

VU Research Portal

Four Pseudo-Chrysostomian Homilies on Job (CPG 4564, BHG 939d-g)

Oosterhuis-den Otter, J.J.

2015

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Oosterhuis-den Otter, J. J. (2015). *Four Pseudo-Chrysostomian Homilies on Job (CPG 4564, BHG 939d-g): Transmission, Critical Edition, and Translation*. VU University Press.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

SUMMARY

SUMMARY

The present study contains a critical edition of four pseudo-Chrysostomian homilies on Job (*CPG* 4564, *BHG* 939d-g) and can be seen as a corollary of a project initiated by C. Datema. The aim of this project was the complete critical edition of the Greek homilies of Severian of Gabala. The first homily stands apart from the other three and can be regarded as an encomium, in which Job is highly praised. It probably was intended to be delivered on 6 May, the day on which Job was commemorated in the Byzantine church. The other three homilies form a series and were probably read on week-days of Holy Week during an evening liturgy.

The four homilies on Job have come down to us in more than one hundred manuscripts. They are listed and described in chapter 1 of part I. Of these manuscripts, approximately fifteen have remained beyond my reach, most of which are young. Not all manuscripts contain all of the four homilies: Homily I survives in approximately seventy-six MSS, Homily II in approximately sixty, Homily III in approximately fifty-five and Homily IV in approximately forty-one MSS.

The relationships between the manuscripts are described in chapter 2. It is shown that the MSS fall into two families, α and β . Each of the two families is further split into groups and further into subgroups. The text of the β family, when compared to that of the α family, is characterised by numerous additions, several transpositions, grammatical variants and word variants, and some omissions, mainly due to *homoeoteleuton*. Chapter 3 discusses which of the readings present in the text of one family but absent from the other are to be considered authentic and whether or not a bifurcate stemma with branches α and β is the most appropriate stemma to account for all data. It appears that in quite a number of passages the reading of α has to be considered authentic and that of β secondary, but in some places it is the other way round. As there are no authentic variants present in subgroups or individual MSS that are not found in the other MSS and which cannot be reached by conjecture, I think that the manuscript relationships are, indeed, best represented by a stemma with two divergent lines, one for the α family and one for the β family.

As the text of α is in general less elaborate and as in the majority of the passages the reading of α seems authentic whereas that of β secondary, in my opinion, the text of α stands closest to the original. Therefore, in the constitution of the text, as a rule, preference is given to α , also in the passages where the variants of α and β are equally possible. Only in those cases where the reading of β is better, is β followed, even though it is not always clear whether this reading is original or the result of emendation.

Chapter 4 describes and discusses the texts which contain parts of the four homilies on Job. A composite recension of the homilies on Job (*BHG*¹ 939gb) is transmitted in seven manuscripts. It contains the text of Homily I, to which several passages from Homilies III and IV were added. This recension is probably based on a ζ -manuscript. Another compilation which is listed as 939t in *BHG*, comprises parts of Homily IV, a few sentences of Homily III and two clauses of Homily I, besides a passage from Chrysostom's homily on *Psalms* 145. It appears to be related to MSS which transmit *BHG*¹ 939gb. Also related to the same MSS is a text found on f. 103 of *Brixianensis Bibliotheca Queriniana A.III.3*, which has fragments of Homily I, intertwined with quotations from the *Book of Job*. Further, parts of Homilies II and III are cited by George the Monk (s. IX) in his *Chronicon*. It seems that in these passages George the Monk has copied from a manuscript belonging to subgroup λ . Lastly, fragments of Homilies II, III and IV have found their way into the catenae. As the compilers of the catenae

SUMMARY

treat their subject matter rather freely, it is very hard, if not impossible, to determine which sources they used and what exactly the relationship is between the catenae fragments and the manuscript tradition of the three homilies.

The text of *CPG* 4564 is also preserved in various ancient translations: Arabic, Slavonic and Latin. In the case of the Arabic and Slavonic translations, I only had a French translation of the title, incipit and desinit of the four homilies. This made it difficult to determine which Greek manuscripts could have served as the source text. As to the Arabic translation, which is contained in MS *Sinaiticus Arabicus* 13 (1222), nothing more precise can be said other than that the translator probably translated from a Greek MS which has the text of the β family. A Slavonic translation of the four homilies is published in the Macarian menologium among the texts for 14th September. There is a very slight possibility that MS 48. (or a MS related to it) served as the source text for this translation. Homily III is also found among the texts for 13th November. There are some indications that the translator used a manuscript belonging to λ . From the fact that two versions of Homily III occur in the Macarian menologium, one may deduce that not one but several Greek texts of Homily III have been translated into Slavonic. In the 15th century a Latin translation of the four homilies has been made and edited by Lilius Tifernas. This translation has been added to the Greek text in the edition of Fronton du Duc (1636). Lilius Tifernas translated from a Greek manuscript belonging to subgroup π 4. A discussion of all these translations can be found in chapter 5.

Chapter 6 describes the history of the printed text of *CPG* 4564 briefly. Henry Savile's edition appears to be based on at least two MSS: 42. and 49.. His edition has influenced the edition of Fronton du Duc and that of Bernard de Montfaucon, whose text was reprinted in Migne. As MS 49. belongs to the α family and MS 42. to the β family, Savile's edition contains readings of both families together with some individual variants of the two MSS themselves. As I have as a rule followed the text of the α family, my critical edition differs significantly from that of Savile and the subsequent editions.

Severian of Gabala has been suggested as a possible author of Homilies II, III and IV by Voicu. Chapter 7 discusses whether or not he is right in attributing these homilies to him and if Severian can also be regarded as the author of Homily I. I have checked whether all the characteristics of a Severianic homily, which have been brought forward by Zellinger and other scholars, are applicable to the four homilies on Job too. Generally speaking, we can answer this question positively. Most of these characteristics, however, are not exclusively encountered in Severian's homilies alone. Despite this, I have argued that he could be the author of Homilies II, III and IV, on the grounds that there are striking agreements between sections of Homily IV and sections of three homilies which are generally accepted as belonging to Severian. If we accept Severian as the author of Homily IV, it follows that he should also be considered the author of Homilies II and III, as these three homilies are closely connected and form a series. As for Homily I, it turned out to be impossible to solve the question of authorship satisfactorily.