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.¹

I know of no systematic study of Musurus’ Greek poems. A checklist thereof may be obtained by combining the references given by Sicherl with the six epigrams published by my father; at least three more pieces can be read in manuscripts of Italian libraries. 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.
1. The Athenian manuscript

An Athenian codex of miscellaneous content, Ἑθνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Ἑλλάδος 1062 (paper, 220 x 150, ff.603), 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, 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*. One remarks the fine miniatures of some initial letters (ff.54r, 88r, 171r, 226–235, 417r, 588r, 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.415r; 305r and 306r), 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-

---

6I do not know of any literature on this manuscript except I. Sakkelion and Α. Sakkelion, *Κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Ἑθνικῆς 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. E. Kephallenaiou). 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. ff.235–237, 302, 518, 520, 529, 531—shows that the manuscript originated in the scribe’s mind as a collection of miscellaneous texts.

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

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)?

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) 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), 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

---

9 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.

10 See below on ff.235r and 571v; 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.

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. 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.552v, in which the scribe says he has found ἐν χαλκοτύπῳ βιβλίῳ Georgius Lecapenus' De constructione, which was printed for the first time together with Theodore Gaza’s grammar in 1515: 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.603v he copies a small concordance-πίνακι with the names of Roman, Egyptian, Greek, Athenian, and Hebraic months, and he adds in


13 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 χαλκοτύπωσις 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. Lâskaris, Epigrammi greci, ed. A. Meschini (Padua 1976) 43 (Epigr. 12.1: Χαλκοτύπωσις σελίδαν, with commentary p.114).

14 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 Syn
cellus, 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, he adds suo Marte a marginal note about the Peloponnesian town of Korone, which might be taken to be his hometown:15 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.16 I do not know if a short, almost illegible note at the very end of the manuscript (f.III) could shed some light on the scribe’s identity: I decipher only, with much hesitation: τέλος τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ ... μᾶς τοῦ 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: ἡ βιβλίος πέρικεν Μονῆς Δουσίκου (the Dusikou Monastery is in Thessaly, not far from the Meteorata most of its manuscripts are now in the National Library of Athens)

ἡ βιβλίος αὐτῆς πέργηκ (sic) τοῦ μοναστηρίου έκ τῶν μεγάλων Πυλῶν ἄνωθεν (another Thessalian monastery, closed in 1843: all its collections passed over to the Dousikou)17

Κύριλλος ἐλέος θεοῦ ἄρχιπεσικόσκος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως νέας 'Ῥώμης καὶ οἰκουμενικός (i.e. Cyril Lukaris, 1570–1638, the

---

15 The text reads Μεσίνη (sic) τῷ Πεταλίδι and the note ὀπέρ τυχάνει πλησιόν τῆς Κορώνης.


famous Patriarch of Constantinople who tried to accommodate
the doctrines of the western Reformed Churches);\(^{18}\) the same *ex-
librís* (only up to *Κωνσταντίνου πόλεως [sic]*) on f.2r

f.2v ἡ βιβλίος αὕτη πέλει τῆς μονῆς τοῦ Σωτήρα ἡμῶν Ἡσυχοῦ Χριστοῦ
τῶν Μεγάλλων (sic) Πιλάνων καὶ μηδείς τὸλ (see above; the sen-
tence ends abruptly).

A general index of its contents would run as follows:

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

3r–4r: exerptum περὶ παθῶν λέξεων (inc. πάθη δὲ λέξεων εἰσίν
κε’, expl. τὰ ἐμά τάμα); schematismi Homerici, fort. e
doctrina Herodianea (inc. τὸν βουλόμενον τὰ παρ᾽ Ὄμηρον
ποιήματα προγυμνάσαι)\(^{19}\)

4r–52v: <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
Erbs’ list of the so-called h-scholia.\(^{20}\) To judge from Erbs’
apparatus of book A, the Athenian manuscript belongs to the h²

\(^{18}\) 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 “Ortho-
specimen of Lukaris’ signature, very similar to our *ex-libris*, is to be seen in the
letter reproduced in *Κύριλλος ο 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 ο Κρῆς,” in
*Κύριλλος ο 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.

\(^{19}\) Some of the explanations are to be read in P. Egenolff, “Zu Herodian
Technikos,” *Jahrbiicher für klassische Philologie* 45 (1894) 338–345.

\(^{20}\) Along with *Marc.gr.* 531, to which I drew attention in my review of M. A.
Pincelli’s book, *Martini Philletici 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
family, as it shows close proximity to \textit{Ag} (\textit{Ang. gr.} 122) against \textit{P}\textsuperscript{11} (\textit{Par. gr.} 2766); still, some readings show a certain degree of independence from \textit{Ag}, which can hardly be regarded as the fruit of conjectural work: see \textit{e.g.} schol. A 1a, p.373.17 Matranga = p.1.6 Erbse ἵνα πρὸ ὀς ἀν χαὶ om. cum \textit{Ms. A}; p.373.25 Matr. = p.1.12 Erbse ἵππος ὀμ. cum \textit{Ms. T}; schol. A 1d, p.374.18 Matr. = p.5.3 Erbse δ'I πρὸ δῆ of \textit{Ms. A}; schol. A 1h, p.375.10–16 Matr. semper cum \textit{A Ag} praeter 12 ὁμίας, 14 χιλίοι (recte, cf. Cramer), 15–16 μυμιδόνεσσα τ' Ἀχιλέα φημίζοντα; schol. A 3b, p.376.10 Matr. κακῶς πρὸ καλῶς cum \textit{P} vs. \textit{Ag} (sed statim infra ἵππονως πρὸ ἵππων cum \textit{Ag}); schol. A 53a, p.394.23 Matr. = p.26.3 Erbse οὐδετέρῳ cum \textit{A} vs οὐδετέρῳ \textit{Ag}, οὐδετέρῳ \textit{P}\textsuperscript{11}. After book \textit{A}, the scholia (still bearing the title ἱστορία καὶ ἰστορία for each book) represent a mere selection of the \textit{h}-corpus, and some seem to have been taken from a different source (see \textit{e.g.} the scholia to \textit{B} 316–364 on f.25°). See also below, on ff. 306°–466°.

53°: scholia in \textit{Odysseae} \textit{α} 127–262

With small exceptions, these scholia are the same that appear in the \textit{Odyssean} section further in the \textit{Ms.:} see below, f.493°.

53°: Anth. Pal. 9.87 (cum epimerismis de etymologia verborum aliquot); epigrammata tria de Homero, scl. 9.24, 7.6, 7.1

54°–87°; 88°–129°: 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.\textsuperscript{21}

129°: \textit{<Simiae> Alae} (Anth. Pal. 15.24)

See below f.302°.

130°–169°: 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 \textit{scholia vetera}), I can only hint at a vague affinity with the Aldine scholia;\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{21}M. Chantry, \textit{Scholia recentiora in Aristophanis Plutum} (Groningen 1996) xxviii, mentions our manuscript and eliminates it because “scholia pleraque ex Aldina eascripta.”

\textsuperscript{22}In this edition, however, Musurus seems not to have been directly involved: see Sicherl (\textit{supra} n.2) 307–309 and most recently A. Tessier, “Due fortunate ‘congetture aldine’ (Eur. Bacch. 862 e 883),” \textit{Eikasmos} 12 (2001) 77–82.
the text bears a generic and inconsistent resemblance to Thomas Magister’s recension.23

169r: excerptum de metro iambico (inc. ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ χώρᾳ, expl. οἴνον λόγος), additis decem trimetris


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 ἄσαφως for σοφοῦ/σαφῶς of the MSS. (κάσαφως 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).

225r: excerptum de metro iambico (inc. δεῖ εἰδέναι ὅτι τὸ φύσι βραχύ, expl. τὸν δὲ τέταρτον ὡς εἰρήται)

226r–234r: Vita Pindari et scholia metrica in Pindarum

235r–237r: compendium Hephaestionis Enchiridii; <Demetrii Triclinii> notula de metris; fragmentum de metris (inc. ἵστεον ὅτι τὸ ἰαμβικὸν ἔχει βάσεις ἔξ, expl. μοιρησθεὶς ὀλβιόδασιμον); 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 Hephaestion’s treatise, is also found together with Triclinius’ note and Pindar’s Olympica (here f.241r) in Marc.gr. 478 f.80–82.24 The metrical fragment is actually a compilation of different excerpts, which occurs identically in MS. Ambr. H 22 sup. 297r–298r (on this MS. see supra n.10). The other texts show no obvious consistency with each other.

238r–239r: excerptum syntacticum (inc. τέσσαρα δὲ συγκείμενα ἀ εἰς τῶν εἰρήμενων κοινά· τὸ μὲν εἰς δύο αἰτιατικάς; expl. πρᾶς δὲ ἑτέρα αἰτιατικῆ)

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

24The preliminary texts are edited by R. Aubreton, Démétrius Triclinius et les récensions médiévales de Sophocle (Paris 1949) 30–33.
241r–301v: Pindari Olympia 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.241r τοῦ σοφωτάτου κυροῦ Μαγίστρου καὶ τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου κυροῦ Μιχαήλ σχόλια· ὡς γὰρ ἐστι καταρχὰς σταυρός, Μοσχοπούλου, τὰ δὲ έτερα τοῦ Μαγίστρου θωμάν. To judge from this inscriptio and from the scanty data in Abel’s apparatus, the greatest affinity subsists with Ms. Vind.phil.gr. 219 (’), though perhaps an even better candidate might be Marc.gr. 478 (’’, apparently not collated by Abel), which carries the metrical paraphernalia (see supra f.235’), and whose textual facies is very close to our Atheniensis.

301v: Anth. Pal. 9.191 (iterum); deinde notula περὶ τῶν ἐν στίχοις παθῶν (inc. πάθη στίχων εἰσιν εἶπεν ἔξ, expl. τὸν τελευταῖον πόδα)

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

Both this carmen figuratum and the one on f.551v apparently derive from the 1516 edition of Theocritus published by Zacharias Calliergis,26 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 ἄρεος or scholium in Alas p.342.18 Wendel ἐπαράζη (βίω) 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 κραῖνον δrors γὰρ θεῖος for Calliergis’ κραῖνον ἐξ ἔνθεος; Securis 1 έρασι τήνων for ἡμὰ τίνων, 7 ἐβας for ἐβαν, 9 θυμὸν for θυμών; schol. in Alas p.342.13 οὐρανοῦ ἀλα for οὐρανοῦ ἄλλη, a couple may be right (schol. in Alas p.342.8 τὸ ἐσχατον, conjectured by Bergk, for τὸν ἐσχατον; schol. in Securim p.344.3 μετὰ ταύτα, 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 (χροσσοβαφείς) that had been omitted by Calliergis and

26 Θεοκρίτου εἰδιόλλια εἶξ 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.27

305r, 306r: picturae duarum navium cum glossis ad navium partes pertinentibus

One is reminded of the big and swift Spanish ships with the σταυρός 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.


415v: 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).

417–466r: Homerii Iliadis I et K 1–18 (sine scholiis, sed cum paraphrasi interlinearis), Λ 1–267 (cum hypothesi et scholiis)

The scholia to the Iliad embrace excerpts from Eustathius’ commentaries (especially the paraphrastic parts),28 important excerpts from the h-scholia (the source is probably the same as in ff. 4v–52v), and sporadic exegetical scholia (e.g. schol. A 5c, A 20a1, 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.).29 Our manuscript will certainly deserve to be collated in full by the future editor of the h-scholia, for it provides interesting readings

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

28 The practice of excerpting Eustathios’ Παρεκλησίαι 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.

29 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).

466v–470v: Homeri Odysseae δ 1–167 cum hypothesi et scholiis
471v–479r: 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. The sporadic scholia, some of which are so far unpublished, share several readings with Ludwigh’s M² (the second hand of Marc.gr. 613, XIII cent.) and especially with O⁸ (Barocc. 64, end of XV cent.), but neither MS. can be the direct source.

479v–492v: Homeri Odysseae α cum hypothesi et scholiis
493r–494r: 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.

495v–512r: Gregorii Nazianzeni carm. de se ipso 1 (PG 37.969–1017), cum glossis interlinearibus et scholiis
512r–516r: eiusdem carm. mor. 33.5–204 (PG 37.928–943)
516r: eiusdem carm. de se ipso 99 (PG 37.1451)
517r–518v: eiusdem epigrammata in Basilium (Anth. Pal. 8.2–11b) cum paraphrasi
518v–520v: fragmentum translationis libri Boethii, qui De consolatione philosophiae inscribitur, a Maximo Planude confectae, cum scholiis aliquot

30 A. Ludwich, Die homerische Batrachomachia des Karers Pigres nebst Scholien und Paraphrase (Leipzig 1896) 63; no separative errors shared with Ludwich’s SPoNz, the other members of this family (Allen’s j). Both Ludwich and Allen ignore our manuscript.
The manuscript, not classified in Papathomopoulos’ stemma, contains only the *Vita Boethii* and the poetical sections of Book 1.31

520v–529r: disticha Catonis a Maximo Planude Graece versa (cum glossis et scholiis)

Ortoleva’s edition32 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*).

529v: Metrophanis Smyrnai archiepiscopi fragmentum (inc. Μητροφάνους νόος ὁ ρυχιερὴς Σμύρνης / ταύτα λέε ἐπιφανεῖς, expl. ένεπικήσο τοφοίς ὄνειρο)

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.33

530r–531r: fragmentum grammaticum (inc. ἀνασκαίοι σὲ εἰδέναι ὁ Γεώργιος, expl. τὴν δύο μηνιν τοῦ ῥήματος)

531v–534v: Ioannis Damasceni can. iamb. in Theogoniam, in Theophania, in Pentecosten 1–19 (PG 96.818σ–833α)

536v–551v: Odysseae δ 246–847 cum scholiis

See above, ff.479v–494v.

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

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

552v–566v et 569v: 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

31 Αννικίου Μαλλίου Σεβηρίνου Βοσθιού Βίβλος περὶ παραμυθίας τῆς φιλοσοφίας, ἣν μετήνεγκεν εἰς τῆς Λατινοῦ φωνῆς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα διάλεκτον Μάξιμος μοναχὸς ὁ Πλανούδης, ed. M. Papathomopoulos (Athens 1999)liv.


33 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. The scribe also mentions in a
note on f.575v Manuel Moschopoulos Περί ὀνομάτων, which was
printed together in the same book as Lecapenus only in the Aldine
ejdition of 1525 and in the Florentine edition of 1526.

567v−568v: excerpta de constructione (inc. Πέτρος γράφει σοι
tούτο δή το βιβλίον, expl. πρώτη τῆς ευθείας), de synizesi
/inc. ἵστεν ὧτι συνίζησις γίνεται, expl. καὶ ἰσαρχεῖαν καὶ
μακράν), de metris (inc. τὸ ἱαμβικὸν μέτρον εξ χόρας ἐπι-
dέχεται, expl. οἶνον Ἡφαίστεος καὶ ταύτα μὲν οὖτος); epitome
Lesbonactis περὶ σχημάτων 1–12 (inc. οἱ Εὐβοεῖς, expl. ἐξ
κτητικῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν)

This part also might seem to be copied from Bodl. Auct. F.6.26 ff.
66–71v (where the grammatical excerpts occur by and large in the
same order) and, for Lesbonax, 59v–61v: still, although Blank's
edition ignores our manuscript, from the work's title (ἐνθὴ καὶ
dιάλεκτοι κατὰ Λεσβώνακτη [sic], while the Bodleianus has ἦνθη
cαι and the other witness of the same ζ-family, Marc. gr. XI 26 [see
supra 178] f.71v, has ἥθηκαι corrected s. l. to ἥθηκαι) and from cor-
rect readings such as 12.14 ὅποτε τινές (with the Marcianus against
ὅποτε τι ὑπὸ 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.

569r–570r: Theodori Balsamonis epigr. 45 Horna

---

34See Donnet (supra n.13) 46–49 and his “Le traité de grammaire de Michel le
Synelle. Inventaire préalable à l’histoire du texte,” BtHBeBe 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, 567v–568v. H. O. Coxe,
Catali codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars prima, recen-
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/Harlfinger/Hunger [supra n.2] 1A).

35Coxe, Catali 688-689. Blank (supra n.34) 149, 178. The text of the Bod-
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.36

570r–571v: excerptum de praepositionibus (inc. ἐν ἀεὶ δοτικῇ συντάσσεται, expl. ὑπὲρ τοὺς ποταμοὺς ἁρτντα)37

571r–572r: 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.567r–568v); still, exactly the same portion of the treatise occurs in Ambr. H 22 sup. f.282r (see above, 235r–237v).

572r et 576r–581v: 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.


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 ἀπαγγέλλω for ἐπαγγέλλω. The note on punctuation describes and explains N
canor’s system of eight στιγματει. The lexicographical and geographical notes are full of demotic terms and toponyms that clearly point to a Greek scribe.

581–583: schemata grammaticalia ab ipso librario appicta (de vocum affectionibus, de pronominibus, de coniugationibus)

584–587 et 591–596: <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.

588–590: <Libanii> declamatio III

596–598: <Matthaei Camariotae> epitome in Aphthonii progymnasmata (I 121–122 Walz), addita in fine Ps.-Phoc. sent. 11

597–599: Aphthonii progymnasmata (pp.1–11.21 Rabe)

From Rabe’s apparatus some sporadic proximity to MS. Ve (Urb. gr. 130) can be inferred.

599–603: <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.

603–605: scriptiunculae variae, inter quas nomina vocum animalium (cf. supra f.575, 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. και τοις ἄστραγάλοις τρυπηθέντες και κρεμασθέντες λαμπύσι πυρός τάς μασχάλας κατεφλέγησαν). Necnon vestigia quaedam notarum musicalium continent, scriptura vero superiori notulas grammaticales et sim. nullius pretii

38 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).

39 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.302v–303v 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.303r and f.303v: 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).

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. In this respect, I note the following:


41A. Hahn, Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche (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 (Bonn 1914).
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(1) Musurus (just like Mamunas) does not follow the Catholic version with the much-disputed addition of Filioque towards the end of the symbolum; line 38 ἐκ σεθεν ἐκπροιόσα 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, is reproduced with very slight variants (and, of course, the Filioque) in the very first edition of the Aldine press: there it belongs—along with other

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 fidelis” 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 Glaubenbekenntnis 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.

Il Simbolo di Nica e di Costantinopoli (Rome 1967) 244–250; Hahn 162–165 no. 144; Denzinger §86. It is very close to the “kürzere Formel” of Epiphanius’ Anckerat: see Hahn 134–135 no. 125.

Constantini Lascaris Erotemata (Venice 1495) (H*9924, IGI 5693, BMC V, 552), cc. BIv–BIIv. 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 μονογενή add. καί; post αὐτὸν add. ήθεν ἐκ θεоῦ καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον ομ.; καί μίαν τίγην προ εἰς μίαν τίγην; ante προσδοξαί add. κατά). This is why I follow this text of the Creed (and precisely that of the 1501/2 edition, cc. mVII–mVIIIv) as the standard one. Apart from the Filioque (and the alternative ἐν δεξιῶν / 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 (πίστεῦσο,
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 *Eίχολόγια, Ὄρολόγια, Ἀκολουθίαι* printed in Italy during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and still in such recent publications as the *Mass of John Chrysostom* of 1993. 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), 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

---

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.

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 (*Néon Ἀνθολόγια* [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 ἐπανόρθωσιν τε καὶ ἐκδοσιν τοῦ Ῥωμαϊῶν Ἀρχερέως* (Padua 1765) p. a3⁰ (on pp. a6⁷–a10⁷ the controversial συμβολα τοῦ Ἀγίου Ἀθανασίου further expounds the most important doctrinal questions). *H θείᾳ λειτουργία τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου* (Athens 1993) 34–35.

Although some isolated Greek and Latin versions of the Symbolum actually mention the nails of Christ’s cross: see Hahn 379.
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(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.48 Details (a), (b), and (c) appear together in the Greek text formulated by the synod of A.D. 359:49

... εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια καταλθόντα, ὁν αὐτὸς ὁ ἄθης ἐτρόμασε ... συναναστραφέντα μετά τῶν μαθητῶν, τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρων πληρωμένων ...

Details (b), (d), and (e) appear in the very idiosyncratic version of the Glaubensbekentnis by Basil of Caesarea:50

... ὃθη τοῖς ἑγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ τοῖς λουποῖς ... ὃθεν ἔρχεται ἐπὶ συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἁναστήσει πάντας καὶ ἀποδύναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ, ὅτε οἱ μὲν δίκαιοι προσληφθήσονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ βασιλείαν οὐρανών, οἱ δὲ ἀμαρτωλοὶ κατακρίθησον εἰς κόλασιν αἰῶνιον, ὅπου ὁ σκόλης 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),51 and in French and German mediaeval creeds the “forty days” are very often mentioned.52 For example, the text of Honorius of

48The pericopae ἀπέλθεσε τοῖς δεσμίοις (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.
52Hahn nos. 100, 102, 106–121.
Autun (twelfth cent.) 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 inspici-entibus …

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,” and it may not be a coincidence that pre-

---

53Hahn 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.

54See 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 quern, 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. 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. 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 Forteguerri, 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


56 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. The poem was never printed, and apparently it had no circulation whatsoever: 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 Apostolos was also claiming. 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; furthermore, though he was certainly acquainted with liturgy since his time in Carpi, 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 or just as a literary divertissement: the humanist dream of uniting

57 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.

58 See by contrast Siphakis (supra n.5) 368–371 on the literary Nachleben (Devaris, Eparchos, etc.) of the Ode to Plato.

59 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.

60 See Legrand I 137–143.


62 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.\(^{63}\)

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.\(^{64}\) 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

\(^{63}\)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,” Riv Studi Biz Neuellen 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).

\(^{64}\)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, “Ἡ ἐν Βενετία Ελληνική Κοινότητα καὶ οἱ μητροπολιτικοὶ Φιλαδελφείς,” Επετηρίς 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.
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 αὐτογένεθλος, of God; 17 ὅργια θεία for the Mystery of Resurrection; 28 ἀφθορία 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 ζητοπρεπέως (12) to celebrate the glory of Christ’s incarnation. 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 προσευχή πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, 18 lines). 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,

---

65 See again Pardos (supra n.1) 361.
66 Zoras (supra n.40) 189–191 and 194–195. For ἀνεκφοίτητος (πατρὸς καὶ νόον) see Jo. Dam. Exp. fidei orth. 8.185 Kotter, which Burgundio of Pisa (p.39.208 Buytaert) translates “indissessibilis a Patre et Filio.”
67 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).\(^6^8\) 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 Ὅλομποι; 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.\(^6^9\) 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


\(^6^9\) 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, “Μετρικές παρατηρήσεις σε άρχαιο-γλωσσα επιγράμματα Ἐλλήνων,” *Platon* 49 (1997) 88–101 (= “Μετρ. παρ. σε άρχ. επιγρ. 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' ἐξαμέτρων
Κληίζω σε, πάτερ παντοσθενές, Οὐλύμποιο
καὶ χθόνος ἑργατίνα, δερκτῶν πάντων καὶ ἀδέρκτων,
καὶ σέο τηλύγετον καὶ μουνογενὴ φίλον ύπα, ἐκ θεοῦ ἀτρεκέος θεον ἄτρεκη, ἐκ τε φάους φῶς,

5 ὁν πρὸ σεληναίης πρὸ τ' ἑτῶν φύτευσας ἀπείρον
γεινάμενος, μὴ τεκτήνας, τοῖ εἴκελον ἄντην,
ὁν διὰ χρήματα πάντα τὰ μὴ πάρος ἐσκε φάωνθεν,
ημειόν ὃς ἐκπιτί βροτόν, ἑνα τ' ἀμμε σαώση,
ἀργαλέης ρυσθέντας ἀλυκτοπέδης καὶ ἀνάγκης,

10 καρπαλίμως κατέβη μὲν ὁπ' αἰθέρος, αἶγα δὲ σάρκα
πνεύματος ἐκ θείου καὶ ἀταυρώτης λάβε κούρῆς
ἀμβροτος ἀνδρομέγην, περιτελλομένων δ' ἐνιαυτόν,
Πιλάτου σκολιήσε δικασπολήσεν ἀερθείς,
χαλκεοίς γόμφοις τανυσθείσας κατὰ χείρας

15 καὶ πόδ' ἐπίζευξθέντες παπαρμένος ἐσκολοπίσθη,
ταρχυσθείς τε τάφοι κατὰ τε τρίτον ἠμαρ ἀναστάς
ἡγαγεν ἐξ Ἐρέβους γένος ἀνδρῶν, οὐ τε θεουδεῖς
οὐ τ' εὐφορκοί ἔσαν, καὶ τριλλίστοις θωόκοίς
οὐρανοῦ ἐγκατένασσε γεγοθότας, αὐτάρ ὁ χαῖρον

20 ἄψεσιν ἀρτεμέσσαι φάνῃ δυσκαίδεκα μύσταις
καὶ μετὰ τεσσαράκοντα πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἡματ’ ἀναπτὰς δεξιώθην γενετὴρ παρέξετο μητεύετι.

.Invalid text-

25 εἰς θεμιστεύουν ζωοῖς ἁμα καὶ νεκύεσσι πασσυδή· τὸν γάρ τ’ ἁμφι στίχες οὐρανιών λάτριες ἀστράψουσιν, ὁ δὲ σθενεῖ βλέμεσίν, τοὺς μὲν, ὅσοι ζωντες ἀτάσθαλα μερμήριζον μηδὲν ὅπιζόμενοι, ῥίπασα ποτὶ κεύθεα γαίης

30 ἐνθ’ ἀτελεύτητον πόνον, ἐνθ’ ἀμέγαρτον οἶζόν στρευόμενοι τῆλσοσιν, ἐπεὶ φρέας ἐν πυρὶ κηλέω.

.einaeta σακαραν της ὅβλιοδαιμονος ἔδρης καὶ σθενὸν αὐτόπτας καὶ κληρονομοὺς βασιλείας θῆσει τῆς σφετάρης, τῆς οὐκ ἔσται τέλος οὐδέν.

35 καὶ μὴν ζωοδότειραν ἀνασασαν ἀχραντον αὐτήν κλέα, τὴν σοι ὅμως ἁγαπητῷ καὶ τεῷ υἱ., πάς τις ἐνυφρόνων τίει σέβεται τε γεραιῶν, ἢ σθενὸν ἐκπροιούσα θεουργίας ὑποφητῶν ὀσα τελείσθαι μέλλε πισθοσκομέναισιν ἐνέπνει.

40 καὶ μίαν ἀστεφελικτον ὄμηγυριν, ὅς τε θεόται σι αἰματι καὶ διδαχαῖσι συμείλια καρπύναντο ἱρά τε καὶ πάνδημα διαμπερές, οὕδ’ ἀποθημεῖν χεῦμα λοετροχόν, τὸ Ἀλαστραῖος κονίς τρήτερον σμήζει καθάπαξ χρόνιο χυτλωθέντων.

45 ἀρχεκάκου λύπον ἀμπλακίτης μάλα πάντα καθαίρων καὶ ψυχὴν φαράγων, ἀτάρ ψιθυμένον συνεγέρσει ἐκδέχομαι μέλλουντος ἐπ’ αἴώνοις βιον ἄλλον.

Apparatus I: variae lectiones

4 ὀθρεκέως ms. 5 προσεληναῖς ms. φύτησας ms. 7 πάντα om. ms. 15 ἐπιζευχθέντες ms. 20 ἁγεσίν ms. 21 ὅματ’ ms. 26 ἁμφι ms. 28 ζώοντες ms. 30 ἐνθα μέγαρτον ms. 31 στατευομένοι ms. κηλέω e κηλαίφ corr. ms. post hunc versum lacunam statui 37 εὐφρονεόν ms. 39 μέλ’ ἐπιφανσκομέναισιν ms. ἐνέπνει ex ἐνέκτει corr. ms. 45 πάντων ms.
Apparatus II: glossae manuscripti Atheniensis

Apparatus III: textus Symboli Nicaeni-Constantinopolitani, qualis in calce editionis Aldinae Grammaticae Const. Lascaris (1501/2) invenitur
Σύμβολον τῶν ἀποστόλων
Πιστεύω εἰς ἑνα θεόν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὀρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων.
Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἱησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰωνίων, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεόν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθίνου, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὀμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο·
τὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατέλθοντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, σαμαρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ ποθόντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ καθεξόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρίνων ζωντας καὶ νεκροὺς· οὔ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.
Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίον τὸ κύριον τὸ ζωοποιών, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξάζομενον, τὸ λοιλήσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.
Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ὀμολογῶ ἐν βάπτισμα εἰς ἀφεσιν ὁμαρτίων· προσδοκῶ ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωήν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.
6. Commentary

1 κλήζω: 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.

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

2 ἔργατινα: the vocative has short α, lengthened in this line by
the masculine caesura. The only occurrence of ἔργατινής for a
divine person is Paul. *Sil. Descr. S. Soph.* 709–711 (of a Ma-
donna and Child) ἀλλ’ ἡ Χριστοῦ κατέγραψε μητέρα τέχνη,
/ φέγγος ἄεναοι δοχηίον, ἤς ποτε γαστήρ / γαστέρος ἔργατινην
ἀγίοις ἐθέρψατο 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 ἔργατινης
πόντοιο, *Anth.Pal.* 5.240.4 ἀλλ’ ἡ τρεῖς δροσερά· μέλιτός γε μὲν
Ἅφρογενείνης ... ἔργατινής, 5.275.12 Κύπριδος ἔργατιναι.
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 ὑβριστήν Μουσέων.

δέρκτων καὶ ὑδέρκτων: 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 II. 9.481–482 (also Od. 16.19) παιδα / μοῦνον 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 ... γεινάμενος) and to merge the two assertions concerning Christ’s birth.

ἐκ τε φάος φῶς: from Nonn. Par. 1.3 (of Christ) ἐκ φάος φῶς.

5 πρὸ Σεληναιάς: 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.

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

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

ἐῦκελον ἄντην: cf. Od. 22.240, Q. Smyrn. 11.9.

7 ὅν διά: this kind of anastrophe is very rare (indeed Aristarchus and Herodian forbade it: see R. Kühner [-F. Blass],
Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache I3 [Hannover-Leipzig 1890] 259), and it certainly derives from Hes. Op. 3 ὅν τε διὰ βροτοῦ ἄνδρες, where the relative pronoun refers to Zeus (Musurus particularly liked anastrophae: 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 (διὰ ὄν) 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 ἔργοισον δίχα μύθου / οὐδὲν ἔφυ τόπερ ἔσκε.

φάσανθεν: the same verbal form in Il. 1.200.

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

ἔκπητι: “for the sake of,” not “according to the will of” as e.g. in Hes. Op. 4 Διώς μεγάλοιο ἔκπητι.


ῥυθέντας: a typical verb in the context of redemption, cf. e.g. Ev.Luc. 1.74 έκ χειροί τῶν ἔθρον ῥυθέντας, Ps. 106:6 έκ τῶν ἁναγκῶν αὐτοῦ ἐφρύσατο αὐτοῦς.

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 αἰσα, and again (26) by πασινθή (= παμπληθεί, πανστρατιώ in Musurus’ glosses to the Iliad in Inc.Vat. I 50).

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

11 ἁπαρῳτῆς: 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.

κοῦρης: the Virgin Mary is often called κόρη, see Lampe s.v.
12 ἐμβροτος ἀνδρομένη: this oxymoron has a Nonnian taste, see e.g. Par. 1.41 (of Christ’s incarnation) ἐξωύσιας χαθήν βροτοειδείς ωψυχα μορφήν; both adjectives are well attested in the Paraphrasis. See also II. 22.9 αὐτὸς θητὸς ἐὼν θεόν ἐμβροτον (of Achilles and Apollo).

περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν: cf. II. 2.551 etc.

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


14–15: this amplification of the crucifixion theme is strongly indebted to Nonn. Par. 19.91–95 κείθη φωνῆς / εἰς δόρυ τετράπλευρον ἐπήδρον ύψωτι γαιής / ὤρθιον ἐξετάνυσαν ἐπισφίγξαντες ἀνάγκη / πεπταμένας ἐκάτερθε σιδηρείῳ τινὶ δεσμῷ / χείρας· ὀμοτρήτω δὲ πεπαρμένων ἄξιγα γόμφῳ / διπλόν ἢτορ ἔχοντα μὴ τετορημένον ὄρμη / ποσσίν ὑμοπλεκέςσιν ἀκομπέα δεσμῶν ὀλέθρου. The only different detail concerns the nails’ material: bronze for Musurus (perhaps misled by the ὀξὺς 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 Mamunas line 13 καὶ ἔμλυσα αὐτὸ σταυρῷ πεπαρμένῳ εἶνεκεν ἡμεῖς.

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

16 ταρχυσθείς: 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 ἰμαρ: Nonn. Par. 2.103 Χριστὸς ἔμελλεν ἐπὶ τρίτον ἰμαρ ἐγείρειν (scil. his own body).
17 ἑοὐδεῖς: 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 τριλλίστοις θεόκοις: this is a strong enallage. The adjective occurs only in Il. 8.488 (the Night; glossed as πολύδεκτος by Musurus’ hand in Inc.Vat. I 50); Call. Cer. 138 (ἰλαθί μοι, τρίλλιστε, μέγα κρείοισα θεόων, of Demeter); Paul. Sil. Descr. S. Soph. 986, where the invocation to the patriarch implies a vocative τριλλίστε and the narration of an episode in which a foreign delegation was impressed by the patriarch’s appearance (988–990): τεῆς δ’ ἀπὸ θέσπιδος αὐλῆς / θελόμενοι ψυχήν τε καὶ αὐχένα πρόφρονι βουλή / οὐρανίοις ἐκλιναν ἐπιχειροίς τε θεοκοίς (note the last word, which ends Musurus’ line as well—but for a similar clausula see also Od. 2.26, 12.318, etc.).


gεγηθότας: 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 οὔτ’ ἄρ χαίρων (otherwise only in Par. 19.197, and twice in the Dionysiaca, 10.358, 47.34).

20 ἀρτέμεσσι: epic adjective (Il. 5.515; Od. 13.43 ἀρτεμέσσι 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 ἐδοξ ἐνίς ἃνέφηνε μαστηταῖς.

μύστας: “disciples” in Greg. Naz. Or. 15.6; also important in Nonnus along with the similar μυστιπόλοις (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 δεξιὸν: see schol. Il. 13.307–9a1). For this usage see Georg. Pachym. Hist. 478.17 ἐκεῖνοῦ δεξιόφιν.

μητιόντι: 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 πότιον ἀνώπιον: the same iunctura is used by the mourning Medea in Ap. Rhod. 3.800.

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

25 θεμιστεύων: probably reminiscent of Μίνως θεμιστεύοντα νέκυσιν in Od. 11.569. See also Ode in Plat. 151 θεμιστεύοντος ὁλὴ χθονί (again the pope).

26 πασσούδη: again Homeric flavour: see Il. 2.12, 11.709, etc.; also Homeric (Il. 5.373 etc.) is the clausular ὀφραντιώνων. 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.”

ἀστράγωσιν: cf. Rom. Mel. Cant. 34.3.8 οἱ δίκαιοι λάμψουσι, 34.16.4, 20.3 ὀσπερ φῶς ἀπαστράψοντες, etc.

σθένει βλεμμείνων: 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 ἄεικεά μερμηρίζον and Il. 11.695 (et alibi) ἀτάσθαλα μηχανόντο. 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 ὑβριν ἔλανε.

29 ῥίψει: cf. in the same context Eudocia Homeroc. 50.33 Rey τὸν μὲν ἐλὸν ῥίψει ἐς Τάρταρον ἀνέκεντα (adapted from Il. 8.13).

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 ἢ τὸ πολίτευμα, ἀτελεύτητον, ἀτρεπτον (*scil.* after the Last Judgment).


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

ἐν πυρὶ κηλέω: 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 τοῦς δὲ, as opposed to τοὺς μὲν of line 28): this must have required not less than two lines.

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

οὐλοδαίμονος: 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.


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 (αύτού).
35 ναὶ μήν: cf. Arat. Phaen. 450; Theoc. 27.27; Anth.Pal. 9.316.7; the same incipit in Ode in Plat. 193.
36 ζωοδότηραν: only in Hsch. ζ 242 (Phot. ζ 74, Suid. ζ 145); ζωοδότης is a normal epithet of Christ, while ἀχρόντος is current for all three persons of the Trinity.
37 ζωοτόταν ἀυτήν: the rhythmical pattern may recall Od. 11.400 ἁνέμων ἀμέγαρτον ἀυτήν.
38 ἐγαπάτω υἱ: Gospel formula for the relationship between Father and Son (e.g. Matth. 17:5, Marc. 1:11, Luc. 3:22).
39 ἐγαρθείν μέλλει: cf. τελέσθαι ἐμέλλεν in Il. 2.36, Od. 2.156, Hes. Th. 552.
40 πυραυσκόμεναισιν: in the sense of “predict, reveal” as in ll. 15.97; see also schol. D ll. 12.280 φανεροποιῶν, ἐμφανιζόμενος.
41 ἀπερεθεκλησθαι: a Lieblingswort of Nonnus (e.g. Par. 3.84, of faith) and Gregory of Nazianzus.
42 ὑποφητῶν: another word for the prophets (also in Ode in Plat. 155), metrically easier to handle, though Nonnus always speaks of προφήται.
43 τελείσθαι μέλλε: cf. τελέσθαι ἐμέλλεν in Il. 2.36, Od. 2.156, Hes. Th. 552.
reúc blames the Apostles: ἰδοὺ πεπληρώκατε τὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ τῆς διδαχῆς ὑμῶν καὶ βούλεσθε ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου.

θεμεῖλια: this form always occurs in this metrical position: see e.g. ll. 23.255 θεμεῖλια τε προβάλοντο; Dion. Per. 1170 θεμεῖλια τορνώσαντο; Nonn. Par. 8.127, 17.14.

42 ἵνα 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.

dιαμπέρες: the pattern may recall ll. 5.284 διαμπέρες, οὖδὲ σ’ ὀἴο, where however the adverb has a local sense, not a temporal one as here.

ἀπόφημι: not in the Homeric sense of “speak out” (ll. 7.362), but in the sense of “deny” (Anth.Pal. 9.107.3, 9.550.1), ἀπαρνώμαι (Hsch. a 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 ll. 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 ll. 18.346a (IV 499.85–500.88 Erbse, with 86 ἀγγελίαν in accordance with ms. Ε⁴) copied by Musurus in the margin of his Inc.Vat. I 50.

Χαλάστραιον: a sort of soda, produced in the Thracian city of Chalastra: see (apart from schol. Plat. Resp. 430α; Suid. χ 10; Etym.Magn. 805.3–4) especially Hsch. χ 39, where the Χαλαστραῖον νήπων (thus reads Musurus’ correction from the manuscript’s Χαλαστραιῶν νήπων) 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 μύρων ἑώθες προσοίσομεν τὴν τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν δογμάτων
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 ἄνδρομές κραδίς ρύπον.

χυτλωθέντων: the passive form of this verb never occurs; χυτλόμαι (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 ἀρχεκάκον ... ἁμπλακίς: two very common adjectives in Christian contexts, see e.g. Cyrill. In Joh. 4.6 (PG 73.681A) τὴν ἀρχέκακον ἁμαρτίαν, and especially Nonn. Par. 3.122 ἁμπλακίας νίπτοντες ἐφαιδρύνοντο ἰηθροί.

πάντα καθαίρει: probably reminiscent of Nonn. Par. 1.25 μουνογενής Λόγος ἦν, ὡς ἀνέρα πάντα καθαίρει (of Christ).

46 ἐφαιδρύνον: 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 συνεγέρσωμαι ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ Χριστῷ which is often used for the action of raising from the dead.

47 μέλλοντος ... αἰώνος: the μέλλον αἰών is the saeculum novum after the Last Judgment: see Lampe s.v. αἰών c2d.