


Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας

Τόμ. 29 (2008)

Δελτίον ΧΑΕ 29 (2008), Περίοδος Δ'. Στη μνήμη της Άννας Μαραβά-Χατζηνικολάου (1911-2005)



Η συλλογή ορθόδοξων κειμένων της Ευδοκίας Μακρεμβολίτισσας: ο κώδικας paris. Gr. 922

Jeffrey C. ANDERSON

doi: [10.12681/dchae.602](https://doi.org/10.12681/dchae.602)

Βιβλιογραφική αναφορά:

ANDERSON, J. C. (2011). Η συλλογή ορθόδοξων κειμένων της Ευδοκίας Μακρεμβολίτισσας: ο κώδικας paris. Gr. 922. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, 29, 17–22. <https://doi.org/10.12681/dchae.602>



ΔΕΛΤΙΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΙΚΗΣ
ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗΣ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑΣ

Eudokia Makrembolitissa's Orthodox Miscellany: Cod.
Paris. gr. 922

Jeffrey ANDERSON

Περίοδος Δ', Τόμος ΚΘ' (2008) • Σελ. 17-22

ΑΘΗΝΑ 2008

Jeffrey C. Anderson

EUDOKIA MAKREMBOLITISSA'S ORTHODOX MISCELLANY: COD. PARIS. GR. 922*

Byzantine rulers of the middle ages presumably read, albeit in different quantities and with different tastes. Some were famously bookish, whereas others couldn't much be bothered. In practically every case, I would guess, "reading" would often mean being read to; and even if both in some sense count, there remains a difference between poring over a book in your lap and hearing someone read it to you, alone or in the company of others. Our documentary evidence in this regard, like that for books owned, borrowed or taken from a library, is so poor as to make any study of imperial reading an effort unlikely to produce any useful result. As it happens, though, a large proportion of the meager evidence of ownership and patronage – the two difficult to disentangle – comes in the form of works that attract the attention of art historians. Imperial patronage and readership can entail a level of book production such that successive generations preserved volumes as objects of exceptional value. Their value can be created through the level of craftsmanship or by association with an illustrious owner, sometimes both. One of the prized books in the library of Federico da Montefeltro, the fifteenth-century Duke of Urbino, was a copy of the Gospels once belonging to John II Komnenos (Vat. Urb. gr. 2). Books like this one are of particular interest to art historians due to their illustrations, although we often find the evidence they present hard to interpret. In the case of the Gospels in the Duke's collection, both the size of the book and its contents suggest use by the Emperor or close family member, and such is the case with other works that survive (Mediol. B.80.sup.; Petrop. gr. 84). But there are also oversize manuscripts that may have been made as gifts for family members (Paris. gr. 139?; Paris. gr. 510?), whereas others were donations to institutions (Sinai. gr. 364). Some books produced with imperial patronage might remain within the palace precinct to be read to the em-

peror, empress or others (Paris. Coisl. gr. 79; Vat. gr. 1613?), thus obscuring the distinction between private ownership and pious donation.

The subject of this essay, Codex Paris. gr. 922, was explicitly made for the use of the Empress Eudokia Makrembolitissa. On fol. 4 the scribe wrote, in a decorative form, the statement of ownership. The book also contains a poem dedicated to the Empress, and the poem faces a portrait of her with her husband and two of their sons (fols 5v, 6). The combined evidence shows that the book was made for Eudokia's use sometime between 1061 or '62 and 1067. What, then was prepared for the Empress to read? I concentrate on an enumeration of the contents of the manuscript (not a full bibliographic description). These will call for brief remarks before some modest conclusions are drawn. Documentation is a microfilm provided by the Bibliothèque Nationale, where the manuscript was catalogued by H. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale*, I, Paris 1886, 176-77, and received a short notice in H. Bordier, *Description des peintures et autres ornements contenus dans les manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale*, Paris 1883, 126-28. The titles given in the table of contents (A) determine the divisions numbered using Roman numerals. I also reproduce from the table of contents the short titles for the sections of the *Pseudo-Anastasian Florilegium* (II), since they would have been a guide for the reader.

PARIS, BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE, GR. 922

A. Fols 1-6: Front Matter. Fols 1-3v, Prologue (Ἰστέον ὅτι ἡ παροῦσα δέλτος λέγεται τὰ παράλληλα διὰ τὸ συγκεῖσθαι αὐτὰ ὡς ἐντάξει ἐρωτήσεων καὶ ἀποκρίσεων περὶ τινων ἀναγκαίων ζητημάτων καὶ ἐν μιᾷ ἐκάστη ἐρωτήσει ἐπιφέρειν τοὺς ἀγίους πατέρας ἡμῶν καὶ διδασκάλους ἐξηγεῖ-

* Abbreviations used are: CCSG = Corpus christianorum, series graeca, Turnhout 1977-. CPG = *Clavis patrum graecorum*, ed. M. Geerard, Turnhout 1974-2003. PG = *Patrologia graeca*, ed. J. Migne,

Paris 1857-1866. SC = Sources chrétiennes, Paris 1941-. ST = Studi e Testi, Vatican City 1900-.

σθαι πρὸς τὸ ἐρώτημα, εἶτα πάλιν ἀπάρεχεται ἕτερα ἐρωτήματα καὶ πάλιν εἰς τοῦτο ἀπόκρισις· ἔχει δὲ ἐρωτήσεις οἱ, κεφάλαια τοῦ); πρόλογος; and table of contents (in bold-face below, I-X). Fol. 3v, blank. Fol. 4, square with owner's name (ΕΥΔΟΚΙΑΣ Η ΔΕΛΤΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΥΤΗΣ ΠΕΛΕΙ: V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Palaeographie*, II, Leipzig 1897, fig. p. 66, after Montfaucon). Fols 4v, 5, blank. Fol. 5v, poem (I. Spatharakis, *The Portrait in Byzantine Illuminated Manuscripts*, Leyden 1976, 103). Fol. 6, Portrait (ibid., fig. 68) and start of text (cf. I).

I. Fols 6-7v: Our Father among the saints Basil, Bishop of Caesarea, Cappadocia, from Against Eunomios, On the Holy, Consubstantial and Uncreated Trinity, extract. Basil of Caesarea, *Adversus Eunomium* (CPG 2837), Ch. 5 (PG 29.752B-753D)

II. Fols 8-228: St. Anastasius, Answers to Questions Put to Him by some Orthodox Concerning Important Topics (*Pseudo-Anastasian Florilegium*, CPG 7746, PG 89.332-824): sections continuously numbered §1-79 (corresponding to PG 89 sections §§1-32, 35-38, 40-48, 52-59, 142-144, 146, 145, 147-151, 60-70, 128, 71-74, 152-154).

III. Fols 228-230v: Dialogue of Sts. Basil the Great and Gregory the Theologian (CPG 3067: ed. G. Heinrici, *Griechisch-Byzantinische Gesprächbücher und Verwandtes aus Sammelhandschriften*, Abhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 28/8, Leipzig 1911, 32-5).

IV. Fols 230v-236: Worthwhile Readings on the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity. Theodoret, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* (CPG 6223), brief extracts from §1 (PG 83.441C), §2 (PG 83.448B-C), §3 (PG 83.453D, 460A); inc. Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ... des. καὶ εἰ ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο; John of Damascus, *De theologia* (CPG 8087.5), extract on the Trinity (PG 95.228D-229B); Theodoret, *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos* (CPG 6285), §128 extract (A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Θεοδωρήτου ἐπισκόπου πόλεως Κύρρου πρὸς τὰς ἐπενεχθείσας αὐτῷ ἐπερωτήσεις ...*, St. Petersburg 1895, 119.7-9, 119.17-27, 120.4-8); Theodoret, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*, §9 extract (PG 83, 477B); Maximus Confessor, *Quaestiones et dubia* (CPG 7689), §III.1 (*Maximi Confessoris Quaestiones et dubia*, ed. J. Declerck, CCSG 10, Turnhout 1982, 170.6-19); Theodoret, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*, §9 extract (PG 83.480B-D, 481B, C); inc. Τὸ σῶμα γὰρ ἄνευ ψυχῆς ... des. καὶ οὐκ ἠλλοίωμα with scholion; Irenaeus of Lyon, *Adversus haereses* (CPG 1306), §12.2 (*Irénee de Lyon, Contre les hérésies*, 5.2, eds A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau, C. Mercier, SC 153, Paris 1969, 143.14-144.10, 145.23-149.34); Augustine, *Ἐκ τῶν δογματικῶν* (*Liber dogmaticus contra Feli-*

cianum de unitate Trinitatis, cf. M. Rackl, "Die griechischen Augustinusübersetzungen", *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle*, I, ST 37, Rome 1924, 34-5).

V. Fols 236-240: Readings by various authors on the Incarnation of our Savior Jesus Christ. Fol. 236-236v: *Constitutiones apostolorum*, excerpt (J. Cotelier, *SS Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt ...*, I, Antwerp 1698, 197); Eusebius of Caesarea, *Chronicon* (CPG 3494), excerpts (PG 92.1053C-D, 1053D-1057A); Hesychius of Jerusalem, *In Christi natalem* (CPG 6595), excerpt (PG 92.1057C).

VI. Fols 240-240v: On the Holy Decalogue (the Ten Commandments: Ex 20:3-5, 7-17).

VII. Fols 241-248v: On the Six Holy and Ecumenical Councils (cf. J. Munitiz, "Synoptic Greek Accounts of the Seventh Council", *REB* 32 [1974], 147-86).

VIII. Fols 248v-259: St. Cyril on the Holy, Consubstantial and Uncreated Trinity. Cyril of Alexandria, *De sancta trinitate dialogi vii* (CPG 5216), excerpts: §505.36-506.30 (G. de Durand, *Cyrille d'Alexandrie Dialogues sur la Trinité*, II, SC 237, Paris 1977, 142-146), §443.13-32, 443.34-444.3 (ibid. I, SC 231, Paris 1976, 300-302, 302), §463.29-38, 464.28-34, 464.35-38, 464.41-465 (ibid. II, 14-16, 18, 18, 18-20), §568.15-27 (ibid., 330-332), §481.27-30, 539.10-11, 481.33-39 (ibid., 68, 242, 68-70); Isidore of Pelousion, *Epistula 422* (CPG 5557; PG 78.417A-B); inc. Εἰ τοίνυν ὁ τὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ μνηρῶς... des. ἡ πρόβατον ἰχθύος, attr. to John of Damascus; Cyril, *De sancta trinitate*, §575.34-39 (de Durand, II, 352-354), §588.41-589.10 (ibid. III, SC 246, Paris 1978, 14-16), §563.20-23, 563.27-35 (ibid. II, 316, 316), §590.39-591.5, 591.7-591.37, 592.20-32, 592.34-41, 592.46-593.23, 593.26-594.2 (ibid. III, 20-22, 22-24, 24-26, 26, 26-28, 28-30), §492.12-16, 492.32-36, (ibid., II, 100, 102), §564.39-43, 565.2-10 (ibid., 320, 320-322), §532.26-37 (ibid., 222-224), §595.4-20 (ibid., III, 34), §648.4-21, 648.31-649.14 (ibid., 190-192, 192-194), §618.34-42, 618.44-619.2 and additional testimony (ibid., 104); cf. Cyril, catena to Romans 8:11 and additional testimony: (J. Cramer, *Catena graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, IV, Oxford 1844, 233.20-26); Cyril, *De sancta trinitate*, §620.41-621.2 (de Durand, III, 110).

IX. Fols 259-260v: St. Maximus, On how God the Logos Indwelt, and What is "Indwelling"? Maximus Confessor, *De aduentu domini* (CPG 7707.28) (S. Epifanović, *Materialy k izučeniju žžni i tvorenij prep. Maksima Ispovjednika*, Kiev 1917, 82-83; edited from this MS).

X. Fols 260v-265v: Chrysostom, from the Homilies on First Corinthians (CPG 4428), extracts. Homily 4, §1 (PG 61.31), §2 (PG 61.32) and Acts 17:31; Hom. 7, §2 (PG 61.56) and I Cor 1:21; Hom. 4, §2 (PG 61.32); Hom. 5, §2, 3 (PG 61.41, 42) and I Cor 2:13; Hom. 7, §4, 5 (PG 61.59, 60, 61); Hom.

17, §2, 3 (PG 61.142) and Si 1:3, Rom 11:33, 34, 12:3, Si 3:21-24, Ec 8:17, 11:5, Wi 9:13-16, 13: 6, 7, 10.

B. Fol. 265v: Back Matter: folio count by scribe writing in a display script: CIIB (=282; Omont, *Inventaire*, reports 265 folios following the written count in the manuscript, but the foliation is unusually sloppy; leaves are left unnumbered after fols 19, 58, 61, 80, 150 and 199; following fol. 229 the count returns to 220 and begins again, and later it skips from 246 to 248, so there are actually 280 folios preserved; one at the start of the florilegium was removed before foliation, leaving one leaf unaccounted for).

Comments

The contents prompt four individual comments, some of them bearing on the questions of what has been produced for the Empress Eudokia and how was it put together. First, the name of the book. It has lately come to be cited as the *Sacra parallela*, a designation that derives from the notice on fol. 1. The utility of a simple name notwithstanding, this one is misleading because it risks confusing the text with the florilegium attributed to John of Damascus (CPG 8056). The author of the notice says that the book is called the 'parallels' – but not (purposefully?) 'holy' or 'sacred' ones – yet he has in mind only the *Pseudo-Anastasian Florilegium*, although it does comprise the bulk of the text. Using *Pseudo-Anastasian Florilegium* as a title for the entire work is not only inconvenient but also falls short of the mark; something like 'Primer on Orthodoxy' or 'Orthodox Miscellany' would be more suitable in light of the sections dealing with historical matters (V, VII). Referring to the collection as the 'Parallels' or *Sacra parallela* does the book an injustice. An alternative title, the 'Soterios', is discussed below.

The second remark pertains to the *Pseudo-Anastasian Florilegium* itself. The first page of the text, once following fol. 7, is missing; it may have been decorated with a headpiece and the title, as well as with an author-portrait initial like the one with St. Basil on fol. 6. As for the title, it likely repeated the one given in the table of contents (fol. 1), *St. Anastasius: Answers to Questions Put to Him by some Orthodox Concerning Important Topics*, which is conventional and misleading. The *Answers to Questions*, written in the seventh century by Anastasius of Sinai or compiled posthumously by one of his disciples¹, enjoyed its great popularity in two edited and augmented editions, one of which stands behind the collec-

tion here. According to M. Richard², an anonymous editor of the late ninth or beginning of the tenth century produced a florilegium consisting of eighty-eight questions and responses with supporting biblical and patristic testimony. Although only twenty-nine of the passages were from the *Answers to Questions*, the collection circulated under the name Anastasius, usually Anastasius of Sinai. The other edition is the one that came to be printed and which serves as the basis for the references here. Published by Jacob Gretser at Ingolstadt, in 1617, and reprinted by Migne, it follows a later and further expanded version of the *Answers to Questions*. Richard gives the eighty-eight question edition as consisting of Gretser's sections 1-59, 142-151, 60-70, 128, 71-74, 152-154. This can be compared with the selection in Empress Eudokia's book: 1-32, 35-38, 40-48, 52-59, 142-144, 146, 145, 147-151, 60-70, 128, 71-74, 152-154. They are much the same in the choice of passages as well as their order. When the Paris manuscript is further compared with the Gretser edition, the patristic and biblical testimony that turned the *Answers to Questions* into the *Pseudo-Anastasian Florilegium* is nearly identical; a summary comparison yields only a handful of additions and deletions. Entire passages missing from the Paris manuscript are Questions 33, 34, 39, 49-51. The scribe of the manuscript counted seventy-nine questions and responses; the discrepancy between the edition of eighty-eight sections and the number here resolves with the addition of the omitted Questions plus the instances in which two are numbered as one (above Paris §§31, 37, 76, 77) minus the one Question divided into two (§§78 and 79 = Gretser - Migne §154).

The third comment is directed mainly to the texts contained in sections VIII and X. The earlier is a compilation of passages from various writings. Enlarged initials signal changes of author, these recognized in the top margins. Section X is more difficult; the editor hopscoches through three of Chrysostom's Homilies on I Corinthians, sometimes taking out only a sentence or two. No markings signal changes (as we would expect), and there are passages that are not in the edition printed in Migne; some consist of biblical testimony with short introductions (e.g., 'the Apostle says'), whereas others seem like Chrysostom's writings but are not in the printed edition. This piece, an eclogue, was in circulation by at least the tenth century (cf. below: Vat. gr. 423, fols 37-42). The fourth and final comment concerns other parts of the

¹ *Anastasioi sinaïtae Quaestiones et responses*, eds M. Richard and J. Munitiz, CCSG 59, Turnhout 2006.

² M. Richard, "Les véritables 'Quaestiones et réponses' d'Anastase le

Sinaïte", *Bulletin de l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes* 14 (1967-69), 39-56 (reprinted in his *Opera minora*, III, Turnhout 1977, §64).

compilation and their source. The convention of cataloguing is to identify passages by author. This approach needs no explanation or justification. Section V consists of passages culled from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the lost Chronicle of Eusebius and a work of Hesychias. The excerpts from the last two appear in the same form and in the same order in the seventh-century *Paschal Chronicle*. It is unlikely that the editor of the Paris manuscript turned to the primary sources and independently produced the same excerpts, or even that he worked from the *Paschal Chronicle*. The three passages from it, as well as those from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, appear together with the *Pseudo-Anastasian Florilegium* (II) and the *Dialogue of Basil and Gregory* (III) in two tenth-century manuscripts, Paris. Coisl. 120 and Vat. gr. 423³. The Vatican manuscript is a collection for which the scribe copied some of the same contents as are found in Eudokia's book, though in a somewhat different order. The divisions in her manuscript, in Roman numerals, correspond with those in the Vatican manuscript, in Arabic ones, as follows: I (1), VII-X (1), II (2), III (6), IV (7-9), V (10), VI (11). The two tenth-century manuscripts and Eudokia's have been identified as belonging to a group called the 'Soterios', after the title that appears in at least one of the later manuscripts⁴. According to D. Sieswerda, the formation of the Soterios took place in the 870s or '80s⁵. Although he does not specify precisely what constitutes the original collection, versions of I-V and X of Paris. gr. 922 seem to be principal units. The scribe of Eudokia's book wrote on fol. 1, 'This book is called the parallels ...', whereas the phrase 'The book ... is called the salvation' is known from the title in a manuscript in the Megiste Lavra⁶. The index to the recently issued *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents* fails to list any book called the 'Soterios', so it remains to be seen just how conventional the title was in the Middle Ages, and if the scribe of Eudokia's book knew it and chose to ignore or reject it⁷.

The closest relative to the Paris manuscript is a fourteenth-century collection now in Madrid (Scorial. R.III.2)⁸. The cataloguer, P. Revilla, numbered its contents in 24 discrete sections, of which §§ 5-16 are the same, including their order, as those in Empress Eudokia's book⁹. The agreement includes the selection of passages from the *Pseudo-Anastasian Florilegium*, from which §§ 33, 34 and 49-51, but apparently not 39, are dropped. In addition, the chronological texts (V) also lack John of Damascus's *De mensibus Macedonicis ex ecclesiastica traditione* (CPG 8087 [11]), which is found as part of this section in Vat. gr. 423 and Coisl. gr. 120, among others. It is perhaps further significant that the matter in the Madrid manuscript that is not in Paris (its texts, numbered by Revilla, 1-4 and 17-24) has been copied at the front and back, leaving the selection of texts common to both as an uninterrupted sequence. A close comparison of the two manuscripts would serve to confirm or rule out the possibility that the one in Paris served as the source for the bulk of the later collection. The alternative is that both derive from a work of identical content.

Concluding Observations

The writings assembled for the Empress should be taken in light of her portrait, on fol. 6. Most often the portrait serves as a source of evidence for dating the manuscript, since it represents the Emperor, Empress and two of their children. The grouping suggests that the book was made soon after her husband's accession and the subsequent elevation of two of the sons, Constantine *Porphyrogenitus*, in 1060, and the elder Michael, some short but unknown time thereafter¹⁰. Henri Bordier's date of 1062 for the creation of the manuscript, though based on no explicit testimony I am aware of, is probably about right¹¹. More to the point, though, is the character of the miniature, which is not that of a family portrait showing Eudokia as wife and mother of the children of

³ For the former: R. Devreesse, *Bibliothèque nationale, Département des manuscrits, Catalogue des manuscrits grecs*, II: *Le fonds Coisl. in*, Paris 1945, 109-11; and for the latter: R. Devreesse, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codices manu scripti recensiti*, II, Vatican City 1937, 138-41. M. Agati, *La minuscola "Bouletée"*, Vatican City 1992, 187, pl. 128.

⁴ D. Sieswerda, "The Σωτήριος, the Original of the Izbornik of 1073", *Sacris Erudiri* 40 (2001) 293-327, 314 on Paris. gr. 922 and its unclear position in the group. The title appears in Mt. Athos, Megiste Lavra, cod. Γ 115: Spyridon Lavriotes and S. Eustratiades, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the Library of the Lavra on Mount Athos*, Cambridge 1925, 48-9.

⁵ Sieswerda, "The Σωτήριος", op.cit., 299.

⁶ Spyridon and Eustratiades, *Catalogue*, 48.

⁷ *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, eds J. Thomas and A.

Hero, V, Washington 2000.

⁸ Scorial. 36 (R.III.2): P. Revilla, *Catálogo de los códices griegos de la Biblioteca de el Escorial*, I, Madrid 1936, 141-50.

⁹ In the Madrid collection the readings are not grouped under headings as in Paris. gr. 922; they correspond as follows: I (5), II (6), III (7), IV (8-10), VI (11, 12), VII (13), VIII (14), IX (15), X (16).

¹⁰ P. Grierson, *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and Whittemore Collection*, III: *Leo III to Nicephorus III (717-1081)*, 2: *Basil I to Nicephorus III (867-181)*, Washington 1973, 779-82. D. Polemis, *The Doukai. A Contribution to Byzantine Prosopography*, London 1968, 34 n. 48. See also N. Oikonomidès, "Le serment de l'impératrice Eudocie (1067). Un épisode de l'histoire dynastique de Byzance", *REB* 21 (1963), 101-28.

¹¹ Bordier, *Description des peintures et autres ornements*, 126.

Constantine X Doukas. It is an official, state portrayal that excludes one of the sons and the daughters Anna and Theodora (possibly also Zoe). On this basis, we should assume that the contents of the manuscript pertain to Eudokia's role as empress. It is perhaps also noteworthy that the illuminator has located the portrait directly above the first passage and shown the rulers surrounded by portraits of Christ and the authors whose writings have been excerpted. He implicitly draws a relationship between the assembled texts and Orthodox rule. We are reminded of the role played by the empress in state affairs as well as the level of education it presumes. As the *Book of Ceremonies* and other sources occasionally make plain, the emperor's wife played an active part in state functions, both the court ceremonies at which she presided as a mirror image of her husband and the private receptions held for the wives of foreign dignitaries¹². She is, with the emperor, both a living symbol of the Orthodox state (in ceremonies) and part of its diplomatic machinery (receptions in which her knowledge of basic church teaching would have been essential).

The writings collected in the manuscript are theological, doctrinal and historical in nature; some have an ethical slant, but they are not expressly linked to good governance or the traits of the ideal ruler; the book does not, that is, belong to the 'mirror' genre. Furthermore, the writings assembled were not specifically culled for Eudokia. Most of what the book contains can be found together in earlier works, and whatever editing occurred must have been minimal, if at all. The authors named in the principal headings, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, Maximus Confessor and Anastasius of Sinai are first- and second-tier fathers of the Church. The *Pseudo-Anastasian Florilegium* (II), which occupies the bulk of the manuscript, consists of clearly marked questions followed by the responses and supporting testimony, each part individually numbered. Altogether, they amount to the three hundred and seventy-one (τριάκοντα ἑπτὰ) passages cited on fol. 1 and given running headings throughout the manuscript. The Questions open on what is a complete Christian (§1), prayer (§2), sin and repentance (§§3-5), confession

(§6), communion (§7), sin more specifically (§§8-10), money matters (§§11-15), the devil (§16), violence (§§17-19), heretics (§20) and death (§21-23); the rest dealing with issues raised by passages in Scripture¹³. Why six Questions (§§33, 34, 39, 49-51) are missing from this version of the *Florilegium* is unclear; all deal with biblical issues and at least one (§50) takes up a significant topic, the distinction between Law and Commandment. Be that as it may, the structure of the *Pseudo-Anastasian Florilegium* is similar to that of Theodoret and Maximus Confessor's works excerpted in IV, as well as St. Cyril's in VIII, although in them the questions are often edited out, leaving only the answers. Closely related to this genre is the dialogue form of part III. The format has, as A. Garzya emphasizes, a conversational quality that links speech and writing and places stress on brevity and clarity¹⁴. Question and answer is an expository genre with early roots and a lengthy history, beginning in Early Christian times and continuing through Photios's *Amphilochia* to the days of Empress Eudokia¹⁵. A wide variety of subjects, secular as well as theological, are treated in this manner, which has been linked with education in the East, especially during the eighth century¹⁶. Many of the questions posed in Eudokia's book nevertheless have a nearly timeless quality. Other parts explore the problem of the Trinity in considerable detail. To the matters of theology and doctrine are added sections dealing with the precise times of Christ's birth, baptism and crucifixion, and to summaries of the first six Church councils. The former are simple, easy to read statements of historical fact, and the latter have been characterized by J. Munitiz as appropriate for instructing religious 'novices' and 'general audience[s]'¹⁷. In all, the collection represents an accessible Orthodox primer of a decidedly didactic nature, though one that does not include any discussion of the Theotokos, saints or sanctity.

Readership of collections like that in Eudokia's book must have varied. If we look to the passages in the Escorial collection that are not present in the Paris manuscript, we find that they are ones principally of interest to a monastic audience (and the manuscript was once in the library of St. Catherine's monastery on Mt. Sinai). The same is not true of

¹² J. Herrin, "Theophano: Considerations on the Education of a Byzantine princess", *The Empress Theophano*, ed. A. Davids, Cambridge 1995, 64-85, on both education and imperial responsibilities.

¹³ Richard and Munitiz (eds), *Quaestiones et responses* (n. 1), xxi.

¹⁴ A. Garzya, "Appunti sulle erotapokriseis", *Vetera Christianorum* 29 (1992), 305-14. See also the provocative article by G. Dagron, "Le saint, le savant, l'astrologue. Etude de thèmes hagiographiques à travers quelques recueils de 'Questions et réponses' des Ve-VIIe siècles," *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés (VIe-VIIe)*. *Études Augustiennes*, Paris 1981, 143-

55 (reprinted in his *La romanité chrétienne en Orient*, London 1984, IV).

¹⁵ A-L. Rey, "Les erotapokriseis dans le monde byzantin: tradition manuscrite des textes anciens et production de nouveaux textes", *Erotapokriseis, Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context*, eds A. Volgers and C. Zamagni, Leuven 2004, 165-80.

¹⁶ E. Chrysos, "Illuminating Darkness by Candlelight: Literature in the Dark Ages", *Pour une "nouvelle" histoire de la littérature byzantine*, Paris 2002, 13-24.

¹⁷ Munitiz, "Synoptic Greek Accounts", 153.

the two tenth-century manuscripts with content similar to that of Eudokia's miscellany, Paris. Coisl. 120 and Vat. Gr. 423. They, in turn, largely overlap with the copy of the Soterios in the thirteenth-century Megiste Lavra, cod. Γ 115, which shares with Eudokia's book sections I-VI, VIII-X. Absent from Paris. gr. 922 but present in the three others are Michael Synkellos's *Hierosolymorum libellus de orthodoxa fide* and George Choroiboskos's *De tropis*, both works of the late eighth or early ninth century, the latter dealing with issues of poetic form. In terms of the readership for which at least a branch of the collection was originally intended, it is perhaps noteworthy that a similar set of texts was translated into Old Slavonic for Symeon, Tsar of the Bulgars (893-927); Symeon's collection is said to stand behind the *Izbornik* (Miscellany) of 1073, produced for Prince Svjatoslav Jaroslavič of Kiev¹⁸. Yet the *Izbornik* of 1073 – which contains, on fols. 1v and 2, facing images of the Prince and his family presenting

the book to the enthroned Christ – is also said to reproduce, 'part for part and page for page', the collection in Vat. gr. 423¹⁹. The possibility arises that one branch of the manuscript family might have been produced for Orthodox rulers. But one might also argue to the contrary: that ownership of such collections by these two men weakens the possibility that the core set of writings was one considered especially appropriate for Byzantine rulers. Symeon and Svjatoslav were foreigners either deeply concerned with, or thought by someone to be in need of instruction in, the basic tenets of the Orthodox religion. Still, part of Eudokia's responsibilities to the Byzantine state are the defense of Orthodoxy and the education of heirs to the throne, for which the manuscript would have been an especially useful guidebook. Extraordinary though she might have been, Eudokia possessed a relatively common didactic collection, the origin and originally intended readership of which remain to be established²⁰.

*Department of Fine Arts and Art History
The George Washington University*

Jeffrey C. Anderson

Η ΣΥΛΛΟΓΗ ΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΩΝ ΚΕΙΜΕΝΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΕΥΔΟΚΙΑΣ ΜΑΚΡΕΜΒΟΛΙΤΙΣΣΑΣ: Ο ΚΩΔΙΚΑΣ PARIS. GR. 922

Είναι σχεδόν αδύνατον να τεκμηριώσουμε τις αναγνωστικές συνήθειες των μελών της αυτοκρατορικής οικογένειας σε βαθμό, ώστε να μπορούμε να εξαγάγουμε χρήσιμα συμπεράσματα. Τα στοιχεία που έχουμε στη διάθεσή μας είναι πολύ λίγα.

Ένα από τα σωζόμενα βιβλία που ανήκαν σε πρόσωπα του αυτοκρατορικού περιβάλλοντος είναι ο κώδικας Paris. gr. 922, που κατασκευάστηκε γύρω στο 1062 για την Ευδοκία Μακρεμβολίτισσα, σύζυγο του Κωνσταντίνου Ι' Δούκα.

Με βάση τη μικρογραφική προσωπογραφία, μπορούμε να εικάσουμε ότι το βιβλίο προοριζόταν να βοηθήσει

την Ευδοκία στο ρόλο της ως αυτοκράτειρας. Είναι σχεδόν βέβαιο ότι η συγκεκριμένη συλλογή κειμένων δεν συντάχθηκε ως ανάγνωσμα με κύριο σκοπό την αναψυχή.

Στην παρούσα εργασία καταγράφονται τα κείμενα που περιέχει το χειρόγραφο, τα οποία σχολιάζονται εν συντομία, το καθένα ξεχωριστά και ως σύνολο. Η ύπαρξη παλαιότερων χειρογράφων με παρεμφερές περιεχόμενο υποδεικνύει ότι η συλλογή κειμένων του παρισινού χειρογράφου δεν έγινε ειδικά για την Ευδοκία, αν και ίσως δείχνει ότι το χειρόγραφο της ήταν ένα βιβλίο που εξυπηρετούσε τις ανάγκες της ορθής διακυβέρνησης.

¹⁸ H. Lunt, "On the *Izbornik* of 1073", *Okeanos. Essays Presented to Ihor Ševčenko on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students*, eds C. Mango and O. Pritsak (*Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, VIII), Cambridge 1983, 359-76. Sieswerda, "The Σωτήριος", *op.cit.* (n. 4), 293-4.

¹⁹ B. Pejčev, "Cod. Vat. Gr. 423 - Ein Analogus dem *Izbornik* J. 1073",

Palaeobulgarica I/3 (1977), 78. *Simeonov Sbornik*, I, ed. P. Dinekov, Sofia 1991, 17, who writes that the Greek original was in Symeon's library; for the illustrations, *ibid.*, figs 2 and 3.

²⁰ I wish to thank Joseph Munitiz for reading and commenting on a draft of this essay.