

# Musurus' Creed

*Filippomaria Pontani*

FIVE HUNDRED YEARS AGO (July 1503) the Cretan Marcus Musurus (Candia *ca* 1470–Rome 1517), probably the greatest Greek Classical scholar of the Renaissance along with his teacher Janos Laskaris, came to live in Padua, and settled in Borgo Zucco, now via Aristide Gabelli (some 200 metres away from my own family house). He taught for six years at the University of Padua, where amongst his pupils were Raffaele Regio, Lazaro Bonamico, Johannes Cuno, and Girolamo Aleandro, and amongst his auditors and friends Erasmus of Rotterdam. Urged by historical events (the *Studium Patavinum* had to close in 1509 under the threat of the League of Cambrai), he then moved to Venice, where he produced some of the most outstanding editions of Greek texts ever published by the Aldine press (he had started working for Aldus in 1494), and finally (1516) to Rome, where he enjoyed the esteem and protection of Pope Leo X, the founder *inter alia* of the renowned *Collegium Graecum ad Caballinum Montem*, to the activity of which Musurus also contributed.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>On Musurus' life and activity see N. G. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy* (London 1992) 148–156; P. Bietenholz and T. B. Deutscher, *Contemporaries of Erasmus II* (Toronto/Buffalo/London 1986) 472–473; K. Staikos, *Χάρτα της Ἑλληνικῆς τυπογραφίας* (Athens 1989) 299–374; D. J. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1962) 111–166; M. Sicherl, "Musuros-Handschriften," in J. L. Heller and J. K. Newman, edd., *Serta Turyniana* (Urbana/Chicago/London 1974) 564–608; E. Mioni, "La biblioteca greca di Marco Musuro," *Archivio Veneto* SER. V 93 (1971) 5–28; E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique des XV<sup>e</sup> et XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles I–II* (Paris 1885: hereafter LEGRAND) I CVIII–CXXIV; most recently A. Pontani, "L'umanesimo greco a Venezia: Marco Musuro, Girolamo Aleandro e l'Antologia Planudea," in M. F. Tiepolo and E. Tonetti, edd., *I Greci a Venezia* (Venice 2002) 381–466, esp. 381–384; C. Belloni, "Lettere greche inedite di Marco Musuro," *Aevum* 76 (2002) 647–679. On his relationship with the Greek community of Venice see Ph. Mauroeidi-

I know of no systematic study of Musurus' Greek poems. A checklist thereof may be obtained by combining the references given by Sicherl<sup>2</sup> with the six epigrams published by my father;<sup>3</sup> at least three more pieces can be read in manuscripts of Italian libraries.<sup>4</sup> But Musurus owes much of his fame to the well-known *Ode to Plato* (1513), rightly celebrated as the highest result of Greek verse in the entire Renaissance, a poem that conveys to the reader not only a magniloquent image of Pope Leo X but also the atmosphere of the Platonic revival and enthusiasm for Greek studies in Florence, Venice, and Rome.<sup>5</sup>

---

Ploumidi, "Ἐγγραφα ἀναφερόμενα στίς ἔριδες τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῆς Βενετίας στὰ τέλη τοῦ ΙΕ' αἰῶνα," *Thesaurismata* 8 (1971) 115–187 (esp. 181–184, whence his origin from Candia rather than from Rethymno can be inferred with certainty), and A. Pardos, "Ἀλφαβητικός κατάλογος τῶν πρώτων μελῶν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀδελφότητος Βενετίας ἀπὸ τὸ κατάστιχο 129 (1498–1530)," *Thesaurismata* 16 (1979) 294–386 at 361. On the *Collegium Graecum* see V. Fanelli, "Il ginnasio greco di Leone X a Roma," in his *Ricerche su Angelo Colocci e sulla Roma cinquecentesca* (Rome 1979; originally in *Studi Romani* 9 [1961] 379–393).

<sup>2</sup>M. Sicherl, *Griechische Erstaussagen des Aldus Manutius* (Paderborn 1997) 156–157 n.7. Most epigrams were edited by Legrand I CIX (for Crastone's *Lexicon*, Aldus 1497, also in MS. *Ambr.* A 115 sup., see A. Martini and D. Bassi, *Catalogus codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* [Milan 1906] I 49); CXIV (from *Vat. Pal. gr.* 287, to his pupil Carlo Cappello); CXXI (a distich to Giovanni Ricuccio da Camerino, quoted by the latter in an epistle); 21 (for Musaeus, Aldus 1494, also in MS. *Ambr.* B 52 sup., see Martini/Bassi 108; Sicherl 29); 45–46 (for Aristophanes, Aldus 1498); 58–59 (for the *Etymologicum Magnum* ed. by Zacharias Kalliergis for Nicholas Vlastos, 1499); II 395 (six lines that Musurus added to fill in the lacuna after line 92 of Moschus' *Epit. Bionis*, quoted in the 1516 Callergi edition of Theocritus and the Bucolic poets). Sicherl also mentions the epigram of MS. *Burn.* 96 f.44v, reproduced in E. Gamillscheg, D. Harlfinger, H. Hunger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten* I.C (Vienna 1981) no. 265 (a manuscript of the *Rhetores Graeci*: see Wilson [supra n.1] 148).

<sup>3</sup>F. M. Pontani, "Epigrammi inediti di Marco Musuro," *ArchCl* 25–26 (1973–74) 575–584 (five epigrams); "Patroclo, Musuro e Capodivacca," in *Miscellanea* I (Padua 1978) 81–87, at 81–84 (an epigram about which see also my *Angeli Politiani Liber epigrammatum Graecorum* [Rome 2002] 188–190). Both these articles are unknown to Sicherl (supra n.2).

<sup>4</sup>Two are printed by H. Stevenson, *Codices Manuscripti Palatini Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome 1885) 143 and 150: both are addressed to Carlo Cappello; the first is iambic, the second in elegiac couplets. Another epigram in *Ambr.* N 234 sup. and Q 114 sup.: see Martini/Bassi (supra n.2) II 669.

<sup>5</sup>An annotated text in G. M. Siphakis, "Μάρκου Μουσούρου τοῦ Κρητὸς ποίημα εἰς τὸν Πλάτωνα," *ΚρητΧρον* 8 (1954) 366–388. A text also in Legrand I 106–112. The early success of this poem is reflected by Zanobi Acciaiuoli's Latin translation and praise: see J. Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance* II (Leiden/New York/Copenhagen/Cologne 1990) 458 n.19.

### 1. The Athenian manuscript

An Athenian codex of miscellaneous content, Ἐθνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Ἑλλάδος 1062 (paper, 220 x 150, ff.603),<sup>6</sup> is to my knowledge the only witness of a hitherto unknown hexametrical poem of Musurus, his second-longest achievement after the *Ode to Plato*.

This manuscript, the work of only one scribe,<sup>7</sup> is an anthology of various grammatical and literary works (most of the latter provided with abundant scholia), that perhaps fulfilled a purpose of teaching or private study: it is something more than a schoolbook, something less than a late Byzantine *Gelehrtenkodex*.<sup>8</sup> One remarks the fine miniatures of some initial letters (ff.54<sup>r</sup>, 88<sup>r</sup>, 171<sup>r</sup>, 226–235, 417<sup>r</sup>, 588<sup>r</sup>, etc.), the scholia and glosses that cover virtually all poetic texts (even Gregory's epigrams and Musurus' poem), the drawings of a chariot and two ships (ff.415<sup>v</sup>; 305<sup>r</sup> and 306<sup>r</sup>), some diagrams concerning declensions or syntactical constructions, a large proportion of grammatical and metrical works and minor excerpts scattered throughout the book. The scribe's degree of correctness is accept-

<sup>6</sup>I do not know of any literature on this manuscript except I. Sakkelion and A. Sakkelion, *Κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Ἐθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Athens 1892) 189, and R. Foerster, in *Libanii opera* V (Leipzig 1909) 163–165. The reason why I indulge in this summary description is precisely the fact that the manuscript has been almost completely neglected by editors; yet the identification and philological evaluation of the individual texts may deserve a more thorough analysis. I have studied the manuscript on a microfilm kindly provided by the National Library of Athens (I owe special thanks to Ms. Ἐ. Κεφαλληνίου). I regret not having inspected directly the manuscript, and not being able to give any detail about the watermarks and the quires; the latter's order is occasionally perturbed (see e.g. the *Odyssey*, Michael Syncellus' and Lascaris' treatises, some of the grammatical and rhetorical texts after f.552); though different texts were certainly copied at different stages, the very fact that heterogeneous works follow upon each other on one and the same folium—see e.g. ff.235–237, 302, 518, 520, 529, 531—shows that the manuscript originated in the scribe's mind as a collection of miscellaneous texts.

<sup>7</sup>Except for very minor additions, especially in the first and final leaves. At the bottom of f.1<sup>r</sup> a later hand writes the name Ζαχαριόφιλος.

<sup>8</sup>On this topic see P. Schreiner, "Literarische Interessen in der Palaiologenzeit anhand von Gelehrtencodices: das Beispiel des Vaticanus gr. 914," in W. Seibt, ed., *Geschichte und Kultur der Palaiologenzeit* (Vienna 1996) 205–219.

able but not excellent; some Homeric scholia, especially for the *Odyssey*, appear to be of great value; for other texts, he seems to draw on good sources now lost; indeed, the very presence of Musurus' poem might point to the scribe's familiarity with the Venetian scholarly milieu. It may be assumed that this book was produced (or at least conceived) by a learned schoolteacher, although the exact destination of such a bulky and time-consuming transcription from mostly easily-available texts (both printed editions and manuscripts) remains uncertain: perhaps the creation of a syllabus of texts and commentaries for the school (Homeric scholia, scenic poets, Pindar, Homer, Gregory, grammatical and rhetorical works)?<sup>9</sup> And if so, which kind of school? I do not know of exact parallels in Italian Humanism, since manuscripts of miscellaneous content such as *Ambr.* A 115 sup. or *Ambr.* H 22 sup. (each containing an epigram by Musurus, the latter also some metrical excerpts that appear in our MS. as well)<sup>10</sup> are written by several hands (the same is true of most older manuscripts of this kind, such as the famous *Ambr.* C 222 inf. of the late twelfth cent., *Par.gr.* 2403 of the early fourteenth, or *Marc.gr.* 514 of the late fourteenth),<sup>11</sup> whereas manuscripts entirely written by one scribe mainly focus on homogeneous texts (as in the case of *Marc.gr.* XI 26, written by the learned theologian Pachomios Rhousanos [Zakynthos

<sup>9</sup>The re-integration in the syllabus of Gregory of Nazianzus (along with other Christians such as John of Damascus) seems in keeping with Musurus' claim in the preface to the 1516 Aldine edition of Nazianzen's orations: see Legrand I 140; Wilson (*supra* n.1) 148–156, 158–159, who points out that this corresponds to the normal practice of a Byzantine school. Gregory's poems had been edited by Aldus in 1504.

<sup>10</sup>See below on ff.235<sup>r</sup> and 571<sup>v</sup>; Pontani, "Epigrammi" (*supra* n.3) 582–583. *Ambr.* H 22, a manuscript owned by Pinelli, was used by Musurus for the edition of the τύποι ἐπιστολικοί: see Sicherl (*supra* n.2) 188–189.

<sup>11</sup>See A. Dain, "A propos de l'étude des poètes anciens à Byzance," in *Studi in onore di Ugo Enrico Paoli* (Florence 1956) 195–201. On the date of *Ambr.* C 222 inf. see C. M. Mazzucchi, "Una misteriosa legatura epsilon-iota," *Boll. Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 54 (2000) 203–207, who however ascribes a large part of the codex to one and the same scribe.

1508–1543] and containing almost exclusively grammatical, metrical, and rhetorical treatises).

The handwriting, well-developed along the lines of the so-called *Chalkondyles-Schrift*, can be compared to Joannes Moschos', Kaisar Strategos', and Arsenios Apostolis', and points to the end of the fifteenth century or the first years of the sixteenth.<sup>12</sup> This is in keeping both with the possible derivation of the *carmina figurata* from the 1516 Calliergi edition of Theocritus, and especially with the very clear marginal note on f.552<sup>r</sup>, in which the scribe says he has found ἐν χαλκοτύπῳ βιβλίῳ<sup>13</sup> Georgius Lecapenus' *De constructione*, which was printed for the first time together with Theodore Gaza's grammar in 1515:<sup>14</sup> the manuscript's text of this treatise does not depend on the printed book, and the scribe only observes *a posteriori* that the text he had copied is now available in a printed edition. This also implies that some of the scribe's marginal notes were added some time after the main text was copied.

As to the scribe's nationality, we can be sure he was a Greek: first, not one Latin word appears in the entire manuscript. Second, the scribe speaks in Greek in the first person: apart from the aforementioned note on Lecapenus' treatise, on f.603<sup>r</sup> he copies a small concordance-πίναξ with the names of Roman, Egyptian, Greek, Athenian, and Hebraic months, and he adds in

<sup>12</sup>This trend of Greek script is singled out by D. Harlfinger, "Zu griechischen Kopisten und Schriftstilen des 15- und 16. Jahrhunderts," in *La paléographie grecque et byzantine* (Paris 1977) 327–362, at 336.

<sup>13</sup>The note is published by D. Donnet, *Le traité de la construction de la phrase de Michel le Syncelle de Jérusalem* (Brussels/Rome 1982) 46. The adjective χαλκοτύπος seems to be used for the first time in the sense of "printed" in Janos Laskaris' epigram printed at the beginning of the *editio princeps* of the *Greek Anthology* (Florence 1494): G. Laskaris, *Epigrammi greci*, ed. A. Meschini (Padua 1976) 43 (*Epigr.* 12.1: Χαλκοτύποις σελίσιν, with commentary p.114).

<sup>14</sup>*Theodori Grammatices introductio, Georgii Lecapeni De constructione verborum* (Florence, in aedibus Ph. Iuntae 1515). The treatise was edited again in Florence in 1520 and 1526, and in Venice by the Aldine press in 1525: see D. Donnet, "La tradition imprimée du traité de grammaire de Michel le Syncelle," *Byzantion* 42 (1972) 441–508. The treatise actually belongs to Michael Syncellus, as the manuscript rightly indicates: see Donnet (*supra* n.13) 28–29.

the margin: εἰς κενὸν ἔγραψα ταῦτα. Last but not least, while copying an excerpt about ancient and modern Greek toponyms on f.573<sup>r</sup>, he adds *suo Marte* a marginal note about the Peloponnesian town of Korone, which might be taken to be his hometown:<sup>15</sup> one is reminded of Joannes Moschos, who subscribed MS. *Brux.* 11281 in Korone in 1475, but this identification is impossible on palaeographical and chronological grounds.<sup>16</sup> I do not know if a short, almost illegible note at the very end of the manuscript (f.III<sup>v</sup>) could shed some light on the scribe's identity: I decipher only, with much hesitation: τέλος τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ ... μὲν του Ψυχείτου.

The manuscript circulated in the East at an early date, as can be argued from the *ex libris* in the first leaves:

f.1<sup>v</sup>: ἡ βίβλος πέφυκεν Μονῆς Δουσίκου (the Dusikou Monastery is in Thessaly, not far from the Meteora: most of its manuscripts are now in the National Library of Athens)

ἡ βίβλος αὕτη πέφεκε (*sic*) τοῦ μοναστηρίου ἐκ τῶν μεγάλων Πυλῶν ἄνωθεν (another Thessalian monastery, closed in 1843: all its collections passed over to the Dousikou)<sup>17</sup>

Κύριλλος ἐλέφ θεοῦ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως νέας Ῥώμης καὶ οἰκουμενικός (*i.e.* Cyril Lukaris, 1570–1638, the

<sup>15</sup>The text reads Μεσίνη (*sic*) τὸ Πεταλίδι and the note ὅπερ τυγχάνει πλησίον τῆς Κορώνης.

<sup>16</sup>Joannes Moschos copied *Par.gr.* 2598 in 1467, some fifty years earlier than our manuscript: see Gamillscheg/Harlfinger/Hunger (*supra* n.2) I no. 203; II (Vienna 1989) no. 279; F. Bertolo, "Giovanni di Corone o Giovanni Mosco?" *Medioevo greco* 2 (2002) 21–48. Joannes Moschos also copied MS. *Haun.* GkS 415<sup>b</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup> of Eustathios' *Commentary to the Odyssey*, annotated by Musurus (who in Venice became a friend of Joannes' son Georgios): see my article "Il proemio al Commento all'Odissea di Eustazio di Tessalonica," *BollClass SER.* III 21 (2000) 5–58, at 51–52. Other scribes from Korone (none likely to be ours) are listed by A. Tselikas, "Μεθώνη καὶ Κορώνη στὴν ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς παλαιογραφίας (1Ε' αἰ.)," in *Πρακτικὰ Β' τοπικοῦ συνεδρίου Μεσσηνιακῶν σπουδῶν* (Athens 1984) 74–80.

<sup>17</sup>M. Richard and J. M. Olivier, *Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues de manuscrits grecs*<sup>3</sup> (Turnhout 1995) 801–803 nos. 2345, 2349–2354; our manuscript is however not mentioned by Ph. Demetrakopoulos, "Ἡ βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Δουσίκου," *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Στερεοελλαδικῶν Μελετῶν* 5 (1974–75) 403–426, esp. 409–416, and "Παλαιογραφικά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Β'," *Trikalina* 3 (1983) 77–89 (note esp. MSS. 51 and 91, written by Pachomios Rhusanos).

famous Patriarch of Constantinople who tried to accommodate the doctrines of the western Reformed Churches);<sup>18</sup> the same *ex-libris* (only up to Κωνσταντίνου πόλεως [*sic*]) on f.2<sup>r</sup>

f.2<sup>v</sup> ἡ βίβλος αὕτη πέλει τῆς μονῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῶν Μεγάλλων (*sic*) Πυλῶν καὶ μηδεὶς τολ (see above; the sentence ends abruptly).

A general index of its contents would run as follows:

1<sup>r</sup> (manus recentioris): <Gregorii Nazianzeni> carm. dogm. 29 (PG 37.507–508)

3<sup>r</sup>–4<sup>v</sup>: exerptum περὶ παθῶν λέξεων (inc. πάθη δὲ λέξεων εἰσὶν κε', expl. τὰ ἐμά τὰμά); schematismi Homerici, fort. e doctrina Herodiana (inc. τὸν βουλόμενον τὰ παρ' Ὀμήρου ποιήματα προγυμνάσαι)<sup>19</sup>

4<sup>v</sup>–52<sup>v</sup>: <Johannis Tzetzae> allegoriae in Homeri Iliadem et scholia in Iliadis libros A–M

For these texts the manuscript is a further witness to be added to Erbse's list of the so-called h-scholia.<sup>20</sup> To judge from Erbse's apparatus of book A, the Athenian manuscript belongs to the h<sup>2</sup>

<sup>18</sup>On Lukaris, Patriarch for various times from 1620 to 1638, see see K.-P. Todt, "Kyrillos Lukaris," in C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello, *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition* II (Turnhout 2002) 618–631; G. Hering, *Ökumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik 1620–1638* (Wiesbaden 1968), and "Orthodoxie und Protestantismus," *JÖBG* 31 (1981) 823–874, esp. 851ff. A nice specimen of Lukaris' signature, very similar to our *ex-libris*, is to be seen in the letter reproduced in *Κύριλλος ὁ Λούκαρις (1572–1638)* (Athens 1939) plate after p.70. If we postulate an Italian origin for the manuscript, it could be supposed that Lukaris acquired it in Padua, where he studied and graduated (on Lukaris' youth see A. N. Diamantopoulos, "Κύριλλος Λούκαρις ὁ Κρής," in *Κύριλλος ὁ Λούκαρις* 13–57, at 25–28), and then brought it to Constantinople, whence some time in the seventeenth century it might have reached Thessaly; but then one wonders why Lukaris should have added his *ex-libris* only after his appointment as ecumenical patriarch: it is thus perhaps wiser to assume that Lukaris acquired the manuscript in Constantinople after 1620. I do not know of any studies on the fate of Lukaris' library.

<sup>19</sup>Some of the explanations are to be read in P. Egenolff, "Zu Herodian Technikos," *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie* 45 (1894) 338–345.

<sup>20</sup>Along with *Marc.gr.* 531, to which I drew attention in my review of M. A. Pincelli's book, *Martini Philetici In corruptores Latinitatis* (Rome 2000), in *BMCR* 2001.03.22 (no textual relation however between the *Marcianus*, a descendant of *Ang.gr.* 122, and our manuscript). The allegories and the scholia to A–B are edited by P. Matranga, *Anecdota Graeca* II (Rome 1850) 361–479, and often quoted by H. Erbse, *Scholia graeca in Homeri Iliadem* I (Berlin 1969).

family, as it shows close proximity to **Ag** (*Ang.gr.* 122) against **P**<sup>11</sup> (*Par.gr.* 2766); still, some readings show a certain degree of independence from **Ag**, which can hardly be regarded as the fruit of conjectural work: see *e.g.* schol. A 1a, p.373.17 Matranga = p.1.6 Erbse ἴνα pro ὡς ἄν cum MS. **A**; p.373.25 Matr. = p.1.12 Erbse ἰατρός om. cum MS. **T**; schol. A 1d, p.374.18 Matr. = p.5.3 Erbse δι' pro δὴ cum MS. **A**; schol. A 1h, p.375.10–16 Matr. semper cum **A Ag** praeter 12 ὅμως, 14 χιλοῖο (recte, ci. Cramer), 15–16 μυρμιδόνεσσιν Ἀχιλέα φημίζονται; schol. A 3b, p.376.10 Matr. κακῶς pro καλῶς cum **P** vs. **Ag** (sed statim infra ἰπώναξ pro ἴπων cum **Ag**); schol. A 53a, p.394.23 Matr. = p.26.3 Erbse οὐδέτερον cum **A** vs οὐδετέρω **Ag**, οὐδετέρων **P**<sup>11</sup>. After book A, the scholia (still bearing the title ἱστορίαι καὶ ἀπορίαι for each book) represent a mere selection of the h-corpus, and some seem to have been taken from a different source (see *e.g.* the scholia to B 316–364 on f.25<sup>r</sup>). See also below, on ff. 306<sup>v</sup>–466<sup>v</sup>.

53<sup>r</sup>: scholia in *Odysseae* α 127–262

With small exceptions, these scholia are the same that appear in the *Odyssean* section further in the MS.: see below, f.493<sup>r</sup>.

53<sup>v</sup>: *Anth. Pal.* 9.87 (cum epimerismis de etymologia verborum aliquot); epigrammata tria de Homero, scil. 9.24, 7.6, 7.1

54<sup>r</sup>–87<sup>v</sup>; 88<sup>r</sup>–129<sup>r</sup>: *Aristophanis Plutus* cum scholiis; eiusdem *Nubes* cum hypothesi et scholiis

Both plays are well equipped with scholia and glosses: the former clearly derive from the Aldine edition of 1498, while the latter and some minor scholia may have some connexion with the Thoman-Triclinian corpus.<sup>21</sup>

129<sup>r</sup>: <Simiae> *Alae* (*Anth. Pal.* 15.24)

See below f.302<sup>r</sup>.

130<sup>r</sup>–169<sup>r</sup>: *Euripidis Hecuba* cum hypothesi (addito in fine *Anth. Pal.* 7.34) et scholiis

In the absence of a reliable edition of Euripidean scholia (Dindorf's is obsolete, Schwartz's focuses only on the *scholia vetera*), I can only hint at a vague affinity with the Aldine scholia;<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup>M. Chantry, *Scholia recentiora in Aristophanis Plutum* (Groningen 1996) xxviii, mentions our manuscript and eliminates it because "scholia pleraque ex Aldina exscripta."

<sup>22</sup>In this edition, however, Musurus seems not to have been directly involved: see Sicherl (*supra* n.2) 307–309 and most recently A. Tessier, "Due fortunate 'congetture aldine' (*Eur. Bacch.* 862 e 883)," *Eikasmos* 12 (2001) 77–82.

the text bears a generic and inconsistent resemblance to Thomas Magister's recension.<sup>23</sup>

169<sup>v</sup>: excerptum de metro iambico (inc. ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ χώρᾳ, expl. οἶον λόγος), additis decem trimetris

170<sup>r</sup>–225<sup>r</sup>: Lycophronis Alexandra cum vita poetae (additis excerptis ex Suida et Etym. Magn., necnon Anth. Pal. 9.191) et commentario Joannis Tzetzae

No exact relationship to extant manuscripts can be traced on the basis of either Scheer's or Mascialino's editions; the text points to a vague affinity with MSS. C and D, whereas the scholia, especially towards the end of the poem, appear to be no more than a selection of Tzetzes' commentary. I note two interesting variants in the liminary epigrams: p.398.1 Scheer ἀσαφῶς for σοφῶς/σαφῶς of the MSS. (κᾶσαφῶς had been conjectured in modern times) and p.398.3 the line is preserved in full only by our MS. and by D (*Par.gr.* 2403).

225<sup>v</sup>: excerptum de metro iambico (inc. δεῖ εἰδέναι ὅτι τὸ φύσει βραχύ, expl. τὸν δὲ τέταρτον ὡς εἴρηται)

226<sup>r</sup>–234<sup>v</sup>: Vita Pindari et scholia metrica in Pindarum

235<sup>r</sup>–237<sup>v</sup>: compendium Hephaestionis Enchiridii; <Demetrii Triclinii> notula de metris; fragmentum de metris (inc. ἰστέον ὅτι τὸ ἱαμβικὸν ἔχει βάσεις ἕξ, expl. μοιρηγενὲς ὀλβιόδαιμον); excerpta quaedam e scholiis in Lycophronis Alexandram (pp. 156.17–157.5, 181.11–20, 235.9–15, 251.17–25 Scheer)

The ἐπιτομὴ τῶν ἐννέα μέτρων, a small résumé of Hephaestio's treatise, is also found together with Triclinius' note and Pindar's *Olympica* (here f.241<sup>r</sup>) in *Marc.gr.* 478 ff.80–82.<sup>24</sup> The metrical fragment is actually a compilation of different excerpts, which occurs identically in MS. *Ambr.* H 22 sup. 297<sup>r</sup>–298<sup>r</sup> (on this MS. see *supra* n.10). The other texts show no obvious consistency with each other.

238<sup>r</sup>–239<sup>r</sup>: excerptum syntacticum (inc. τέσσαρα δὲ συγκεῖμενα ἅ εἰσι τῶν εἰρημένων κοινά· τὸ μὲν εἰς δύο αἰτιατικάς; expl. πρὸς δὲ ἕτερα αἰτιατικῇ)

<sup>23</sup>I have profited from the data collected by W. Biehl, *Textkritik und Formenanalyse zur euripideischen Hekabe* (Heidelberg 1997).

<sup>24</sup>The preliminary texts are edited by R. Aubreton, *Démétrius Triclinius et les révisions médiévales de Sophocle* (Paris 1949) 30–33.

241<sup>r</sup>–301<sup>v</sup>: Pindari Olympica cum scholiis

The metrical scholia, Hephaestio's epitome (see above), and the abundant marginal scholia to the text, particularly keen on textual matters, belong to the so-called second Triclinian edition, as is shown by their very title on f.241<sup>r</sup> τοῦ σοφωτάτου κυροῦ Μαγίστρου καὶ τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου κυροῦ Μιχαήλ σχόλια· ὅπου γάρ ἐστι καταρχὰς σταυρός, Μοσχοπούλου, τὰ δὲ ἕτερα τοῦ Μαγίστρου Θωμά.<sup>25</sup> To judge from this *inscriptio* and from the scanty data in Abel's apparatus, the greatest affinity subsists with MS. *Vind.phil.gr.* 219 (μ'), though perhaps an even better candidate might be *Marc.gr.* 478 (π', apparently not collated by Abel), which carries the metrical paraphernalia (see *supra* f.235<sup>r</sup>), and whose textual *facies* is very close to our Atheniensis.

301<sup>v</sup>: Anth. Pal. 9.191 (iterum); deinde notula περὶ τῶν ἐν στίχοις παθῶν (inc. πάθη στίχων εἰσὶν ἕξ, expl. τὸν τελευταῖον πόδα)

302<sup>r</sup>: Anth. Pal. 15.24 (iterum) cum scholiis et paraphrasi; intermixta etiam scholia in Simiae Securim

Both this *carmen figuratum* and the one on f.551<sup>v</sup> apparently derive from the 1516 edition of Theocritus published by Zacharias Calliergis,<sup>26</sup> where they were printed for the first time, together with the scholia: most readings show great proximity to the *familia Ambrosiana*, from which Calliergis also depends, and in fact easy corrections such as *Alae* 9 Ἄρεος for ἀέρος or *scholium in Alas* p.342.18 Wendel ἔπραξα <βία> are shared with our MS. by Calliergis' edition alone. Still, apart from the fact that the paraphrasis of Simias' *Wings* is new, some other wrong readings are very idiosyncratic (*Alae* 12 κραινῶν δ' ἐν θεοῖς for Calliergis' κραινίδες δὲ θεοῖς; *Securis* 1 ἐρατὴ τήνων for ἦρα τίνων, 7 ἔβα for ἔβαν, 9 θυμόν for θυμῶ; *schol. in Alas* p.342.13 οὐρανοῦ ἄλα for οὐρανὸν ἄλλη), a couple may be right (*schol. in Alas* p.342.8 τὸ ἔσχατον, conjectured by Bergk, for τὸν ἔσχατον; *schol. in Securim* p.344.3 μετὰ ταῦτα, conjectured by Bergk, for μετ' αὐτό) and at least in one case (*Securis* 4) our manuscript restores at the end of the line a word (χρυσοβαφεῖς) that had been omitted by Calliergis and

<sup>25</sup>J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris 1952) 340–364. See also J. Irigoin, *Les scholies métriques de Pindare* (Paris 1958); A. Tessier, "Demetrio Triclinio revisore della colometria pindarica," *StIt* SER. III 5 (1987) 67–76.

<sup>26</sup>Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια ἕξ καὶ τριάκοντα (Rome 1516) (Legrand I 134–136).

by the entire Ambrosian family (starting with *Ambr.* C 222 inf.) before him. Our manuscript depends on a corrected copy of an “Ambrosian” text or of Calliergis’ edition, or else on a lost manuscript very close to the latter.<sup>27</sup>

305<sup>r</sup>, 306<sup>r</sup>: *picturae duarum navium cum glossis ad navium partes pertinentibus*

One is reminded of the big and swift Spanish ships with the σταυρὸς ἀλεξίκακος on top of the main mast, described by Musurus in *Ode in Plat.* 123–126. The glosses are schol. Lycophr. p.121.13–16 Scheer and *Etym.Sym.* α 447 L.-L. respectively.

306<sup>v</sup>–415<sup>r</sup>: *Homeri Iliadis A–E cum argumentis, glossis et scholiis (praemissa notula de metro heroico—inc. τὸ ἠρωϊκὸν μέτρον δέχεται πόδας ἕξ, expl. ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς στρέφεσθαι—necnon Anth. Pal. 14.147)*

415<sup>v</sup>: *pictura currus cum glossis ad eius partes pertinentibus*  
Hera’s chariot (E 722–732) is meant: in fact, the scholia represent a collection of the b-scholia to E 724–734, particularly close to MS. **B** (see esp. p.96.88 Erbse τροχοῦ ξύλον cum **B** solo).

417–466<sup>v</sup>: *Homeri Iliadis I et K 1–18 (sine scholiis, sed cum paraphrasi interlineari), Λ 1–267 (cum hypothesi et scholiis)*

The scholia to the *Iliad* embrace excerpts from Eustathius’ commentaries (especially the paraphrastic parts),<sup>28</sup> important excerpts from the h-scholia (the source is probably the same as in ff. 4<sup>v</sup>–52<sup>v</sup>), and sporadic exegetical scholia (e.g. schol. A 5c, A 20a<sup>1</sup>, A 569c, B 10a), most of which show a closer textual relationship to MS. **B** than to **T**; some Porphyrian zetemata are also included. According to Allen’s list, the only manuscript of the *Iliad* with a paraphrase on books I–K alone is *Ambr.gr.* I 58 sup. (XIV cent.).<sup>29</sup> Our manuscript will certainly deserve to be collated in full by the future editor of the h-scholia, for it provides interesting readings

<sup>27</sup> Perhaps *Par.gr.* 2726 or perhaps the lost exemplar corrected by Musurus, on which see C. Gallavotti, *Theocritus quique feruntur bucolici Graeci*<sup>2</sup> (Rome 1955) 285, 308–318; F. M. Pontani, “Patroclo” (*supra* n.3).

<sup>28</sup> The practice of excerpting Eustathios’ Παρεκβολαί on the margins of Homeric manuscripts or incunabula is very old and attested for Musurus himself in the incunabulum *Inc.* I 50 of the Vatican Library (see Pontani [*supra* n.16] 54 n.66), although no evident relationship can be traced between the latter and the collection of our manuscript.

<sup>29</sup> Martini-Bassi (*supra* n.2) I 557; Erbse (*supra* n.20) xxv.

(often in agreement with **A** or **bT** against the **D**-corpus, or just a reelaboration of **A**'s *Wortlaut*) and some new scholia (see *e.g.* ad E 364, 656, 906).

466<sup>v</sup>–470<sup>v</sup>: Homeri Odysseae δ 1–167 cum hypothesi et scholiis

471<sup>r</sup>–479<sup>r</sup>: Homeri Batrachomyomachia cum glossis et scholiis aliquot

As far as the text is concerned, our manuscript must be ranged in the Vulgate family, *i.e.* the family of Chalcondyles' 1488 edition, of which it must be an apograph.<sup>30</sup> The sporadic scholia, some of which are so far unpublished, share several readings with Ludwig's **M**<sup>2</sup> (the second hand of *Marc.gr.* 613, XIII cent.) and especially with **O**<sup>s</sup> (*Barocc.* 64, end of XV cent.), but neither MS. can be the direct source.

479<sup>v</sup>–492<sup>r</sup>: Homeri Odysseae α cum hypothesi et scholiis

493<sup>r</sup>–494<sup>v</sup>: Homeri Odysseae δ 168–245 cum scholiis aliquot

I shall go into detail about the Odyssean parts of this manuscript (see also below, ff.536–551) in a forthcoming study on the tradition of the scholia to the *Odyssey*: here it will suffice to say that these scholia have primary value, in so far as they belong to the "Eastern" family, but cannot depend on the extant manuscripts **D**, **E**, **s**, or **J**: though not particularly bulky, they happen to offer some good readings, and a few hitherto unknown scholia, the antiquity of which is hard to assess.

495<sup>r</sup>–512<sup>v</sup>: Gregorii Nazianzeni carm. de se ipso 1 (*PG* 37.969–1017), cum glossis interlinearibus et scholiis

512<sup>v</sup>–516<sup>r</sup>: eiusdem carm. mor. 33.5–204 (*PG* 37.928–943)

516<sup>v</sup>: eiusdem carm. de se ipso 99 (*PG* 37.1451)

517<sup>r</sup>–518<sup>r</sup>: eiusdem epigrammata in Basilium (*Anth. Pal.* 8.2–11b) cum paraphrasi

518<sup>v</sup>–520<sup>v</sup>: fragmentum translationis libri Boethii, qui De consolatione philosophiae inscribitur, a Maximo Planude confectae, cum scholiis aliquot

<sup>30</sup>A. Ludwig, *Die homerische Batrachomachia des Karers Pigres nebst Scholien und Paraphrase* (Leipzig 1896) 63; no separative errors shared with Ludwig's **SP**<sup>o</sup>**Nz**, the other members of this family (Allen's **j**). Both Ludwig and Allen ignore our manuscript.

The manuscript, not classified in Papathomopoulos' stemma, contains only the *Vita Boethii* and the poetical sections of Book 1.<sup>31</sup>  
520<sup>v</sup>–529<sup>r</sup>: disticha Catonis a Maximo Planude Graece versa (cum glossis et scholiis)

Ortoleva's edition<sup>32</sup> neglects our Atheniensis and is not entirely reliable, and the manuscripts are far too many to allow any inference about relations to extant sources. However, there exists some affinity between the text of our manuscript and the Iunta edition (Florence 1514: the text was published together with Chrysoloras' *Erotemata*).

529<sup>v</sup>: Metrophanis Smyrnaei archiepiscopi fragmentum (inc. <Μ>ητροφάνους νόος ἀρχιερέως Σμύρνης / ταῦτα λέξε περιφραδέως, expl. εὐεπίησι σοφοῖσιν ὄνειαρ)

These 19 lines seem an introduction to some composition of the ninth-century ecclesiastical writer Metrophanes of Smyrna: I could not find anything of the sort in the editions of his works listed by H.-G. Beck.<sup>33</sup>

530<sup>r</sup>–531<sup>r</sup>: fragmentum grammaticum (inc. ἀναγκαῖον σὲ εἰδέναι ὦ Γεώργιε, expl. τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ῥήματος)

531<sup>v</sup>–534<sup>v</sup>: Ioannis Damasceni can. iamb. in Theogoniam, in Theophania, in Pentecosten 1–19 (PG 96.818D–833A)

536<sup>r</sup>–551<sup>r</sup>: Odysseae δ 246–847 cum scholiis

See above, ff.479<sup>v</sup>–494<sup>v</sup>.

551<sup>v</sup>: <Simiae> Securis (Anth. Pal. 15.22)

See above, f.302<sup>r</sup>. The poem is ascribed to Theocritus both in the Roman edition and in our manuscript.

552<sup>r</sup>–566<sup>v</sup> et 569<sup>r</sup>: Michaelis Syncelli Hierosolymitani de constructione

This text, under the name of George Lecapenus, was printed after Theodore Gaza's grammar in the 1515 edition (*supra* n.14). Starting with the title, which ascribes it clearly to Syncellus, there are

<sup>31</sup> Ἀννικίου Μαλλίου Σεβηρίνου Βοηθοῦ Βίβλος περὶ παραμυθίας τῆς φιλοσοφίας, ἣν μετήνεγκεν ἐκ τῆς Λατίνου φωνῆς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα διάλεκτον Μάξιμος μοναχὸς ὁ Πλανούδης, ed. M. Papathomopoulos (Athens 1999) LIV.

<sup>32</sup> *Maximus Planudes, Disticha Catonis in Graecum translata*, ed. V. Ortoleva (Rome 1992).

<sup>33</sup> *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich 1959) 543–544.

many textual differences between the text of our manuscript and the printed edition, so that derivation of the former from the latter is impossible: according to Donnet, this treatise was copied from *Bodl. Auct. F.6.26* (Misc. 120), a manuscript probably written by Matthew Camariotes (+1490), which may have been the source of other items of our codex as well.<sup>34</sup> The scribe also mentions in a note on f.575<sup>v</sup> Manuel Moschopoulos' *Περὶ ὀνομάτων*, which was printed together in the same book as Lecapenus only in the Aldine edition of 1525 and in the Florentine edition of 1526.

567<sup>r</sup>–568<sup>v</sup>: *excerpta de constructione* (inc. Πέτρος γράφει σοι τοῦτο δὴ τὸ βιβλίον, expl. πρώτη τῆς εὐθείας), *de synzisesi* (inc. ἰστέον ὅτι συνίζησις γίνεται, expl. καὶ βραχεῖαν καὶ μακράν), *de metris* (inc. τὸ ἰαμβικὸν μέτρον ἔξ χώρας ἐπιδέχεται, expl. οἶον Ἥφαιστος καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως); *epitome Lesbouactis περὶ σχημάτων* 1–12 (inc. οἱ Εὐβοεῖς, expl. εἰς κτητικὸν μεταλαμβάνουσιν)

This part also might seem to be copied from *Bodl. Auct. F.6.26 ff. 66–71<sup>r</sup>* (where the grammatical excerpts occur by and large in the same order) and, for *Lesbonax*, 59<sup>v</sup>–61<sup>v</sup>: still, although Blank's edition ignores our manuscript,<sup>35</sup> from the work's title (ἔνθη καὶ διάλεκτοι κατὰ Λεσβώνακτη [*sic*], while the Bodleianus has ἄνθη καὶ and the other witness of the same ζ-family, *Marc. gr.* XI 26 [see *supra* 178] f.71<sup>r</sup>, has ἔθικαῖ corrected *s. l.* to ἔθνικαῖ) and from correct readings such as 12.14 ὅποτε τινές (with the Marcianus against ὅποτε τι δέ *Bodl.*), it can be inferred that our manuscript is not a copy of the Bodleianus: on the other hand, it must be an apograph of the common source of the Bodleianus and the Marcianus.

569<sup>r</sup>–570<sup>r</sup>: *Theodori Balsamonis epigr. 45* Horna

<sup>34</sup>See Donnet (*supra* n.13) 46–49 and his “Le traité de grammaire de Michel le Syncelle. Inventaire préalable à l'histoire du texte,” *BHBelge* 40 (1969) 33–67, at 40. The evidence for direct dependence of the Atheniensis from the Bodleianus is however scanty, no more than a couple of *sauts du même au même* of the Athen. not shared by the *Bodl.*: see also below, 567<sup>r</sup>–568<sup>v</sup>. H. O. Coxe, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars prima, recensionem codicum Graecorum continens* (Oxford 1853) 688–692, at 689. On N. G. Wilson's tentative identification of Camariotes' hand see D. L. Blank, *Lesbonax Περὶ σχημάτων* (*Sammlung der Griechischen und Lateinischen Grammatiker VII* [Berlin/New York 1988]) 135–216, at 149 and n.57 (this attribution, though, is not mentioned in Gamillscheg/Harfinger/Hunger [*supra* n.2] I.A).

<sup>35</sup>Coxe, *Catalogi* 688–689. Blank (*supra* n.34) 149, 178. The text of the Bodleian is printed by Cramer, *Anecd.Ox.* IV (Oxford 1837) 270–271.

It is the long hexametrical poem introducing his commentary to the Nomocanon: none of the several manuscripts listed by Horna is likely to be the source of our manuscript.<sup>36</sup>

570<sup>r</sup>–571<sup>v</sup>: excerptum de praepositionibus (inc. ἐν ἀεὶ δοτικῇ συντάσσεται, expl. ὑπὲρ τοὺς ποταμοὺς ῥέοντα)<sup>37</sup>

571<sup>v</sup>–572<sup>r</sup>: excerpta e Tryphonis περὶ παθῶν λέξεων (capp. 1–28 Schneider)

This treatise is also found in *Bodl. Auct.* F.6.26, where it occurs just before the Lesbonax epitome (see above, ff.567<sup>r</sup>–568<sup>v</sup>); still, exactly the same portion of the treatise occurs in *Ambr.* H 22 sup. f.282<sup>r</sup> (see above, 235<sup>r</sup>–237<sup>r</sup>).

572<sup>v</sup> et 576<sup>r</sup>–581<sup>r</sup>: Constantini Lascaris de constructione liber II

Lascaris' handbook was available in the Aldine editions quoted below (n.44), one of which is most likely the source for our manuscript.

573<sup>r</sup>–575<sup>v</sup>: excerpta varia geographica (fragmentum de nominibus antiquis et recentioribus urbium et regionum, inc. Χαλκίδος ἡγουν τῆς Εὐρίπου, expl. καὶ Βέρροια ἡ μεγάλη; scholia in Dion. Per., *GGM* II 457a19–b25), de epistulis (rhet. anon. III 573.9–25 Walz), grammaticalia (de στιγμαί, *Anecd. Bach.* II 316 et *Anecd. Bekk.* III 1167), lexicographica (nomina antiqua et recentiora ciborum et herbarum, inc. λέξεις τῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν εἰδῶν. πωπάναξ τὸ σκοροδολάζαρον, expl. ἡ λεγομένη ζῶχος), prosodica (de syllaba ancipiti, cf. schol. Dion. Thr. 50.20–54.15 Hilgard), voces animalium (cf. Bancalari, *StIt* 2 [1894] 88–89, sed alio ordine)

The scholia on Dionysius Periegetes offer a better text than both *Par.gr.* 2708 and *Par.suppl.gr.* 36 used by Müller. The short rhetorical excerpt on epistolography confirms all of Walz's conjectures on the text of *Par.gr.* 2918, especially p.573.16 ἀπαγγελία for ἐπαγγελία. The note on punctuation describes and explains Ni-

<sup>36</sup>See K. Horna, "Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon," *WS* 25 (1903) 165–217, at 202–204 (the editor believes this epigram to be spurious, see 177–178).

<sup>37</sup>This is a richer version of the relevant part of Constantinus Lascaris' *Syntax* (see n.44 *infra*; cc. δ III<sup>v</sup>–δ IV<sup>v</sup> in the 1512 edition).

canor's system of eight στιγμαί.<sup>38</sup> The lexicographical and geographical notes are full of demotic terms and toponyms that clearly point to a Greek scribe.

581<sup>v</sup>–583<sup>v</sup>: schemata grammaticalia ab ipso librario appicta (de vocum affectionibus, de pronomibus, de coniugationibus)

584<sup>r</sup>–587<sup>v</sup> et 591<sup>r</sup>–596<sup>r</sup>: <Libanii> declamatio IV

Libanius' text is similar to MS. **Vi** (*Vind. philos. et philol.* IV 82), though no direct dependence can be postulated. Our manuscript is listed by Foerster (*supra* n.6: 163–166) as the earliest to show a preference for these two *declamationes*.

588<sup>r</sup>–590<sup>v</sup>: <Libanii> declamatio III

596<sup>r-v</sup>: <Matthaei Camariotae> epitome in Aphthonii progymnasmata (I 121–122 Walz), addita in fine Ps.-Phoc. sent. 11

597<sup>r</sup>–599<sup>r</sup>: Aphthonii progymnasmata (pp.1–11.21 Rabe)

From Rabe's apparatus some sporadic proximity to MS. **Vc** (*Urb. gr.* 130) can be inferred.

599<sup>v</sup>–603<sup>r</sup>: <Georgii Gemisti Plethonis> compendium rhetoricae (III 546–592.6 Walz)

On the basis of Walz's apparatus, the text of our manuscript seems to share some readings with *Par.gr.* 2926, but it cannot be considered its apograph.

603<sup>r-v</sup>: scriptiunculae variae, inter quas nomina vocum animalium (*cf. supra* f.575<sup>v</sup>, sed non eadem), nomina mensium, nomenclaturae iuridicae et philosophicae

In fine codicis duo folia membranacea palimpsesta scriptura inferiori (saec. XIII ut vid. exarata) fragmentum hagiographicum de sanctis Manuele, Ismaele et Sabele (inc. καὶ τοὺς ἀστραγάλους τρυπηθέντες καὶ κρεμασθέντες λαμπάσι πυρὸς τὰς μασχάλας κατεφλέγησαν),<sup>39</sup> necnon vestigia quaedam notarum musicalium continent, scriptura vero superiori notulas grammaticales et sim. nullius pretii

<sup>38</sup>The derivation of this note is uncertain: Bachmann prints it from *Suppl.gr.* 122, while Bekker draws on *Barocc.* 72, written in Crete by Andreas Donus, the teacher of Francesco Barocci (1st half XVI cent.: see Gamillscheg/Harlfinger/Hunger [*supra* n.2] I 14 = II 22).

<sup>39</sup>These three saints were celebrated on the 17th of June: the text of our MS. does not match the *Passio* listed by F. Halkin, *BHG* II 74 no. 1023; I do not have access to the *Passio* of Symeon Metaphrastes (no. 1024).

## 2. Musurus' poem: contents

Musurus' poem occupies ff.302<sup>v</sup>–303<sup>v</sup> of the Athenian manuscript; it is written by the same scribe of the entire codex, who decorates the initial K (line 1), provides some difficult terms with interlinear glosses (see Apparatus II), and makes a few clerical errors in his copy, all easy to correct except for the omission of at least two lines between f.303<sup>r</sup> and f.303<sup>v</sup>: at this point in the poem (lines 31–32) matters of meaning force us to postulate a lacuna. Attribution to Musurus is guaranteed by the title and by stylistic affinity with other poems of the Cretan scholar, especially the *Ode to Plato* (see lines 2, 10, 20, 24, 26, 32, 35).

As we learn from the title, the poem is a hexametrical paraphrase of the Creed, *i.e.* of the most important *symbolum fidei* of the Christian religion. This kind of literary exercise is well known in Byzantine literature, though the known instances belong to a much lower linguistic and literary level: we meet decapentasyllabic paraphrases of the Creed in the novel *Digenis Akritas*, and a paraphrase in thirty “vulgar,” tremendously flawed hexameters was produced by the Cretan scholar Marcus Mamunas in the second half of the fifteenth century (on these works see also below 199ff).<sup>40</sup>

The first question to be faced concerns the text of the Creed that Musurus was following: everybody knows how many variants affected this text from the beginnings of Christianity through the Renaissance, and Hahn's systematic list gives a good glimpse of its countless different versions in the Eastern and Western Churches.<sup>41</sup> In this respect, I note the following:

<sup>40</sup>See G. Th. Zoras, “Ἐμμετροὶ διασκευαὶ τοῦ Συμβόλου τῆς Πίστεως,” in *Χαριστήριον εἰς Α. Κ. Ὁρλάνδον* III (Athens 1966) 186–197. A. Cataldi Palau, “La biblioteca di Marco Mamuna,” in G. Cavallo, G. de Gregorio, M. Maniaci, edd., *Scritture, libri e testi nelle aree provinciali di Bisanzio* II (Spoleto 1991) 521–575, at 558–559. I am grateful to C. M. Mazzucchi for drawing my attention to these texts.

<sup>41</sup>A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche*<sup>3</sup> (Breslau 1897; henceforth HAHN). A nice albeit short selection of the most important texts published by Hahn was provided by H. Lietzmann, *Symbole der alten Kirche*<sup>2</sup> (Bonn 1914).

(1) Musurus (just like Mamunas) does not follow the Catholic version with the much-disputed addition of *Filioque* towards the end of the *symbolum*:<sup>42</sup> line 38 ἐκ σέθεν ἐκπροϊούσα clearly shows that for Musurus the Holy Ghost proceeds directly from the Father alone, not from the Son.

(2) The basic, “official” Greek text of the Creed in Greek liturgy, which kept itself more or less unchanged from the late fourth century until now, is the so-called *Symbolum Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum*, probably written by Cyril of Jerusalem, and approved by the 150 Holy Fathers in A.D. 381 at Constantinople. This text, recently edited and provided with a large *apparatus criticus* by G. L. Dossetti,<sup>43</sup> is reproduced with very slight variants (and, of course, the *Filioque*) in the very first edition of the Aldine press:<sup>44</sup> there it belongs—along with other

<sup>42</sup>This addition, which was first adopted as the true interpretation of the Creed's formulation by the III Council of Toledo (589) and then spread throughout Europe until it entered the Creed's *Wortlaut*, enthusiastically accepted by Charlemagne and later by the popes themselves, is the crucial theological argument in the schism of the Orthodox Church (1054), which neither the resolutions of the Lyons Council of 1274 (with the “*Professio fidei*” accepted by Manuel Paleologus: H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum* [Rome 1937: hereafter DENZINGER] §§460–463) nor the unitary decisions of the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1439: see the «*Decretum pro Graecis*» in Denzinger §691) ever managed to remove: for a good overview of this issue see R. Staats, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis von Nizäa-Konstantinopel* (Darmstadt 1996) 193–202, and now V. Peri, *Da Oriente a Occidente II L'aggiunta del Filioque* (Rome/Padua 2002). See also C. P. Caspari, *Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel I* (Oslo 1866) 215–220.

<sup>43</sup>*Il Simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli* (Rome 1967) 244–250; Hahn 162–165 no. 144; Denzinger §86. It is very close to the “*kürzere Formel*” of Epiphanius' *Ancoratus*: see Hahn 134–135 no. 125.

<sup>44</sup>*Constantini Lascaris Erotemata* (Venice 1495) (H\*9924, IGI 5693, BMC V, 552), cc. BIV–BII<sup>v</sup>. This book was reprinted by Aldus with various additions in 1501/2 (the edition is *s.d.* and its date can only be inferred) and 1512 (under the title *Constantini Lascaris Byzantini De octo partibus orationis*); in these two editions the text of the Creed does not suffer from certain typographical flaws it exhibits in the *princeps* (post *μονογενῆ* add. *καί*; post *αἰώνων* add. *θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ; καὶ συνδοξάζομενον* om.; *καὶ μίαν ἁγίαν* pro *εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν*; ante *προσδοκῶ* add. *καί*). This is why I follow this text of the Creed (and precisely that of the 1501/2 edition, cc. mVII<sup>v</sup>–mVIII<sup>v</sup>) as the standard one. Apart from the *Filioque* (and the alternative *ἐν δεξιᾷ* / *ἐκ δεξιῶν*, which is however a very old matter) the only difference in this text of the Creed from the *Symbolum Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum* is the use of the first person singular (*πιστεύω*,

religious texts, Pythagoras' *Aurea carmina*, and Phocylides—to a sort of “first reader in ancient Greek” with Latin translation, that follows the grammatical treatise of Constantine Lascaris. This text of the Creed is the same referred to in the Greek *Εὐχολόγια, Ὁρολόγια, Ἀκολουθία* printed in Italy during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,<sup>45</sup> and still in such recent publications as the *Mass of John Chrysostom* of 1993.<sup>46</sup> The text I give below in Apparatus III is, *ad litteram*, the Aldine text (based on the 1501/2 ed., see n.44), with which Musurus was certainly familiar.

(3) Musurus' paraphrase obviously tends to amplification, and this rhetorical aim well explains some of the details of his poem that do not find an exact equivalent in the Symbolum's text: see line 7 τὰ μὴ πάρος ἔσκε, 9, 14–15 (after Nonnus' example),<sup>47</sup> 41–42 (on the Apostles), 43–45 (on baptism). Yet a few passages may hint at the author's acquaintance with other versions or re-elaborations of the Creed:

- (a) 17–19, Christ's descent to the Underworld (the “Anastasis”)
- (b) 19–20, Christ's appearance to the Disciples after His resurrection
- (c) 21, the forty days elapsed between His resurrection and His Ascension

---

ὁμολογῶ, etc. instead of πιστεύομεν etc.): this feature is very common in Greek versions of the Creed in both East and West: for a discussion see Caspari (*supra* n.42) 110–112, 234–236; about some Greek texts of the Creed in Western manuscripts and early prints see his learned discussion at 236–248.

<sup>45</sup>In most of these books the text is taken for granted, and its recurrence during the mass or in the course of private devotion is marked by the quotation of the first two lines only. I pass over the rather abridged text of the Creed that was put together by Antonius Arcudius (*Νέον Ἀνθολόγιον* [Rome 1598]): it enjoyed a certain success within the Basilian monastic order and beyond—for instance it occurs on the first page of the *Ἀκολουθία τῆς μακαρίας παρθένου Μαρίας κατὰ τὴν ἐπανόρθωσίν τε καὶ ἔκδοσιν τοῦ Ῥωμαίων Ἀρχιερέως* (Padua 1765) p. a3<sup>r</sup> (on pp. a6<sup>v</sup>–a10<sup>r</sup> the controversial σύμβολον τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἀθανασίου further expounds the most important doctrinal questions).

<sup>46</sup>*Ἡ θεία λειτουργία τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου*<sup>5</sup> (Athens 1993) 34–35.

<sup>47</sup>Although some isolated Greek and Latin versions of the Symbolum actually mention the nails of Christ's cross: see Hahn 379.

- (d) 23–24, the end of the world before Christ's δευτέρα παρουσία  
 (e) 26–34, the depiction of the Last Judgment.

Details (a) and (d) occur sporadically in versions of the Symbolum prior to the Nic.-Const.<sup>48</sup> Details (a), (b), and (c) appear together in the Greek text formulated by the synod of A.D. 359:<sup>49</sup>

... εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα, ὃν αὐτὸς ὁ ἄδης ἐτρόμασε ...  
 συναναστραφέντα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν, τεσσαράκοντα ἡμερῶν  
 πληρουμένων ...

Details (b), (d), and (e) appear in the very idiosyncratic version of the *Glaubensbekenntnis* by Basil of Caesarea:<sup>50</sup>

... ὤφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ... ὅθεν  
 ἔρχεται ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἀναστῆσαι πάντας καὶ  
 ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ, ὅτε οἱ μὲν δίκαιοι  
 προσληφθήσονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, οἱ δὲ  
 ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατακριθήσονται εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον, ὅπου ὁ σκόληξ  
 αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.

Musurus might therefore have expanded the original text through amplification inspired by such well-read authors as Theodoret and Basil. Yet another fact must be taken into account: some of these details appear in Latin versions of the Symbolum that might have been known to Musurus. In the West the *descensus Christi ad inferna* soon entered the *textus receptus* of the *Symbolum Apostolicum* (a shorter and supposedly older form of the Creed, never acknowledged by the Orthodox Church),<sup>51</sup> and in French and German mediaeval creeds the “forty days” are very often mentioned.<sup>52</sup> For example, the text of Honorius of

<sup>48</sup>The pericopae ἀπέλυσε τοὺς δεσμίους (det. a) and ἐπὶ τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος (det. c) occur for example in some versions of Cyril's original *Symbolum*: see Denzinger §10 *sub finem*.

<sup>49</sup>Theodoret *Hist. Eccl.* 2.16, cf. Athanas. *De syn.* 30: Hahn 205–206 no. 164. A very similar version in the formula of the Constantinople Synod of 360, preserved by Athan. *De syn.* 30; Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* 2.41; Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* 9.44: Hahn 208–209 no. 167. On the Anastasis-theme in particular see J. Kroll, *Gott und Hölle* (Leipzig/Berlin 1932) esp. 5, 126, and 116–117 (on the symbolum of Sirmium of A.D. 359, no. 163 Hahn).

<sup>50</sup>Basil. *De fide* 3 (PG 31.685A–C): Hahn 269–270 no. 196.

<sup>51</sup>Hahn 383 and his nos. 24, 26–30. Denzinger §§6 (“forma occidentalis recentior”), 40 (“symbolum Quicumque”). Staats (*supra* n.42) 153–154.

<sup>52</sup>Hahn nos. 100, 102, 106–121.

Autun (twelfth cent.)<sup>53</sup> contains details (a), (b), and (c):

*Credo quod ad infernum ivit et eos inde sumpsit qui suam voluntatem fecerant ... et post resurrectionem comedit et bibit cum suis discipulis ad probandam veram suam resurrectionem. et postea in quadragesima die sursum ad caelos ivit suis discipulis inspicientibus ...*

It is hard to verify whether Musurus drew inspiration for his additions from the Greek or from the Latin tradition. On the whole, however, this does not greatly affect our understanding of his poem: the lines Musurus added *suo Marte* certainly did not originate *ex nihilo*.

In theory it is equally possible that the hint about the Anastasis, the reference to the end of the world, and the great fresco of the Last Judgment originated from meditation on Hymns 24–29 and 34 of Romanus the Melode, or that they were conceived by the author after a visit to Giotto's Cappella degli Scrovegni in Padua, or perhaps—a hypothesis that ought to be given serious consideration—that they flashed through his mind after a trip to Torcello, where the impressive eleventh-century mosaic of the Last Judgment on the west wall of Santa Maria Assunta culminates in a vivid representation of the Anastasis and in a smaller Crucifixion above it: as a matter of fact, the unique combination of Crucifixion, Anastasis, and Last Judgment just above the door leading to the baptistery (with all the Baptism's symbolism) has led some scholars to regard Torcello's mosaics as a “message of redemption through the church and its sacraments,”<sup>54</sup> and it may not be a coincidence that pre-

<sup>53</sup>Hahn 113–114 no. 107. This text also shows special interest in some realistic details of the Passion: *captus est, ligatus est, irrisus est, flagellatus est, crucifixus est*.

<sup>54</sup>See A. D. Kartsonis, *Anastasis: the Making of an Image* (Princeton 1986) 159–160 and 221–223 (with pl. 58). The combination of Last Judgment and Anastasis is altogether uncommon in Eastern and Western art (see also *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie* IV [Freiburg 1972] 515). Musurus' description seems to have no direct relation to contemporary Italian art (one thinks of the great pictorial achievements by Beato Angelico, Orcagna, or Signorelli), nor can any significant parallel be traced with the imminent revolutionary gestures of Michelangelo's *Last Judgment* in the Sistine Chapel (1534–1541).

cisely these scenes are given special emphasis by Musurus in his paraphrase of the Christian Creed (lines 14–15, 17–20, 26–34, 43–45).

### 3. Musurus' poem: date and context

The date of this poem is unknown, but some elements can help us infer its *termini*:

(a) It is beyond question that Musurus was inspired by the reading of Nonnus' *Paraphrase of the Gospel of St John*, which gives us a *terminus post quem*, since this work was unknown to the Italian humanists before Aldus' edition, and manuscript **P** (*Pal.gr.* 90), the only antigraphon of this edition, did not arrive in Venice before 1501.<sup>55</sup> One might guess that Musurus was directly involved in the last stage of this edition, which—according to Aldus' own words—was ready in 1501 but actually came to be published *post* 1504: Musurus' return to Padua in 1503 might have given him the leisure for checking and correcting this almost-ready edition by the following year.<sup>56</sup> Be that as it may, our poem is an important witness of the success Nonnus' work immediately enjoyed in the restricted, learned Venetian circle, a success otherwise attested by Aldus' laudatory judgments and by an epigram εἰς Νόννον by Scipio Carteromachus Forteguerra, which was printed on the last page of the Aldine.

(b) There are a few words (lines 11, 35, 42, 43) that point to the author's familiarity with Hesychius' *Lexicon*, which Musurus

<sup>55</sup>G. Agosti, "Prima fortuna umanistica di Nonno," in V. Fera and A. Guida, edd., *Vetustatis indagator. Scritti offerti a F. di Benedetto* (Messina 1999) 89–114, at 101–102; for the history of the Aldine edition of Nonnus see 90–96. On the date and genesis of Nonnus' *Paraphrase* itself see most recently A. Cameron, "The Poet, the Bishop, and the Harlot," *GRBS* 41 (2000) 175–188, and C. de Stefani, *Nonno di Panopoli. Parafrasi del Vangelo di S. Giovanni. Canto I* (Bologna 2002), esp. 14–21 on the Christological implications of the prologue and 66–71 on the Aldine.

<sup>56</sup>At any rate, according to Agosti (*supra* n.55) 104, the Aldine edition did not reach a wide public, but "fu piuttosto destinato alla circolazione privata tra gli amici," which well explains its rarity.

edited for the Aldine press in 1514, though he had surely become acquainted with it at an earlier date.<sup>57</sup>

(c) The poem was never printed, and apparently it had no circulation whatsoever:<sup>58</sup> this could point to a date of composition late in Musurus' life, or at any rate to a sort of "unofficial" destination.

(d) The poem shows several stylistic affinities with Musurus' *Ode to Plato* of 1513 (see above, and commentary), and it may be argued that Musurus conceived it during his stay in Rome or shortly before: in Rome Musurus started an honoured ecclesiastical career, and he was appointed first to the bishoprics of Hierapetra and Cherronesou, on the island of Crete, later (in 1516) to the archbishopric of Monemvasia, a post Arsenius Apostolis was also claiming.<sup>59</sup> We have a glimpse of his religious worries in the preface to his 1516 Aldine edition of Gregory of Nazianzus' *Orationes*, where he insists on the praise of orthodoxy and on the dangers of heresy;<sup>60</sup> furthermore, though he was certainly acquainted with liturgy since his time in Carpi,<sup>61</sup> one might imagine that direct contact with the papal Curia would prompt him to a closer attention to religious topics, either in view of his teaching at the *Collegium Graecum*<sup>62</sup> or just as a literary *divertissement*: the humanist dream of uniting

<sup>57</sup>As a matter of fact, Hesychius' *Lexicon* was already known to Venetian scholars around 1505, as can be gathered from some commentaries to the *Greek Anthology*: see Pontani (*supra* n.1), esp. 392, 435.

<sup>58</sup>See by contrast Siphakis (*supra* n.5) 368–371 on the literary *Nachleben* (Devaris, Éparchos, etc.) of the *Ode to Plato*.

<sup>59</sup>The legend reporting that Musurus died because of the *chagrin* of not being appointed a cardinal by Pope Leo X in 1517 has to be rejected as pure invention: see Geanakoplos (*supra* n.1) 163–166.

<sup>60</sup>See Legrand I 137–143.

<sup>61</sup>In an undated letter to John Gregoropoulos he complains that, although he is not a clergyman, καθ' ἐκάστην ὥραν σχεδὸν εἰς εὐχὰς ὀρμᾶσθαι προσήκει (Legrand II 316–319 at 317; A. Firmin-Didot, *Alde Manuce et l'Hellénisme à Venise* [Paris 1875] 501–507; Geanakoplos [*supra* n.1] 127).

<sup>62</sup>Musurus' text could help the young Greek pupils (who were certainly familiar with the Orthodox Creed) to recognize in a religious text some important features of Classical versification.

Classical and Christian culture finds in Musurus' *Creed* (also against the background of his *Ode to Plato*) a brilliant realisation.<sup>63</sup>

All this speculation is somewhat impaired by the absence of the *Filioque* in Musurus' paraphrase, something that could hardly escape the attention of Pope Leo X, for all the protection he afforded to the Greeks and especially to the Greek community of Venice.<sup>64</sup> Although a "Vatican" context and destination is by no means excluded, one might also situate this poem within the years of Musurus' second Venetian stay, 1509–1516, and link it with the great *Aufschwung* of the Greek community in 1514, a time when both the privileges obtained from the pope (notably the permission to start construction of a new church, the future San Giorgio dei Greci) and the general climate of favour that Leo X created around the Greeks of Venice, may have prompted Musurus to a special praise of his faith and

<sup>63</sup> While I hope to come back to the broader cultural purport of this poem in a separate essay, I note that Musurus' poem could also bear some chronological or cultural proximity to the Greek prose translation of the *Salve regina* by his teacher and colleague Janus Lascaris, who in 1516/7 was working precisely at Leo X's *Collegium* in Rome: see F. M. Pontani, "La *Salve Regina* di Giano Laskaris," *RivStudiBizNeoellen* 20–21 (1973–74) 109–112. This translation remained totally unknown to posterity, buried as it was in Lascaris' own *Kolleghefte* and private papers in *Vat.gr.* 1413, a manuscript that mostly contains material later than 1523. Pontani's argument must be corrected insofar as Lascaris' translation was not the first: the aforementioned appendix to the Aldine edition of Constantine Lascaris' *Grammar* (see *supra* n.44) also includes a bilingual text of *Salve regina*, in a form that is virtually identical to the 1598 Arcudius text (Pontani 110).

<sup>64</sup> See e.g. L. Pastor, *Storia dei Papi dalla fine del Medioevo* IV.1 (Rome 1926) 532–533, 568–569; Pardos (*supra* n.1) 306–307; G. Fedalto, "La comunità greca, la Chiesa di Venezia, la Chiesa di Roma," in Tiepolo/Tonetti (*supra* n.1) 83–102, esp. 90–91, 94–97. Special attention to Leo's *bullae* for the Greeks of Venice (18 May and 3 June 1514) is paid by G. Fedalto, *Ricerche sulla posizione giuridica ed ecclesiastica dei Greci a Venezia nei secoli XV e XVI* (Florence 1967) 44–53, and by G. S. Ploumidis, "Αἱ βούλλαι τῶν παπῶν περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὀρθοδόξων τῆς Βενετίας (1445–1782)," *Thesaurismata* 7 (1970) 228–266, esp. 238–239. M. I. Manussakas, "Ἡ ἐν Βενετία Ἑλληνικὴ Κοινότης καὶ οἱ μητροπολίται Φιλαδελφείας," *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 37 (1969–70) 170–210, 178, even argues that Musurus himself may have had a role in persuading the pope to issue these two decrees in favour of the Greek community. See also M. Manussakas, "La date de la mort de Marc Musurus," *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970) 459–463.

creed: after all, the Cretan scholar enrolled himself in the Ἑλληνικὴ Ἀδελφότητα only in 1514.<sup>65</sup>

#### 4. Musurus' poem: style

Musurus' paraphrase does not compare with analogous poems of the Byzantine tradition: both *Digenis Akritas'* and Mamunas' versions of the Creed are radically different in terms of language, style, and sources. The former, obviously written in vulgar Greek, follows rather literally the liturgical text, though some amplification appears in the so-called Petritzi version, where Christ's both human and divine nature is stressed, as if in a polemic against the Monophysites. Mamunas' versification is almost completely regardless of prosody or metre, and it shows a very poor literary skill, let alone any kind of rhetorical elaboration: one remarks just a few learned terms (line 1 ἀὐτογένεθλος, of God; 17 ὄργια θεῖα for the Mystery of Resurrection; 28 ἀφθορίη in the sense of ἀφθαρσία), the doctrinal definition of the Holy Ghost as ἀνεκφοίτητος (*i.e.* "inseparable" from Father and Son, 22), and a beautiful *hapax legomenon* ζαθεοπρεπέως (12) to celebrate the glory of Christ's incarnation.<sup>66</sup> Better terms of comparison for Musurus' poem can be found in Italian Humanism.

In 1472, at the age of eighteen, the Italian Angelo Poliziano had written a short religious poem, which in several respects proves to be a mere paraphrase of the *Pater Noster* (*Epigr.gr.* IX Προσευχὴ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, 18 lines).<sup>67</sup> Politian lacked direct knowledge of Nonnus' *Paraphrase*, and his style—not yet as syntactically fluent and impressively "Greek-looking" as in some of his late epigrams—was deeply indebted to Homeric vocabulary,

<sup>65</sup>See again Pardos (*supra* n.1) 361.

<sup>66</sup>Zoras (*supra* n.40) 189–191 and 194–195. For ἀνεκφοίτητος (πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς) see Jo. Dam. *Exp. fidei orth.* 8.185 Kotter, which Burgundio of Pisa (p.39.208 Buytaert) translates "indiscissibilis a Patre et Filio."

<sup>67</sup>See my edition and commentary in *Angeli Politiani Liber* (*supra* n.3) 38–47.

to the *Orphic Hymns*, and especially to Gregory of Nazianzus' *Carmina*, which he imitated in a number of lines (in Renaissance Florence they had also attracted the attention of Marsilio Ficino).<sup>68</sup> The result of Politian's attempt was certainly remarkable for an eighteen-year-old, but still suffered from some harshness of expression.

Musurus' paraphrastic technique, while quite far from that of his Byzantine predecessors, is ultimately not very different from Politian's, in that it becomes a rhetorical amplification of the underlying text; furthermore, both poems openly present themselves as cletic hymns, which is less obvious for Musurus (who was dealing with a *symbolum*) than for Politian (who was writing a prayer *stricto sensu*). Still, apart from some other similarities between the Italian and the Greek scholar, such as the use of "pagan" onomastics for Christian matters (see Mus. line 1 Οὐλύμποιο; Politian line 2 Πάν), or the conspicuous adoption of Homeric and epic vocabulary, Musurus' poem—despite some minor prosodical or syntactical flaws (see 5, 16, 31, 44) and some unexpected vagaries of dialect (esp. 8, 24)—shows a higher degree of literary ripeness and skill than Politian's, also on the metrical side.<sup>69</sup> This is partly due to Musurus' thorough study and discrete emulation of Nonnus' *Paraphrase*—by all means a *Vorbild* for this kind of versification—and partly to the Cretan's genuine enthusiasm for Greek letters and Greek poetry, which is very evident in the epic flavour

<sup>68</sup>See M. Sicherl, "Zwei Autographen Marsilio Ficinos: Borg. gr. 22 und Paris. gr. 1256", in G. C. Garfagnini, ed., *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone I* (Florence 1986) 221–228, and my commentary to Politian's *Epigr. gr. IX.2*.

<sup>69</sup>I find just one hexameter split into halves (30) and one violation of Hermann's bridge (35), while Naeke's law is violated three times (6, 17, 36). There are 12 holodactylic hexameters, and 22 more lines have only one spondee, with particular frequency of spondee in the second foot (9 times as opposed to 4 times each in the first, third, and fourth foot). All this is to say that Musurus—who of course did not know either Hermann or Naeke—had an innate sense of the rhythm of the line, at a higher level compared to the Greek poets of his time: see H.-E. Kallergis, "Μετρικὲς παρατηρήσεις σὲ ἀρχαῖο-γλωσσὰ ἐπιγράμματα Ἑλλήνων," *Platon* 49 (1997) 88–101 (= "Μετρ. παρ. σὲ ἀρχ. ἐπιγρ. Ἑλλήνων λογίων τοῦ 16ου καὶ 17ου αἰώνα," *Thesaurismata* 28 [1998] 223–237).

of some scenes (the incarnation, 8–10; the Anastasis, 17–19; the punishment of the evil, 27–31), in the creation of *Neubildungen* (1, 2, 38, 46), and in the learned re-use of forgotten gems of ancient authors (11, 18, 32, 35), a stylistic device Politian himself followed successfully in his later years. If Musurus' syntax is quite heavy (the first sentence spans lines 1 to 19 with a virtually ceaseless series of relatives), this has to be ascribed to the particular structure of the underlying text: apart from this, I believe that—especially in the sections he expands *suo Marte*—Musurus does his best to give a taste of plausible “antiquity” to one of the pillars of Christian belief.

##### 5. Text

Μάρκου Μουσούρου τὸ πιστεύω δι' ἑξαμέτρων  
 Κληίζω σε, πάτερ παντοσθενές, Οὐλύμιοιο  
 καὶ χθονὸς ἐργατίνα, δερκτῶν πάντων καὶ ἀδέρκτων,  
 καὶ σέο τηλύγετον καὶ μουνογενῆ φίλον υἷα,  
 ἐκ θεοῦ ἀτρεκέος θεὸν ἀτρεκῆ, ἕκ τε φάους φῶς,  
 5 ὄν πρὸ σεληναίης πρὸ τ' ἐτῶν φύτευσας ἀπείρων  
 γεινάμενος, μὴ τεκτήνας, τοὶ εἴκελον ἄντην,  
 ὄν διὰ χρήματα πάντα τὰ μὴ πάρος ἔσκε φάνθεν,  
 ἡμείων ὃς ἕκητι βροτῶν, ἵνα τ' ἄμμε σωθήσῃ,  
 ἀργαλέης ῥυσθέντας ἀλυκτοπέδης καὶ ἀνάγκης,  
 10 καρπαλίμως κατέβη μὲν ἀπ' αἰθέρος, αἶψα δὲ σάρκα  
 πνεύματος ἐκ θείου καὶ ἀταυρώτης λάβε κούρης  
 ἄμβροτος ἀνδρομέην, περιτελλομένων δ' ἐνιαυτῶν,  
 Πιλάτου σκολιῆσι δικασπολίησιν ἀερθεῖς,  
 χαλκείοις γόμφοισι τανυσθείσας κατὰ χεῖρας  
 15 καὶ πόδ' ἐπιζευχθέντε πεπαρμένος ἐσκολοπίσθη,  
 ταρχυσθεῖς τε τάφῳ κατὰ τε τρίτον ἡμῶν ἀναστάς  
 ἤγαγεν ἐξ Ἑρέβους γένος ἀνδρῶν, οἳ τε θεουδεῖς  
 οἳ τ' εὐορκοὶ ἔσαν, καὶ τριλλίστοισι θωόκοις  
 οὐρανοῦ ἐγκατένασσε γεγηθότας. αὐτὰρ ὁ χαίρων  
 20 ἄγασιν ἀρτεμέεσσι φάνη δυοκαίδεκα μύσταις

καὶ μετὰ τεσσαράκοντα πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἤματ' ἀναπτὰς  
 δεξιόφιν γενετῆρι παρέζετο μητιόεντι.  
 ὕστερον αὖ μετὰ πότμον ἀνώϊστον καὶ ἄελπτον  
 ἡμερίας γενεῆς μετὰ τε σβέσιν ἠελίοιο  
 25 εἴσι θεμιστεύων ζωοῖς ἅμα καὶ νεκύεσσι  
 πασσυδίῃ· τὸν γάρ τ' ἄμφι στίχες οὐραγιῶνων  
 λάτριες ἀστράψουσιν, ὁ δὲ σθένει βλεμεαίνων,  
 τοὺς μὲν, ὅσοι ζῶντες ἀτάσθαλα μερμήριζον  
 μηδὲν ὀπιζόμενοι, ῥίψει ποτὶ κεύθεα γαίης  
 30 ἔνθ' ἀτελεύτητον πόνον, ἐνθ' ἀμέγαρτον οἰζύν  
 στρευγόμενοι τλήσουσιν, ἐπεὶ σφέας ἐν πυρὶ κηλέω  
 · · · · ·  
 εἰνάετας μακάρων τῆς ὀλβιοδαίμονος ἔδρης  
 καὶ σέθεν αὐτόπτας καὶ κληρονόμους βασιλείας  
 θήσει τῆς σφετέρης, τῆς οὐκ ἔσται τέλος οὐδέν·  
 35 ναὶ μὴν ζωοδότειραν ἀνασσαν ἄχραντον ἀϋτμήν  
 κλείω, τήν σοι ὁμῶς ἀγαπητῶ καὶ τεῶ υἱί,  
 πᾶς τις εὐφρονέων τίει σέβεταιί τε γεραίρων,  
 ἢ σέθεν ἐκπροϊοῦσα θεοπροπίαις ὑποφητῶν  
 ὅσσα τελεῖσθαι μέλλε πιφασκομέναισιν ἐνέπνει·  
 40 καὶ μίαν ἀστυφέλικτον ὀμήγυριν, ἧς τε θεόπται  
 αἶματι καὶ διδαχαῖσι θεμεῖλια καρτύναντο  
 ἰρά τε καὶ πάνδημα διαμπερές, οὐδ' ἀπόφημι  
 χεῦμα λοетроχόον, τὸ Χαλαστραίοιο κονίης  
 ῥήτερον σμήχει καθάπαξ χροά χυτλωθέντων,  
 45 ἀρχεκάκου ῥύπον ἀμπλακίης μάλα πάντα καθαῖρον  
 καὶ ψυχὴν φαιδρῦνον, ἀτὰρ φθιμένων συνεγέρσει  
 ἐκδέχομαι μέλλοντος ἐπ' αἰῶνος βίον ἄλλον.

## Apparatus I: variae lectiones

4 ἀτρεκέως ms. 5 προσεληναίης ms. φύτησας ms. 7 πάντα om. ms.  
 15 ἐπιζευχθέντες ms. 20 ἄψεσιν ms. 21 ὄμματ' ms. 26 ἀμφι ms. 28  
 ζῶντες ms. 30 ἔνθα μέγαρτον ms. 31 στρατευγόμενοι ms. κηλέω e  
 κηλαίω corr. ms. post hunc versum lacunam statui 37 εὐφρονέων  
 ms. 39 μέλλ' ἐπιφασκομέναισιν ms. ἐνέπνει ex ἐνέπτει corr. ms.  
 45 πάντων ms.

## Apparatus II: glossae manuscripti Atheniensis

8 ἄμμε] ἐμέ gl. ms. 11 ἀταυρώτης] ἀφθόρου gl. ms. 12 ἄμβροτος] ἄφθαρτος gl. ms. (cf. Hsch. α 3528; Phot. α 1170; Suid. α 1540; schol. D Ω 460) 13 δικασπολίησιν] βήματι, κριτηρίῳ gl. ms. ἀερθείς] ὑψωθείς gl. ms. (cf. schol. Opp. Hal. 2.152) 15 ἐσκολοπίσθη] ἐσταυρώθη gl. ms. (cf. Hsch. σ 1066, 1644) 17 θεουδείς] θεοσεβεῖς gl. ms. (cf. *Etym. Magn.* 446.16; lex. Gr. Naz. θ 12) 25 εἶσι] ἐλεύσεται gl. ms. (cf. schol. Aesch. *Sept.* 1065f; schol. rec. Soph. *OT* 1458) ζωοῖς] ζῶσι gl. ms. (cf. schol. V α 197; schol. Opp. Hal. 1.544) 29 κεύθεα] κευθμῶσι gl. ms. (cf. gl. Hes. *Th.* 300; Eust. in *Il.* 1282.13) 32 εἰναέτας] ἐγκατοίκους gl. ms. 40 ἀστυφέλικτον] ἄσειστον gl. ms. (cf. Hsch. α 7933; *Etym. Gen.* α 1321) ὀμήγυριν] ἄθροισιν ἐκκλησίαν gl. ms. (cf. schol. D Y 242; cf. etiam Suid. ο 242, Phot. 332.5, *Etym. Magn.* 623.43) 41 καρτύναντο] ἐστήριζαν gl. ms. 42 οὐδ' ἀπόφημι] οὐκ ἄρνοῦμαι, ὁμολογῶ gl. ms. 43 χεῦμα λοετροχόον] βάπτισμα gl. ms.

## Apparatus III: textus Symboli Nicaeni-Constantinopolitani, qualis in calce editionis Aldinae Grammaticae Const. Lascaris (1501/2) invenitur

## Σύμβολον τῶν ἀποστόλων

Πιστεύω εἰς ἓνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων.

Καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο·

τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.

Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ κύριον τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.

Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ὁμολογῶ ἐν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· προσδοκῶ ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.

## 6. Commentary

1 κληίζω: this verb overtly ranges Musurus' poem in the category of cletic hymns (and thus very far from that of faith professions): see esp. *Hymn.Orph.* 1.1 (to Hecate) and 6.1 (to Nemesis).

παντοσθενές: this adjective never occurs in Classical Greek: it is created by Musurus on the basis of εὐρυσθενής, μεγασθενής, and the like, but esp. on the pattern of πανσθενής, a term that in Christian literature often refers to the three persons of God: see Greg. Naz. *Carm.dogm.* 3.5 (PG 37.408) and many instances in Cyril; Man. Phil. *Carm.* 5.9.18 has πανσθενής παντοκράτωρ. For compounds of this sort—*hapax* only in terms of their structure—see also *Ode in Plat.* 33, κερατηφόρος for the regular κερασφόρος.

Οὐλύμπιο: for “sky, universe” also in *Ode in Plat.* 9 (same metrical position), 45.

2 ἐργατίνα: the vocative has short α, lengthened in this line by the masculine caesura. The only occurrence of ἐργατίνης for a divine person is Paul. Sil. *Descr. S. Soph.* 709–711 (of a Madonna and Child) ἄλλοθι δὲ Χριστοῖο κατέγραφε μητέρα τέχνη, / φέγγεος ἀενάοιο δοχήϊον, ἧς ποτε γαστήρ / γαστέρος ἐργατίνην ἀγίοις ἐθρέψατο κόλποις. The noun itself is never construed with a *genetivus obiectivus* in the sense of “creator of something”: where a genitive does occur, it generally specifies the kind of work the man practices, e.g. Nonn. *Par.* 1.163 Σίμων ἐργατίνης πόντοιο, *Anth.Pal.* 5.240.4 ἀλλ' ἔαρι δροσερῶ· μέλιτός γε μὲν Ἄφρογενείης ... ἐργατίνης, 5.275.12 Κύπριδος ἐργατίναι. However, Musurus' *Vorliebe* for objective genitive appears for example in the epigram of *Vat.gr.* 2273 (Pontani, “Epigrammi” [*supra* n.3] 580–581) line 7 κέρδους ... ὑπέρφρονα, or in his *Ode in Plat.* 37 ὑβριστὴν Μουσέων.

δερκτῶν καὶ ἀδέρκτων: the first is never attested, while the second is a *hapax legomenon* of Soph. *OC* 1200 (in 131 the

adverb ἀδέρκτως), where however it carries the active sense of “blind, not seeing,” in keeping with the deponent form of the verb δέρκομαι. Musurus’ passive sense implies a sort of linguistic *outrance*.

3 τηλύγετον καὶ μουνογενῆ: see *Il.* 9.481–482 (also *Od.* 16.19) παῖδα / μούνον τηλύγετον; also used of Christ in Eudocia *Homeroc.* 1.21; 4b.7 Rey.

μουνογενῆ: the adjective goes back to Hes. *Op.* 376, *Th.* 426, 448; but it is a normal epithet for the Son in the Church fathers; in the Ionic form it occurs in poets such as Gregory of Nazianzus (*Carm.dogm.* 1.28 [PG 37.400]) and Nonnus (*Par.* 1.25, 1.58, 3.82).

4: this line “anticipates” the corresponding section of the Creed: Musurus seeks to avoid the repetition γεννηθέντα ... γεννηθέντα (= φύτευσας ... γεινόμενος) and to merge the two assertions concerning Christ’s birth.

ἐκ τε φάους φῶς: from Nonn. *Par.* 1.3 (of Christ) ἐκ φάεος φῶς.

5 πρὸ Σεληναίης: this recalls the epithets often used of the Arcadians (βεκκεσέληνοι, προσέληνοι), in order to signal the antiquity of their *genos*: see for example Ar. *Nub.* 398 with scholia; Suid. β 292, π 2634.

φύτευσας entails a prosodical flaw, since in this verb the υ is short.

ἐτῶν ... ἀπείρων: Musurus stresses God’s (and His Son’s) antiquity, in more or less the same way as Nonnus (*Par.* 1.7 πρεσβύτερος κόσμοιο) and Politian (*Epigr.gr.* 9.4 πρεσβύτερός τε χρόνου, πάντων ἀρχή τε τέλος τε).

6 τεκτήνας: the verb applies to craftsmen, and to God the ἀρχιτέκτων, τεκτονάρχης. Mamunas has a similar metaphor (8): οὐ κτισθέντα.

εἵκελον ἄντην: cf. *Od.* 22.240, Q. Smyrn. 11.9.

7 ὄν διά: this kind of anastrophe is very rare (indeed Aristarchus and Herodian forbade it: see R. Kühner [-F. Blass],

*Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* I<sup>3</sup> [Hannover-Leipzig 1890] 259), and it certainly derives from Hes. *Op.* 3 ὄν τε διὰ βροτοὶ ἄνδρες, where the relative pronoun refers to Zeus (Musurus particularly liked anastrophe: see *e.g. Ode in Plat.* 19–21). This source also explains Musurus' choice of the accusative (actually improper, in that it replaces *per* with *propter*) instead of the genitive (δι' οὗ) that occurs in the Creed.

τὰ μὴ πάρος ἔσκε: Musurus insists on Creation *ex nihilo*. Perhaps he is also remembering Nonn. *Par.* 1.8–9 ἐργοπόνου δίχα μύθου / οὐδὲν ἔφν τόπερ ἔσκε.

φάανθεν: the same verbal form in *Il.* 1.200.

8 ἡμείων ... ἄμμε: both forms, the Ionic and the Aeolic, are Homeric: their co-existence in the same line sounds a bit clumsy.

ἔκητι: "for the sake of," not "according to the will of" as *e.g.* in Hes. *Op.* 4 Διὸς μέγαλοιο ἔκητι.

9 ἀργαλέης ... ἀλυκτοπέδης: *cf.* Hes. *Th.* 521–522 δῆσε δ' ἀλυκτοπέδησι Προμηθέα ποικιλόβουλον / δεσμοῖς ἀργαλέοις.

ῥυσθέντας: a typical verb in the context of redemption, *cf. e.g.* Ev.Luc. 1:74 ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ῥυσθέντας, Ps. 106:6 ἐκ τῶν ἀναγκῶν αὐτοῦ ἐρρύσατο αὐτούς.

10 καρπαλίμως: epic flavour at line-beginning (*Il.* 1.359 etc.), also in *Ode in Plat.* 11. The idea of rapidity conveyed by this adverb is repeated by αἶψα, and again (26) by πασσυδίη (= παμπληθεί, πανστρατιᾶ in Musurus' glosses to the *Iliad* in *Inc. Vat.* I 50).

κατέβη μὲν ἅπ' αἰθέρος: in Q. Smyrn. 2.603 the Pleiades κατέβησαν ἅπ' αἰθέρος, in the same metrical position.

11 ἀταυρώτης: the feminine form of this two-ending adjective (otherwise only in Aesch. *Ag.* 245) is clearly borrowed from Ar. *Lys.* 217, or from Hesychius' related lemma α 8031 (see also Suid. α 4327): in Aristophanes the term represents the focus of Lysistrata's (and her mates') oath.

κούρης: the Virgin Mary is often called κόρη, see Lampe *s.v.*

12 ἄμβροτος ἀνδρομένην: this oxymoron has a Nonnian taste, see *e.g. Par.* 1.41 (of Christ's incarnation) ξυνώσας ζαθέην βροτοειδέϊ σύζυγα μορφήν; both adjectives are well attested in the *Paraphrasis*. See also *Il.* 22.9 αὐτὸς θνητὸς ἐὼν θεὸν ἄμβροτον (of Achilles and Apollo).

περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν: *cf. Il.* 2.551 etc.

13 Πιλᾶτου: Nonnus counts both vowels of Pilate's name as short (*e.g. Par.* 18.140 καὶ Πίλατος ταχυεργός etc.), which is contrary to the Latin prosody of this name. Musurus is therefore justified in his decision to depart from Nonnus' usage.

σκολιῆσι δικασπολίησιν: *cf.* the σκολιαὶ δίκαι of Hes. *Op.* 219, 221, 250.

14–15: this amplification of the crucifixion theme is strongly indebted to Nonn. *Par.* 19.91–95 κείθι φονῆες / εἰς δόρυ τετράπλευρον ἐπήορον ὑπόθι γαίης / ὄρθιον ἐξετάνυσσαν ἐπισφίξαντες ἀνάγκη / πεπταμένας ἐκάτερθε σιδηρεῖω τινὶ δεσμῶ / χεῖρας· ὁμοτρήτω δὲ πεπαρμένον ἄζυγι γόμφω / διπλόον ἦτορ ἔχοντα μιῆ τετορημένον ὀρμηῆ / ποσσὶν ὁμοπλεκέεσσιν ἀκαμπέα δεσμὸν ὀλέθρου. The only different detail concerns the nails' material: bronze for Musurus (perhaps misled by the ὄξυς χαλκός by which Joseph of Arimathea did the ἀποκαθήλωσις: see Nonn. *Par.* 19.200), iron according to John and Nonnus; no mention of bronze nails in J. W. Hewitt, "The Use of Nails in the Crucifixion," *HThR* 25 (1932) 29–45. *Cf.* also Mamunus line 13 καὶ ξύλω ἀῖ σταυροῖο πεπαρμένον εἵνεκεν ἡμείων.

ἐσκολοπίσθη: this verb is rare, especially in the passive, but here it stands for ἀνασκολοπίζω, which commonly denotes the crucifixion in the Fathers.

16 ταρχυθείς: the correct form would be ταρχυθεῖς (*e.g. Lyc. Alex.* 369, *Q. Smyrn.* 7.658, *Anth.Pal.* 7.176.3): the mistake most probably goes back to Musurus himself.

κατὰ τε τρίτον ἡμαρ: Nonn. *Par.* 2.103 Χριστὸς ἔμελλεν ἐπὶ τρίτον ἡμαρ ἐγείρειν (*scil.* his own body).

17 θεουδεῖς: the adjective frequently occurs in Gregory of Nazianzus and Nonnus (*Par.* 8.39, 9.28) for the disciples and the first Christians in general.

18 τριλλίστοισι θεώκοις: this is a strong *enallage*. The adjective occurs only in *Il.* 8.488 (the Night; glossed as πολύευκτος by Musurus' hand in *Inc. Vat.* I 50); *Call. Cer.* 138 (ἴλαθί μοι, τρίλλιστε, μέγα κρείοισα θεάων, of Demeter); *Paul. Sil. Descr. S. Soph.* 986, where the invocation to the patriarch implies a vocative τρίλλιστε and the narration of an episode in which a foreign delegation was impressed by the patriarch's appearance (988–990): τεῆς δ' ἀπὸ θέσπιδος αὐδῆς / θελγόμενοι ψυχὴν τε καὶ αὐχένα πρόφρονι βουλῇ / οὐρανίοις ἔκλιναν ἐπιχθονίοις τε θεώκοις (note the last word, which ends Musurus' line as well—but for a similar clausula see also *Od.* 2.26, 12.318, etc.).

19 οὐρανοῦ ἐγκατένασσε: two possible sources: *Ap. Rhod.* 3.116, where Zeus οὐρανῷ ἐγκατένασσεν ἐφέστιον ἀθανάτοισιν his beloved Ganymede, and *Moero fr.* 1.6–8 Powell (quoted by *Ath.* 491b) Διὶ μητιόεντι / τῷ καὶ νικήσας πατέρα Κρόνον εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς / ἀθάνατον ποίησε καὶ οὐρανῷ ἐγκατένασσεν.

γεγηθότας: the choice of this term, denoting eternal beatitude, may be reminiscent of *Nonn. Par.* 4.232, where it applies to the servants of Capernaum's *basilikos* after the healing of his son: this may be so both because the term appears in exactly the same metrical position and because the clausula of Nonnus' hexameter is precisely αὐτὰρ ὁ χαίρων (otherwise only in *Par.* 19.197, and twice in the *Dionysiaca*, 10.358, 47.34).

20 ἀρτεμέεσσι: epic adjective (*Il.* 5.515; *Od.* 13.43 ἀρτεμέεσσι φίλοισι), also used by Musurus in *Ode in Plat.* 96. Actually, one might have expected here a mention of Christ's stigmata: see e.g. *Nonn. Par.* 20.90–91.

φάνη: see e.g. *Nonn. Par.* 21.1 ἄμβροτον εἶδος ἐοῖς ἀνέφηνε μαθηταῖς.

μύσταις: "disciples" in *Greg. Naz. Or.* 15.6; also important in Nonnus along with the similar μυστιπόλος (*Par.* 3.126, 9.161).

22 δεξιόφιν: the word derives from *Il.* 13.308 ἐπὶ δεξιόφιν, but Musurus understands it as if it were an adverb rather than an archaic form of genitive (= δεξιοῦ, or δεξιόν: see schol. *Il.* 13.307–9a<sup>1</sup>). For this usage see Georg. Pachym. *Hist.* 478.17 ἐαυτοῦ δεξιόφιν.

μητιόνεντι: normal epithet of Zeus (Hes. *Th.* 286, 457, *Op.* 51, 273, 763, etc.), but recall its occurrence in Moero fr.1.6 quoted above on line 19.

23 πότμον ἀνώιστον: the same *iunctura* is used by the mourning Medea in Ap. Rhod. 3.800.

24 ἡμερίας γενεῆς: note the two different endings, Attic and Ionic. γένος ἡμερίων occurs in *Ode in Plat.* 150.

25 θεμιστεύων: probably reminiscent of Minoan θεμιστεύοντα νέκυσσι in *Od.* 11.569. See also *Ode in Plat.* 151 θεμιστεύοντος ὄλη χθονί (again the pope).

26 πασσυδίη: again Homeric flavour: see *Il.* 2.12, 11.709, etc.; also Homeric (*Il.* 5.373 etc.) is the clausular οὐρανιώνων. Both features occur at the beginning of Musurus' *Ode in Plat.*, 2 and 5.

27 λάτριες: semantically rather from λάτρης “worshipper” than from λάτρις “servant.”

ἀστράψουσιν: cf. Rom. Mel. *Cant.* 34.3.8 οἱ δίκαιοι λάμψουσιν, 34.16.4, 20.3 ὥσπερ φῶς ἀπαστράψοντες, etc.

σθένει βλεμεαίνων: Homeric formula: see *Il.* 8.337 and 9.237 (Hector); 12.42, 17.22, 17.135 (animals, chiefly lions); 20.36 (Hephaestus).

28 ἀτάσθαλα μερμήριζον: Homeric imitation, cf. *Od.* 4.533 ἀεικέα μερμηρίζων and *Il.* 11.695 (*et alibi*) ἀτάσθαλα μηχανόωντο. This second Homeric formula had already been used for sinners by Eudocia, *Homeroc.* 1.32 Rey. See also Politian *Epigr. gr.* 9.16 καὶ ἀτάσθαλον ὕβριν ἔλαυνε.

29 ρίψει: cf. in the same context Eudocia *Homeroc.* 50.33 Rey τὸν μὲν ἐλὼν ρίψει ἐς Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα (adapted from *Il.* 8.13).

κεύθεα γαίης: the Underworld in *Hymn.Hom.Cer.* 340, 415; *Arg.Orph.* 174; *Hymn.Orph.* 29.4 (for Persephone).

30: cf. *Il.* 2.420 πόνον ἀμέγαρτον. The adjective ἀτελεύτητος in Homer has only the meaning "incomplete" (e.g. *Il.* 4.175), whereas here it means "endless," just as in Greg. Naz. *Carm. de se ipso* 13.6 (PG 37.1228), and in Rom. Mel. *Hymn.* 34.21.4 ἀλλ' αἰώνιον ἔσται ἀεὶ τὸ πολίτευμα, ἀτελεύτητον, ἄτρεπτον (*scil.* after the Last Judgment).

31 στρευγόμενοι: at line-beginning in Ap. Rhod. 4.384, 1058.

τλήσουσιν: the future of τλάω is always in the middle: one could easily correct to τλήσονται (see e.g. *Orac.Syb.* 7.132 τλήσονται ἄγαν πόνον), but the mistake probably goes back to Musurus.

ἐν πυρὶ κηλέφ: the burning fire of *Il.* 18.346 etc. For the context see Rom. Mel. *Hymn.* 34.19.4 ὁ ἐχθρὸς καὶ οἱ δαίμονες τούτου βληθήσονται εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον.

After this line the poet had to complete the depiction of the punishment of the damned souls, and to start dealing with the blessed (something like τοὺς δέ, as opposed to τοὺς μὲν of line 28): this must have required not less than two lines.

32 εἰναέτας: the normal form would be ἐνναέτας: the orthography is probably influenced by a form like Call. *Dian.* 179 εἰναετίζομαι.

ὀλβιοδαίμονος: only in *Il.* 3.182 (of Agamemnon); Const. Manass. *Comp. chron.* 3908, 4135, has the same adjective for Constantinople; Musurus himself (*Ode in Plat.* 49) uses it for the ἀνάκτορον of Leo X.

33 αὐτόπτας: cf. Ev.Luc. 1:2 αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ τοῦ λόγου; Rom. Mel. *Hymn.* 34.17.4 θεωροῦσι τὸ κάλλος ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἄφραστον, 18.1 ὕστερον πάλιν οἱ δίκαιοι θεασάμενοι τοῦ κυρίου τὸ πρόσωπον.

κληρονόμους βασιλείας: from Ep.Jac. 2:5 onwards (see also *Const. apost.* 5.16.6) a normal expression for those who will be saved.

34 σφετέρης: not used by Homer for the singular pronoun (αὐτοῦ).

35 ναὶ μὴν: cf. Arat. *Phaen.* 450; Theoc. 27.27; *Anth.Pal.* 9.316.7; the same incipit in *Ode in Plat.* 193.

ζωοδότειραν: only in Hsch. ζ 242 (Phot. ζ 74, Suid. ζ 145); ζωοδότης is a normal epithet of Christ, while ἄχραντος is current for all three persons of the Trinity.

ἄχραντον ἀϋτμήν: the rhythmical pattern may recall *Od.* 11.400 ἀνέμων ἀμέγαρτον ἀϋτμήν.

36 ἀγαπητῷ υἱ: Gospel formula for the relationship between Father and Son (e.g. Matth. 17:5, Marc. 1:11, Luc. 3:22).

37 the beginning of the line evokes *Il.* 1.73 ὄσφιν ἐϋφρονέων.

σέβεται τε γεραίρων: for a similar *iunctura* see *Ode in Plat.* 47 πᾶς ὃν ἄναξ σέβεται γουνούμενος (referring to Leo X).

38 ἐκπροϊόυσα: this is to my knowledge the first occurrence of ἐκπρόειμι in Greek. A similar compound was created by Musurus in *Ode in Plat.* 99 ἐπιπροΐαψον.

ὑποφητῶν: another word for the prophets (also in *Ode in Plat.* 155), metrically easier to handle, though Nonnus always speaks of προφήται.

39 τελεῖσθαι μέλλε: cf. τελέεσθαι ἔμελλεν in *Il.* 2.36, *Od.* 2.156, Hes. *Th.* 552.

πιφασκομέναισιν: in the sense of “predict, reveal” as in *Il.* 15.97; see also schol. D *Il.* 12.280 φανεροποιῶν, ἐμφανιζόμενος.

40 ἀστυφέλικτον: a *Lieblingswort* of Nonnus (e.g. *Par.* 3.84, of faith) and Gregory of Nazianzus.

ὁμήγουριν: this noun indicates the Church in Cyrill. *In Isai.* 5.1 (PG 70.1144A); also Caes. Naz. *Dial.* 122 (PG 38.1012A).

θεόπται: θεόπτῆς *par excellence* is of course Moses; the word also is applied to Abraham, Elias, Isaiah; to the Apostles in John Damascene *Ep. ad Theophilum* (PG 95.349D, 353B).

41 αἷματι καὶ διδαχαῖσι: αἷμα is here certainly the disciples' blood, but this *iunctura* might be a learned, somewhat anti-phrastic reference to Act.Apost. 5:28, where Jerusalem's ἀρχιε-

ρεύς blames the Apostles: ἰδοὺ πεπληρώκατε τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ τῆς διδαχῆς ὑμῶν καὶ βούλεσθε ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου.

Θεμείλια: this form always occurs in this metrical position: see e.g. *Il.* 23.255 θεμείλιά τε προβάλοντο; *Dion. Per.* 1170 θεμείλια τορνώσαντο; *Nonn. Par.* 8.127, 17.14.

42 ἰρά τε καὶ πάνδημα: this combination of adjectives (nothing to do with the ancient opposition οὐράνιος/πάνδημος: πάνδημος means here “belonging to all the people”) probably indicates both the sacrality and the universality of the message of the Apostles; as a matter of fact, it occurs as such only in *Greg. Naz. Or.* 14.12 (*PG* 35.873A), about Christian feasts.

διαμπερές: the pattern may recall *Il.* 5.284 διαμπερές, οὐδέ σ' οἶω, where however the adverb has a local sense, not a temporal one as here.

ἀπόφημι: not in the Homeric sense of “speak out” (*Il.* 7.362), but in the sense of “deny” (*Anth.Pal.* 9.107.3, 9.550.1), ἀπαρνοῦμαι (*Hsch.* α 6773), which is common in prose, very often in a litotes similar to ours.

43 λοετροχόον: this adjective is the same used for the tripod of *Il.* 18.346 (cited above on line 31), where the water is boiled for the purification of Patroclus' corpse; see also *Hsch.* λ 1224. The rhetorical power of this solemn compound is highly praised by the *schol. ex. in Il.* 18.346a (*IV* 499.85–500.88 Erbse, with 86 ἀγγελίαν in accordance with ms. E<sup>4</sup>) copied by Musurus in the margin of his *Inc.Vat.* I 50.

Χαλαστραίοιο: a sort of soda, produced in the Thracian city of Chalastra: see (apart from *schol. Plat. Resp.* 430A; *Suid.* χ 10; *Etym.Magn.* 805.3–4) especially *Hsch.* χ 39, where the Χαλαστραῖον νίτρον (thus reads Musurus' correction from the manuscript's Χαλαστραιῶν νήτρων) is mentioned. In a Christian context this comparison occurs in the preface of Theodoret's *Haeret.fab.comp.* (*PG* 83.340A) καθάπερ τι Χαλαστραῖον καὶ μύρον εὐῶδες προσοίσομεν τὴν τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν δογμάτων

ἀλήθειαν. See also Stob. 4.1.98 (p.40.7 W.-H.) for the association with powder.

44–45 σμήχει ... ρύπον: in Nonn. *Par.* 3.114 John the Baptist is σμήχων ἀνδρομέης κραδίας ρύπον.

χυτλωθέντων: the passive form of this verb never occurs; χυτλόομαι (middle) means “to anoint oneself” (with oil) in *Od.* 6.80, “to wash away” in *Call. Jov.* 17 (where Rhea looks for water to clean herself after begetting Zeus), *Ap. Rhod.* 4.1311 (where χυτλώσαντο is at the end of the line as here), *et alibi*.

45 ἀρχεκάκου ... ἀμπλακίης: two very common adjectives in Christian contexts, see *e.g.* *Cyrill. In Joh.* 4.6 (*PG* 73.681A) τὴν ἀρχεκάκον ἀμαρτίαν, and especially Nonn. *Par.* 3.122 ἀμπλακίας νίπτοντες ἐφαιδρύνοντο ῥεέθροις.

πάντα καθαίρον: probably reminiscent of Nonn. *Par.* 1.25 μουνογενῆς Λόγος ἦεν, ὃς ἀνέρα πάντα καθαίρει (of Christ).

46 φαιδρῦνον: see Nonn. *Par.* 3.122 quoted above on line 45.

συνεγέρσει: another word never attested in Greek. Musurus created it from the normal ἀνέγερσις (τῶν σωμάτων = ἀνάστασις) and the verb συνεγείρομαι ἐν Χριστῷ / τῷ Χριστῷ which is often used for the action of raising from the dead.

47 μέλλοντος ... αἰῶνος: the μέλλων αἰών is the *saeculum novum* after the Last Judgment: see *Lampe s.v. αἰών* c2d.

December, 2002

Scuola Normale Superiore  
Piazza dei Cavalieri 7  
56126 Pisa, Italy  
f.pontani@libero.it