts whose texts are not ordered according to the criteria of the calendar of saints or the movable church year, but follow each other randomly in an eclectic mix (1952:725–727). Ehrhard rejects the hypothesis that these collections are based on a different calendar of saints. He bases his rejection of the hypothesis on the fact that such mixed collections are found in all the larger manuscript collections next to the other collections, which are all arranged according to the single Byzantine calendar and the same single church year. Ehrhard is keen to point out, however, that one thing can be deduced from this lack of liturgical order, namely that these texts were not usually intended for the official Liturgy. Rather, they were intended for private reading, for which the exact order and sequence of feasts and Sundays of the Church year was unnecessary.⁵ Their design for private use can be further deduced from the fact that most of them are in small format, unlike large liturgical collections, which have a large format. Thus, Ehrhard suggests, it was very easy to place them on a private bookshelf. Furthermore, texts maintained in private collections had the advantage of evading the process of living evolution to which the officially read texts were subjected (Ehrhard 1952:725–727). Ehrhard's hypothesis that such collections were intended for private use seems to explain why only a single manuscript witness is known for the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (BHGⁿ 1980a).

It is surprising, however, that Ehrhard does not mention folios 46r–55r in his description of the codex. He is very attentive to hagiographic texts, distinguishing between pre-metaphrastic and metaphrastic ones. He also comments on the Constantinopolitan origin of the nine homilies provided as readings for Sundays 10–12, 14 and 15, in which the Gospel of Luke is read, and for the Sundays 2–5, in which they are read from the Gospel of Matthew, but says nothing here about folios 46r–55r (Ehrhard 1952:865–867).

5. From these mixed collections, the dates of the feasts are usually missing and are replaced by order numbers. Also missing are the headings for each day and the order numbers (Ehrhard 1952:726).

TABLE 1: The first part of the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (BHGⁿ 1980a) in the codex *Parisinus gr. 1611*, folios 46r–48v.

f. 46r	Τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Πρόκλου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, λόγος εἰς τὴν μετα-
f. 46v	μόρφωσιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Δέσποτα, εὐλόγησον Δεῦτε, φίλοι, καὶ τήμερον τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν ἀόκνως ἐφασχόμεθα θησαυρῶν, ἵνα ἐκείθεν συνήθως ἀρυσώμεθα πλοῦτον καὶ οὐδαμῶς οὐδέποτε δαπανώμενον. Δεῦτε τῶ πανσόφῳ ⁶ καὶ καλῶς ὀδηγοῦντι, καὶ πάλιν ἀκολουθήσωμεν Λουκᾶ, ἵνα ἴδωμεν τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν ἀναβαίνοντα, καὶ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην, τῆς θείας μεταμορφώσεως λαμβάνοντα μάρτυρας. Παραλαβὼν γὰρ φησιν, τοὺς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον, εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν ἀνήλθεν ὁ Δεσπότης. Ὅρος ὑψηλὸν, ἐν ᾧ Μωσῆς καὶ Ἠλίας διελέγοντο τῷ Χριστῷ ⁷ ὄρος ὑψηλὸν, ἐν ᾧ Μωσῆς, [ὁ] τοῦ πάσχα τὸν ἀμὸν σφαγιάσας, καὶ τῷ αἵματι τὰς φιλίας τῶν Ἑβραίων βάντισας ⁸ ὄρος ὑψηλὸν, ἐν ᾧ Ἠλίας, ὁ τὸν βοῦν παρ' ἐκείνους μελίσας, καὶ τὴν δι' ὕδατος θυσίαν ἐν πυρὶ δαπανήσας ⁹ ὄρος ὑψηλὸν, ἐν ᾧ Μωσῆς, ὁ ἀνοίξας καὶ κλείσας ἐρυθρὰ ¹⁰ τὰ συστήματα ὄρος ὑψηλὸν, ἐν ᾧ Ἠλίας, ὁ κλείσας καὶ ἀνοίξας τῶν ἀρετῶν τὰ ὀμβρήματα ¹¹ ὄρος ὑψηλὸν, ἐν ᾧ μάθωσιν οἱ περὶ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστίν, ᾧ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψει ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων [Phl 2:10]. Τρεῖς γὰρ μόνους παραλαβὼν εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν ἀνήλθεν ὁ Δεσπότης ¹² οὐ πάντα παραλαβὼν οὐ πάντα καταλιπὼν ¹³ οὐ φθονήσας τοῖς ἄλλοις τῆς δόξης ¹⁴ οὐκ εὐτελεστέρας κρίνας ¹⁵ οὐ τοὺς ἐννέα λυπήσας. Δίκαιος γὰρ ὢν δικαίως τὰ πάντα διέπει, ἕνα λογιζόμενος πάντα κατὰ τῆς παραλλήλου ἀγάπης οὐ μερίζων, οὐς ἦνωσηεν. Ἄλλ' ἐπειδὴ πᾶς ἀνάξιος ἦν τῆς θείας ὄψεως, καὶ τῆς φοβερᾶς ἐκείνης ὀπτασίας, ὡς μέλλων γίνεσθαι προδότης, ὁ Ἰουδας, τοῦτου χάριν σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους καταλιμπάνει, ἵνα κἀκείνῳ ὡς μὴ μόνῳ καταλειφθέντι πᾶσαν ἀπολογίαν εἰς ὕστερον ἀποκλήσει ¹⁶ καὶ τῆς μεταμορφώσεως τοὺς τρεῖς αὐτάρκεις κατὰ τὸν νόμον, ἐπιστάσῃται μάρτυρας, ἐν ἑαυτοῖς αὐτὰ ψυχὴν καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς περιφέροντας. Αὐτοὺς γὰρ φησὶν ¹⁷ Φύλαξον, Πάτερ δίκαιε, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ὧσιν, καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν ἔσμεν. Ὅρων γὰρ Ἰουδας παρὰ τὸ ὄρος Ἀνδρέαν, Θωμᾶν, Φίλιππον, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ διατρίβοντας, καὶ οὐδὲ γογγύζοντας, οὐκ ἀγανακτοῦντας, οὐ λοιδοροῦντας, ἀλλὰ χαίροντας, καὶ κοινὴν τοῖς ¹⁸ ἀποῦσι τὴν ἄνωθεν ψηφίζοντας ¹⁹ , ἀναπολόγητος παντελῶς ὑπῆργεν, εἰς οὐδὲν οὐδέποτε τῶν θαυμάτων παροραθεῖς ²⁰ ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ γλωσσόκομον, ἔχων καὶ τὸ μύρον ἀνατίως βασκαίνων, καὶ τὸν διδάσκαλον τοῖς ἐχθροῖς τολημῶς προδιδούς. Καὶ τί φησι; <i>Καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν καὶ ὠφθησαν Μωσῆς καὶ Ἠλίας συλλαλοῦντας αὐτῷ</i> [Mt 17:2–3]. Ἄλλ' ὁ Πέτρος, ὡς αἰεὶ περὶ πάντων θερμῶς, ὁμοίαι διανοίας συλλαλοῦντας αὐτῷ, οὐ τὸ πολὺ μετριάσας ²¹ τοῦ θαύματος, οὐ τὸ παράδοξον σκοπήσας τῆς θείας ἐλλάμψεως, καλὸν καλεῖ τὸν ἔρημον τόπον, καὶ σκηνοποιὸς γίνεσθαι ²² βούλεται. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτε διελέγετο <i>ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστηκότων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου ἕως ἂν εἰδῶσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἑλληλυθῶν</i> ²³ ἐν δυνάμει [Mk 9:1]. Ἐπειδὴ πολλὰ περὶ κινδύνων διελέχθη καὶ θανάτου, καὶ τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς τῶν μαθητῶν σφαγῆς, καὶ τὰ αὐστηρὰ ἐπέταξεν ἐκεῖνα ²⁴ καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ καὶ ἐν χερσίν· τὰ δὲ ἀγαθὰ ἐν ἑλίπτι καὶ προσδοκίαις· βουλόμενος καὶ τὴν ὄψιν αὐτῶν πληροφοροῦσαι, καὶ δεῖξαι τίς ποτέ ἐστίν ἡ δόξα ἐκείνη μεθ' ἧς μέλλει παραγίνεσθαι, ὡς ἐχώρουν αὐτοῖς ἦν μαθεῖν καὶ κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον, δεικνυσὶν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀποκαλύπτει ταύτην, ἵνα μήποτε καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ οἴκειω θανάτῳ, μήτε ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Δεσποτοῦ λοιπὸν ἀλγῶσιν· διὰ τοῦτο ²⁵ φησὶν ²⁶ <i>εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστηκότων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου καί...</i> [Mk 9:1]

A first close look at the folios 46r–55r of the codex *Parisinus gr. 1611*

An examination of folios 46r–55v brings to light an unexpected surprise. As the text preserved by these folios is unedited, I will provide here the first transcription of folios 46r–48v (see Table 1). It should be observed that the text in the Parisian manuscript has a large number of spelling variations. In order not to clutter up the footnotes, I will indicate here the most frequent spelling variants encountered. For example, there are numerous variations of:

- ο/ω: θησαυρόν for θησαυρῶν, δαπανόμενον for δαπανώμενον, τολημῶς for τολημῶς, γεύσονται for γεύσονται;
- ω/ο: πλοῦτων for πλοῦτον, λοιδοροῦντας for λοιδοροῦντας, προδιδούς for προδιδούς, βίων for βίον;
- iotacism: η for ι: μελήσας instead of μελίσας;
- ι for υ: ἀρυσώμεθα instead of ἀρυσώμεθα;
- η for ει: κάμψη instead of κάμψει, διέπη instead of διέπει, καταλιμπάνη instead of καταλιμπάνει, καταληφθέντι instead of καταλειφθέντι, παροραθῆς instead of παροραθεῖς, μαθῆν instead of μαθεῖν;
- η for οι: ἐαντῆς instead of ἐαντοῖς;
- ι for ει: ἐπιγίων instead of ἐπιγειῶν;
- ι for η: σκοπίσας instead of σκοπήσας;
- ε for αι: ἀνετίως instead of ἀνατίως.

Scholars who have previously commented on this text – Omont, Halkin, Gerard, Noret, Sachot, Constantinides

6. τῶν πανσόφων *cod.*

7. ἐρύθηρα] *correxī*, περιθῆρᾶ *cod.*

8. καταλειπῶν *cod.*

9. τῆς *cod.*

10. ψηλαφίζοντας *cod.*

11. μετριάσας *cod.*

12. γύνεται *cod.*

13. ἑλληλυθῆεν *cod.*

14. διὰ τοῦτω *cod.*

and Browning – have pointed out, we are dealing with a homily on the Transfiguration under the name of Saint Proclus, Archbishop of Constantinople (Τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Πρόκλου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, λόγος εἰς τὴν μεταμόρφωσιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). The *incipit* of the text, as already indicated, is identical with the *incipit* of the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (CPG 5807; BHG 1980).¹⁵ However, the following text (f. 46v–48r) is not identical to the text of the homily CPG 5807 published in volume 65 of *Patrologiae Graecae* (1862:65:764B1–765B8). In addition to some grammatical differences, there are also a few omissions, inversions and word substitutions in the Paris manuscript text. For example, the Paris manuscript omits ἀφθόνως μεριζόμενον ('it generously shares') (Daley 2013:89) from the first sentence of the homily (see Table 2).

Also, the Paris manuscript text omits the brief passage in which it is said that Moses and Elijah represent the Law and the prophets, who now converse with grace (ὄρος ὑψηλὸν, ἐν ᾧ νόμος καὶ προφήται συνωμίλου τῇ χάριτι) (ed. Migne 1862:65:764B.11–12). Elsewhere, the copyist of the homily chooses to rearrange the text in a logical order (see Table 3).

On folio 47r (lines 3–4), we read ἐρυθρὰ τὰ συστήματα instead of τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης τὰ συστήματα (ed. Migne 1862:65:764C.3).

TABLE 2: The beginning of the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (CPG 5807; BHG 1980) and the beginning of the homily on the Transfiguration in the codex *Parisinus gr. 1611*.

Migne 1862:65:764B.1–4	<i>Parisinus gr. 1611</i> , folio 46v, lines 2–6
Δεῦτε, φίλοι, καὶ σήμερον τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν ἀόκνως ἐφασχόμεθα θησαυρῶν, ἵν' ἐκείθεν συνήθως ἀρυσώμεθα πλοῦτον ἀφθόνως μεριζόμενον, καὶ οὐδαμῶς οὐδέποτε δαπανώμενον.	Δεῦτε, φίλοι, καὶ τήμερον τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν ἀόκνως ἐφασχόμεθα θησαυρῶν, ἵνα ἐκείθεν συνήθως ἀρυσώμεθα πλοῦτον καὶ οὐδαμῶς οὐδέποτε δαπανώμενον.

TABLE 3: A variant reading.

Migne 1862:65:764C.3–5	<i>Parisinus gr. 1611</i> , folio 47r, lines 4–6
ὄρος ὑψηλὸν, ἐν ᾧ Ἠλίας, ὁ ἀνοίξας καὶ κλείσας τῶν ὑδάτων τὰ ὀμβρήματα ¹¹	ὄρος ὑψηλὸν, ἐν ᾧ Ἠλίας, ὁ κλείσας καὶ ἀνοίξας τῶν ἀρετῶν τὰ ὀμβρήματα ¹¹

15. For his edition of homily CPG 5807, Jean-Paul Migne used Riccardi's text (ed. 1630:297–303).

TABLE 4: Another source of homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (BHGⁿ 1980a).

Parisinus gr. 1611, folios 48v–49r ¹⁷	Migne 1862:58:549.10–22	Cramer 1840:351.26–352.16	Proiou & Schirò 1980:43 = Delehaye 1902:869–870
<p>Ἐπειδὴ πολλὰ περὶ κινδύνων διελέχθη καὶ θανάτου, καὶ τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς τῶν μαθητῶν σφαγῆς, καὶ τὰ αὐστηρὰ ἐπέταξεν ἐκεῖνα· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ καὶ ἐν χερσίν· τὰ δὲ ἀγαθὰ ἐν ἐλπίσι καὶ προσδοκίαις· βουλόμενος καὶ τὴν διὴν αὐτῶν πληροφορῆσαι, καὶ δεῖξαι τίς ποτε ἔστιν ἡ δόξα ἐκείνη μεθ' ἧς μέλλει παραγίνεσθαι, ὡς ἐχώρουν αὐτοῖς ἦν μαθεῖν¹⁸ καὶ κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον, δείκνυσιν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀποκαλύπτει ταύτην, ἵνα μήποτε καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ οἴκειω θανάτῳ, μήτε ἐπὶ τῷ Δεσπότητος λοιπὸν ἀλγῶσιν. Διὰ τοῦτο¹⁹ φησὶν· εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὡς ἐστηκότων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσονται²⁰ θανάτου [Mk 9:1] καὶ [f. 49r] τὰ ἐξῆς. Ταῦτα δὲ ἀπλουστερον μὲν, ἀνάγεται ἐπὶ τὴν μετὰ ἕξ ἡμέρας ἄνοδον τῶν μαθητῶν εἰς τὸ ὄρος σὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ κατ' ἴδιαν, λέγων δὲ Πέτρου, Ἰακώβου τε καὶ Ἰωάννου, εἶδον²¹ γάρ οὗτοι μεταμορφωθέντα Ἰησοῦν ἐν βασιλείᾳ καὶ δόξῃ καὶ ὡς δορυφόρους Μωσῆα καὶ Ἠλίαν παρεστώτες αὐτῷ· καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἴδιαν μόνους· καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ ἴμια αὐτοῦ ἐγένοντο στιλβόντα, λευκὰ ἴλια ὡς χιών, οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται λευκᾶναι. Καὶ ὥφθησαν αὐτῷ Ἠλίας σὺν Μωϋσῇ καὶ ἦσαν συλλαλοῦντες²² τῷ Ἰησοῦ. [Mk 9:2–4].</p>	<p>Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πολλὰ περὶ κινδύνων διελέχθη καὶ θανάτου, καὶ τοῦ πάθους τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ τῆς τῶν μαθητῶν σφαγῆς, καὶ τὰ αὐστηρὰ ἐπέταξεν ἐκεῖνα· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἦν ἐν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ καὶ ἐν χερσίν, τὰ δὲ ἀγαθὰ ἐν ἐλπίσι καὶ προσδοκίαις· οἷον, τὸ σῶζειν τὴν ψυχὴν τοὺς ἀπολλύντας αὐτήν, τὸ ἐρχεσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, τὸ ἀποδιδόναι τὰ ἑαθλα· βουλόμενος καὶ τὴν διὴν αὐτῶν πληροφορῆσαι, καὶ δεῖξαι τίς ποτε ἔστιν ἡ δόξα ἐκείνη, μεθ' ἧς μέλλει παραγίνεσθαι, ὡς ἐγχωροῦν ἦν αὐτοῖς μαθεῖν· καὶ κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον δείκνυσιν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀποκαλύπτει ταύτην· ἵνα μήτε ἐπὶ τῷ οἴκειω θανάτῳ, μήτε ἐπὶ τῷ Δεσπότητος λοιπὸν ἀλγῶσι, καὶ μάλιστα Πέτρος οδυνώμενος.</p>	<p>Ἐπειδὴ πολλὰ περὶ κινδύνων διελέχθη καὶ θανάτου, καὶ τοῦ πάθους τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ τῆς τῶν μαθητῶν σφαγῆς, καὶ τὰ αὐστηρὰ ἐπέταξεν ἐκεῖνα· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἦν ἐν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ καὶ ἐν χερσίν· τὰ δὲ ἀγαθὰ ἐν ἐλπίσι καὶ προσδοκίαις· βουλόμενος καὶ τὴν διὴν αὐτῶν πληροφορῆσαι, καὶ δεῖξαι τίς ποτε ἔστιν ἡ δόξα ἐκείνη μεθ' ἧς μέλλει παραγίνεσθαι, ὡς ἐγχωροῦν ἦν αὐτοῖς μαθεῖν καὶ κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον, δείκνυσιν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀποκαλύπτει ταύτην, ἵνα μήτε ἐπὶ τῷ οἴκειω θανάτῳ, μήτε ἐπὶ τῷ Δεσπότητος λοιπὸν ἀλγῶσι· καὶ μάλιστα Πέτρος οδυνώμενος· καὶ ὄρα τι ποιεῖ περὶ γενένης καὶ βασιλείας διαλεχθεὶς, τὴν μὲν βασιλείαν τῇ ὄψει δείκνυσιν· τὴν δὲ γενέαν οὐκέτι. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εὐδόκιμοι ὑπῆρχον καὶ εὐγνώμονες μετὰ τῶν χρηστοτέρων ἐνάγει· οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐκεῖνο παρατρέχει τὸ μέρος, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὅπου σχεδὸν καὶ ὑπ' ὄψιν αὐτὰ φέρει τὰ πράγματα τῆς γενένης, ὡς ὅταν τοῦ Λαζάρου τὴν εἰκόνα εἰσαῆγ, καὶ τοῦ τὰ ἑκατὸν δηνάρια ἀπαιτήσαντος μνημονεῖη, καὶ τοῦ τὰ ρυπαρὰ ἐνδεδυμένου ἱμάτια, καὶ ἐτέρων πλειόνων. καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἴδιαν μόνους· καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ ἴμια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στιλβόντα, λευκὰ ἴλια ὡς χιών, οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται λευκᾶναι [Mk 9:2–3].</p>	<p>Ἐπειδὴ πολλὰ περὶ κινδύνων ὁ Χριστὸς διελέχθη πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς τῶν μαθητῶν σφαγῆς, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἦν ἐν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ καὶ ἐν χερσίν, τὰ δὲ ἀγαθὰ ἐν ἐλπίσι, βουλόμενος καὶ τὴν διὴν αὐτῶν πληροφορῆσαι καὶ δεῖξαι, τίς ποτε ἔστιν ἡ δόξα ἐκείνη μεθ' ἧς μέλλει παραγίνεσθαι, ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἴδιαν καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν [Mk 9:2].</p>

The similarity with the homily *CPG* 5807, however, stops abruptly at the end of folio 48r, when the text from Mk 9:1 is quoted. What follows is a passage that bears a very close resemblance to the section on the Transfiguration in *Catena in Marcum*, edited by Cramer,¹⁶ and to the first part of the Synaxarion of Constantinople (or Synaxarion of the Great Church) and the Byzantine Synaxarion on the Feast of the Transfiguration, celebrated on 6 August. Before appearing in *Catena in Marcum* and as a notice for the Synaxarion of Constantinople, the beginning of the second element of our composite text is first and above all borrowed from the beginning of Chrysostom's homily 56 in *Matthaeum* (ed. Migne 1862:58:549.10–21), which is devoted to the exegesis of the episode of the Transfiguration. Sachot recalls in his article of 1983 that the Chrysostomic commentary on the Gospel of Matthew was a source of the recension II of the exegetical chain on Mark (Sachot 1983:124; see also Geerard 1980:236). In the following, I will present this similarity by placing in a table the text transmitted by the Parisian manuscript, the beginning of Chrysostom's homily 56 in *Matthaeum*, the beginning of the exegesis to the episode of the Transfiguration in *Catena in Marcum*, and also the beginning part of the Synaxarion to the Transfiguration (see Table 4).

Concluding remarks

As discussed, the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (BHGⁿ 1980a) is not a recension of the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (*CPG* 5807; BHG 1980), nor is it another homily on the

Transfiguration by Archbishop Proclus of Constantinople. Rather, it is a compilation in the composition of which the author decided to use the beginning of the homily *CPG* 5807 (ed. Migne 1862:65:764B1–765B8). If he were still alive, Michel Aubineau would probably have once again exclaimed '*un inédit fantôme disparaît*', as he did when he dashed the Bollandist Halkin's hopes for the existence of an unknown homily attributed to Proclus in the manuscript *Metochii Sancti Sepulchri* (today *Atheniensis*) 163, saec. XVI (Aubineau 1983:424). So we are not wrong to say that folios 46r–48r are the third indirect manuscript witness to the homily *In transfigurationem Domini* (*CPG* 5807; BHG 1980), and that the manuscript *Parisinus gr. 1611* should be added to the list of indirect witnesses, alongside the manuscripts *Vaticanus gr. 604* and *Romanus Angelicus gr. 125 (T.1.7)* (see Gârbasea 2021a, 2021b). Note that unlike the first two indirect witnesses, which transmit passages from the homily *CPG* 5807 under the name of John Chrysostom, the third indirect witness transmits the fragment under the name of Proclus.

Finally, it is legitimate to wonder who compiled this homily for the composition of which the homily *CPG* 5807 and *Catena in Marcum* were used. What is certain is that to date no other manuscript witness is known. This does not exclude the

17.The copy used by Peter Blabestes seems to belong to the same family of manuscripts as codex *Laurentianus Pluteus gr. VI.18, saec. 10*, available online at Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana - Scaffale Digitale (bmlonline.it), last accessed on 6.10.2021. Compare, for example, ff. 48v–49r of *Parisinus gr. 1611* with f. 113v of the Florence codex. It can be seen that the differences are very small.

18.μαθῆν *cod.*

19.διὰ τούτω *cod.*

20.γεύσονται *cod.*

21.ἶδον *cod.*

22.συλλαλοῦντες *cod.*

16.For his edition, Cramer used one 10th century codex, *Parisinus gr. 178*, and two 11th century codices, *Oxonienis Bodleianus Laudianus gr. 33* and *Parisinus Coislinus 23*. According to the Pinakes database, there are currently no less than 30 known manuscript records for *Catena in Marcum*. Pinakes|Πινάκες – Notice: Catena, In Marcum (<https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/8183/>), last accessed on 06 October 2021. On the origins of the *Catena in Marcum*, see Lamb (2012:27–73).

possibility that the copyist Peter Blabestes compiled this text. Although he wants to humble himself by claiming in the colophon at the end of the manuscript (f. 437v) that he does not know the divine teachings, and he puts the completion of the writing of the manuscript down to divine help (καὶ καμὸι συγχωρήσατε διὰ τὸν Κ[ύριον], ὅτι ἀμαθῆς ὑπάρχων τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων), nevertheless his self-proclaimed status as a ‘reader’ (ἀναγνώστης) tells us that he was very familiar with the patristic writings. Such a hypothesis waits, of course, to be proved.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to express his gratitude to Pierre Augustin for his valuable comments on the first draft of this article.

Competing interests

The author declares that he has no financial or personal relationships that may have inappropriately influenced him in writing this article.

Author's contributions

R.G. is the sole author of this research article.

Ethical considerations

This article followed all ethical standards for research without direct contact with human or animal subjects.

Funding information

Project is financed by Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu and the Hasso Plattner Foundation research grants LBUS-IRG-2019-05.

Data availability

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated agency of the author.

References

Aubineau, M., 1983, 'Un inédit fantôme. Proclus, *In Transfigurationem* (BHG 1974s)', *Analecta Bollandiana* 101(3–4), 423–424. <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.ABOL.4.03098>
Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, *Homepage*, viewed n.d, from <http://mss.bmlonline.it/>.

- Constantinides, C.N., 2000, 'Scriptoria in Sixteenth-Century Cyprus', in S. Patoura (ed.), *Ἡ ἑλληνική γραφή κατά τοὺς 15ο καὶ 16ο αἰῶνες*, Ἐθνικὸ Ἰδρυμὰ Ἑρευνῶν. Ἰνστιτοτο Βυζαντινῶν Ἑρευνῶν. Διεθνή Συμπόσια 7 [*The Greek Script in the 15th and 16th Centuries*, National Hellenic Research Foundation. Institute for Byzantine Research. International Symposium 7, pp. 261–282, Athens 18–20 October 1996], Ἰνστιτοτο Βυζαντινῶν Ἑρευνῶν, Ἀθήνα.
- Constantinides, C.N. & Browning, R., 1993, *Dated Greek Manuscripts from Cyprus to the Year 1570*, *Dumbarton Oaks Studies* 30, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection/Cyprus Research Centre, Washington, DC/Nicosia.
- Cramer, J.A. (ed.), 1840, *Catena Graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum, Vol. 1: In Evangelia S. Matthaei et S. Marci*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Daley, S.J.B.E. (transl.), 2013, *Light on the Mountain: Greek Patristic and Byzantine Homilies on the Transfiguration of the Lord*, *Popular Patristic Series* 48, St Vladimir's Seminary Press, New York, NY.
- Darrouzès, J., 1950, 'Les manuscrits originaux de Chypre à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris', *Revue des études byzantines* 8, 162–196. <https://doi.org/10.3406/rebyz.1950.1028>
- Delehaye, H. (ed.), 1902, *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae (e codice Sirmondiano nunc Berolinensi)*, Society of Bollandists, Brussels.
- Ehrhard, A., 1952, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Band III/2, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 52/2, Akademie Verlag Berlin in Arbeitsgemeinschaft mit dem J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, Leipzig.
- Gârbacea, R., 2021a, 'A few remarks on the Inedita Pseudo-Chrysostomic Homily *De transfiguratione et eleemosyna* (CPG 5009; BHGn 1996t)', *HTS Theologise Studies/Theological Studies* 77(4), a6686. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v77i4.6686>
- Gârbacea, R., 2021b, 'A new indirect witness to *In Transfigurationem Domini* (CPG 5807): Codex Romanus Angelicus gr. 125 (T.1.7)', in M. Vinzent (ed.), *Studia Patristica CXXVIII: Papers presented at the Eighteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 2019*, pp. 363–371, Peeters, Leuven.
- Geerd, M., 1979, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum III: ab Cyrillo Alexandrino ad Iohannem Damascenum*, Brepols, Turnhout.
- Geerd, M., 1980, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum IV: Concilia, Catena, Brepols*, Turnhout.
- Geerd, M. & Noret, J., 2003, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum III: ab Cyrillo Alexandrino ad Iohannem Damascenum*, Editio secunda, anastatica, addendis locupletata, Brepols, Turnhout.
- Grec 1611|Gallica, *Homepage*, viewed n.d, from <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b107234374/f57.item>.
- Halkin, F., 1968, *Manuscripts grecs de Paris. Inventaire hagiographique*, Subsidia Hagiographica 44, Société des Bollandistes, Bruxelles.
- Halkin, F. (ed.), 1969, *Auctarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae*, Subsidia Hagiographica 47, Société des Bollandistes, Bruxelles.
- Halkin, F. (ed.), 1984, *Novum Auctarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae*, Subsidia Hagiographica 65, Société des Bollandistes, Bruxelles.
- Jackson, D., 2010, 'The Colbert Greek Library from 1676 to 1678', *Codicis Manuscripti* 73–74, 43–57.
- Lamb, W.R.S., 2012, *The Catena in Marcum. A Byzantine Anthology of Early Commentary on Mark*, Text and Editions for New Testament Study 6, Brill, Leiden.
- Leroy, F.J., 1967, *L'homilétique de Proclus de Constantinople: Tradition manuscrite, inédits, études connexes*, Studi e testi, 247, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano.
- Migne, J.-P. (ed.), 1862, *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*, 162 vols., Migne, Paris.
- Omout, H., 1888, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale et des autres bibliothèques de Paris et des Départements*, vol. 3, Alphonse Picard, Paris.
- Omout, H., 1902, *Missions archéologiques françaises en Orient aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*, Collection de Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, vol. 2, Imprimerie Nationale, Paris.
- Pinakes|Πίνakes – Notice: Proclus Constantinopolitanus, *Hom 8: In transfigurationem Domini*, viewed nd., from <https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/6924/>.
- Pinakes|Πίνakes – Notice: Catena, *In Marcum*, viewed n.d., from <https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/8183/>.
- Proiou, A. & Schirò, J. (eds.), 1980, *Analecta Hymnica Graeca. XII: Canones Augusti*, Istituto di studi bizantini e neoellenici, Università di Roma, Roma.
- Sachot, M., 1983, 'Le réemploi de l'homélie 56 in *Matthaeum* de Jean Chrysostome (BHG⁹ 1984) dans deux homélies byzantines sur la Transfiguration (BHG 1980k et *1985)', *Revue des sciences religieuses* 57(2), 123–146. <https://doi.org/10.3406/rsr.1983.2973>
- Sachot, M., 1987, *Les homélies grecques sur la transfiguration: Tradition manuscrite*, Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, Paris.