

Cyril of Scythopolis, V. Sabae 53; a note on *κατά* in late Greek 87

χρυσικός, ἡ, ὅν = *χρύσεος*, golden. In this sense the adjective is known from only one source, according to the *LSJ*⁹ entry s.v. II. A second instance of its use in the same sense is found in Sec., p. 76,23: *πλούσιος . . . ἦν χρυσικοῖς ὀβολοῖς*. For similar formations cf. *μαρμάρεος* — *μαρμαρικός*, *ταύρεος* — *ταυρικός*.

Cyril of Scythopolis, V. Sabae 53;
a note on *κατά* in late Greek

By A. CAMERON, New York

I

The holy man Sabas spent the winter of 511/12 at Constantinople in τὸ προάστειον Ῥουφίνου τοῦ κατὰ Δημόστρατον,¹⁾ which A.-J. Festugière renders 'au faubourg de Rufin, le contemporain de Démonstrate.'²⁾ Convinced that *κατά* here could only mean 'contemporary of,' he added in a footnote that this Demonstratus, though otherwise unknown, must have been a contemporary of Rufinus, praetorian prefect under Theodosius I and Arcadius, who built the palace. It is in fact possible to suggest and parallel a quite different meaning for *κατά*—implying a quite different date for Demonstratus.

The obvious objections to Festugière's interpretation are (a) why date the famous Rufinus by the unknown Demonstratus, and (b) why indeed date him at all? We know a certain amount about this 'palace of Rufinus', known as the *Rufiniana*:³⁾ confiscated by Arcadius on Rufinus' death in 395, it was used as an imperial residence by his three daughters and, occasionally, by Theodosius II. By the mid sixth century, when Cyril was writing, it was owned by Belisarius (Procopius, *BP* i. 25.23f.). Surely what we should expect from Cyril is information about who owned the place in 511/12. Who was Sabas' host?

¹⁾ *Kyrrillos von Skythopolis*, ed. E. Schwartz (Texte und Untersuchungen xlix. 2), 1939, p. 145, 6.

²⁾ *Les moines d'Orient* iii. 2 (1962), p. 71.

³⁾ See the material (to which we can now add the Cyril passage) collected by J. Pargoire, 'Rufiniana', *BZ* viii (1899), 429–77, at pp. 458f.

Compare now Justinian, *Novel* 150 *pr.* (555), a list of estates tabulated in the will of the 'most glorious Alexander,' including:

τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τὴν κατὰ Μαρμιανόν . . . τὸ προά-
στειον τὸ ἐν Βλαχέρναις τὸ κατὰ Εὐγένιον καὶ Ἰουλιανὸν τοὺς
τῆς ἐνδόξου μνήμης, καὶ τὸ προάστειον τὸ ἐν τῷ ἄκρῳ τοῦ κόλπου τοῦ
Σωσθενίου τό ποτε κατὰ Ἀρδαβούριον τὸν τῆς ἐνδόξου μνήμης . . .

How can these estates be 'contemporary with' the various persons named? There can in fact be little doubt that *κατά* here means 'in the possession of'; thus in the last case the property 'used to belong to Ardaburius' (dead now for more than a century).

I have not been able to trace further Greek examples, but interestingly enough the usage passed into Latin.⁴⁾ First and most obviously the contemporary Latin version of *Novel* 150: 'domum quae in Antiochia cata Mammianum . . .' The meaning is neatly illustrated by the one item in the list where the Latin version diverges slightly from the Greek: *προάστειον τοῦ Φιλοθέου* appears as 'proastium . . . cata Philotheum,' showing that 'cata' + acc. is no more than an 'Umschreibung' for the possessive genitive. For another illustration of the meaning of the formula compare De Rossi, *ICUR* II (1888), p. 413, 1.25, 'olibet(um) qui est . . . cata Gemmulu[m] mag(istru)m milit(um)' with the very next line, 'olibet(um) quem tenet Franculus colonus.' And for a further example of the usage cf. the later document published by De Rossi,⁵⁾ 'hortum cata quondam Annibonium', exactly paralleling *τό ποτε κατὰ Ἀρδαβούριον* in *Nov.* 150.

What Cyril is saying then is that Sabas stayed at the *προάστειον* of Rufinus which *at that time belonged to* a certain Demostratus. Only to extract this sense we must make a very slight correction to bring his words into line with what was evidently a standard quasi-legal formula: for *τοῦ κατὰ* write *τὸ κατὰ*.

It follows that Demostratus was a contemporary of Sabas, not Rufinus. He may be added to the list of pious Byzantine aristocrats who were so ready to entertain visiting holy men.

For the sake of completeness, and to save the authority of his name misleading the unwary, it is perhaps necessary to draw attention to E. Stein's unfortunate attempt to identify both Rufinus and Demostratus. 'En réalité', he wrote, 'il s'agit indubitablement d'un

⁴⁾ For 'cata' in Latin see *ThLL* III. 585.

⁵⁾ *Bull. d'archéol. chrét.* sér. 2, i (1870), 113, quoted by J.-O. Tjäder, *Die nichtliterarischen latein. Papyri Italiens aus der Zeit 445–700*, I (1955), p. 422.

autre Rufin, diplomate bien connu, grand favori de Kavadh I^{er}, gendre du consul de 498 Jean le Scythe, et frère de Demonstratus ou Timostratus, que nous connaissons également fort bien.⁶⁾ Alas, this Demonstratus is a ghost. As de Boor pointed out long ago,⁷⁾ it is clear from Evagrius (*HE* iv. 12) that *Τιμόστρατον* must be restored for the *Δημόστρατον* of the MSS at Procopius, BP i. 17.44 (Evagrius' source); all other sources agree that the man (a general) was called *Timostratus*.⁸⁾ And with the restoration and true interpretation of Cyril's actual words, there is no longer any need to suppose (as Stein, like Festugière, did) that the two men were contemporaries. There can in any case be no question about the identity of the *προάστειον* of Rufinus.

It can be added that the possession denoted by this *κατά* formula does not necessarily imply legal ownership. The glorious Alexander was in no doubt that *he* owned all the properties he disposes of in his will; indeed his heirs are expressly forbidden to alienate their legacies, whether by sale, exchange or gift. Those who are not stated to have been former owners of his properties (e.g. Ardaburius) were perhaps only his tenants. It seems natural to suppose that the Rufiniana, for long an imperial palace, was presented to Belisarius by Justinian, in return for his exceptional services.⁹⁾ So how did Demonstratus come to be living there, if it was still an imperial property then?

The maintenance of these palace must surely have been a heavy drain on imperial finances. It would (I suggest) be highly characteristic of the canny Anastasius, who left his empire the fullest treasury it had ever seen, to have let out such of the many imperial palaces as he did not use, for an appropriate rent, to those who could afford to keep them up. It may be that Justinian's gift of the Rufiniana to Belisarius was not entirely disinterested generosity.

II

This qualification that the *κατά* formula might connote 'at the disposal of' rather than straightforwardly 'in the possession of', may perhaps provide the bridge to another, rather puzzling, series

⁶⁾ *Anal. Boll.* lxii (1944), 181 (= *Opera Minora Selecta* (1968), 593), in a review of Schwartz's edition (important for its correction of Schwartz's chronology).

⁷⁾ In his edition of Theoph. Simocatta, *index nom.* p. 348.

⁸⁾ All quoted by Stein, l.c. (and see too *PLRE* II s.v., forthcoming).

⁹⁾ Procopius happens to mention that it was actually Belisarius' property, *Βελισαρίων δὲ ἴδιον ἐτύγγανεν ὄν*, BP i. 25. 21.

of texts, where we find the same formula, but with a person, not a property, as its subject.

Standard reference works state firmly that 'A κατὰ τὸν B' means 'A surnamed B', or 'A who was known as B.'¹⁰ By the ninth or tenth century this was certainly the case. There are a number of examples in the corpus known as Theophanes Continuatus, of which the most explicit is p. 122.8, *Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ κατὰ τὸν Κορτομύτην* ('Snubnose')¹¹; we hear later (p. 175.8) of a man who, by marrying this Constantine's daughter, won himself his father-in-law's nickname too (*ἐκεῖθεν γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ ἡ τοῦ Κορτομύτου ἐκκληρώθη προσηγορία*). There are several other cases where the second name is fairly clearly a nickname: e.g. p. 175.2, *Κωνσταντῖνῳ τῷ κατὰ τὸν Βαβούτζικον*; p. 250.9, *τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Καπνογένην Κωνσταντίνου*; p. 293.2, *ὁ κατὰ τὸν Ὠορύφαν Νικήτας*.¹² The *Κωνσταντῖνον τὸν κατὰ τὸν Τριφύλιον* of p. 122.8 reappears at p. 635.21 (a different writer) as *Κωνσταντῖνῳ τῷ Τριφυλλίῳ* (and for *Τριφύλλιος* as a nickname cf. Theophanes, p. 476.7 de Boor, with pp. 477.2, 479.10, 491.7).

There are also many cases where κατὰ plus a second name (usually written as one word) is used as a family name, the κατὰ denoting association with a particular locality. Most notably the Ca(n)-tacuzeni (from Kouzenás near Smyrna);¹³ others are the names Katakalon, Katakalenos,¹⁴ Katasabbas¹⁵ and Kataphloron.¹⁶ From a somewhat earlier period there is *Νικήφορος ὁ κατὰ τὸν Φωκᾶν προσαγορευόμενος* in Theophanes Continuatus (p. 313.1), where Phocas, though not a locality, can hardly be a nickname.

But there are many examples, mostly of a much earlier date, that do not fit either meaning (though they are often classified among those that do). Perhaps the clearest is the latest, from Theophanes' list of those persecuted by Constantine V:

- (1) *Δαβὶδ σπαθᾶριος κατὰ τὸν Βησῆρ καὶ κόμης τοῦ Ὀψικίου, Θεοφύλακτος ὁ Ἰκονιάτης πρωτοσπάθαριος καὶ στρατηγὸς τῆς Θράκης,*
- (2) *Χριστοφόρος ὁ κατὰ τὸν πατρίκιον Ἰμέριον σπαθᾶριος, Κωνσταντῖνος σπαθᾶριος καὶ βασιλικὸς πρωτοστράτωρ...*

¹⁰ E.g. Sophocles, *Byzantine Lexicon*, s.v. κατὰ (c); A. N. Jannaris, *Historical Greek Grammar* (1897), § 1591 (p. 385).

¹¹ Compare Basil *μεγαλομύτης*, 'Bignose': *GRBS* xi (1970), 342.

¹² For other examples see pp. 17. 6; 22. 11; 69. 18.

¹³ See D. M. Nicol, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos ca. 1100–1460* (1968), viii–ix; see too, more generally, V. Laurent, *REB* xx (1962), 218–21.

¹⁴ Nicol, p. viii, n. 9.

¹⁵ K. Amantos, *BZ* xxviii (1928), 14–16.

¹⁶ Most recently P. Wirth, *BZ* lvi (1962), 235–6.

- (3) Θεοφύλακτος κανδιδᾶτος ὁ κατὰ τὸν Μαρινάκην, καὶ ἕτεροι (p. 438.8f.).

Now *σπαθᾶριοι* and *κανδιδᾶτοι* are both types of guardsman, and I would suggest that the word order, (1) *σπαθᾶριος κατὰ τὸν* –, (2) ὁ *κατὰ τὸν* – *σπαθᾶριος*, and (3) *κανδιδᾶτος ὁ κατὰ τὸν* –, means that David, Christopher and Theophylact were in each case personal bodyguards of the bearer of the second name.¹⁷⁾ The ‘surname’ explanation certainly fails in the second case, since ‘Christopher, nicknamed Himerius the patrician, the spathar’ is a manifest absurdity. Beser too is a well known figure (but dead by the time of which Theophanes is writing, whence David’s advancement to a regular post in the imperial service). The better documented sixth century provides many examples of men in private service (*bucellarii*, as they were popularly known, or, in Procopius’ Greek, *Βελισαρίων δορυφόρος* or *λόγιμος ἐν τῇ Βελισαρίων οἰκίᾳ*) moving on to imperial commands.^{17a)}

The next batch of examples all come in the same fragment of Malalas, from the list of those accused of conspiring against Justinian in 562:¹⁸⁾ (1) Ἀβλάβιος ὁ κατὰ Μελτιάδην ὁ μελίστης (musician)¹⁹⁾ . . . (2) Μάρκελλος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης (banker)²⁰⁾ . . . ὁ κατὰ Αἰθέριον τὸν κουράτορα . . . (3) Ἰωάννη τῷ λογοθέτῃ τῷ κατὰ Δομνετζιόλον . . . (4) Ἰσάκιος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης ὁ κατὰ Βελισάριον. The nickname ex-

¹⁷⁾ So, correctly, de Boor in his index nominum s.vv.—as indeed the Latin version printed beneath the Bonn text (‘Theoph. candidatus Marinaci deputatus’ etc.). Interestingly enough the near contemporary Latin version by Anastasius (in de Boor’s vol. II) omits all the *κατά* formulae (presumably Anastasius could not understand them).

^{17a)} A. H. M. Jones, *Later Roman Empire* III (1964), 206, n. 140 *ad fin.*; cf. (e.g.) Procopius, *BG* i. 29. 20, *BV* ii. 10. 4.

¹⁸⁾ *frag.* 49, *Excerpta de Insidiis*, ed. de Boor, p. 173. 33f.; cf. the abbreviated versions in the Bonn edition text of Malalas (p. 493. 4f.) and Theophanes (p. 237. 17f. de Boor).

¹⁹⁾ Translators and commentators normally render this word ‘monetarius’ or the like (even E. Stein, *Bas-Empire* ii (1949), 779). There seems no good reason to doubt that it bears its ordinary sense, namely musician: see D. Tabachovitz, *Sprachl. und Textkrit. Studien zur Chronik des Theophanes Confessor* (1926) 28–9, and (independently) J. Handschin, *Das Zeremonienwerk Kaiser Konstantins* (1942), 73. Curiously enough Theophanes makes the man an *ex*-musician, ἀπὸ μελιστῶν.

²⁰⁾ A forthcoming study by Patsy Vanags will cast much light on the character and role of bankers at this period; meanwhile, see S. Vryonis, *DOP* xvii (1963), 295

planation obviously does not work for (2); Aitherius is a well-known figure, as of course is Belisarius (4). Moreover, in the other two examples, the Oxford epitome (Bonn ed.) of Malalas has Ἀβλάβιος Μελτιάδου (1) and Ἰωάννη τῷ Δομετιόλου (3), implying that the first named is in some relation of dependance to the second. Not, however, the direct relationship of kin that the genitive might seem to imply, since Isaac at any rate was certainly not Belisarius' son. Surely it is just as with Theophanes' list: Ablabius was a musician employed by Meltiades, Marcellus the personal banker of Aitherius, John the personal logothete of Domentziolus, and Isaac a banker in Belisarius' own household. Another of those accused was Belisarius' *optio* (or *curator*, according to Theophanes).²¹ Not surprisingly Aitherius and Belisarius themselves were later accused, on the pretext that they must have been privy to the doings of their employees.

We should probably explain in the same way Nicephorus Patr., *Hist.* p. 23.13 de Boor, Σέργιος γὰρ ὁ κατὰ Νικήταν τελεύτα τρόπω τοιῶδε (Nicetas could hardly be a surname or nickname). Nor can there be much doubt about the one Latin example I have found, one among a list of witnesses in another will, dated 25 February 575 at Ravenna:²²)

T]heodosius v(ir) d(evotus), mag(ister) l(itterarum).
Andreas v(ir) h(onestus) cata ipso Zenobio.

The 'ipso' shows that Zenobius is not the same person as Andreas — and presumably someone of consequence. Tjäder rightly translated 'bei dem Zenobius,' meaning 'in the household of Zenobius.'

Then there are the two sepulchral inscriptions published by F. Cumont²³) from Heracleopolis (modern Beduktun) in Pontus:

²¹) The former is surely correct; cf. Proc., *BV* i 17. 1, where there is mention of another personal *optio* of Belisarius (Ἰωάννη . . . ὃς οἱ ἐπεμελεῖτο τῆς περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν δαπάνης — ὁπίωνα τοῦτον καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι); properly 'quartermaster', but in a private context 'steward' would seem the nearest equivalent. Jones, *Later Roman Empire* III (1964), 103, n. 39 *ad fin.*, cites this passage of Theophanes (p. 238. 8) as evidence for private curators, but quotes no evidence for personal *optiones*.

²²) Tjäder, *Nichtlit. Papyri*, no. 6. 41, with p. 422; I do not think that the use of the ablative instead of the accusative has any bearing on the meaning.

²³) 'Le sacrifice du faon à Pédachtoé', *Byzantion* vi (1931), 530–1; cf. too possibly the inscription discussed by A. Wilhelm, *ib.* vi (1931), 466–7.

†θέσις Ἰωάννου κατὰ Βιταλιανόν†
 †θέσις Ἰωάννου τοῦ τῆς θεοφιλοῦς
 [μνή]μης διακόνου κ[ατὰ] Ἀρμάτιν

κατὰ Βιταλιανόν was interpreted by Cumont (on the advice of H. Grégoire) as ‘surnommée d’après Vitalien’, with the observation that the name of Vitalian was understandably popular in this orthodox area. Now while the use of the *κατά*-formula for designating nicknames and family names is comprehensible enough, it would surely be very strange to record on a man’s tombstone whom he happened to be *named after*. No, the first John was a *bucellarius* of Vitalian, and the second a cleric in the entourage of Armatius, possibly (though hardly with Cumont’s conviction) the favourite of Basilicus’ wife Zenonis.²⁴)

There remains²⁵) the *Ἀθανάσιος ὁ κατὰ τὸν Ζήμαρχον Ἀντιοχεύς* met by John Moschus²⁶) sometime not before *ca.* 570. Zemarchus occurs several times at this period as a proper name, not a surname or nickname; and if (as seems likely) John’s Zemarchus is the one attested as *comes Orientis* (whose residence was normally at Antioch) in 560/1,²⁷) then time and place alike point to a man from this Zemarchus’ household.

A place in the household of or on the staff of a great man is bound to have conferred a certain status, and it is not surprising that there was a special formula to denote the relationship. The position did not have to be lowly,²⁸) and might well be worth recording long after the employer was dead or the employment terminated. There is thus a real similarity between this usage and the usage concerning the possession of properties. The surname-usage seems to be a later development.

Addendum

I can do no more than refer in a postscript to a passage in the letter from Paulus Helladicus published by V. Lundström, *Analecta Byzantina* (1902), p. 20.22–3: *Εὐτρώπιός τις εὐνοῦχος νοτάριος Ἰου-*

²⁴) Cumont also refers to a bronze cross of the late sixth century (which I have been unable to trace) inscribed *Μεσεβρίον κατὰ Θεόγν(ν)*.

²⁵) It is difficult to be sure about the list of patricians (dated to 639) in Const. Porph., *De Caer.* 629. 5f., *ὁ πατρίκιος Ἰωάννης καὶ ὁ πατρίκιος ὁ κατὰ Ἰέσδην καὶ ὁ πατρίκιος Δομέτιος*. The absence of the article after and even more a proper name before the *κατά* suggests that the text may not be sound.

²⁶) *Prat. Spir.* § 190 (PG lxxxvii. 3. 3069B). ²⁷) Theophanes, p. 235.

²⁸) As perhaps implied by A. Rüger’s ‘Client des Belisarios’, *Studien zu Malalas* (1895), 38.

λιανῆς τῆς κατὰ Πλακιδίαν τῆς γυναικὸς Ἀρεοβίνδου τοῦ στρατηλάτου. The three last named are well known figures whose relationship can be established with certainty: Placidia the daughter of Valentinian III, her daughter Anicia Juliana, and Juliana's husband Areobindus, cos. 506. Here, as in *Novel* 150, κατὰ plus acc. comes close to the possessive genitive, and 'of the house of' in effect means 'daughter of'. We should perhaps allow the possibility of this meaning in some of the texts discussed in § II, though it may be doubted whether the formula would be so used of any but those who could boast of a royal or noble 'house'.

Word Final Velar and Labial Stops in Latin

By JANE LAURITZEN, Aarhus

According to A. Ernout (1953 pp. 3 and 13) neutral consonant stem substantives in Latin use the zero ending in nom. acc. sing., i.e. show the bare stem. But the neutral consonant stem adjectives, including the present participles and the *-i-* stem adjective, which lose their *-i-* in nom. acc. sing., quite unexpectedly show the ending *-s* in nom. acc. sing.

The reason for this lack of distinction between masculine and neutral forms has bewildered many scholars. Some of them have tried to give an explanation, e.g. A. Ernout (1953 p. 3) who talks about a tendency in Latin to give up the distinction between masculine and neutral forms, and P. Monteil (1970 p. 183) who finds the origin of this extension of the masc. ending in the existence of neutr. nouns which designate animate beings. Other scholars find that none of the many suggested explanations are wholly convincing and consider the problem to be unsolved, e.g. C. D. Buck (1933 § 289), E. Kieckers (1931 p. 51), A. Meillet et J. Vendryes (1953 p. 538) and J. Safarewicz (1969 § 144). I think it is profitable to divide the question 'why do neutral adjectives of the *atrox* type use the masculine ending' into two parts: a) 'why did the neutral adjectives not use the expected zero ending' and b) 'why was a masculine ending used instead'.

In his book from 1913 about the phonemes in word final position in Indo-European R. Gauthiot (pp. 89 and 98) concludes that word final stops were very rare in the I.-E. languages, and that in Latin