

## NOTES AND STUDIES

### THE CODEX OF THE *PASCHAL CHRONICLE* USED BY HOLSTEIN.

To the issue of this JOURNAL for Jan. 1901, vol. ii No. 6, I contributed a note on the Composition of the Paschal Chronicle, in which on the basis of a recently published letter of the French scholar Bigot I combated the view, propounded by Prof. Gelzer and accepted by Mommsen, Car. Frick, Krumbacher, and others, that the so-called *Codex Holstenii* of the Paschal Chronicle never really existed. For Ducange believed in the reality of a codex acquired by Holstein through Messina from Constantinople, in which the Chronicle was only carried up as far as the year 354, and of which the text omitted not only all matter inconsistent with that earlier date, but also much which was consistent with it.

We only learn from Ducange's Preface to his edition that Holstein collated his codex in the margin of a copy of Rader's edition, adding some conjectures of his own, and especially noting what the supposed *continuator* of the age of Heraclius had interpolated before the year 354. In the rest of the *Chronicon* Holstein had added emendations of his own. All this, says Ducange, we have relegated to our notes: 'quae quidem omnia in Notas nostras retulimus.'

Bigot, in his letter to Ducange, attests that when at Rome, he had finished in the margin of Holstein's copy the collation which the latter through sickness could not complete, and that, after Holstein's death in Feb. 1661, he restored the codex to Holstein's executor, but brought the collation to Paris, where he lent it to M. Thoinard. This information seemed to me to make it certain that Holstein had such a codex as Ducange describes. But I concluded my note with the remark that in Ducange's papers preserved in No. 9467 of the *Fonds français* of the Bibliothèque Nationale 'further information would, if anywhere, be found to supplement' my note.

On examining these papers in the Spring of 1904 I found three collations<sup>1</sup> of the *Chronicon Paschale*. Of these the first regards a few

<sup>1</sup> These collations are separate documents merely bound together in the one volume.

passages only, and is headed thus: 'Chronici Alexandrini exemplar optimaе notae quod modo in Bibliotheca Vaticana asservatur, No. 1941, ex Sicilia comparatum fuit, Messanae emptum a Georgio C P vi KL. Octob. [1651]<sup>1</sup> MALI ut initio codicis adscriptus legitur. Codex est Membranaceus scriptus ab annis circ. 700.

'Lacuna quae habetur in editis pag. 552 (= ed. Dindorf p. 437) ibidem reperitur in MS Cod. ob unum quaternionem avulsum, ut eodem in loco notatur.'

This collation gives but a few readings of the codex, and occupies one side only of a sheet, and is followed by a note of the Benedictine scholar who made it, and which ends thus: 'Voilà à peu près, mon cher Monsieur, ce que vous souhaitiez du Ch. Alex. que nous avons conféré le mieux que nous avons pû. On ne sçait ce qu'est devenue la copie corrigée de Mr Holstenius. Il n'y a guères d'apparence que l'on puisse avoir la liberté de copier ce MS tout entier. Mr Schelstrate est fort jaloux de sa bibliothèque, et il garde tant de mesures lorsqu'il en communique quelques-uns que ce ne seroit jamais fait encore qu'il donnât la faculté de la copier' &c.

It is clear that Ducange, who is the *cher Monsieur* addressed, had not the least idea that the Vatican MS 1941, about the existence of a lacuna in which he had asked for information of his Benedictine friend, was the very *Codex Holstenii* of which he speaks in his preface.

The second collation preserved in his papers bespeaks the same ignorance. It is in two hands, for Ducange<sup>2</sup> has written out select passages or words from Rader's edition, and Bigot adds in an opposite column the variant reading of the Vatican codex, or a mere *sic* in case there is no variation. This collation is headed in Ducange's handwriting: 'Chronicon Alexandrinum edit. Raderi emendandum ex MS Vaticano.' It fills three pages.

It is noteworthy that several of the readings of the Vatican MS signalized in this second collation are absent or are differently reported in the third collation, which must now be considered<sup>3</sup>. This circumstance may have encouraged Ducange to suppose that this Vatican MS was other than that which he calls Holstein's codex.

<sup>1</sup> The date bracketed is crossed out as also an X after the Δ in that which follows.

<sup>2</sup> It seemed to me that the hand is that of Ducange, yet I do not feel quite sure about it.

<sup>3</sup> I may instance the following. At p. 62 l. 29 (ed. Raderi) Bigot gives the variant: *διακοβίας*. . . ἐγένετο κακῆς διακοβίας. Here the third collation has no note. At p. 108 l. 10 Bigot reports the readings *αλόγων* for *αλόγων*: *βάβιζε θηητέ* for *θηητέ βάβιζε*: *διανών* for *διανοών*. Here again no note in the third collation. At p. 468 l. 14 Bigot reports *τανόν*, where the third collation gives *τοίνω* which is actually the reading of the Vatican cod. 1641.

The third collation fills seven folios of which the last two should precede the rest, having been bound up in a wrong order. It hardly seems to be in Ducange's hand, but I am not sure of this, and if any of Thoinard's<sup>1</sup> writing could be found with which to compare it, it might turn out to be his. Anyhow, it is a seemingly faithful transcription of the marginal notes in Holstein's copy of Rader's edition. In this edition the Latin version faces the Greek text, and Holstein's corrections of this are equally given with his notes and collation of the Greek MS. This collation was headed thus originally: 'Chronicon Alexandrinum Thoinard.' But another(?) hand has scored through the name *Thoinard*, and added in blacker ink the words *ex Holstenio*.

It is clear therefore that Ducange succeeded in obtaining from Thoinard or Thoinard either Holstein's copy of Rader's edition or a transcript of its marginal notes. The latter is the more probable hypothesis, for if he obtained the book itself, why should he make so elaborate a copy? If Bigot recovered the volume from Thoinard, he may have had the marginal notes copied by a third person, perhaps by M. Fromentin. Thoinard told Bigot that he had written notes of his own in Holstein's copy of Raderus lent him by Bigot, no less than in Bigot's own, similarly lent him. It is possible therefore that in this third document now before us Thoinard's notes are mixed up with Holstein's, though Ducange evinces in his preface no suspicion of any such thing.

In this third collation each note is referred to page and line of Rader's edition of the *Chronicon*, and as it is almost certainly the only document through which Ducange knew his *Codex Holstenii*, I venture to transcribe parts of it. It begins thus:—

p. 38 ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ | πρωτοπλάστου ἀνθρώπου H. MS | καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ H. MS.

40 B τούτων ἐγέννησεν | ἀδάμ σλ. ἐπέζησεν | πλ. 930 | ὅς ἤξιώθη | τε αὐτοῦ | H. c ἐκβέβηκεν.

42 A τὴν ἰσοτιμίαν | χρέος ἀπέτισεν σχίσας εὐλόγως | B τὸ δοκεῖν.

H. c ubique pro ὁμοῦ, κόσμου exemplo 2. 4. 6. 8. 10 et ultimo.

44 A λύσιν δέξεται | H. c In 1. 3. 5 pro ὁμοῦ, κόσμου | μέχρι τοῦ |

46 A delet marginem | ἀπέστειλε | κεκόπακε.

48 A οὕτοι ἐκείναις τέκνα ἐποίησαν τὴν ἡλικίαν μεγίστους καὶ γίγαντας | B ἐπεὶ δὲ | C μετ' αὐτῶν f. ou | περὶ παιδείαν | delet ex, καί με usque ad pag. 50 A τὸν Σήθ.

50 A In marg. φαρμακείαι καὶ μαγείαι et delet ἀσέλγεια |

A ἀδικία ἐχρημάτισαν | B σεαντῶ κιβωτὸν | ὅθεν καὶ | Κλήμεντι | delet Νῶε, σὺν τοῖς ἐξ αὐτοῦ | προανήγγειλεν | πάντων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων | ἀσεβεῖν

<sup>1</sup> *Bibl. Nat. Fonds Nouv. Acq.* 560–563 are four vols. indexed 'Correspondants de Thoinard', but these contain letters written to him and none by him.

Junge lin. 21. 22 p. 52 ἐκ τῶν etc. | Νῶε δίκαιος del. usque ad pag. 52 lin. 13 ἐκτελουμένων, reponit p. 52 l. 26 post ἀπέθανεν |

BC δὲ Νῶε ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴνου (μετὰ τὸ) | C οὔτε τούτους ἠύλόγησεν | ἐν τάξει C. p. 574 B.

52 A καὶ τὸν χαναὰν | γὰρ τῆς κατοικίας | τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ Σῆμ | B τούτων οὖν | τὰ κατὰ τὴν | ἐκτελούμενα | αἱ τῶν αἰρέσεων etc. usque ad u. βουλήματος ἐγένετο delet | C δι' οὓς | in 1<sup>o</sup> et 3<sup>o</sup> pro ὁμοῦ lege κόσμου.

54 A In 1<sup>o</sup>. 3. 5. pro ὁμοῦ lege κόσμον | εβερφαλεγ ex 70 B φαλέγ | φαλέγ | κατὰ τούτου | B καὶ εἶπεν ἄνθρωπος | C ex ἐπὶ οὖν τούτων usque ad pag. 110 lin. 24 λοιποὶ, dele | C ἔκ τε |

58 B φαλέγ | συνδιάσαντας | πυργοποιᾶν | C κατέφησεν | οἱ τινες.

70 B Ἄρφαζὰδ ui p. 52.

72 B Ῥινοκούρων.

Schol. pp. 58 A B, 60 B A.

At p. 680 in this collation we have this note :

l. 8 Αἰγούστου. Hic desiiit auctor Chronici Paschalis, caetera sunt continuatoris.

This is the entry from which Ducange concluded that Holstein's codex contained an earlier form of the Chronicle carried up to A. D. 354 only. After this note the collation continues in the same hand as follows :—

l. 9 Ἄρβετιῶνος καὶ λολλιανοῦ Socrates | l. 13 ad ἴσφ in marg.—περὶ θαλάμωνα τὴν νῆσον Cedren etc. | l. 15 ad ὀκτοβρίων in marg. νοεμβρίων | l. 19 ad ε. In marg. η | l. 23 σὺν πάσῃ | l. 25 ad κ'. In marg. θ | l. 27 ἐξ Ἰνδικτιῶνος ιε | l. 31 . . . ex ἀπελήθη<sup>1</sup>.

682 l. 18 ad ιβ. In marg. ι.

684 l. 18 ad πρότιμον. In marg. πρὸ τῆ μονῆ iuxta monasterium.

l. 22 νί ἰνδικτιῶνος ε | l. 26 β. κόσμον εωβ 3872.

688 l. 17 ὅς λαοδικείας (-κιος supra vs.) τῆς συρίας | l. antep. τυγχάνειν.

689 l. huic haeresi ansam praebuit Apollinaris qui fuit ex Laodicea Syriae grammatici fil.

Turning to the long lacuna which occurs in the Vatican codex p. 552 of Rader's edition we have the following note :—

552 l. 2 εὐαγγέλιον οἶμαι. Media de(le).

Here the *delenda* are the lemma : ὡς λέγει ὁ χρυσόστομος. The lacuna itself is not noticed, and the next note refers to the next page of Rader, and is as follows :—

554 l. 8 ad marg. Κανονάρχης.

Now it is inconceivable that a codex containing an earlier form of the Paschal Chronicle, as Holstein's hypothetical codex is said to have done, could contain a lacuna which first arose by the loss of a quaternion in

<sup>1</sup> A word is undecipherable. Rader has ἀπετέθη in mg.

the existing tenth-century Vatican Codex 1641. At one time I explained the circumstance of Ducange's not having filled up this lacuna from the earlier form by supposing either that Holstein did not copy out from it the missing matter, or that, the matter being too long for a marginal note in his edition of Rader, he copied it out on a separate *Scheda* which was lost or never reached Ducange. But the existence of the note in this third collation: 'εὐαγγέλιον ὀψιμα. Media dele' proved conclusively that Holstein paid attention to the particular passage wherein the lacuna begins, and made such suppositions highly improbable. I was already on the way to resign my belief in the reality of such a codex as Ducange supposed to have been in Holstein's hand, when in reply to a letter in which I asked for information about the lacuna in Cod. Vatic. 1641, Dr Mercati, out of the rich stores of his learning, addressed me in the form of a letter the essay which is here subjoined. Dr Mercati has, I need not say, convinced me that my first position was untenable, and it is evident to me now that Ducange, reading in Bigot's letter of a real codex which he and Holstein had jointly collated, misinterpreted the copy sent to him by Thoinard of Holstein's marginal notes. It is not impossible, of course, that Thoinard's own notes are mixed up in this; and the entry at p. 680 'Hic desiit auctor Chronici' &c., may even have been a conjecture of Thoinard's and not a note of Holstein's at all. One or the other was led, by a comparison of the *Chronicon* with some Latin Chronology terminating in that year, to postulate an earlier form of the Chronicle, and to mark in the text those passages which were inconsistent with such a date. This is Gelzer's idea, and the only fact against it is that long passages of Josephus and of other writers equally consistent with the date 354 are ruled out. The author of the hypothesis cannot therefore have been guided exclusively by the motive to exclude only matter subsequent to 354. There is something here that needs to be cleared up. It is just possible that Holstein or Thoinard had seen a Latin text carried up to that date, and corresponding much more fully than any we have in its contents to the Paschal Chronicle.

Frick, in his *Chronica minora*, has proved that long sections of the *Chronicon Paschale* were rendered into Latin before the year 400; and it therefore comes to much the same thing, whether we call its final redactor of the age of Heraclius a compiler or a *continuator*. I have shewn in the pages of the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* that the matter it has in common with Malalas was not taken from Malalas, but by both from a common source; for the History of Moses of Khorene embraces much of this common matter, and agrees in its readings sometimes with Malalas, sometimes with the *Chronicon*. There existed then a middle text which renders not only superfluous but impossible the ordinary

assumption that the Heraclian compiler copied Malalas. And this conclusion holds good, whether Moses wrote late in the fifth or early in the eighth century.

I have shewn in the same way<sup>1</sup> that the sections supposed to be taken from Epiphanius's tract *On weights and measures* are not really taken therefrom, although headed by a rubric to that effect.

It is satisfactory to think that no one of the four scholars—Holstein, Bigot, Thoinard, and Ducange—was guilty of any mystification in regard to the text of the *Chronicon*. Ducange made a mistake, and we can see how he fell into it: but no one tried to hoax him. In my anxiety to vindicate Holstein's good faith I have fallen into the same error as Ducange, and I hope I may be excused.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

## A STUDY OF THE *PASCHAL CHRONICLE*.

THE substance of the following pages was written in the summer of 1904, in reply to a question by Mr F. C. Conybeare about the Vatican MS of the Paschal Chronicle, and in particular about the great *lacuna* at p. 436. The answer turned out much longer than I had anticipated beforehand, but remained and remains more or less within the four corners of the question—though I have now added something about the final *lacuna*, which, if the theory lately propounded by a scholar of my own country had held good, would have been a considerably more serious one than had hitherto been supposed.

I have also, as a matter of fact, continued my investigations in a third and more lengthy chapter. But this extends beyond the limits of the JOURNAL, and only the introductory words of it appear here. I hope to publish the whole paper in my own language in the Vatican *Studi e Testi*.

The present translation from the Italian is the work of my friend Mr C. H. Turner, to whom is due also the choice of a somewhat ambitious title. 'Study', properly so called, of the Chronicle these pages are not, but only of certain points about the Chronicle which had hitherto been either discussed inadequately or not discussed at all.

### I. *The MS of Lucas Holsten and the Vatican MS.*

The Vatican MS gr. 1941 is without doubt the same MS which was bought by Jerome Zurita at Messina in A.D. 1551, and by him after-

<sup>1</sup> In my edition of the *Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacharias and of Timothy and Aquila*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.