

RECENTIORES NON DETERIORES

by R. Browning

It has by now become a commonplace that readings first appearing in later Byzantine manuscripts may be not the interpolations of pedants but genuine tradition, derived from early manuscripts accessible to the scholars of the last centuries of the Byzantine empire. Pasquali¹ recognizes that a text may be transcribed from uncials into minuscule more than once. A. Dain² cites a number of possible examples of such double transliteration. At the same time recent studies of the history of particular Greek texts have frequently underlined the importance of the work of Byzantine scholars of the generation flourishing around 1300 in unearthing and making use of old manuscripts, whether uncial or minuscule.

It may be of interest, both to classical scholars and to Byzantinists to attempt to sum up what we know of editorial activities of this particular kind on the part of late Byzantine scholars, and of the possibility of gaining access to genuine ancient tradition offered by the conditions in which they worked. In this connection two main types of evidence are relevant. The first is what is known about the accessibility of ancient, and in particular uncial, manuscripts in the late Byzantine period and the use made of them by scholars. The second is provided by the history of the texts of classical authors in the same period, in so far as it can be reconstructed from surviving manuscripts. Neither can be treated exhaustively or definitively. Much of the correspondence of later Byzantine men of letters, from which we can often learn a great deal about their literary interests and activities, remains unpublished. A particularly likely source of information of this kind is the correspondence of Gregory of Cyprus, Patriarch of Constantinople from 28 March 1283 to June 1289, from which Treu³ cited a number of interesting passages in his edition of the *Letters of Planudes*. A preliminary study of this correspondence made almost a quarter of a century ago has not yet been followed up by an edition.⁴ Another source from which evidence of the first kind can sometimes be derived is the study of subscriptions and ownership notes in manuscripts. Much remains to be done in this field. As regards the second type of evidence, our ignorance of the history of most Greek texts, in particular prose texts, is still abysmal, despite the good work done by Professor Turyn in America and by Professor Dain and his pupils in France.

That a renaissance of classical studies took place in the last decades of the 13th century and the first decades of the 14th is a truism. The character of this renaissance, and the causes of its origin and decline have often been

studied in connection with this or that particular problem, but never, to the present writer's best knowledge, has a comprehensive survey of it been made.⁵ We are concerned here, not to make such a survey, but to examine solely the question of the accessibility and use of early manuscripts.

The decades preceding and following 1300 were a period in which we might expect to find some considerable movement of manuscripts from other regions to Constantinople. For more than fifty years the political and cultural centre of the Byzantine world had been at Nicaea, in the heart of Asia Minor, where under the Lascarid emperors higher education was organized on the Constantinopolitan model. We hear of the establishment of libraries in the principal cities of the Empire by Theodorus II Lascarus in the mid-13th century (Theod. Skutariotes ap. Sathas, *Μεταωνική Βιβλιοθήκη* 7.525-536); and Nicephorus Blemmydes was sent by John III Vatatzes on an expedition *πρὸς τὰ δυτικώτερα* to search for manuscripts. It is likely that when Michael VIII recaptured Constantinople in 1261 books from Nicaea and elsewhere were brought to the capital. One can scarcely imagine men like Georgios Akropolites, appointed professor of philosophy - ὑπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων - by Michael VIII, or Manuel-Maximos Holobolos, appointed head of the refounded Patriarchal Academy - ῥήτωρ τῶν ῥητόρων - in 1267, arriving in the city without their libraries. One book brought by Akropolites to Constantinople has recently been recognized.⁶

A little later, the gradual loss of most of Byzantine Asia Minor to the Turks is likely to have led to a fresh influx of books to Constantinople, as refugees from these regions brought their possessions with them. These might include the contents of monastic libraries. Maximus Planudes speaks of many of the books in the library of the Chora monastery as having been brought from elsewhere - *πρὸς τὴν βασιλῆα πόλιν ὅθενδῆποτε μετηνέχθησαν αἱ βίβλοι* (ep.67.69).⁷ And shortly before 1294 he is concerned to get a copy of Ptolemy's *Harmonics* from Nymphaeum (ep.106). But it is not only from Byzantine Asia Minor that books will have reached Constantinople. Contact with the Arab world was close. The patriarch Germanos III (25 May 1265 - 14 Sept. 1266), the restorer of the Patriarchal Academy, had spent many years in the monasteries of Palestine. As an example of the treasures to be found there one need only mention the Jerusalem palimpsest of Euripides, originally from the monastery of St. John on the Jordan, and not palimpsested until the thirteenth century.⁸ And contact with the Latin world, and in particular with Rome, was closer than before, partly as a result of Michael VIII's union of the churches. The subscription of cod. Paris gr.1115, a theological miscellany, shows it to have been copied in 1276 (whether at Rome or Constantinople is not clear, though the latter seems more probable), from a manuscript in the Papal library - itself dated in 759 - and placed in the Imperial library in the palace of Blachernae.⁹ It was presumably not unique of its kind.

This concentration of books from remote areas in Constantinople is in some ways parallel to what went on in the earlier part of the ninth century when, for instance, we find the Iconoclast patriarch John the Grammarian causing books to be brought from outlying monasteries to the capital.¹⁰ Both these movements, by giving scholars access to old books, provided the conditions necessary for a revival of learning.

We hear a good deal about libraries, imperial, monastic and private in Constantinople.¹¹ It is difficult to form an idea of the contents of these libraries in the absence of inventories (the only inventories we possess are of provincial monasteries, such as those of St. John at Patmos, dated 1201, 1355 and

1382), but of their richness there can be no doubt. An interesting example of a private library is that of Nicephorus Moschopoulos, Metropolitan of Crete and Proedros of Sparta, c.1300, uncle of the scholar Manuel Moschopoulos. Eleven mules were required to transport it. Eight volumes belonging to it have been identified. They include an Odyssey (Cod. Cesen. Malatest. 27.2) as well as liturgical and theological books. And one of them is a manuscript of homilies of John Chrysostom written in 986 (Cod. Athon. Lam. 451), a real collector's piece.¹² The great library of Theodorus Metochites was presented by him to the Chora monastery to which he returned after his dismissal in 1328, cf. Treu, *op. cit.* poem A. 1176ff.

τὰς μὲν ἐγὼν οὕτω κ' ἐνοκευχοάμην παντοίας
βίβλους κοινὸν ἄν' ἅπασιν ἀγαθόν,

126ff.

ἦτοι τὰ μὲν ἐγὼν παρ' τόνδε νόον ταμίεσσα
τῇ μονῇ θησαυρίοματ' ὀνήοιμα βιβλῶν ἐσθλά.

A more humble library is that of Theodoros Hyrtakenos, schoolmaster and protégé of Theodorus Metochites, whose son was a pupil at his school. He often mentions his library in his correspondence.¹³ He had no Aeschylus, Euripides or Sophocles, but only the principal church fathers (*ep.*30, p.3). Yet he could arrange to send a manuscript of the Odyssey to Trebizond (*ep.*56, p.22). This can have been no ordinary manuscript, as Trebizond was a centre of learning at this time, and there can have been no difficulty in obtaining a text of Homer there.

The antiquarian taste to which these collections testify is paralleled by a growing interest in the ruins of ancient sites. Planudes describes in some detail the temple of Olympian Zeus built by Hadrian at Cyzicus (*ep.*55), the ruined church at nearby Artake (*ibid.*), the ancient remains near Priene, used as fortifications by the Turks, which he was inclined to identify either as the temple of Apollo at Branchidae or the tomb of Mausolos (*ep.*120), and eagerly awaited an account of the site of Troy from his pupil Merkourios (*ep.*69).¹⁴

Old manuscripts were restored by the scholars of this age. Planudes speaks of an old manuscript of Diophantos which he had restored and apparently rebound for Theodoros Muzalon - ἐπανήκεις νῦν ἐκ τῶν πάλαι ρυτίδων ἡρώα. τὰ μὲν ἔξωθεν ὄφιν ἂν εἰποί τις τὴν παλαιὰν ἀποξυοάμενον λεβηρίδα, τὰ δ' ἐντός, οἷαν ἂν ἴδοιμεν οἰκίας ἐκ μακροῦ πεπονηκυίας ἐπισκευὴν καὶ ἀνώστησιν (*ep.*67, 33-36). Wendel's identification of the restored manuscript with Matrit.48 must remain doubtful, as this manuscript is dated by Iriarte in the 13th century. A somewhat later example of such restoration is that of the Vienna Dioscorides (Vindob. med. gr.1) written at Constantinople before 512 for Juliana Anicia, daughter of the western emperor Olybrius and on her mother's side great-granddaughter of Theodosius. It was rebound and repaired in 1405-6 by Joannes Chortasmenos, patriarchal notary and teacher at the Patriarchal Academy, later metropolitan of Selymbria, a man of letters and collector of manuscripts, who incidentally owned and annotated a copy of Triclinius' edition of Euripides (Vat. Urb. gr.142) which was a direct copy of Triclinius' autograph manuscript.¹⁵ Part of Chortasmenos' restoration consisted in copying in minuscule in the margin the faded uncial legends of the illuminations.¹⁶

It is noteworthy that both the Dioscorides and the manuscript from Rome written in 759 were uncial manuscripts. There are very few uncial manuscripts indeed of classical texts surviving to-day.¹⁷ But it is likely that there were many more in 1300, and they would tend to survive in the outlying areas from which manuscripts

reached Constantinople about this time. Uncial manuscripts of Biblical and liturgical texts are still quite numerous, so a man of education in the 13th or 14th century would be familiar with uncial hands and able to read them easily. It may well be from an uncial exemplar that Georgios Bardanes, the future metropolitan of Corfu, copied the text of Nicander, ἐκ τοιούτου ἀντιγράφου, ὅπερ ἔοικεν εἶναι βιβλίον ἐσφραγισμένον πρὸς ἀνάγνωσιν, οἶμαι, πᾶσι πλὴν αὐτοῦ.¹⁸

A scholar did not normally copy an old manuscript. He collated it with others. When Planudes wished to prepare a text of the *Arithmetic* of Diophantos, he borrowed manuscripts from others and excerpted from them readings which he thought superior to those of his own copy. One such manuscript was borrowed from Manuel Bryennios, the most learned mathematician of his time, to whom he writes: τὴν ὑμετέραν Διοφάντου βίβλον - ἀντιβαλεῖν ἐξ αὐτῆς γὰρ βουλόμεθα τὴν ἡμετέραν - ἐφ' ἡμερῶν ὅσων δὴ σοι βουλομένῳ τυγχάνει προθέομια πέμψεις ἡμῖν (ep.33,7-9). The other was borrowed from a library through the good offices of Muzalon the Protovestiarios (ep.67.30ff.). Similarly, his text of Plutarch was based on several manuscripts. Demetrius Triclinius used a manuscript of Pindar similar to Q, a manuscript of the Planudean recension, copies of the editions of Moschopoulos and Thomas Magister, and other manuscripts, in preparing his text of Pindar.¹⁹ He had several manuscripts of Sophocles, and often refers in his commentary to their variant readings.²⁰ In the same way, he clearly had several copies of the annotated plays of Euripides, including possibly one of the old tradition represented by MC.²¹ Turyn has suggested that he had the manuscript L of the unannotated plays in his possession and added many corrections and notes; that the manuscript may even have been prepared under his direction; and that he had access to the original from which L was copied, and corrected L from it (A. Turyn, *op.cit.*222-258). Nicephorus Gregoras evidently collated a number of manuscripts of the *Harmonics* of Ptolemy.²² These examples could easily be multiplied.

www.Biblical-data.org - Mr. Gary Dykes

It is clear then that late Byzantine scholars had opportunities to consult ancient manuscripts, including some written in uncials, that they availed themselves of these opportunities, and that they collated them with their own, modern copies of classical texts, but did not as a rule transcribe them in entirety. We may now turn to the second type of evidence mentioned at the outset, and examine the tradition of a number of texts to see if we can find signs of material attributable to very old exemplars, and in particular to uncial exemplars.

The Genevensis 44 of the *Iliad* comprises for the greater part of the poem scholia copied almost entirely from the Townleianus.²³ In book 21, however, though the text continues to be undistinguished, the scholia change their character, and we get a corpus quite distinct from the A, B, and T scholia, though doubtless originating in the same 'Viermännerkommentar' of late antiquity, and containing much detailed Alexandrian comment. The most likely explanation is that these scholia were transcribed from a fragment of an old manuscript (Erbse, *op.cit.*, 187 suggests a compilation of the 9th or 10th century parallel to A and B). If it was a manuscript containing text and marginal commentary, the text was evidently not thought worth copying. But the exemplar which we postulate may, of course, have contained no text, but only a ὑπόμνημα.²⁴ The Genevensis 44 was dated by Omont in the 13th century, by Briquet late 13th or early 14th century, although neither took adequate account of the different hands.²⁵ It contains subscriptions, probably copied when parts of the manuscript were recopied at a late date, of Manuel Moschopoulos and of Theodoros Meliteniotes, Megas Sakellarios and διδάσκαλος

τῶν διδασκάλων in the middle of the 14th century, and a distinguished mathematician and scholar.²⁶ It seems most likely that the manuscript was originally written for Moschopoulos and later supplemented by Meliteniotes, whose hand Nicole recognizes in many passages.²⁷ If this is so, it originated in precisely those circles around Maximus Planudes in which the search for old books and their systematic collation is known to have been practised. It has recently been shown that the copyist of the bulk of the scholia to books other than 21 had before him at least three exemplars, one of which contained the D scholia in a fuller form than the Venetus A.²⁸

The non-select plays of Euripides are another interesting case. With one exception, of which we shall speak, there is no sign of acquaintance with these plays, other than what could be obtained from grammatical or gnomological sources, from late antiquity until the 14th century. The use of the *Bacchae* in the *Christus Patiens* is irrelevant, since this was originally one of the select plays. Then two manuscripts, L (Laur.32.2) and P (Vat. Pal.287) turn up. One of the scribes of L was one Nikolaos Triklinos, possibly a relation of Demetrios Triclinius; and Turyn claims to recognize throughout the manuscript corrections and notes in the hand of Triclinius. Triclinius seems to have worked mainly in Thessalonica. The only earlier Byzantine writer showing direct acquaintance with the non-select plays is Eustathios,²⁹ who was from 1175 till 1192 metropolitan of Thessalonica. It has been suggested with some plausibility that he took a manuscript containing the select plays with him from Constantinople, where he wrote his commentaries upon Homer, Pindar and Dionysios, to Thessalonica, where it was found and used by Triclinius 150 years later. Whether this Eustathio-Triclinian exemplar was an old manuscript, perhaps in uncials, or a copy of one made in the late 12th century, or whether what Triclinius used was not Eustathios' manuscript but a copy made from it, we cannot tell. At any rate it seems to represent a portion, perhaps one volume out of several, of an alphabetically arranged edition of Euripides' plays which survived into Byzantine times independently of the select plays, and which was not transliterated into minuscule until the 12th century at the earliest.³⁰ And once again it seems to be connected with scholarly circles.

The text of Pindar in cod. Ambros. C 222 inf.(containing 01.1-12) is from the second Olympian onwards of a unique character both in text and scholia, preserving many good readings unknown elsewhere. The errors which it shows are rarely due to misreading of a minuscule hand, but often to misreading of uncials.³¹ Editors of Pindar have long realized that the Ambrosian recension goes back to a separate sub-archetype from the rest of the tradition. Irigoin plausibly suggests that it is a copy, at very few removes indeed, of a mutilated uncial manuscript which happened to survive into late Byzantine times, when, as he puts it, 'it appears that... the renewal of literary study was accompanied by a search for ancient manuscripts. Men began to seek out in libraries old manuscripts in uncials, codices and perhaps even rolls, often damaged, which had hitherto been neglected in favour of more recent manuscripts. These old exemplars were then copied, i.e. transliterated'. (Irigoin, *op.cit.* 246). The Ambrosian manuscript is dated by Turyn in the early 14th century; Schroeder and others dated it in the 13th, and Irigoin is inclined to put it about 1280. He points out (*op.cit.* 240) the remarkable resemblance between the hand of the Ambrosian manuscript, and that of Laur. 32.16, a miscellany of poetic texts prepared for and annotated by Maximus Planudes. If the two are in fact written by the same person, we find ourselves once again in a milieu known to have been interested in collating old witnesses

to texts. The Ambrosian manuscript contains certain introductory matter, such as a Vita and a collection of Apophthegmata, not found in other manuscripts of Pindar. These are unlikely to come from the same source as Ol.2-12, since they are separated from it by Ol.1. Both the Vita and the Apophthegmata seem to have been known to Eustathius (Irigoin, *op.cit.* 241-3). So the compiler of Ambros. C 222 inf. or its immediate exemplar - be he Planudes or someone else - seems to have filled up the gap at the beginning of his ancient manuscript from another manuscript of unusual character, connected with scholarly circles of the third quarter of the twelfth century.

The same Ambros. C 222 inf. also contains a text of Theocritus of unusual character. Gallavotti, arguing from the frequency of errors due to misreading of uncials, e.g. 15.68 δωμὰ for ἀμῶν, epigr.11.4 ἀλιμῶνως for δαιμονίως suggests that the Ambrosian recension goes back to a transliteration made in the ninth or tenth century.³² But from what we have seen of the place of this manuscript in the tradition of Pindar, the peculiar character of its Theocritus text seems as likely to be the result of the discovery and collation of an uncial manuscript of the Bucolici in the thirteenth century. An interesting problem is presented by the last part of the Theocritean corpus, poems XIX-XXX. These are preserved only in a group of manuscripts of the 14th and 15th centuries, one of which was used by Demetrius Triclinius. There is little trace of knowledge of these poems by Byzantine writers. Two of them turn up in the Palatine Anthology, in an inferior text; a quatrain from a third is used as a page-filler in a miscellaneous manuscript of the tenth century; a few lines from one poem are cited by Stobaeus. All this is consistent with the hypothesis that these passages were incorporated in anthologies at an early date. Wilamowitz suggested that the recension of the Bucolici containing the later poems - which he calls Φ - survived into late Byzantine times in an uncial manuscript. 'Evidently what happened was this', he writes, 'A very badly used copy of an old book, written in a style we now seldom meet, was found in the late Byzantine period and transcribed into the writing of the time'.³³ Gallavotti, however, treats Wilamowitz's Φ recension as part of his Laurentian family,³⁴ so in this matter we must suspend judgment.

The tradition of the text of Aratus has only recently been studied with thoroughness. A manuscript written in Crete in the late fifteenth century (Scorialensis Σ III 3)³⁵ has been found to contain a large number of individual readings. The text of Apollonius Rhodius in the same manuscript appears to be copied directly or indirectly from an exemplar of 1280-1300, and the Aratus text may well come from the same source. At any rate, it appears to result from the collation of a manuscript closely akin to Marcianus 476 and 'another much older copy, of a very different type, which had just been discovered'.³⁶ Maximus Planudes edited and commented upon the Phaenomena of Aratus. His edition has to be reconstructed from a number of surviving manuscripts. It shows a number of readings in common with the Escorial manuscript. Martin has argued that he too had access, via an old codex, to the divergent tradition represented in that manuscript.³⁷ Be that as it may, it seems that some late Byzantine scholar or scholars collated an old copy of Aratus, possibly in uncials, containing a text of a different kind from that current since the first transliteration in the ninth or tenth century.

Two manuscripts of the Argonautika of Apollonius Rhodius, Laur.32.16 of 1281, and Guelferbytanus Aug.2996, S.XIII/XIV, show many readings distinct from all the rest of the tradition. Fränkel, in his discussion of the history of the text of Apollonius, assumes that all the surviving manuscripts are descended from an archetype with variants.³⁸ This may well be so. But if it is, the peculiar readings

of the two manuscripts under discussion imply a fresh reference to the archetype. When one bears in mind that one of these, Laur.32.16, was prepared for and annotated in 1281 by Maximus Planudes, such a proceeding seems quite possible. An equally likely explanation, however, is that Planudes or someone in his circle found an old manuscript, possibly in uncials, representing a different tradition, and collated it with his own copy.

This Planudean manuscript, Laur.32.16,³⁹ contains a number of other poetic texts as well as the *Argonautika*. One of these is the *Kynegetika* of Oppian. The text which it offers of this poem - one closely similar to but superior to that of another manuscript of almost the same date, Laur.31.3, apparently written in 1286 - is in many respects distinct from that of the rest of the tradition and often better than it.⁴⁰ Only closer study of the textual tradition of Oppian will show whether we have here another instance of collation of an ancient and divergent exemplar or not. But the possibility remains open. The same manuscript is our sole authority for the text of the *Dionysiaka* of Nonnos,⁴¹ apart from some fragments in a Berlin papyrus of the seventh century. There is little sign of acquaintance with Nonnos among earlier Byzantine writers. Eustathios quotes five passages without naming the author, and the *Etymologicum Magnum* mentions the work once. Planudes' exemplar must have been a great rarity, and may have been very old. The number of lines which he marks as his own interpolations suggests that it was damaged. Though, of course, we have no basis for comparison, we must recognize the possibility that Planudes found the *Dionysiaka* in an uncial manuscript, and made the first and only transliteration into minuscule at the end of the thirteenth century.

Thus far we have been dealing with poetic texts. Similar features may be observed in the tradition of certain prose texts, though here it is usually impossible to link them with any particular scholar.

A 16th century manuscript (Vindob.IV.37) of the *Kynegetikos* attributed to Xenophon contains both a different redaction of the poem from that of the other manuscripts, and a number of individual readings. It is itself evidently copied from an exemplar in minuscule, as is shown by typical errors.⁴² But where did this minuscule exemplar get its divergent text from? Pasquali suggests that 'in the 12th or 13th century there reappeared in the Orient a codex of the *Kynegetikos* superior to all those known hitherto or thereafter: one or more Byzantine scholars copied it, probably on paper, trying to save as much as time and space as possible'.⁴³ Probably only the variant poem was copied in entirety from the new manuscript, and elsewhere readings from it were adopted into a normal text.

The text of most of the speeches of Lysias depends entirely upon a twelfth century manuscript, Palatinus Heidelbergensis 88. The first speech in the corpus, however, the *De Caede Eratosthenis*, also survives in a number of manuscripts of the thirteenth century or later which preserve a text different from and often superior to that of the Palatine manuscript.⁴⁴ It looks as though here we have a trace of a manuscript independent of the Palatinus and containing only the beginning of the corpus. Was it a fragment of an old uncial manuscript of Lysias unearthed by some scholar of the late thirteenth century?

Vindobon. suppl. phil. gr. 39 (F) of Plato, of the thirteenth rather than the fourteenth century, was recognized by Burnet, followed by Alline and Deneke,⁴⁵ to be derived at very few removes if any from an uncial exemplar representing a different form of the text from that in all other manuscripts. The manuscript

has many lacunae, left blank by the original copyist, which suggests that the uncial exemplar was damaged. E. R. Dodds' recent collation of the manuscript from photographs amply confirms the supposition of Burnet, Alline, and Deneke. He points out, incidentally, that F agrees in several passages with two second century A.D. papyri of the Gorgias (P.S.I. 119 and 1200).⁴⁶ And he suggests, on the basis of two quotations in the *Ecloga Vocum Atticarum*, that Thomas Magister was acquainted with the F text of the Gorgias.⁴⁷ This is an interesting suggestion, which would point to the circles in which the uncial exemplar of F was transcribed. But as Dodds recognizes, we should have to see whether the readings in question turn up in the indirect tradition of Plato, with which F not infrequently agrees, before crediting Thomas with acquaintance with F.

The manuscript H of Thucydides (Paris. 1734, s. XIV) was recognized by Poppo in 1825 to have, like B (Vat. 126, s. XI), readings distinct from the whole of the rest of the tradition in books VII and VIII (actually from VI, 92.5 on). Scholars tended to assume that H was a descendant of B and to accord it little importance. B. Hemmerdinger⁴⁸ has recently demonstrated:-

- (a) that H contains variants absent from B.
- (b) that it contains a number of unique and good readings *before* the break in B.

He argues that H is an indirect copy of B, embodying readings from an old manuscript showing an independent tradition, perhaps the very exemplar from which B was copied in the eleventh century. E. G. Turner⁴⁹ has pointed out that a wrong reading of a third century B.C. papyrus (P. Hamburg 163) turns up later in H and in B alone. This is a striking confirmation of the soundness of Hemmerdinger's argumentation.

The text of Ps.-Longinus *De Sublimitate* stems entirely from a tenth century manuscript, Paris gr. 2036 (P). However, a fifteenth century manuscript (Paris gr. 985) contains a short passage in chapter 2 which is not in P. At the corresponding place in P there is a lacuna of two leaves. Paris gr. 985 cannot be descended from a copy of P made before the two leaves were lost, as the passage in question is much too short, and in any case does not link up with the following text. Did some late Byzantine scholar find an old manuscript or fragment of a manuscript of the *De Sublimitate*, and, collating it with his own text, notice the supplementary passage and copy it? The latest editor, Rostagni, leaves the matter open, merely saying 'utcumque de additis illis uerbis iudicandum erit'.⁵⁰ We must, however, recognize the possibility.

Finally, a certain recension of the letters of Synesios occurs both alone and accompanied by glosses and scholia associated with Manuel Moschopoulos and possibly with Maximus Planudes. A typical specimen of the recension is Vat. gr. 113, fol. 307-374. Some of the characteristic readings of this recension, e.g. ep. 105 p. 705.38 ὁμιλον for λήμην look like misreadings of an uncial exemplar.⁵¹ Did someone in Planudes' circle find an uncial manuscript or fragment of a manuscript of these letters, so much appreciated by the Byzantines, and collate it with his own copy? Here again we can only keep an open mind at present.

What emerges from the above examples is that it was not an exception for a thirteenth or fourteenth century scholar to have access to early tradition, it was the rule. Where a man of the calibre of Planudes or Triclinius is known to have been associated with a particular manuscript, its individual readings cannot be assumed a priori to be conjectures. Similarly, where a number of examples of

error due to the misreading of uncial script⁵² not occurring elsewhere in the tradition are found, we can presume that an old exemplar was discovered and collated by the copyist of the manuscript or of one of its ancestors. But even in the absence of these criteria, an editor must always be alert to the possibility of such access to old tradition. The more individual good readings there are in a thirteenth or fourteenth century manuscript, the more probable is it that they are not all due to conjecture. We can now more readily recognize the types of conjecture of which scholars of this period were capable. Whatever falls outside of these categories may well be sound tradition.

Each reader will be able to supplement or correct these lines from his own knowledge and experience. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that this will effect a radical change in the overall picture. It is this overall picture of the way in which the later Byzantines regarded and made use of manuscripts which the present writer hopes may be of some use to editors, in suggesting both what to look for and what not to look for. Much work remains to be done in the field of textual history, work which until the advent of the microfilm was impossible. Prose writers are almost untouched. We still await a history of the text of Homer. And Christian writings which were not used liturgically often have a tradition very similar to that of the pagan classics.

University College London

NOTES

- 1 G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, 1934, ²1952, 15-16.
- 2 A. Dain, *Les manuscrits*, 1949, 115ff.
- 3 M. Treu, *Maximi Monachi Planudis epistulae*, Breslau 1890, pp. 197, 241, 242, 246, 261.
- 4 W. Lameere, *La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre*, Brussels-Rome, 1937.
- 5 A. Tuilier's interesting paper 'Recherches sur les origines de la renaissance byzantine au XIIIe siècle', *Bull. de l'Assoc. Bude* 1955. 3.71-76 is too short to do more than touch on some aspects of the subject.
- 6 cf. S. Kougeas, *Byzantina Metabyzantina* I.ii (1949) 61-74.
- 7 For the identification of the monastery cf. C. Wendel, *Planudea*, *B.Z.* 40 (1940) 406-410.
- 8 cf. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 'Ιεροσολυμιτική Βιβλιοθήκη I 109.
- 9 Τὰ παρὸν βιβλίον ἐγράφη διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ Λέοντος τοῦ Κιννάμου, τελειωθὲν σὺν θεῷ μηνὶ μαρτίῳ ιδ', ἰνδ. δ', ἡμέρᾳ ἐβδόμῃ, ἔτους ςψβ', ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ πιστοτάτων καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐστεμμένων μεγάλων βασιλέων ἡμῶν τοῦ τε κυροῦ Μιχαὴλ Δοῦκα Ἀγγέλου Κομνηνοῦ τοῦ Παλαιολόγου καὶ νέου Κωνσταντίνου, καὶ Θεοδώρου τῆς εὐσεβεστάτης Αἰγούστης, καὶ τοῦ κυροῦ Ἀνδρονίκου Κομνηνοῦ καὶ Παλαιολόγου, καὶ Ἀννης τῆς εὐσεβεστάτης Αἰγούστης, καὶ ἐναπετέθῃ ἐν τῇ βασιλικῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ μετεγράφη δὲ ἀπὸ βιβλίου εὐρεθέντος ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ βιβλιοθήκῃ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, ὅπερ βιβλίον ἐγράφη καὶ αὐτὸ ἐν ἔτει ςςξζ', ὡς ἀριθμῆσθαι τοὺς χρόνους τοῦ τοιοῦτου βιβλίου ἄχρι τοῦ παρόντος ις' πρὸς τοὺς πεντακοσίους.
cf. H. Omont, *Fac-similés des manuscrits grecs datés des IXe au XIVe siècles*, 13.
- 10 *Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio 1028*; cf. also B. Hemmerdinger, *Histoire du texte de Thucydide*, Paris, 1955, 33-35.

- 11 For the imperial library in 1276 cf. the subscription to cod. Paris gr. 1115, quoted above; the last definite mention of the library is by Constantine Lascaris, who was aged nineteen at the time of the capture of Constantinople, cf. Migne, P.G. 161, 918. For the library of the Chora monastery cf. Planudes, *ep.* 67, Theodoros Metochites ap. R. Guiland, *Les poesies inedites de Theodore Metochite*, *Byzantion* 3 (1926) 277; M. Treu, *Dichtungen des Gross-Logothetes Theodoros Metochites*, *Progr. Victoria-Gymnasium, Potsdam*, 1895, A. 1145-1175. A useful but by no means complete survey of Byzantine libraries by V. Burr is to be found in F. Milkau and G. Leyh, *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft* III.1 (1955) 146-187.
- 12 cf. M. I. Maniassak, Νικητόρου Μαχσιπούλου ἐπιγράμματα σε χειρόγραφα τῆς βιβλιοθήκης του, Ἑλληνικά, 15 (1957) 232-246.
- 13 Ed. F. J. G. la Porte-du Theil, *Notices et Extraits* 5 (1799) 709-744, 6 (1800) 1-48.
- 14 On these passages cf. C. Wendel, *Planudea*, *B.Z.* 40 (1940) 432-438.
- 15 His colophon (fol. 1r) reads: τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον τὸν Διοσκουρίδην παντάπασιν παλαιωθέντα καὶ κινδυνεύοντα τελείως διαφθαῖναι ἐστάχασεν ὁ Χορτασμένος Ἰωάννης προτροπῇ καὶ ἐξόδῳ τοῦ τιμωτάτου ἐν μοναχοῖς κυροῦ Ναθαναὴλ νοσοκόμου τηνικαῦτα τυγχάνοντος ἐν τῷ ξενῶνι τοῦ Κραλῆ ἔτους 533 ἰδ' Ἰν(δικτιῶνος) ἰδ'.
- 16 On Chortasmenos cf. H. Hunger, Johannes Chortasmenos, ein byzantinischer Intellektueller der späten Paläologenzeit, *W. St.* 70 (1957) 153-163, A Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of Euripides*, 1957, 389-397, where the extensive literature on Chortasmenos is cited, and a list compiled of the manuscripts which he owned or edited.
- 17 Palimpsests and fragmentary manuscripts apart, only the following, so far as is known to the present writer:- Vat. 1288 (Cassius Dio), Ambros. 1019 (Iliad), both of the fifth century; though the latter is hard to date; the Vienna Dioscorides and the Laurentian Digest, of the sixth century; Naples, Bibl. Naz. Suppl. gr. 28, olim Vindob. Suppl. gr. 28 (Dioscorides), of sixth or seventh century; Vat. Reg. 886 (Theodosian Code), of the seventh century; Ambros. 491 (Anthemius, incomplete), of seventh or eighth century; Vat. 1291 (Ptolemy's astronomical tables), Paris. 2389 (Ptolemy's Μεγάλη Σύνταξις), Paris. 2179 (Dioscorides), Montepessulanus H 306 (Dositheus), all of the ninth century; Laur. 23.26 (Chronological tables), c.900. Several of these manuscripts are only partly in Greek.
- 18 S. Lampros, Μιχαὴλ Ἀκακινάτου τὰ αὐξόμενα II. 206.
- 19 J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, 1952, 331-364.
- 20 R. Aubreton, *Demetrius Triclinius et les recensions médiévales de Sophocle*, 1949, 127-160.
- 21 A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of Euripides*, 1957, 193-4.
- 22 R. Guiland, *Correspondance de Nicéphore Grégoras*, 1927, 96.
- 23 H. Erbse, Die Genfer Iliasscholien, *Rh.M.* 95 (1952) 171-175.
- 24 On the question of the origin of marginal scholia cf. G. Zuntz, Die Aristophanes-Scholien der Papyrus, *Byzantion* 13 (1938) 631-690, 14 (1939) 545-614, particularly 570-594.
- 25 J. Nicole, *Les scolies genevoises de l'Illiade*, 1891, xxviii.
- 26 J. Nicole, *op.cit.*, xix-xx; K. Krumbacher, G.B.L.², 623-4, 782-4; A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 706-7; G. Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science* III.1. 1512-1514; H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, 792.
- 27 J. Nicole, *op.cit.*, xxii-xxiii.
- 28 H. Erbse, *op.cit.*, 170-182.
- 29 cf. Eust. *ad Od.* p. 1850.35; *ad Il.* p. 30.34; in *Dionys Perieg.* 1181, etc. etc.
- 30 This question is most fully discussed by A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of Euripides*, 1957, p. 303-6, 222-58, where all the relevant literature is cited.
- 31 J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, 1952, 245-246.
- 32 C. Gallavotti, *Theocritus quique feruntur bucolici graeci*, 1946, 244.
- 33 *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker*, 1906, 74.
- 34 *op.cit.*, 245-260.
- 35 The Aratus text is on fol. 30-53. For a description of the manuscript cf. P. A. Revilla, *Catalogo de los codices griegos de la Biblioteca de el Escorial I.* 1936. 343-346.

- 36 J. Martin, *Histoire du texte des Phénomènes d'Aratos*, 1956, 231-234.
- 37 Martin, *op.cit.* 288-292.
- 38 H. Fränkel, *Die Handschriften der Argonautika des Apollonios von Rhodos*, *Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1929, 189.
- 39 Of which the fullest description is contained in A. Chiari, *Raccolta di scritti in onore di Felice Ramorino*, 1927 (*Pubblicazioni della Univ. catt. del Sacro Cuore*, IV.7 , 568-574.
- 40 cf. P. Boudreaux, *Oppian d'Apamée, La Chasse*, 1908, 32-3; A. Ludwig, *B.Ph.W.* 30 (1910) 261-263.
- 41 cf. A. Ludwig, 'Überlieferung der Dionysiaka des Nonnos', *Hermes* 12 (1877) 273-299.
- 42 cf. G. Pierleoni, 'De fontibus quibus utimur in Xenophontis Cynegético recensendo', *Stud. Ital.* 6 (1898) 77.
- 43 G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*², 1952, 47.
- 44 For a list of these cf. M. Fernández-Galiano, *Lísias, Discursos I-XII*, 1953, xxxvi.
- 45 J. Burnet, *C.R.* 16 (1902) 98-101; 17 (1903) 12-14; H. Alline, *Histoire du texte de Platon (Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Sciences Historiques et philologiques*, fasc.218), 1915, 242-244; E. Deneke, *De Platonis dialogorum libri Vindobonensis F memoria*, Diss. Göttingen, 1922.
- 46 E. R. Dodds, Notes on some Manuscripts of Plato, *J.H.S.* 77 (1957) 24-30.
- 47 *ibid.* 26 n.9. courtesy of: www.Biblical-data.org
- 48 *Essai sur l'histoire du texte de Thucydide* 55-60.
- 49 *J.H.S.* 76 (1956) 98.
- 50 A. Rostagni, *Anonimo, Del Sublime*, 1955, xl.
- 51 cf. A. Garzya, Per l'edizione delle Epistole di Sinesio: 4, Contributo alle edizioni bizantine, *Rendiconti dell' Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, Ser.VIII, 13 (1958) 200-217.
52. One of the best illustrative collections of such errors is that compiled by J. Burnet from the manuscript F of Plato, *C.R.* 16 (1902) 99, 17 (1903) 13-14.