

J.-C. Haelewyck, V. Somers, E. Van Elverdinghe¹

Diverse Perspectives on the Manuscript Tradition of the Story of Zosimus

Introduction

The *Story of Zosimus on the Life of the Blessed Rechabites* (hereafter *HZos*) is the narrative composed by a monk who is said to have visited the island of the Blessed Ones.² At the end of a rather perilous journey across the desert, he encounters on an island a group of people who live naked and draw nourishment from the wonderful products of nature. They are not immortal, but are gifted with an exceptional longevity (the number of years varying from one recension to the other). After many adventures Zosimus learns that these Blessed Ones are actually the descendants of the clan of Rechabites mentioned in the Bible in chapter 35 of Jeremiah. These sons of Rechab, son of Jonadab, son of Aminadab, in the days of Jeremiah, had opted for a nomadic and ascetic life so that God would spare Jerusalem from the threats of the Babylonians led by Nebuchadnezzar. These Rechabites were miraculously transported to this island located in the middle of a river or, according to some other tradition, in the middle of the sea.

The section on the Rechabites is found in chapters 8-10 of *HZos* (numbering according to the Greek text in Charlesworth's edition). It has been remarked, following Charlesworth³, that these chapters seemed to form a coherent unit, eventually detachable from the rest of *HZos*. Questions are then raised concern-

- 1 An earlier version of this research has been presented in Besançon (France), at the annual meeting of the AELAC (Association pour l'Etude de la Littérature Apocryphe Chrétienne), June, 29th – July, 1st 2015: "L'Histoire de Zosime: récit apocryphe ou hagiographique ? Regards croisés sur la tradition manuscrite".
- 2 For a preliminary overview of this work, see C. H. KNIGHTS, "A Century of Research into the Story/Apocalypse of Zosimus and/or the History of the Rechabites", in *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15 (1997), p. 53-66; J.-Cl. HAELEWYCK, *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti*, Turnhout, 1998, n° 166 (CAVT 166); A.-M. DENIS *et. al.* assisted by J.-Cl. HAELEWYCK, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, 2 vols., Turnhout, 2000, p. 486-488; L. DiTOMMASO, *A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research 1850-1999* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha. Supplement Series 39), Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, p. 983-993; J.-Cl. HAELEWYCK, "Narratio Zosimi de vita Beatorum (CAVT 166). Une relecture du mythe de l'île des Bienheureux", in *Acta Orientalia Belgica* 26 (2013), p. 135-147 [hereafter HAELEWYCK, "Une relecture"].
- 3 J. H. CHARLESWORTH assisted by P. DYKERS and M. J. H. CHARLESWORTH, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research. With a Supplement* (Society of Biblical Literature. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, 78), Chico CA, 1981, p. 223-228.

ing the rapports between these two unities i. e. *HZos* and the History of the Rechabites (hereafter *HRech*): *HRech* could be either a narrative block inserted into *HZos* or the nucleus around which *HZos* developed. Charlesworth has resolutely opted for the second possibility: it is from *HRech* that *HZos* was formed through successive accretion. He is in fact the first to affirm that *HRech* consists of all that remains of a Jewish apocrypha of independent origin. As such, he says, *HZos* has its place among the apocrypha (or the pseudoepigrapha, as he calls it). Following him, all reference works on the Apocrypha (introductions, collections of texts or clavis) have chosen to include *HZos* which they have considered as an apocrypha and not as a “late monastic legend” (Charlesworth).

We would like to verify this point, starting not with a literary analysis of the work, but by examining the manner in which the manuscript collections have understood *HZos*. Our objective is to take into consideration the environment in which *HZos* was copied, and to examine the titles which were attributed to it in each of the traditions transmitted to us.

In addition to Greek, *HZos* is in fact largely known in the ancient Christian traditions: in Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopian, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavic; and often in multiple recensions. Only the Ethiopian and the Slavonic traditions have transmitted a single text form. Apart from the Ethiopian, edited based on a single manuscript (only two manuscripts are known), the editions are either non-existing (Arabic, Georgian) or insufficiently critical (Syriac, Armenian, and Slavic), for which reason we have undertaken in Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgium) a project for a complete edition of *HZos*. So far, the work is completed for the Syriac of which the three recensions have been edited; they have already been published or are about to be⁴. The heuristics and the identification of manuscripts are now almost completed. More than a hundred manuscripts have been identified, all the traditions being confused. They are presented in a volume of the *Subsidia* of CSCO⁵, the reason why the bibliographical information here is reduced to the minimum.

Since the research has been divided among the three of us, we have decided to present the results of our investigation in a dossier, each part of which corresponds to a geographico-linguistic field: Part I. The Semitic Traditions, by J.-Cl.

4 J.-Cl. HAELEWYCK, “Historia Zosimi de Vita Beatorum Rechabitarum. Édition de la version syriaque brève”, in *Le Muséon* 127 (2014), p. 95-147; ID., “La version syriaque longue de l’*Historia Zosimi de Vita Beatorum Rechabitarum*. Édition et traduction”, in *Le Muséon* 128 (2015), p. 295-379, and ID., “Histoire de Zosime sur la vie des Bienheureux Réchabites. Les trois recensions syriaques. Édition de la version résumée”, in *Parole de l’Orient* (to be published in 2017).

5 J.-Cl. HAELEWYCK (dir.), *Histoire de Zosime sur la Vie des Bienheureux Réchabites. Les versions orientales et leurs manuscrits* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 664; Subsidia, 135), Louvain, 2016 [hereafter HAELEWYCK (dir.), *Les versions orientales*]. The Greek tradition is not included in that volume; the three Appendices at the end of the present paper supply for the Greek tradition information found in that volume about the others.

Haelewyck; Part II. The Caucasian Traditions, by E. Van Elverdinghe; Part III. The Greek and Slavonic Traditions, and the three Appendices, by V. Somers.⁶

Part I. The *Story of Zosimus* in the Semitic Traditions,
by J.-Cl. HAELEWYCK

1. The Syriac Tradition

In Syriac, *HZos* is transmitted in three forms: a short recension, a long recension, and an abridged recension. The short recension is known from 9 manuscripts, the long one also from 9 manuscripts, and the abridged one only from a single manuscript. Three other manuscripts have been identified, but copies of them could not be obtained. It is therefore not possible to specify the recension transmitted by them.

a. Contents of the Collections

Let us begin by analysing to which literary genre the works transmitted at the same time as *HZos* belong.

Multiple preliminary observations:

1. Nothing can be said concerning the incomplete manuscripts (Ms. New York 33), manuscripts of which we have obtained only one partial copy and of which it is not possible to have an exact idea of the contents from the catalogues: what are the words for “various stories in Syriac” (Ms. Mardin 257), for example?

2. In an appropriate method, fake manuscripts should be excluded, such as the Mss. Rahmani 132 and 247 from the Convent of Charfet, which are the results of the assemblage of the *membra disiecta* by Rahmani.

3. There are no examples of manuscripts containing only apocryphal works in addition to *HZos*. Along similar lines, the works seem to have never been regrouped by literary genres in the collections: all the apocrypha on one side, all the hagiographic texts on the other.

The three oldest manuscripts of the Syriac short recension date from the very end of the 12th and the 13th centuries: Mss. Paris, BnF 235, 236, and London, B.L., Add. 12174. These collections contain mostly hagiographic texts, respectively 35, 27, and 78 (*HZos* included). The London manuscript contains a certain number of apocryphal texts (which are not always easy to identify): History of the Image of the Saviour Installed During the Reign of the Emperor Zeno in Tiberias by the

6 The three authors may refer to the following instruments; we give here their full references and abbreviation: *BHG* = F. HALKIN, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, 3 vol., Brussels, 3rd ed. 1957; *Auctarium*, Brussels, 1969; *Novum Auctarium*, Brussels, 1984; *BHO* = P. PEETERS, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Orientalis*, Brussels, 2nd ed. 1954; *CANT* = M. GEERARD, *Clavis apocryphorum Novi Testamenti*, Turnhout, 1992; *CAVT* = J.-Cl. HAELEWYCK, *Clavis apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti*, Turnhout, 1998; *CPG* = M. GEERARD, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, 5 vol., Turnhout, 1974-1987; *Supplementum*, Turnhout, 1998.

Jews for Ridiculing It, Acts of Paul and Thecla, History of Shamuni (IV Macca-bees); *Transitus Mariae*. Ms. Paris 235 contains only one apocryphal text: The Acts of Philip at Carthage. Ms. Rahmani 19, which dates probably from the 17th century, contains three hagiographic texts in addition to *HZos*. Ms. Mardin 261, dated 1760, transmits 15 texts in addition to *HZos*, all of them hagiographic in nature.

The abridged Syriac recension is known only from a single manuscript: Ms. Paris BnF Syr. 234 dated 1192. It contains 15 different items: lives of saints and martyrs, and pious stories, but no apocryphal Biblical texts. The conclusion is clear enough: the authors of the different collections of the short and abridged Syriac versions considered *HZos* a hagiographic text.

Things are a bit different in the case of the collections of the long recension. The oldest manuscripts of the Syriac long recension does not date from before the 16th century. If one sets aside Ms. Mardin 350 (formerly Diyarbakir 67) (16th century), which regroups *HZos* with three liturgical texts (2 poems on the Eucharist and a collection of chants for Easter), the appearance of apocryphal texts together with *HZos* is clearer in the following collections which transmit mostly hagiographic texts or more generally theological texts. Thus, among the 14 texts from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Syr. 74 (Sachau 9) dated 1569, four are apocryphal: Cave of Treasures (extract), History of Joseph, History of Philip, and Acts of Andrew and Philip in the Land of the Anthropophagists. Ms. London, RAS 1, dated 1569, contains 12 texts of which three are considered today as apocryphal: History of Philip, History of the Virgin, and Letter Fallen from the Sky on Sunday Observance. Among the 19 items put together in Ms. Teheran Issayi 18 (dating from 1742-1743), 5 are apocryphal: History of the Virgin, History of Philip, Acts of Andrew and Philip in the Land of the Anthropophagists, Dialogue of Moses with God, and Apocalypse of Paul. The proportion of apocryphal texts among the 35 works in Ms. Vatican, BAV, Borgia 39, dated 1680, is much lower: it contains only two apocryphal texts, namely Apocalypse of Paul and *Transitus Mariae*. Conversely, it is in Ms. Trichur, Metropolitanate of the East, Syr. 9, dated 1615, that the percentage is highest: out of 16 works, almost half are apocryphal: History of Philip, History of the Virgin, Acts of Peter, Acts of Paul, History of John in Ephesus, Acts of Andrew and Philip in the Land of the Anthropophagists, and Acts of Thomas.

There is something paradoxical here. *HZos*, in its longer form in Syriac, is mostly accompanied by apocryphal texts. Yet it is the long recension that accentuates the hagiographic nature of *HZos*. Indeed, it contains the chapters 19-23 which were absent from the shorter version. In other words, these chapters give *HZos* precisely the appearances of a hagiographic text. It is in these chapters (19-21) that the temptation of Zosimus by Satan is found, a narrative of the death

of Zosimus and the elevation of his soul to heaven as well as the indication of a cult performed at his tomb (22-23).

b. Titles

What could be the significance of the titles in the Syriac tradition? In some Syriac recension, no matter which one it is, the work is always called “history” (ܚܝܫܬܐ), and never “story” of Zosimus. The shortest title for the short recension is found in Ms. Paris 236: “History of Saint Zosimus, the Monk, and of the Sons of Jonadab, Sons of Rechab”. In some other manuscripts of the short recension, Zosimus and the sons of Jonadab are always mentioned, but some additional details are found as well: the sons of Jonadab are on an island in the middle of the ocean, and Zosimus asks God to be able to see them. Only one manuscript (London, Add. 12174) adds that the work “was translated from Hebrew into Greek, thereafter from Greek into Syriac by Saint Mar Jacob of Edessa”. In the shorter version, the explicit appears in this form: “Here ends the history of the sons of Rakabim”; there is no mention of Zosimus.

The mention of the “sons of Rakabim” reoccurs in the abridged recension: “We are writing a summary of the history of the sons of Rakabim, their transfer to the midst of the ocean, the Great Sea, and the advent of Zosimus to their midst”. There is no explicit, but only a colophon mentioning Zosimus implicitly and the Blessed Ones explicitly: “By his prayers (those of Zosimus) and those of the Blessed Ones, may the wretched one, who has written (these lines), obtain mercy and be absolved (from his errors). Amen and amen”.

Let us now turn our attention to the long recension. Here, for example, is the title of the fourth⁷ manuscript (the others diverge only on some minor details not relevant to our purpose): “By the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, we begin to write the marvellous history of the Blessed men. Lord, help me in your love and lead me to the end in your love and your grace, forever and ever, amen and amen. Dearly beloved, we are bringing to your knowledge the history and the wonderful way of life of the just and elect men, pure temples and temples of the Holy Spirit, those who are called Blessed Fathers. It is they who have left this world on the order of God in the days of the prophet Jeremiah”. It is noted that in the work, the emphasis is always on the Blessed Ones and Zosimus is not even mentioned. It is clear that the work is not considered a hagiographic text in the titles of the longer Syriac version. The same applies for the explicit which appears in this form (except for some variants irrelevant to our purpose): “Here ends the history of the Blessed Fathers” (followed by a prayer). There is no mention of Zosimus either.

This well demonstrates that there is another possible way to describe *HZos*. The alternative apocryphal text (Rechabites) – hagiographic text finally does not reflect the reality. An essential term is omitted: the words “Blessed Ones”. I have

7 Mss. London RAS 1, Trichur 9, Berlin 74 and Teheran 18.

developed elsewhere⁸ my hypothesis on the objective of *HZos*. In its oldest form (represented by the short Syriac recension), *HZos* is neither an apocryphal text nor a hagiographic one, but rather a work of Christian propaganda with the objective of Christianising the Classical myth of the Isle of the Blessed Ones, a work which must have been composed some time during the first half of the 4th century.

2. The Arabic Tradition

The Arabic tradition has come down to us in three distinctive forms: a short recension (following the short Syriac recension very closely), a long recension (close to the longer Syriac recension) and a free independent recension that is fully distinct. None of these forms has been edited, not even partially.

An initial remark is necessary: the catalogues, where they exist, generally give very little information that helps to identify the copied works at first glance. Thus, behind a general title such as “History of Joseph”, hides an apocryphal work on the patriarch Joseph, but it is not possible to decide if it is the one bearing the number 114 or 115 in the *Clavis*. Ms. Mingana Syr. 369 (Garshuni) indicates the presence of an extract from the Apocalypse of Peter, but according to the *Clavis*, this work does not exist in Arabic or in Garshuni.

A second remark: all the Arabic manuscripts⁹ are relatively recent. They are placed chronologically between the 14th and 19th centuries.

a. Contents of the Collections

The short recension is known only from two manuscripts: Ms. Mingana Syr. 369 (dated 1474) and Ms. Mosul, Mar Behnam 390 (dated 1695). These two manuscripts contain 41 and 47 texts respectively, mostly hagiographic texts and discourses; in the first one, there are 5 apocryphal texts (History of Joseph, History of Shammuni and His Seven Sons, an extract from the Apocalypse of Peter, The Dialogue of Moses with God, and the Martyrdom of Pilate) and in two in the second one: Ahiqar and probably the Paralipomena of Jeremiah.

For the long recension, 13 manuscripts are accessible. Some do not contain, beside *HZos*, any apocrypha recognised as such today: Mss. Paris Arab. 72 and Mingana Syr. 87. Among the three voluminous manuscripts (containing over 25 items), namely Mss. Beirut 625, Charfet Armalet Arab. 2/34, and Sinai Arab. 448, the proportion of apocryphal texts is highly variable. Thus from 3 apocryphal texts (History of Matthew and Andrew in the Land of the Anthropophagists, History of Bartholomew, and History of Andrew), it comes to 43 texts in Ms. Beirut 625, from 6 apocryphal texts (Apocalypse of Paul, Transitus Mariae, Ahiqar, History of Joseph, Shammuni and His Seven Sons, and Letter of Abgar to Jesus) to 28 texts in Ms. Charfet Armalet Arab. 2/34, and again from 6 apocryphal texts (Letter of

⁸ HAELEWYCK (dir.), *Les versions orientales*.

⁹ There is doubt concerning the Mss. Mardin 300/8 and Sinai Arabic 448 dating respectively from the 12th and 13th centuries.

Abgar, History of Paul, History of Matthew and Andrew in the Land of the Anthropophagists, History of Philip, History of Paul and Peter, and History of Abraham and Isaac) to 38 items in Ms. Sinai Arab. 448. The percentage therefore rises from under 10% to close to 25%. For other manuscripts, the proportion of apocryphal texts oscillates between 7% and 15% (it is impossible to provide the details here). One finds a higher percentage of 25% in Ms. Paris Arab. 70 (containing 4 works). Only one manuscript consists of up to 50% of apocryphal works: Ms. Vatican, Arab. 536 (6 works in total).

Two manuscripts transmit the free Arabic recension: Ms. Balamand 123 dated 1661 and Ms. Dublin Trinity College 1531 of unknown date. Out of the 14 works in the former, 5 are apocryphal (Cave of Treasures, Apocrypha of Jeremiah on the Babylonian Captivity, Apocalypse of Paul, Sybilla, and Apocalypse of Pseudo-Gregory); and out of the 13 in the latter, 6 are apocryphal (History of Joseph, History of Job, History of Abraham, Apocrypha of Jeremiah on the Babylonian Captivity, False Image of Jesus Christ by the Jews of Tiberias [see *supra* of the Syriac Ms. London Add. 12174], and History of Paul), which is close to 50%.

Fourteen other Arabic manuscripts have been identified without being able to say with certainty to which recension the text of *HZos* belongs. Ten are accessible for our purpose. Here too, we will indicate the percentage without going into details. One should set aside Ms. Jerusalem St. Mark 199 which is a copy of the Syriac Ms. Damascus Syr. 12/17. Six of them do not contain any apocrypha (Mss. Charfet Rahmani 558 and 746, Cairo Museum Copt. Arab. 111, Vatican Arab. 460, Vatican Sbath 672, and London Or. 3311). The proportion is from 10 to 15% in three manuscripts (Mss. Charfet Rahmani 168 grouping 51 texts, Rahmani 193 with 11 texts, the manuscript may be a fake one, and Séert 64 with its 13 texts). The proportion is much more significant in two manuscripts: 20% in Ms. Vatican Arab. 125, dating from the 15th century and containing 32 items, and 30% in Ms. Charfet Sony 883, dating from the 19th century and grouping 19 texts.

b. Titles

Shifting our focus to the titles, all the recensions seem mingled up. Twenty-six manuscripts are accessible. Five manuscripts carry a very short title mentioning only Zosimus, for example “History of Saint Zosimus, One of the Hermits” (Ms. Beirut 625; see Mss. Vatican Arab. 536, Mardin 300/8, Balamand 123, and Charfet Rahmani 193). Seven other do not mention Zosimus and involve only the Blessed Ones: “History of the Blessed Fathers Who Have Lived in the Pure Land” (Mss. Paris Arab. 70 and 265; see Mss. Paris Arab. 72, Sinai 448, Dublin 1531, Cairo Arab. 111, and Séert 64) and of whom they indicate that they are the sons of Jonadab (Mss. Paris Arab. 72, Sinai 448, and Dublin 1531) and that they had lived in the days of Jeremiah (Mss. Paris Arab. 72 and Séert 64). The majority, however (thirteen manuscripts), mention Zosimus and the sons of Jonadab (who, however,

are never identified as Rechabites), for example “History of Zosimus the Priest to Whom God Showed the Sons of Jonadab Who are in the Middle of the Sea, the Great Ocean” (Ms. Mingana Syr. 369; also see Mss. Mosul 390, Charfet Armalet Arab. 2/34, Paris Arab. 264, Mingana Syr. 35, 87, and 299, Charfet Armalet Syr. 11/14, Charfet Sony 883, Vatican Sbath Arab. 125, Berlin Syr. 246, and Charfet Rahmani 168 and 746). Only one manuscript has a bizarre title: “History of Anbā Zosimus and Jeremiah the King” (Ms. Charfet Rahmani 558), but there is nevertheless a link with the sons of Jonadab.

In conclusion, only five manuscripts identify the work as being a purely hagiographic text trying to present a history of Zosimus. The other 21 manuscripts highlight the figures of the Blessed Ones, sons of Jonadab visited by Zosimus. Such a strong emphasis on the Blessed Ones confirms the hypothesis, formulated in the course of the presentation of the Syriac material, according to which *HZos* is a propaganda narrative with an objective of Christianising the Classical myth of the Blessed Ones.

3. The Ethiopian Tradition

The Ethiopian text¹⁰ is known from three manuscripts: Ms. Paris, BnF Eth. 146 from the 17th century, Ms. London, BL, Or. 818 from the first half of the 18th century, and Ms. Pistoia, Biblioteca Forteguerriana, Ms. Martini etio. n. 5 (Zanutto n. 2) from the 18th-19th century. The first two contain 18 and 17 texts respectively, roughly the same ones, of which three are apocryphal (Transitus Mariae, Letter of Abgar, and Sibylla). The third one contains 7 texts, of which two are apocryphal (Apocalypse of Ezra, Transitus Mariae), three hagiographical, and one homiletic. The titles of our story are almost identical and mention only the Blessed Ones: “... Narrative on the Blessed Ones, Saints and Just Men Who Lived in the Days of the Prophet Jeremiah, Son of Hilkiah” (Ms. Paris Eth. 146).

The Ethiopian has introduced such modifications into the work that the literary problems are no longer of the same nature. Indeed, the reminder of events supposed to have occurred in under Jeremiah (*HRech*) is no longer found in chapters 8 to 10, but at the very beginning of the work as the first episode. Moreover, the Blessed Ones are no longer identified as the Rechabites. The passage on Jeremiah is followed by a second episode that narrates in which circumstances Alexander the Great had visited the Isle of the Blessed Ones. It is for imitating him that Zosimus asks God to be able to visit this island. The quest of Zosimus loses all originality: he becomes nothing but a pallid imitator of Alexander. It is observed

10 E. A. W. BUDGE, *The Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great, Being a Series of Ethiopic Texts Edited from Manuscripts in the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, with English Translation and Notes*, London, Clay and Sons, 2 vol., 1896, p. 555-584; S. ZANUTTO, *Bibliografia etiopica in continuazione alla ‘Bibliografia Etiopica’ di G. Fumagalli. Secondo contributo: mss etiopici*, Rome, 1932, p. 81-84; G. LUSINI, “I codici Etiopici del Fondo Martini nella Biblioteca Forteguerriana di Pistoia”, in *Aethiopica* 5 (2002), p. 156-176.

that in the two manuscripts, *HZos* is followed in each case by two other texts also devoted to Alexander. *HZos* (if one may still call it so) becomes a sort of introduction to the history of Alexandria.

Part II. The *Story of Zosimus* in the Caucasian Traditions,
by E. VAN ELVERDINGHE

1. The Armenian Tradition

a. Introduction: the versions

The Armenian text of *HZos* appears in variegated guises. At the most elementary level, a shorter and a longer redaction have been distinguished since research has begun on this text, in the first decades of the 20th century. At present, we know of twenty-nine Armenian manuscripts containing *HZos*, among which four have the shorter version.¹¹

The witnesses of the longer version that we have gathered reveal a rather complex tradition, resting upon at least five different states of text. Further details, however, are beyond the scope of the present article. Suffice it to mention that besides this longer version, itself protean, we also have three manuscripts holding a special place, either because the text transmitted in them is impossible to reconcile with any one recension, or because the text is lost or too incomplete to allow us to determine the recension to which it should pertain.

b. Zosimus' Journey to Athens

Let us immediately explain that no Armenian version includes *HRech*, or even mentions the name "Rechabites": in Armenian, the Blessed Ones are always merely called "blessed" (*eraneli*). However, the Armenian account presents a unique feature that deserves attention: *Zosimus' Journey to Athens*, a narrative unknown to other traditions and present in the longer Armenian version.

Before embarking on his expedition to the Blessed Ones, Zosimus makes a first stop in Athens. Standing in front of the city, on the bank of some unnamed river, he encounters a mercenary. A long interchange begins: the mercenary speaks in riddles to Zosimus, then, having acknowledged him as a wise man, he asks him a series of questions, betraying a near-obsession with natural elements, especially fire. Most of these questions relate to the book of Genesis or the organization of the world; Eve's creation is one of the topics discussed. Zosimus' sagacious answers elicit statements of emphatic admiration on the mercenary's part. This first dialogue is reminiscent of numerous parabiblical texts, notably the Queen of

11 A detailed presentation of these Armenian manuscripts is found in VAN ELVERDINGHE – OUZOUNIAN, "La tradition arménienne", in HAELEWYCK (dir), *Les versions orientales*, p. 99-131.

Sheba's Questions to Solomon,¹² transmitted in Syriac and in Armenian, but also the Shepherd of Hermas, the Vision of Gregory the Illuminator,¹³ or the Apocalypse of Ezra.¹⁴

Zosimus is now crossing the river and entering Athens. His arrival causes overall elation in the city and he is welcomed with great pomp. The wisest doctors from all over the Empire are crowding around him, and even the highest among the wisest, who goes by the name of "the remote Papiaws, from the great Rome, who is patriarch of the Armenian faith, of the Twelve Nations",¹⁵ has made the journey. And then begins with these illustrious individuals a new session of questions and answers. The first question concerns the Book of Job, of which Zosimus proceeds to propose an interpretation, but the discussion soon focuses on the narrative of the Fall. Zosimus again arouses the awe of his whole audience. He is then asked by Papiaws where actually he is from and where he intends to go. Once Zosimus has uttered his personal particulars and explained his plans, one of the doctors warns him that the journey to the abode of the Blessed will be long and perilous, and details the itinerary he shall have to follow. Eventually they all escort him to the river and bid him farewell. Alone again, Zosimus can now begin his journey.

This episode, exclusively found in Armenian, is, it must be said, rather hermetical, and there is a substantial possibility that certain especially obscure passages may be corrupt. It seems to be an appendix, developed from the character of Zosimus, that was aggregated to his narrative, but also circulated independently, as witnessed by three of our manuscripts.

c. Titles

After these preliminary clarifications, we may now get to the heart of our subject, beginning with an examination of the different titles by which *HZos* is known in codices. Out of 29 manuscripts, 27 give *HZos* a title, and every title mentions first Zosimus, and then the Blessed Ones – except naturally those having only *Zosimus' Journey to Athens*. In this case, the title is always the same: *Patmut'wn Yovsimosi vardapeti(n): gnal yAt'ens i mayr imastut'ean ew handipumn*

12 CAVT 157. Cf. J.-Cl. HAELEWYCK, "La reine de Saba et les apocryphes salomoniens (*Testament de Salomon* et *Questions de la reine de Saba*", in *Graphè 11: La reine de Saba* (2002), p. 83-99 (91-97). The Armenian text is in need of a definitive edition, cf. M. STONE, "The Armenian Apocryphal Literature of the Old Testament in the Twentieth Century", in V. CALZOLARI (ed.) with the collaboration of M.E. STONE, *Armenian Philology in the Modern Era. From Manuscript to Digital Text* (HdO VIII, 23/1), Leyden – Boston, 2014, p. 247-263 (255).

13 BHO 328 (this vision is part of Agathangelos' *History of the Armenians*).

14 CAVT 180.

15 *Heřaworn Papiaws i mecin Hřomay, or ē hayrapet Hayoc' hawatoc', erkutasan azgac'* (B. SARGISEAN (ed.), *Vkayabanut'wn Srboyn Yovsimiosi, yorřam xorhec'aw ert'al yerkirneraneleac'*, Venice, 1919, p. 21₂; see also A. ZANOLLI, "Una più ampia redazione armena della leggenda di Zosimo", in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 26 [1926], p. 36-54 [43]).

varjkani(n) “Story of Zosimus the doctor: [his] coming to Athens, mother of wisdom, and [his] encounter with the mercenary”.

In most manuscripts, the story is labelled as *patmut'awn* “story”, but three among them rather use the word *vkayabanut'awn* “martyrology”. Only one manuscript, cod. Angora, Red Monastery 251 (missing since 1915), does attest another appellation, *patčark'*, meaning “motives”.

It is also worthwhile to look into the qualifications bestowed upon Zosimus in those titles. One of the most frequent is *eraneli* “blessed”. *Surb* “saint” is found in all three manuscripts using the word *vkayabanut'awn* “martyrology” in the title. In the three manuscripts that only transmit *Zosimus' Journey to Athens*, as well as in one isolated manuscript, Zosimus is called *vardapet* “doctor”. Another category of qualifiers stresses Zosimus' asceticism, and a numerically important group of manuscripts names him *surb ew arak'inasēr krawnawor ew čgnazgeac' mi(ayn)akeac'* “holy and virtuous monk and ascetic anchorite” (six manuscripts). The proximity prize goes to cod. Yerevan, Mat. 723, a late manuscript qualifying Zosimus as *surb ew arak'inasēr krōnawor ew čgnazgeac' miakeac' ew imastasēr tiezeralur vardapet* “holy and virtuous monk and ascetic anchorite and wisdom-loving doctor famous in the whole universe”!

d. Manuscript contents

Most of our manuscripts are miscellanea (called *žolovacoy* or *žolovacu* in catalogues): even though it is sometimes possible to discern a common theme between the different pieces they contain, those collections most often look like disorganized oddments. However, *HZos* is also transmitted in cod. Venice, S. Lazzaro 985, a homiliary written ca. 1300 AD (and thus the oldest Armenian manuscript of *HZos*, with cod. Jerusalem 2481 dated 1306 AD), as well as in a collection of sermons (*k'arozgirk'*) and in two anthologies (*oskep'orik*). From here on, two manuscripts, being composite assemblages, must be excluded from our investigations.

Among the twenty-six manuscripts whose contents we have been able to analyze, twenty contain one or more apocryphal texts. This makes up a quite significant 77%. On the other hand, should we take as counting basis, instead of the number of codices, the number of texts they enclose, the proportion would be far lesser, falling to only 3% for thirty-four apocrypha out of about a thousand texts in total. These apocrypha are generally lost amidst a multitude of other pieces.

Paradoxically, one of the most prolific manuscripts with regard to apocrypha is our homiliary, cod. Venice, S. Lazzaro 985, containing four apocrypha on a total of eighty-seven texts: the *Sunday Letter*,¹⁶ the *Story of Joseph of Arimathea* (which is in fact a passage of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*),¹⁷ the *Apocalypse of*

¹⁶ *CANT* 311.

¹⁷ This version, edited by E. TAYEC'Ġ, *Ankanon girk' nor ktakaranac'* (T'angaran haykakan hin ew nor dprut'eanc', 2), Venice, 1898, p. 346-355 (right column), is omitted in *CANT*; like other

*Paul*¹⁸ and the *Protevangeliūm of James*.¹⁹ The remaining pieces are mostly homilies and martyrdom narratives.

Two other witnesses deserve special attention: codd. Jerusalem 1529 and London, Or. 13941. Both follow a similar structure and one in particular, Jerusalem 1529, gives pride of place to apocrypha. Six texts make up the core of both these manuscripts: Aṛak'el Siwnec'i's *Adam Book*,²⁰ Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i's *Rhymed History* (also known as *Commentary on Genesis*),²¹ a poem about Genesis by Karapet vardapet Bališec'i, a summary of the *Geography* ascribed to Vardan Arewelc'i, *Zosimus' Journey to Athens* and the *Death of Adam*.²² In the Jerusalem manuscript, this last piece is followed by two other apocryphal texts about Adam, namely the *Fragment I*²³ and the *Story of Adam and His Grandsons*,²⁴ whilst the London codex continues with little poems more loosely related to the preceding texts. These manuscripts are clearly governed by a determined programme: they are collections devoted to Adam, in the lineage of the famous "Adam cycle".²⁵ Evidently, *Zosimus' Journey to Athens* was included in them on account of its exegetical value about Genesis and especially about the narrative of the Fall.

Another approach of the question is to identify the pieces that are most frequently found alongside *HZos* in the manuscripts. Only those appearing in a minimum of five manuscripts out of twenty-six will be considered here. From this perspective, the *Quaestiones et responsiones* genre occupies a prominent place. The *Questions of Athanasius of Alexandria and Answers of Cyril of Jerusalem*²⁶ – a collection covering part of the *Quaestiones ad Antiochum ducem* ascribed to Athanasius in Greek²⁷ – do indeed appear in no less than seven manuscripts, i. e.

Armenian redactions, it stems from the A recension of Greek (CANT 62.1), but this text contains only ch. 12-15, of which it is moreover missing the beginning and the end.

18 CANT 325; BHO 900; S. J. VOICU, "Gli Apocriphi armeni", in *Augustinianum* 23 (1983): *Gli Apocriphi cristiani e cristianizzati*, p. 161-180 (178 ([No. 49]) [hereafter VOICU, "Gli Apocriphi armeni"]).

19 CANT 50 (uersio armeniaca a); BHO 613; VOICU, "Gli Apocriphi armeni", p. 176 (No. 37^b).

20 Edited by M. POTUREAN (ed.), *Aṛak'el Siwnec'i. Adamgirk'* (T'angaran hin ew nor dprut'eanc', 4), Venice, 1907.

21 Edited by N. POLAREAN (ed.), *Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i. Taḡagirk'*, Jerusalem, 1985, p. 75-110 and translated by J. R. RUSSELL, *Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i and the Mediaeval Armenian Lyric Tradition* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies, 7), Atlanta, 1987, p. 176-187.

22 CAVT 20; VOICU, "Gli Apocriphi armeni", p. 169-170 (No. 1b).

23 CAVT 21; M. E. STONE, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Society of Biblical Literature. Early Judaism and Its Literature, 3), Atlanta GA, 1992, p. 105-106.

24 CAVT 28; STONE, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, p. 108.

25 Cf. A.-M. DENIS, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, 1), Leyden, 1970 [hereafter DENIS, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs*], p. 3-14; VOICU, "Gli Apocriphi armeni", p. 169-170 (No. 1).

26 Edited by E. TAYEC'I (ed.), *S. At'anasi Alek'sandrioy hayrapeti čark', t'uft'k' ew ənddimasc'ut'iwink'* (Matenagrut'iwink' naxneac'), Venice, 1899, p. 347-477.

27 CPG 2257, cf. G. BARDY, "La littérature patristique des « quaestiones et responsiones » sur l'écriture sainte", in *Revue Biblique* 42 (1933), p. 328-332.

in more than a quarter of them. They are followed by Vardan Arewelc'i's *Geography* (abridged or in full, in six manuscripts), the *Questions of Gregory the Illuminator and Answers of Archangel Michael* (also in six manuscripts),²⁸ the *Wisdom of Ahiqar*,²⁹ and the already mentioned *Sunday Letter* (both in five manuscripts). However, with but few exceptions, no significant overlap is noted between our Armenian manuscripts regarding their contents.

The two last mentioned texts, the *Wisdom of Ahiqar* and the *Sunday Letter*, do constitute apocrypha, yet quite marginal ones. The *Wisdom of Ahiqar*, although traditionally considered an "Old Testament pseudepigraph" albeit not composed in a Jewish environment but depending on ancient Mesopotamian traditions, is intrinsically far more closely connected to sapiential literature than to biblical literature.³⁰ A late and blatant apocryphon, the *Sunday Letter* mixes several genres, and fits as much the apocryphal category as it fits the apocalyptic, prophetic, epistolary, homiletic, and law code genres.³¹ Both are extremely widespread in Armenian.³² They tend to appear alongside *HZos* by virtue of their popularity and their belonging to folk literature; in addition, the *Wisdom of Ahiqar* is thematically close to the longer Armenian version of *HZos*, in which Zosimus is portrayed as an archetypal sage during his stay in Athens.

e. Conclusions

This brings us to a first conclusion: in Armenian, the testimony of the manuscripts does not allow the consideration of *HZos* as an apocryphal text. More exactly, with the exception of *Zosimus' Journey to Athens*, associated to apocrypha in the context of a group of texts concerning the Creation, no consciousness of the apocryphal (or not) nature of this narrative has to be deducted from its joint presence with one apocryphon or another amid the mass of texts in each codex. Internal criteria corroborate this observation: the Armenian does not identify the Blessed Ones as the Rechabites and does not even link them in any way with the biblical story of Jeremiah.

28 Cf. B. SARGISEAN, *Mayr c'uc'ak hayerēn jeṛagrac' matenadaranin Mxit'areanc'i Venetik*, t. 2 [Venice], 1924, p. 118 (text No. 17).

29 CAVT 195; VOICU, "Gli Apocrifi armeni", p. 170 (No. 2).

30 Cf., amongst many others, DENIS, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs*, p. 201-214 and Fr. BRIQUEL-CHATONNET, "L'histoire et la sagesse d'Ahiqar: fortune littéraire de la vie d'un dignitaire araméen à la cour assyrienne", in J.-L. BACQUÉ-GRAMMONT – A. PINO – S. KHOURY (eds.), *D'un Orient l'autre. Actes des troisièmes journées de l'Orient, Bordeaux, 2-4 octobre 2002*, Paris – Louvain, 2005 (Cahiers de la société asiatique, N. S. 4), p. 17-40.

31 M. VAN ESBROECK, "La Lettre sur le dimanche, descendue du ciel", in *Analecta Bollandiana* 107 (1989), p. 267-284 (267).

32 According to their summary descriptions in Ö. EGANYAN *et al.*, *C'uc'ak jeṛagrac' Maštoc'i anvan Matenadaran*, I-II, Yerevan, 1965-1970 and A. MALXASYAN – A. TER-STEP'ANYAN (ed.), *C'uc'ak jeṛagrac' Maštoc'i anvan Matenadaran*, III, Yerevan, 2007, among the 11077 manuscripts kept at the Matenadaran (a sample amounting to roughly one third of all extant Armenian codices), 79 contain the *Wisdom of Ahiqar* and 62 contain the *Sunday Letter*.

On the contrary, an examination of the titles given to *HZos* tips the scales in favour of hagiography, since they, in their majority, somehow or other portray Zosimus as a saintly man. Yet, had we to categorize *HZos* in the Armenian tradition, we would be more inclined to define it as a popular legend in the guise of hagiography. The term “story” (*patmut’iwn*) largely prevailing in titles, as well as the text being transmitted in miscellanies rather than in synaxaria or in collections of *vitae* – as it is in Georgian, for instance – puts this story at a distance from traditional hagiography. On the other hand, the co-presence of *HZos* with different series of *quaestiones et responsiones* in most manuscripts shows the affinity of *HZos*, with its dialogued passages (above all in *Zosimus’ Journey to Athens*), to this kind of religious literature. Furthermore, as we have already seen, a strong sapiential flavour characterizes this legend, particularly its longer version. The same can be said of the manuscripts: many of them abound in apophthegmata, sayings and counsels of wise men, riddles, edifying tales and excerpts, fables and similar texts. Codd. Yerevan, Mat. 3461, 6866 and 8076 are good examples of this tendency.

On the whole, this ambiguous position helps explain the wide variety of texts transmitted along with *HZos*. One manuscript gathers essentially tales and sapiential literature: therefore the copyist or his sponsor must have been motivated to include *HZos* on account of its element of fantasy (cod. Balat 30).³³ In another codex, the longer version of *HZos* provides a nice transition between the canonical Revelation and a succession of counsels and wise sayings (Berlin, Or. quart. 805). Yet another only reproduces the very beginning of *HZos* and inserts it among apophthegmata, anecdotes and lives of diverse Fathers (cod. Antelias 129). The homiliary (cod. Venice, S. Lazzaro 985) in fact mixes homilies (predominant in the first part) and lives of saints and martyrdom accounts (prevalent in the second half): the longer version of *HZos*, entitled “martyrology” and appearing towards the beginning of the codex, is apposite to this configuration.

One has nonetheless to admit that, in quite a few cases, the rationale behind the decision to include *HZos* in a particular manuscript escapes the modern reader. For example, one collection contains exclusively astrology or calendar-related texts (cod. Venice, Kurd. 88), and it remains to be explained why *HZos* shows up at the end of the manuscript. Did the copyist judge that this story could reveal itself as useful or interesting in the framework of such a compilation? Did he add it because it was present in one of his models? Or did he confuse *HZos* with the *Vi-*

33 Most other texts in this manuscript belong to a cycle revolving around the *History of the City of Brass*, a tale from *The Thousand and One Nights*. This cycle awaits a detailed study, but see already J. R. RUSSELL, “The Cross and the Lotus: The Armenian Miscellany *Patmut’iwn phnjē k’alak’i* (‘History of the City of Brass’) On the Periphery of the Iranian *Oikoumene*”, in V. S. CURTIS – S. STEWART (ed.), *The Rise of Islam* (The Idea of Iran, 4), London, 2009, p. 71-83 (77-81, and 82-83 about manuscripts similar to ours in the British Library).

sions of Zosimus by Zosimus of Panopolis, an alchemical treatise possibly alluded to in Nicephorus Homologetes' fourth canon, among other astrological texts?³⁴

Anyway – and this applies to every manuscript known to us – it is evident that the notion of apocryphal narrative took no part in the process of copying *HZos* and is irrelevant to understand its reception in Armenian. This should serve as a reminder that our modern, neat classifications and attempts at classifications often reflect neither the testimony of manuscripts, nor the understanding of their makers and users.

2. The Georgian Tradition

a. Introduction: the versions

The Georgian tradition knows *HZos* in three recensions, for which seven manuscripts are available.³⁵ The first version is attested by a single manuscript, Sinai geo. 6, dated 982/3 –the oldest witness of *HZos* in any language. The other two versions are transmitted by three manuscripts each. In Georgian, the Rechabites are known as the Gymnosophists, literally “Naked-Righteous” (*šišuel-martalni*).

b. Titles

It is interesting to note that those Naked-Righteous are the only persons mentioned in the title of the first Georgian version. In the other two versions, all titles cite both the Naked-Righteous and Zosimus, but the Naked-Righteous come first, Zosimus being named next. The titles in version III place Zosimus and the Naked-Righteous on an equal footing, but in version II, Zosimus, relegated in a subordinate clause, holds a secondary position (“the Naked-Righteous, to whom Zosimus set off”).

In each version, the title transposes a formulation usually found in Greek hagiography: behind the Georgian words *cxorebaj da gangebaj* (version I), *cxovreba(j) da mokalakeba(j) da sakmeni* (version II) are the Greek expressions βίος καὶ πολιτεία, βίος καὶ πολιτεία καὶ ἔργα / πράξεις, and similarly in version III, where the title varies according to each manuscript. Only in this version do titles impart the qualifiers “holy father” (*c'mida mama*), “blessed” (*net'ari*) or “anchorite” (*ganšorebuli*) to Zosimus.

c. Manuscript contents

All seven Georgian manuscripts are hagiographical collections, containing an overwhelming majority of *vitae*, *passiones* and the like.³⁶ Two among them include

34 See DENIS, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs*, p. 95 and HAELEWYCK, *Les versions orientales*, p. 30-31; some modern scholars have also mistakenly taken the text mentioned by Nicephorus for *HZos*. To our knowledge, there exists no Armenian translation of Zosimus of Panopolis' work.

35 For a detailed presentation, see T. PATARIDZE, “La tradition géorgienne”, in HAELEWYCK, *Les versions orientales*, p. 133-169. I am grateful to Dr. Pataridze for her advice during the writing of this part of the paper.

36 The contents of each manuscript are precisely detailed by PATARIDZE, “La tradition géorgienne”, p. 133-156 (see also the table, p. 166-169).

metaphrastic redactions (Tbilisi A-161 and S-300). Without delving into details about every single manuscript, we can say that the number of texts in each witness varies between 12 and 56, and the proportion of apocrypha between 0 and 33%. In total, out of the 176 texts contained in these manuscripts, 18 are apocryphal, which amounts to some 10%. The two most recent manuscripts, codd. Tbilisi A-1050 and A-395, both from the 19th century, are also those transmitting the largest ratio of apocrypha.

These are exclusively New Testament apocrypha, all of them life and martyrdom narratives in scope. The *Acts of John* ascribed to Prochorus,³⁷ found in four manuscripts out of seven, occur most frequently. The number of apocrypha appearing in two manuscripts amounts to four: codd. Tbilisi H-972 and S-300 both contain the *Passion of Paul*,³⁸ the *Passion of James*,³⁹ the *Miracles of Thomas*,⁴⁰ while a piece about the apostle Andrew is transmitted in both codd. Tbilisi A-161 and A-395.⁴¹ Finally, seven apocryphal texts turn up in only one manuscript.

To summarize, noteworthy commonalities bind together the contents of several of our manuscripts. However, this proximity is not limited to apocrypha: rather, it concerns whole collections of *vitae* and similar texts, which may include apocryphal pieces. This phenomenon is most evident in codd. Tbilisi H-972 and S-300, which have 69% of their texts in common.⁴²

d. The Gymnosophist theme

In Georgian, several other works, besides *HZos*, exploit the theme of the Gymnosophists or Blessed Ones.⁴³ In addition to the *Alexander Romance*, we have:

- the tenth chapter of the *Passion of Pansophius of Alexandria*;⁴⁴

37 *CANT* 218; K'. K'EK'ELI3E, "Kartuli natargmni agiografia", in ID., *Et'iudebi zveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oriidan*, t. 5, Tbilisi, 1957, p. 115-211 [hereafter K'EK'ELI3E, "Kartuli natargmni agiografia"] (p. 129, No. 119). In codd. Tbil. A-395, A-1050, H-972 and S-300.

38 *CANT* 211.v; K'EK'ELI3E, "Kartuli natargmni agiografia", p. 134 (No. 184).

39 *CANT* 278; K'EK'ELI3E, "Kartuli natargmni agiografia", p. 127-128 (No. 104).

40 K'EK'ELI3E, "Kartuli natargmni agiografia", p. 127 (No. 101). Not mentioned under *CANT* 245. As stated by K'. K'EK'ELI3E, *Zveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oria*, 4th ed., Tbilisi, 1960 (repr. 1980) [hereafter K'EK'ELI3E, *Zveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oria*], I, p. 448, this is not the same text as the *Martyrdom of Thomas* translated from Armenian (about which see G. GARITTE, "Le Martyre géorgien de l'apôtre Thomas", in *Le Muséon* 83 [1970], p. 497-532). Judging by its incipit and length, it does not seem to match any other version of the *Acts of Thomas* either.

41 K'EK'ELI3E, "Kartuli natargmni agiografia", p. 118 (No. 16); again absent from *CANT*. See K'EK'ELI3E, *Zveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oria*, I, p. 448.

42 See the table in PATARIDZE, "La tradition géorgienne", p. 166-169.

43 See most recently PATARIDZE, "La tradition géorgienne", p. 162-166, and G. SHURGAIA, "I gimnosofisti nella tradizione letteraria georgiana antica: status quaestionis", in A. PIOLETTI – F. RIZZO NERVO (ed.), *Medioevo Romano e Orientale. Il viaggio dei testi. Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale (Venezia, 10-13 ottobre 1996)*, Rubbettino, 1999, p. 135-154 [hereafter SHURGAIA, "I gimnosofisti nella tradizione georgiana"].

44 K'EK'ELI3E, "Kartuli natargmni agiografia", p. 135 (No. 185). Edited by K'. K'EK'ELI3E, *Kimeni*, t. 1: *ianvris, tebervlis, mart'is, ap'rilis da maisis tveta t'ekst'ebi* (Kartuli hagiografiuli zeglebi, 1), Tbilisi, 1918 [hereafter K'EK'ELI3E, *Kimeni*], p. 48-59; translated by P. PEETERS, "La Passion de S. Pansophios d'Alexandrie", in *Analecta Bollandiana* 47 (1929), p. 307-337.

- the *Life of Saint Nisime*;⁴⁵
- a text falsely attributed to Basil of Caesarea;⁴⁶
- an extract of the *Liber Generationis Hominum* that somehow crept into a translation of Maximus the Confessor's Questions to Thalassius.⁴⁷

Two of these texts are of a hagiographical nature; the *Life of Saint Nisime* is found in three of our manuscripts, once immediately following *HZos*. Nonetheless, with regard to their contents, those texts seem only fairly loosely linked; the *Life of Saint Nisime* does not even speak of the nudity of the Blessed Ones, who are rather called "Grazers" (*mzovarni*). Moreover, only the *Life of Saint Nisime* – being a *vita* – appears alongside *HZos* in our codices. There is consequently no "Gymnosophists cycle" evidenced by the manuscript tradition.

e. Conclusions

Both the titles and the contents of the manuscripts clearly rank *HZos* in the Georgian tradition among hagiographical texts. In reality, the manuscripts we have examined do not appear to make any distinction between hagiographical and apocryphal narratives. All are collections of exemplary Christian lives, and the protagonist's status – biblical or not – just as the narrative's status – apocryphal or not – has not the slightest relevance in the compiler's mind.

What is more interesting is to remark that the Gymnosophists are perceived as the central characters of *HZos*, since its Georgian titles invariably refer to the "Life of the Blessed Gymnosophists (or Naked-Righteous)", Zosimus being only secondarily cited, or not mentioned at all.

One could, following the path of the Georgian scholar K'orneli K'ek'elize⁴⁸, methodically compare *HZos* with the other texts bearing upon the Gymnosophists, on the basis of the references to the Old Testament in each of them. However, not only do these reminiscences in all cases compete with the classical and the Christian element, but they are also always included in a larger, indubitably Christian, context.

45 K'EK'ELIZE, "Kartuli natargmni agiografia", p. 134 (No. 177), cf. *BHO* 814-816. Edited by ID., *Kimeni* I, p. 202-214; translated in ID., « Ėpizod iz načal'noj istorii egipteskogo monašestva », in ID., *Et'iudebi žveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oriidan*, t. 7, Tbilisi, 1961, p. 76-101 (p. 93-101).

46 Edited by E. TAQ'AİŠVILI, (ed.), *Kartlis cxovreba. mariam dedoplis variant'i* (K. š. c'era-k'itxvis gamavrc. sazogadoebis gamocema, 79), Tbilisi, 1906, p. 846-849 and K'. K'EK'ELIZE, « Gimnosopist'ebi žvel-kartul lit'erat'uraši », in ID., *Et'iudebi žveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oriidan*, t. 2, Tbilisi, 1945, p. 108-129 [hereafter K'EK'ELIZE, "Gimnosopist'ebi"], p. 127-129; translated by Z. AVALICHVILI, "Géographie et légende dans un écrit apocryphe de Saint Basile", in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 3rd S. 6 [26] (1927-1928), p. 279-304 (280-283).

47 *CPG* 768, cf. BARDY, "La littérature patristique des «quaestiones et responsiones», p. 332-337 and K'EK'ELIZE, "Gimnosopist'ebi", p. 112.

48 K'EK'ELIZE, "Gimnosopist'ebi". See also K'EK'ELIZE, *Žveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oria*, I, p. 450-451, and recently SHURGAIA, "I gymnosofisti nella tradizione georgiana".

Part III. The *Story of Zosimus* in the Slavonic and Greek Traditions,
by V. SOMERS

Our study will bring us back West after travelling East to the Caucasus, to examine the context within which the Zosimus text circulates in the Greek and Slavonic traditions (it seems the text has not been translated into Latin).

1. The Slavonic Tradition⁴⁹

The *HZos* is found in two Slavonic manuscripts. The text is close to the Greek, and circulates in both manuscripts in an undoubtedly hagiographic environment.

The most recent of these two manuscripts (XVIIth cent.) is *Moscow, Synod* 797-808, Великие Четьи Минеи Миллүтина (collection of Ioannij Miliutin). The manuscript has been written in Russian cursive by many hands, and is dated 1646-1654⁵⁰; *HZos* is found in volume 806 (June), p. 1361-1380. It is a copy of the "Great Menaion Reader", consisting of a huge book of 27000 pages in-4°, compiled in the XVIth cent. under the supervision of Macarius, Archbishop of Novgorod and future Metropolitan of Moscow. The Great Menaion Reader is a collection of various texts (Bible commentaries, patristic opera, Lives of Saints) for liturgical as well as private use.⁵¹ Among the sources, one can identify Greek synaxaries, but numerous Lives of local Saints occupy an important part of it. The *Story of Zosimus* is to be found on June, 19th.

The earlier manuscript (Moscow, State Archives, F. 381, № 53) is known as the «Sylvester Collection» and is dated back to the XIVth cent. It is constituted of membra disjecta from three different manuscripts. The part with the Vita Zosimi also contains five hagiographic pieces (Miracle of Simon, Gouri and Aviv; Narratives on Boris, and on Gleb; Cyprian's Penitence; the Narrative on Cyprian and Justine) and two apocryphal pieces (the Letter to Tiberius by Pontius Pilatus, and the Apocalypse of Abraham).

Most of these pieces are accompanied by the indication of a date for reading. In this particular book, the Vita Zosimi is indicated to be read on November, 19th. This element is important to note as, in addition to the title (Vita Zosimi) where

49 The information on the Slavonic tradition of Zosimus has been collected by Marcel Pirard (collaborateur scientifique UCL/CIOU/Zosime project: <http://www.uclouvain.be/429132.html>). More details will soon be available in M. PIRARD, "La tradition slave", in HAELEWYCK (dir.), *Les versions orientales*, p. 171-173.

50 Cf. T. N. PROTAS'EVA, *Description des manuscrits de la Collection synodale, non inclus dans la description de A. V. Gorkij et de K. I. Nevostruev*. Moscow, 1970, p. 219-208 (in Russian); Savva (TICHOMIROV), *Inventaire de la sacristie et de la bibliothèque du Patriarcat de Moscou (aujourd'hui synodale)*, Moscow, 1858, p. 211 (in Russian).

51 Cf. U. ZANETTI, "Les 'grands ménées' de Macaire de Moscou. Inventaire et sources grecques (1-11 mars)", in *Analecta Bollandiana* 116 (1998), p. 331-353; E. WEIHER – S. O. ŠMIDT – A. I. SKURKO (ed.), *Die grossen Lesemenäen des Metropoliten Makarij. Uspenskij Spisok. 1-11 März* (Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris. Fontis et Dissertationes, 39), Freiburg, 1997.

Zosimus alone is mentioned, it shows the hagiographic character of Zosimus: as Father H. Delehayé used to say, a Saint corresponds to a name, a date, a place.

2. The Greek Tradition

a. Introductory remarks

Though it has been up to now only partially studied, the Greek *HZos* has already been edited three times (by James⁵², Vassiliev⁵³, and Charlesworth⁵⁴). Each edition is only based on a few manuscripts. However, according to the catalogues, there are about 45 manuscripts which transmit the text of *HZos*. A checklist of these manuscripts is given in *Appendix I* at the end of the present paper; I shall refer to these manuscripts by the number in this list. The earliest can be dated back to the XIIth cent., and the most recent ones to the XIXth cent.

It should be emphasized that most of the consulted catalogues do not give very precise information: they rarely copy the *incipit* of the texts, and often indicate as title “Vita [beati] Zosimi”, even though the title in the manuscript is different.⁵⁵ I had the opportunity to read the title in reproductions of most of the manuscripts in person, but the description of the content of the codices entirely depends on the catalogues. The current descriptions often do not include the elements required for our study: considering the numbering given by the *Bibliographia Hagiographica Graeca*, there should exist different types of text⁵⁶, but so far I do not have enough elements to determine to what extent short, long, abridged, extended, summarized, etc. recensions exist in Greek. The situation will be clarified in a further step of the research.

b. The context

We may analyse the content of 46 manuscripts, in order to determine what kind of texts circulate with *HZos*. Most of the time, those codices are hagiographic-homiletic collections. When it is not the case, they are miscellanies, in which the hagiographic and homiletic components are equally found.

Among the 46 manuscripts, as far as the available descriptions are accurate enough, 18 are entirely lacking any apocryphal texts (No. 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14 [no description], 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 32, 35, 37). In the other ones, the proportion of apocrypha is variable, and oscillates from 5 to 20 %. These texts are too numerous to be enumerated here, not to mention some that I am hesitant to identify. Such are, for instance, pieces in No. 5 (in relation to Adam, Eve, and the

52 M. R. JAMES, *Apocrypha Anecdota: A Collection of Thirteen Apocryphal Books and Fragments Now First Edited from Manuscripts* (Texts and Studies, vol. 2.3), Cambridge, 1893, p. 86-108.

53 A. VASSILIEV, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, Moscow, 1893, p. 166-179 (Introd. p. XXXVIII-XL).

54 J. H. CHARLESWORTH, *The History of the Rechabites, I: the Greek Recension* (SBL Texts and Translations, 17; Pseudepigrapha Series, 10), Chico CA, 1982.

55 Not to mention the title “Alloquia”, normally introducing the sayings of another Zosimus. See below, Checklist.

56 *BHG* 1889-1890f.

flight from Paradise; in relation to the Virgin Mary); in No. 7 (Διήγησις περὶ τῶν παθῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ); in No. 12 (related to the Virgin Mary); in No. 15 (related to the Virgin Mary); in No. 16 (Περὶ τῆς ἀνακομιδῆς τῆς τιμίας ἐσθῆτος τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου); in No. 27 (Ἐπιστολὴ Τιβερίῳ καίσαρα... πρὸς Λικίνιον...; Λόγος... εἰς τὸ σωτήριον πάθος).

It is however remarkable that only eight of the apocrypha circulating in the *HZos* mss are apocrypha of the Old Testament⁵⁷:

- *Apocalypsis Moysis, Vita Adami et Evae* (No. 43);
- *Testamentum Abrahæ* (No. 5, 24, 28, 36);
- *Ieremias, Narratio de capta Ierusalem* (No. 1, 29, 40);
- Ὅρασις Δανιὴλ περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ κόσμου (No. 4); another Vision of Daniel is found in No. 44, and a piece corresponding to the *Apocalypse of Daniel* by the Pseudo-Methodius is in No. 2, 4, 19, 36;
- *Paralipomena Ieremias* (No. 8, 28, 42);
- *Apocalypsis Baruch graeca* (No. 1, 29) is considered either among the apocrypha of the Old Testament or of the New Testament.

The other pieces are apocrypha of the New Testament. Most of them appear only in one or two manuscripts, but some texts are more frequently transmitted with *HZos*:

- *Protevangelium Iacobi* (complete or partial) (No. 19, 28, 29, 33, 42, 46);
- *Evangelium Nicodemi (Gesta Pilati)* (No. 1, 4, 27);
- *Acta Andreae et Matthiae in urbe anthropophagorum* (No. 33, 34, 45);
- *Epistula e caelo missa de servanda dominica* (No. 5, 7, 12, 16 vid., 29);
- *Apocalypsis Mariae* (No. 1, 4, 5, 13, 19, 27, 28, 29).

Whatever the frequency of the apocrypha in the *HZos* manuscripts, they mainly develop these thematics, such as the pieces related to Christ's childhood:

- *Evangelium de infantia Salvatoris* (a. Thoma) (No. 25, 46);
- *Miracula Infantis* (a. Iacobo) (No. 2, 29);
- De sacerdotio Christi (No. 4, 44);

or, in relation to Pilatus and the so-called Evangelium Nicodemi:

- *Anaphora et paradosis Pilati* (No. 43);
- *Anaphora Pilati cum Tiberii rescripto* (No. 27, 38);
- Evangelium Nicodemi, recensio B (No. 45);

and about the Θεοτόκος:

- *Vita Virginis* (No. 44);
- *De Dormitione Beatae Mariae Virginis* (a. Ioh.) (No. 43, 46);
- Διήγησις περὶ τῆς Θεοτόκου (No. 46);

or about the Apostles :

- *Acta Pauli et Theclae* (No. 42);

57 The apocrypha circulating in the *HZos* mss., with the identification numbers in *CANT*, *CAVT* and *BHG*, are listed in *Appendix II* below.

- *Acta Iohannis* (a. Prochoro) (No. 46);
- *Transitus Iohannis* (No. 1, 29);
- *Acta Andreae* (No. 42);
- *Acta Thomae* (No. 28, 33);
- *Acta Thomae*, abbrev. (No. 1, 29);
- *Martyrium Philippi* (No. 42);
- *Apocalypsis Iohannis apocrypha* (No. 24, 43);
- *Apocalypsis Iohannis apocrypha altera* (No. 44).

This being so, these apocrypha are lost within much more numerous Lives of Saints, Passions of Martyrs, liturgical homilies, and other narratives aiming at edification. In this respect, a miscellany (*Athens* 2127) may be set apart due to the presence of some historical texts, and of some texts showing a great diversification of interests, such as:

- Σύνθεσις ἐν ἐπιτόμῳ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Φιλοπόνου Ἀντιοχείως...
- Ἀνεπίγραφος σύντομος σημείωσις περὶ ἀλώσεως τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ὑπὸ τῶν Λατίνων...
- Ἐκ τοῦ Ἱστορικοῦ Νικηφόρου πατριάρχου
- Ἀνεπίγραφον κείμενον περὶ τῶν διαφορῶν μηνῶν τῆς κυήσεως καὶ τῆς κατόπιν ἐξελίξεως τοῦ νεογνοῦ
- Ἀπόσπασμα περὶ τοῦ σχήματος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
- Τὰ μοναστήρια τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὁρους
- Γραφὴ Δομνίκου πατριάρχου Βενετίας πρὸς τὸν πατριάρχην Ἀντιοχείας κύριν Πέτρον περὶ τῶν ἀζύμων (*sic*), followed by the latter's answer.

These observations cannot allow one to conclude that apocryphal texts are the most frequent companions to *HZos*. On the contrary. An analysis of the *HZos* titles might give us further information.

c. Titles

The titles of *HZos* in the manuscripts that we analyse here are not homogeneous, and can be distributed into two categories: the Βίος καὶ πολιτεία series, and the Διήγησις series.

Sixteen codices form the first series, whose titles begin with Βίος καὶ πολιτεία. In a first group, five manuscripts give a title with no mention of the name of Zosimus: they only mention the Holy Blessed Ones (No. 4, 25⁵⁸, 27, 42, 44). A sixth codex adds that the Blessed Ones are just men (No. 2).

Another testimony (No. 12) constitutes a link with the other group of the series, where the text is presented as the *Vita Zosimi*, and where the episode of the Blessed Ones is clearly part of that *Vita* (No. 7, 9, 17, 24, 34, 35, 38, 43). The link-

58 Ms. No. 25 could be considered in separation, since part of the title of the other group (with Ζώσιμος) is added in the margin.

ing testimony must be discarded from the second group because of a specific detail: Zosimus is called ἄββᾶς (Abbot) in it, though he is μακάριος in the others. The title in No. 36 may be set apart with No. 12, but is different: it is called Λόγος, the Blessed Ones are the subject of the discourse, and Zosimus is only the author.

In the second series, the titles are less homogeneous, but united around the notion of Narration: Διήγησις in twenty manuscripts (No. 3, 6, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 30, 32, 33, 37, 45), Ἐξήγησις in five others (No. 11, 13, 39, 40, 41), and even Διήγησις καὶ ἐξήγησις in two (No. 1, 29); λόγος is also found (No. 22). In all these cases, the same idea is evinced (except maybe when Ἐξήγησις is found alone): the passage from the category of “Vita” to that of “Narrative”. For the rest, we may distinguish small groups presenting common elements, but without clear and systematic connections. In order to make the analysis easier, the titles have been divided into different elements. In addition to the category marker (“Narrative”),

a) the main subject of the narrative changes, and is:

- the βίος of the Blessed Ones (No. 6, 37, 45);
- the πολιτεία of the Blessed Ones (but, unlike in the first series, we do not find βίος καὶ πολιτεία together) (No. 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 19, 22, 23, 28, 30);
- Zosimus’ expedition to visit them (No. 18, 21, 29, 39, 40, 41);
- in one of the manuscripts (No. 33), the Brahmins, Alexander and Philip make their appearance⁵⁹!

b) In most titles of this series, Zosimus is identified as the author of the narrative. Most of the time, his status relatively to the narrative has been marked by a simple genitive; but it happens that it is an agent: ὑπὸ τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου (No. 29).

c) Whatever his status in the title, Zosimus is only rarely simply mentioned; he may be qualified or designated in various ways:

- ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν (No. 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 19, 22, 23, 26, 28, 30);
- ἁγίου (No. 3);
- μακαρίου (No. 1, 11, 13, 20, 29, 39, 40, 41);
- ἄββᾶ (No. 21);
- ἁγίου μοναχοῦ (No. 18);
- μοναχοῦ (No. 33).

d) There are two Greek forms of the name Zosimus: Ζωσίμου / Ζωσιμᾶ (the latter is found in one testimony of the first series as well).

e) In some titles, the subject of the story is the πολιτεία τῶν μακάρων, and in other their βίος, as I mentioned above. When the Blessed Ones receive a qualification, they are said to be ἁγίων.

f) In three manuscripts, the narrative (διήγησις) is qualified as ψυχοφελής (No. 6, 18, 45), and even πάνν ὠφέλιμος in two of them (No. 6, 45). That kind of

59 It is interesting to mention, in one ms. (No. 9), a piece entitled Λόγων ὠφέλιμοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξω σοφῶν τῶν λεγομένων Βραχμάνων τῶν καὶ Γυμνοσοφιστῶν just following *HZos*.

formula is frequent in the titles of ascetic and edifying literature, such as narratives on holy fathers or abbots.

g) In the codices with the title ἐξήγησις, the Blessed Ones are presented as the object of Zosimus' narrative, but with a prepositional structure: τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου ἐξήγησις πρὸς τοὺς μακάρους (No. 11, 13, 39, 40, 41). In almost all of them, there is an addition: πῶς εἶδεν αὐτούς (No. 11, 39, 40, 41).

h) Specific formulations are found in a single manuscript:

- ... περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν μακάρων καὶ περὶ τῆς διαγωγῆς αὐτῶν (No. 21);
- ... μακάρων τῶν ἐν μακαρία τῇ γῇ φανερωθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ μακαρίου ... διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου (No. 29);
- ... καὶ πῶς ἐμβῆκε μέσα εἰς τὴν μακαρίαν γῆν (No. 18);
- and finally the most "exotic": Διήγησις Ζωσίμου μοναχοῦ, περὶ τῶν πατέρων ἥτοι τῶν βραμάνων οὓς εὗρεν Ἀλέξανδρος (+ καὶ Φίλιππος καὶ διελέχθη πρὸς αὐτούς *mg*) γυμνοὺς ὡς ὄφεις ὄντας· δεῖξαι οὖν βούλομαι, ἐκ ποίας φυλῆς ἀποσπασθέντες· κατώκησαν τὰς τῶν μακάρων νήσους (*sic*; No. 33). This is the most distinctive title we find in the Greek tradition.

The most surprising conclusion we may draw from these observations is that in none of the titles the Rechabites, sons of Jonadab, Jeremiah or any biblical allusion whatever is to be found (excepting, maybe, the ἐκ ποίας φυλῆς in the last cited title). And, if Zosimus is at times qualified as μακάριος, as we have seen, the Blessed Ones are always designated by a form lacking iota (μακάρων, μακάρους), except in 3 cases of the Βίος καὶ πολιτεία series (No. 17, 34, 36). The competition between both forms may possibly be responsible for the "pearl" we find in a XVIIIth c. manuscript: Διήγησις τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Μακαρίου (No. 20).

d. Liturgy

A specific aspect has been briefly touched on when presenting the Slavonic tradition: the liturgical situation of *HZos*. Father Delehaye's saying may be repeated here: "A Saint is a name, a date, a place". The date is important, since it allows the location of the Saint in the liturgical calendar. That is obviously why the hagiographico-homiletic collections often present their texts chronologically (following the feasts' chronology) - even though this is not systematic.

An important argument to decide whether *HZos* is a hagiographic text or an apocryphon could thus be the presence of a reading (or celebration) date in the title or in the margin. None of the catalogues give such an indication for *HZos*. However, we read in two manuscripts the date of January 19th (ἱαννουαρίῳ ιθ') in or next to the title: *Moscow, Synod. gr.* 431 (XIIth cent.) and *Patmos*, 448 (XVth cent.). The Slavonic tradition proposed two different dates: June 19th and Novem-

ber 19th. In order to find out which would then be Zosimus' day, we must investigate in the Byzantine *Typika*.

These books describe the liturgy for each feast, and give the texts and hymns to be read and sung respectively. In the Index of the liturgical *Typikon* of the Μεγάλη Ἐκκλησία (Xth cent.)⁶⁰, we find several different mentions to a Zosimus and Μακάριος, but no plural Μακάριοι nor Μακάρες. Those named Zosimus are distributed as follows:

- Ζώσιμος (m.), 28-IX, cf. Ἀλφειός
- Ζώσιμος, Ἀθανάσιος (mm.), 3-I (in some mss)
- Ζώσιμος, ep. Syracusarum, 21-I (in some mss)
- Ζώσιμος (m.), 19-VI (in some mss)

Therefore, there is a Zosimus commemorated on September 28th, another one on January 3rd, or on January 21st, and on June 19th, most of them being martyrs and the last one a bishop of Syracuse.

On the various dates collected, we find indeed often saints or martyrs called Zosimus, as is clear from the notices we reproduce below:

- September, 28th: “martyrs des Calytenoi : Alphée, Alexandre, Zosime, Niccon, Néon, Héliodore et Marc; Chariton le Conf.; Eustathe, martyr romain, et ses compagnons” (I, p. 50-51)
- (November, 19th: “Azès, martyr et thaumaturge; mm. Anthime, Thalélé, Christophore, Euphémie et leurs enfants; les ss. apôtres Pierre, Paul, Etienne et Jacques frère du Seigneur” [Fa and Ox having Abdias, Azès, Agapios]) (I, p. 108-109)
- January, 3rd: “Gordios ; Théogène ; prophète Malachie” [but Fa and Ox having also a Zosimus] (I, p. 172-173)
- January, 19th: “m. Théodote, év. de Cyrénie à Chypre; m. Euphrasie; mm. Lucillien, Paule et les enfants, Claude, Hypace, Paule, Denys; s. Macaire, anachorète du désert” [mss Fa and Ox mentioning “Macaire anachorète, Macaire d’Alexandrie, Euphrasie”] (I, p. 202-208)
- January, 21st: “m. Néophyte ; Zosime, év. de Syracuse; Irène, Agnès” [other mss having also “Macaire, Max. Conf., Eugène, Candide, Aquila...”] (I, p. 204-207)
- June, 19th: “archange Michel; apôtre Thaddée; m. Zosime” (I, p. 316-317).

But there is no trace of a Zosimus on November 19th or January 19th.

In the *Evergetis Typikon*⁶¹, there is no new date proposed for Zosimus, and when examining the dates given in the *Typikon* of the Great Church, we find

60 J. MATEOS (ed.), *Le typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croix n° 40, X^e siècle*. Introduction, texte critique et notes. Tome I. *Le cycle des douze mois* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 165), Rome, 1962; Tome II. *Le cycle des fêtes mobiles* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 166), Rome, 1963 (Index: II, p. 243).

61 A. DMITRIEVSKIJ (ed.), Συναξαριον... ἡτοι Τυπικὸν... τῆς Εὐεργετιδος..., in ID., *Opisanie Liturgitseskich Rukopisej*, I, Kiev, 1895 (anast. Hildesheim, 1965), p. 256-655.

Macarius the Egyptian on January 19th, and a martyr Zosimus on June 20th (p. 395 and 462 respectively).

Finally, in the *Typikon* of Messina⁶², we find confirmation for Macarius' feast on January 19th (p. 110), but no trace of a Zosimus.

In conclusion, for the dates we examined, the only Zosimus we could identify in the *Typika* are martyrs, except for a Sicilian bishop, but none of them could be identified with our Zosimus. We may suppose that his appearance in a hagiographic environment is due to his homonymy with the others.

On the same dates, I underlined also the presence of a Macarius, because as we have seen *HZos* is entitled in one manuscript (No. 20): Διήγησις τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Μακαρίου. Interestingly enough, in some codices *HZos* is surrounded by pieces related to a Macarius, according to the catalogues. The table given in *Appendix III* summarizes the concomitant presence of *HZos* and one (or more) text(s) related to a Macarius. This is not the place to enter the complex Macarius *dossier*, but a quick investigation in the *BHG* shows that there are more than one Macarius, and various texts related to each of them.⁶³ The indications given in the catalogues do not always allow one to determine which texts (and about which Macarius) circulate with *HZos*. Nevertheless, I could pick up eleven pieces related to Macarius the Roman⁶⁴, eight to Macarius the Egyptian, and seven to some other Macarius (without identifying characteristic, ἐρημίτης, πνευματικὸς παπᾶ, ἄββᾶ, τοῦ πολιτικοῦ, or *Alexandrinus*⁶⁵). Among those, Macarius the Egyptian is celebrated on January 19th,⁶⁶ so are Macarius from Alexandria and Macarius the Roman. At this stage, we may thus confirm the observation read in Dobschütz's description of the Dresden codex: "Die N. 12 [Makarios Romanos. 19 Jan. Vita] und 13 [Zosimos Vita] sind in der Überlieferung oft vereinigt" (*cf.* Checklist, No. 25).⁶⁷

There is no need to specify that in none of the *Typika* is the reading of *HZos* recommended at any moment, even though in a large part of the manuscripts the title ending shows a formula typically found for a public reading:

- εὐλόγησον Πάτερ (No. 12, 34, 39, 40, 44);

62 M. ARRANZ (ed.), *Le typicon du monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine. Codex Messinensis Gr. 115, A. D. 1131*. Introduction, texte critique et notes (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 185), Rome, 1969 (Index: p. 373 [μακαρίου!]).

63 *BHG*, II, p. 63-68 ; III, p. 45; *Auctarium*, p. 116-120; *Novum Auctarium*, p. 128-132.

64 Mainly *BHG* 1005m when identified.

65 Mainly *BHG* 999y when identified.

66 Or 20th.

67 We noticed above that there might have happened some confusion because of the name Μακάριος / Μακάρεϋς or Μακάριοι; but the substance of the content of these narratives might also play a role. See also on this subject the interesting paper by Chr. ANGELIDI, "La vie de Macaire le Romain : écrire pour le plaisir ?", in P. ODORICO (ed.), *La face cachée de la littérature byzantine. Le texte en tant que message immédiat*. Actes du colloque international, Paris, 5-6-7 juin 2008 (Dossiers byzantins, 11), Paris, 2012, p. 167-178, esp. 176-177.

- Πάτερ εὐλόγησον (No. 11, 15, 25);
- Κύριε εὐλόγησον (No. 42);
- Δέσποτα εὐλόγησον (No. 2, 26, 43);
- εὐλόγησον Δέσποτα (No. 3, 29, 38);
- εὐλόγησον (No. 13, 22, 30, 36).

e. Conclusions

It seems we may conclude our investigation in the Greek tradition in the same terms as for the other traditions: *HZos* does not appear as an apocryphon. On the other hand, despite the presence of some elements in the titles, it cannot be defined either as a hagiographic text, *stricto sensu*: we have a name, but neither a precise date nor a place...

The question of the nature of *HZos* (apocryphon *vs.* hagiographical text) may well be a false one: we are dealing with modern categories, but these texts were obviously apprehended in the same way as the pieces they were circulating with.

The most suitable category in which to put *HZos* would be something like “monastic literature aiming at edification”⁶⁸. Moreover, in the particular case of *HZos*, it may also be a narrative aiming to christianize the classical myth of the Blessed Islands, as we concluded from the analysis of the Semitic and Caucasian traditions. That aspect is usually discussed when analysing the content of *HZos*, the proper story of Zosimus from an internal point of view⁶⁹. It is not our point here. However, it might be interesting to remember that some components of *HZos* do not only refer to Jer. 35, but also to the so-called Alexander Romance. It is particularly the case for the community of naked people encountered by our “hero”.⁷⁰

68 It is also the conclusion of P. D’AGOSTINO, “*Narratio Zosimi de vita beatorum (BHG 1889-1990 = CAVT 166)* revisited: its literary genre and sources”, to be published in *Byzantinoslavica*.

69 For a general presentation, cf. for instance HAELEWYCK, “Une relecture” and HAELEWYCK (dir.), *Les versions orientales*, p. 1-40.

70 See for instance ANGELIDI, “La vie de Macaire le Romain”; C. JOUANNO, “Des Gymnosophistes aux Réchabites : une utopie antique et sa christianisation”, in *L’Antiquité Classique* 79 (2010), p. 53-76; both papers give a good bibliography on the subject.

Appendix I

Checklist of Greek Mss *HZos*

This checklist has been established after personal research through the catalogues, and for the purpose of this presentation. I have been aware of a similar research by J. Dochhorn⁷¹ and P. D'Agostino⁷², but I do not refer here to their descriptions, unless we significantly disagree. I thank them both for sharing reproductions of some manuscripts.

The elements of description given hereafter are the results of information taken from personal observation, published catalogues, and *Pinakes*, the continuously updated database kept by the IRHT; the Parisian codex was the only one to which I had physical access. I tried to gather for each manuscript the descriptive elements necessary for this study: datation, location in the manuscript (when available)⁷³, title⁷⁴ (and marginal annotation when it occurs and the information is available), type of collection. I usually restricted the bibliography to the current catalogue, with reference to some essential tools such as the *BHG* and A. Ehrhard's *Überlieferung*.⁷⁵ A more complete description will be given in a further study. As this constitutes only the first step to a critical edition of the text and all the collating is far from being completed, I do not mention textual groups, even though attempts of the kind have already been made.⁷⁶

1- Andros, Monis tis Hagias, 46

XVth cent., f. 161^v-173^v. Mainly hagiographico-homiletic collection.

Tit. (catal.): Διήγησις καὶ ἐξήγησις τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων τῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ φανερωθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου.

Cf. Sp. LAMPROS, *Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ἄνδρον μονῇ τῆς Ἀγίας κωδίκων*, in *Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Παρνασσοῦ*, 2 (1898), p. 136-244 (p. 180-183).

Cf. *BHG Auctarium*, p. 190; *BHG* 1890c.

71 J. DOCHHORN, "Die *Narratio Zosimi* (CAVT 166): Ein Vorbericht", in E. TIGCHELAAR (ed.), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures* (BETL, 270), Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA, 2014, p. 389-448 (mainly n. 23 in p. 395-398 for a list and description of Greek manuscripts).

72 P. D'AGOSTINO, *Narratio Zosimi de Vita Beatorum*: testo, traduzione e commento, Padova, 2013-2014 (unpublished Master dissertation). Part of this work is now published in P. D'AGOSTINO, "Una recensione inedita della *Narratio Zosimi de vita beatorum* (BHG 1889-1890)", in *MEG* 15 (2015), p. 109-136, and in P. D'AGOSTINO, "Narratio Zosimi de vita beatorum (BHG 1889-1890 = CAVT 166) revisited: its literary genre and sources", to be published in *Byzantinoslavica*.

73 I always give the folios as they are numbered in the manuscript, or given in the mentioned catalogue.

74 When the title is known to me only by the catalogue, it is preceded by the mention "Tit. (catal.)".

75 Hereafter for A. EHRHARD, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche, von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Erster Teil. *Die Überlieferung*, Leipzig, I-III, 1937-1952. I refer here only to the mentions I consider relevant to the topic.

76 See for instance DOCHHORN, "Vorbericht", p. 395-399 (and notes) and D'AGOSTINO, "Recensione inedita". These attempts are based upon a partial list of manuscripts.

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 839: f. 63-310 (cf. Lambros, p. 180-183) constitutes a separate part (36 texts). Amongst the premetaphrastic pieces, is the “sog. Vita des Zosimos Monachos”.

2- Athens, EBE, 355

XVth cent., f. 21-30. Mainly hagiographico-homiletic collection, akephalon.

Tit. (red): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τῶν ἁγίων καὶ δικαίων μακάρων. Δεσπότη εὐ(λ)ό(γησ)ον.

In mg (red): λογ/ ι', φυλλ. θ'

Cf. F. HALKIN, *Catalogue des manuscrits hagiographiques de la Bibliothèque nationale d'Athènes* (Subsidia hagiographica, 66), Bruxelles, 1983,⁷⁷ p. 45 (BHG 1890d).

J. and A. SAKKELION, *Κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Ἐθνικῆς Βιβλιοθηκῆς τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, Athens, 1892,⁷⁸ p. 60 does not mention HZos in the description of that codex.

3- Athens, EBE, 1049

XVIth cent., p. 110-123 (= ff. 55^v-62). Ascetic-hagiographic collection.

Tit. (red): Διήγησις τοῦ ἁγίου ζωσίμου· περὶ τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων. Εὐ(λ)ό(γησ)ον δέσποτα.

Cf. HALKIN, *Athènes*, p. 103-104 (BHG 1889).

SAKKELION, EBE, p. 186 does not give an accurate description (no folios mentioned nor pieces identified: Μαρτύρια ἁγίων, διηγήσεις θαυμάτων, γεροντικά τινα,...).

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 856-857: HZos is amongst the pieces that “beziehen sich auf den gewohnten Kreis von Heiligenfesten”.

4- Athens, EBE, 2187

XVth cent., f. 166^v-171^v. Miscellany (σύμμεικτος κῶδιξ διηγήσεων προφητικῶν, ἀποκρύφων, θεολογικῶν, ἀσκητικῶν).

Tit. (red, faded): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τῶν μακάρων.

Cf. L. POLITIS, in collaboration with Maria L. POLITI, *Κατάλογος χειρογράφων τῆς Ἐθνικῆς Βιβλιοθηκῆς τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, ἄρ. 1857-2500, Athens, 1991,⁷⁹ p. 213-220.

HALKIN, *Athènes*, p. 122-123 (BHG 1890a).

5- Athens, EBE, 2420

XVI-XVIIth cent., f. 39-62^v (akephalon). Miscellany (σύμμεικτος κῶδιξ ἀσκητικῶν καὶ ἀποκρύφων διηγήσεων). Written by different hands (the same hand copied HZos and the pieces n° 5, 11, 12). Olim in the Prodrome monastery at Serres (n° 251 [469]).

Tit.: lost. HZos begins from βασιλέως· ἑώρας ἐγγύς σου. Ὁ δὲ ζωσιμὰς λέγει· οἶδα ὅτι πάντα ὅσα... (sic!)

Cf. POLITIS, EBE, p. 418-420 (BHG 1889 or 1890).

6- Athens, EBE, MPT 561

XVIIth cent., f. 63^v-75^v. Hagiographic collection (edifying narratives).

Tit. (red): Διήγησις ψυχοφελῆς περὶ τοῦ βίου· τῶν μακάρων· καὶ πάνυ ὀφέλιμος.

Cf. HALKIN, *Athènes*, p. 171 (BHG 1890d).

A. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, *Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ βιβλιοθήκη, ἥτοι κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ... πατριαρχικοῦ θρόνου τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ πάσης Παλαιστίνης ἀποκειμένων Ἑλληνικῶν κωδίκων*, S.-Petersbourg, 1915,⁸⁰ t. 5, p. 117-118.

7- Athos, Dionysiou, 199

XVth cent., f. 174^v-183. Hagiographic collection.

Tit.: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ μακαρίου ζωσίμου· καὶ πῶς ἐδεήθη τὸν θ(εο)ῦ καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τ(οὺς) μακά(ρ)ους· καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰς διηγήσεις (sic!) αὐτ(ῶν).

⁷⁷ Hereafter HALKIN, *Athènes*.

⁷⁸ Hereafter SAKKELION, *EBE*.

⁷⁹ Hereafter POLITIS, *EBE*.

⁸⁰ Hereafter ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, *Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*.

Cf. Sp. LAMPROS, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, 2 vol., Cambridge, 1895-1900,⁸¹ No. 3733 = I, p. 360-361 (No folios indicated).

8- Athos, Docheiariou, 127

XVIIth cent., f. 120-144.⁸² Hagiographic collection, akephalon and ateleuton.

Tit.: Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου π(α)ρ(ὸ)ς ἡμῶν ζωσιμᾶ, περὶ τ(ῆ)ς πολιτείας τῶν ἀγίων μακάρων. (+ μακάρων repeated, abbreviated).

In mg sup.: Λόγος ζ´ and the number of folios.

Cf. LAMPROS, *Mount Athos*, No. 2801 = I, p. 253 (no folios indicated).

9- Athos, Iviron, 408

XIVth cent., f. 336-352.⁸³ Mainly hagiographic collection.

Tit. (red, most faded): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ μακαρίου ζωσίμου καὶ ὅπως ἐδεήθη τῶν θ(εο)ῦ καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς μακάρας (-ους ?) καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰς διοικήσεις αὐτῶν.

Cf. LAMPROS, *Mount Athos*, No. 4528 = II, p. 143-144 (no folios indicated). The next piece is entitled: Λόγοι ὠφέλημοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξω σοφῶν τῶν λεγομένων Βραχυμάνων τῶν καὶ Γυμνοσοφιστῶν.

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 932 and n. 4: dates the manuscript back to the XII-XIIIth cent.; finding no number on the folios when he examined the codex, he numbered 341-357 the folios with HZos.

10- Athos, Iviron, 477

XVIIth cent., f. 27-34, 34a^v. Hagiographic collection.

Tit. (red): Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου π(α)ρ(ὸ)ς ἡμῶν ζωσιμᾶ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν μακάρων.

Cf. LAMPROS, *Mount Athos*, No. 4597 = II, p. 152 (no folios indicated).

11- Athos, Iviron, 483

XVIIIth cent. (AD 1717, f. 176), f. 165-175.⁸⁴ Hagiographico-homiletic collection.

Tit. (red): Τοῦ μακαρίου ζωσίμου ἐξήγησις πρὸς τοὺς μακάρους πῶς εἶδεν αὐτοὺς· π(ά)τερ εὐλόγησον.

Cf. LAMPROS, *Mount Athos*, No. 4603 = II, p. 153 (no folios indicated).

12- Athos, Iviron, 732

XVIIth cent., f. 48-60^v. Miscellany.

Tit. (red): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία, τοῦ ἀββᾶ ζωσιμᾶ· καὶ διὰ τοὺς μακάρους· εὐλόγησον πάτερ.

Cf. LAMPROS, *Mount Athos*, No. 4852 = II, p. 214-215 (no folios indicated).

13- Athos, Iviron, 767

XVIIIth cent., f. 202^v-213^v.⁸⁵ Mainly hagiographico-homiletic collection.

Tit. (red): Τοῦ μακαρίου ζωσίμου ἐξήγησις πρὸς τοὺς μακάρους· εὐλόγησον.

In mg f. 203 (red): λόγοι ιβ´ (sic !).

Cf. LAMPROS, *Mount Athos*, No. 4887 = II, p. 224.

14- Athos, Iviron, 1451

XVIIth cent., f. 27-38. Hagiographic miscellany (σύμμεκτο ἀγιολογικό). Written by 3 different hands (HZos is in the main part).

81 Hereafter LAMPROS, *Mount Athos*.

82 Following the Latin numeration; the folios received also a Greek numeration, with a small gap (f. 121 Latin = f. ρκζ´ for instance). Both numerations are in the top margin.

83 Following the numeration in the top margin; there is another one in the bottom margin, but not written on each folio (f. 336 top = f. 341 bottom, for instance).

84 Following the Latin numbers; the folios present also a Greek numeration (f. 165 = f. ροη´ for instance). F. 171-174 were first numbered 184-187.

85 The folio number 203 is written with a pencil; it was previously numbered 188 written with ink. According to J. Dochhorn, *HZos* is on f. 203^v-213^v.

Tit. (red): Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου π(α)ρ(ὸ)ς ἡμῶν ζωσιμᾶ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων.
Cf. Π. ΣΩΤΗΡΟΥΔΗΣ, Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Ἰβήρων, Κατάλογος Ἑλληνικῶν χειρογράφων. Τόμος ΙΑ΄ (1387-1568), Ἅγιον Ὄρος, p. 132-134 (BHG 1889).
Not mentioned in LAMPROS, Mount Athos.

15- Athos, Κουτλουμουσίου, 48 [561]

XVIIIth cent., f. ? (no folio numbers indicated).⁸⁶ Hagiographic collection.

Tit.: Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου π(α)ρ(ὸ)ς ἡμῶν ζωσιμᾶ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων· π(ά)τερ εὐλόγησον.

Cf. Α. ΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ - Μ.Ι. ΜΑΝΟΥΣΑΚΑΣ, *Συμπληρωματικοὶ κατάλογοι χειρογράφων Ἀγίου Ὁρους*, Thessaloniki, 1973, p. 32, No. 48 [561]: Βίοι ἁγίων καὶ διηγήσεις εἰς δημόδια [Α. ΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ, “Συμπληρωματικοὶ κατάλογοι χειρογράφων Ἀγίου Ὁρους, Α΄. Χειρόγραφα Μονῆς Κουτλουμουσίου”, in Ἑλληνικά 21/1 (1968), p. 109-148 (138-139)].

NB: LAMPROS, *Mount Athos*, No. 3117 = Κουτλουμουσίου 48 does not correspond: Λόγοι πανηγυρικοὶ περὶ τοὺς πεντήκοντα (XIIth cent.); there is no description in it of a codex Κουτλουμουσίου 561 (descriptions stop at No. 461: Ψαλτικὴ φωνή). But the reproduction of the manuscript described under No. 48 by Politis and Manousakas is signed 561 on the back.

16- Athos, Laura, I 55

XVIIth cent., f. 4-15. Ascetico-hagiographic collection.

Tit.: Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου π(α)ρ(ὸ)ς ἡμῶν ζωσιμᾶ· περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων.

Cf. Σ. ΕΥΣΤΡΑΤΙΑΔΗΣ – ΣΠ. ΛΑΥΡΙΩΤΗΣ, Κατάλογος τῶν κωδίκων τῆς Μεγίστης Λαύρας, Paris, 1925,⁸⁷ p. 187: No. 1139.

Pinakes identifies HZos in that codex with “Zosimas abbas Alloquia” (CPG 7361), which does obviously not correspond.

17- Athos, Laura, I 141

XVIth cent., f. 381-392. Mainly ἀκολουθία.

Tit.: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου καὶ πῶς ἐδεήθη τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς μακαρίους καὶ ἔλαβε τὰς αὐτῶν διηγήσεις.

Cf. ΕΥΣΤΡΑΤΙΑΔΗΣ – ΣΠ. ΛΑΥΡΙΩΤΗΣ, Μεγίστης Λαύρας, p. 206: No. 1225.

18- Athos, Panteleimonos, 299

XIXth cent. Mainly ascetical collection. Two pieces in that codex could be identified with HZos, according to the catalogue:

1) No. 34 (f. 258^v-268)

Tit.: Τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ζωσιμᾶ Λόγος πάντῳ ὠφέλιμος.

Identified in Pinakes as “Zosimas abbas Alloquia” (CPG 7361). The Greek title might correspond to HZos, but the Latin designation is usually used for a different Zosimus. The informations at our disposal do not allow us to consider that first piece as HZos; we will thus leave it for now.

2) No. 66 (f. 375^v-381 = p. 246-253).

Tit.: Διήγησις ψυχοφελὴς τοῦ ἁγίου Ζωσίμου μοναχοῦ περὶ τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων· καὶ πῶς ἐμβήκε μέσα εἰς τὴν μακαρίαν γῆν.

Not mentioned in Pinakes, but corresponds to HZos. (Modern Greek version).

Cf. LAMPROS, Mount Athos, n° 5806 = II, p. 356-359.

19- Athos, Panteleimonos, 789

XVIIIth cent., f. 33^v-39^v.⁸⁸ Ascetico-hagiographic collection.

Tit. (catal.): Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ζωσιμᾶ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν μακάρων.

Cf. LAMPROS, Mount Athos, n° 6296 = II, p. 433-434.

86 F. 56-78 according to J. Dochhorn.

87 Hereafter ΕΥΣΤΡΑΤΙΑΔΗΣ – ΣΠ. ΛΑΥΡΙΩΤΗΣ, *Μεγίστης Λαύρας*.

88 F. 28^v-33^v according to J. Dochhorn.

20- Athos, Panteleimonos, 800XVIIIth cent., f. 142^r-150^v. Miscellany.

Tit. (catal.): Διήγησις τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Μακαρίου (sic Lampros).

Cf. LAMPROS, Mount Athos, n° 6307 = II, p. 435-436.

21- Athos, Philotheou, 187XVIII-XIXth cent., No. 9 (f. not indicated).⁸⁹ Ascetico-hagiographic collection.

Tit. (catal.): Διήγησις τοῦ Ἀββᾶ Ζωσίμου Περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν μακάρων καὶ περὶ τῆς διαγωγῆς αὐτῶν.

Cf. LAMPROS, Mount Athos, No. 1951 = vol. I, p. 165 (no indication of folios).

22- Athos, Vatopedi, 95XVIIth cent., f. 156-179^v.⁹⁰ Composite codex; HZos is in the part dated AD 1611, forming a small ascetic collection (4 pieces).

Tit. (red): Λόγος τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου π(α)ρ(ὸ)ς ἡμ(ὼν) ζωσιμά: τῆς πολιτείας τ(ῶ) ἁγί(ων) μακάρ(ων): εὐ(λ)ό(γησον) [sic !].

Cf. E. LAMBERZ, Katalog der griechischen Handschriften des Athosklosters Vatopedi. Band I. Codices 1-102 (Κατάλογοι Ἑλληνικῶν Χειρογράφων Ἁγίου Ὁρους, 2), Thessaloniki, 2006, p. 393-400 (BHG 1890e).

23- Athos, Vatopedi, 155XIXth cent., f. 30-48^v. Ascetic collection.

Tit. (red): Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου π(α)ρ(ὸ)ς ἡμῶν ζωσιμᾶ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων.

In mg (red): στ.⁹¹

Cf. Σ. ΕΥΣΤΡΑΤΙΑΔΗΣ - ΑΡΚΑΔΙΟΣ ΒΑΤΟΠΕΔΙΝΟΣ, Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ Μονῇ Βατοπεδίου ἀποκειμένων κωδίκων, Paris, 1924, p. 36.

24- Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, gr. Q 22 (320)XVth cent., f. 99^r-108^v. Hagiographico-homiletic collection.

Tit. (catal.): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου καὶ πῶς ἐδεῖθη τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς μακάρους καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰς διήκῃσις αὐτῶν.

Cf. C. DE BOOR, Verzeichniss der griechischen Handschriften der Königl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, II, Berlin, 1897, p. 180-182.

C. VAN DE VORST – H. DELEHAYE, Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Germaniae, Belgii, Angliae, Brussels, 1913,⁹² p. 167-168 (BHG 1889).According to J.-M. OLIVIER, Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues de manuscrits grecs de Marcel Richard, 3rd ed., Turnhout, 1992, p. 149, the codex is now at the Bibliotheka Jagiellonska in Cracovia.

EHRHARD, Überlieferung, III, p. 765: mentions HZos with other hagiographic pieces, and two apocrypha: Abraham's Testament and John the Theologian's Apocalypse.

25- Dresden, Sächsischen Landesbibliothek, A 187XVIth cent., p. 215*-226*. Miscellany. The manuscript is now lost.

Tit.: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων (+ καὶ πῶς εἶδεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἀββᾶς Ζώσιμος mg). π(ά)ρ εὐλόγησον.

Cf. Fr. SCHNORR v. CAROLSFELD, Katalog der Handschriften der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek zu Dresden, Leipzig, 1882, p. 80: 2 volumes, whose content is not much detailed. The second volume is

⁸⁹ F. 72^r-76^v according to J. Dochhorn.⁹⁰ F. 156-180 (anno 1780) according to J. Dochhorn.⁹¹ In the top margin, is indicated the number of folios for that piece.⁹² Hereafter VAN DE VORST – DELEHAYE, *Germaniae, Belgii, Angliae*.

described in an extremely concise way: “S. 1*-429*: Λόγοι εἰς τὰ μαρτύρια τῶν ἁγίων”; a manuscript marginal addition specifies: φ. 215*-226*: Zosimi narratio.

E. v. DOBSCHÜTZ, “Eine Sammelhandschrift des 16. Jahrhunderts. Dresden MS. A 187”, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 15 (1906), p. 243-274 (part. 271) gives a more accurate description and indicates “Zosimus vita ed. Wassiljeff” as the 13th piece in vol. 2 (p. 215-226).

VAN DE VORST – DELEHAYE, *Germaniae, Belgii, Angliae*, p. 177-180 (BHG 1889).

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 751-752: “um 1600 geschrieben”. According to him, the second part of the collection contains 21 hagiographic pieces, divided into the mentioned feastdays (with dates; the feasts – and texts – do not appear in the chronological order); on January, 19th are found a Zosimos Monachos and Makarios the Roman.

Unfortunately, I do not see any such indication on *HZos*’ first page.

26- Istanbul, Œcumenical Patriarcate, Panaghia 13

XVIth cent., f. 203-207^{v,93} Homiletic collection (Ephraem Graecus), followed by 2 Saints’ Lives.

Tit.: Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου π(ατ)ρ(ὸ)ς ἡμῶν ζωσίμου. Δέσποτα εὐ(λ)ό(γησον).

Cf. P. GÉHIN – M. KOUROPOU, *Catalogue des manuscrits conservés dans la Bibliothèque du Patriarcat Œcuménique. Les manuscrits du monastère de la Panaghia de Chalki*, vol. I. *Notices descriptives*, Turnhout, 2008, p. 89-91 (and pl. 21) (BHG 1890d)

NB: Metropolitite Athenagoras, “Κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς ἐν Χάλκῃ Μονῆς τῆς Παναγίας”, in *ΕΕΒΣ* 10 (1933), p. 236-292 (p. 257): XVth cent.

27- Jerusalem, Greek Orthodox Patriarcate, Saba 290

XVIIIth cent. (AD 1711 f. 48), f. 8^v-15. Miscellany.

Tit. (red): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων.

Cf. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, *Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, t. II, 1894, p. 413-415.

NB: the piece opening the codex and preceding *HZos* is the *Vita Macarii* (BHG 1004) as stated in the catalogue, with the title *Τῶν ὁσίων καὶ θεοφόρων πατέρων ἡμῶν Σεργίου, Θεοφίλου, καὶ Γηίνου Λόγος*.

28- Jerusalem, Greek Orthodox Patriarcate, Saba 373

XVIth cent., f. 261^v-277^r. Hagiographic-homiletic collection.

Tit.: Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ζωσιμᾶ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων.

Cf. BHG *Auctarium*, p. 190: *HZos* is found in ff. 261v-277 (BHG 1890e). However, it is not mentioned in the description of the codex by A. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, *Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, t. II, 1894, p. 497-499.

29- London, British Library, Addit. 10073

XVIth cent., f. 192-208. Ascetic-homiletic collection (“Homiliae et excerpta ex gerontiis et menaeis”).

Tit. (red): Διήγησις καὶ ἐξήγησις τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων· τῶν ἐν μακαρία τῇ γῇ φανερωθέντων· ὑπὸ τοῦ μακαρίου ζωσίμου διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου· εὐλόγησον δέσποτα.

Cf. VAN DE VORST – DELEHAYE, *Germaniae, Belgii, Angliae*, pp. 262-264 [cod. 316]; referring to EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, I, p. 457, n. 3.

The most accurate and recent description can be found on the British Library website: http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?index=0&ref=Add_MS_10073 (BHG 1890e).

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 847-848: no mention of *HZos*, but some apocrypha are indicated.

30- Meteora, Hagios Stephanos, 15

XVIIth cent., f. 192-215^v. Composite miscellany codex; one hand copied only *HZos*.

Tit.: Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου π(ατ)ρ(ὸ)ς ἡμ(ῶν) ζωσιμᾶ· τῆς πολιτεί(ας) τ(ῶν) ἁγί(ων) μακάρ(ων)· εὐ(λ)ό(γησον).

In mg sup.: Λόγ(ος) τῶν ἁγίων μακάρ(ων).

In mg inf.: Οὗτος ὁ λόγος ἐστὶ τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων.

Cf. D. Z. ΣΟΦΙΑΝΟΣ, Τὰ χειρόγραφα τῶν Μετεώρων. Κατάλογος περιγραφικὸς τῶν χειρογράφων κωδικῶν τῶν ἀποκειμένων εἰς τὰς μονὰς τῶν Μετεώρων. Τόμος Γ': Τὰ χειρόγραφα τῆς Μονῆς Ἀγίου Στεφάνου, Athens, 1986, p. 30-32.

31- Meteora, Metamorphoseos, 98

XIVth cent., f. 157^r-163^v (akephalon and ateleuton). Miscellany. HZos has been copied by a different hand.

Tit.: lost. The preserved text begins with: καὶ ἔστηεν με ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ· οὗτος ὄνομα ευμελῆς (sic!).

Des.: καὶ ἦλθεν ζῶων ἐκ τῆς ἐρήμου καὶ ἦρεν με ἐπὶ τὴν χέτην αὐτοῦ.

Cf. N. A. ΒΕΗ, Τὰ χειρόγραφα τῶν Μετεώρων. Κατάλογος περιγραφικὸς τῶν χειρογράφων κωδικῶν τῶν ἀποκειμένων εἰς τὰς μονὰς τῶν Μετεώρων. Τόμος Α', Athens, 1967,⁹⁴ p. 129-131.

32- Meteora, Metamorphoseos, 266

XVIth cent., f. 14^v-23^v. Composite miscellany codex.

Tit.: Διήγησης ζωσίμου καὶ μακάρων (sic!).

Cf. ΒΕΗ, Τὰ χειρόγραφα τῶν Μετεώρων, p. 291-292 (f. 13^v-sqq).

33- Moscow, Synod. gr. 303 (= 290 Matt.; 395 Vlad.)⁹⁵

XV-XVIth cent. (Vlad.), f. 112^v-118^v. Miscellany, mainly ascetic collection.

Tit. (red): Διήγησις ζωσίμου μοναχοῦ, πε(ρὶ) τῶν π(ατε)ρῶν· ἦτοι τῶν βραμ(ά)ν(ων) οὓς εὗρ(εν) ἀλέξανδρος [+ (καὶ) φίλιπος (καὶ) διαλέχθη πρ(ὸς) αὐτούς· mg]. Γυμνοὺς ὡς ὄφεις ὄντ(ας)· δεῖξαι οὖν βούλομαι, ἐκ ποίας φυλῆς ἀποσπασθέντες· κατώκησ(αν) τὰς τ(ῶν) μακάρων νήσ(ους) (sic!).

Cf. Archimandrite VLADIMIR, *Sistematičeskoe opisanie rukopisej Moskovskoj Sinodal'noj (Patriaršej) Biblioteki*. I. *Rukopisi grečeskija*, Moscou, 1894,⁹⁶ p. 595-597.

A. VASSILIEV, *Anecdota Graeco-byzantina*, Moscow, 1893,⁹⁷ p. XL: XVIth cent.

B.L. FONKICH - F.B. POLYAKOV, *Grecheskiye rukopisi Sinodal'noj biblioteki*, Moscow, 1993⁹⁸, p. 130: XV-XVIth cent.

34- Moscow, Synod. gr. 364 (= 351 Matt.; 397 Vlad.),

XVIth cent. (Vlad.), f. 353^v-360^v⁹⁹ (ateleuton). Composite miscellany.

Tit.: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ μακαρίου ζωσίμου. Καὶ ὅπως ἐδεήθηεν τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ·[κ]αὶ εἰσῆλθον πρ(ὸς) τοὺς μακαρίους· καὶ ἔλαβον τὰς διηγήσεις αὐτῶν. Εὐ(λ)ό(γη)σον π(ά)τερ.

Up to: ὅτι ἐπλήρωσας τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ.

Cf. VLADIMIR, *Sinodal'noj*, p. 598-601 (f. 355-).

VASSILIEV, *Anecdota*, p. XL: XVth cent.

FONKICH - POLYAKOV, *Sinodal'noj*, p. 130: XVth cent.

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 593-594: 16th cent.; "Enthält die erweiterte Gestalt des Homiliars II, beginnt aber erst mit dem 1. Fastensonntag (Homilie Μακάριοι wie in dem Cod. Monac. 275)... N. 3: the homiliary occupies f. 1-253; f. 254-534 consist of a different manuscript, containing a non-menological collection. That part is dated back to the XVIth cent. (p. 771).

94 Hereafter ΒΕΗ, *Τὰ χειρόγραφα τῶν Μετεώρων*.

95 I must express special thanks to M. Mushinsky (Moscow) and M. Pirard (Louvain-la-Neuve), whose help was essential in dealing with the Moscow manuscripts.

96 Hereafter VLADIMIR, *Sinodal'noj*.

97 Hereafter VASSILIEV, *Anecdota*.

98 Hereafter FONKICH - POLYAKOV, *Sinodal'noj*.

99 The folios are also numbered with Greek letters (f. τνς-τξγ'). According to J. Dochhorn, *HZos* is found on f. "355-375 (?)".

35- *Moscow, Synod. gr.* 431 (= 3 Matt.; 114 Vlad.)

XIIth cent. (Vlad.), f. 126-138^{v.100} Hagiographico-homiletic collection.

Tit.: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ μακαρίου ζωσίμου· καὶ ὅπως ἐδεήθη τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τοὺς μάκαρας· καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰς διοικήσεις αὐτῶν. μ(ηνὶ) ἰαννουαρίῳ ιθ'.

Cf. VLADIMIR, *Sinodal'noj*, p. 108-109.

VASSILIEV, *Anecdota*, p. XL: XIIIth cent.

FONKICH – POLYAKOV, *Sinodal'noj*, p. 55: XIth cent., possibly originating from South Italy.

36- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canonic. 19

XVth or XVIth cent., f. 289-294. Hagiographico-homiletic collection.

Tit. (catal.): Λόγος τῶν ἁγίων μακαρίων τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ζωσίμου. Εὐλόγησον¹⁰¹.

Cf. H.O. COXE, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae*, t. III. *Codices graecos et latinos Canonicianos complectens*, Oxford, 1854, col. 22-28.

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, p. III, 768: XVth cent.; Hzos is mentioned amongst other pieces and some apocrypha.

37- Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, gr. 1217

XIIth cent., f. 145-153^v. Hagiographic-homiletic collection ("Mélange d'homélies et de Vies de saints").

Tit. (red): Διήγησις ζωσίμου εἰς τῶν βίων τῶν μακάρων· κ(ύρι)ε εὐλό(γησον).

In mg (red): ιδ'

Cf. H. OMONT, *Inventaire sommaire des mss grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale...*, Paris, 1898, p. 268 (olim Colbert. 4767).

BHG Auctarium, p. 190: BHG 1889-1890.

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 778: XIth-XIIth cent.; Hzos is mentioned amongst other pieces.

38- Patmos, Μονή τοῦ Θεολόγου, 448

XVth cent., f. 66^v-76^v. Varia (Διαφόρων), *akephalon* and *ateleuton*.

Tit. (red ?): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου καὶ ὅπως ἐδεήθη τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ εἰσῆλθε πρὸς τοὺς μάκαρας καὶ ἔλαβε τὰς διοικήσεις αὐτῶν. Εὐλόγησον Δέσποτα.

In the top margin (red): Ἰαννουαρίῳ ιθ'.

In the right margin: λ(όγ)ος ιε', and the number of folios (ις').

Cf. J. SAKKELION, *Πατμιακὴ βιβλιοθήκη...*, Athens, 1890, p. 202: Hzos is not mentioned, nor the ff. where the mentioned texts are found.

39- Sinai, S. Catherine, gr. 463

XVIIth cent., f. 28^v-36^{v.102} Ascetico-hagiographic collection.

Tit. (red, ut vid.): Τοῦ μακαρίου ζωσίμου ἐξήγησις πρὸς τοὺς μακάρους πῶς εἶδεν αὐτοὺς· εὐ(λ)ό(γ)η(σον) π(ά)τερ.

Cf. V. GARDTHAUSEN, *Catalogus codicum graecorum Sinaiticorum*, Oxford, 1886,¹⁰³ p. 113.

V.N. BENEŠEVIČ, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum graecorum qui in monasterio Sanctae Catherinae in Monte Sina asservantur*.¹⁰⁴ Tomus I. *Codices manuscripti notabiliores bibliothecae monasterii Sinaitici eiusque metochii Cahirensis, ab archimandrita Porphyrio (Uspenskio) descripti*, S. Petersbourg, 1911, p. 312-315 (No. 499 [463]).

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 888 => Hzos; "Die hagiographischen Texte beziehen sich auf den Heiligenkreis, der für die nichtmenologischen Sammlungen charakteristisch ist".

100 The actual folios numbering has been changed : the folios were originally numbered 125-137.

101 I take the opportunity to thank N. Wilson for checking on the manuscript, and noticing the presence of Εὐλόγησον (January 2016).

102 F. 28^v-45^v according to J. Dochhorn.

103 Hereafter GARDTHAUSEN, *Sinaiticorum*.

104 Hereafter BENEŠEVIČ, *Sina*.

40- Sinai, S. Catherine, gr. 529

AD 1555, f. 470-483^v. Mainly hagiographico-homiletic collection.

Tit.: Τοῦ μακαρίου ζωσίμου ἐξήγης (sic !) πρὸς τοὺς μακάρους πῶς εἶδεν αὐτούς· εὐλόγησον π(άτ)ερ.

In mg: λ(ό)γον μζ´.¹⁰⁵ The number of folios is also written in the margin.

Cf. GARDTHAUSEN, *Sinaiticum*, p. 129.

BENEŠEVIČ, *Sina. Tomus III*, 1. Codices numeris 1124-2150 signati, S. Petersbourg, 1917 (repr. Hildesheim, 1965), p. 299 (No.2015 [529]: nothing).

BHG *Auctarium*, p. 190: BHG 1890a

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 772: mention of *Hzos*.

41- Sinai, S. Catherine, gr. 1630

XVI-XVIIth cent., f. 74-85^v. Ascetic-hagiographic collection.

Tit. (catal.): Τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου ἐξήγησις πρὸς τοὺς μακάρους πῶς εἶδεν αὐτούς.

Cf. BENEŠEVIČ, *Sina. Tomus III*, 1. Codices numeris 1124-2150 signati, S. Petersbourg, 1917 (repr. Hildesheim, 1965), p. 111-113.

In Pinakes, HZos is wrongly entitled “Zosimas abbas Alloquia” (CPG 7361), cf. in No. 18 above.

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 773: mention of Zosimos Monacos.

42- Vatican, Vat. gr. 1631

XIIth cent., f. 222^v-227. Mainly hagiographic (“Sanctorum vitae”).

Tit.: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων. κ(ύρι)ε εὐλόγ(ησον).

In mg: λδ´.

Cf. C. GIANNELLI, *Codices Vaticani graeci. Codices 1485-1683*, Vatican, 1950, p. 310-314 (saec. XI; f. 222-228 are written by a contemporaneous but rougher hand).

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, I, p. 323-325: *Olim Grottaferrata*; “italogriechische Sammlung für das Winterhalbjahr”; description of content (texts sequence and dates); HZos is No. 34 “(? Fasten-sonntag”).

43- Venice, Marc. II 42 (coll. 1123; *olim* Nan. 63)

XIIIth cent., f. 277-285. Hagiographic-homiletic collection (“Homiliae Patrum et vitae sanctorum”).

Tit.: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου π(ατ)ρ(ὸ)ς ἡμῶν ζωσίμου· περὶ τῶν μακάρων· Δέσποτα εὐλόγησον (*sic!*).

In mg (red): λόγ(ος) μστ´.

Cf. E. MIONI, *Indici e cataloghi, Nuova serie, VI. Codices graeci manuscripti Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum, Volumen I. Codices in classes a prima usque ad quintam inclusi. Pars prior, Classis I – Classis II, Cod. 1-120*, Rome, 1967, p. 141-144.

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, 813 (v. **II 82**): XIVth cent.; no mention of HZos, but the presence of some apocrypha is noted.

44- Venice, Marc. III 12 (coll. 1267; *olim* Nan. 236)

AD 1467 (f. 492), f. 436-441.¹⁰⁶ Composite codex. Miscellany.

Tit. (red): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τῶν ἁγί(ων) μακάρ(ων), εὐ(λ)ό(γησον) π(άτ)ερ.

In mg (red, faded): π(ερὶ) τῶν μακάρ(ων)

Cf. E. MIONI, *Indici e cataloghi, Nuova serie, VI. Codices graeci manuscripti Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum, Volumen I. Codices in classes a prima usque ad quintam inclusi. Pars altera, Classis II, Cod. 121-198 – Classes III, IV, V*, Rome, 1972, p. 176-190 (BHG 1889-1890d).

105 It seems the number of the piece has been written on the same place as the Greek numbering of the folio, so that (on the microfilm at least) it is not really easy to separate both numbers: f. 470-483 are numbered in Greek μλγ-υο´.

106 The folios also numbered with Greek letters: υιθ-υ** (not visible on my reproductions).

45- *Venice, Marc. VII 41* (coll. 1468; *olim* Nan. 157)

XVIth cent., f. 235-244. Composite codex.

Tit.: Διήγησις ψυχοφελῆ πάνυ, ὀφέλημα, περὶ τῶν βίων τῶν μακάρων (*sic!*).

Cf. E. MIONI, *Indici e cataloghi, Nuova serie, VI. Codices graeci manuscripti Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum, Volumen II. Codices qui in sextam, septimam atque octavam classem includuntur continens*, Rome, 1960, p. 92-97 (*BHG* 1889).

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 751: summarized description; n. 4: "Besteht aus 4 selbständigen Codices".

46- *Wien, theol. gr. 123*,

XIIIth cent., f. 189^{r-v}, 149^{r-v}, 190^r-191^v (*akephalon*). Hagiographic-homiletic collection ("Homiletisch-hagiographische Sammelhandschrift").

Tit.: lost. *HZos* is kept from διοικούμε|νοι· ἀπὸ γὰρ δὲ ἔκτης...

Cf. H. HUNGER - O. KRESTEN, unter Mitarbeit von Chr. HANNICK, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Teil 3/2. Codices theologici 101-200*, Vienne, 1984, p. 74-81.

EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 759: summarized description.

NB: According to the catalogues and literature, *HZos* should be found in at least two more manuscripts: *Turin*. 148, b.II.1 and *Vatican, Ottob. gr.* 393.

The first one is mentioned by A. VASSILIEV, *Anecdota*, p. LX. That codex has received the new shelf-location C.VII.18 in the beginning of the XXth cent.¹⁰⁷ the description corresponds to that given by G. Pasini, p. 238-240.¹⁰⁸ Unfortunately, the piece related to a Zosimus (f. 117-sqq) begins *akephalon* (the prologue is missing); the first words given by G. Pasini are: ἐγένετο τις ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Παλαιστήνη μοναστηρίοις ἀνὴρ βίῳ καὶ λόγῳ... These words are part of the *Vita Mariae Aegyptiacae a. Sophronio* (*BHG* 1042-1042d)¹⁰⁹. Hence, the text has nothing to do with *HZos*, as A. Ehrhard had seen¹¹⁰ (EHRHARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 853, n. 2: "Der ebenfalls mutilierte Text, den Pasini als die Vita eines Mönches Zosimos ausgibt (Fol. 117-137v) ist die Vita der Maria von Ägypt, wie sich aus dem von ihm mitgeteilten Anf. der Vita nach dem (mutilierten) Prolog mit Sicherheit ersehen lässt").

On the other hand, the *Ottobonianus* 393 is a synaxarion. The catalogue¹¹¹ gives for f. 96^v the indication "Synax. S. Zosimi monachi et Micheae prophetae"; it is not obvious from that mention, but there are in reality two different texts on that folio:¹¹²

- Μὴν Ἰαννουαρίου εἰς τὴν Δ', ἀθλητοῦ ὁσίου Ζωσιμοῦ μοναχοῦ.

107 G. DE SANCTIS, *Inventario dei codici superstiti greci e latini antichi della Biblioteca Nazionale di Torino*, in *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica*, 34 (1904), p. 385-588 (p. 417).

108 J. PASINUS - A. RIVAUTELLA - Fr. BERTA, *Codices manuscripti Bibliothecae Regiae Taurinensis Athenaei.*, t. I, Turin, 1749.

109 The text begins in *PG* 87/3, col. 3697 C 1.

110 Although VASSILIEV, *Anecdota*, p. XXXVIII-XL insists on the nearness of the two pieces.

111 E. PERON - F. BATTAGLINI, *Codices Manuscripti Graeci Ottoboniani Bibliothecae Vaticanae*, Rome (Vatican), 1893, p. 205-207.

112 I express my warmest thanks to M. Sever Voicu, who checked the manuscript for me and gave me the transcription of the titles and incipits (12/02/2016).

- Μὴν Ἰαννουαρίου εἰς τὴν Ε΄, τοῦ ἁγίου πορφήτου Μιχαίου.

The first text is not connected with *HZos*, but with Zosimus martyr of Anazarba in Cilicia (cf. *BHG* 2476-2477). According to EHRARD, *Überlieferung*, III, p. 724, n. 1, the manuscript was copied in South Italy, in the XIIIth cent.

According to the imprecise indications of some catalogues, I had first considered a third codex, which has to be discarded after further analysis: the *Athos, Iviron*, 493, an ascetic collection of the XVIIIth cent.; the text No. 14 is entitled Τοῦ ἁββᾶ Ζωσιμῶ in Lampros' catalogue.¹¹³ In *Pinakes*, the piece is named "Alloquia", and identified as *CPG* 7361, referring to another Zosimus; but since experience has shown that confusions are possible (cf. above for No. 16 and 41), I prefer to leave it out until someone is able to check on the codex.

Appendix II

Apocrypha found in the Greek mss. with *HZos*

The synthesis hereafter may be incomplete or imprecise: most manuscript descriptions were completed before the *CANT* (1992)¹¹⁴ and *CAVT* (1998)¹¹⁵ were published, and the titles, incipit or descriptions designating the different pieces do not always allow a precise identification. Nevertheless, it gives an idea of the most popular apocryphal pieces circulating in the same manuscripts as *HZos*, and the addition of the *BHG*¹¹⁶ numbers when possible will at some point counterbalance that uneasy situation.

1. New Testament apocrypha

<i>CANT</i>		MSS No.	<i>BHG</i>
50	<i>Protevangeliū Iacobi</i>	19, 28, 29, 33, 42, 46	1046
54	<i>De Sacerdotio Christi</i>	4 (<i>BHG</i> 811), 44 (<i>BHG</i> 812)	810-812
57	<i>Miracula Infantis a. Iacobo fratre</i>	2 ; 29 <i>partim</i> (<i>BHG</i> 779k and m)	779n
57	<i>Evangelium Thomae de infantia Salvatoris</i>	25, 46	779p-pb
62	<i>Evangelium Nicodemi (Gesta Pilati)</i>	1, 4, 27	779t
62.II	<i>Evangelium Nicodemi. Recensio B</i>	45	779uv

113 Cf. LAMPROS, *Mount Athos*, No. 4613 = II, p. 154-155 (no folios indicated).

114 M. GEERARD, *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti* (Corpus christianorum. Series apocryphorum), Turnhout, 1992.

115 J.-Cl. HAELEWYCK, *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Corpus christianorum. Series apocryphorum), Turnhout, 1998.

116 F. HALKIN, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, 3 vol., Brussels, 3rd ed. 1957; *Auctarium*, Brussels, 1969; *Novum Auctarium*, Brussels, 1984.

65	<i>Anaphora Pilati cum Tiberii re-scripto</i>	27, 38	779xI-xII
66	<i>Anaphora et Paradosis Pilati</i>	43	779yI, yII, yIIb
84	<i>Iesu contentio cum diabolo</i>	43	812f-g
cf. 91	<i>Vita Virginis</i>	44	1049e
101	<i>Liber de dormitione, a. Pseudo-Iohanne</i>	43; 46 [Iacobo a. ms.]	1055-1056
106 ? ¹¹⁷	<i>Homilia in annuntiationem</i>	46	1085c
211.III	<i>Acta Pauli et Theclae</i>	42	1711
218	<i>Acta seu peregrinationes [Iohannis], a. Prochoro</i>	46	916
cf. 215.II ?	<i>Transitus Iohannis</i>	1, 29	919e
225.I ? ¹¹⁸ (226 <i>Pinakes</i>)	<i>Acta Andreae</i>	42	94
236	<i>Acta Andreae et Matthiae in urbe anthropophagorum</i>	33, 34, 45	109-110d
245.II	<i>Acta Thomae, versio graeca</i>	28, 33	1800-1831z
246	<i>Acta [Thomae] abbrevata</i>	1, 29	1833-1834
250.II	<i>Martyrium Philippi</i>	42	1525
311	<i>Epistula e caelo missa de servanda dominica</i>	5, 7 (<i>BHG</i> 812j), 12, 16 <i>vid.</i> , 29	812i-r 812s
327	<i>Apocalypsis Mariae</i>	1 (<i>BHG</i> 1052), 4 (<i>part.</i>), 5, 13, 19 (<i>BHG</i> 1053), 27, 28 (<i>BHG</i> 1054h), 29 (<i>BHG</i> 1050)	1050-1054m

117 According to *Pinakes*, that codex (our No. 46) gives on f. 63-65^v: *Johannes Chrysostomus, In annuntiationem Sanctissimae Deiparae*. *CPG* 4628 = *BHG* 1085d (1085c next column); the Catalogue indicates: [Johannes Chrysostomos], *In annuntiationem B.M.V.*: *BHG* 1085c, *PG* 60, 755-760; in the *CANT* Index: *BHG* 1085 = *CANT* 106; but *CANT* 106 is *Homilia de dormitione, auctore Ps.-Modesto Hierosolymitano* (*PG* 86, 3277-3312). Is thus the piece an apocryphon or not? I have no answer so far.

118 In *Pinakes*, the piece on our ms. No. 42 is described as following: f. 152-160: *Apocrypha. Andreas apostolus (S.), Epistula presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaiae*: *BHG* 93-94c = *CANT* 226; in the catalogue, it is less precise: *Acta s. Andreae ap.* (*BHG* 94); in the *CANT* Index: *BHG* 93-94 = *CANT* 226, 229. However, *CANT* 226 = *Epistula presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaiae* (*BHL* 428) (in Latin only), while *CANT* 229 = *Narratio seu martyrium Andreae* (*BHG* 99); and in Note b: *BHG* 99b = *compilatio est iuxta Narrationem addita retractatione Actorum Andreae et Matthiae et BHG* 93-94. What is it to conclude?

331	<i>Apocalypsis Iohannis apocrypha</i>	24, 43	921
332	<i>Apocalypsis Iohannis apocrypha altera</i> ¹¹⁹	44	922i
344 = CAVT 235	<i>Apocalypsis Baruch</i>	1, 29	237

BHG 779m (Nativitas a. Iacobo ap.) ? No. 1

2. Old Testament apocrypha

CAVT		MSS No.	BHG
1.i	<i>Vita Adae et Evae (Apocalypsis Moy-sis)</i>	43	24- 25f
88	<i>Testamentum Abrahæ</i>	5, 24, 28, 36	2001- 2002
225	<i>Paralipomena Jeremiae (Reliqua ver-borum Baruch)</i>	8 ?, 28 ?, 42 ? (or CAVT 226 ?)	777 777 ^a
225.2	<i>Narratio de capta Ierusalem</i>	1, 29, 40	778- 778b
235 = CANT 344	<i>Apocalypsis Baruch graeca (3 Baruch)</i>	1, 29	237
254	<i>Apocalypsis [Danielis] pseudo-Methodii</i>	2, 4, 19, 36	2036- 2036d
255	<i>Ultima visio Danielis (græce)</i>	44	1874c
257	<i>Visio Danielis de tempore novissimo et de fine mundi (græce)</i>	4	1871a

Appendix III

Zosimus and the Macarius in the Greek *HZos* Mss.

In this table are reproduced the titles or designations given in the catalogues for the texts related to a Macarius and circulating in the same manuscripts as *HZos*. When a more precise identification is either possible or given in the catalogue, the *BHG* number has been specified. For the sake of clarity, the titles related to Macarius the Roman and Macarius the Egyptian have been reproduced in separate columns. In the first column, the manuscripts are mentioned after the number they received in the checklist (Appendix I). The texts (*HZos* and about Macarius)

119 The title given in the catalogue is: *Interrogationes Iohannis Theologi et responsiones I. C.*

are located in the manuscripts either by their place number or by the first folio (as given in the catalogues), to show their vicinity (or not).

Mss.	Zosimus (<i>BHG</i> 1989-1990)	Macarius the Roman	Macarius the Egyptian	Other or undetermined Macarius
6	f. 63 ^v -sqq: Διήγησις ψυχωφελῆς περὶ τοῦ βίου τῶν μακάρων καὶ πάνν ὠφέλιμος	f. 4 ^v -sqq: “Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μακαρί- ου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου καὶ ἡ πολιτεία αὐτοῦ” Inc.: Τρεῖς τινες ἡγιασμένοι γέροντες... (<i>BHG</i> 1005m)		
7	(13): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ μακαρίου ζωσίμου καὶ πῶς ἐδεήθηεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς μακάρους καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰς διηγίσεις αὐτῶν	(12): “Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ἁγίου Μακα- ρίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου” [<i>sic!</i>]		
8	(4): Διήγησις Ζοσιμᾶ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν ἁγίων Μακάρων	(8): January 19 th . Βίος καὶ πολιτεία ἁγ. Μακαρίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου		
9	(14): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου			(13): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου Μακαρίου
10	(2): Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ζωσιμᾶ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν μακαρίων		Between β´ et γ´ : B. “Διήγη- σις τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς Μακα- ρίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου”	(5 γ´): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία Μακαρίου τοῦ ἐρημίτου

12	(4): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ἁββᾶ Ζωσιμᾶ καὶ διὰ τοὺς μακάρους		(1): “Διήγησις ὠφελήμος Μακαρίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου λόγος”	
13	(14): “Τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου Ἐξήγησις πρὸς τοὺς Μακάρους”	(13): Διήγησις Μακαρίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου Inc. : Τρεῖς τινὲς ἡγιασμένοι γέροντες... (BHG 1005m)	(18): Μακαρίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου Διήγησις	
15	(4): Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ζωσιμᾶ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων	(5): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία ὁσ. Μακαρίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου	(7): Διήγησις πάντῳ ὠφέλιμος τοῦ ἁββᾶ Μακαρίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου Inc.: Πορευόμενος ποτὲ ὁ ἁββᾶς Μακάριος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ... (BHG 999rb)	
19	(4): Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ζωσιμᾶ περὶ τῆς πολητήας τῶν μακάρων	(5): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία Μακαρίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου	(3): Διήγησις Μακαρίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου	(9) Ὅπτασία ἣν ἶδεν ὁ πνευματικὸς παπὰ κύρ Μακάριος ὁ ἐν τῇ μονῇ τοῦ Καρακάλου
21	(9): “Διήγησις τοῦ Ἀββᾶ Ζωσίμου Περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν μακάρων καὶ περὶ τῆς διαγωγῆς αὐτῶν”	(2): “Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μακαρίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου, τοῦ ἀπὸ εἴκοσι μιλίων μακρὰν τοῦ παραδείσου ἀσκήσαντος” (7): “Ἀκολουθία τῶν ὁσίων πατέρων ἡμῶν Ὁνουφρίου τοῦ		

		Αἰγυπτίου, Πέτρου τοῦ Ἀθωνίτου καὶ Μακαρίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου”		
22	(II,4): Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ζωσιμᾶ· τῆς πολιτείας τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων		(II,2): Διήγησις πάνυ ὠφέλιμος Μακαρίου μοναχοῦ τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου	
29	(19): Διήγησις καὶ ἐξηγήσις τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων τῶν ἐν μακαρία τῇ γῇ φανερωθέντων· ὑπὸ τοῦ μακαρίου ζωσίμου διὰ τοῦ ἁγγέλου	(41/4): Μηνὶ ὀκτωβρίῳ ΚΓ´· τοῦ ὁσίου Νικηφόρου τοῦ τὴν μονὴν συστησαμένου τὴν ἐν τῷ Χαρσιανῷ· καὶ μνήμη τοῦ ὁσίου μακαρίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου. Inc.: Τίς τινὲς ἡγιασμένοι γέροντες... (BHG 1005m)		-
30	(7): “Διήγησις τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ζωσιμᾶ· τῆς πολιτείας τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων”		(5): “Διήγησις πάνυ ὠφέλι- μος Μακαρίου μοναχοῦ τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου”	
32	(2): Διήγησις Ζωσίμου καὶ μακάρων		(1): Διήγησις τοῦ ἀββᾶ Μακαρίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου περὶ τὸν χωρισμὸν τῆς ψυχῆς	
35	(4): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου· καὶ	(3): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία καὶ διήγησις παράδοξος περὶ		

	ὅπως ἐδεήθη τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τοὺς μάκαρας, καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰς διοικήσεις αὐτῶν	τοῦ ὁσίου Μακαρίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου, τοῦ εὐρεθέντος εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς ἀοικῆτου		
36	(44): Λόγος τῶν ἁγίων μακαρίων τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ζωσίμου			(43): Διδασ- καλία τοῦ ἁββᾶ Μακαρίου εἰς μοναχοὺς
39	(3): τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου ἐξηγήσεις πρὸς τοὺς μακάρους πῶς εἶδεν αὐτοὺς			(12): Περὶ τοῦ ἁββᾶ Μακαρί- ου τοῦ πολιτι- κοῦ λόγος Inc.: Τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν αἰώνων πλουσίως χαριζομένου... (BHG 999y)
40	f. 470-sqq: Τοῦ μακαρίου Ζωσίμου ἐξηγῆς πρὸς τοὺς μακάρους πῶς εἶδεν αὐτοὺς.	f. 353 ^v -sqq: <i>Nar- ratio de Macar- io Romano anachoretae</i> (BHG 1005m)		f. 404-sqq: <i>Ap- ophtegmata tria : narratio de Macario Al- exandrino</i> (BHG 999y)
44	(46): Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τῶν ἁγίων μακάρων			(48): τοῦ ἁγίου Μακαρίου τοῦ ἐρημίτου λόγος περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Inc.: τοῦ ἁγίου Μακαρίου ὁ μαθητὴς διηγήσατο ὅτι ποτὲ διοδευ- όντων ἡμῶν... (BHG 999w)