

Orígenes. Finalmente la doctrina de la apocatástasis fue condenada, pero en realidad, la causa de esta condena fue el hecho de que la apocatástasis se asoció a la doctrina de la preexistencia de las almas, que según nuestra autora, Orígenes nunca enseñó. También la doctrina de la preexistencia fue asociada a la *θέωσις*, pero fue concebida en forma panteísta. En el último capítulo dedicado fundamentalmente a Agustín y al Eriúgena, I. Ramelli comienza mostrando que es plenamente consciente de la sorpresa que sus afirmaciones con respecto a Agustín, pueden producir en algunos especialistas. Al respecto sostiene que Agustín al comienzo de su obra y en su etapa anti-maniquea, sostuvo la doctrina de la apocatástasis, desconociendo que ésta pertenecía a Orígenes. Luego al ser mal informado con respecto al pensamiento del alejandrino, la condenó como herética en sus *Retractationes*. Finalmente en el apartado dedicado a Juan Escoto Eriúgena, muestra como la presencia de Orígenes, es fundamental para comprender su obra *Periphyseon*, postulando que ésta tuvo como fuente de inspiración al *De Principiis* de Orígenes. Retomando nuestra consideración inicial acerca de que hacer una reseña bibliográfica de un libro como éste, era una tarea destinada al fracaso, concluiremos diciendo que somos plenamente conscientes de que no hemos podido abordar todos los temas y autores que aquí se estudian. Sólo no queda recomendar a los lectores interesados en la historia de la patrística, la lectura cuidadosa y detenida de esta obra monumental, no buscando siempre estar de acuerdo con todo lo que la autora postula, pero si admirando el esfuerzo serio y audaz de una investigadora que ha planteado con gran rigor científico una cuestión controvertida y decisiva no sólo para el pasado, sino también para nuestro presente.

[Patricia Ciner]

Macario l'Egiziano

Satoshi TODA, *Vie de S. Macaire l'Égyptien. Édition et traduction des textes copte et syriaque* (Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 31) Gorgias Press, Piscataway, NJ 2012, pp. xi+704.

Satoshi Toda's project related to the *Life* of St Macarius ascribed to Serapion first appeared in a detailed outline as early as in 2000¹. Even then, it was evident that the author had already completed, among others, a painful task of discerning, in various recensions of Macarius' *Life*, the apophthegms which were passing under his name in various collections of the *Apophthegmata patrum*. The *Life* of Macarius was originally composed as a common macroform for these short stories and sayings of earlier origin, and, therefore, must be considered not only on its own account but also as a specific kind of apophthegms' collections. Thus, Toda's study was a contribution into the hagiographic subdiscipline sometimes called 'apophthegmology', and now this earlier work is incorporated and enlarged in Toda's monograph. However, Toda's Ph.D. thesis on the *Life* of Macarius has not been defended and published in the early 2000s, as it had to be expected. Now the author mentions in the *Préface* to his book that the whole work was «menacé d'un naufrage catastrophique» (v) but saved by the Leiden University, where his thesis was eventually defended in 2006. Then, the publication of such a voluminous work turned out to be another difficult task – now accomplished with the help of the Gorgias Press. The game was worth the candle: the book contains much more than its subtitle promises. In fact, Toda considers the whole dossier of Macarius in all languages (Coptic, Syriac, Greek, Arabic, Ethiopic, Georgian, and Slavonic), including a detailed study of the Arabic tradition (whose understanding is crucial for that of the whole history of the text) and the Greek one (including the *editio princeps* of the Greek recension BHG 999j = CPG 2501 based on the two preserved manuscripts). The Coptic Bohairic (BHO 573) and Syriac (BHO 574) recensions were edited previously (by E. Amélineau, 1894, and P. Bedjan, 1895, respectively) but not critically. Moreover, Toda republished, with his own revision, the two known Sahidic fragments of the *Life* previously published respectively by Walter Ewig Crum (1909) and Youhanna Nessim Youssef (2005). These fragments, despite their relatively small size, serve to demonstrate that the available Bohairic text is secondary in relation to an earlier Sahidic recension. Toda discerns two recensions of the *Life*, called by him A and C. Formerly, in his 2000 study, he discerned three recensions (A, B, and C) but now he considers his former recension B as a subrecension of the Arabic version which still represents the recension A. The recension A is presented by the manuscripts from the anti-Chalcedonian camp (in Coptic, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic), whereas the recension C circulated among the Chalcedonians (in Greek, Georgian, and Slavonic). The Ethiopic recension matches almost exactly one of the subsisting Arabic subrecensions (see pp. 65-70, with publications of fragments of unpublished Arabic and Ethiopic manuscripts). The main conclusions of the author concerning the history of the text are the following. It is still impossible to say with any certitude whether the original language of the *Life* was Greek or Coptic Sahidic. At least, there is no specific argument in favour of the original in Greek, unless general consideration that such often was the case. The author proves that the actual Greek version is a reworking of an Arabic one (78-87), where the name of the eparch of Antioch, Agathonicus, was corrupted into "Diocletian". In Greek, this name

¹ S. TODA, *La vie de S. Macaire l'Égyptien: État de la question*, AnBoll 118 (2000) 267-290.

provoked a further corruption of the text, where this Diocletian is no longer an official but the emperor himself, and so, the passage where Macarius explains the healing of the daughter of this official with the piety of her parents (presented in Coptic, Syriac, and Arabic) disappeared from the Greek text being inapplicable to such an emperor as Diocletian. The reading 'Diocletian' is presented in the available Arabic manuscripts, whereas none of them can be considered as the original of the Greek version (Toda concluded that the Greek text goes back to a lost Arabic subrecension, which was, however, a predecessor of a part of the preserved Arabic manuscripts). Toda establishes the *terminus ante quem* for the Greek version the late eleventh or early twelfth century when it is quoted by John the Oxites, patriarch of Antioch (1085–1100, died after 1112) (p. 87). The Syriac version, according to Toda, depends not only on the Coptic one (already Bohairic: see, for the demonstration, pp. 70–73) but also other Bohairic sources: two collections of Macarius' apophthegms in Bohairic published and translated by Amélineau in 1894². The Arabic translation is, according to Toda, unique and was performed from the Syriac but, very probably, in Egypt (pp. 55–64). The Georgian and Slavonic versions are unpublished. Judging from the published descriptions of the manuscripts but without consulting the manuscripts *de visu*, Toda considers them as representatives of the recension C and translations of the preserved Greek version. I tried to find out whether this *a priori* Toda's consideration is right by checking some Slavonic³ and Georgian⁴ manuscripts at the crucial place where either Diocletian or Agathonius is mentioned. Both these versions mention «the king Diocletian»; therefore, Toda's supposition seems to be right. It is clear, from the available data, that these versions – or, at least, the Slavonic one – were more widespread than their Greek original. The Georgian version is known in three manuscripts of the 12/13th cent. (pp. 51–54)⁵. The Slavonic manuscripts known to Toda are only the two (16th cent.) indicated in 1950 by R.A. Klostermann (p. 54), but there are, at least, ten more South Slavic manuscripts starting from as early as the fourteenth century (apparently belonging to rec. C)⁶, not to say of the presence of the *Life of Macarius* in the monumental Russian menologion (*Velikie minei četii*) of metropolitan Macarius of Moscow. It is a somewhat unsuspected result of Toda's research: we know now one more example of a success in Slavonic of a Greek work that has never been especially popular in Byzantium. We have to congratulate all the devotees of the Christian hagiography and the texts with an especially complicated history on this too long-awaited publication of Toda's work.

[Basil Lourié]

Plotino

Plotinus, *Ennead II 9* [33] 'Against the Gnostics': *A Commentary* by Nicola SPANU (Studia Patristica Supplement 1), Peeters, Leuven-Paris-Walpole, MA 2012, pp. XXIV+229.

Il primo volume della nuova collana *Studia Patristica Supplements*, diretta da Allen Brent e Markus Vinzent, trae origine da una tesi di dottorato preparata nel triennio 2007–2010 presso l'Università di Birmingham sotto la supervisione dello stesso Vinzent. L'autore appartiene alla schiera, ormai sempre più nutrita anche nel campo degli studi umanistici, di giovani italiani che, dopo essersi formati in un'università del nostro Paese (in questo caso, Cagliari), hanno trovato migliori opportunità di ricerca all'estero. Il libro si presenta come un commento del trattato plotiniano (il 33° in ordine cronologico) che Porfirio ha collocato all'ultimo posto della seconda enneade con il titolo *Contro gli Gnostici* (Πρὸς τοὺς Γνωστικούς), o anche *Contro quelli che dicono che è cattivo il demiurgo del cosmo e*

² I would like to add a reference to the translation by Antoine Guillaumont (prepared to replace the translation by Amélineau as inexact and often erroneous) in L. REGNAULT, *Les sentences des Pères du desert. Troisième recueil et tables*, Solesmes, 1976, 151–191 («Vertus de Saint Macaire»), 191–194 (other Macarian apophthegms).

³ Only one Slavonic manuscript has been checked for me by Natalia Pavlovna Pokhilko (to whom I am grateful very much): Moscow, The State Historical Museum (GIM), BMЧ [= *Velikie minei četii*, 'The Great Menologion'], *Sinod.* 990, f. 686r–v, but this manuscript is a very good one, being a part of the official (manuscript) 16th-century edition of the complete hagiographical collection in Slavonic prepared under the metropolitan of Moscow Macarius when he was still the archbishop of Novgorod (1526–1542). The *Life of Macarius* (on January 19) is contained in the very small part of the 12-month collection that remains unpublished even now. The publication is scheduled in the series *Monumenta linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris*.

⁴ I am very grateful for David Shengelia (National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi) for providing me a kind of critical edition of the relevant chapter 13 according to the mss Codices Tbilisi A-79 and A-129 (the photocopy of the Jerusalem ms Roto Jer. 17 available in the National Centre of Manuscripts in Tbilisi is incomplete and does not contain the relevant part). The relevant place contains *მეფისა დიოკლეტიანესი* [ფეოკლეტიანესი] «of king Diocletian» (A-79, f. 244r [A-129, f. 81v]).

⁵ Enrico Gabidzashvili from the National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi, confirms that this list provided by Toda is so far exhaustive. I am grateful to him and Nikoloz Nikolozishvili for the consultation.

⁶ Климентина Иванова [Klimentina IVANOVA], *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Balcano-Slavica*, Sofia 2008, 445. There is no Russian manuscript earlier than the 16th cent.: cf. lack of the *Life of Macarius* in Oleg Viktorovich Tvorogov's inventory (O.B. ТВОРОГОВ, *Переводные жития в русской книжности XI–XV веков. Каталог* [The Translated Lives in the Russian Literature of the 11th–15th centuries. A Catalogue], Moscow-St Petersburg 2008).