

THE AUTHENTICITY OF ANASTASIOS SINAITA'S *HEXAEMERON* (CPG 7770)*

Dimitrios ZAGANAS

Scholars, since the 17th century, have been debating the authenticity of numerous works that have been traditionally assigned to Anastasios of Sinai. Opinions have differed widely as to the identity of the author: from those who identified one and the same person, Anastasios I patriarch of Antioch, to those who postulated the existence of three, four or more Anastasioi.¹ The same problem arises with regard to the *Spiritual Anagogy of the Hexaemeral Creation* (hereafter: *Hexaemeron*), which is ascribed to “saint Anastasios, presbyter and monk at holy mount Sinai and archbishop of Antioch”.² This commentary has been made available in Greek as recently as 2007, yet the fundamental issue of its authenticity and authorship is still a matter of controversy. In the present article, I will first review the recent hypotheses regarding the authenticity of the *Hexaemeron* and challenge the late dating and the title given to the commentary. I will then reassess its relationship with the two *Homilies on the making of man* (hereafter: *Sermones*) and show affinities and striking parallels with the aforementioned *Homilies*, the *Hodegos* and the *Questions and Answers* – works which are attributed to Anastasios of Sinai and considered authentic –, in order to answer to the

* This article is a revised and expanded version of a paper presented at the Fifth British Patristics Conference, London, September 2014. It was written as a part of an interdisciplinary research project entitled “From Chaos to Order – the Creation of the World. New Views on the Reception of Platonic Cosmogony in Later Greek Thought, Pagan and Christian” funded by the KU Leuven.

1. For an overview of the research, see S. N. SAKKOS, *Περί Αναστασίων Σιναιτών*, Thessaloniki 1964, p. 23-38; more recently, C. A. KUEHN, J. D. BAGGARLY (eds.), *Anastasios of Sinai: Hexaemeron* (OCA 278), Rome 2007, p. XIV-XXIII.

2. ANASTASIOS OF SINAI, *Hexaemeron*, ed. C. A. KUEHN, J. D. BAGGARLY, cited *supra* (hereafter: *Hex.*), p. 2: Τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀναστασίου πρεσβυτέρου καὶ μοναχοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου ὄρους Σινᾶ καὶ ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀντιοχείας εἰς τὴν πνευματικὴν ἀναγωγὴν τῆς ἑξαήμερου κτίσεως.

thorny question whether this commentary is to be attributed to Anastasius Sinaita, the author of *Hodegos*, or not.

1. – THE STATE OF THE ART

In 1964, Stergios Sakkos published his “diatriba de Anastasiis”, where he claimed that the *Hodegos* in its present form is a compilation which can be dated to the late 9th century, and that together with the *Hexaameron* and other works, was penned by a certain “presbyter Anastasius the allegorist”. Lacking historical evidence, his theory received ample criticism and has been generally rejected. However, Sakkos’ research provided valuable information about common features within the *Corpus Anastasianum*. Whilst the spiritual exegesis of the *Hexaameron* induced Sakkos to invent Anastasius the allegorist and to transpose his literary *œuvre* two centuries later, a parallel between Michael Psellus and the *Hexaameron*, discovered by John Baggarly, gave rise to a new hypothesis in 1970: Ps.-Anastasius, the author of the *Hexaameron*, would have copied from Psellus’ *De omnifaria doctrina* (Διδασκαλία παντοδαπή), for the simple reason that a talented writer like Psellus had no need to draw on the *Hexaameron*, and that no common source has been found. Baggarly then dated the composition of the *Hexaameron* between 1042 – the *terminus ante quem non* of redaction I of the *De omnifaria doctrina* – and ca 1164, the time that Michael Glycas composed his *Annales*, making use of the *Hexaameron*.³ One year later, Baggarly, a future editor of the *Hexaameron*, suggested that Ps.-Anastasius’ commentary would have been composed in about 1156; this late date would also explain the absence of any (surviving) manuscript copied before the end of the 15th century.⁴ Based on Sakkos and Baggarly’s contributions, in 1979 Maurice Geerard placed our *Hexaameron* as first among the “Anastasiana incertae originis” (CPG 7770).⁵

In the following years, Karl-Henz Uthemann, editor of *Hodegos* and a collection of ten other works ascribed to Anastasius of Sinai,⁶ demonstrated in a relatively convincing way that the *Hodegos* is a collection of *opera*

3. J. D. BAGGARLY, A Parallel between Michael Psellus and the *Hexaameron* of Anastasius of Sinai, *OCP* 36, 1970, p. 337-347.

4. J. D. BAGGARLY, Hexaplaric Readings on Genesis 4:1 in the Ps.-Anastasian *Hexaameron*, *OCP* 37, 1971, p. 242-243; IDEM, *The Conjugates Christ-Church in the Hexaameron of Ps.-Anastasius of Sinai: Textual Foundations and Theological Context*, Rome 1974, p. 22.

5. M. GEERARD (ed.), *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, III, Turnhout 1979, p. 462-463.

6. K.-H. UTHEMANN (ed.), *Anastasii Sinaitae: Viae dux* (CCSG 8), Turnhout 1981 (hereafter: *Hod.*); IDEM (ed.), *Anastasii Sinaitae Sermones duo in constitutionem hominis secundum imaginem Dei necnon opuscula adversus monotheletas* (CCSG 12), Turnhout 1985 (hereafter: *Sermo*).

minora, which had gone through two redactions in the life of its author, Anastasios monk of Sinai. Furthermore, based upon traditional ascriptions and similarities in style and content, Uthemann argued in support of the authenticity of both the *Sermones* and the antimonothelete chapters: they both belong to a single author, who is identical with the author of the *Hodegos*, i.e. Anastasios monk and presbyter in Sinai in the 7th century. However, a scholium in the margin of the second *Sermo* in the 10th-century ms. *Laurentianus* VII, 1 (Τούτων αἱ λύσεις τῶν κεφαλαίων κεῖνται ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῆς ἐξαημέρου ἡμῶν)⁷ raised the issue of the relationship between the two *Sermones* and the *Hexaemeron*, which Uthemann considers as inauthentic. In his Introduction,⁸ Uthemann acknowledged, on the one hand, that the scholium seems to come from the author of the *Sermo*, referring to another of his works, the *Hexaemeron*; such an impression otherwise is supported by an explicit reference in the *Hexaemeron* to Anastasios' two *Sermones*.⁹ While considering the contents of the commentary – not yet available in Greek – he postulated, on the other hand, the existence of two different authors. Without excluding the possibility that the *Hexaemeron* comes from the author of the *Hodegos* and the so-called *Sermons on the image of God in man*, Uthemann preferred not to identify the author of the commentary with Anastasios of Sinai and thus to consider their shared authorship as not genuine.

Although Uthemann also doubted the authenticity of the *Hexaemeron*, Baggarly was then forced to reconsider his position in the light of the scholium found in *Laurentianus* VII, 1. In his review of Uthemann's edition,¹⁰ the latter overemphasized the theological differences between the *Hexaemeron* and the *Sermones*, then suggested a parallel between the *Homilies on Psalms* attributed to a certain Asterius,¹¹ Anastasios of Sinai's *Questions and Answers* as they appear in the *Patrologia Graeca*, and the *Hexaemeron*, in order to formulate a new proposal: Ps.-Anastasios, the author of the *Hexaemeron*, seems to draw on Anastasios of Sinai's *Questions and Answers* rather than on Asterius' *Homilies*, and likewise, he seems to have read and reworked parts of Anastasios of Sinai's *Sermones*. In this way, Baggarly attempted to defend the existence of Ps.-Anastasios, whose *Hexaemeron*

7. In *Sermo* II, 3, 59/69.

8. *Sermo*, intr. by K.-H. UTHERMANN, p. CXXXIX-CXL.

9. *Hex.* VI, 370-372.

10. J. D. BAGGARLY, review of *Anastasii Sinaitae: Sermones duo* (CCSG 12), ed. K.-H. UTHERMANN, *OCP* 54, 1988, p. 253-255.

11. The identity of Asterius has been much debated and remains uncertain. See *CPG CPGS* 2815; M. P. CICCARESE, La composizione del "corpus" asteriano sui *Salmi*, *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 3, 1986, p. 7-42; ASTERIUS, *Psalmenhomilien*, ed. and transl. W. KINZIG, I-II (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur. Abteilung Patristik, 56-57), Stuttgart 2002.

would now have been composed at some point between the 9th or early 10th century – the date of redaction of the *Questions and Answers* containing a florilegium – and the second half of the 10th century, the latest possible date of *Laurentianus* VII, 1. In the following years, Uthemann became also more categorical about the inauthenticity of the *Hexaameron*: in an article for the *Patrologia* of A. Di Berardino,¹² he stated, for example, that the *Hexaameron* “con certezza non appartiene all’autore dell’*Hodegos*”.¹³ However, it is noteworthy that J. Baggarly and C. Kuehn published the *Hexaameron* under the name of Anastasius of Sinai, though without discussing the contentious issue of its authenticity.¹⁴ Whilst the edition princeps left open the possibility that the *Hexaameron* might have come from the author of the *Hodegos*, in 2010 Kuehn assumed that “nothing in the surviving text makes it impossible that Anastasius was the author”.¹⁵ Was he the author? Let’s examine in more detail the main arguments against its authenticity.

2. – OF A LATE DATE?

With regard to the date of the *Hexaameron*, one must say first that the lack of any manuscript copied before the end of the 15th century is not *per se* an argument against its authenticity, neither a reason for a late dating. Second, the latest date of the *Hexaameron* suggested by Baggarly – some time during the 11th-12th century – was based on an erroneous assessment of the parallel with Psellus, as Uthemann has rightly pointed out.¹⁶ Indeed, a close reading of the corresponding texts¹⁷ makes it highly probable that the author of the *Hexaameron* and Michael Psellus drew independently on a common doxographical source. To mention but two obvious differences between them,¹⁸ the

12. K.-H. UTHEMANN, Anastasio Sinaita, in A. DI BERARDINO (ed.), *Patrologia*. V, *Dal Concilio di Calcedonia (451) a Giovanni Damasceno (†750): I padri orientali*, Genova 2000, p. 338.

13. According to a personal communication, Uthemann maintained this opinion after the edition princeps of the *Hexaameron* in 2007 and in his forthcoming monograph (*Anastasios Sinaites: Byzantinisches Christentum in den ersten Jahrzehnten unter arabischer Herrschaft*).

14. Similarly, in his review of Uthemann’s contribution in A. Di Berardino’s *Patrology*, C. KUEHN (*BZ* 101, 2008, p. 813-815) attributed the *Hexaameron* to Anastasius of Sinai, bypassing the fact that Uthemann had treated it as spurious.

15. C. KUEHN, Anastasius of Sinai: Biblical Scholar, *BZ* 103, 2010, p. 56-57.

16. K.-H. UTHEMANN, intr. in *Sermones*, p. CXLVII n. 289, postulated the existence of a common third source.

17. *Hex.* I, 194-214; MICHAEL PSELLUS, *De omnifaria doctrina* 82-83, ed. L. G. WESTERINK, Nijmegen 1948 (hereafter: *De omnif.*). For the Greek text with an English translation, see J. D. BAGGARLY, A Parallel between Michael Psellus, cited n. 3, p. 339-345.

18. For a detailed comparison, see D. ZAGANAS, Debating the Principle(s) According to Anastasius Sinaita’s *Hexaameron* (on Gn 1:1a), to appear in the proceedings of the

Hexaemeron reports a materialist account of the origin of the world, according to which the prime “matter is the principle of the whole” (ἔστι δ' ὕλη πάντων ἀρχή) and thus prior to the “form” (εἶδος), whereas Psellus' *De omnifaria doctrina* presents a rather hylomorphic version.¹⁹ Furthermore, in the *Hexaemeron*, Plato's ideal form is regarded as “vain” (ματαιία ιδέα) and his philosophical system as a deviation from the truth, whilst in Psellus' miscellaneous work it is fully justified.²⁰ Third, the scholium preserved in the codex *Laurentianus* evidently implies that the *Hexaemeron* was composed before the 10th century. However, Baggarrly's hypothesis that the author of the *Hexaemeron* copied from the works of Anastasios Sinaita again relies upon a false parallel between Asterius, Anastasios of Sinai's *Questions and Answers* and the *Hexaemeron*. An examination of the relevant texts²¹ reveals that Asterius' twenty-first *Homily on Psalms* is the source on which the compiler of the florilegium in Anastasios' *Question 5* and the author of the *Hexaemeron* drew, though independently of one another. Except that the excerpt is not identical in content and in length, *Hexaemeron* adapts Asterius' demonstration on seven ages, whereas the florilegium simply quotes it. Fourth, Sakkos' theory that Anastasios the allegorist, the author of the *Hexaemeron*, lived in the second half of the 9th century has been based on a very problematic text, the *Disputatio Anastasii*, which is an anti-jewish pamphlet compiled in the 9th century from different sources.²² Fifth, the fact that the 10th-century ms. *Laurentianus* VII, 1 is the earliest testimony to the *Hexaemeron* does not imply that the commentary was composed shortly before that this ms. had been copied. In reality, the scholium in *Laurentianus* provides no more than a *terminus ante quem*.

international conference “Light on Creation: Ancient Commentators in Dialogue and Debate on the Origin of the World” (Leuven, 4-6 February 2015).

19. Compare *Hex. I*, 194-198: Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχὴ οὐκ ἔχει τι πρότερον ἑαυτῆς, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ὕλης καὶ τοῦ εἶδους γίνεται· προτέρα γὰρ ἢ ὕλη τοῦ εἶδους. [...] Ἔστι δ' ὕλη πάντων ἀρχή, φασί, πρῶγμα οὐσα ἀσώματον ἄποιον, with *De omnif.* 82: Ἡ μὲν ἀρχὴ οὐκ ἔχει τι πρότερον ἑαυτῆς, ὥσπερ ἡ ὕλη καὶ τὸ εἶδος· [...] Ἔστι δὲ ἡ ὕλη πρῶγμα ἀσώματον.

20. Compare *Hex. I*, 212-214: Πλάτων δὲ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὴν ὕλην εἵρηκεν ἀρχάς, τὸν μὲν ὡς θεὸν καὶ πατέρα, τὴν δὲ ὡς δεχομένην τὴν δημιουργίαν, καὶ τὴν ὡς ἔφησε ματαίαν ιδέα, παρεκκλίνων τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ πᾶν μὴ διδοὺς τῷ Θεῷ, with *De omnif.* 83: Πλάτων δὲ ἀρχάς εἵρηκε τὸν θεὸν ὡς πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν, τὴν ὕλην ὡς δεχομένην τὴν δημιουργίαν, καὶ τὴν ιδέα. Ἰδέαν δὲ λέγει Πλάτων τὴν πρώτην ἐννοίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν ἄρρητον ἐκείνην φαντασίαν καὶ ἀνατύπωσιν καθ' ἣν τὸν κόσμον ἐδημιούργησεν.

21. ASTERIUS THE SOPHIST (?), *Homily on Psalms* 21, 9-10, ed. M. RICHARD, Oslo 1956; PS.-ANASTASIOS OF SINAI, *Quaestio V*, PG 89, 368^c-369^c; *Hex. VII*, 469-493.

22. Cf. C. SCHIANO, Dal dialogo al trattato nella polemica anti giudaica. Il *Dialogo di Papisco e Filone* e la *Disputa contro i giudei* di Anastasio abate, *Vetere Christianorum* 41, 2004, p. 121-150.

3. – BY ANASTASIUS, “ARCHBISHOP OF ANTIOCH”?

Besides the date of the *Hexaemeron*, some clarification is needed regarding the title given by its editors. In his dissertation,²³ Baggarly argued that the archetype of the manuscripts read: “by saint Anastasius, presbyter and monk at holy mount Sinai and archbishop of Antioch, on the spiritual anagogy of the six-day creation”. Although Uthemann doubted the phrase “and archbishop of Antioch”, which seems to be not as original as “Anastasius, presbyter and monk at holy mount Sinai”,²⁴ Baggarly and Kuehn published in 2007 the *Hexaemeron* under that title. However, since the edition princeps is a collation of only three mss.,²⁵ this unlikely and somehow misleading title should not be taken for granted. On the contrary, at least four mss. of the so-called family IIIC²⁶ include: “by (our saint father) Anastasius of mount Sinai, monk and presbyter, on the spiritual anagogy of the six-day creation”, which agrees with the 16th-century Latin translation of Gentien Hervet (Paris 1579): “Anastasio Sinaitae monachi et presbyteri, in spiritualem anagogen sex dierum creationis”. In addition, Michael Glycas, the only Byzantine writer (12th c.) who expressly refers to the *Hexaemeron*, is ascribing it to “divine Anastasius Sinaita”.²⁷ On the basis of these data, the phrase “and archbishop of Antioch” seems to result from the usual confusion of Anastasius Sinaita with Anastasius patriarch of Antioch in late Byzantium, and therefore, it must be dismissed as an interpolation.

4. – RELATIONSHIP WITH THE *HOMILIES ON THE MAKING OF MAN*

Given that the *Hexaemeron* is ascribed to “Anastasius monk and presbyter at holy mount Sinai”, it is important to assess its relationship with other works, which are assigned to the same author and considered authentic. As mentioned above, a scholium appears in the second *Sermo*, where Anastasius is arguing that the whole narrative of Gn 2-3 has a mystical sense and thus it is to be taken as prefiguring the incarnation of Christ. The scholium establishes then a clear connection with both the *Hexaemeron* and its author,

23. J. D. BAGGARLY, *The Conjugates Christ-Church*, cited. n. 4, p. 22.

24. *Sermones*, intr. by K.-H. UTHEMANN, p. CXLIX-CL.

25. *Oxoniensis Collegii Novi* 139; *Vaticanus Palatinus* gr. 372; *Monacensis* gr. 145.

26. *Matritensis Bibliothecae Nationalis* 4773; *Vallicellanus* 99; *Vaticanus* gr. *Reginae Pii* II 12; *Musaei Britannici Additionalis* 21061. On the family IIIC, see *Hex.*, intr. by C. A. KUEHN, J. D. BAGGARLY, p. XLIII-XLVII.

27. E.g. MICHAEL GLYCAS, *Annales*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonn 1836, p. 30 (ὁ θεϊότατος Ἀνασ-τάσιος ὁ Σιναιτῆς ἐν τῇ ἐξαήμερῳ αὐτοῦ), 340 (ὡς φησιν ὁ Σιναιτῆς θεῖος Ἀναστάσιος).

since it indicates: “the solution to these chapters lies in the book of *our* hexaemeron”. Indeed, the second half of the *Hexaemeron* (books VIIb-XII) offers a radically typological exegesis of Gn 2-3, in which the listed *kephalaia* are discussed in depth. Moreover, the *Hexaemeron* itself contains a cross-reference to the two *Sermones*: καθὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς προονομασθεῖσι δύο ἐνομίσαμεν λόγοις τοῖς ἰδίᾳ ἐκδοθεῖσι περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατασκευῆς.²⁸ Except that the reference agrees with the title of the two homilies in the ms. tradition, the Trinitarian typology of man – *psyche*, *logos* and *nous* regarded as an image of the Father, the Logos and the Holy Spirit – is found in the first *Sermo*.²⁹ Despite this evidence, Uthemann postulated the existence of two different authors on the basis of the *Hexaemeron*'s contents. More specifically, he alleged that the Christ-Church typology which pervades the commentary on Gn 1-3 cannot be found in the *Hodegos*, nor in the two *Sermones*. However, Uthemann's objection seems to arise from a misunderstanding of two other scholia in the *Sermones*,³⁰ which suggest that the creation of Eve from Adam can also be read as related to Christ and the Church. Although Uthemann considers both scholia to be dubious, it seems that only the scholium in the first *Sermo* referring to Anastasios as a third person (ὁ ἐξηγητής) is due to a copyist,³¹ because it reproduces the original scholium found in the second *Sermo* about the same topic, i.e. the creation of Eve from Adam. Furthermore, it is noteworthy to observe that the second *Sermo* itself marks a step from a Trinitarian account of the creation of man to a Christological one; this change is justified *a posteriori* through another longer scholium added by Anastasios in the beginning of his *Sermo*.³² Hence, it is not a surprise that the *Hexaemeron*, composed after the second *Sermo*, lays great emphasis on the mystery of Christ and that it includes a Church typology as well. Rather, it should be regarded as an organic evolution of Anastasios' thought.

28. *Hex.* VI, 370-372.

29. Compare *Hex.* VI, 367-374, with *Sermo* I, 3, 1-40.

30. In *Sermo* I, 1, 83/85: Οὐκ ἀγνοῶν ὁ ἐξηγητής ὅτι ὁ Ἀδάμ καὶ ἡ Εὕα εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν λαμβάνονται, ἐξηγεῖται τοῦτο; in *Sermo* II, 2, 14: Ταῦτα καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀναφέρονται.

31. This copyist is apparently the same who added an introductory scholium to the third *Homily on the making of man* (*Sermones*, p. 55¹⁻⁵), for two reasons: first, the scholium is also referring to Anastasios as a third person (ὁ ἐξηγητής); second, it summarizes the explanation given by Anastasios himself in the middle of his *Sermo* (III, 3, 1-16). On this scholium, see J. DECLERCK, review of *Anastasioi Sinaitae: Sermones duo* (CCSG 12), ed. K.-H. UTHEMANN, *Byz.* 57, 1987, p. 287-288. It is noteworthy that similar scholia appear as chapter titles in *Hod.* XI (ἰα' Κεφάλαιον, ἐν ᾧ σημαίνει ὁ ἐξηγητής...) and XXI, 4 (Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις κατ'ἐπιτομὴν δηλοῦσα τὸν σκοπὸν τοῦ ἐξηγητοῦ...).

32. In *Sermo* II, 1, 1s., p. 51¹⁻⁶.

Besides the scholia and the cross-references, there is abundant evidence to identify the author of the *Hexaemeron* with the author of the two *Sermones*. To give but a few examples: both works share the idea that God speaks to Adam and Eve “as a single individual” (μονοπροσώπως);³³ that, unlike the beasts and birds, man was created naked by God, not by “clothing himself” (αὐτένδυτος);³⁴ that the angels were not created according to the image of God;³⁵ and that the completion of the creation in seven days displays the Trinity as uncreated, since the number ten completes all numbers.³⁶ Both works regard Methodius of Olympus as “the great wise man” (ὁ πολλὸς ἐν σοφίᾳ Μεθόδιος);³⁷ they dispute similarly with Jews (εἰ δὲ ἀντιλέγει ὁ Ἰουδαῖος)³⁸ and they refute the ditheism of Manicheans;³⁹ they defend a positive view of Adam’s fall, as prefiguring the Incarnation;⁴⁰ they apply the same exegetical method to the creation narrative. Furthermore, it is evident that the *Hexaemeron* is an *opus magnum*, where Anastasius incorporates elements of the two *Sermones*, as well as of other of his works which are lost and otherwise unknown.⁴¹

5. – AFFINITIES WITH THE *HODEGOS*

Now one might suggest, as Sakkos partially did, that the *Hexaemeron* and the *Sermones* come from a single author, who is not identical with the author of the *Hodegos*. But such an assumption is not valid, since the *Hexaemeron* shows so many affinities with the *Hodegos* as well. First, like the *Hexaemeron*, different pieces of the *Hodegos* are traditionally assigned to “Anastasius monk or presbyter (of mount Sinai)”,⁴² while in chapter X.3 the author of the *Hodegos* introduces himself as “Anastasius

33. *Sermo* II, 2, 61-63; *Hex.* X, 153-156.

34. *Sermo* II, 3, 12-13; *Hex.* X, 223-230.

35. *Sermo* I, 1, 37-40; *Sermo* II, 4, 9-16 and scholium; *Hex.* VIIb, 35-36.

36. *Sermo* II, 2, 30-33; *Hex.* VII, 505-508.

37. *Sermo* II, 1, 63-64; *Hex.* XI, 935-936.

38. *Sermo* II, 4, 8; *Hex.* IV, 196, VIIb, 28, X, 33.

39. *Sermo* II, 3, 29-43; *Hex.* I, 727-729.

40. See for example the identical exegesis of Gn 3:22 (Ἰδοὺ γέγονεν Ἀδὰμ ὡς εἷς ἐξ ἡμῶν) in *Sermo* II, 2, 50-70 and in *Hex.* XII, 65-88, where God’s statement is taken as not abusive (ὀνειδιστικόν) to Adam.

41. Namely: *Treatise Against the Jews* (cf. *Hex.* VI, 462-463), *Mystical Contemplation of the Passion* (cf. *Hex.* VII, 237-239), *Encomia to Egypt* (cf. *Hex.* VIII, 351-352).

42. *Hod.* III, 1, 9 (Ἀναστασίου ἐλαχίστου μοναχοῦ), IV, 1, 3 (Ἀναστασίου ἐλαχίστου πρεσβυτέρου τοῦ ἁγίου ὁρους Σινᾶ). See also the apparatus, *Hod.*, p. 3 and 18.

monk of holy mount Sinai".⁴³ Second, both works refer to the Fifth Ecumenical Council and the condemnation of Origenism, whilst articulating anti-origenistic positions.⁴⁴ Third, the two works rely on a vast corpus of patristic authors, show preference for early Greek fathers (like Justin the martyr, Irenaeus of Lyon, Clement of Alexandria),⁴⁵ claim the authority of Gregory of Nazianzus,⁴⁶ demonstrate sound knowledge of Alexandrian authors (from Philo to Olympiodorus), regard Cyril of Alexandria as "revealing God" (θεοφάντωρ)⁴⁷ and praise Ammonius of Alexandria.⁴⁸ Fourth, both works suggest that their author had been involved in disputes with Jews⁴⁹ and Monophysites,⁵⁰ and that he used to number his arguments.⁵¹ Fifth, with respect to language and style, both works contain *hapax legomena*,⁵² similar phrases,⁵³ characteristic sets of similar words,⁵⁴ and same etymologies.⁵⁵

43. *Hod.* X.3, 37: 'Εγὼ Ἀναστάσιος μοναχὸς τοῦ ἁγίου ὅρους Σινᾶ...

44. *Hod.* V, 1, 68-74, XXII, 3, 52-63; *Hex.* VIIb, 683-694, VIII, 14-18, XI, 929-930 etc.

45. *Hod.* I, 3, 73-79, II, 1, 1-3, VII, 1, 88-91; *Hex.* I, 321-324, VII, 170-171, VIIb, 469-475.

46. See e.g. the extensive use of Gregory's *Oration* 38 in both the *Hod.*, p. 417, and the *Hex.* I, 364-366, II, 62-64, VI, 646-647, VIIb, 48-9, 628-630 etc.

47. *Hod.* IX, 2, 43, X.2, 6, 39; *Hex.* VIIb, 701.

48. *Hod.* XIII, 10, 1-3 (ὁ περὶ πάντα πολυπειρότατος τῶν ἐξηγητῶν Ἀμμώνιος ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς); *Hex.* I, 150 (Ἀμμώνιος ὁ δοκιμώτατος τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐξηγητῆς), 323 (Ἀμμωνίου τοῦ σοφωτάτου).

49. Compare e.g. *Hod.* XIV, 1, 37-67, with *Hex.* VI, 415-467.

50. For example, both works offer the same anti-monophysite reading of GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS' *Oration* 39, 16, ed. C. MORESCHINI, *Discours 38-41* (SC 358), Paris 1990, p. 184 (τὸ σῶμα... τῇ θεώσει Θεός): *Hod.* XIII, 1, 30 (οὐ τῇ φύσει, ἀλλὰ τῇ θεώσει καὶ ἐνώσει); *Hex.* II, 70-71 (τῇ θεώσει καὶ τῇ ἐνώσει λέγεται Θεός, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ φύσει).

51. See e.g. *Hod.* VI, 2, 60-65, VII, 1, 24-39, X.2, 2, 1-40; *Hex.* IX, 127-148, XI, 426-434, 940-973.

52. Σημειοποιεῖν, σημειοποιῖας (*Hod.* XIV, 1, 35-36; *Hex.* VI, 557); ὁμματίζουσα (*Hod.* I, 1, 1; *Hex.* XII, 470); θεόστομος (*Hod.* I, 2, 123; *Hex.* X, 430, cf. *Sermo* II, 4, 50, III, 4, 72), πτωχοπρεπής (*Hod.* XIII, 8, 108, XXI, 1, 8 and 22; *Hex.* I, 18, II, 179). Occurrences of πτωχοπρεπής in PS.-ORIGEN'S *Fragmenta in Psalmos* (ed. J.-B. PITRA, Venice 1883, p. 465) and in the *Doctrina Patrum* (ed. F. DIEKAMP, Münster 1907, p. 245) come respectively from a quotation of the *Hex.* and the *Hod.* Outside the *Corpus Anastasianum*, θεόστομος and ὁμματίζων only occur later in the southern Italian hymnography (AHG V, canon 34; VII, canon 31), whilst the adverb πτωχοπρεπῶς is found once in the *Life of Theophanes* attributed to Methodius the Confessor.

53. E.g. προασφαλίζεσθαι τὸν ἀκροατὴν (*Hod.* I, 2, 29-30), προασφαλίζεται τὸν ἄνθρωπον (*Hex.* IX, 210); μανθανέτω ὁ ἀπαίδευτος (*Hod.* XIII, 3, 47, XVIII, 1, 59), μανθανέτωσαν οἱ ἀπαίδευτοι (*Hex.* VII, 378).

54. E.g. ἐνθρον καὶ σύνθρον (*Hod.* XIII, 4, 52), δλόθεις καὶ ἐνθεις καὶ σύνθεις (*Hod.* XXI, 4, 15); σύνθετον καὶ ἐνθρον καὶ ὁμόθρον (*Hex.* XII, 56-57). Cf. ἐνθρον καὶ σύνθρον καὶ ὁμόθρον (*Sermo* III, 5, 18).

55. E.g. ἀηδών (*Hod.* II, 4, 156; *Hex.* XII, 463); σελήνη (*Hod.* II, 8, 64-65; *Hex.* IV, 435-437); Κύριος, Θεός (*Hod.* II, 8, 62 and 87-93; *Hex.* VIIb, 111-115).

6. – WITHIN THE GENUINE ANASTASIAN WRITINGS

Moreover, the *Hexaemeron* offers three striking parallels with the *Hodegos*, as well as with the *Sermones* and the *Questions and Answers*, which are considered authentic. The first one concerns the distinction between *typos* and divine reality. According to Anastasius' refutation of Monophysitism in the *Hodegos*,⁵⁶ the anthropological model and any other pattern which is employed to explain the mystery of Christ or the mystery of the Trinity has to be considered "as a symbolic image" (εἰς εἰκόνα τυπικήν), not "as natural equality" (εἰς ἰσότητα φυσικήν) to Christ or to the Trinity. This distinction permits, in the *Hexaemeron*,⁵⁷ to regard the creation of the firmament called heaven (Gn 1, 6-8) as foreshadowing the Incarnation: the upper and invisible heaven symbolizes the divinity of Logos, the firmament from below is a type of Christ's flesh, while the water between the first and the second heaven images Christ's soul. The reason is that such a reading relies on "symbolic and not natural patterns of things" (τυπικοῖς ἀλλ' οὐ φυσικοῖς παραδείγμασι). The same distinction appears in the first *Sermo*,⁵⁸ where the creation of man in the image and the likeness of God is always understood as "in the symbolic image and likeness" (κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τυπικήν) of the Trinity, not as "in a natural equality" (κατ' ἰσότητα φυσικήν) to the Trinity. Likewise, in Anastasius' *Question 19*, the divine nature is compared to the human soul, since the latter, created in the image of God, foreshadows the divine nature "as in an image and sketch by grace, not by nature".⁵⁹

The second parallel refers to the account of the hypostatic union of Christ. In the *Hodegos*,⁶⁰ Anastasius defines this union as "the coexistent concurrence (ἀμφύπαρκτος συνδρομή) of the two natures in the womb of the saint mother of God". By the adjective ἀμφύπαρκτος, which is an *hapax*

56. *Hod.* VIII, 4, 37-52; XVIII.

57. *Hex.* II, 48-73.

58. *Sermo* I, 1, 48-57 (ὥσπερ ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ τινὶ καὶ σκιαγραφίᾳ τυπικῇ, οὐ φυσικῇ) and 96-98; 2, 9-11; 3, 85-86; 4, 92; 5, 35-36 and 65-66 (τυπικῶς... ἀλλ' οὐκ ἰσοφυῶς); 6, 10-14. Cf. *Sermo* II, 1, 12-13 and 38-48 (κατ' εἰκόνα λέγω, οὐ κατ' ἰσότητα).

59. *Anastasii Sinaitae: Quaestiones et responsiones* 19, 12-16, eds. M. RICHARD, J. A. MUNITIZ (CCSG 59), Turnhout 2006 (hereafter: *Quaest.*) (ὡς ἐν εἰκόνι τινὶ καὶ τύπῳ κατὰ χάριν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατὰ φύσιν). For an English translation, see J. A. MUNITIZ (intr., tr. and notes), *Anastasios of Sinai: Questions and Answers* (Corpus Christianorum in translation 7), Turnhout 2011, p. 90.

60. *Hod.* II, 5, 9-18. Cf. PS.-ATHANASIOS OF ALEXANDRIA, *Liber de definitionibus*, PG 28, 544^b-545^a; PS.-ZONARAS, *Lexicon*, ed. J.A.H. TITTMANN, Leipzig 1808, repr. Amsterdam 1967, p. 731.

legomenon,⁶¹ Anastasios indicates that the divine Logos did not assume a pre-existing body or soul, but existed at the same time with an animated and intellectual flesh, similarly to man's conception.⁶² The analogy between Christ and man is expounded in the second *Sermo*,⁶³ where man's conception is described in very similar terms as the soul-body union in the woman's womb through a coexistent concurrence (ἀμφυπάρκτω συνδρομῇ) and a twofold combination (συνόδω διδύμω), excluding any pre-creation or pre-existence both of the body and of the soul. On these grounds, the commentary on Gn 3:21,⁶⁴ regarding the clothing of Adam with skins as a prefiguration of the Incarnation in the light of Jn 1:14 ("The Word became flesh and dwelt among us"), provides a close yet more sophisticated account of the hypostatic union: "in the virgin Mary as in some intellectual dwelling, the Word of God, in a coexistent concurrence and instantaneous combination (ἐν ἀμφυπάρκτω συνδρομῇ καὶ συνόδω ἀκαριαίᾳ), has been intertwined and co-moulded in twofold nature in the hypostasis, but he has not pre-moulded the bodily nature".⁶⁵

61. Often confused with αὐθύπαρκτος in mss., the term ἀμφύπαρκτος occurs for the first time in the writings of and seems to have been coined by Anastasios of Sinai as more appropriate than συνύπαρκτος (cf. *Sermo* I, 4, 54) in a Christological context. Otherwise, ἀμφύπαρκτος only appears later in MICHAEL GLYCAS' (*Annales*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonn 1836, p. 132 and 139; *Quaestiones in sacram scripturam* 48, ed. S. EUSTRATIADIS, Athens 1906, p. 51) stereotypical definition of the human soul-body union as a hypostatic union (ἡ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑνωσις, τουτέστιν ἡ ἀμφύπαρκτος τῶν ἑτέρουσίων [ἐν τῇ μήτρᾳ] κατὰ ταύτῃ συνδρομῇ), which combines elements from three existing definitions: ANASTASIOS I OF ANTIOCH, *Capita philosophica* 139, ed. K.-H. UTHEMANN, *OCF* 46, 1980, p. 358; MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR (?), *Unionum definitiones*, ed. P. VAN DEUN, *REB* 58, 2000, p. 145; ANASTASIOS OF SINAI, *Hod.* II, 5, 9-11. With regard to the term ἀμφύπαρκτος, in *Quaest.* 48 Glycas acknowledges his debt to Anastasios of Sinai.

62. For earlier patristic discussions, see Uthemann's substantial apparatus *ad locum*, to which we can add: THEODORE OF SCYTHOPOLIS, *Libellus de erroribus Origenianis*, *PG* 86.1, 233^B, 236^A; ANASTASIOS I OF ANTIOCH (ed. S. N. SAKKOS, Thessaloniki 1976), *De orthodoxa fide* III, 14-20; IDEM, *Adversos eos qui in divinis dicunt tres essentias*, 47; IDEM, *De operationibus*, fragm. II, 4; MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR, *Ambigua ad Iohannem*, *PG* 91, 1325^{ABC} and 1341^{ABC}.

63. *Sermo* II, 2, 34-47.

64. *Hex.* XII, 29-47.

65. *Hex.* XII, 38-41: ἐν ᾗ (sc. παρθένῳ Μαρίᾳ) ὥσπερ τινὶ σκηνῇ λογικῇ ἐν ἀμφυπάρκτω συνδρομῇ καὶ συνόδῳ ἀκαριαίᾳ διδυμοφυῶς συνεπλάκη καὶ συνεπλάσθη καθ' ὑπόστασιν, ἀλλ' οὐ προεπλάσθη ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος τὴν σκηνόδημον φύσιν. I have emended αὐθύπαρκτω to ἀμφυπάρκτω on the grounds of the *Hodegos* and the second *Sermo*. This reading is otherwise supported by the *Hexaemeron*, which describes the incarnate Christ as ἀμφύπαρκτος (rather than αὐθύπαρκτος) καὶ ἀμφιγενῆς σύνθετος δερματοφόρος (*Hex.* XII, 42). I have also corrected the *hapax legomenon* σκηνώδημον to σκηνόδημον, which I translated as "bodily", instead of Lampe's "dwelling in a body", because προεπλάσθη can only refer to the human body/flesh assumed by the divine Logos.

The third parallel comprises a hermeneutical principle for the interpretation of Scripture. In his *Letter on the Faith* as preserved in the *Hodegos*,⁶⁶ Anastasius, although he alludes to the mystical meaning of the Genesis fall story, argues that “we don’t have to pry into what has been kept silent in the divine Scripture (οὐ γὰρ δεῖ ἡμᾶς περιεργάζεσθαι τὰ σεσιωπημένα τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ), I mean about paradise, the tree, the nudity, the garments and other similar questions, which have not been clearly made known in the sacred books”. The same approach is applied at the start of the eighth book of the *Hexaemeron*, where the interpreter warns in quite similar terms against delving into what has been kept silent in the divine Scripture (Καὶ ὅτι μὲν οὐ δεῖ τὰ σεσιωπημένα τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ διερευνᾶν, δῆλον)⁶⁷ with regard to the essence of the two trees in paradise (Gn 2:9). Apart from the similarity in wording and scope with the *Hodegos*, the *Hexaemeron*’s phrase occurs almost verbatim in Anastasius’ *Question 19*,⁶⁸ which discusses the nature of the human soul.

There is abundant evidence to object to the inauthenticity of the *Hexaemeron*. However, is this evidence sufficient to ascribe with certainty the *Hexaemeron* to Anastasius Sinaita, the author of the *Hodegos*, and thus to regard it as authentic? For an answer, we shall go back to late 7th-century Egypt, when the monk Anastasius was fighting against Monophysitism. In that period, he seems to have visited often the library of the Patriarchate of Alexandria. As he narrates in the *Hodegos*,⁶⁹ he noted there with regret that the doctrinal writings of St. Cyril had been “corrupted and falsified” (νενοθευμένας καὶ διεστραμμένας) by the Severians. Therefore, he was advising to argue against the Monophysites on the basis of the Bible, which is “genuine and indisputable” (ἀνόθευτος καὶ ἀναντίρρητος).⁷⁰ Surprisingly, this is what Anastasius frequently does in the *Hexaemeron*: he defends the Chalcedonian doctrine while explaining the creation narrative. For instance, he comments extensively on the double name “Lord God” (Κύριος ὁ Θεός) in support of the double nature of Christ (Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος).⁷¹ The doubling of name occurs, as he states, after the creation of man, not once

66. *Hod.* IV, 30-36. The same principle appears also in the short *Progymnasia* which opens the *Hodegos* (I, 1, 15-16: ὅτι οὐ δεῖ τὰ βαθυτέρα ἡμῶν ψηλαφᾶν, οὐδὲ τὰ σεσιωπημένα τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ).

67. *Hex.* VIII, 6-8. Cf. *ibidem*, 19-22.

68. *Quaest.* 19, 6-7 (“Ὅτι μὲν οὐ δεῖ τὰ σεσιωπημένα τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ ἐρευνᾶν, πρόδηλον).

69. *Hod.* X.1, 1, 3-9; X.1, 2, 16-17; X.2, 7, 176-190.

70. *Hod.* VI, 2, 54-66.

71. *Hex.* VIIIb, 1-278.

or twice, but in seventeen passages in a row. To reinforce his argument, Anastasius quotes then the beginnings of the biblical sections of Gn 2:8 to 3:23, according to what he found “in the most accurate, genuine and ancient (ἀκριβῆ καὶ ἀνόθευτα καὶ ἀρχαῖα) copies of the Scripture, among the texts of Clement, Irenaeus, Philo the philosopher and the compiler of the annotated Hexapla”.⁷² The pro-Chalcedonian reading of Genesis as well as the recourse to the authority of genuine Bible manuscripts and early Alexandrian masters – whose writings seem to have been preserved in the library of the Patriarchate of Alexandria – make it highly probable that the interpreter of the *Hexaemeron* was addressing the Christians of Egypt in a period when forgery was very common (7th c.), and that he was thus identical with the polemicist of the *Hodegos*, Anastasius monk of mount Sinai.

Dimitrios ZAGANAS
Faculty of Theology
KU Leuven

72. *Hex.* VIIb, 231-252. Cf. *Hex.* VIII, 72 (εὕρομεν ἐν τοῖς ἀνοθεύτοις τῶν Ἑξαπλῶν ἀντιγράφων).