THE BYZANTINE REVIEW

ByzRev 07.2025.057
doi: 10.17879/byzrev-2025-8933

CAROLINE MACÉ (ed.), Organising a Literary Corpus in the Middle Ages. The Corpus Nazianzenum and the Corpus Dionysiacum. Turnhout: Brepols 2024. 699 pp. – 978-2-503-61096-2. The ebook is in open access.

• PHILIPP ROELLI, University of Zurich (roelli.sglp@yandex.com)

This volume is a collection of essays on two of the most important Greek literary corpora. The contributions are based on a conference in Göttingen from April 27 to 29, 2022, organised by CAROLINE MACÉ. The book is written by seventeen scholars in English, German, French, and Italian. The topics are varied, but there is a focus on the early translations of the two corpora into Oriental languages, especially Armenian, Georgian, and Syriac. Latin and Greek quotations are usually left without a translation. Each contribution ends with an abstract in two languages (one of them being English). The works of Gregory of Nazianzus (c. 330–390) consist of orations, epistles, and poems and are much more voluminous than the Corpus Dionysiacum (written around AD 500). In this book, the main focus for the former is on the orations. The two corpora share the fact that they are often transmitted *in globo* and both were very popular and are extant today in hundreds of Greek manuscripts as well as in early translations into several Oriental languages. Philology, codicology, and textual criticism are used to shed new light on these corpora. The introduction provides background on the genesis of the volume and connects the various threads addressed by the contributors. Macé then provides some background on the two corpora, with more detail on the Corpus Dionysiacum since it receives less attention in the remainder of the book. The vexed question of the author's identity is not tackled, as it is not of great importance for the topic of the book. More important is the question of whether the corpus we have today is complete in the form its author left it to posterity. He mentions seven further works of his of which no trace can be found in extant manuscripts. MACÉ concludes (p. 22) that they are likely part of his literary fiction and have never existed. John of Scythopolis edited the corpus in the mid sixth century and added a prologue and a commentary which are nearly always included in the corpus, along with some additional paratexts (a brief lexicon, a florilegium, capitula, book epigrams). This may have been a conscious strategy to protect the corpus from growing by the intrusion of further material (p. 27). Gregory's corpus differs in that the author is a well-known personality and although his works are usually transmitted

in corpora, there are some pseud-epigraphic works that have intruded into some manuscripts, such as a *Hymnus ad Deum* and probably the Euripides cento *Christus patiens* (p. 34). Macé herself was able to demonstrate that all of our Greek manuscripts derive from a hyparchetype posterior to the early translations into Latin and Armenian (p. 50). A more detailed comparison of the similarities and differences between these two cases would have been interesting, but this may still require further research.

In the first two contributions, the project leaders describe the critical editing projects currently under-way for the two corpora. BERNARD COULIE writes about the *Centre d'études sur Grégoire de Nazianze* (pp. 41–52), a long-term project that dates back to the 1980s. The project's main focus is on editing the orations, while the poems are being studied by their colleagues in Münster. Their database contains approximately 1,500 Greek manuscripts before ca. AD 1550. The oldest ones among these are from the ninth century, making them quite distant in time from the author. There are approximately 150 manuscripts of the Armenian translation that may date from around AD 500. The Syriac translation is even somewhat older although it was reworked in the seventh century. The oldest translation, however, is the one by Rufinus of Aquileia, who translated nine orations into Latin around 400. The project aims to be as comprehensive as possible and has already published many studies and editions of texts in various languages. A brief *bilan* ends the chapter. The previous hypothesis that the Greek text of the orations can be separated into two groups N and M, based on their order, is no longer tenable. This has negative consequences for the editions based on this principle in Sources Chrétiennes. EKKEHARD MÜHLENBERG then describes *Das Akademievorhaben "Dionysius Areopagita" in Göttingen* (pp. 53–59). This project has an even longer history: Hermann Langerbeck, a pupil of Werner Jaeger, set himself the task of critically editing the Corpus Dionysiacum. A first edition of one of its works was published in 1955. Most constituent parts of the corpus have been critically edited by now.

The first main part of the book studies the origin and evolution of the two corpora. MARGHERITA MATERA begins with *Le palimpseste Parisinus graecus 1330, le plus ancien témoin manuscript du Corpus Dionysiacum* (pp. 63–91). Thanks to novel digital techniques it has become possible to make the lower text of this palimpsest readable again to a significant degree (about half of the folios, p. 76). MATERA studied the part that contained Dionysius in her PhD. In the present article, she reconstructs the manuscript's history: the old text in majuscule script was cancelled in the

thirteenth century in order to use the parchment for a legal work by Zonaras. The folios were mixed up in the process (p. 84 [table]). The manuscript was bought in 1670 in Smyrna for the French king. Montfaucon had already noticed the lower writing, which may have been more legible at the time. The codex and its palaeography are described in detail, especially the lower text. The author dates it to the early ninth century. Four reproductions of the codex are included. The codex's stemmatic position is not discussed. Next, PIERRE-MARIE PICARD in *Les divisions mauristes des œuvres poétiques de Grégoire de Nazianze, des sous-corpus évolutifs à interroger* (pp. 93–114) studies the order of the poems and finds that the standard order today was invented by the Maurists and follows mostly a criterion of content; in contrast the manuscripts more commonly follow an arrangement by metre. CAROLINE MACÉ's own contribution *Éléments d'une histoire ancienne de la tradition des discours de Grégoire de Nazianze* (pp. 115–159) examines *Oratio* 38 in the same manner as MACÉ previously did for *Orationes* 2, 6, and 27. She is able to confirm her earlier stemma for the translations (p. 143). MACÉ identifies eighteen passages where the Latin and Armenian translations agree against the Greek text with five of them being significant variants, all of them *lectio difficilior* in Latin/Armenian. Additionally, analysing a sample of Greek manuscripts, MACÉ finds that the reworked Syriac version is closer to the Greek group primarily consisting of M manuscripts, whose order of orations also aligns more closely with the Armenian version. However, the N manuscripts tend to preserve the more original text. Then, ALESSANDRO CAPONE in *Alle origini delle antiche versioni latine delle Orazioni di Gregorio di Nazianzo* (pp. 161–178) studies Rufinus' Latin translation. A close examination of the nine orations translated by Rufinus suggests that he did not intentionally select them from a complete collection. Instead, it appears that he translated what he was able to find (p. 168f), indicating that this represents a collection that pre-dates the full corpus (none of these orations is later than AD 381). Similarly in a list of Gregory's works provided by Jerome in *De viris illustribus* (AD 393), it also appears that Jerome was not aware of the full collection (p. 172). These findings raise questions about the hypothesis that Gregory's works were typically transmitted in a fixed corpus form (177). MACÉ acknowledges difficulties in reconciling Capone's findings with her own (p. 157). Further research is necessary. Then VÉRONIQUE SOMERS explores the paratexts in a group of six tenth-century manuscripts in her article *Sur les traces d'une édition byzantine des discours de Grégoire de Nazianze?* (pp. 179–322). She concludes that they form a family, i.e. that they de-

scend from a common ancestor about which certain characteristics can be deduced (p. 241f). While this is an important finding, some readers may question the necessity of providing such extensive evidence. The article concludes with forty manuscript reproductions. MAIA MATCHAVARIANI, *Books for Bibliophiles: Two Ancient Collections of the Georgian Translations of Gregory of Nazianzus' Works – NCM S-1696 and NCM A-87* (pp. 323–342) examines the two Georgian manuscripts mentioned, uncovering unusual translations as well as texts and commentaries that do not normally belong to the corpus. The first manuscript was written by Peter the Priest (mid eleventh century) at the court of Bagrat IV for his personal use, the second for Georgian princess Maria of Alania (1053–1118). The article includes three reproductions of the manuscripts in question.

The second part of the book focuses on reading tools, scholia, and commentaries to the corpora. It begins with CHIARA FARAGGIANA DI SARZANA's article, *Gehören παρατιθέναι, παραγράφειν, παρακεῖσθαι zum literarischen oder zum kodikologischen Vokabular? Überlegungen zur spätantiken Exegese als Paratext* (pp. 345–359). The author examines the mentioned terms in the meaning of 'providing a paratext' and argues that the prefix παρα- does not indicate a specific location, i.e. these verbs do not specify where on the page the referred paratexts are located. This discussion is inspired by John of Scythopolis' prologue to Dionysius where he uses the verb παρατιθέναι to indicate that he added scholia. Next, JOSEPH CHURCH discusses *The Ancient Lexica to the Corpus Dionysiacum* (pp. 361–377). Many manuscripts of the Dionysius corpus include a brief lexicon of approximately 200 lemmas, which has not been edited since the sixteenth century. The author is currently working on a critical edition of this lexicon. Here, he provides a list of manuscripts, explains its importance, and poses questions to whose solution a critical edition can contribute. Of particular interest is the fact that the lexicon contains three words not present in the current corpus (p. 370). Additionally, its relationship to the much larger Cyrill lexicon needs to be determined. Then EMILIANO FIORI discusses *School and Scholia in the Syriac Miaphysite Tradition* (pp. 379–424). The 'Syriac Boethius' Sergius of Reshʿaina translated the works of Dionysius, but the scholia of John of Scythopolis were translated only later by Phokas of Edessa. In the first half of the ninth century the corpus was intensely studied by little known Syriac writers who produced new paratexts. The only extant full commentary stems from Dionysius Ṣalībī in the twelfth century. SERGIO LA PORTA, *Reading the Areopagite* (pp. 425–448) considers the eighth century Armenian translation. Its two translators

also translated John of Scythopolis' scholia. The resulting corpus was used in school teaching. Armenian scholia on Letter 6 are edited and translated in an appendix. Next is JONATHAN LOOPSTRA's, *Reading the Corpus of Gregory of Nazianzus by Way of the Margins* (pp. 449–509). The article examines marginalia in Syriac manuscripts. The author begins by rightly emphasising the importance of marginalia. For this he quotes CERQUILINI (p. 451) who believed marginal notes are 'imprisoned' in the apparatus in scientific editions. However, it can be held against the reader if he is only able to glance sideways and not downwards on the page. Paul of Edessa's renderings of κίδαρις by transliterating the word and subsequent discussions about it in the margins of Syriac manuscripts follow. In §3 the author proposes a classification of the marginalia he found: notes on the Greek original, notes comparing the older translation, notes on translation equivalences in other passages, notes on synonyms, notes of clarification, and longer explanatory notes. The author shows that the annotations in these manuscripts were part of a living tradition and integral to the corpus. An appendix offers examples of marginal notes to the Theological Orations in some manuscripts. It is unnecessarily confusing to refer to the translator Paul of Edessa sometimes as Paul (p. 502), sometimes as Pawla (p. 508), sometimes as Paula (passim). THOMAS SCHMIDT's article, *Les Commentaires de Basile le Minime aux Discours de Grégoire de Nazianze* (pp. 511–528) focuses on *Oratio* 38. Basilius Minimus was bishop of Caesaria under Constantine Porphyrogenitus (reign 913–959) and wrote commentaries on the entire corpus of Gregory's orations, which were dedicated to the emperor. SCHMIDT initially edited the commentary to *Oratio* 38 in CCSG 46 (2001) and now revisits existing scholarship. Only two more of the commentaries have in the meantime been edited. Basic questions about the commentary to *Oratio* 38 remain unanswered: was the longer or shorter version written first? Was the commentary originally written on the margins of Gregory's text or independently? An appendix is included which lists manuscripts with the commentary and the dedicatory letter to the emperor. The same topic is further explored by GAËLLE RIOUAL, *Basile le Minime, commentateur de quel texte de Grégoire de Nazianze*? (pp. 529–562), where an attempt is made to identify the text-family of Gregory's *Orationes* Basil used. A first approach uses the order of orations, leading to the conclusion that Basil had a text from the collection of sixteen sermons, which is first known around the same time (p. 551). Another method involves analysing variae lectiones for *Orationes* 4 and 5 in a sample of fourteen manuscripts. The results are not very clear (p. 555), but it is noted that N6, M16, and

M14 share the most readings. THAMAR OTKHMEZURI studied *The Corpus Nazianzenum and the Corpus Dionysiacum in the Georgian Literary Tradition* (pp. 563–583). Ephrem Mtsire (or the Minor) translated sixteen *Orationes* of Gregory and the Corpus Dionysiacum in the late eleventh century in Antioch. Ephrem was a significant proponent of the Hellenophile school of translation. His translations also contain paratexts. Four pictures of manuscript pages are included. JOST GIPPERT's article, *Ephrem the Minor's Preface Revisited* (pp. 585–597), concludes the volume. Ephrem wrote a letter to his hegumen justifying his new translation of Gregory's *Orationes* (as an older one already existed). This letter has been edited with significant differences due to the poor readability of the microfilm of the manuscript Jerusalem, Greek Patriarchate 43. The author proposes several new readings and a translation of the first lines (p. 593). Three images of the manuscript are included.

The volume's back-matter features a list of abbreviations, a common bibliography of primary and secondary literature for the entire volume, and three indices. The book as a whole is well organised and proofread. There are only few minor typographic mistakes (such as *Dionysiii* [p. 31]). There are also few linguistic issues, for example 'features ... is' (p. 36), 'wife of the Byzantine Emperors' should be 'wife of two Byzantine Emperors' (p. 339), the verb 'to lack' should not be used in the passive voice (p. 371), 'seems have' should read 'seems to have' (p. 452). 'Neoplatonician' (p. 15) seems to be an uncommon synonym for 'Neoplatonist'. The members of the Congregation of St Maur are typically referred to as Maurists, not Mauriners (pp. 9, 12, 113). Is 'rebus' (p. 137, translating *stercus*) really a French word? The book offers many new insights that provide a basis for a better understanding of the life of these interesting text corpora and will certainly inspire further research on them.

Keywords

Corpus Dionysiacum; Gregory of Nazianzus; Translations, Armenian, Georgian, Syriac; Textual Criticism; Rufinus of Aquileia; Basilius Minimus; Paratexts