

Christ Church MS 5

A MANUSCRIPT OF THEOPHANES IN OXFORD

Nigel G. Wilson*

The chronicle of Theophanes was edited by C. de Boor.¹ His text was accompanied by a long discussion of the complicated problems of the manuscript tradition, which arise because some of the manuscripts are fragmentary, while others change their textual affinities or have suffered from alterations by unidentified redactors of the text.

It now turns out that de Boor's investigation of the manuscripts was not quite as complete as it appears at first to be. He may readily be pardoned for not knowing of the tiny fragments of a tenth-century Theophanes discovered by J. E. Powell in a Basel manuscript of Thucydides.² In any case the Basel fragments do no more than tantalize us by proving the existence of another early copy of the chronicle. It may be worth saying in passing that, though the fragments doubtless belong to the tenth century, a Photostat in my possession makes it clear that they can scarcely be assigned to the earlier half of the century.

What is more surprising is that de Boor overlooked a complete Theophanes manuscript which had been described in a printed catalogue some years before his edition appeared. It is MS Wake 5 in the library of Christ Church, Oxford; the catalogue had been published by G. W. Kitchin.³ The credit for first noticing the manuscript belongs to J. B. Bury, who published a short note about it.⁴ But since his dating of the script is incorrect and he was unable to work on the book long enough to establish its position in the stemma accurately, I have thought it worthwhile to investigate the matter further. At this point I should like to offer my warmest thanks to the Librarian of Christ Church, Dr. J. F. A. Mason, for putting the manuscript so readily at my disposal.

First a brief description of it. It consists of 315 folios of good quality parchment measuring 305×220 mm. There are thirty lines to the page, and the lines to guide the script are ruled in the pattern numbered I,2c by K. and S. Lake.⁵ The single column of text on each page measures 230×145 mm. The quires are of eight leaves each, except for the eighth quire, which has six leaves only, folios 57-62. The quires are numbered serially in uncial letters on the upper right-hand corner of the first recto, but some of these numbers were cut away when the book was rebound. The numbers are not written in the same ink as the text, but I am inclined to think that they are original and not later additions. The text was written by one hand, which is regular in appearance and slopes a little to the left, except that the letter gamma often slants in the opposite direction. The script is sometimes placed so as to rest on the ruled lines, sometimes to hang from them. It appears to be pure minuscule. There are few abbreviations. The accentuation is written on most words. Breathings are in general of

* The study was published in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (26: 1972, 357-360).

¹ *Theophanis Chronographia*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1883-85; reprinted 1963).

² E-III-4 = 79; "Eine verschollene Handschrift des Theophanes," *BZ*, 36 (1936), 5-6.

³ *Catalogus codicum MSS. Qui in Bibliotheca Aedis Christi apud Oxonienses adservantur* (Oxford, 1867).

⁴ "An unnoticed Ms. Of Theophanes," *BZ*, 14 (1905), 612-13.

⁵ *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the year 1200* (Boston, 1934).

angular shape. Very little has been written in the margins apart from brief notes by the scribe in half-uncial letters to indicate the contents of the text. There is no subscription, because the last leaf, on which it might have stood, is missing. Later owners, one of whom perhaps belongs to the seventeenth century, have written a few notes here and there; on folio 33 one reveals his identity as George, anagnostes in the Pantocrator monastery, and on the last verso gives his name as Kallinikos. The binding is of leather with handsome gold tooling, and is clearly later than the Renaissance, so that it affords no clue about the history of the book. Nothing about the provenance of this or other manuscripts from Wake's collection is to be learned from N. Sykes.⁶

A century ago the state of palaeographical knowledge did not permit accurate dating of Greek manuscripts, and Kitchin, followed later by Bury, assigned the book to the eleventh century. In fact it must be much earlier, as it is written in the stiff and angular style of early miniscule seen in the celebrated Paris Demosthenes (Paris. gr. 2934), a copy of some medical treatises in the Escorial (Σ-11-10), and the early copy of Photius' letters in Oxford (Barroci 217). The similarity between the Theophanes and the Demosthenes is striking, and the hands may be identical, but it should be noted that the Demosthenes does not seem to display the type of gamma mentioned above. This style of script may be dated to the last two or three decades of the ninth century. The Oxford manuscript, therefore, appears to be the oldest extant, but this conclusion must be modified in the light of a discovery which I made in the Vatican library; examining one of the manuscripts known to de Boor (Vat. gr. 155) I found that it, too, is written in the same type of minuscule and shares with the Oxford codex the feature of the gamma sloping in the opposite direction to the rest of the hand. Though de Boor alluded to the strange character of the hand,⁷ he was not in a position to date it accurately. Now that we know the two copies of the Theophanes chronicle that are as old as the ninth century, we have striking evidence of the diffusion of the text at this early date in addition to the indications given by de Boor's stemma, which itself testifies to wide circulation. (At this point I ought to say in passing that the dates assigned to the other early manuscripts of this author do not seem to me to be in need of revision).

The contents of the MS Wake 5 are as follows:

1. 1^r-11^v Nicephorus, *Chronographia brevis*. This was edited by de Boor,⁸ and the manuscripts are discussed in the preface.⁹ The text exists in two recensions, and the Christ Church MS presents the longer and later of the two. As far as I can ascertain it is earlier than any manuscript consulted by de Boor.

2. 12^f-60^f Georgius Syncellus, the shorter form of the chronicle, as found in most manuscripts, with text beginning at p. 566 of the Bonn edition. The Christ Church copy and the Vatican codex mentioned above are presumably the oldest witnesses to the text. It should

⁶ *William Wake Archbishop of Canterbury 1657-1737* (Cambridge, 1957).

⁷ *Theophanis Chronographia*, II, 374.

⁸ *Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula Historica* (Leipzig, 1880), 81-135.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. xxxi-li.

be noted that W. Laqueur in his article on Syncellus in Pauly-Wissowa,¹⁰ attributes the most important manuscripts of the text known to him to the eleventh century, and I am not aware of any more recent study of the tradition. The absence of any up-to-date edition makes it impossible to give any useful sample collations at presents.

3. 61^v-315^v Theophanes. The text appears to be complete except that it breaks off one line before the end, at p. 503.24 μαρμά[ροις, owing to the loss of the final folio.

The stemmatic position of the codex must now be established. Specimen collations by J. B. Bury led him to the conclusion that “it is closely connected with de Boor’s *d* and *c*,” but this statement is vague and misleading. The vital fact, which Bury failed to grasp, is that the text changes allegiance from what de Boor called the *y*-group of manuscripts to his *x*-group, and this change takes place after about sixty pages of the printed text. In other words this codex behaves in the same way as *d* (Paris. gr. 1710), which was thought by de Boor to be the oldest manuscript. But, whereas the scribe of the Paris codex abbreviates the text a good deal and otherwise alters it,¹¹ the Oxford codex presents a normal text. There is no reason to doubt that *d* is derived from the Oxford codex or from an almost identical gemellus of it and may therefore be disregarded for all practical purposes in the future.

Now for a demonstration of what has been said: In the first sixty pages the Oxford codex sides with de Boor’s *y*-group in almost every detail. It does, however, have a few errors of its own. I note from the opening pages 8.5 Καῖσαρ, 8.22 omission of κθ’, 8.23 after ιδ’ the addition of α’, 9.14 ὄν, 9.32 τοῦτο, 10.12 ἀναλαβόμενος, 10.19 Κωνσταντιος, 10.20 μέρη, 10.28 ἐπὶ ἐπόψεσι, 11.3 Κωνσταντῖνος. Otherwise, in the first sixty pages I find all the readings quoted by de Boor¹² as characteristic of the group *dgy*.

Thereafter the Oxoniensis displays the readings of the *x*-group. It has all the readings listed by de Boor on p. 540ff. as variants of the inferior family of MSS. The same is true of the list of interpolations on p. 542ff. In both these lists the behaviour of the codex is consistent before and after the change of relationship at p. 60.

Though the Oxoniensis belongs to the inferior class it may perhaps be of some value. For much of the text we do not possess the superior tradition represented by *a* and *b*, and since *c* also comes to an end at p. 461, even the *x*-group has been represented until now in pp. 461-503 only by the erratic *d*. I have therefore collated the Oxoniensis for these pages and offer the results below. The siglum *o* is used; deviations from de Boor’s text are noted, with the exception of a few minor orthographic errors. It will be seen that *o* exhibits a great many but not all of the readings peculiar to *d*; the remainder must evidently be due to the scribe of *d* himself or to some intermediate source of error.

¹⁰ *Realencyclopädie*, col. 1390.

¹¹ De Boor ed., II, 364-73.

¹² *Ibid.*, 520-21.

I. Pp. 461-486; in these pages the d-text is preserved.

461.11, 13-14, 20, 22, 23 o = d || 25 αὐτῶν o || αὐτοὺς o (= d) ||

462.1 o = dh || 7 ἰ om. o || 8 αὐτῶ o || 14 ἄρματα o (= codd. praeter d) || 15 o = codd. || 17 καὶ ἐγεννήθη o || 18 o = d || 29 o = codd. ||

463.3 o = dz || 4 o = d || 5 Νικαίων o || 9 o = dz || o = d || 17 Κοπιναδον sine accentu ut videtur o || 23 o = d || 25 o = yz || 26 o = d ||

464.5 o = dg || o. codd. || 9 ἰ β' κα' ζ' o || 15 o = d || 19 o = dz || 21 o = codd. || 22 ἀνθρώποις αὐτοῦ ὀλιγίστοις οὖσιν o || 24 o = yz || ἐξορίσαι αὐτὸν o || 29 o = d ||

465.2 o = z || 5 o = deh || o = d || 16 o = dehm || 20 o = d || 21 o = dy || 22 o = dz || 33 Ἀρμενιακῶν o ||

466.11 o = codd. || 19 o = d || 27-28 o = z || 28 o = d || 29 o = d ||

467.3 τὰ χρήματα τὰ πλεῖστα o || 5 o = d || 6 o = dfz || 10 o = codd. praeter g || 25 o = d || 28 o = yz ||

468.1 o = deh || 3 o = deh || 5 o = d || 6 o = codd. praeter h || τε] δὲ o || 10 ἐξήγαγεν αὐτὸν o || 12 o = d || 13 o = d (both readings cited by de Boor) || 15 o = d post correctionem || 18, 20, 25 o = d || 26 πρωτοσπαθάρην o ||

469.2 Νοεμβρίῳ o || o = d || 5 Ἀρμενιακῶν o || 20 ὑπὸ λόγον om. o || 30 o = dfm || 31 o = d (both readings) ||

470.1 Ἰωάννου post ἀγίου ἀγίου transp. o || 2 o = f || 6 o = dg || 7 o = g || 8 o = d || 19 o = d || 30 δομέστηκον o (this spelling recurs repeatedly, but is not recorded again in these collations) ||

471.1 o = d || 4 o = dg || 10 o = d || 12 o = d || 13 o = degm || 31 o = dg ||

472.4 αὐτοῦ om. o || 5 o = d || 15 o = codd. || 16 o = gy || 22 οὕτως o || o = d || 27 o = eg || o = codd. || 28 ἠμύναντο o || 29 o = d ||

473.5 βασιλεύει o || 24 o = d || 26 o = codd. || o = g || 27 λαβῶν om. o || 29 o = codd. || 33 Σκλαβινῶν o ||

474.2 γνοῦς o || 3 o = d || 9 δὴ] δὲ o || o = dg || 14 o = d || 16 o = codd. || παλατίου τῶν Ἱερίου o || 17 o = d || 26 o = d || 29 καρδιόπνικτος o ||

475.11 o = d || 17 o = dy || 22 o = fm ||

476.10 o = d || 11 o = df || 13 o = codd. || 14 ὑπ' αὐτῆς o || 15 τὸν αὐτὸν Νικηφόρον εἰς βασιλέα o || 16 Ἀέτιον] Λέοντα o || Λέοντα o || 20 o = codd. || 24 o = dfg || 27 o = d || 28 o = d || 29 o = dg || 30 o = d ||

477.15 o = d || 16 o = gy || 18 o = codd. praeter d || 22 o = d || 28 μηδεμία o ||

478.2 o = d || 6 o = dem || 9 βασιλέων] βασιλευόντων o || 18 προβληθέντα o || o = dy || 27 o = codd. || o = dfg || 28 o = d || 32 o = d ||

479.6 εὐεργεσίας Εἰρήνης o || 22 ὑπόγραφον o || 28 o = em || 32 o = egm ||

480.1-2 ο = δ || 4 ο = δ g || 8 ο = gy || 9 ο = g || 14 ο = δ y || 17 ο = δ || ἐκελεύσω ο || 18 ο = δ g || 22 ο = g || 27 ἐξοφωμένον ο (noted by Bury as probably correct) ||
 481.1-2 ο = δ || 11 ο = δ y || ο = y || 15 ο = codd. || 18 ο = gy || δ_] τετράδι ο || 20 ο = δ ||
 482.2-3 ο = δ || 6 ο = δ || 9 ο = δ g || 13 καὶ . . . εἰρήνην om. ο || 14 ο = δ y || ο = codd. || 15 ο = δ || δ16 ο = f || 17 ο = δ ||
 483.12 ο = δ || 15 τὸν κίνδυνον om. ο || ο = codd. praeter δ || 16 ο = δ || 17 ο = δ || 18 ο = codd. || 19 ο = δ || 24 ο = δ || 25 ο = δ ||
 484.8 ο = y || 14 ο = δ || 19 ο = codd. praeter δ || 30 ἀφείλοντο ο ||
 485.1, 3, 4, 7 (both readings) ο = δ || 9 ο = codd. || 11 ο = codd. || 13 ο = y || 14 ἐορτάσαι ο || 24 ο = δ g || ο = codd. || 25 ο = δ g || 31 ο = δ ||
 486.4 ο = δ || 11 ο = δ y || 20 ῥηθησομένων ο || 25 ο = egm || 26 ο = δ y || παρέχοντας post ἔνεκα transp. ο || 28 χαρτίων ο ||

II. Pp. 486.28-493.25; here both d and δ are missing.

487.6 ο = g || 12 ἔξω τῆς Ἀβύδου post οἰκετικὰ transp. ο || 13 ο = ef || 16 ο = codd. || 18 ο = y || 19 λίτρας ο || ο = y || 22 post βασιλίδα add. πόλιν ο || 23 ο = y || ὀπόσοι ο || 23-4 καθυποβάλλοντας ο || 25 ο = y || 26 βεβαιοῦντας ο || 27 ο = codd. || 31 τούτου ο ||
 488.2 ο = g || πόσος] ὅσος ο || 4 αὐτοῦ] εὐθὺ ο || 5 σὺ om. ο || 6 νομίσματα ρ_] λίτρας ι_] ο || 11 ο = g || ἐμπλοίοις ο || τὸ om. ο || 12 κακῶν om. ο || 17 αὐτῶ] αὐτὸν ο || 20 λοιπὸν ἐντεῦθεν ο || 23 καλουμένων] λεγομένων ο || 24 διάπυρος] διάφορος ο || 25 ὅτε ο || 26 τοῦτον ο || μαγγανίας ο || 27 ο has the correct reading || 28 εἰλυσπομένου ο || 34 ο = y || ὄνοματι Νικόλαος τοῦνομα ο ||
 489.1 prius καὶ om. ο || 6 ἀλόγουσ] ἄδικουσ ο || 7 ἐν om. ο || 12 ἱερὰ post κοινοῦσθαι transp. ο || 18 ο = y 19 || ο = y || 20 ἀφείλοντο ο || 23 Μήδου ο || 25 Ἰουνίου ο (cf. A's reading Iulio) || 25-6 λογοθέτη γενικῶ καὶ πατρικίῳ ο ||
 490.3 ὁ συγγραφόμενος post ἀκήκοα transp. ο || 7 ο = em || 13 ἀπατήση ο || 14 ἔλκη ο || 15 ο = m || 19 ο = egm || 21 ἠπείλη ο || 24 Κρούμου ο (this spelling recurs later but is not recorder here) || 25 ἠσφαλιζέτο ο || 29 ἐν οἷσ ο || 32 ο = g ||
 491.6 ο = codd. || 7 ο = g || 8 ο = g || 11 ο = g || 17 εἰκάδι ζ_] ο || 25 ο = g ||
 492.3 ὁ παῖς ο || 14 ο = g || 15 ο = g || 18 ταλάντων γ' ο || 23 ἐπιβουλεύουσιν ο || Θεοφάνους ο (correct apart from the accent) || 24 ο = codd. || 27 ο = f || 29 καὶ Θεόκτιστος μάγιστρος post δομέστηκος (sic) transp. ο || 29-30 εἰς φιλιαν ἐκ πολλῆς ἔχθρας ο || 30 ἀλλήλοις om. ο ||
 493.1 δυνηθῆ ο || 6-7 πραγμάτων ο || στρατεύματα om. ο || 7 ἵπποδρομείῳ ο || 9 τῶ ὄρθρῳ ο || 11 ἠπήτησεν ο || 12 ὀρθοδόξου ο ||

III. Pp. 493.25-499.21; here δ is available again.

27 καὶ τῆ ἀδελφῆ om. ο || 30 ο = δ ||
 494.5 ο = codd. || 12 ο = δ || 31 ο = δ g ||

495.2 alterum τῶν] καὶ ο || 9 ο = δ || 11 ο = δ || 12 τοὺς] τῆς ο || 13 ἐμπλέως ἐμπλέως ο || ο
codd. praeter g || 15-6 ο = δ || 18 ο = δ g || 20 τρεῖς ἥμισυ] γ ζ ut videtur ο || ια.] ιδ' ο || 22 ο
= egm || ο = δ || 23 ο = y || (24 προσρυνέντας ο, conjectured by Combefis) ||

496.2 ο = δfg || 3 ο = δ || 13 ο = fg || 26 ο = δ || 27 ο = δ || ο = δ y ||

497.5, 7, 10 ο = δ || 11 τὴν Περσικὴν τὴν ἐνδοτέραν ο || 12 τὰ Βαγδὰ ο || 14 ο = δ || 16 ο = δ ||
19 ο = codd. || 19-20 τὸν τῶ ο || 20 ὄρκους ο || 21 Μηλαιῶνων ο || 27 σπεύσης ο, confirming
de Boor's conjecture || 30 ο = δ ||

498.5 ο = δ || 8 ὑπάρχοντος ο || 10 ποιήσας ο = efg, and the reading should probably be
adopted || 11 ο = y || 12 ο = δ || 16 περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης ο || 22 ο = gy || 28 ο = efg, which may be
the right reading despite A's *plures* || 30 ο = δ || 31 ο = δ || ο = codd.

499.3 σοφώτεροι ο || 5 ταύτη ut videtur ο || 16 ο = g || 20 ο = δ A ||

IV. Pp. 499.21-503.24; here both d and δ are missing.

29 ο = f || 31 ο = codd. || 32 ο = g ||

500.4 ἀθρόος ο || 8 ἐν τῇ μονῇ ο || 9-10 ο = f || 15 καὶ om. ο || 16 Ἀκιδίκτου ο || 17 ο = g || 31
Βερσινικεῖαν ο || 32 ο = y ||

501.3 ο = f || 7 ἀθρόος ο || κτύπου τινὸς ο || 11 διεφήμισαν τε ο, which may be correct || 13 ο
= g || 15 ὑπαρχικῶ ο || καὶ πατροπαράδοτον om. ο || 31 τῶν Χριστιανῶν ο || 32 γενόμενον ο ||

502.4 ο = g || 11 ο = em || 16 ἀνθέξεσθαι ο, partially supporting de Boor's tentative
emendation || 17 ἀνεβάλετο ο || 18 ο = codd. || 29-30 δὲ om. ο ||

503.1 ο = g || (2 ο confirms de Boor's conjecture, as noted by Bury) || 3 ο = g || 7 ἰδίας]
οικείας ο || 10 ο has καὶ, supplied previously from A || 16 ο = codd. praeter m || 23 ἄρκα ut
videtur ο || 24 ὑδρείου ο, confirming de Boor's suggestion, as noted by Bury ||

Our final verdict on the Oxoniensis must be that, although it disappoints the high hopes that might be placed in such an early manuscript, it does present a few readings of value in the final pages of the text.

ADDENDA

On the type f script see I. Hutter, *Rivista di Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, 46 (2009) 73-126.

Syncellus, the second text in the MS, has now been edited by A. A. Mosshammer (Leipzig 1984); see pp. xii-xiii for this MS.

Collation: a bifolium has fallen out between folios 59 and 60.