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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASS</td>
<td><em>Acta sanctorum</em>. Brussels; Antwerp; Paris, 1643– .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AbhBerl</td>
<td>Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIPHOS</td>
<td><em>Annuaire de l’Institut de philologie et d’histoire orientales et slaves</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAW</td>
<td>Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><em>Byzantion</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAB</td>
<td><em>Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres de l’Académie Royale de Belgique</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAGB</td>
<td><em>Bulletin de l’Association Guillaume Budé</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASO</td>
<td><em>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHM</td>
<td><em>Bulletin of the History of Medicine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMGS</td>
<td><em>Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNJ</td>
<td><em>Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BollClass</td>
<td><em>Bollettino dei classici</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br.</td>
<td>BRIQUET 1968; see also Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Teubneriana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budé</td>
<td>Collection des Universités de France, l'Association Guillaume Budé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZ</td>
<td><em>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSL</td>
<td>Corpus christianorum, Series latina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFHB</td>
<td>Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChHist</td>
<td><em>Church History</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMG</td>
<td>Corpus medicorum Graecorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRS</td>
<td>Centre national de la recherche scientifique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CQ  Classical Quarterly
CSCO  Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium
CSHB  Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae
DenkWien  Denkschriften der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse
DOP  Dumbarton Oaks Papers
EEBS  Ἐκκλησίας Ἰστορίας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν
GCS  Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
GLM  Gazette du Livre Médiéval
GRBS  Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies
Ha.  HARLFINGER & HARLFINGER 1974–1980; see also Bibliography
HAW  Handbuch der [Klassischen] Altertumswissenschaft
HTR  Harvard Theological Review
JHB  Journal of the History of Biology
JHI  Journal of the History of Ideas
JÖB  Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik
JWarb  Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes
Loeb  Loeb Classical Library
MiscByzMon  Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia
MT  Museum Tusculanum
Νέος Ἑλλ.  Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων
ÖAW  Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
OCP  Orientalia Christiana Periodica
P&P  Past and Present
Pi.  PICCARD 1961–; see also Bibliography
PLP  Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit, ed. E. Trapp et al.

PMLA  *Publications of the Modern Language Association*


REB  *Revue des études byzantines*

REG  *Revue des études grecques*

RenQ  *Renaissance Quarterly*


RH  *Revue historique*

RhM  *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*

RSBN  *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici*

SAWW  Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philos.-Hist. Klasse

SBN  *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*

SC  *Sources chrétiennes*

StudMed  *Studi Medievali*

TM  *Travaux et mémoires*

TAPhA  *Transactions of the American Philological Association*

TLG  *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu)


WByzSt  Wiener byzantinistische Studien

ZPE  *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*
In the field of Greek and Byzantine studies working with manuscripts is no revolutionary stance. Rather the opposite. But the radical question is: how do we go about our manuscript study? The normal procedure has been to collect manuscripts containing a specific text, selecting among them the superior witnesses, discarding most of the others as “corrupt,” and cleansing the remainders into a critical edition. Of course, we are all very grateful when we can read a text in a reasonably decent edition. Time is too scarce to have everyone consult the manuscripts, and the facsimiles are as yet too few to make up for the limited access to the real thing. But you are doomed to miss out on a lot of exciting matter in this process. An objection to the quest for the conclusive edition is that one will possibly end up with a fabricated text that was never ever read at the time. If indeed one does arrive at a fairly pristine wording, it is still not the “same” text, since it is cut out of its context and is presented as a singular, monograph text, despite the fact that more often than not the medieval codex happened to hold not only one text, but two, three, ten, or even several dozens of texts.

Let us say you end up with one of these multi-text, rather ordinary-looking medieval codices on your desk. It may not contain the rare pieces of canonized authors. Its readings are of little use in the preparation of a critical edition. Well, you may feel like the archeologist who came to the excavating site a little too late to dig up the golden treasures, the death masque of Atreus, but grubbing around once more you find small but undeniable traces of people’s daily life. It may not be Mycenean civilization, but a medieval farmer’s kitchenware, or even Herr Schliemann’s shaving brush. So, we modify our picture of the past, less heroic, more diversified.

Medieval and postmedieval manuscript books are more than just text carriers. They were the belongings of people who ordered, copied, bought, and read them, who perhaps wanted their children to own and read them in turn. This is why I wish to take the context into account, keeping whatever is possible of the original setting of the texts, trying to see the books as they may have been approached before they became the anonymous objects of library accession lists. Little attention has been paid to these mundane realities by literary critics, despite the fact that they often claim to elucidate a text’s meaning and impact. But the contextual and codicological awareness is gaining ground, and future researchers will hopefully benefit from a more com-
A book is both meaning and the vehicle by which meaning is conveyed; it is the object of various enterprises of production, distribution, and consumption, so that “just what it is under one of these headings necessarily influences what it is under the others.”¹ This is the point of departure for my investigation of Codex Upsaliensis Graecus 8, a late fifteenth-century miscellany. My first acquaintance with the manuscript came through a project financed by the Swedish Research Council. One of the main ambitions of the project was to publish the many anonymous and hitherto inedited texts in this extensive manuscript. However, through assiduous work by three students (Dimitrios Iordanoglou, Johan Löfström, and myself) and our supervisor, professor Jan Fredrik Kindstrand, the number of inedita shrunk, less because of editing work than by the fact that we were able to identify many of the texts as portions of already known works from Greek and Byzantine literature. What I present here is, thus, an offshoot of this project, but I have chosen a different approach, keeping the whole book in perspective.

¹ Davidson 1989, 1.
INTRODUCTION
1 Preliminaries: Book History, Codicology, and Philology

Do I contradict myself?
Very well then I contradict myself,
(I am large, I contain multitudes.)

Walt Whitman, *Leaves of Grass*

What can a book tell us? – Scope and aim of the study

The main focus of this study is a late fifteenth-century codex from Uppsala University Library, *Codex Upsaliensis Graecus 8* (henceforth abbreviated *Gr 8*). The book presents a kaleidoscopic combination of some ninety texts of various character and length, and despite the fact that technically it is made up of several units, the book was almost entirely produced by one and the same scribe. One may thus expect it to reflect a particular individual’s reading interests, whether the scribe collected the texts for himself or for a commissioner.

*Gr 8* is a many-sided book in a number of ways: it is post-Byzantine but also *not*—few of the included works are of later origin than the 1450s. The subject matter is Greco-Byzantine, and yet there are tracks leading to Western Europe, for example Leonardo Bruni’s text about the constitution of Florence and a couple of others on doctrinal issues debated at the Church Council of Ferrara-Florence 1438–39. In addition, it opens up to cultures east of Byzantium, as in a Greek version of the Persian-Arabic fable story *Kalīlā wa-Dīmna* and a text on *ramplion*, a form of divination which seems to have spread from Arabic-speaking areas. The book gives us religious and secular texts, advanced and elementary, poetic and practical, in different styles and on different language levels, works from within a chronological span of more than 1500 years. The oldest texts are from Hellenistic times or even earlier, authored by—or attributed to—Aristotle, Isocrates, Hippocrates and Aesop, to take a few examples. Among the latest texts are letters from Cardinal Bessarion (d. 1472); one of them, to Michael Apostoles, is dated...
Another late example is a *Monody on the Fall of Constantinople* written by Manuel Christonymos (d. 1482), who during Turkish rule became patriarch of Constantinople.

Is it possible to achieve order in such a farrago? What can it tell us about the book’s originator and the cultural setting it sprang from? Is it unique, or is it rather an example (though quite excessive) of a type of book which was common in those days? The aim of my investigation is to find answers to at least some of these questions through a careful examination of the codicological structure of the book as well as the included texts, their placing and context.

The extent and complexity of *Gr 8* (it runs to about 700 pages, or 348 folios) force me to put some limits to the exploration: I present in-depth studies of three hitherto unknown texts, mainly to illustrate how the smaller, apparently unassuming texts in a book may contribute to our understanding of the setting in which the book was created. Other *inedita* are instead assembled in an appendix to allow other researchers access to them. They are provided with a limited apparatus, and textual corrections are gingerly undertaken so as to make the texts slightly more readable, but still facilitate for the readers to get an idea of what they look like in the manuscript.

To place *Gr 8* in a wide-ranging comparative study of Byzantine multitext books is also a task which will have to wait. Research in this field is still in the initial stages, with too few detailed studies from which to create a synthesis. What I do hope to achieve is a useful case study and a first step in the mapping out of late Byzantine multitext books as a “book genre.” Put together with contributions and special studies by other researchers, this may help us reach a better comprehension of medieval books in general and multitext books in particular.

**Codex Upsaliensis Graecus 8, a first acquaintance**

Uppsala University Library has among its possessions around seventy-five Greek manuscripts. These have ended up in the library from different paths, but one important collection is the books which once belonged to Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld (*codices Upsalienses Graeci 1–8*). During the late seventeenth century this polyglot diplomat travelled widely in Europe. One of his commissions was to acquire old books which might support the Geatish ideas at sway in Sweden in those days. King Karl XI was enthusiastic about seeing Sweden as the original home of the Goths, since it would be an excellent piece of propaganda in his ambitions for the country as Europe’s great

---

2 For ancient Greek authors I use the more familiar English or Latinized names. For the Byzantine period I follow the example of *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (Greek transliteration, except for those first names which have an equivalent in English).
power, and even though this specific assignment was hopeless, Sparwenfeld did bring home a considerable number of manuscripts from his travels. The European and North African expedition of 1689–1694 also took him to Venice, where he obtained codices Gr. 1 and 4, and to Spain where codices Gr. 2–3 and 5–8 came into his hands.

There is no information in the codex itself on exactly when and where in Spain Sparwenfeld purchased it. What we do know is that it once belonged to the monastery of El Escorial, but disappeared from there in connection with the great fire in 1671. According to the old library catalogs, the codex was in the library of El Escorial for about a hundred years. Gregorio de Andrés and Alejo Revilla claim to have information that it arrived at Philip II’s library by way of Diego Guzman’s acquisition in 1573 of Matteo Dandolo’s books in Venice. But their specifications are confused, and I cannot say that I have been able to confirm this fact. An inventory from the Palace Archive in Madrid verifies that in 1576 the codex was included in Philip II’s donation to the Escorial library. In chapter 3 I argue that the codex was probably created around 1480 or somewhat later. The geographic origin is not clear, but there are indications which may point to Crete; at least it seems the scribe had connections to the circle of scribes around Michael Apostoles.

3 The donation included books in many different languages besides the Greek (Arabic, Syriac, Persian, Chinese, Slavonic, among others; see Catalogus centuriae 1706). On Sparwenfeld himself, see further BIRGEGÅRD 2002, 13–17; JACOBOWSKY 1939.

4 Notes of purchase are found in the following codices: Gr 2 in Madrid, May 1690; Gr 6 in Valladolid, April 1690; Gr 7 in Toledo, April 1690. According to Carl Wilhelm Jacobowsky, Sparwenfeld’s stay in Spain lasted nine months, 1689–90 (JACOBOWSKY 1939, 59).

5 On this calamity, in which nearly 4,000 codices were destroyed, see ANDRÉS 1965, 65–81. Olim Escorialenses are also Sparwenfeld’s codices Gr. 2, 5, 6 and 7; the different notes of purchase (see n. 4) show that these Escorial codices were already dispersed in many directions, and that Sparwenfeld could have acquired Gr 8 in any of these places or elsewhere.

6 See No. 66 in Andrés’ catalog on the lost holdings of El Escorial, where he states that this codex, with the earlier shelf mark A. VI. 16, is identical to Gr 8. For the information on Matteo Dandolo as the former owner of the codex he refers to “Revilla p. LXXV n. 142” (ANDRÉS 1968, 38). Yet, in Andrés’ appendices to the edition and Spanish translation of Charles Graux’s Essai sur les origines du fonds grec de l’Escurial (Los origenes del fondo griego del Escorial) a certain “Barlaami historia, papyro, nunquam edita. /g506. VI. 16” is put forward as the book that Guzman de Silva bought from Dandolo in Venice in 1573 (GRAUX 1982, 509, No. 12). Revilla’s No. 142 refers to a parchment codex in octavo: “Historia Æthiopica Joannis monachi pergamo” (REVILLA 1936, lxxv). This Historia Æthiopica most likely refers to another Barlaam codex and not to Gr 8, and since Gr 8 is a paper codex the reference in Revilla seems to be of no value. I have also checked the archival material which both Revilla and Andrés build upon: the “Barlaami historia papiro” and the “Historia Æthiopica Joannis monachi pergamen” are both mentioned among the 87 codices which Guzman bought from Dandolo, but I cannot see that this would bring us any further in relation to the provenance of Gr 8. Cf. Archivo General de Simancas, sección de la Secretaría de Estado, legajo 1549, ff. 44–45 (Relacion de los libros que se han comprado en Venecia por orden de su Mg. y de lo que por ellos pagó el Embaxador Diego Guzmán de Silva los quales se han embiado a su Mg.).

7 BEER 1903, xcii (Nº 160 c i). Our codex had by then been kept by Juan de Serojas for two years, i.e. from March 1574. Serojas was Philip II’s treasurer of arms and apparently also the keeper of the king’s valuable books (BEER 1903, xxvif.).
Stig Rudberg held a different view in this matter, and suggested Constantinople as the place of origin for Gr 8 by reason of the alleged affinity of Gr 8 to another manuscript, Parisinus graecus 2991A. I will problematize this later on, in connection with the codicological analysis of the codex. Some notes in Gr 8 by subsequent owners suggest that the book was in Greek hands up until at least the mid-sixteenth century. That is, accordingly, the whole story of Gr 8 as we know it today: the codex was created in the 1480s (Crete?); owned by various Greek-speaking persons at least until around 1550; perhaps bought by Matteo Dandolo after that (not fully corroborated); purchased—in Venice?—in the 1570s on behalf of the Spanish king, Philip II; donated to El Escorial in 1576; gone missing from El Escorial in 1671; acquired by Sparwenfeld around 1690 and brought to Sweden; donated to Uppsala University Library in 1705.

Earlier descriptions of Gr 8 include Charles Graux’s contribution in his Notices sommaires des manuscrits grecs de Suède. Like all late nineteenth-century catalogs, Graux’s publication has its drawbacks, especially when it comes to codicological matters. But the established practice is also different nowadays in how to deal with minor texts, scribal remarks, and readers’ additions. If we wish to assess a book in its entirety, these pieces of adiaphora must also count. They give important information on how scribes proceeded when replenishing a book, exploiting the space they had at hand. Furthermore, they may offer insights into how a book was read and used, perhaps indicating the scribe’s or a reader’s paths of association. Graux’s catalog provides no information on these points.

In 1994 Sofía Torallas Tovar published a new survey of those Uppsala codices which were once part of the El Escorial collection. Unfortunately, this cataloging project did not provide as much novel information as one may have hoped. At least for Gr 8, her additions seem to be drawn mainly from the articles which Vilhelm Lundström, Stig Rudberg and Lars-Olof Sjöberg had already published on the subject. Many texts in the manuscripts were still left unidentified, just as they were in Graux’s catalog. In the case of Gr 8, though, an important contribution was Torallas Tovar’s suggested identification of the main scribe, Theodoros. Although she was not positively stating this, proposing Nicholas Sagundino as her main alternative (not viable, in my opinion), she did add that “[s]e puede comparar con Hunger, 2, 176, Theodoros, a. 1488.” I believe that it is establishable beyond doubt that this Theodoros is the person behind Gr 8. This scribe is only known from a colophon in a Paris manuscript and through the comparison of
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8 See further p. 110.
9 Sparwenfeld’s letter of donation is included in Catalogus centuriae 1706.
10 GRAUX & MARTIN 1889, 34–41.
11 LUNDSTRÖM 1897; RUDBERG 1960; SJÖBERG 1960; RUDBERG 1977.
12 Cf. TORALLAS TOVAR 1994, 225; Repertorium II, 176. On the scribes in Gr 8, see further Chapter 3.
his handwriting in the case of Gr 8 and yet another manuscript. One aspiration of this study is to reveal more about his work procedure and, at best, to give an indication of possible connections between him and other scribes or scriptoria.

Rudberg emphasized the importance of the numerous inedita in Gr 8.\textsuperscript{13} Some of these have since been identified as already known and edited works, others have become the subject of separate studies.\textsuperscript{14} Although not unconcerned with the aspect of textual editing, my approach is rather to take a comprehensive view of the book in its entirety, to make sense of its different parts in relation to the whole. This brings us closer to the original idea of the book as it took shape through the scribal work, decoration and assembly of quires and units. It also takes into account the fact that this was the way these texts met the owners and readers of the book, in precisely that coexistence of high and low, of varying subject matter and different genres. Short texts, longer ones, complete texts and minute excerpts: They were all present and contributed to people’s reading experience.

\section*{Book history}

By taking a “whole-book approach,” the investigation of Gr 8 becomes part of a field of research which is nowadays about to establish itself as an academic discipline in its own right. The labeling of this domain varies between different universities: at some it is called The History of the Book, at others Sociology of Literature, or it may, for example, be included in Cultural Studies. Since this is not a very common common approach in the fields of Classical and Byzantine Studies, I will introduce it briefly, and also relate it on one hand to what manuscript scholars are doing in practice, in their codicological and philological research, on the other hand to the theoretical tendencies behind the development in these areas.

Book history is not a new area of research but it has certainly thrived in recent times. I borrow the definition that the editors Ezra Greenspan and Jonathan Rose gave in the Introduction to the first issue of the journal \textit{Book History} (1998):

\begin{quote}
Our field of play is the entire history of written communication: the creation, dissemination, and uses of script and print in any medium, including books, newspapers, periodicals, manuscripts, and ephemera. We will explore the social, cultural, and economic history of authorship, publishing, printing, the book arts, copyright, censorship, bookselling and distribution, libraries, literacy, literary criticism, reading habits, and reader response.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13} Rudberg 1960, 6.
\textsuperscript{14} Searby 2003a; Searby 2003b; Nilsson & Nyström 2009.
Two directions of research have shaped recent studies of book history: the French *Histoire du livre* with its connection to the *Annales* circle focusing mainly on social history; and the *Analytical bibliography* with its emphasis on the study of books as physical objects, which has had its strongest support among British and American scholars. The broad outlines of *Histoire du livre* run the risk of generalizing too much about cultural and social movements if not grounded in knowledge of the actual books, their production and reception. And, likewise, *Analytical bibliography* may end up being charged with antiquarianism if no effort is made to put the particulars on editions, printing runs, bindings, et cetera, into a larger social context. Nevertheless, both perspectives are necessary and can fertilize each other.\(^{15}\)

What most book history research has had in common, regardless of theoretical framework, is that it has been carried out on so-called “modern” books, i.e. on printed material. This is obvious if we look at some of the classics in the field: Lucien Febvre’s and Henri-Jean Martin’s work *L’apparition du livre* from 1958; Elizabeth Eisenstein’s *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* from 1979; the many eminent publications by, for example, Robert Darnton, Roger Chartier, Don F. McKenzie, and Jerome J. McGann; they all reinforce the picture of book history as a discipline interested principally in material from the sixteenth century onwards. But how is it possible for “books” suddenly to “appear” in the second half of the fifteenth century? As if the *manuscript* books and the great demand for them were not the whole reason for inventing the printing press! This lack of historical insight in, or at least conscious disregard of, a long tradition of handwritten book production, is unfortunately widespread. Another consequence of this chronological restriction is that researchers have favored the monolithic single-text books, which soon became the prevailing product of print. Thus, an investigation of medieval, and post-medieval, handwritten books—of which many are multitext and perhaps even multigenetic—becomes a wholesome reminder that books may be created in different ways to meet the needs of the readers, but also that in their different shapes they reflect the time and society in which they are born.

**Codicology**

If a certain naïveté has marked many modern studies in their disregard of the pre-Gutenberg book, we must remember that other voices have been heard as well. In “Towards a History of the Mediaeval Book” (1967) Léon Delaissé attacks on more than one flank. He criticizes the histories of the book

\(^{15}\) For a short outline of book history and its development, see, for example: DARNTON 1983; RUBIN, 2003. The recent debate on whether book history should be considered a discipline in its own right or rather a meeting place for scholars of different backgrounds, is commented on by BELL 2002 and VAN DER WEEL 2002.
which are concerned merely with the printed book; he deprecates the lack of an holistic approach to medieval manuscripts, since many experts have limited themselves to the study of a single element, like script, illumination, or binding; he complains about textual scholars who pay lip service to the idea of codicology being a necessary component of manuscript studies, but who never reach beyond adding a conventional description of all the manuscripts to their editions and then fail to use those descriptions for the appreciation of the content in the book.16 “Too many do not yet know,” he writes, “that the mediaeval book can be an objectif of study in itself and that [...] the archaeology of the manuscript is not only useful to them, but that it will permit the creation of another history, that of the mediaeval book.”17

What followed upon Delaissé’s article on the “archaeology of the book” was a discussion as to what this, not altogether new but certainly perfectible, approach should be called.18 Among those who took part in the discussion were Albert Grujjs and Albert Deroléz.19 The German term of Handschriftenkunde was already well established. But eventually the term generally settled on was codicology, nowadays an established scientific branch with its own organizations for scholarly cooperation, conferences, and journals. Albert Grujjs wished to retain two different scopes for codicology, one “stricto sensu” for the technical, hands-on study of all physical aspects of codices, and one “lato sensu.” The latter would include, for example, the provenance of the manuscript, its incorporation in libraries or collections and “the social function it fulfilled in its own day, the philosophical and sociological problems it creates as a cultural phenomenon and communication medium, the symbolism with which it is associated, and so on.”20 Grujjs’ definition of codicology lato sensu seems to tally well with definitions of book history at large. I do not see any need for defining the boundaries so strictly, but prefer to use codicology as a methodological tool in contributing to the establishment of a history of the book which has room for medieval and ancient books, just as it manages to accommodate the new book formats which arise with computer technology at the other end of the time scale.

Philology, old and new

About two decades ago, there was a vivid discussion concerning another methodology, philology, on its assets and drawbacks, and whether it needed
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16 DELAÏSSE 1967, 433.
17 DELAÏSSE 1967, 425, n. 7.
18 That the phenomenon existed long before the name is pointed out by, for example, GUMBERT 1975.
20 GRUJS 1972, 104.
renewal or not.\textsuperscript{21} Contrary to codicology, philology has a history which goes all the way back to (at least) Hellenistic times, to the Alexandrian scholars and their efforts to establish “editions” of the Homeric epics. This kind of scholarly activity has been carried on throughout ancient and medieval times, not least in Byzantium.\textsuperscript{22} Without the efforts of Byzantine intellectuals, the full range of the literary and scientific heritage from ancient Greece would not be with us today. I will not present any survey here of how philology has developed over two thousand years, but merely note that the traditional emphasis on classical and biblical texts—where the main objective was to cleanse and restore an important and often canonical text of the long gone past—has played an important formative role for philology and textual criticism. As always, one has to be cautious when applying a certain method to other kinds of materials than those originally intended, or at least ask oneself what the wider implications of such an undertaking would be. Eckehard Simon (1990) problematizes the construction of an “original text” which may never have existed in that form, considering the fact that medieval literature was often transmitted in many versions and redactions. In no way belittling the efforts of editorial scholars, he stresses the importance of the original sources, recognizing the variance of the textual material by returning to the manuscripts themselves. According to Simon, philology in its original meaning as “the study of the written record in its cultural context” is the ineluctable prerequisite of Medieval studies. He anticipates that the codices themselves will be studied as “depositories of cultural history.”\textsuperscript{23}

And this is where the spokesmen and -women for the “New Philology” come in. The background seems to be an anxiety among medievalists of being left behind, on the one hand ignored by theoretically more avant-garde disciplines, and on the other hand held back by a heavy weight of ideologies which molded medieval studies into an academic discipline in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, among them political nationalism and scientific positivism. Taking Bernard Cerquiglini’s \textit{Eloge de la variante} (1989) as a point of departure, the New Philologists proposed a return to the manuscripts and a greater awareness of the diversity of medieval culture in general and especially of the diversity and fluidity of texts as transmitted in medieval manuscripts.\textsuperscript{24} This is an intelligible and fully justifiable proposal, and I would be unwise to take exception to it, as it more or less describes my own interests and orientation. Nevertheless, I think the claims of the so-called

\textsuperscript{21} See for example \textit{Comparative Literature Studies} 27:1 (1990), which gathers contributions from the 1988 conference entitled “What is Philology?” held at the Center for Literary and Cultural Studies, Harvard University. The 1990 special issue of \textit{Speculum} presents other voices on the subject of (New) philology, an issue which in turn gave rise to scholarly debate on the subject during the 1990s (BUSBY 1993; GLEBGEN & LEBSANFT 1997).

\textsuperscript{22} On the Byzantine so-called renaissances, periods of intensified scholarly activity, see LEMERLE 1971; WILSON 1983.

\textsuperscript{23} SIMON 1990, 19.

\textsuperscript{24} NICHOLS 1990, 9.
New Philology should be balanced against what was already in the making, long before Cerquiglini pronounced his eulogy on the variant.

Whatever view one takes of New Philology, one must at least admit that the debate vitalized and inspired researchers to sharpen their arguments. Whether New Philology’s focus on non-canonized texts was a contribution, or it was a development already set in motion by (book) historians and philologists in general, a lasting outcome of many recent studies has been the enhanced interest in the reception of texts, and the role of the readers vis-à-vis the books and book production. More ordinary books and “common” readers have also come to the fore and are studied with a zeal previously applied only to high culture and the upper cultural strata of society.25

Contextualizing medieval books

Eckehard Simon’s prophecy, or wish, of soon twenty years ago, has in fact come true. Studies of codices as depositories of cultural history have since been undertaken in many areas and languages. The origins of the development in the last two decades can be traced back in different directions, most significantly in the general re-evaluation of the Middle Ages that has been going on in the last few decades. In a way it begun already with Johan Huizinga and his *Herfsttij der Middeleeuwen* (1919). Despite much criticism and fluctuating views on Huizinga’s work, his reputation lives on. A historian by profession, he has been acclaimed a pioneer of the history of mentalities, of ethnography and cultural anthropology. 26 This is worth mentioning as these new fields of research have also influenced literary studies since at least the 1980s.

Not only have historians looked at the Middle Ages with “new eyes,” but also in literary studies scholars have taken a contextual turn in the last couple of decades. *New Criticism*’s way of treating texts as autonomous aesthetic entities which should be analyzed *per se*, without being loaded with the historical ballast of context, has been attacked by many theoreticians since the sixties. But the focus on *textuality*, as opposed to *contextuality*, dominated many other school formations during the twentieth century, from Russian formalism over to the Prague movement and Saussure’s linguistic theories and all the way through structuralism and poststructuralism; these critics saw language and discourse as the basis of not only texts but every human enterprise, giving precedence to synchronic perspectives over diachronic. The consequence of this position—if everything is considered as text and nothing exists outside the text—has often been a disinclination to contextualize. But

25 Recent publications on books and reading in Byzantium are, for example, CAVALLO 2006 and MONDRAIN 2006.

26 By 2004 Huizinga’s bestseller had been reprinted twenty-seven times and had seen numerous translations into different languages during the more than eighty years since it first appeared. On its reception, see PETERS & SIMONS (1999).
there are alternative ways of dealing with this belief in “pantextuality.” Trying to place a text in its chronological, geographical, sociological and other environment is not to put strains on its literary habitat. It means that we create a web of texts around it, allowing the text to come forth as a pattern in the woven fabric. This web is not static, it need not be a matter of the original setting, of source hunting; rather, it allows us to read the text afresh when in a new setting. There is no turning back from the insight that everything is construed, that all history is narrative. Still, the incredulity toward metanarratives has not excused us from scrutinizing the narratives we, as human beings, create and construe daily.\textsuperscript{27} If “language, images, and other cultural phenomena are as central to the production of contemporary social order as economic or political processes,”\textsuperscript{28} as both postmodernists and their more politically oriented critics (whether they work from a Marxist, feminist, queer, postcolonial, or other agenda) claim, then there is ample reason to explore the impact that manifestations of language have had also in the past.

The new tendency to contextualize is not uniform in scope. It includes thinking anew about our literary heritage and earlier canons, looking at cultural production and cultural practice, bringing in nonliterary texts beside the \textit{belles lettres}, making place for the low, the marginal, and the grotesque, leaving more room for alternative voices, mirroring the complexity and variation of a text rather than its central themes. The orientation which has received most attention in the attempts to reintroduce history in literary studies is the so-called \textit{New Historicism} with Stephen Greenblatt and Catherine Gallagher as its initiators.\textsuperscript{29} Not being a theory or doctrine in itself—the theoretical perspective varies with each practitioner—the label stands for a way of looking at texts not only as representations of a society’s behavioral patterns but also as components in re/shaping these patterns and codes. Questions of authority and power, cultural dominance versus subversive voices, are the focus of inquiry. I am not endorsing New Historicism’s postulations as a whole, but certain prerequisites have their analogues in my investigation. The assumption that representations are best understood when considered in the context of their specific historical period is one which comes naturally enough. Likewise the willingness to consider all sorts of texts and not just the aesthetically valued pieces of literature. I believe that New Historicism’s interest in identity formation as conditioned by discourse can be a fruitful point of departure in a venture to analyze the changes which

\textsuperscript{27} The definition of postmodern as “incredulity toward metanarratives” is Jean-François Lyotard’s (Lyotard 2005, xxiv). On history as narrative, see also White 1987.

\textsuperscript{28} McGowan 2005, 769.

\textsuperscript{29} Even Greenblatt himself vacillates in his designation of this theoretical movement, and has suggested “cultural poetics” as an improvement. Nevertheless, the label has stuck and is now more or less accepted. See further Gallagher & Greenblatt 2000, 1–18. A balanced presentation of New Historicism together with further suggestions on where to go from there, is given by Brook Thomas (Thomas 1991).
Byzantine society and culture went through in Late Palaiologan times and after the downfall of the Byzantine Empire.

When it comes to understanding cultural representations in the context of their specific historical period, we encounter a built-in problem concerning how to define these periods and overarching structures to which we wish to relate specific documents or occurrences. Here I find myself bound in the hermeneutical dilemma, the connection between part and whole, between specifics and generalizations. We need the particulars to understand the whole (even if, when it comes to history, we are aware that the “whole” is only a creation of our limited minds), and yet without the whole the particulars lose their relative position. *Gr 8* is in a way caught in-between different cultures and different times. It was produced in a Greek-speaking environment but probably in Venetian-ruled territories, handwritten although the printed book was beginning to gain in importance, displaying Byzantine learning at a time when Byzantium itself was past saving. In other terms, the cultural setting for *Gr 8* is not altogether easily determined.

Also on a micro-level the relation between parts and whole will take up a great deal of my study, viz. the relation between texts within a book and books made up of separate codicological units. A new appreciation of medieval cultural expressions must include not only the texts, but also their embodiment in books. In choosing the book and especially the multitext book as an object of study, we need not conjure up a context for the individual text. It is there for us to explore, in abundant constellations, since every handwritten book is unique and every instance of a text put together with other texts—by somebody and for somebody—renders a new path to understanding the place of these texts in their cultural setting.

Previous research on multitext books

Investigations of medieval multitext books have been carried out from various perspectives. Many of them focus on a particular manuscript, or an individual author’s texts as they have been transmitted in multitext books. Even text genres, for example vernacular love poems or sermons, have been studied. Many interesting studies are being done on multitext books in the fields of Middle English, French, Dutch, Latin and other language areas. I confine myself to mentioning a couple of important conferences/colloquia on miscellanies and multitext books which have put the spotlight on this area of research. Unfortunately, the terminology for multitext books is not constant among scholars; I will return to this problem in Chapter 2.
A few conference volumes

Pioneering in the area of multitext books was a conference held at the University of Pennsylvania in 1993, the proceedings of which are collected in the volume *The Whole Book*, edited by Stephen Nichols and Siegfried Wenzel (1996). The focus of the conference was on the taxonomy of medieval miscellaneous manuscripts, mainly from the perspective of contents. In the conference volume, Barbara Shailor’s article “A Cataloger’s View” has a special bearing on what I try to do in my study. Shailor starts out by suggesting that *miscellaneous* manuscripts may not be an appropriate term for describing structurally or textually complex codices. In most cases there is an underlying principle of organization that helps explain both the physical format and the contents of the volume. After describing four types of fifteenth-century (Latin) “miscellaneous” books from the Beinecke Library, she concludes with some advice on how to handle collections of this kind: “I would try to describe more explicitly and consistently the relationship between the structure of the codex and its texts; I would speculate on the apparent principle or principles of organization and would place each volume more firmly in its cultural milieu.”

In 1999 a colloquium took place in Brussels regarding the Van Hulthem manuscript, an early fifteenth-century Dutch miscellany containing more than 200 texts. The lectures, which deal not only with the Van Hulthem manuscript but also with other miscellanies from the Low Countries, France and England, were edited by Ria Jansen-Sieben and Hans van Dijk in *Codices miscellanearum: Brussels Van Hulthem Colloquium 1999*. From Wim van Anrooij’s article, “Medieval Miscellanies from the Low Countries,” we may conclude that scholarly work on Dutch miscellanies has, relatively speaking, come a long way. Reasons for the vivid interest in these kinds of manuscripts are manifold, but the fact that a few of them are central transmitters of medieval Dutch literature must have helped. Also, the religious revival of *Devotio moderna* in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, with its focus on practical piety for both laity and priests, brought about an intense copying activity, the result of which was often *rapiaria*, i.e. miscellanies for devotional use.
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30 Shailor 1996, 165.
31 The Brussels colloquium was part of the larger Van Hulthem project and of the project “Medieval collective manuscripts from the Low Countries,” a venture which has also manifested itself in the publication series *Middeleeuwse Verzamelhandschriften uit de Nederlanden*. The term “collective” for multi-text manuscripts is, to my mind, not an optimal choice, since it may be misinterpreted as “produced by several scribes,” a mode of procedure which may apply also to manuscripts which contain only one text. Cf. the generally accepted term *collective novel* for novels which are created by several authors in cooperation.
32 On *Devotio moderna* and book production, see Kock 1999.
Previous research on multitext books

manuscripts extant, waiting to be analyzed. According to van Anrooij, two important changes have taken place recently to enhance our understanding of miscellanies: for one thing “it appears a rule rather than an exception that miscellanies were produced in several phases, which means that the original design of a manuscript can be quite different from the eventual result.”  

This implies that it might not be enough to look for just one function of a manuscript, that we rather need to be open to the possibility that different phases can reflect different functions over time. The second conclusion Anrooij draws is that a clarification need be made on the concept of “composite volume.” It seems solutions to this problem now exist, through the efforts of several scholars: more on that in Chapter 2.

A more recent conference, held at the University of Cassino in 2003, gave evidence of the rapid progress in this field of research: investigations are nowadays excitingly manifold and wide-ranging. Focus has shifted to include more of codicological studies, discussion of terminologies covering all kinds of medieval multitext books, statistical treatment of larger library collections, typologies of different kinds, the reader’s perspective, and much more. The proceedings of the conference appeared as Il codice miscellaneo: tipologie e funzioni, edited by Edoardo Crisci and Oronzo Pecere (Segno e testo 2, 2004). Five of the fourteen contributions are expressly devoted to Greek and Byzantine materials; the others are either more general in their scope or deal with books in Latin, Italian and French. As far as terminology for multitext books is concerned, I found both Peter Gumbert’s and Marilena Maniaci’s discussions very helpful. As will be obvious in Chapter 3, I follow Gumbert more closely (partly a result of my writing in English and not in Italian).

Studies of Byzantine multitext books

Inquiries into Byzantine multitext books have been fewer than into their Western counterparts, especially in the capacity as “whole books” and not merely as containers of certain selected texts. The impression conveyed is that up until recently it has been a matter of isolated efforts, with no general acknowledgement of how large a part the multitext books play in Byzantine book culture. I will mention a few studies to illustrate their different kinds of scope. The first is one of the earliest examples where attention was given

33 ANROOIJ 1999, 22.
34 The following articles concern Greek and Byzantine miscellaneous books: Marilena Maniaci, “Il codice greco ‘non unitario’: Tipologie e terminologia” (75–107); Edoardo Crisci, “I più antichi codici miscellaneous greci” (109–144); Filippo Ronconi, “Per una tipologia del codice miscellaneous greco in epoca mediobizantina” (145–182); Daniele Bianconi, “Libri e mani: Sulla formazione di alcune miscellaneous dell’età dei Paleologi” (311–363); Michael D. Reeve, “Dionysius the Periegete in Miscellanies” (365–378).
specifically to miscellaneous manuscripts. The three others are more recent and of interest in a comparison of method and aims.

In 1911 C. F. Georg Heinrici published his *Griechisch-Byzantinische Gesprächstbücher und Verwandtes aus Sammelhandschriften*, in which he set out to explore a text genre: *erotapokriseis* or “question-and-answer literature.” Still, he recognized that texts of that kind were transmitted primarily in miscellaneous manuscripts and took some of these as his point of departure, describing their contents and character, and surmising their use. Heinrici’s interest lay in theological miscellaneous manuscripts: he emphasized their popular character (“bei ihnen liegt der Schwerpunkt in der Volkstümlichkeit”) and saw them as giving the truest and most lucid picture of the interests and perspectives of the Byzantine Church. Even if Heinrici did not esteem the miscellanies very highly—likening them to “das Unterholz im Walde der patristischen Literatur”—he called attention to the wealth of subject matter presented in the text collections. Though they are all unique, their distinctive features may give us a clue to which interests lay behind each of them. As for the geneses of miscellanies, Heinrici speculates about a possible development from Bible-, Psalter- and Gospel manuscripts with commentaries attached, and from the *catenae*, the exegetic texts which were made up of connected series (chains) of extracts from the writings of the Church Fathers.

In *Ανωνύμων Φιλοσοφικά Σύμμεικτα: A Miscellany in the Tradition of Michael Psellus* (1992), Ilias Pontikos gives a presentation of a thirteenth-century composite book containing mainly rhetorical and philosophical texts. *Codex Baroccianus 131* is a comprehensive volume of 541 folios, originating from Nicaea and Constantinople around 1250–1280. Pontikos has limited himself to a thorough study of what he describes as a unique miscellany inside the larger composite, i.e. ff. 397v–446v. This seems to form an autonomous section, copied by a single scribe around 1250 and comprising short treatises on a variety of subjects: rhetorical, medical, meteorological and theological matters are touched upon. Pontikos argues that a significant

---

35 Heinrici 1911, 6.
36 “Was wissenschaftliches und erbauliches Gemeingut war, ist in ihnen regellos in bunter Folge aufgehäuft, längere und kürzere Auszüge aus den patristischen Klassikern, [...] Florilegien, Gnomensammlungen, Glossarien, Namenlexika mit Deutungen, dogmatische, liturgische, kasuistische, kirchenrechtliche, ethische, geschichtliche, chronologische, naturwissenschaftliche, astrologische, rhetorische, grammatische Traktate, Apokalyptisches, Apokryphes, Legenden, zwischendurch auch medizinische Rezepte, Beschworungen und sonstige Zeugnisse für den Aberglauben der Zeit” (Heinrici 1911, 6). Although Heinrici’s enumeration of different kinds of texts is quite inclusive and concerns miscellaneous books as a group, it is in fact not wide of the mark to fit as a description of the single codex we are dealing with here, Gr 8.
37 Heinrici 1911, 7.
38 For a description of the whole manuscript, see Wilson 1978 and Wilson 1966.
39 Wilson suggests that this scribe might tentatively be identified as Nikephoros Alyates (1966, 306).
part of the texts emanates from the intellectual milieu of the Byzantine polymath Michael Psellos (1018–c.1081) and his contemporaries (for example Symeon Seth). The miscellany was further enriched with Aristotelian material in the twelfth century (Psellos is known as a fervid advocate of Plato as opposed to Aristotle), maybe in the circle of scholars around Anna Komnena, wherein Aristotle’s works received special attention. Pontikos calls attention to the fact that, taken as a whole, the *Baroccianus 131* consists of miscellaneous works from authors of primarily the twelfth century, and suggests that this could indicate that the anonymous compiler of the miscellany transmitted in the Baroccianus copy, ff. 397–446, may actually have been one of these authors who belonged to the group which took part in and furthered the twelfth-century Aristotelian revival in Byzantium. An interesting part of Ilias Pontikos’ study, from my perspective, is the discussion of the purpose of the miscellany, why it was compiled in the first place. He elaborates on this question in chapter IV, arguing that it may have been created as a teacher’s compendium and used as such in the *enkyklios paideia* of twelfth-century Constantinople. Regrettably Pontikos stops at this point, having given an outline of the genesis of the compendium: we do not get an answer as to how this compendium or miscellany came to fit into the larger composite book (*Baroccianus 131*) of mid-thirteenth century Nicaea, or whether its use would still be the same when put into the new and much more voluminous textual mix a century later.

In his article “Literarische Interessen in der Palaiologenzeit anhand von Gelehrten-Codices” (1996) Peter Schreiner shows how miscellanies can mirror the intellectual interests of a certain period of time or a specific person. The “Gelehrten-Codex” is a multitext book compiled by one or several scribes, which furthermore displays signs of continued study, e.g. in the form of added notes and interlinear glosses. Schreiner presents a case study of *Vaticanus gr. 914*, which is an autograph by Isidore of Kiev. He traces the intellectual interests of this theologian and humanist by looking at Isidore’s selection of texts, his scribal working method, and the notes that he added. With his study Schreiner indicates a promising path in the study of scholars’ miscellanies, arguing that the combined use of palaeography, codicology and literary studies may contribute new insights not least in cases where external biographical information is scarce.

Finally, a recent study of miscellaneous manuscripts which saw their origin in the ninth to twelfth centuries. In *I manoscritti greci miscellanei* (2007), Filippo Ronconi draws attention to the fact that two main approaches have thus far dominated the studies of miscellaneous manuscripts: one is the focus on the “mise-en-recueil,” how the texts are distributed in the con-

40 PONTIKOS 1992, xxxix.
41 PONTIKOS 1992, xl.
According to Ronconi, the center of attention has been on the material aspects, while the texts have been considered primarily in their spatial dimension, their extension in relation to the accessible writing area. Ronconi argues that these two approaches should be supplemented with the historical-philological perspective, the study of the texts as such. An integrated study of the manuscripts that takes the palaeographical and philological details of the texts into due account, may contribute, *inter alia*, to the reconstruction of the genesis of a miscellaneous manuscript, through the tracking down of model manuscripts. The characteristics of the scribal hands are also important here, since the individual traits of a hand as well as signs of scribal collaboration may clarify what kind of cultural products these manuscripts were. By way of a number of case studies on middle Byzantine manuscripts Ronconi dexterously demonstrates the variety and complexity in this field of research.

The study of *Gr 8* will in some ways resemble the aforementioned, in others not. Like Pontikos and Schreiner I have only one codex in focus. A comparative study of manuscripts related to *Gr 8* would indeed be interesting to undertake, but it cannot be accomodated within the scope of this study. Pontikos, Schreiner and Ronconi are concordant in their ambition to situate the codices in their original cultural milieu. In this Pontikos quarries deeper, but he also breaks off at the stage of looking at only one part of *Codex Baroccianus 131*; in addition, he offers an edition of the texts. Schreiner’s study is only an article and therefore not fully comparable with the other two items, but his methodological discussion is important and his emphasis on the combination of codicology with literary studies attractive. He suggests that manuscripts may be seen as a “psychograms,” a means for profiling a certain scribe, owner, or user. The significance of the scribe is highlighted by both Schreiner and Ronconi. But whereas Schreiner gives much attention to the individual person behind the codex, Ronconi concentrates more on an assessment of different types of multitext codices; cultural history in both cases, but on various levels of particularity and general features.

The study of *Gr 8* may be characterized as follows. In common with Schreiner’s study, I deal with an example of a late Byzantine codex marked by the cultural situation of the fifteenth century—the end of the empire, the migration westwards of Byzantine intellectuals, the Church union discus-

---

42 Ronconi 2007, 17ff.
43 Ronconi’s book came to my attention at a very late stage, and I have thus not had the opportunity to benefit from his presentation in the preparation of this thesis.
Previous research on multitext books

sions and the humanist movement in Italy. The codicological structure as well as the scribe and his work procedure make up one center of attention. Another will be the literary (and not so literary) contents of the codex. The progression will be along these lines: Chapter 2 gives a background on terminology and on the technical aspects of analyzing multitext codices. Chapter 3 is the codicological investigation, where the book is dissected in all its structural parts. In Chapter 4 the texts are in focus; I group and characterize them all in an attempt to find typological connections throughout the whole book as well as in relation to the separate structural units. The aim is to sketch a portrait of the book and of the scribe behind it. If Chapter 4 deals with the central tendencies, finding the median so to speak, Chapter 5 is an illustration of the sprawling tendency in miscellanies, where sometimes the range between extremes can be very wide as regards the reflected interests. In this instance three disparate texts have been selected for comprehensive presentation.
Multitext books

What expectations do modern readers generally have of books and the contents of books? When we go to the bookstore and browse, we usually find inside the covers one novel, or one biography, or a manual over one kind of technical equipment; the book is probably written by one author or maybe by more than one author but collaboratively, as in the collective novel. But there are other models: a book can hold the collected works by one and the same author, or a choice of those works (or just part of one work—when the work in its entirety is too long to fit into just one volume). It can be a collection of essays by different authors but over a common theme. It could cover, say, Polish poetry from the interwar period. Whenever there are more than one text in the book, we can easily find a common denominator for the text collection. What we do not expect to find is a book which contains one text on computer programming, followed by one text on effective bargaining, followed by George Orwell’s Animal Farm, followed by an enumeration of household remedies against migraine or ulceritis. I might, as a reader, be interested in all of these things, but they do not belong in the same book.

There was a time, however, when a book could cover subjects as diverse as those mentioned above. More often than not the medieval handwritten book held two or more texts. One could almost say that the monograph was the exception. When did this happen and why? To start from the other chronological end: yes, most likely Greek books in antiquity were monographs—by force, more or less, since the format of the book roll could not accommodate larger quantities of text. According to Theodore Skeat a standard roll during the Greco-Roman period was made up from 20 sheets (kollemata) of papyrus “glued” together. With the normal sheet breadth of 16–18 cm the standard roll would thus measure 320–360 cm. This means that a text the length of Plato’s Phaedo would fit when written in a “compressed hand,” while a less crammed hand would comfortably yield enough space to fit in one or two tragedies or at most three short songs of Homer. Thus, if

45 Skeat 1982, 169.
46 Gallo 1986, 13. Rhetorical texts are often found written in narrower columns, i.e. requir-
several works were to be put in the same book roll, it had to be either small-format genres, like epigrams or apophthegms, or else excerpts from longer works.

There is, however, a curious formulation in Plutarch, *Life of Antony* 58, which might have a bearing on the question of the papyrus roll being a monograph or not. Plutarch speaks about the Pergamene library and how “ἐϊκοσι μυριάδες βιβλίων ἁπλῶν” where located there. Likewise, Tzetzes in his *Preface to Aristophanes* gives some numbers for the library in Alexandria, viz., “βιβλίων μὲν συμμηγόν ἀριθμὸς τεσσαράκοντα μυριάδες, ἁπλῶν δὲ καὶ ἀμηγόν βιβλίων μυριάδες ἐννέα.” Researchers have discussed this at some length around the turn of the last century, but I have not found any recent contributions to this matter. The numbers have generated more comments than the categories of books mentioned. But even if the figures themselves might be inaccurate owing to palaeographical mistakes during transmission, there ought to be some explanation for the terms “mixed, simple, and unmixed rolls.” It is difficult to imagine what else could be referred to besides contents. Perhaps the monograph, the one-text book (roll) was not totally dominant after all?

If we assume that the “mixed” rolls refer to multitext books, there is still room for different interpretations as to what they contained. Some material evidence of multitext books from extant papyrus finds may help us out here. Most often a roll of this kind contains a few texts—usually poems—by the same author. Some present more than one author but similar kinds of text, as for instance, the “garland” of Hellenistic epigrams by many different authors, which Meleagros compiled. There are also a small number which we might call *miscellanies*: rolls containing several texts or parts of texts from various genres and by different authors. These are usually considered to have been created for educational purposes. A well-known case is the Cairo papyrus, “Livre d’écolier,” from the 3rd century BCE, a roll which on its 2½ meter of papyrus embraced passages from Euripides’ *Phoenician Women* and *Ino*, from book five of the *Odyssey*, a couple of epigrams and New Comedy fragments, in addition to syllabaries, lists, and a mathematical manual.

---

47 See DEVREESSE 1954, 69; FRASER 1972, I, 329 and II, 485, with further references. The edition of Flacelière and Chambry presents a different reading, in accordance with Reiske’s conjecture: ἐϊκοσι μυριάδες βιβλίων ἁπλῶς (à peu près deux cent mille volumes). But in the light of Tzetzes’ wording, the text had perhaps better be kept as it stands in the manuscripts. Cf. FLACELIÈRE & CHAMBRY 1977, 157.

48 See, for instance, Kathryn Gutzwiller’s endeavor to establish the order of these epigrams in the very books, i.e., the book rolls (GUTZWILLER 1998).

49 P. Cairo inv. 65445; Pack 2642. “Le contenu du papyrus est d’un caractère scolaire évident; mais l’écriture n’est pas celle d’un écolier. C’est une sorte de manuel, où l’enfant pouvait s’exercer à lire at à compter, en même temps qu’il y trouvait diverses notions utiles à son
In the era of book rolls there are examples of what might be seen as another kind of “fore-runner” of the multitem text codex. The use of wooden cases (τεῖχος or κιβωτόν) for three or four rolls is attested already in classical and Hellenistic times (for example in Xenophon, Anabasis VII, 5, 14): created to meet the physical demands for containment these receptacles would also entail the opportunity to gather small corpora of texts.\textsuperscript{50} We know of the ancient grammarians’ habit to make three-partite or four-partite sets, not only of the works of tragedians and comedians, but also of Plato’s dialogues, to take one prose example.\textsuperscript{51} It seems that ancient and medieval source material points to an “originally” (i.e. going back to Hellenistic libraries) alphabetic order within these groups of tragedies and comedies. But then again, we also see in some manuscripts a different order—or discontinuity—within the same groupings. According to Alain Blanchard this goes back to the moment of transcription from scroll to codex: “Le cadre originel de ces désordres (the corpora in non-alphabetic order) est sans doute constitué par de petits codex, de trois et quatre unités, correspondant chacun au contenu d’une boîte.”\textsuperscript{52}

But the radical change came with the codex. At first the book format changed from roll to single quire codex, an operation that saved writing space and thus the expense of writing material.\textsuperscript{53} Or, inversely, you could afford to fit another text into the same length of papyrus. The next development of the codex form—the codex made up of several quires—gave the advantage of accommodating larger amounts of text into the same volume. Thus it was during late antiquity that the multitext book could rise in importance and become a common alternative to the unitary, single-text book which had so far dominated the field.\textsuperscript{54} In his survey of early miscellaneous codices, which are extant in more or less fragmentary state, Edoardo Crisci shows that the miscellaneous book was in the initial stages a rather marginal product, geographically as well as in other ways. It was modest in its graphic and textual appearance, often written by a non-professional scribe on writing material of less than average quality. These unpretentious books seem to...
have been produced for immediately practical and multifarious use. Varied in content but still with a clear scope, they became “uno strumento librario efficace” for Greek and Coptic readers in early Christian surroundings, whether for studies or work, for personal reading or collective moral edification, for circulation of doctrinal polemics or just sharing a good reading experience with your friends.\(^{55}\)

In his article “Dal libro unitario al libro miscellaneo” Armando Petrucci also focuses on these early stages of the production and use of miscellaneous books. But his definition of miscellany is more limited than Crisci’s. Petrucci deals with the book “in which several texts of different authors are more or less coherently juxtaposed in a single container.”\(^{56}\) He excludes from his survey multitext books with only one author represented (corpora). Further, he leaves out anthologies of excerpts or of citations, liturgical books, so-called composite books where different texts share a common container despite being written separately in successive phases over time, and later copies of early miscellanies. I can see why Petrucci sets these limits, and that they are useful for his purpose of tracing the beginnings of the miscellany. But in a wider context, and certainly for my investigation, this strict delimitation of the phenomenon would be counter-productive. The coherent miscellany is but one variety of many in the area of multitext books, and if we wish to assess how these books reflect on the reading habits and transmission of texts, we must see to the whole field. We do need to take into account these other appearances of multitext books: the school exercises, the re-use of manuscripts, and the later additions of new text(s) to a scroll or codex. It has to do with the expectancy of the reader (and of the scribe): what you have seen in other places, namely in composite books, seems less farfetched when you are up to create a “miscellany proper,” i.e. an intentional copying of different authors and texts into the same container. What is crucial is the function of the book. This functional—user’s—perspective will also be explored in relation to \textit{Gr 8}. But before we proceed to the analysis of \textit{Gr 8} from this and other angles, we need to disentangle some of the terms and concepts which appear in the area of multitext books.

**Terminology current at the time**

Can we learn from Byzantine vocabulary how multitext books were looked upon? What is obvious, according to Basile Atsalos, is the abundance of terms related to the codex, their variation, concurrence and fluidity. It seems that among the various terms which denominate monographs (βίβλος – βιβλίον, ποιήμα – ποιήσις, δέλτος, τεῦχος, as well as diminutives and other variant forms of these) most of them are also employed for the

\(^{55}\) CRISCI 2004, 142–144.

\(^{56}\) PETRUCCI 1986, 173.
miscellaneous codex, which Atsalos defines as “un recueil [...] des ouvrages portant sur le même sujet ou sur des sujets différents.” As if this were not enough: sometimes the very same terms designate the separate parts of a text embracing more than one volume, or individual works in an author’s production, and also quite often individual texts and treatises inside a miscellany:

parfois, dans les manuscrits, et surtout dans les “codices miscellaneous” ces termes sont utilisés, non pour indiquer le “codex” lui-même comme matériel, mais un ouvrage ou un traité qui y est contenu. Cette dernière notion est presque de règle en ce qui concerne les auteurs.

This means that from a codicological point of view the Byzantine terminology for codices is of little help in assessing what a material might have looked like, and neither would it seem to yield any chronological hints as to which terms designated what at what time. This negative evidence—or absence—of a specific terminology for codices miscellaneous in Byzantine writings can nevertheless be taken as an indicator of the “normality” of multitext books. The miscellaneous contents did not make these books stand out from other kinds of books so as to require a special terminology. They were simply “books”, looked at and treated as any other book.

The container and its contents

Physical structure

Multitext books can be approached mainly from two perspectives: the physical structure of the book and the contents. Terminologies have often been obscured by the mixing of these two aspects. Even Denis Muzerelle’s so fundamental *Vocabulaire codicologique* is deficient in this area, since his terms “do not constitute a logically coherent system; they mix reference to the physical makeup with reference to the contents.”

---

57 *Atsalos* 1971, 41.
58 *Atsalos* 1971, 42.
59 According to Spyridon Lambros, a few late terms—i.e., terms which appear in post-Byzantine manuscripts—seem to denote miscellaneous specifically: πανθόκτης, πολυμιγής βιβλίον, πολύβιβλον and βιβλοπανσύλλεκτος άνθολογία. They are mentioned by Lambros in his revised version of E.M. Thompsons *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Thompson – Lambros, Παλαιογραφία: Έγχειρίδιον Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Λατινικῆς Παλαιογραφίας ύπό Εὐδίροδον Θόμπον κατὰ μετάφρασιν Σπυρίδωνος Π. Λάμπρου, Athens 1903, 108–109). Atsalos, however, is skeptic about their importance since they were not in general use (*Atsalo* 1971, 41 and 66–68). I still find it interesting that these terms do appear at this late stage in Byzantine book culture. Even if we find only scattered examples of them, it might at any rate hint at a rising awareness of or need for distinctions as to different kinds of books.
60 *Gumbert* 2004, 20. Cf. Munk Olsen 1998. The terms that apply to these matters are found in Muzerelle 1985, § 143 (Aspects généraux du livre: le codex) and § 431 (Contenu de volume: types de contenu), and also in the web site (http://vocabulaire.irht.cnrs.fr/vocab.htm).
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The reason why it is so important to establish the structure or stratigraphy of multitext books is the large variation in how handwritten books were created, and also the fact that codices are not stable entities. They can be—and often are—rebound, and concomitant changes in the structure can take place: parts of the original book may be lost or deliberately left out, other parts may be added, the internal order of the quires may be confused, or new texts may be added on blank pages long after the primary text or text collection was created. To analyze the text(s) in such a manuscript without awareness of the “archaeology” is a precarious undertaking. It is problematical to draw any conclusions as to how texts belong together. Likewise one cannot unconditionally assume that facts of origin and date in one part of the manuscript are transferable to other parts: this has to be established for each part individually.

What “parts” am I talking about? The structural units commonly dealt with in a manuscript description are the quires of a codex; information on these is given in the collational formulae of modern manuscript catalogs. Certainly we need to know how the book is built up from quires, but this must be related to the texts. That is how we can begin to map out the codicological units (éléments codicologiques, in Birger Munk Olsen’s terms), which are the self-contained “building modules” of a codex.61

A codex may, of course, have been created in one single operation, when “somebody decides to make a book with a certain text or set of texts, or to have it made; then the work is executed, and at a certain moment it is ready.”62 This means that the codex contains only one codicological unit (a so-called monomorous codex). But often the procedure of codex production is a lot more complicated than this. To find out whether a codex contains two or more codicological units, you have to look for the boundaries between them. Normally these can be found when quire boundaries coincide with the ending of one text or group of texts, a new text beginning on the next quire. But each case must be analyzed closely; there may be an incidental ending of a text on the last verso of a quire even when the next quire is part of the same scribal operation. One also needs to observe other kinds of breaks or boundaries which may give us clues as to how the codex was put together. These may be a change in handwriting, or in writing material (a new paper or parchment quality or a different watermark or even a change in the dimensions of the leaves). The layout of the page (mise-en-page) can be different. It may be a change in decoration, or in the quire signatures. Sometimes the outer leaves of a quire are worn or soiled, indicating that this part of the codex was used as a separate booklet before being bound in its present

---

61 Module: “a separable component, frequently one that is interchangeable with others, for assembly into units [for our purposes, read: books] of different size, complexity, or function,” as the Random House Dictionary (rev. ed., New York 1988) puts it.
surrounding.\textsuperscript{63} Often the last quire of a codicological unit differs from the rest of the quires; maybe a couple of leaves are cut out, or have been added to fit in the whole text. A proficient scribe might have gradually maximized the amount of text which goes into the writing area, written the words more tightly and added a line or two. If his or her calculation was correct no addition of leaves to the quire would be necessary. Another important indication of unit endings is the presence of blank pages (which might eventually have been filled with new text).

All these changes and irregularities \textit{might} indicate that we have identified a codicological unit, but every instance must be judged carefully on its own premises, the crucial point being that its content forms a self-sufficient whole.\textsuperscript{64} When the codex contains two or more codicological units it is called a \textit{composite}. Since the definition of codicological units demands that we now have different, and autonomous, texts in the units, a composite is by definition also a \textit{multitext codex}. We will come back to these concepts in greater detail in the analysis of \textit{Gr 8} in Chapter 3.

The relation between contents and structure

Apart from the physical structure, multitext books can also be approached from the perspective of contents. The combination of different texts in one book can be more or less complex. Many of the terminological discrepancies originate in different ways of dealing with this complexity. An obvious example is the term \textit{miscellany} or \textit{miscellaneous codex} which seems to have been given as many definitions as there are scholars in this area. Should this term cover all kinds of multitext books, both the structurally homogeneous and the composite codices? Should it designate only the contentually heterogeneous or should we include other possible text combinations as well: different texts by the same author (corpora), different kinds of texts which have a common use (e.g. liturgical text collections)? Would collections of excerpts qualify, or must the texts be complete? I have tried to avoid this problem by using the overall term “multitext book” for the whole field, regardless of structural differences and regardless of how similar or diverse the texts seem.

Some prefer to use the term \textit{miscellany} in contrast to the \textit{composite}, so that the miscellany would always be monomorous or at least homogenetic, i.e. produced in the same circle and approximately at the same time. This is

\textsuperscript{63} For further discussions of the \textit{booklet} together with examples from English composite manuscripts, see the articles by Pamela Robinson and by Ralph Hanna III (ROBINSON 1980; HANNA 1986).

\textsuperscript{64} Peter Gumbert gives a full and very distinct definition: “a codicological unit is a discrete number of quires, worked in a single operation—unless it is an enriched, enlarged or extended unit, containing a complete text or set of texts—unless it is an unfinished, defective or dependent unit.” For further clarification, see GUMBERT 2004.
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unfortunate, because it maintains the confusion of the structural and contenterential aspects. It might also put too much focus on the stratigraphy: even though we, as researchers, need to establish how the books were constructed, we should keep in mind that the medieval readers probably saw little reason to treat composite books differently from homogeneous books. If you copy a composite you end up with a structurally homogeneous book: the contents are exactly the same, so why call one of them miscellaneous and not the other? Since the concept of miscellaneity is so problematic, my suggestion would be to leave the term miscellany out of the structural discussion altogether and reserve it for the contents, as is also common usage when it comes to modern literature. Here we could be generous and simply let it stand for “containing various texts” and then define subgroups. For the structural differences I think it is better to use the terms discussed above (the monomeric codex, the composite, and further specifications thereof, all based on the analysis of codicological units) and, hopefully, minimize the confusion.

In German (and Swedish) one can indicate the structural difference between monomeric miscellanies and composite miscellanies by using the terms Sammelhandschrift and Sammelband respectively. Even if these terms give a first and very useful preliminary sorting, they cannot account for all the variations in stratigraphy. Grouping multitext books as monomeric or composite books is just the first step. To grasp the stratigraphy in greater detail we must be able to specify all the different instances where a book has changed its appearance over time. This is where Gumbert introduces such concepts as the enriched, enlarged, and extended codicological unit. Another practical aspect of this is covered by Erik Kwakkel’s concept usage unit (gebruikseenheid), or what Gumbert designates as file.

But let us consider the definition of miscellany further (apart from it being monomeric or composite, and apart from establishing possible usage units). As for the definition of contents, the wording “containing various texts” is rather vague. What about the book containing various texts by the same author? Often it is referred to as corpus. I prefer to restrict the use of “corpus” to denominate an author’s total production. So the book containing various texts by the same author can in my opinion still be a miscellany provided that there is a “mixture” or “assortment” in some other way, for example in thematics, subject matter, or genre.

65 Cf. Oxford English Dictionary, s. v.: “A mixture, medley, or assortment; (a collection of) miscellaneous objects or items [...]. A book, volume, or literary production containing miscellaneous pieces on various subjects.”
66 Kwakkel 2002, 13–15; Gumbert 2004, 34. I interpret Kwakkel’s productie-eenheid as more or less equivalent to codicological unit. But I prefer Kwakkel’s term “usage unit” over Gumbert’s “file,” since it is more immediately transparent.
67 Crisci suggests that we call this an author’s miscellany, “una miscellanea, per così dire, d’autore” (Crisci 2004, 109, note 1). Cf. also Filippo Ronconi, who in his typology of the miscellaneo disorganico stipulates that it comprises “testi eterogenei, oltre che per autore, per
As for anthologies of excerpts or citations: when the form is unitary and the collection can be perceived as creating a new whole of similar extracts, then I would prefer using the widely accepted terms *florilegium*, *anthology* et cetera. In one way they are multitext books, but in another they may be seen as something new and “unitary”—a single-text work which gets its own transmission as a whole. If, on the other hand, the excerpts are varying in form and length, in genre and subject matter, and the collection does not seem to create a new unity, a new “work,” then it is in my view a miscellany, regardless of whether the texts are complete or not.

This distinction is also valid for other multitext books: a *tetraevangelion* contains four texts by different authors, but in text transmission they most often stay together as a whole. I would not treat the New Testament or the Bible as a miscellany, despite the fact that they actually do adhere to the basic definition: they contain various texts by different authors and in different genres. This has to do with tradition and transmission history. On the other hand, if a book contains a choice of texts from the Bible in addition to some assorted apocryphal texts the definition is less straightforward. The “whole” is not present anymore, a new “collection” of miscellaneous pieces has been created. To sum up: some kind of heterogeneity in its contents is needed for a book to be called a miscellany, and the texts which are gathered should normally have a tradition of being transmitted separately, outside of this collection. Of course, rare texts might not be found at all in other contexts, but that would be an exception to the overall rule.

It has further been proposed that we distinguish between *organized* or *organic* and *disorganized* or *disorganic* miscellanies, according to the possibility for us to perceive an organizational principle behind the choice of texts. In Muzerelle’s *Vocabulaire* a distinction is made between the *recueil organisé*, an assemblage of which we can make sense, where the combination of texts corresponds to an intention, and the other extreme, the *recueil factice*, where the combination of different “pièces” has been made seemingly in an arbitrary fashion and purely for the practical needs of conservation in a library. In-between these extremes there will always be cases where one cannot make out what the possible intention once was, whether units were combined for practical, economical, or intellectual reasons. Here it is once again important to beware of falling into the trap of mixing structure with contents. A composite consisting of two or more distinct codicological units, can be very well organized textwise, so that the purpose which underlay the collection is evident for all, while a monomerous codex may look as if it has been created by a mere toss-up. To estimate the level of coherence one must in each case be prepared to dig deeper, analyzing both the texts and the physical structure of the book to see how these aspects come together. What we really need, in

---

68 See *Muzerelle 1985, § 431.10* and *§ 431.16*. 
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order to reach a comprehensive view of what “coherence expectancy” people may have had on their multitext books, is to undertake more thorough investigations of miscellaneous codices, without taking a premature stance on their (possible lack of) organization. Fusion need not always mean confusion.

I also wonder if it is reasonable to treat a composite bound in the twelfth century differently from one bound in the sixteenth. Is it just the modern librarian who gets dismissed for making an “arbitrary combination,” even though the twelfth-century librarian or book owner could have made a similar decision? Is it not true that the personal miscellany, the *Hausbuch* or *zibaldone*, is—among other things—a gathering of texts for precisely practical reasons of “conservation”? Certainly, we should try to establish when and how a composite was made, since this provides information on how the texts were transmitted together and in what form the book was available to readers at different stages. But we must keep in mind that there are many reasons why texts become situated together. A book is, after all, a practical object, a container which is meant to be used. And the (in our eyes) less rational text combination may have worked just fine for the readers at the time. As Lynn Thorndike puts it: “strict unity in subject-matter is by no means always observed. Or at least what seem to us anomalies and inconsistencies creep in, but they should perhaps warn and inform us of a different mental outlook then.” Well organized or not, the miscellanies still have a story to tell us.

To conclude, let me give a short recapitulation of my own definitions in this area. I use the term *multitext books* to describe the whole field of books that are not monographs, that is, they contain at least two separate texts, but more often several or even a large number of texts. In its physical structure a book can be homogeneous or not. The homogeneous, *monomerous* book

---

69 Hanna calls these postmedieval constellations “binding accidents” (HANNA 1996, 22 and 285, note 3).

70 Hausbuch refers to a book containing a person’s own correspondence and literary undertakings, often in addition to selected readings from other authors, usually a manuscript created over an extended period of time. A well-known instance is John Chortasmenos’ autograph manuscript, *Vindob. Suppl. gr. 75* (HUNGER 1969, esp. 54–63). On the term Hausbuch, see also HUNGER 1989, 74f.

71 THORNDIKE 1946, 98–99.

72 J. P. Gumbert refers this term to Jan Willem Klein (GUMBERT 1999, 28, n. 1). But it seems that Klein uses the term *meerteksthandschrift* more or less as an equivalent to *verzamelhandschrift*, that is, referring to the book which is made at one sweep and not put together from different components or on different occasions. A short text written as a separate quire is in Klein’s terminology called a *libellus*: “Meerdere van zulke *libelli* kunnen verzameld zijn in een *convolut* [...]. Maar ook kunnen meerdere *libelli* gekopieerd worden tot een ‘meerteksthandschrift’ of verzamelhandschrift […]. Niet alleen ‘enkeltekst-handschriften’, maar ook verschillende ‘meertekst-handschriften’ kunnen tot een *convolut* worden samengebonden” (KLEIN 1995, 26). This means that my usage of the term *multitext book* does not correspond completely with Klein’s, since I let it cover both *verzamelhandschriften* and *convoluten* and all the variants in-between these.
consists of only one codicological unit, i.e. it was made at one go, so to speak. The heterogeneous, *composite* book has a multiple genesis, i.e. it consists of at least two codicological units. The texts may be related in content or not; in the latter case I use the term *miscellany*. Note that this does not imply any statement on the codicological structure: the *miscellany* can be a structurally homogeneous or heterogeneous book, the fundamental element is that it contains texts of various (miscellaneous) contents.
BRINGING OUT THE STRUCTURE
3 Codicological Description and Analysis

In this chapter I present a thorough codicological analysis of *Codex Upsaliensis Graecus 8*. Firstly, I examine those aspects of *Gr 8* which apply to more than one unit, e.g. the book block, the binding, and the scribes. Secondly, I discuss what criteria may help us to distinguish the boundaries between different codicological units. Establishing these is indispensable in the case of composite codices, since we will otherwise risk drawing conclusions based on—and accurate for—only one part of a book but invalid for another part of the same book. Then the units are dealt with separately by way of brief and rather formalized descriptions and analyses when such are called for. The focus of analysis differs from unit to unit according to the various problems involved. A short discussion ends the chapter. As an auxiliary there is a codicological table which gives an outline of all units in the codex. This is found in Appendix 2 at the end of this book.

General aspects of the codex

Provenance and further vicissitudes

In a catalog description of a manuscript there are usually some notes on the provenance and history of the manuscript. One could argue that this belongs to book history at large rather than to a codicological description. The evidence, though, will often be what one is able to find out by scrutinizing the codex itself: we may, for instance, be able to trace the origin of a book by the quality and watermarks of the paper, by identifying a scribe or scriptorium—if we are lucky, the scribe might even have left an explicit subscription—and the book’s further destinies can be unveiled by owners’ notes, or remaining library shelf-marks. Sometimes external evidence, like inventories and letters, may add further details to the overall picture.\(^1\) As a general pres-

---

\(^1\) The *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*, for example, recommends that one include under the caption “History” information about “Schreiber, Herkunftsort, Entstehungszeit, Auftraggeber, Leservermerke, örtlich bestimmbare oder sprachlich vom Text der Handschrift abweichende Glossen mit Zeitangabe; Besitz- und Kaufeinträge, Exlibris, Wappen, Stempel von Vorbesitzern; Nennung in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen; alte Ausleihvermerke; alte Signaturen” (*Richtlinien* 1992, 11).
entation of Gr 8 has already been given in Chapter 1, I will be brief on the history of the codex here, trying to keep to what is strictly observable.

Library shelf-marks
The earlier shelf-marks from different library arrangements are known to us partly from Gr 8 itself: on the spine, there is a number “49” indicating its former incorporation in the Sparwenfeld donation to the University Library at Uppsala. On the fore edge one may with difficulty discern another number, “16,” which remains from the manuscript’s stay in the library at El Escorial. The old library catalogs of El Escorial give further clues: in addition to the placing as “olim Escorialensis Α-VI-16,” yet another label, “olim Escorialensis Θ-VI-19,” shows that the shelves were reorganized at some point and that this affected our manuscript as well. That these two shelf-marks should refer instead to two different manuscripts with the very same contents is unlikely. No such duplicate manuscript has been reported as belonging to El Escorial.

Watermarks
Apart from what the library catalogs tell us, we have only the evidence of the codex itself, its material, its outer appearance, its texts and the notes that have been added. There is no colophon in it, and we must thus find other means to date the manuscript. One way is to compare the watermarks with similar designs in dated collections. The basis for this is that the molds for manufacturing paper were replaced regularly as they were worn out. Accuracy in dating watermarks is based on the matching of paper sheets produced from the very same mold, and the odds are better if the patterns from both molds (twins) are represented in the manuscript. At best, one may expect a dating accuracy of ±4–5 years in relation to an identical match in the repertory.

---

2 In El Escorial there are several older library catalogs which mention the contents of what was to become Codex Upsaliensis Graecus 8: two of them, Esc. X.I.16 and X.I. 18, are in Nicholas de la Torre’s hand. David Colville’s handwritten catalogs from the early 17th c., extant in Esc. K.I.18 and K.I.20, are the last to record Gr 8, since later cataloging work was carried out after the fire in 1671, when our book had already disappeared from El Escorial.
3 Repertories of dated watermarks are, for example, the ones produced by BRIQUET 1968 (Br.), HARLFINGER & HARLFINGER 1974–80 (Ha.) and PICCARD 1961 (Pi.).
4 The work in the paper mill was organized so that molds were always used in pairs—while one mold was emptied the other one was dipped into the vat and vice versa. This pair of molds used to carry very similar but not quite identical wire figures, which is why we speak of “twin watermarks.”
5 The estimate mentioned counts only for common-size paper, where the molds were normally worn out in one or two years; molds for very large formats were probably not in everyday use, and could thus last for many years. One must also keep in mind that a scribe could have had a sheaf of paper stashed away for a while. A dating with the help of watermarks is thus more of
In the case of Gr 8 we are lucky to have such a match with a dated manuscript, and this for a watermark which is present with both its twin appearances in not only one but several codicological units of Gr 8 (Ha. Boeuf 51, left and right, in Parisinus gr. 2938). The date in the colophon of the Paris manuscript is 1481, 20 September, the scribe there being Antonios Damilas. One might add that Ha. Boeuf 52 (Parisinus gr. 2097) is also very similar. This watermark is attested in a manuscript from Kydonia/Crete, 15 August 1484; scribe Michael Souliardos. It has been suggested that watermarks be used as a means to arrange manuscripts according to scriptoria or workshops. This may also help in identifying scribal hands. Identical paper forms and watermarks may, in addition to palaeographical and other evidence in the manuscripts, indicate a similar provenance when it comes to time of origin and workshop. This course of action could contribute to the reconstruction of cultural connections otherwise not easily detected. As we have little to go on when it comes to establishing the exact geographical provenance of Gr 8, it is an important piece of information that Antonios Damilas’ scribal activity took place on Crete. He held the post of notary in Candia, the main city of Crete (today’s Iraklio), and had connections also with the workshop of Michael Apostoles. Dated manuscripts in Damilas’ hand range from 1466 to 1491.

Another watermark which appears in Gr 8, though only on a couple of leaves, is similar to Ha. Balance 41. Normally one would need a larger proportion of leaves carrying the same twin watermarks and not just stray appearances, in order for them to be significant for dating. But in this case it is still of interest since the Codex Parisinus graecus 3045, in which the watermark has been identified, is copied by the same scribe who wrote most of the texts in Gr 8, Theodoros; I will return to this Paris manuscript in the discussion on him, below. If we could convey further connections between Theodoros and other scribes who have used the same kind of paper, or even who have worked on the same manuscripts as Theodoros, it might be possible to establish with more accuracy the milieu where Gr 8 saw its origin. For the time being, this can be considered wishful thinking: there is just not enough evidence to follow up on. But as more scribes are identified in codicologi-
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cal/palaeographical research, and further treasures from fifteenth-century paper mills are systematically investigated, there may arise opportunities to pick up this clue later on. As for other watermarks in Gr 8, I will comment on these in the descriptions of codicological units below.

Book block and binding

The original book block of Gr 8 encompasses 342 leaves, all Western paper of different types and watermark impression, in 8º format. In connection with the last binding, upper and lower endleaves were added to protect the book block, in each place a binion from which one leaf has been pasted down onto the inner surface of the cover (= iii + 342 + iii' folios; 135 x 90 mm). The flyleaves carry watermarks, the identification of which still remains: on the third upper flyleaf, f. iii, and the first lower flyleaf, f. i', we can see the letter “B” and possibly a heart encircled by one large and one small circle respectively. On ff. ii'–iii' there is an escutcheon watermark. These kinds of watermarks, with letters and/or figurines encircled by two or three circles on top of each other, seem to be quite common in Spanish seventeenth-century manuscripts.9

The volume is sewn on three leather thongs, its headbands being oversewn with hemp cord. The edges are gilt, and the front edge is decorated by means of a punched Eierstab. On the fore edge the letters INΔIKA may with some difficulty be read, and also the number “16” (originating from the Escorialensis shelf-mark, A-VI-16). The cover is made out of limp yellowish vellum of a kind not uncommon for Spanish bookbindings.10 This is in sharp contrast to the usually quite elaborate covers of Escorial manuscripts.11 Therefore it seems probable that the manuscript was rebound at some point after its disappearance from El Escorial in 1671, the year of the great fire. I am thus inclined to date the binding to the last quarter of the seventeenth century, which would also be in accord with the type of watermarks that we can see on the endleaves of the manuscript.12 On the outer edges of the cover

9 A number of parallels are provided by HEAWOOD 1950, especially among the figures designated “Circles,” Nos. 247–335, and “Coat of arms” with circles, Nos. 724–776. These patterns may indicate that the paper was fabricated at mills in Genoa: “In Genoese papers made for Spain, the watermarks most commonly met with are the coat of arms of Genoa and three moons, known also as three Q, as well as latin cross in an oval” (JAMES 1997, 53).

10 The information on Spanish vellum bindings was given to me orally, by Sten G. Lindberg.

11 “Der typische Escorial-Einband [...] ist gekennzeichnet durch mittel- bis dunkel- und, bisweilen auch rotbraunes Leder auf Pappe, seltener auf Holz, mit schlichtem, in Einzelheiten wenig variierendem Blinddruck: ein oder zwei Filetenrahmen meist mit Blattstempeln in den Ecken; in der Mitte der San Lorenzo-Rost, bei einem Teil der Einbände von einer Krone überragt, umgeben von einem Rankenkranz; am vergoldeten Schnitt mitunter eine kleinere oder eine grössere Krone eingraviert” (MORAUX 1976, 144ff.).

12 This is also indicated by the fact that while codd. Ups. gr. 2 and 5, both olim Escorialenses, have similar covers and watermarks on added blank folia, they are clearly of different date.
are still the remains of two pairs of thin leather tying straps. There are no decorations on the cover, other than the olim shelf-mark, 49, on the upper end of the spine.

Foliation
In addition to the unnumbered protective leaves (iii + iii'), Roman numerals in pencil have been added to the *pinakes*, ff. I–III; the rest of the codex has a foliation in Arabic numerals in the upper outer corner of recto pages, ff. 1–336. This foliation in ink was made in El Escorial by the scribe Nicholas de la Torre (v. infra), who also gives the corresponding folio number for each entry in his *pinakes*. Some inconsistencies need to be mentioned: f. 12 is followed by ff. 12a and 12b. On f. 6' a "6" and on f. 7' an "8" have been added in the lower margin; on f. 12a', 12a", and 12b' the number "7" has been added, and on f. 12b' we once again find a number "8" added. There is one leaf between ff. 34 and 35 numbered 34a by a modern hand. Thus, the total number of leaves is 348.

There are no traces of any original quire numbering (in Byzantium this was the customary way of keeping the leaves in order). However, since the book block has gone through a rather severe trimming at binding or rebinding, we cannot rule out the possibility of quire numbers having been lost in the process.

Scribes
Disregarding pen trials, notes, and other later additions, the hands of four different scribes may be discerned in *Gr 8*. One of them is responsible for 99% of the writing in *Gr 8*, and since his hand turns up in every codicological unit except the first (which was added to the codex at a later stage), it is appropriate to describe it thoroughly here. The other scribes are briefly presented here, but I will deal with the characteristic features of their hands in the codicological units where they come to the fore (U1, U4, and U15). The scribes are introduced here in consecutive order as they appear in the manuscript.

The scribe of the *pinax* on ff. I–II, has since long been identified as Νικόλαος Τουρρτανός, alias Nicholas de la Torre. The ensuing two pages and provenance. All six codices which Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld purchased in Spain have matching vellum covers in the same design (*Ups. graecii* 2–3, 5–8).

13 This rather complex quire (Q3) is presented in more detail in the discussion of unit 2 (U2) below.

14 GRAUX & MARTIN 1889, 34. For my presentation of Nicholas de la Torre, I rely mainly on Gregorio de Andrés’ comprehensive biography from 1969. Andrés includes several illustrations with Torre’s hand; see further *Repertorium* I, 319, and GRAUX & MARTIN 1891, plate XVII, No. 59.
were inaccessible heretofore, the leaves being glued together, but it is now clear that they carry an earlier draft by the same scribe. I may add that the foliation and one or two headings seem to be Nicholas’ additions too (e.g. on f. 200'). Nicholas de la Torre, was born on Crete—in Candia, Gregorio de Andrés conjectures—around 1535–40, moved from Crete to Padua/Venice in 1559, where he came to work together with Andreas Darmarios, among others. In 1564 Nicholas was commissioned by the bishop of Salamanca (and later Segovia) Diego de Covarrubias y Leiva to copy some Greek books for him, books which belonged to different Spanish humanists, one of them Diego Hurtado de Mendoza. Accepting the assignment Nicholas moved to Segovia, where he also met Ana Sanchez who became his wife. During the years that followed he moved around finding patrons now in Paris, now in Venice, and then eventually found his way back to Spain, where in 1569 he had the position as university scribe in Salamanca.

In these years Philip II spared no efforts in founding and furnishing his library in El Escorial with rare books collected from all over Europe. He soon realized that he would need a skillful Greek calligrapher who could create copies of important works and transcribe the illegible or defective ones into more usable books. In addition, the scribe must be well versed in Greek literature, to be able to compose indices to all the Escorial manuscripts. The choice fell on Nicholas de la Torre who took up his new post as βασιλικός ἀντιγραφός, or royal secretary, in March 1573. As for his work on the indices and catalogs in El Escorial, we will come back to this in the discussion of codicological unit 1, below.

Apart from the pinakes that were added at El Escorial, there is one scribe, who dominates all other units of Gr 8. Sofía Torallas Tovar proposed that his script looks very much like Nicholas Sagundino’s (Repertorium I, 316). I am not inclined to agree, considering the differences in both the details and the overall appearance. But in addition Torallas Tovar puts forward another hand for comparison, of one “Theodoros,” whom we can find in Repertorium II, 176. To my mind, we have ample reason to believe that this Θεόδωρος is the actual scribe of all but a few pages of Gr 8. I have favorably compared the handwriting in Gr 8 with a microfilm copy of Codex Parisinus graecus 3045, which is where we meet with the scribe Theodoros’ own colophon. On f. 172r it reads:

+ ἔτελειώθη ἡ παρούσα βιβλία ἐν μηνὶ ιαννομαρίῳ καὶ ἱνδ(ικτιών)ὸς ζ ἀδία χειρὸς κἄμοι τεοδώρου κα...κου ἐν ἔτει ζ' ἔδος ἐν

On the second line of the colophon the ink is somewhat smeared; thence the loss of the second segment of Theodoros’ name. A name which would fit with the short lacuna might be “Κυζίκου,” i.e., Theodoros from Kyzikos, a

15 Torallas Tovar 1994, 225.
city on the southern side of the Sea of Marmara, but this remains an assumption until we meet with further evidence. With a place-name in the genitive, one would perhaps also expect a title of office here, as in “bishop of (Kyzi- 
kos).” Another possibility would be to surmise Theodoros’ father’s name here; a name that would fit the lacuna would, for instance, be Kyrikos (Θεόδωρος Κυρίκος – Theodoros, son of Κ.). The Anno Mundi 6996 above equals 1488 CE. Another date, 1486 CE, is given on f. 5v in the Paris manuscript:

\[\text{ἐν ἔτει ζητοῦ ἱνωδ(ικτιων)ος ὄ ἐν ἡμι ἱουνίου ς}\]

Apparently the Paris manuscript is also a composite one, worked out over time. It contains on ff. 1–3 (written in another hand than Theodoros’) what is said to be letters by Zonaras, but are actually the collected κεφάλαια, or survey of chapters, of the work Εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας τῆς Θείας Γραφῆς by Michael Glykas.\(^\text{17}\) F. 4 is blank, and the date on the following leaf was added by Theodoros. Then, anew, on f. 6 Theodoros has started out with the full text of Michael Glykas’ work (though still going under the name of Zonaras). The text ends on f. 172v, where it is followed by the aforementioned colophon with Theodoros’ name in it. Theodoros is the scribe responsible also for ff. 173v–192v, this time presenting a mathematical treatise.

One more manuscript is supposed to be in Theodoros’ handwriting, the Sinaiticus Graecus 1677 from the Monastery of St. Catherine at Mount Si-

---

\(^{16}\) Marie Vogel’s and Victor Gardthausen’s note on this scribe is totally misleading: they seem to have confused this fifteenth-century scribe—who copied Par. 3045—with Theodoros Skoutariotes who was metropolitan of Kyzikos in the 1270s (VOGEL&GARDTHAUSEN 1909, 138, n. 8). Also Karl Krumbacher has written oddly about a Theodoros, bishop of Kyzikos, and his contribution to Cod. Marc. gr. 407 and to Cod. Athous 3758, as if this person might be another than the Skoutariotes who once owned the Cod. Marc. 407 (KRUMBACHER 1897, 390). As August Heisenberg claimed that the author of the so-called Synopsis Sathas in the Marcianus manuscript would be Theodoros Skoutariotes himself, Herbert Hunger concluded that “achtung! findet auch die von Krumbacher (390) behandelte Chronik eines ‘Theodoros, Bischofs von Kyzikos’ weg, da der Cod. Athous 3758 die Synopsis Sathas enthält” (HUNGER 1978, I 477; cf. HEISENBERG 1901, 5–16). Though Alexander Kazhdan has questioned this attribution (ODB, s.v. Skoutariotes), Ruth Macrides seems to keep to the hypothesis (2003, 64, n. 11, and 69f.). However we choose to solve the question of authorship of the Synopsis Sathas, it is still imperative that we sort out Theodoros, the fifteenth-century scribe of the manuscripts Gr 8, Par. 3045, and Sinait. 1677, from these discussions. There is also another person known under the name “Theodoros of Kyzikos,” who was bishop there in the 10th c. and is known as an epistolographer (ODB, s.v. Theodore of Kyzikos): of course, he is to be kept out of this discussion just as adamantly.

\(^{17}\) This work is either referred to as a collection of didactic letters from Michael Glykas to various addressees within clergy and government, or as a theological treatise, “95 Lyseeis zu Aporien der Hl. Schrift,” as Hunger puts it (HUNGER 1978, I 235). In Sophronios Eustratiades’ edition the “Θεολογικά κεφάλαια τοῦ Γλυκᾶ” are reproduced in vol. 1, pp. 1α’–νβ’.
This codex contains Aristotle’s Rhetoric (ff. 1–74v) with concomitant commentaries (ff. 79v–244v Anonymi Comm. in Rhet.; ff. 244v–247v Fragm. Comm. in Rhet.; ff. 250v–283v Stephani Comm. in Rhet.). As I have not examined this manuscript myself, I rely on Diether R. Reinsch’s inspection of it for the Aristotle Archive in Berlin. He notes that some corrections and lemmata have been added by another, contemporary hand (ff. I, IIrv, 75–78v, 248–249v, 283v–305, I’–II’). So far, only one more scribe has been identified in manuscripts which, according to the stemma, belong to the same family as Sinaiticus 1677: Michael Souliardos copied the Rhetorica of Vaticanus Graecus 1326. In trying to reconstruct a cultural network around Theodoros, this might be another clue to which persons may have belonged there.

As I mentioned above, the scribe Michael Souliardos also turns up in the discussion of watermarks used by Theodoros. Possibly one could get further illumination on scribal networks through this kind of investigation, comparing the transmission of related texts with facts from the physical text carriers, such as watermarks in the manuscripts, identified scribes, contemporary owners, et cetera. To follow up on this is not within the limits of the present study, but I believe it could be a rewarding path to take. That Michael Souliardos worked in Crete is not uninteresting in this connection, if we also consider that Theodoros’ manuscript ended up in the Monastery of St. Catherine in Sinai: this monastery had a daughter monastery with the same name in Crete (in Candia/Iraklio), and the contacts between the two communities were close. The monastery school of St. Catherine’s in Candia was for a long time the leading Greek educational center on the island. This was the fertile soil where many Cretan scribes started out and were introduced to Greek literary tradition.

The third scribe of Gr 8, “co-scribe A,” has only contributed a few pages, ff. 104r, 107r, 109r and 112r (in addition to these also the headline of f. 88r and line 6 on f. 106v). It has been proposed that these leaves too were copied by Theodoros and that he was only trying out another style, varying his usual...

---

18 Dieter Harlfinger mentions the scribe Theodoros Ky...kos as responsible for the Sinaiticus 1677 in his survey of “Neuidentifizierte Kopisten griechischer Aristoteles-Handschriften der Renaissance” (HARLFINGER 1971, 413).
19 See further KASSEL 1971, 13 and 56.
20 I am grateful to Prof. Dr. Diether R. Reinsch, who kindly sent me his codicological notes on this manuscript.
21 KASSEL 1971, 14; stemma on p. 61.
22 To reconstruct precisely the whereabouts of Michael Souliardos is difficult, but he seems to have spent the 1470s and 80s mainly in Crete and other parts of Venetian-dominated Greece (Kydonia/Chania, Methone and Nauplion). In the 1490s, he transferred his activities to Italy (cf. Repertorium I 286 and II 392).
23 One may compare with what happened to the Greek books which were donated by the scribe Maximos Margounios to the Monastery of St. Catherine of Candia in Crete: “Of the manuscripts Margounios bequeathed to the monks of Crete, five to seven [...] got to the parent monastery of Mt. Sinai” (GEANAKOPOULOS 1968, 78).
24 GEANAKOPOULOS 1962, 46.
way of writing.\textsuperscript{25} This is unlikely, I think: the differences in letter forms and ligatures between Theodoros’ hand and the one responsible for the aforementioned pages are considerable and stable.\textsuperscript{26} It is more plausible that Theodoros had a colleague, or perhaps an apprentice, with whom he worked at times. This hypothesis is corroborated by the Paris manuscript, \textit{Parisinus graecus 3045}, where this same scribe has copied not only ff. 1–3, as I mentioned earlier, but also everything from f. 71\textsuperscript{r}, line 5, to f. 84\textsuperscript{v}: once more he has obviously seconded Theodoros inside the middle of a text.

The fourth scribe of \textit{Gr 8}, “\textbf{co-scribe B},” writes in Latin only. We find his contribution in the bilingual part of the codex, ff. 308–323. The Latin text is accompanied by an interlinear Greek translation in Theodoros’ hand, but I hesitate to think Theodoros capable of writing Latin in such a fine Italian humanist hand; I am more inclined to suppose that an indigenous or at least experienced Latin scribe wrote those texts.\textsuperscript{27}

Criteria for discerning codicological units

In the previous chapter I cited Gumbert’s definition of a codicological unit as “a discrete number of quires, worked in a single operation and containing a complete text or set of texts” (see p. 44, n. 64). At times there are obvious clues given in a manuscript which inform us that a unit has come to an end: the scribe may have inserted a subscription or a date as to when the particular unit (or even the whole book) was finished. It is vital that the codicologist consider this when, for example, it comes to referring a date to a composite manuscript. If further units follow, there are no guarantees that the subsequent units are from the same time or place. Usually, though, we have to rely on other, less conclusive, criteria than a scribal colophon. Below I have listed such criteria with the help of which we may find out where a codicological unit begins or ends. The reason why “dating or subscription at the end of a text” is not put up as a criterion among the others is that I consider this superior to the rest of the list. Information of that quality would be a clear-cut end note which we need not weigh in relation to other traits. In part the listed criteria correspond with similar suggestions from Pamela Robinson, J. P. Gumbert, and Erik Kwakkel.\textsuperscript{28} One or two are my own additions or

\textsuperscript{25} Nigel Wilson, viva voce, who on his visit to Uppsala in 1998 briefly inspected the manuscript.

\textsuperscript{26} See further the discussion of codicological unit 4, below.

\textsuperscript{27} As the Latin hand is present only in codicological unit 15 (U15) in \textit{Gr 8}, I deal with the specifics of it in connection with the presentation of U15, below.

\textsuperscript{28} ROBINSON 1980, 47f.: features mentioned correspond to the criteria A, B, C, D, F, G, H, I, K, and M. In addition she brings up the \textit{catchword} as a criterion, if it runs only within the “booklet” and there is none on the verso of last quire. As Byzantine manuscripts do not usually carry catchwords, I omit this criterion. GUMBERT 1989, 6–7: defines a caesura as a quire boundary “qui est en même temps une limite de texte, de main et/ou de quelque autre aspect
specifications. I believe that by formalizing the procedure, we will have a viable method of investigation, which—with due adjustments for different research materials—other codicologists and manuscript researchers may benefit from using.

The criteria are listed according to where in the unit they are normally observed:

A and B apply to both first recto and last verso of units.

C applies chiefly to the end of a unit, but may also come into question at the beginning of a unit (though for other reasons).

D – G apply to the end of a unit.

H – O apply to the ensuing unit in relation to the preceding one.

A  quire boundary and text boundary coincide
B  external damage: outer leaves soiled or worn
C  different quire construction
D  leaf/leaves cut out at the end of a quire
E  script compressed or distended to make the text fit
F  space left open after the text end
G  further text(s) added on an originally blank space at quire end
H  different dimensions of the leaves (but: often cropped to uniform size by binding)
I  different set of quire signatures (not relevant in Gr 8)
J  different paper/watermark
K  different handwriting
L  different mise-en-page (ruling, number of lines,…)

codicologique” and—transposed into the terms of the criterion list—exemplifies this with A, F, I, K, L, and also another trait: different language). GUMBERT 1995, 61: mentions, in addition to “a change in text,” the following traits: “for instance a change in hand, in watermark, in ruling practice, in quire signatures, in style of decoration, in number of lines”, i.e. A, I, J, K, L, M. Further down, p. 63, he also draws attention to “short and imperfect” quires and blank pages, i.e. C and D, and also to a dating at the end of a text. KWAKKEL 2002,13f.: the main indicator of a production unit is said to be the catchword, or rather, the lack of one (but this criterion is more relevant for those working with manuscripts outside the Byzantine tradition). Criteria corresponding to C, K, and L are also brought forward by Kwakkel.
From the definition of a codicological unit, it follows that A is a necessary criterion, although there are instances where this has to be modified: for example when the scribe broke off without finishing his or her text, or when the quire has been interfered with afterwards.29

Criterion B is a possible help. Not only the condition of the outer leaves is important, but also the distinct traces of water damage, mildew, scorching, which can be seen throughout a limited part of the book but not in the neighboring quires.

The criteria C – G are often helpful in establishing where the codicological units begin and end, as are H – I if the traces have not been trimmed away at later binding.

For J – N one has to bear in mind that these changes, or instances, may appear also within codicological units and some even within quires. It is the accretion of criteria which makes the unit delimitation plausible, and always with criterion A present. As with H – I, traces from criterion N may also have disappeared through trimming of the leaves.

Finally, O: This criterion is not purely codicological, since it has to do with the textual contents of the book. Even if it is not as decisive as some of the aforementioned, I believe it can still defend its place if combined with the others. It is difficult to decide on textual affinity now, centuries later, when we do not even know why someone decided to gather the particular texts present in a miscellany. But, if the book in general seems sensibly organized and there is a definite change in type of texts, this might be worth looking into.

To sum up, by gathering information on how the quires and leaves of a book have been produced, adjusted, filled with texts, damaged (and in some cases even lost), we are able to outline the extension and scope of the codicological units, i.e., the essential building blocks or modules of the book. The criteria listed above are meant as a help in this work process. It is never enough just to tick the demarcation traits off from a list; they must be weighed and assessed in an open but slightly skeptical spirit, since the body of evidence does not always point unanimously in one direction. In uncertain situations it is often wiser to divide assumed units rather than to bring them together. That way we are not tempted to draw conclusions from one part to

---

29 In these instances—exceptions to the rule—Gumbert refers to the units as being defective or extended. See further GUMBERT 2004, 30–33.
another; instead we are forced to give attention to each part on its own terms.30

Codicological unit 1 (U1) – the pinax

**Quires**: Q1, a binion from which the first leaf has been cut out. Roman numerals in pencil for ff. I–III.

**Paper**: Western paper of good quality, present solely in this unit; no watermark visible.

**Justification**: Irregular, leaving little marginal space; writing area ca. 120 x 75 mm; 19 lines per page on f. I r–v, 14 lines on f. II r, 21 lines on f. II v, 5 lines on f. III r.

**Scribe**: Nicholas de la Torre.

**Texts**: Nos. 1–2. *Pinakes*, i.e. tables of contents, for the whole book.

**Decoration**: Entries in black ink with plain red initials. Small black wisps with a dot mark the end of some items, a larger one of the same design in red on f. II r. Also on f. II r a floriate ornament in red.

**Condition**: From the upper margin of f. I a thin strip of paper has been cut away. The last two leaves of the binion, which used to be glued together, have been separated; residues of glue remain.

**Unit demarcation traits**: A – quire boundary and text boundary coincide both initially and at the end of the unit; C – the number of leaves in the quire (binion) differs from the more common quaternion, which, as we will see from the other units, dominates the rest of the manuscript.

Nicholas de la Torre’s contribution to *Gr 8*

The first unit of *Gr 8* is a single binion which was added to the book after its arrival at El Escorial in 1576. Nicholas de la Torre initiated his cataloging work at the library in the very same year, and from the fact that our codex is mentioned already in Torre’s first catalog one may assume that the pinakes were added within a year or so.31 As Gregorio de Andrés shows in his presentation of the extant correspondence between Nicholas and his superiors, this task of producing indices to all the manuscripts was not Nicholas de la Torre’s favorite choice.32 He had attained permission from the king to stay in Segovia for a year on account of his wife’s infirmity, and was continuously working at distance, copying the works that were sent to him from El Esco-

---

30 An example of a problematic unit boundary is discussed in unit 11, below.
31 Cf. ANDRÉS 1968, 38 (No. 66). The first catalog, *X. I. 17*, was produced by Torre in 1577. The other two, *X. I. 16* and *X. I. 18*, are from 1588 and 1600 (ANDRÉS 1968, 9).
rical. But during his absense the terms were changed. When he returned to the library in early 1576 he found himself no longer receiving $1\frac{1}{2}$ real for each sheet (pliego), as agreed: now he was down to 1 real per sheet. What is worse, since his immediate superior Antonio Gracián had assigned him to create the indices, it now took him more than a day to finish just one sheet, since he had to read through the whole volumes before excerpting the authors and titles for each of them. As his usual rate was four sheet a day, he was used to making six reales a day, so the new work duty was obviously an economic drawback.

Finally a solution to the practical matters was found, and Nicholas de la Torre spent much of the year 1576 on cataloging duties for the library. One of the items in the library was the manuscript that we are now engrossed in, Gr 8, and as this was devoid of many of its headlines while containing a multitude of texts, it must have been one of Nicholas’ less agreeable assignments to catalog it. First he had to identify its contents in detail and prepare the pinax. We will presently turn to the contents of the pinax in Gr 8, but first a couple of comments on the physical appearance of the quire. There is no way to tell if something has gone missing on the leaf which was cut out at the front of the binion. If it was blank, the scribe may have cut it out himself, using it for other purposes. Or it may still have been part of the manuscript, holding some information which betrayed its being the property of El Escorial. In that case it is reasonable to suppose that the leaf was removed at the same time as the small paper strip in the upper margin of f. I', because that is the place where El Escorial library shelf-marks generally are inscribed. The excised strip bears witness to an illegal book transaction somewhere along the line.33

As appears from the reproduction of the first page of Nicholas’ pinax, the script slopes to the right. His hand can be described as a bit turgid with the size of letters varying and the accents prolonged. Conspicuous traits are, for example, the “superscript” epsilon in περ, περί, ἔττεραι, etc; the chi put at an upright angle, as in τράχηλος on f. I'; and the και-ligature. Iota subscriptum is indicated.34

33 Of the codices Escorialenses purchased by Sparwenfeld at least one, Codex Ups. gr. 2, still contains this kind of information on the first folio (at the top of f. 1r one can read II 20, i.e. the former El Escorial shelf-mark). Consequently, the incision was probably made not by Sparwenfeld himself but before his purchase; perhaps the vendor was covering up a prior theft.

34 The style of Nicholas de la Torre’s hand was obviously appreciated in his time, considering the distinguished orders he received from patrons in more than one country. Gregorio de Andrés shares the opinion: “Uno de los más diestros calígrafos cretenses de mediados del siglo XVI, comparable por su bella escritura con Angel Vergecio (del cual vino el dicho popular en Francia de «escribir como un angel»), fue Nicolás Turrianos, o de la Torre, una de las más elegantes plumas del Renacimiento” (ANDRÉS 1969, 14).
The selection of entries for the pinax

Not all of the texts in *Gr 8* are put as separate items in the pinax. Here I will briefly discuss the entries in relation to the information which Theodoros gave in connection with the texts themselves, and also touch upon possible reasons for Nicholas de la Torre’s selection of items. The motive for this kind of examination is that such details might reveal what parts of a book were considered interesting at a certain time. It could render insights into how different texts were valued, and thus contribute to a “conceptual his-
tory” of Byzantine literature/books. For an overview, I have put the new pinax and the old one side by side in the table, below. It may also be profitable to compare this with the “Codicological table” in Appendix 2, where all the texts in Gr 8 are listed and numbered in consecutive order. As for the texts themselves, a more exhaustive discussion will follow in Chapter 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text No.</th>
<th>NEW PINAX, ff. I′–II′. Leaf numbers are given only in the new pinax</th>
<th>Fol.</th>
<th>OLD PINAX, ff. II′ and subsequent (unnumbered) page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(f. I′)</td>
<td>Τάδε ἐνεστὶν ἐν τῷ δῷ τῇ βιβλίῳ.</td>
<td>(f. II′)</td>
<td>Τὰ κόσμωμα τῶν γραφῶντος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Η περὶ τοῦ Περζωε ἀποστολὴ πρὸς Ἰρώιναν, καὶ διάγνωσι τῶν ἐκείσης. ἔπειτα ἡ Ἰνδική βιβλίος ἢ ἐκχύσεων ἢ Ἰνδίας, δόο μὲν ἐξοσα πραγματείας· μία μὲν ἢ τοῦ Στεφανίτου καὶ Ἑγνιλᾶτου, ἐτέρα δὲ ἢ περιπράξης περιστερά, καὶ ἄσπαρ ἐξονισιν ἀμφότεραι τροπικά μυθικά.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Η περὶ τοῦ Περζωε ἀποστολῆ, καὶ τὰ λοιπά.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ἰσοκράτους λόγος πρὸς Δημόνικον.</td>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Ἰσοκράτες.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Βασιλείον τοῦ μεγάλου πρὸς τινα Γηγορίαν καὶ ὅσ τὸν μέγαν.</td>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Βασιλείος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ἐπιστολαί βασιλείως Αρταζέρζου καὶ ἑτέρων.</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>Ἀρταζέρζου βασιλείου καὶ ἑτέρων ἐπιστολαί.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Παύλου Αιγινίτου περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς τροφαῖς δυνάμεων.</td>
<td>104.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Γηγορίου τοῦ Θαυματουργοῦ περὶ ψυχής.</td>
<td>128.</td>
<td>Γηγορίῳ ὁ Θαυματουργός.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Μανουὴλ τοῦ Χρηστονῦμον μιονοδίᾳ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποστόλη ἀλλότερον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως.</td>
<td>138.</td>
<td>Μανουὴλ ὁ Χρηστονῦμος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Λεονάρδου Αρετίνου πολιτείας Φλωρεντίνου.</td>
<td>147.</td>
<td>Λεονάρδος ὁ Αρετεῖν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Γεώργιον τοῦ Γεώργιον περὶ ἄρετόν.</td>
<td>152.</td>
<td>Γεώργιος ὁ Γεωργίος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24–25</td>
<td>(f. I′) Τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἑτέρων ἐπιστολαί.</td>
<td>163.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Νικολάου τοῦ Σεκουνδίνου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀνδρόνικον τῶν Κάλλαστων.</td>
<td>167.</td>
<td>Νικόλαος ὁ Σεκουνδίνος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Λιβανίου μελέτη (ἐπιστολὴ expuixit) πρὸς λάλον γυναίκα.</td>
<td>173.</td>
<td>Λιβανίος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28–29</td>
<td>Χρυσοστόμου λόγος κατὰ Ἡρωδιάδην, καὶ περὶ ποιημάν γυναίκων, καὶ ἄλλα τινά.</td>
<td>186.</td>
<td>Χρυσόστομος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–31</td>
<td>Μάρκου Ἐφέσιου γνώματα καὶ ἑτέρων.</td>
<td>191.</td>
<td>Μάρκος ὁ Ἐφέσιος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ἰστορία διάφορα βραχεία.</td>
<td>208.</td>
<td>Ἰστορία διάφορα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἰωάννην τῶν Λαχανίων. αὕτη.</td>
<td>217.</td>
<td>Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἰωάννην τῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 It would also be beneficial to compare this material with some of the pinakes which Nicholas de la Torre has added to other El Escorial manuscripts, thus evaluating the scribe’s idiosyncrasies on a larger scale. But this goes beyond the scope of my thesis.

36 Normal abbreviations in the text have been resolved without comment and names are represented with initial capital letters, for the sake of readability.
The first item of Nicholas’ pinax, Text 3 *Stephanites and Ichnelates*, gets a six-line description, whereas most items are described in just a few words. One could perhaps suspect that this indicates a special interest in this first piece on Nicholas’ part. But considering that the *Stephanites* text never had its rubricated headline filled in (f. 1), the explanation is probably that Nicholas simply chose to copy the first paragraph of the text more or less as it stands.

Nicholas de la Torre usually puts the author’s name first even if the headline of the text has the words in another order, e.g. Text 5 (Isocrates *Oration* 1), where Λόγος Ἰσοκράτους πρὸς Δημόνικον is given on f. 88\(^v\). The attribution of Text 7 (Gregory of Nazianzos *Ep.* 114) to Basil the Great will be discussed in Chapter 4: suffice it here to notice that Nicholas just copies the headline as Theodorus has it on f. 98\(^v\). The Hippocrates letters and the Anacharsis ones (Texts 8–9) are treated as one single item in the pinax.

---

37 The last three items (equaling Texts 71–72) were written in a different, brownish ink, which has dissolved a bit and discolored the paper. The same goes for the correction of ἑπιστολὴ into μελέτη, above (Text 27).
From unit 4 the only text selected for the pinax is Text 11, Paul of Aegina’s *Medical Compendium*. On the whole it seems that Nicholas tends to ignore the anonymous texts, though not always, as will be seen as we proceed through his pinax. Three texts from unit 5 turn up in the pinax: Texts 16 (Gregory Thaumatourgos), 20 (Manuel Christonymos), and 21 (Leonardo Bruni). These happen to be the three which have the largest floriate initials in the unit.

Plethon’s *On Virtues* (Text 23) is put as an item of its own. Then Nicholas takes Plethon’s treatise *Reply to Scholarios*, Text 24, and bundles it together with Bessarion’s letters to Plethon’s sons, to Michael Apostoles, and to Andronikos Kallistos, Text 25. That the treatise is taken for a letter here is understandable: in *Gr 8* the headline says Γεωργίου τοῦ Γεμιστοῦ πρός Γεώργιον τὸν Σχολάριον but only the rhetorical “preface” of this treatise is included. Usually the sender of a letter is put in the nominative while the author of a text is in the genitive, something which Nicholas obviously did not take notice of or think important. After Bessarion’s letters the one from Nicholas Sagundino to Andronikos Kallistos stands as an item of its own (Text 26).

Text 27, Libanios’ *Declamation 26*, was put up as a letter at first, but the scribe then changed ἐπιστολή to μελέτη. The Chrysostom item (Text 28) ends with the phrase καὶ ἄλλα τινά, which ought to point to the otherwise unknown text introduced with τοῦ αὐτοῦ by Theodoros (f. 189’), inc. Διὰ τὴν ἄκρασιαν (Text 29).

Three items in a row Nicholas defined as works by Mark Eugenikos (while Theodoros calls him “ὁ Ἀγος Μάρκος ὁ Ἑφεσίων,” sic. ἐπίσκοπος, Nicholas simply calls him “Μάρκος Ἐφεσίος” [sic]). The first and third are texts of his (30 *Thoughts* and 41 *On the filioque* doctrine); the middle one, which in the manuscript lacks the rubricated title and author indication, Nicholas put up as “τοῦ αὐτοῦ κατὰ λατινόν,” but the text is actually a work by Plethon (40 Plethon *Reply to the Treatise in Support of the Latin Doctrine*). In-between the Mark Eugenikos’ *Thoughts* and Text 40 by Plethon, no less than seven shorter texts (and a small page filler) are passed over in silence.

Another text which in *Gr 8* lacks its headline and author is taken up by Nicholas de la Torre as an anonymous item: Ιστορίαι διάφοραι βραχεῖαι (Text 42). This is actually a selection of passages from John Tzetzes’ *Chiliades* or *Book of Histories*, written in fifteen-syllable verse. But the text was apparently not familiar enough to be identified by Nicholas. The short historical or mythical episodes in verse in the *Chiliades* function as a commentary to Tzetzes’ own collection of letters addressed to friends and contemporaries as well as to fictitious persons. One such letter, to John Lachanas, is transmitted in *Gr 8* and was itemized separately in the pinax. Nicholas gives a detailed account of its contents (taken from Theodoros’ text, f. 217’): Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἰωάννην τὸν Λαχανᾶν. αὕτη δὲ ἡ ἐπιστολὴ μετέχει τῶν τριῶν
Codicological Description and Analysis

This time there was no need for a longer description due to the work having no title (cf. Text 3 Stephanites, above). So perhaps this matter actually interested Nicholas; at least he must have thought it worthwhile to be able to find this rhetorical exposition.

That Nicholas chose to mention the Decalogue (Text 44) is more peculiar. One would think that the Ten Commandments should be well known enough to function rather as a page filler. Why pick up this text and not the Prayer to the Theotokos, for example (Text 33)? The fact that the preceding eight leaves were left without a rubricated title and therefore remained unidentified by Nicholas (they contain twenty letters by Theophylact Simokates, Text 43) may have come into play here. One can easily imagine how Nicholas after 16 pages finally finds something he recognizes, and thus, puts that item in the pinax.

The list of kings (Text 45) also lacks its headline. Wishing to have this item in his pinax, the scribe thus had to make up his own characterization: βασιλεία ἀπὸ Ἁβραὰμ μέχρι Κώνσταντος πατρὸς τοῦ μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου.

The florilegium on ff. 238–247 (Text 48) was considered interesting enough to put in the pinax, and here as well Nicholas had to supply the text with a title: γνώμαι σοφῶν κατ᾽ ἀλφάβητον. This corresponds with the meaning but not the wording in the upper margin of f. 238, where a reader has added ἀρχή τὴν μέλησα κατὰ ἀλφαβητό τὸν φρονίμων ἵ λογη. This text is followed by another anonymous item, a lexicon (Text 50), which Nicholas saw fit to include in his survey.

Text 51, an elegy on the city of Athens by Michael Choniates, Στίχοι ἐπὶ τῇ ἄρχετῳ ἀνιστορήσει πόλεως Ἀθηνῶν, is the only one that Nicholas equips with a floriate decoration: was it the highlight for him perhaps?

On f. 254 yet an anonymous text begins (Text 53). However, Theodoros did spare a line for a rubricated title, so perhaps he knew more about it than we do. Nicholas chose to describe it as Περὶ ψυχῆς ἀνόνυμον, καὶ ἄλλα τινά. After having passed over 24 leaves in silence—despite the fact that one of the texts covers as much as 33 pages (56 Theodoret Cure of the Pagan Maladies)—he then includes the listings of patriarchates, metropolises, etc. (Text 62).

At first Nicholas de la Torre appears to have planned to end the pinax with the letters by Basil et al. (Texts 67–70). A rubricated wreath in the middle of the page (looking like a larger elaboration of the small wisp we can see at the end of some lines on f. I) now seems mistakenly put there, with another few text lines crowded around it. The subsequently added item, Λέοντος βασιλέως ἐξαποστειλάρια, now surrounds and encroaches on the decoration; this text (Text 73) begins on f. 302. And then, as an afterthought,

---

38 I.e.: ἀρχή τὴν μέλησαν κατ᾽ ἀλφάβητον· τῶν φρονίμων οἱ λόγοι.
Nicholas refers us to the two excerpts from Josephus, and to Nikephoros Gregoras’ letter to the Grand Logothete Metochites, these three texts actually preceding the one attributed to Leo (Texts 71–72). That this was done in a second relay is indicated by the difference in ink. The dye of the four last lines has dissolved and spread into the paper, and due to the acidity of the ink it has eaten away the second letter of the word παρακλητική.

Which texts in Gr 8 are overlooked by Nicholas de la Torre? Shorter “page fillers” are ignored, as are later additions (like the document on f. 87 and the continuation of Text 65 in the margin of f. 283v). Most of the anonymous texts—both shorter and longer—are omitted, but in cases where he can easily deduct the contents from the texts themselves even anonymous ones get represented (Texts 42 histories, 45 kings, 48 florilegium; 50 lexicon; Text 53 on the soul; Text 62 patriarchates). Omitted completely are the bilingual texts in unit 15 (Texts 76–81), the mathematical texts in unit 16 (Texts 84 and 86), as well as the truncated Aesop-text at the end of the book (Text 88).

The discarded pinax on f. IIv

If we take the old and discarded pinax as a point of departure, the author-based strategy becomes obvious. In this first step Nicholas de la Torre only wrote down the author for each item, and the few anonymous entries, like Stephanites and Ichnelates, are described in just a few words. Starting on the new pinax Nicholas expanded the entries to author + title (and/or short description).

That Nicholas chose to cancel and glue together the old pinax can be explained on account of one mistake being added to another. The first mishap was the text by Paul of Aegina (Text 11) which was not put in proper order (in my numbering of the texts Nicholas’ items come in the sequence 2–5–11–7). The next faux pas was Michael Choniates’ poem (Text 51), which was first put in at the bottom of f. IIv. Then the lexicon (Text 50) follows as first item on the recto page. After this entry Nicholas unfortunately added the title of Michael Choniates’ work, στίχοι ἐπὶ τῆ ἄρχετύπῃ ἀνιστορήσει πόλεως Ἀθηνῶν, i.e., he had now recorded the same item (Text 51) twice. Eventually he put the list of patriarchates (Text 62) after the text attributed to Leo VI (Text 73). This was the point of no return; he had to start anew, giving the book an introduction without these flaws. For the sake of clearness: placing the old (original) pinax at the end of the binion was logical. Preferably you put the table of contents as close as possible to the block of texts to which it belongs. This also made it reasonable for Nicholas de la Torre to glue these leaves together, since that way the new and valid pinax got placed right before the rest of the texts.
Codicological unit 2 (U2), ff. 1–87

**Quires:** Q2: [1–6] ternion. Q3: [7–12, 12a–12b] 1 ternion + 2 leaves which seem to be glued together at the spine and attached to the ternion. The original place for ff. 12a and 12b was in-between what is now numbered folios 6 and 7; by restoration or rebinding the insertion mistakenly ended up at the end of Q3. Q4–11: [13–75] 8 quaternions (f. 34 numbered twice). Q12: [76–83] quaternion. Q13: [84–87] binion.

**Paper:** Western paper of good quality. Q2–11 have the twin watermarks depicting an oxhead with a crown, identical to Ha. Boeuf 51, left and right, *(Parisinus gr. 2938*, dated 1481, 20. Sept.; scribe Antonios Damilas). In Q12 there are no visible watermarks but the somewhat coarser paper quality and wire line pattern correspond with the next quire. In Q13 we see a balance, similar to Ha. Balance 41 *(Parisinus gr. 3045*, dated 1488, 24. Jan.; the scribe is Theodoros, i.e. the very same scribe as in *Gr 8*).

**Justification:** 103 x 65 mm, 18 lines per page (ff. 1–63); 107 x 65 mm, 19 lines (ff. 64–75); 103 x 70/75 mm, 19–20 lines (ff. 76–78); 107 x 70/75 mm, 20–22 lines (ff. 79–83); 115 x 70/75 mm, 22–23 lines (ff. 84–86).

**Scribe:** main scribe, i.e. Theodoros, except for later inserted initials and the last leaf which Theodoros left blank. Good black ink used for ff. 1–75. Brownish ink on ff. 76–86. On f. 87 a subsequent owner of the book has added a private document: the same hand is discernable also elsewhere in *Gr 8*, for example in the marginal notes on f. 283v.

**Texts:** Nos. 3–4. *Stephanites and Ichnelates* (ff. 1–86); a document inscribed by a somewhat later hand on a previously blank leaf (f. 87).

**Decoration:** The page layout shows that Theodoros reserved a two-line space for insertion of a rubricated title and perhaps a headpiece on the first page (not fulfilled). Spaces for larger initials in red—some of them set out in the margin, some within the text area—were also left void (or, at times, indicated by the scribe by putting only the spiritus and accent there in the usual black ink and leaving the rest of the initial to be filled in with red ink, e.g. f. 9v, 12b’), but have later awkwardly, and occasionally wrongly, been filled in with a pale smeary red. On f. 13v an initial *omicron*, 3 lines in height, is ornamented in brownish-black and pale red with unfilled, pointed palmettes coarsely executed by what seems to be an untrained hand.

**Condition:** The first two quires are in worse shape than the rest of the unit when it comes to damp and mildew. The first few leaves are also scorched but legibility is not affected. On f. 75v the surface is soiled, and the damp stains which are fairly consistent in the leaves up to f. 75, look differ-

39 Cf. the appearance of the title with a band-shaped headpiece on the first page of U5 (f. 128) and a similar solution in U4 (f. 104). In U3 there is only a one-line title in red and a large ornamented initial (f. 88). In U6, the scribe uses two lines for the rubricated title but decorates it with flowers in the upper margin and at the end of line 2.
ent in the next quires. At the end of U2—most prominently in the last binion where the writing area is extended—the trimming of the leaves has reached into the writing area and cut off part of the uppermost text line.

Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit: A – a new text is initiated on first recto; B – the first few leaves are very worn and darkened; J – different paper; K – different scribe; L – different mise-en-page; M – different style of decoration; O – change in textual contents (obviously, since U1 is a table of contents for the whole book).

Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit: A – main text ends on the penultimate leaf of U2; B – last verso is darker, more soiled and worn than the preceding leaves; C – last quire is a binion; E – the script is elegantly compressed towards the end of the *Stephanites* text, the scribe slowly enlarging the writing area one line at a time over several folios so as not to make the change show; F – last leaf was originally left blank; G – on the formerly blank leaf at the end a new text has been added some 50 years later, in the form of a personal document including a blessing and some pen trials.

Anomalies in the quire construction

In *Gr 8*, as in the great majority of Byzantine manuscripts, the predominant quire type is the quaternion, composed out of four double-leaves (that is, amounting to 8 folios or 16 pages). This pattern is altered in two places in U2: at the beginning (Q2–3) and in the last quire (Q13), and we will address these instances one at a time. My approach to these irregularities in the manuscript has been the codicologist’s, i.e., scrutinizing the structure. In this I also came upon textual problems. But, of course, one may also address these matters from the opposite point of departure, something which is the experience of many editors of medieval manuscript texts. In that case the researcher collates the text, more often than not in a microfilm copy, where codicological details are much more difficult to assess. When he or she comes across problematic textual passages, there may be reason to proceed to the codex itself, or at least consider whether material issues could have influenced what the transmitted passages look like.

A reconstruction of Q2–Q3

To understand the design of the first two quires of *Stephanites*, Q2–Q3, we need to reconstruct the procedure step by step, as illustrated in the figures A–C below. The scribe starts out with one ternion and one quinion (figure A). This is, as I just said, not common procedure. But let us suppose that he had two quaternions cut and ready, waiting to be inscribed. Somehow they got disarranged and when he put them in order again he happened to put one leaf extra in the second bundle instead of the first. So the scribe writes his text
with the leaves in this order and then goes on using quaternions for the rest of the text.

What happens later on is that the outside bifolia of the quinion meet with wear and tear, and eventually a couple of leaves (ff. x and y) at the end of Q3 may have come loose. They disappear from the book, leaving us with a text lacuna (figure B) just before Q4.40

No thread can now hold the first two leaves of this quire in place (I have chosen to give them the alternative numbers of “6a” and “6b” here, since this shows their logical placing with regard to the textual contents), so they become loose leaves. By restoration or rebinding these two loose leaves are glued together, so that the stub of one of them is still visible in-between. By mistake, they are now placed at the end of the quire and not between ff. 6 and 7. That is how they got their present foliation as 12a and 12b, which is actually misleading to the reader. These extra numbers were added recently, in pencil, whereas Nicholas de la Torre, on the contrary, deliberately refrained from including them in the consecutive numbering when he was foliating the rest of the manuscript. Stains of damp, which are more pronounced in Q2 and on ff. 12a and 12b but fainter in the rest of Q3, reveal that these two leaves kept their original place for a considerable period of time. The numbers added in the lower margin (a number “6” on f. 6\(^v\), an “8” on ff. 7\(^r\) and 12b\(^v\), a “7” on ff. 12a\(^r\), 12a\(^\nu\), and 12b\(^\nu\)) show that the person who did that had figured out the right sequence of the remaining leaves. The Escorial scribe Nicholas de la Torre is probably responsible for those numbers as well, since he obviously did detect the displacement, not foliating the misplaced leaves with the rest (figure C).41

In its present state Gr 8 is so tightly bound, that it is not really possible to see whether ff. 12a–12b is sewn in together with the preceding leaves or whether this new “singulion” has simply been glued on to f. 12. But the explanation suggested above seems to account for what is observable in the manuscript here and now.

40 The existence of a lacuna in the text was acknowledged already in the 1780 edition of the prolegomena which was carried out on the basis of Gr 8 (Prolegomena ad librum 1780, 42). This dissertation was published as complementary to Sebastian Gottfried Starcke’s 1697 edition which does not include the prolegomena. At the Uppsala disputation Pehr Fabian Aurivillius acted as respondent while professor Johannes Floderus was the praeses: either of them may be the one who in fact produced the edition.

41 The shape of the numbers does not contradict this; it is consistent with Torre’s numbering in the upper margin and in the pinax.
Sketch of Q2 and Q3 (ff. 1–6 and 7–12b):

A

```
1 2 3 4 5 6
```

```
12a 12b 7 8 9 10 11 12 x y
```

B

```
1 2 3 4 5 6
```

```
12a 12b 7 8 9 10 11 12 x y
```

C

```
1 2 3 4 5 6
```

```
7 8 9 10 11 12 12a 12b
```
Below are given the incipit and explicit for the textual joints where ff. 12a and 12b, correctly posited, would fit in:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{α} & \quad \text{F. 6', expl.: Καὶ πῶς ἐλάλησεν (a above last ε) διὰ στόματος τῶν ἄλο[...]

\text{F. 12a'} ("6a" recto), inc.: ...]γων ζῶν καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ ποιήσαντες αὐτῶν καταλόγων

\text{F. 12b'} ("6b" verso), expl.: ἀνεγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἀνερμηνεύτως. ἦρξατο δὲ καθέξεσθαι μετὰ τῶν

\text{α} & \quad \text{F. 7', inc.: ἀνθρώπων δοκῶν ἐν ἑαυτῷ μεθηθηκέναι (a above first η – the ligature θ could easily be misread as μ, and the expected word is μεμαθηκέναι) τὴν λέξιν καὶ λαλῆσας ἔσφαλεν}

The lacuna before f. 13

As for the textual lacuna between f. 12' and f. 13', the text goes as follows (the words inside the square brackets are borrowed from Vittorio Puntoni’s edition, Prolegomenon III, § VIII, line 22 and § X, line 23):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{F. 12'}, \text{ expl.: οὐ δεῖ σαι (sic) ψυχὴ φεύγειν τὴν ἁσκησιν καὶ μένειν ἐν τοῖς βιωτὶ[κοίς ὅταν...]}

\text{F. 13'}, \text{ inc.: [...] τὸν δὲ λά[κκ]κον τὸν βίον τούτων τὸν πλῆρες κακίας καὶ πονηρίας καὶ δεινῆς διατριβῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας.}

If we compare the text in Gr 8 with Puntoni’s edition the lacuna amounts to 62 lines of printed text. A comparison of the prolegomena (the introductory chapter, or frame stories, of Stephanites) with Puntoni’s printed text shows that, roughly estimated, you need 16–18 lines of his edition to fill a page in Gr 8. 62 lines divided by 4 = 15½, so, hypothetically, we could assume that the lacuna amounted to four pages, i.e. two leaves. This would tally well with the sketch we just outlined. But since the textual tradition of Stephanites is rather fluid, the assumption can only be preliminary. The open character of this kind of text, with all its short novellae or independent stories, has resulted in an exceedingly variegated textual tradition where different paragraphs, or sub-stories, could be dropped or included at will. As long as these “textual omissions” do not break up stories and make them unintelligible, this could very well be the result of inclusions and eliminations made through the deliberate choice of an editor somewhere along the way, rather than an unintentional loss of leaves or faulty scribal omission. Before asserting any definite size of the lacuna, it may be appropriate, in a case like this,
to compare the text transmitted in other manuscripts, to see whether they unanimously include all paragraphs which have gone missing in Gr 8.  

As an example of such a variation in the text one may choose the property that made Lars-Olof Sjöberg assign Gr 8 to “group V” in his survey of the textual tradition of Stephanites. According to Sjöberg, the manuscripts of this group (Par. Suppl. 118, Laud. 8, Monac. 551 and Gr 8, or, with Sjöberg’s signa: P2O2M2U) all share the feature of not including Prolegomenon II, 7–8, and the first few paragraphs of Prolegomenon III (III,1–4a). This omission is not announced in Gr 8, except that the next paragraph (III, 4b) was due to begin with a red initial in the middle of line 2 on f. 9v. The cross in the margin may point to the scribe’s awareness that this was indeed opening the third prolegomenon. The ink has faded a bit here due to moisture damage, but in the way it is written it closely resembles the cross in the margin of f. 6v, and that one is definitely written together with the primary layer. In any case, since the omitted part of the text does not coincide with any page or leaf end in Gr 8, there is no reason to think that anything is missing from what Theodoros himself wrote. The omission probably took place earlier in the textual transmission, in some hyparchetype to Sjöberg’s “group V”. The same probably goes for the novellae in chapter III, 5a, 5c, and 6a, which are absent in several manuscripts and not only from Gr 8.

The case is different with the lacuna towards the end of Prolegomenon III, where, as we could see above, Gr 8 breaks off right in the middle of a word, just a couple of lines into a new paragraph. According to our counting above, the two leaves gone missing from Gr 8 would have contained Prolegomenon III, §§ 9a–b and 10a–b. But the other manuscripts in Sjöberg’s “group V” only include §§ 9a and 10b, not §§ 9b–10a. From the place where Gr 8

42 For the origin, development and textual traditions of Stephanites, or Kalīlah wa-Dimnah, as it is called in the Arabic version, see p. 121. Suffice it here to mention two of the versions: the shorter one, recension A in Lars-Olof Sjöberg’s edition, comprises chs. I–VII and part of ch. IX, and was created by Symeon Seth in the late 11th c. The longer version, Sjöberg’s recension B, is the work of two translators, who independently added translations of other parts of the Arabic text, parts which Symeon Seth had chosen to abridge or exclude. From the Bö redaction we get the rest of chapter IX and the addition of chs. X–XI. The Bö redaction filled in the gaps in the text where Symeon Seth had made abridgements, supplied the translation of the frame stories, Prologomena, and most of the remaining text, chs. VIII, X, and XII–XV. The only modern edition, SJÖBERG 1962, is devoted to the A recension of Stephanites. For the B recension we still have to rely on Puntoni’s 1889 edition.

43 Sjöberg’s division of the Stephanites manuscripts into several subrecensions has been questioned by Johannes Niehoff-Panagiotidis. Where Sjöberg saw fit to divide the “B-Fassung” into five subrecensions (δ,ε,ζ,θ,ι), the ζ recension is equivalent to what Sjöberg elsewhere designates as “group V” and includes, among other manuscripts, Gr 8. Niehoff-Panagiotidis argues that only two of these, δ and ε, are in fact autonomous versions which include new material translated from Arabic. The other three, ζ, θ, and ι, should rather be counted as contaminated versions of the recensions Bö and Be (NIEHOFF-PANAGIOTIDIS 2003, 39–45).

44 SJÖBERG 1962, 80–83. Prolegomenon II ends in Gr 8 with ἢλαβε τοῦ χῆτον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνεδόσατο τοῦτον, τὸν δὲ σῖτον ὑπέστρεψεν ἐν τῷ πίθει. The next sentence in Gr 8, from Prolegomenon III, 4b, goes as follows: Λέγεται γὰρ ὅτι κλέπτης τις ἀνελθὼν ἐπὶ τινὸς δόματος μετὰ τῶν ἐαυτοῦ συντρόφων.
breaks off to the end of § 9a Puntoni’s edition counts 15 lines (i.e. about one page in Theodoros’ hand). §§ 9b + 10a occupy 30 lines in Puntoni, while § 10b occupies 18 lines. This means that if Gr 8 complied fully with P2O2M2 only one leaf would have gone missing. We can compare this with variations in other groups of the manuscript tradition; in Sjöberg’s group VI (K2F2E1E3) the passage from §§ 9b–10a is omitted in three of the four manuscripts, while the fourth, contaminated, E3 includes these paragraphs. Another instance of “contamination” or at least of Gr 8 not corresponding with the group which according to Sjöberg’s investigation is most closely related to it may be adduced: in Stephanites chapter V Gr 8 has the paragraph sequence 116a+b, 117, 118a+b+c, while P2O2M2 have these paragraphs transposed into the sequence 116a, 118b+c, 116b, 117, 118a. As Sjöberg puts it: “U folgt in diesem Kapitel der ε-Gruppe.” The practical side of the problem is not to be ignored either. If we were to assume that Gr 8 followed the wording of the rest of the group in Prolegomenon III, we would be forced to explain why the scribe should have suddenly chosen a ternion + a single leaf for this part of his text, instead of using even quaternions as is customary. I consider it far more likely that Gr 8 did include all the paragraphs the way they stand in Puntoni’s edition, thus not corresponding with the wording of P2O2M2.

Some reflections around the boundary at f. 76

Between Q11 and Q12 some kind of break or boundary is observable. Being inside a continuous text it is not a boundary between self-sufficient codicological units, but there is still reason to investigate what may have happened here in the fabrication process.

What is there for the eye to perceive? Already a little earlier Theodoros has started to expand the amount of text per page (19 lines to the page on ff. 64–75). The verso of f. 75 is soiled and darkened and the damp stains which are present in previous quires do not extend into Q12. Another kind of paper is used in Q12–13, the ink has a new brownish nuance, and the script is slightly more cursive here. When Theodoros picks up his pen again at f. 76 (or possibly at the last paragraph of f. 75\textsuperscript{v}, since already here the appearance of the script changes and becomes somewhat larger and more cursive), he seems to pay attention to the original vertical justification of his Stephanites, the way it looks in the first eight or nine quires (up until f. 63), but extends the length of his lines slightly. It seems he is no longer as meticulous with the mise-en-page: inside the same writing area he can vary the number of lines. Successively the number of lines per page grows, as does the condensation of text, and also the writing area increases a bit. After these gradual and at first almost imperceptible changes Theodoros chooses a binion as his

---

\textsuperscript{45} Sjöberg 1962, 76, n. 26.
last quire of U2. The reason is obvious: he did not plan to add further texts after *Stephanites*, but simply wanted to end this unit (or even independent book?) with as little waste of paper as possible. The *Stephanites* text comes to an end exactly on the last line of a verso page: professional work, in short. That one leaf, f. 87r–v, was left blank thereafter is not necessarily the result of oversight on the scribe’s behalf, since the extra leaf protects the text from attrition.

It is clear that U2 is complete (but for the two leaves in Q3) and yet its execution has been done in two phases, leaving us with a so-called *extended* unit.46 What explanation could there be for the kind of break in the copying work visible at f. 76? One hypothesis (a) could be that the scribe simply ran out of paper. Maybe he was visiting somewhere to copy the work and did not bring enough material with him to finish the text. So he had to return to the library, or whatever place was harboring the model manuscript, on another occasion. Another possible explanation (b) could be that he did write a complete text in the first go, but that the last two quires were then ruined or got lost somehow, since the work lay unbound in bundles. That would have forced him to rewrite the end of the text once more.

But there are some complications to consider. If we look at the passage in the *Stephanites* text where Theodoros had arrived when he broke off at f. 75, we find that it is in the story about the King and the Parrot, i.e. chapter IX, § 133b in Puntoni’s edition. According to Sjöberg the last passage that the A-recension manuscripts include is the beginning of chapter IX (§§ 132 and 133a). The rest of chapter IX and the following chapters X–XV, were never part of Symeon Seth’s translation. § 133b, which includes the Parrot story, is therefore not present in the A-recension. The same paragraph is lacking also in the Be-recension, with a few exceptions,47 and about one of the manuscripts of the Bt-group Sjöberg writes: “In E3 fehlt der §133b bis auf die letzte Zeile dieses Abschnittes.”48 The rest of the B-recension manuscripts include § 133b. It is not unthinkable—this would present us with yet an hypothesis (c)—that Theodoros at first had at his disposal a model manuscript which lacked the final chapters of *Stephanites*. Using that model he got as

46 The terminology for units which have been interfered with in different ways is elaborated by Gumbert (GUMBERT 2004, 30–33). A codicological unit can grow by various means: by enrichment, if a new layer or guest text is added on the original leaves; by enlargement, if a limited number of leaves are added and they “do not fundamentally change the quire structure” (p. 42); by extension, if “a substantial amount of matter – at least one quire – has been added” (loc.cit.). To distinguish between the last two categories (the enlarged and the extended unit) seems to me almost too pedantic. To my mind the quire structure is changed when you put in an extra leaf or a couple of leaves somewhere: putting a terminological dividing line at precisely one quire extra seems meaningless and complicated. I would like to suggest that we use the latter term, *extended unit*, for both categories since they still need to be qualitatively explained in each case.


48 SJÖBERG 1962, 77, n. 32.
far as the beginning of chapter IX (Q2–11, or ff. 1–75 in Gr 8). Then he had to replenish the text with the help of another manuscript offering him the rest of ch. IX and chs. X–XV. That this was done at a later stage (when he had already used up all the paper carrying the “oxhead” watermark) would explain why the leaves of the preceding quires got worn and soiled, waiting unbound on some shelf.

One may also speculate whether the paper used in Q12–13 corresponds to the kind in another manuscript by Theodoros’ hand, Parisinus 3045 (copied in 1486 and 1488). Because of the octavo-format of Gr 8 (which splits the watermarks and makes them end up folded at the spine) and the considerable trimming of the leaves, it is difficult to establish whether this one instance of the watermark in Q13 is the exact replica of the Parisian counterpart (Ha. Balance 41; cf. above, p. 53). But it seems very likely from the look of the remainders. If that is so, then we could perhaps infer that there was actually a delay of a few years until the last two quires of Stephanites were added to Gr 8. That the Stephanites text in Gr 8, which primarily belongs to the BC-group, in some places seems more closely related to the Be-group reveals further the complex and contaminated textual transmission, and might also be taken as an indication that the third hypothesis (c) is reasonable. This is not the place to actually prove this point, since I am not thoroughly investigating the whole manuscript tradition or aiming at an edition. I still think it is fruitful to raise the questions and see where this kind of reasoning may lead us.

Secondary layers of U2

The Stephanites text in Gr 8 never got as far as being rubricated during Theodoros’ command. No headings were ever inserted and the rather sloppy red initials were added afterwards by someone who used a pale red ink of inferior quality. One may compare the initials of the following units, U3–6, which were undoubtedly supplied by Theodoros himself, and which look qualitatively different both in ink and in style of execution.

The very last leaf of U2 also represents a secondary layer of inscription. The text on f. 87r–v was added by a later owner of the book. One date is given in the first line of f. 87r and a second one in the middle of the same page:

\[\text{ἀφαίρε} \ \eta \ \mu \ \epsilon \ \rho \ \tau \ \sigma \ \varepsilon \ \pi \ (\tau \ \varepsilon \ \mu \ \beta \ \rho \ (\iota \ \omega) \ \mu \ \nu \ \nu \ (\zeta) \ \iota \ \delta \ \iota \ (\kappa \ \iota \ \iota \ \nu \ \nu \nu) \ \varepsilon \ (A.D. 1546, September 10, indiction year 5)\]

\[\text{ε} \ \tau \ \omega \ \mu \ \iota \ \zeta \ \nu \ (\zeta) \ \iota \ \delta \ \kappa \ \epsilon \ \mu \ \rho \ (\iota \ \omega) \ \theta \ (A n n o \ M u n d i \ 7055, \ i.e., \ A.D. 1546, indiction year 5, December 9.}\]

\[49 \ \text{So for example in chapter V; cf. SJÖBERG 1962, 76, n. 26.}\]
The notes on this folio make difficult reading. Some details were lost with the trimming of the page and the hand itself is very cursive. I would still say that the person adding the notes was an able writer, exhibiting a flowing and adroit hand. The first section of the notes appears to be a petition draft on land litigation, a complaint concerning a piece of land close to the marsh (τα χωρόφια ης το βάλτο). A couple of names are mentioned: Ντζορτζ... Λαντζ..., καπετάν and a κύρ Σήμο. The next few lines include the name of a bishop Theoleptos, who blessed the piece of land and sprinkled it with holy water. On the verso page there is a doxology, and lastly some pen trials.
Codicological unit 3 (U3), ff. 88–103

**Quires:** The unit is composed of two quires (Q14–15), both quaternions.

**Paper:** The paper in U3 is different from the kinds in U2 but corresponds with the paper used for U4, U5, and U6. Watermarks in the form of scissors appear in both quires. A similar, but not identical, watermark would be Ha. Ciseaux 68 (1473–1474).

**Justification:** 95 x 60/65 mm, 17 lines per page.

**Scribe:** Theodoros, except for the headline on f. 88r: this line was, I believe, written by co-scribe A, whose collaboration Theodoros has made use of on some pages in U4. We will come back to this in connection with that unit. Suffice it right now to point out the similarities of the word λόγος in the title on f. 88r with the same word on f. 104r line 4, the extra flourish of Δημήτρικος in the title and the corresponding one in καὶ at the end of f. 107r. Taken together with letter forms such as crescent-shaped sigma, quadratic nu, and the overall appearance, these traits do indicate that this scribe has effectuated the first title of U3.

**Texts:** Nos. 5–10. Four larger texts (Isocrates *Oration* 1; Gregory of Nazianzos *Ep.* 114; letters by Hippocrates and Anacharsis). One micro-text (On the soul and its faculties) on f. 98r to complete the page at the end of the first main text. The unit ends with a section of five sayings from the Alexander Romance filling up the last one and a half page of Q15. These, and the micro-text mentioned above, are written with a thinner nib, the ink being slightly different in blackness. The last three lines of Q15 are not from the Alexander Romance, but may be seen as an appended commentary to the fifth saying. The first sentence comes from Libanios, *Declamation* 6, the second from *Prov.* 11: 22.

**Decoration:** Initial for first main text (Isocrates): 5 lines in height, red, flourished. Second main text (Gregory of Nazianzos): initial same size and kind. Third main text (Hippocrates): each epistle starts with a red, flourished initial, 2–3 lines in height. Fourth main text (Anacharsis): each of the eight epistles starts with a red initial, 2–3 lines in height. All but the last one are flourished. Also the small page filler in f. 98r, Text 6, has its own rubricized title, half a line long, and very small red initial letters in a few places. Even the very last line (mentioning the five senses) got its own title in red, this time in the margin (an afterthought by Theodoros?). A tiny line filler—three dots and a curved line in red—ends the page. In the last text of U3 (the sayings) the initials are, in comparison to the main texts, smaller (1–1½ lines in height) and less embellished.

**Condition:** First and last page of U3 are more soiled than the rest of the pages. There is a diagonal rip in the lower margin of ff. 97–108; in ff. 97–102 the torn part has been cut out, probably to avoid further ripping into the
writing area. F. 103 hangs loose. The rip is seen also in U4, which means that the damage probably happened subsequent to the binding of the codex.

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit:**

A – new text initiated on first recto, also emphasized with a rubricated heading and a large ornamented initial; B – first recto is darker, more soiled than the rest of the leaves; J – a new watermark is introduced; L – the *mise-en-page* has changed: writing area now lesser in height and with 17 lines per page; M – in this unit all the decorations have been neatly executed by the main scribe, as it seems. The red ink is of very good quality compared to the one in U2.

**Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit:**

A – text ends at last verso of Q15, a new text beginning on first recto of next quire (U4); B – soiled last verso; F and G – from ink and other details it seems that the last one and a half page was written in a second relay, after the main texts were finished though by the same scribe.

Bridging components at a manifest unit boundary

The boundary criteria which distinguish U3 from the preceding unit make it quite clear that we are dealing with another, independent unit. In fact, this border is one of the most manifest in the whole book. But, of course, there are also connecting links. There is the main scribe himself, active in every unit (the pinakes excepted). Another link, if we look at the book as a whole, is the paper; the same watermark that we found in U2, appears in several other units further on in the book. This fact suggests that the scribe created U2, U8–12, and U14–15 at about the same period of time. So even if there is a change in paper between U2 and U3, we need to look further to see the complete picture of connective and separating traits.

In its narrative contents U3 concords well with U2. The Isocrates speech, *To Demonicus*, is often held to be a kind of prince’s mirror, or paraenetic text—and the same goes for *Stephanites and Ichnelates*, besides being “a good read” and a widely circulated text. The letter from Gregory of Nazianzos to a certain Keleusios also happens to present a small but charming fable story within it and with a humorous touch: no patristic gravity there. The epistolary novels, Texts 8–9, are examples of the highly favored epistolographic genre, popular among the Byzantines in general, and also with our scribe, Theodoros, as it seems. But they are also narratives, stories, thus going well together with the preceding texts.

Using sayings, proverbs, or other micro-texts is a convenient way of filling up an area which was left over in the first round, and we can see how Theodoros handles this skilfully at many points in *Gr 8*. The excerpts from the Alexander Romance are well adjusted to the other narrative texts in U3. The way the scribe keeps to the subject and adds the two extra commenting lines to the last Alexander saying, goes to show how carefully prepared these quires were, even down to the page fillers.
Codicological unit 4 (U4), ff. 104–127

**Quire**: Q16–18: [104–111; 112–119; 120–127] 3 quaternions.


**Justification**: 95 x 65 mm, 17 lines per page.

**Scribe**: Theodoros, except for ff. 104r, 107r, 109r and 112r (and line 6 on f. 106v), where co-scribe A has taken turns with him. Chapter headings and decorations are in Theodoros’ hand also on the four pages mentioned above.

**Texts**: Nos. 11–15. Mainly medical texts: two longer ones (Paul of Aegina and a botanical lexicon) and three shorter ones completing the last leaf (a formula from Aëtios; a note on contraceptives; the seven ages in life).

**Decoration**: Rubrication effectuated in titles, initials and marginalia. On f. 104r the title passes into a rubricated strapwork line filler of the same design as the headpiece on f. 128r (U5). Floriate initial on f. 104r: four lines in height, ditto on f. 106r. Subsidiary red initials: 2–3 lines in height. Also the “secondary” texts at the end of the unit have been bestowed with floriate initials, 2–3 lines in height. On f. 127r there are two line fillers with the same vegetal design as most of Theodoros’ initials. Theodoros seems to have had a problem with the red ink in some places: on f. 122r some initials are more brownish than red, and on f. 125r the red color is very pale. There are paragraph numbers (α’–κ’’) in the margins of Text 11 corresponding to chapters 73–99 in Paul of Aegina’s *Medical compendium*, but not so in chapter 100 (i.e. the letter from Diocles to King Antigonus); instead Theodoros signals it as a new text, with the customary cross before the rubricated title, and a large floriate initial at the beginning of the text. In this last chapter a reader has added some key words in the margin and also a couple of large plain initials where he thought it was needed. But Theodoros’ text is actually complete: no initials are missing in those places. In Text 12, the botanical lexicon, the lemmata all have their first letter in red. Perhaps a marginal decoration was planned at the beginning of this lexicon, f. 122v (as we have it on ff. 147r and 152r); the red ink there is smeared out.

**Condition**: First recto and last verso of the unit are soiled and stained. Water damage in upper and outer margins. Stains of mildew. There is a rip in the lower margin on ff. 104–108 (the same rip is seen in the latter part of U3).

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit**: A – new text initiated on first recto, also emphasized with a rubricated heading and a large ornamented initial; B – soiled first recto, separate damp stains which do not reach into neighboring units; O – the texts in U4 all deal with medicine one way or another, something which none of the other units in *Gr 8* does.

---

50 The handwriting of co-scribe A is described infra. See also the general section on scribes, p. 55.
Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit: 

- **A** – text ends at last verso of Q18, a new text beginning on first recto of next quire (U5); 
- **B** – last verso soiled and stained; 
- **F** and **G** – the shorter texts on f. 127r–v (Texts 13–15) seem to have been added in a second relay judging from the ink.

**Theodoros’ collaborator, co-scribe A**

As I mentioned above, p. 59, co-scribe A has seconded Theodoros not only in *Gr 8* but also in *Parisinus graecus 3045*. There is no identification of the scribe at present. It seems peculiar that this collaborator has been filling in intermittently and on recto pages only (with the one-line exception on f. 106v). Could this be an indication that this was a student or apprentice who was allowed to “have a go at it,” while Theodoros maintained the standard? If Theodoros had already copied the opposite page, the preceding verso, it would have been easier to eye the exemplary size and shaping of the script.

Most likely, it was co-scribe A who added the first heading of U3, on f. 88r (cf. p. 80). Hence it follows that we cannot use the scribal situation in U4 as a boundary criterium in relation to U3. In fact, it would work the other way around, as a unifying trait which concerns the whole book rather than just “unit level,” especially since we have the same combination of scribes in the Paris manuscript.

Conspicuous traits of his handwriting are: uniformly quadratic or circular letter-forms with small start- and end-spots on most strokes; crescent-shaped *sigma*; the καλ-*ligature* (looking like “a large stigma”); μετά with *tau* shaped like a semi-circular stroke (kind of like the left half of a heart) bound to the *alpha*; the diagonal strokes of letters *chi* and *delta* stand out on the page (cf. photo below). Even though the overall result looks fairly even, the hand seems to me less fluent and resourceful as compared to Theodoros’. For example, even if we limit the comparison to ff. 104–112, the leaves in immediate vicinity to the work of co-scribe A, Theodoros makes use of a much larger repertoire of variegated ligatures. The following table illustrates letter forms that differ considerably in the two hands. When more than one shape of a letter is listed, the first one is quantitatively most important (graphs scanned from *Gr 8*, ff. 104–109):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letters and signs</th>
<th>Theodoros</th>
<th>co-scribe A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beta</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="beta Theodoros" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="beta co-scribe A" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epsilon</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="epsilon Theodoros" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="epsilon co-scribe A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. 104r (upper half of the page, original size). Scribe: co-scribe A. The rubricated heading and decorations are in Theodoros’ hand.
Codicological unit 5 (U5), ff. 128–151

**Quires:** Q19–21: [128–135; 136–143; 144–151]: three quaternions.

**Paper:** Same paper as in U3–4 and U6. Watermark: scissors.

**Justification:** 95 x 65 mm, 17 lines per page.

**Scribe:** Theodoros.

**Texts:** Nos. 16–22. Philosophical treatises on the soul and its constituents, one by Gregory Thaumaturgos, one by John Philoponos, and two anonymous passages; Manuel Christonymos, *Monody on the Fall of Constantinople*; Leonardo Bruni, *The Constitution of Florence*; a short account of the seven wonders of the ancient world.

**Decoration:** Rubricated strapwork headpiece on f. 128r (cf. first recto of U4, f. 104r). Titles and subsidiary titles in red. Floriate initials in red (five lines in height) on ff. 135v and 147r (smaller ones of the same design passim). On f. 138v the initial is even larger and more embellished (six lines in height), and here it is outlined in two colours, red and golden-beige ink. The golden-beige ink is here also used for the accompanying heading and line filler. Floriate line fillers accompany the titles on ff. 138v and 147r and in the latter case there is also a flower in the margin. It may be noted that the large initial on f. 135v was really not called for: in the text there is just the beginning of a subordinate paragraph, the kind that most often takes an initial two lines in height. Only this time it happened to stand on the first line of the page, thence the enhancement. The last three lines of the unit (Seven Wonders) were written in a second relay, as a page filler. For the lack of a rubricated title the first half of line one is blank. The small plain initials were inserted at a later stage, and poorly at that, first in pale red and then anew with greyish ink at a couple of places.

**Condition:** F. 128 hangs loose. A rip in the upper margin of ff. 144–145 reaches far into the text (no textual loss). The lower corner of f. 151 is torn off. The unit’s first recto and last verso are soiled. Also in the middle of one quire, on ff. 138v–139r, the paper is soiled and darkened, supposedly from readers handling it. Was it perhaps the large, floriate initial that someone was interested in displaying, or was it the text itself which attracted more attention than other parts of the unit (Text 20, *Monody on the Fall of Constantinople*)? On ff. 128–129 wax stains and a burn mark (did someone have trouble with the candle by reading?). In the upper margin of f. 128r there are some traces of words in red ink, most of it lost by trimming. It could be either a prayer formula or a subtitle of some kind: my guess is the latter, since prayer formulae tend to be written in black, i.e., the same ink that the scribe starts out filling the page with. The fact that the first text of the unit includes quite a few such subtitles in red corroborates this supposition.

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit:** A – new text initiated on first recto, title enhanced by rubricated headpiece; B – first recto of unit
more soiled that the rest of the leaves; **O** – in last unit there were only medici
cal texts, whereas here the emphasis lies on contemporary, fifteenth-century
texts.

**Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit:** **A** – text end coincides
with end of Q21; **B** – last verso soiled and damaged, the corner torn off; **F**
and **G** – Text 22 was added secondarily in a blank space at the end.

**Theodoros as rubricator**

I have assumed that the floriate initials and other embellishments and deco-
rations are made by Theodoros, and not by somebody else, on account of the
rubricated headlines. These are clearly in Theodoros’ own handwriting (with
one exception on f. 88v in U3) and the red ink is identical to the one used for
the decorative elements.

How did the rubricator work (in this case Theodoros himself)? Since
Theodoros omitted both large and smaller initials in the text to be filled in
afterwards with red, he probably had to read through his own text rather
carefully so as not to miss out on some of the voids. In some places this be-
comes obvious, since the corrections which Theodoros has put in the text—
such as additions of accents—are made in red ink (e.g. on f. 128v a question
mark, f. 129v accents, f. 131v an inserted μέν). The initials at the beginning of
a line were always set out in the margin, outside of the justification area. By
vowels Theodoros usually put the accent and breathing there right away, in
black ink, thereby giving a hint for where to fill in the rubricated initial.

Floriate initial from f. 138v (original size).
Codicological unit 6 (U6), ff. 152–199


**Paper:** Same paper as in U3–5. Watermark: scissors.

**Justification:** 95 x 65 mm, 17 lines per page.

**Scribe:** Theodoros.

**Texts:** Nos. 23–39. Several texts from the mid-fifteenth century (by Plethon, Bessarion, Nicholas Sagundino, Mark Eugenikos); a declamation by Libanios and a couple of texts attributed to John Chrysostom on much the same theme (women’s wretchedness); two short theological tracts (one anonymous, one by John of Damascus); a hymn to the Theotokos; a selection of sayings; two letters by Isidore of Pelousion; a gnomology consisting of excerpts from Constantine Manasses’ *Synopsis Chronike*. Pen trials/notes (including a name, Διμος πετζαλης φρυσαλητης).

**Decoration:** Rubricated titles accompanied by floriate decorations (f. 152’), a headpiece in strapwork design (f. 162’), or just followed by floriate initials of varying size, from 5 to 1 line in height. Floriate line filler on f. 162’. The last three leaves are not rubricated, and the two-line blank space on f. 197’ never got a title filled in. The secondary initials on these leaves, ff. 197–199, are in light brown ink.

**Condition:** Soiled first recto and last verso of unit. Also at the quire boundary between Q23 and Q24 the pages are darkened and soiled. The corner of f. 167 was torn off but has been stitched on again with hemp yarn. Water damage especially large in Q23, but also visible in upper and outer margins of Q24–25. Edges scorched towards end of unit, Q27.

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit:** A – new text on first recto; B – first recto soiled.

**Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit:** A – quire end and text end coincide; B – last verso soiled; F and G – Text 38 (the *Synopsis Chronike* gnomology) represents a secondary layer of inscription, added on leaves that were left blank in the first round. After this text follows yet another—tertiary—layer (Text 39), in the form of scribbles and a name, presumably an owner’s additions.

Τάξις ἀρετῶν: a schematic outline of the virtues

On f. 162’ there is a diagram illustrating the cardinal virtues *prudence, righteousness, fortitude, and temperance*, and the qualities associated with each of them. It is worked out in red and black ink with decorations in the same floriate design as Theodoros uses for his initials. The diagram summarizes what has been presented in the text on the previous page and is introduced on f. 162’ with the request: Ὁρα δὲ ἐμπροσθενν καὶ τὰ σχήματα τῶν ἀρετῶν.
The fact that the numbering in the diagram seems somewhat random is explained by the list on the preceding page: here the qualities are listed in order from α to τβ (1–12), and in the diagram Theodoros adjusted the numbers accordingly. The planning of rubricated initials did not turn out quite right, though; when he wrote the words in black he forgot to leave out some of the initial letters, so that as a result we now have read πολιτεία, χρηστότης, κκοσμότης, et cetera. This indicates that the visual appearance of the rubrication was more important than a correctly written text. Another oversight on Theodoros’ part was to change the size of the writing area below the diagram. Apparently he took the text written in black ink in the diagram as the normal left border position, with the result that the text lines are indented and the floriate initial is placed inside the normal mise-en-page instead of in the margin where it ought to be. The diagram is reproduced on the front cover (dust jacket) of this book.

F. 167v. The torn-off corner was stitched on with hemp yarn.
Codicological unit 7 (U7), ff. 200–207

**Quires**: Q28: [200–207] quaternion.

**Paper**: Watermark in the form of an anchor on f. 204 (a small fragment of it also on f. 203), remotely similar to Br. Ancre 460 (1475–1490). This watermark appears only in U7, though it is reasonable to believe that the same paper is used for Q31 (in U9); the quality and laid pattern are identical but no watermark is visible in the ternion.

**Justification**: 103 x 65 mm, 18 lines per page.

**Scribe**: Theodoros.


**Decoration**: Rubrication planned but not executed. Two lines are left blank on f. 200r, indicating that a headpiece or some other means of decoration was supposed to accompany the title (cf. the introduction of units 4, 5, and 13; ff. 104, 128, and 286 respectively). In the upper margin Nicholas de la Torre (cf. U1) has added τὸ αὐτὸ κατὰ λατίνων. The blank title space has been used by another reader, who gawkishly tried to copy the first line of the text. Likewise, the plain initials on f. 200r and f. 206v were added afterwards. Also on f. 206v Theodoros left a blank line for a rubricated title; here somebody added “μαρκος ὁ φρεσις άποφαση του πατρημαρχ(ου).”

**Condition**: Soiled first recto (difference less conspicuous on last verso); the overall impression is that this quire is cleaner than both the preceding and the following units. Upper edge slightly singed.

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit**: A – new text initiated on first recto, the text was supposed to carry a rubricated heading; J – different kind of paper; L – different *mise-en-page*; (M) – preceding unit was rubricated and decorated, whereas this one is not.51

**Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit**: A – text end and quire end coincide, a new text beginning on first recto of next quire (U8); F – small blank space ending last verso.

---

51 I have put the last criterion in parenthesis, since its weight is lessened by the fact that the last three leaves of U6 are not rubricated. It could be that the scribe after having finished U6, though with the last three leaves blank, then decided to expand the unit with Text 38 (the *Synopsis Chronike* gnomology) and what is now U7. In that case the boundary between U6 and U7 is blurred by the fact that neither Text 38 nor Texts 40–41 are rubricated. On the other hand, U7 may very well have been created independently; we cannot know if Text 38 was added to U6 before or after the creation of U7.
The affinity between U6 and U7

The two texts of U7 both fit into the intellectual discussions which were topical in the aftermath of the Council of Ferrara-Florence, 1438–1445. The same goes for the preceding unit, where several texts by Plethon and his circle of acquaintances are included as well as texts by Mark Eugenikos (ff. 152–173 and 190–193). A question that lies near at hand is whether the two units were jointly planned. If there would have been space enough in the last quire of U6, these two texts would, from the viewpoint of contents, suitably have fitted in that section. Could that have been Theodoros’ original plan? Only, when he had finished Text 31 (Mark Eugenikos Analogies) there were six leaves left blank and the Plethon text, Reply to the Treatise in Support of the Latin Doctrine, would require seven leaves. This may have led him to postpone copying what are now Texts 40–41, putting them in a separate quire, and to proceed filling the last quire of U6 with other items instead. As the basis for such a supposition we would need some kind of inverted O-criterion: the absence of a break in contents, the affinity in genre/authors/texts, would supposedly point to a deliberate juxtaposition. Although not wholly unlikely, there is a catch here: the juxtaposition can be primary (by inscription), secondary but still made by the scribe himself at some later stage in the copying process, or it may be done on a much later occasion when somebody else decides to create a composite out of separate codicological units. An “inverted O-criterion” is, accordingly, not very practical as an analytical tool.

If we consider what is clearly a secondary layer at the end of U6, it only comprises the last three leaves, i.e., the excerpts from Manasses’ Synopsis Chronike, Text 38 (plus an owner’s scribblings, Text 39). There are no traces of a break in Theodoros’ work procedure after Text 31 (i.e. on f. 193v), something which could perhaps be expected if we adhere to the hypothesis of joint units. Another complication is the rubrication, present in U6 (except for the secondarily written leaves, ff. 197–199) but absent in U7. We also need to consider the difference in watermarks which may tell against an uninterrupted work session (an admittedly weak argument, since one can certainly run out of one sort of paper and go on copying from another stack of paper). The only moderately “safe” supposition is that Theodoros—or whoever prepared the book for binding—recognized the similar contents of U6 and U7 and thought it befitting to combine them in the composite book.
Codicological unit 8 (U8), ff. 208–223


**Paper**: Same paper as in the main part of U2, also used for the last quire of U9, U10–12 and U14–15. Watermark: oxhead.

**Justification**: 103 x 65 mm, 18 lines to the page.

**Scribe**: Theodoros.

**Texts**: No. 42, a selection of excerpts from John Tzetzes’ *Book of Histories* (*Chiliades*), including a letter from Tzetzes to John Lachanas (*Chil*. 4, 471–779).

**Decoration**: Rubrication of title and initials planned but not executed by Theodoros. In upper margin of f. 208r a later hand has filled in a short title, most of it illegible due to stains and dirt (ἡστορή ... δηνόνσην?) The initials in place were probably added by the same reader, sometimes wrongly and never elegantly. From letter forms and ink it seems likely that the reader/owner who wrote his name in the preceding unit, Διος Πετζαλης Φυσαλοτης (U6, f. 199v) is responsible for these additions. Similar short titles are scattered throughout the unit.

**Condition**: The unit is severely stained by moisture. First recto and last verso soiled. On f. 217 there is a rip in the lower margin.

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit**: A – new text initiated on first recto, blank line left for rubricated title; B – first recto stained and soiled, the water damage does not match with U7; J – different paper/watermark; O – contents change from fifteenth-century theological discussions in U7 to historical/mythical episodes in verse in U8.

**Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit**: A – text end and quire end coincide; B – last verso darkened and stained; E – an extra line added and script compressed on last verso.

Transposed units?

There is a possibility that units 6–10 were intended to be arranged in another sequence than the present one and that they happened to be transposed at binding or rebinding. This is not obvious from the contents: no texts have been affected internally. But if we put together indications of a codicological nature we get the following picture (outlined in the table, below). The paper quality and watermarks differ between units: scissors in U6, anchor in U7, oxhead in U8, probably anchor in U9 (at least the paper quality agrees with U7), oxhead in U10. U7 (Q28) and first quire of U9 (Q31) are cleaner than the other parts; they show almost no water damage. Even the last verso of U7 and the first recto of U9 look neat. U8, on the contrary, has large conspicuous moisture stains in upper and outer margins and at the bottom of the spine. The stain in the upper margin seems gradually to appear in Q31 and is
fully developed in Q32 of U9, and in Q32 the rest of the staining seems to correspond with what is visible in U8. Some quires are singed at the edges, especially Q27 (U6) and Q32. When it comes to the number of lines to the page, there are 17 lines in U6, 18 in U7 (except last verso which has 17 lines + blank space at the end); U8 has got 18 lines, as does U10 as well; in U9 Q31 has a writing area of 17 lines while Q32 has 18 lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Watermark</th>
<th>Moisture stains</th>
<th>Singeing</th>
<th>Lines per page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U6</td>
<td>scissors</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>front edge of last quire</td>
<td>17 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U7</td>
<td>anchor</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>18 (last verso 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U8</td>
<td>oxhead</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>18 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U9, Q31</td>
<td>anchor?</td>
<td>incipient from mid-quire on</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>17 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U9, Q32</td>
<td>oxhead</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>upper edge</td>
<td>18 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U10</td>
<td>oxhead</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>18 lines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the differences outlined here may point to U9 having originally been produced in sequence with U7 and prior to U8. As an hypothesis we may suppose that U8 was thereafter inserted in-between those two. The original unit sequence would then have been U6—U7—U9—U8—U10.

How would this hypothesis affect the contents? The texts in U7 are closely connected with some in U6, thence probably planned to follow there. U8 is independent and could stand anywhere; the Tzetzes episodes and his letter to Lachanas fit well with several units in Gr 8, not least with U9 and U10, though. U10 has one stanza (Text 52) of the poem Carmen Paraeneticum which, in U9, is presented together with the rest of the stanzas (Text 46). Thus it makes more sense that U9 was produced prior to U10 and that Theodoros reused some lines of the poem in a subsequent unit. On the whole, the reasons for connecting U7 to U9 are material/codicological rather than based on contents, but there is nothing that speaks against a transposals of U8 and U9 at some stage in the composition or recomposition of Gr 8.
Codicological unit 9 (U9), ff. 224–237


**Paper:** Q31: no watermark visible, but the laid pattern matches the paper of Q28 (U7), with the watermark anchor. Q32: watermark oxhead, i.e. the same paper as in the main part of U2, and in U8, U10–12, and U14–15.

**Justification:** Q31: 98 x 65–70 mm. Q32: 102 x 65 mm. 17 lines to the page on ff. 224–226 and 228–229; 18 lines on f. 227r–v though still inside the same *mise-en-page* as the surrounding pages; 18 lines on ff. 230–237.

**Scribe:** Theodoros. Later additions of “titles” to the epistles in greyish ink.

**Texts:** Nos. 43–47. A selection of twenty letters by Theophylact Simokates; the Decalogue; lists of kings; an anonymous poem, *Carmen Paraegeticum*; a three-line epigram as a page filler.

**Decoration:** No decoration effectuated by Theodoros. First line on f. 224r left blank for heading; likewise a blank line spared for the title of Text 45 (lists of kings). Small plain initials were added later in light brown ink.

**Condition:** In Q31 f. 224r looks fine; 229v and 230r are slightly more soiled. Q32 is singed and stained by moisture.

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit:** A – new text on first recto; C – the unit starts with a ternion; J – first quire of different paper than that of U8, but seems to be of the same kind as the one used for U7; L – writing area of different size and the number of lines to the page differs in first quire; N – prayer formula written by Theodoros in upper margin of first recto: + t(ησοι)δοι μου βοηθει μοι.

**Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit:** A – text boundary and quire boundary coincide; B – last verso soiled, the scorched edges of last quire have no counterpart in next unit.

**The change in layout between Q31 and Q32**

There are some differences between the two quires that together make up U9. A different kind of paper is used for the second quire and the *mise-en-page* is not quite the same. But since Text 43 overlaps the quire boundary, Q31–32 ought to have been produced together. Had Theodoros used a quaternion instead of a ternion, the letters by Simokates would have fitted nicely. Could this be another instance of Theodoros overlooking the size of the quire at hand (cf. U2, Q2–3)? Or was he just determined to use up that kind of paper (with the anchor watermark) anyhow, knowing that the text would have to reach into another quire? Either way there is a change in writing area in the middle of U9 and in mid-text, something which is otherwise rare. One way to explain this is to suggest that all the quires with the watermark “oxhead” were prepared in advance to have a writing area of ca.
103x65 mm, just as we have it in Q32 and also in most of the other units carrying oxhead watermarks. On the other hand, one would further expect the writing areas of Q31 and Q28 (U7) to correspond if—as I hypothesized earlier—they were produced in sequence from the same stack of paper. They do not correspond. This looks aggravating for the credibility of our hypothesis; perhaps the units were not transposed after all? There is a way to salvage this, though: let us suppose that Theodoros has just copied U7 and it lays there on the table. He proceeds with Q31 (U9), and has as his model the last verso page of U7. That particular page had only 17 lines of text, whereas the rest of U7 had 18 lines to each page. The outcome is that Theodoros will design the writing area of Q31 to equal the layout of f. 207v, which is exactly how it has turned out in Gr 8. Consequently, what seemed to be a compromising factor has now been shown to corroborate the link between U7 and U9.

Codicological unit 10 (U10), ff. 238–253

Paper: Same paper as in Q2–Q11 of U2, also present in U8, in Q32 of U9, in U11–12 and in U14–15. Watermark: oxhead.
Justification: 103x65 mm, 18 lines to the page.
Scribe: Theodoros. In this unit and also in units 11–13 Theodoros uses a dark brown ink, whereas in the other parts of Gr 8 the ink is generally deep black.
Texts: Nos. 48–52. A florilegium encompassing almost 200 sayings from alpha to omega (inc. Ἀλέξανδρος ἔρωτηθείς); a short chronological note on the Trojan war, Homer, and Xerxes’ crossing of the Hellespont; a lexicon of synonyms (inc. Ἀλαλάξατε· ύψοςατε); Michael Choniates’ Elegy on Athens; one stanza of Carmen Paraeneticum.
Decoration: The plain initials are secondary, added in light brown ink (cf. U9).
Condition: Soiled first recto and last verso. Water damage especially in upper and outer margins.
Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit: A – new text on first recto; B – first recto soiled; K – color of ink different than in preceding units.
Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit: A – text end and quire end coincide; B – last verso soiled; E – script is smaller and more crammed

52 For the discussion on transposed units, see U8, above.
53 Stanza 17 of Carmen Paraeneticum is also met with in Text 46, ff. 234r–237v (U9).
on last verso, especially in Text 52, and an extra line was added at the end, thus stretching the writing area.

U10 is a relatively uncomplicated unit. Also in contents (sayings, a synonym lexicon, poems) it harmonizes well with adjacent units, and this is true whether one presupposes a transposition of units 8 and 9 or not. U8 with its gnomic stories on verse, U9 with its fictitious letters, lists, and a poem: neither sticks out in relation to U10 (cf. discussion on these units, above).

**Codicological unit 11 (U11), ff. 254–261**

**Quires:** Q35: [254–261] quaternion.

**Paper:** Same paper as in the main part of U2, in U8–10, U12, and U14–15. Watermark: oxhead.

**Justification:** 102 x 65 mm, 18 lines to the page.

**Scribe:** Theodoros, using dark brown ink.

**Texts:** Nos. 53–55. An anonymous text on the soul (inc. Ἄς μὲν ἔχομεν δόξας περὶ ψυχῆς); two short sayings; an anonymous prose paraphrase of Gregory of Nazianzos’ Carmen 2.9, *De virtute*.

**Decoration:** A blank line saved for a title on f. 254r and f. 257r. Rubricated initials planned but not executed. Small plain initials added by a later hand (the first one mistakenly as ἦ instead of α). On f. 256r–v there are simple diagrams which give an outline of what has been discussed in Text 53; here too some initials are missing.

**Condition:** Damp stains in common with preceding and ensuing units. First recto is soiled (but not the last verso).

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit:** A – new text on first recto; B – first recto page is more soiled than the rest of the quire.

**Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit:** A – text end and quire end coincide; E – on last verso the writing area is enlarged with yet another line and the script is both smaller and more compressed to fit the text on the page.

U11–12: One divisible unit or two single but closely related units?

One may doubt whether U11 should actually be seen as separate from the ensuing unit. The texts are admittedly complete and we do have compressed writing at the end of the quire. Still, it is important to notice that the last verso of U11 and the first recto of U12 do not seem very soiled or worn. It is thus likely that these quires were put together quite soon after having been
copied, or even that they were copied at the same time, i.e. as one single unit comprising two separable parts. Nevertheless, I have chosen to present these parts as two different units, and rather discuss how much or little boundary “proof” we have in each case. As noted above, when the data are inconclusive you lose more in bringing the presumed units together than by keeping them apart in the overall schedule. It is safer to admit the vagueness in present criteria than to blur possible differences by implicitly sketching a tight link.

Recycling of page fillers

The two sayings at the bottom of f. 256v are the same as were used on f. 196v (Text 37, U6) but for a slight change in word order in the second one: μνήμη θανάτου χρησιμεύει τῷ βίῳ ὁρός δὲ φιλοσοφίας ἢ τοῦ θανάτου μελέτη (re-membrance of death is beneficial in life; philosophy’s definition: the study of death). From a stylistic point of view, the two sentences are here nicely knit together through the crosswise position of the terms μνήμη θανάτου – θανάτου μελέτη. But there is no way to tell which of the two instances was primary. Besides, it is more interesting to see how they are used, whether the scribe wanted to make them fit with the context or if it is all the same to him what preceded the blank space. In this instance the sayings follow a text with philosophical contents, whereas in U6 this is less obvious. We may compare with U5, where Theodoros put the page filler on the “Seven wonders,” i.e. impressive building endeavors, in sequence with the texts on two mighty contemporary cities, Constantinople and Florence. Also in U3 we saw a conscious usage of the space left at the end of the unit, as anecdotal extra material was put in sequence with similar main texts. Evidently it is not insignificant for our scribe what material he adds to fill up his pages and quires. The fact that these micro-texts are often arranged to have rubricated initials and decorations together with the rest of the texts (as in U3–6) goes to show their status as acknowledged parts of the book expressing a compositional whole.

54 On f. 196v the latter is rendered as ὁρός φιλοσοφίας μελέτη θανάτου.
55 Another instance of recycling was seen at the end of the preceding unit (U10), where one stanza of the poem Carmen Paraeneticum reappeared as a page filler, despite having already been included together with the rest of the stanzas in U9.
Codicological unit 12 (U12), ff. 262–285

**Quires:** Q36–38: [262–269; 270–277; 278–285] 3 quaternions.

**Paper:** Same paper as in the main part of U2, also present in U8–11, U14–15. Watermark: oxhead.

**Justification:** 102 x 65 mm, 18 lines to the page.

**Scribe:** Theodoros, using a dark brown ink. Some “titles” and marginal notes have been added in greyish and light brown ink by a later hand, probably the same person who wrote the document on f. 87 and the short chronicle in the margin of f. 283v.

**Texts:** Nos. 56–66. Four longer excerpts from Theodoret’s *Cure of the Pagan Maladies* fill up almost 17 leaves. The next three leaves contain a number of short texts of various kinds: philosophical commentaries, two epigrams (*AP* IX 359–360), a dialectal lexicon. Lists of patriarchates and bishoprics, of inventors and emperors follow on ff. 281–283. The unit ends with an astrological/geomantic text which is not complete.

**Decoration:** Plain initials in light brown ink were all filled in secondarily. A blank line was allocated for rubricated headlines to Texts 56 (Theodoret) and 62 (lists patriarchates), but the rubrication was never executed by the scribe. On f. 283v a zodiac is depicted; astrological signs in the margins of ff. 284v–285v, and on f. 285v a diagram with geomantic “houses.”

**Condition:** First recto is relatively clean, cf. U11. Last verso is darkened and soiled. The moisture stains in upper margin and at the spine look similar to the ones in U11, but differ slightly from U13. Trimming has affected some of the marginal notes. Probably at least one quire is missing at end of unit.

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit:** A – new text on first recto.

**Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit:** (A) – the last text does not continue into the ensuing unit, but since the text breaks off incomplete, we do not know how comprehensive U12 was originally. Nevertheless, there is still a boundary here in relation to U13, but that conclusion must rely more on what we can infer from U13 itself; B – last verso soiled.

The relationship between micro-texts

The fact that the unit lacks decorations, titles, and rubricated initials makes it more difficult to distinguish how Theodoros perceived the relationship between smaller texts. One can conclude that even though he did not leave much blank space at the beginning of Text 58, for example, he probably

---

56 The zodiac and the diagram with geomantic houses are depicted in Chapter 5, pp. 218 and 222.
planned to have an author’s name there and perhaps the beginning of the epigram written in red (now the first half line of *AP* IX 359 is missing). Otherwise he would not have put "τοῦ ἀντοῦ" above the next epigram (*AP* IX 360). Texts 59–60 are also problematical: in contents Text 60 looks like an amplification of Text 59, and thus it is not clear whether they should be treated as one or two items. Furthermore, Text 60 seems to be construed from a number of short excerpts added one after another. But one cannot say whether Theodoros picked this and that from different sources, or the "whole" text was borrowed from a model manuscript.

If we compare with the rubrication in U3, we see that Theodoros often needs less than an inch of a line to fit in a small title or subtitle. We can thus assume that such aid was to be added as a means of orientation for the reader. However, large initials which have been inserted secondarily must not be trusted as guidance in these matters. As an example we may choose the initial at the top of f. 279v: it would be easy to infer from the large initial that a new text starts right there. One would then treat the last line of f. 279r as a page filler with no relation to what follows on the next page. But that is not the case: the large initial is quite uncalled for since the text definitely bridges the recto and verso pages.\(^57\)

**Codicological unit 13 (U13), ff. 286–301**

**Quires:** Q39–40: [286–293; 294–301] 2 quaternions.

**Paper:** The paper does not resemble what we find in other units in *Gr 8*. No watermark visible in Q39, but the somewhat coarse quality equals the paper of Q40 where we can see the spikes of a crown.

**Justification:** 103 x 70–75 mm on ff. 286–298; 108 x 70–75 mm on ff. 299–301v; 110 x 75 mm on f. 301v. Q39: 23–26 lines, Q40: 22–31 lines to the page.

**Scribe:** Theodoros, using dark brown ink. Densely filled pages with little space left for outer margin now due to trimming. The lines are sloping downwards to the right on most recto pages.

**Texts:** Nos. 67–72. A selection of letters by Basil the Great, Libanios, and Gregory of Nazianzos, two excerpts (speeches) from Josephus’ *The Jewish War*, and a treatise/letter on astronomy by Nikephoros Gregoras.

**Decoration:** On f. 286r a strapwork knot in upper margin and a large ornamented initial, 3 lines in height; the shade of ink is not inconsistent with

\(^{57}\) The reader who added the initials seems to have assumed that f. 279v rendered the beginning of a lexicon starting on *alpha*, thence the large and decorated *alpha* wrongly inserted for *delta* ("Ἀζιζόν" instead of <Δ>Ξζόν). Also the third word on the page got an initial *alpha* instead of the *phi* that was required ("ανως" instead of <Φ>ως). See also Appendix 1, p. 293.
Theodoros’ text on the same page, but it is still difficult to assess whether the decorations are primary (by Theodoros) or not. Blank spaces left for insertion of initials were later filled with plain ones partly in brownish-black, partly in light brown ink. The fairly sized breathings and accents set out in the margin by Theodoros (e.g. on f. 293v) indicate that he planned to have larger initials also at the beginning of each of the letters. As for the titles and subsidiary titles: though the lines are thinner Theodoros could still have put them in together with the primary layer. The variation can be explained by a different slanting of the pen.

**Condition:** Soiled first recto and last verso. Damp stains which do not resemble the ones in Q38 (U12). Cropped leaves, marginal notes partly lost.

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit:** A – quire boundary and text boundary coincide; B – first recto is darker, more soiled and worn than the rest of the leaves; H – plausibly the size of the leaves was different in this unit, since the writing area leaves almost no room for an outer margin in its cropped state; J – different paper/watermark; L – different mise-en-page; M – different style of decoration; O – change in textual contents.

**Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit:** A – quire boundary and text boundary coincide; B – last verso soiled and worn; E – script compressed to make the text fit, or rather: the writing area is very well planned, so as to gently fit the texts into the quire.

**A unit sloppily written or not?**

At first sight it may seem that U13 is less carefully executed than the rest of Gr 8. The number of lines per page varies, the pages are very densely written, and the nib of Theodoros’ pen is less sharp than usual. The fact that the titles and marginal entries were executed in black ink and not in red—as they are in U3 for example—reinforces the picture of U13 being, if not perfunctorily, so at least less lavishly copied. Another detail which adds to the impression of a more trivial copying is the narrow outer margin. Nor is the balancing of the page and the marginal space that we see in other parts of the book present here. But this could also be the result of trimming: it seems most likely that the leaves of U13 were originally of a larger size than those of other units in Gr 8.

At a closer inspection, however, it becomes apparent that the planning of these leaves was just as professional and premeditated as ever. Take, for example, the page with the fewest lines, f. 294v: by writing only 22 lines Theodoros was able to end Basil’s letter at precisely the last line of the page, beginning a new letter at the top of f. 295r. In a corresponding case on f. 292v–293r the subtitle is put at the bottom of the preceding page while the letter itself starts on the first line of the next page: that way Theodoros had the opportunity to plan a large initial at the top of the page. On the other hand Theodoros respects his mise-en-page higher than the urge to squeeze in
each letter on its own page: he could, for example, have chosen to add a line at the bottom of f. 295r to fit the letter in. But since that would have burst the justification measurements, he had to do without it. A tricky parallel is present at the transition from recto to verso of f. 296: Theodoros puts the subtitle in the upper margin of the verso page despite the fact that the first line on the verso actually belongs to the end of the preceding letter, the new letter starting on line two. The illusion is that he succeeds in starting out with a new text at the top of this verso page also.

The slight increase in number of lines in Q40 seems well-arranged too (starting out with ca. 25 lines per page and ending with the suite 31/29/29/28/28/28). From the bottom of f. 298v (Texts 71–72) Theodoros combines the larger number of lines per page with a further condensation of words on each line. These last six pages must have been meticulously calculated, since he manages to stick to his mise-en-page of 28 lines per page all through the last three pages and nevertheless end his last text exactly at the bottom of f. 301v. The conclusion must be that a cursory judgment on scribal work based on what the pages superficially look like may be fallacious. If, on the contrary, we inspect the copying procedure more closely and try to follow the steps a scribe has taken—reading his mind, so to speak—this may well lead us to a revised view on these matters.

Codicological unit 14 (U14), ff. 302–307

**Quires:** Q41: [302–307] quaternion minus 6th and 7th leaves, which have been cut out (stubs remain).

**Paper:** Same paper as in the main part of U2, also present in U8–9, U11–12, and U15. Watermark: oxhead.

**Justification:** 108 x 70 mm, 19 lines to the page.

**Scribe:** Theodoros, using good black ink. By other hands: owner’s marks, computations, and notes on otherwise blank pages (ff. 305v–307v).

**Texts:** Nos. 73–75. *Leo VI*, *Canticum Compunctionis*, i.e. an alphabetical anacreontic poem on the Last Judgement, and another anonymously transmitted poem of similar structure, with the incipit Ἀπὸ μοναστικῶν ἀμαθείας. The author of the latter is Constantine of Sicily. Pen trials and notes.

**Decoration:** Two lines left blank on f. 302r for rubricated title and perhaps a headpiece; ditto on f. 303v. The void spaces left for rubricated initials were later filled in with small plain ones in greyish-beige ink.

**Condition:** Moisture damage the same as in neighboring quires. Only slightly more soiled on first recto and last verso.
Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit: A – new text on first recto; D – leaves cut out from latter half of the quire; J – different paper than in U13; L – different mise-en-page.

Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit: A – main texts end already on f. 305v; F – ff. 305v–307v left blank by main scribe; G – owners’ notes and scribbles added on previously blank pages.

The notes and scribblings in U14

Of the scribbled entries that we find on the otherwise blank pages in this unit, one is by Theodoros himself, at the top of f. 306*: + τί γάρ μοι ὑπάρχ(ει) ἐν τῷ οὐ(ρα)νῷ καὶ παρὰ σοῦ τι θ[...]. “Whom have I in heaven, and beside You whom would I <desire upon earth>?“ This is a verse from the Septuagint, Ps. 72: 25. The entry is in the same black ink that Theodoros has used for the rest of the texts, but it starts in the middle of the upper margin and it does not seem as if he planned to complete the text.

The rest of the notes are by at least two different hands. One, rather fluent, on f. 305v, perhaps the same hand as we see traces of in several units (the longest entry being the document on f. 87). Here it reads:

+ θ(εδ)ζ τὸ τεχθὲν ἢ δὲ μ(ὴ)ηρ παρθένος· τι μείζων ἄλλον καινόν

This we may identify as a short poem in dodecasyllabic verse by Manuel Philes, the second line of which runs τί μείζων ἄλλο καίνον εἶδεν ἢ κτίσις,. i.e. Carmina 1. 5. The next line on f. 305v may perhaps be by the same hand:

+ ὅν τα καθύσω νὰ ἡδὸν ταδ.

In stumbling strokes of the pen an owner of the book has declared his and his children’s right to the book. On f. 305v it reads:

+ στο μὲν πεδεσεν φαβο κ(υριο)ν εμεὶς γαρ εἰληπ(σ)ον με + ἐ τουτο το βιβλίο ενε το + ἐ ταυτα τα χαρτι

Then, on f. 307r, the whole message:
+ ε τούτο το βιβλίο ενε του παπα καλωι(αννι)? αντιοχου του πρωτοπαπα της παλεα? και το εχη και τα πεδημα του. Here we are thus given the name of one of the many owners and readers of this book: the priest Kaloiannis Antiochos who was protopapas in "Palea." From the position of the entry on f. 305v, where the owner’s notice follows upon the more fluent lines (the Manuel Philes excerpt), we may infer that this Kaloiannis was a later owner of the book than the person who wrote the document on f. 87. This means that he must have owned Gr8 some time between 1547 and the early 1570s. Unfortunately nothing else is known about this man and his children.

On f. 306v this Kaloiannis has put another few words: Χ(ριστο)ς ανεστι εκ νε<κρων>, i.e. “Christ has risen from the dead.”

The rest of the notes on f. 306v and 307r are computations:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>(f. 307r): 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2181</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. 307v is blank except for the phrase μακάριοι ὁν ἄφεθησαν, which has been copied from the beginning of U15, f. 308v (Ps. 31).

---

58 During the period of Venetocracy the ecclesiastic office of protopapas was common in Crete and in the Heptanesa (Ionian Islands). Second to the bishop in rank, the protopapas functioned as an intermediate between the authorities and the Greek population (BAGIAKAKOS 1959, 223).

59 An even more unambiguous sequence is the “repetition” of pen trials on f. 328v; cf. U16, below.

60 The unskilled writing of this priest should not be taken as a sign of illiteracy or incapacity to appreciate the contents of the book. The abilities to read and write were not as closely coupled then as they are today. Cf. GREEN 1994, 9.
Codicological unit 15 (U15), ff. 308–323

**Quires:** Q42–43: [308–315; 316–323] 2 quaternions.

**Paper:** Same paper as in the main part of U2, also present in U8–9, U11–12, and U14. Watermark: oxhead.

**Justification:** 103 x 70 mm, 9 + 9 lines of Latin and supralinear Greek (writing area of f. 316 is 110 x 70 mm; on ff. 320–323 ca. 110–120 mm in height, length of lines varying).

**Scribe:** Greek text in Theodoros’ hand, Latin text by co-scribe B; see discussion infra.

**Texts:** Nos. 76–83. Ps. 32 (=LXX, Ps. 31) *Beati quorum remissae sunt/ Μακάριοι ὅν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι;* Ps. 38 (=LXX, Ps. 37) *Domine ne in furore tuo/ Κύριε, μὴ τῷ θυμῷ σου ἐλέγξῃς με;* and Ps. 51 (=LXX, Ps. 50) *Miserere mei Deus/ Ἐλέησόν με, ὁ Θεός;* Ausonius’ poem *De institutione viri boni;* “Ἦδον μεν γέν” (in a later hand); liturgical texts (*Ave Maria, Pater Noster, Credo*); Ps. 6 *Domine ne in furore tuo/ Κύριε, μὴ τῷ θυμῷ σου ἐλέγξῃς με;* letter headings. Pen trials and notes on last leaf (among them the initial lines of an arithmetic problem, inc. εἰςὲν μῆλοι τρεῖς).

**Decoration:** Plain initials in the Latin text executed in the same black ink as the rest of the script. One initial missing—supposed to be rubricated?—at beginning of Text 77.

**Condition:** Unit badly water damaged. First recto and last verso soiled. A rip in upper margin of f. 312.

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit:** A – new text on first recto; B – first recto soiled; K – different handwriting; L – writing area differs slightly from U14, but concords with many of the other units in Gr 8; M – plain initials in black filled in together with the primary layer; O – change in contents.

**Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit:** A – text end and quire end coincide; B – last verso soiled; F – space left open at end of quire; G – alphabets and other notes added on the formerly blank leaf at the end.

The scribes of U15

U15 is bilingual. One of the texts, *De institutione viri boni,* is written solely in Latin, while the others are in Latin but have a translation into Greek above each line. The Latin, which is written in a humanist hand, is very neat and professional. I have earlier suggested that the hand might be Janus Lascaris’ (at a conference in Hamburg, 1999), but fear that this question has to be left in suspense. The Greek text is—judging from orthography and the flow the

---

61 Incidentally, the incipits of *Ps. 38* and *Ps. 6* are identical.

62 The arithmetic note is discussed in connection with U16, below.
Greek text—written by an indigenous Greek speaker, not by someone just starting to learn a new language. This contradicts Nigel Wilson’s supposition that the Greek text could have been written by a young Pietro Bembo (1470–1547).63 After a meticulous comparison of letter forms, ligatures, and other characteristics, my conclusion is that also in these quires the Greek is in Theodoros’ hand. The script looks more relaxed, almost heedless; without doubt this was written for personal use. Since the translation was supposed to accompany the Latin words closely, the Greek text became intermittently stretched out and compressed and is not always easily deciphered. Even if the identification of the scribes is not unequivocal, there is another detail which does point to Theodoros as designer of U15: the measurements of the writing area coincide with the justification that Theodoros uses for most of his other units in Gr 8.

On account of the appearance of the Greek text, this unit does not seem to be a professional copy. To use the Psalter and other well-known texts, like prayers, was the common way to learn languages, utilized all over Europe during the Middle Ages. But would Theodoros, obviously a well-educated man, really have needed such help with his Latin? It seems unlikely, I think, though it may, of course, have been prepared for somebody close to him or for a pupil. Another possible function of the unit may have been as a model for the practice of writing Latin. The humanist style of writing was still novel at this time, so even a professional scribe like Theodoros may have needed to learn it from another expert. The letter headings (Text 81) are the kind of thing that would be helpful for an immigrant just starting out in Italy, someone who needed to find his way among patrons and authorities. It is intriguing to imagine that this could apply to Theodoros himself, leaving Kyzikos or Constantinople for the West, but there is no real evidence to associate the use of the text with him personally. For now we can only speculate around these matters.64

The quire boundary at Q42–43

There is a blank space at the end of not only Q43 but also of Q42, i.e. in the middle of U15. The blank space following upon the purely Latin text on f. 315v was later used for the anonymous Text 78 about “water and earth,” added in Greek by the same person who used f. 87 and the margin of f. 283v for extra texts (U2 and U12). As criteria F and G this should make us aware of a possible boundary here. Also criterion A, coinciding text and quire boundaries, is applicable in this place. But this is not enough, the contents and appearance of the two bilingual quires link them closely together. The

---

63 That Bembo could have been the scribe was suggested by Nigel Wilson on his visit to Uppsala University Library in 1998.
64 See also the discussion of Text 81 in Chapter 5.
writing area of Q43 is admittedly slightly larger, but it still has $9 + 9$ lines to the page, and the conclusion must be that the boundary at f. 315 is a subordinate one inside the unit.

In the photo, below, we see first the hand of the Latin co-scribe (latter half of Ausonius’ poem), then the secondary layer (the micro-text “ἡδόνος μὲν γέν”), and last a third layer, someone trying to copy both the last line of the Latin and the initial words of the micro-text).
Codicological unit 16 (U16), ff. 324–331

**Quires:** Q44: [324–331] quaternion.

**Paper:** Fragment of a watermark on ff. 324 and 331, probably the cord and tassel from a hat.

**Justification:** 96 x 60–63 mm, ca. 20 lines per page.

**Scribe:** Theodoros. Black ink except for secondary initials in greyish brown.

**Texts:** Nos. 84–87. Mathematics in two sections with blank pages in-between. Notes and pen trials added in blank spaces. On f. 326v in upper margin a date: the trimming of the leaf makes the interpretation ambiguous, but presumably it reads ἀφεξῆς τουλάου θ’ (July 9 1566).

**Decoration:** No titles. The initials, 1–2 lines in height, are secondary.

**Condition:** This unit is incomplete: on first recto, f. 324r, we get thrown right into the middle of a mathematical problem. Also at the end of the unit the mathematical problem lacks its solution, despite the fact that there is blank space left unused. Water damage mostly in upper and inner margins; some wax stains. Outer pages moderately soiled.

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit:** B – quire(s) missing at beginning of unit; J – different paper/watermark; L – different mise-en-page; O – change in contents.65

**Demarcation traits in relation to ensuing unit:** A – text ends at last recto, but is incomplete; F – space left open after last text; G – scribbles added on last verso.

Minor additions of various kinds

Despite the trimming, there are some traces left on f. 327r of a prayer formula in Theodoros’ hand: + ἰ(ηςο)υ μου βοηθο... ...υ. This does put a question mark on one of the criteria for assessing codicological units, as we have them in the list on p. 61. U16, however, is not very regular with its blank pages in the middle and the texts split up into different parts. Perhaps it was copied in different phases or from an incomplete model. Therefore, I tentatively keep prayer formulae as a criterion of unit breaks.

On f. 328r there are some pen trials which closely resemble the ones on f. 87v (U2): δόκειμαν τοῦ κονδήλιον μοῦ καὶ τοῦ μελάνιον μου· τέλος καὶ το θεόδο δοξα. Right below someone awkwardly tried to copy the same phrase (δόκειμαν τοῦ κονδῆ). These inelegant blots of ink are, however, an important clue in establishing the sequence of owners. The latter hand is presumably Kaloiannis’, the protopapas who put his owner’s mark on f. 307v. The

---

65 The change in contents relates to the main texts of the previous unit. There is in fact a small mathematical excerpt on the last verso of U15, but that issue is dealt with separately (see next page).
sequence of these pen trials proves that the book came into his hands after and not before 1546.

Further traces of the “documentary” hand follow on 328v. This passage, too, was copied below by yet another reader:

+ ζώον κουτάλα ἠλκησθεν επὶ τοῦ δένδρου σήχυ(ας) φωνάς λέγκουσα πρὸς τὸν αρχήμαντρητη(ην)· ἂν θες πάτερ κάτελθε επὶ τοῦ δένδρου ἵνα καγὼ τάπην πρόσκινίσω σου το μέγα σου κουκουλ(ιν).

A ladle (glutton) pulled an animal up the tree incessantly saying to the archimandrite: if you want, father, come down from the tree, so that humbly I may honor your big cowl.

We see the same contrast between the trained hand and the more halting one on f. 329r, where the following saying is written twice:

+ φρόνιμον φύλον ὡς χρίσσον κόλπον βάλε· τὸν δ’αυ γε μωρῶν ὡς κακῶν δρήν τε ευεγεν·–

+ φρονημον φηλον ως χρησσον κολπον βαλε· τον δαυγε μερον ως κακον οφι

Greet a prudent friend as a pocket full of gold; as for the stupid one, flee him as were he an evil serpent.

A note on the orthography of the second entry: it is obvious that whoever wrote this did it on the basis of the pronunciation instead of giving heed to the exact letters in the model. The second and less able scribe has thus switched eta/iota and omicron/omega as he pleased. Apparently he also had some trouble deciphering ligatures (like the superscript omega in μωρόν).

The mathematical note at the end of the preceding unit

An arithmetic problem, or at least the first few lines of it, was added by a reader on f. 323v, i.e. on the last verso of U15:

εἰς Ἀν ἀν δcontents/length:933}

As we have seen above, it is common to find lines from the original texts (or from later entries) copied once more, whether it was done as an exercise in writing or just to try out the pen and ink. This does not seem to be the case with the example of the three mills, above, because that problem is not part of the mathematical texts which follow (Texts 84 and 86). But here it may be illuminating to turn to the other manuscript in Theodoros’ hand, Parisinus 66 I am grateful to Dr. John Burke for improving my understanding of this micro-text.
gr. 3045, which also contains a text on arithmetic. On ff. 173¹–192¹ there is a
text of precisely the same character as Texts 84 and 86 in Gr 8, in fact, sev-
eral examples are identical (or just slightly varied in wording). Among the
mathematical problems in the Paris manuscript one also finds the one pre-
sented here above as an extra, as something a reader may have added.⁶⁷ If
Theodoros included this problem in another codex, it is not farfetched to
imagine that it may have been included in the mathematical text of Gr 8 too,
namely, in the quire which apparently is missing at the outset of U16. Once
again, we find how important it is to observe the micro-texts and the later
insertions in a manuscript, and not only the larger texts.

Codicological unit 17 (U17), ff. 332–336

**Quires:** Q45: [332–336] ternion from which the last leaf has been cut out.

**Paper:** Same paper as in the main part of U2, also present in U8–9, U11–
12, U14–15. The fragment of a watermark present on f. 332 looks like two
thongs of a star.

**Justification:** 108 x 67 mm, 42–49 lines per page.

**Scribe:** Theodoros has here crammed an extreme mass of text into each
page.

**Texts:** No. 88a–b, *Life of Aesop* and 58 fables by Aesop. Text incomplete
at end.

**Decoration:** One large and ornamented initial, 5 lines in height. Small but
elegant initials at the beginning of each fable. All initials are black with tiny
dots of gold attached.

**Condition:** Severely damaged by singeing and water. A couple of holes
burnt also in text area, mainly on last leaf. The text breaks off in the middle
of a sentence on f. 336².

**Demarcation traits in relation to previous unit:** A – new text beginning
on first recto; B – different condition altogether due to burn; C – different
quire construction; J – different paper/watermark; L – different mise-en-
page; M – different style of decoration; O – change in contents and genre.

Aesopian leftovers

Besides being incomplete, due to quire damage and burn, the text transmitted
in this unit is a bit odd. On the first twelve lines of f. 332⁴ we have the very
brief version of Aesop’s life called “Vita III” (ed. Eberhard). Then comes the
first part of fable No. 1. This is interrupted on line 22 by a part of *Vita W* (ed.
Westermann). Then, on line 13 of f. 332⁵, we retrieve the second half of

⁶⁷ In Par. gr. 3045 the problem begins on f. 173⁵, mid-page.
fable No. 1, and the rest of the fables follow in sequence. Possibly Theodoros realized that he had made a mistake with the introduction, rewrote it, and kept the mackle paper himself (=U17). This would explain the gilt initials, something which would otherwise hardly be found in a personal copy. In that case, the singeing may be unrelated: it could have happened much later, for example in connection with the fire at the library of El Escorial. But there is, of course, also the alternative explanation: that the quire or booklet which he had prepared got accidentally burnt and he managed to save only a few pages.
The composite with all its units

One codex, seventeen units, around ninety “texts,” i.e., catalog items (if we count each letter, each poem and excerpts from separate books, we would end up with a much larger number of texts, more than two hundred altogether. If the sum of all these texts belongs to the complicating factors in assessing the composite book, there is still one counterweight present: one (1) main scribe, Theodoros. Gr 8 is not a mere recueil factice, it has a creator who is sensible to his task. In this chapter I have drawn attention to a number of specific instances where the conscious work of this scribe has made an impact. He is very professional in the planning and execution of his work, he fits the texts into the quires with meticulous organization of the amount of text put into each page. He has apparently rubricated and decorated some of the units himself, but in most units the last finish is wanting. The fact that the book was left in this state, lacking headings and red initials, indicates that it never made it as a commercial product, or that it was not even intended as such.

Moreover, I have suggested that mindful planning is to be detected in the mise-en-recueil. In many cases Theodoros has made sure to gather texts of similar character into the same unit, and even taken heed to adjust the page fillers to the preceding subject matter. I will come back to this aspect of textual contents in the next chapter.

There are also connections between units. One factor is the writing material: in eight of the seventeen units (or in 22 quires out of 45) we find the paper carrying the oxhead watermark. These units are thus presumably also connected when it comes to the time of production. That they are scattered throughout the codex instead of having been set together as a group, may suggest that Theodoros sorted the booklets according to contents. At least it was not a question of just unthinkingly piling the texts on to each other until he had enough booklets to bind together.

The importance of structural analysis

There is more to say about the whole composite and the relation of all the units within, but I will pick that thread up at the end of the next chapter. Here I would like to return to the subject of provenance and Rudberg’s suggestion that Gr 8 may have originated from Constantinople (cf. p. 24). He put this forward after having investigated the manuscript tradition of the letters by Basil the Great. In the stemmatic grouping of manuscripts, he established a close connection between Gr 8 and Parisinus graecus 2991A (from 1419). Rudberg also referred to Richard Foerster, who had made the

68 He states that Par. gr. 2991A and Gr 8 “sont en relation particulièrement étroite. [...] Pour l’essentiel les contenus de ces deux mss s’accordaient, et une collation ultérieure a confirmé plainement la relation qui les unit.” (RUDBERG 1953, 173).
same observation regarding Libanios’ letters.\textsuperscript{69} Since the \textit{Parisinus 2991A} was known to have been made in Constantinople, he assumed that this would be the case also for \textit{Gr 8}.\textsuperscript{70} However, I have checked on the texts which these two manuscripts have in common, and several convey a different picture than do the passages from Basil and Libanios. The texts that would allegedly be identical in both manuscripts are the following (I have divided them into pros and cons in relation to Rudberg’s theory):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Text 43 Simokates’ letters: the two MSS belong to the same group (“familia a” in Zanetto’s edition; my collation of \textit{Gr 8}). \textit{Par. gr. 2991A} (\textit{P}) holds 80 of 81 letters, \textit{Gr 8} only 20.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 45 List of patriarchs/kings: a longer narrative in \textit{P} in certain passages (on Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the Persians, the Romans), but otherwise rather similar. Whereas \textit{Gr 8} ends with Konstas, \textit{P} goes on to Michael Komnenos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texts Letters by Basil and Libanios: \textit{P} and \textit{Gr 8} belong to the same group of MSS according to Rudberg and Foerster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 71 Both MSS contain the same two excerpts from Josephus’ \textit{The Jewish War} (\textit{P} has further Josephus excerpts).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Text 44 The Decalogue: included in both MSS, but would a professional scribe really need a model for it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 72 A large lacuna in \textit{P}, amounting to 34 lines in \textit{Gr 8}, shows that \textit{P} could not have been the model for \textit{Gr 8} for Nikephoros Gregoras’ letter unless a leaf from \textit{P} was lost at a later stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Text 3 The selection of Aesopian fables is completely different.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 5 Engelbert Drerup’s collation does not indicate a notably close relation between \textit{Gr 8} and \textit{P}.\textsuperscript{71}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 34 On the eight capital sins, but not at all the same text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 59 Seven Sages, but not the same persons, different order and partly different wording (\textit{P}: Kleoboulos, Pittakos, Solon, Bias, Thales, Menander; \textit{Gr 8}: Bias, Thales, Kleoboulos, Pittakos,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{69} Foerster writes about \textit{Gr 8} that \textit{tantopere conspirat, ut si non ex eo descriptus, certo ex eodem exemplari repetendus sit} (see Rudberg, loc. cit.).

\textsuperscript{70} Jean Darrouzès holds another view on the origin of \textit{Par. gr. 2991A}, suggesting that it came from the Peloponnese and ended up in a monastery in Chalkidiki, the St. Anastasia Pharnakolytria (Darrouzès 1954, 54; for this monastery see Glabinas 1983; for the homonymous monastery in Constantinople, see Janin 1969, 26).

\textsuperscript{71} Cf. DRERUP 1906, lx-lxii. The recent Isocrates edition by Basil Mandilaras (2003) contributes no further information on these two manuscripts.
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The conclusion drawn from this sketch must be that there are definite similarities between the two books, but not to the extent that Rudberg suggested. The crucial point is that the match exists for merely two codicological units in *Gr 8*: U9 and U13. On the other hand, these manifest correspondences shed light on the two “uncertain” texts in the presentation above: the Decalogue, Text 44, probably was part of the parcel which ended up in U9, and in the case of Text 72 (in U13), one may assume that the Paris manuscript later lost one leaf. Thus a reasonable modification of Rudberg’s hypothesis is that Theodoros came across *Par. gr. 2991A* (alternatively a shared model or an intermediate copy), perhaps on the Peloponnes but there is no proof of that. Constantinople seems a less probable alternative, considering the political situation after 1453. It also means that the two manuscripts have only a minor share of texts in common: nine texts or ca. 40 folia in *Gr 8*. This is not much if we look at the respective size of the codices (336 ff. in *Gr 8*; 495 ff. in *Par. gr. 2991A*). A lesson to learn from this comparison is that one should not underestimate the importance of a thorough structural analysis. In combination with the philological scrutiny of textual relationships this can provide us with more accurate results when it comes to the linking of manuscripts.

The final design

The paper in U13 is of a kind that does not reveal any relation to other units in *Gr 8*, and it is not datable on the basis of watermarks. In U9, however, Theodoros starts out with one kind of paper (probably the same as we have in U7, watermark anchor) and continues with the paper carrying oxhead watermarks. Since Text 43, Simokates’ letters, runs into that quire as well, we may now deduce that the production time for U9 (and thus also U13) should be set around the same period as U2, U8, U10–12, and U14–15 were made. U3–6 stand apart in paper and in decoration. U16 and U17 are

---

72 For U13 the match is exceptionally fine, since the texts appear together and in the same order also in *Par. gr. 2991A*. This is not the case with the *Parisinus* texts corresponding to Texts 43–45. If these texts were indeed copied from *Par. gr. 2991A*, then Theodoros must have picked them out here and there in the model manuscript. In that case he was also the one who made the active choice to heavily abridge the list of kings and select only a fourth of the Simokates letters.

73 Since I have only consulted *Par. gr. 2991A* in a microfilm copy, I cannot confirm what the quires look like.

74 This assumption is based upon a direct copying of *Gr 8* from *Par. gr. 2991A*. Further copies in-between would obscure the conjecture.
also loners, having little in common with the other units. Thus one may schematically reconstruct *Gr 8* to consist of the following distinctive parts:

1. Unit providing the table of contents; later addition (U1).
2. Units presumably created some time around 1481; headings and decorations added only occasionally (U2, U7–15).
3. Units perfected to an extent which may point to vending intentions; not dated (U3–6).
4. Unit in a very preliminary state; blank pages in the middle of the text suggest that the scribe may have wished to add more examples to the mathematical text; no date (U16).
5. Unit which was definitely prepared for a client, if we are to judge from the gilt decorations on initials; probably a quire discarded due to faulty copying or damage; no date (U17).

One may now speculate around the reasons for the present sequence of units. In my opinion, the following factors ought to be considered (I now leave U1 aside): U2 at the outset because it is the longest text; U3–6 follow because of their degree of finish and elegance and perhaps due to similar contents in U2 and U3; U7 as a sequel due to similarity with U6 in contents; U8 probably misplaced after switching places with U9; U9 was, I believe, written in sequence with U7. The sequence from the last quire of U9 with U8 and U10–15 to follow may have been the actual production sequence, but of course a swap here and there would not make much difference, the contents being of a similar kind. U13 stands out (different paper, different *mise-en-page*) but, as we saw above, it was probably produced during the same working period. In a way, U15 is even more distinct with its bilingual design and Theodoros’ more casual handwriting. U16 and U17, finally, are the least presentable units, the one unfinished, the other in a pitiful state. Even so, the texts were obviously worth keeping. The hierarchy is clear though: Theodoros put the longer texts and the more elaborate units first and the more personal and unassuming units at the end of the codex.
MAKING SENSE OF A ONE-VOLUME LIBRARY
How to assort and categorize (and to what end)

What was split up unit by unit in the previous chapter we will now put together again, as we look at the contents of the whole volume and examine what we may learn from the total combination of texts in Gr 8. The aim is to trace whether there is an underlying pattern, a master plan behind the whole volume or if it is more accurate to presuppose the co-existence of several ambitions in the material. To facilitate the investigation, our first concern is to assort the texts according to principles which allow a better overview. When trying to assess the contents of a miscellany, the longer and often well-known texts are usually less of a problem. It is the small, unassuming excerpts and micro-texts which complicate matters. This is why I have decided to account for all texts irrespective of their size. This gives us an opportunity to find connections between textual themes both inside the units and when the texts stand further apart in the codex. At the end of the chapter I will take the discussion back to the codicological units and to the design of the whole book. I will also evaluate the scribe Theodoros’ creative contribution in planning the entirety of the book.

Categorizations are never uncomplicated, since a text may be perceived and used in many different ways by different readers at different times: one may feel that the arrangement of texts into genre, theme, or use, narrows the field of possible interpretations. On the other hand, the process of comparison and interpretation of different aspects is an opportunity for us to reconsider old truths and suppositions about Byzantine texts. In the larger handbooks of Byzantine literature, the genres have usually been at the forefront as sorting criterium; literary (or not so literary) works were put into secular and theological compartments, and the works in high style were separated from the so-called Volksliteratur.1 Alexander Kazhdan chose another approach in his literary history, focusing on authorship instead of genre.2 This is a wholesome complement to the genre-based taxonomy, since a single author may well have been prolific in several genres and more than one level of style and language. It is nonetheless important that we also respect

---

1 So Krumbacher, Hunger, and Beck, among others. Important contributions to the discussion of genres, authorship, and other aspects of vital interest in the quest for a new history of Byzantine literature, are collected in ODORICO & AGAPITOS 2002.
2 KAZHDAN 1999.
anonymous and fluid texts no less than the ones authored by famous personages.

The reception and use of the texts is another aspect that is often neglected in the compartmentalization according to genres and styles. Just as the concept of a genre changes with every addition of new text, the reception of the texts is never static. With Byzantine books it is sometimes of lesser concern whether a work was originally written in antiquity, in Early-, Middle-, or Late Byzantine times: the fact that these texts are now bound in the same volume regardless of origin makes them “new” in a way, since the context is more or less unique for each codex. It may therefore help to be a bit squint-eyed when studying Byzantine books, keeping one eye on the original setting of the texts and one at the receiving end, the present context. This provides us with means to pursue literary analysis in combination with an assessment of social and cultural aspects of the Byzantine books which transmit the texts.

Categories of texts in Gr 8

A substantial number of textual types or genres are represented in Gr 8, depending on how you subdivide and sort them, and it is a challenge to try to find an optimal way of introducing them to the reader. To determine the predominance of any group over another, one would have to take into account both quantity (number of folios, number of texts) and distribution (occurrence in several units). In order to prevent confusion, splitting the reader’s vision unduly by too many small categories, I have decided to bring in all the texts under four—to my mind—fundamental headings: narrative texts, rhetorical texts, philosophical-theological texts, and practical texts. Even though this still implies certain overlappings and borderline cases, it has the advantage of elucidating how the texts may have been used and appreciated by the readers (including, of course, the scribe Theodoros himself). Keeping in mind that the function of texts necessarily varies from person to person and from time to time, I admit that my arrangement is tentative. This is why I ask the reader of my book to bear in mind that the arrangement of the texts here is momentary, determined by the needs at hand, and is open to rearrangement by anyone who would like to consider these texts from a different perspective.

The categories are not uniform in scope: there is an asymmetry in the use of the traditional notion of genre as opposed to subject matter, structure, mode, and use.³ The category of “narrative texts” is not commensurable to the category of “rhetorical texts.” In the first case we are dealing with a mode of expression which is present in many different genres; while the

³ On concepts of genre, see for example Fowler 1982, 37–53.
second category is based on a supposition of why or in what setting the texts were produced, and, admittedly, some of these texts incorporate the narrative mode as well. The third category, the philosophical and theological texts, is obviously fashioned from the perspective of subject matter, and the fourth is based on the practical character of much of its contents and/or form. This co-positioning of different motives may seem unjudicious. But however we do this, there will still be oversimplifications to consider. The aim of this procedure is to let the groups of texts illuminate each other, and, at best, to arrive at a synthetical view at the end of the chapter, when we consider issues like the *raison(s) d’être* for the book.

I will keep the focus rather strictly on *Gr 8* and only occasionally discuss other manuscripts, either to illustrate the overall transmission of a certain text or to compare the situation in *Gr 8* with manuscripts that may or may not be related to ours. Unless I have reason to call attention to a divergence in readings, attribution, and so forth, I will not mention any data on specific editions of the texts. Following the subtitles I indicate which *Gr 8* texts are treated in each section. If the number is given within parenthesis, this means that the text is mentioned there but treated more thoroughly in another section.

**Narrative texts**

*Narrative texts* should here be understood not as a genre, but rather as a mode of representation: the desire to “tell a story,” to convey things which have happened (more rarely, which *will* happen), either in real life or in a person’s imagination. This mode of describing and retelling events can permeate a work more or less completely. The narrative mode decides the form altogether in cases when the presentation of the story, or sequence of connected events, is the intended end result. The alternative situation, when the author uses narrative devices in a text which has as its main purpose something else above and beyond the (mere) story-telling, is likely to be even more frequent—at least that seems to be the case in *Gr 8*. The clean-cut works of story-telling are more easily counted, whereas the number of narratives inside other kinds of texts is considerable.

---

4 For information on editions of the texts, see Appendix 2.

5 Emmanuel Bourbouhakis and Ingela Nilsson define narrative as “*the linguistic representation of an event or a series of events occurring in the past, regardless of whether that past be real or fictional*” (BOURBOUHAKIS & NILSSON, forthcoming). I am grateful to the authors for giving me the opportunity to read their contribution in advance. One may add that the linguistic or literary representation is but one possibility: narratives are also present in Byzantine art, for example in *vita* icons describing a saint’s life in pictures. A study of the narrative in *vita* icons depicting St. Nicholas of Myra is under preparation by Irina Brändén (Uppsala University). On the concept, see also ŠEVČENKO 1999, 150f.
The decidedly narrative genres which we meet with in Byzantine literature are historiography and hagiography, both of which were held in high esteem throughout most Byzantine centuries, and the novel, the interest of which peaked in Komnenian times but also had later advocates in the Palaiologan romances. Smaller formats with story-telling as the major ingredient are, for example, fables, poems, and gnomical forms like *chreiai* and *apophthegmata*.\(^6\) Sometimes these and other miniature narratives are referred to as *progymnasmata*, “fore-exercises” from which one learned how to write, or tell, a story. From their basic role as preparatory exercises in rhetorical education, they eventually became promoted as literary pieces in themselves. We also encounter them as building blocks in larger narratives. In Iskra Gencheva-Mikami’s study of the *Notitia Dignitatum* it is even suggested that lists be included among “narrative” forms.\(^7\) This raises the question of how short a narrative can be and still be recognized as such. Is it up to the reader to decide what is a narrative and what is not? One may at least assume that the shorter the narrative segment, the more important the reader’s previous knowledge becomes; he or she must be able to “fill in” the author’s “blanks.”\(^8\)

In addition to the more autonomous narrative genres mentioned above, we often come across stories inserted into other kinds of texts: narrative as a device in rhetoric, in homiletics, in letters, and in treatises of various kinds, even in arithmetic. Stories provide good reading material, they stir the readers’ imagination and help their memory. No wonder they have been used for teaching as well as for preaching, for persuasion and for sheer entertainment.\(^9\) When we approach Byzantine texts as strangers—most often reading them in a language we have toiled to learn as adults and with half a millennium or more in-between their conception and our comprehension—it is all too easy to forget the joy of reading, the appreciation Byzantine readers must

---

\(^6\) Both *chreiai* and *apophthegmata* may be considered anecdotes or maxims. The difference between them is slight, but the former can be taken to include more of a person’s doings and the latter a person’s sayings. On these terms, see Searby 2007, I, 3–5.

\(^7\) These thoughts were presented by Gencheva-Mikami in a paper held at the 14th Conference of the Australian Association for Byzantine Studies [Byzantine Narrative]. For the abstract, see http://home.vicnet.net.au/~byzaus/conferences/14th2004/abstracts.html. The *Notitia Dignitatum* is the administrative listing of all major offices in the (Western as well as Eastern) Roman Empire. In *Gr 8* there are several lists which might be said to carry an inherent narrative: the list of the seven wonders (Text 22), lists of Israelitic, Chaldean, Persian and Assyrian kings (Text 45), lists of patriarchates and metropolises (Text 62); inventors (Text 63); Palaiologan emperors and Ottoman sultans (Text 65). Some of these texts are also discussed below, in the section on practical texts.

\(^8\) Hayden White discusses how the smallest entry in a chronicle (as for example: “Emperor X died and his son Y succeeded to the rule”) contains in embryo the elements of a narrative. The entry serves as a “narreme” since it produces a connection between two events, in fact it is a narrative in itself (White 1987, 14).

\(^9\) On the uses of narrative in different genres of Byzantine literature, see further the articles by Margaret Mullett, Roger Scott, and Ingela Nilsson in Burke 2006.
have had of not only linguistic form and rhetorical elegance but also of humor, irony, exciting subject matter, intriguing development, intertextual play, et cetera. This is also the reason why I put narrative texts as the first subgroup in Gr 8: I use the (by necessity) circumstantial and contingent factor of arranging texts into groups and genres to highlight the fact that many of the texts in the manuscript incorporate appealing stories, even if they superficially may seem to be very different in genre and kind.

Stephanites and Ichnelates

Text 3

The first text in Gr 8 to qualify in the group of narrative texts is *Stephanites and Ichnelates* (Text 3), which also happens to be the longest text in the whole book. The fact that it furthermore stands at the very beginning of the book (only the pinakes from El Escorial precede it), gives this text a distinctive weight in the process of assessing what kind of book Gr 8 is, or could have been appreciated as, at the time of its formation. A codex which was made up of several texts would in medieval times often be recognized and labeled by its first major item. Likewise, our codex has the marking “INΔΙΚΑ” on its fore edge, a label which can only refer to the *Stephanites and Ichnelates* and is inappropriate for the rest of the texts. Although this narrative work constitutes a separate codicological unit within the codex, it should be seen as a vital part of the whole book instead of merely a later addition to the composite; as we saw in the preceding chapter, the writing material connects it to several of the other codicological units (the same kind of paper, with the “oxhead” watermark, is present there as well). It remains to be shown how this fits in with the rest of the contents.

*Stephanites and Ichnelates* is not a Byzantine work in origin, but it became one of the more popular narrative works in its Greek translation, just as it became a success in many other translations and adaptations throughout the Middle Ages and up until modern times. All the good stories within the work must have played a major part in this winning recipe. The history of the work starts with a core of Indian tales from the *Pançatantra*, itself a famous piece of wisdom literature which proffers fable stories with the aim of teaching *niti*, i.e., policy, social order, and prudence to prospective rulers. In the sixth century, Burzōy, who was a physician at the Sasanid court of Khosrow I, put together the work *Karīrag ud Damanag*, drawing on the *Pançatantra* but also adding Persian components. The various fables, which in the Sanskrit versions were relatively autonomous, often combined in a Chinese box technique, were now knit more closely together through a new, seemingly autobiographical, frame story about Burzōy’s life and religious

---

10 The Sanskrit original, now lost, was written sometime between the 1st c. BCE and the 5th c. CE.
development and about his voyage to India. This Pahlavī (Middle Persian) work has not survived, but can be reasonably well reconstructed on the basis of the Old Syriac and Arabic translations.\textsuperscript{11}

Most of the later translations, including the Greek ones, were directly or indirectly made from the Arabic version, the \textit{Kalīlah wa-Dīmnah}. The Arabic editor Ibn al-Muqaffā‘ (ca. 720–ca. 756) chose to include yet another frame story or prologue and four more chapters of fables, two of Indian and two of unknown origin. In that form, with three prolegomena and fifteen chapters of fable stories (where the cast ranges from animals to wise men and travelers), the \textit{Kalīlah wa-Dīmnah} reached the Byzantine readers. The Greek title is a kind of folk etymological translation, by which the two jackals and leading characters Kalīlah and Dīmnah got Greek-sounding names.

The Byzantine transmission of \textit{Kalīlah wa-Dīmnah} is not altogether straightforward. According to Johannes Niehoff-Panagiotidis, the Arabic text was translated into Byzantine Greek on four occasions.\textsuperscript{12} The earliest translation is the least known, since we only have a few folia left of it in a manuscript which used to belong to the Basilian monastery in Grottaferrata. This manuscript, \textit{New York Pierpont Morgan M. 397}, also contains a version of the Aesop Romance, a collection of Aesopian fables, the fables of Babrios and the \textit{Physiologos}.\textsuperscript{13} The next effort of translation was made by Symeon Seth, a physician from Antioch, who dedicated his work to the emperor Alexios I Komnenos, a circumstance that would date the work to around 1085.\textsuperscript{14} It was Symeon Seth who minted the Greek title \textit{Stephanites and Ichnelates}. He wrote in a very polished Byzantine koine with the Komnenian court as his primary audience, and he also endeavored to make his version comply with the genre expectations of ancient Greek fable epics: he transposed oriental-sounding names and titles into Greek, adapted the storytelling to the Aesopian tradition and incorporated citations and reminiscences from classical Greek authors, from the Bible, from patristic and Byzantine literature.

Though obviously well-suited as a prince’s mirror, \textit{Stephanites and Ichnelates} won an audience outside of court circles as well, and was soon revised into a little less sophisticated koine. Two translators, working independently

\textsuperscript{11} For the early stages of the work, see DE BLOIS 1990, 1–11.
\textsuperscript{12} For an overview of the Greek translations and their relationship to each other, see NIEHOFF-PANAGIOTIDIS 2003, 34–47.
\textsuperscript{13} As for the time of translation, the only safe assumption is that a certain period of time must have passed between the time of the original translation and the time when the Pierpont Morgan manuscript was copied. Elinor Husselman dates the manuscript to between 980 and 1050, and adds that “[i]t should be noted that the Greek contains several mistakes which cannot well have been in the original. Therefore the Morgan manuscript cannot be the first copy of the translation from the Arabic” (HUSSELMAN 1939, 6–7 and 14).
\textsuperscript{14} The dedication is transmitted in the oldest manuscript, \textit{Codex Laurentianus XI 14} (12\textsuperscript{th} c.). The different recensions and subrecensions of the manuscript transmission have been touched upon above, p. 75.
of each other, added translations of other parts of the Arabic text, parts which Symeon Seth had chosen to abridge or exclude. One of these translations can be traced back to Eugenios of Palermo, if not as translator so at least as curator for the work, in the late twelfth century; the other translation was probably produced in the East, since in its least contaminated form it has survived in a Church Slavonic translation.\textsuperscript{15} What happened later was that these two versions were combined so as to form a full translation of the Arabic original, and a closer one at that, since the ambition of Symeon Seth to “Hellenize” the work was by now absent. This is the kind of full-fledged story assemblage we meet with in \textit{Gr 8}.

\textit{Stephanites and Ichnelates} has been labeled “popular literature” (Volksliteratur) in the handbooks on Byzantine literature.\textsuperscript{16} In a more recent handbook, however, Jan Olof Rosenqvist presents a more cautious view: he stresses that the language form and style do not justify categorizing the work as popular.\textsuperscript{17} To characterize it as popular literature is certainly problematic, considering the fact that the story was translated and adapted at court, dedicated to the emperor, and was spread and read mainly in the educated stratum of Byzantine society. It is only in the light of later developments that the estimation is comprehensible: the fact that these fables got an afterlife in so many languages and revisions and eventually ended up in many a reading primer in schools, might have colored our perception of the earlier phases of reception as well. According to Hélène Condylis-Bassoukos’ investigation of the manuscript tradition, the \textit{Stephanites and Ichnelates} is often found in close connection with other fable collections, with moralizing and philosophical works, with medical works, and with bestiaries. The conclusion she draws is that the work “se trouve lié tour à tour à des familles de textes différents; il peut donc être considéré de différentes manières.”\textsuperscript{18} Even though it is hard to fathom why “bestiaries” are mentioned separately—as moralizing fable literature it ought to be well covered by the preceding categories—her conclusion can nevertheless be seen to correspond with the project of making sense of \textit{Gr 8} as a book.

\textsuperscript{15} On the recensions Bō (the “Eastern” translation) and Br (the \textit{recensio Eugeniana}), see \textsc{Niehoff-Panagiotidis} 2003, 39–45. In addition to the Church Slavonic translation, the Byzantine \textit{Stephanites and Ichnelates} stood model to one Italian and one Latin version and also to paraphrases into modern Greek. Theodosios Zygomalas, who was the protonotary of the patriarchate in Constantinople, produced one of these, in 1584. Another one, from 1721, was written by the physician Demetrios Prokopios at the request of the Phanariote prince (hospodar) of Walachia, Johannes Nikolaos Alexandros Mavrokordatos (\textsc{Sjöberg} 1962, 133).

\textsuperscript{16} \textsc{Beck} 1971, 41–45; \textsc{Mazal} 1989, 144f.

\textsuperscript{17} \textsc{Rosenqvist} 2007, 110f. Rosenqvist’s reference is to Symeon Seth’s version, admittedly the most polished one; other versions followed, and especially with the sixteenth-century paraphrases into Modern Greek the \textit{Hochsprachlichkeit} of the work was no longer an issue.

\textsuperscript{18} \textsc{Condylis-Bassoukos} 1997, xxvii.
Further fable stories and fictitious biographies
Texts 7, (8–9), (43), 88

Let us proceed to look at some of the other texts which have something in common with the *Stephanites and Ichnelates*. In its present state, *Gr 8* displays another set of fable stories at its very end: the *Life of Aesop* together with a collection of Aesopian fables (Text 88). This would, from the point of view of its contents, seem to give the book a very neat closure. The original order of the texts in *Gr 8* could have been different, though: the earliest reference to the manuscript in an inventory indicates that the Aesop fables were placed after the “Epistolae Basilii e aliorum” (Texts 67–72), but *before* the lists of patriarchates and metropoles (Text 62 in *Gr 8*).¹⁹

The *Life of Aesop* has been described as a fictional biography with elements of the comic-realistic novel, something which would put the work in the same category as, for example, the *Alexander Romance* and the *Life of Apollonios from Tyana*.²⁰ Composed sometime in the late Hellenistic or early Imperial period,²¹ the work mingles oriental influences from *The Story of Ahiqar* with ancient Greek legends about “the anti-hero and trickster Aesop, the prototype of the Cynic sage.”²² In *Gr 8*, The *Life of Aesop* is presented in a very abbreviated version; perhaps one should rather see it as an *hypothesis*, since it amounts to less than 150 words.²³ If the short version sufficed, one may assume that the readers were already acquainted with the story and thus able to recall the more substantial narrative from a few data, or rather argue that the fables were, after all, the most important part of the narrative, mak-

---

¹⁹ See *Beer* 1903, xcii (N° 160 c 1). The inventory description is far from complete in its account of the items in *Gr 8*. Therefore it is not unambiguously clear whether one should rely on it or rather assume that the note on the patriarchates and metropoles was put in last, as an extra piece of information, regardless of its place in the book. There seems to be yet another alteration of the sequence of texts compared to today’s: in the inventory Text 24 (Plethon’s *Reply to George Scholarios’ defense of Aristotle*) is introduced after Text 25 and 26 (the letters from Bessarion and Nicolas Sagundino), but this sequence, 25–26–24, is physically impossible, since the three items are written in a sequence inside one and the same quire. If, nevertheless, we should take the inventory at face value regarding the placement of Text 88 (Aesop), the reason for moving it was most likely due to its condition. Being a small, even incomplete unit (about half a quire), and badly damaged by singeing at that, it certainly stands out from the rest of the book. The page layout, jammed with minute script, also makes its appearance less compatible with the other units, something which could have contributed to the placement of it at the end of the book.

²⁰ See Grammatiki Karla’s summary of the recent genre discussion around the *Life of Aesop* (KARLA 2001, 1–3).

²¹ The date of composition is still unclear; cf. KARLA 2001, 8, with further references.

²² *West* 2003, 428.

²³ This is the text that Albert Eberhard presented as “*Vita III*” (EBERHARD 1872, 309ff.). Ben Perry calls it a “short preface,” and states that its origin comes from the lost archetype (λ) of manuscripts LFV (*Leiden Vulc. 93, 15th c.; Flor. Laur. LVII, 30, 16th c.; Vat. gr. 695, 14–15th c.*). According to Perry, this “λ” manuscript was probably written in the first half of the 13th c., perhaps in Southern Italy or Sicily (PERRY 1933, 214ff.). Cf. also PERRY 1952, 212–213, where the text is placed among the *vitae minores* under the label “Testimonium 1a.”
ing the frame story second priority. In either case, a few brief facts of Aesop’s life remain, together with an introduction to his storytelling, explaining how the fables are cunningly wrought, precious, useful, and edifying.

After the introductory hypothesis fifty-nine fables follow. They are arranged alphabetically, from the story of the eagle and the fox (αετός καὶ ἀλόωτης), to the story of the aging lion (λέων γηράσας). The last one is incomplete, breaking off because of the quire damage in U17, and we may draw the conclusion that originally the sequence was supposed to continue with more fables, arranged from lambda to the end of the alphabet. As I mentioned in the preceding chapter, there is another incongruity in Text 91: after the initial Vita III there is a short passage from Vita W, i.e. the so-called Westermann recension, inserted right in the middle of the first fable. This passage tells about Aesop’s stay at Samos, and how he helped the Samians in their relation to King Kroisos. He does so not by explicitly telling them or the king how to act, but by relating parables and fables which they in their turn have to interpret. Thus another two fables are inserted inside this passage of the Life: the stories on the war between the wolves and sheep, and the poor man and the cicada (Aes. Fab. 158 and 298, ed. Hausrat). The intriguing Chinese box technique which characterizes Stephanites and Ichnelates is present here as well, even if it also happened to be enhanced by mistake: placing the extract from Vita W inside the story of the eagle and the fox was probably due to confusion of leaves in a model manuscript somewhere.

Turning to fables as an ingredient in other kinds of texts, there is reason to bring in a text in Gr 8 which might easily be overlooked in a quest for narrative texts. Gregory of Nazianzos’ letter to Keleusios (Ep. 114; Text 7) is an appealing example of the incorporation of a fable: on the subject of loquacity and taciturnity Gregory tells the story about the swallows who ridiculed the swans for not wanting to be around people and not singing except among themselves. Inside this fable, he includes a very compressed narrative, giving the whole story of Philomela’s rape by merely mentioning names, places, and a few keywords:

---

24 It was apparently not unusual to copy the Aesopian Fables without including the Life: Perry states that from the 12th c. onwards, “[i]f a scribe decided to include the Life at all, he chose either the Westermann recension or [...] the brief notice about Aesop ascribed to Aphthonius” (Perry 1936, 26). The so-called Vita III is an imitation of the Aphthonian preface (Perry 1933, 215).

25 The fables, numbered according to Hausrat’s edition, are listed in Appendix 2 (Hausrat & Hunger 1956 and 1970).

26 Vita Aes. 93–100 (incip. οἵμοις συνεῖδον καὶ τὸν Ἀἰσιωπὸν; expl. νῦν ἀναγινωσκόμενους κατέληπον).


28 On the narrative structure of the Life of Aesop at large, see Holzberg 1992.

29 In Gr 8 the attribution of the letter is “from Basil the Great to a certain Gregory but not the Great” (f. 98v–99r). Thus, even if our scribe Theodoros did not read the text as authored by Gregory of Nazianzos, he at least reckoned it to be by another church father.
Pandion, Athens, Tereus, Thrace, the journey, the grief, the violence, the mutilation, the (woven) message, and, on top of it all, Itys and how we became birds instead of people.

A story as condensed as this would obviously not succeed unless it brought up very familiar stories or anecdotes. This, however, is quite characteristic of the literary culture of late antiquity and Byzantium, with its long tradition of passing on a common treasure of story-telling. This telling and retelling of stories was a dynamic process, which many Byzantine authors and compilers ventured to refine and excel in. Gregory of Nazianzos’ story is a good example of such literary adaptation. Gregory not only seizes the opportunity to remind us of the Philomela story, but he also gives the legend a further twist, simply by putting it in the mouths/beaks of the swallows: according to the legend—which every reader would have been aware of—Philomela herself was transformed into a silent swallow. To the swallows’ accusations Gregory has the swans give their retort, and as a final point he ends his letter with the plea that Keleusios stop badgering him about being quiet, since “the swans will sing when the jackdaws fall silent.”

Another form of narrative may be found in fictional letters and epistolary novels. Of these we have some representatives in Gr 8 as well: the suite of eight letters attributed to Anacharsis (Text 9); three Hippocratic letters out of the so-called “Persian” epistolary novel (Text 8); a considerable number of Theophylact Simokates’ letters, also fictitious (Text 43). I discuss these items below within the category of rhetorical texts.

Historical narratives
Texts (20), 21, 42, 49, (51), 64, 71

30 Sophocles made use of the story in his play Tereus (TrGF, IV, 581–595b); it is also retold by Achilles Tatius in the novel of Leucippe and Cleitophon (Ach. Tat. Leuc. 5.4–5.6). Ovid’s Latin version in the Metamorphoses (Ov. Met. 6. 424–674) has made a lasting impact on European literature, not least through reuse of the story by Chaucer, Shakespeare, and others.
31 Paul Gallay’s edition renders the last sentence of the swans’ riposte as a rhetorical question: “مِمَّا قُربَنَّ نُفَّتَلُوا بَيْنَاءَ لَا سَأْ لَيْ تَفْعَلَنَا بَرَاءَةَ، فَلَا إِلَّا لَا سَأْ لَيُّ.” The wording of Gr 8 “مِمَّا قُربَنَّ نُفَّتَلُوا بَيْنَاءَ لَا سَأْ لَيْ تَفْعَلَنَا بَرَاءَةَ,” might be preferable (“and then you turn out being chatterboxes, although not even eloquent and harmonious”).
32 Whole fables are incorporated also in two of Simokates’ letters (Text 43): in Simoc. Ep. 34 the subject is moderation, σοφροσύνη: why concern ourselves with riches and physical matter, when our borrowed plumes are stripped off in death? This moral is illustrated with the story about how the birds once went to Zeus and asked him to give them a king. He ordered them to wash themselves to reveal their beauty—or lack thereof; the most beautiful would become king. The jackdaw could not compete, and chose to simulate what nature had refused him by embellishing himself with feathers not his own, but the owl recognized his own feathers and exposed the fraud (cf. Aes. Fab. 103). A variant tradition of this fable is included in Stephanites and Ichnelates chapter IV (Of the Owls and the Crows), but here it is the crow who viliﬁes the owls, calling them the ugliest and dirtiest of birds. This chapter is included in
There is a certain permeability between forms like letters and prose fiction: letters are used within fictional narratives (for example in the ancient and Byzantine novels), just as narrative is used within fictitious (and real) letters.\textsuperscript{33} This is also the case with historiography, where speeches and letters are often interwoven in the narrative. Consequently, overlappings are common between these and other genres. The investigation of a multifaceted book like Gr 8 becomes a wholesome reminder of the fluid borders between different kinds of texts. Literature is more compound and intricate than our attempts at organizing it into the pigeon-holes of construed systems of genre would allow. As a case in point we may look at the selection of excerpts from John Tzetzes’ Chilikiades (“Thousands”) or Book of Histories (Text 42).\textsuperscript{34} The short historical or mythological episodes in the Chilikiades function as a commentary to Tzetzes’ own collection of letters; these letters were in turn addressed to fictitious persons as well as to his contemporaries. Before Tzetzes was done, the learned commentary had swelled into more than 12,000 lines of political verse, a somewhat impractical format, which did not help the distribution of this book either in the author’s own time, or later. What we have here in the form of a commentary is thus a poem, and a history book, and an etymological handbook, and an antiquarian collection of this and that and everything else. At the same time there are important stories transmitted here. To take one example only: in Chil. I, 3, Tzetzes tells us about Gyges who became king of Lydia, and in just a few lines he manages to remind us first of the version where the shepherd Gyges found a bronze horse with a corpse in it; on its finger the corpse had a ring which could render its master invisible. Gyges used the ring to kill King Kandaules and seize power.\textsuperscript{35} Then Tzetzes narrates Herodotos’ version: King Kandaules who had a very beautiful wife insisted that Gyges see her undress; she noticed this and gave Gyges the choice of either murdering her husband and taking his place or being killed himself.\textsuperscript{36} Not content with reiterating these two versions, Tzetzes proceeds with an allegorical interpretation of the first version, thus giving us yet another “renarrativization” of the story.

Two passages drawn from Josephus’ history on the Jewish War are included in Gr 8 (Text 71). These are selected so that there is little information on the historical framework and the situation at large; what the excerptor has

\textsuperscript{33} On letters embedded in novels, see ROSENMEYER 2001, 133–168.

\textsuperscript{34} John Tzetzes (ca. 1110–ca. 1180) was a poet and grammarian who belonged to the group of professional literati which had connections to the imperial court at Constantinople (as did for example Constantine Manasses, by whom we also have a text in Gr 8 (Text 38). Among other tasks, Tzetzes was entrusted with introducing Empress Eirene (Bertha von Sulzbach) to ancient Greek literature, and especially to Homer (HUNGER 1978, II, 60). On the literary life in 12th-c. Constantinople, see MULLETT 1984; MAGDALINO 1993, 382–412.

\textsuperscript{35} This version is given by Plato in The Republic (Pl. R. 359d–360d).

\textsuperscript{36} Hdt. I, 8–13.
bestowed us with are two speeches (BJ 3, 472–484 and 361–382). The first passage presents a situation where the emperor Titus realizes that the enemies gathering outside the walls of Tarichaeae so outnumber the Roman army that it ought to be impossible to win. Nonetheless, Titus makes this exhortatory speech to urge on his subordinates. The other passage is Josephus’ argument against suicide in a situation of total defeat: Jotapata, the besieged town which they have defended, has fallen, and Josephus and his men can now either kill themselves or surrender themselves to the Romans. The parallel of the recently experienced siege and fall of the Byzantine capital in 1453 inevitably presents itself. A reminder may, however, be in place: this last and fatal blow had been preluded by many earlier sieges, several of which the Byzantines had withstood and some not. Thus, the two excerpts may originally have been selected and combined by reason of other harsh circumstances. Whether or not the two excerpts are unique for Gr 8 or rather a common choice from Josephus’ work, this need not prevent our idea of actualization: even if a prior excerptor may have had another occasion in mind than the one furthered by Mehmet II, the situation which Theodoros and his contemporaries had lived through would certainly have made the message in Josephus’ speeches ever so urgent again.

Two more texts go well together with Josephus’ speeches on a conquered and ruined city: Manuel Christonymos’ lament on the fall of Constantinople (Text 20) and Michael Choniates’ elegy on Athens as he saw it in the early thirteenth century (Text 51). These, however, will be dealt with in the next section.

Another fifteenth-century text which comments on contemporary circumstances is Leonardo Bruni Aretino’s treatise on the constitution of Florence (Text 21). That Bruni chose to write it in Greek was probably brought about by the occasion of the Council of Ferrara-Florence, where the Byzantine delegation included a significant number of distinguished and learned men (Emperor John VIII, Patriarch Joseph II, George Gemistos Plethon, Cardinal Bessarion, Mark Eugenikos, and George Scholarios, to mention the most prominent). Bruni took the opportunity to present himself and his city state in the language of the visitors. In 1439 he had just finished his Latin
translation of Aristotle’s *Politics*, and the influence of this work (especially Book Four) is evident in *The Constitution of Florence*.\(^{39}\) The autograph version is not extant, but there are enough copies to suggest that the work had a considerable dissemination in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. One of the manuscripts has marginal notes and corrections in the handwriting of George Gemistos Plethon (*Ven. Marc. gr. Z. 406*).\(^{40}\)

In addition to these elaborate pieces of narrative, there are also some more unpolished and terse texts which convey historical information, in the form of lists and so-called short chronicles. I will mention two of these here, although they would also fit very well in the section on “practical texts,” discussed below. “68 years after the Trojan war Homer was born. From Homer’s birth until Xerxes’ crossing [of the Hellespont] 622 years went by.” This is the whole extent of Text 49. Not much, I admit, but these micro-texts were there for a purpose. The scribe could have chosen to fill the last two lines of a page with decorations, but instead—and especially so in personal miscellanies such as Theodorus’—one made use of every single blank space to keep memorable information, adages, and other minimal items. Text 64 is another short chronicle, a world history painted in broad strokes:

> From Adam until the Flood 2242 years went by. And from the Flood until the hundred years of Abraham, 1569 years. And from Abraham until the exodus of Israel’s sons, 405 years. And from Moses until the Zedekiah’s siege [of Jerusalem], 1076 years. And from Zedekiah until Augustus, the emperor, during whose reign our Lord Jesus Christ was born, 608 years. All in all, from Adam until Christ, 5500 years. And from the birth of Christ until Constantine the Great, the holy king of the Christians, 296 years. And from the first year of Constantine the Great until the great Justinian, 224 years.\(^{41}\)

Stories are told and a range of narrative devices are employed more or less everywhere in *Gr 8*, regardless of what genre definition we allot to the separate items, and I could go on relating texts which display a high degree of narrativity, if it were not for the fact that there are other aspects of the manuscript to consider. Some of the narrative pieces will end up in the other groups in this chapter: speeches and poems, for example, would in many

---

\(^{39}\) Moukakis 1986, 147.

\(^{40}\) According to Athanasios Moukakis, *Gr 8* and *Vat. pal. gr. 146* both depend on *Monac. gr. 170* (stemma on p. 173). In his edition he has used *Gr 8* only for lines 73–111, where *Monac. gr. 170* has a lacuna. But there is a problem with the dates: Moukakis states that the Munich manuscript is from the 16th c. (as does the old library catalog by Hardt). As we are dealing with a composite manuscript, the leaves with Bruni’s text may of course be of earlier date than the rest of the volume. To keep the stemma as it is, we thus need to assume either an earlier date than the 16th c. for the Monacensis text, or else a connection between that manuscript and *Gr 8* by way of a common model. The dating of *Vat. pal. gr. 146* (also composite) is of no help, as Moukakis only states that “[t]he works, though not necessarily the copies in this codex, date from the XIVth, XVth and XVIth centuries” (Moukakis 1986,165).

\(^{41}\) For the Greek texts, see Appendix 1.
cases have qualified excellently, but in their case I have looked at functions besides story-telling.

All in all, the narrative works should be seen as an important feature of \textit{Gr 8} when considering the overall character of the book. They certainly contribute to making the book an enjoyable piece of reading. What enhances their importance is the fact that the longest narrative text (\textit{Stephanites} in U2) and also several shorter ones (many of the letters in U3) stand at the front of the book. But they also come intermingled with many other kinds of texts: reasoning texts mainly on philosophical and theological subjects, texts useful for practical reasons, and texts where the narrativity is but one trait and possibly not the most important factor for the compiler when he made his selection. To these other kinds of texts we will now proceed.

\section*{Rhetorical texts}

Most texts in this category display an obvious awareness of rhetorical form and epideictic chiselling of expression. Not that rhetorical training is absent from the other texts in the codex; there are examples among both narrative and philosophical texts which could have fit into this category as well. But in the categorization of texts in \textit{Gr 8} my lodestar has been the \textit{function} of the texts: what need did the texts serve for the compiler? Rhetorical training was crucial in Byzantium. If you had rhetorical techniques in your toolbox (in addition to a good portion of classical erudition) and knew how to make efficient use of them, they could open doors to a career, a position in the bureaucracy, they could help you become someone of importance whether in secular or ecclesiastical circles. The writing of letters, for example, was after all “the major activity of the bureaucracy,” as George Kennedy puts it.\textsuperscript{42} Oral performance must also have been part of what one prepared for. In addition, the rhetorical excercises and display pieces had become a learned game which one played alone or in the company of equally well educated friends and colleagues.\textsuperscript{43}

Nowadays, we tend to see rhetoric as an analytical tool. Not so in late antiquity and in Byzantium: there it was first and foremost a creative-didactic method. And this is, in my opinion, the underlying rationale of the selection of many texts which ended up in \textit{Gr 8}. Normally, Byzantine rhetorical instruction was based upon the textbooks of Hermogenes and Aphthonios—at least from the transmission in manuscripts it seems that these two dominated

\textsuperscript{42} \textsc{Kennedy} 1983, 71.

\textsuperscript{43} After 1453 the career paths for Greeks were not self-evident, whether they stayed in Ottoman-ruled areas or moved westwards, but in many professions rhetorical skills would still have been considered an asset. On the place and importance of Greek rhetorics after the fall of Constantinople, see \textsc{Conley} 2000.
the market.\footnote{Cf. KUSTAS 1973, 9f. New rhetorical manuals were added as well: George Gemistos Plethon and John Argyropoulos, for example, wrote their own treatises on rhetoric in the 15th c. (MONFASANI 1983, 255).} Thus, the rules were more or less set: everyone had to work one’s way through the *progymnasmata* (the exercises of fables, elaborations of proverbs, refutations and confirmations of a statement, and encomia, to just mention some of the kinds).\footnote{On progymnasmata, see, for example, KENNEDY 1983, 54–73.} Just as one had to become skilled at the old, and in reality extinct, version of Attic Greek, one also had to emulate the rhetors of the past, using examples such as Isocrates, Libanios, and the Cappadocians as models.

The educational situation was the foundation, but rhetoric became more important than that. Out of these exercises were created new forms and genres, literary pastimes as well as significant works. Even though, as is often said, the only rhetorical genus that survived and flourished in Byzantium was the epideictic (display), it could be pursued in various manners. Rhetoric was never “empty.” These works, whether speeches of praise (and blame), laments over cities lost, or letters of different kinds, had a role to play in Byzantine society. A letter was not just a personal affair, it would probably be read aloud, and especially so if one had managed to set the accurate level of discourse; a subtle display of learning was never wrong if it was done with grace. It showed that one belonged to the educated few and it offered delight to the reader who could decipher the common code.

The texts from *Gr 8* that will be considered here are on the one hand some oratory works and poems, on the other hand letters of different kinds: fictitious, personal, literary, instructive, there is a variety to choose from. The epistolographic section is rich, all in all there are some seventy letters in the codex. As a consequence, the discussion of these will dominate the survey. But first a few words on the other rhetorical genres.

**Oratory**

*Texts* (5), 20, 27, 28, 55, (71), 72

Depending on the subject matter, oratory works may variously be described as, e.g., speeches, sermons, and laments. The variation in *Gr 8* is analogous. Two texts are defined as “λόγος,” speech; two as “δημηγορία,” deliberative (or just public) speech; one is a “μονωδία,” literally a solo song although the term later came to signify a lament; one has an abbreviated heading: “by Libanios concerning a garrulous woman”; one lacks its heading in the manuscript, and another is transmitted as a letter (ἐπιστολὴ Γρηγορᾶ πρὸς ...).

Text 5, Isocrates’ *Oration 1* (Λόγος Ἰσοκράτους πρὸς Δημόνικον), displays rather few signs of actually being a “speech.” At least it seems to have been produced as a written discourse, sent by Isocrates as a gift to Demoni-
The ambiguity between written and oral is present in other texts as well. Since it was common to read texts aloud, the distinction is perhaps less of a problem. One and the same text could also have been performed publicly at one point, and been distributed for circulation as a text later, as in the case of Libanios’ speech. The subject matter of Isocrates speech makes it expedient to postpone the discussion of it until later, in connection with the practical texts.

Libanios’ Declamation 26 (Text 27) is an exhibition of forensic speech as it was practiced in the old days, in Athens. Libanios presents the case of a husband making an appeal to the court to rid himself of his unendurable wife. In Byzantium this imaginary speech was the most popular of all of Libanios’ declamations. The main characters could have been picked from New Comedy, and Libanios’ handling of the subject makes the piece a kind of literary stand-up comedy. An interesting detail in the description of the wife is that she is not only talkative (in her husband’s opinion, that is), she is obviously also an educated woman, who makes encomia and orations, she studies during the night, is interested in matters of the city, the army, the businesses in town, et cetera. This is not the role in which we are used to picture women in antiquity. The comical part is that the old grump just goes on and on describing his wife and her loquaciousness. His whole statement in front of the jury is one long tirade (which he has opened by declaring how much he yearns for silence). “A talkative person I couldn’t bear even in a dream,” he says, while his longwinded speech gushes forth uninterruptedly like a torrent in spring.

The two “δημηγορίας,” public speeches, are the the ones from Josephus’ The Jewish War (Text 71). Since these, the δημηγορία Τίτου υἱοῦ Οὐσπασιανοῦ and the δημηγορία Ἰωσήπου, were discussed among the narratives, I leave them aside here.

The text which besides Isocrates’ speech is called a “λόγος” is an item ascribed to John Chrysostom (Text 28). The title in our manuscript is Λόγος τοῦ μεγάλου Χρυσοστόμου κατὰ Ἑρωδίαδα καὶ περὶ γυναικῶν πονηρῶν (speech against Herodias and regarding wicked women). The Chrysostom attribution of this work is usually regarded as spurious. The text seems to be a misogynic sermon in a vein all but rare in patristic texts—at least it looks that way from the portion of the text transmitted in Gr 8. In its entirety the sermon is actually made up of two parts, one of invective (ψογος), where all the vile women in (Biblical) history are enumerated and discarded,
and one of praise (epainos), an attempt at finding at least a few female counter-examples. Too bad that only the psogos part was spicy enough to find a place in Gr 8. Probably the work was not at all conceived as a sermon. It could be that we have here a sheer rhetorical exercise in the praise-and-blame genre, though with the subject matter borrowed from the religious sphere. Due to later readers’ willingness to take it seriously, it may have gotten more weight than intended.

The historical lament on a city is a rhetorical and literary topic with a long tradition. From having been a predominantly poetic form during antiquity, the city lament, or monody as it is often called, became more of a prose composition from the Second Sophistic and onwards. The Byzantines continued in the same strain, delivering orations but also poems on various cities, and the last and greatest calamity of all, the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453, was certainly not to be left unsung. Erwin Fenster comments on some of these monodies, those written by Andronikos Kallistos, John Eugenikos, two Anonymi, and Matthew Kamariotes. He also has a few remarks on the monody written by Manuel Christonymos. Gr 8 is one of the few manuscripts known to transmit this work (Monody on the Capture of Constantinople, Text 20), and Spyridon Lampros used it for his edition. Fenster finds Christonymos’ monody more interesting than the one that John Eugenikos wrote (although one should add that Fenster restricts his study to the use of rhetorical topoi of praise). The themes exploited by Christonymos are Constantinople as the “eye of the inhabited world,” the “crown of the Graces,” the devoted “mother of cities.” But the most important trait was her role as sovereign in intellectual matters: “she alone was the mother and nurturer of Logos, she was the real Hellas.”

Text 72 is presented in Gr 8 as a letter from Nikephoros Gregoras to the Grand Logothete Theodore Metochites. I mention it here, among the oratory works, because, as a whole, the text shows very few signs of adhering to

---

50 Aelius Aristeides, for example, wrote a piece on Smyrna after the earthquake and Libanios did the same for Nicomedia. On the tradition of historical laments for cities, see also Alexiou 1974, 83–101.


52 Μονοθεία ἐπὶ τῇ ἁλώσαι τῆς Κωνσταντινοπόλεως, ed. Lampros 1908, 227–240. The other two manuscripts are Bruxell. 11270 and Par. gr. 2077 (text incomplete). According to Paul Wittek the scribe of the Brussels manuscript is “wahrscheinlich <Michael Apostoles>” (Moraux 1976, 81). The other monodies which Fenster mentions were edited in the same publication by Lampros (Νέος Ἑλλ. 5).


54 Nikephoros, who was born in Herakleia (Paphlagonia) in the early 1290s, came to Constantinople to study. Among his teachers was Theodore Metochites, the addressee of the letter in Gr 8. Supported by his patron John Kantakouzenos (later to become emperor), Nikephoros devoted his life to scientific and literary studies. His largest undertaking is the Historia Rhomaïke, which covers the period 1204–1358. In addition to this, and numerous treatises on various subjects (not least on hesychasm, to which he was an ardent opponent), there is a large collection of letters extant. The letter in Gr 8 is not included in Pietro Leone’s edition of the epistolary collection (Leone 1982–83).
the epistolary genre; as a matter of fact, without the heading, Ἐπιστολὴ Γρηγορᾶ πρὸς τὸν σοφῶτατον λογοθέτην παρακλητικὴ περὶ τῆς ἀστρονομίας, one would never have suspected it to be a letter at all. Its primary place in the manuscript tradition is as an oration integrated into Gregoras’ Historia Rhomaïke. The subject discussed is astronomy. Nikephoros urges the Grand Logothete to share his knowledge in astronomical matters with him, and, as he points out in his history where he refers to this communication with Metochites, his request was well-received and he ended up spending much time with the Logothete in astronomical pursuits. The speech is more of an exhibition of rhetorical splendor than a personal message. In one manuscript it is added as an introduction to Metochites’ own treatise on the fundamentals of astronomy, and that is perhaps the most suitable place for it, considering its adulatory appeal and high-flown rhetoric.

That there is a close connection between prose composition and poetry, and that both were part of rhetorical training, may be illustrated by the next example, Text 55, which is a prose paraphrase of Gregory of Nazianzos’ poem On Virtue (Carm. mor. 1. 2, 9). The progymnasmata, especially fables, narratives, descriptions, and comparison, were preparations for the study of rhetoric but also for poetic composition, and the paraphrase was one type of exercise which enhanced poetic awareness. Specific instructions on how to write prose paraphrases of poetry were included in the rhetorical handbooks. Text 55 is a rather ordinary example of such an exercise: the paraphrast has not commented on or elaborated the text very much but kept close to the original. Still, it is more advanced than an alternative paraphrase of the same poem, known from three manuscripts. The paraphrase in Gr 8 is thus far not attested elsewhere.

Poetry

The poetical works in Gr 8 are not a particularly prominent group. Altogether they occupy ca. 40 pages, or 6 % of the whole codex. In addition to the poems discussed here, there are three texts which are composed in so-called political, or fifteen-syllable, verse: the excerpts from Tzetzes’ Chili-

---

55 Nic. Greg., Hist. I. 322, 19 – 327, 5. According to Jan-Louis van Dieten, the text is transmitted as a letter in six manuscripts (Gr 8 uncounted); VAN DIETEN 1975, 138. Cf. VAN DIETEN 1973, I 46 (No. 12) and 50 (No. 32).
56 Besides Nikephoros Gregoras’ letter on astronomy, there are other texts in Gr 8 which suggest that the scribe Theodoros took an interest in such matters, especially Text 66, a text on astrology and sand divination, and some of the passages from Text 56, Theodoret of Kyros’ Cure of the Pagan Maladies. This is discussed further in Chapter 5.
59 SEARBY 2003a, 341f.
60 Cf. SEARBY 2003a, 342.
Rhetorical texts

ades (Text 42), a hymn to the Theotokos (Text 33), and a gnomology containing excerpts from Constantine Manasses’ Synopsis Chronike (Text 38). There is also, somewhat unexpectedly perhaps, a Latin poem in Gr 8. Text 77 is Ausonius’ poem De institutione viri boni. This poem appears alongside those texts in U15 which are set bilingually, in Latin with a Greek translation above. The Ausonius poem was apparently not intended to have a translation accompany it, because the lines are set much closer on the page. An hypothesis may be that Theodoros wished to practice writing in a humanist hand, and needed another model text for this.

The rhetorical topic of praise and lament on cities has already been introduced. There is a poem on the same theme, Text 51. Michael Choniates’ Elegy on Athens is a small lament in twelve-syllable verse, which he wrote when he was the bishop there in the early thirteenth century. He deplores what has been lost over the centuries of ancient Athens and describes the sorry state of the medieval “rural” town. The poem has been shown to intricately combine the monody with ekphrastic and erotic discourse as we know it from twelfth-century novelistic writings.

Two epigrams from the Palatine Anthology are included in Gr 8, AP IX 359–360 (Text 58). The first is by Posidippus of Pella (ca. 310–240 BCE), the second (although headed by τοῦ αὐτοῦ, “by the same author” in Gr 8) is presumably written by Metrodoros, who was active at the turn of the sixth century. Together these create a contrastive pair of epigrams, where the second one apparently was created as a close variation and comment on the first. In Posidippus’ poem, a pessimistic picture of life is given. “What’s the best path to take in life?” the poet asks, and goes on to enumerate all the difficulties and anxieties which a human being inevitably comes across. “It all boils down, then, to a choice of two: never to be born or, once born, to die on the spot.” To this Metrodoros retorts: “Pursue every path in life [...] There is, then, no choice of two, never to be born or, once born, to die; for all in life is great.” This rhetorical sport, where one emulates a poem and makes something new out of it, was not a new phenomenon in Byzantium, although it must have been a very appropriate pursuit, given the general veneration of ancient literature. With its focus on how to improve one’s argu-

61 Ausonius’ poem has also been transmitted in manuscripts as (pseudo-)Vergilian. See further CLAUSEN 1966, 165–168.
62 The discussion is found in the comment by Marc Lauktermann on Panagiotis Agapitos’ report on Byzantine vernacular romances: see AGAPITOS 2004, 65f. (debate in Symbolae Osloenses 79:1).
63 The popularity of these epigrams is shown by their inclusion into numerous florilegia (cf. GOW & PAGE 1965, II, 502).
64 Transl. Frank Nisetich (GUTZWILLER 2005, 47).
65 Plutarch’s discussion of how the poets’ wordings may be re-written to better suit a certain moral also goes to show how an active reader could go about using the texts; cf. examples in Plut. Mor. I, 33 (from How the young man should study poetry). On the infidus author in Greco-Roman literature, who selects from and modifies his sources, repeating with a differ-
mentation and how to vary one’s speech, the rhetorical education would also have encouraged this activity of re-writing.

The epigram as a poetic genre is often associated with the short, perhaps witty, always elegant pieces such as the ones just mentioned. As Marc Lauxtermann has shown, though, the Byzantine epigrammatic genre is so much more than that; Byzantine epigrams may, for example, easily turn into full-length poetic texts. Two such poems are present in Gr 8, one on an explicitly Christian subject, the Last Judgment, and one composed as a lament on the occasion of a shipwreck. The former (Text 73) could have been referred to the section on theological texts, below, while the latter (Text 74) was kept here as an example of rhetorical splendor. But since these two texts are transmitted in connection to each other in other manuscripts as well, I prefer to discuss them together. As in the case with the praise-and-blame piece on Biblical women mentioned above, one may assume that epideictic epigrams, poetic showpieces, were created on secular as well as Christian topics. Both of these poems display technical and rhetorical skill and compositional awareness. Text 73 (inc. ἡρα πίς γῆθεν ἁξίρας) is an anacreontic poem written by Emperor Leo VI (Leo the Wise). In Gr 8 the title is missing, but in other manuscripts it is usually referred to as ἑνδιώριν κατανυκτικόν. The poem is organized acrostically, something which goes for the next poem also, Text 74. This text, which has not been identified in Gr 8 before, is Constantine Sikeliotes’ “anacreontic alphabet” (inc. ἀπὸ μοισικῶν μελάθρων).

Text 46, a strophic poem in fifteen-syllable verse, has suffered the fate of two misleading designations, Carmen paraeneticum and τοῦ Σπανέα. Let us begin with the latter. The genuine Spaneas poem goes back to the twelfth century but has seen many versions as regards its length, contents, and language form. These versions, however, have one thing in common: the close correspondence to a certain florilegium, the so-called Excerpta Parisina. All the strophes in the Spaneas build upon a suite of sayings borrowed from
this florilegium.\textsuperscript{71} The poem in \textit{Gr 8}, on the other hand, shows no relation to these sayings. It belongs to the version which George Danezis labeled “Pseudo-Spaneas.” One manuscript actually refers to the poem as Στήχοι πολιτικοί τοῦ Σπανία,\textsuperscript{72} but it is obvious that the poem “bei jeder weiteren Beschäftigung mit dem Spaneas-Text ausgeschlossen werden muß.”\textsuperscript{73}

The other designation, \textit{Carmen paraeneticum}, was applied by Vilhelm Lundström in his 1902 edition.\textsuperscript{74} But whereas the genuine Spaneas is paraenetic, providing moral advice in the same vein as gnomological literature, this is not quite so in Text 46. Instead we have a despondent poem about the world and its illusory character, the vanity of human existence.

The poem \textit{Carmen Paraeneticum} is present in \textit{Gr 8} in yet another setting, as Text 52, but this time with only one stanza, inc. Οἴδασιν οἱ φιλόσοφοι. The re-use of this strophe may suggest that this was a poem that Theodoros had learnt by heart. The striking position of Text 46 may also support this: following upon a long list of Jewish patriarchs and of the kings of various nations, the poem very neatly starts out with a strophe on King Solomon, and also in several other stanzas there are comments about the kings and rulers of this world.

Text 47 is a small epigram used as a page filler, this time in twelve-syllable verse: Δόξαν προσλαβὼν τίμα τοῦ ὑπὸ χείρα | φόβον ἐμποιῶν μέχρι καὶ λόγου μόνου | ἀντὶ γὰρ παρέρχεται ταχὺ πηδῶσα, | μόνη δὲ ἡ μνήμη σου συμπαραμένει.\textsuperscript{75}

\textbf{Epistolography}

The writing of letters was a major application of rhetoric in late antiquity as well as in the Byzantine centuries. Epistolography is often put forward as a central literary genre, or even the genre in which the Byzantines excelled the most. Letters can certainly be literature, but they were also part of people’s lives in a more pragmatic way. Since most of the letters extant in manuscripts were probably deliberately composed to be of lasting value, even to be “published” if one were lucky, they are hardly representative of Byzantine letter-writing as a whole. The late ancient papyrus letters which reflect

\textsuperscript{71} The earlier theory was that the Spaneas poem built directly on Isocrates’ speech \textit{To De-}

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Vat. Barb. II 99}, f. 4\textsuperscript{v}; \textit{Lundström} 1902, 3.

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Danezis} 1987, 214.

\textsuperscript{74} Twelve manuscripts are known to transmit this poem (15\textsuperscript{th}–18\textsuperscript{th} c.). Lundström based his edition on six of them, \textit{Gr 8} included. For the manuscripts and editions of “Gruppe IV: Pseudo-Spaneas,” see \textit{Danezis} 1987, 209f.

\textsuperscript{75} “Having received an honor, reward those whom you have at your hands, inspiring awe even as you utter one word, because an honor escapes on swift feet, only the memory of you stays on.”
everyday life are certainly of a different kind. Here we will concentrate on
the more conscientious production of so-called literary letters, those which
presuppose a certain familiarity with rhetorical training. It is necessary to
make further distinctions: in addition to the real everyday letters, private as
well as official ones, we have the fictitious letters, either those in which
manufactured words are at a later stage put in the mouth of an historical per-
son, or those which are entirely imaginary, composed simply for the amuse-
ment and gamefulness of it. In either case they functioned as rhetorical ex-
cercises in mimesis: at the level of representation—expressing a certain per-
son’s ethos and speech—and at the level of artistic imitation, in relation to
the genre of letter-writing.

Thus far, the boundaries are fairly clear, and these categories more or less
cover the ancient letters. However, when it comes to Byzantine letters, the
most profuse output consists of so-called real but literary letters. These are
the letters that were actually written and sent as an act of communication
between sender and receiver, but which were also designed with the ulterior
motive that they might get a larger audience: they could be read aloud
among friends and copied by fans, collected by the writer or receiver, or by
someone else who wished to treasure them for the future. They could be
honest and personal—as far as people allow for that in public—but at the
same time molded and polished to pass as small artefacts. Byzantine letters
filled a social function, confirming friendship and contacts, they were also
a ticket to the small clique of intellectuals who understood the riddles and
allusions, and could appreciate the balanced and elegant form. One charac-
teristic of the genre is its playful approach to literary creation, thus demand-
ing a fair share of education and erudition from its consumers.

In Gr 8, there are no less than 70 letters of different kinds and from dif-
ferent times. Some are obviously fictitious; others are addressed to real per-
sons. Most of them show literary ambition; one or two seem more like trea-
sises, one is just a covering letter which explains why another (copy of a)
letter was sent to someone. In length they vary between two lines and eleven
manuscript pages. Below, I will briefly touch upon most of these, at first in a

76 A discussion of this epistolary category is found in MULLETT 1981; on Byzantine epistolo-
graphy at large, see also HATLIE 1996; GRÜNBART 2007.
77 Antonio Garzya has stressed that letters, though deliberately well-wrought, were still a form
of Gebrauchslyiteratur, something that was consumed immediately at reception, and also fit
for practical purposes, through recycling of their topoi and themes, wording and imagery.
Thus new letters could be written as intellectual “palimpsests” on those one had received and
read (GARZYA 1981).
78 On friendship as an epistolary topos, see KARLSSON 1962, esp. chs. 1 and 3.
79 The instructions that Gregory of Nazianzos presented to his nephew Nikoboulos (Ep. 51)
are often referred to as a kind of measuring stick for Byzantine letters. According to Gregory,
letters should have the properties of μέτρον, συνήθεια, and χάρις, i.e., they should be concise,
80 “Der Gattung ist ein spielerischer Umgang mit den literarischen Vorfahren immanent”
(GRÜNBART 2007, 137).
more or less chronological order, but I will also look at the position of these
texts inside the manuscript, to see if that can help us assess their functions.

**Ancient letters**

Texts 8–9, 11b

The larger share of the letters in *Gr 8* stems from late antiquity, but some are
even earlier in origin. The first such group, the Hippocratic letters (Text 8),
belongs to what is sometimes referred to as the “Persian” epistolary novel.81
Their authorship is considered spurious, and dating the letters is also prob-
lematic: Wesley Smith only states that “whatever their date of composition,
the letters were added to the collection of medical works at a time later than
the two [pseudepigraphic] speeches,” i.e. after the last quarter of the third
century BCE.82 The outline of contents in the three letters transmitted in *Gr 8*
is the following: (8) Artaxerxes wants the Coans to surrender Hippocrates to
him for being insolent, or else he will destroy their city. (9) The Coans an-
swer that they will not give in to his claims. (1) Artaxerxes laments the
plague which is ravaging among his people and asks Petos to send him word
of where to find a remedy.83 As Niklas Holzberg points out, there is both
satire and realism in the glimpses that we get from the Hippocratic letters.84
An important theme is also the interaction between intellectuals and those in
power: Hippocrates will not help the enemy, and the gold that Artaxerxes
offers is less influential than a wise word.

Another fictitious letter in *Gr 8* dealing with illness is attributed to Dio-
cles of Karystos, who in the fourth century BCE was a renowned physician
in Athens (latter part of Text 11). This letter, probably stemming from the
first century BCE, is discussed below, in connection with the medical texts.

The Anacharsis letters (Text 9) form another instance of fictitious letters.
There was in the sixth century BCE an historical person with the name
Anacharsis, known to us through Herodotos’ writings. This Scythian trav-
eled widely and came to Greece to learn about the Greek way of life. When

---

81 On epistolary novels as a genre, see HOLZBERG 1994 (the Hippocratic letters are dealt with
specifically on pp. 22–38); and ROSENMEYER 1994.
82 SMITH 1990, 6. According to Dimitrios Sakales they derive from the 1st c. BCE (SAKALES
1989, 17, n. 1).
83 The order of the texts is obviously reversed compared to the logical explication of the
novel: the introductory letter (*Ep. 1*) follows after *Epp. 8* and 9, but this is probably not a
deliberate choice made by Theodoros. The manuscript tradition of these letters is very com-
plex; the papyri only contain letters 3–6 and 11, and some manuscripts also seem to corrobo-
rate that the sequence 3–9 was the core to which the first two letters were then added as an
introduction to the letters that follow; cf. SMITH 1990, 18 and 37. In its sequencing of the
letters *Gr 8* corresponds with *Cod. Monac. gr. 490* (15th c.), where Hipp. *Epp. 3–9* and 1 are
presented in the same way. Moreover, it also contains the Anacharsis *Epp. 1–8* (+ No. 9 *mu-
til.*) in the same position as in *Gr 8*, i.e. directly after Hippocrates. According to Franz
Heinrich Reuters’ edition of the Anacharsis letters, both of these manuscripts are dependent
on *Cod. Vatic. gr. 1353*, dated to 1462 (REUTERS 1957, 42).
84 HOLZBERG 1994, 22.
he returned home, this was not appreciated and he was put to death by his own people, says Herodotos. The memory of Anacharsis became idealized, and eventually he was even counted among the Seven Sages. However, the epistolary tradition is much later than Anacharsis himself; the pseudonymous letter collection was produced in the first half of the third century BCE, when the Cynic movement made him into a hero. Gr 8 presents us with Epp. 1–8: the first two letters spell out that Greeks and barbarians (those who speak other languages) should be seen as equal, and hospitality should apply to everyone, without difference. In customs and outer appearance people differ, but wisdom and foolishness are the same everywhere. The rest of the letters are an appeal for a simple, righteous life and fair government. In this they display the same kind of sentiment as we find in some of the other texts in Gr 8: Stephanites and Ichnelates (Text 3) and Isocrates’ speech To Demonicus (Text 5), both of which are regarded as Prince’s Mirrors.

The Church Fathers take up the pen
Texts (7), 36, 67–70

Let us proceed with the late antique letters in Gr 8. I have already mentioned one letter by Gregory of Nazianzos, above (Text 7, p. 125); the other one allegedly by Gregory is a mere two-line trifle addressed to Libanios (Text 69). In general terms, though, it is worth mentioning that many of Gregory’s letters were among those held up as exemplary in both Byzantine and post-Byzantine letter manuals. This admiration was also given Basil the

---

85 Hdt. 4. 76–77. On the Anacharsis legend and its florilegial transmission, see Kindstrand 1981.
86 The tradition of the Seven Sages is not entirely stable: the version in Gr 8, for example, does not include Anacharsis (Text 59, f. 279v). On this tradition, see further Kindstrand 1981, 33–50.
87 This means that the Anacharsis letters may be the oldest extant collection which unquestionably is made up of pseudonymous, fictitious letters (Reuters 1963, 2). The dating is mainly based upon linguistic traits, but also on geographical information in the letters; cf. Reuters 1963, 3f. and 1957, 11f. Patricia Rosenmeyer argues that pseudonymous letters occupy a kind of middle-ground between embedded letters (such as we meet in historical and novelistic works) and the epistolary novel; she sees them as influenced by the former and suggestive of the latter; Rosenmeyer 2001, 193, and 209–217.
88 “As a mother I have sent children to a father, me—a mother by nature, to you—a father of eloquence. That I may still take care of them, you should take care of them.” (Gr. Naz., Ep. 236). Why someone even bothered transmitting it, is difficult to understand. The topic, however, is similar to Basil’s Epp. 1 and 3 to Libanios, above (numbered according to the correspondence of Libanios and Basil; they equal Epp. 335 and 337 in the Benedictine edition of Basil’s letters; see also n. 94, below). I find it less plausible to see the letter as something Gregory sent “im Namen der Mutter des Jünglings,” as Marie-Madeleine Hauser-Meury has it, and read it rather as if Gregory likens his own role to that of a mother; cf. Hauser-Meury 1960, 113).
89 This is the case for example in Theophilos Korydalleus’ letter manual (RhoBy 2007, 416–418). A couple of letter manuals of late antique or early Byzantine origin have been transmitted under the names of Demetrius of Phaleron, Libanios and Proklos. On these, see Rabe
Great and Libanios, whose correspondence in Gr 8 is more substantial (Texts 67–68, 70). These texts, 27 letters all in all, make up the greater part of U13, together with a couple of excerpts from Josephus’ The Jewish War and yet another letter, from Nikephoros Gregoras to Theodore Metochites.

Among the letters of Basil and Libanios, Text 67 (Basil Ep. 2) seems to stand apart, giving more comprehensive information, whereas most of the others are relatively short and could have been included for their merit as model letters for a scribe. The title given in the manuscript also points in that direction: while the others are presented with just an επιστολαι ἰμανταί (mutual letters), Basil’s Ep. 2 is labeled ὀμυλία. This letter, addressed to Gregory of Nazianzos, is an early sketch of Basil’s anchorite program, the conditions of ascetic life. Since no other texts in Gr 8 are devoted to monastic or ascetic matters, I find it worthy of note that Theodoros incorporated precisely this letter of the Church Father. These are the basic elements of Basil’s rule, as he pictured it in Ep. 2: stillness, solitude, prayer, Scriptural study, moderation in speaking, sandals and one girdled tunic only, vegetarian food, light sleep interrupted by meditations. With such a severe subject matter one may think the letter is as harsh to read, but that is not so. It flows smoothly, and is interspersed with similes and allusions to various stories, to carry the reader onward; from the unaccustomed voyager who keeps suffering from sea sickness even on shore, over similes of the unsteady gaze which cannot focus, the wax tablet which must be erased before being inscribed again, the doctor’s shop with specific remedies for each infirmity, to the Biblical stories of Joseph, Job, David, and others. Even if Basil states that one should show moderation in speech, he surely knows how to put his words agreeably and efficiently in a letter. On one point, this letter does adhere to his ascetic code: he does not resort to wit here, whereas in some of the letters sent to Libanios there is a definite (although subtle) quality of humor and jest.

The opinions on the presumed or refuted authenticity of Libanios’ and Basil’s correspondence (Text 68) have differed widely over the years, and the matter still seems unresolved. If Libanios was the teacher of Basil—an

1909; Weichert 1910. See also Chapter 5, below, concerning the formulacy in Gr 8, ff. 320–323 (Text 81).

90 Although cataloged as just three items in my inventory of Gr 8, the actual number of letters by these two authors is larger: Text 67 = Bas. Ep. 2. Text 68 = Lib.–Bas. Epp. 7; 1; 15–22; 2–6; 8–9; 13–14; 10–12. Text 70 = Bas. Epp. 330; 332; 186; 187.

91 The full title on f. 286 is: τῶν ἐν ἁγίως πατρῶς ἡμῶν Βασιλείου ἀρχεπισκόπου Καισαρείας Καππαδοκίας τοῦ μεγάλου ὀμυλία πρὸς Γρηγόριον τὸν θεολόγον περί βίου καταστάσεως.

92 As Wolf-Dieter Hauschild summarizes the matter, “Die Echtheit der Korrespondenz zwischen Basilius und Libanios ist seit den Zweifeln Garniers und Marans [PG 29, CLIX] mehrfach bestritten worden. Bis heute hat das Problem keine allgemein akzeptierte Lösung gefunden […]. Die auf stilistischen Beobachtungen basierende Kritik an der Echtheit (z.B. bei Laube und Forster) kann nicht definitiv überzeugen; sie müßte umfassender und detaillierter begründet werden” (Hauschild 1993, 243). Unquestionably spurious are Letters 9, 13, and
issue still under dispute—it is at least possible that the communication took place. Whatever the truth, the position of *Gr 8* is unwavering: Theodoros has meticulously marked each letter with either Ἀλβάνιος Βασιλείῳ or Βασιλείῳ Ἀλβανίῳ. The subject matter of the letters varies: there are letters of recommendation, as Basil sends young men to join Libanios’ teaching, and Libanios’ replies to these (*Epp.* 1; 15; 2; 3; 12). There are comments on everyday conditions and practical matters: Basil in *Ep.* 16 “while I wrote it, I covered this letter with snow, so that you may feel how cold it is and understand how it is to be locked in by the grim winter. We live in tombs here until spring brings our corpses back to life;” *Epp.* 13 and 14: Libanios needs rafters—can Basil send them to him? This could of course not be said without due rhetorical meandering. Basil answers with more of this wordplay and teasing, the key message being: “have sent 300 rafters to you.” *Epp.* 3–6 are linked to and comment on each other, praising the eloquence of the other in a quest for humbleness and mutual admiration. They are letters about letter-writing, something which could make them even more interesting as “model letters” for a scribe like Theodoros. Other letters, too, comment on the lack of letters or the difficulty in writing them: *Ep.* 7 Libanios to Basil: Are you still mad at me? If not, why don’t you write me? *Ep.* 22 Basil: “Receiving the letters you write, joy; but when asked to reply to your letters, struggle.” *Ep.* 10: Basil has not heard from Libanios for ages and ends with an “Ok, bye then”—which sounds more like a “well, screw you, then!”—“Write if you wish, don’t write if that suits you better.” To this Libanios in *Ep.* 11 says “I’m sorry” (although Libanios actually needed 300 words to say this and make it sound like it was Basil who had wronged him).

*Epp.* 17–20 create an intriguing appendage to another text in *Gr 8*, Text 27. I give an abridged paraphrase of the first letter, from Basil to Libanios:

People marvel at your eloquence. They seem to have listened to a splendid display, and I hear everyone was there: nobles, enrolled recruits, craftsmen, yes, even women! They told me the orator had given a declamation on a grouchy husband. Well, I want to hear it too. Send it to me!

---

14, and this probably goes for Letter 8 as well (Hauschild 1993, 244). On the authenticity of the correspondence, see also Cribiore 2007, 100f.

93 Raffaella Cribiore states that “Basil was indeed a student of Libanius, but not in Antioch and not for long.” Basil took advantage of the teachings of philosophers and rhetors during his stay in Constantinople (in 348 or 349 CE), precisely the period when Libanios taught in Nicomedia and Constantinople. A letter of Basil’s brother, Gregory of Nyssa, corroborates this, since Basil is there called “student” (μαθήτης) of Libanios (*Ep.* 13); Cribiore 2007, 100.

94 I number these mutual letters according to Foerster’s edition of Libanios (*Epistularum Basilli et Libanii quod fertur commercium*; Foerster 1922, 11, 572–597. This means that Lib.–Bas. *Epp.* 1–22 equal Bas. *Epp.* 335–356 in Garnier & Maran’s edition of Basil’s letters (usually called the Benedictine edition of 1839; *PG* 32, 1077–1097); the letters in *Gr 8* are set in the following sequence: *Epp.* 7; 1; 15–22; 2–6; 8–9; 13–14; 10–12.
Libanios’ lauded performance probably presented the same declamation that Theodoros has included in U6 (Text 27, cf. above, p. 132). In the next letter Libanios says that he has sent his speech to Basil, but he trembles at the verdict. Basil replies, piling up superlatives, saying that he really thought he saw this man together with his chatty woman. “For a speech alive on earth has Libanios written, he who alone has given words a life.” Libanios is very happy with Basil’s estimation and can now swagger around with pride. In sum, the exchange of letters between Libanios and Basil is an exhibition of eloquence coupled with charm and wit. Consequently, this part of the manuscript vouches for amusing reading in addition to being a possible fount for model texts.

The same could be said about the next few letters by Basil, Epp. 330, 332, 186 and 187 (Text 70). The first two, both without addressee, are short, pithy expressions from someone who is tired of waiting for letters. The ideas are:

a) If you love me, write me!
b) Are you dead or what? If not, write me!

Epp. 186–187 are devoted to Sauerkraut(!). In a letter to Antipater, the governor of Cappadocia, Basil comments on the fact that pickled cabbage has restored the governor’s appetite and health. This food, which Basil could hardly endure, “both on account of the proverb [cited only in Antipater’s reply], and because it reminded me of its companion, poverty,” ought therefore be re-evaluated and held in highest esteem, even surpassing Homeric lotus and the ambrosia of the gods. In Antipater’s reassuring answer he gives us the proverb: “cabbage twice is death.” The tone in these letters is light and good-humored. “I have often wished to die,” Antipater says, “but that will only happen once—and whether I ask for it or not.” These letters go well together with some of the medical texts in Gr 8: the excerpts from Paul of Aegina, which all treat the connection between food-stuff and health, and the letter attributed to Diocles of Karystos, stressing diet and purging as the way to avoid sickness (see Text 11, below p. 174).

Text 36 (on f. 196 in U6) bestows us two more letters from late antiquity. Isidore of Pelousion lived his life as a monk near Pelousion (today’s Tell el-Faraama, in the eastern part of the Nile Delta) and died an old man not later than 449–450. His voluminous correspondence—2000 letters—deals with dogmatics and exegetics, with ecclesiastical and monastic discipline, but it also addresses practical morality for the guidance of laymen, whether they be judges, rulers, or teachers. The two letters in Gr 8, Epp. 1, 390 and 1, 167, belong to this last category. Since their subject matter is somewhat peculiar, I render them in full:

---

95 Lib. Decl. 26: Δύσκολος γήμας λάλων γυναῖκα έαυτόν προσαγέλλει.
96 On the transmission and authenticity of the correspondence, see EVIEUX 1976, 329–335. There is no modern edition of Isidore’s whole correspondence; for the Greek wording of the above letters, see PG 78, 401 and 292f.
Harsh rumors trouble me and bring offensive tidings. Some people say that you were so mad and out of your mind, so as to wish to bring this child who by God was made capable of receiving all erudition, to carry weapons and go on a cheap and despicable campaign, a playground of death. Now, if you have not completely suffered a loss of wits, give up this confused plan. Do not put a light out which endeavors to glow brilliantly, but allow him to devote himself to studies. That other dignity, or rather penalty, you should procure for other vagrants, those who go well together with the common lack of learning. (*Ep. I*, 390)

The man who takes pleasure in combat, and enjoys the clamor, and keenly pursues that which is repulsive to everybody else—what should one aptly call him, if not an evil demon, who of his own accord has transformed his nature? Because already here, ahead of time, Christ punishes the demons, and in that other place he has promised them an eternal fire along with their father. Either bring an end to your quest for a tumultuous life, or know that already here you are liable to whipping, and beyond, you will not escape vengeance. (*Ep. I*, 167)

One certainly wonders what made Theodoros select these two letters and no other from Isidore’s vast collection. Had he himself once wished to be a soldier? Did he have a son or another person close to him, whom he needed to dissuade from walking that road? Mere speculations, yes, but out of 2000 letters, why these pacifist statements? One may object here that we cannot know if Theodoros selected these two letters out of a corpus of Isidore’s writings or not. True, but he still chose to put these two in his book, even if he happened to stumble upon them in another context. I find the choice of the subject matter fascinating.

**Byzantine epistolographers**

Texts (42), 43, (72)

Theophylact Simokates is perhaps less known than many other writers of the early Byzantine period. He lived in the early part of the seventh century, and wrote, among other things, a history of the reign of Emperor Maurice (582–602). As an author of fictitious letters he has been rather unfairly judged by some scholars: Eduard Norden and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff used words like “silly” and “grimacing monster” to describe him, but, fortunately, their yardstick of estimation is now out-of-date. In the wake of the ongoing reappraisal of Hellenistic poetry and post-classical rhetoric has

---

97 The addressee Quintinianos is not mentioned in *Gr 8*, and neither is Esaias, the soldier, in the next letter. These have been added from Migne’s text in *PG 78*.

98 *Nissen* 1937, 17.
come a wider understanding of the minor formats of literary creation, and an appreciation of the games authors play through intertextual commentary and re-use and variation of familiar topics. Simokates’ short fictitious letters have been compared to “small poems, neatly structured: he draws a scene in a few lines and then closes it off with a clever twist or moral.”

Theophylact’s collection of 85 letters includes three different categories: moralizing, rustic, and courtesan letters (ἐπιστολαὶ ἡθικαί, ἁγροικικαί, ἐτυμρικαί), sorted according to the principle of variatio. There are twenty of these in Gr 8, representing all three categories: ten on ethical matter, three letters where Theophylact gives voice to farmers, and seven letters on courtesans (Text 43). What becomes apparent as one reads Theophylact’s letters is the way the author creates something new by stretching a traditional theme or topos a bit further, toppling the story in a comical direction. To give an example, the subject matter of Ep. 16 seems at first glance rather dull: don’t take loans, don’t buy on tick, and you’ll be free and happy. The joke does not appear until we remember to check who sent it and to whom: the sender is Gorgias, who is reputed to have become vastly affluent from his sophistic teaching; he was criticized for wanting to make money by deceiving the public with misleading arguments. The addressee Aristeides,

99 Moffatt 1984, 345.  
100 The sequence is such that every third letter is moralizing, every third rustic, and likewise with the courtesan letters. Since the collection begins and ends with moralizing letters, there are all in all 29 of these and 28 letters each of the other two groups. The only exception to the sequencing is Epp. 26–27, though they may have just swapped places in the manuscript tradition (cf. Moffatt 1984, 348; according to Zanetto, the wrong sequence of Epp. 26–27 was present already in the archetype; in four manuscripts it has been corrected to the more logical sequence with regard to contents 25–27–26–28; Zanetto 1985, xxv). Adriana Pignani also breaks the sequencing by putting Ep. 20 in the courtesan group, epistole amorosi (Pignani 1979–80, 51; Moffatt, as above, n. 14, suggests likewise), but the letter must first and foremost count as a rustic one: one farmer writes to another complaining that the girl he is courting does not love him back. He had just sent her wild pears as a gift, “but she threw away the thread and rose from the loom, took the pears and gave to the pigs.” With amusing result Theophylact combines the epistolary topos of gifts accompanying letters and the topos in love letters of blind fate and torturing erotes. The clash between the farmer’s anguish (“But I cry! Terrible Eros has wronged me...”) and the picture of the girl throwing his precious pears to the hogs, is downright funny. 

101 Simoc Epp. 1, 3–4, 9–10, 13–19, 26, 29, 34, 37, 46, 60–61, 66. Epp. 14, 17, and 29 are rustic; Epp. 3, 9, 15, 18, 26, 60, and 66 are courtesan letters. The most recent editor of Simokates’ letters, Giuseppe Zanetto, has not mentioned Gr 8 in his surveys of manuscripts and did not include any account of these letters in his editorial work, most likely because he could not know about them: Graux’s catalog is entirely silent, Torallas Tovar gave the incipit but no identification (cf. Zanetto 1976; Zanetto 1982b; Zanetto 1985). The selection of letters in Gr 8 does not correspond to that of any other known manuscript (cf. Zanetto 1982b, Appendix II), but a preliminary collation of the texts indicates that Gr 8 is related to Zanetto’s “familia a” (which, in Zanetto’s stemma, is made up of Par. gr. 690, Par. gr. 2991A, Vat. Urb. gr. 134, and Ambros. A 115 sup.; Zanetto 1985, xiii). 


103 Sprague 1972, 31. Cf. Diod. Sic. 12. 53, on Gorgias’ enormous fees; Paus. 10. 18, 7, on his statue of gold in Delphi; Ael. Var. 12. 32, on his purpurean clothes.
on the other hand, is remembered for his righteousness, never seeking benefits for his own sake. “Of all his virtues, it was his justice that most impressed the multitude. [...] Wherefore, though poor and a man of the people, he acquired that most kingly and godlike surname of ‘The Just.’” Theophylact thus twists the subject around: the arguments in the letter seem sound enough, but in the mouth of a swindler they get another tinge. A letter which appeared to be about living beyond one’s means, becomes a challenge to the reader, who must ask her- or himself: who is the real crook here?

Unfortunately, in Gr 8 no captions to Theophylact’s letters were inserted: thus a reader may have missed out on some of the fun here. When Theodoros copied the letters though, he probably did have access to a more complete model, because he left just enough room for a title at the beginning of U9, and for rubricated captions to be inserted at each letter. This rubrication was never carried out, but we can see in the manuscript that later readers did partake of these cultivated and also very enjoyable letters. They have tried, with poor result, to supply some short-titles: Ep. 3, for example, is introduced by περὶ τον επερησθὸν ἡγοὺν τον ποιητῶν, and Ep. 16 is called τοὺς δανιστὰς κι χραοιστάς.

John Tzetzes’ letter to John Lachanas is included in Gr 8 together with the commentary excerpts from the Chiliades (Text 42), and begins with the statement that the letter displays the three forms of speech: judiciary, hortatory, and festive speech. The remark that “through the stories (ταῖς ἱστορίαις) it delivers praise of some people and blame of others,” is to the point, since Tzetzes’ letter seems to be more of a catalog of exempla than a real act of communication. “With these things you can embellish, Zabareiotan Lachanas: Kroisos on riches, Midas on gold, … Narkissos on beauty, Orpheus on music,” Tzetzes sets off, and then he just carries on and on with all his references to ancient tales. To cast this in the form of a letter in fifteen-syllable verse seems rather bizarre.

104 Plut. Arist. 6. 1; trans. Perrin. Herodotos calls Aristeides “the best and most just man in Athens” (Hdt 8. 79).
105 That Theophylact really strove to chisel out the form of the letters is obvious from Theodor Nissen’s article, where Nissen brings the nineteenth-century editor Rudolph Hercher to the book, showing that his “emendations” had broken up the prose-rhythm of Theophylact’s clause endings (NISSEN 1932). Cf., however, Wolfram Hörandner, who argues that Nissen may in some cases have gone too far in his defense of Theophylact, through adding new conjectures rythmi gratia (HÖRANDNER 1981, 82).
106 John Lachanas was a contemporary colleague to Tzetzes, a teacher who apparently got an appointment at the ζαβαριστῆς, the arsenal of Constantinople. Yet another letter from Tzetzes to Lachanas is extant (Ep. 105), but here he is called diakonos instead of grammatikos. The Archbishop Eustathios of Thessalonike also sent a letter to Lachanas (GRÜNBACK 1996, 222, n. 245).
107 Αὕτη δὲ ἡ ἐπιστολὴ μετέχει τῶν τριῶν εἰδῶν τῆς ῥήτορικῆς: ἢ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ὀνειδίζει, τὸ δικανικὸν εἰδὸς τιρεῖ: ἢ δὲ παρανέστει, τὸ συμβουλευτικόν τὸ πανηγυρικόν, ἢ ταῖς ἱστορίαις τοὺς μὲν ἐγκομιαστικῶς, τοὺς δὲ μειμπτικῶς ἐπιφέρει (Gr 8, f. 217’).
Text 72, the letter from Nikephoros Gregoras to the Grand Logothete Metochites was discussed above, among the oratory works.

**Letters from humanist circles**

Texts 24, 25a–c, 26

Five letters in *Gr 8* saw their origin in the humanist circle of Plethon and Cardinal Bessarion in the 1450s or a little later. They are transmitted in sequence in the manuscript, on ff. 162–173. The first letter was written by George Gemistos Plethon shortly before his death in 1452 and is addressed to George Scholarios (Text 24). Its contents reflect one of the large intellectual controversies of the time: the supremacy of Plato’s or Aristotle’s teachings. George Scholarios (soon to become Patriarch of Ottoman Constantinople under the name of Gennadios II) had already written a pamphlet in favor of Aristotle, and Plethon now sends him his objections. Our manuscript does not reproduce the entire letter, merely the introductory paragraph where Plethon criticizes Scholarios for not sending him his pamphlet and for lying about this; Plethon asserts that having now acquired part of it by other means, he clearly sees Scholarios’ ignorance and unsound train of thought. Plethon is quite offensive and ridicules Scholarios.108

Though there are other philosophical and theological texts in *Gr 8* (Plethon’s treatise *On Virtues* is presented in full, just to mention one example), in this case the subject matter of the treatise does not seem to have been the scribe’s first priority. Choosing only the rhetorically juicy part of the introduction must have filled another function: was it for the mere fun of it? Did Theodoros think it useful as a model in his own rhetorical or authorial enterprise? The position of the text in the codicological unit does not provide any definite clue on this. Preceded by Plethon’s *On Virtues*, it begins in the middle of a verso page and ends in the middle of the next page, and the texts which follow belong to the same cultural setting (on these, see more below). Supposing the main arguments of this philosophical controversy were familiar to a professional scribe like Theodoros—and there is nothing which speaks against that—it is quite plausible that he made a deliberate selection of this *psogos* part of the treatise.

Cardinal Bessarion’s correspondence includes both private letters of personal, literary, or philosophical content, and official letters and reports.109

---

108 Plethon’s offensiveness is more understandable when seen against the background of a long period of disagreement between the two men. Already during the Council of Florence they were avid opponents in church matters as well as in their philosophical outlook. In fact, when Plethon first wrote his treatise on the differences between Plato’s and Aristotle’s conceptions of God (*On the differences*), it was George Scholarios who convinced Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos that Plethon had rendered himself guilty of heresy, and when Plethon’s *Book of Laws* finally came into Scholarios’ hands, he arranged to have it burnt (Mohler 1923, 204). On Plethon’s and Scholarios’ views of Aristotle, see further Karamanolis 2002.

109 Bessarion’s correspondence has been collected and edited by Ludwig Mohler (Mohler 1942).
The three letters in *Gr 8* (Text 25) all belong to the first category. *Ep.* 22, written shortly after Plethon’s death in 1452, is addressed to the two sons of Plethon, Demetrios and Andronikos. It is a letter of condolence and veneration: Bessarion eulogizes his teacher Plethon as the most admirable man in Greece, who in himself had Plato’s soul come down to earthly life anew. *Epp.* 49–50, though written some ten years later, are actually closely connected to the Plethon-text we have just encountered above. The controversy between Aristotelians and Platonics continued after Plethon’s last word was said, and one of the scholars who wrote yet another defense of Aristotle against Plethon’s ideas was Theodore Gazes. His treatise is not extant, but we still have Bessarion’s reply to it. On another occasion Gazes opposed Plethon’s critique on the Aristotelian category of “substance.” Gazes’ views were furthermore attacked by Michael Apostoles, and he, in his turn, was rebutted through Andronikos Kallistos’ writings. Bessarion was convinced that no inherent opposition was to be found between Plato’s and Aristotle’s teachings, and he tried to mediate in this heated debate, both through his own reconciliatory treatises, and through personal addresses to people involved. This is where the other two letters in *Gr 8* come in.

*Ep.* 49 is the reprimand Bessarion sent to Michael Apostoles, scolding him for his youthfully injudicious comments on Gazes’ treatise. “One should not abuse one’s opponents; rather, it is by providing proof and logical arguments that one should both support a friend and defend oneself against the enemy,” he says. “If indeed Plethon has flung mud at Aristotle, and if Theodore has done it with Plethon, and if you have spoken ill of Theodore, then all things said seem to me to be past reason and need. For it is not possible to reproach Aristotle who has done us so much good; neither Plethon who is wise and a truly good man (well, if it were not for the fact that he started the abuse and those who defend themselves could be granted some pardon...).” One could argue that here we have the key to why the scribe

110 So much so, that even after half a century there was a scholar who composed a critique of Aristotle and had it published under the pseudonym of Pletho himself. On this late and somewhat misdirected support of Pletho written by the Augustinian friar Nicolaus Scutellius, see further Monfasani 2005.

111 Möhlér 1942, 88–90. Theodore Gazes (ca. 1400–1475) was born in Thessalonica but fled to Italy in 1430. He took part in the Church Council at Florence-Ferrara, and as the successor of Nicholas Sagundino (on him, see more below) he taught Greek in Ferrara in 1440–1449. He also enjoyed the patronage of King Alfonso of Naples and spent his last years in Calabria, translating Greek texts into Latin. Aristotle was one of the authors to whom he dedicated his translating efforts (Geanakoplos 1989, 68–90).

112 Möhlér 1942, 153–58.

113 Monfasani 1992, 238. For the contributions by Michael Apostoles and Andronikos Kallistos, see Möhlér 1942, 159–203.

114 This letter was written at Viterbo’s thermal baths and is dated Μαΐου μηδὲς ἐννέατη πρὸς ἐκκάτην ἄγοντος, ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ ἀψβή’ (*Gr 8*, f. 167v). This ought to refer to the night between the ninth and tenth of May. Cf. however Möhlér: “Der Brief stammt vom 19. Mai 1462” (Möhlér 1942, 511; the edited text, p. 513, reads ἐννέατη πρὸς ἐκκάτην).
Theodoros included only the *psogos* part of Plethon’s letter (Text 24): the offensive tone in that part of Plethon’s letter is precisely what Bessarion refers to in *Ep*. 49.

Bessarion defends Plethon as a thinker even though he does not agree with his views, and the instructions he gives to Apostoles are plain: “If you wish to obey me, you should hold both Aristotle and Plato as the wisest, follow them in their tracks, and make each of them your guide.” Bessarion uses the rest of the letter to further explicate his arguments for this, and also to explain why Theodore Gazes and Andronikos Kallistos are to be commended for their contributions to the debate. Bessarion also exhorted Apostoles to learn from Andronikos. Apparently Bessarion then decided to send Andronikos Kallistos a copy of *Ep*. 49, because *Ep*. 50 is just a short note which he attached: “From Cardinal Bessarion to Andronikos Kallistos, to study. I read both what Michael confusingly had composed against Theodore and your criticism of him. I have delivered my verdict and vote on them, and I now send you a copy of what he received. For it is neither necessary nor easy for one who has been charmed, to write more extensively to you. (I also put down from where and when I sent it to Michael).”

The next letter in *Gr 8* also comments on the writings of Theodore Gazes and Michael Apostoles. It was sent to the same Andronikos Kallistos from Nicholas Sagundino (Text 26). Sagundino—in Greek Sekoundinós—was a Venetian from Negroponte (Euboia) who had been taken prisoner by the Ottomans when they sacked Thessalonica in 1430. Thanks to his linguistic skills he served as interpreter at the Council of Florence-Ferrara, where he also made Bessarion’s acquaintance. With the exception of only four letters, his extant correspondence is written in Latin. The letter to Andronikos Kallistos was sent from Viterbo in early June 1462, and Sagundino definitely sides with Theodore Gazes and Andronikos Kallistos against Michael Apostoles.

---

115 Εἳ τι ών ἐμοὶ πείθην, καὶ Πλάτωνα καὶ Ἀριστοτέλη σωφροτάτους ἡγούμενος, κατ’ ἕχος τε τούτων ἐπόμενος, ἕκατερον ἡγεμόνα τε σαυτοῦ ποιοῦ. Καὶ *Gr 8* has πάθη instead of πείθη, but that reading is clearly wrong.

116 Already from these few letters of Greek humanist scholars, it is obvious how closely knit this community was. We have met some of these names already in Chapter 3 (especially persons who worked as scribes on commission of Bessarion and others; Michael Apostoles, Michael Souliardos, Antonios Damilas). Another entry to this circle of colleagues and friends, several of whom had originally met at Florence-Ferrara, is offered us in Text 81 (see Chapter 5). The position as interpreter at the Council was first offered to Francesco Filelfo, who had to renounce it for political reasons. The skillfulness of Nicholas Sagundino, however, is well attested: he could translate the speeches of both parties straight off in the Council sessions (MOHLER 1923, 123).

117 The edition of this letter is still the one made by Boissonade in 1833 (reprinted by Migne, *PG* 161, 691–696). Another Greek letter of Sagundino’s was edited by Mastrodemetres (MASTRODEMETRES 1965). According to Mastrodemetres’ survey, the letter from Sagundino to Andronikos Kallistos is extant in fifteen manuscripts, but he did not include *Gr 8* among them (MASTRODEMETRES 1970, 149–154). Sagundino also wrote a treatise on the “rules” of Greek and Latin letter-writing, “De epistolari dicendi genere” (MASTRODEMETRES 1970, 129).
That he is more verbose than Bessarion is also clear; in the eleven manuscript pages that his letter covers in *Gr 8* he says less than Bessarion did in half the space.

One text which definitely belongs to the subject of epistolography, but on a more practical level, is Text 81. Moreover, it also gives some interesting perspectives on people connected with Bessarion’s network of humanists. This text is a mid-fifteenth century collection of letter-headings, a formulary which provides instructions mainly on how to address public officials of various kinds. Text 81 is dealt with more thoroughly in Chapter 5, below.

**Why these letters in *Gr 8***?

To wrap up this overview of letters in *Gr 8*, we may benefit from a list on where they are situated:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U3</th>
<th>Text 7 (Gregory of Nazianzos)</th>
<th>narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 8 (Hippocrates)</td>
<td>d:o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 9 (Anacharsis)</td>
<td>d:o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U4</th>
<th>Text 11b (Diocles)</th>
<th>medical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U6</th>
<th>Text 24 (Plethon)</th>
<th>polemic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 25 (Bessarion)</td>
<td>humanist and pacifist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 26 (Sagundino)</td>
<td>d:o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 36 (Isidore)</td>
<td>d:o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U8</th>
<th>Text 42 (Tzetzes)</th>
<th>in verse; instructive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U9</th>
<th>Text 43 (Simokates)</th>
<th>moral, rustic, and amatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U13</th>
<th>Text 67 (Basil)</th>
<th>personal; models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 68 (Libanios &amp; Basil)</td>
<td>d:o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 69 (Gregory of Nazianzos)</td>
<td>d:o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 70 (Basil)</td>
<td>d:o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 72 (Gregoras)</td>
<td>display</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U15</th>
<th>Text 81 (formulary)</th>
<th>practical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As we have seen above, there are letters of many different kinds in *Gr 8*, and presumably they ended up in the manuscript for a number of reasons. The

---

118 The town of Viterbo is known as a Papal resort, both due to its stout walls which gave refuge in times of strife, and its hot springs which were thought to be beneficial for the Pope’s health. In 1462 Pope Pius II (Enea Silvio Piccolomini, 1405–1464) went to Viterbo seeking relief for his gout, and Nicholas Sagundino, who was the Pope’s secretary at the time, apparently accompanied him there (*MASTRODEMETRES* 1964, 254).
Philosophical and theological texts

Sheer reading experience must not be overlooked: there are more than a few examples of amusing and intriguing subject matter. The skill with which many of the letters were wrought would have contributed to the pleasure of reading as well: the polished language form, the rhythmical clause endings, the disguised or open allusions to other literary works, et cetera. This would also have made the letters suitable as models if one were to create letters of one’s own. The epistolary production of authors like Libanios, Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nazianzos soon became models of style, and they remained so throughout the Byzantine period and even beyond. These late antique letters were all placed as a group by Theodoros, in U13 (one letter by Gregory excepted). In that same unit we also find Nikephoros Gregor’as’ letter. The ancient fictitious letters are placed in U3, in close proximity to other narrative works, and they probably functioned as such, too. Gregory of Nazianzos’ Ep. 114, also in U3, may easily be regarded as that kind of text as well, with its focus on fables and stories. The Anacharsis letters also display similarities in subject matter to Isocrates’ speech To Demonicus, as both deal with paraenetics (advice on how to lead a virtuous life and how to govern justly), and these go together in the same codicological unit.

Tzetzes’ letter does not really strike one as a letter: the contents are too much of a catalog, and the direct addressing of the letter’s recipient is vague. This text together with the commentary to it (Chiliades) make up U8, and they are immediately followed by the collection of Simokates’ letters in U9. The humanist letters, from the circle of Plethon and Bessarion, are also placed as a group and follow upon another text by Plethon: On Virtues. One could argue that these were included because they reflect the philosophical debates in the Quattrocento, but they are also interesting as specimens of derogatory letter-writing, either in themselves or as comments on other offensive writings. These letters are situated in U6, where we also have other fifteenth-century writings, by Mark Eugenikos (Texts 30–31). In the same unit, U6, we come across the two letters by Isidore of Pelousion, interesting for their strong viewpoints on warfare and on a soldier’s career.

It seems quite clear that Theodoros’ organization of his book, or at least of the contents inside each codicological unit, was very much premeditated. We are thus encouraged to give some respect to miscellaneous manuscripts like Gr 8: the first impression may be that a book looks disorganized and confused, but it may be worth the effort to try to look beneath the surface.

Philosophical and theological texts

The philosophical texts in Gr 8 can roughly be divided into three groups: a) the ancient or early Byzantine works, authored by Gregory Thaumatourgos,

---

119 Cf. GRÜNBART 2007, 129.
John Philoponos, and Theodoret of Kyros; b) anonymous works, therefore precarious to date; c) late Byzantine works, mainly by George Gemistos Plethon. A common denominator in many of these texts is the focus on the soul: what is a soul, how can it be defined, described, analyzed? However, the fact that these—undeniably philosophical—questions are discussed and answered in accordance with Christian beliefs blurs the distinction between philosophical and theological texts, and this is why I have decided to treat the philosophical and theological items in combination. According to Katerina Ierodiakonou, the general tendency nowadays is to allow for a clear dividing line between Byzantine theology and philosophy.\(^\text{120}\) But it is one thing to look at the situation in institutional education (where, for example in Italy, philosophy was always linked with medicine and was unrelated to theology), and another to ask what an individual makes of his interests in different areas. Thus there were many a theologian during these centuries who took an interest in philosophical matters. In addition, the roles of ecclesiastics and laypersons were not always separated: one and the same person could be a teacher in one period of his life and a servant of the Church in another.\(^\text{121}\)

Whether it is feasible to raise partition-walls between philosophy and theology must also depend on which questions are at stake in the philosophical discussion, and, at least for our treatment of \textit{Gr 8}, the combination of these categories is functional: we will start out with the texts which may count as “hardcore philosophy,” and then work our way over to more strictly theological turf, ending with devotional matter.

Cosmology according to the ancient philosophers

\textbf{Text 56}

Needless to say, Theodoret had an agenda as a Christian author and a bishop: in his work \textit{Cure of the Pagan Maladies} (Text 56) he wanted to show the superiority of Christian doctrine over the Greek thinkers of old.\(^\text{122}\) In this process he presented a long line of ancient philosophers together with some of their viewpoints. Xenophanes and Parmenides on the perpetual unity and immutability of the cosmos: if it is everlasting, Theodoret objects, then it is without beginning and without cause, and that cannot be; the belief in a

\(^{120}\) IERODIAKONOU 2002, 2. On the comparable situation regarding boundaries between philosophy and theology in Western Europe, cf. also KRISTELLER 1979, 42.

\(^{121}\) A peculiar turn of the arguments occurred in Plethon’s and George Scholarios’ polemic against each other: Scholarios, the theologian, argued that it was a defect in Plato to mix different disciplines, such as physics, mathematics, and theology, while the philosopher Plethon stated in his reply that “disciplines which are incomplete require other disciplines which are more complete to supplement them”; thus, as geometry needed arithmetics, “physics and ethics would never be complete without theology” (WOODHOUSE 1986, 46; Scholarios, \textit{Contra Plethonis ignorationem de Aristotele} iv, 83; for Plethon’s reply, see \textit{PG} 160, 993B).

\(^{122}\) Thdt, \textit{Affect} 4.5–16; 4.32–42; 5.8–52; and 6.11–26 are included in \textit{Gr 8} on ff. 262\^\text{v}–278\^\text{v}. 
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Creator must prevail (no need to add here that the discussion of the “first cause” has continued throughout the centuries and no less so in the fifteenth century, with its concern to link Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy to Christian dogmas). One may be tempted to put Theodoret’s argument down to Scriptural influence, but he may actually just as well be referring to Plato.\footnote{On the opinion that nothing comes into being without cause, and that we therefore must reckon with a creator, a demiurge, see Pl. \textit{Tim}. 28a–29a.} Theodoret proceeds with Democritus’ theory of the void and the solid, Metrodorus of Chios on the undivided, and so forth. The fifth element is mentioned in passing, form and matter discussed at length (the name-dropping naturally includes Plato and Aristotle, but also Xenocrates, Thales, Heracleitus, Pythagoras, Epicurus, Crates, Zeno, and many more). Now, how could these philosophers be right and trustworthy about cosmos, when “they not only disagree vehemently with each other but also at the same time borrow from each other,” Theodoret argues.\footnote{Thdt, \textit{Affect} 4.15: Όδι μόνον δέ ἐν τούτοις διαφωνίας γε πλείστη, ἄλλα καί τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐνφήσαντο.}

In the next excerpt in \textit{Gr} 8, Theodoret does refer to Plato’s \textit{Timaeus} and \textit{Republic}, commending some of Plato’s theories on cosmological matters and challenging others. As for the excerpting technique, the joint was apparently skillfully wrought, rendering the omission of paragraphs 17–31 nigh to undetectable. Having mentioned Aëtius, Plutarch, Porphyry, and Xenophon in § 31, Theodoret says “but all of these I leave aside, instead focussing on Plato” (Thdt, \textit{Affect} 4.32). In the excerpt of \textit{Gr} 8, Ἐγὼ δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἀπαντᾶς παραλείψω has become Ἐγὼ μὲν τοὺς ἄλλους, κτλ., which here comes to serve as a reference to all the ancient philosophers mentioned in the preceding excerpt. It is also intriguing to see that the excerpt in \textit{Gr} 8 only includes those Platonic ideas which Theodoret approved of. Shortly after the break, in § 4.45, Theodoret continues with those Platonic theories that did not harmonize with his own views, but that part was omitted by the excerptor. Whether our scribe Theodoros was responsible for this selection himself or got it from a model manuscript, it is still food for thought that someone at the time, in the century which had seen so much debate on Aristotle versus Plato, took pains to collect and include arguments for one side only—the one \textit{pro} Plato.

The two remaining passages from Theodoret treat human nature and fate. The purpose is still to establish how the Christian views differ from the philosophers’ (ὅσον τὸ μέσον τὸν τε θεῖον καὶ τὸν φιλοσόφων δογμάτων, § 5.8). The greater part of the opinions of poets and philosophers is discarded,\footnote{Aristotle gets a real scolding in §§ 5.46–47: not only did he set himself up in opposition while Plato was still alive, showing no respect, but recklessly adopted views which were very much inferior (πολλῷ γε χείροις χρησάμενος δόγμασιν), such as the soul purportedly being mortal and the earth being deprived of God’s providence.} but Plato’s teaching is, once more, seen as rewarding, although
mainly as a presentiment of the full truth found in the Scripture. As we will see below, the subjects of the soul, reason, free will, and fate are brought up for discussion in other texts in *Gr 8* as well.

The soul
Texts 6, 53, 57, (59), 60

Most of the philosophical texts in *Gr 8* focus on problems which in a way may be said to be timeless, but which were fervently discussed by fifteenth-century humanists: the immortal human soul, and the question of fate and predestination.126 We have already seen this in the passages from Theodoret’s *Cure* (Text 56), and the fact that these subjects were elaborated on both with and without religious overtones is not surprising. One anonymous text on the soul is found on ff. 254r–256v (Text 53); perhaps it was even composed by the scribe Theodoros himself?127 “The views we hold on the soul and its essence we expound in this wise,” it begins,128 and the subject is then developed in several hierarchical stages, illustrated at the end of the text with diagrams of “theories on the soul” (τῶν περὶ ψυχῆς θεωρουμένων), its properties, faculties, perceptions, states of mind, etcetera.129 The text, which is easily comprehensible thanks to its structure, may have been compiled for teaching purposes (or for someone who needed to sort out these matters for his own sake). To some extent its contents overlap with the explications on the soul in Texts 16–17; on these, see more below. It is also reminiscent of Theodoret’s outline in §§ 5.19–22 of the *Cure*, although in the case of Theodoret a synopsis is given of the views of several philosophers (Pythagoras, Plato, Xenocrates, Aristotle, the Stoics), whereas in Text 53 the intention seems to be to create a coherent stance on the soul and its properties. Another difference is that in Text 53 there are no references whatsoever to indisputably Christian ideas. A micro-text which also treats the soul and its faculties is Text 6. This, too, is non-committal as to Christian ideas, but there

126 On the immortality of the soul, which became “one of the most important and characteristic themes of Renaissance philosophy,” see KRISTELLER 1979, 181–196. Evidence of the ongoing debate on fate is found in Plethon’s treatise *Περὶ εἰμαθμένης* (*PG* 160, 961–964); in several treatises on predestination and fate by George Scholarios (PETIT et al. 1928, 390–460); in Cardinal Bessarion’s correspondence with Plethon (*Epp.* 18–20; MOHLER 1942, 455–465), in Bessarion’s own treatise *In calumniatorem Platonis* III, 30–31; MOHLER 1927, 418–421); and in Matthew Kamariotes’ two orations, were he attacked Plethon’s treatise (*MONFASANI* 1976, 207). Several of the Italian humanists also contributed to the discussion, among them Marsiglio Ficino (see further KELLER 1957).

127 A passage in the text purportedly refers to Plato (παύτη τοι καὶ μικρότερον ὑπον καὶ κάλλιστον ἐνυπνίων ὁ Πλάτων ἐκάλει τὴν τουωέν τζοήν), but the phrasing does not seem to have its origin there. It may derive from Theophylact Simokates’ *Ep.* 37; in *Gr 8* this letter is included on f. 230v.

128 Ἀς μὲν ἐρωμένον δόξας περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ τῆς ὑσιᾶς αὐτῆς ἐκθέθεμεν ὁδε. A rubricated heading was meant to precede this sentence, but was never put in.

129 For a transcription of Text 53, see Appendix 1.
are nevertheless close parallels in patristic authors as well as in ancient texts.130

Text 57 (inc. ἐντελέχεια) is a less lucid text which treats the concept of entelechy, the forming, governing principle of matter. The subject is treated by several Aristotelian commentators on De Anima (Alexander of Aphrodisias, John Philoponos, Simplikios), but the text in Gr 8 seems to be unknown. Since it is not very coherently written, it should perhaps rather be taken as notes, or a rough draft. In the manuscript the text follows directly on the passages from Theodoret’s Cure of the Pagan Maladies, and, since entelechy is treated also in that text, albeit briefly,131 it seems that there was a thought behind the arrangement of these texts on the part of our scribe Theodorus. Perhaps one could even suppose it to be Theodoros’ own notes, brought in as an afterthought to Theodoret’s text. Text 57 is an attempt to define and explain the concept linguistically, but also by illustrating the full realization of a human being: a human being is an entelechy not when he as an embryo lives in the womb, still being formed and perfected, but when he is detached and brought forth, consummated according to the human form (εἴδος). Thus, the soul is defined as the full realization of the physical, instrumental body, which (in itself only) has the potentiality (δύναμις) for life. That is what Aristotle says in De Anima 412a 27, and also what Theodoret refers to. But Theodoret equated entelecheia with energeia, actuality/activity, whereas in Text 57 this identity is denied. This may be an indication that it is Theodoros himself who wishes to comment upon and correct Theodoret’s version. The last sentence of Text 57, καὶ η κίνησις ἐντελέχεια λέγεται, ήσυχην ἀπλοῦς ἐνέργεια, may seem a bit unrelated to the rest of the account, but it could be a way of supplementing the definition through another reference to Aristotle.132 As for entelecheia and energeia, Aristotle is admittedly vague on the distinction,133 although in the Metaphysics the two terms are subtly distinguished, so as to make energeia “tend toward” or “implicate” entelecheia, i.e. complete reality.134 It may be of interest that the concept of κίνησις was explicitly brought up also in the Quattrocento con-

---

130 The text, which was put as a page filler after Isocrates’ speech To Demonicus (or. 1), is unpretentious and short enough to have been passed down in florilegia. A similar passage is found, e.g., in Jo. Dam. virt., PG 95, 85B–C. Text 6 is included in Appendix 1.

131 Thdt., Affect 5.17–18: ὅ δὲ Ἱσααρίτης ἐντελέχειαν πρώτην σώματος φυσικοῦ ὀργανικοῦ, δινάμει ζωῆς ἐχοντος· ἐντελέχειαν δὲ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κέκληκεν.


134 Ar. Metaph. 1047a: ἐξήλθε δ’ ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦνομα, ἢ πρὸς τὴν ἐντελέχειαν συντεθεμένη, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐκ τὸν κινήσεων μάλιστα· δικὲς γὰρ ἡ ἐνέργεια μάλιστα η κίνησις εἶναι. Ar. Metaph. 1050a: τὸ γὰρ ἔργον τέλος, ἢ δὲ ἐνέργεια τὸ ἔργον, διὸ καὶ τοῦνομα ἐνέργεια λέγεται κατὰ τὸ ἔργον καὶ συντείνει πρὸς τὴν ἐντελέχειαν.
troversy on Plato and Aristotle. In his *Defense of Aristotle*, George Schola-
rios argued that the verb *κινεῖν* meant not only “to move” but also “to
make,” as in making something change from non-existence to existence,
from potentiality to actuality; Plethon disagreed with this linguistic shift in
meaning.\textsuperscript{135}

A text that represents philosophy at an elementary level is Text 60 (inc.
<"Ε-τι συντοιχίας τινάς ἔξεύρον οἱ πυθαγόρειοι). It follows upon an enu-
meration of the Seven Sages and the maxims ascribed to them,\textsuperscript{136} and since
these sages were at times—although not explicitly in Text 59—also seen as
great inventors, Text 60 seems like a spontaneous addition to that text:

The Pythagoreans, too, invented corres ponding categories, ten in number to
which every existing thing can be referred as to ten elements: good – bad; fi-
nite – infinite; excessive – well-fitted; unity – plurality; right – left; light –
darkness; male – female; being at rest – moving; straight – curved; square –
oblong. And yet another eight opposites which are said to pervade through all
bodies, being original and common: warmth – coldness; humidity – draught;
lightness – heaviness; softness – harshness; elasticity – brittleness; smooth-
ness – roughness; thinness – thickness; porousness – denseness. Three kinds
(of measurement): measuring the line, the surface, the solid. Of these the first
is about length, the other about length and width, and the last about all three
dimensions. Five forms (to measure): square, triangular, rhombic, trapezium,
circular.\textsuperscript{137}

---

\textbf{Gregory Thaumatourgos et sqq.}

**Texts 16–19**

With these texts we return once more to one of the more ponderous philoso-
phical topics: the soul. When discussing dividing lines between philosophy
and theology, it may be instructive to take a look at a part of the manuscript,
that is somewhat ambiguous in its structure: ff. 128–138. From a codicologi-
cal viewpoint there is a coherence here, at least from the way the section is
laid out with rubricated initials and titles/subtitles. Nevertheless, it seemed
sensible to catalog it as four different texts, due to their origin and content.
Conceivably, the break between Texts 18 and 19 was less necessary, but we
will come back to that in a moment. The first text starts with an attribution to

---

\textsuperscript{135} Scholarios, *Contra Plethonis ignorationem de Aristotelie iv*, 28; Plethon, *Contra Gennadii
defensionem Aristotelis*, in *PG* 160, 1008); cf. \textsc{Woodhouse} 1986, 247 and 290.

\textsuperscript{136} The selection of sages in *Gr 8* corresponds to Diogenes Laërtes’ list in *Lives of the Phi-
losophers* i. 13. Cf. also i. 41–42, on other possible constellations of sages.

\textsuperscript{137} For the Greek text, see Appendix 1. Although this specific text seems to be unknown, there
are numerous parallels to its different parts in other commentaries. See, for example, Alex.
Aphr., *In Aristotelis metaphysica commentaria*, ed. Hayduck, 41. 32–38; Sophonias, *In Arist-
Heron, *Geometrica*, 3. 18–22.
Let us first look at Text 16. The preamble following the title is truncated at the beginning compared to the edited text (PG 10, 1137–1145), but it gives no impression of incompleteness: “A discourse on the soul, with consecution and order such as those who are experts in these matters have employed towards those who desire to investigate the matter intelligently.” These lines are analogous to the last four lines of column 1137 in Migne’s reprint of Vossius’ edition (PG 10, 1137–1145). What was lost from the preceding section is the personal address to (the otherwise unknown) Tatian, and the explanation why Gregory chose to use non-Scriptural vocabulary to elucidate important facts about the soul, although he writes to Tatian who is also a Christian; Tatian had apparently asked for precisely such advice, since he needed to use these arguments when confronting pagans, i.e., without resorting to the testimonies of Scripture (although that would be a method which, “to those who seek a pious mind, proves a manner of setting forth doctrine more convincing than any reasoning of man”). The treatise deals with seven questions on the subject of the soul: 1) by what criterion can the soul be apprehended? 2) by what means can it be proven to exist? 3) is it a substance or an accident? 4) is it a body or incorporeal? 5) is it simple or compound? 6) is it mortal or immortal? 7) is it rational or irrational?

Text 17 consists of a number of excerpts from John Philoponos’ *Commentary to Aristotle’s De Anima*. Once again, the soul is in focus. This time the issues are: the incorporeality of the soul (since it holds the body together); the senses (also incorporeal, since they can perceive opposites at the same time through the same sense); the mind (incorporeal and more advanced than the senses, since the senses do not know anything about themselves and do not seek that knowledge, whereas the mind does); faculties and actualities (and their corporeality); the soul as eternal and separable from the

---

138 Gregory Thaumaturgos, or the Wonderworker, was a student of Origen who later became bishop of Neocaesarea, Pontos (ca. 213 – ca. 270 CE). He wrote a panegyric on his teacher, and a small number of his theological works are extant.

139 Λόγος περὶ ψυχῆς ἀκολουθία τινι καὶ τάξει ήπερ ἐχρήσαντο οἱ περὶ ταύτα δεινοὶ πρὸς τοῦς ἐπιστημόνους ζητεῖν ἐθέλοντας.


141 On the extent of the excerpts in Hayduck’s edition, see Appendix 2. John Philoponos (ca. 490 – ca. 570) taught science and philosophy in Alexandria and was a prolific author of works which criticize both Neoplatonist and Aristotelian concepts. He contributed innovative hypotheses of his own, for example on dynamics (SORABJI 1987, 7–16).
body; perishables are destroyed by dissolution or fire, but since it was proven that the soul is incorporeal and separate from the body, it will not be destroyed either way. The excerpting procedure has compressed the account compared to Philoponos’ original work, but it was done intelligently, so that the summarized text of Gr 8 seems neatly knit together. And yet, very few deviations were made from Philoponos’ own wording: a couple of ἄξιον (“he says”) were dropped, something which would make the text seem more like an authoritarian statement and less of a neutral recounting of someone else’s viewpoints.

When it comes to Texts 18–19, one may hesitate whether it would not have been possible to itemize these as one combined text instead of two. In the transition between Texts 18 and 19 there is nothing in the layout which announces that a new text begins, not even a subtitle. The two texts are similar to each other in language and expression, but they treat slightly different subjects. Thus, I suspect that they may have come from the same original treatise, or at least to have been composed by the same author. But since I cannot prove this, I abide by what was said about codicological units in the preceding chapter: it is better to keep them apart if the evidence is unclear. Consequently, although it is possible that the two texts are related, I have left this question open, in the hope that the passages may eventually be identified and the question be settled more definitely.

Text 18 gives an exposé of the carnal, the natural, and the spiritual life. What does it mean to live in these states? Those who live carnally are obscured in their thoughts, the clouds of their passions are like high walls blocking out the beams of the Spirit. They fight over worldly things, privileges and carnal pleasures. Those who live naturally are fools, they are weak, self-loving, never toiling for virtue but shrinking from blameworthy deeds because they care what people say. They fuss over their bodies and terrestrialize their minds. Being empty of the Holy Spirit there is in them no love of God nor neighbor, no self-control, no compassion: it is all pride and arrogance. The last group, finally, are those who are led by the Spirit of God. They practice the spiritual life, purging their souls and chastizing their flesh. By prayer and meditation they fill their minds with light. They transcend to the things that are beyond sense-perception and receive the wisdom of God. Thus they become the salt of the earth and the light of the world.

---

142 The floriate initial at the outset of Text 19 is the same size as those within Text 18. The signs that Theodoros uses to announce the end of a text and the end of a paragraph (two dots and a line) are also the same. The size of these signs may differ, but that has more to do with the accessible space; one may compare the sign just before Text 19 (f. 137v l. 3) with the sign inside Text 16, on f. 128v line 10.

143 Τρεῖς ἄποκαταστάσεις τοῦ βίου ὁδὲν ὁ λόγος καλεῖν· σαρκικήν, ψυχικήν καὶ πνευματικήν. For the translation of ψυχικός here as “natural,” cf. 1 Cor. 2:14. This state represents human life as such without the divine dimension, i.e., body and mind but no spirit.

144 For the Greek text, see Appendix 1.
Text 19 picks up what was said in the preceding paragraph, i.e., it further elucidates the spiritual life and the stages one has to go through on the way to perfection. The three stages are the purgative, the illuminative, and the mystical (perfective). This is actually what was said at the end of Text 18, but here the author goes into more detail. The aim of the purgative stage is to throw off every poison of sin, being smoldered in the ascetic fire, hardened and tempered in the bath of compunction, thus becoming a sharp and mighty sword against passions and demons. When one has reached this stage of passionlessness the illuminative stage follows: here the aim is the word of wisdom which makes distinct the natures of beings, the recognition of divine and human affairs, and the revelation of the mysteries of the heavenly kingdom. The mystical stage is for those who have already run the whole course and reached the maturity of Christ. Then one rises above everything, drawing close to the first light, searching the depths of God through the Spirit. The aim is to initiate the one thus perfected into the hidden mysteries of God.

The combination of texts only just touched upon shows the intricate merging of what we may call philosophical inquiries and spiritual guidance. There is no way to separate the religious sphere from the philosophical. The outer wisdom (ἡ ἕξω σοφία) was not necessarily on edge with the divine Word: one read and used Aristotle and Plato as one needed and wished. This is apparent already in the excerpts from John Philoponos’ commentary on Aristotle. The question of the mortal soul was a stumbling block in Aristotle’s philosophy for Christian thinkers, but although the excerpts above have Aristotle’s philosophy as a starting point, we still end up with an immortal soul separable from the body, contrary to Aristotle’s original views. This development was apparently facilitated by the fact that the excerptor picked up Philoponos’ reasoning along the way.

Reverberations from the Ferrara-Florence discussions

Texts 23, (24), 40, 41

Byzantine thinkers continued to relate to Plato’s and Aristotle’s philosophy, and the waves of discussion were higher than ever in the middle of the fifteenth century, at the time of decline of the Empire. Old arguments were brought to life in the debates around a possible Church union, at the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438–39, and through the intensified relations between Byzantine intellectuals, who had a broad education in both (Neo)Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy, and humanists in the West, who were trained mainly in the scholastic tradition and to whom Plato’s works

145 Τρεῖς εἰσὶ τάξεις ἐν τοῖς ποιημένοις τὰς προκοπάς τῶν τελειωσιῶν ἀναβάσεων καθαρτική, φωτιστική, μυστική ἢ τελειοποιός.
146 See also Appendix 1.
had the charm of novelty when they became accessible in new translations.\textsuperscript{147} In the wake of these debates, theologians in the East and in the West had to adjust not only to dogmatic discrepancies but also to the different traditions of interpreting the ancient philosophers. This tension is reflected in treatises and letters written by many of the great intellectuals of the time: Plethon and George Scholarios, Bessarion and the circle around him—we have already met them above in the section on epistolography. I would like to emphasize one point, though, something which is not always highlighted, but which George Karamanolis has expressed very clearly:\textsuperscript{148} George Gemistos Plethon wrote his treatise against Aristotle’s philosophy (\textit{On the differences}) not because he wanted to place himself in opposition to the Christian faith but because he considered Plato’s philosophy to be closer to Christian doctrine than Aristotle’s. Scholarios, on the other hand, was undertaking the same kind of apologetic task, but favoring Aristotle over Plato. This was not a fight over pagan versus Christian philosophy but a question of which interpretation of the ancient philosophers adhered most closely to Orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{149} One of the issues that Plethon focused on was precisely the immortality of the soul. In other treatises Plethon apparently did experiment with more esoteric outlooks—Zoroastrian, Pythagorean, Neoplatonic—but the dispute on Plato versus Aristotle was an internal affair within Christian bounds.\textsuperscript{150}

In addition to the \textit{Reply to George Scholarios’ Defense of Aristotle} (Text 24), there are two other works by Plethon in \textit{Gr 8}: his treatise \textit{On Virtues} (Text 23), and a treatise on the views of the Roman Church regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit (Text 40). The latter is clearly related to the Council discussions, the former perhaps not, although some scholars believe that it was composed in Italy; at least we know that John Eugenikos made a copy of it in 1439, on his way home from Ferrara.\textsuperscript{151} Brigitte Tambrun-Krasker argues that it may just as well be an earlier work by Plethon.\textsuperscript{152} \textit{On Virtues} was probably intended to befit a general public (as opposed to \textit{The Laws}, for example, which was written for the intimate circle of like-minded

\textsuperscript{147} For a summary of the Plato-Aristotle controversy, see for example Monfasani 1976, 201–229.
\textsuperscript{148} Karamanolis 2002.
\textsuperscript{149} Cf. also Bessarion’s four-volume treatise \textit{In calumniatorem Platonis}, where the first subtitle of vol. 2 reads as follows: “ὁτι τὰ Πλάτωνος μήλλον ἤ τὰ Ἀριστοτέλειος τῇ τῶν Χριστιανῶν συμφωνούσι θρησκείᾳ” (Mohler 1927, 80).
\textsuperscript{150} Plethon had no direct knowledge of either ancient or contemporary zoroastrianism (Woodhouse 1986, 63). The limitation of his “acquaintance” with Zoroaster was the so-called \textit{Chaldean Oracles}, which were made up of Platonic, Neopythagorean, Stoic, Gnostic, and Persian elements, probably compiled in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} c. CE; on these, see further Dannenfeldt 1957.
\textsuperscript{151} Woodhouse 1987, 179; Knös 1950, 178; François Masai’s view, that it was composed in the years that followed 1439, is ruled out by John Eugenikos’ copy of the work (Par. gr. 2075); cf. Masai 1956, 402.
\textsuperscript{152} Tambrun-Krasker 1987, xxxiv.
at Mistra) and became Plethon’s most widely distributed work. Since Tambrun-Krasker has provided a modern edition of the work together with a French translation, I will not pursue the discussion of it here, but just add that it is a well-composed but not very innovative treatise founded on Platonic and Stoic ideas, but also incorporating Aristotelian and Christian elements.

The treatise *Reply to the Treatise in Support of the Latin Doctrine* is much less known (Text 40, incipit Ὁ ὑπὲρ Ἀλατίνων βιβλίων). It has, as far as I know, only seen one edition, in Dositheos Notaras’ Τόμος ἀγάπης κατὰ λατίνων, printed in Jassy, Moldavia 1698. Dositheos, patriarch of Jerusalem, wrote in reaction to Cyril Loukaris’ efforts to renew Orthodox Christianity in pro-reformatory direction, and in the compilation of Τόμος ἀγάπης he found Plethon’s treatise expedient for his purposes. In *Gr 8* there is no original heading to the work: an owner of the book copied a few words from the incipit (and a prayer formula), and the El Escorial secretary Nicholas de la Torre added to the upper margin. In Dositheos’ edition the title is Πρὸς τὸ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λατινικοῦ δόγματος βιβλίον. The treatise Plethon replied to here was John Argyropoulos’ Πᾶσι μὲν ἄλλοις.

Upon Plethon’s text on the Holy Spirit follows another, shorter text which also treats the *filioque* question (Text 41). It lacks a title but has been given

153 At least 65 manuscripts are known plus several editions and translations into Latin, Italian, and other languages (TAMBRUN-KRASKER 1987, xxix; MASAI 1956, 248, n. 1).
154 Plethon’s text ends with a chart over all the virtues; this is reproduced on the front cover of this book.
155 Reprinted in *PG* 160, 975–980.
156 Cyril Loukaris was the patriarch of Alexandria from 1601 and of Constantinople 1620–1638. He was the driving force for a modern Greek translation of the New Testament (carried out mainly by Maximos Rodios from Gallipoli and printed in Geneva after Cyril’s death in 1638). Cyril’s contacts with Protestant churches of northern Europe were ill seen in Orthodox as well as in Catholic circles, and he was finally executed on the charges of high treason. From a book-history point of view it is worth mentioning that Cyril Loukaris introduced the first printing press in the Greek world: in 1627 he invited the printer Nikodemos Metaxas to set up a press in Constantinople. Metaxas set off printing religious—mostly anti-Catholic—books and tracts. The Jesuits, however, instigated an attack on the printing house and the janissaries destroyed the press only a few months after it had been set up (KITROMILIDES 2006, 193–201; see also ROBERTS 1967). It is intriguing that the very next attempt to set up a Greek press on Ottoman soil, was initiated by Patriarch Dositheos. This was installed in 1682 in the monastery of Cetatuia, close to Jassy, i.e. under the Phanariote regime in Romania. Thirty-eight Greek books (four of them bilingual) were printed here up until 1710 (BOUCHARD 2005, 36).
157 This must not be confused with the treatise which often goes under the name of *Reply to Scholarios*, Πρὸς τὰς υπὲρ Ἀριστοτέλους Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἀντιλήψεις, i.e. Text 24 in *Gr 8*.
158 MASAI 1956, 389–392.
159 On the place of the *filioque*-controversy in the discussions at the Council of Ferrara-Florence, see for example PAPADAKIS & MEYENDORFF 1994, 379–408, esp. 401f. A presentation of one of the main (pro-Greek) sources of the Council, the Memoirs of Sylvester Syropoulos, Grand Ecclesiarch of Hagia Sophia of Constantinople, together with some glances at two other sources, the *Acta Graeca*, a record by a prounionist bishop (Dorotheos from
an attribution by a later reader, probably the person who owned the book around 1546 (cf. above, p. 78): μαρκος ό φεσης ἀποφαση του πατρη-αρχ(ου). Nicholas de la Torre, who created the index to our book at El Escorial, inaccurately attributed both this and the preceding (i.e. Plethon’s) text to Mark Eugenikos (Μάρκου Έφεσου). However, even though Text 41 does not, as far as I know, correspond with any published work of Mark Eugenikos, bishop of Ephesus, it may perhaps communicate his answer (ἀποφασις) or his views on this matter in the Council discussion of 1439. At least there are expressions and phrases included which closely resemble what Eugenikos uses in other council-related texts. The text is not well-wrought but seems rather more like a draft or notes taken down. Mark Eugenikos and Bessarion were appointed chief representatives at the Council (πρόκριτοι ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ), and were granted imperial authority to reply to the Latins’ arguments. Eugenikos seems to have come to the Council with the earnest wish to see a durable union on dignified terms, but was dejected by what he saw coming in the discussions. In the end, Eugenikos was the only bishop who refused to sign the decree of union. Eugenikos and Bessarion had known each other long, they had been classmates in John Chortasmenos’ school in Constantinople and had both studied under Plethon. But in theological matters they stood widely apart: Bessarion, with his thorough philosophical and humanist education, was influenced by the Aristotelian Thomism, whereas Eugenikos had a more traditional, monastic background, and had his heart set on hesychasm in its Palamite form.

Fate and predestination
Texts (29), 30–32, (56), (73)

In the excerpts from Theodoret (Text 56), treated above, we came upon the problem of fate and God’s providence. In Gr 8 this topic is brought up in some other texts as well. Two of these have an explicit attribution to Mark Eugenikos, this time made by the scribe Theodoros himself (Texts 30–31). Again, they seem more like a report of Mark Eugenikos’ opinions or

Mytilene’?), and the Acta Latina by the papal lawyer, Andrea of Santacroce, is given by GEANAKOPOLOS 1991. See also http://www.syropoulos.co.uk/biblio.htm.

160 This would probably be Patriarch Joseph II, who was present at the Council in Florence. But since Mark Eugenikos was in fact sent there to represent the patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, one cannot say for certain. Cf. TSIRPANLIS 1974, 41.

161 For the Greek text, see Appendix 1.

162 In addition to the filioque controversy, the main theological issues of divergence between the churches were the purgatory, the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, and, of course, the primacy of the Pope (TSIRPANLIS 1974, 50).

163 TSIRPANLIS 1974, 39.

164 Text 30: Γνώμαι τοῦ ἀγίου Μάρκου τοῦ Ἐφεσίου περὶ ὧν τῇ ζωῇ καὶ περὶ τῆς αἰωνίου κολάσεως. Text 31: Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀναλογίαι τῶν ἀπελουμένων κολάσεων πρὸς τὰ ἀμαρτήματα. See also Appendix 1.
thoughts (γνώμαι), i.e. notes or excerpts made by someone else than the bishop himself. Text 30 discusses predestination and eternal punishment; Text 31 describes how the punishments of sinners are given in analogy with their transgressions: deep outer darkness for those who have loved the inward darkness of ignorance, the poisonous worm for sins of the flesh, Tartaros for those who have grown cold in their love of God and neighbor, et cetera. According to George Scholarios, Mark had early on been summoned by the Emperor to explain his theological stance on predestination. Could the notes which ended up in Gr 8 have been taken down already on this occasion?

Text 32 is a theological problem, ἀπορία, stated briefly and answered with the help of frequent references to Scriptural passages, much in the vein of ἐρωταποκρίσεις, question-and-answer literature, a genre which is often represented in miscellaneous manuscripts. In its subject matter it also follows neatly upon the two preceding items in Gr 8, which deal with predestination and eternal punishment. The text is anonymous, and since I have no secondary material on it I let it speak for itself:

**Problem**: How does God endure that such a large crowd of people around the whole world perishes, all those who are incessantly destroying their lives in sin?

**Solution**: Tell me, what kind of crowd are you referring to? Good people also seemed to be in the crowd. Have you not heard that for God “all the nations are like a drop from a bucket; they are regarded as spittle” (Isa. 40:15). Do you not understand the unsurpassed greatness of God’s power? Have you not heard the prophet saying “He holds the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants on it like grasshoppers” (Isa. 40:22)?

Tell me, how many fleas did you thoughtlessly crush on your body, or how many caterpillars on the vegetables? But a man who preserves his image (and likeness with God) untouched and through virtue makes himself familiar to God, him cannot even the whole world outweigh. But if he gives up the divine portion and falls into the beastly way of life (Ps. 72:22), then an earthworm that preserves its natural state is more preferable to God than he is. The Lord loathes a bloodstained and deceitful man (Ps. 5:7).

Do you not see the corpse, how we all loathe it? And we cover it up with earth, so that it does not fill everything with its worms and putrid liquids and foul smell and decay. Such is to God the soul that has acquired sinews (muscles) through sin and separated itself voluntarily from the godly life.

Punishment after death is a subject treated also in Leo VI’s poem of contrition (Text 73), discussed above.

---

165 The text includes wordings like κρίνει ὃπι (“he distinguishes, interprets that”) and λέγει ὃπι (“he says that”).
166 PETIT et al. 1928, 428.
167 Cf. HEINRICI 1911, 6. On Greek question-and-answer literature, see also PAPADOYANNAKIS 2006.
168 For the Greek text, see Appendix 1.
While on the subject of predestination and punishment, Text 29 should be mentioned. It presents an unusual view on what happens to children if the parents beget them during the woman’s menstrual period. The children are destined to fall ill in horrible diseases, but the illness will always surface at a certain time in their life depending on when (which day and hour) during the menstruation the conception took place. Text 29 is discussed in Chapter 5.

More on virtue and vice

Virtue and vice—always a topical subject—is also brought up in Text 34, an excerpt on the eight enticements to sin (gluttony, lust, avarice, wrath, grief, indifference, conceit, and arrogance). Whereas in the Catholic tradition one counts with seven deadly sins or capital vices, it is notable that Text 34 only speaks of enticements, or bad thoughts (λογισμοί), that may or may not lead to the commitment of sin:

Whether all these bad thoughts harass us or do not harass us is not in our power to decide. To be assaulted is one thing, to harbor the thought in one's mind is another, to give room to passion is still another, (and another to fight back), assent is one thing, outright activity another.¹⁶⁹

The text has been attributed to three different authors: John of Damascus (ca. 650–ca. 750), Athanasios of Alexandria (ca. 295–373), and Ephrem the Syrian (306–373). The textual tradition which Theodoros had at hand was the one associated with John of Damascus. However, in all three cases these texts further explain how one can behave when faced with temptation, whereas the text in Gr 8 cuts off in the middle of this exegesis, without explaining the last two steps (συγκατάθεσις and ἔνεργεια) and their consequences. This seems a bit odd, since Theodoros actually had a few more lines at his disposal on the page. It could, however, be that this blank space was insufficient for copying the whole paragraph, and accordingly Theodoros cut off at a “good” line in the exegesis, just where we are invited to wrestle and so resist the temptations that would lead to sin.

On virtue, there is also the prose paraphrase of Gregory of Nazianzos’ poem with the same name, On Virtue (Carm. mor. I. 2, 9), but this text, Text 55 in Gr 8, has already been discussed above. Likewise, Plethon’s treatise On Virtues, Text 23, has been mentioned. Under the same heading one could certainly add large portions of the gnomological texts in Gr 8, but we will save these until later and discuss them among the practical texts.

¹⁶⁹ Jo. Dam., De virtutibus et vitiis, PG 95, 93A (CPG 8111).
It may seem from my treatment here that there are countless entrances into the subjects of philosophy and theology in Gr 8. To be clear: yes, these texts do color the overall impression of the manuscript, and prove that Theodoros had a genuine interest in these matters. But the texts are in themselves so diverse in genre and style, poetic, prose, learned, simple, “modern,” (i.e. for someone in the fifteenth century) and ancient, that we get a rich and interesting picture of the field. I also hope to have shown that the texts were not selected randomly: there are themes which recur time and again, and link different parts and units of the manuscript together with others.

**Devotional, biblical, and liturgical texts**

Texts 33, 44, 76, 79, 80

Let me end with a few texts of a more devotional kind. A prayer to the Theotokos, Εὐχή εἰς τὴν ύπεραγίαν δέσποιναν ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου (Text 33), seems to be unknown from other sources and I have not found it in any repertories of Byzantine hymns and related material (such as Enrica Follieri’s *Initia hymnorum*). The prayer, as it is called in Gr 8—perhaps one could categorize it as a “hymn” written in fifteen-syllable verse—begins with the address Παντάνασσα, πανύμνητε, παρθενομήτορ κόρη. Even if the text as a whole seems to be uniquely presented in Gr 8, there are a few musical manuscripts from later centuries which show that at least the first four lines of it were used as a kalophonic heirmos.170 These later manuscripts correspond with each other in wording, but differ slightly from Gr 8 in lines 3–4:171

Παντάνασσα, πανύμνητε, παρθενομήτορ κόρη,
ήμων ῥήματον ἄκουσον καὶ πρόσχες μου τοῖς λόγοις.
ἲδε δακρύων σταλαγμούς, ἱδε ψυχῆς τὴν λύπην.
ἲδε καὶ μὴ παρίδης με, δέσποινα Θεοτόκε.

170 Par. suppl. gr. 1135, ff. 219v–222v (mid-18th c., Kition); Vindob. suppl. gr. 190, f. 170v–v (late 18th c.); Par. suppl. gr. 1136, f. 196v (before 1819); Par. suppl. gr. 1140, ff. 93–96 (after 1827); catalog entries in ASTRUC&CONCASTY 1960, 246–259 and 272–277; HUNGER ET AL 1994, vol. 4, 331–333. All four manuscripts present Meletios Sinaites’ composition of the hymn, and in one of them, Par. suppl. gr. 1140, there is also an alternative version by Archbishop Germanos (both of them 17th-c. composers). A kalophonic heirmos is a hymn which functioned as a musical accompaniment during, or in connection with, the service in church; it could, for example, be sung during mass, when the bread was distributed. This hymn, i.e. the short version of Text 33, is flagged as “unediert” in the Vienna catalog, but it was apparently printed in Εἰρμολόγιον καλοφωνικόν (Γρηγορίου Πρωτοψάλτου), Ἐν Κοσπαντανιοπόλει 1835; reprinted by Κουλτούρα as facsimile sine anno. I am grateful to Professor Hilkka Seppälä for providing me with this piece of information.

171 In Text 33, lines 3–4 read as follows (Gr 8, f. 193v): ἱδε δακρύων σταλαγμούς, ἱδε τοὺς σταναγμοὺς μου | ἱδε τὴν λύπην τῆς ψυχῆς, ἱδε καὶ μὴ παρίδης. For the rest of the text, see Appendix 1.
Furthermore, in the akolouthia which John Eugenikos wrote over his brother Mark, bishop of Ephesus, there is an exaposteilarion which might echo the first line of Text 33: its second strophe starts with the line Παντάνασσα, πανόμητε, Θεομήτορ παρθένε. On the other hand, the thesaurus of phrases to use would have been there for anyone to combine, as is obvious from, e.g., Ephraem the Syrian’s collection of hymns to the Mother of God.

Lastly, there are some biblical and liturgical texts in Gr 8: the Decalogue or Ten Commandments (Text 44), some psalms (Texts 76 and 80), and also Ave Maria, Pater Noster, and Credo (Text 79). One would imagine the Ten Commandments to be a text which everybody knew by heart, making it superfluous in a manuscript. Nevertheless, it is not included as an “extra,” as a page filler. Rather, it seems planned with as much diligence as any other text, with spaces left for rubricated initials for every commandment, and so forth. In the manuscript the text is followed by a list enumerating the biblical patriarchs and Jewish, Chaldean, Persian, Syrian, Egyptian and Roman kings/emperors. Both the psalms and the liturgical items are set bilingually; evidently, these were intended as language practice, with the Greek words put in above and carefully matching each Latin word. To use the Book of Psalms as a primer was more or less standard procedure during the Middle Ages (when it replaced Homer as the students’ first acquaintance), and thus it also made sense to employ these well-known texts when introducing a new language. Apropos of Texts 40–41 which deal with the problematic addition of filioque to the creed, one may observe that the Credo in Text 79 includes the qui ex patre filioque procedit / ὑπὲρ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκ πατρὸς ἐκ πατρὸς, with no extra comment whatsoever. Apparently, the issue was no longer so hot so as to incite Theodoros to make any remarks on this in his book. Perhaps the question was of less concern precisely because the text was supposed to be a mere language lesson.

Practical texts

Is it possible to distinguish how texts in a certain book were used? Or for what intended use they could have been gathered in the first place? Perhaps not specifically, unless there are actual traces in the form of comments, marginal notes and the like. But the textual types themselves may invite a reader more or less patently to go about using them in a practical way. It may also be the case that we find it hard to imagine any other function for some of the

---

172 The akolouthia over Mark Eugenikos has been edited by Louis Petit; for the exaposteilarion, see PETIT 1927, 221.
174 Ps. 32 (= LXX, Ps. 31); Ps. 38 (= LXX, Ps. 37); Ps. 51 (= LXX, Ps. 50); Ps. 6.
texts. Can an enumeration of bishoprics ever be enjoyable to read for its own sake? Would a description of the parts and potencies of the soul inspire anyone to leisurely reading? I think one must conclude that a large portion of Gr 8 consists of precisely these kinds of texts. Nevertheless, as with all categories, this also has its border cases: lists of anecdotes, proverbs, historical tidbits would easily trigger a reader’s imagination. As soon as there is a trace of narrativity in a text, there is also a good chance that it could have been kept for its reading value, regardless of other aspects of usefulness. Let us therefore start out with these micro-narratives, the chreiae and anecdotes, and then work our way toward the more technical texts, the lists, lexica, collections of arithmetic examples, procedures of fortune-telling, language exercises, and so forth.

Gnomical texts

Texts 5, 10, (88)

To this cluster I count collections of sayings, scattered maxims which often function as page fillers, and, in addition, works which to a great extent are built up from sayings and proverbs. The reason why I put these among the “practical texts” is their role as treasuries; some of them may have offered moral guidance, but most were probably quarries: if you wanted to write a letter, give a speech or a sermon, or even appear bright in a dinner conversation, you needed these morsels of famous sayings and anecdotes, proverbs and words of wisdom. This was true not only for ordinary readers (whoever these were). In Byzantine literary works, in letters and speeches as well as in the larger narratives we find it illustrated time and again: the same anecdotes, adages, and fine-sounding phrases recur frequently.

One rather excessive example of the use of proverbs in a literary work is Isocrates’ speech To Demonicus (Text 5 in Gr 8). Although To Demonicus traditionally counts as an oration, it is, as I stated above, in its form more of a treatise or a letter. In his hortatory treatise Isocrates has collected and connected admonitions and precepts which could be useful to a young man who aimed at living a good and virtuous life. The compositional technique was not uncommon: one finds the same “gnomic” character in works by Hesiod, Theognis, Pindar, and Menander. But in the case of To Demonicus this has become a stumbling block for its authorial attribution to Isocrates. Scholars have criticized the treatise’s lack of style and form precisely due to its integration of many proverbial wordings. Among Byzantine readers (and authors) this critique would have seemed inconceivable. To use well-known

---

175 THÜR 1998, 1112.
176 The debate around the (in)authenticity of To Demonicus is the concern of my article “Bodybuilding for the Soul: Earnest Words are Needed. The Case of Isocrates’ Speech To Demonicus” (forthcoming).
wordings and pithy sayings when composing literature, especially in classi-
cizing Greek, was not a sign of lack of originality; the thing was to use them
intelligently, to make a point, to sum up, to vary your composition, et cetera.

Aphoristic literature has a long record, in Greek as well as in other cul-
tures, and it is not unreasonable to count the fables of Aesop (Text 88) to this
same sphere of didactic, gnomic and proverbial literature. Since these were
treated in the section on narrative texts, I will here mention another work,
which was composed on the basis of earlier anecdotes and legends: the Alex-
ander romance. In numerous versions and languages the story became
widely disseminated during the Middle Ages. In Gr 8 it is represented by a
few anecdotes in Text 10, plus another ten in the gnomology starting on f.
238 (Text 48).177

Gnomologies
Texts 35, 38, 48, (59),

Collections of sayings are often referred to as gnomologies (after the Greek
word for sentence or thought, γνώμη), or florilegia (“pickings of flowers”).
Among scholars, florilegia have been exploited mainly as sources of an other-
wise lost (classical) literature, but there are other ways of looking at this
kind of literature. One is to emphasize the role florilegia played in the pro-
cess of the intellectual production of their own time, i.e. to put them into an
historical-literary context. This path was taken by Marcel Richard, who was
one of the pioneers on this genre, and Paolo Odorico has worked much in the
same vein, for example in his study of John Georgides’ florilegium.178 André
Guillou considered the Sacra Parallela and similar collections as mirrors
providing indications on the organization of Byzantine society, and proposed
that they be used as a source for Byzantine histoire de mentalité.179 Even if it
is rational to count gnomical texts among the practical texts, as a form of
Gebrauchsliteratur, I still think we must allow more than one area of use for
the gnomological texts in our manuscripts: depending on their subject matter
and the preferences of the collector/reader, they could have been compiled
and copied for didactic purposes, for devotional use, as a help for the mem-
ory, as a treasury to draw from in one’s own creative work, for the sheer joy
of having pithy and memorable aphorisms to relish and share with people,
and so forth.180

177 The Alexander legend is also referred to in Tzetzes’ Chiliades; in the excerpts included in
Gr 8 one can read about Alexander’s taming of the horse Boukephalos (Chil. I, 28), and about
Alexander’s two-colored eyes and bent neck (Chil. XI, 368). Tzetzes’ Chiliades and his letter
to Lachanas were also mentioned above, among narratives and letters.
178 ODORICO 1986, 4; Cf. RICHARD 1964.
179 GUILLOU 1976, 11.
180 On the Byzantine culture of compilation, see also ODORICO 1990; LEMERLE 1971.
There are a few florilegia in Gr 8, and we have already come across one, Text 48. This is a rather comprehensive florilegium, encompassing 19 pages in the codex. Organized alphabetically it starts out with sayings attributed to Alexander, Anacharsis and Aspasia and ends with the saying “Ὄσπερ τοῖς νοσοῦσιν ἱατροὶ πατέρες, οὕτω καὶ τοῖς ἀδικομένοις οἱ νόμοι.”\(^{181}\) Although organized alphabetically, it still seems to be a mix of different kinds of florilegia: some sayings are sorted by names, i.e. the person who supposedly said it; some are anonymous and are sorted by incipit instead. In Text 48, we have both principles in a blend. Within this investigation there is no place for mapping the earlier sources or related collections in any detail. I limit myself to a couple of observations. At present, there are about ten sayings which I have not identified in other florilegia. Since most of these happen to stand as the last few items per each letter in the alphabetic order, this may imply that they are recent additions to the collection, perhaps even added by the scribe himself. A case in point may corroborate this: the last three items under letter alpha are sayings attributed to Alexander. The very same items, however, are also part of Text 10, i.e., the Alexander sentences which Theodoros added toward the end of U3. If one of these two instances is secondary, relying on the other, it is probably Text 48, since in Text 10 these excerpts are given in the same order as they stand in the Alexander romance, whereas in Text 48 the order is jumbled. Another observation that may be of interest is the fact that a number of sayings which I have not found in other florilegia correspond to sayings incorporated in the Life of St Cyril Phileotes.\(^{182}\) This twelfth-century work by Nicholas Kataskepenos is known from three manuscripts only,\(^{183}\) and “shares many features with monastic-cum-sacro-profane florilegia compiled by near contemporaries including John the Oxite, Paul Evergetinos and Nikon of the Black Mountain.”\(^{184}\)

Text 35 is another small collection of only ten sentences. One is attributed to Maximos the Confessor, six to Demosthenes, one each to Brutus and Aristotle, and one is anonymous. In the first sentence, we once again meet the soul, and its three parts—reason, will, and desire: “bridle the hot-tempered part of the soul through love, quench the passionate part of it through self-control, put wings on the rational part through contemplation, and the light of your soul will never grow faint.” The rest of the sentences display the same sentiment of virtue and common sense: “nobody can avoid death, but good men must always try to act honorably, offer good hope, and hold that

\(^{181}\) This saying is rendered slightly differently in Nicholas Kataskepenos’ Life of St. Cyril Phileotes 46. 4, where the doctors, reasonably, are said to be the saviors of the sick, not their fathers.

\(^{182}\) The lack of parallels in other florilegia is just a preliminary result that a thorough investigation may modify.

\(^{183}\) Cod. Athous Caracallou 42 (a. 1341), Cod. Marc. gr. II. 104 (16th c.), Cod. Athous Lavra H 191 (18th c.); see further SARGOLOGOS 1964, 23–27.

\(^{184}\) MULLETT 2002, 144.
god give magnanimously”; “to join someone in what one should not and not to join in what one should, amounts to the same thing.” Did Theodoros select these sentences specifically or were they already part of a florilegium which he had at hand? It is not easy to say, but one can at least say that there is no easily detectable principle which would explain the combination of sentences. Text 59, on the other hand, is a short but coherent gnomology, covering the sayings which became attributed to the Seven Sages of Greece.

Normally, florilegia are created by the combination of many source texts, but there are examples of one-author florilegia, and even florilegia which limit its source material to one single work. Examples of collections based on a single author are Menander’s “one-liners,” Monosticha, and the collection of Euripides citations. The core of the so-called Gnomologium Byzantinum is the sentences from three authors: Democritus, Epictetus, and Isocrates. In Gr 8 there is one decidedly “ monocultural” collection of excerpts and sentences, a gnomology which has Constantine Manasses’ historical work, the Synopsis Chronike, as its only source (Text 38). This collection of Synopsis excerpts is not unique; there are a number of similar gnomologies in manuscripts dated to the fourteenth through eighteenth centuries. When Odysseus Lampsides wrote his article on some of these gnomologies, he did not include Gr 8 in his survey, probably due to the poor quality of the Uppsala manuscript catalog, where the text is itemized merely as “Farrago sententiarum ex diversis excerptarum.” Constantine Manasses’ twelfth-century chronicle is a colorful work, which presents lively stories and beautiful ekphraseis in a vein not far from the contemporary Komnenian novels. The contrast is stark between the chronicle in its entirety and the gnomology based upon it. What the excerptor selected in this case was above all the proverbial wordings, the moral at the end of certain episodes, and also occasional ekphraseis, in all probability because of their applicability, i.e., with the prospect of recycling them in other contexts, oral as well as textual. As I have shown in a recent article, this was not the only mode of selection; depending on personal preferences and the purpose of a certain collection, a compiler could gather mainly descriptions, or historical episodes, or material on the imperial family, et cetera. The material was rich and the choices many. Compared to related collections, such as the one in Bodleian Misc. 285 (Auct. T 5.23, 16th c.), the Synopsis gnomology in Gr 8 is truncated: all the excerpts derive from the first half of Manasses’ chronicle. The position in the manuscript may be the reason for this, since the text was put in secon-

---

185 For the whole collection of sentences, see Appendix 1.
186 This text was mentioned among the philosophical texts, above.
188 Cf. catalog entries in GRAUX 1889, 39 and TORALLAS TOVAR 1994, 234. Originally, the expression comes from Sparwenfeld’s catalog (Catalogus centuriae 1706, 59).
189 NILSSON & NYSTRÖM 2009, 54f.
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darily, filling the last three folia of U6. Nonetheless, the location of the gnomology is not arbitrary: it goes well together with the preceding texts, which include many passages on virtue and vice plus gnomological material.

Scattered sayings
Texts 10b, 37, 47, 54

Proverbs are regularly put in as page fillers in Gr 8, but this does not mean that they must be secondary from a scribal perspective. Three short proverbs or sayings finish off f. 196v (Text 37), and to judge from the ink and the decoration they were put in at the same time as the preceding material.\footnote{F. 196v, the last three lines: Τῇ χρήσει γὰρ μὴ παρούσης δυστυχοῦσιν αἱ φρέναι. Μνήμη θανάτου χρησιμεύει τῷ βίω. Ὁρος φιλοσοφίας: μελέτη θανάτου.}

This may be compared to the subsequent text, the Synopsis gnomology, which Theodoros apparently added at a later stage, and which lacks both its title and rubricated initials.\footnote{A reader has added what looks like a title in the upper margin of f. 197r, but it turns out to relate only to one of the excerpts on the next page (“The Trojan war, how Achilles died”).}

That the scribe paid special attention even to the smallest additions in the book may be illustrated with Text 10b. Here the two proverbial sentences are thematically related to the preceding anecdote in Text 10a (on Alexander who saw a soldier being deloused by a woman): “The seemly adornment for a woman is not beauty but moderation”; “Like a golden earring in a pig’s snout, so is beauty in a heedless woman.”\footnote{Πρέπειν γυναικὶ κόσμος οὐ τὸ κάλλος, ἀλλ’ ἡ σωφροσύνη (Lib. Decl. 6. 2, 35); Ὑσπερ ἐνόπτιον χρυσοῦν ἐν βινι ὡς, οὕτω καικόφρονι γυναικὶ κάλλος (Prov. 11:22).}

Recycling of sayings may be observed even within Gr 8. The same Alexander sentences were included twice (in Text 10 and Text 48), and likewise, two of the sayings in Text 37 also appear elsewhere as a page filler (Text 54). Tagged onto a text dealing with the soul, these gnomic expressions on life, death, and philosophy here seem a perfect match. One of the two sayings, the “memento mori epigram” Μνήμη θανάτου χρησιμεύει τῷ βίῳ, is also attested as an inscriptive epigram: it is found on a marble slab now immured in the exterior wall of the monastery of Xeropotamos (Mount Athos), and the same line is also known to have been inscribed in Palaiologan times on the Xyloporta in Constantinople.\footnote{Marc Lauxtermann suggests that the marble slab at Xeropotamos originally came from a monastic graveyard, either in Constantinople or elsewhere. Cf. LAUXTERMANN 2003, 243 and 350f.}

Text 47 is another micro-text, this time put as a page filler after a long strophic poem with solemn contents, the so-called Carmen paraeneticum (see above, p. 136).

\footnote{190 F. 196v, the last three lines: Τῇ χρήσει γὰρ μὴ παρούσης δυστυχοῦσιν αἱ φρέναι. Μνήμη θανάτου χρησιμεύει τῷ βίῳ. Ὁρος φιλοσοφίας: μελέτη θανάτου.}

\footnote{191 A reader has added what looks like a title in the upper margin of f. 197r, but it turns out to relate only to one of the excerpts on the next page (“The Trojan war, how Achilles died”).}

\footnote{192 Πρέπειν γυναικὶ κόσμος οὐ τὸ κάλλος, ἀλλ’ ἡ σωφροσύνη (Lib. Decl. 6. 2, 35); Ὑσπερ ἐνόπτιον χρυσοῦν ἐν βινι ὡς, οὕτω καικόφρονι γυναικὶ κάλλος (Prov. 11:22).}

\footnote{193 Marc Lauxtermann suggests that the marble slab at Xeropotamos originally came from a monastic graveyard, either in Constantinople or elsewhere. Cf. LAUXTERMANN 2003, 243 and 350f.}
Lists
Texts 22, 45, 62, 63, 65

From the catalog of ships in Book Two of the Iliad to the endless enumeration of persons and professionals in Whitman’s poem Song of Myself, literature is full of them, the lists, the enumeration of things, persons, offices, rulers, and what not. So why not in the miscellanies, a book form especially suited for minor works. “And of these one and all I weave the song of myself,” says Walt Whitman, and a parallel may effortlessly be drawn with the miscellanies, so full of seemingly adversative texts. Among the lists in Gr 8 are one of the seven wonders (Text 22), one on ancient inventors (Text 63), and so-called Notitia episcopatuum, i.e., lists of all the patriarchates, metropolises, and sees in the Byzantine Church (Text 62).

Text 45 is a long list of all the biblical patriarchs and Old Testament kings, kings from Jewish, Chaldaean, Persian, and Assyrian dynasties, and also the Roman kings/emperors from Julius Caesar, ο Κωνσταντίνος Μάγνος, to Constantius, father of Constantine the Great, Κωνσταντίνος, in which it presents some extras: small pieces of information on certain rulers and, in addition, several chronological notes on how many years had passed from Adam until this or that dynasty came into power. The enumeration ends with the phrase “from this time on, the emperors of the Christians,” ἐντεῦθεν οἱ τῶν Χρυστιανῶν βασιλείς. It is not fully clear whether this was meant as a heading to yet another paragraph, or if Theodoros simply chose to end on this note. Since there is room for another six lines or so on the page, perhaps the second suggestion is the more probable.

In Text 65 we meet the Palaiologan emperors and the Ottoman sultans. This list was later amplified through a reader’s marginal notes: another three sultans and their respective conquests bring us all the way up to the battle of Mohács in 1526. The original list of sultans ends with Mehmet II, who ruled from 1451 and conquered Constantinople two years later. The fact that there is no mention of his successor is worthy of note, considering that—based on the watermarks—we have an approximative date for large parts of Gr 8 to around 1481. Mehmet died in May 1481 and was succeeded by his son Bayezid II later that year. Although there are no guarantees that lists like these would always be updated by a scribe, the situation is at least

---

194 On the topos of first inventor, πρώτος εὐρετής, in encomia and other rhetorical texts, cf. ΘΗΡΑΕΔΕ 1962, 1202. On the list of bishoprics in Gr 8, see DARROZÈS 1981, 443.
195 See also Appendix 1. Similar examples may be found in Peter Schreiner’s collection of “Chroniken Türkischer Eroberungen;” see, for example, Chronik 65–68 (SCHREINER 1975, 1, 498–525).
196 The date in the manuscript is Anno Mundi 6959, indiction 14. Mehmet had two periods of rule, first from 1444–46 and then from 1451.
suggestive of a dating of this part of the manuscript before May 1481, in accordance with the watermark evidence.

Lexica
Texts 12, 50, 61, (76, 79–81)

This is another group of texts obviously included for their practical applicability, whether one’s own interests were decisive or one needed the linguistic and factual information for teaching purposes. Text 12 is a botanical lexicon, which gives synonyms or explanations to herbs, roots, and all sorts of other things which were used as pharmaceutical ingredients or remedies. Even though most items in the lexicon are botanical species, there is certainly a generous attitude to what fits in an enumeration like this: beer, glue, and occipital bones are found scattered among freshwater turtles, moles, and seal feces. The feeling is that one would rather not know what components were in the drug one just ate. A similar lexicon was edited by Armand Delatte, from Parisinus graecus 2318 (15th century), but some of the lemmata have more exhaustive explanations in Gr 8. Another manuscript, which contains a botanical lexicon closely related to the text in Gr 8, is Marcianus graecus 292. This codex is of Cretan origin, most of it copied in 1306 by Michael Lulludes. Here, just as in Gr 8, the botanical lexicon follows upon Paul of Aegina’s Medical compendium.

Text 50 is a lexicon of synonyms, which seems to have advanced literary vocabulary as its focus, words which one would encounter when reading the Septuagint, Homer, and ancient tragedy, for example. Both this and the botanical lexicon are organized alphabetically, i.e., from alpha to omega according merely to the first letter of each word but not the rest. A comparison of Text 50 with edited lexica of a similar kind seems to suggest that many entries come close to the readings in Pseudo-Zonaras’ lexicon. But there are lemmata included that would rather point in other directions, to an affinity with the lexical corpus of Hesychios, the Suda, Lexicon Segueriana, et al. None of these seems to offer a clear-cut model for Text 50.

Yet another lexicon gives evidence of linguistic interests. The subject matter of Text 61 is glosses from all kinds of Greek dialects, including Roman loanwords: “words such as there are in each city (such as are called glosses).”

One unit of Gr 8, U15, exemplifies linguistic practice by the widespread method of “take a text that you know well, preferably by heart, add a transla-
tion of it word for word, and you have a language lesson.” The texts selected for this purpose are, not unexpectedly, drawn mainly from the Psalter (Text 76 and 80) and the liturgy (Text 79). A letter formulary, examples of how to address different people, is also included among the bilingual—Latin and Greek—items in U15 (Text 81).

Medical texts
Texts 11, (12), 13, 14, 15, (29)

The medical texts in Gr 8, among which the medico-botanical lexicon must be counted, is a clearly demarcated genre in the book. Just about all the medical material is gathered in a codicological unit of its own, U4. The only medical subject matter located elsewhere in the manuscript, in U6, is a text which I mentioned among the theological texts; it is also treated more thoroughly in the next chapter: Text 29 (inc. Διὰ τῆς ἀκρασίαν). That text is indeed concerned with medical questions, but the “scientific” medical explanations are combined with a theological and moral message in a vein unrelated to the more strictly medical texts discussed here.

The medical material in U4 comprises five texts, or possibly six, if we consider the fact that the first and longest text, by Paul of Aegina (Text 11), also incorporates a fictitious letter from Dioecles of Karystos to the Macedonian King Antigonus. This letter, which is an exposé “on illness, whence it comes, which the signs are and how one should approach it,” is transmitted as the last chapter of Book One in Paul of Aegina’s Medical Compendium. But one may also come across it transmitted independently. Although, in Gr 8, the letter obviously belongs to the tradition of Paul’s works, following as it does upon chapters 73–99 of the same book, it is clear from the layout of the manuscript that our scribe, Theodoros, considered it a separate text (cf. p. 82). Chapters 73–99 offer a survey on foodstuff and nutritional matters as well as some advice on sleep and insomnia.

Text 12, the medico-botanical lexicon, has already been mentioned above. Following upon the lexicon are two texts possibly chosen from a personal

---

201 The psalms and liturgical texts were mentioned above, among the devotional texts. For the formulary, see Chapter 5.
202 Paul of Aegina was a physician and surgeon in 7th-c. Alexandria, whose encyclopaedic work deeply influenced Arab medical teachings, and thereby in turn Western medieval medicine. The fictional character of Dioecles’ letter has been confirmed by Felix Heinimann, not only due to the chronological difficulty in combining the activity of the Attic physician Dioecles (fl. 340–320 BCE) with a king by the name of Antigonus, but even more cogently because of the contents: the dietary and non-pharmaceutical inclination of the teachings is such that it can hardly have been composed earlier than the 1st c. BCE (HEINIMANN 1955, 166). Arnaldo Momigliano, on the other hand, wanted to ascribe the letter to Aristogenes (3rd c. BCE), court physician to Antigonus Gonatas (Suda, α 3910 and α 3911, s.v. Αριστογένης; MOMIGLIANO 1933, 132–135).
203 Cf. DIELS 1906, 27f. and 77f.
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need: a pharmaceutical formula intended to provide a remedy “for swollen glands and edemas, a diuretic, also efficient on ischias” (Text 13), and a brief anonymous note on cyclamen and tamarisk as contraceptive and abortive agents (Text 14). The last text of the unit, Text 15, could well be seen as supplementary and less significant material, filling up the page. It is an exposition on the stages of man’s life divided into seven-year phases. The excerpt, which comes from the Hippocratic tradition, has found its way into florilegia by way of excerpts from Philo.

On the whole, the character of these medical texts does not point to professional medical practice. The medical information may be considered serviceable for someone interested in and taking care of his own health, keeping a wholesome diet, and so on. But there is also a component of cultural legacy; the herbs in the botanical lexicon are not there simply for their curative capacity. Some are definitely more of glosses on ancient texts, plants mentioned in the Odyssey for example. Most of the lexical material comes from Dioscorides’ Materia medica, but some lemmata reveal later influences. The epistolary form of Paul of Aegina’s chapter 100 is another hint that these texts may have been included in Gr 8 as part of what may be called medicine as a topic useful for table-talk, conversational rather than therapeutical matter.

Mathematical problems

Texts 83, 84, 86

The penultimate quire in Gr 8 contains a number of mathematical problems. I refer to these as two texts, Texts 84 and 86, since they present different methods of problem-solving and are separated by almost three blank pages in the middle of the quire (space which was later used for notes and scribbles, Text 85). It is quite possible, however, that they were copied from one and the same model text. The blank spaces may indicate that Theodoros had planned to insert further examples later on. The first section (Text 84) presents algebra with the help of examples from daily life. The second (Text 86) deals with fractions and the addition, multiplication, and division of the same. Part of a mathematical problem (Text 83) was also added by a later reader (see p. 107).

---

204 The formula comes from Aëtios of Amida (Aët. XV, 15, 693–704). For the notice on contraceptives, see Appendix 1.
205 Philo, De opificio mundi 105.
206 Cf. Ilias Pontikos’ discussion of the medical excerpts from Alexander of Aphrodisias included in Cod. Barocc. 133 (13th c.): “a collection of natural questions of no great philosophical or medical value, reminiscent of the table-talk genre of writing which derived from the Late Roman period and was still popular among the Byzantines of that time” (PONTIKOS 1992, xxxvii).
207 For the notes which make up Text 85, see p. 106.
208 Cf. SEARBY 2003b.
Astrology/divination

Text 66

In *Gr 8* one also finds a practical manual on geomancy, or sand divination. Theodoros apparently had far-reaching interests into different things. It is fascinating that this cultural expression is put side by side with pious texts (a prayer to the Virgin, spiritual guidance, doctrinal discussion, eschatology, etc.). Text 66 includes a zodiac, basic astrological lore, and a brief introduction to the art of *ramplion*, divination with the help of a random number of marks struck in the sand. One of the studies in Chapter 5 is dedicated to Text 66.

An idiosyncratic selection

The delimitation of the group “practical texts” has been made on the basis of subject matter and the assumed function. In some cases the subject matter tends toward the range of subjects included in Byzantine education, though we have no hint that the volume ever functioned as a school book or teaching compendium per se.\(^{209}\) Just as in Western Europe, Byzantine instruction included rhetoric, grammar, and logic (*trivium*), arithmetics, geometry, astronomy, and music (*quadrivium*).\(^{210}\) Not all of these subjects are represented in *Gr 8*, and the texts in the volume are not really typical school texts. Theodoros’ selection of texts seems more idiosyncratic than that. Was it governed by personal interests or professional motives? With an educated scribe it is not always possible to draw the line between these incentives.

Minding the gaps, bridging the differences

With miscellanies and composite books there is always the question “why did somebody put these texts together?” What was the purpose of it all? Are the pieces connected, and if so, how? *Gr 8* has been scrutinized from different perspectives. The codicological investigation revealed information on the overall structure of the book, on where—and how wide—the gaps are between different units. Despite the obvious composite character of the volume, there are still connective traits that knit units together: the handwriting, the writing material of several units, the decoration in some of them, the *mise-en-page*, to mention the most conspicuous. Another unifying factor is

\(^{209}\) The connection between miscellaneous books and schooling has been suggested in other studies, for example by Robert Black (BLACK 2003). This connection, however, is not self-evident and must be determined discriminately, from case to case.

\(^{210}\) On Byzantine education during the last centuries of the Empire, see MERGIALI-FALANGA 1996 and MARKOPOULOS 2008, with further references.
the contents. To argue that one may find coherence in a volume with 90 texts, when they belong to so many different genres and centuries is not uncomplicated. Fiction, letters, medical texts, botany, mathematics, astrology, philosophy, theological queries, sermons, prayers, poems, speeches, chronicle material, sayings, lists and lexica: is there really a logic to all this? Perhaps not overtly; at least it would have been difficult to maintain this had the book been a composite created from units of various origin. But the unifier here is above all Theodoros himself. This was his book, his selection of texts, and that is why we need to bring in the perspective of use, even if that is a somewhat elusive category.

I argue that *Gr 8* was Theodoros’ own book. It is his scribal creation, by all means, and the arrangement of the codicological units seems conscientious enough to let us assume that the book did not come about through a “cleaning of desk drawers.” In any case the one who put the texts together knew what he was doing, and had full comprehension of which units and texts to combine: starting with *Stephanites and Ichnelates* (U2), next picking up the theme of prince’s mirror in Isocrates’ speech followed by further narrative texts (U3); having Plethon’s and Mark Eugenikos’ texts on the *filioque* controversy (U7) follow upon the units which hold other humanist texts, by Leonardo Bruni, Bessarion, Nicholas Sagundino as well as Plethon and Eugenikos themselves (U5–U6); and so forth. The addition of all the microtexts in connection to—and often in style with—the larger texts also points to *Gr 8* being a personal book, and not something Theodoros intended to sell. All that extra work would not have paid off in a vending situation.

In the present chapter the texts from *Gr 8* were collected and connected into four categories. This gave us the chance of a bird’s-eye view of the contents. The point of departure for the categorizing was the function that we may assume for these texts. At this stage we might even bring these categories down to three objectives that may have guided Theodoros in his compiling of texts: 1) “things I like to read” 2) “things I’m interested in” 3) “things that might be useful for me.” In many cases these three reasons for including texts may have interacted. The category of narrative texts, for example, would mainly go together with objective 1, but that does not exclude the possibility that some of those texts could have been of more practical use as well. The category of philosophical and theological texts would match with objective 2, but the intellectual (or devotional) side of these matters was just one possible reason for their inclusion; there may have been others. The rhetorical texts and the practical manuals are apparently bent on usefulness, objective 3, but there are letters, poems, and declamations which may just as well have been included for the pleasure of reading or for their subject matter. The same goes for some of the practical texts, which could well have

---

211 The third objective could include both private and professional applications.
been sorted under a different heading, had we wished to emphasize another aspect.

Can we draw any conclusions from the absence of some textual categories or genres? The diversity of the texts does not point to the book reflecting a specific profession, i.e., there is nothing in *Gr 8* that would prove Theodoros to be a lawyer, a physician, a priest, or even a teacher for that matter. But of course he could have owned those kinds of texts in another volume. What about the intellectual level of the contents of *Gr 8*? The book was written and laid out in a professional way, but it reveals few signs of having been intended as a scholar’s book. It does not include much of marginal comments, scholia, or other learned activity. There are some reading signs in the margins in Theodoros’ hand, glosses like σημείωσις, ὠραίον, ὠραίότατον, but most of them were added by later readers. The subject matter points more to a well-educated but not really specialist reader, a person who is informed of the intellectual trends in humanist circles, but who needs an all-round library rather than the most advanced writings and theories on a certain subject. An aspect which must be kept in mind is the “business side” of all this: Theodoros was a professional scribe, and however interested he may have been in texts for his own sake, it would have been necessary for him to think also about marketing, about having model texts at hand from which he could make copies for the benefit of his customers.

I initiated my investigation of *Gr 8* out of curiosity about a book type, the one which contains so many different texts so as to make you wonder why they were gathered in the first place. But the more I worked my way into the manuscript, its mise-en-page, combination of texts, combination of units, the more I saw the impact of the scribe’s mindful work. Theodoros is no plain copy cat. There is definitely thoughtfulness behind the composition. Neither was this book created on somebody else’s commission. The reason for keeping the units unbound may, of course, have been their function as his own model texts; he could use them time and again in his professional work. After a time, though, Theodoros must have decided to keep the libelli as his own instead, added the micro-texts, thus creating the whole composite in a deliberate and attentive manner.

The next chapter will not be about the whole book anymore, and thus it stands a little apart from what I have been aiming at in the previous chapters. What I will do in Chapter 5 is to present a selection of minor texts from *Gr 8*, the kind of texts which are often included in multitext books but tend

---

212 This statement is valid for the codex as a whole. Individual units (perhaps U3–6 and definitely U17) may originally have been prepared for vending although for some reason they were instead set aside.
to be neglected in catalog descriptions. But they certainly contribute to the
character of the book. These texts, too, are part of *Codex Upsaliensis
Graecus 8*. It contains multitudes.
TAKING A CLOSER LOOK
“Varia nullius momenti” or significant components?

In the discussions above Codex Upsaliensis Graecus 8 has undergone both being torn apart into its codicological units and being glued together by speculations around the collective focus and purpose of the volume. Here we will gently pull out a few pages here and there, with the intention of acquiring a more thorough comprehension of a limited number of texts. What can they tell us about the world of ideas that our scribe Theodoros and his contemporaries embraced? Can we find imprints of a late fifteenth-century (post-)Byzantine mentality in the subjects which Theodoros chose to bring into his book?

My selection of texts for in-depth analysis is in a way arbitrary, since there was so much to choose from. One purpose, though, in choosing them was to present three very different texts to call attention to the width and variety in the book. Another challenge was to pick short and seemingly insignificant texts to see where a study of them would lead us. These are the kind of texts which at least in older manuscript catalogs, if at all mentioned, would have been described as quisquiliae, nugae merae, or varia nullius momenti—scraps, trifles, of little interest to anyone. Countering this, I argue that they are well worth our efforts. They not only work as an integral part of the manuscript books, where one often wished to use all pages to the limit. They can also be the texts which offer new insights, either because they have been overlooked by earlier scholars or because they represent more of a personal addition, something one would like to include although maybe not as a main category or first text of a unit.

The first item to be put under the magnifying glass is Text 29 in Gr 8, which belongs to the religious sphere. It is a short piece of moral instruction, which also dwells on the medical consequences of sexual misconduct, in this case represented by intercourse during menstruation. The text has, to my knowledge, never been published or discussed, despite the fact that it carries an attribution to John Chrysostom in our manuscript. Even if this ascription is likely to be spurious, it does add interest to the evaluation of the text and its cultural context.

The second one, Text 66, leads us on a tour into some of the astrological lore which, as part of the ancient Greek cultural heritage, lingered on and saw new developments in Byzantium as well as in Persian and Arabic-
speaking areas. Here the framework is an introduction to a divinatory art which became widely spread in the Mediterranean world during the later Middle Ages: *ramplion* or geomancy, divination with the help of sand.

In our third text, finally, Text 81 in *Gr 8*, we may catch a glimpse of the everyday conditions for post-Byzantine scribes and other intellectuals, whose sources of revenue in the political turbulence of the fifteenth century often depended on contacts with potential patrons and on the ability to start a new career “abroad,” in Italy or in other parts of Western Europe. The text is a so-called formulary, examples of how to address various officials. The formulary is bilingual, written in Latin with a Greek translation above each line and, as it follows upon several other short texts presented in the same way, it indicates to us the prevalent model of learning a new language: take a text which you know by heart, get a word-for-word translation and start memorizing.1

The first two texts are presented together with an English translation; in the case of the third, I figured the Latin translation would suffice. I have tried to interfere very little with the Greek text, with the exception of a slight normalization in the spelling (concerns the variation of η/ι/ει/οι, o/o, single/double consonants, and *iota subscriptum*). When not stated otherwise, the translations in this chapter are my own.

**Due to the lack of self control: Text 29**

Text 29 is a modest component of *Gr 8*, occupying little more than two pages in the manuscript, or thirty-eight lines. It is introduced as being “by the same (author),” τοῦ αὐτοῦ, implying that its author was John Chrysostom; the preceding text is presented as a “sermon by the great Chrysostom on Herodias and wicked women.”2 But considering the fact that the number of spurious sermons attributed to this author has been seen to surpass the genuine in bulk, this supposition is somewhat shaky.3 Nevertheless,
we must acknowledge that for the scribe of Gr 8, Theodoros, these two texts did pass as Chrysostom’s works, thus carrying the weight of authoritative statements.4

The context in this part of the manuscript (U6) is made up of a fair number of near contemporary works, written in the intellectual milieu of Mistra and Italy in the mid-fifteenth century: by Plethon the treatise On virtues and the opening paragraphs of his reply to George Scholarios on Aristotle’s philosophy; letters by Bessarion (to the sons of Plethon, to Michael Apostoles, to Andronikos Kallistos) and by Nicholas Sagundino (also to Andronikos Kallistos); and theological notes by Mark Eugenikos. In immediate vicinity to Text 29 we find two other texts explicitly derogatory of women. The preceding Chrysostom sermon (Text 28) is biased in an interesting way: whereas in the primary version (CPG 4570) the enumeration of wicked women is followed by their good and virtuous counterparts, our scribe, or his model manuscript, excluded the end part of the sermon, thus emphasizing female vileness only. Text 27, Libanios’ Declamation 26 “On the morose and his wife,” is a text less venomous but still directed at giving a disagreeable picture of women. After Text 29 follows an assortment of short texts with moral or theological content (Mark Eugenikos on the end of life and on eternal punishment, John of Damascus on the eight capital sins, letters by Isidore of Pelousion, and a few anonymous texts).

Text 29 will be explored here with focus on the contents and ideas presented in the text. How do these fit in with earlier and contemporary views on the subject? Is there a Byzantine tradition behind the ideas, or do we need to look elsewhere to find the cultural trail eventually leading to the text we now read in Gr 8? What does the manuscript context tell us; do the surrounding texts give any clues on how to read Text 29? From the limited scope of the text we may assume that the manuscript only transmits an excerpt or notes based on an originally longer text. The language of the text is problematic in some places, whether because of textual corruption or because it is some kind of shorthand notes, not even meant to be complete is difficult to know. Nevertheless, even though there are minor points in the edition which are solved only tentatively, I do not find this an impediment for the overall comprehension of the text. So as not to interfere too much with the original, I have made only slight adjustments to the text, accounted for in the apparatus, and will instead discuss the difficulties in connection with the translation.

4 Text 29 is mentioned in CPG as “Sermo anepigraphus” (No. 4878), and is also included in Robert Carter’s enumeration of Chrysostom codices (CARTER 1970, No. 33). It has not entered José Antonio de Aldama’s inventory of pseudo-Chrysostomian works.
Text 29 (ff. 189v–190v)

1 τοῦ αὐτοῦ·
Διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν τῶν ἀπαραφυλάκτως συγγινομένων τὰ τικτόμενα καὶ
χρόνω λοιμώδη παραπτυτούσι, καὶ νόσοι ἐπισκήπτουσιν ἀνεξάλειπτοι καὶ
πολέμιοι. λέγω ἃ νόσος λοιμώδης καὶ ἄλητος ἐλεφαντεῖα, (190v) κελεφία,
5 γάγγραινα καὶ φαγέδαινα. ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἐν καιρῷ ἰδίῳ ἐπέρχονται τοις
συλλαμβανομένοις τῶν γυναικείων. ἐπτὰ γὰρ ἡμέρας ἢ ἀφέδρος αἰμορροεί
cατὰ μήνα. ἐκάστη οὖν ἡμέρα ὅ συγγινόμενος τοιαύτα· ὥρα ἢ δ’ ἂν
συλλάβοι ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά τῆς ἀφέδρου τὸ γινόμενον παιδεύεται καὶ κατὰ τὸν
χρόνον τῆς συλλήψεως. ὥρα γὰρ εἰς ἑνιαυτὸν ὁρίζεται καὶ ἡμέρα εἰς
10 διοδεκαέτειαν τοῦ σπειρομένου ἐκ τῆς ἀφέδρου. ἐάν μὲν ἐν ἀρχῇ τῶν
γυναικείων συλλάβοι τῶν σπόρων, ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ τὸν τεχθέντα ἐπισκήπτετι ἡ
νόσος, εἰ δὲ δεκάτη ὥρα, μετὰ δεκαέτειαν ἡ νόσος ἐπέρχεται, εἰ δὲ δευτέρα
ἡμέρα ἡ τρίτη, κατὰ τὸν ψήφων τῶν ἡμερῶν <καὶ> τῶν όρων τὰ ἐτη
ἐπισυνετένουσι τὸ τεχθέντι. ἐάν δὲ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ τῆς ἀφέδρου λοχευμένη
συλλάβοι, τοῦ τικτομένως, εἰ δὲ, ἐν τῷ τέλει τῆς ζωῆς μετὰ ὠδοιχοντα
téssara ἐτη ὅ λοιμοδής νόσου αὐτῶ κυριεῦει. ἀκρασία γὰρ συγγινόμενοι
(190v) σώματι καὶ πεφυρμένοι τῶν σπόρων ἐν αἵματι μολύναντες
cataβάλλοντες. ἐνθα καὶ πληροῦται τῷ ἀμαρτίᾳ γονεῶν τρέχουσι ἐπὶ
tέκνα. τί δέ; καὶ Μωσῆς ταῦτα ἐν μυστηρίῳ οὐκ ἔφασεν; ἡμεῖς οὐκ
15 ὀφείλομεν τὸ καλὸν συνορᾶν καὶ ἐν σώματι καθαρὸ καθαρὸν σπείρα τῶν
σπόρων, καὶ μὴ τῇ λοίμῃ ἐκδοῦναι καὶ ὡς χοῖροι γίνεσθαι τῷ βορβῷ;
Οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ τυφλός συνεβλητάτη τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ; ἀγάπη δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ πρὸ
cαιροῦ ἐκυψῆ, διὸ σπουδὴ πρὸ τοῦ τέλους προεκδραμὼν ἐλληπῆς ἐγεννῆθη.
πρὸς γὰρ τὴν ἐκβασίν τοῦ τέλους τὰ ὁμίματα ἐγχαράττεται· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλα
20 μέλη πλαστούργεται πρὸ ὁμίμάτων τῷ σώματι συσφιγγόμενα. αἱ δὲ κόραι ὡς
δρόσος μαρανόμεναι ὑπὸ θέρμης ἐσχατὸν πάντων ἐνῆδονται διὰ τὸ μὴ
συμφραθῆναι αὐτάς ἢ ἐκλήβηναι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκρι βερμότητος· ἔνεκεν τούτου
οὐχ ἡμαρτον οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ.

1 τοῦ αὐτοῦ scil. τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου 4 ἀλλήληκτος U 9 ἡμέρας U 12 εἰ δὲ δεκάτῃ] ἢ δὲ
dekάτη U εἰ δὲ δευτέρα] ἢ δὲ δευτέρα U 14 εἰν] ἐν U λοχευμένων U 18 ἀμαρτία U 25
πρὸ] πρὸς U 28 γονεῖς U
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Translation

By the same author [John Chrysostom]:

Due to the lack of self control of those who recklessly have intercourse, plague will eventually befall the children and indelible and inimical diseases will come upon them. I mean a pestilential and unceasing illness, such as elephantiasis, leprosy, gangrene, and cancer. All this will in due time invade those who are conceived from the menses of women. Seven days a month the discharge of blood flows. Thus, the person who has intercourse on any of these days [will experience] the following things: in the moment during the seven days of discharge in which she conceives, the offspring will be punished in accordance also with the time of conception. For an hour is defined as a year and a day as a twelve-year period for the seed sprung from the menstrual discharge. If she receives the seed at the beginning of the menses, the disease will fall upon the new-born child early in life; if in the tenth hour, the disease will invade it after ten years; if on the second or third day, the years will extend further for the child according to the calculation of days and hours. And if she conceives on the seventh day of the menses, the pestilential disease will seize the offspring—if it is still alive—at the end of life, after eighty-four years. Because they are having intercourse without self control, they defile a body with their seed, sullying it in blood. Then is fulfilled the saying, “the sins of the fathers befall the children.” Nothing new in that: even Moses said this in a secret message, did he not? Should we not observe what is good and sow our seed pure in a pure body, and not surrender it to pestilence, becoming like swine in the mire?

Was thus also the blind man conceived in impurity? Through charity, rather, he was brought forth prematurely, as he hurried forth before completion and was born deficient. The eyes are engraved towards the end of the completed pregnancy; the other limbs are formed prior to the eyes, being tightly compressed with the body. But since the pupils dry up like dew by

---

5 Elephantiasis is usually taken as the Greek term for the disease nowadays named “leprosy.” In Arabic there was also a disease with the corresponding name (dā’ al-fil), but it signified quite another illness—modern lymphatic filariasis. Here it is, by all accounts, the former disease which is aimed at, i.e. leprosy. Nevertheless, I have decided to keep the original word, especially since the next disease mentioned in the text (κηλευθέν) means leprosy as well. On these diseases, see further below.

6 The verb σολλαμβάνω, is here understood as “conceive,” with menstrual fluid being the matter out of which the fetus is created. Another option would be to read the phrase as “those who come into contact with the menses.”

7 Literally “on each of these days.” The Greek clause lacks an active verb, here added in brackets in the translation.

8 Cf., e.g., Ex. 20:5 and Deut. 5:9.

9 The term μυστήριον is rare in the Septuagint and in no instance is it associated with Moses (it is found only in Daniel, Judith and Tobit). On its use in patristic writings, see HAMILTON 1977.
heat, they are put in last of all, so as not to perish altogether or become damaged by the extreme heat. Therefore his parents did not sin.¹⁰

The message of Text 29 is that intercourse with a woman during her menstruation may result in severe diseases, generated in the fetus but manifested later in life depending on when in the woman’s period the conception took place. This is supposed to be concordant with the Old Testament notion of “inherited sin,” of God punishing the next generation for the parents’ transgressions. The moral instruction, which is at the heart of the text, is combined with medical explanations, the key concept being ἀκρασία, which according to Liddell and Scott’s lexicon means either (A) bad mixture, or (B) incontinence, lack of self control. “Bad mixture” captures the meaning of shared bodily fluids, and is a term used in Hippocratic medicine. But the wording “διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν” is also reminiscent of 1 Cor. 7:5, ἵνα μὴ πειράζῃ ὡμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν ύμῶν (so that Satan will not tempt you because of your lack of self control), a passage which deals with proper sexual conduct and whether one should marry or abstain from sexual intercourse altogether. This Pauline passage was commented on in numerous patristic writings, and ought therefore to have rung a bell for many people, whether through their own readings and education or just by their going to church and being immersed in Christian vocabulary from their early years. The last paragraph of Text 29 opens up an alternative etiology for disablement. John 9:1–12 relates how Jesus caught sight of a man who had been blind from birth and the disciples asked him who was to blame for the impairment: τίς ἠμαρτεν, οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ. His answer was that neither he nor his parents had sinned; rather, it happened “so that the work of God might be displayed in his life.” In Text 29 this is expanded on in an unusual way. The text refers to “charity” or “love”—ἀγάπη—and premature birth as reasons for his blindness and gives an embryological sketch on why this affected his eyes. Whose love or charity is at issue here, God’s or the parents’? Text 29 gives no hint on how to comprehend this.

The combination of religious and medical discourse in Text 29 motivates an approach from different angles. We will thus examine both the Jewish/Christian views on purity and the ancient medical lore which has left an imprint in our treatise. I maintain that it was precisely the combination of these two systems of thought which facilitated a long-lasting belief in the detrimental effects of menstrual sex.

Menstrual impurity

The taboo around menstruation is often said to be world-wide. It was present also in ancient Greece to some extent, though most writers exhibit a moderate outlook, some even considering menstruation in a woman healthy and positive—we will come back to this below, in the discussion on medical views. The text which has had the greatest impact on Byzantine and western medieval attitudes to menstruation is Leviticus, where the religiously based taboo is an exhortation to the Israeli people to stay ritually pure when performing cultic ceremonies. The purity laws in Leviticus marked out the restrictions for a person who was approaching the holy sphere and covered many different areas: food, clothing, animals, sexual relations, life and death. Leviticus chapter 15 is about bodily discharges which cause uncleanness. It is noteworthy that the first eighteen verses actually treat male bodily discharge, whereas the next twelve verses are about the female equivalent. The regulations and the appropriate sacrifice for cleansing are very much the same for both sexes, and yet, throughout the centuries the curse has been on Eve to an extent that Adam never had to undergo: it was evidently convenient to use biblical support to continually circumscribe the freedom of women. The prohibition against menstrual intercourse is not only about ceremonial cleanness, whether women have access to the tabernacle/temple or not, but seems to be more of a general ban. It is mentioned in Leviticus 18:19 and 20:18, as well as in Ezekiel 18:6. Jewish purity laws as we meet them in the Torah do not stand alone: there is a history behind them too. Codified in post-exilic times they are reminiscent of Mesopotamian practice, and the Zoroastrian taboo on the menstruant was as severe, menstrual sex being considered a capital offense. The same overall picture is present in Hindu law as well, and, given the cultural interchange between the peoples of the Mediterranean and the Middle East regions, it would be unexpected if

11 “Menstrual taboos may not be universal, but they are sufficiently widespread to justify the inference that they are an extremely ancient component of the human cultural configuration” (Knight 1991, 375).
12 Hesiod states that a man must not wash himself in water previously used by a woman (OD 753–755), but he is not explicit as to whether uncleanness (and possibly banefulness) applies to women as such or, specifically, to women as menstruating creatures. Later writers, though, had no qualms about how this was to be interpreted: Averr. 3. Collec. cap. 7. dicebat, coitum cum menstruata lepram inducere, atque hoc se experientia cognovisse, ut non solam à legislatoribus prohibitus sit huiusmodi concubitus, sed etiam ab Hesiodo vetitus, ne in balneis versetur quis, ubi lavatae sunt mulieres menstruatae (Hieronymus Mercurialis, De morbis muliebribus, IV. I, in Spachius 1597, 257). On ancient Greek views, see also King 2002.
13 See Phipps 1980, 299. In ancient and medieval times, if a Zoroastrian man knowingly had sex with a menstruant he was to be punished with up to ninety lashes (according to Vidvadāt 16: 13–16), although, as Jamsheed Choksy states, this severe penalty could also be transformed into a fine (Choksy 1989, 92). Choksy emphasizes the menstruant’s ritual impurity as sufficient reason for the Zoroastrian prohibition of menstrual intercourse and does not mention any Zoroastrian belief reminiscent of our text’s subject matter, i.e. the possibility of damage to a fetus created during the menses.
the attitudes to women and the restrictions around them had not been affected by adjacent beliefs during the centuries.14

For Christian theologians the purity laws from the Old Testament have been difficult to handle. How are they to be harmonized with New Testament teachings, what elements should be kept unchanged, and what could be cast aside? The dietary laws of Acts 15:29, for example, were observed in the Greek and oriental Church up to and including the fifth century, but have since then had little impact in Christian teachings.15 The precepts on correct sexual conduct have persisted more or less unchanged up until today.16 As for chapters 13–14 in Leviticus, which deal with skin diseases and mildew, only one part lingered on: the ban on leprosy. In Josephus’ description of the temple area in Jerusalem, we meet with an early juxtaposition—but not causal connection—of leprosy and menstruation.17 Except for one or two voices, the patristic tradition has unanimously commended the exclusion of menstruants from mass and declared menstrual sex abominable.

A text which is often put forward as radical in its stance on menstruation is the Syriac work Didascalia (mid-third century).18 In chapter 26 of this text, the author does away with Jewish purity laws and claims that they are no longer necessary for Christians. The context is clear, and the Syriac wording “And when (your wives have) those issues which are according to nature, take care, as is right, that you cleave to them,” follows logically upon what is said in the rest of the chapter.19 The early Latin version, on the other hand, “cum naturalia profluunt uxoribus vestris, nolite convenire illis,” i.e.

14 According to Hindu regulations of sacred and civil conduct (dharma), codified in The Laws of Manu around 200 BCE – 100 CE, the husband may approach his wife in “due season,” avoiding “six forbidden nights and eight others” each month (III, 45–50). The Brahmana must “not approach his wife when her courses appear, nor let him sleep with her in the same bed. For the wisdom, the energy, the strength, the sight, and the vitality of a man who approaches a woman covered with menstrual excretions, utterly perish. If he avoids her, while she is in that condition, his wisdom, energy, strength, sight, and vitality will increase” (IV, 40–42). The Zoroastrian purificatory use of bull’s urine in connection with menstruation may be compared to The Laws of Manu V, 120–121. Cf. also XI, 174 and 213, where the urine of cows is mentioned as a remedy of purification for the man who has had intercourse with a menstruating woman.

15 See Tomson 1999, 75. Even though both Origen and Chrysostom stress the importance of purifying your heart, the discussion in itself bears witness to subsisting observation of purity commandments among Christians. Peter Tomson also refers to explicitly Christian purity rules as they stand in, e.g., the Apostolic Constitutions 8.32: Πᾶς πιστός ἢ πιστή ἐωθον ἀναστάντες εξ ὑπνου πρὸ τοῦ ἐργον ἔπελθας νυμφάμοι τροσεσχέθως (every believing man or woman must, when they wake up at dawn, wash their hands and pray before they accomplish any work).

16 This applies to Islamic tradition as well; cf. Qur’an 2:222, 223.

17 Josephus, BJ 5, 227: γονορροιος μὲν δὴ καὶ λεπρός ἢ πόλες ὀλη, τὸ δὲ ἱερόν γυναικῶν ἐμινίνως ἄπεκέλεστο (those who had gonorrhea and leprosy were excluded from the city entirely, and women, during their menstruation, were shut out of the temple).

18 See, for example, Fonrobert 2000, 166–188; Cohen 1991.

19 Vööbus 1979, Syriac version p. 262; English translation p. 244. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Mats Eskhult for helping me with the Syriac text.
“do not cleave to them,” does not fit with the rest of the arguments in chapter 26. Thus, on hermeneutical, intratextual grounds, the Latin negation ought to give rise to suspicion. Nonetheless, the editor Arthur Vööbus states that something must be wrong with the text in Syriac: “a deliberate change cannot come into account here,” he argues.20 On the contrary, it would be all but unlikely if on some occasion a negation crept into the Latin text, considering the fervent anti-menstrual tradition in Latin texts, from Pliny, over the early Church Fathers, and onward.

The Leviticus decrees were originally promulgated as cultic observances, related to the temple and the priesthood of Judaism. In the course of time, however, they became reinterpreted as part of a social and moral code, something which has often been associated with the rise of Christendom. But the moralizing approach is found also in rabbinic writings, and mirrors the changes in Israel’s socio-historical situation at the time of the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE.21 Thus, leprosy became connected with pride and arrogance.22 For the sake of their impiety, Diodorus Siculus says, the Israelites were expelled from Egypt, cursed as they were and afflicted with scurvy and leprosy.23 In the same way, moral corruption is what the early church fathers imply when they declare leprosy to be an “emblem of sin.”24 However, before we delve into the patristic tradition and its continuation in Byzantine and Western medieval texts, we need to consider the medical side of the problem.

The medical view of menstruation

The attempt at a medical explanation of diseases by the notion of “bad mixture” (ἀκρασία) is in line with the ancient tradition of humoral pathology, which maintains that an impertinence in the body fluids is potentially harm-

20 VÖÖBUS 1979, 244, n. 229.
21 BEENTJES 2000, 72. Jonathan Klawans argues that the moral aspect is present already in Leviticus, and that there is a clear difference in the judgement of menstruation in itself—not referred to as an “abomination” and easily cleansed—and in impurity contracted by the performance of sin, e.g. menstrual sex, which leads to dire and permanent consequences (KLAWANS 2000, vi).
23 D.S., Bibliotheca historica (ed. Walton), Fragmenta librorum 34/35. 2: τοὺς γὰρ ἀλφοὺς ἢ λέπρας ἔχοντας ἐν τοῖς σώμασι καθαρμοῦ χάριν ὡς ἐναγείς συναθροισθέντας ὑπερροίος ἐκβεβλήσθαι.
24 Ps.-Justin Martyr, Fragment 2 (ed. Otto): ἃστε οὖ προκειμένως [prob. error for προκειμένη] περὶ λέπρας τῆς ὑπόθεσις ἢ τοῦ καθαρσιοῦ, άλλα περὶ αφέσεως ἀμαρτιῶν, ἵνα νοηθη καὶ ἡ λέπρα παραβολή τῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τὰ θοῦμενα παραβολή τοῦ μελλόντος θύεσθαι ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτιῶν (therefore the material for purification was not prescribed for leprosy, but for acquittance of sins, in order that leprosy might be apprehended as an emblem of sin and the things sacrificed an emblem of Him who was to be sacrificed for sins).
ful and will result in illness if balance is not restored.\textsuperscript{25} Menstruation as such was not necessarily seen as negative. In the Hippocratic tradition menstruation was a sign of health in a woman, a stance maintained also by subsequent medical writers, like Galen and Paul of Aegina.\textsuperscript{26} Its purpose was to purge women from superfluous humors: while men could remove the impurities from their blood by sweating, women, whom they imagined being colder and less active, could only do so by menstruating. A variant of this was to view menstruation as the shedding of a plethora: women concocted more blood from their digestion of food than they could use up. This excess might be used to nourish a fetus, or might be converted into milk for the baby. When not pregnant or breast-feeding, the plethora in women’s bodies had to be expelled, as menstruations.

The embryological teachings of Aristotle, Galen, and others, maintain that the embryo is created from a mixture of semen and menstrual blood.\textsuperscript{27} According to Galen, who owes much of his theoretical background to Hippocratic medicine, both man and woman contribute seed.\textsuperscript{28} Aristotle, on the other hand, claims that the male semen only supplies the energizing principle or “form” to the embryo while the menstrual blood is the sole matter from which it is created (GA, 766b). As male seminal fluid was thought to be foam, made out of water and the active principle, \textit{pneuma}, and the female counterpart was the menstrual blood, the mixing of body fluids would be inevitable in procreation. The fluids of the body are, according to Aristotle’s theory, generative of each other—food becomes blood, and blood may in turn become menstrual fluid, milk, or semen, as well as marrow or fat.\textsuperscript{29} Hence it is difficult to understand why menstrual blood came to be singled out as particularly despicable. There is one passage in \textit{The generation of animals} which seems to link Aristotle with the subsequent tradition to stigmatize the menstruant, especially in connection with abnormal births:

Democritus said that monstrosities arose because two emissions of seminal fluid met together, the one succeeding the other at an interval of time. […] If,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} This theory of the four humors (blood, phlegm, black and yellow bile) and their concomitant characteristics (connected with the elements, the seasons, and the scales of hot-cold and dry-moist) was put forward by Hippocratic doctors, and, mainly through Galen’s writings, it became the dominating system of thought in medicine up until the 19\textsuperscript{th} c.
\item \textsuperscript{26} A more negative view on menstruation was put forward by Soranus, who argued that it is harmful to all women (Sor. Gyn. 1. 29).
\item \textsuperscript{27} This outlook is present also in Jewish wisdom literature; cf. \textit{Wisdom of Solomon} VII, 2: \textit{δέκαμημων χρόνω παγεῖς ἐν αἰεὶ ἐκ σπέρματος ἀνθρώπος καὶ ἑδονῆς ὑπνόῳ συνελθόσης}. But since this apocryphal text was created in Alexandria at a time when the city was the great center of medical learning (1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} c. BCE), it is not impossible that Greek embryological thinking influenced the author.
\item \textsuperscript{28} The male seed provides the material for nerves and vascular walls, whereas the female contributes by creating the blood of the fetus. Galen vacillates on the nature of female seed, whether it is the menstrual fluid or the fluid found in the vagina during excitation (\textit{De semine} II, 2).
\item \textsuperscript{29} PREUS 1977, 78.
\end{itemize}
then, we must attribute the cause to the semen of the male, this will be the way we shall have to state it, but we must rather by all means suppose that the cause lies in the material and in the embryo as it is forming.30 (my italics)

The raw material (ὑλή) Aristotle saw as potentially causing monstrosities was the material contributed by the female, i.e. the menstruum.

Except for the citation above, Aristotle’s embryological explanations do not particularly stigmatize the menstruant: they are rather degrading women in general, as passive creatures, colder, and in every way less perfect than men.31 Yet, Aristotle obviously influenced the negative view of menstruants which persisted all through the Middle Ages (and far beyond). The coupling of the menses to the moon may also have contributed, since this implied that women were under the spell of an ominous celestial body often associated with magic.32 In Aristotle’s treatise On Dreams (459b–460a), we read that the menstruant’s gaze is so potent, it can stain a mirror: “If a woman chances during her menstrual period to look into a highly polished mirror, the surface of it will grow cloudy with a blood-colored haze.” From here there is only a short step to Pliny’s indulgence in the devastating and fatal consequences of menstrual contamination. These are described in detail in two chapters of the Historia Naturalis, VII, 15 and XXVIII, 23. Here we limit the discussion to the aspect of menstrual sex. In VII, 15 Pliny relates what Aristotle says about embryo formation, that the male seed, acting as a kind of rennet, causes the embryo formation, that the male seed, acting as a kind of rennet, causes the aspect of menstrual sex. In VII, 15 Pliny relates what Aristotle says about embryo formation, that the male seed, acting as a kind of rennet, causes the

30 Arist. GA, 769b–770a: Δημόκριτος μὲν σὸν ἐρήμησε γίγνεσθαι τὰ τέρατα διὰ τὸ δῶο γονᾶς πίπτειν, τὴν μὲν πρότερον ὄρμησασαι <καὶ μὴ ἐξέλθουσαν> τὴν δ’ ὀστέρων καὶ ταύτην [ἐξέλθουσαν] ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὴν ὀστέραν, ὡστε συμφωνεῖν καὶ ἑπαλλάττειν τὰ μόρια [...]. εἰ μὲν οὖν αἰτίασασθαι δεῖ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρνεὺς γονῆς, ταῦταν ἄν τὸν τρόπον ἐκ λεκτέων· ὅλος δὲ μᾶλλον τὴν αἰτίαν οἴητον ἐν τῇ ὤλῃ καὶ τοῖς συνισταμένοις κυμαίνεται. Direct references to Democritus’ theory are rare: an echo of this Aristotelian passage may lie behind Marcantonio Zimara’s discussion in his commentary on Aristotle’s Problematum: Warumb entpfangen die gemeine weiber nicht / als nemlich die huren? Antwort. Es geschicht vorn wegen der mancherley Samen / dadurch derselbigen Geburtzeug verderbet wirdt / unnd werden schlupfericht gemacht / also dass kein natüricher same / bey ihnen behalten wirdt / oder kompt auch darumm / dieveil ein same den andern verderbet / dafs keiner zu der geburt tauge. Daher gesagt wird Versus: Impedit et semen alii simul, et mediante Quo impetito sequitur destrueto prolos. Ein same den andern vertreben thut / Dardurch verdirt die fruchte gut (ZIMARA 1571, f. LVIII). I had access only to the German translation; the Latin original was written in Padua before 1514. On Marcantonio Zimara (1475–1532), famous for his commentaries to Aristotle and Averroes, see LOHR 1982, 245–254.

31 He even calls her a monstrosity in kind, before proceeding to further malformed creatures (GA, 767b: καὶ γὰρ ὁ μῆ οὐκοκός τοῖς γονεύσαι ἤδη τρόπον τινα τέρας ἔστιν: παρεκκλήβηκε γάρ ἡ φύσις ἐν τούτως ἐκ τοῦ γένους τρόπον τινα. ἀρχὴ δὲ πρῶτη τὸ θήλει γίγνεσθαι καὶ μή ἄρεν).

Delving deeper: a selection of texts

non vitales partus eduntur aut saniosi, 15:66). This passage may easily account for a complicated pregnancy perhaps ending in miscarriage; Pliny’s wording does not indicate menstrual sex but has to do with abnormal bleeding during pregnancy. Yet, the interpretations of later commentators and readers went in another direction, and in this they could in fact rely on Pliny’s authority as well:

From the menses themselves, monstrous in other respects—as I have stated elsewhere—ominous and shocking things are foreboded. Out of these I have no qualms to tell you the following: if this [menstrual] power coincides with an eclipse of the moon or the sun, irredeemable consequences follow, and no less so if the moon is silent. Coitus at that time would be fatal and pestilential for the male…33

The adjective monstrificus need only mean magical or monstrous in a figurative sense, and since Pliny refers us to his own text in VII, 15, this seems to be the nuance asked for. Nonetheless, as subsequent texts show, it has been taken literally, as “monster-making, creating monstrosities” (monstrum facere). Still in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries we find references to Pliny’s text, as is evident in, e.g., Ambroise Paré’s chapter on monstrosities as examples of God’s wrath: “Quand une femme enceinte a ses moys, l’enfant sera bien debil, ou ne viendra à terme.”34

Once Aristotle had laid the fundament, later interpreters used scholastic reasoning to set up rules for sexual intercourse. If woman, as the Philosopher had claimed, is weak and deficient, and her material, the menstruum, is formless and in need of male perfection, then it follows that menstrual fluid not used up in creating a fetus would become superfluous and degenerated. Therefore one should engage in intercourse while the material is still fresh and sensitive to form, i.e. in the week following the end of a period. If one waited until later, the menses would have had time to deteriorate: this would increase the likelihood “first of female offspring (i.e., only slightly deformed); then of badly defective ones; and then of none at all.”35

---

33 Plin. HN, XXVIII, 23: ex ipsis vero mensibus, monstrificis alias, ut suo loco indicavimus, dira et infanda vaticinantur, e quibus dixisse non pudeat, si in defectus lunae solisve congruat vis illa, iremediabilem fieri, non segnius et in silente luna, coitusque tum maribus exitiales esse atque pestiferos…

34 Père 1971, 152, n. 15. The same outlook is found in Summula Raymundi, a work based on the writings of 13th c. Dominican friar and canonist Raymond of Peñafort, the codifier of Pope Gregory IX’s canon law (Crawford 1981, 61). The text saw wide transmission both in manuscript and recurrent prints (cf. Kapp 1886, 336ff.). On the matter of menstrual intercourse, Raymond warns that the woman will bring forth leprous or red-haired children, pueros leprosos vel cum rufis crinibus (Browe 1932, 14, n. 82).

35 Wood 1981, 716.
The penalty paid

What were the imagined consequences of menstrual sex according to ancient medicine? In what way was the fetus (and sometimes also the parent/s) affected? Above, we have met with some variants already (debility or premature birth, according to Paré; pestilence or death for the male involved, according to Pliny; malformation, according to Aristotle). In Text 29 an array of illnesses are mentioned, leprosy being the main candidate. One could reasonably conclude that Leviticus’ juxtaposition of bans had brought about this connection of two proscribed categories: the leprous person who had to stay outside the camp until clean, and the persons who were to be “cut off from among their people” having had menstrual intercourse. But in fact, there were medical grounds for the leprosy part too. According to humoral theory, an accumulation of black bile in the body would thicken and corrupt the blood, and hinder the natural expulsion of it through the pores or with the blood. Balance could be restored through purging or bleeding, wherefore menstruation became vital in the discussion and treatment of melancholic disorders. Thus, one of the earliest connections between breast cancer and (cessation of) menstruation is hypothesized by Hippocrates (Mul. II, 133). “Cancer” was understood not just as breast cancer but as swellings anywhere in the body, tumors, festering ulcers, gangrene, et cetera. The etiology of leprosy became the same, although this disease is a complex and not always easily defined disorder. Returning to Aristotle once again, there is a passage in The Generation of Animals which points in this direction. The embryo could become misshapen owing to “the bulk and coldness of that which is being concocted and articulated.” Aristotle compares this to what happens to athletes through eating an excessive amount:

in their case, owing to the great bulk of nourishment there is, Nature cannot gain the mastery over it so as to bring about well-proportioned growth [...] Similar to this is the disease which is known as satyriasis; in this too, a large bulk of unconcocted flux or pneuma finds its way into parts of the face of the animal, and in consequence the face actually appears like that of a satyr.

---

36 Demaitre 1998, 609.
37 Arist. GA, 768b, 25–36, translated by Arthur Peck, who comments that the last sentence “is probably a marginal note which has crept into the text; in any case it is corrupt, and ‘unconcocted pneuma’ is meaningless” (Peck 1965, 413). Nonetheless, it is fully compatible with the rest of the paragraph: Bekker’s suggestion, to bracket ἡ πνεύματος as the problematic part of the phrase διὰ ὥμοιος ἡ πνεύματος ἀπέσταυ πλήθος, is a feasible solution. On the other hand, corresponding expressions about unconcocted pneuma do appear in Galen and others. See, for example, Gal. De locis affectis, 8, 280 (in connection to a passage dealing with inflamed tumours, erysipelas, ulcers, and abscesses): ἐμάθετε δ’ ὅτι καὶ δυσκρατίας ἀνομώλοις ἀλγήματα πολλάκις ἐπιγίγνεται, καὶ πνεύματος ἀπέσταυ τε καὶ φυσιώδους πλήθει. On Galen’s pneumatology, see Temkin 1977, 154–161. Cf. also the statement attributed to Resh Lakish in Leviticus Rabbah 15:2 (5th c. CE), maintaining that “much blood produces much σέθην (boils); much sperm produces much σάρα (leprosy)” (cited from Zias 1989, 28). Simeon ben Lakish (Resh Lakish) lived in Syria Palæstina in the 3rd c. CE.
The analogy with the athletes’ regimen is apt, since menstrual blood was both created from women’s intake of food (compare the plethora theory, above) and also became nourishment (for the fetus and for the suckling child). This brings us to Galen’s description of elephantiasis:

Elephantiasis is also a melancholic condition, the onset of which comes from biliary blood. Eventually the black bile exceeds the blood, and then the patients become malodorous and repulsive to look at; some of them also develop ulcers. In its initial stage this condition is called satyriasis, since in their faces they become like satyres. But some use this term on account of the bone-like protrusions at the temples.\(^{38}\)

Does the Greek term \(\epsilon\lambda\varepsilon\phi\alpha\nu\tau\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\varsigma\ (\epsilon\lambda\varepsilon\phi\alpha\varsigma)\) positively equate what we today call leprosy? Modern leprosy, also known as *Hansen’s disease*, is caused by the *Mycobacterium leprae*: its extremes range from a disfiguring skin infection to a mutilating and sometimes fatal disease, permanently damaging the skin, nerves, limbs and eyes.\(^{39}\) Leprosy is only mildly infectious and the bacteria multiply very slowly: the incubation period is about five years and it can take up to twenty years before symptoms appear. This delay in outbreak is worth noticing in relation to the numerological speculations in Text 29. These ideas, which I have not come upon in any other Byzantine or Western medieval texts, have a parallel in rabbinic teachings. On the question why some progeny contracted the disease at an early age and others decades later, the rabbinic answer was that if sexual relations occurred on the first day of the mother’s menses, the child would develop leprosy at age ten; on the second day, age twenty, et cetera, up until age seventy if on the seventh day.\(^{40}\) The arithmetics are not identical to the ones presented in Text 29, but there is good cause to suppose that these ideas did not develop independently.\(^{41}\)

Even though the ancient physicians knew nothing about bacteria and created their own nosological explanation for the disease, it seems that the descriptions of symptoms do match the modern disease. But to complicate matters further, there are actually more than one term for leprosy in Greek.

38 Gal. *De tumoribus praeter naturam*, 7, 728: Μελαγχολικόν δὲ πάθος καὶ ὁ ἔλεφας ἔστι, τὴν μὲν πρώτην γένεσιν ἐξ ἀματος ἱερον μελαγχολικου, τὸ χρόνῳ δὲ πλείων ἢ μελανα γίνεται τοῦ ἀματος ἱενία δυσώδεις εἰσὶ καὶ ἀπεχθεῖς ἰδείς, ἐνιοὶ δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ ἔλαπ συμπέπει, τούτῳ τὸ πάθος ἀρχόμενον ὄνομάθευσι σατυριασμόν ἐπειδή τοὺς σατύρους ὄμοιοι γίγνονται τὸ πρόσωπον. ἔνιοι δὲ τὰς κατὰ τοὺς κροτάφους ἐξοχάς ὀστώδεις ὑπὸ καλούσι.

39 With the discovery of antibiotics some sixty years ago, leprosy became curable and in the last twenty years the decrease in leprosy cases has been dramatic thanks to this treatment, from 5.2 million patients in 1985 to around 225,000 registered cases at the beginning of 2007. Pockets of high endemicity remain in a small number of African countries as well as in Brazil, India, and Nepal (http://www.who.int/lepro/en/).

40 Tachuma Metzora 39:22b (ZIAS 1989, 29). This rabbinic text is usually dated to the 9th c. CE (Strack & Stemberger 1991, 332).

41 This kind of correlative thinking according to a day-year principle has been employed mainly in relation to prophetic texts, as, for example, in the case of both Jewish and Christian interpretations of the *Book of Daniel* (Dan. 8:14, 8:26, and 9:25).
We see this even in Text 29: ἔλεφαντιάσις accounts for the elephantine appearance of the face, deformed by nodulation;\textsuperscript{42} κέλεφριά probably refers to the skin lesions.\textsuperscript{43} This leads us to the well-known quandary of biblical “lepra.” The skin disorder(s) deemed unclean in Leviticus 13 has/have no clinical likeness whatsoever with today’s chronic leprosy. It comes close to psoriasis, but it probably covers many skin disorders which can fluctuate or heal completely in a week or two.\textsuperscript{44} The Septuagint translators rendered the Hebrew word σάραφατ as λέπρα from λεπίς – scale, flake, epithelial debris.\textsuperscript{45} Thus “lepra” or “scale disease” is the term we actually find in the Bible texts and the Greek patristic authors. When the Arab translators wished to translate the Greek word ἔλεφαντιάσις, they encountered another problem: they were already using the term “elephant disease” (dā’ al-fīl) for another illness, what is nowadays known as (Arabic) elephantiasis or lymphatic filariasis (see above, p. 187). Thus they chose another word, judām, for Greek elephantiasis. This word was eventually translated into Latin as lepra, i.e. the same term which in Greek meant something totally different. If the ancient linguists had not juggled these terms around, the condemnation of lepers throughout the ages might have been less harsh.\textsuperscript{46}

In Pseudo-Galen’s Definitiones medicae, the illnesses lepra and elephantiasis are defined separately, as distinct and independent diseases:

Lepra is an abnormal change of the skin making it rugged, itchy and sore; sometimes it implies desquamation, sometimes it spreads over larger parts of the body. [...] Elephantiasis is a condition which makes the skin thick and uneven and the whites of the eyes livid in color. The extreme parts of hands and feet decay and give off a livid and foul-smelling pus.\textsuperscript{47}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{42} Richards 1977, 9. This explanation is fully passable, but Ps.-Galen prefers another: the resemblance of the skin and feet to those of the elephant (ἔλεφαντιάσις μὲν οὖν λέγουσι τὴν ἐμφασθαμα κατὰ τὸ δέρμα καὶ κατὰ τοὺς πόδας ἐλέφαντι παχεῖς γάρ καὶ οὕτω τοὺς πόδας ἔχουσιν οἱ τὸ πάθει τούτῳ περιπεσόντες δηλοῦσιν, ὥσπερ έκεῖνον. Ps.-Gal. Introducitio seu medicus, 14, 757).
  \item \textsuperscript{43} From κέλεφρος, sheath, shell. Cf. the expressions “leprous of the flesh” and “leprous of the skin.” Even today one often distinguishes between two principal forms of leprosy, lepromatous and tuberculoid leprosy. The habit of putting down two terms for leprosy, which is observable in the texts on menstrual intercourse, may thus not have been so far off the mark. Another possibility, though, is that this was a result of the terminological vagueness in medical literature, which some authors then tried to compensate for.
  \item \textsuperscript{44} Cf. the cleansing rules in Lev. 13–14. A recent suggestion is that mold/mildew would not be an unreasonable candidate explaining σάραφατ, since certain fungi (e.g. Stachybotros sp.) can infest houses as well as manifest themselves in humans as a skin condition with symptoms matching those described in Leviticus (Heller, Heller & Sasson 2003).
  \item \textsuperscript{45} Richards 1977, 9.
  \item \textsuperscript{46} Even today, the disease leprosy would probably have a lower mortality rate, had not the stigma of uncleanness hindered people from asking for help. The age-old stigma associated with the disease still remains an obstacle to self-reporting and early treatment, according to WHO (WHO 2005).
  \item \textsuperscript{47} Ps.-Gal. Def. med., 19, 427f.: σφε’. Λέπρα ἐστὶ μεταβολή τοῦ γρυτοσ ἐπὶ τὸ παρὰ φύσιν μετὰ τραχύστης καὶ κυνημὸν καὶ πόνον, ἔσθ’ ὧτε μὲν καὶ λεπίδας ἀποπάτειν, ὧτε δὲ καὶ ἐπινέμεται πλείονα μέρη τοῦ σώματος. [...] σφε’. Ἐλεφάς ἐστι πάθος παχύ τὸ δέρμα καὶ
\end{itemize}
If we compare this to the account in *Introductio seu medicus* (cf. n. 42), it seems that elephantiasis is still made the superior concept, which encompasses many different symptoms. In addition, Pseudo-Galen refers to the ancient authorities of medicine and their habit to divide this disease into six subgroups: *elephantiasis, leontiasis, ophiasis, lepra, alopecia,* and *lobe.* These may reflect varying manifestations of the disease at different stages in the development, and also the fact that leprosy affects different parts depending on how powerfully the body’s immune system resists the infectious attack. Taken separately, however, the six differential diagnoses may also indicate various other diseases.

Whatever we make of the ancient medical descriptions of leprosy and related diseases, the basic theory about black bile, and the purgation of its excess through menstruation, is what matters here. This model, in addition to the inexactness of the ancient notions of cancer, ulcers, sores, apoplexies, gangrene, and other disorders which tend to “eat” the skin or the limbs, is sufficient to explain the listing of diseases in Text 29 (*ἐλεφανταιαί, κελεφία, γάγγραινα καὶ φαγέδαινα*). The last word, *φαγέδαινα,* which equates cancer/canker, is actually applicable to all four of them, as “devouring the victim.” The first one, *ἐλεφανταιαί,* on the other hand, may also include the rest of the symptoms: leprosy will in time result in boils and nodules, but also sores, ulcers, loss of limbs due to secondary gangrene. The foul-smelling pus, which ancient physicians used to connect with cancers, will be pervasive in the decaying nerve-damaged tissue.

Yet another disease is under consideration in Text 29: blindness. Although innumerable causes may bring about this impairment, there are two links to consider here. One is that blindness is a frequent consequence of leprosy. Due to loss of eye lashes, nerve damage, loss of sensation, paralysis, and inflammatory processes (conjunctivitis, eye keratitis, iridocyclitis), a leper is at great risk of eventually losing his or her eyesight. If we add the awareness of this to the list of diseases explicitly mentioned in Text 29, the last paragraph of the text is not as unexpected as it may seem. There is a link

---

άνώμαλον παρασκευάζον καὶ πελιδών τὸ χρύμα καὶ τὰ λευκά τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, ἀναβιβρόσκεται δὲ χαλέμαν καὶ πουδόν τὰ ἀκρα καὶ ἱχώρα ἀφίησι πελιδών καὶ δυσιώδη.

48 Ps.-Gal. *Introductio,* 14, 757: τινὲς δὲ τῶν παλαιοτέρων εἰς ἔλεφανταίσιν, λεοντίασιν, ὀφίασιν, λέπραν καὶ ἀλωπεκίαιν καὶ λώβην. The symptoms adduced in the six ailments are easily detected in a leper: the first indicates changes in the skin resembling an elephant’s hide as well as deformation of hands and feet (loss of fingers and toes) due to neuritis and paralysis of the muscles; the “lion disease” accounts for the tuberous nodule on the forehead and face; ophiasis compares the loss of skin to a serpent’s sloughing of the same; scaliness (lepra) was described above; “fox disease” (alopecia) is “a whitening change of the skin, through which the hair ages and falls of from the root” (19, 431); “lobe,” finally, is the mutilation of the extremities, easily injured because the leper has lost sensation and cannot guard himself against burns or other damage.

49 On the problematic relation between ancient and modern terminology and perception of diseases, see NUTTON 2004, 28f.
missing in the author’s train of thought, but, considering the fact that the text seems to be notes taken down, or a sketch, this is not so remarkable.

The other potential connection of blindness to the subject matter in Text 29 is the importance commonly placed on the menstruant’s gaze. The eye, so filled with superficial blood vessels, was imagined to have a special relation to menstrual matter, and therefore capable of carrying pollution as well as magical and detrimental powers.50 Sight was believed to form a bond between performer and recipient, and made it necessary to avoid the dangerous glances of a menstruating woman.51 A passage from Columella seems to have influenced medieval tradition. In *Res rustica*, he advises the farmer “not to allow a woman to enter a field with cucumbers and gourds, because their vigorous growth will wither through contact with her. And if she is menstruating, she will even with her glance kill newly planted shoots.” Although it is perfectly clear that the whole passage deals with greenery—the next sentence tells us to soak the seed in milk before sowing, to get a tender and delightful cucumber—later commentators made this a reason to bar women from looking at newborn children.52 In Text 29 blindness as punishment for menstrual intercourse is only tacitly inferred, but it was made explicit in similar communications, by Thomas Aquinas among many others.53 Leprosy was also referred to as punishment for lustful and covetous glances. All in all, menstruation, eye-sight, blindness, and leprosy come together in an intricate web of connections in ancient and medieval thinking. Add to this the biblical tradition that blindness could be God’s way of punishing people. The story in *John* 9 does not imply a general denial of sin as a cause of disease: rather the opposite, since the disciples would otherwise not have asked their question. Jesus’ healing of the blind man is a particular case. Nevertheless, it is important that Text 29 also gives a “scientific” explanation for blindness, not only pleading “charity” or “love” as the *raison d’être* for his

50 This belief is present not only in Greco-Roman tradition, as shown in the texts by Aristotle and Pliny, but is found in Hindu, Zoroastrian, Muslim, and many other cultures as well.
51 The parallel notion of “the evil eye,” still present in many Mediterranean cultures, lies near at hand; see further Rakoczy 1996, 134–140.
52 Col. 11. 3. 50–51: *Sed custodiendum est, ut quam minime ad eum locum, in quo vel cucumeres aut cucurbitae consitae sunt, mulier admissatur. Nam fere contactu eius languescunt incrementa virentium. Si vero etiam in menstruis fuerit, visu quoque suo novellus fetus necabit. Cucumis tener et iucundissimus fit, si, ante quam seras, semen eius lacte maceres*. The fear was not restricted to menstruating women: the menstrual poison was believed to multiply in the body at menopause, since there was no outlet for it anymore; see n. 87, below.
53 On Thomas Aquinas, see further below. His contemporary, Berthold of Ratisbon (d. 1272), gave further suggestions of possible consequences: *Denn das da empfangene Kind wird entweder mit dem Teufel behaftet oder es wird aussäzig [i.e. leprous] oder es bekommt die fallende Sucht oder es wird höckerich oder blind oder krum oder stumm oder blödsinnig oder es bekommt einen Kopf wie ein Schlegel... Und geschieht ihm dessen nichts..., so fährt es eines unrechten Todes hin* (cited from Browe 1932, 4). Berthold also explained that so few medieval Jews were leprous because they observed this law concerning intercourse. Jan Hus (d. 1415) did not bring up blindness, instead asserting that, in addition to further impairment, the children would be born squint-eyed or one-eyed(!) (Browe 1932, 5, n. 25).
situation. The medical argumentation added by the author of Text 29 has its roots in Hippocratic teachings. According to these, the humid embryo is set in motion by fire, and is given its bodily form through a process of solidification and condensation in the womb. Aristotle, who dissected bird fetuses, found it quite problematic to explain the creation of the eyes: they seemed too large for the head at first. His explanation was that they gradually shrink from the surrounding heat and are perfected at the very last stage in the womb (or egg). The eyes seem big because of their amount of moisture. They and the brain take the longest time to form, i.e. to heat up and solidify (GA, 743b–744b). This corresponds with the description in Text 29, explaining why a premature birth would impede full development of the faculty of vision.

A mindset established and transmitted

Put together, the biblical texts and the Greco-Roman medico-philosophical tradition created a mindset around women’s bodies, menstruation, and cleanness, which was not easily shaken. It became the starting-point for patristic authors, for rabbinic commentators, for sermon-writing clerics, and also for those physicians and natural philosophers who in later medieval centuries, either through unbroken Byzantine tradition or on the basis of Avicenna’s and Averroes’ writings, transmitted and revived the Aristotelian heritage. A selection of writings will be presented here, to give an idea of how these beliefs persisted.

A text which has had great impact in its Latin version is the apocryphal book of Ezra, labelled either 4 Ezra or 2 Esdras. The Greek version is not extant, but there are citations from it in patristic texts. Among the evils and sorrows which will take place before the coming of the Messiah, the angel Uriel mentions this: “There shall be chaos also in many places, and fire shall often break out, and the wild beasts shall roam beyond their haunts, and

54 ‘Υπὸ δὲ τῆς κινήσεως καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς ξηραίνεται καὶ στερεούτα: στερεούμενον δὲ πυκνοῦται πέριζ (Hp. De diaeta, I, 9).
55 The Old Testament book following the (first) book of Ezra, Nehemiah’s book, is in some LXX manuscripts called the second book of Ezra. The so-called third book of Ezra is an apocryphal Greek version of both of these. 4 Ezra is a pseudepigraphical apocalyptic work from the late 1st c. CE. Originally composed in Hebrew, it is preserved only in various translations from a lost Greek version. Citations in Greek patristic texts and an Oxyrhynchus papyrus containing a fragment from ch. 15 (POxy. 1010) confirm the earlier existence of the lost Greek version, as does some of the phrasings in the Latin translation. The Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Arab translations (plus fragments of a Coptic and a Georgian version) further confirm the importance of this text in the early Christian Church. 4 Ezra is included in the Ethiopian Orthodox Canon, and it has been appended to many printed versions of the Bible since the 16th c. (among them King James Version).
56 METZGER 1983, 520. Quotes from 4 Ezra are found, e.g., in Clem. Al. Strom. 3.16 and in the apocryphal Epistle of Barnabas 12:1.
menstruous women shall bring forth monsters.” Here is a text which appears to correspond with Pliny’s views—or at least later readings of Pliny. The English translation above is based on the Vulgate: *et mulieres parient menstruatae monstra*. However, if we scrutinize the other branches of the Ezra tradition this formulation seems askew. Frederik Klijn has collected the textual evidence in his 1992 German translation “[n]ach dem lateinischen Text unter Benutzung der anderen Versionen.” The text he renders is “und Weber werden Ungeheuer gebären.” I cite his apparatus in full, with the abbreviated sigla written out:

\[ et mulieres parient monstra, (Latin) | und an Frauen werden Zeichen gesehen werden; es werden nämlich Fötusse geboren werden, ohne vollendet zu sein, (Syriac) | und von Frauen wird ein Zeichen (*sed plur Δ*) geboren worden (Ethiopic) | und Zeichen werden kommen von Weibern (Georgian) |. \]

Something must have happened with the Latin translation along the way of its transmission, which has subsequently left its traces in many translations into modern languages. Klijn shows that the word *monstra* is a translation of the Greek ἐγενήθη, a word which can mean both “monstrosities” and “signs” in a more neutral sense, something which is reflected in the Syriac and other translations. The word *menstruatae*, on the other hand, is only present in the Latin version, and could have been inserted by mistake, through dittography (menstr-/?monstr-). Another possibility would be that a scribe who wanted to “clarify” the reading in 4 Ezra simply added the word *menstruatae* to *mulieres*. Whichever the case, the curse on menstruants got new fuel, undeservedly this time, since menstruation was not even mentioned in the original text.

Another “monster myth” in Eastern literature is the gnostic story about Sophia—Wisdom—bringing forth a child, Yaldabaoth, the Demiurge, without the assistance of a father. This child, Yaldabaoth, created solely from menstrual matter, turned out an androgynous, lion-faced monster, blind, ignorant, weak and lustful. Although there is no outright reference to leprosy here, it is worth noting that one of the main features of *elephantiasis* mentioned in Greek medical texts was the *facies leonina*, or λέοντιάσις. The gnostic heterodoxy had a certain influence over the early Church, evident, for instance, in the more or less continuing Christian repugnance toward the

57 4 Ezra, 5:8; translation METZGER 1983, 532.
58 Klijn’s Latin text is based upon ten manuscripts, the earliest of which is from the 7th c. (KLIJN 1983, 13–15).
59 KLIJN 1983, 11f. and 34. A nasal abbreviation, as we have it in one manuscript (V) may also have contributed to the misreading; cf. the apparatus in KLIJN 1983, 34).
60 The myth about Sophia and Yaldabaoth is transmitted in The Apocryphon of John, present in different versions in three Nag Hammadi codices. The originally Greek text has survived only through its Coptic translation. See further WALDSTEIN & WISSE 1995.
61 FISCHER-MUELLER 1990, 80.
material world and the body. Nevertheless, the “monster argument” in connection with menstrual sex has been explored mainly in the Latin tradition, perhaps due to Pliny’s authority. By and large, the impression is that the ban on menstrual intercourse has been treated somewhat differently in Greek and Latin texts. The tendency to indulge in possible consequences appears to be more uninhibited in the Western medieval material compared to its Greek and Byzantine counterparts. Did the Aristotelian revival in the West inspire these misogynic treatises? Was it a sudden outbreak of leprosy in Western Europe which made the argument useful? Or was it simply convenient for the ecclesiastical authorities to use intimidating tactics to restrain debauchery?62 This is not the place to fully investigate these matters; I can only sketch part of the process through a few selected authors and texts.

Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150–ca. 215 CE) provides an early juxtaposition of Leviticus and Aristotle. In The Instructor he asserts that Moses himself forbade husbands to approach their menstruant wives. “Because it is not appropriate that bodily discharge should defile the fertile seed, soon to be a human being, and indeed not that the filthy flow of matter and discharge should spill out the seed to well-formed generation, robbing from it the furrows of the womb.”63 The picture here is that of a plethora of humor flushing the male seed out of the womb. It does not overtly state that deformity in the fetus will come about. But the opposite correlation of “filthy flow” and “seed to well-formed generation” left the field open for the readers—and later au-

62 Given the medical outlook of the time, the ban on menstrual sex can admittedly be seen as comprehensible. Even so, one cannot discount the possibility that a Church agenda of preferred chastity lay behind some of these rules. Would all periods of “natural contraception”—menstruation, pregnancy and lactation—have been off limits, if it were not for the patent demand that all carnal intimacy had to have procreation as its goal? Why, if not to minimize licentious behavior, did the Church spread the word that children created through intercourse on Sundays and feast days fell victim to the same diseases as those begotten during menstruation? Cf. Caesarius of Arles, Serm. 44, 7: qui uxorem suam in profluvio positam agnoverit, aut in die dominico aut in alia qualibet sollemnitate se continere noluerit, qui tunc concepti fuerint, aut leprosi aut epileptici aut forte etiam daemoniosi nascuntur (CCSL 103, 199). Likewise, Gregory of Tours held that children engendered on a Sunday would be born crippled, epileptic or leprous (METZLER 2006, 88f.). On prescribed sexual abstinence on Sundays and feast days, see BRUNDAGE 1987, 157–162. In Byzantine texts, this ban does not come forth very strongly (DAGRON 1998, 168). Balsamon mentions it (PG 138, 900), but does not indicate any grave consequences. In the Life of St. Andrew the Fool, though, the tone is different: Andrew explains that a man who relapses into this offense could bring death upon himself (ll. 2869–2892; RYDEN 1995, II, 198–202 and 335). According to an early Islamic source, the hadith after Judhama bint Wahb, the prohibition of intercourse during lactation was not upheld in Byzantium: “I was there when the Prophet was with a group saying, ‘I was about to prohibit the gila [i.e. intercourse with breastfeeding women], but I observed the Byzantines and the Persians, and saw them do it, and their children were not harmed’” (MUSALLAM 1983, 15f.).

63 Clem. Al., Paed. 2.10.92: Ὅ γούν αὐτὸς ὁ τέος Μωσής καὶ ταῖς γαμεταῖς αὐταῖς ἀπογορεύει πλησιάζειν, ἣν ταῖς ἐπιμνησίας καθάρσεσιν ἐνεσχημέναι τύχοισιν. Οὐ γὰρ πο ἔνθελον τὸ ἀποκαθάρματι τοῦ σώματος τὸ γονιμώτατον τοῦ σπέρματος καὶ μετ’ ὦλγον ἄνθροπον <δεν> μολύνειν οὐδὲ μὴν ἀποκλέσειν τῷ ὑπαρξεῖ τῆς ὡλες ῥύμης καὶ ἀποκαθάρματι σπέρμα [δε] γενέσεως εἰσφοράς τὸν τῆς μήτρας ἀποστεροῦμενον αὐλάκων.
thors—to make their own conclusions. The wording of Clement echoes Philo of Alexandria, who, likewise, points to fertility being the main concern. Philo only says that the seed will be swept away and utterly destroyed if sown during menstruation—no talk of disabled babies here. In the same paragraph he also criticizes the intemperate pleasure-seeking of men who connect themselves with barren women, coveting the carnal enjoyment "like boars or goats." The menstruant is seen as temporarily barren: that is why the husband should not waste his seed. Incidentally, in addition to describing the incentive for non-procreational sex in words similar to those of Text 29, Philo only says that the seed will be swept away and utterly destroyed if sown during menstruation—no talk of disabled babies here. In the same paragraph he also criticizes the intemperate pleasure-seeking of men who connect themselves with barren women, coveting the carnal enjoyment "like boars or goats." The menstruant is seen as temporarily barren: that is why the husband should not waste his seed. Incidentally, in addition to describing the incentive for non-procreational sex in words similar to those of Text 29, Philo’s text has the same imagery as Text 29: having intercourse out of mere lust is to behave like swine, σύνων τρόπον, just as the exhortation in Text 29 was that we not “become like swine in the mire.”

One church father, Lactantius, seems to hold a middle ground in this matter: he does not mention menstrual intercourse, only unlimited lusts, but there are wordings which indicate that his text was taken to mean that later on. In *Divinae Institutiones* IV, 26, Lactantius speaks of the figurative meaning of Christ’s sufferings and the significance of His divine works. After mentioning the blind, deaf, dumb, and lame, he adds that He also cleansed the stains and blemishes of defiled bodies:

> this [...] prefigured that by the instruction of righteousness His doctrine was about to purify those defiled by the stains of sins and the blemishes of vices. For they ought truly to be accounted as leprous and unclean [*leprosi enim vere atque elephantiacci debent haberi*], whom either boundless lusts compel to crimes, or insatiable pleasures to disgraceful deeds, and affect with an everlasting stain [*labe*] those who are branded with the marks of dishonourable actions.

Essential here is that Lactantius does not say that the lustful and dishonorable will *be* leprous, but that they may be *seen as, held as* leprous. Lactantius is expounding the figurative meaning of Christ’s works and connects

---


65 Born in Roman Africa in 240, Lactantius worked as a teacher of rhetoric in Nicomedia (Izmit), but moved westwards during Diocletian’s persecutions. At the end of his life, he tutored Emperor Constantine’s son in Trier. His life clearly illustrates how interwoven the East and the West were at the time, and, consequently, that we cannot disregard the cultural interchange between Latin and Greek texts.

66 In accordance with the Old Testament purity laws, the people with defiled bodies would logically include lepers and the woman with an issue of blood (see Mt 8, Mk 1, Lk 5, and Lk 17, on Jesus healing lepers; Mt 9, Mk 5, and Lk 8, on the woman who had bled for twelve years).


68 Cf. Ps.-Justin Martyr, n. 24, above.
leprosy with lustful deeds, but on a symbolic plane. Nevertheless, his last sentence is ambiguous: the word *labes* may be taken for destruction, ruin in a more common sense, or it may stand for spot, stain. 69 Although, according to Lactantius, the sinners themselves are those branded with the marks of shameful actions, the later tradition may have reinterpreted this as if it were the offspring that was marked. Likewise, the nuance in *debent haberi*, was dropped: the almost unanimous verdict of later writers became that they (the children) *will be* leprous. The passage in *Divinae Institutiones* is also interesting from another point of view: it presents an early instance of the word combination “*leprosus et elephantiacus*”; as we will see, this phrase turns up time and again in both Greek and Latin texts on the subject of menstrual intercourse.

Around 380 CE the *Didascalia* was expanded and revised to be part of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, a collection of canonical and liturgical instructions. Though the section on women’s fluxes differs significantly from its precursor, it nevertheless presents a relatively balanced view on the issue. In *Const. App.* 6. 28 we read that husbands should not approach their wives when their natural purgations appear, “out of concern for those engendered.” 70 This could indicate adherence to the view that children would fall victim to deformity or illness (even if that is not stated outright), but it could also be that, just as in the case of Clement of Alexandria, above, there is an understanding here that none at all are born out of menstrual sex. The context is very much focused on procreation as such: one should not have intercourse at all if not to bring forth children, for it is not befitting for a lover of God to be a lover of pleasure. 71 Note that a few lines earlier the text actually states that the menses, ἡ φυσική κάθαρσις, are *not* abominable to God. The medical explanation, that they were designed to regulate the accumulation of humor and strengthen the woman, is recognizable from Aristotle, although in this text God himself is responsible for the arrangement. 72 This view on menses is at variance with the one in *Leviticus*. There is no impurity in menstruation: instead it is pleasure and licentiousness which are impure and abominable.

---

69 One may also note that the word *labes* is related to the Greek word λόβη, which was a *terminus technicus* for leprosy or elephantiasis (see above, p. 198). Cf. Theodoret of Kyrrhos (ca. 393–ca. 466), *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, ed. Fernández Marcos & Sáenz-Badillos, p. 172 (in *Leviticum*, qu. 21): *φασί γὰρ τίνες ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης συναφείας καὶ λόβην καὶ λέπραν ἀπογεννᾶσθαι, τοῦ περιτόματος ἑκείνου τὰ διαπλαττόμενα πημαίνοντος σώματα.*

70 * Const. App.* 6. 28, 55–61: *Καὶ ψυχικῶν μὲν φαινομένων τὰς γυναικές οἱ ἄνδρες μὴ συνερχόμεθαν προνοίας ἐνεκεν τῶν γεννομένων· ἀπείπεν γὰρ ὁ Νόμος: “Πρὸς γυναικὰ γάρ, φησιν, ἐν ὀφέλῳ οὐσάν οὐ προσεγγίζεις.”

71 This is stated clearly regarding intercourse during pregnancy (οὐκ ἐπὶ παιδῶν γὰρ γενέσθε τὸτε ποιοῦσθε) and prostitution (οὐκ ἐπὶ παιδοποίη τιναμένην). In the case of adultery, the unsure status of the children is seen as a problem (τοὺς τε παιδὰς ὑπόστους).
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Jerome’s view on menstruants stands in stark contrast to the *Apostolic Constitutions*. “There is nothing filthier than the menstruant,” says Jerome (ca. 347–420).⁷³ Now, we are back in *Leviticus* again, where everything a menstruant touched became unclean. In his commentary on *Ezekiel* 18:6, we have an early reference to impairment of the fetus due to menstruant sex:

> Each month women’s heavy and sluggish bodies are alleviated through an emission of impure blood. They say that if a man has intercourse with a woman at that time, the fetus will contract the defect of the semen, so that lepers are born from this conception. And disfigured bodies of either sex, with shrunken or enormous limbs, will be the degenerate result of the corrupt blood.⁷⁴

That Jerome has two words for leprosy is worthy of note: this phrase, *leprosi et elephantiaci*, was repeated in several treatises and sermons throughout the centuries, and has its parallel also in Text 29.⁷⁵

Isidore of Pelousion has been called a pupil of John Chrysostom (by Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos), something which is chronologically possible though not confirmed. In three letters this presbyter and monk from Egypt explains why the Law prohibits lepers and others who suffer involuntary diseases from entering sacred spaces. Whereas in *Leviticus* lepers and menstruants were two separate groups, each in its own way subject to the purity laws, there is now total symmetry between leprosy and menstrual sex. Why did the lawgiver not permit the leprous inside the sancta? Because their parents had been lascivious and intemperate, Isidore says (την γὰρ ἀκρασίαν

---


⁷⁵ Sharon Faye Koren states that “the Council of Nicea (325 CE) warned that husbands who approach their menstruating wives risk elephantiasis and leprosy for themselves and their unborn children” (KOREN 2004, 331). But this needs rectification: the decree in question comes from the Arabic *spuria*, later additions to the twenty officially established canons of the Council. These 80 canons (in Turrianus’ edition) or 84 (in Abraham Ecchelensis’) “pretend to be translations of lost Greek originals, but are demonstrably falsifications made for various special purposes” (DOWNEY 1958, 228). According to Carl Joseph Hefele, they are of much later origin (*Hefele* 1855, 348f.; Hefele’s examples indicate a *terminus post quem* in the ⁵ᵗʰ, ⁶ᵗʰ, and even ¹⁰ᵗʰ c., for some of them). Canon 29, on the menstruant’s exclusion from mass, is reprinted in *MANSI* 1759, II, 990 (from Ecchelensis’ edition; notice that this canon is not included in Turrianos’ edition, which is why it is not mentioned in *The Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*; PERCIVAL 1977). The prohibition of Canon 29 is extended to cover menstrual intercourse in Caput VIII of the “Sanctions and Decrees by the Same 318 Holy Fathers,” also translated from Arabic by Ecchelensis (*MANSI*, II, 1038). For our purposes, the Arabic spurious canons cannot help establishing how these ideas became part of the teachings of the Church, but the word combination of *elephantiasis et lepra* suggests the wide dissemination of the tradition, in Arabic as well as Greek and Latin texts.
τὸν γονέων κολάζων). To curb the parents’ intemperance, put reins on their lust, and set a limit to the copulation, the law on lepers was established. From untimely intercourse polluted and ugly-looking bodies (ἀκάθαρτα καὶ εἰδοχή σώματα) are born. In the letter to Valens, Isidore elucidates the position of those who are born leprous: it is not those who are born out of this ἀκρασία who are retributed most severely, but the parents. The former group may not consider it a punishment, long used to the illness as they are. Conversely, the punishment on the latter group is pernicious, while instead of seeing their offspring surpass them they see them debared from the holy assembly. For those who suffer involuntarily, the misfortune is lighter to bear, but the pain is unbearable for those who know that it is a sign of their deliberate intemperance. This standpoint is important for our understanding of the role assigned to lepers in late ancient society: far from being seen as mere outcasts and condemned sinners, lepers could actually be regarded as blessed. In their infirmity and suffering, they had, according to church authorities, already endured purgatory and were thereby closer to paradise. Gregory of Nazianzos called leprosy the Sacred Disease (a term traditionally used for epilepsy), and Gregory of Nyssa tried to convince his congregation not to withdraw from lepers but instead follow the Lord’s example, and accept, feed, and embrace them, thereby earning salvation for their own souls as well. Basil the Great and John Chrysostom acted accordingly, initiating the construction of leprosaria in Caesarea and just outside Constantinople. These were never intended for expulsion or confinement, but for the benefit and health of the lepers. That this view lasted through the centuries, is shown from Theodore Balsamon’s testimony that lepers in twelfth-century Constantinople continued to live with healthy people (PG 138, 552).

The Latin tradition on the prohibition of menstrual intercourse almost unanimously carries the stamp of Jerome’s account. Isidore of Seville (ca. 560–636) is a rare exception. Indeed, he communicates Pliny’s views on the menstruum’s poisonous quality for crops, et cetera. (Etym. XI. 140–142). Although he has much information on portents and monsters, he does not explicitly say that they are created from menstrual intercourse, only that “after many menstrual days the semen is no longer germinable because there

---

76 Isid. Pel., Ep. 3.46; PG 78, 761–764. The same point is borne out in Ep. 4.141 (ed. Ėvieux, Ep. 1251; PG 78, 1220–21). In the former letter, Isidore gives a telling explanation as to why the husbands approach their wives before the purgation is over: they think the woman is faking it (νομίζοντες πεπλάθθαι τὴν γυναῖκα).

77 Isid. Pel., Ep. 4.117 (ed. Ėvieux, Ep. 1489; PG 78, 1192).


79 The same message is present in Matthew Blastares’ Syntagma of imperial and canonical law, from ca. 1335. He refers to John Nesteutes, i.e. Patriarch John IV, d. 525 (Blastares, Collectio alphabeticca. Kappa, 28). For further examples of compassionate treatment of lepers, and how this tradition also reached Western Europe, see Miller & Smith-Savage 2006.
Due to the lack of self control: Text 29

is no menstrual blood to irrigate the ejaculate.” A couple of centuries later, Hrabanus Maurus (780-856) stated loud and clear that children will be born leprous and subject to elephantiasis because they were conceived at the time of menstruation (Comm. in Ezech. 18:6; PL 111, 706C). This “truth” was thereafter repeated in numerous treatises in the West, whether they dealt with theology, natural philosophy, or medicine. I will just mention a couple of examples. In 1195 Cardinal Lotario dei Segni (soon to be Pope Innocent III) wrote his treatise *De miserio condicionis humane*. This became extremely popular: extant in 672 manuscripts, it had seen fifty-two printed editions by the middle of the seventeenth century.80 According to Lotario, the primary reason for corruption of the semen is the carnal intercourse in itself, the fact that it is performed in libidinous fervor and foul wantonness.81 Chapter four of *De miserio* presents an interesting mixture of ancient ideas and religious teachings, not unlike what we meet in Text 29. The ancient notion that menstrual fluid is what nourishes the fetus in the womb is presented. Using Pliny—without mentioning the source—Lotario points to the detrimental qualities of the fluid for crops, fruits, and for dogs becoming rabid, et cetera. Fetuses conceived in it will contract the defect of the semen, and as a consequence they will, due to corruption, be born leprous.82 Just as we saw in Jerome and in Hrabanus Maurus, two words for leprosy, *leprosus* and *elephanticus*, are used to explain what will happen to the fetus. Lotario concludes that this is the reason why Moses in his law reckoned the menstruant unclean and condemned whosoever came near her to be killed. Likewise, monstrosities derive from the parents’ shameful behavior, as Lotario explains in the ensuing chapter.83

From the twelfth century onward, the awareness of Aristotle’s teachings was renewed in Western Europe thanks to translations from Arabic. Earlier, the ban on menstrual sex was primarily presented in theological tracts; now natural philosophy and astrology loom large, and gynecological treatises

---

80 Lewis 1980, 3.
81 *Quis enim nesciat concubitum etiam coniugalem nunquam omnino committi sine pruritu carnis, sine fervore libidinis, sine fetore luxurie? Unde semina concepta fedantur, maculantur et vitiantur, ex quibus tandem anima infusa contrabrit labem peccati, maculam culpe, sordem iniquitatis* (De miserio, ed. Maccarrone, I, iii, 1). Cf. also the 15th-c. treatise *De lepra*, where the anonymous author frankly states that leprous children are generated through mensural sex because at that time of the month the woman enjoys sex more (*Istis temporibus pueri leprosi maxime generatur in conceptione menstruantis quia tunc mulier tempore menstruorum plus delectatur in coopio quia sanguis eius mordicat et sic venit titillatio. Et sic cum puer concipitur in fluxu menstruorum sine dubio incurrit lepram vel scabiem*; Basel MS D.III.10, cited from DeMaitre 1985, 334).
82 *De miserio* I, iv, 4: *Concepti fetus vitium seminis contrahunt, ita ut leprosi et elephantici ex hac corruptione nascantur*.
83 *De miserio* I, v, 1: *Quidam enim tam deformes et prodigiosi nascuntur, ut non homines, sed abominationes potius videantur* (the spelling of *abominatio* suggests that Lotario saw an etymological connection to *homo* instead of *omen* – monsters as non-human or sub-human creatures).
play a weightier part. Avicenna (980–1037) taught that leprosy could be due
to heredity and to the condition in the womb, as in the case of conception
during menstruation.⁸⁴ Rabbinic teachings were also part of this interchange
of ideas, and since Persian, Arabic, and Jewish philosophy had absorbed
much Hellenistic material, it is often hard to distinguish between different
paths, and directions, of influence. The medical centers, such as Salerno,
were important junctions for the discussion of philosophical and medical
theory as well as medical practice.⁸⁵ The Trotula texts on women’s medicine,
created and compiled in Salerno, became an integrative part of European
gynecological expertise.⁸⁶ Other texts, just as, or even more, popular were far
more speculative in their outlook: Pseudo-Albertus Magnus’ De secretis
mulierum expatiates on the venomous character of the menstruant, and, to-
gether with the commentators on the text, gives several pieces of advice on
why one should avoid menstrual sex: the outcome for the male is leprosy
and/or cancer in the male member, and the fetus will become leprous or epi-leptic. ⁸⁷

Roughly, one may distinguish between three different kinds of texts
which convey the tradition of harm caused by menstrual intercourse: texts of
(mainly) theological, philosophical, and medical content. Sometimes these
aspects come together and the impact of one upon the other is unmistakable.
Text 29 would belong to the theological sphere, even though medical theory
is used to support the dogmas. If we return to texts by church authorities, we
may mention Thomas Aquinas as a representative of the Catholic tradition.
Thomas refers to Jerome on the matter in question, but develops the number
of diseases mentioned: “thus is a deformed, blind, lame, leprous offspring
conceived: so that those parents who are not ashamed to come together in

⁸⁴ Avicenna, The Canon of Medicine / Al-Qanun fi al-tibb, IV.3.iii.1; cf. DEMAITRE 1985, 332.
⁸⁵ Sharon Faye Koren shows how the gynecological theories of Isaac the Blind (1165–1235)
and Nahmanides (1194–1270) are a mixture of kabbalistic theosophy, medicine, and natural
philosophy. Their attitudes towards menstruation and the niddah (menstruant) correspond
closely with Galenic and Aristotelian models, though, naturally, there was a long rabbinic
tradition to build on as well. The association of menstrual blood and inflammatory skin dis-
ease (leprosy) is expounded on, but Koren also mentions the Jewish tradition that children
engendered during menstruation were impudent. The male participant in menstrual sex is
punished with premature death, according to rabbinic teachings; Nahmanides, and other kab-
balists, reinterpreted this to signify destruction of the soul (KOREN 2004).
⁸⁶ See, for example, GREEN 2001, Introduction.
⁸⁷ The menstruant’s hair is filled with venom; her body expels toxics which makes men in her
vicinity hoarse; by their glance, old women who still menstruate (and some who do not) can
poison the eyes of children lying in their cradles; non-menstruating women are even more
seriously infected, more toxic, because the menstrual flow has a purgative function, et cetera.
Beside Aristotle, his main authority, Pseudo-Albert relies heavily on Avicenna and Averroes.
De secretis mulierum, composed in the late 13th or early 14th c., saw abundant proliferation in
manuscript and printed form. Moreover, it had an impact on witchcraft persecution by serving
as a direct source for the 15th-c. inquisitorial treatise, Malleus Maleficarum (LEMAY 1992, 49–
58).
sexual intercourse have their sin made obvious to all."

That he explicitly mentions blindness may give some perspective to the fact that the compiler/author of Text 29 saw fit to comment upon that kind of impairment. The Byzantine Church also continued to express its concerns about menstrual intercourse, but in a more moderate tone. The few examples I shall cite here are all from the twelfth century and later, coinciding, perhaps incidentally, with the intensified discussion of these matters in the West. It is not impossible that a fuller treatment of the Greek tradition would alter this picture. The canonist Theodore Balsamon, mentioned above for his views on lepers, does not discuss menstrual intercourse, focusing only on whether a woman could be baptized when menstruating, if she could participate in Communion, et cetera. Nikephoros Blemmydes, who in fact includes quite a number of references to John Chrysostom in his work, nevertheless has Isidore of Pelousion as his only authority on the question of menstrual intercourse (cf. Isidore’s views above). This speaks against the attribution of Text 29 to Chrysostom. One aspect which could support the association, is Chrysostom’s frequent usage of medical discourse in the sermons. Nevertheless, this is not particular to him, but appears in other patristic texts as well.

Finally, Michael Glykas, in his *Εἰς τὰς ἄποριας τῆς Θείας Γραφῆς*, a text that, interestingly enough, we know the scribe of *Gr 8*, Theodoros, had access to there Glykas deals with the question whether unborn babies who die prematurely, do so because God foresaw that they would turn out exceedingly wicked (question 37). The author refutes this, arguing that in such a case none of us would have been born, and “besides, it is from natural causes that the infants suffer this, and are often carried off.” Then Glykas adds Ὅρα γὰρ ὅτι καὶ εἴητε ἀνήρ ἄρροστος ἢν ἄρρωστο γυναῖκι συμπλακῆ, καθά δὲ καὶ Ἰσιδώρῳ τῷ Πιλουσίωτῃ δοκεῖ, νοσερὰ τηνικαῦτα τὰ τικτόμενα γίνεται (a sickly man who is intimate with a sickly woman will bring forth sickly children). The reference here is to Isidore of Pelousion, the same letter that was mentioned above (*Ep. 4.141*). But Glykas foregoes menstrual intercourse, instead emphasizing the part of Isidore’s letter where he states that lepers can be sick due to heredity and not only as the result of their parents’ intemperance. God does not want to act on his foresight, patiently awaiting our remorse instead. In addition, He has given us herbs and medical science, so that we act wisely to remove imminent threats to our health. Oth-

90 John Chrysostom is referred to, now and then, in connection with—what we would call—misogynic views, for instance in the *Malleus Maleficarum*, just mentioned: *De mulierum vero malitia differitur [...] Crisostomus super Mat. xix* (f. C5r in the editio princeps from 1487; ed. Schnyder 1991, 41; cf. *PG* 56, 803). The pseudo-Chrysostomic sermon included in *Gr 8* certainly substantiates this connection, and this, more commonly aimed, scorn of wicked women, may be what lies behind the attribution of Text 29 to the Antiochene church father.
91 On medical discourse in John Chrysostom and other patristic authors, see Frings 1959.
92 Theodoros copied Glykas’ *Εἰς τὰς ἄποριας τῆς Θείας Γραφῆς* in *Par. gr. 3045* (see p. 57).
erwise, Michael Glykas says, we would soon see our destruction from negligence and not due to natural causes. The destruction not coming from natural causes is our own responsibility, as is the caution we take deciding when to have intercourse. This is not spelled out by Glykas, but the knowledge on this seems to have been present in Byzantine minds, nonetheless. Glykas even refers to Chrysostom in his argument (ὡς ὁ χρυσός τὴν γυνακίαν φησι), so the question here is: does God’s patience, μακροθυμία, match up with the ἀγάπη in Text 29? Could Theodoros himself be the one who added the last paragraph of Text 29, acting on what he may have read in Εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας τῆς Θείας Γραφῆς? The fact that the next text in Gr 8, by Mark Eugenikos, brings up the question of predetermination and the end of life, as well as the correspondence between our sins and the penalties we must endure, is also a striking coincidence, in relation to the problems stated in Text 29. Tying the discussion on intemperance and menstrual intercourse to the two preceding, misogynic, texts in Gr 8 was unproblematic, but now it turns out that there is also a logic within the texts following Text 29. The theological problems concerning the end of life, sin and retribution, and the question of how God endures the fact that so many sinners perish (Texts 30, 31 and 32), are, to my mind, a compatible line of thought which has everything to do with iniquity and retaliation, reflected also in the dilemma of how disease and God’s charity add up (Text 29).

Wrapping up this discussion, I would like to stress the continuing influence of the ancient Greco-Roman world of ideas; the early Church could easily adapt these thoughts to suit their own beliefs, whether on marriage and virginity, on women, or on disease. From Pliny’s “chaste elephant” and Plutarch’s discussion on the right time for intercourse (at best never, or at least only in the dark, so as not to be too overwhelmed and excited, and definitely not on a day of worship) you need not add much to have the Christian dogmas fully-fledged. The same link is operating when we come to the prohibition of menstrual intercourse. Without the ongoing—and, in the West, reborn—interest in the ancient heritage of moral-philosophical and medical works, the restrictions on women’s lives might have been set differently. Had not women’s bodies persistently been associated with weakness, filth, poison and, subsequently, leprosy, the more liberal views of Didascalia might have stood a better chance to have a lasting impact on Christianity. This state of affairs is, on a small scale, present in Text 29 as well. The author merges ancient Greek medical and moral views with the Church’s discourse on temperance, uses numerological speculation (convergent with Rabbinic beliefs) and counts on the Old Testament notion of retribution on later generations. But he also prepares for another, more compassionate view on the disabled, in accordance with New Testament teachings, even though

---

still anxious to make this fit with “scientific” explanation. This makes Text 29 a fascinating example of Byzantine culture as the recipient and transformer of cultural influx from various times and places, just as *Codex Upsaliensis Graecus 8*, in its turn, may be seen as such a transformer, with its unique combination of texts from different times, genres, and cultures.
The method of *ramplion*: Text 66

As the last item of codicological unit twelve (U12), in a quire which crowds a dozen other short texts of various kinds (philosophical commentaries, epigrams, lists of this and that), there is a condensed manual on geomantic divination (ff. 283v–285v). The text opens with a zodiac wheel, describes how to construct a geomantic chart—the basic “map” with the help of which one could then find out what the outcome of any query would be—and gives further information on “houses” and planets, on geomantic figures, favorable and unfavorable days, et cetera. Geomantic procedure, which could be said to comprise an arithmetical base and an astrologically inspired superstructure, has been portrayed as “a poor man’s astrology,” since one could do away with intricate astrolabes and still keep the aura of a qualified and detached divination through the association with astrological concepts. Thus, in older manuscript catalogs, this kind of text was sometimes mistakenly classified as astrology *per se*. This was also the case with Text 66, which Graux described as *Astrologica quaedam*.95

The mixture of texts in U12 may seem a little odd to a twenty-first-century reader: the main text, which occupies slightly more than two quaternions, consists of four lengthy excerpts from Theodoret’s *Cure of the Pagan Maladies*. Theodoret, who was bishop of Kyrros in the mid-fifth century, wrote many works mainly on exegetic subjects, although he is perhaps best known for his *Church History*. The *Cure* is an example of his apologetic authorship, in which he defends Christianity against pagan ideas and practices, although he actually does this with the help of Greek philosophy. Couple this patristic text with the lists of patriarchates and bishoprics further on in the unit, and a divinatory/astrological text would appear to be a little out of place. Actually, if we take a closer look at what passages our scribe Theodoros chose to include from the *Cure*, the incongruity may be less obvious than we thought. The excerpts in *Gr 8* concern cosmos, matter, the creation, the nature of human beings, the soul, providence, et cetera.96 Worth noting here is that the scribe of *Gr 8* skipped paragraphs 17–31 of Book 4, which indeed deal with the stars, the sun and moon, phases and eclipses on an elementary level, but which also express disdain for this form of knowledge. Theodoret finds it futile to ask how many myriad of stades the distance to

---

94 Ibn Khaldùn (1332–1406) maintained that “[w]hen the sand diviners came, they discontinued use of the stars and the positions of the spheres, because they found it difficult to establish the altitude of stars by means of instruments and to find the adjusted (positions of the) stars by means of calculations. Therefore, they invented their combinations of figures. […] Many city dwellers who had no work, in order to make a living, tried sand divination” (IBN KHALDÙN, *Muqaddimah*, I, 204; transl. Rosenthal, 1958, 228).


the moon is, while, for example, ignoring how deep the sea is. On the other hand, in paragraphs 38–42, which are included in the Gr 8 excerpts, the discussion touches upon the Logos as Demiurge, generating the sun, moon, and planets for the sake of time counting. Here Theodoret refers to Euripides, to underscore that the stars are the servants of men: “but you, you accept to serve your servants and credit them with divine majesty.” The excerpts from Book 5 and 6 bring up other subjects which may be of importance in connection with divination: human fortune and misfortune, freedom and necessity, destiny and providence. Nevertheless, even if a text on astrology and divination could somehow be seen to fit in with the patristic text, it is unlikely that the excerpts from the Cure were included in the codicological unit with divination in mind. Rather the other way around: questions of man’s destiny, the function of the stars (set up in accordance with God’s plan for man), fortune and adversity, as included in an authoritative Christian text, could secondarily have triggered Theodoros to put the geomantic text here. A view of planets and fixed stars as man’s servants could actually open up for the use of astral divination, letting knowledge about the “servants” improve one’s life, so to speak. Some readers may disagree with my attempt to create a meaningful connection between these two texts, and, rightly, one should not stretch this endeavor too far. My impression, though, is that Theodoros was a thoughtful copyist, who knew what he was up to. An alternative way of looking at this juxtaposition would be to say that an unlikely combination of texts is part of the charm of late and post-Byzantine miscellanies: lendings and borrowings of texts, cultural crossovers, are characteristic of this pan-Mediterranean literary culture. These “Arabic” divinatory texts were translated and imported into Spain, Provence, Italy, and Byzantium, just as the Greek and Latin patristic texts continued to be part of the heritage of Egypt, Ethiopia, Syria, and beyond. Even so, before we take a closer look at Text 66, some perspective on the use of divination in Byzantium could be of value.

Magic and divination in Byzantium

Byzantine magical practices can basically be seen as links in a long and rich tradition going back to imperial and Hellenistic Greece, and in some cases having precursors as far back as the Mesopotamian royal courts of the second and first millennia BCE. Rather than trying to pinpoint a precise origin of these arts, it is important to stress the high degree of cultural interchange that has allowed ideas and practices to travel back and forth throughout the centuries. Such is the obvious case with astrology, which combines Aristotelian physics and Hellenistic astronomy with Mesopotamian and Egyptian

97 Thdt. Affect. 4.24.
98 Thdt. Affect. 4.41; Eur. Ph. 546.
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5 elements, sees further developments in second- and third-century India and later in Sasanian Iran, and, after being improved by Arabic astronomers as to measuring and calculation, finds its way back to Byzantium and to Western Europe.99

To find sources of information on magical and divinatory practices, we must for the most part turn to written evidence. Even though there is ample archaeological evidence for the use of amulets, phylacteries, and other instruments employed in magical procedures, it becomes increasingly difficult to evaluate these in the Late Byzantine era, when the use of enkolpia—pendant crosses, icons, and portable relics—also played a part in the official orthodox rite.100 No doubt the distinction between sanctioned and forbidden contact with the supernatural was basically upheld by the Byzantines themselves.101 And yet, since Christian culture is ever so aware of demonic powers and their workings, it would be more surprising than not if this awareness did not manifest itself in various ways in Byzantine society.102 The written sources from late antiquity and the early Byzantine era are predominantly magical papyri; literary sources in various genres also provide glimpses. Documentary evidence from trials gives another perspective on the alleged or actual practice of magic.103 Among Palaiologan manuscripts we find a considerable number of treatises and handbooks more overtly dedicated to magic. Would this textual material be representative of Byzantine conceptions in general? Though there is no definite answer to that question, the chance is that in focusing on the literate part of society, i.e. the educated and often more affluent, we at least counter the modern misconception that “irrational” and “superstitious” thinking would belong only to the lower strata of society who “did not know better.” Actually, no such correlation is to be found.104 Another misreading would be to put magic in opposition to more

---

99 See further Pingree 1997, passim.
100 As Brigitte Pitarakis affirms, the use of Pre-Christian amuletic images actually continued throughout all Byzantine periods, at the same time as their Christian counterparts were endowed with multivalent functions, both apotropaic and devotional (Pitarakis 2006, 180).
101 That this dividing line was thin is apparent from the vehement claims of several authors that they only write about astrology and similar pursuits on a theoretical level, never to actually practise it themselves. Was this perhaps a necessary defense against condemnation from stricter orthodox circles? Cf. Paul Magdalino, who discusses whether in the time of Michael Psellos and Symeon Seth an attempt was made to “scientificate” astrology, separating it from other forms of magic (Magdalino 2006, 95–96 and 121). On the attitudes of Psellos and Michael Italikos towards magic, see also Duffy 1995.
102 For a summary of demonological beliefs current in Palaiologan times, see Greenfield 1988, 307–326.
103 Carolina Cupane shows how the entries in the Constantinopolitan Patriarchal Register can provide interesting insights into people’s everyday life and the measures taken by the secular and ecclesiastical authorities to restrain unwanted activities (Cupane 1980).
104 Astrologers from the middle and late Byzantine period were in fact likely to be “members of the educated élite, associated with the imperial court and consulted by the rich and powerful” (Magdalino 2002, 37). Cf. Hans-Georg Beck’s view: “Es ist erstaunlich, wie weit verbreitet auch in den höchsten Kreisen die Praktiken der Mantik waren und was es sonst an
“rational” branches of expertise, such as mathematics, astronomy or medicine. That distinction between different categories of thinking is of a much later date. On the contrary, the manuscripts bear witness to magic being well integrated with especially what we define as natural science. Just as in Western Europe, it was the educated Byzantines, often medical experts, who inquired into and experimented with divination, alchemy, and astrology.105

To sum up: devices to try to foretell the future were manifold in Byzantium and elsewhere. They included astrology, which was looked at with skepticism by the Church, though it was at times practiced even at the imperial court.106 Other arts of divination included the observation of natural phenomena such as earthquakes and thunder, dream interpretation, and watching the behavior of animals. One could also use various objects such as palms, mirrors, a sheep’s shoulder-blades, or Bible verses, just to mention a few examples of man’s inventiveness in his attempts to reveal hidden knowledge. Divination based on letters and numbers was particularly in vogue in late antiquity, and continued to be used during the Byzantine era in many different ways.107 This familiarity with numerological applications in combination with a widespread use of astrology as codified for example by Ptolemy, probably prepared the ground for the subsequent circulation of geomantic treatises as well. Here we may recall the categories which Varro (116–27 BCE) used for ancient divinatory arts: he meant that they could all be connected to one of the four elements “terrae, aeris, aquae, ignis: geomanus, aeromantis, pyromantis, hydromantis.”108

---

105 The medico-magical manuscript Cod. Bonon. 3632, would seem to illustrate the caution which scribes and writers of such books had to take. The physician John of Aro (son of Aaron?), who copied the manuscript in 1442, did put his subscription and owner’s notices in the book but always in cryptographic characters. In its 475 folios the manuscript contains astrological, medical, and geomantic texts, dreambooks, spells, and much more. For John of Aro’s subscription, see MCCOWN 1922, 23f. Lynn Thorndike, whose survey of the Western magic tradition is still very important, explicitly states that he deals with the learned literature of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but he also points out that “astrological prediction rode high in public favor, producing most of the ‘best sellers’ of the incunabula period” (THORNDIKE 1934, vol. 4, 611).

106 Manuel Komnenos, for example, wrote a controversial defense of astrology, a science which he considered necessary for both politics and medicine (MAGDALINO 2006, 109–132). The Palaiologan emperors Andronikos III, John V, and Andronikos IV all consulted astrologers. Maria Mavroudi suggests that the volatile times and continually escalating political troubles could have incited the Palaiologan rulers to resort to such predictions (MAGDALINO & MAVROUDI 2006, 72).

107 KALVESMAKI 2006.

108 The quotation is preserved in Servius’ commentary to Vergil’s Aeneid (Serv. A. 3. 359).
whereas in the Middle Ages the term came to bear upon “sand divination” instead, at least in Latin texts. This sand divination, or method of *ramplion* as it is called in Text 66, is the subject approached here.

As we will see later on (p. 232), the origin of this art of divination is not fully clear. But it seems likely that in the form outlined in Text 66 it reached Byzantium and the Occident by way of Arabic influence, some time in the twelfth or thirteenth century.

The geomantic nomenclature used in Greek manuscripts is often transliterated Arabic, even though the art is more often introduced as Persian by Byzantine scribes. The name of the art commonly met with in Greek manuscripts, δάμπλιον (in some texts spelled out ῥάβδολιον or ῥάμουλιον) matches the Arabic word for sand, *raml*, and refers to the method of “writing” in the sand, ashes or whatever medium was at hand. The procedure could be modified by using things like grain, pebbles, or even paper and ink. In some manuscripts the art also has a genuinely Greek name, λαξευτήριον or “stone chisel,” which probably refers to the tool used for striking the sand or soil.

An early reference often mentioned is the translation and versification of Al-Zanātī’s geomantic treatise by the monk Arsenios in 1266 (inc. ββλος πέροκα ἁστρονομίας ψάμμου, κτλ.; extant e.g. in Cod. Berol. 173, where a marginal addition says: Εὐρέσεις Ζανατίου Πέρσου; μεταγλώττισα Αρσενίου μοναχοῦ; CCAG 7, 49); the author Al-Zanātī (Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Zanātī) is referred to in several manuscripts, e.g. in Bonon. 3632, Neapol. II.C.33, Par. gr. 2381, Par. gr. 2424, and Vindob. phil. gr. 108. Latin translations are attested from around the mid-12th c., a couple of the earliest being by Hugh of Santalla and Gerard of Cremona (CHARMASSON 1980, 93). Anne Regourd has discussed the manuscript situation and the lack of scholarly editions for Al-Zanātī’s Arabic treatise, but I could not get access to this article (REGOURD 2001).

The term “geomancy” in Greek manuscripts often indicates that the text is a translation from a Latin model. The procedure of sand divination was described in one of the earliest Arabic sources as the act of tracing marks on the ground, *al-tark bi ’l-haṣā* (Ibn al-Arābī, d. ca. 844 CE; FAHD 1966, 196). Variant terms are *al-khatt bi-raml*, sand-writing, *ilm al-raml*, sand-science, and *darb al-raml*, sand-striking (FAHD 1978, 1128). Greek designations hinting at the use of sand are σπάδομαντεῖα and τέχνη τῆς ψάμμου (sand divination, sand art; DELATTE & DELATTE 1936, 577), and ψαμμομαντεῖα (cf. CCAG 8:1, p. 71). To those one may add the term *στροφομαντία* τῆς ψάμμου (sand astronomy).

Joel Kalvesmaki mentions a Byzantine variant, where the geomantic figures were created with the help of lines picked at random from the Gospels or the Psalter: one used the first four letters in the line, checked whether the numbers they represented were odd or even, and put up for each of them a single dot or a pair of dots accordingly to create the figure (KALVESMAKI 2006; as we will see below, this corresponds to the method of *ramplion*, where figures are also made up of single or pairs of dots). This practice may, however, have been a Byzantine adaptation of a more general usage: a similar case but with the use of the Korʾān (τὰς ββλοὺς τοῦ Μοιάματος) instead of the Bible, is indicated by the 15th-c. chronicler John Kananos (*De Constantinopoli oppugnata*, 249f.). Cf. also Pieter van der Horst’s discussion of Jewish, pagan, and early Christian oracle books (VAN DER HORST 1998).

The use of a “stone chisel” might seem weird in connection with sand, but as an epigrapher’s implement it could perhaps count as a tool for “writing” in general, just as the verb γλύφειν was used for carving and engraving as well as for writing. In some manuscripts the
Geomantic texts in Greek have not attracted much scholarly attention and several of the studies are a hundred years old by now. The only longer text that has been edited is that of Parisinus graecus 2419, which Armand and Louis Delatte published in 1936. Some excerpts from the same codex and from Parisinus graecus 2424 (late 14th century), examined by Paul Tannery, were presented posthumously in 1920; these studies of the subject are still the most informative in the Byzantine area. This dearth of studies in Greek geomancy justifies a presentation of Text 66, even though it is an incomplete text of modest size. As we turn to the text the sequence will be the following: first, the manuscript text is presented together with a translation. The succinctness of the text makes it rather opaque even with a translation. Thus, an explanation of the geomantic chart and of the underlying astrological concepts will be added. Then we will return to the cultural background to and dissemination of this divinatory art. Finally some thoughts are added on the role of ramplion in late Byzantium.

rather sound-alike word λαξομητήριον is used instead of λαξομετήριον; here, of course, the connection to λεγχόνευν (to obtain by lot) is easily applicable to the random element of geomancy. The geomantic procedure is also suggestive of the way mathematical calculation was performed during Antiquity. Archimedes used to sketch his circles and geometric figures in sand. Cf. Plutarch, who banterers about the sudden philosophical frenzy of Dionysius of Syracuse at Plato’s arrival: the king’s palace was filled with dust by reason of the multitude of men who were drawing their geometrical diagrams in it (Plut. Mor. I, 52D). The dustboard, takht, which was used as a kind of minicalculator to perform Chinese and Hindu-Arabic arithmetic, could also fit with the procedure of sand divination (LAM 1996, 40). A dustboard functioned more or less like a wax tablet and a stylus, but with dust or clay instead of wax on the board. An application of the same idea was actually in practice much later, in Swedish elementary schools of the 19th c. The front desk in the class-room, where the youngest children sat, was in fact a “sand desk” (sandbänk), where the beginners could perform their first writing exercises, before moving on to the use of slate and, eventually, to pen and paper.

114 Delatte & Delatte 1936, 591–658.
115 Tannery 1920, 295–412, esp. pp. 354–368. On the Latin side, geomancy has been touched upon more recently by, among others, Thérèse Charmasson (Charmasson 1980). Emilie Savage-Smith has discussed the Arabic tradition in connection with a 13th-c. mechanical device, an intricately elaborated gear with rotating dials, which functioned as a random generator of the geomantic figures without resort to sand or grain for the procedure (Savage-Smith & Smith 1980).
5 Delving deeper: a selection of texts

Text 66 (ff. 283v–285v)

A. (f. 283v)

"Εαρος ζώδια Γ' · Κριός, Ταῦρος, Δίδυμοι
Θέρως ζώδια Γ' · Καρκίνος, Λέων, Παρθένος
Φθινοπώρου ζώδια Γ' · Ζυγός, Σκορπίος, Τοξότης
Χειμώνος ζώδια τρία: Αἰγόκερος, Ὕδραχος, Ἰχθύς

Φαμενώθη, Φαρμουθί, Παχών
Παυνί, Ἐπιψή, Μεσωρί (Μεσωρί cod.)
Θωθί, Φαωφί, Ἀθήρ
Χιακί, Τυβή, Μεχήρ

B. (f. 284r)

Τὸν ρομπλίου ἡ μέθοδος γίνεται οὕτως· κοκκίζει ὁρδίνους ις’ ἀνὰ τεσσάρων τεσσάρων. ἄρριθτες δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀριστεροῦ μέρους καὶ τελειούταται (τελειούτατα cod.) εἰς τὸν κύκλον. οἱ δὲ κόκιδες γράφονται ὡς τοῦχοςν ἄνευ ἀρίθμου συλλογισμὸν καὶ ἐνοῦνται δύο δύο, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, εἰ μὲν εἰσὶν ἄρτια, λαμβάνομεν καὶ τὰ β’ καὶ τίθομεν αὐτὰ ἰδίως. εἰ δὲ ἐν, τίθομεν καὶ αὐτὸ ἰδίως. καὶ οὕτως ποιοῦμεν εἰς τοὺς καθολοῦ ὁρδίνους, ἠγούν τοὺς ις’, καὶ τίθονται τέσσαρας δ’. ποιοῦσι δὲ σχήματα δ’, ἀ πατέρας καλοῦμεν. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν ἀπὸ ἕκαστον τῶν πατέρων σχήμα καταπλάτος. καὶ τίθομεν αὐτὸ καταβάθος. καὶ ἀποτελοῦμεν σχήματα δ’, ἀ καὶ μητέρας καλοῦμεν. εἰτὰ ἀπὸ τῶν σχημάτων τοῦτον τῶν πατέρων καὶ μητέρων, ἀτίνα εἰςὶν ἦ’, ποιοῦμεν παῖδες δ’. καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων παιδῶν ποιοῦμεν μάρτυρας β’ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν δύο μαρτύρων ποιοῦμεν κριτὴν ἕνα. καὶ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν τῶν μαρτύρων καὶ τοῦ κριτοῦ ἀποβαίνει τὸ ἐρώτημα.
A. [The zodiac:] (f. 283’v)
Three zodiac signs of spring—Ram, Bull, Twins—in the months of Phamenoth\(^{116}\) (March), Pharmuthi (April), Pakhon (May).
Three zodiac signs of summer—Crab, Lion, Virgin—in the months of Payni (June), Epiphi (July), Mesore (August).
Three zodiac signs of fall—Scales, Scorpion, Archer—in the months of Thoth (September), Phaophi (October), Athy (November).
Three zodiac signs of winter—Capricorn, Water-pourer, Fish—in the months of Choiak (December), Tybi (January), Mechir (February).

B. [The procedure:] (f. 284’r)
The method of ramplion is as follows: one beats out sixteen series of marks, in groups of four,\(^{117}\) beginning from the left and ending in the form of a circle.\(^{118}\) The marks are drawn at random without any counting and are yoked together in twos, and, for what is left, if it is an even number we take two marks and put them up separately; if it is one we put one mark up separately. In this manner we work out the series complete, all sixteen of them, and we arrange them by fours. They represent four figures which we term “fathers.”\(^{119}\) After that, we select the marks horizontally from all the “father” figures, each row at a time, and set them up vertically. In that way we accomplish four figures which we term “mothers.” Next, from these eight figures, the fathers and mothers, we create four “sons.” From the four sons we create two “witnesses” and from the two witnesses we create one “judge.” The query then proceeds according to the nature of the witnesses and the judge.

\(^{116}\) The spelling of the Egyptian names of the months is normalized; cf. PARKER 1950, 8.
\(^{117}\) Όρθονς: from Latin ordo -inis. Κοκκίς: according to LSJ it means to “pick the kernel out of fruit” (used in connection with pomegranates in Aristophanes’ frg. 610). An entry in Hesychios’ lexicon might be interesting here: κρυσταλλος κοκκίς (Hsch., κ 4239). The first verb may conceivably be related to κρούειν, κρυτείν (strike) and κρότημα (work wrought with the hammer; LSJ, s. vv.). Considering that the traditional way of de-seeding a pomegranate is to cut the fruit in halves and whack the back of the fruit firmly and repeatedly with a ladle or other gadget to knock the arils out, there might be room here for a connection with the Greek name of this divinatory art, λαξευθήριον, which also indicates an element of striking or hammering (cf. n. 113, above). Similarly, the use of a dustboard or wax tablet, where one “beats out” the marks of one’s future, may be compared to a threshing-floor, where one prepares the grain for future days, beating it out with the help of a pole or flail. Cf. the use of the verb κρούειν in the text of Par. gr. 2491: εἰ ἐπαναστρωθῇς καὶ τιρήσῃς τὸ κρουσθὲν ἰστάλον, εὐρήσεις αὐτὸ ἐσφαλμένον (DELATTÉ & DELATTE 1936, 594).

\(^{118}\) The drawing of circles is unusual; in most treatises one is instructed to draw the marks along 4 x 4 lines, usually from right to left (i.e. the same way Arabic is written).
\(^{119}\) The standard designation of the kinship pattern is: four mothers, four daughters, four granddaughters (or nieces/nephews) and then the two witnesses and a judge. The paternal variant is rare, but it does appear also in a small number of Arabic manuscripts (cf. VAN BINSBERGEN 1996a, 7, with n. 20). To make the kinship pattern patrilinear is thus not specifically a Byzantine trait, though it does suit the conventions of Byzantine society.
C. <Π>ερὶ βίου. <π>ερὶ πραγμάτων. <π>ερὶ ἀδελφῶν. <π>ερὶ γονέων. 
(f. 284v) <π>ερὶ παιδίων. <π>ερὶ νοσούντων. <π>ερὶ γυναικῶν. <π>ερὶ 
θανάτου. <π>ερὶ ὀδού. <π>ερὶ βασιλείας. <π>ερὶ ἐλπίδος. <π>ερὶ ἀνάγκης. 
<π>ερὶ εὖφροσύνης. <π>ερὶ ὀδύνης. <π>ερὶ κρίσεως.

D.  

Κρόνος.  

ἀργός, <H> φύσες αυτοῦ ψυχρά καὶ ξηρά, κακὸς καὶ φθοροποιῶς καὶ θανάσιμος. 
δηλοῖ τὰ παλαιὰ πράγματα, τὰ προγενέστερα, τὰ βαθέα καὶ τὰ μέλανα. καὶ τὰ 
βρομισμένα καὶ πάσαν δυσωδίας, καὶ φυλακῆς καὶ ἀγκαθωδὴς φυτᾶ καὶ 
στηφᾶ, καὶ ἀδίκους ἀνθρώπους καὶ πονηροὺς.

Ζεύς.  

<H> φύσες αυτοῦ θερμῆ καὶ ψυχρά, καὶ ἀγαθοποιῶς καὶ καλῶς, δίκαιος. δηλοῖ 
δὲ καὶ εἰς όσίους ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἄσκητας, καὶ εἰς λίθους λευκάς καὶ 
κρυσταλλόδεσις, καὶ εἰς ἐκκλησίας καὶ εἰς ἐξορία εὐμορφα καὶ εἰς πάσαν ὄραμαν 
ἂ ἔχει φιλῶν ἐν τόνδε τὸν καρπόν, καὶ εἰς τὰ ἀρόματα ἂ ἔχουσιν εὐωδιάν, καὶ 
εἰς φιλότιμον ἀνθρώποιν καὶ εἰρηνικόν καὶ νομιμάριον καὶ φιλάνθρωποιν.

Αρης.  

<H> φύσες αυτοῦ θερμῇ καὶ ἀττικῇ, (κατόη cod.) καὶ 
φθειρῶν. δηλοὶ καὶ εἰς καμίνα πυρὸς καὶ αἰμάτων χύσιν, καὶ πολέμους καὶ 
ἄγχης καὶ πληγάς καὶ φόνους, καὶ εἰς πάντα λίθον ἐρυθρόν, καὶ εἰς πάν 
ἄρωμα, καὶ εἰς ἀδίκους ἀνθρώπους καὶ παρανόμους καὶ κλέπταις, καὶ 
παντοῖος κακῶς ὑπάρχει.

Ηλιος.  

<H> φύσες αυτοῦ θερμῇ καὶ ἀττικῇ, ὑπάρχει δὲ καὶ καλοποιὸς καὶ 
κακοποιὸς, δηλοὶ εἰς βασιλέες καὶ ἄρχοντας, καὶ εἰς τὸν χυσὸν καὶ λίθος 
χυσοδέος, καὶ εἰς χρυσοχρόους καὶ εἰς κάλλος, καὶ ἀνήριαν καὶ φιλόπλουτον.

Ἀφροδίτη.  

<H> φύσες αυτοῦ (αὐτῆς;) ψυχρά καὶ ψυχρά. καλῆ καὶ ἀγαθοποιῶς. δηλοὶ εἰς 
εὐθυμίαν καὶ εἰς μουσικὰ καὶ εἰς εὐνοῦχους καὶ εἰς γυναῖκας, καὶ εἰς 
ἀφροδίσια καὶ εἰς κύβους καὶ εἰς χρώματα διάφορα.

Ερμης.  

<H> φύσες αυτοῦ μεταβαίνει ἐν ταῖς φύσεσι τῶν λουτῶν ἄστερον πλῆ 
κλίνει εἰς ψυχράν, ὅλγον καὶ ἔρημητα. δηλοὶ δὲ εἰς φιλοσόφους ἀνθρώπους 
καὶ γεωμέτρας καὶ ἀριθμητικοὺς καὶ πραγματευτάς καὶ γλύπτας καὶ 
στοριστάς, καὶ εἰς ὑδάραγγον (θαρρη cod., cf. Cod. Par. 2424, f. 166; Tan- 
ner 1920, 365) καὶ εἰς σχολεία (σκάλια cod.) καὶ ἐργαστηρία καὶ 
πηγάς ὄδατον καὶ ποταμοὺς καὶ χειμάρους. καὶ ἀστρονόμους καὶ καὶ 
γραμματικοὺς καὶ στηριξιστάς καὶ προφήτας καὶ 
φιλοχριστήματος.

Σελήνη.  

<H> φύσες αὐτῆς ψυχρὰ καὶ ψυχρὰ. μετέχουσα καὶ ὅλγον θερμότητας, 
σκέπτουσα καὶ φθοροποιοῦσα. δηλοὶ εἰς ναῦτας καὶ στρατιώτας καὶ 
ἁποκρισιάδους καὶ ὑποχειρίους καὶ εἰς τοὺς πολὺ ἐσθίοντας.
C. [The houses:]
On life; on pursuits; on siblings; on parents; (f. 284v) on children; on the sick; on women; on death; on travel; on the empire; on hopes; on duress; on happiness; on grief; on judgment.

D. [The planets:]
Saturn: its nature is cold and dry, bad, destructive, and deadly. It points to former matters, things that took place before us, the deep and the dark; also to the stinking and foul-smelling, to confining and thorny and acrid plants, unjust and base people.

Jupiter: its nature is hot and moist, beneficent and good, righteous. It points to pious people and ascetics; also to white stones and crystals, to churches and well-formed beings and to all fruit which has a cover on its body; to fragrant herbs, to an honorable and peaceable person and a law-observing and benevolent one.

Mars: its nature is hot and dry, destructive, burning, and ruinous. It points to blazing furnaces and the shedding of blood, to war and distress and calamities and murder; also to all red stones and to all herbs; to unjust and law-breaking people and thieves. It is evil in every possible way.

(f. 285r)
Sun: its nature is hot and dry, but it is both beneficent and maleficent. It points to kings and rulers and to gold and golden stones; also to the color of gold and to beauty, to courage and love of riches.

Venus: its nature is cold and wet, beautiful and beneficent. It points to cheerfulness and music and eunuchs and women; also to sexual pleasures and dice, and various colors.

Mercury: its nature fluctuates with the nature of the rest of the stars, except that it tends to coldness and somewhat to dryness. It points to philosophers and land-measurers, to mathematicians, tradesmen, sculptors, and historians; also to quicksilver and to schooling and workshops; to wells and rivers and winterbourne streams; to astronomers, diviners, teachers, poets, prophets, and money-lovers.

---

120 The form ἀλκανθώδης seems to be a variant of the more common ἀλκανθώδης, full of thorns. Correspondent words which have survived into Modern Greek (ἀγκάθη, αγκαθωτός) attest that the form in Gr 8 is not a scribal error.

121 The term νομιμάρτιος, lawyer, is met with for instance in Doukas’ Historia Turco-Byzantina 13, 5.

122 “Schooling” (for σχολεῖα) is my suggestion; in Gr 8, the word reads σκολία, i.e. bent or crooked things.
E. (f. 285v)

F.

α’ πρωΐ    β’ δείλης    γ’ μη̄ χρόνος    δ’ δι’ ὄλης χρόνος    ε’ μη̄ χρόνος
ζ’ δι’ ὄλης    ζ’ πρωΐας    η’ μη̄ χρόνος    θ’ δείλης    ι’ ὀμοίως
ια’ δείλης    ιβ’ ὀμοίως    ιγ’ πρωΐας    ιδ’ δείλης    ιε’ πρωΐας
ις’ ὀρφά τρίτη    ιζ’ δείλης    ιη’ ὀρφά γ’    ιθ’ μη̄ χρόνος    κ’ μη̄ χρόνος
κα’ πρωΐ    κβ’ ὀμοίως    κγ’ δείλην    κδ’ μη̄ χρόνος    κε’ δείλης
κς’ δείλης    κζ’ μη̄ χρόνος    κη’ δείλης    κθ’ ὀμοίως    λ’ δείλης

G.

... Πρὸς τίνας ἔχει ὀμοίωσιν καὶ ὁδὸν; ἔχει ὁδὸν μετὰ τῶν
didaskállon, tôn γραμματέων, tôn ἐπισταμένων τῆς γραφῆς. ἦ
φύσις αὐτοῦ θερμή καὶ ύγρα. ἔστιν ἀνατολικόν. πλανῆται αὐτῷ ὁ
2., οἶκος ὁ Ἀρ. ἦ ἔρωτησις περὶ μεγιστάνων ὀηλοῦ εἶναι τὸν αἰῶνα
μακρὸν, εὐειδὴ, πλατυγένειον, οὔτε παχήν οὔτε λεπτὸν ἄλλα
μέσον. ταῦταν δὲ καὶ περὶ γυναικῶν: –
Moon: its nature is cold and moist, though it also has a small share of warmth; it is watchful and destructive. It points to sailors and soldiers, to secretaries, captives, and gluttons.

E. (f. 285v)
[Table showing all possible geomantic figures, their relation to different planets and whether they are good, bad, or intermediate:]

κ = κακός, α = ἄγαθός, μ = μέσος (good, bad, intermediate)
ό ἀναβιβάζων (sc. σύνδεσμος) the ascending node of the Moon; also called “Dragon’s Head”
ό καταβιβάζων (sc. σύνδεσμος) the descending node of the Moon; also called “Dragon’s Tail”

F. [Hemerological table:]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>don’t use</td>
<td>all through</td>
<td>don’t use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all through</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>don’t use</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>likewise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>17th</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third hour</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>third hour</td>
<td>don’t use</td>
<td>don’t use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>24th</td>
<td>25th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>don’t use</td>
<td>late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th</td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>28th</td>
<td>29th</td>
<td>30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late</td>
<td>don’t use</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>late</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. [Qualities of geomantic figures:]

For whom does it have a resemblance and profit? It is profitable for teachers, secretaries and those who know how to write. Its nature is warm and moist. It is an ascendant (eastern) figure. Its planet is Jupiter (2), its house the Archer (ξ). The matter concerns noble-men. It points to a long life, to a comely (person), broad-bearded, neither stout nor thin but of moderate build. The same applies to women.
How to create a geomantic chart

Text 66 begins at the bottom of a verso page with a zodiac wheel (section A). There is no heading either there or on the next recto page, and Theodoros has not spared any blank line for a later insertion. We are thus thrown right into “the method of ramplion” in the description of how to prepare a geomantic chart (section B). The chart is the constellation of geomantic figures upon which the diviner’s interpretation is then supposed to be based. In some manuscripts, the procedure is illustrated graphically, but not so in Gr 8. Since the text is not easily understood without this kind of sketch, one may speculate whether Theodoros had already seen the procedure in practice, and thus understood what it was about anyway.

A chart is composed out of fifteen tetragrams, figures consisting of four rows of single or pairs of dots. To create the first four figures, the diviner strikes the ground with a sharp object to make sixteen lines of marks, four lines for each tetragram. This should be done randomly, without counting the marks. Next, the marks in each line are paired together: if only one mark is left at the end, you put one dot for it in the geomantic figure; if they pair evenly, you put two dots in the figure. The tetragrams can thus take any of the following shapes:

![Diagram of tetragrams]

To illustrate the rest of the procedure, let us suppose that the diviner is now done striking the ground and has paired together all the marks, ending up, e.g., with the following four figures:

![Diagram of paired marks]

Whereas the first four figures in a chart are randomized, the subsequent eleven are based upon these four. The results can be seen in the chart on the next page (it should be read from right to left, just as one would read Arabic script):

123 Instead of sixteen lines, we have in Text 66 sixteen circles of marks, arranged in fours.
You get figures 5–8 by reading figures 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 together horizontally, one row at a time: the upper row of dots are put vertically to create figure 5, the next row becomes No. 6, and so forth. To create figures 9–12 you get new combinations of even and odd numbers of dots by combining the dots of figures 1 + 2, 3 + 4, 5 + 6, and 7 + 8. By combining figures 9 + 10 you create No. 13, from 11 + 12 you get No. 14, and finally you create No. 15 by combining figures 13 + 14. The finished chart is now made the basis for predictions or elucidations related to the client’s query.\(^\text{124}\)

The geomantic figures all have their specific names, qualities, and connections to planets and other celestial phenomena. To this should be added that the outcome of a query also depends on where in the chart the figures end up. The fifteen possible positions in the chart are called *houses*, in resemblance with the so-called mundane houses of astrology. Each house rules over a different aspect of life, as we can see in section C of Text 66. To make an initiated assessment of a laid chart, the diviner had to bring together all this information and relate it to the question at hand. It is reasonable to assume that some kind of handbook would be needed for this second step in the divinatory procedure, at least for novices, but in *Gr 8* there is no such

\(^{124}\) Sometimes a sixteenth figure is created, by combining the dots of figure No. 1 with figure No. 15. This is only used in cases of uncertain judgment, when the results of the chart are ambiguous.
section included. Text 66 ends rather abruptly, with only one geomantic figure out of sixteen presented at the end of the last verso page of U12. This could mean that a “handbook” was in fact copied in full by Theodoros but that one or two quires went missing afterwards. Another alternative would be that Theodoros was only superficially interested in the art, and chose to keep from the model manuscript just what happened to fit into the quire he had at hand.

The astrological lore in Text 66

Astrology is, to a varying degree, present in most geomantic texts, and certainly in Text 66. Given that this represents a vast field of research in itself, it is necessary to limit the presentation here so as to touch only upon phenomena encountered in the manuscript text. The concepts are explained in the same order as we find them in Text 66.

Section A, the zodiac: astrological calculations are based upon a conception of the universe where the earth is at the center and the other celestial bodies (stars, planets, moon, etc.) seem to ambit around it in fixed orbits. The most important orbit is the ecliptic of the sun, i.e. its apparent annual path over the celestial sphere, as perceived by an observer on earth. The zodiac is a representation of the astral constellations which the sun appears to pass through on its route, counting from the vernal equinox and forward. With the solar path divided into twelve equal parts, it became possible to tell in what “sign” the sun was posited at a particular time of the year. The zodiacal circle on f. 283v shows the relation between the zodiacal signs, the months, and the seasons.

Section B deals with the construction of the chart. This was discussed above.

Section C is an enumeration of the geomantic houses. The astrological concept of houses is actually twofold: one interpretation concerns which zodiacal sign the planets are “at home” in, i.e. their own signs, the ones that they rule. Each planet is thought to be the ruler of two signs, except for the luminaries (Sun and Moon) which rule one sign each. This is connected to the division of the signs into day- and night-signs. Signs from Leo to Capricorn were day-signs, Aquarius to Cancer were night-signs. The Sun ruled over Leo and the Moon over Cancer. The rest of the planets were assigned as rulers over one day-sign and one night-sign in the following way: Saturn – Capricorn and Aquarius; Jupiter – Sagittarius and Pisces; Mars – Scorpio and Aries; Venus – Libra and Taurus; Mercury – Virgo and Gemini. The importance of knowing where the planets are “at home” stems from the idea that their characteristic influence is increased when they pass through their own zodiacal constellation. The second interpretation of “houses” is even
The method of ramlion: Text 66

more abstract: counting counter-clockwise from the Ascendant (the point of the zodiac rising over the horizon), these mundane houses were visualised as permanent and stationary sectors of the heavenly sphere, like a fixed compass wheel set in relation to the rotation axis of the earth. Each of the usually twelve segments of this wheel governed certain aspects of life. In accordance with their movement across the sky, the zodiacal signs and planets were thought to enter one house after another, thus entering and influencing new aspects of human existence in each segment.126 The geomantic houses, finally, are modelled on the concept of mundane houses in astrology, i.e., the first twelve positions in a geomantic chart govern the same areas of life as do the segments of the astrological “heavenly wheel.” As the geomantic chart includes three (or even four) positions further, these are then given a special significance in the interpretation of the cast chart. They are the “witnesses” (i.e., positions 13 and 14 in the chart on p. 225), the “judge” (position 15), and the “judge’s judge,” in case a sixteenth figure is needed to elucidate the reading (position 16; cf. n. 124, above).

Section D is a description of the planets and their elemental qualities which are associated with everything from natural phenomena, botany, minerals, and events, to people—their disposition, interests and professions. To an earth-bound observer most of the stars appear to always retain the same position in relation to one another. These are called “fixed stars.” The celestial bodies which are observed as moving in the sky are called “wandering stars” or πλάνητες ἀστέρες. That is the reason why the ancients counted not only Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn as planets but also the Moon and the Sun. These seven “planets” all wandered through the heavens and could thus be observed as they passed through the zodiac. The planets were associated with certain qualities, temperaments, genders, day/night, et cetera. These temperamental differences decided which planets were malefics or benefics. As Ptolemy says about the four temperaments or fluids: “two of the four humors are fertile and active, the hot and the moist (for all things are brought together and increased by them), and two are destructive and passive, the dry and the cold, through which all things, again, are separated and destroyed.”127 The influence from the planets is of paramount interest to astrological deliberations: in Ptolemy’s description of the fixed stars and their respective influence it is obvious how each star is compared to, and is said to operate like, this or that planet (this applies to fixed stars within the zodiacal

---

126 These mundane houses are sometimes called “Places,” in order to distinguish them from the zodiacal houses (BARTON 1994, 98). I keep the term “house” here, since that is the term we meet in Byzantine geomantic texts (οἶκος, οἶκημα).

127 Ptol. Tetr. 1. 5. 1. (transl. Robbins). An application of this view of the fluids was touched upon in the discussion of Text 29, where the embryo was imagined to be concocted and shaped by the heat and moisture in the womb, while too much dryness at the end of the shaping process could be hazardous for the perfection of the eyes.
constellations as well as those south and north of the zodiac). Another influential aspect is the four cardinal points of the horizon, also seen as the main directions of the wind. Given the impact of the Sun during the day, the eastern point (angle of the ascendant) is mainly dry, the southern point is hot, the western point (occidental angle) is moist, while the northern point—also called the lower heaven—is cold.129

Section E is a table of all geomantic figures, showing their planetary or other celestial connections, and indicating the good/strong, bad/weak, or intermediate/ambivalent impact of the figures on the query at hand. As we can see in the table above, fourteen of the sixteen geomantic figures are connected to a planet. Two figures, however, are instead accompanied by the terms ἀναβηβάζων and καταβήβαζων, which refer to the more abstract concept of nodes. The orbit of the moon is slightly tilted in relation to the ecliptic. This means that its path seems to cut the ecliptic in two nodes (intersecting points). These points are important for predicting eclipses. For an eclipse to appear, the Sun and Moon must be close to a node simultaneously. Lunar eclipses are liable to appear at Full Moon, while solar eclipses (occultations) appear at New Moon, in both cases given that there is a syzygy, i.e., provided that the Sun, Earth, and Moon stand in conjunction to each other—that they “are in a line.” The ancient belief that eclipses were the result of a dragon’s devouring of the sun or the moon is the reason why the nodes are often called Dragon’s Head and Dragon’s Tail. In astrology the Dragon’s Head is seen as positive and beneficial, while the Dragon’s Tail expresses the opposite qualities. This tallies well with the characterisation in Text 66, where the ascending node, ὃ ἀναβηβάζων, is described as ἄγαθός (α), and the descending node, ὃ καταβήβαζων, as κακός (κ). The ascending node (ἀναβηβάζων, Ά) indicates the point where the moon’s orbit crosses to the north of the ecliptic, and the descending node (καταβήβαζων, Ώ) the moon crossing the ecliptic southwards. Our scribe has, for some reason, swapped the sym-

---

128 Ptol. Tetr. 1. 9.
129 Ptol. Tetr. 1. 11. In Chinese tradition, the cardinal points are at the heart of the geomantic interpretation; one even talks about a “compass school” (Braswell-Means 1990, 133f.). Braswell-Means contends that this stands in contrast to the Arabic-Western tradition with its focus on time rather than on space. However, if we compare the use of Feng Shui to the Malagasy geomantic tradition, the East Asian geomancy does not turn out to be so unique. The geomantic procedure is in both cases employed to make spatial considerations, finding the right geographic locale, erecting houses and designing interiors in a way that ensures that one stay in balance with the elements or with the gods. On the spatial use of geomancy in Madagascar, see Vérin & Rajaonarimanana 1991, 56–59. Time and space—the planets are clearly the guardians of both. Similarly, even if Byzantine geomancy is used mainly to find the right moment for acting in some way or other, the texts do refer to the compass directions: we see this also at the end of Text 66, where the geomantic figure is described as an “Eastern” figure (cf. p. 222f.).
130 Compare the more familiar phenomenon of solar nodes, the positions where the ecliptic intersects the equator. The nodal points are then referred to as the vernal and the autumnal equinoctial points.
131 Berry 1961, 48.
bols written directly below the geomantic figure (⚙️, ⚋): these symbols should probably change places.\textsuperscript{132}

**Section F** concerns *hemerology* or the belief in auspicious and inauspicious days. The hemerological table on f. 285\textsuperscript{v} indicates when and on which days of the month it is suitable to proceed with divination. Despite the important place of the Moon in magic and divination, the calendar forming the basis of astrological texts is rarely based on lunar months. I will not go into definitions and lengths of different lunar months here (synodic, anomalistic, draconic, sidereal), but simply state that from early on it was the Egyptian calendar, with twelve 30-day months and five intercalated days (αἱ ἑπτάγομεναι ἡμέραι, resulting in a year of 365 days) that became standard in Greek astronomy and thus in many divinatory texts.\textsuperscript{133} This may explain why the picture of the zodiac in Text 66 is accompanied by Egyptian names of the months, even though there were other possible ways of denomenating the months in Byzantium.\textsuperscript{134} The origin of the seven-day week—through Jewish and Christian mediation in use even today—is linked to the Assyrian belief that the seven planets ruled in turn over the hours of the day.\textsuperscript{135} The weekdays were accordingly dominated by the planets, i.e., the divinities that ruled the very first hour of each day. Just as the planets had their qualities, being benefic, malefic, or shifting, so also the hours and days in the week became influenced by these.\textsuperscript{136} This was probably one source of the vast array of beliefs in auspicious and inauspicious hours, days, and years, beliefs which multiplied and eventually ended up in *The Farmer’s Almanac*, which has

\textsuperscript{132} I cannot say if this is a scribal mistake or if the use of symbols in the late Middle Ages was different from modern usage. The same switch of the nodal symbols is present also in *Par. gr. 2424*, f. 163\textsuperscript{v} and f. 189\textsuperscript{v}; see TANNERY 1920, 359 and Pl. II (right before p. 357).

\textsuperscript{133} See, for example, Proklos, *Hyp. astr.* 3.56; Cf. FREETH 2006, 588.

\textsuperscript{134} An overview of different naming systems is given by Andrew Libadenos in connection to his 14\textsuperscript{th}-c. travel narrative *Periegesis* (LAMPSIDES 1975, 129).

\textsuperscript{135} The sequence was determined by the perceived distance of each planet—it was thought that the slower the motion of a body over the celestial sphere the further away in space it must be. Thus Saturn was viewed as the most distant planet, followed by Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, and the Moon. This is, evidently, the order followed also in the presentation of planets in Text 66. That this sequence is not immediately seen in the sequence of weekdays, comes from the seven-hour sequence moving down through the weekdays: Saturn ruling the 1\textsuperscript{st}, 8\textsuperscript{th}, 15\textsuperscript{th} and 22\textsuperscript{nd} hour of the first day (hence “Saturday”), and subsequently the 5\textsuperscript{th}, 12\textsuperscript{th}, etc. of the second day; Jupiter ruling the 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 9\textsuperscript{th}, 16\textsuperscript{th} and 23\textsuperscript{rd} hour of the first day, the 6\textsuperscript{th} and 13\textsuperscript{th} of the second, and so forth (cf. the presentation of days in *Cod. Athous Dion.* 282, ff. 28\textsuperscript{v}–29\textsuperscript{v}, edited in DELATTE 1927, 649–651). Emperor Constantine the Great officially introduced this week in 321, thus replacing the former Egyptian-Greek week of ten days and the Roman system of Nones, Ides and Kalends. Gilbert Dagron notes that few attempts were ever made to Christianize the planetary names of the days (DAGRON 1990, 147). I would think that the Byzantines had little need for that, since they followed the ecclesiastical tradition in naming the days (Sunday was *Kyriake*; thereupon followed *Deutera*, *Trite*, *Tetarte*, *Pempte*, *Paraskeue* for “preparation day” and *Sabbaton* for Saturday). The lore of planetary connections to the weekdays apparently survived despite this neutralization in naming. A couple of Byzantine Christianizations of planetary names are presented in HÜBNER 1983, 144–147.

\textsuperscript{136} For an account of lucky and unlucky hours, see e.g. *CCAG* 12: 198–199 (from *Cod. Mus. Hist. Mosq.* 186).
seen new editions ever since. 137 The Assyrian hemerologies are often seen as precursors to the account of lucky and unlucky days which Hesiod included in his *Works and Days*, and to the Orphic *Ephemerides*. 138 Another trail, however, brings us all the way back to Pharaonic Egypt, where calendars of good and bad days have been transmitted in papyri at least from the Middle Kingdom and onwards. 139 In Egyptian papyri one can find precisely the division of the day into three parts, each part either good or bad, that are extant also in Byzantine hemerologies. The reason why a whole day or just part of the day had a certain influence is not quite clear. According to Theodor Hopfner it was connected to the activities of Egyptian gods on specific days of the year: the feast day of Râ, the day of the fight between Hor and Seth, etcetera. 140 In *Papyrus Sallier IV* (BM 10184; ca. 1300 BCE), one can read that the fifteenth day of the month *Phaophi* is good in the morning and mid-day but bad in the afternoon: “Verlass deinen Aufenthaltsort nicht in der Abendzeit, denn die Schlange Uatch, der Sohn des Gottes, geht aus um diese Zeit und Unglück folgt ihr,” as Hopfner translates. On the other hand, the fourth of the same month is put up as “bad, good, good,” but the prescriptions are simply “do not leave your house at all on this day; a person born on this day will die this day from severe illness.” That the moon, and perhaps other planets, were considered influential may be concluded from the title of some of the records: *περιφοτισμένα καὶ ἄφωτοτα ἱμέραι, lit and unlit days*. Hemerologies were consulted for guidance on *καταρχάι, “beginnings,”* i.e. when to undertake a certain activity (travel, marriage, business deals, medical treatment), and also for birth prognoses, to determine the character and future of a child born on a certain day. 141 Not least, they were crucial for

137 The same idea was even applied to millennia: Patriarch Gennadius (George Scholarios) referred to his own time as “the millennium of the Moon” (*τὴν ἔβδομην χιλίαδα τοίχην* [...] *χρονοκρατοριῶν οὕσαν σελήνη*). It followed upon the millennia of all the other planets and revealed its Selenic nature through the brevity of human lives, the inconstancy of fate and the political vicissitudes taking place just then (PETIT 1930, 3, 287).

138 On Hesiod, see WEST 1978, 348, with further references, and WEINSTOCK 1949, 57f. For the Orphic fragments on day prognostics, see KERN 1922, 274–279.

139 Theodor Hopfner refers to the “Kahunpapyrus,” *BM Kahun XVII,3* (HOPFNER 1921, 229); cf. GRIFFITHS & PETRIE 1898, 62 with Pl. 25. Lana Troy gives an overview of the religious contents and the cultural setting of some of these calendars; the Kahun papyrus, though, is misnumbered in this article (TROY 1989).

140 HOPFNER 1921, 229.

141 Stefan Weinstock gives an example from *Cod. Bodl. Cromwellianus 12*, p. 402, where the text gives advice on “medical treatment, horse-breeding, travel, marriage, slave-trade, hair- and nail-cutting, clothing, agriculture, etc.,” in addition to information on the planetary ruler of the day, and the horoscope for a boy or girl born on that day (WEINSTOCK 1949, 49 and 55). Often enough, hemerologies are more specialized and focus on just one thing, like dream interpretation, or the right time for blood-letting; cf. Erik Widstrand and Emanuel Svenberg, who have discussed the Latin tradition of “Kollektivlunaria” and “Speziallunaria” (SVENBERG 1936 [in Swedish]; WIDSTRAND 1942; SVENBERG 1963). See also László Chardonnens’ suggestions of how to denote different lunar prognostic genres (CHARDONNENS 2007, 393–398). Chardonnens is mainly working with Latin and Anglo-Saxon texts, but his discussion is worthy of note also for the Greek tradition.
divinatory practice.\textsuperscript{142} This mantic use of the hemerological table—the \textit{selenodromion} as it is called in Greek—is attested also in the manuscript tradition of the \textit{Sortes Astrampsychi}.\textsuperscript{143} Here, too, either the whole day or a certain part of the day can be useful or not, just as we have it in section F of Text 66. In the later redaction of the \textit{Sortes Astrampsychi} a table of days is included which is identical to the one in Text 66. It is preceded by these instructions:

Seek out the day and time on which the oracle works best. You should inquire on the following weekdays: the third—day of Ares, the fifth—day of Zeus, the sabbath—day of Kronos, and the Lord’s day which is the day of the Sun, and in no wise on other days. Use the third hour of the Lord’s day, the sixth of the sabbath, the fifth hour of the fifth day and the third hour of the third day, because on these days and times the answers given are more reliable. And before you consider the inquiry, consider if the time is right to devote yourself to the oracle, as the thirteenth [day] is the most important [...]. Further, you should consider the days of the Moon [or month], the way they are set forth here.\textsuperscript{144}

Whether a combination of these precepts with the ensuing table of allowed and forbidden days and times of the Moon cycle (month) amounted to a reasonable practice is debatable. It could be the result of interpolation, someone adding an alternative way of deciding on the right time for oracles. Nevertheless, \textit{selenodromia} were obviously assumed to be important, since they are transmitted in numerous magical (and medical) manuscripts of late Byzantine and post-Byzantine date.

Section G, finally, describes one of the geomantic figures, the so-called \textit{laetitia}, joy. The information in section D, the description of the planets, and in section E, the connection of each figure to a planet or celestial phenomenon, has provided the background, and now we see how the laws of cosmic sympathy are replicated in the qualities of the geomantic figure. We learn about the celestial relations and general qualities (warm, moist, and ascendant, in the case of \textit{laetitia}). Furthermore, there is specific information on what kinds of people are concerned, their professions and societal position, and also the physiognomic appearance and character of such a person.

\textsuperscript{142} Cf. the title ήμερομαντεῖα κ[α]ὶ ὄρατι, in the papyrus \textit{BM} \textit{gr. 121} (3\textsuperscript{rd} c. CE), which clearly spells out the use of the account of days in connection to divination, explaining when it is propitious or not to seek out the hidden knowledge (PREISENDANZ 1974, II, 6f.; HOPFNER 1921, 228).

\textsuperscript{143} The “Lots of Astrampsychos” is an oracle book stemming from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} c. CE. The book, which contained 92 questions and around ten possible answers to each of the questions, became widely spread in both pagan and Christian versions, and is extant in 3\textsuperscript{rd}–5\textsuperscript{th} c. papyri and in medieval manuscripts from the 13\textsuperscript{th}–15\textsuperscript{th} c.

\textsuperscript{144} STEWART 2001, 3; \textit{ecdosis altera}, from Erlang. 89; Laur. 28, 14; Marc. 324 (my translation). For an introduction to and an English translation of the main text of the \textit{Sortes Astrampsychi}, see HANSEN 1991, 287–324.
Why is Text 66 incomplete?

After the description of just one geomantic figure (*laetitia*), the text in our manuscript breaks off. This comes precisely at the end of the last verso page of the quire (and also of the codicological unit; i.e. Q38 in U12). As I mentioned above, it is not evident whether or not Theodoros originally continued presenting the rest of the geomantic figures and followed up with an interpretational catalog, similarly to many other treatises. If he did give this additional information, it would have helped the reader assess the combination of geomantic figures and houses, and connect this to the astrological lore of cosmic sympathy, physiognomy, and much more. If Theodoros intentionally broke off at f. 285v, one wonders to what use the text could have been put. Was the model manuscript incomplete? Or did Theodoros only want a brief orientation around the procedure of casting a chart? One small detail could perhaps support the latter alternative, and that is the professional link of the figure *laetitia*. Besides being one of the most positive geomantic figures, it is also connected to “teachers, secretaries and those who know how to write.” Theodoros as a copyist may have liked that association. All in all, though, I would rather think that the text is incomplete by accident, and that one or two quires are absent from the book.

A further look at the background of geomancy

Although geomantic texts are found in quite a number of late medieval manuscripts, it is not a form of divination which has been given much attention in research, at least compared to its big sister, astrology. Therefore we will make room for a brief discussion of the cultural background of this art.

Geomancy is one of the most widely spread divinatory techniques in the world: from China and India in the east to Senegal and Morocco in the west, and from Anglo-Saxon Europe to Botswana in Southern Africa.\(^{145}\) So where did it come from? Most often the art is referred to as Arabic or Islamic, since wherever Arabic and Islamic influence has reached, so has geomantic divination.\(^{146}\) As for the origin, it may be as complex to trace as in the case of

---

\(^{145}\) With the African slave trade it also proliferated in the West Indies and South America. Furthermore, it is indeed still practiced in many parts of the world, for instance in parts of Africa, on Madagascar, and in Chinese-speaking areas, where the art has merged with the long-revered art of Feng Shui—nowadays popular also in the West (on geomancy in Africa, see for example FAHD 1966 (covers Arabic divination at large); MAUPOIL 1988 (Benin); Jaulin 1966, 147–163 (Sudan, Tchad, Benin); van Binsbergen 1996b (Botswana with surrounding areas); Verin & Rajaonarimanana 1991 (Madagascar); on Chinese geomancy, see Braswell-Means 1990.

\(^{146}\) See for example Jaulin 1966, 13–16; FAHD 1966, 196–204; Savage-Smith & Smith 1980, 1; Carra de Vaux is more guarded, only stating that the origin of Arab divination “reste chez les Orientaux, purement légendaire” (in: Tannery 1920, 303). To call geomancy “Islamic,” is perhaps a way to avoid falling into an ethnic pitfall, but even the religious label is
astrology, referred to above. Arabic manuscript evidence brings us back to the tenth or ninth century CE, but this does not leave out the possibility of an earlier existence of geomancy, whether on Persian, Egyptian, or other soil. The necessary components for the art were present already in the astrological lore of Ptolemy or Vettius Valens, and the fad for numerology and Sortes literature (divination with the help of random choice from a handbook of questions and answers) during the same era would seem to match up with the procedure of geomancy. Armand and Louis Delatte suggest that the book entitled Άμοκοπία (sand striking), supposedly written by “Orpheus,” could point to a Neopythagorean connection. The hypothesis would be that this kind of sand divination was known and practiced in Greek-speaking areas during late antiquity when “Pythagorean” and Hermetic mysticism were in vogue, but later became reintroduced to Byzantium and Western Europe in its Arabic form. A reference preserved in the prooemium by Niccolò of Otranto to one geomantic text may possibly provide a lead here: Niccolò says that he himself translated the text from a Latin model, but also added what he had compiled from several Greek manuscripts. He ends his prooemium with the words γέγονεν δὲ πρῶτον ἢ τοιαύτη σοφῆ τέχνη τρόπῳ τωθε, ὡς ὁ Σελμὸν αὐτὸς ἄρχεται τοῦ ταύτης συνάγματος ύστερο ποις, according to Codex Scorialensis Φ II 14. In Parisinus graecus 2419 (copied by George Meidiates in 1462) the reference is even more detailed: ύστερ γὰρ καὶ Ἀρασ Σελμὸν ὁ πρὸς Μαμοῦν ἰδακτὰ τῆς Βαβυλῶνος ταύτην τὴν τέχνην ἐκ τῆς μεγάλης ἀστρονομίας συντάξας φησίν. It is not unlikely that this “Selmōn” points at Salmān, the chief librarian of Caliph al-Ma’mūn (813–833). Salmān was the leader of the ‘Abbāsid delegation to Constantinople, sent to acquire Greek books from the Byzantine court of Emperor Leo

problematic. As a reminder, we may recall what it looked like at the Abbasid court in the late 8th c.: the chief astrologers were Theophilos of Edessa, a Greek from Syria (Nestorian Christian), Abū-Sahl ibn-Nawbakht, a Persian (convert from the Zoroastrian religion), Māšā‘allāh, a Jew from Basra (Jewish name Manasses), and Abū-‘Ma’ṣar, a Persian (born in Balkh, now Afghanistan); GUTAS 1998, 108f. These astrologers all played a part in Arabic/Islamic cultural history, but it was their linguistic and cultural otherness that made them useful for the caliphate. Likewise, for the origin as well as the spreading of geomancy, the blend of several cultural traditions was probably more important than a precise ethnic or religious affiliation.

147 Cf. Suda, s.v. Ὀρφεύς (Omicon 654); DELATTE & DELATTE 1936, 578–580 and 585.
148 Cod. Scor. Φ II 14, f. 47v (14th–15th c., according to Gregorio de Andrés’ catalog); the manuscript is written by a single scribe, and readers’ notes from 1430 onwards imply a composition date at least prior to that (Andrés 1967, 41f.). The prooemium is preserved also in Cod. Flor. Laur. 86,14, f. 47 (15th c.).
149 Cod. Par. gr. 2419, f. 228v (DELLATE & DELATTE 1936, 597). The Latin treatise, which Niccolò used, seems to have been the one produced by Hugh of Santalla. In her study of Hugh’s text, Therèse Charmasson makes no mention of a person named Selmōn or Salmān (Charmasson 1980). This piece of information ought therefore to have come from the scattered Greek treatises which Niccolò used for his compilation. Cf. Cod. Scor. Φ II 14, f. 46v: Νικολάου Υἱόροφοςς προμίον εἰς τὴν τοῦ λαξευτηρίου τέχνην, ἔξελεντεσίαν παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐκ μυσμαίκης διαλέκτου, χολλαίαν οὐσίαν τὸ πρῶτον, καὶ συνταχθήσαν ἐκ τὶ ἄλλων βιβλίων ἐλληνικῶν σποράδων ἐδη (sic) γε ὑπάρχουσαν.
the Armenian.\textsuperscript{150} These books were then translated into Arabic in Baghdad. We know that astrological works were a top priority and in great demand at the ‘Abbāsid court,\textsuperscript{151} so perhaps geomancy was part of the parcel already at that time. This suggestion would be interesting to follow up as a potential missing link to an early use of geomancy, which then got a wider audience in its Arabic version, only to end up being translated once again into Greek in Otranto, in the early thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{152}

Wim van Binsbergen has suggested a reevaluation of the origins of geomancy. Given that most manuscripts—including the Arabic which are usually taken to be precursors to all Western European and Byzantine geomantic texts—present a very heterogeneous collection of names of the geomantic figures, names which apply to different semantic categories such as physical appearance, emotions, colors, astronomic terms, et cetera, van Binsbergen argues that the text in \textit{Parisinus graecus 2419} could actually represent an earlier, uncorrupted stage of the geomantic art.\textsuperscript{153} In this manuscript the names of the figures can all be interpreted in astrological terms, thus providing a comprehensive system of nomenclature.\textsuperscript{154} Although van Binsbergen’s proposal certainly does not prove an ancient Greek or Byzantine origin of the art of geomancy, it does encourage us to look beyond the apparent “fact” of a tenth-century Arabic or Islamic invention of geomancy. Another intriguing idea offered by van Binsbergen is the possibility that the geomantic text in \textit{Codex Harleianus 5596} could convey a form of “proto-geomancy.” He

\textsuperscript{150} WELLISCH 1986, 21; cf. al-Nadīm \textit{Fihrist}, 7. 1 (DODGE 1970, 584).

\textsuperscript{151} GUTAS 1998, 108–110.

\textsuperscript{152} Niccolò of Otranto, a bilingual Greek from southern Italy, was the official translator in the church union discussions in Constantinople in 1205–07, and again in 1214. Under the name of Nectarius he became the abbot of the monastery of S. Niccolò di Casole 1220–35, and the many Byzantine books which he brought back to Italy became part of the monastic library. This monastery remained an important center for the diffusion of Greek culture in southern Italy for centuries, until its destruction by the Turks in 1480 (SETTON 1959, 14f. and 32f.).

\textsuperscript{153} VAN BINSBERGEN 1996a, 40–46.

\textsuperscript{154} The opposite case, that the author/scribe of \textit{Par. gr. 2419} could have tidied up the arrangement secondarily, seems less plausible. Even though some of the Arabic names can be shown to be corruptions of precisely those astronomic notions which present themselves in the Paris manuscript, a translator from Arabic to Greek would hardly have recognized the source concepts—the gap is too wide for that. Cf. also van Binsbergen’s examples of possible textual distortions in the Arabic tradition due to orthographic similarities (VAN BINSBERGEN 1996a, 48). On the other hand, a Latin geomantic manuscript reminds us not to take too lightly the ability of educated scribes to “ameliorate” a text: to the text of \textit{Br. Mus. Sloane 3487} (15\textsuperscript{th} c.) the scribe added that he had reduced it to an astronomical basis, “Explicit aggregatorium sive compilatorium geomancie editum per Ro. Scriptoris ... quantum possibile est ad astronomiam redacta” (cited from THORDIKE 1934, vol. 4, 143). This Roland Scriptoris of Lisbon went about similarly with a chiromantic text, according to Thorndike: he associated the parts of the hands with the planets, explained how to examine the hands of a person to determine under what planet he or she was born, etc. (for details of manuscripts, see THORDIKE, \textit{loc. cit.}, n. 41). It may very well be that the case of \textit{Par. gr. 2419} is quite another than the one of Roland “astrologizing” his texts—I am just stressing that further investigations are needed to confirm van Binsbergen’s theory and eliminate other possibilities. On Roland Scriptoris’ geomancy, see also CHARMASSON 1980, 177–193.
argues that the astrological orientation of geomancy emphasizes the seven planets (and not the twelve zodiacal signs), thus only needing seven or eight different configurations instead of sixteen: this is conveniently met in the geomantic figures consisting of only three rows of dots, just as we have them in the Harleianus manuscript. The less economic variant, with four rows of dots per figure, must link two signs to each planet (just as in the table on f. 285v in Gr 8). Furthermore, a connection between the geomancy put forward in Harleianus 5596 and the Pa Kua, the eight trigrams which form the basis of ancient Chinese cosmology and divination, does not seem unrealistic, though, as van Binsbergen states, this is highly hypothetical at present.

Not a poor man’s astrology

As mentioned above, geomancy has been called a “poor man’s astrology.” This may be correct for more recent uses of the art, but in Byzantium and in the medieval West it definitely stayed an advanced intellectual pursuit in the upper strata of society, among sovereigns, doctors, and ecclesiastics. In these areas it would be more suitable to call geomancy “the daughter of astrology,” as do some of the medieval treatises. Thus, one should not be surprised to find in some manuscripts the note that the geomantic text was copied from an exemplar belonging to Patriarch Gennadios, i.e. George Scholarios. The interest in occult sciences was certainly not absent in ecclesiastical quarters. There are further examples: Codex Scorialensis Y III 18 (early 16th century) brings together texts on Greek alchemy and theological treatises relating to the discussion of the “filioque.” Cardinal Bessarion, high

---

155 VAN BINSBERGEN 1996a, 50–54. For the Greek text of Par. gr. 2419, see DE LATTE & DELATTE 1936, 591–658; the excerpt from Cod. Harl. 5596 (15th c.), ff. 3v–5v, was edited by Armand Delatte (DE LATTE 1927, 392–396). To render the planets a more important place than the zodiacal signs was typical of Greco-Roman astrology in its earlier stages (BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ 1879, I, 225f.).

156 VAN BINSBERGEN 1996a, 54. Representations of the Chinese trigrams are extant from at least the 7th c. BCE, and the claim of contemporary Chinese geomancy is that the art descends from the Qin dynasty, in the 3rd c. BCE (BRASWELL-MEANS 1990, 132f.). The Pa Kua are associated with elements, seasons, times of day, compass directions, animals, etc., but not with planets and astrological concepts, as far as I understand. To follow this East Asian geomantic trail goes far beyond my scope here, but it is worth emphasizing that there has been a considerable exchange of ideas between China and the West at many points in history, through India and Persia and along the Silk Road. As for astrology, China has its own three-thousand-year-long tradition of stargazing, but an import of Arabic astronomers/astrologers has also taken place, for instance during the Yuan dynasty (1271–1368); STEELE 2000, 161. Notwithstanding a possible connection of Eastern and Western geomantic trigrams and tetragrams, the astrological framework in the Arabic and Western geomantic texts is definitely Ptolemaic, not Eastern. Chinese astrology is, for example, polar- and equator-oriented rather than planetary and ecliptic (NEEDHAM 1974, 67).


158 Cf. several of the incipits in CHARMASSON 1980, 295–303.

159 Par. gr. 2419, f. 241v: Ἐτέρα ἕκθεσις τοῦ ῥαμπλῶν ἑν ἔλαβον ἀπὸ τὸ βιβλίον Γεναδίου πατριάρχου; CCAG 8:1, p. 53; the note is extant also in Vat. Pal. 312, f. 235 (15th–16th c.).
Delving deeper: a selection of texts

up in the Church hierarchies, is known to have had in his possession the earliest of the surviving Greek alchemical manuscripts, *Marcianus gr. 299*. The scribe Michael Apostoles, who also worked on commission from Bes- sarion, copied at least two codices containing geomantic treatises (*Cod. Laur. 28, 22 and Cod. Laur. 86, 17*). At the same time, geomancy does come forth as a somewhat “foreign” element in fifteenth-century Byzantium, at least if we are to judge from John Kananos’ account of the siege of Constantinople in 1422. After having ravaged the surrounding areas, Sultan Murad II was about to capture the city, but the Ottoman “patriarch” Mersaïtes (Amîr-seyyîd) told Murad to await his instructions on the right time for assaulting the walls. When the troops had gathered, this Mersaïtes “went into his tent [...] and began to peruse the books of Muhammad and perform the *ramplia*, putting on an act as he did this, in order to deceive the Turks into revering and honoring him as a prophet.”

Mersaïtes promised them an easy victory if they listened to his advice, and said that if the sultan and his troops advanced at the right moment, then the city walls would collapse automatically and they would unhindered seize the city. Eventually these schemes, which Mersaïtes had substantiated through oracles obtained from the “books of Muhammad” and “the *ramplia*,” came to nothing, since, according to John Kananos’ report, the Theotokos miraculously intervened and gave the victory to the Byzantines.

Looking at this episode, it is striking that Kananos seems to have taken his readers’ familiarity with “tà Ἡμέραι” for granted: he sees no need to explain what was going on in Mersaïtes’ tent. Furthermore, geomantic divination is apparently something that a fifteenth-century imam could be expected to resort to. Would it matter here that Mersaïtes is depicted as a Persian, speaking and singing hymns in “Persian dialect”? Further on in Kananos’ text Mersaïtes is reported to have said that wise men from Persia had calculated the right time (for capturing Constantinople) “through the power of the stars and the skills of astronomers.” It is not clear whether this statement still points to geomancy or to astrology in a wider sense. John Kananos emphasizes that the Theotokos could counteract the astrologers’ prediction because her power did not come from earth (οὐκ ἀπὸ γῆς) or from people but from heaven and from an invisible force. To mention earth as a less powerful element could possibly be a hint at the geomancy used, but the

---

161 One must, however, bear in mind that this particular “patriarch” is depicted as depraved; John Kananos describes him as well-born, εὐγενής, a descendant of Prophet Muhammad, but also as a callous person, ambitious, haughty, and violent, even as having abducted and raped a daughter of Murad II (ibid. 199–209).
162 Ibid., 530–535: Ἐλέγχω γὰρ Μησσαίτης καὶ πατριάρχης τῶν Τουρκῶν, ὅτι ἡ πόλις ἐπρόκειτο παρ’ ἡμῶν αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι, ὡς οἱ σοφοὶ τῆς Περσίας εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ Μωάμεθ ἐφισοφοφόρησαν περὶ τοῦτο, καὶ εὑρόν ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἔτος καὶ τὸν μήνα καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτης τῆς ὀρας ἡ πόλις παρ’ ἡμῶν πρόκειται κρατηθῆναι. Καὶ ἐμελλε τούτῳ γενέσθαι κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τῶν ἀστέρων καὶ τὴν τέχνην τῶν ἀστρονόμων.
whole argument of Kananos is that the Persian prophecy was valid and could be reverted only through the power of God. There is no patent disapproval in the text concerning the use of either astrology or geomancy; Mersaïtes’ selfish and cruel scheming and his blasphemous utterances were probably more serious offenses in the eyes of John Kananos (“Blind Romans, where is your God now? Where is your Christ? Where are the saints who should help you?”).  

All things considered, the reference to geomancy in John Kananos’ narrative must not be given too much weight in a discussion of geomantic divination. It gives one person’s perspective, and that in a text which is supposed to denigrate the enemy and eulogize the Byzantine victory as supported by the Virgin. Nevertheless, it is a contemporary observation and therefore interesting for the investigation of late and post-Palaiologan geomantic texts. To get a more solid comprehension of the place of geomancy in Byzantine culture one would certainly need to expand the investigation to a larger number of texts. If someone were to undertake that chore, my advice would be to take into account also the location of these texts in the books where they are found. With a firm grip on the codicological structure and the context of books, their place of origin, scribes, owners and readers, there is a good chance to learn more about the cultural background and importance of a phenomenon like geomancy. To link that kind of study to an inquiry into the Arabic and possibly Persian geomantic traditions would moreover give us the broader perspective, attainable through interdisciplinary collaboration.

---

163 Ibid., 271ff.
How to address the Pope (and a friend): Text 81

To learn a foreign language was no simple undertaking during the Middle Ages. The aids we take for granted, like lexica and grammars, were scarce. Thus, in addition to more or less ample word lists, the key strategy was to use well-known texts and supply them with a word-for-word translation. More often than not psalms were used for this purpose, and this is what we find in \textit{Gr 8}. One of the codicological units, U15, is devoted almost entirely to bilingual texts, the Latin version in a neat humanist hand and the Greek translation above each line a little more idiosyncratic in style—not that the Greek is carelessly written, but rather swiftly, the letters either stretched out or crammed together, with the aim of getting each word in the right place in relation to the Latin.

In addition to the Psalms and liturgical items (\textit{Ave Maria}, \textit{Pater Noster}, \textit{Credo}), there is another bilingual text: a rudimentary letter manual or titulary collection, instructions on how to address public officials of various kinds as well as private persons. This reflects letter-writing not as a literary genre, but as a necessary aid in daily life. Research on Hellenistic and Byzantine letter manuals has concentrated mainly on the more systematic ones which became associated with names like Demetrius of Phaleron, Libanios, and Proklos. These were surveys of epistolary types with exemplary letters of different kinds attached. Extant in manuscripts from the tenth century and onwards, they saw their widest dissemination in the late Palaiologan and early Ottoman periods. That this tradition of letter manuals continued also in the post-Byzantine era is evident from an analogous seventeenth-century

---

164 The first Greek grammar to appear in print was Constantine Lascaris’ \textit{Greece Institutiones}, in 1476; three others, by Manuel Chrysoloras, Demetrios Chalkokondyles and Theodore Gazes, followed suite in the next twenty years (Stevens 1950, 242). Being entirely in Greek, Lascaris’ book was ill suited for beginners, who must have needed initial instruction from a Greek teacher. We may note, though, that just at the end of his book there is a Latin version of the Lord’s prayer with an interlinear Greek translation: this prayer is presented among the bilingual texts in \textit{Gr 8} as well. Lascaris includes among his reading selections the \textit{“Psalmus quinquagesimus, cui principium, Miserere mei domine”}; this, too, is part of the Greek-Latin material in \textit{Gr 8}. I am not suggesting a direct link between Lascaris’ work and the texts in \textit{Gr 8}, but rather pointing out the standard procedure and the conventional choice of texts, known to all, and therefore practical in language learning. Several early Greek printers produced “student versions” of texts, presenting the Greek text together with interlinear Latin. Paul Botley shows how fables, biblical, and liturgical texts, seem to have been the preferred choice for these language primary readers (Botley 2002).

165 In his introduction of Byzantine elementary schooling, Herbert Hunger mentions that letter openings are found among the practice texts in manuscripts: “Sehr häufig übte man (fiktive) Briefanfänge und Teile von Urkundentexten” (Hunger 1989, 78). This pedagogical pattern may have influenced our scribe Theodoros to add the letter headings to his language exercises. It is fairly obvious, though, that the texts in \textit{Gr 8} are in no way elementary: the end user of these pages was an adult rather than a school boy.

166 Ps.-Demetrios, \textit{Tύποι ἐπιστολικοί} and Ps.-Libanios/Ps.-Proklos, \textit{Ἐπιστολομαίοι χαρακτήρες}. See, for example, Rabe 1909; Brinkmann 1909; Sykutris 1928/29.

167 Cf. the introduction to Weichert’s edition (1910).
creation by Theophilos Korydalleus (ca. 1574–1646), Περὶ ἐπιστολικῶν τύπων, a work that was reprinted several times.\footnote{The Περὶ ἐπιστολικῶν τύπων was first published in London 1625 by Nicodemus Metaxas (printer William Stansby); cf. ROBERTS 1967, 16f. and 40f. On a text in Cod. Vat. Barb. gr. 71,3 possibly being the model for Korydalleus’ work, see RABE 1909, 288.}

Less attention has been given to the address and titulary books, which were more of an auxiliary for professional scribes and civil servants; only rarely have they been made accessible through an edition. In 1913, Giannino Ferrari edited some formulary texts taken from Vaticanus graecus 867, ff. 30–43. Among a large number of model documents concerning legal matters, there is one section of particular interest for us: §§ 21–36 present examples of how to address different dignitaries, sometimes with an outline on how to treat this or that question, sometimes also with a letter-ending formula.\footnote{FERRARI 1913, 57–62.} The manuscript is dated to 1258–59, but a couple of details could point to an earlier date for the formulary, or at least for the letters serving as its models. In the address “from ruler to ruler” (§ 29), for example, the wording of the letter is: εἰς ἄρχοντας κομνην(οῦς)· πανευγενέστατε κομνην(έ). In the address πρὸς δοῦκαν (§ 31), the name Komnenos is mentioned again. As the Komnenian dynasty held sway only until 1185, these entries ought not have been current during the Lascarid rule in the thirteenth century, at least not in Nicaea. The rulers of Trebizond, of whom many were related to the Komnenoi of Constantinople, most often referred to themselves with the phrase Megas Komnenos. Ferrari suggested that it is used as an honorific title, and this may well be the case.\footnote{FERRARI 1913, 126. One example of how the expression ὁ Κομνηνός βασιλεὺς can point to someone outside of the Komnenian family is the reference to Emperor Andronikos Gidos in John Lazaropoulos’ Synopsis (BHG 612–613); see the commentary on Lazaropoulos’ Synopsis line 1206, ROSENQVIST 1996, 439; MACRIDES 1979.} On the other hand, the names may simply be details remaining from real letters, which the scribe chose to use as models for his formulary.

Another text of this kind, the so-called Ekthesis Nea, saw a fairly wide dissemination: Jean Darrouzès presents some twenty-five manuscripts, mainly from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.\footnote{The Ekthesis Nea has seen other editions, prior to Darrouzès’, though based on just one or a few manuscripts. One of these editions is accessible in PG 107 398–418; cf. DARROUZÈS 1969, 5, n. 2.} The collection, which was originally compiled in 1386, was—as Darrouzès shows—soon thereafter subject to transpositions, additions, and other changes. Textual instability would come naturally with a text of this kind, but it is also a sign of its popularity and usefulness. A dilemma for the textual editor, this becomes part of its charm for the cultural historian: at least potentially, each text has the prospect of presenting a reflection of a certain time, of a historical, geographical, or social setting. In a couple of manuscripts there was an addition made in the form of an address to a ύποψήφιος, a bishop elect; in one a πιτ-
takion was directed to the voivode Stefan and his wife Maria; in another manuscript a model letter from Niccolò Gattilusio to the emperor Alexios of Trebizond was recorded (and also criticized in a marginal note, because Gattilusio actually died before Alexios IV began his reign, and “how could the redactor be so ignorant, so as not to know this”).

What information does a text like Ekthesis Nea provide? We can, for example, learn “how the Patriarch of Constantinople nowadays writes to the Pope” and to other ecclesiastical and political officials. From the wording, in the headline cited, it appears that the compiler reworked an earlier formula; thus there is not only textual instability after 1386, but the compilation Ekthesis Nea is itself an adjusted version. The element of practical usefulness of these collections is imperative: since titulary etiquette and bureaucratic order changed in the course of time, the chancery manuals had to be up to date. This ongoing process of adaptation is clear from other, even more modified versions of the work than the ones Darrouzès used for his edition. Shortened or expanded, with new offices and names added, they sometimes give the impression of not being chancery manuals anymore, but an aid for anyone who would need to contact authorities, teachers, or even friends and family. Darrouzès refers to a couple of such recensions nouvelles, more or less remote, or even independent, versions of address collections, in Vaticanus 573 and Sinaiticus 1609. Hugo Rabe mentioned yet a few manuscripts, like Oxford Bodleian misc. 242, Neapolitanus Borb. III.B.27, and Escorialensis Ψ.IV.1. The latter manuscript is of particular interest to us,
since the formulas in that text differ only slightly from the ones in Gr 8, apart from the fact that no Latin version was included there. Variant readings from Escorialensis Ψ.IV.1 (siglum E) are indicated in the critical apparatus to Text 81, and a brief discussion of the manuscript and its relation to Gr 8 is given in the “Addendum,” at the end of this chapter.

An intriguing aspect of formularies like these is that, besides giving information on the usage of titles and courtesy phrases at a certain time, they occasionally indicate the persons for whom or the circumstances in which the formulas were—or could have been—used. By combining names, initials of names, places or certain offices as far as these have left traces in the particular text or copy, this may also help us figure out a date for the composition of the manual, or of a specific version of it. This is what we will venture to do with Text 81. The listing begins with religious dignitaries, ranging from pope to monk. Subsequently civil offices follow, from king to learned nobles, and at the end a few entries are given on how to greet a friend. In some cases the formula includes a name, in others just an initial, and in yet others there are no clues whatsoever. Likewise, not all of the persons mentioned have made an imprint on posterity: we will never know who the “beloved son Antonius” is, unless we find out who actually compiled the formulary. I have chosen to present Text 81 the way it is written in the manuscript: the Greek above the Latin text. Subsequently, I will discuss the information it contains and its implications for our assessment of the text in relation to Gr 8 as a whole book.

176 For the use of existing persons or correspondences in designing a guide to letter-writing, cf. ÖBERG 1997, 12–19.
5 Delving deeper: a selection of texts

Text 81 (ff. 320r–323r)

1  \text{τῷ πάπα}  
\text{Papae}  
\text{τῷ ἁγιοτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ αὐθέντῃ ἡμῶν τῷ πάπα}  
Sanctissimo ac beatissimo domino nostro papae

5  \text{καρδινάλῃ}  
\text{Cardinali}  
\text{τῷ αἰδεσιμωτάτῳ ἐν Χριστῷ πατρὶ καὶ δεσπότῃ κυρίῳ}  
Reverendissimo in Christo patri et domino domino B. tituli sanctae
\text{Σαβίνης ἐπισκόπῳ καρδινάλῃ αὐθέντῃ ἐμῷ ἐξοχωτάτῳ ἢ ἐπιεικεστάτῳ}  
Reverendissimo in Christo patri et domino domino B. episcopo  
καρδιναλίῳ Θουσκουλανῷ αὐθέντῃ ἐμῷ ἐπιεικεστάτῳ  
Cardinali Thusculano domino meo singulari

10  \text{Sabinae episco}  
\text{p cardinali domino meo}  
\text{tῷ αἰδεσιμωτάτῳ ἐν Χριστῷ πατρὶ καὶ δεσπότῃ κυρίῳ B. ἐπισκόπῳ}  
Reverendissimo in Christo patri et domino domino B. episcopo  
\text{καρδιναλίῳ Θουσκουλανῷ αὐθέντῃ ἐμῷ ἐπιεικεστάτῳ}  
Reverendo in Christo patri et domino domino P. papiensi episcopo  
\text{αὐθέντῃ ἐμῷ ἐπιεικεστάτῳ}  
\text{Cardinali Thusculano domino meo singulari}

15  \text{ἐπισκόπῳ}  
\text{Episcopo}  
\text{τῷ αἰδεσίμῳ ἐν Χριστῷ πατρὶ καὶ δεσπότῃ κυρίῳ}  
Papías ἐπισκόπῳ  
Reverendo in Christo patri et domino domino P. papiensi episcopo  
αὐθέντῃ ἐμῷ ἐπιεικεστάτῳ  
Reverendo in Christo patri domino Athanasio abbati Sanctae Mariae  
\text{domino meo singulari}  
\text{ appréμενω}  
\text{Abbatì}  
\text{τῷ αἰδεσίμῳ ἐν Χριστῷ πατρὶ κυρίῳ Ἄθανασίῳ καθηγουμένῳ τῆς Ἁγίας Μαρίας}  
Reverendo in Christo patri domino Athanasio abbati Sanctae Mariae  
\text{δόμινo meo singulari}  
\text{πατρὶ τιμιωτάτω}  
de Patiro patri colendissimo

1 τῷ πάπα\text{] tolm}ον ο δούλος τῆς ἁγίας βασιλίας σου δεσποτα μου ἄγε δουλοικός ἀναφέρω E  
3 supra αὐθέντη\text{add. δεσπότη supra lin. U ἡμῶν τὸ} \text{] ἡμῶν E  5 καρδινάλη deest E}  
7 τίτλου\text{] τίτλου E  9 ἡ} \text{] καὶ E  17 αἰδεσίμῳ} \text{] αἰδεσιμωτάτῳ E  23 αἰδεσίμῳ} \text{] ἐδεσιμωτάτῳ E}  
25 Πατέρων deest E \text{] πατρὶ τιμιωτάτῳ quasi titulum textus sequentis transposuit E}  

242
íereúsi kai kanonikoiς
Sacerdoti canonico
tò eulabēstátω ἀνδρὶ κυρίῳ Δημητρίῳ kanonikῷ τῆς Ἀγίας Μαρίας τῆς Μείζονος

30 Venerabili viro domino Demetrio canonico Sanctae Mariae Maioris
patri aíōseímō
patri venerando

μοναχῷ
Monacho

35 tò ὁσίῳ ἀνδρὶ κυρίῳ Μάρκῳ τάξεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Βενεδέκτου ἐν τῷ Κασσίνῳ
Religioso viro domino Marco ordinis Sancti Benedicti in Monte
"Ὅρει πατρὶ τῶν τιμίων
Cassino patri observando

βασιλεῖ
Regi

40 tῆ ἱερᾶ βασιλικῆ μεγαλειώτητι Ἀραγώνων καὶ ἐκκατέρας Σικελίας καὶ τὰ ἔξης
Sacrae regiae Maiestati Aragonum utriusque Siciliae et cetera

πρίνκπι
Principi

45 tὸ περιφανεστάτω αὐθέντη κυρίῳ 
Tarántou príngkipi kai tὰ ἔξης αὐθέντη
Illustrissimo domino domino M. Tarenti principi et cetera, domino
ἐμῷ ἐπιεικεστάτω
meo singulari

50 δούκί
Duci

tὸ περιφανεστάτω αὐθέντη κυρίῳ 
Σαβαούδιας δούκι παὶ τὰ ἔξης αὐθέντη
Illustrissimo domino domino G. Sabaudiae duci et cetera domino
ἐμῷ ἐπιεικεστάτω
meo singulari
5 Delving deeper: a selection of texts

55 Marchioni

56 κόμιτι

57 Comiti

58 κόμιτι

60 meo singulari

61 κόμιτι

64 Comiti

65 επιεικεστάτω

69 singulari

71 strátori καὶ βαρόνω

73 Mili et barono

74 τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεὶ καὶ περιφανεὶ κυρίῳ τὸν ἐκ Λουζί...ας strátori

75 Magnifico et excellenti domino Sansoneto de Lusi... militi

77 νομοδιδασκάλῳ

78 Jurisconsulto

80 τῷ ἐνδοξόστατῳ τεχνῶν καὶ ἰατρικῆς διδασκάλῳ κυρίῳ τὸν ἐκ Παταβίου

85 Spectabili et eximio legis doctori domino Antonio de Padua

88 ἐπιστήμονι

90 Artium doctori

93 τῷ ἐνδοξόστατῳ τεχνῶν καὶ ἰατρικῆς διδασκάλῳ κυρίῳ τὸν ἐκ Περουσίας

96 Eximio artium et medicinae doctori domino Matheo Perusino

100 ἀνδρὶ σοφῷ καὶ λογίῳ

104 Homini docto et eloquenti

108 τῷ σοφωτάτῳ καὶ λογισμότατῳ ἀνδρὶ κυρίῳ

110 Doctissimo et eloquentissimo viro domino Joanni Aurispae...
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εὐγενεῖ καὶ πλουσίῳ

Nobili et diviti

85 τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ καὶ εὐγενεῖ ἀνδρὶ κυρίῳ Παύλῳ Σαβέλλῳ

Magnifico et nobili viro domino Paulo Sabello

tῷ φρονιμωτάτῳ καὶ φιλανθρωποτάτῳ ἀνδρὶ κυρίῳ Πέτρῳ φίλῳ ἀρίστῳ

Prudentissimo et humanissimo viro domino Petro amico singulari
tῷ φιλανθρωποτάτῳ καὶ εὐπαιδευτάτῳ ἀνδρὶ κυρίῳ Ἀντωνίῳ φίλῳ ποθενοτάτῳ

90 Perhumano et eruditissimo viro domino Antonio amico carissimo

tῷ μετριωτάτῳ καὶ φρονιμωτάτῳ ἀνδρὶ κυρίῳ

Modestissimo et prudentissimo viro domino

tῷ ἀνδρικωτάτῳ καὶ γενναιοτάτῳ ἀνδρὶ κυρίῳ

Strenuo et generoso viro domino

95 τῷ εὐγενεῖ καὶ λαμπροτάτῳ ἀνδρὶ κυρίῳ

Nobili et praeclaro viro domino

tῷ ποθενοτάτῳ μοι ἀδελφῷ κυρίῳ

Carissimo fratri domino
tῷ ἡγαπημένῳ μοι υἱῷ Ἀντωνίῳ

100 Carissimo filio Antonio
tῷ ἡγαπητῷ καὶ ποθεινῷ μοι υἱῷ

Dilecto et caro filio

Τῷ εὐσχήμονι καὶ ἐπιεικεῖ ἀνδρί

Honesto et bono viro

105 τῷ εὐγενεῖ καὶ ἑντίμῳ ἀνδρὶ κυρίῳ

Nobili et honorato viro domino

Ecclesiastical offices

The office of cardinal is given two entries in our formulary, both of which undoubtedly point to Cardinal Bessarion of Trebizond (1403–1472). Bessarion, bishop of Nicaea at the time, played a leading role as proponent of a church union at the Council of Ferrara-Florence. After the Council, Pope Eugenius IV wanted him to continue as a mediator between the Byzantine and the Roman churches, and to that end ordained him cardinal in December 1439. Bessarion was appointed Episcopus Cardinalis Sabinensis by Pope Nicholas V, in March 1449, and a few weeks later was transferred to the diocese of Tusculum. In the early fifteenth century, Enrico Minutolo was the bishop of the corresponding sees, and according to Ferdinando Ughelli, there was yet another fifteenth-century bishop who held the same two chairs: Latino Orsini. Nevertheless, in Text 81 the initial “B.” decides the issue to Bessarion’s advantage. Bessarion’s distinction in the circle of humanist scholars at Mistra in the 1430s and in Italy later on, his involvement in the Church Council, and his undisputed importance for supporting Greek immigrant intellectuals, would furthermore make him the most probable cardinal to appear in a Latin-Greek titulary collection.

The bishop of Pavia, whose name starts with the letter “P,” may refer to Petrus Grassius de Castro Novo, who held the episcopal chair from 1402 until his death in 1426. The wording of our text can be compared to his epitaphium in the sacellum of Saint Martha, which begins in the following way:

Hic iacet Reverend. in Christo Pater, & Dominus D. Petrus de Grassis, de Castro Novo, Dei & Apostolicae Sedis gratia Episcopus Papiensis, et Comes, qui obiit anno Domini…

Another possibility would be his successor, Francesco Pizolpasso (bishop of Pavia 1427–1435), who is better known as the archbishop of Milan. The normal rendering of the title would be with a person’s first name, in this case “Dominus F.” Could the scribe writing “P” have been influenced by the subsequent P in Papiensis, a slip further facilitated by the fact that Francesco’s second name started with P? Or could the phi in a Greek model manuscript

177 Cardinal Enrico Minutolo held the see of Tusculum/Frascati 1403–1409 and the see of Sabina 1409–1417 (GAMS 1873, xx and xiv).
178 Cf. UGHELLI 1644, 208 and 210. Ughelli’s years of nomination for Latino Orsini are 1468 and 1472 (in Gams, the latter date is 1473). Eubel, on the other hand, does not bear out Latino Orsini’s presence as Bishop of Sabina, mentioning only Tusculum (EUBEL 1914, 11). Giordano Orsini—member of the same family of Roman nobles—did hold the Sabinian chair prior to Bessarion (1431–1439), but he was never bishop of Tusculum. What seems clear is that in 1465 Latino Orsini was nominated bishop of the suburbanicarian diocese of Albano, in 1468 he became bishop of Tusculum, and in 1472 archbishop of Taranto (GAMS 1873, 856).
179 Cf. UGHELLI 1644, 37*. In Ughelli’s text a comma was put in the wrong place: “de Castro Novo Dei, & Apostolicae Sedis.”
180 See GAMS 1886, 801 (Piccopasio, bishop of Pavia) and 796 (Picolpasso, bishop of Milan).
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(“κυρίῳ Φ. Παπίας ἐπισκόπῳ”) have become reproduced as a “P.” in a Latin
apograph? Palaeographic hypotheses set aside, what certainly points to the
advantage of Pizolpasso (compared to his predecessor Petrus) is that he
would have been much more renowned among the Greek émigrés than his
predecessor Petrus. Pizolpasso took part in the Council of Basel from 1432
to 1439, and belonged to the circle of humanists who devoted themselves to
the study of Latin and Greek literature. In a letter to Nicholas of Cusa, Pizol-
passo writes about the Council of Basel, hoping that their work might bring
permanent unity and peace in the church.181 Pizolpasso was the patron of Pier
Candido Decembrio, who translated Plato’s Republic and took part in the
ongoing discussion on Plato and Aristotle, polemizing against Leonardo
Bruni, among others.182 Among Pizolpasso’s correspondents are several of
the leading cultural personalities during the 1430s–40s: Giovanni Aurispa—
dealer in Byzantine manuscripts, Leonardo Bruni and Ambrogio Traver-
sari—both leading Italian Hellenists, Enea Silvio Piccolomini—later to be-
come Pope Pius II, Lorenzo Valla—skilled latinist and translator of Greek
texts, Bessarion—bibliophile and patron of many Byzantine émigré scholars,
and Humphrey, duke of Gloucester—he, too, a benefactor of several Italian
humanists.183

The Greek monastery of Sancta Maria del Patire (or Patirion), situated
close to the city of Rossano in Calabria, was founded in the early twelfth
century through the efforts of Saint Bartholomew of Simeri and Norman
donations.184 The abbot mentioned in Text 81 would point to Athanasios
Chalkeopylos, who was archimandrite of Patirion 1448–1457.185 Originally
from Constantinople, he entered the Vatopedi monastery on Mount Athos
and came to Italy probably accompanying his superior, Dorotheos of Va-
topedi, who was to take part in the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1439.186

181 BOND 1996, 145. Nicholas of Cusa (1401–1464) was sent to Constantinople as the pope’s
ambassador in 1437 to negotiate the reunification of the churches. His friendship with Pizol-
passo “found nourishment in their mutual preoccupation with theological and philosophical
problems, but most of all, so it seems, in their love of books” (BIECHLER 1975, 16).
182 GARNSEY 2007, 44f.
183 On Pizolpasso’s time in Pavia, Basel and Milan and his contact with the humanist move-
ment, see PAREDI 1961, 25–65. Portions of Pizolpasso’s correspondence are found in PAREDI
184 The “del Patire” (del padre, τοῦ πατρός) derives from the founder, Bartholomew, “father”
of the monastery (cf. BHG 235). The “Norman” who promoted the monastery was Christo-
doulos, an admiral of Greek descent who held a distinguished position at the Norman court of
Sicily (he was also conferred the honorary title of protonobilissimos by Emperor Alexios I).
Cf. BATIFFOL 1891, 4f.; VON FALKENHAUSEN 1985.
185 In BATIFFOL 1891, 7, the author mentions an icon, now belonging to the Church of S.
Pietro in Corigliano, which was commissioned by Athanasios. On the lower part of the frame
it has the following inscription: Ἀθανάσιος Φιλίππου Χαλκεόπυλος ἀρχιμανδρίτης τῇ μητρὶ
tοῦ Θεοῦ σωτηρίας τῶν προσερχόμενων γάριν.
186 According to Joseph Gill, the monk Athanasios was ordered by the Emperor to collect
appropriate codices at Athos and bring them back to the Council as support for the Greek
position in theological controversies (GILL 1959, 76).
Athanasios made the acquaintance of Bessarion and is mentioned in the latter’s correspondence with Michael Apostoles. That he copied manuscripts on behalf of Bessarion is attested, likewise his activity as a translator of Greek texts into Latin.\(^{187}\) It was Bessarion who appointed Chalkeopylos archimandrite of Patirion. In 1458 Pope Pius II made him abbot of the Cistercian monastery of S. Maria dell’ Arco in Syracuse, and a few years later he became bishop of Gerace (1461–1497), the last Greek to hold that office. Athanasios Chalkeopylos died in 1497.\(^ {188}\)

The two subsequent entries in Text 81, concerning a priest and a monk, both mention persons by name. The most famous church with the epithet “Sancta Maria Maior” is the Santa Maria Maggiore at the Piazza dell’ Esquilino in Rome. The sacerdotal records of this church may possibly give us further information on pater Demetrius, but I have not pressed the issue any further. Neither have I found sources which could help me to identify Marcus, monk at the monastery of Montecassino. Cassino is situated midways between Rome and Naples, and was once on the border between Latin and Greek Italy. Though officially a Benedictine foundation, the monastery was at times also associated with Greek monasticism. The Byzantine emperor was the protector of the monastery from the late ninth century onwards. In the tenth century, Neilos of Rossano lived in a metochion of Montecassino together with a large number of disciples.\(^ {189}\) There were also Benedictine monks from Montecassino who decided to migrate to Mount Athos and Mount Sinai. That Montecassino became the melting-pot for different cultural influxes can be seen in its art, its architectural decoration, and its scribal production. For example, the influence of Byzantine artistry can be traced in the illuminated manuscripts deriving from the Montecassino scriptorium.\(^ {190}\)

\(^{187}\) On Chalkeopylos’ scribal activity, cf. Repertorium II, 7 with further literature. The Cod. Ravenn. Bibl. Class. 210, which he probably copied for Bessarion, contains Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics and Eudemian Ethics, and some poems from the Planudean Anthology. His translations of two homilies of Basil the Great and of Lucian’s De saltatione are extant (the latter work, in Cod. Par. gr. 3013, is dedicated to Antonello Petrucci, secretary of King Ferdinand of Sicily; in Repertorium II, 7 it is pointed out that the scribe of the Paris manuscript is not Athanasios but John Chalkeopylos, but the translation and dedication would still be Athanasios’ own. The dedicatory text is reproduced in Laurent & Guillou 1960, 228–231). See further Manoussacas 1973.

\(^ {188}\) Cf. Gams 1873, 883; Eubel 1914, 159.

\(^ {189}\) Subsequently, Neilos (cf. BHG 1370) founded his own monastery, the Basilian abbey of Grottaferrata which became renowned for its scriptorium. On the relations between Montecassino and Byzantium, see Bloch 1986.

\(^ {190}\) On the illuminative art, see Toubert 1971; Belting 1974. Francis Newton, in his impressive treatment of the Montecassino scriptorium and library, makes no mention of Byzantine influence (Newton 1999).
Secular offices

Among the secular offices the prime one is the king or βασιλεὺς. This is also the first one mentioned in Text 81, more specifically, the king “of Aragon and the two Sicilies.” The background of this title reaches back to the revolt called the Sicilian Vespers. In the war that followed, Peter III of Aragon made common cause with Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos against Charles I of Anjou, and in the peace of 1302 the Norman kingdom of Sicily was divided into two.\footnote{On Michael VIII Palaiologos’ role in the uprise against the Angevins, see his “autobiography” (ed. Grégoire 1959). The emperor’s description of his life and deeds is part of a \textit{typikon} for the convent of St. Demetrios in Constantinople (Grunebaum 1964, 97). On the Sicilian Vespers, see also Geanakoplos 1959, 335–367.} The island of Sicily came under Aragonese rule while the mainland of Southern Italy remained under the Angevins. This situation lasted until 1442, when Alfonso V of Aragon defeated René of Anjou and proclaimed himself \textit{Rex Sicilie citra et ultra farum}.\footnote{Alfonso’s royal claim to Naples was recognized by Pope Eugenius IV in 1443. The reason why the Kingdom of Naples continued to be called another “Sicily,” derives from its historical origin as part of the Norman conquest of Sicily. The lighthouse—\textit{Farum}—at the straits of Messina marked the border between the two Sicilies. The alternative formula which we find in Text 81, \textit{Rex utriusque Siciliae}, was also employed for titulating Alfonso V, and appears in the record of the parliament as early as 1443 (Ryder 1976, 32).} After Alfonso’s death in 1458, the supremacy was divided between his son, Ferdinand I, king of Naples,\footnote{Note that Alfonso’s son Ferdinand (Ferrante) I of Naples and Jerusalem is not the same person as Ferdinand of Sicily (later also named Ferdinand II of Aragon and, after 1504, Ferdinand III of Naples), who was mentioned in n. 187, above. The two kings were first cousins.} and the younger brother of Alfonso, Giovanni II, king of Aragon and Sicily. The two Sicilies were united once more in 1503, and stayed so more or less continuously until 1860. Alfonso V was one of the few Western leaders who advocated a counter-attack on the Turks on behalf of the collapsing Byzantine empire (even if his main interest in this was the Catalan trade in the Levant). His military involvement in Albania did encourage other Balkan princes to turn to him in the hope of refuge and aid, among them Thomas Palaiologos of the Morea. Alfonso took a great interest in cultural matters. Though he never learnt Greek himself, he prized Lorenzo Valla’s translations of Greek literature, and many other Italian humanists dedicated their translations to him (Leonardo Bruni, Poggio Bracciolini, and Pier Candido Decembrio were among these). Even more important for the assessment of Text 81 is the fact that, as a result of Alfonso’s contacts with the activities of Italian humanists, he warmly welcomed and offered payment to any Greek scholar who chose to settle in Naples. Thus, Gregory Tiphernas, George Trapezuntios of Crete, and Theodore Gazes were among those who benefitted from Alfonso’s ambitions as a “Renaissance king.”\footnote{On Alfonso’s contacts with the humanist movement and his ambitions to create a library and center of scholarship at Naples, see Ryder 1990, 313–335.}

Under the office of \textit{princeps} we find the prince of Taranto together with the initial “M.” This is an odd combination: there was no such person in the
fifteenth century or in the time nearby. It is of course easy to imagine that a single letter could have been misread or mistaken, especially by copying.\footnote{A similar case is notated in ÖBERG 1997, 17.}

If we look at which princes could come into consideration, the first to bear the title in the fifteenth century was Raimondo Del Balzo Orsini, who shouldered the principate in 1399. He died in 1406. Ladislao d’Angio Durazzo then laid siege to Taranto twice (in 1406 and 1407), but, unable to defeat the widow of Raimondo, Maria d’Enghien, he decided to marry her instead, and so attained the title aimed at. After Ladislao’s death in 1414, the principate came into the hands of his sister, Giovanna II of Naples, but she chose to pass it on to her sister-in-law and the latter’s children. This way a Del Balzo Orsini once again came to be in charge of the principate, viz., the first-born son of Raimondo Del Balzo Orsini and Maria d’Enghien, Giovannantonio Del Balzo Orsini. In 1435 Giovannantonio was imprisoned together with Alfonso of Aragon, and they were taken to Milan by Filippo Maria Visconti. The imprisonment and their joint interests bound the prince and the Aragonese together, and after the latter had been made king of Naples they had a mutually beneficial relation for many years.\footnote{PONTIERI 1935, 611.}

Ferdinand I of Naples, who succeeded his father to the throne in 1458, did not have the same generous attitude towards the prince, and withdrew the privileges in 1463. If—with the aid of the information furnished above—one should have a guess at the prince referred to in the address of Text 81, the natural choice would be Giovannantonio Del Balzo Orsini, prince of Taranto 1414–1465, based on his time of reign and also his connections to Alfonso. With this solution in mind, we may return to the initial problem with this address, i.e. why someone would put in a prince’s name starting with an “M” here. If the copyist’s point of departure was the medieval Greek way of spelling the name Del Balzo, we would actually end up with an “M” in the Latin text.\footnote{One may compare, for example, the spelling of De Bagi as τῆς Μπάγι (PLP 19608).}

The initial preceding the title “Sabaudiae duci” in the manuscript presents a comparable problem. The initial looks like a “G,” but no duke during the fifteenth century bore a name starting with that letter. There are only two candidates for this address—if in fact it is supposed to point to a real duke of Savoy: Amadeo VIII or Ludovico I of Savoy. Amadeo VIII was the first to bear the title duca (Sigismund, king of Rome and later emperor, raised the former countship to ducal dignity in 1416). Successful in his reign as the leading prince and politician in Italia Subalpina, Amadeo VIII nevertheless decided in 1434 to retire from his secular commitments. He moved to Castello di Ripaglia at the Lake Geneva, where he founded the religious and chivalrous order of San Maurizio. In 1439 he was elected pope—i.e. antipope—by the Council of Basel, and took the papal name of Felix V. The Christian leadership in general, and the kingdoms of Europe, did not look
upon this renewed division of the Church with approval. In fact, Amadeo VIII was supported only by his son, who was now the duke of Savoy, by some German potentates and universities, by the university of Cracow, and, for a period, by Alfonso of Aragon. Only two cardinals were devoted to the antipope: Hugues-Lancelot de Lusignan and Louis Aleman. The former was connected to the house of Savoy through his sister Anne de Lusignan, princess of Cyprus and wife of Ludovico I of Savoy, i.e. the son of Amadeo/Pope Felix V. In 1449 the schism came to an end as Felix V laid down the Papal Tiara, and accepted the rank of “cardinale del titolo di S. Sabina.” He died at Geneva in 1451.

Ludovico I of Savoy succeeded his father as head of the duchy in 1434. Although not as prominent as his father, he did play a certain role in the political complications which followed upon the proclamation of Repubblica Ambrosiana (1447). Ludovico was—as was the marquis of Este—one of the many participants who wanted their share at the scramble which seemed to be at hand in Lombardy. When the people of Milan in their precarious situation searched for a solution, there were voices raised in favor of the duke of Savoy (as also of King Alfonso V) as a possible new leader of the duchy. Eventually, they unanimously advocated Francesco Sforza, who became the new duke of Milan in 1450. At the time of Ludovico’s death in 1465, the ducal title was passed on to his son, Amadeo IX.

Of the two dukes of Savoy we have been discussing here, the likeliest guess would be that the titulary address in Text 81 refers to the latter, Ludovico I, considering the fact that he had taken over the title in 1434. Even though his father Amadeo continued to be influential after that date, we must bear in mind that he then went by the name of Felix V, and politically also acted in quite a different role than before. Ludovico’s marital connection to the kingdom of Cyprus is another detail which ought to have been of interest to a Greek scribe. One may add that, palaeographically, a carelessly slanted “Λ” may easily be mistaken for a “Γ” in the process of copying. The apograph would in that case reproduce a “G” in the Latin text, just as we have it in Text 81.

In the case of the marquis, we need not guess anymore: the scribe gave us the full name of Leonello d’Este, eminent marquis of Ferrara (1407–1450). Following a military education, Leonello became acquainted with humanist studies, which flourished in Ferrara thanks to Giovanni Aurispa in the 1420s and Guarino Guarini da Verona in the 1430s. Under Guarino’s guidance he pursued studies in rhetoric, history and philosophy, and at the opening of the Council of Ferrara in 1438, it was Leonello d’Este who gave an elegant welcoming speech in Latin on behalf of Pope Eugenius IV. In political matters

198 Valeri 1949, 476.
199 For the section on Leonello d’Este, I rely mainly on Brunelli 1993. On Guarino’s role in educating the prince, see also Pade 1990.
Leonello held a fairly low profile and was renowned for his prudence and ability to keep Ferrara out of most armed conflicts—not an easy task in those decades in Italy, when alliances with various neighboring city states needed shifting now and again. During Leonello’s reign, which extended from 1441 until his death, he earned a grand reputation as “principe saggio.” The Court of Ferrara became a center of humanistic learning and cultural events through Leonello’s hospitality to scholars such as Giovanni Aurispa, Pier Candido Decembrio, and Theodore Gazes, as well as to poets, musicians and painters (among these Antonio Pisanello and Iacopo Bellini). The Biblioteca Estense was another chief concern of Leonello’s. Leonello’s father, Niccolò III had begun this enterprise, buying books, ordering copies, and engaging the somewhat ruthless book trader Giovanni Aurispa at his court. Leonello continued to consolidate their holdings, and furthermore embraced the idea of creating a sort of public library, a lasting collection of all literature—Latin, Greek, and vernacular—for “the common use of learned men.”

The city of Fondi is situated to the south of Rome, along the Via Appia, and not very far from Montecassino. To find a count of Fondi whose name starts with an H, we must go to Onorato (Honoratus) II Caetani d’Aragona, whose countship lasted for half a century (1441–1491). The Aragonian branch of the Caetani family was particularly powerful in the time of Onorato II, who, besides filling the offices of logothete and protonotary, also was a close personal friend of Ferdinand I of Naples. During his countship, Onorato II contributed to the construction of several churches at Fondi and furthermore to the beautiful palace where he kept a grandiose court. As he was one of the richest and most influential magnates of the Kingdom of Naples, it is particularly interesting that an inventory of all his mobile and immobile possessions was taken down at the time of his death in 1491. This manuscript has recently been made accessible through the efforts of Sylvie Pollastri. According to the inventory, Onorato’s library seems to have contained, among other items, Aesop (“un livre précieux”), Aristotle’s Ethics,
Cicero’s *Tusculans*, Plautus’ comedies, *De bello Gothorum*, Valerius Maximus, books on warfare, grammars, and missals.205

Sansoneto, addressed in Text 81 as a magnificent and excellent soldier and baron, is so far an obscure figure. I will present two alternative solutions here, although they must both be seen as tentative at this stage. Sansoneto’s second name, “de Lusi...” or in Greek “τῶν ἐκ Λουσι...ος” (neither entry is fully readable), may point to the house of Lusignan, the French noble family which included among its most memorable medieval conquests the crowns of Cyprus, Jerusalem, and Armenia. In the *PLP*, several ways of spelling “Lusignan” in Greek are recorded, but no entry includes a person named Sansoneto.206 Perhaps we must at this time be content with the discovery of what could be yet a member of the Lusignan house, soldier and baron, but otherwise unknown.207 Nevertheless, since it is somewhat astonishing to find a person belonging to such a well-known royal family not accounted for already, I would like to propose an alternative interpretation: this one involves a province in today’s Albania, called Lushnja. Having been a part of the Despotate of Epiros, Lushnja came under Venetian authority in the fifteenth century. Soldiers of Albanian origin had at the end of the fourteenth or early fifteenth century settled in large numbers in Morea, summoned there by the Palaiologan Despot Theodore I to help impede the Ottoman expansion on the Peloponnese.208 It is not impossible that a soldier and baron with a family background in Lushnja could be the man we are looking for here.209 Towards the mid-fifteenth century, as the situation in Morea worsened, a considerable number of these Albanians settlers chose to emigrate once more, this time to Italy.210 Many were employed as light cavalry forces, *stradioti*, by the Venetians in the fifteenth and sixteenth century, much appreciated for their style of fighting and tactics. Another characteristic which, ac-

205 POLLASTRI 2006, xxiii.
206 *PLP*, nos.15056–15087. The varieties in spelling are recorded in connection to no. 15059. The text offered by the *Escorialensis IV.1*, τῶν ἐκ Λουσιας, does not help us here.
207 In the late 16th c., Steffano Lusignano di Cipro wrote a work on Cyprus, *Chorographia et breve historia universale dell’ Isola de Cipro* (ed. PELOSI 2001). There is in Steffano’s rendering of the House of Lusignan no mention of a baron Sansoneto de Lusignan. But he does have an enumeration of the other houses of Cyprus, which might be of interest (section 15): among them there is one Cypriot family with the name of Sanson. Could we suppose a connection here? The French baptismal name Sansonnet, since the late Middle Ages also known as the name for a bird, the starling, is the hypocoristic form of the biblical name Samson or Sanson (DAUZAT 1949, 126 and 217).
208 According to Dionysios Zakythinos, some 10 000 men came together with their families and livestock (*Zakythinos 1975*, I, 131 and II, 31–36).
209 That there is an island at the coastline of Southern Albania called Sazan (Σάσων; Ital. *Saseno*) does not make this less intriguing (though it may just be a coincidence of little significance, since the name Sansoneto is explainable anyway). On the island Sazan, see LAMPROS 1914.
210 Not least they seem to have chosen Sicily and southern Italy as their new place of settlement, perhaps feeling more at home there due to their double identity as both Albanians and Morean Greeks (cf. ZAKYTHINOS 1975, II, 36).
According to Nicholas Pappas, made these Greek-Albanian forces attractive to Italian leaders, was their preference of honors and privileges over pay: they were simply cheaper to hire than Western mercenaries. "The *stradioti* actually sought out favors in the form of parades and titles, and the frugal Venetian government was only too glad to oblige them."211 Maybe our Sansoneto, both a baron and an excellent soldier, is a good example of such an officer?

In the search for a Paduan jurisconsult, one may consult the minutes of examinations held at the University of Padua. The records from the years 1431–1450 testify of the presence of a certain Antonius de Padua on at least ten occasions, mostly at examinations in civil law and always in the duty of faculty beadle.212 The earliest records designate him *magister*, later he is called *ser*. The term of office is either *bidellus iuristarum* or *bidellus generalis universitatis*. His by-name seems to have been Baptista, but usually he is merely called Antonius de Padua. Now, could this be the man mentioned in Text 81 as an admirable and distinguished law teacher? I doubt it: the presence of the beadle is mentioned in the minutes together with that of the *notarius curie et collegii*, thus indicating that this Antonius only performed an administrative or formal role at the examinations. Rather, I think we need to look at another Antonius, even though he is generally called Antonius de Roselli or Antonius de Aretio, after his birth-town Arezzo. To call him Antonio de Padua in the titulary address would be based on his long and well-known teaching activity at the University of Padua.213 Perhaps a humorous hint at the local saint with the same name could have played a part too.214

Antonio Roselli (1381–1466) started out with legal studies in Bologna 1406–7, lectured in Siena and Rome, and became the ambassador of Emperor Sigismund, of King Alfonso of Naples and of the Cardinals’ Collegium. In 1431 he went to Basel as the legate of Pope Eugenius IV; an outcome of Antonio’s commitment to this task was the treatise he wrote on the legal side of church councils, *De conciliis ac synodis generalibus*.215 After he wrote his work *Monarchia sive de potestate imperatoris et pape*, the situation became increasingly difficult for him in Rome, and instead of an ecclesiastical career he took up a position in canon law at the University of Padua in 1438.216 He

---

211 See online-article by PAPPAS (http://www.shsu.edu/~his_ncp/Stradioti.html).
212 ZONTA & BROTT 1922; see index, s.vv. “Antonius de Padua” and “Antonius bidellus iurist.”
213 See, for example, Johann Friedrich von Schulte who calls him a *monarcha juris* (SCHULTE 1875, I, 304).
214 On Saint Anthony of Padua (ca. 1195–1231), see AASS Junii II (Dies 13), 703–780.
215 On this treatise, see further WEITZ 2002.
216 Word has it that Antonio Roselli during his time in Basel had been promised an appointment to cardinal, which the Pope later called off for reasons of Antonio having been married twice (ZEDLER 1742, vol. 32, 871–872). Antonio Roselli certainly had enough inside experience of the executive power to substantiate his suggestions to differentiate between imperial and papal authority, but his treatises may have had a bitter personal background as well: he expressly emphasizes the possibility of a pope making mistakes and the importance of a judi-
continued his teaching there well into his eighties—the last consilia that he undersigned show an old man’s wobbly and barely legible signature.\textsuperscript{217}

In the case of the artium doctor the specifications of the formulary are unambiguous. Matheus de Perusio is found in the very same Paduan university records and during the same period of time. In 1432 the “licencia et publica in med. egr. arc. doct. mag.” of Matheo (or Matheolo) Baldasari was approbated.\textsuperscript{218} Later on, he was to become the most famous medicus from Perugia in the Quattrocento. His teaching career started off with medicine and philosophy in Perugia in 1427. In 1447 he became a lecturer at the faculty of medicine in Padua, the university where he came to spend most of his active years. He died and was buried in Padua in 1479.\textsuperscript{219} One of his numerous disciples during these years, Hartmann Schedel, has left us a eulogy that is quite fascinating to read—it certainly shows that the superlatives in our titulary record are in no way an exaggeration compared to his posthumous reputation:

Matheolo of Perugia, the most learned among the physicians of our time, king among philosophers, and simply the most prominent in all liberal arts and every branch of science, my most erudite teacher. His were the lectures which I, Hartmann Schedel from Nuremberg, Paduan doctor, sat in on for three years, and from him [...] I received my doctorate in Padua.\textsuperscript{220}

Matheolo from Perugia was renowned not only for his skills in medicine and philosophy, but also for his rhetorical talent. He gave several orations at the university, and seems to have had a wide-embracing interest in humanistic and scientific studies.\textsuperscript{221} Later on in his eulogy, Hartmann Schedel especially mentions Matheolo’s expertise in poetry, oratory, astronomy and music.\textsuperscript{222}

As for Hartmann himself, he went from Nuremberg to Padua to study medicine in the 1460s, just as his elder cousin Hermann had done before him. He

\textsuperscript{217} See \textsc{Belloni} 1986, 143–149, who also includes information on manuscripts and editions of Antonio Roselli’s works.

\textsuperscript{218} \textsc{Zonta \& Broutto} 1922, 206.

\textsuperscript{219} \textsc{Verrua} 1924, 88.

\textsuperscript{220} \textsc{Matheolus Perusinus Medicus doctissimus hoc tempore medicorum, ac philosophorum monarcha, omniumque liberalium artium cunctarumque scientiarum facile princeps, preceptor meus eruditissimus. Quem ego Hartmannus Schedel Nurembergensis doctor Patavinus tribus annis ordinarie legentem auscultavi, a quo [...] doctoratus Padue accepi} (\textsc{Schedel} 1493, ccii).

\textsuperscript{221} On Matheolus’ oratory, see \textsc{Siraisi} 2004, 193f., with further literature. For his commentary on the \textit{Aphorisms of Hippocrates}, see \textsc{Kibre \& Siraisi} 1975. His treatise on mnemonics, \textit{De Memoria}, was reprinted time and again from 1474 and onwards (\textsc{Klebs} 1938, 222f.).

\textsuperscript{222} Pietro Verrua (1924, 87–88) seems not to have distinguished between Hartmann Schedel and his cousin Hermann Schedel, who also studied in Padua. Thus, it was of course Hermann who became a laureate in medicine in 1442 (the younger cousin, Hartmann, was then only two years old).
attended the medical lectures of Matheolo Mathioli of Perugia as well as the Greek lectures of Demetrios Chalkokandyles, and became one of the earliest Germans to know Greek. His Nuremberg Chronicle, Liber Chronicarum, printed by Anton Koberger in 1493, was the fruit of his extensive book collecting and compilation, and is famous for its more than 1 800 woodcuts created by Michael Wolgemut and Wilhelm Pleydenwurff.

On the subject of circulation of Greek books in Italy during the humanist era, one is bound to come across the name of Giovanni Aurispa. In Text 81, this doctissimus et eloquentissimus vir is mentioned in connection with the academic teachers of law and medicine, and right before the addresses to people merited with more general virtues: the rich and noble, the prudent, erudite, and benevolent. This appears to be on the mark, since Aurispa never held any official university post, but certainly was renowned as a dedicated book collector and humanist. He was born in Sicily in 1376 and spent his youth in Naples. Already in 1413, he brought with him to Italy some Greek manuscripts from a trip in the East (among other things a volume from Chios containing texts by Euripides and Sophocles). But he collected the lion’s share of his Greek books in Constantinople where he was sent by Gian Francesco Gonzaga in 1421. Aurispa was received at the Court of Emperor Manuel Palaiologos, and the emperor’s son, John, decided to make Aurispa his “secretary.” When John Palaiologos went on a diplomatic tour to the courts of Western Europe, Aurispa escorted him as far as Venice, Verona and Milan. The outcome of this séjour in Constantinople was that a shipload of far more than two hundred Greek books reached Italy’s humanists, a vital contribution to fuel the early humanist movement and the study of Greek in the West. Giovanni Aurispa’s reputation as a teacher and scholar is less flattering, but he nevertheless spent three years teaching at the Florentine studio and became the personal tutor of Niccolò III d’Este’s son Meliaduse. At the court of Ferrara, he seems to have been content to settle down. Although Aurispa did go on several embassies for the Estensi and the papal Curia (one of these were to the Council of Basel, in 1433), for the most part he chose to remain at Ferrara up until his death in 1459.

I have not been able to establish with certainty the identity of the nobleman Paulus Sabellus. He ought to have belonged to one of the mightier fami-

---

223 For the various forms of this name, see PLP 30511.
224 On the Nuremberg Chronicle, see WILSON & WILSON 1976. On Schedel’s humanist interests as reflected by his library, see STAUBER 1908.
225 Bigi 1962, 593.
226 As Nigel Wilson points out, the often quoted figure of 238 manuscripts refers to the volumes containing pagan texts alone; we do not know how many volumes with patristic and other spiritual contents Aurispa added to these (WILSON 1992, 25).
227 In Hartmann Schedel’s Nuremberg Chronicle, only one line is devoted to Aurispa: Joannes quoque Aurispa secretarius apostolicus rhetor luculentus in precio fuit et quedam compo-suit (Schedel 1493, ccxlvii).
228 On the inventory of Aurispa’s own library at his death in 1459, see Franceschini 1976.
lies in Rome, the Savelli alias Sabelli. To this family, which became prominent in the thirteenth century, are counted cardinals and even a couple of popes (Honorius III and Honorius IV), furthermore a considerable number of condottieri, mercenary leaders. Several members of the Savelli family were christened Paulus. One Paolo Savelli (1350–1405) served initially as a military commander under Gian Galeazzo Visconti of Milan, but after temporary assignments in Florence and Bologna he became the general of the troops of Venice. He died of the plague while besieging Padua. A wooden equestrian sculpture of him was erected shortly afterwards in Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, a church that was still under construction at the time of his death. This Savelli was apparently also a wealthy man, since he contributed to the building fund of the same church. The address in Text 81, which describes Paulus as nobilis et dives, εὐγενής καὶ πλοῦσιος, would thus be eminently met in this condottiere. Another Paulo is mentioned briefly in Pompeo Litta’s genealogical work: the son of Mariano Savelli and Servanzia Del Balzo, i.e, belonging to the Palombara branch of the Savelli house, this Paulo served in the army of the Florentine Republic in 1479. The occasion was the war against Pope Sixtus IV after the so-called “Pazzi conspiracy” (the attempted coup d’état against Lorenzo de’ Medici and the assassination of his brother Giuliano de’ Medici). Whereas the date of birth of this condottiere is unknown, he must have died long before 1509, according to Litta.

Towards the end of Text 81, it becomes increasingly difficult to identify the people referred to. The individuals called Petrus and Antonius may forever be hidden in history. There are ten of these less specific entries, addressed to friends, to a brother, to a son, and for the rest they simply give different options for how to approach anyone in letter form with courtesy and affability. Even though the addresses to a brother or a son might be aimed at family relations, one could also, and with a certain extent of probability, expect them to pertain to ecclesiastical or monastic relations, as when a cleric writes to a colleague or an abbot to his fellow brother in Christ. In my survey above, I have not brought up the question of polite phrases and the different levels of subservience and flattery, but one may easily imagine the importance of this matter for the Byzantine émigrés. Naturally, it had been of great significance in Constantinople too, in contacts with various

---

229 The Savelli family was conferred the office of conclave marshal by Pope Gregory X, a position which was hereditary until the family’s extinction in 1712, and which now belongs to the Chigi family (BAUMGARTNER 2003, 40).
230 ZEDLER 1742, vol. 34, 302.
231 On the sculpture of Paulo Savelli, see VALENTINO 1953.
232 His father Mariano, also a military man, was for a long time employed by the Aragonese of Naples, then by Sigismondo Pandolfo Malatesta (1417–68), and finally by Pope Sisto IV (LITTA 1872, plate VII).
233 “Mori assai prima del 1509” (LITTA, ibid.). There may, of course, have been another 15th-c. Paulus Sabellus, noble and rich, who did not make it to the annals of history but happened to be mentioned in our titulary collection.
court officials and servants of the Church. In the new political situation, where one needed to adjust oneself to Western feudal hierarchies and conventions, the question of language might become yet a stumbling block. The scribe of Gr 8 apparently saw a formulary like Text 81 as a useful remedy for this, even though we do not know whether he needed it for his own sake or if he was teaching someone else how to navigate in an hierarchical society.

The formulary reflecting a certain milieu

The model of Text 81 may have been bilingual or just in one language—we cannot tell at this stage. Nonetheless, the inaccurate initials in our Latin version (M. for del Balzo, G. from a misread Λ / Γ, and probably P. from an original Π.), do seem to indicate that the original text was written by a Greek-speaking scribe.234 The person who created the original formulary either knew his way around the high and mighty in Italy or compiled his text using existing letters or letter collections where the persons were mentioned by name. Can we pin down when and where the original titulary collection was created? By looking at the dates—life span, time of appointment, et cetera—for the persons mentioned in the addresses, and combining them, we may at least narrow the scope for when the compilation would have been up to date. This can prove helpful even when not each and every entry adds up (as when a compiler makes use of extant letters of an older date).

**Pope:** no name/date  
**Cardinal:** Bessarion, appointed cardinal in December 1439  
appointed *Sabinensis* 5. March 1449  
appointed *Tusculanensis* 23. April 1449 † 1472  
**Bishop:** F. Pizolpasso bishop of Pavia 1427–June 1435. † 1443  
**Abbot:** A. Chalkeopylos abbot in Patirion 1448–1457 † 1497  
**Priest:** Demetrios of S. Maria Maioris (no further identification)  
**Monk:** Marco of Monte Cassino (no further identification)  
**King:** Alfonso V ruled over both Sicilies from 1442 † 1458  
**Prince:** G. Del Balzo Orsini ruler of Tarent from 1414 † 1465  
**Duke:** Ludovico of Savoy duke from 1434 † 1465

---

234 From the page layout it is clear that in Gr 8 the Latin text was copied prior to the Greek; the Greek words are carefully positioned to fit on top of each Latin equivalent. The nib width and ink color used in the entry mentioning Marcus, monk of Monte Cassino, also suggest that the scribe, Theodoros, either used a model which allowed him to supplement the Latin—the “.d.” (for “dominus”) is a correction added simultaneously with the Greek translation—or else that Theodoros knew enough Latin phrasing to supplement this text from the Greek wording in the model.
Marquis: Leonello d’Este marquis of Ferrara from 1441 † 1450
Count: Onorato II countship from 1441 † 1491
Soldier and baron: Sansoneto de Lusi... (no further identification)
Jurisconsult: Antonio de Roselli in Padua from 1438 † 1466
Doctor of arts & medicine: Matheolo of Perugia, teaching in
Perugia from 1427 and in Padua from 1432 † 1479
Learned & eloquent: Giovanni Aurispa † 1459
Noble & rich: Paolo Savelli (uncertain identification: perhaps † 1405)

Some of these timespans are too wide to provide any guidance for us. The
time of reign for the king, marquis, and count points to a date after 1441–42
and before 1450, and most of the other entries would fit into the 1440s. The
cardinal and abbot entries lever the balance towards the middle of the cen-
tury, or 1448–49. On the other hand, if we consider the possibility of a cul-
tural network which included the persons above, and perhaps even an exist-
ing letter collection, the most interesting period would be around the time of
the Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence. The contacts and friendships made in
that setting, through contacts between Roman and Byzantine prelates, intel-
lectuals, and political leaders, have left vestiges far and wide in letters and
notes which still remain in Italian library collections and elsewhere. Above, I
have pointed to Pizolpasso’s wide correspondence with persons in the hu-
manist circles, something which may explain why he is included in the for-
mulary even though his Pavian appointment lies outside our tentative time
span of the 1440s. Even if we suppose a general connection between many
of the above-mentioned persons mainly at the Florence council proceedings,
i.e. when Pizolpasso had already become archbishop of Milan, he would still
have been a prominent figure. Earlier letters from or to him, where he is
titulated episcopus papiensis, could have been available in somebody else’s
copy. Agostino Sottili mentions the correspondence between Aurispa, Pizol-
passo, and Leonello d’Este.235 We have seen that Athanasios Chalkeopylos
maintained contacts with Bessarion and many others. Other nodal points of
great importance would be Bessarion and his “academy” in Rome, or one of
the courts which became locales of benefaction for Byzantine and Italian
intellectuals, whether at Naples, Fondi, or Ferrara.

On the other hand, with an epistolary network one need not gather every-
body in one place, and this is convenient when dealing with Text 81. Geo-
graphically the entries cover parts of southern Italy, with its Byzantine con-
nections still operating in monastery circles, further Naples, Rome, and other
princely centers in central and northern Italy, and university settings such as
Padua. The titulary collection suggests the networking which was called for

235 SOTTI 1966, 63.
if one arrived in Italy and wanted to do well as a Byzantine scholar. At the
time of the humanist movement, one could make a living as a Byzantine
immigrant by teaching, copying manuscripts, translating Greek texts into
Latin, obtaining Byzantine books for the Western European market, et cet-
era. But this was not done in a vacuum: someone had to pay for this work,
and that is why an address collection like the one in Text 81 was practical.
Ideas of what to include in a formulary need not always have come from
actual letters. Another way to discover the networking would be from dedi-
catory addresses in manuscripts (and later in prints). Examples of this activ-
ity were seen in the case of Athanasios Chalkeopylos (links to Bessarion,
Nicholas of Cusa, 236 to the royal house of Aragon/Naples), likewise in con-
nection with Pizolpasso. The phenomenon becomes even more obvious
when we look at major patrons of literary endeavors, like Alfonso V,
Leonello d’Este and, once again, Bessarion.

The year 1449 is a plausible construction date for the original titulary col-
lection, but perhaps we may speculate a bit further: the two entries for Bes-
sarion could point to a construction date in the spring of 1449. Was Bes-
sarion just about to be transferred to Tusculum when the formulary was writ-
ten? Another possibility would be that the original entry concerned the see of
S. Sabina and that the subsequent entry is a later addition, to update the con-
tents of the formulary. Considering the fact that the Escorialensis Ψ.IV.1,
where a text very similar to Gr 8’s Text 81 is included, has been dated to the
mid-fifteenth century, our hypothetical construction date becomes more or
less contemporary to that volume. One might even suspect that the Escorial
text proffers the “archetype” for our Text 81. From the inclusion of the ad-
dress collection in Gr 8 some thirty years after the original list was created,
we may gather that new readers (newly arrived émigrés?) could still avail
themselves of its contents: the way to address the authorities would be the
same, even if names and initials mattered less to later generations.

In Chapter 3, I suggested that we need to look for possible links between
Gr 8 and other scribes and manuscripts from the same time and area, in order
to establish whether the scribe Theodoros could be tied to a cultural network.
A name that was mentioned (on the basis of corresponding watermarks) was
Michael Apostoles. In this connection, it is worth noting that Athanasios
Chalkeopylos may be one of the scribes represented in the Bruxellensis
11270–11275, a folder containing several writings mainly emanating from
the circle of scribes around Michael Apostoles. Dieter Harlfinger attributes
ff. 104–105v to Chalkeopylos (although with the reservation that his hand-
writing shows resemblance to that of Demetrios Sgouropoulos), and suggests
that Bessarion may be one of the other two hands represented in the same
quire. 237 These leaves, containing Aristotle’s Metaphysica, are followed by a

236 Cf. MANOUSSACAS 1973, 517.
237 MORAUX 1976, 81.
quire containing Manuel Christonymos’ *Monody* in Michael Apostoles’ hand, the same, rare, text which happens to appear in *Gr 8* as well (Text 20). Even if this connection between the personage of the formulary and the scribe of *Gr 8* is tentative, it may offer an opening for continued discussions of how texts and manuscripts present us with vestiges of literary activity and textual transmission in the cultural networks of the Quattrocento.

**Addendum: The formulary in Codex Escorialensis Ψ.IV.1**

The Escorialensis Ψ.IV.1 originated from Cyprus in the mid-fifteenth century, but since the manuscript is a composite written by several hands it is not obvious when the formulary was added to the book. What Hugo Rabe did not observe was that there are actually two separate formularies in the same quire, written by different hands and in different ink. The first one, on f. 301r–v, is an abridged version of the Ekthesis Nea, which breaks off in the middle of the verso page with the rest of the page blank. On f. 302r–v, another scribe then added a second collection of letter headings, analogous to Text 81 in Gr 8 except that it is given in Greek only. The formularies are written on the first two leaves of a binion, the next two leaves of which are blank (ff. 303–304). This quire and the next one, which contains patristic letters written by yet another hand (ff. 305–312), have been inserted into a sequence of quires housing Emmanuel Raul’s letters (four quaternions are involved: ff. 293–300; ff. 314–337; note that f. 113 does not exist). Gregorio de Andrés’ catalog description of the manuscript incorrectly indicates that Emmanuel Raul’s letters continue on ff. 301–302, and makes no reference whatsoever to any formularies.

The Escorial formulary (i.e., the one on f. 302) was added on a blank page, probably as an appendage to the preceding formulary. It is, despite the confusion of quires just mentioned, situated in a section of the manuscript wholly dominated by letters and letter collections. The text is written in black ink, in

---

238 Before these texts ended up in a folder in the Royal Library at Brussels, they were part of a two volume composite manuscript belonging to Pierre Pantin. The quire with Aristotle’s *Metaphysica* and the quire with Christonymos’ *Monody* were included in the second volume, though in reverse order (cf. MORAUX 1976, 78–83).

239 See the catalog entry in ANDRÉS 1967, 81–85. I would like to express my gratitude to Professor José Luis del Valle Merino at the El Escorial Library for giving me the opportunity to consult this manuscript firsthand.

240 Cf. RABE 1909, 286.

241 A reason for this misplacement at binding could be the quire numbering, since in the lower margin of the last verso of f. 300 and of f. 312 there is the quire number “α.” The number “β” follows on f. 321”. The quire number on f. 312 is apparently not in the same hand as the other two mentioned.


243 In addition to Emmanuel Raul’s letters, the following authors are included: Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzos, Libanios, Isidore of Pelousion, Synesios of Cyrene, Manuel Palaio-
what seems to be a skilled hand, but the orthography is very confused. A comparison with Text 81 as it stands in Gr 8 reveals that the Escorial manuscript gives a less complete text and muddles some of the items. It uses the superlative throughout, whereas the Uppsala manuscript shows a gradation in line with the status of the addressee. The place name in line 63, Φούνδων (Fondi) is distorted: the scribe probably read the phi in the model as a tall one-stroke tau with a loop, the way he himself often writes tau.

We have already seen that Text 81 in Gr 8 must have been copied from a model; this would explain some of the peculiarities in initials and also the concentration of entries which point to the 1440s, perhaps peaking in 1449. Since the Escorialensis Ψ.IV.1 as a whole is dated to the mid-fifteenth century, its formulary would thus chronologically be closer to the original source. But since its readings are inferior in many places as compared to the ones in Gr 8, my conclusion is that neither of the two is the model for the other one. Rather, there must have been a third manuscript source to which both of them are related, each in its own way.

In the Escorial manuscript a fascinating addition was put in at the end of the formulary. It is an attempt to put together the opening of a letter to cardinal Bessarion. We recognize the first phrase from the formulary itself, but then the scribe continued with another few lines, as can be seen below. I keep the spelling unchanged, except for using capital letters in names.

tου Νηκίας: –

Τῷ ἐδεσιμοτάτῳ ἐν Χριστῷ πατρὶ καὶ δεσπότῃ κυρίῳ κυρίῳ. Β· ἀξιοτάτῳ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ καρδιναλίῳ τῆς ἀγιώτατης τοῦ θεοῦ ῥωμαϊκῆς καὶ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ Κωσταντίνουπολεος νέας Ρώμης καὶ ἱκουμενηκὼ πατριάρχη, αὐθέντη ἐμῷ ἐπιεικεστάτῳ: –

logos. There are also some anonymous letters; cf. ANDRÉS 1967, 83. The codicological unit ends right before f. 346 (after three blank leaves and the stub from a cut-out leaf). Missing are, for example, the place name Patire, and Maria in the phrase “τῆς Ἁγίας Μαρίας τῆς Μείζονος.” Confusion as to which item some of the words belong, can be seen in lines 25–29 and 77–79. The scribe has apparently made a leap from ἡγασιμένῳ (line 99) to ἀγασιμένῳ in the next item, thus mixing two items into one. The same could have happened in line 97, where no brother is mentioned; perhaps he picked up the ending “ἀνδρὶ κυρίῳ” from the preceding item.
Initially I stated that this would be a pilot study. It has been, but in two meanings of the word: a study of the codex from different perspectives and a study of the pilot himself, the κωβερνήτης βιβλίον Θεοδόρος. The scribe has been an important centripetal force, and I have hopefully shown that the maze of texts was less chaotic than a first glance would suggest. Still, I hesitate to demand full closure and coherence from a codex like this. It should be allowed to sprawl, because that is part of the character of a composite with miscellaneous contents. The centrifugal tendencies might have presented themselves with more clarity had we chosen other foci in the analysis of the contents. This inherent vacillation between openness and closure also means that a different approach may be needed for another composite. One crucial element must however be included: the codicological survey, which provides the basis for assessing the structure of the whole codex and of the parts that make up the whole.

Even though the scribe Theodoros has been very much present in this study, we still know little of him as a person. Perhaps more information will come to light in the future through the study of other manuscripts in his handwriting or other sources. As for now, the “psychogram” is only initiated on the grounds of his work procedure and the contents of his “one-volume library.” In creating the codex Theodoros has woven a song of himself, and we are subsequently invited to follow some of the threads. Maybe a hitherto faded picture emerges, maybe we make a new one out of the fabric, based on our world view and experience.
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Text 6

Αἱ πέντε δυνάμεις τῆς ψυχής (f. 98v)

Αἱ πέντε δυνάμεις τῆς ψυχῆς: νοῦς, δίανοια, δόξα, φαντασία καὶ αἴσθησις. οὐ δὲ νοῦς τέσσαρες ἀρεταῖς ἐνετθερόντας ὡς ἱερότατος ὦν φρονήσει, δικαιοσύνην, ἀνδρείαν καὶ σωφροσύνην. τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς μέρη τρία: θυμικόν, ἐπιθυμητικόν καὶ λογιστικόν.

Αἱ πέντε αἰσθήσεις τοῦ σ<ἀματος>1 ὄρασις, ὄσφρησις, ἀκοή, γεύσις καὶ ἀρη.

Text 12

Λεξικόν τῆς τῶν βοτανῶν ἐρμηνείας κατὰ στοιχείον (ff. 122v–127v)

άκτεα: ή κοφοξυλεά. 
ἀδένες: τὰ καταμάγουλα.
άσις: ή λιποθυμία.
ἀλμάδων: κολυμβάδων.
ἀλφιτα: τὰ πίτυρα.
ἀνθεμίς: τὸ χαμαίμηλον.
ἀρκευθος: ἀγχάλος πόλα, ἐοικὸς ἀκανθώδες κέδρος.
ἀκαλυφερ (-ής LSJ): ή κνίδα.
ἀδίαντον: τὸ τριχοβότανον.
ἀμπελός λευκή: ή βρυννία. ἕστι δὲ καὶ μαύρη ή ποιοῦσα ὡς ἀσπαράγγια καὶ ἐσθίοντα.
ἀκορον: ἐοικὸς βίζαν ἱέρεως υπόπικρον καὶ ἀροματίζειν.
ἀρνόγλωσσον: τὸ λεπτὸν πεντάνευρον ἀνεμώνη: ή κουτζούνδα. (ἄδα Du Cange)
ἀείζουν: τὸ ἀμάραντον.
ἀλλούνιον: τῆς φώκης τὸ ἀρόδευμα.

ἄνθος λεικοῦ (λόκου?): ή ἐπετιμένη.
ἀγάλυχος: ή ἀλόγη καὶ μὴ ἀπαναίνου.
ἀγύλωψ (αιγύλωψ LSJ): οἱ βρόμος. ἔστι δὲ μὴ καθάπαντα παρόμοιον πλὴν μικρόν. φύεται δὲ εἰς παράστατον καὶ εἰς δόμα.
ἀμυναία: ή σταφυλὴ ή στύφουσα, εξ οὗ καὶ μυναῖος οἶνος οὐ σώστηρος.
ἀδάρκει: τὸ συναπτό. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἄδαρκαι καὶ ἄδαρκος οἱ φλοιοὶ τοῦ καλάμου.
ἀκακία: οἱ χυλὸς τῶν προϊμων.
ἀνθός θαλάσσης: οἱ σπόγγοι.
ἀσκαλαβώτας: εἴδος ἐξου διατρέχον περὶ τὰ τεῖχα, τὸ λεγόμενον σαμμαίνιν.

(123v) ἄλος ἀμμονικοῦ τὸ ἀφρόνιτρον.
ἀσφαλτόν: πίσσα ἐξ Ἀραβίας.
ἀσφαλτίδα: τὸ τρίφυλλον. ἔστι δὲ ή πικροσίκη.

1 The word suggested inside brackets is missing in the manuscript due to trimming of the page; cf. John of Damascus, who calls the senses δυνάμεις σωματικά (Jo. Dam. virt., PG 95, 85B–C.), and Ath., De morbo 7, 26ff.
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Άρχη τοῦ β

βοράχιον· ή πομφόλυξ.
βρέφους· αμόρφον· ή άρκτος.
βάλανος· τὸ ὑποδέτων.
βατράχιον· ή βοθρακίδα.
βοδέλλων· χυλὸς ἵνδικος ἐοικὸς
σμύρνη.
βράδυν· ἐοικὸς κυπαρίσσου φύλλα,
ἀρωματίζετο.
βεριδά (i.e. ἰβηρίς)· τὸ ἀγριοκάρ-
δαμον.
βόγλωσσον· πάντες ἱσασι.
βήσασα· τὸ μώλυ.
βαλαστιτιω· ῥόδων Αἰγύπτιον ἀγρίας
ροίας.
βουβάλιμον· ἐοικὸς χαμαίμηλον,
(123') ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ καὶ
ὄριμ καὶ μεῖζον.
βρωνινα· ή ἀμπελος λευκή.
γινώσκεται δὲ κάθ τῆς ῥίζης καὶ οὐκ
ἅπα τῶν φύλλων.

Άρχη τοῦ ε

ἐλέζην· τὸ παρθενοῦδιν.
ἐλλέβορος· τὸ καρπίν.
ἐρυθράδανον· τὸ ῥυζάριν.
ἐδρα· ῥοφθρόν.
ἐλατήριον· ὁ χυλὸς τῶν ἄγριοσκύνων
(.region).
Εὐπατόριον· τὸ ὑπάτοριν φύλλα ἔχων
παρόμοιον συμμακίν.
ἐρεμικόν· ὁ τῶν κυάμων φλοίους ἡ τῆς
πτισάνης.
ἐρύσιμον· τὸ ἄγριον σύναιπ.
ἐλένιον· ἀγχάλιος πόδα, ἐοικία τὰ
φύλλα τετύλων μικρά.
ἐντος· ὁ φλοίως ἡ κυάμων ἡ κριθῆς ἡ
ἐτέρου τινός.
ἐρευνός· ἡ κοκκινότης.
ἐπισκύνην· (124') τὰ βλέφαρα.
ἐυζόμου· ἡ ῥόκα.
ἐμῦθα· ἡ λίμνια χελώνη.
ἐλέχυσος· ἀνθος κισσοῦ.
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άργη τοῦ ζ
ζύθος: τὸ φουκάδιν.

άργη τοῦ η
ηρύγγιον: ἀγχίαλος σὺν ἀκάνθαις βοτάνη.
ήτερον: ἢ ὅστερα ἢ τὸ ἄντερον.
ήτοιον (i.e. ἴτοιον): ὁ τράχηλος.
ηδόσαρον: ὁ πελεκίνος, ἔστι δὲ ὁ καρπὸς παρόμοιος σπάρτο.
ἡλιοτρόπιον: τὸ σκορπιούριον.

άργη τοῦ θ
θέρμια: τὰ λυπναρία. 
θαψία: εἶδος βοτάνης.
θρίδας: τὸ μαρούλιον.
θάμνος: πάσα φύσις βοτανῶν. 
θεραπαινίδον: τὸ κυνόγλυσσον.
θύμος: ὁ θρύμβος.
θιάστη: ἡ βερίδα ἤγουν τὸ ἀγριοκάρ
δαμον.
θυμελάϊα: ἡ κνίδα.

θραλίς: ὁ γροῦς (i.e. ἄγριος) φλόμος, ἔστι δὲ καὶ χρυσοειδῆς καὶ μυρίζειν 
toῖς ἀνθῆς.

άργη τοῦ ι
ἱρ: τὸ καλαμόκρινον. 
ἰός: τὸ ἱάριν.
ἰξία: τὸ υὐλόφονον.
ἐλεκτρον: (i.e. ἠλ.) τὸ βερονίκιν.
ἐράκιον: τὸ παρόμοιον σῶχος.
ἰα: τὰ ἀνθῆ.

ἰπποσελίνων: τὸ ἀγριοσέλινον. γίνεται 
dὲ εἰς κύμας πετρώδης φύλλον ἔχων 
πλατό.

ἰπποῦρι: τὸ πολυκόμπιν.
ἰππομαλαθρόν: τὸ ἀγριομαλαθρόν.

γίνεται δὲ εἰς ἄγρος.
ἰππολάπαθον: τὸ ἀγριολάπαθον.

άργη <τοῦ> κ
κισσάνθεμον: τὸ κυκλάμινον.
κιρυς: ὁ ὀνόματος. 
κέττη: τὸ κιτάριον.
κυάμου θηρος ἀπ’ Ἀρκαδίης: τὸ υὐσκύσαμον. (ἀσκ- cod.)
κόνια (κονία Gal.): ἡ στακτῆ.

κέλυφος: ὁ φλοιός.
καλλικεραία: ἡ τύλη, (i.e. τῆλις)
κάταγμα: τὸ ἐπικάθισμα.
(124°) κύαθος: μέτρον σταθμοῦ.
κυνόμορον: κυνὸς βάτου.
κτίδωνα: τὰς τζέπας.
κέστρος: ἢ βετονίκη.
κύαιος: τὸ φάβα.
κύμινον Αἰθιοπικόν: τὸ καρναβάνδιν ἢ 
tὸ μελανῦν.
κοκκομηλλὸν: τὸ δικαστικην.
κόμμι: τὸ ψυμμίθιον.
κόπμι: τὸ κομίδην.
κράμα: τὸ σύρεως (i.e. σίραιν) ἤγουν 
tὸ ἔγημα.
κύωνι: ἡ μαγκουναία.
κόλλη τεκτονική: ἡ ηφικούλλη (ξύλο-) 
κάσαμον: τοῦ βαλάμιου το στέρμα.
κάλαμος ἀρωματικός: ἐοίκος 
λεπτότάτῳ δόνακι, ὑπόπικρον καὶ ἀρωματίζῃ 
κάρχριν: εἶδος ἄρωματος.
κρότων: ἢ κικέα.
κενταύριον: ἢ θαλάλη.
κύτον: ὅνομάζονται ὁ δ’ οὖτως αἱ 
προτόγοινοι ροιαί, καθ’ ὃν χρόνων 
ἀνθοῦν παύεται τὸ δένδρον. ὁ δὲ 
καρπὸς αὐτοῦ σηματιεύμενος εἰς 
eἰδέαν ροιάς.
κυριανός: τὸ κολιάνδρον.
κάρυου Ποντικόν: τὸ λεπτόκαρον.
καρπίσιον: εἴδος ἀρωμάτος ἐοίκος 
κολιάνδρο.
καυκαλίδα: τὸ ἀγριόδαιμον.
κοτυλίδα: ἡ ποτηρίδα.
κνέωρον: ἡ χαμαλαία.
καθμία: ἡ τουτία.
κόνιοι: οἱ στρόβυλοι ἢ καὶ κόκκαλοι 
παρὰ τοῦ Ἰπποκράτους.
κωδία: ὁ μήκος.
Κολοφονία: ἡ κατευρασμένη ῥητινή.
<κ>ὅστος γλυκός: ὧ ἐς Ἀραβίας, ἔστι δὲ 
καὶ ἔτερος πικρός. (cf. s.v. φοῦ) 
κυάνεων: τὸ μέλαν.
κυνόγλυσσον: τὸ θεραπευνίδ.
(125°) κνίδη: ἡ θημολέα (θημελαία LSJ) 
䓨ον ἢ κνίδα.
κολοκινθίδα: ἡ ἐντεριών.
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[Text content]

μύες· οἱ τζίπες. (cf. s.v. κτιδώνας)
(125 سنوات) μυροβάλανον· μικρότερον και λευκότερον τοῦ χρυσοβαλάνον. 
μυρτέα· η μυρσίνη.
μύκητες· οἱ ἄμμανίτες.
μύρα (μύρα Suda)· τὰ συκάμινα. 
μύλων· τὸ ἀγριοπήγανον.
μύκανθα· ἡ ἀσπάραγγια.
μελλότα· τὸ καρπτζαμίδι.
μύαρος· ὁ πετραῖος ἀσπάραγγος.
μύρτος· ὁ καρπὸς τῆς μυρσίνης.

[Further text content]
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σανδάραχη: το κόκκινον ἀρσενίκη.
στυπτηρία: ἢ στύψις.
σέσελ: το πλατυκυμίνον.
σίνηπι: το σίναπι.
σαρκοκόλλη: δ λέγεται ἄζαρούτιν

εἰκός ὡς μικρὸν λίβανον.
σικώα: τα τετράγγουρα.
στρούθιν: το καλυστρούθιν.
σίσωνος: εἴδος ἀρώματος εἰκός ἀνίσω
μικρῷ, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ὀσμήν θύμου.
στιχάδα: εἰοκία θύμου, κορύβων
ἀρωματίζουσα.
σουσούνιον: το κρινέλαιον.
σφέκλης: οἴνου τρέξ.
σ<κ>υφίον: το ύπεράνο τοῦ ὀστέου τῆς
κεφαλῆς.
σκύνια: τα βλέφαρα.
σισύμβριον: το κάρδαμον.
σκύλλον: το σκυλλοκρύμιον.
σκόρδιον: (σκάρδιον cod.) εἰοκὸς λεπτή
καλαμίνθη [υπόλευκον], ἐν δὲ τῇ ὀσμῇ
ποσῶς σκορδέζων.
στόρας: εἰοκός τῇ ὀσμῇ θυμάματι, τῇ
dὲ χρόα ὑπόλευκον.
σατύριον: ἕχον ῥίζαν ὡς διδύμους.
σαρησφαγόν: φυτὸν ἕχον ἀκάνθας περὶ
tῆν κεφαλῆν.
sίσαμον: το σισάμιον.

ἀρχή τοῦ <ρ>
ρόδα: τα τριαντάφυλλα.
ρόδη: το σομάκιν.
ράσδον: το ἑλένιον.
ρήξης ψευδονύμου: το ἵδικον νάρδον.

ἀρχή τοῦ <σ>
σύρεως: το ἔψημα. (cf. s.v. κράμα)
σφαρίτης: ἢ κυπάρισσος.
σχῆς (σχιστῇ?): ἢ στυπτηρία.
σμύρνιον: το ἱπποσέλινον.
σικυνία: ἢ ἐντερισίνη.
σφυρά: τα ἀντίζια.
στέρνον: το στήβος.
σιλφιον: εἴδος βοτάνης.
σκορπίουρον: ἐοικὸς οὐράν σκορπίου
χερσαίον τὸ ἀνθεί.
σταφυλίνος: τὸ ἄγριον δαυκίν.
σέρκα: τὸ ἄγριον ἱπτυβόν.
σκόλυμνον: ὁ σκόλυμβρος.
σαγαπηνόν: ὑπὸ ἐκ τῆς Ἰνδίας βαρύ-
οσίως.
σίδα: τα τῆς ροιας ἄνθη.
σύμφωτον ἡμερον: ἔχον φύλλα ἀει-
ζώου παχύτερα καὶ ἐπιμηκέστερα.
σύμφωτον ἄγριον τὸ ἑλένιον.
(126') σκάνδε: ἢ βελωνίδα.
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τριφύλλιν ό πικροσκιή ἤγουν ἀσφαλτιν. (cf. s.v. ἀσφαλτίδα)

ἀρχὴ τοῦ <ν>
ὑπατόριον (ὑποτάφρ- cod.) τὸ εὐπατόριον ἤγουν πεντάφυλλον.
ὑπερικόν ιδίος βετάνης. ὑφορόν τὸ πεντάνευρον.

ἀρχὴ τοῦ <φ>
φροῦ ὁ πικρός κόστος. (cf. s.v. κόστος γλυκός)
φυσαλλίδες ἐοικυῖα δορύκνιον.

ἀρχὴ τοῦ <χ>
χρυσάνθεμον τὸ χαμαιμήλον.

χαμαιμίτως ἐοικυῖα λεπτῆ κονίζῃ.
χάσκουσα ἡ παιωνία.
χάλκανθον τὸ χαλκάνθιν.
χάρμων τὸ μύθεον.
χρυσοβάλλαν τὸ ἐοικὸς ἐξανθὸν κέπουλε, ἔστι δὲ στρογγυλόν.
χαλκός κεκαυμένος ὁ λεγόμενος χόχλος.

ἀρχὴ τοῦ ψ
ψέλλον (i.e. ψόλλον) βότανον ἔχον σπέρμα καθάπερ ψύλλου.

ἀρχὴ τοῦ <ω>
ἄκιμον τὸ βασιλικόν.

Text 14
On contraceptives, inc. Κυκλάμινον (f. 127v)

Κυκλάμινον βασταζόμενον ἀτοκίαν παντελῆ ποιεῖ· πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἐμβρύα φθείρει. ἢ μηρίκαι (μυρίκην!) καρπῶς καὶ φύλλα πενόμενος μετὰ οἴνου, ἀτοκίαν καὶ αὐτὸ ποιεῖ.

Text 18
Περὶ τὰς τρεῖς ἀποκαταστάσεις τοῦ βίου (ff. 134v–137v)

Τρεῖς ἀποκαταστάσεις τοῦ βίου οἴδεν ὁ λόγος καλεῖν· σαρκικὴν, ψυχικὴν καὶ πνευματικήν· τοῦτω ἐκάστη ἤδιν ἔχει διάθεσιν τῆς ζωῆς διακεκριμένην καὶ κεχωρισμένην πρὸς ἑαυτὴν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποκαταστάσεων παντάπασιν ἄμικτον καὶ ἀνόμοιον. ἢ μὲν γὰρ σαρκικὴ τοῦ βίου κατάστασις ὅλη καθ’ ὅλον πρὸς ἐνδοναίς καὶ ἀπολαμβάνεις τῆς παρούσης ζωῆς καταγίνεται, 2 μηδὲν ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχικῆς καταστάσεως ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς πνευματικῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἔχουσα ἢ κἂν ὅλως βουλωμένη προσκτήσασθαι.

(134v) Ἡ δὲ ψυχική μεθοδίας τις κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς πρὸς τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ ὑγείαν ὅρα καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἔμπαινων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐπ’ ἵσις τοὺς τε πόνους ἀποσιεύμενον τῶν ἀρέτων καὶ τὰς πράξεις ἀποφεύγουσα τῆς σαρκός, μὴ προσκειμένη κακία ἢ ἀρετή διὰ τὰς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀντιθέτους αἰτίας, ἀρετὴ μὲν διὰ τὸ

2 καταγίνεται] ἐπιγίνεται cod. κατὰ supra ἐπι- addidit
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τραχύ ταύτης ὁμοῦ καὶ ἐπίπονον, κακίας δὲ διὰ τὸ μὴ προσπολέσατο τοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπαίνου.

Ἡ δὲ πνευματικὴ τοῦ βίου κατάστασις τοὺσ οὐδὲν οὕτω ἔχει ἀἱρεῖται οὕτω πρὸς οὕτω κακὰ καταγίνεσθαι τὰ ἁμρότερα, ἀλλ᾽ ὡσ ὅλου ἐλευθέρου ἔστι ταύτης κάκενης, περνέας περιπραγμομένη (Ps. 67:14) ἀγάπης καὶ ἀπαθείας, ὑπερισταμένη τῶν ἁμοτέρων μὴτε πράττοιται τι τῶν ἀπροσμεμένων καὶ τὴν ἀγρείαν ἀποφεύγουσα τῶν καλῶν.

Οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκί ζῶντες Θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται (Rom. 8:8).

Οἱ σαρκικὸς ζῶντες καὶ πολὺ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονήματα ἐπικαίρους ἐναυτοὶς ἔχοντες οὐ δύνανται ἀρέσαι Θεῷ, σάρκες ὄντες αὐτόχρημα. σκοτεινοὶ γὰρ εἰσί τοῖς φρο(135)νίμπας καὶ τῶν ἀκτίνων τοῦ θείου φωτὸς πάντη ἀμέτοχοι. τὰ γὰρ ἐπιρροθεῦντα νέφο τῶν παθῶν ὠσπερ ὑψηλὰ τείχη ἀποτείχοντα ἔχοντες τὰς λαμπηδόνας τοῦ πνεύματος ἀφώτιστοι διαιμένουσι, πηροὶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ὁφθαλμοὺς ὄντες τῶν ἱδίων ψυχῶν οὐ δύνανται πρὸς τὰ νοητά κάλλη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνανεύονυμαι καὶ τὸ φῶς ἰδεῖν τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ ὄντι ζωῆς καὶ ὑπέρανοι γενέσθαι τῶν ὀρωμένων τῆς ταπεινότερος, ἀλλ᾽ οὖν ἀποκτηνοῦντες καὶ ἀίδησις γεγονότες τοῦ κόσμου, τούς αἰσθητοὺς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνους πράγματα τοῦ τὸν λόγον δεσμοῦντος ἀξίωμα καὶ τὸν ἁγιὰν πάντα πρὸς τὰ ὀρώμανα καὶ φειδομένα ἔχονσιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ ταῦτα μαιχθήμενοι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν τοιούτων ἐσοφ' ὅτε καὶ τὰς ἱδίας τιθέντες ψυχὰς ἀντεχομένους χρηματῶν, δόξης καὶ ἱδιών τῆς σάρκος καὶ ζημίαν μεγάλην τῆν τῶν τοιούτων ἀποτυχίαν ἠγομένην. πρὸς οὖς εἰκότως ως ἐκ προσόπου τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ προφητικὸν ἐκέινο λέγεται λόγων, οὐ μὴ μείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τοῖς διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῖς σάρκας (Gen. 6:3).

(135) Ὡς δὲ ψυχικὸς ζῶντες καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καλουμένοι ψυχικοὶ (1 Cor. 2:14) ὡμοὶ μορφῷ τινες καὶ ως παραμεῖναι τὰ μέλη τυγχάνουσι, μήτε πονεσαί ποτε ὑπὲρ ἄρετῆς καὶ ἐντολῆς Θεοῦ προθυμοῦμενοι, καὶ τὰς ἐπιφάνειας πράξεις διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων δόξαν ἐκφραζόμενες φολιάται δὲ τῇ τροφῇ τῶν ὀλεθρίων παθῶν κατακρατοῦμενοι, πάσης θεραπείας διὰ τὴν ἡγείαν καὶ ἀπόλαυσιν τῆς σάρκος ἀντιποιοῦμεν, καὶ πάσαν ὀλίγην καὶ πάντα πόνον καὶ πάσαν κακοπαθείαν ὑπὲρ ἄρετῆς ἀποσειούμενοι, τὸ πολέμιον πέρα τοῦ δέοντος ἐπιθάλλοντες σώμα. οὕτω δὲ βίου καὶ ἁγωγῆς ἔχοντες ἀπογιουμένων τὸν νόον, τοῖς πάθεσι παραγινόμενοι, καὶ ἀπαράδεκτοι εἰς τῶν νοητῶν καὶ θείων πραγμάτων, ὕψον ὁνὶς τῆς ὑλῆς ἀρπάζεται καὶ ὁλὴ πρὸς νοητούς ἐμπερικλεῖ οὐρανοὺς. τοῦτο δὲ πάσχουσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὑλικοῦ ἐτε κατεχομένοι πνεύματος ὡς τὰς ἱδίας φιλοῦντες ψυχὰς καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ θελήματα αὐτῶν προαιρούμενοι. κενοὶ γὰρ ὄντες τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἀμορφὸς εἰς καὶ τῶν χαρισμάτων αὐτοῦ, (136) ὅθεν οὐδὲν καρπὸν ἔστι θείων ἰδειν ἐν αὐτοῖς – ἀγάπην εἰς θεον καὶ τὸν πλῆσιον αὐτῶν ἢ χαράν ἐν πτωχείᾳ καὶ θλίψει ἡ ψυχῆς εἰρήνην ἢ εὐδαιμονίαν πίστιν ἡ περικτική ἐγκράτεια – ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲν κατάνυξιν ἢ δάκρυν ἢ ταπείνωσιν καὶ συμπάθειαν, πάντα δὲ ὄγκου καὶ ὑπερφανίας μεστά. ἦνθεν τοι καὶ βαθύνει εἰς τὰ βάθη τοῦ πνεύματος οἴκοθεν δυνάμεος ἀποροσίαν. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ ὁδηγοῦν φῶς καὶ διανοιγόν τοῦ νοὸν εἰς το τοιοῦτος εἰς το γεγονός (Lk. 24:45), ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ ἄλλον διηγομένου ἀκούσα ταῦτα ἀνέχονται. εἰκότως οὖν καὶ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων ὁ ἀπόστολος ἀπεφήνατο, ψυχικὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπος, λέγων, οὐ
déchetai tā tōu pneümatorow' moriai gár eisai autō kai óske oidein óti ó nómos pneumatikos épsti kai pneumatikos ānakaírietai (1 Cor. 2:14).

"Osos pneümatoi Theou ágonontai, ouτoi eisai ouios Theou (Rom. 8:14).

Ωi δὲ pneumatikoi stoichoúntai kai tìn pneumatikìn épameiroménoun zoih déi ólou eudástei eisai tò Theò, prossanakémenoi ós naizirai autòw, áei gár pánnois ãautówn kathairovs tás psuchás kai tás éntolázw tòu Kúriou têrhoúsi. kevnoûn ãautón tò aûmatà (136') úpér tîs ãagápis autòw, tîn sárka tîkousiathen neostýias kai ãargynnia, dáskroui tò pácho leiptónonu tîs khrýias, kakkopátheia nekrovúsi tîs méla tâ èpi tîs gíz, vonousi kai melèti tòv nòun ploróusi kyrakós kai lemporón autón àpergaizonta, tî àpannhési tòn thelematów ãorózoui tás idías psuchás apó tîs tòu sómatos protasofásias kai òlou mónou tòu pneumatóu gínonatai. òd kai pneumatikoi òu mónon gnorizontai ãllla kai kalóntai ðp pántón eikôtos. ouτoi prós àpátheian kai ãagápin érgómenoi prós theorián peirontai tîs kútesw kai tîn gnôsan ekpeithen tòv òntwn diá theoriás kai sofrías lêmyounoi tîs àpokrekuménnhs Theou kai mónoùs didoménnhs tòs òpéránw genoiménou tîs tòu sómatos tàpseinúseos. tòynun kai pássan tîn aîsthísen tòv kósmou diapérásantes kai diannoi ðfwniwméni eis tâ òpér aîsthísen genonótês pranounoi tîn lógôn kai ñ mónos èkkhíssas Theou kai sunagugíshis tòn pistów lógous katharouk ek katharusk khrýias èrégoujáni kai gínonatai tòs àntrhópius ìlaz wòs kyraká kai tî Kûrios prós autòw ðpùtthegetai: ìmei ëste tò ìlaz tîs gíz (137') kai ìmei ëste tò fòs tòv kósmon (Mt. 2:13–14): fòs mévn, ós tòn bîn enárretos kai lemporos tòv lógw kai sofrós tîn diánwou, ìlaz ðe, ðò tîn gnôsan polús tîn theia kai ðunastos tîn sofrían tòv Theou.

Text 19

On the three stages of spiritual life, inc. Τρεῖς εἰσὶ τάξεις (ff. 137'–138')

Τρεῖς εἰσὶ τάξεις ἐν τοῖς ποιουμένοις τὰς προκόπας τῶν τελειοποιῶν ἀναβάσεων καθαρτικῆ, φωτιστικῆ, μυστικῆ ἡ τελειοποίησις· καὶ ἢ μὲν ἔστι τῶν εἰσαγωγικῶν, ἢ δὲ τῶν μέσων, ἢ δὲ τῶν τελείων. διὰ γὰρ τῶν τριῶν τούτων κατὰ τάξειν ἁνερχόμενος ὁ σπουδαῖος αὐξάνεται εἰς τὴν κατὰ Χριστὸν ἡλικίαν καὶ γίνεται εἰς ἀνθρώπων τέλεως τῆς ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Eph. 4:13).

Ἡ γοῦν καθαρτικῆ τῶν ἡδη πρὸς ἁγίας ιεροθεὸς εἰσαγωγικῶν ἑστὶν καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν αὐτῆς ἡ ἀπόθεσις τῆς μορφῆς τοῦ χοικοῦ ἀνθρώπου (1 Cor. 15:49), ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις πάσης προσώπου κακίας καὶ ἡ ἀφοίνας τοῦ καινοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ διά πνεύματος ἀνακαινιζομένου ἁγίου (Col. 3:9–10). ἔργον δὲ τὸ μίσος τῆς ὑλῆς, ἡ τῆς τῆς σαρκός, ἡ φυγὴ πάσης αἰτίας ἐρεθιζούσης πρὸς πάθη τὸ λογιζόμενον, ἡ ἐπὶ τοὺς πλημμέλεις πεπραγμένους μεταμελεῖα, πρὸς δὲ τὸ τοὺς ἀνάκρισιν ἀποκλύσασθαι τὴν ἁλμήν τῆς ἀμαρτίας, τὸ τὰ ἰθη χρηστότητι ρυθμῆσαι τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τὸ (137') ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου (Mt. 23:26) διὰ κατανύξεως ἐκκαθάρα παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς τε καὶ πνεύματος (2 Cor. 7:1) καὶ οὕτως τὸν ὀμνὸν τοῦ λόγου βαλεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν εὐφραίνοντα καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου καθαρισμοῦ καὶ προσαγαγεῖν τὸ βασιλεί τῶν πνευμάτων εἰς γεῦσιν. τέλος δὲ τὸ πυρωθήναι ἐμπράκτως τὸ πυρὶ τῆς ἀσκήσεως καὶ
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τοὺς πόνοις τῶν ἀγώνων πάντα ἵνα ἀποσείσασθαι ἀμαρτίας στομωθήναι τε καλῶς καὶ βαρὴν τῷ τῆς κατανόειος ὑδατὶ καὶ ἐξίφος ἀποστελεσθήναι τοιμὸν κατὰ παθῶν καὶ δαιμόνων εἰς δύναμιν. ὁ εἰς τούτῳ φθάσας διὰ πολλῶν ἀγώνων ἀσκήσεως ἐξέβασε δύναμιν ἐμφύτου πυρὸς, ἔφραξε στόματα λεόντων ἀγρίων παθῶν, ἐνενυμαμώθη τῷ πνεύματι ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας (Heb. 11:33–34), ἐγένετο ἵσχυρὸς καὶ ὡσεί τις Ἀὐσίτης (Job 1:1) τρόπαιον ὑπομονῆς ἔστησε νενικήκώς τὸν πειράζοντα.

Ἡ δὲ φωτισικὴ τῶν ἔς ἱερῶν ἀγώνων προκοπάντων ἐστὶν εἰς πρώτην ἀπάθειαν καὶ ἵδιον μὲν ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἡ γνώσις τῶν ὄντων, ἡ θεορίᾳ τῶν λόγων τῆς κτίσεως καὶ ἡ μετουσία τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος. ἔργον δὲ ἡ κάθαρσις τοῦ νοὸς ἢ δὴ (138') τοῦ πυρὸς γινομένη τοῦ θείου, ἡ τῶν νοερῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τῆς καρδίας νοερὰ ἀποκάλυψις, καὶ ἡ τοῦ λόγου γέννησις μεθ’ ὑγιελὸν τῶν νοημάτων τῆς γνώσεως. τέλος δὲ ὁ διατρανῶν λόγος τῆς σοφίας τὰς φύσεις τῶν ὄντων, ἡ ἐπέγνωσις τῶν θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων καὶ ἡ ἀποκάλυψις τῶν μυστηρίων τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν. ὁ εἰς τούτῳ φθάσας διὰ νοερᾶς τοῦ νοὸς ἐργασίας ἄρματι πυρὸς (2 Κρ. 2:11) ἐποχεῖται τετρακτύ τῶν ἁρπᾶτων, ὡσεί τις Ἀὐσίτης καὶ ἔτι ξὺν εἰς ἄερα τὸν νοῦτόν αἴρεται, καὶ περιπολεῖ τὰ οὐρανία ὑπεράνω τῆς τοῦ σύματος γεγονός ταπεινώσεως.

Ἡ μυστικὴ δὲ τελεοποιύς τάξεις τῶν ἕδη πάντα διαδραμόντων ἐστὶν καὶ εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας ἐλθόντων Χριστοῦ. καὶ ἵδιον μὲν αὐτοῖς τὸ διατείμεν τὸν ἁέρα καὶ τοῦ παντὸς ύπερκύπναι, τὸ περὶ τὰς ἀνῶ τάξεις γενέσθαι τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ τὸ πρῶτο φωτὶ πληροῦσα καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐρευνήσας (1 Cor. 2:3) διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. ἔργον δὲ τὸ πληροῦσα τὸν θεατὴν τῶν τοιουτῶν νοῦν τῶν περὶ προνοίας λόγων τῶν πε(138') δικαιοσύνης καὶ άληθείας, τῶν περὶ λύσεως αἰνιγμάτων καὶ παραβολῶν καὶ σκοτεινῶν λόγων τῆς θείας γραφῆς. τέλος δὲ τὸ μυσταγωγῆσαι τὸν οὐτὸ τελεσμένον τὰ ἀπόκρυφα μυστήρια τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ σοφίας ἐστὶν πληρῶσαι ἀρρήτου διὰ συνουσίας τοῦ πνεύματος, καὶ σοφὸν θεολόγου μιᾶς ἐκκλησίας μεγάλης ἀποδείξει Θεοῦ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς σοφίας καὶ τῆς θεολογίας.

Text 29
Τοῦ αὐτοῦ (scil. John Chrysostom)· inc. Διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν (ff. 189v–190v)

For this text, see Chapter 5.
Text 30
Γνώμαι τοῦ ἀγίου Μάρκου τοῦ 'Ἐφεσίων· Περὶ ὅρους ζωῆς καὶ περὶ τῆς αἰονίου κολάσεως (ff. 190v–192v)

a. (f. 191r l. 2–6) Περὶ μὲν τοῦ προορισμοῦ κρίνει ὃτι μόνα τὰ τῶν δικαίων τῶν τῶν θεόν εὐφρεστούντων εἰσὶν προορισμένα, καὶ θάνατοι καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς /αὐτῶν cod., καὶ ταύτα εἰσίν τὰ κατ’ εὐδοκίαν γενόμενα, τὰ δ’ ἄλλα ὅσα κατὰ παραχώρησιν ἢ κατὰ συγχώρησιν ἢ κατὰ ἐγκατάλειψιν γίνονται, καὶ οὐκ εἰσίν προορισμένα.

b. (ff. 191r l. 7–192v l. 7) Περὶ δὲ τῆς αἰονίου κολάσεως λέγει ὃτι οἱ θεοὶ ἑστὶ μὲν ὄν, ἐστὶ δὲ ἀγαθός. τὰ δὲ ταύτα ὄνοματα πάντων ἐστὶ τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ λεγομένων κυριότατα τε καὶ περιεκτικότατα. καὶ ὅταν μὲν ἀκούοντες τὸν θεόν, ἐπὶ τὴν ἐννοίαν εὐθὺς ἐρχόμεθα τῆς μακραίας οὐσίας αὐτοῦ καθ’ ἣν ἀνίδως ἐστὶν ὑπέρ πάσαν γνώσιν, ὅλον ἐν ἑαυτῷ συναλαβόν τὸ εἶναι καθαρὸν τι πέλαγος ἀπεραιον καὶ ἀόριστον· ἀγαθόν δὲ ἀκούοντες, ἐνέργειαν τινα νοοῦμεν πρὸς ἀπεραον’ τείνουσαν, εἰτέρ τὸ ἄγαθόν τισιν ἐστὶν ἄγαθόν, καὶ συνεισάγει πρὸς ἢ λέγεται. ἦμως τούτων τὰ θεία ταύτα ὄνοματα, τὸ μὲν τὴν οὐσίαν, τὸ δὲ τὴν (191v) ἐνέργειαν τοῦ θεοῦ σημαίνον διαιροῦνται, τὸ μὲν εἰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, αἱ δὲ καλοῦνται πατήρ, υἱὸς καὶ ἄγιον πνεῦμα, τὸ δὲ εἰς πολλάκις καὶ διαφόρους δινάμεις καὶ ἐνέργειας. καὶ μᾶν μὲν τὴν ἐτέραν τῶν διαιρέσεων τρισυπόστατος οἱ θεοὶ, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἔτεραν παντοδυνάμου ἐστί καὶ λέγεται. καὶ τῇ θελήσει μετρουμένας αἰεὶ τὰς δυνάμεις ἔχει καὶ προσαγομένας εἰς τὴν ἐνέργειαν.

Τὴν μὲν οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν τῆς παροῦσας ζωῆς συνεκλήρωσε· καὶ πολλαχόθεν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰ καλὰ προβιβάζει καὶ τῶν κακῶν ἀναστέλλει· νόμον ἔδωκεν εἰς βοήθειαν· ἀγγέλους ἐπέστησε φύλακας· πρὸ τοῦτον τὸ συνειδός ἠμῖν ἐγκατέστησεν ἐνοικὸν4 τινα τῶν πραπτομένων δοκιμαστήν προφῆτας ἐπέμψε· σημεία καὶ τέρατα δι’ αὐτῶν κατὰ γενέσαι εἰρήσατο· καὶ τέλος τὸν μονογενὴν αὐτοῦ υἱόν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἔδωκεν· καὶ μέλη ἑαυτοῦ τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύοντας ποιησάμενος πνεῦματος ἄγιον χά(192r)ριν καὶ δύναμιν ἔπεμψε· καὶ τὴν διὰ τοῦ ἄγιου βαπτισμάτος ἀναγέννησαν ἐδορσήσατο· καὶ οὕτως οὐδὲς θεοῦ καὶ συγκληρονόμους τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας κατεστήσατο. εἰ τούτων μετὰ τοσακτὰς εὐθυγρασίας ἀχάριστοι γεγονότες ἀθέτησαμεν τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν πίστιν καὶ τῶν ἐντὸς αὐτοῦ κατεφρονήσαμεν, καὶ τὸ ἀίμα τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ ἐν ὧν ἡγίασθημεν κοινὸν ἠγισάμεθα, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυπηρέσαμεν, τὶ λοιπὸν ἀλλ’ ἢ τὸ δίκαιον αὐτοῦ φανεροί καὶ τῶν τῆς δίκης ἐπιστήμην καῳρὸν ἢ τὰ κατ’ ἄξιον ἡκάστος τῶν βεβιομένων αὐτοῦ λήφηται· οὕτω γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ δικαίου λόγος οὗ τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνον τὰ γέρα καὶ τὰς τιμὰς ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν φαύλως ἀποδίδοντα τὴν πρέπουσαν δίκην. ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ ἀμαρτωλὸς προετίμησε τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγάπης ἡδονήν τινα κατὰ πάθος ἢ ἀνθρώπινην εὐημερίαν καὶ δόξαν ἢ ἄλος τῖς τῶν προσκαïρον, δήλον (192v) οὖν ὅτι προετίμησεν αὐτὰ οὐχ ὡς πρόσκαιρα ταχὺ παρερχόμενα, ἀλλ’ ὡς καθέξι αὐτὰ διὰ παντός, εἰτέρ ἡδύνατο, καὶ διὰ παντὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονήσων. ὁ δὲ θεός

3 ἀπεραον] ἀπεραον cod.
4 οἶκον cod.
Text 31

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ (scil. Mark Eugenikos): Ἀναλογία τῶν ἀπειλουμένων κολάσεων πρὸς τὰ ἀμαρτήματα (ff. 192v–193r)

Σκότος ἐστὶ βαθὺ καὶ ἐξότερον (Mt. 22:13) τοῖς τὸ ἐνδόν ἀγαπήσασι σκότος τῆς ἀνοσίας καὶ πρὸς τὰς θείας αὐγὰς ἀτενίσας μὴ βουληθεῖσι καὶ σκόληξ (Mt. 9:48) ἰσθήλος τοῖς τὴν ἡδονήν τῆς σαρκὸς περὶ πολλοῦ τεθειμένοις καὶ τῷ βορβόρῳ τῶν παθῶν ἐγκαλινδηθείσι καὶ Τάρταρος τοῖς ἐνυγμένοις περὶ τῆς εἰς θεὸν καὶ τὸν πλησίον ἀγάπης καὶ πῦρ ἄφεγγες τοῖς ἐκκεκαυμένοις ὑπὸ θυμοῦ καὶ μαινομεῖς τὸν τρόπον καὶ θηριώδεσι καὶ βρυγμός ὀδόντων (Mt. loc.cit.) τοῖς αἰσχρὰ καὶ κακίγορα (193r) φθεγγομένοις καὶ πάν δὲ τύχη προσειδεῖ τοῦ στόματος. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐρέστῃ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσι (1 Cor. 15:28; Eph. 1:23), τοῖς ἐκπεσούσι θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο λείπεται πλὴν ἢ κακία μόνη, κακία δὲ ἡδονῆς ἀφηρημένης κόλασις ἐστὶν ψυχῆς ὄσπερ ἡ νόσος τοῦ σώματος.

Text 32

Problem, inc. Ἀπορία πῶς ἄνεχεται (f. 193v–)

Ἀπορία πῶς ἄνεχεται ὁ θεὸς ἀπολωλέναι κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην τοσοῦτον πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἐν ἀμαρτίας ἐκατοστεί τὴν ζωὴν ἀνόντων.5

Λύσις:
Ποῖον πλῆθος εἰπὲ μοι λέγεις; καὶ καλοὶ ἐδόκει πλῆθος εἶναι. θεῶ δὲ οὐκ ἀκοῦεις ὅτι πάντα τὰ ἐθνὰ ὡς σταγόν ἀπὸ κάδουν, καὶ ὡς σίλεος ἐλογιζότην (Is. 40:15); οὐκ ἔννοεις τὸ ἀννυπήρβλητον μέγεθος τῆς θείας δυνάμεως; οὐκ ἀκοῦεις τοῦ προφητή κύνα μονὸς ὁ κατέχουν τὸν γύρων τῆς γῆς καὶ τοὺς κατοικούντας ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ὡς αἰκρίδας (Is. 40:22). πόσας εἰπὲ μοι ψύλλας 6 ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς, ἢ κάμπας ἐκ τὸν λαχάνων ἀπερμυκρίνως διάφθειρας, ἀνθρώπων δὲ τὸ μὲν κατ’ εἰκόνα φυλάξαντος ἀκραιφώς καὶ θεὼ δ’ ἀρετῆς ἔαυτὸν ὀκειόσαντος, οὐ (193v) δὲ ὁ πάσας κόσμος ἀντάξεις, ἀποστάντος δὲ τῆς θείας μερίδος καὶ πρὸς τὴν κτηνώδη ζωῆς ὀλισθήσαντος, αἱρετότεροι παρὰ θεῶ σκόληξ, δε τὸ κατὰ φύσιν τηρον. ἄνδρα αἰμάτων καὶ δόλων βεβλισσεται κύριος (Ps. 5:7). οὐχ ὄρα τὸν νεκρόν ὡς βδελυγμόθεα πάντες, καὶ τῇ γῇ συγκρύπτομεν, ἢν μη σκωλήκων, καὶ ἱχώρων, καὶ δυσωδίας καὶ σήπεως

5 ἀνόντων cod.
6 ως σίλεος] ὡσεὶ ἑλος cod.
7 ψυχῆς cod.
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εκπλήση πάντα,8 τοιούτον ἔστι θεώ, ψυχήν νευρωθείσαν δι’ ἀμαρτίας, καὶ τῆς θείας ἡμῶν ζωῆς ἐκουσίως ἑαυτήν χωρίσασαν.

Text 33
Εὐχή εἰς τὴν ὑπεραγίαν δέσποιναν ἡμῶν θεοτόκον (ff. 193v–194v)

Παντάνασσα, πανόμηντε, παρθενομήτωρ κόρη, ἡμῶν ῥημάτων ἄκουσον καὶ πρόσχες μου τοῖς λόγοις. ἵδε διακρύνω σταλαγμοὺς, ἵδε τοὺς στεναγμοὺς μου, ἵδε τὴν λύπην τῆς ψυχῆς, ἵδε καὶ μὴ παρίδης.
Οὐ φέρω τὰς ἐπιβουλὰς Σατάν τοῦ βροτοκότου, οὐ φέρω τὴν ἐπίθεσιν, οὐ φέρω τὴν κακίαν, οὐ στέργω τοῦτον μηχανάς, ἐνέδρας, λόχους, δόλους. (194v) οὐχ ὑπομείνειν δύναμι τὴν πλάνην, τὴν ἀπάτην. βιώζει καὶ πειράζει με νῦκτα καὶ καθ’ ἡμέραν, τοξεύει, βάλλει βέλεσιν ἀτόπων λογισμῶν με, ἀγρεύει καὶ θηρεύει με πράξεσιν αθεμίτους. εἰς ἀπωλείας βάραθρον καθέλκει, συνωθεῖ με. ψυχῆς τάς κόρας ἔβεβεσεν, ἡμαύρωσε τὸν νοῦν μου, τὸ σῶμα κατερρύπωσεν, ἐσπλώσεν τὸ πνεῦμα. ἐξέδουσε με τὴν λαμπρὰν στολὴν τῆς σωφροσύνης, ἐνέδουσε με ῥυπαρὸν τῆς ἀμαρτίας σάκκον. ἐσύλησεν, ἀφήρπασεν τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς ψυχῆς μου, τὰ δόρα, τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ πρῶς θεοῦ ὅθέντα καὶ πένητα κατέστησε παντοδαπὸν καλὸν με.
Λοιπὸν ἄγνη πανάραστη, Χριστιανῶν προστάτης, τῶν ὀλβιμένων χαρμονή, λιμὴν χειμαζομένον, τὸ πάντων καταφύγιον τῶν καταπορμημένων, ἢ τὸν Χριστόν κυήσασα τοῦ κόσμου τὸν δεσπότην καὶ γαλακτοτροφήσασα τὸν τρέψατα· τὴν κτίσιν ἔλε(194v)ησον, οἰκτήρισαν τὸν σὸν ἀγρεύον δούλον τὸν οὕτω δράσαντα κακῶς, καὶ ταπεινώσαντά με ταπεινώσωσον. κατάβαλε καὶ σύντριψαν ἐν τάχει καὶ δός μοι τὴν συνχώρησιν τῶν πρώην ἐσφαλμένων καὶ τὴν ἀντήλησιν τὴν σήν καὶ σκέπην μέχρι τέλους, καὶ ἐν τῷ τέλει δὲ ἅγιή μεσίτες καὶ προστάτες ἐξαργυρομένη με ἑκεῖ πυρὸς τοῦ αἰωνίου, ὡποῖς ὑμῖν καὶ ἐυλογῶ σὲ τὴν ἐμὴν προστάτιν καὶ μεγαλόνω διὰ σοῦ τὸν πλάστην καὶ θεόν μου, καὶ νῦν καὶ πάντοτε ἀεὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.

8 πάντας cod.
Text 35
Sayings by Maximos, Demosthenes, et al. (ff. 195\textsuperscript{v}–196\textsuperscript{r})

[1.] Τοῦ ἁγίου Μαξάμου περὶ τῶν τριών μερῶν τῆς ψυχῆς· λόγου, θυμοῦ καὶ ἐπιθυμίας.
Τὸ θυμικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγάπη χαλάνως καὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν αὐτῆς ἐγκρατεῖας μάρανοι καὶ τὸ λογιστικὸν αὐτῆς θεωρεῖα πτέρωσον· καὶ τὸ φῶς τοῦ νοῦ ὅπως ἀμαρωνεῖται ποτε.

[2.] Τοῦ Δημοσθένους· Τέλος μὲν ἀπάσιν ἀνθρώποις τοῦ βίου θάνατος, κἂν ἐν οἰκίσκῳ τις αὐτῶν καθέρως τηρή\textsuperscript{9} ηρὴ δὲ τοὺς ἀγάθους ἀνδρας ἐγχειρεῖν μὲν ἀεὶ τοῖς καλοῖς, τὴν ἁγαθὴν προβαλλομένους ἐπίδια, φέρειν δὲ ὅτι ἐν ὁ θεός δώ γενναῖος.

[3.] Τοῦ αὐτοῦ· Ἐστὶ μὲν γάρ, ἔστι πάσης ἁρτητῆς ἄρχη μὲν σύνεσις, πέρας δὲ ἀνδρεία.

[4.] Τοῦ αὐτοῦ· Τὸ γὰρ εὐ πράττειν παρὰ τὴν ἄξιὰν ἄφορμη\textsuperscript{10} τοῦ\textsuperscript{11} κακῶς φρονεῖν περὶ τοῖς ἀνοικτοῖς γίγνεται.

[5.] Τοῦ αὐτοῦ· Δεῖ δὴ χρημάτων, καὶ ἅνευ τούτων οὐδὲν ἔστι γενέσθαι τῶν δεόντων.

[6.] Τοῦ αὐτοῦ· Πρῶτον μὲν εἰσεσφέρετε κατὰ συμμορίας, νῦν δὲ συνάγεσθε κατὰ συμμορίας.

[7.] (196\textsuperscript{r}) Τοῦ αὐτοῦ· Φύσει γὰρ τοῖς παροῦσι τὰ τῶν ἀπόντων, καὶ τοῖς ἐθέλουσι ποιεῖν καὶ κινοῦσείν τὰ τῶν ἀμελοῦσιν.

[8.] Βρόουτου· ᾿Ω τλήμων ἁρετή, ἐγὼ μὲν σε ὡς ἔργον ἠςκουν\textsuperscript{12} σο δ᾿ ἐδούλευες τύχη.

[9.] Ὅπου γὰρ εἰσέρευσεν τὸν πλούτου χάρις, ἐκεῖ φρενὸν ἐβλύσεν ὄντως ἀδύνης· εἰ γὰρ μερὶς λάβοι σε τῶν πενεσθέρων ἀν καὶ Σολομών κατὰ τὰς φρένας γένοις, ἐξοιχος ὅτις τοῖς πάσι χρηματισί.

[10.] Αριστοτέλους· Ὅμοιον ἔστι τὸ ἔποτάσσεσθαι τινὰ εἰς ὃ μὴ δεῖ, ὡς τὸ μὴ ὑποτάσσεσθαι εἰς ὃ δεῖ.

Text 38
A gnomology derived from Constantine Manasses’ Synopsis Chronike (ff. 197\textsuperscript{v}–199\textsuperscript{r})

1) [272–276]
Οὗτος οὐδὲν τῆς ἀπαθοῦς ψυχῆς κατακαυγάται, οὐ θῆρ, οὐ πῦρ, οὐ ποταμὸν μεγαλοδούπου θράσος.

\textsuperscript{9} τηρή] θυρὶ cod.
\textsuperscript{10} ἄφορμη] ἄφορμήν cod.
\textsuperscript{11} τοῦ] τοῖς cod.
\textsuperscript{12} ἠςκουν] ἠςκουν cod.
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κάν βασιλεύεις τῶν παθῶν, ἃν ἀμαρτίας ἀρχεῖς, καὶ βασιλέσκων καὶ δεινῶν σκορπίων ἐπιβήσῃ καὶ ταπεινώσεις λέοντα καὶ τίγριν ἡμερόσεις.

2) [780–782 + 956–957]
 Ἄλλ’ ἔσφαλεν, ὡς ἑοίκε, τούτους ἵστχε ἡ θεία, καὶ τὴν λαμπρότητά την πρὶν αὐτοῖς ἐπιξομένην ἐν τοῖς παιγνίοις ἔφασαν ἐκβήναι τὸ παιδίον. Ἀλλ’ ἢν οὐδέν, ὡς ἑοίκε, μόνιμον ἐν τῷ βίῳ, οὐ πλοῦτος, οὐ βασιλείαι κράτος, οὐ δυναστεία.

3) [1157–60; 1162–67]
 "Ην ἡ γυνὴ περικαλλής, εὐφορίας, εὐχρουστάτη, εὐπάρεις, εὐπρόσωπος, βούτις, χιονόχρους, ἐλκοβλέφαρος, ἀβρά, χαρίτον γέμιον ἄλος λευκοβραχίον, τρυφερά, κάλλος ἀντικρυς ἐμπνοῦν, τὸ πρόσωπον ἐπίχαρι, τὸ βλέφαρον ὄρατον, κάλλος ἀνεπιθέουτον, αὐτόβαφον, αὐτόχρουν· ἐβάπε τὴν λευκότητα ῥοδόχροια πυρίνη, ὡς εἴ τις τὸν ἐλέφαντα βάνει λαμπρα πορφύρα, δειρὴ μακρα, κατάλευκος, ὁθὲν ἐμμουργήθη κυκνογενήτην εὐσπον Ἐλένην χρηματίζειν.

4) [1327–28]
 "Ω δυστυχῆς ἀλήθεια, σὲ καὶ πενθῶ καὶ στένω σὺ γὰρ μου προαπόλωλας καὶ προεδανατώθης.

5) [1403–09]
 Ὄς εἶδον οὖν ὠλόλυξαν καὶ προσπεσών τῷ στήθει Ἀλίας ὁ μέγας ἐν κλαυθῷ πρὸς τὸν Πηλέως ἔφη «ὁ ἄρα πολεμόκλονε καὶ γίγα βριαρόχειρ, ὡς ἀνελεῖν ἡδύνατο τὸν θυμολέοντα σε.» ὁ δ’ ἀμαυρὸν ἐφώνησε καὶ παρακεκομμένον ἀνεῖλον με Δήμιοβος καὶ Πάρεις μετὰ δόλου», καὶ ταῦτ’ εἰπὼν ἐξέπευεσαν ὁ τηλικοῦτος ἱρως.

6) [2078–79]
 Ἀμίς καὶ ποτηστήριον ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἔλου, ποδοντήτηρ καὶ κύπελλον ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν χωμάτων.

7) [2529–32]
 Ὄς ἄρα τὸ θρηστότροπον ἔστι κάν τοῖς βαρβάροις, καὶ τὴν φυλὰν ἄτροτον καὶ τὴν φιλαλληλίαν οἶτεν ἀνήρ ἀλλόγλωσσος ἀθώλωτον φιλάσσειν· τὸ γὰρ καλὸν ἐκ φύσεως ἐπασιν ἐνεσπάρη.

8) [2600–2607]
 Ἀλλ’ ἢν οὐδέν, ὡς ἑοίκε, εὐτύχημα τοῦ βίου
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ζάλης καὶ λύπης ἄμιγές, οὐδέ τις εὐποτμία
μὴ συναναφρόμενον ἔχουσα καὶ τὸ κνίζον
καὶ γὰρ καὶ ρόδων εὐόσμου φρίσσει πυκνὰς ἀκάνθας
ήλιον τε τὸ βλέφαρον σκοτίζουσι νεφέλαι
καὶ φθόνος ἐπιφυεῖται τοῖς τὸ καλὸν ἀσκοῦσι
καὶ πᾶν εὐτύχημα λαμπρόν, πᾶν τὸ σεμνὸν τοῦ βίου
φέρει καὶ τὸ δυστύχημα συνανακεκραμένον.

9) [2693–2695]
Ὡς ἁρὰ γε τρισεδῶμιν καὶ μέρος εὐποτμίας
εἴνοις ἀνθρώπως συνοικεῖν καὶ καθαρῶς φιλοῦσι
καὶ μὴ καταρρυπαίνουσι τὰ τῆς φιλαλληλίας.

10) [2792–2796]
Τὸν γὰρ θεοῦ ταῖς κραταιαῖς φρουρῷμενον παλάμαις
τίς ἂν ἰσχύσει θνητῶν ὁλέσαι πρὸ τῆς ἁρας;
ἀν ἡ θεοῦ μεγαλαλκής χεῖρ σε περιφρουροῖν,
οὐ δειλιάσεις σίδηρον, οὐ ξίφος ὑποτρέεις,
οὐ πῦρ, οὐ θυμοβάρβαρον, οὐ μιαίφον ἣδος.

11) [2819–2820]
Ὡςτε πολλάκις ταπεινοῦς ἐργάζεται τὸ κέρδος,
οὔτως ἐλπίδες πλάξουσι τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων φρένας.

12) [2846–2848]
Ὡς ἁρὰ πάς τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸ χρῆμα δυσωπεῖται,
ἄλλογενής, ἠθαγενής, Ἡλλήν, ἄλλοθροις, Σκύθης,
μόνη γὰρ σύναται κοσμεῖν τοὺς ἐραστὰς καὶ σώζειν.

13) [2873–2877]
Ἀλλὰ τυραννικῶτατον τὸ σθένος τοῦ χρυσίου
ἀλλὰ δυναμικότατον μυρίων στρατευμάτων.
Τοῦτο καὶ πόλιν εὐπυργον ἐκ βάθρων ἀνασκάπτει,
τοῦτο καὶ δόμους ὄλλοι, τοῦτο καὶ τῶν πολέμων ὄλων ἐθνῶν ἀφανείσθαι καινοτομεῖν ἰσχύει.

14) [2925–2926]
Ὡς ἁρὰ τιμιότερον ψυχής οὐδὲν ἀνθρώποις
οὐ κράτος τὸ βασίλειον, οὐ θάλασσα χρημάτων.

15) [2959–2960]
Ἀλλὰ τὴν ἄμαχον ἰσχὺν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ προνοίας
οὐδές ἰσχύσει γηγενής ἄπρακτον ἀπελέγχαι.

16) [2980–2982]
Ὡςτε οὐκ οἶδεν εὐσεβῆς αἰδεύει τα βασιλείας,
ὅτε πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν κίνδυνον ἀνατρέχει,
οὐδὲ λαμβάνει πρόσωπον, οὐδὲ δυνάσταις τρέμει.
17) [3024–3025]
'Αλλ' οὐ γὰρ πάντα τὰ κακὰ πρόσεστι τοὺς ἄνθρωποις, ἀλλὰ συμβαίνονται ποτε καὶ βέλτιστα κακιστοίς.

18) [3062–3063]
Οὕτω πάσιν ἐπέραστος ἢ σκηντοκρατοῦσα, κάνταϊθα μόνον ἄδικει οὐδ' εἰς τι κατοκνήσει.

19) [3101–3104]
Οὕτω τι πράγμα δύσμαχον ἢ εἰσπραγία πέλει καὶ φίλους οἴδε καθεστάν τοὺς πρώην μισουμένους ἐφέλκεται τε τούς ἐχθροὺς ὡς σίδηρον μαγνήτις, δείγμα χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τρόπου φιλανθρώπου.

20) [3497–3515]
Χρυσὲ διώκτα, τύραννε, πάντολμε, δολοπλόκε, πάντων κακῶν ἀκρόπολις, πάντων κακῶν ἢ βία, ἐλέπολις, ἰριψαλέξεις, σπαράκρεια τείχεον, πόλεων τείχοςείστρα, τινάκτρα δωμάτον, οὕς κακοῖς τοὺς γηγενεῖς κρισκοπεῖς καὶ τρόχεις. οὐδὲν ἀνθαμμιλλάται σοι, πραγμάτων τῶν ἐν βίῳ, οὐδὲν ἀντισφερίζει σοι πάντων τῶν ἐπιγείων. μαλαθάσεις τῶν ἄμαλακτων, τῶν μαλακῶν σκληρύνεις, γλύσαν ἀνοίγεις ἄφωνον, λάλον ἐπιστομίζεις, ποιεῖς βραδὸν τὸν δρομικόν, πηνιόπου τῶν ἄργοπον. πειράξεις γὰρ καὶ θέλητερον ἐπάγεις τὰς καρδίας καὶ γοητεύεις ἰγρεῖς ἀφόκτοις τὰς αἰσθήσεις, ἀλλὰ σοι τὸ καλλήρον ὡς ἔχινα φαρμάσει, θεσιοῦς καὶ νόμους συμπατοῦν καὶ τὴν αἰών διόκεις, τυμβρωρυχεῖς, τουχορυχεῖς, ἀπεμπολέξεις, προδίδος. λήρος τὸ κομμενόμενον, ὡς  ὑσίκε, καὶ μύθος, ὡς ἄρα τὸν ἀδάμαντα μόνον ἀίμα μαλαθάσεις: τί γὰρ σοῦ δραστικοκτέρον καὶ λόθους ἀπαλάνειν; τί γὰρ τὴν ὑπερίσχυρον ἴσχυν σοῦ διαφεύγει!

Text 41

Inc. Ἐκπορεύεται μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (ff. 206v l. 2–207v)

A later hand has attributed the text to Mark Eugenikos: Μαρκὸς ὁ φεσιος ἀποφασὶ τοῦ πατριαρχοῦ.

'Εκπορεύεται μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἂγιον κατὰ τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος φοινὴν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀλλότριον ἔστιν τοῦ υἱοῦ, πάντα γὰρ ἔχει μετὰ τοῦ πατρός. κατ' οὖν ἄρα δὲ τρόπον σαλεύεσθαι παρὰ τινος ἀντεχόμεθα τὴν ὀρισθέταιν πίστιν καὶ τὸ τῆς πίστεως σύμβολον παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἰμῶν οὐτε μὴν ἐπιτρέπομεν.
Appendix 1: Some inedita in Gr 8

ή αυτοίς ἢ ἐτέροις, ἢ λέξεν κοινήν <ℵμεύηαι>. 13 Μὴ μεταφερὲ ὅρια αἰώνια ἢ ἐθέντο οἱ πατέρες σου (Prov. 22:28), οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν αὐτοὶ οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ὁ ἐκπορεύεται μὲν ἐς αὐτὸν, ἔστιν δὲ οὐκ ἀλλότριον κατὰ τὸν τῆς οὐσίας λόγον· ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μὲν ἐκπορεύεται τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν, ἔστιν δὲ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἱδιον.

Καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ ζωοποίησις προσκυνουμένῳ τὸ ἐκπορευομένῳ ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, τοποθετήστω ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός· οὐ γεννητός καθάπερ ὁ υἱὸς ἵνα μὴ δύο υἱοὶ ἔν τῇ τρίαδι, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκπορευτός, καθάπερ εἰρήματι, ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπὸ στόματος, πεφηνότι δὲ δι᾽ ὑιοῦ καὶ λαλήσαντι14 ἐν τοῖς ἀγίοις πάσι προφήταις καὶ ἀποστόλοις.15

(207r) Σκόπει τοῖς καὶ τί τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν τὰ κτιστὰ πάντα δυναμοῖ ἐν πατρὶ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ· οὗ μὴ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκπορεύεσθαι διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἔχει. ίτις δὴ ἐκπορευομένης καὶ τρόπος ἐστὶ τῆς ὑπάρχεισι τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος· ἡ μέντων ἐκραταίτων καὶ πρόδοσις, ἡ πέμψεις καὶ ἡ χαραγή, αἱ οὐχ τρόποι εἰσὶν ὑπάρχεισι καὶ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ· ὡστε, εἰ καὶ ποῦ τῶν πατέρων, ἔσθι, εἰρήκει ἐκ πατρὸς δι᾽ ὑιοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν ἐκπορεύεσθαι, οὐκ ἀποδεξάμεθα μὲν, δι᾽ οἰκονομοῦσα δὲ εἰς εἰσεβάζεις οὗτο νοήσωμεν ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν ἐκπορεύεσθαι, δι᾽ υἱοῦ δὲ τοῖς ἄξιοις χορηγεῖσθαι· τὸ γάρ ἀνάλογον ἑρ᾽ ἐκάστῳ δοής· οὐχ ὑμόνυμον αὐτὴν τὴν λέξιν αὐτῆς καὶ μιᾶν λαμβάνουμεν. καὶ Ἰσως καὶ οὕτως τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν φημι ἐκ πατρὸς μόνου ἐκπορεύεσθαι ὡμολογουμένων. λέγεται δὲ ἐκ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ αἰτίου αὐτοῦ εἴναι υἱῶν· πατὴρ γὰρ υἱοῦ λέγεται πατὴρ ὡς τῶν πρὸς τι· οὗ μὴ πατὴρ ἐκπορευτόν· διὰ τούτοι φημὶ ἐκ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αἰτίαν ἵνα δηλώσω ὅτι ὁ τὸν υἱὸν γεννήσας, αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν ἐκπορεύεται. οὕτω κυρίως ἐδει εἰπεῖν· (207r) τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ ἐκπορευόντος, ὃ ἐστίν ὁ πατὴρ, διὰ δὲ τοῦ γνωριμοτέρου εἰναι πατὴρ ὅνομα ἐθετο τοῦτο. προσεγγίσθης καὶ διὰ υἱοῦ, διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα αἰτίαν ὁπερ εἰρήκαμεν. τέως ἡμεῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μόνου γινόσκομεν ἐκπορεύεσθαι, λέγομεν δὲ αὐτὸ εἶναι καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, ὡς φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος· ἔξαπεσελεῖν16 ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ κράζον ἄρβα ὁ πατὴρ (Gal. 4:6),17 εἰ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ δὲ αὐτὸ εἶναι λέγομεν, ὡς Νικαίους Γρηγόριος, κἂν τινες ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ λέγεται διασχυρίζοντες, τὰ θεῖα παρεξηγοῦμεν. ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας μὲν τοῦ υἱοῦ ὁ μέγας τοῦτο φησὶ Κύριλλος, ὅπερ εἶναι λαβὴν18 τινα τοῖς ἑναντίοις διάδοσιν,19 ἀλλὰ καὶ λίγαν ἐστὶν ἄσφαλες· καὶ γάρ φησιν ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν, “οὐ γὰρ ἄν ἔχει τό εἶναι ὁ υἱὸς, ἑκείθεν καὶ τοῦτο,” ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς δηλαδή, ἐκ τῆς θεικῆς οὐσίας. ἀμφό γὰρ καὶ ἅμα ἀρχόν τοις ἀφράτωσις ἀπερνοῆς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς προῆλθε, τὸ μὲν γεννητὸς, τὸ δὲ ἐκπορευτός.

13 Cf. Mark Eug. Testimonia spiritum sanctum ex patre procedere probantia 77; Cyril. Alex. Ep. ad loamem Antiochenum, PG 77, 180D.
14 λαλῆσαντίας cod.
16 δεικνυσιν cod.
17 Cf. Acta Graecorum concilii Florentini II, 6, 342 (ὁ Ἐφέσου).
18 λαλεῖν cod.
Text 48

**A florilegium, inc. Ἀλέξανδρος ἐρωτηθεῖς (f. 238r–247r)**

A title was added by a later hand: ἄρχ(ή) τιν μέλησα κατὰ ἀλφαβητον Ἰ ἱογη.

[1.] Ἀλέξανδρος ἐρωτηθεῖς, πῶς τοσούτων ἐθνῶν ἐν ὀλίγοις χρόνοις ἐκράτησεν, ἐφὶ “μηδὲν ἐς αὕριον ἀναβαλέμμενος.”


[3.] Ὁ αὐτὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς τινά φιλόσοφον ὃτι ἡ γῆ ἢ ἡ ἡθὰλασσα πλεῖον ζῶα ἠχει, ἐφὶν: “ἡ γῆ, καὶ γάρ ἡ ἠθαλασσα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔστιν.”

[4.] Ἀλέξανδρος ἐρωτηθεῖς, τίνα μάλλον ποθεῖν, τὸν πατέρα Φίλιππον ἢ Ἀριστοτέλην τὸν διδάσκαλον, ἐφὶ “τὸν διδάσκαλον, ἐπεὶ ὁ μὲν πατὴρ αἴτιος τοῦ γεννήσαι, ὁ δὲ διδάσκαλος τοῦ καλῶς γενέθαι πρόξενος.”

[5.] Ἀλέξανδρος ἰδίων Διογένεν ἐν πίθω κοιμώμενον ἐφὶ “χαίρε πίθε μεστε φρενῶν,” ὁ δὲ φιλόσοφος ἐφὶ “ὁ βασιλεὺς, κρεῖσσον σταλαγμιοῦ τύχην ἤ φρενῶν πίθω, ἢ μὴ παρούσης δυστυχουσίν αἱ φρένες.”

[6.] Ὁ αὐτὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἔστι φίλος ἐφὶ: “μία ψυχή ἐν δυοί σώμασιν οἰκύσα.”

[7.] Ἀνάχαρας ὁ Σκύθης κρείττον ἐφὶ εἶναι ἕνα φίλον ἠχειν πολλῶν ἄξιον ἢ πολλοὺς μηδενὸς ἄξιοι.”

[8.] Ἀλέξανδρος ἐφὶ “ἲμεινον ἐστίν ἄρχειν θηρῶν ἢ ἅνθρώπων κακῶν.”

[9.](238r) Ἂ τις μὲν ἐπίστασαι, διαφύλαττε ταῖς μελέταις, ᾲ δὲ <μή> μεμάθηκας, προσλάμβανε ταῖς ἐπιστήμης ὁμοίως γὰρ ἐστὶ κακῶν ἀκόωσαντα χρήσιμον λόγον μὴ μαθεὶν καὶ διδόμενον τι ἄγαθὸν παρὰ τῶν φίλων μὴ λαβείν.

[10.] Ἀσπασία ἐρωτηθεῖσα διὰ τί κατὰ μὲν τῶν γυναικῶν θάνατος ἐστίν ἐὰν ἄλλῳ πλησίάσειν, κατὰ δὲ τῶν ἀνδρῶν οὐ, ἐφὶ “ἀνδρὲς γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ ταῦτα νομοθετήσαντες, ἀλλ’ οὐ γυναικὲς.”

[11.] Ἀκούσας μοιστήριον ἐν φιλίᾳ ὅπερ περὶ ἠχεῖν γενόμενος μὴ ἐκφάνης ἀδικεῖς γὰρ ὁ τῶν ἐχθρῶν, ἀλλὰ τὴν φιλίαν.

[12.] Αἱ ἐπιφανεῖς τύχαι καθάπερ οἱ σφοδροὶ τῶν ἀνέμων, μεγάλα ποιοῦσι ναυάγια.


[14.] Ἀριστοτέλης ἐφὶ ὃ ἐν νόσῳ διαθήκας γράφων παραπλήσια πάσχει τοῖς ἐν χειμῶνι θαλαττῇ εὑρετείζεσθαι ἠρχομένοις τὰς τῆς νησὶ ὅπλα.

[15.] Ἀρχίδαμος ὁ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεὺς θεασάμενος τὸν ἰδίον παιδα προπετός Ἀθηναίος μαχόμενον, ἐφὶ “ἡ τῇ δύναμει πρόσθες ἦ τοῦ θράσους ἄφρελε.”

[16.] (239r) Ἀνάχαρας ὁ Σκύθης ἐρωτηθεῖς διὰ ποίαν αἰτίαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι πάντοτε λυποῦνται, ἐφὶ: “ὅτι οὐ μόνον αὐτοῦς τὰ ἱδία κακὰ λυπεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἀλλῶτρα ἄγαθα.”

[17.] Ἀνδρὸς χαρακτήρ ἐκ λόγου γνωρίζεται.

---

20 ὃν νόσῳ ἐν νόσῳ cod.
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[18.] Ἀνάξιον ἄνδρα μὴ ἐπαίνεις διὰ πλοῦτον.
[19.] Ἀνδράντα μὲν τὸ σχῆμα, ἄνδρα δὲ ἢ πράξεις κοσμεῖ.
[20.] Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ βασιλεύς ἵδιν παν τῶν γερόντων βάπτων τὰς τρίχας ἔφη: “μὴ τὰς τρίχας βάπτε, ἀλλ' ἐ' ἐνύνασα τὰ γόνατα.”
[21.] Ἀλέξανδρος ἵδιν στρατιώτην ὑπὸ γυναικὸς φθειρίζομεν ἔφη: “ἵδιον καὶ πρόβατον ὑπὸ λύκου φθειρίζομεν.”
[22.] Ἀλέξανδρος ἵδιν γραφὼν καλλωπιζομένην ἔφη: “εἰ μὲν πρὸς τοὺς ζώντας, πεπλάνθησαι, εἰ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς νεκροὺς, μὴ βράδυνε.”
[23.] Βέλτιον τοὺς υἱοὺς σπουδάζειν πεπαιδευμένους μᾶλλον ἢ πλουσίους.
[24.] Βουλευτῶν πολλά πρὸ τοῦ λέγειν τι ἢ πράττειν· οὐ γὰρ ἔξεις ἅδειαν ἀνακάλεσασθαι τὰ πραγμένα ἢ λεγθέντα.
[25.] Βασιλέα φρόνιμον τὸ διάδομα οὐ ποιεῖ. Νοῦς γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ ἄρχον.
[26.] (239') Βεβαιώς ἐπίσταμαι ὅτι τῶν ἐχόντων πάντες ἀνθρώποι φίλοι.
[27.] Βέλτιον λίθον βαλέιν, ἢ εἰκή λόγον.
[28.] Βέλτιον τοῦ τάχους ἢ μακροθυμία, καὶ τῆς αἰθαδείας ἢ συγκατάβασις.
[29.] Γῆρας καὶ πεντὰ ὡμοὶ δύο τραύματα δυσθεράπευτα.
[30.] Γάλικον τὴν παιδείαν ἵναρ ἄσυλον ἔλεγεν εἰναι.
[31.] Γνώσει θεοῦ ποιεῖ ἄνδρα βραχύλογον.
[32.] Γαμβροῦ ὁ μὲν ἐπιτυχῶν εὗρεν οὐν, ὁ δὲ ἀποτυχῶν ἀπόλεσε καὶ θυγατέρα.
[33.] Γόνα, γυναικὸς κύσμοιν ἢ σιγή φέρει.
[34.] Γυνὴ τοῦ προσώπῳ κοσμουμένη τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀμορφίαν ἐμφαίνει.
[35.] Γυναῖκα καλὴν μικρὰν ἵδιν τις ἔφη· “μικρὸν μὲν κακὸν, μέγα δὲ καλόν.”
[36.] Γυναῖκα σώφρονα ζήτει καὶ μὴ εὔμορφον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ θησαυρὸς ἀνέκλειπτος, τὸ δὲ ὑπόψια γνώμης.
[37.] Διογένης τὴν μὲν ρίζαν τῆς παιδείας ἔφη εἰναι πικράν, τοὺς δὲ καρποὺς γλυκεῖς.
[38.] Δημοκρίτω ἔφη τις· “διατι μέγας ὁν μικρὰν ἔγιμας γυναῖκα,” εἶπεν· “ἐκλογήν ποιησάμενος τοῦ κακοῦ, τὸ ἔλεγον ἠρετισάμην.”
[39.] Δημοσθένης ἔφη ὅτι οὐ21 οἶνον πληροῦμενοι τὸν νους κενοῦνται.
[40.] (240') Δημόδωνα ἔφη· “τοῖς ὑπί πλέον ἢ τῇ γλώττῃ χρῶ.”
[41.] Δημοσθένης ἐν συμποσίῳ πρὸς τὸν πολλὰ λαλοῦντα ἔφη· “εἰ τοσαῦτα ἐφρόνεις ὡς λαλεῖς, οὐκ ἂν τοσαῦτα ελάλεις.”
[42.] Δεινὸν ὅταν τις μὴ φρουρῶν δοκῇ22 φρονεῖν.
[43.] Δημοσθένης ἐρωτηθείς, τί δύσκολον ἐν βίῳ, ἔφη·“ἀληθινὸν φίλον ἐπιτυχία.”
[44.] Δυνάμενος χαρίζεσθαι μὴ βράδυνε, ἀλλὰ δίδου, ἔπει· “οὐκ οἶδας, κατὰ τὸν προφητήν, τί τέξεται ἢ ἐπιτυγία.”
[45.] Δημοσθένης ἐρωτηθείς ὑπὸ τίνος “πῶς τῆς ἰθηρικῆς περιεγένους,” ἔφη· “τὸ ἀγγευσεν καὶ τὸ πλέον οἴνου ἀναλίσκειν ἔλαιον.”
[46.] Διογένης ὁ Κυνικὸς φιλόσοφος τριδύλους ἐκάλει τοὺς γαστρός καὶ αἰδοῖον καὶ ὑπνον ἠττωμένους.

21 τοῖς cod.
22 δοκεῖ cod.
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[47.] Διογένης θεασάμενος μικράν πόλιν μεγάλας πύλας έχουσαν ἡφι: “κλείσατε
tάς πύλας, μή ἡ πόλις ἔξελθῃ.”
[48.] Δόξα καὶ πλοῦτος ἄνευ φρονήσεως οὐκ ἄσφαλες κτήμα.
[49.] Δεῖ πάντα μὲν ἀκούειν, ἐκλέγειν δὲ τὰ χρήσιμα.

[50.] Ἰν εὐτυχίᾳ φίλον εὐρείν εὐκολοῦν, ἐν δὲ δυστυχίᾳ πάντων ἐστὶν ἀλλοτριότης.
[51.] Εἰ ταῖς τὸν ἀνθρώπον εὐχαίς ὁ Θεὸς κατηκολούθει, πολλῷ θὰτὸν ἄν
ἀπάλοντο πάντες ἄνθρωποι, συνεχῶς πολλὰ καὶ χαλεπὰ κατ´ ἀλλίθνων εὐχόμενοι.
[52.] (240’’) Ἐβουλεὶ διττῶς εὐδοκιμεῖν, καὶ τοὺς καλὰ ποιοῦντας προτίμα καὶ τοὺς
χειρῶν ποιοῦντας ἐπίτιμα.

[53.] Ἐν οἴνῳ μὴ βαττολογήσεις σοφίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος.
[54.] Ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ παραδείγμασι παίδευε σεαυτόν καὶ ἀπαθής τὸν κακῶν ἔσῃ.
[55.] Εὐρυπίδης ποτὲ φακὴν ἔψοιν καὶ μὴ ἔχον ἔξολον ἀνέλομενος ξώανον Ἡρακλέους
ἐγγὺς ἐστικός ἐπέθηκε τῷ πυρὶ εἰπόν: “τρισκαιδέκατὸν σοι τοῦτο τὸ ἄθλον
Εὐρυπίδης ἐπέβηκεν ἐπὶ φακὴν ἐνήσησα.”
[56.] Ἐν μὲν εὐδίᾳ σπάνιον τὸ ναυαγήσα, ἐν δὲ εὐβουλίᾳ τοῦ ἄτυχήσα.
[57.] Εἰς ἀρχὴν κατασταθεὶς μηδὲν ἄνθρωπον πονηρῷ χρῷ πρὸς τὰς διοικήσεις· ὣ
γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἀμάρτειι, σοὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἀναθησοῦν.
[58.] Εἰ καὶ πάντων ἔξεστι μεταλαμβάνειν ἀλλὰ οὐ πάντων πάντοτε πᾶσι συμφέρει.
[59.] Ἐροτηθησοίς τις, πῶς ὑβριζόμενος οὐκ ὄργύζεται, ἡφι: “οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπαροῦμενος
ἐπαιρόμα.”
[60.] Ζήηνον ἔλεγεν ὅτι ὁ παιδευόμενος τριῶν τοῦτον χρήζει, φύσεως, μελέτης καὶ
χρόνου.

[61.] Ζήηνον ὁ Στωϊκὸς φιλόσοφος ἀφυσίς ζωγράφου λέγοντος αὐτῷ: “κονιάσων
σου τὴν οἰκίαν, ἵνα αὐτὴν ζωγραφήσω.” “Οὐμενόν, εἶπεν, (241’) ἀλλὰ πρότερον
αὐτὴν ζωγράφησον, ἵνα μετα ταῦτα ἔγω αὐτὴν κονιάσω.”
[62.] Ζάλευκος ὁ τῶν Λοκρῶν νομοθέτης τοὺς νόμους ἔλεγε τοῖς ἀρχαγιός ὁμοίους
εἶναι: “καὶ γὰρ εἰς ἐκεῖνα ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ μιὰ ἡ κόνωψ, κατέχεται, ἐὰν δὲ σφῆς ἢ
μέλισσα, διαρρήξαται ὁπωσδέκατα ὁπωσίς καὶ ἐν τοῖς νόμοις: ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ πένης,
συνέχεται: ἐὰν δὲ πλούσιος ἢ δυνατός, διαρρήξας ἀποτρέχει.”
[63.] Ἁ τῶν περιστάσεων ἀνάγκη τοὺς μὲν φίλους δοκιμάζει, τοὺς δὲ ἐχθροὺς
ἐλέγχει.

[64.] Ἡ χάρις πρὸς εὐγνώμονας φίλους οὐδέποτε θνήσκει.
[65.] “Ἡ σιγὴ κρείσσων ἔχειν δεὶ ἢ λόγων ὡφέλμοιν.
[66.] Ἡνίκα πράττεις τὴν ἄρετὴν χαίρε, ἀλλὰ μή ἐπαίρον μῆποτε τὸ ναυάγιον ἐν τῷ
λιμὴν γένηται.
[67.] Ἡ παιδεία εὐτυχοῦσα μὲν ἐστὶ νόμος, ἄτυχοῦσι δὲ καταφύγιον.
[68.] Θηρεύουσι τοὺς μὲν κυστὶ τοὺς λαγωὺς οἱ κυνηγοὶ, τοὺς δὲ ἐπαίνοις τοὺς
ἀνοίκτους οἱ πολλοί.

23 ἐνήσησας cod.
24 σὸν cod.
25 χρίζει cod.
26 σφῆς cod.
[69.] Θαλής ο Μιλήσιος ἐρωτηθεῖς, τί πρεσβύτερον τῶν ὄντων “θεός, ἔφη, ἀγέννητος γάρ” τί κάλλιστον: “κόσμος”27 ἀπάντησε σαρχρησαμένος “νους” διὰ πάντων γάρ τρέχει” τί ἱσχυρότατον: “ἀνάγκη κρατεῖ γάρ πάντων” τί σοφότατον: “χρόνος” εὐρύτερα γάρ πάντα.”

[70.] (241') Θεόκριτος παρακαλούμενος υἱῷ καὶ πατρὶ διαιτήσαι, εἶπε πρὸς τὸν υἱόν· εἰ μὲν δικαιότερα μέλλεις λέγειν τοῦ πατρός, διὰ τούτο ἄξιος κατακεκρίσθαι· εἰ δὲ ἄδικα, καὶ οὕτως ἄξιος εἰ κατακεκρίσθαι.

[71.] Θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, ἔστω πάντων εὐτελέστερος.

[72.] Θεός οὐ ληπτός· εἰ δὲ ληπτός οὐ Θεός.

[73.] Ἰπποῦ μὲν ἀρετὴν ἐν πολέμῳ, φίλου δὲ πίστιν ἐν ἀντιχία κρίνομεν.

[74.] Ἰατρὸν καὶ φίλου, οὔ τὸν ἑδιόν·28 ἀλλὰ τὸν ὑφελιμότερον.

[75.] Ἰσοκράτης ἔφη· “μηδενὶ πονηρῷ πράγματι μήτε παρίστασο μήτε συνηγόρει δόξεις γάρ καὶ αὐτὸς τωρίστατο πράττων.”

[76.] Ἰσοκράτης ἐρωτηθεῖς, τί λυπεῖ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς, ἔφη· “ἐνυπνια πονηρῶν.”

[77.] Ἰσοκράτης ἐρωτηθεῖς, τί ἐστιν ἔργον ἰθήρος, ἔφη· “τὸ τὰ μικρὰ μεγάλα ποιῆσαι, τὰ δὲ μείζων μικρὰ τὸ λόγῳ.”

[78.] Ἰέρον ἐρωτηθεῖς, τις ὁ εὐδαίμων, ἔφη· “ὁ τὸ μὲν σῶμα ύγίης, τὴν δὲ ψυχήν εὐποροῦν, τὴν δὲ φύσιν εὐπαίδευσον.

[79.] Κλεάρχος ἔφη· “ἐν συλλόγῳ πρῶτος λέγειν μὴ ἐπιτίθεναι. μετὰ γὰρ πλεῖον ὀφθαλμὸν λέγειν ὲψει τὰ συμφέροντα.

[80.] Κρύστειν ἀντιχία χρῆ, ἵνα μὴ εὐφραίνωσαί τις ἕχοροι.

[81.] Καλὸν τὸ ψεῦδος ὅταν ὀφελεῖ τοὺς λέγοντας, μηδὲν καταβλάπτει τοὺς ἀκούοντας.

[82.] (242') Κλεάρχος ἐπιτιμῶντος αὐτῷ Φιλίππου, ὧν ἢδει ἀιτεῖ, “καὶ γὰρ σὺ, φησίν, ἢδει ἔχεις.”

[83.] Κρέιττον νοουτείν τὸν ὀνειδίζειν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἦπιον τε καὶ φίλου, τὸ δὲ σκληρόν τε καὶ υβριστικὸν, καὶ τὸ μὲν διορθοὶ τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας, τὸ δὲ μόνον ἐξέλεγχε.

[84.] Κόλαξς κρίνων, ἀλλὰ μὴ θυμούμενος.

[85.] Ἐαν μυρίῳ πχχών γῆς κύριος ὑπάρχεις, θανὼν γενήσῃ ἢ τριών ἢ τεττάρων.

[86.] Λάκων ἐρωτηθεῖς, δι’ ἂν αἰτίαν τὸς πόγον τρίχας ἐπιπολλοῦ κωμὴ, ἔτεν· “ίνα βλέπω ταύτας πολλάς μηδὲν ἀνάξιον αὐτῶν πράττων.”

[87.] Λάκων πρὸς τὸν κολαζόμενον καὶ λέγοντα· “ἀκὼν ἰμαρτον,” εἰ<πε>, “ἀκὼν τοῖνοι καὶ κολαζοῦ.”

[88.] Μυστηρίων σου μὴ κατείπης τῷ φίλῳ σου, καὶ ὢ θυραμπεσει αὐτὸν γενέσθαι ἐξόρν.

[89.] Μικρὰς χάριτις ἐν καιρῷ περιστάσεως μεγάλα εἰσὶ τοῖς λαμβάνουσι ταύτας.

[90.] Μὴ φεύγε μικρά χαρίζεσθαι· δόξεις γάρ καὶ πρὸς τὰ μεγάλα τοιοῦτος εἶναι.

[91.] Μὴ ὀνειδίσῃς φίλῳ σου χάριτας· δόξεις γάρ ὡς ὦ δεδωκός.

[92.] Μηδενὶ συμφορὰν ὀνειδίσῃς· κοινὴ γὰρ ἢ τύχη καὶ τὸ μέλλον ἄρατον.

---

27 κόσμος] κόσμος ποιήμα γάρ τοῦ θεοῦ· τί μέγιστον· “τόπος· Gnom. Vat. 320.
28 ἵδιον σοι.
29 ὑφελιμότερον] ὑφελιμότερον ἐκλέγεσθαι δει Corpus Par. 5.55.
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[93.] Μή ζήτει [γενέσθαι] τὰ γενόμενα γίγνεσθαι ὡς θέλεις, άλλα θέλε ὡς αὐτὰ γενόμενα γίνεται.
[94.] (242') Μηδὲνα φύλον ποιοῦ πρὶν ἂν ἐξετάσῃς πῶς κέχρηται τοῖς προτέρους φύλοις. Ἐπιτε γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ περὶ σὲ γενέσθαι τοιοῦτος οἶος καὶ περὶ ἐκεῖνους γέγονε.
[95.] Μήτε παρά νεκροῦ ὁμόλιο, μήτε παρὰ φιλαργύρῳ δεῖ χάριν ἐπιζητεῖν [δεῖ].
[96.] Μὴ ταχὺ λάλειν ἄνυοιν γὰρ ἐμφαίνει.
[97.] Νεκρὸν ιατρεῦειν καὶ γέροντα νοθεῦειν ταῦτάν ἐστιν.
[98.] Νικίας ἔφη: “οὐ καλὸν πεπαιδευμένοις30 ἀπαιδεύοντος διαλέγεσθαι, ὡσπερ οὐδὲ νήφοντα31 μεθύουσιν.”
[99.] Νομικὸς φιλαργύρῳ ἔφη τίς: “οὐ δεῖ ἐν πολλοῖς λέγειν ὁλίγα, ἀλλ’ ἐν ὡλίγοις πολλά.”
[100.] Ναὸς θεοῦ ὁ σοφός, ὅπειρα δεῖ καθαίρειν δεῖ καὶ κοσμεῖν πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν θεοῦ.
[101.] Ξενοφόν ὁ φιλόσοφος ἠτίσε παρὰ τῖνος τῶν πλουσίων· ὁ δὲ προσκαλεσάμενος χωλὸν ὄντα πλησίον ἐκείνος δέδωκεν· καὶ ὁ Ξενοφόν ἔφη: “πάνυ καλὸς πεποίηκας· χωλὸς μὲν γὰρ προσδοκάς γενέσθαι, φιλόσοφος δὲ ὦ.”
[103.] Ξανθίππη ἐπὶ θεάν πορευομένη (243') ὡς θεάσατο αὐτὴν Σωκράτης κοσμημένην ὀδην ἔφη: “οὐχ ἕνα θεάση, γύναι, πορεύῃ, ἀλλ’ ἕνα θεαθής.”
[104.] Ο πλουσίω χορηγῶν ἢ χαριζόμενος οὐδὲν διαφέρει τοῦ εἰς θάλασσαν ὕδωρ ἐκχέοντος.
[105.] ‘Ὁ πολλοῖς φοβερὸς δὲν πολλοὺς φοβεῖται.
[106.] Οὔτε συμπόσιον ἀνεύ ὁμλίας, οὔτε πλοῦτος χωρίς ἀρετῆς ἔχει ἤδονήν.
[107.] Οὔτε ἕπω χωρίς χαλινοῦ οὔτε πλοῦτου χωρίς λογισμοῦ δύναται κρατῆσαι τίς.
[108.] ‘Ὁ τῶν φιλαργύρων βίος ὡσπερ ὁ ἠλιος δύνων ὑπὸ γῆν οὐδένα τῶν ξάντων εὐφραίνει.
[109.] Οὐ τὸ πένεσθαι κατὰ φύσιν αἰσχρῶν, ἄλλα τὸ ὡς αἰσχρὰν αἰτιᾶν πένεσθαι ὑνείδος.
[110.] Οἰνοποίης ἔφη: “ὅποια ἡ φύσις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐστί, οὕτως καὶ ὁ λόγος.”
[111.] Ο Δημόκριτος ἐρωτηθείς, τί ἔστιν ἄριστον μάθημα, ἔφη: “τὸ ἀπομαθεῖν τὰ κακὰ.”
[112.] Οὔτε θολερὸν ὕδωρ, οὔτε ἀπαιδευτὸν ψυχήν ταράσσεσθε δεῖ.
[113.] Οἰνοποίης ὀρῶν μειράκιον πολλὰ βιβλία κτόμενον, ἔφη: “μὴ τῇ κιβωτῷ ἄλλα τῷ στήθει.”
[114.] Οὐδεὶς ἤλιπον τὸν βίον διήγαγεν ἀνθρώπος ἄν, οὐδ’ ἄχρι τέλους ἐξειμεν εὐτυχῶν.
[115.] Οὐκ ἔστιν βίον εὑρεῖν ἤλιπον ἐν οὐδενί.
[116.] Ὁστὶς τῷ ὁμόνοοι κὴ πεῖθεται, αὐτὸς (243') ἐπιορκεῖν ραδίως ἐπίσταται.

30 πεπαιδευμένοις functions as a direct object here.
31 νήφοντα cod.
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[117.] Ὅ Άξωπος ἄρωτηθεῖς, τί ἐστιν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀγαθόν τε καὶ φαύλον, ἔφη· “γλώσσα.”

[118.] Ὅδεις πονηρὸν πρᾶγμα χρηστὸς δὲν ποιεῖ.

[119.] Ὅδηγεν τυφλὸν λαβεῖν καὶ σύμβουλον ἀνόητον ταυτόν ἐστιν.

[120.] Οἱ πονηροὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κἂν χρηστότητα ἐπαγγέλλωνται, διὰ τὸν τρόπον ὅποι πιστεύονται.

[121.] Ὅ κακὸς διανοηθεῖς περὶ τῶν οἰκείων οὐδέποτε καλὸς βουλεύσεται περὶ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων.

[122.] Ὅ τῶν φιλαργύρων πλοῦτος ἐοικε δεῖπνον νεκροῦ· πάντα γὰρ ἔχων, τὸν εὐφρανθησμόνον οὐκ ἔχει.

[123.] Ονείρῳ ἐοικεν ὁ τῶν ἀπαίδευτων βίος, κενὰς ἔχων φαντασίας.

[124.] Ὅσον τοῖς δικαίοις τὸ θεῖον συναγωνίζεται, τοσοῦτον τοῖς ἀδίκοις ἐναντιοῦται.

[125.] Οὐδεὶς μετ’ ὄργης ἀσφαλῶς βουλεύεται.

[126.] Ὅν τρόπον θυμοῦμενα τὰ θηρία τοῖς θηριομαχοῦσι πολλάκις ἕαυτὰ τὰ ἔξω περιτείρει, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὀργῇ τὸν ὀργιζόμενον.

[127.] Οἱ πεπαιδευμένοι τὸ τοσοῦτον διαφέρουσι τῶν ἀπαίδευτων ὅσον θεᾶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

[128.] Οὐ τὸ πένεσθαι αἰσχρόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ αἰσχρὸς εὐπορεῖν.

[129.] Οἱ νοῦς σοφοὶ ἀντεχόμενοι, οἶνον πολλὸν ἀπέχονται (244') ὑπερβὰς γὰρ τοὺς ὄρους τῆς χρεᾶς· μέθυν ἐπέγει δεινήν, ἢ δὲ μέθυ ἀμβλύνει ψυχήν. ὅι δὲ συμμέτρου οἶνον μετέχοντες καὶ εὐφροσύνης ἀπολαλύουσι καὶ ἀφροσύνην ἀπελαύνουσιν.

[130.] Ὅσον ἀπέχει καὶ τοῦ πικροῦ σοφιστοῦ.

[131.] Πονηρὰ φύςας ἐπιλαβομένη ἐξουσίας δημοσίας ἀπεργάζεται συμφοράς.

[132.] Πιττακὸς ὁ Μιτυληναῖος ἔφη· “ἡ μέλλεις ποιεῖν, μὴ λέγε· ἀποτυχόν γὰρ καταγελασθήση.”

[133.] Πυθαγόρας φήσαντος αὐτῷ τινὸς “λίαν μοι ἐπισκόπεσις,” ἔφη· “καὶ γὰρ τοῖς σπλήνικοις τὰ μὲν ὀριέμα καὶ πικρὰ ἀφέλεμα, τὰ δὲ γλυκὰ βλαβερὰ.”

[134.] Πλοῦτορυς παρακελεύετο τοῖς νέοις τρία ταῦτα ἔχειν· ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς γνώμης σωφροσύνην, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς γλώττης σιγήν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ προσώπου αἰδό.

[135.] Πλάτων ὁ σοφὸς ἵδον μειράκιον εὐγενεῖς ἀσώτος τὴν γονικήν οὕσιαν ἀναλόγοντα καὶ ἐπὶ θύρας πανδοχείου ἄρτων ἐσθίόντα καὶ ὡδῷ πίνοντα “μειράκιον,” ἔφη· “εἰ οὕτως καταγγόμην ἡρίστας, οὐκ ἄν οὕτως καταγγόμην ἐδείπνεις.

[136.] Πολλοὶ φίλοις οὐ τοὺς ἁρίστους ἀλλὰ τοὺς πλοῦσίους ἀριστοῦντο· σὺ δὲ τοὺς φρονίμους χέπτει.

[137.] (244') Πάθος ἀπαν τὸ μὲν ταχέως γινοσκόμενον εὐβοήθητον, τὸ δὲ χρόνῳ καταθεχόμενον ἄνιατον.

[138.] Πιλάδῆς ὁ Μεσσήνιος θεωσάμενος κατάκριτον νόμους ἀναγινώσκοντα ἐπεκαίνευτο τοὺς νόμους ἀναγινώσκεις.”

[139.] Παραδοξότατον ἐστίν ἀνθρώπως ἐὰν τὶς ἐξουσίαν κυρεύσας ἐαυτὸν γνωρίζει.

32 Πυθαγόρας cod.
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[140.] Πάσα συμφορά κούφη ἐστὶν ἀνδρὶ μὴ κούφῳ.
[141.] Πόνος συνεχῆς ἐλαφρός τῇ συνήθει γίνεται.
[142.] Παρὰ μαθητῶν λαβὸν τὰς μισθὸν ἐδάκρυσεν ἔρωτησεις δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν εἶπεν· ἓτι δὲ ὀλίγον ἀργόλησα μοι τὴν παρουσίαν."
[143.] Πήρος ἀκούσας ὅτι νεανίσκοι τινὲς πολλὰ βλάσφημα περὶ αὐτῶν εἰρήκασιν, ἐκέλευσεν ἀρχήνας πρὸς αὐτὸν μεθ’ ἡμέραν ἀπαντάς ἀχέντες δὲ τὸν πρῶτον ἠρώτησεν, εἰ ταῦτα εἰρήκασιν περὶ αὐτῶν· καὶ ὁ νεανίσκος εἶπεν "ταῦτα, ὁ βασιλεὺς πλέον τούτων εἰρήκαμεν ἄν, ἐι πλέονα ἔσον ἐπίνημεν."
[144.] Πλάτων λοιδοροῦμενος ὑπὸ τινὸς ἔφη· "λέγε κακῶς ἐπεὶ καλῶς λέγειν οὐκ ἔμαθες."
[145.] Ρήτορος ἀπόφθεγμα ὅτι· ἰρίν τρέφειν καὶ ποιηρὸν εὐρεγετεῖν ταύτων (245") ἐστίν· οὐδέτερον γὰρ ἡ χάρις εὐνοιάν γεννᾷ."
[146.] Ἠρώμην μεγίστην καὶ πλοῦτον τὴν ἐγκράτειαν κτῆσιν.
[147.] Σόλων ὃνειδίζοντος ποτέ, ὅτι ὅκην ἔχον ἐμισθωσατο ῥήτορα, "καὶ γὰρ" ἔφη, "ὅταν ἔχειν μέγαν ἄσκον μισθοῦμαι."
[148.] Σωκράτης ἔφη "οἰς μὲν ἀκρατεῖς ἐν ταῖς ἄρωσταις, οἱ δὲ ἀφρόνες ἐν ταῖς ἄντιστοις εἰσὶν διουθέτεσθαι."
[149.] Σωκράτης ἔλεγεν τοὺς μὲν ἀνθρώπους ζῆν ἢν ἐσθώσιν· "ἐγὼ δὲ ἐσθὼ ἢν ἕκω."
[150.] Σωκράτης ἔφη τὸν σπουδαίον φίλον πρὸς μὲν τὰς εὐφροσύνας κληθέντα δεῖ παρεῖναι, πρὸς δὲ τὰς πεπράσινς αὐτόκλητον δεῖ παρεῖναι.
[151.] Σωκράτης ἔρωτησεις ὑπὸ τινὸς, ἐι κατασκεύα δύναται τις λόγον εὐπόρητον, ἔφη· "ὅστις διάπερον ἀνθράκα τῇ γλώσσῃ κατασκεύα δυνήσεται."
[152.] Σόλων τὸν μὲν κόρον ἐλεγεν ὑπὸ τοῦ πλοῦτον γενέσθαι, τὴν δὲ ὑβρίν ἄπο τοῦ κόρου.
[153.] Σεμίραμις ἐαυτὴν κατασκεύα<σα> σα τάφων ἐπέγραψεν· "ὅστις ἀν χρημάτων δεηθῇ βασιλέως, διελθὼν τὸ μνημεῖον ὅσα βοῦλεται λαμβανέτων" Δαρείος οὖν διελθὼν χρήματα μὲν οὐχ εὔφρα, γράμμασι δὲ ἓ(245")νέτυχεν φράζοντας οὕτως· "εἰ μὴ κακῶς ἡθοῦ ἄνηρ καὶ χρημάτων ἄπληστος, οὐκ ἂν νεκρὸν θῆκας εἴκοις."
[154.] Τίμων ὁ μισάνθρωπος ἔρωτησεις· "διατί πάντας ἀνθρώπους μισεῖς," ἔφη· "τοὺς μὲν ποιηροὺς εὐλόγος μισό, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς ἄν ὅ μισοῦσι τοὺς ποιηροὺς." Τίμων ἡ μέγιστα τῶν κακῶν ὁ πένητας ἐκκεφεῦγοις, ἐπιβουλήν, φθόνον καὶ μίσος, οὗ οἱ πλούσιοι καθ' ἡμέρας συνοικούσιν.
[155.] Τὸν τοῦ πλοῦσιον καὶ ἀσώτον χρήματα ταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν κρημνῶν σικάς ὁ Διογένης ἐκαζέν ἀφ᾽ ἀν ἀνθρώπος μὲν οὐ λαμβάνει κόρακες δὲ καὶ ἱκτινοί ἀστερά παρὰ τούτοις ἔταρκε καὶ κόλαξε.
[156.] Τοὺς μὲν κενοὺς ἀσκοῦς τὸ πνεῦμα διατείνει, τοὺς δὲ ἁνοίγος τὸ ὅμημα.
[157.] Τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι βοηθεῖν τοὺς φίλους ἀπορίας, τὸ δὲ μὴ βοῦλεσθαι κακίας τεκμηρίων.
[158.] Τῆς ἐνεπηρτησάντων τῶν φίλων θρηνεῖν μὲν οὐκ εὐγενές, προνοεῖν δὲ τῶν οἰκείων ἐπιμελεῖς.

33 εἰ cod.
34 Σύμων cod.; the sigma was added by a later hand.
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[160.] Τῇ γῇ δανείζειν κρείττον ἢ τοῖς βροτοῖς, ἢτις τόκους δίδωσι μὴ λυπουμένη.
[161.] Τῆς παιδείας ὁσπερ χρυσοῦ τὸ καλὸν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ τίμιον.
[162.] (246’) Τὸ σιωπᾶν οὐ μόνον ἄδιστον, ὡς φησίν Ἰπποκράτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλυποῦν καὶ ἄνδρονον.
[163.] Τήκεται μὲν σίδηρος πυρὶ, ὅ δὲ λογισμὸς ἔρωτι.
[164.] Τοὺς μὲν ψύχος δημοσίους μὲν ἐπαινεῖ, κατ’ ἱδίαν δὲ νοὐθετεῖ.
[165.] Τὸν ἀνθρώπον οἱ μὲν συνετοὶ πρὸ τῶν παθημάτων μινθάνουσι, οἱ δὲ ἀσύνετοι πάσχοντες διδάσκονται.
[166.] Υγιαῖνον νοσεῖ πᾶς περίγρος ὁ τὰ ἄλλοτρα πολυπραγμονών.
[167.] "Ὑβρίς καὶ οἶνος ἀποκαλύπτειν εἰώθασι φύλοι τὰ ἤθη τῶν φύλων.
[168.] Φύλοις ἀτυχόυσιν καὶ εὔτυχόυσιν ὁ αὐτὸς ἵσθι.
[169.] Φεύγειν δὲ κακῶν μὲν φυλίαν, τῶν δὲ ἁγαθῶν ἐξήθραν.
[170.] Φύλον μὴ ἀγάπα ἔνεκα χρείας· ἢ γὰρ τοιαύτῃ φυλίᾳ πρόσκαιρος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀβέβαιος.
[171.] Φρόνησις εὐτυχίαν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ χαρίζεται, τόχη δὲ φρόνησιν οὐ ποιεῖ.
[172.] Φιλαργυρία ἐστὶ πάθος αἰεὶ πενθομένων.
[173.] Φύλος ἀλήθης ὁ κοινονόν ἐν ταῖς συμφοραῖς τοῖς φύλοις.
[174.] Φεύγαμεν προάξει ἐσθόλος λόγου οὐκ ἀμαυρεῖ, οὔτε προάξει ἁγαθῆν λόγου βλασφημία λυμαίνεται.
[175.] Χρῆ τὸν υἱὸν δοῦλον εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς ἢ τὸν οἰκέτην· οὐ μὲν γὰρ φύσει τοῦ πατρὸς δοῦλος ἐστίν, οὐ δὲ νόμῳ.
[176.] Χρόσιππος ἔλεγεν· "τὸ (246’) σιγάν τὴν ἀλήθειαν χρυσὸν ἐστὶ θάπτειν."
[177.] Χρηστὸς ἀνθρωπος πονηρὸν πράγμα οὐ ποιεῖ.
[178.] Χῖλων ἐρωτηθείς, τί ἐστι διακόλοταιταν, ἔφη· "τὸ γινώσκειν ἐαυτόν."
[179.] Χαρίζου χάριτας ἄλλα μὴ ἀχαρίστους.
[180.] Χρυσὸν κηλιδοῦν καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ψέγειν ταύτην ἐστίν.
[181.] Χρῆ τοὺς εὐφρονοῦντας τὰ μὲν τῆς φυλίας ὑπομνήματα μηδέποτε διὰ μικρᾶς προφάσεως ἐξαλέφειν, τὰ δὲ τῆς ἐξήθρας σημεῖα κἂν ἢ μεγάλα τὴν ταχύτητάν τού ἀφρανίζειν.
[182.] Ψυχῆς μέγας χαλινός ἐστιν ο νοῦς.
[183.] Ψιθύραν καὶ διάβολον ἄνδρα μὴ προσδέχου· οὐ γὰρ ἔνεκεν εὐνοίας τούτο ποιεῖ· ὡς γὰρ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπορρήματα ἀπεκάλυψε σοί, οὔτος καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ σοῦ λεγόμενα ἑτέροις ἀναθέσει.
[184.] Ψείδως ἐν πρώτοις λεγέντων πλείονα πίστιν ἔχει παρὰ τὴν ἐν δευτέρῳ λόγῳ ἀλήθειαν ἐνδεικνυμένην.
[185.] Ψεύδος ὅταν θέλη πιστεύθηναι, εὰν μὴ πήξῃ θεμέλιον δοκούσης ἀληθείας, οὐ πιστεύεται.
[186.] Ψευδόμενος οὔδες λανθάνει χρονίσας.
[187.] Ὀσπερ θηνόν τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν ἐφυ, οὕτω προσήκειν μηδὲ τὴν ὄργην ἔχειν ἀθάνατον, ἄτοις σωφρονέοι ἐπίσταται.
[188.] Ὀσπερ τὴν μέλιτταν οὐ διὰ τὸ κέντρον μισεῖς, ἀλλὰ (247’) διὰ τὸν καρπὸν τοῦ μέλιτος φυλεῖς, οὕτω καὶ φύλον μὴ δι’ ἐπίπληξιν μισῆς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν εὐνοίαν ἁγάπα.
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[189.] Ὅσπερ οἱ ἐν εὐδόξῃ πλέοντες καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὸν χειμῶνα ἔχουσιν ἔτοιμα, οὕτως οἱ ἐν εὐτυχίᾳ φρονοῦντες τὰ πρὸς ἄτυχην ἦτοιμακασὶ βοηθῆματα.

[190.] Ὅσπερ ὁ κατώς ἐπιδιάκονος τὰς ὤψεις οὐκ ἐγὼ προβλέπειν τὸ κείμενον ἐν τοῖς ποισί, οὕτως ὁ θυμὸς ἐπεισερχόμενος τὸν λογισμὸν ἐπισκοπεῖ καὶ τὸ συμβουλέμουν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔτοπον οὐκ ἀφίησι τῇ διανοιᾳ προβλέπειν.

[191.] Ὅσπερ πλοία ὦθι οὐκ ἐν εὐδόξῃ πλεῖ γενναία εἰσίν, ἀλλ᾽ ὦθα πρὸς χειμώνα ἀντέχει καὶ σώζεται, οὕτω καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ ὄργη καὶ κινήσει ἀντέχοντες μεγαλόψυχοι καὶ ἀνδρείοι.

[192.] Μὲν τὰς δόξας ζηλοῖς,35 τούτον καὶ τὰς ἄγαθὰς πράξεις μιμοῦ.

[193.] Ὅς ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ ίου σιδήρος, οὕτω καὶ οἱ φθονεροὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱδίου Ἥθους κατεστίονται.

[194.] Ὅσπερ τοῖς νοσοῦσιν ἰατροὶ πατέρες, οὕτω καὶ τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις οἱ νόμιοι.

Text 49
A short chronicle, inc. Τῶν Τρῳκίδον ὥσπερ (f. 247v)

Τῶν Τρῳκίδον ὥσπερ γεγένηται Ὅμηρος ἔτεσιν ἐξήκοντα καὶ ὄκτων ἅφ᾽ οὖ δὲ Ὅμηρος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ εἰσίν χιβ᾽ μέχρι τῆς Σέρεξου διαβάσεως.

Text 53
Views on the soul, inc. Ἀς μὲν ἔχομεν δόξας (ff. 254r–256v)

Ἀς36 μὲν ἔχομεν δόξας περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτῆς ἐκτίθεμεν δόξη: τὴν μὲν οὖν οὐσίαν αὐτῆς μίαν εἰναι φαιμὲν ὡς μή εἶναι τρεῖς ἐν ἡμῖν ἀσυνδέτους ψυχὰς, τὴν μὲν φυτικήν, τὴν δὲ αἰσθητικήν, τὴν δὲ λογικήν. μίαν δὲ φάσκοντες οὐ σῶμα ταύτην φαμὲν οὐθὲ μὴν σωματικὴν τινα ποιήσατε, οὔτε τὸ τῶν ἔτερῳ τὸ εἰναι ἐχόντων, ἀλλ᾽ ὄντοτα αὐθυπόστατον δυναμένην καὶ χορῆς τοῦ σώματος ὑφεστάναι καὶ χην. ἀπλὴν οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ὑλῆς καὶ εἰδοὺς συντέθηται. ἀμερή ἀπόσος γὰρ ἐστιν. αὐτοξύνη οὐ γὰρ ἐπέρευθε λαμβάνει τὸ ζῆν, ὡσπερ τὸ σῶμα ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος αὐτῆς κατὰ τὴν ζωὴν οὐσίωτα. ἀναλοιαστὸν κατὰ τὰς σωματικὰς ἀλλοιωσίας, ἐπεὶ πρόσεστι γε ταύτῃ ἀλλοιώσεις ἑτέρα νοερά. ἀθάνατον ὅτι ζωῆς ἐστὶν αὐθυπόστατος εἰδὸς οὐσία37 τοῦ ὁργανικοῦ σώματος· μετὰ γὰρ τοῦ τοιοῦτο σώματος τὸ ἀνθρώπινον εἶδος ἀποτελεῖ. περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς οὐσίας αὐτῆς τοσαῦτα εἰρήσθω.

Αἱ δὲ δυνά(254r)μες κατοί μιᾶς οὐσίας πλεῖους εἰσὶ καὶ τοσοῦτον ἀλλὰς διαφέρουσας ὡς καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν συνδιαιρισθεῖαι ταύτας δοκεῖν. δὲ δὲ σε τὴν δύναμιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἀναφέρειν· δύναμιν γὰρ ἔχειν λέγεται τοῦ ἐνεργείαν τὸδε τι
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ι' πάσχειν. διαιροσθεί δέ τάς δυνάμεις ἄλλος μὲν ἄλλος πρὸς τήν ἐνεστώτατον χρείαν. ἡμείς δὲ τό γε νόν έχον οὕτω διέλομεν τῶν ψυχικῶν δυνάμεων· αἱ μὲν σοματικῶν ὠργάνων εἰσὶν ἐντελέχεια ήτοι τελείοτητης μὴ δυνάμεναι τήν οἰκείαν ἐνέργειαν ἀπότελεῖν, εἰ δὴ διὰ τοῦ σοματικοῦ καὶ οἰκείου ὀργάνου. ἔξονεν τοι καὶ βλαβέντος ἐνίοτε τοῦ ὀργάνου μένουσιν ἀνενέργητοι. αἱ δὲ χωρίς ὀργάνου περφύκασιν ἐνέργειαν, αἵτερ εἰς τής λογικῆς ζωῆς ὑδαί. αὕτε δὲ εἰς· γνωστική μὲν νοῦς, ὀρεκτικῇ δὲ θέλησις, εἴτε οὖν βούλησις.

Αἱ δὲ δὲ ὀργάνων, αἱ μὲν εἰς φυτικά, αἱ κἂν φυτοῖς παραπλησίως εὐρίσκονται. αἰ δὲ τῆς ἅλογου ψωψίς φυτικά μὲν οὖν εἰσὶν, ἢ τε θερητική καὶ αὐτητική καὶ ή τοῦ ὁμοίου γεννητική. 38 τῶν δ’ ἅλογων, (255’) αἱ μὲν γνωστικαί, αἱ δὲ ὀρεκτικαί, αἱ δὲ ὀρημικαί. γνωστικά μὲν, άσθησις τε. 39 καὶ φαντασία, δόξα καὶ μνήμη. καὶ οὕτως αἰσθητική, φανταστική, δοξαστική, μνημονευτική, ὀρεκτικῇ δὲ θυμὸς καὶ ἐπιθυμία, καὶ οὕτως θυμικόν καὶ ἐπιθυμικόν. ὀρημικαί δὲ ἢ τε τῶν μορίων τοῦ σώματος κινητική, καὶ ή ἀπὸ τόπου εἰς τόπον μεταβατική, καὶ ή ἀνάπνευστική καὶ ή φωνητική. τὰ μὲν οὖν φυτα τάς φυτικάς εἰρημένας ἦσει μόνας, τὰ δ’ ἅλογα ζῶα καὶ τάς φυτικάς ἦσει τῶν φυτῶν μᾶλλον, ἐτί δὲ καὶ τάς εἰρημένας τῆς ἅλογου ψωψίς. δεῖ δὲ τῇ αἰσθητικῇ διαιρέσιν εἰς ορασίν, άκοιν, ὀσφουσίν, γευσίν καὶ ἀρήν. ἢ δὲ λογικὴ ψυχή καὶ τὰς φυτικὰς ἦσει καὶ τὰς ἅλογους σφυροδότερον ἢ τὰ ἅλογα, ἐτί δὲ πλέον τάς λογικὰς εἰρημένας.

Ἐν μὲν οὖν σώματι οὖσα ψυχή θνητός κατά πάσας μὲν ἐνεργεῖ τάς δυνάμεις, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μὲν τὰς λογικὰς ἀμοδῶς, κατὰ δὲ τὰς ἅλογα σφυροδότερον. ἀποφοιτήσας δὲ τοῦ σώματος κατὰ μὲν τὰς ἅλογας τὰς (255’) δὲ ὀργάνων ἐνεργοῦσας οὐκ ἐνεργεῖ, κατὰ δὲ τὰς λογικὰς μόνον, ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτον τρανότερον καὶ σφυροδότερον ὡς δοκεῖν ἐνύπνιον εἶναι τὴν νόν ἐνεργείαν πρὸς τὰ ἄπαρ φαινόμενα, φημὶ δὲ τὴν κεχωρισμένην ἐνέργειαν. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ νοῦς γυμνὸς τοὺς πράγμασιν ὁμολόγων γνώσκει ταῦτα τρανός ἱκετα ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν ἀμαιρούμενος. ταῦτα τοι καὶ μακρότερον ὑπὸ καὶ κάλλιστον, 40 ἐνυπνίων ὁ Πλάτων ἐκέλευ τὴν τοιαύτην ᾗων ἐνεργοφτομένος γὰρ μᾶλλον νόν ἢ γνώσκομεν. σοφίας δὲ καὶ ἐπιστήμης εὑρείμεθα μὲν, ἀλλ’ ἀδυνατούμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς ἁλίς πάθους ἐμποδιζόμενοι. οἷς μὲν νοῦς οὕτω μετὰ θάνατον· θάνατος γὰρ ἀλήθες ἢ παρφούσα ᾗω, ζωῆς δ’ ἀληθός ἢ μετὰ θάνατον διαγωγὴ τοῖς μὴ διὰ κακίαν εἰρχησημόνεις. ή δὲ γε βούλεσις οὐκ ἀμβλύνεται την κατά τῇ ἀνθολοκτίνων ἅλογων ῥέξεων, ἀλλ’ ἐκ ἐστὶ συντεταμένη καὶ συνεπημένη τῷ νόσῳ οὕτω μὲν οὖν καὶ χωρίς σώματος ἐνεργείν ψυχή πέφυκε ᾗω, 41 ζωῆς ἁγίων καὶ ἀμέρμονα, ἀνώδυνων, τρανήν, σοφὴν, ἔλευθεραν καὶ παντός (256') βάρους ἀπηλαμβηνέν, 42 μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, ὦπεικα τῷ ἱδίῳ σώμα, ἢπερ πιστεομέον, ἀθεατόν ἀπολήγεται, ὡς ἂν εἶ ἐνέργους, οἴδε μὲν ἀκριβῶς ἢ καὶ πλάσας αὕτην καὶ συζεύξες φθορά καὶ αὕθες συνδόσασθε ἀθφάρτων πάσχει. εἰ δὲ καὶ σύ μαθαίν ἑρές, ὃ μὲν ἔρως ἐπαινετόν, εἰ δὲ μὴ κρούσεις οὐκ ἀνοίγησαι.
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"<Τ>διν περὶ ψυχῆς θεωρουμένων.

τὰ μὲν περὶ τὰ δὲ περὶ τῶν τὰ δὲ περὶ τῶν τὰ δὲ περὶ τῶν τὰ δὲ περὶ τὰ δὲ περὶ
οόσιας τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεων αὐτῆς ἐνεργείων αὐτῆς παθῶν ὀργάνων ἔξεσιν

"<Τ>διν ψυχικῶν δυνάμεων.

αἱ μὲν εἰσὶ φοιτικάι αἱ δὲ ζωτικὰ ζῶοια αἱ δὲ λογικάι

αἱ μὲν θεραπευκάι αἱ δὲ γεννητικάι

αἱ μὲν γυναῖκαι αἱ δὲ ὀρεκτικαί

οἵν νοῦς οἵν βούλησις

(f. 256")

"<Α>ί ζωτικὰ καὶ ζῶοια.

αἱ μὲν ζωτικαὶ, ὅ ἐστι τὸ σφυγμικὸν αἱ δὲ γυναῖκαι αἱ δὲ ὀρεκτικαὶ

αἱ δὲ καθ' ὀρμήν κινητικαὶ
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Text 57
On entelechy, inc. "Entelécheia (f. 278r–v)

'Entelécheia'\(^{43}\) προηγουμένως μέν ἡ τοῦ ἐντελοῦς ἔχεια λέγεται, ἦγουν ἡ κατὰ τὸ ἐντελεῖς ἔξις, ἢ τελειότης τοῦ πράγματος καθ’ ἢ τὸ ἐντελεῖς ἔχει τὸ πράγμα, καθ’ ἢ τὴν τέλειον ἐστὶν εἴδος τὸ πράγμα. διὸ καὶ ἀνθρωπὸς ἐντελέχεια, οὗ τὸ κατὰ μήτραν οἰκονομούμενον ἐμβρύον καὶ διοργανόμενον καὶ τελεσιουργούμενον ἐτί, ἀλλ’ ἐκείνος ἐντελέχεια.\(^{44}\) ἐστὶν ἀνθρωπὸς ὁ ἀποτελθεὶς καὶ ἀποτελθεὶς ὡς κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρωπεῖον εἴδος τελειωθεὶς. θεὲν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐντελέχειαν ὄριζονται τοῦ φυσικοῦ καὶ ὄργανου καὶ δυνάμει ψυχὴν ἔχοντο σῶματος, οὐχ ὃτι\(^{45}\) ἐνέργεια ἐστὶν (278\(^{v}\)) ἡ ψυχή, ἀλλ’ ὅτι κατ’ ἐκείνην ἡ τελειότης αὐτὸ. καλεῖται δ’ ἐντελέχεια καὶ ἡ τοῦ τελείου ἐνέργεια, ταύτων δ’ εἰπεῖν ἢ τελεία ἐνέργεια τῶν γὰρ τελείων καὶ αἱ ἐνέργειαι τέλειαι, ἀσπερ τὸν ἀτελέον ἀτελεῖς. ἐντελέχεια δὲ λέγεται ἡ τελεία ἐνέργεια, ὡς τὸ ἐντελεῖς ἔχουσα καὶ αὐτὴ καὶ ὡς ἐντελεστικὴ τῆς ἔχειας, ἦγουν τελειωτικὴ τῆς ἔχειως καταρχησικῶς δὲ καὶ ἀπλῶς λέγεται ἐνέργεια ἡ ἐντελέχεια καθ’ ὅσον ἐκαστὸν ἐνεργοῦν ἀποδίδοσι τὰς οἰκείας ἐνεργείας κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν, εἶτε τελεία ἡ φύσις εἶτε ἀτελείς κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ σημαινόμενον. καὶ ἡ κίνησις ἐντελέχεια λέγεται, ἦγουν ἀπλῶς ἐνέργεια.

Text 60
Pythagorean categories, inc. "Ετι συστοιχίας (f. 279r–v)

<̴E>τι συστοιχίας τινὰς ἐξεύρων οἱ πυθαγόρωι δέκα τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ως ἡ ψυχή πάντα τὰ ὄντα ως εἰς δέκα ἀρχάς ἀγαθόν καὶ πέρας ἄπειρον, περίττον ἄρτιον, <E>n – <n>λήθος. (279\(^{v}\)) <d>eζίον\(^{46}\) – ἀριστερόν, <φ>δς\(^{47}\) – σκότος, <α>ρρεν – <θ>ήλυ, <η>ρεμοῦν – <κ>νοοῦμεν, <ɛ>θύδο – <κ>αμπύλον, <τ>ετράγωνον – <e>τερόμηκες. καὶ

\(^{43}\) ‘Entelécheia’ \(\text{εντελέχεια} \) μὲν cod.
\(^{44}\) ‘Entelécheia’ \(\text{ἐντελέχει} \) cod.
\(^{45}\) οὐχ ὃτι \(\text{ὡς supra ὃτι cod.} \)
\(^{46}\) <d>eζίον \(\text{λεξίον cod.} \)
\(^{47}\) <φ>δς \(\text{άος cod.} \)

Text 61

&lt;Τ&gt;οἱ αὐτοί γλῶσσαι καταπόλεις, αὐτοὶ καλοῦνται γλώσσημα (ff. 279v–280v)


&lt;Α&gt;ἰολέων· αἰχμῆ: λόγχη. γόος: κλαυθμός. δόμα: οίκος. κεκρυφάλεον: ἄριστερόν.

&lt;Α&gt;καρνάνων· ἐνέπει: λέγει. στίχη: περέπου. κήρ: ψυχή.


&lt;Β&gt;οιωτόν· ἀγορεύει· (f. 280′) λέγει. ἀγεία· ἰσχυραί. αἰαία: μούρα. κτόπος: ψόφος. μήλα: πρόβατα.

&lt;Α&gt;χαϊών· ἀεί(?) φῶνε. ἀτέρ: χώρις. ἄξω (= χάζω?) λαμβάνο.

&lt;Α&gt;μηβρακιοτόν· αἰθεταί: καίεται. βιός: τόξον. χαίτη: τρίχες.
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<Ἐ>ρμονέων·
ίσθην περεόν.
κνίσαν επίπλους.

<Θ>σοσαλών·
αίνας ταχέος.
ἀνευθύνει χορίς.
βρωτός ἀνθρώπος.
ἐκας πόρης.
καλπίς ὕδρα.
κίρκος ἑραξ.
κράτας κεφαλῆς.
λάτρεις δούλος.

<Κ>λειτορίων·
άηται ἁνεμοι.
αὐδὴν φωνή.
δεδορκε ὀργ.
ἔστιος νεκροὶ.
ἐσθολόν ἀγαθόν.
λευσεὶ ὀρα.
πάροιθεν ἔμπροσθεν.
χηλὸς (χήλος cod.) κιβωτός.
ὀκας ταχέος.
ὦλεναι βραχίονες, οἱ ἀγκάλαις.

<Τ>όνων·
κοῦρος παῖς.
νέκυς νεκρός.

<Κ>ρητών·
γόνυτος θήκη φαρέτρων (scr. γόρυτος; cf. Hsch. s.v., Etym.magn.
s.v. γωρύτος).
ἐλπιμαί ὀδύσαν.
ἔντεα ὑπα.
λᾶς λίθος.
μύχθος πόνος.
φώτες ἄνδρες.

Κυπρίων·
ἀλαδός ὁ τυφλός.

(280') <Κ>ορινθίων·
ἔτοιμον ἄληθες.
ἀλγες ὀδύνη.
ἀλογος γονή.
δέπας ποτήριον.

ἐμιρψεν ἔλαβεν.
ἡ βαϊών τὸ μικρὸν.
ἔξες κάθισον.

<Κ>ερκύρων·
κοπη λαβῇ ξίφους. (λαβῇ scripsi: λαλῇ cod.)
φαλανθός, φαλακρός.
φιγός ὀργ.
ἀγλαός καλός.

<Σ>ικελών·
κόρας κεφαλάς.
μέλαθρον οἰκία.
ναῖες οἰκεί.
φόρμιχ (μόρμιχ cod.) κιθάρα.

Φλισίων·
ἀμφοὶ ἀμφότεροι.
ἀντίκρον ἐναντίον.
θεράπες οἱ δοῦλοι.
μειῶν ἔλασσινον.
σάκος ἀστίς.
σκῆπτον βακτηρία.
φάρος ἵματιον.

<Λ>ἐξεις Ῥωμαίαι·
πούβλικος ὁ δημόσιος.
φαλκίδος ἡ τετάρτη μοῖρα.
ῥεποῦδιον διαζύγιον.
κωδίκελος ἐστὶν ἐλλιποὺς διαθήκης ἀναπλήρωσις.
τριβοῦνος ὁ τὰς διοικησεῖς τῶν ὀικημάτων ποιῶν.
σχολάριος ὁ προτοσπαθάριος.
πούβλικον τὸ δημόσιον ἔγκλημα.
ἐμαγκηπάτος ὁ αὐτεξοῦσιος.
μεταλλεῖται περιορίζεται.
ἡμοῦλα τὰ ἡμεῖς.
τῶν τόκων νατάλιον ἠγουν σιτηρίσσων βασιλικών.
φαμώσα τὰς γραφομένας φλυαρίας καὶ ῥίπτουμένας.
κατάτινων (sc) εἰς τοὺς κληρικοὺς.
ἄλλοστρος ἐπιφανής.
κομμωνιτάριον τὸ πρακτικὸν τὸ παρὰ τῆς συνόδου ἐκτεθέν.
σπορτατεύεται ἠγον ἐξορίζεται.
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Text 65b

A short chronicle: in the margin of f. 283\textsuperscript{v} three more sultans have been added to the list of Text 65a. The text was partly trimmed away.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ό ἕννατος ὁ σουλ} & | \\
\text{τα Παγιάζητη} & | \\
\text{δὲ ἐπήρε τὴ Μεθωκορωνί.} & | \\
\text{δέκατος υἱός του} & | \\
\text{ὁ Σελήμης δὲ εδουλεσε} & | \\
\text{Περσία καὶ Σι} & | \\
\text{ρια δῆν.} & | \\
\text{δέκατος πρώτος} & | \\
\text{υἱός του ὁ Σουλεημαν} & | \\
\text{σούλτανος δὲ ἐπηραὶ} & | \\
\text{τὴν Ροδὸ καὶ ἕαλοσι} & | \\
\text{καὶ τὴν Οὐγκρία το} & | \\
\text{α φ κ Ὁ ετος ἀπο χῦ} & | \\
\text{ἀγωντου κθ} & | \\
\text{... ὁ πολεμος}
\end{align*}
\]

Text 66

A geomantic treatise, inc. Τοῦ ῥαμπλίου ἢ μέθοδος (ff. 283\textsuperscript{v}–285\textsuperscript{v})
For this text, see Chapter 5.

Text 81

A formulary, inc. τὸ πάπα | Papae | τῷ ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ, etc. (ff. 320\textsuperscript{r}–323\textsuperscript{r})
For this text, see Chapter 5.
Appendix 2: Codicological table
**Codex Upsaliensis Graecus 8**, (olim Sparwenfeldt 49, olim Escorialensis A. VI. 16)
A composite with miscellaneous contents.
Paper, ff. iii + 342 + iii', 135 x 90 mm, Crete? ca. 1480.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex unit</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Quesirs</th>
<th>Watermarks</th>
<th>Boundary Criteria</th>
<th>Textual types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U1</td>
<td>1. Pinax 1 (Τάδε ἔνεστιν ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ.)</td>
<td>I–IIr</td>
<td>Q1: binion where the first leaf has been cut out</td>
<td>no wm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Added in El Escorial, circa 1576.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pinax 2 (prior El Escorial pinax, discarded)</td>
<td>IIv–IIIr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2</td>
<td>3. Stephanites and Ichnelates</td>
<td>1r–86v</td>
<td>Q2: [1–6] ternion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inc. &lt;Λ&gt;νακοφαλαίας τῆς παροδίας πραγματείας Expl. ἐλεμονάσθαι τε καὶ ἐλεγχθῆσθαι, ἀμήν.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3: [7–12, 12a–12b] 1 ternion + 2 leaves glued together and attached to the ternion</td>
<td>Oxhead</td>
<td>A B C J K L M O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The most recent edition of this work is SJÖBERG 1962 (on Symeon Seth’s version, recension A). The text in Gr 8 belongs to recension B, for which we still rely on Puntoni’s edition, PUNTONI 1889. Gr 8 was used for Aurivillius’ edition of the prolegomena, Prolegomena ad librum 1780.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q4–11: [13–75] 8 quaternions (number 34 used for two ff.: 34+34a)</td>
<td>Oxhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q12: [76–83] quaternion; the coarser paper quality matches the following binion</td>
<td>Oxhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q13: [84–87] binion</td>
<td>no wm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Later notes</td>
<td>87r–v</td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A petition draft concerning a land dispute, dated Sept. 10, 1546. Notes on a bishop’s benediction of land, dated Dec. 9, 1546. A doxology, followed by pen trials at the bottom of the page.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3</td>
<td>5. Isocrates, Oration 1 (Λόγος Ἰσοκράτους πρὸς Δημόνικον)</td>
<td>88–98r</td>
<td>Q14: [88–95] quaternion</td>
<td>Scissors</td>
<td>A B C E F G J L M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U4</td>
<td>11a–b. Paul of Aegina, Medical Compendium (Παύλου Αἰγίνητος τὸ περιοδόπιον περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς τροφαῖς δυνήμεων)</td>
<td>104–122v</td>
<td>Q16: [104–111] quaternion</td>
<td>Scissors</td>
<td>Prac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. &lt;Aetius of Amida, Sixteen Books on Medicine XV, 15, 693–704&gt; (a formula)</td>
<td>127r–v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inc. Κυκλόμον βασταζόμενον. Expl. ἀποκλήν καὶ αὐτῷ ποιεῖ. See Appendix 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. *John Philoponos, Commentary in Aristotle’s De Anima* excerpts

Ed. Hayduck 1897. *References within brackets are to the corresponding pages and lines in Hayduck’s edition:*


c. (f. 132’ II, 3–8) Inc. πῶς δὲ ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ χρόνῳ. Expl. τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἀκόμη [13, 7–12].


e. (f. 132’ II, 10–14) Inc. εἰ οὖν σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ χρόνῳ. Expl. καὶ τοῦτο τοῦτο σῶμα ἀσώματος [13, 14–17].


g. (f. 133’ I, 6–133’ I, 12) Inc. δεῖ θεῖ τοῦ ἐνεργείον. Expl. προέρχεσθαι καὶ ἑαυτῆς χρηστικῆς [15, 15–34].

h. (f. 133’ II, 12–17) Inc. ὅταν οὖν σκοπεῖ τοῖς νοητοῖς. Expl. γνώσῃ γνωστικὴ σῶματος ἀδήμων ἑστὶν [16, 5–12].

i. (ff. 133’ I, 17–134’ I, 9) Inc. εἰ δὲ ὁδὸς καὶ ἀθάνατος, ὅταν πάνθε θείρθει. Expl. κατ’ οὖν ἅπασα ἀρὰ τρόπων φθειρέται [46, 28–34].

18. *Anonymous, On the three states in life* (Περὶ τὰς τρεῖς ἀποκαταστάσεις τοῦ βίου)

Inc. Τρεῖς ἀποκαταστάσεις τοῦ βίου. Expl. δυνάταις τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. See Appendix 1.

19. *Anonymous, On the three stages of spiritual life*

134r–137r Q20: [136–143] quaternion Scissors PhTh


22. The Seven Wonders


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Libanius</td>
<td>Declamation 26</td>
<td>Speech against Hermias (Ἄρωμα εἰς τὸν Ἰεραπόντην Ἡρμιανον) Ed. FOERSTER 1911, VI, 494–544.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>John Chrysostom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sermon without a title (Ὁ ἄρωμα τῶν ἀθρόων) Inc. CPG 4878; see the edition, p. 186.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Marc Eugenikos</td>
<td>Thoughts</td>
<td>(Ὅσα τοι γνώριζε τὸν Μάρκον Ἐγενικόν) Inc. CPG 8111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Marc Eugenikos</td>
<td>Analogies</td>
<td>(Ὅσα τοι γνώριζε τὸν Μάρκον Ἐγενικόν) Inc. CPG 8111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Hymn to the Theotokos</td>
<td>(Ὅσα τοι γνώριζε τὸν Μάρκον Ἐγενικόν) Inc. CPG 8111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>John of Damascus</td>
<td>On virtues and vices</td>
<td>Excerpt (Ὁ ὄρθος τῶν θεόρων ἢρωδος ἡ δοκεί) PG 95, 92D–93B, CPG 8111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Sayings by Maximus, Demosthenes, et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ὅσα τοι γνώριζε τὸν Μάρκον Ἐγενικόν) Inc. CPG 8111.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inc. Τοῦ ἀγίου Μαζίμου περὶ τῶν τριῶν μερῶν τῆς ψυχῆς.  
Expl. ὑποτάσσεσθαι εἰς ἄ δεί. See Appendix 1.

(a. Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Πελούσιου ἐπιστολῆ.  
b. τοῦ αὐτοῦ)  
a. Inc. Άκουσι εἰς σκληροῖς. b. Inc. Τόν μάχης χαίροντα.  
PG 78, 401 and 292f.

37. Three short sayings.  
Tύχης γάρ μὴ παραγός, δυστυχοῦσιν αἱ φρέναι.  
Μνήμη θανάτου χρησιμεύει τῶν βίων.  
Ὅρος φιλοσοφίας μελέτη θανάτου.

38. A gnomology derived from Constantine Manasses’ Synopsis Chronike.  
Inc. Όθεις όοθέν τῆς ἀπαθούς. Expl. ἵσχυς σου διαφεύγει.  
See Appendix 1. Cf. LAMPSIDES 1996.

39. An owner’s note? A name: δῆμος πεταλίας φρυσαλησίτις and the phrase αρχή πιστεύο μου η εἰκ... σταυρος can be seen.  
Cf. No. 87, below.

U7 40. George Gemistos Plethon, Reply to the Treatise in Support of the Latin Doctrine  
Inc. Τὸ ὑπὲρ Λατίνου βιβλίων. Expl. τὰ κρατήστα ἤμων  
βουλευομένους ἔλεγεν.  
PG 160, 975–980.

41. Mark Eugenikos, On the filioque doctrine (no author or title given by main scribe; Μαρκοῦ δ ἡφαίσθεν ἰδιοφασία του  
πατριαρχοῦ added by a later hand)  
Inc. Ἐκχορούται μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. Expl. τὸ μὲν γεννητός,  
τὸ δὲ ἐκχορούτως. See Appendix 1.

U8 42. <John Tzetzes, Book of Histories> excerpts  
b. (f. 208’ I. 18–208’ I. 9) Chil. X, hist. 316, 167–177  
e. (ff. 209’ I. 6–210’ I. 2) Chil. II, hist. 34, 65 and 68–105

See Appendix 1. Cf. No. 87, below.
|    | 44. The Decalogue | 232r |  |  | PhTh |  |
|    | Cf. LXX, Deut. 6:5; Exod. 20. |  |  |  | Prac |  |
|    | 45. Lists of kings (Jewish patriarchs and kings; Chaldean, Persian, and Assyrian kings; Egyptian kings; Roman emperors) Inc. Πρώτος Άβραάμ. Expl. Κόσμας ὁ τοῦ μεγάλου Κοσμοτινοῦ απώτηρ. Ἑνετέθιν οἱ τῶν Χριστιανῶν βασιλείς. | 232r–233v |  |  |  | Oxhead |
|    | 47. A short epigram Δὸς ἐν προσαβλῆται τίμα τοῖς ὑπὸ χέρα | 237v |  |  |  | Rhet/Prac |
|    | φῶνες ἐμποτῶν μέχρι καὶ λόγῳ μόνον |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | ἅπτῃ γὰρ παρέρχεται ταχὸ πηδώσα, ἃ μόνη |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | δὲ ἢ μὴν σος συμπαραμένει. |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | 50. A lexicon of synonyms Inc. Ἀλλατίζετε: ὑφάστατε τὴν φωνήν. Expl. ἀρά ἐν εἰμηρωσία. | 247v–253r |  |  |  | Prac |
|    | 51. Michael Choniates, *Elegy on Athens* (Στίχοι τοῦ συροφατοῦ μητροπολίτου Ἀθήνων κυρίῳ Χοιμᾶ, τοῦ Χοινίτου εἰς τῇ ἄρχητι χαιστορίσει πόλεως Ἀθηνῶν) | 253r–v |  |  |  | Rhet |

52. Anonymous, *Carmen Paraeneticum*, stanza 17
Inc. οἴδασιν οἱ φιλόσοφοι. Expl. τοῦ λόγου κινηθέντος.
Cf. Text 46, above.

U11 53. Anonymous, *Views on the soul*
Inc. Ἀς μὲν ἔχομεν δόξας περὶ ψυχῆς. Expl. ei δὲ μὴ κρούσης
οὐκ ἀνοιγήσαται. See Appendix 1.

54. Two short sayings
Μνήμη θανάτου χρησιμεύει τῷ βίῳ.
Ὅρος φιλοσοφίας: ἢ τοῦ θανάτου μελέτη.
Cf. Text 37, above.

Inc. Πόθος μὲν ἐμοὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς. Expl. ἡμέρας ἐκείνης φοτι
διαλυθήσεται.

U12 56. *Theodoret of Kyrros, Cure of the Pagan Maladies>*
Four longer excerpts: Thdt, *Affect* 4.5–16; 4.32–42; 5.8–52; and

57. Anonymous, *On entelechy*
Inc. Ἑνικλέιχες μὲν προηγομένως. Expl. ἤγγους ἀπελῶς
ἐνέργεια. See Appendix 1.

58a–b. Two epigrams, *AP IX* 359–360
b. <Metrodoros> (τοῦ αὐτοῦ), *AP IX* 360. Inc. Παντοτίνην
βιόσκο τόμβης.
Ed. Beckby 1968.

59. Sayings of the Seven Sages (heading in a later hand: η
λόγη τιν κυρρον άρτρον)
Inc. <Β> ἢς ὤς Πραγμάτως οἱ πλεονες κακοί. Expl. <<_> ὸς
τέρμα βιόστοι.
Cf. Tziatzis-Papagianni 1994, 444.

60. Anonymous, *Pythagorean categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59. Sayings of the Seven Sages</td>
<td>279r</td>
<td>Q38: [278–285] quaternion</td>
<td>Oxhead</td>
<td>PhTh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inc. "Επιστολή των τυπίδων ἑξισθρίων. Εξηλ. ῥώμης, τραπεζίων, ῥύκλας. See Appendix 1. Similar enumerations of opposites are found in many works and commentaries in the Aristotelian tradition. Cf. also Arist. Metaph. 986a, 23–26; Hero, Geom. 3, 18–22.

61. A dialectal lexicon (οία γλάνωσα καταπόλεμες, αὐτὰ καλούνται γλασσοστήματα) 279v–280v
Inc. θηματίων ἄγεν ἆλαν. Εξηλ. σπορτατευτέα ἦσαν ἔξορίζεται. See Appendix 1.

62. Lists of patriarchates, sees etc. (heading in a later hand: τα πατριαρχεῖα ὅλα καὶ οἱ μητροπόλεις καὶ οἱ ἀρχιεπισκόποι) 281r–282v
Inc. Παπαῦ Ρώμη, Νέα Ρώμη. Εξηλ. καὶ Σιλεύκεια Σαλαμίας. For similar lists, see DARROUZES 1981.

63. List of inventors (heading in a later hand: η τέχνες τον σωφον αναρμ) 283r
Inc. Ζεῦς ἐξέβρε πλευστήριν. Εξηλ. Τυρσανοὶ τυρεῖα πάλι.

64. A short chronicle from Adam to Justinian 283v
Inc. Ἐστιν απὸ Ἀδὰμ ὡς τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ. Εξηλ. τοῦ μεγάλου Ἱούσπινανοῦ ἔτη σκῆ.

65a. Lists of Palaiologan emperors and sultans 283v
Inc. Πρὸς τοῦ Παλαιολόγου Μυχήλ. Εξηλ. δὲ διανύθη ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀγαρμίνων.

65b. A short chronicle (marginal note in a later hand) 283v
Inc. ὁ ἐναντίος ὁ οὐκ ἤταν Περίτητης. Εξηλ. τὸ αφετέρου τοῦ ἐνεργοῦ καὶ τοῦ πόλεμος. See Appendix 1.

Inc. Τοὺς ραμπλέους καὶ μέθοδος, Εξηλ. ταυτόν δὲ καὶ περὶ γυμνακῶν. See the edition, p. 218.
69. Gregory of Nazianzos Ep. 236 (Ἀλβανίῳ Γρηγόριος) 297r
Inc. Πατήρ πατρί πέσωμε παίδας
CPG 3032, Ed. GALLAY 1967.

70. Basil the Great, Epp. 330, 332, 186 and 187 297r–v

Ed. PELLETIER 1980.


73. <Leo VI, Canticum compunctionis> 302r–303v

74. <Constantine Sikeliotis, An anacreontic poem> 303v–305r
Inc. Ἀρτὸς μουσικῶν μελήθησαν. Expl. ὡς Δημοφόδους νόστοι ἄλληξαν.
Ed. MONACO 1951; MATRANGA 1850, II, 689–692.

75. Pen trials and an owner’s note. 305v–307v
Cf. p. 101, above.

76. Three Psalms, in Latin and supralinear Greek a. Ps. 32 (LXX, Ps. 31) Beati quorum remissae sunt / Μακάριοι ὁι ἀφεθήσασιν αἱ ἀνομία. 308r–314v
Q42: [308–315] quaternion minus 6th and 7th leaf Oxhead
b. Ps. 38 (LXX, Ps. 37) Domine ne in furore tuo / Κύριε, μή 308r–314v
PhTh
77. <Ausonius, De institutione viri boni>
Ed. CLAUSEN 1966; PRETE 1978 (under the title: *XVI De viro bono* *Πολιτική Άκρωτας*).

78. Later note
Inc. *...mēn γέν καὶ τραφν (sic)*. Cf. p. 105, above.

79. Liturgical texts, in Latin and supralinear Greek
c. *Credo in unum Deum* / Πιστεύω εἰς ἕνα θεόν.

80. A psalm, in Latin and supralinear Greek
*Ps. 6 Domine ne in furore tuo* / Κύριε, μὴ τῷ θυμῷ.

81. A formulary, in Latin and supralinear Greek

82. Later notes (alphabets)
83. An arithmetic problem (incomplete; added by a later hand) Inc. eiēn μέλιοι τρεῖς. Expl. *...εἰς μόδια ιη'...* εἰς μοι
Cf. p. 107, above.

84. Mathematical problems, part one
Inc. εἶτα πολλαπλασίασον τὰ 9 μετὰ τῶν 10. Expl. εὐρεις ἁπαλῶς τὴν ζημίαν ἐν ἕκαστῳ.
Ed. SEARBY 2003b.

85. Later notes
Pen trials; an indecent(?) microtext; a proverb on friendship.
Cf. p. 107, above.

86. Mathematical problems, part two
Inc. εἰ θελεῖς μαθεῖν νὰ ὁμαδάσεις. Expl. εἰ μὲν ἔξημει ἐπτὰ ἀκέραια ἕνα ἀληθεύς.
Ed. SEARBY 2003b.

87. A note
Ἀρχὴ πιστεος μου η εικος σταιρος (cf. No. 39, above).

---

315r–v  Rhet/
315v  Prac?
316r–318r  Q43: [316–323] quaternion
316v–318r  Oxhead  PhTh
318v–319r  PhTh
320r–323r  (Prac)/spec
323r–v  A B F J L O
324r–328r  Q44: [324–331] quaternion
324v  traces of wm on 324 and 331 (hat?)
328r–329r  A B F J L O
329v–331r  Prac
331v  Prac
| U17 | **88a–b. Life of Aesop and Aesopian Fables**  
|     | a. "*Vita III*" (Ed. EBERHARD 1872, 309ff.; Cf. PERRY 1952, 212f., "Testimonium 1a").  
|     | b. 59 fables (numbered according to HAUSRATH & HUNGER):  
|     | *Fab.* 1 (first half), inc. Ἀετός καὶ ἀλώπης, expl. θυσίων δὲ τινῶν.  
|     | *Vita W*, 93–100, inc. ὁμος συνείδου, expl. ἀναγινωσκομένους κατελέπτο.  
|     | *Fab.* 1 (second half), inc. ἀετὸς καταπτάς, expl. τιμωρίαν οὐ διαφεύγονται.  
|     | *Fab.* (HAUSRATH & HUNGER) 2–4; 9–10; 16–20; 22–23; 27; 284; 283; (PERRY) 275; (HAUSRATH & HUNGER) 42; 29; 24; 11; 21; 28; 12–13; 44; 43; 45; 47; 49–50; 60; 57; 52–53; 58; 64; 66–67; 69; 239; 270; 184; 81; 76; 208; 100; 103; 289; 285; 115; A1; 116–117; 120; 126; 288; 146–147. The last fable (inc. λέον γηράσας) is truncated, expl. χάριν σύλλα[μβάνων etc.].  
|     | Ed. HAUSRATH & HUNGER 1956 and 1970; PERRY 1952. | 332v–336v | Q45: [332–336] ternion where the last leaf has been cut out | traces of wm on 332 and 334 | Narr/ (Prac) |
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*Thoughts* 162f., 274
Eugenius IV, Pope 246, 249, 251, 254
Eugenios of Palermo 123
Euripides 39, 170, 213, 256
Eustathios of Thessalonike 146
*exaposteilarión* 66, 136, 166
fable 77, 81, 108f., 111, 120–127, 131, 134, 151, 168
Ferrara, *see also* Council 251f., 256, 259
fiction 119–127, 177
  fictitious biography 124, 139
  fictitious letters 126, 139f., 144–146, 174
file: *see* codicological unit
Filelfo, Francesco 149
*filioque*, doctrine of 67, 89, 161, 177, 235
Florence, *see also* Council and Bruni, Leonardo 96, 128, 257
florilegium (cf. gnomology) 46, 68f., 94, 136f., 168–170, 277, 282–290
Fondi 252, 259, 262
formulary 238–262
Gazes, Theodore 148f., 238, 249, 252
*Gebrauchsliteratur* 138, 168
*Gelehrtenkodex* (scholar’s miscellany) 35
Gennadios II: *see* George Scholarios
geomancy 97, 176, 212–237
  *Feng Shui* 228, 232
  geomantic chart 212, 224f., 218f., 227, 232
  geomantic houses 97, 220–227
  *Pa Kua* 235
George Gemistos: *see* Plethon
George Scholarios 67, 124, 128, 147, 152, 154, 156, 160f., 163, 185, 230, 235
Genoa 54
Glykas, Michael 57, 209f.
gnomology, *see also* florilegium 137, 164, 168, 170
  derived from Constantine Manasses’ *Synopsis Chronike* 87, 135, 170f., 277–280
Gorgias 145
Gregoras, Nikephoros 133
*Historia Rhomaike* 134
  *Letter to the Grand Logothete* 69, 98, 111, 133f., 141, 147, 150f.
Gregory of Nazianzos 138, 141, 151, 206, 261
  *Carm. mor. I. 2, 9* 95, 134, 164
  *Epistles* 66, 80f., 98, 125f., 140, 150f.
Gregory of Nyssa 142, 206
Gregory Thaumaturgos, *Treatise on the Soul* 67, 85, 151, 156f.
Guzman de Silva, Diego 23

*Hausbuch* 47
hemerology (cf. geomancy) 223, 229–231
Heptanesa (Ionian Islands) 102
Herodotos 127, 139f., 146
Hesiod, *Works and Days* 189, 230
hesychasm 133, 162
Hippocrates 188, 192, 195, 200, 255
  *Epistles* 66, 80, 126, 139, 150
  *On the Number Seven* 175
*histoire de mentalités* 168
historiography (*see also* chronicle, short; Manasses, Constantine) 67, 91, 120, 126–130, 133, 170
Hrabanus Maurus 207
Hurtado de Mendoza, Diego 56
*Hymn to the Theotokos* 68, 87, 135, 165
  Ibn al-ʿArabī 216
  Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ 122
  Ibn Khalduʿn 212
*inedita* in *Gr 8*: 18, 25, 186f., 218–223, 242–245, 265–296
Isidore of Kiev 35
Isidore of Pelousion 87, 143f., 150f., 205f., 209f., 261
Isidore of Seville 207
Isocrates 131
  *Oration 1 (To Demonicus)* 66, 80f., 111, 131, 137, 151, 167
John Chrysostom
  *Due to the lack of self control* 183, 184–211
Index

Speech against Herodias 67, 87, 132
John of Damascus 87, 164, 185, 265
John Lachanas 146
John Philoponos, Commentary in Aristotle’s De Anima 155–159
Joseph II, Patriarch 128, 162
Josephus 190f.
The Jewish War 69, 98, 111, 127f., 132, 141

Kalila wa-Dimna: see Stephanites and Ichnelates
Kallistos, Andronikos 67, 133, 148f., 185
Kamariotes, Matthew 133, 154
Kananos, John 236f.
Kantakouzenos, John 133
Karl XI of Sweden 22
Korydalleus, Theophilos 140, 239
Kyzikos 56f., 104

Lactantius 203f.
layout: see mise-en-page
Leo VI (Leo the Wise), Emperor 69, 100, 136, 163
Leonello d’Este, Marquis of Ferrara 244, 251f., 259f.
leprosy 187–211
leprosaria 206
letter headings: see formulary
lexica
botanical 82, 173, 267–272
dialectal 97, 173, 296f.
of synonyms 68, 94, 173
Libanios 133, 262
Declamation 6 80
Declamation 26 67, 87, 131f., 185
Epistles 98, 111, 131, 140–143, 150f., 238
lists 39, 120, 172
inventors 97
Palaiologan emperors and sultans 97, 112, 172
patriarchs and kings 93, 111, 172
patriarchates and bishoprics 97, 124
Seven Wonders 85, 96, 120, 172
Seven Sages 111, 140, 156, 170
literacy 102
literary communities 53
liturgical texts 44, 103, 166
Lotario dei Segni (Innocent III) 207
Loukaris, Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria and Constantinople 161
Ludovico I, Duke of Savoy 250f., 258
Lushnja, Albania 253
Lusignan, house of 251, 253

magic (see also geomancy) 193f., 199, 213f.
Manasses, Constantine, Synopsis Chronike 87, 135, 170, 184
gnomology derived from 277–280
Manuel II Palaiologos, Emperor 147, 256, 261
manuscripts
Bonon. gr. 3632: 215f.
Bruxell. 11270: 133, 260
Harl. 5596: 235
Monac. gr. 490: 139
Oxf. Barocc. 131: 34–36, 136, 175
Par. gr. 2077: 133
Par. gr. 2097: 53
Par. gr. 2424: 216f., 220, 229
Par. gr. 2491: 216, 219
Par. gr. 2938: 53, 70
Par. gr. 2991A: 24, 110–112, 145
Scorial. Φ. II. 14: 233
Scorial. Ψ.IV.1: 240f., 260–262
Sinait. gr. 1677: 57f.
Vat. gr. 867: 239
Vat. gr. 914: 35
Vat. gr. 1353: 139
Vindob. Suppl. gr. 75: 47
Margounios, Maximos 58
mathematics 39, 57, 69, 106–108, 152, 175, 217
Matheolo of Perugia 244, 255f., 259
Maurice, Emperor 144
Mehmet II 128, 172
medicine (see also Aëtios; menstruation; menstrual intercourse; Paul of Aegina) 82, 123, 139, 152,
Index

174f., 191–200, 215, 230f., 244, 255
contraceptive and abortive 82, 175
formula 82, 175
humoral pathology 188, 191f.
medico-botanical lexicon: see botany
Meleagros 39
menstruation
and blindness 186–188, 198–203, 208f.
and cancer 186f., 195, 198, 208
and leprosy 184–211
menstrual intercourse 184–211
menstrual taboo 189
and monstrosities 192–194, 201, 207
Metaxas, Nikodemos 161, 239
Metochites, Theodore 69, 133f., 141
Methone 58
Metrodoros, AP IX 360: 97f., 135
miscellaneity 44–47
miscellany
author’s 45
disorganic 46f.
homogenetic 44
miscellaneous codex 32–37, 40–48 and passim
organized/organic 46, 61
recueil factice (see also binding accident) 46, 110
recueil organisé 46
mise-en-page 43, 60 and passim
calculation of 99f.
mise-en-recueil 35, 110
monastery, see also El Escorial
of Cetatuia 161
St. Anastasia Pharmakolytria, Chalkidiki 111
St. Catherine, Candia 58
St. Catherine, Sinai 57f., 248
Grottaferrata 122, 248
St. Maria del Patire 242, 247, 262
Montecassino 243, 248, 252, 258
monograph 17, 28f., 41, 47
Morea 249, 253
multitext books 22, 26, 31–37, 38–48
and passim
Naples 148, 248–260
narrative texts (see also fable; saying;
Stephanites and Ichnelates) 111, 118–130, 177
historical narrative 120, 126–130, 133–135, 237
minor narratives 120, 124, 126, 129, 134, 167–171
narrativity 81, 120
narreme 120
Nauplion 58
Negroponte 149
New Historicism 30
Nicaea 34f., 205, 239, 246
Nicolò of Otranto 234
Nicholas V, Pope 246
Nicholas of Cusa 247, 260
Notaras, Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem 161
novel 32, 38, 120, 124, 126f., 135, 170
epistolary novel 81, 126, 139f.
offices
ecclesiastical 242–248
secular 243–259
Onorato II, Count of Fondi 244, 252, 259
oratory 131–134, 255
Origen 157, 190
owner of book 23f., 36, 47, 51, 58, 70, 78, 161
owner’s notice 87, 91, 100–102, 106, 215
Padua 56, 193, 244, 254f., 257, 259
page filler 67–69, 80f., 85, 93, 96, 98, 110, 137, 166f., 171, 175
paleography 35f., 39, 42, 53f., 247, 251
Palaiologan period 31, 35, 120, 171f., 214f., 237f., 253
papyri (cf. writing material) 139, 200
P. BM Kahun XVII.3: 230
P. Sallier IV (BM 10184): 230
Index

P. Cairo inv. 65445; Pack 2 2642: 39
Paul of Aegina, Medical compendium 64, 82, 173
pen trials 55, 71, 79, 87, 100, 102f., 106f.
Pergamon 39
Perugia 244, 255f., 259
Philes, Manuel, Carmina 101f.
Philip II of Spain 23f., 56
philology 27, 36, 40, 112
New Philology 28f.
Philomela, story of 125f.
philosophy (cf. Aristotle; Avicenna; Gregory Thaumatourgos; John Philoponos; Pletho; Psellos; Theodoret of Kyros) 34, 85, 96f., 119, 123, 142, 151–165, 171, 177, 185, 200, 207f., 212, 217, 221, 251, 247, 255
physiognomy 231f.
pinax 55f. 62–69
Pius II, Pope (Enea Silvio Piccolomini) 150
Pizolpasso, Francesco 246f., 258–260
Plato 35, 38, 40, 127, 147f., 152–154, 156f., 159–161, 217, 247
Pletho, George Gemistos 67, 87, 90, 128f., 131, 147–152, 154, 156, 160f.,
On the differences 160
On virtues 67, 147, 160, 164
Reply to George Scholarios’ Defense of Aristotle 67, 124, 149,
156, 160
Reply to the Treatise in Support of the Latin Doctrine 67, 89f., 161f.
Pliny 191–195, 201f., 206f., 210
Plutarch 39, 135, 146, 153, 210, 217
poetry (see also epigram) 39, 127f., 133–137, 144, 153, 165, 255
anacreontic 100, 136
political verse 127, 135f., 146, 165, 167
Posidippus of Pella, AP IX 359: 97f., 135
prayer 68, 104, 141, 158, 165f., 238
prayer formula, scribal 61, 85, 93, 106, 161
predestination 153f., 162–164, 212f.
prince’s mirror 81, 122, 140, 177
printing 25–27, 31, 161, 238
progymnasmata 120, 131, 134
Proklos 140, 229, 238
provenance of Gr 8 22–25, 51–59, 110–112
Psellos, Michael 34f.
psychogram 36, 263
Pythagorean 153f.
categories 156, 293f.
(Neo-)pythagorean influence 160, 233
question-and-answer literature: see erotapokriseis
quire
boundary 43, 60, 104 and Chapter 3 passim
construction 44, 60f., 71–73, 76f., 93f.
signatures 43, 55, 60
ramplion: see geomancy
rapiaria 32
Raul, Emmanuel 261
readers 24f., 29, 33, 41, 45, 47, 117f., 120, 133, 135, 167f., 178, 194, 236, 260
readers’ notes 68, 82, 89, 91, 98, 102f., 105–108, 171f., 175, 178, 296
rhetoric (cf. oratory) 34, 38, 58, 67f., 118–121, 130–151, 172, 176f., 203, 251, 255
Rome 248–259
Roselli, Antonio 254f., 259
Sagundino, Nicholas 24, 56, 148–150
Letter to Andronikos Kallistos 67, 87, 124, 149f., 185
Salmān, librarian of Caliph al-Ma’mūn
Sammelband 45
Sammelhandschrift 34, 45
Savelli, Paolo 245, 256f., 259
sayings (see also gnomology, florilegium) 80f., 87, 94–96, 107, 136f., 167–171, 177, 277

Sagundino, Nicholas 24, 56, 148–150
Letter to Andronikos Kallistos 67, 87, 124, 149f., 185
Salmān, librarian of Caliph al-Ma’mūn
Sammelband 45
Sammelhandschrift 34, 45
Savelli, Paolo 245, 256f., 259
sayings (see also gnomology, florilegium) 80f., 87, 94–96, 107, 136f., 167–171, 177, 277
Index

Schedel, Hartmann 255f.
scribe (see also Torre, Nicholas de la and Theodoros Ky...kos)
co-scribe A 58, 80, 82–84
coscribe B 59, 103–105
scribal working method 35f., 43, 99f., 171, 177f.

scipitorium 51, 53, 248
Scutellius, Nicolaus 148
selenodromion (cf. hemerology) 222f., 229–231
Serojas, Juan de 23
Seven Sages, The 140
sayings of 111, 156, 170
Seven Wonders, The 85, 96, 120, 172
Sicily 124, 243, 247–249, 252f., 256
Simokates, Theophylact 144f.
Epistles 68, 93, 111f., 126f., 145, 150, 154
Sortes Astrampsychi 231
soul (see also Aristotle; entelecheia;
Gregory Thaumaturgos; Plato)
53, 152, 154–163, 171
faculties of 80, 154, 169
immortality of 154, 157–160
views on the 85, 95, 154, 290–293
Souliardos, Michael 53, 58, 149
Spain 23, 54–56, 213
Salamanca 56
Segovia 56, 62
Spaneas 136f.
Pseudo-Spaneas, see also Carmen Paraeneticum 137
Sparwenfeld, Johan Gabriel 22–24,
52, 55, 63
spiritual life, stages of 158f., 270–273
Stephanites and Ichnelates 66, 68–78, 81, 121–123, 125
recensions/versions 75, 123
stradioti 253f.
Symeon Seth 35, 77, 75, 122f., 214
Syropoulos, Sylvester 161
textual variance 28f., 74
Theodoret of Kyrros, Cure of the
Pagan Maladies 68, 97, 152–155, 162, 203, 212f.
Theodoros of Ky...kos, main scribe of Gr 8 (passim)
colophon of 24, 56f.
Titus, Emperor 66, 128
Torre, Nicholas de la 52, 55f., 62–69, 72, 89, 136, 161f.
Tusculum 242, 246, 260
Tzetzes, John 39, 67, 91f., 127, 135, 146, 150f., 168
Uppsala: see provenance of Gr 8
Valla, Lorenzo 247, 249
Venice 23f., 56, 256f.
virtue (see also Plethon, On Virtues)
87f., 134, 146, 158, 163f., 169, 171
Viterbo 148–150
watermark 43, 51–53, 58, 60, 172f., 260
anchor 89, 91–93, 112
balance 53, 70, 78
escutcheon 54
hat 106
oxhead 53, 70, 78, 91–95, 97, 100, 103, 110, 121
scissors 80, 82, 85, 87, 92
twin marks 52f., 70
writing material
parchment 23, 40, 43
paper 52–54 and Chapter 3 passim
papyrus 38–40
zibaldone 47
Zonaras, John 57, 173
zodiac (see also geomancy) 97, 218f., 226
zodiacal houses 222f., 226
zoroastrianism 160, 189f., 199, 233
Zygomalas, Theodosios 123