

NIGEL G. WILSON, *A mysterious Byzantine scriptorium : Ioannikios and his colleagues*, in «Scrittura e civiltà» (ISSN: 0392-1697), 7 (1983), pp. 161-176.

Url: <https://heyjoe.fbk.eu/index.php/scrciv>

Questo articolo è stato digitalizzato dal progetto [HeyJoe](#) - *History, Religion and Philosophy Journals Online Access* della Biblioteca Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Il portale HeyJoe, in collaborazione con enti di ricerca, società di studi e case editrici, rende disponibili le versioni elettroniche di riviste storiografiche, filosofiche e di scienze religiose di cui non esiste altro formato digitale.

This article has been digitised within the Bruno Kessler Foundation Library project [HeyJoe](#) - *History, Religion and Philosophy Journals Online Access* platform. Through cooperation with research institutions, learned societies and publishing companies, the *HeyJoe* platform aims to provide easy access to important humanities journals for which no electronic version was previously available.

La digitalizzazione della rivista «Scrittura e civiltà», a cura dalla Biblioteca FBK, è stata possibile grazie alla collaborazione con Aldo Ausilio editore, erede dei diritti della Bottega d'Erasmus

Nota copyright

Tutto il materiale contenuto nel sito [HeyJoe](#), compreso il presente PDF, è rilasciato sotto licenza [Creative Commons](#) Attribuzione–Non commerciale–Non opere derivate 4.0 Internazionale. Pertanto è possibile liberamente scaricare, stampare, fotocopiare e distribuire questo articolo e gli altri presenti nel sito, purché si attribuisca in maniera corretta la paternità dell’opera, non la si utilizzi per fini commerciali e non la si trasformi o modifichi.

Copyright notice

All materials on the [HeyJoe](#) website, including the present PDF file, are made available under a [Creative Commons](#) Attribution–NonCommercial–NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. You are free to download, print, copy, and share this file and any other on this website, as long as you give appropriate credit. You may not use this material for commercial purposes. If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you may not distribute the modified material.



La digitalizzazione della rivista «Scrittura e civiltà», a cura dalla Biblioteca FBK, è stata possibile grazie alla collaborazione con Aldo Ausilio editore, erede dei diritti della Bottega d’Erasmus

NIGEL G. WILSON

A MYSTERIOUS BYZANTINE SCRIPTORIUM:
IOANNIKIOS AND HIS COLLEAGUES

The scriptorium which is the subject of this paper is one of the most fascinating and enigmatic phenomena in the history of Greek texts. Many of its products were identified two hundred years ago, when A. M. Bandini in his catalogue of the Laurentian Library noted the occurrence of Ioannikios' hand in a number of manuscripts¹. He did not comment on the script, and somewhat strangely he failed to mention the even more striking hand that is found keeping company with Ioannikios in almost all these volumes. Since Bandini nearly all other scholars have ignored the existence of the second scribe. It is extraordinary that no study should have been devoted to this scriptorium, since we are now in a position to attribute to it seventeen manuscripts. No other scriptorium active during the middle Byzantine period produced a larger number of surviving books. The most active centre of book production was the one that flourished in the monastery of the Hodegoi in the capital during the fourteenth century². Let me say in passing, to forestall a possible objection, that the known production of the Studite monastery does not conflict with the assertion that I have just made. The evidence which has induced scholars to assign many books to it is in some cases inadequate. The list of books which certainly originated in that house is

1. A. M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae* (Florence 1764-70).

2. L. Politis, *Eine Schreiberschule im Kloster τῶν Ὁδηγῶν*, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 51 (1958) 17-36, 261-87. Reservations about the commonly accepted view of the criteria for recognising Studite manuscripts are expressed by J. Leroy, *Un témoin ancien des Petites Catéchèses de Théodore Studite*, in *Scriptorium* 15 (1961), 48-9 and N. G. Wilson, *Medieval Greek bookhands* (Cambridge Mass. 1972-3) 18.

not long, and there is no closely defined period in which we have enough evidence to study its practices in detail.

To return to Ioannikios: his production is unique in one other respect. All but one of the texts belong to pagan literature or are medical treatises dating from the Roman empire or early Byzantine period. The almost complete absence of theological literature and the large number of manuscripts invite closer study. Investigation shows that a high proportion of the manuscripts are important, in some cases the most important, witnesses for the tradition of the texts they contain. I will anticipate one of my conclusions by saying that the usually accepted dating in the fourteenth century is wrong by an unsatisfactorily wide margin of two centuries.

The essential facts about the manuscripts are as follows. Bandini identified nine of them, and a tenth was found in Florence in the Conventi Soppressi collection by Festa when he and Rostagno prepared their catalogue³. More recently Turyn added several more, some in the main part of the Laurenziana collection where they somehow escaped Bandini's attention, and one in Paris⁴. In the last few years others have come to light. More than half the collection consists of medical writers. Aristotle is well represented. The only purely literary texts are the *Bibliotheca* of pseudo-Apollodorus, the *Iliad*, and some plays of Sophocles and Euripides. Let us deal with these literary texts first.

The Apollodorus is MS. Paris gr. 2722, a book of some note because it is the archetype of all the other surviving manuscripts. Only seventeen leaves are preserved (in the present composite manuscript they are numbered 16-32), and because of the loss of the remainder some copies of this manuscript become essential for the constitution of the text. There is no subscription. Ioannikios wrote the whole of the text himself⁵.

3. N. Festa in E. Rostagno-N. Festa, *Indice dei codici greci Laurenziani non compresi nel catalogo del Bandini*, in *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 1 (1893) 169.

4. On Paris gr. 2722 see A. Turyn, *The Byzantine manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana 1957) 78 and 333. His other discoveries were communicated to me privately. The attribution of MS. Paris suppl. gr. 352 to Ioannikios by J. Wiesner in P. Moraux (ed.), *Aristoteles graecus* I (Berlin 1976) 472, seems to me incorrect.

5. Two illustrations are given by R. Wagner, *Mythographi graeci* I (Leipzig 1894).

The *Iliad* is MS. Vat. gr. 1319. It is of no particular importance for the constitution of the text, and there are no significant marginalia or glosses. The text is written by Ioannikios in a rather tidier style than is usual for him. The anonymous colleague is perhaps responsible for a few of the glosses, but I am doubtful. The volume was repaired during the Renaissance by George Alexandrou, Giovanni Onorio of Maglie near Otranto, and a third hand which I did not recognise; it belonged to Fulvio Orsini⁶.

The volume of Greek tragedy is MS. Laur. 31.10. It has all seven plays of Sophocles, and is known to be a witness of some value. Although it is thought to be a descendant of the famous tenth-century Laurentian manuscript, the text has undergone some contamination, and as a result our volume is the unique source of a few good readings. Recent research on the text that it offers of the plays which remained outside the school syllabus confirms this view. There are also a few marginal scholia on *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Antigone* and *Trachiniae*, which are believed to belong to the old corpus⁷. The Euripides part of the manuscript contains eight plays, with sparse scholia on the *Hecuba*, *Orestes* and *Medea*, again said to belong to the old corpus⁸. As far as the text of the tragedies is concerned, editors vary in their opinions, but on the whole seem to be agreed that while it is worth consulting it is not of the first importance⁹. The text is in the hand of Ioannikios, while the notes were written by his anonymous colleague. The book is interesting in one other respect: it belonged to Leonzio Pilato, who wrote between the lines his version of Euripides' *Hecuba* 1-466. He must have done this while lecturing at the Florentine Studio in 1362. We are therefore entitled to draw the conclusion that when Boccaccio and his circle made their first acquaintance with Greek tragedy they had the advantage of using a

6. T. W. Allen, *Homeri Ilias* I (Oxford 1931) 47, 177-8, discusses this MS.; I am grateful to my friend G. Cavallo for drawing my attention to it.

7. A. Turyn, *Studies in the manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Sophocles* (Urbana 1952) 166-8. R. D. Dawe, *Studies in the text of Sophocles III* (Leiden 1978) quotes its readings extensively. In the earlier parts of his work relating to the triad Dawe does not refer to it. See also N. G. Wilson, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100 (1980) 218-9.

8. A. Turyn, *op. cit.* in n. 4, 333-5; E. Schwartz, *Scholia in Euripidem* I (Berlin 1909) ix.

9. W. S. Barrett, *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Oxford 1964) 63-8; K. Matthiessen, *Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides* (Heidelberg 1974) 39, 60-3.

text rather less corrupt than some which might have come into their hands¹⁰.

By way of appendix to this section I mention here some small discoveries of my own. In the margins of an early copy of the *Odyssey*, MS. Laur. 32.24, there are a number of notes written by the anonymous colleague. They do not appear to be of any importance¹¹. He also appears in the margin of an early copy of Oppian, MS. Laur. 31.39, which he clearly read more than once, as the notes are not all in the same ink (Pl. VI). He seems to have neglected the other text in this volume, Hesiod's *Works and Days*. But his interest in Greek literature is beyond doubt. This copy may have been written in an Italo-Greek scriptorium.

Next we come to the Aristotelian volumes, of which there are five. First the logical works: MS. Laur. Conv. Soppr. 192 contains *Categoriae*, *De interpretatione*, *Analytica priora*, *Analytica posteriora*, *Topica*, *Sophistici elenchi*, preceded by Porphyry's *Isagoge*. Since manuscripts of the *Organon* are very numerous, editors have not bothered to investigate a witness which seemed to be as late as the fourteenth century, and even if it is put back to the twelfth it remains to be seen whether they would be prepared to change their minds. There seems to be practically no information about the merits of its readings. Ioannikios wrote the text, his colleague the marginalia¹².

The second volume in this category in MS. Laur. 87.7, containing *Physics*, *De caelo*, *De generatione et corruptione*, and *Meteorologica*. Scholars have devoted more attention to it. For the *De generatione et corruptione* H. H. Joachim used it and to his great credit declared it to be 'a twelfth century manuscript of considerable value'. The same dating is repeated in C. Mugler's Budé edition of 1966. Neither editor explained his reasons for departing from the traditional date, and the matter has not been taken up by anyone else. For the Budé edition of *De caelo* P. Moraux looked into the

10. A. Pertusi, *Leonzio Pilato fra Petrarca e Boccaccio* (Venice-Rome 1964) 113-21 with plates X-XI.

11. See P. C. Molhuysen, *De tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis* (Leiden 1896) 3-4 with plate I.

12. P. Moraux (ed.), *Aristoteles graecus* I (Berlin 1976) 344-5. For its text of Porphyry see the remarks and sample collations in A. Busse's edition (*Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca* IV, 1) (Berlin 1887) XVI-XVII.

readings carefully and discovered that there are a number of highly important variants, which may need to be explained by supposing that the scribe had access to an independent source of tradition. And for the *Physics* Sir David Ross had already observed that this manuscript is independent of all the others. Our curiosity is roused; where can the scribe have been at work¹³? Once again Ioannikios wrote the text and his colleague the notes.

Thirdly we may consider MS. Laur. 87.4, which contains a number of the minor biological writings and the *De generatione animalium*, *Historia animalium*, and *Problems*. Ioannikios wrote most of this volume (Pl. III); his regular colleague is found on folios 145-147, and a third hand on folios 194-208 and 210-226 (Pl. XIII). This too is a book of some importance, but it does not look to me as if enough work has been done to permit a final judgement about its place in the tradition¹⁴.

The fourth Aristotelian volume is a mere fragment, the first twenty-two leaves of MS. Barb. gr. 591, which I hit upon in the Vatican in 1976. Ioannikios is not found in what remains of the manuscript, but the idiosyncratic hand of his colleague is unmistakable. There are two texts, Philoponus' commentary on the *Physics* and pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *De divinis nominibus*, the latter being the only Christian text so far known to have been copied by our scribes. The book is in very poor condition, and many passages are too badly damaged for it to be collated. Not surprisingly editors have neglected it.

Finally MS. Paris gr. 1849 is a miscellany which includes the beginning of the *Metaphysics*, written by Ioannikios, who is responsible for most of the volume, while the regular colleague and one or more other hands also appear. It has not been thought worthy of notice by editors of Aristotle.

We now come to the medical texts. It will be best to take them in chronological order. Hippocrates is not represented, which may be due to coincidence, since the collection includes some of Galen's

13. H. H. Joachim, *Aristotle On coming-to-be and passing-away* (Oxford 1922) VIII; C. Mugler, *Aristote: De la génération et de la corruption* (Paris 1966) XVI; P. Moraux, *Aristote: Du ciel* (Paris 1965) CLXXXI; Sir David Ross, *Aristotle's Physics* (Oxford 1936) CVII.

14. In A. L. Peck's Loeb edition of the *Historia animalium* I (London 1965) xxxii-xxxiii it is treated as one of five important witnesses.

commentaries on his predecessor. One does not need to resort to the view that these books were written for practical men who believed that more recent writings were of greater value, but equally it cannot be excluded. A considerable number of Galen's writings are found in MSS. Paris gr. 1849, Laur. 74.5, 74.18, 74.25, 75.5, 75.7, 75.17. Very few of Galen's works have been published in a modern critical edition, but from the information available to us it becomes clear that some at least of these manuscripts are of great importance. The lists of medical manuscripts drawn up by Diels show that in many cases there is no earlier witness than the copy transcribed by Ioannikios and his colleague. For one of the minor works MS. Laur. 75.7 is the only extant Greek manuscript; this is the *De consuetudinibus*. For two others, the *De sectis* and the *De naturalibus facultatibus*, MS. Laur. 74.5 is the best manuscript. Although a less favourable judgement has been passed on the text of the *De usu partium* in MS. Laur. 74.18, it was a judgement based on a small sample collation, and perhaps a fuller inquiry would be rewarded with better results. It has recently been stated that MS. Paris gr. 1849 is the archetype of the Greek text of *De anatomicis administrationibus*. Without any doubt future editors must take seriously the claims of Ioannikios' products to a leading place in any apparatus criticus¹⁵.

Four volumes make up a set of the compilation by Aetius, a court physician of the early sixth century; they are MSS. Laur. 75.20, books 1-5, 75.5, books 6-8, 75.18, books 9-12, 75.7, books 13-16. Many manuscripts of the work are known, and some of them are older than this set, but Olivieri records in his edition that Laur. 75.20 offers an outstandingly good text¹⁶. Once again our scribes are working from an exemplar of unusual quality.

Lastly there is one volume from what may have been a full set of Paul of Aegina, a still later compiler whose account of surgery in Book VI is a valuable source of information for historians of medi-

15. The basic facts are recorded in H. Diels, *Die Handschriften der griechischen Ärzte* (Abb. Berlin 1905). See also G. Helmreich, *Galenus De usu partium* (Leipzig 1907) xi-xii; id., *Galenus scripta minora* II (Leipzig 1891) xi, III (Leipzig 1893) iii; id., *Galenus De temperamentis* (Leipzig 1904) iv; id., *Corpus medicorum graecorum* 5.9.1 (Leipzig 1914) xxxv; H. Diels, *ibid.* 5.9.2 (Leipzig 1915) x; I. Garofalo, *Le 'Anatomikai 'Egchirhōseis di Galeno e la traduzione araba della scuola di Hunain ibn Ishaq*, in *Studi classici e orientali* 31 (1981) 257-8.

16. A. Olivieri, *Corpus medicorum graecorum* 8.1 & 2 (Leipzig 1935-50); see pp. v, x of vol. I.

cine. MS. Laur. 74.26 contains Books V-VII. It was used by Heiberg for his edition, but he did not find it of much value. Here again there are many other manuscripts, some of them earlier¹⁷.

A volume of Byzantine medical texts, Palladius and Theophilus, turns out to have notes and corrections by Ioannikios' colleague; it is MS. Laur. 74.11, which seems to me to have been written early in the twelfth century, and bears no obvious mark of origin in the Italo-Greek area (Pl. VII).

One general observation should be made about the division of labour between the two scribes in the medical manuscripts. While Ioannikios is still the dominant figure, it is noticeable that his partner is not usually restricted to the addition of marginalia but writes some part of the text himself. On two occasions other hands make brief contributions (MS. Paris gr. 1849, folios 95-102, and MS. Laur. 74.5, folios 182-6 [Pl. XII]; the latter consists of extraneous material). Ioannikios suffers from the common Byzantine habit of writing twelve-syllable verses to celebrate the completion of a book. His verses in MS. Laur. 87.4 reveal that the book was intended for two people called Neilos and John, and he describes himself as a humble unmarried grammarian (ἄζυξ ταπεινὸς γραμματικός). That suggests a school-master writing books to supplement his income. If he had been a monk he would almost certainly have said so.

It is now time to turn to palaeographical matters. The first fact to be noted about Ioannikios is the extraordinarily untidy and variable appearance of his script. It is probably to be explained as the result of extreme haste. A small selection of illustrations may well create the impression there must be more than one scribe at work. But having looked through every manuscript with care I am able to state with confidence that this is not so; there are no points where a clear break occurs so as to suggest that one scribe is being succeeded by another. Second, and of vital importance, is the question of the date. My first impression on seeing the hand and learning that it was normally assigned to the fourteenth century was one of disbelief, an instinctive feeling prompted by the complete absence of the features which might be expected in a scholar's hand of that time. Thanks to the recent advances in palaeography, and in particular the publications by Turyn of dated manuscripts of the thirteenth and

17. J. L. Heiberg, *Corpus medicorum graecorum* 9.1 & 2 (Leipzig 1921-4); see p. v of vol. II.

fourteenth centuries, there is now a great deal of reliable information about fourteenth century hands, and one is entitled to state that no published specimen of script from that period is remotely like the hand of Ioannikios. The further back one goes into the thirteenth century the less reliable our picture becomes, especially for scholars' hands. I personally believe that the most likely date for Ioannikios is the last third or quarter of the twelfth century. Let me now state my reasons.

Ioannikios has no trace of the stiffness resulting from an attempt to archaïse. While the hand as a whole is very untidy, when it is examined in detail the ductus of the individual letters and ligatures is found to conform to the patterns of the middle Byzantine period, that is to say the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This fact, which may not be appreciated at first glance, and clearly has not been appreciated by other palaeographers, is of the utmost importance. The general observation can be supported by points of detail. The script exhibits certain features characteristic of scholarly hands of that period. I note especially (1) the *alpha* consisting of a loop and a long bold down-stroke at an angle of forty-five degrees, (2) the enormous compendium for the syllable *-ων*, (3) the very long strokes in the compendium for the syllable *-ον*. These are features which I have emphasised in a study of scholars' hands of the period c. 1050 - c. 1200¹⁸, and I do not believe that they are so prominent in hands of the thirteenth century. That is of course a subjective statement, but we are dealing with a matter in which decisive proof is not yet possible and may never be so. There is, however, external evidence from two sources which is decisive. One of these sources can be revealed immediately. My attention was drawn by Turyn to another Laurentian manuscript (MS. Laur. 58.24), a miscellany of mainly rhetorical contents. Turyn tentatively identified one hand as that of Ioannikios, but subsequently changed his mind. I doubt the identity, but there can be no question that we are dealing with a hand of the same general type and date. This unknown scribe has a partner, whose script fortunately offers us the proof we are looking for. He writes a conventional hand which an impartial observer will be bound to place in the eleventh or twelfth century, but no later (Pl. XI *a-b*).

Other features of Ioannikios' script which are worth a brief mention, although no great significance is to be attached to them, are

18. *La paléographie grecque et byzantine* (Paris 1977) 221-39.

the use of a curving stroke for the letter *eta* (noted in MSS. Laur. 75.7 and Laur. Conv. Soppr. 192) and the position of the *iota* adscript, which has begun to shrink and descend towards the subscript position. Both are more likely to occur in the twelfth century than at other times.

If the handwriting of Ioannikios is strange, that of his anonymous partner is bizarre in the extreme. I know of no parallel. But the explanation of it is simple. It is the hand of a man who was brought up to write Latin. His practices as a scribe reveal his origin. He writes catch-words at the end of each quire, a habit which he passed on to Ioannikios, and he sometimes numbers the quires with Latin letters or Roman numerals (MSS. Laur. 74.25 and 87.7) (Pl. V). Close inspection shows that he may have written some Latin notes in a very tiny hand in four of our manuscripts. The possibility of identification depends on some notes in MS. Paris gr. 1849, where Greek and Latin notes on folios 98r and 100r look as if they are in the same ink. That could however be the result of coincidence, because the notes in question are only a minute proportion of the total. And in view of other facts shortly to be revealed a different explanation is perhaps to be preferred. It is that the second scribe and the Latin annotator on one occasion went through the book together and used the same inkpot. Even if the scribe is not responsible for these notes, they provide the second of the decisive proofs already alluded to, since they are written in a hand of the late Caroline type, falling within a tradition that lasted up to the end of the twelfth century. The notes therefore provide a *terminus ante quem* unless they were written by an eccentric archaist. To return for a moment to the Greek script of the anonymous partner: its most striking characteristic is the letter *phi*. *Rho* and *lambda* are also distinctive, and *theta* and *kappa* stand out. The grave accent is usually horizontal. The compendium for the syllable *-ev* is rather like a figure 2. In some places *eta* has a curious tail stretching down to the right (MSS. Laur. 87.4 and Barb. gr. 591); Ioannikios uses this in the Apollodorus, but I have not noticed it elsewhere.

It is now necessary to say a few words about the occasional collaborators. In MS. Laur. 87.4 we find a fairly conventional hand, clear but uncouth and seemingly provincial. Its date is uncertain; the second half of the twelfth century seems possible; I have not found a close parallel in a dated manuscript. The anonymous partner wrote

interlinear and marginal notes. Another Latin hand, a little later than the first, has written short notes on folios 194 (Pl. XIII) and 210. In MS. Laur. 74.5 folios 182-6 are written in a very crude and ragged scholar's hand, which is consistent with the date that I am suggesting but is otherwise not very remarkable (Pl. XII). In MS. Paris gr. 1849 the position is more complicated, and all that I feel able to say with certainty is that folios 95-110 are written by other hands, probably four in number, of whom the first three wrote 95-102, exhibiting great variety of styles, and the fourth 103-110, which are in a relatively normal script.

Granted that the anonymous partner was an Italian, where is he most likely to have met Ioannikios? In the west the obvious places are Palermo, Reggio or Messina, and the district of Otranto. At one time I had considered Salerno, but the non-medical texts would have been of no interest to anyone there, and in any case I cannot find evidence that Greek medical texts were studied in the original at Salerno¹⁹. On the other hand a partnership in Constantinople is not to be excluded. We may imagine an Italian taking up residence in one of the quarters inhabited by the Pisans or Genoese or Venetians and making contact with a local scribe. Ioannikios does not need to be thought of as the owner of numerous rare and valuable texts; he may simply be the scribe commissioned to make copies, as is rather suggested by the verses in which he calls himself a humble grammarian.

On this hypothesis the Italian and, if he is a different person, the scribe of the Latin notes, might both be early translators from the Greek. James of Venice is probably too early for our purpose, since the dates of his career are 1136-1169, and his hand has never been identified²⁰. Similar considerations apply to Moses of Bergamo, with the added complication that he once lost his entire

19. I note in passing a curious coincidence. Ioannikios is also the name given to a translation of Galen made by Hunain ibn Ishaq and then turned into Latin, which had a great vogue in the middle ages. Whether the assumed equivalence of the two names is correct or not, the Latin text is found in two eleventh-century manuscripts and is referred to in various library catalogues of the following century, including one dated 1160. See E. Wickersheimer, *Manuscrits latins de médecine du haut moyen âge dans les bibliothèques de France* (Paris 1966) 145-6.

20. On James of Venice see L. Minio-Paluello, *Jacobus Veneticus grecus. Canonist and Translator of Aristotle*, in *Traditio* 8 (1952) 265-304. He has kindly informed me that there is still no known autograph.

library in a fire, so that we have much less chance of finding anything transcribed by him²¹. A better candidate is Burgundio of Pisa, who lived c. 1110-1193. His hand is known from signatures, a slender basis for identification (Pl. X). Yet there is great similarity in the forms of *a*, *d* and *g*, which are distinctive in both hands and all the Latin palaeographers to whom I have shown the evidence are impressed by it²². And there is circumstantial evidence as well. Burgundio is supposed to have used the ancestor of one of Ioannikios' manuscripts (MS. Laur. 74.5) as the basis of a translation from Galen (*περὶ κρᾶσεων*). That view is expressed by an editor who did not doubt the traditional dating in the fourteenth century. But if the twelfth century were a possible date, why not test the hypothesis that we actually possess the manuscript used by Burgundio? The variant readings coincide with his version very closely; there are few exceptions, and they appear not to be significant²³. He could have acquired it in Constantinople, where he stayed in 1136 and again in 1170. Furthermore, the Latin notes in MS. Laur. 74.5 relate to this one text only, which Burgundio translated, not to the many others in the same volume. That is a suspicious circumstance, and there is one more of the same kind. In MS. Laur. 74.18 the Latin notes begin in the second part of the volume, and relate to Galen's works on the pulse, one of which was certainly translated by the Pisan ambassador. In MS. Paris gr. 1849 the notes relate exclusively to the *De musculorum motu*, but I do not yet have a proof that Burgundio translated this²⁴. Dr. R. J. Durling has drawn my attention to Latin marginalia in MS. Laur. 74.30, Galen's *De locis affectis*, a copy not written by Ioannikios but with extensive marginalia by the anonymous colleague. The Latin notes are clearly by the same hand

21. See the study by G. Cremaschi, *Mosè del Brolo e la cultura a Bergamo nei secoli XI e XII* (Bergamo 1945) (Plate I shows his Latin hand).

22. See further the monograph by P. Classen, *Burgundio von Pisa* (S.B. Heidelberg 1974.4). I am much indebted to Dr. B. Barker-Benfield, Dr. A. C. de la Mare, Prof. F. di Benedetto and Mgr. L. Duval-Arnould for giving me advice on this subject. On a difficulty arising from a previous identification of Burgundio's hand see appendix I.

23. R. J. Durling, *Burgundio of Pisa's translation of Galen's περὶ κρᾶσεων 'De complexionibus'* (*Galenus Latinus* I) (Berlin 1976) xx, xxv-xxx. As to the question whether Burgundio could have handled MS. Laur. 74.5, see the readings cited by Durling on p. xxiii.

24. Diels, *op. cit.* in n. 15 above, recorded a translation of this text in MS. Basel D-III-8, but Dr. R. J. Durling kindly informs me that this is a mistake.

that we have found making annotations in the other four manuscripts, and the text is one of those translated by Burgundio²⁵.

If the Latin hand is really Burgundio's, it is very hard to believe that he is Ioannikios' partner in the production of the manuscripts, because of the wide interests Ioannikios evidently had in Greek literature outside the fields of medicine and philosophy. So I am inclined to think that we are dealing with two hands. Apart from Burgundio we have a scribe of Latin upbringing. Where did he and Ioannikios find their exemplars to copy from? The number and quality of the texts are such that we must seriously consider the possibility of origin in the capital of the Byzantine empire.

However much the libraries of the Italo-Greek communities were enriched by the activities of Henricus Aristippus, who went as an envoy to the Byzantine court in 1158, and of Bartholomew of Simeri or Scholarios Saba, who collected many books for their monastic foundations, it is extremely optimistic to suppose that as a result all the texts which we are now concerned with were available in the west in the second half of the twelfth century. On balance this line of inquiry favours the view that Ioannikios and his friend were drawing on the resources of the capital.

There are two objections which now have to be discussed. All the manuscripts in question are written on paper, and there is reason to think that some of it is of Spanish manufacture, which can be detected by the format and the presence of zig-zag lines like watermarks²⁶. If that is so, does it follow that the books must have been

25. I am indebted to Durling for the loan of a microfilm and other material. Bandini, *op. cit.* in n. 1 above, III cols. 52 and 131, thought the notes in MS. Laur. 74.5 and 74.30 were by Niccolò Niccoli.

26. J. Irigoien first noticed Spanish paper in MS. Laur. 87.4; Mgr. P. Canart reckons that nine of the manuscripts are made of Spanish paper; see *Le livre grec en Italie méridionale sous les règnes normand et souabe: aspects matériels et sociaux*, in *Scrittura e Civiltà* 2 (1978) 151-2. See now J. Irigoien, *La tradition manuscrite des tragiques grecs dans l'Italie méridionale au XIII^e siècle et dans les premières années du XIV^e siècle*, in *Bisanzio e l'Italia, Raccolta di Studi in memoria di Agostino Per-tusi* (Milan 1982) 133-5. I mention here a curious fact about the format of the paper in MS. Laur. Conv. Soppr. 192. It looks as if it was originally 305 x 195, but each folio appears to have been enlarged by the addition of a strip on one side, so that the measurements are now 305 x 240. This is so strange as to sound incredible; but I have looked at the book afresh after an interval of time and can still see no other explanation. One may note that the format of MS. Laur. 31.10 is 300 x 190. The resulting page is too narrow to allow much annotation in the margins.

written in the west rather than Constantinople? I myself doubt if the inference is necessary, since Pisan and Genoese merchants might well have included paper in the cargoes that they loaded for export to Byzantium.

A more serious difficulty arises from the occasional verses written by Ioannikios. Although they give little information about him, they reveal something about the original destination of three manuscripts. In MS. Laur. 74.18, folio 188, he addresses a friend called Neilos, and on folio 322 another called John. The present volume must originally have been two books, and there are two different series of quire signatures to confirm the fact. Why the two books were put together is a question that cannot be answered at present. But they were evidently being produced for other patrons, neither of whom *prima facie* is the Italian translator of my hypothesis. Similar considerations apply to MSS. Laur. 75.5 and Laur. 75.7, where the patron is not named, but may be inferred to be the same Neilos because of the way he is addressed²⁷. One can imagine that Neilos was a member of a monastic community which ran a hospital and had a use for such books. If that suggestion is to be reconciled with my hypothesis, we are forced to make the difficult assumption that the Italian took part in their production in order to make a living for himself. We know too little of the circumstances to rule out the possibility. It does not seem very likely that an ambassador or a translator would have done so, but one could imagine a less exalted person, sent to obtain materials for a translator, engaging in such activity as a sideline. All we know about Burgundio's activities in the Byzantine capital is that during his visit in 1171 he was too busy to make his planned translation of Chrysostom but had a copy of the text made for him by two scribes²⁸. Perhaps the balance of probability swings back in favour of production in some western country. We know that on his way home in 1171 Burgundio stop-

27. The verses were printed by Bandini. The essential phrases are: MS. Laur. 74.18, folio 188

ὦ Νεῖλε χρυσόρειθρε γλυκέων λόγων

MS. Laur. 75.7, folio 216

σὺ δ' ὦ σοφῶν πρώτιστε καὶ τῶν ῥητόρων

MS. Laur. 75.5, folio 165

δέξαι πόνημα μικρόν, ὃ κρήνη λόγων.

28. See the preface to his translation of Chrysostom's homilies on St. John's Gospel, printed by Classen, *op. cit.* 84-5.

ped for some time in Messina, which would be an obvious place for him to acquire some more Greek texts.

With that inconclusive result I must bring my discussion of Ioannikios and his partner to an end, leaving them almost as mysterious as they were at the outset of this inquiry. Nevertheless I hope to have shown that they must be ranked among the most important copyists of Greek texts and deserve further study.

APPENDIX 1

M. Morani, *Il manoscritto Chigiano di Nemesio*, in *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo* 105 (1971) 621-35, identified the hand of Burgundio in the glosses found in Chigi R.IV.13. He did not refer to the extant signatures of Burgundio but relied on the general coincidence between the Greek text and Burgundio's version on the one hand and on the other between the Latin glosses in the Chigianus and the terms used in the Latin version. This gave him sufficient reason to reject the previous dating of the Latin glosses to the 15th century, as had been proposed by P. Franchi de' Cavalieri in the printed catalogue of the Chigi collection, and to assert that the Chigianus is the book used by Burgundio. So far so good; but it is necessary to add that the similarity between the glosses in the Chigianus and the signatures of Burgundio is not great. To be precise, the characteristic form of *d* is not found, and the *g* is by no means always of the distinctive type. The best way to try to reconcile conflicting facts is to assume that Burgundio's hand varied a good deal over the years. His version of Nemesius, the text in the Chigianus, belongs to 1164-5 (see Classen, *op. cit.* 74), while the signed documents are from the years 1146, 1147, 1152 and 1159 (plates 2-4 in Classen = Pl. X *a-c* here). There is therefore a short period during which his hand may have changed; yet it must have changed back to its former appearance, if we are right to suppose that the translations of Galen belong to a later stage of his career. The sequence of translations, so far as it is known at present, is as follows:

- 1151 Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew
- 1153-4 John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa*
- 1164-5 Nemesius
- 1173 Chrysostom's Homilies on John
- 1178-9 Galen, *De sanitate tuenda*
- 1184-5 Galen, *De sectis medicorum*.

It seems to me that a problem still remains in regard to the glosses in the Chigi manuscript.

APPENDIX 2

An incidental result of establishing firmly the date of Ioannikios is that we can reject the widely received opinion that the manuscripts of Galen are surprisingly late, fifteenth century copies being the rule (see J. Mewaldt in *RE* s.v. *Galenos*, col. 590). The idea is not in itself implausible, since books used regularly by practitioners might not stand up well to the inevitable wear and tear. In fact even from a perusal of the census made early this century by Hermann Diels it is possible to see that the usual opinion is something of an exaggeration. But the transfer of more than half a dozen volumes in his list from the thirteenth or fourteenth century to the twelfth results in a substantially different picture. And in addition to volumes written by Ioannikios Burgundio owned and annotated another copy of Galen (Laur. 74.30) which has to be redated in exactly the same way.

APPENDIX 3

One further point should be made about the later history of the volumes written by Ioannikios and his colleague. Four of them exhibit marks of an identifiable owner; three of those four, and several other volumes, constituting in all the major part of the known production, have been in Florence since the 15th c. It is possible that most of the books came into the hands of Burgundio very soon after production, perhaps not immediately because of the verses naming the first intended owners of Laur. 74.18, and remained *en bloc* as a collection thereafter. Suppose instead that the original owners were numerous; how likely is it that so many of the books would have been reassembled in Renaissance Florence? All we know at present about the previous history of these volumes is that Laur. 75.17 belonged to Politian and before him to the Florentine doctor and humanist Paolo Dal Pozzo Toscanelli, while Laur. Conv. Soppr. 192 belonged to Antonio Corbinelli (1370/5-1425) (see A. Perosa in V. Branca et al., *Umanesimo e Rinascimento. Studi offerti a P. O. Kristeller* [Florence 1980] 75-6; D. Harlfinger in *Aristoteles graecus I* [Berlin 1976] 345).

PLATES

I. Laur. 74.18, fol. 1

II. Laur. 75.18, fol. 231

III. Laur. 87.4, fol. 70v

Nos. I-III are chosen in order to show how variable Ioannikios' script is, but they do not exemplify his full range; no. I is perhaps the most typical.

IV. Laur. 74.5, fol. 236

V. Laur. 75.17, fol. 283v

VI. Laur. 31.39, fol. 27

VII. Laur. 74.11, fol. 105v

Nos. IV-VII show the anonymous colleague; no. V is remarkable for the quire-signatures in both Latin and Greek numerals and the Greek catch-word; nos. VI-VII are given as examples of his corrections and annotations in MSS not produced by the partnership.

VIII. Laur. 74.5, fol. 28v

IX. Laur. 74.18, fol. 314v

X. Documents: *a* from the Archivio di Stato, Pisa; *b* from the Archivio di Stato, Florence; *c* from the Archivio Arcivescovile, Pisa

Nos. VIII-X show Burgundio's hand; in no. IX one may draw attention to the use of an abbreviation for *quibus* which bears some resemblance to the shape of the letter *phi* in the anonymous colleague's hand.

XI*a*. Laur. 58.24, fol. 9v

XI*b*. Laur. 58.24, fol. 62v

Nos. XI*a-b* are included in order to show a hand similar to that of Ioannikios found in conjunction with a much more conventional script; the twelfth century is the latest possible date.

XII. Laur. 74.5, fol. 182

XIII. Laur. 87.4, fol. 194

Nos. XII-XIII show the hands of two other scribes who collaborated occasionally with Ioannikios.

Note: because of the need to avoid substantial reductions of scale it has not always been possible to show the full written area of a page.

Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely a form of Greek or Latin, covering the entire page. The text is dense and appears to be a continuous passage or a list of entries. The script is highly stylized and difficult to decipher without specialized knowledge of the language and dialect. The text is written in dark ink on aged, slightly yellowed paper. There are some large, dark ink blotches or smudges, particularly on the right side of the page, which may be intentional or accidental. The overall appearance is that of an ancient manuscript or a historical document.

Γαρεκλαίμαρ Γδρωσαχορτεο
 Ε'Ι' ΠΠΤΑ ΔΗΦΝΟΙ ΓΕ ΕΛΑΙΝ
 Κησ κρωδόν πρε υπό μωρ
 τωσ δαν θέν μωρ κί τω φνέρον
 ζαν θοί ζαε τβί οί τε τώ δει ται μκελ φ
 αλλο δαυ πο νο τ ζαυ λω ποιο κλέγοι
 σω εκ τοίσ καυ υπε θβρε λιασο μ κί κηλ
 οφρ ε κ θεω πβρι δρομ δε φαν τ υδατ
 δοι αδ κλεροί σαρ κρο τ γλαχι τωσ
 φραζα μ κολ ποισ ε ωί πλω γοι θαλα
 καρα βόζ νω γησ κ δα σα κ οί α κ α φ
 πβρησ εν κ αι γοι ζε κ π βρε κ αι με μ τ
 α σα κ αι π β κ τικ γ φ α το ροί ον ε ρω τ
 οί κ ησ θαλα μ σ κ α θ φ ρ α ν γ ο πο τ αι τ
 χ πε θε κ ω κ α λ λ η μ ρ α γ κ αι κ τ ε ρ ι ο
 τ ι λ ε φ ε ρ α κ η ε ρ ο σ π α λ ι κ π ο ν τ α μ ε θ η κ
 αι τα ρ ο γ γ μ ε θ α κ η ε κ η ρ ο σ η κ α ρ α ρ
 α σ α δ η ν γ α ε θ ε κ ζ η ρ κ η χ α λ κ ι κ ε θ
 δ ο κ ε ρ ο σ π β ρ ο σ ε π ι β α ι λ η σ ι α λ λ δ ω κ η π θ η κ
 κ αι λ ο μ ο ρ κ α τ λ ι π κ η θ ε κ η χ α λ κ η
 κ η ρ ο σ η μ ρ ε φ ε ρ β σ γ κ η χ α κ η ρ ε θ α λ α σ

πᾶσι τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν οὐκ ἐπιδοθέντων
ἀρκούντων· ἀλλὰ τὸν γὰρ τούτου ἐστὶν
φῆμ' ἡμεῖς ὅτι πομπὴν οὐ φερούμεν·

ΚΟ

βυβλικὸν πομπὴν ἢ ἢ μὴ τὰ κατὰ μέ
μελέτη λαλοῦμεν ἀντὶ·

γυναικῶν πομπῶν· ὅτι πλεονεξία
χρῆσις οὐκ ἔστι τῆς ἐξουσίας κατὰ μέν.

ὅτι ἡμεῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιχρῶμεθα·

πομπῶν καὶ χρημάτων πλεονεξία
ἢ ἢ φῆμ' ὅτι τὰ ἑσθλὰ ἢ ἀκέραια

ἢ πομπῶν ἀποδοθέντων οὐκ ἔστιν
κατὰ μέν· ἀλλὰ κατὰ μέν.

ΚΟ

πᾶσι οὐ πομπῶν πρὸ τοῦ ἀφροδισίου·

οἱ καὶ ἀποδοθέντων ἀφροδισίου ἀποδο
μεν· ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἀφροδισίου

ἀποδοθέντων τῆς ἐξουσίας· ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι
αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἔστι τῆς ἐξουσίας ἀφροδισίου

οἷον· μετὰ τὸ ἀφροδισίου ἀποδοθέντων πομπῶν
μετὰ τὸ ἀφροδισίου ἀποδοθέντων ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας

τῆς ἐξουσίας ἀφροδισίου· ἀλλὰ χροῖσι
οὐκ ἔστι τῆς ἐξουσίας κατὰ μέν· ἀλλὰ πομπῶν

πομπῶν ἢ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἀποδοθέντων ἢ τῆς ἐξουσίας
πομπῶν πομπῶν·

Handwritten marginal notes in a smaller script, likely a commentary or gloss on the main text. The notes are organized into several distinct sections, each beginning with a small heading or initial letter. The text is dense and fills the left margin of the page.

Main body of handwritten text in a large, cursive script. The text is densely packed and covers most of the page. It appears to be a continuous narrative or a collection of related entries. The script is highly stylized and characteristic of the period.

