

Proceedings of the
Danish Institute at Athens · I

Edited by Søren Dietz



© Copyright The Danish Institute at Athens, Athens 1995

The publication was sponsored by:
Consul General Gösta Enboms Foundation.
The Danish Research Council for the Humanities.
Konsul George Jorck og Hustru Emma Jorck's Fond.

Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens

General Editor: *Søren Dietz*
Graphic design and Production by: *Freddy Pedersen*

Printed in Denmark on permanent paper

ISBN 87 7288 721 4

Distributed by
AARHUS UNIVERSITY PRESS
University of Aarhus
DK-8000 Århus C
Fax (+45) 8619 8433

73 Lime Walk
Headington, Oxford OX3 7AD
Fax (+44) 865 750 079

Box 511
Oakville, Conn. 06779
Fax (+1) 203 945 94 9468

The cover illustration depicts a Bronze Statuette
of a Horse found at the Argive Heraion. NM 13943.
Drawing by Niels Levinsen. See p. 55, Fig. 19.

The noble art of abbreviating

In the light of some texts attributed to Severian of Gabala

Henning
Lehmann

1. Preliminary remarks

Originally, this paper was intended to have as its modest subtitle the words: "Some simple remarks", for, what will be presented, will not be anything like either a broad or a thorough analysis of rhetoric practice or principle in Antiquity in abbreviating procedures. What I shall try to do is - in a very simple, straightforward and elementary way - to look at a few instances where texts attributed to Severian of Gabala appear in more than one version, usually in what may be considered a "full-length" version and some kind of abbreviated form.

On my way through the examples I considered more than once the possibility of transferring the adjective "simple" from the subtitle to the main title, having ascertained that the procedure of abbreviating very often is quite a simple one.

So the art of abbreviating is, maybe, not always a noble one; on the other hand, the abbreviated form of a text often has a particular strength of expression, entirely its own, so I left the notion of "noble" in the title; but I certainly ask and warn my readers to retain the notion of "simple" as a subtitle for what follows.

2. Introductory remarks on the homily

In natale domini nostri Iesu Christi (CPG 4657).

First it would be natural to give a hint about the main reason(s) that led me to go into the matter of abbreviated forms of texts by Severian. My point of departure was the discussion about a certain homily, viz. the Pseudo-Chrysostomic homily *In*

natale domini nostri Iesu Christi (CPG 4657). The external evidence for this homily, in my view, points rather strongly in the direction of Severianic authorship, but internal arguments on the basis of the Greek text (as published in Migne) have led modern scholars to deny that the homily in question could be by Severian.

Let me elaborate a little further on the state of the matter.

For this homily, in fact, a number of potential authors have been proposed, in ancient as well as modern times. A mere glance in M. Geerard's *Clavis*¹ tells us that there is a Coptic version having been attributed by W.E. Crum (on insufficient grounds, it seems) to St. Basil the Great², and there is a Georgian version under the name of Epiphanius. On Syrian ground Severus of Antioch considers the homily to be by John Chrysostom, as does most of the Greek manuscript tradition.

One Oriental line of evidence was not known when Geerard published the *Clavis*, i.e. the Armenian. In an article published in 1982³ I have tried to elucidate the Armenian transmission, as far as it is known to me. This includes a version of the homily in two Armenian manuscripts of the library of the Jerusalem Patriarchate (and two later manuscripts in the Mechitarist library in Venice) attributing the homily to "Severianos, the Priest"⁴, and two quotations in a series of fragments attributed in MS Galata 54 to "Seberianos, Bishop of Gabala"⁵. It should be noted that in this series of quotations there are a number of fragments belonging to texts which are generally held to be by Severian of Gabala⁶.

The Armenian transmission therefore fits very well with the first fact ascertained

NOTE 1

Clavis Patrum Graecorum II, cura et studio Maurittii Geerard, (CChG), Turnhout, 1974.

NOTE 2

W. E. Crum, "Theological Texts from Coptic Papyri", *Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series*, 12 (Oxford 1913), 18-20.

NOTE 3

Henning J. Lehmann, "Severian of Gabala: New Identifications of Texts in Armenian Translation", *Classical Armenian Culture, Armenian Texts and Studies*, 4, ed. Th. J. Samuelian, University of Pennsylvania, 1982, 113-124 (quoted: "New Identifications").

NOTE 4

"New Identifications", 114.

NOTE 5

Ibid., 117.

NOTE 6

Cf. below and "New Identifications", 118f.

in M. Geerard's primary "nota": *Tamquam Severiani Gabalensis citatur a Theodoro*⁷.

To me it is difficult not to consider such an early – and often reliable – Greek source as Theodoret of Cyrus and the occurrence in the Galata-series as weighty external arguments for Severian's authorship. Maybe less weighty, but still of importance is the attribution to "Severian the Priest" in the Jerusalem manuscripts.

However, modern authors such as B. Marx, J. Zellinger, H.-D. Altendorf and Sever J. Voicu⁸ reject the attribution to Severian, and scholars responsible for current plans of a new edition of the Greek Severian – such as C. Datema and K.-H. Uthemann – seem to take the same stand⁹.

These sceptics mainly refer to one reason for their position, viz. that the stylistic and linguistic characteristics of Severian are absent from this homily. To quote Zellinger, after referring to the quotation in Theodoret, he comments as follows: "*W. Dürks*¹⁰ ist es gelungen, die Rede aufzufinden, der das Stück entnommen. Es ist das (sic!) die kurze, nur drei Mignespalten füllende, pseudochrysostomische Homilie: *Εἰς τὴν γέννησιν* ... Dürks glaubt die Rede auf Grund des Theodoretzitates Severian zurückerstatten zu sollen (De Severiano Gabalitano 46-48; vgl. auch ebd. 19.66). Ich vermag aus *sprachlichen* Gründen nicht zuzustimmen"¹¹. That is all Zellinger has to say about this homily, and Marx and Altendorf only add little. Voicu regards this homily as attributable to a certain anonymous Cappadocian author of the early 5th century. His arguments are mainly stylistic, particularly linkages within a collection of 33 (or 30-odd) Pseudo-Chrysostomic homilies belonging, according to Voicu, to the same author¹².

At a first glance the short Greek text seems to contain few of the stylistic elements usually referred to as characteristic of Severian, to which could be added that a desideratum (which may be on its way to be fulfilled by those responsible for the new Greek Severian edition) is a thorough stylistic analysis of Severian's homiletics. To some extent earlier research has left us with rather superficial descriptions.

In my view, there is reason in general to question the validity of the verdict "spurious" based on the absence in a certain text of locutions, otherwise often used by an author. Methodologically, the simple fact that a homily is very short makes a judgment of this kind all the more doubtful. Dealing with Severian's *natale*-homily, in my article quoted above I therefore wrote: Great caution is required before conclusions about authorship are drawn from general observations on style and language, especially where short homilies are concerned which may very likely have been given their form by excerptors¹³.

I refer, of course, to the fact that in the process of abbreviation – as also in the process of translation – stylistic particulars will be liable to be smoothed out or even disappear.

In the following, as mentioned already, it is my modest purpose to make some simple and straightforward remarks about observations made on a few texts by Severian or attributed to him which have undergone abbreviating or excerpting processes.

3. Examples of abbreviated texts

3.1.

My first example is the homily on Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (CPG 4246), so far only known in Armenian. The long version of this homily is the last of the Akinian collection – No. XIII, published in 1959¹⁴, whereas the short version was published more than 130 years earlier, viz. as homily No. XI in the volume of 15 homilies edited by J. B. Aucher¹⁵.

It might be appropriate once again to quote Zellinger. His verdict on the last five homilies of the Aucher collection runs as follows: "Für die Echtheit der letzten fünf Reden liegt weder äussere noch innere Bezeugung vor, und man muss restlos *W. Dürks* beistimmen, der aus sachlichen und stilistischen Erwägungen den Namen Severians aus deren Titel streichen

NOTE 7
Op. cit., 587.

NOTE 8
For references cf. below and "New Identifications", 121, n. 6.

NOTE 9
I here rely on oral information and communications at the Oxford Patristic Conference in 1987.

NOTE 10
G. Dürks, *De Severiano Gabalitano*, Kiel 1917.

NOTE 11
Johannes Zellinger, *Studien zu Severian von Gabala*, (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie, 8), Münster i.W., 1926, 36, n. 1.

NOTE 12
Sever J. Voicu, "Trentatre omelie pseudocrisostomiche e il loro autore", *Lexicon Philosophicum*, 2 (1986), 73-141, see esp. 99-101; S. J. Voicu, "Note sull'omelia pseudocrisostomica In natale Domini nostri Iesu Christi (CPG 4567 (sic!))", *Memorial Dom Jean Gri-bornont (1920-1986)*, *Studia Ephemerides "Augustinianum"* (1988), 621-626.

NOTE 13
"New Identifications", 115 and 121, n. 6.

NOTE 14
N. Akinian (ed.), "Die Reden des Bischofs Eusebius von Emesa", *Handes Amsorya*, (1956-1959). For homily No. XIII, see *HA* (1959), 321-360.

NOTE 15
Severiani sive Seberiani Gabalorum episcopi Emesensis homiliae, ed. J. B. Aucher, Venice, 1817. For homily No. XI, see pp. 402-409.

NOTE 16
Zellinger, op. cit., 71, with reference to Dürks, op. cit., 60-64.

NOTE 17
Henning J. Lehmann, *Per Piscatores*. Studies in the Armenian version of a collection of homilies by Eusebius of Emesa and Severian of Gabala, Århus 1975 (quoted: *Per Piscatores*), 335–367.

NOTE 18
Zellinger's expression, op. cit., e.g. 33.

NOTE 19
I am thinking of the omission of the question in Akinian XIII, 47 (cf. Aucher, 402,20). Correspondingly, the "superfluous" *oê et'é ... ayl* in Akinian XIII, 221 is left out in the short version (cf. Aucher, 408,1), and it could be noted that the word *ank'nin* (Akinian XIII, 154) which might be called a favourite word of Severian's is not to be found in the short version (cf. Aucher, 406,19).

NOTE 20
Cf. *Per Piscatores*, 348ff. On the discussion of the very word "hosanna" in Severian (and other authors), see my: "Hosanna - A Philological Discussion in the Old Church", *Armeniaca - Mélanges d'études arméniennes*, (Venice, 1969), 165–174.

NOTE 21
Cf. *Per Piscatores*, 357ff.

möchte. Zum wenigsten ist über ein *Non liquet* nicht hinauszukommen"¹⁶.

In my book *Per Piscatores*¹⁷ it is shown that with the long version in our hands we are in a situation fundamentally different from that of Zellinger's time. We can point to the external argument of the occurrence of the homily among the group of five in the Akinian collection (homilies IX–XIII), and internally to a great number of correspondences to well-known Severian homilies, as arguments for Severian's paternity.

The relation between the two versions is shown in TABLE 1.

It appears that the short version covers less than one seventh of the long version (99 out of 715 lines). It further appears that apart from the first two lines the short version consists of four "blocks" representing about one half of the first 200 lines of the homily in its long version.

A closer scrutiny of the relationship between the two texts, of course, reveals a number of variants, most of them manifestly inner-Armenian, and for the great majority of rather a trivial character: omission of "article", *ew*, *z-*, etc. Choice of different words in some cases could be a copyist's mistake, in other cases there seems to be a choice between synonyms, which, of course, would point to either different translators or the copyist's change to a word more familiar to him. As the texts for the greater part follow each other

very closely, I would plead for the latter possibility.

In only one or two cases one could ask the question whether the reason for a variant could be that a Severianic "Zwischensatz"¹⁸ or characteristic idiom had been omitted in the short version¹⁹.

The comparison therefore shows that only a modest amount of stylistic "smoothing out" or editorial manipulation for linguistic or other reasons seems to have taken place in the passages used by the abbreviator.

If it is true to say that there is little in the Aucher-version to substantiate Severian's paternity to the text, so that Zellinger's and later scholars' judgment is understandable (and I would certainly admit this, if only stylistic criteria, traditionally applied to the text, are taken into consideration), it must therefore be ascertained that this is due mainly to the very choice of passages and arrangement of the text, not to a very active effort to change stylistic details.

Furthermore it should be noted that a great part of what is left out is concerned with a discussion of biblical material, first and foremost the whole context of Psalm 8,3 quoted in Mt 21,16 as Jesus' answer to the indignation of the chief priests and doctors of the law (Mt 21,15) because of the shouting of *Hosanna* to Jesus (and other elements of the narrative of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem)²⁰. Also a great number of other biblical texts are commented upon in the long version, among them a number of Severian's favourite sources of "testimonials" such as e.g. Joel 2,19 and 2 Sam 24,10–17²¹.

As mentioned already, the amount of deliberate "smoothing" and alteration is obviously very modest; it therefore seems to me justifiable to call the abbreviating method used a "subtraction technique", i.e. a technique where a number of "blocks" of the text are left out whereas other passages are preserved; and as such a great amount of the biblical testimonial material so characteristic of Severian is left out, not only the modern scholar using stylistic criteria but also the investigator

Table 1. *De adventu domini super pullum* (CPG 4246)(Akinian XIII/Aucher XI)

	Akinian XIII (line)	Aucher XI (page, line)	Number of lines (Akinian)
(a)	1 - 14	-	14
(b)	15 - 16	402,1-2	2
(c)	16 - 29	-	13
(d)	30 - 73	402,2-404,24	44
(e)	74 - 95	-	22
(f)	96 - 115	404,25-406,8	20
(g)	116 - 145	-	30
(h)	146 - 165	406,8-32	20
(i)	166 - 214	-	49
(j)	215 - 227	406,33-408,8	13
(k)	228 - 715	-	488

who would use the biblical material to solve the question of authorship is left in a very difficult position by the abbreviator.

3.2.

Technically speaking my second example will have strong resemblances to the first. In other respects it will differ.

I am referring to homily No. III in the Akinian collection for which again a shorter version is found in Aucher's Severian volume as homily No. I.

The relation between the two versions is shown in TABLE 2.

Here, the abbreviated version is made up of six "blocks" of varying length taken from the first two thirds of the homily.

Also, as far as this homily is concerned, the amount of variations in detail is fairly small (see note 27), and again the passages left out by the abbreviator, to a great extent consist of biblical material and exegetic discussion.

Technically speaking, therefore, the method of abbreviation largely seems to be the same as that used in our first example, a "subtraction technique".

On this background, therefore, it might be characterized as a surprising fact that a number of circumstances, and not least, the history of research present quite a different picture of this text.

First of all it should be noted that we are here concerned with a text which is *not* by Severian, and our best introduction to the history of research might be a consideration of the reasons that nevertheless led Zellinger to accept the short version as being by Severian.

Zellinger voiced a certain, modest amount of reluctance or uneasiness about the attribution to Severian, saying: "Dabei wird sich ... ein letztes klärendes Wort kaum sprechen lassen"²². On the other hand, he gives his approval of Martin Jugie's statement about the homily: "Son authenticité est hors de doute ..." ²³, and even if it might be strange for Severian, that "Die Rede, bescheiden an Umfang, wurde zu Jerusalem gehalten"²⁴, Zellinger finds the explanation of what is unusual in the fact that "Was nun folgt, ist freilich

	Akinian III (line)	Aucher I (page, line)	Number of lines (Akinian)
(a)	1-116	2,1-10,12	116
(b)	117-157	-	41
(c)	158-177	10,12-34	20
(d)	178-189	-	12
(e)	190-197	10,34-12,7	8
(f)	198-207	-	10
(g)	208-246	12,7-14,12	39
(h)	247-278	-	32
(i)	279-290	14,12-25	12
(j)	291-332	-	42
(k)	333-339	14,26-16,1	7
(l)	340-519	-	180

Table 2. *De passione* (CPG 3531,5) (Akinian III/Aucher I)²⁷

keine Rede im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes, sondern eine des rhetorischen Charakters stark entkleidete symbolartige Expositio fidei, die mit dem trinitarischen Teile des Athanasianums überraschende Ähnlichkeit aufweist"²⁵. To this statement Zellinger adds a quotation from Jugie, giving this description of the text: "C'est, peut-on dire, un résumé en phrases lapidaires de la théologie de Dieu un et trine"²⁶. Zellinger even suggests that the *expositio*-character of the text might be sufficient explanation of the fact that the words ἀγέννητος and γεννητός are used, "die der Bischof sonst nach Inhalt und Form in schroffster Weise ablehnt und deren wissenschaftliche Diskreditierung er sich zum Ziel gesetzt"²⁸.

Today we know that the expressions mentioned are there because they belong to the central theological vocabulary of Eusebius of Emesa who is the author of the text. The reason why I have chosen to consider some wrong assumptions during the history of research at some length is that it seems to me highly interesting that the abbreviating technique, even if technically speaking, it is to a large degree of the same subtraction character as that of our previous example, has left us with a text about which serious scholars have been led astray by elements in the history of transmission as far as the identification of the author is concerned and then argued for their wrong assumptions on the basis

NOTE 22

Zellinger, *op. cit.*, 72.

NOTE 23

Zellinger, *op. cit.*, 74, with reference (in n. 6) to Martin Jugie, "Sévérien de Gabala et le symbole Athanasien", *Echos d'Orient*, XIV (Paris, 1911), 193-204.

NOTE 24

Zellinger, *op. cit.*, 75.

NOTE 25

Zellinger, *op. cit.*, 75f.

NOTE 26

Zellinger, *op. cit.*, 76.

NOTE 27

The following differences of detail should be noted. In (a) the indication of the contents of the homily is shorter in Aucher I (l. 6-8) as compared with Akinian III (l. 6-11). Correspondingly, l. 17ff in the long version are richer than the "parallel", Aucher, 4,1ff. In (c) about 1½ lines are left out (Akinian, 165f), maybe through homoiotakon. Aucher, 16,2-5 contains a final doxology which is evidently secondary.

NOTE 28

Zellinger, *op. cit.*, 78.

NOTE 29
Ibid.

NOTE 30
“New Identifications” and Henning J. Lehmann, “Severian of Gabala: Fragments of the Aucher Collection in Galata MS 54”, *Armenian Studies/Études arméniennes in memoriam Haïg Berbérian*, ed. Dickran Kouymjian, Lisbon, 1986, 477-487 (quoted: “Aucher Fragments”).

NOTE 31
“New Identifications”, 117f.

NOTE 32
“Aucher Fragments”, 481-483

NOTE 33
See the discussion of the relation between the Aucher collection and the quotations in the “Seal of Faith” and about the history of the collection with or without the homily: Aucher No. I, “Aucher Fragments”, 484f.

NOTE 34
Cf. “New Identifications”, 114 (where, regrettably, there are a couple of errors in the figures given).

of considerations of “genre”, so to speak: *expositio fidei, resumé en phrases lapidaires*, a “Traktat ... auf Prägnanz und knappe Fassung ... abgestimmt”²⁹.

Today, it is presumably easy to see that it is partly a matter of abbreviating technique, and partly a matter of style and theology of an author concerned with problems of an age about two generations earlier than Severian that determine the character of the short version of the homily.

But when we consider in how many cases we are still bound to the arguments of Zellinger and his contemporaries about style and language, the importance of our attempt to gain an insight in the art and procedures of abbreviation in the patristic period seems to gain in strength from our second example.

3.3.

My third example may be said to take us outside the field of abbreviating if the notion of abbreviation can only be used in cases where a single homily (or a text of another genre) is found in a short and a long version. In any case, the phenomenon which I would call “the construction of a florilege homily” seems to me to be of interest for our evaluation of what has happened in the course of the history of transmission of Severian’s homilies.

I am thinking of the two series of fragments of Severianic texts in MS Galata 54. I have dealt with these series elsewhere³⁰, so I shall here only recapitulate that one of the series consists of 11 quotations taken from six different homilies, the titles of which are referred to very carefully in the “florilege”³¹. The second series contains 20 quotations taken from 8 of the homilies of the Aucher collection (homilies I-VII and IX)³².

What is of particular interest in this connection is that each of the series in itself constitutes a unity of its own, an *expositio* as it were of a central theological topic, a “florilege homily” to use the expression coined above, and thus to my mind, they represent a particular, very selective, method of abbreviating a number of texts

in order to present certain subjects and themes of general interest, in the MS Galata 54 series from one author, Severian, in a number of cases - in real “florilegia”, as is well-known - core quotations about the same subject from a number of different authors.

I very much doubt that such theological *resumés* or *expositiones* would easily have been identified by modern researchers as belonging to Severian, had it not been for two facts:¹⁾ the careful citation of the author’s name and the title of the homily in question, and²⁾ the fact that some of the homilies quoted belong to the least disputed core of genuine Severianic homilies.

It might be added that such chains of quotations might reflect the fact that a number of homilies had been connected in a particular collection, as is evidently the case as far as the Aucher homilies are concerned³³.

I shall not go into a further description of MS Galata 54 or discussion of the shaping of florilegia, which in many respects is a different matter from the abbreviation technique met with in our two first examples, even if there is a certain amount of correspondence in the search for theological “formulae” and core passages.

Before returning to one of the homilies quoted in the first-mentioned Galata-series, viz. the *natale*-homily, it might be of interest, however, to give a brief survey of the contents of the two “florilege homilies”. This is done in TABLES 3 and 4.

4. The *natale* homily reconsidered

The correspondences and differences between the Greek text as published in Migne and the Armenian text to be found in MS Jerusalem arm. 1 is shown in TABLE 5³⁴.

Expressed in the terminology chosen in this paper, three “blocks” of the text as known in Greek (corresponding to less than half of the text - 110 out of 251 lines in Migne’s edition) find their parallels in the Armenian (84 + 31 + 19 = 134 lines

in the manuscript) which has three further “blocks” (22 + 43 + 83 = 148 lines in the manuscript).

Technically speaking the “abbreviation method” now looks familiar. Only, we have here two texts which might both be abbreviations; and it is of course difficult to give any opinion of how long was the original unabbreviated homily.

Above I expressed my uneasiness about the rejection of the external evidence for Severian’s original author’s rights to this homily. I further hope to have shown what problems and consequences arise from the process of abbreviating, even in its least radical form, as far as the editorial accomplishment is concerned, and hence find new reasons for an exhortation to be cautious in verdicts of inauthenticity about short homilies.

As the Armenian version of this homily has never been published, I shall finally give a few specimens of the contents of the Armenian “blocks” which are not covered by the Greek.

In section b the comments about the virgin birth from the preceding paragraph are continued, first with a parallel between Jesus’ birth and the way in which Eve was “born” out of Adam (Gen 2,21f). In order to obviate the lack of understanding of the Jews there is then a reference to the narrative in Exodus 17 of how Moses smites the dry rock with his dry rod making water come out of the rock. Finally, reference is made to the narrative of the prophet Habakkuk being carried by an angel to Babylon to feed Daniel in the lion’s den (Dan 14,34ff (apocryphal addition)).

All three references to Old Testament “testimonia” can be found in genuine texts by Severian. The miraculous birth of Eve (Gen 2,21f) as a foreboding of the virgin birth is commented upon with a number of parallels in Genesis—homily No. 5 (CPG 4194,5)³⁶ and in *Quomodo animam acceperit Adamus* (CPG 4195)³⁷.

The reference to Moses’ dry rod miraculously making water come out of the dry rock as an image of the virgin birth is known from e.g. *In pretiosam et vivificam crucem* (CPG 4213)³⁸.

	Homily No. CPG	Aucher	MS Galata 54 (p. (col.), line)	Aucher page, line
(a)	3531,3	I	363a,21-28	4,1-5
(b)			363a,28-b,22	14,26-16,1
(c)	4240	II	363b,25-364,15	18,24-20,12
(d)			364,15-32	24,7-27
(e)			364,32-366,2	34,7-36,10
(f)			366,3-29	36,37-38,31
(g)	4241	III	366,32-367,6	78,5-14
(h)	4242	IV	367,8-20	160,16-33
(i)			367,21-368,8	162,32-164,21
(j)	4243	V	368,10-369,2	202,15-204,8
(k)	4244	VI	369,3-18	216,32-218,16
(l)			369,18-25	228,22-30
(m)			369,25-370,16	236,21-238,12
(n)	4198	VII	370,17-24	258,13-21
(o)	4215	IX	370,26-372,9	336,14-338,33
(p)			372,9-32	340,6-32
(q)			372,33-373,28	342,26-344,20
(r)			373,29-374,11	350,7-24
(s)			374,11-375,5	356,3-358,3
(t)			375,6-13	362,22-32

Table 3. MS Galata 54: Severian Cento I (Aucher): *Seberianosi Emesu*

	Homily No. CPG	MS Galata 54 (p. (col.), line)
(a)	4249	375,15-376,18
(b)	4657	376,19-25
(c)	-	376,25-377,7
(d)	4699	377,9-19
(e)	4201	377,21-24
(f)	-	377,24-33
(g)	-	377,33-379,8
(h)	-	379,9-16
(i)	4196	379,18-23
(j)	4295,17a	379,25-381,21
(k)	-	381,21-384,6

Table 4. MS Galata 54: Severian Cento II: *Eranelwoy Seberianosi Gaba ...*³⁵

Finally, the wonder of Habakkuk being brought to Babylon is used by Severian in more than one context³⁹.

After section c about Jesus’ birth in Bethlehem the first part of section d presents Hab 3,3 as a testimony that the birth should take place in Bethlehem in Judea. A little further on also Hab 3,2 LXX is quoted and commented upon, and after quotations of Ps 71,6 and elements from Ps 49 (vss. 2.3.5) attention is

NOTE 35

For manuscripts and editions see “New Identifications”, 117f. The fragment quoted by Severus of Antioch referred to under CPG 4295,17a (cf. (j)) only covers part of the first quotation of this homily in the Gabala MS, which therefore is the only source – so far – for a hitherto unknown part of this homily.

	PG 61 col., line	Number of lines (PG)	MS Jer. arm. 1 col., line	Number of lines (MS)
(a)	763,1-765,3	69	41a,48-42a,35	84
(b)	-	-	42a,36-42b,19	22
(c)	765,4-26	23	42b,20-43a,2	31
(d)	-	-	43a,3-45	43
(e)	765,27-44	18	43a,46-43b,16	19
(f)	-	-	43b,17-44b,3	83
(g)	765,45-768,12	141	-	-

Table 5. *In natale domini nostri Iesu Christi* (CPG 4657)

NOTE 36
PG 56,482f.

NOTE 37
Savile, 5,650ff. Cf. Johannes Zellinger, *Die Genesishomilien des Bischofs Severian von Gabala*, (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen VII,I), Münster i.W., 1916, 40-46.96ff.

NOTE 38
Combefis, 225.

NOTE 39
Cf. Zellinger, *Studien*, 95. References are to the following homilies: CPG 4194,5, 4196, 4213, 4244.

NOTE 40
This topic is dealt with twice in CPG 4213, apart from Combefis, 255f, also 274f. In the latter passage, the shadowy mountain is considered to refer to the Virgin Mary, and it is added that τινες (“some”) take it to mean Zion. Such an inconsistency is not unseen in a text by Severian. In any case the problem of inconsistency is an internal one for CPG 4213, and of course does not detract from the value of the parallel between the first quotation here and that in CPG 4657, arm.

NOTE 41
Combefis, 272f.

again - in section e - turned to the historical reports of Jesus’ birth.

The elements in section d taken from the prayer of Habakkuk have very close parallels in a genuine Severianic homily, viz. again: *In pretiosam et vivificam crucem* (CPG 4213).

Thus the comments that Teman of Hab 3,3a (Θάμμαν) (which can be translated “South”, it is maintained) is Bethlehem, and that the shadowy mountain (Mount Taran) of 3,3b is Zion are found in practically the same wording in Combefis, 255f, including the explanation that Mount Zion is called shadowy because it is overshadowed by the strength of God. The verb ἐπιτοκιάζω is that used about the virgin in the Annunciation narrative⁴⁰.

Also the explanation that the two creatures of Hab 3,2 should be understood about life in this aeon and life in the aeon to come or about the Old and the New Testament is shared with the homily *In*

pretiosam et vivificam crucem (CPG 4213)⁴¹. Here even minor details of the two texts are identical.

Now, whereas the last half of the Greek (section g) is a fulfilment of the promise in the title of the Armenian, viz. that the homily shall be concerned also with the wise men’s adoration (Mt 2,1ff), the last part of the Armenian (section f) is mainly concerned with the trial, apology and death of Stephen (Acts 6-7).

These chapters have not been commented upon by Severian elsewhere to such an extent as to give material for comparison, so on the basis of the criterion for internal argument, which I have mainly used, viz. the use of the Bible, there is little to be gained. I shall here abstain from going into stylistic or other details.

By way of conclusion to this paper I find it permissible to say, that the Armenian version of the *natale*-homily has furnished us with valuable comparative material for reaching a positive conclusion from internal evidence corresponding to that suggested by strong external arguments, viz. that the homily is by Severian. It is my hope that our way through some elementary observations on the process, which some texts attributed to Severian underwent in order to find an abbreviated form, has been of some value for deepening our attentiveness to what would happen in such a process, thereby assisting us on our difficult way “back to the original text”.

