

Paris, BnF, grec 2423: A Newly Discovered Witness to Ps.-Proclus'/Ps.-Libanius' Treatise on Letter-Writing in a Byzantine Amplified Recension

Argyro Lithari

Abstract: *This paper argues that folios 112r–117r of Paris, BnF, grec 2423, hitherto thought to belong to Περὶ διαλέκτων by Gregory of Corinth, actually contain a separate work titled Πρόκλου περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτῆρος. The text combines a late antique treatise on letter-writing, preserved in the so-called ps.-Libanius and ps.-Proclus versions, with a Byzantine supplement transmitted in multiple versions. The study introduces this previously overlooked manuscript witness and demonstrates its importance for the textual history of both works. It first surveys the late antique and Byzantine versions and modern scholarship, then describes the manuscript section itself. Next, it analyzes the manuscript's place within the manuscript tradition through evidence relating to content, structure, and textual readings. The paper concludes by considering the implications of this witness for the reception history of the ps.-Proclus/ps.-Libanius treatise.*

Keywords: *Paris gr. 2423, letter-writing, ps.-Libanius, ps.-Proclus, textual and reception history*

Folios 112r–117r of Paris, BnF, grec 2423 (= Paris. gr. 2423) have been regarded so far as part of the preceding treatise *Περὶ διαλέκτων* by Gregory of Corinth. It has gone unnoticed that *Περὶ διαλέκτων* occupies only f. 102r–111v, and that a different work begins at the very top of f. 112r and continues to the

middle of f. 117r.¹ This work is entitled *Πρόκλου περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτῆρος*. Indeed, the first three fifths of the text correspond to a late antique treatise on letter-writing, probably composed in the late 4th–early 5th century² and transmitted through two versions, the so-called ps.-Libanius and ps.-Proclus versions. The remaining part contains a Byzantine supplement to this treatise, likewise attested in multiple versions. The aim of this paper is to present this new witness to both the ps.-Proclus/ps.-Libanius treatise and its Byzantine enriched version, and to argue for its significance. The discovery of this Byzantine recension in Paris. gr. 2423 sheds new light on the reconstruction of the original treatise from which the ps.-Proclean and ps.-Libanean versions derive. It further contributes to the discussion of its (educational) use in late Byzantium and, finally, to a critical edition of the Byzantine supplements to the late antique treatise.

1. *The ps.-Proclus and ps.-Libanius versions and the Byzantine recension: content and recent editorial reference works*

The late antique treatise in question can be described as a manual on letter-writing. It contains several theoretical sections in which the need for such a treatise is justified, a definition of ἐπιστολή is provided, different types of letters are distinguished and defined, and stylistic issues related to letter-writing are discussed. It also includes sample letters corresponding to the types identified. Some manuscript witnesses attribute the treatise to Proclus, the Neoplatonic philosopher, or to a Proclus without further qualification, while others ascribe it to Libanius the sophist. However, the distinction between the ps.-Libanean and ps.-Proclean versions does not rest on the title under which the treatise has been transmitted, although certain agreements or similarities can be observed among the titles – where they are attested – of each version. Rather, the difference between the two versions lies in the structure of the text (see Table 1 below).

¹ The same handwriting and uniform page-layout of f. 102r–117r (Burri, *Die Geographie des Ptolemaios*, 416–417) may have contributed to this infelicity.

² See, for instance, Chernoglazov, “The Treatise ‘Epistolary Styles’,” 14, 19, 66–67. Sykouris (“Proklos Περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτῆρος,” 117) gives a broader possible time span for the composition, namely the 4th–6th century.

Parts	ps.-Libanean version	ps.-Proclean version
I	Introduction to the subject of the treatise; definitions	
II	List of 41 letter types according to their purpose	
III	Definitions of the 41 letter types	Remarks on epistolary style in general
IV	Remarks on epistolary style in general	For each of the 41 letter types, the definition is given first, followed by an example
V	Examples for each of the 41 letter types	

TABLE 1: Structure of the two versions

In the ps.-Proclean version, Parts III and V of the ps.-Libanean version are merged into a single section, while Part IV of the ps.-Libanean version follows immediately after Part II.

In some manuscripts, the late antique treatise is transmitted together with a set of sample letters probably produced in the 9th and/or 10th century³ and added at the end of the treatise as a form of supplementary material. Their transmission is equally complex. First, the number of examples included in such an appendix varies. Second, some of these sample letters correspond to letter types already defined in the late antique treatise, while others introduce additional types. Third, the example or examples given for a single letter type may also vary. Moreover, in some manuscripts, this set of Byzantine sample letters is transmitted on its own, that is, independently of the late antique treatise, which is not included in the codex. In other manuscripts, it does not even constitute a separate set; instead, individual Byzantine sample letters are integrated into the treatise in order to supplement or replace original examples or

³ Chernoglazov (“Die Byzantinische Fassung,” 198) argues that the majority of the Byzantine sample letters were produced in the 9th and/or 10th century. See also Chernoglazov, “The Treatise ‘Epistolary Styles’,” 14.

to fill a gap where the relevant example appears to be missing.

In 1910, Weichert edited the text in question under the title [*Λιβανίου σοφιστοῦ*] *ἐπιστολιμαῖοι χαρακτήρες*.⁴ He divided the manuscripts into six groups:⁵ (a) manuscripts containing the ps.-Libanean version, which bear the title *Λιβανίου σοφιστοῦ ἐπιστολιμαῖοι χαρακτήρες*; in a few manuscripts of this group no title is given; (b) manuscripts transmitting the ps.-Proclean version – most of them bear the title *Πρόκλου τοῦ Πλατωνικοῦ περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος*, though the titles *Περὶ ἐπισταλτικοῦ χαρακτήρος* and *Λιβανίου σοφιστοῦ ἐπιστολιμαῖοι χαρακτήρες πάννυ χρησιμότατον* are also attested; one manuscript of this group contains no title at all; (c) manuscripts of low quality (i.e., abridged, truncated); (d) amplified versions of the text, in which further sample letters are included, either as a distinct set of sample letters or appended to the genuine examples in their proper place; here too the titles, when given, vary: *Πρόκλου περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος*, *Πρόκλου σοφιστοῦ περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος*, and *Περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίων χαρακτήρων*; (e) two manuscripts transmitting a treatise different from, yet based on, the treatise under examination; and (f) manuscripts offering recensions in which one part of the original text is expanded while another part is omitted. As the title indicates, Weichert's edition records the ps.-Libanean version,⁶ and, to date, it remains the only edition to include the additional sample letters (see manuscript group (d)).⁷

The ps.-Libanean version was also edited separately by Foerster in 1927 under the title *Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι χαρακτήρες*.⁸ Foerster considered additional manuscripts beyond those examined by Weichert and classified all of them into three groups: (i) manuscripts of the ps.-Libanean version; (ii) manuscripts of the ps.-Proclean version; and (iii) manuscripts presenting a mixed form derived from both versions.⁹ Quite reasonably, Weichert's groups (a) and (b) corre-

⁴Weichert, Valentinus. *Demetrii et Libanii qui feruntur ΤΥΠΟΙ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΙ et ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΙΜΑΙΟΙ ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΕΣ*. Teubner, 1910.

⁵Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, XLII–LXX.

⁶Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, 13–34.

⁷Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, 34–66.

⁸Foerster, Richardus. *Libanii Opera*. Vol. IX: *Lib. Qui feruntur Characteres Epistolici. Prolegomena ad Epistulas*. Teubner, 1927, 27–47.

⁹Foerster, *Characteres Epistolici*, 3–21.

spond directly to Foerster's groups (i) and (ii), respectively. The majority of manuscripts in Weichert's groups (c), (d) and (e) are placed in Foerster's group (iii), while the remainder are distributed among the other two groups.

The ps.-Proclean version was edited by Hercher in 1873 under the title *Πρόκλου τοῦ Πλατωνικοῦ περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος*,¹⁰ who relied on Westermann's 1856 edition. Westermann's edition, in turn, was based on just two manuscripts, Paris, BnF, grec 1630 (= Paris. gr. 1630) and Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Pal. gr. 43 (= Pal. Heid. 43),¹¹ as well as on two earlier editions, that of Hartung (1548)¹² and that of Morelius (1558), which give the ps.-Proclean and the ps.-Libanean version, respectively.¹³

Preparatory work for an edition of the Byzantine material added to the initial treatise has already been published by Chernoglazov.¹⁴ He considers manuscripts of which previous editors of ps.-Proclus/ps.-Libanius and of the supplementary sample letters appear to have been completely unaware, and divides them into five classes accord-

¹⁰ Hercher, Rudolphus. *Epistolographi Graeci*. Instituti Franciae Typographo, 1873, 6–13.

¹¹ More specifically, according to Foerster (*Characteres Epistolici*, 13–15, 21), Paris. gr. 1630 and Pal. Heid. 43, both dated to the 14th century, derive from a common source and are the oldest representatives of one of the two subfamilies into which the ps.-Proclean branch of the manuscript tradition may be divided. The dating of Pal. Heid. 43 has, however, been the subject of some controversy. Following Stevenson (*Codices Manuscripti*, 23), Weichert (*Demetrii et Libanii*, L) and Chernoglazov ("The Treatise 'Epistolary Styles'," 44) date it to the 15th century, Agapitos ("Poets and Painters," 173–174) to the 12th century, and Zagklas (*Theodoros Prodromos*, 95) to the 13th century. Lastly, according to "Bibliotheca Palatina – digital", the portion of the codex recording ps.-Proclus/ps.-Libanius was written in the second half of the 13th century.

¹² Hartung worked with a manuscript that appears to be unidentified today. The only information he provides is that he received it in 1547 from Michael Westermann (Hartung, *Methodus*, 3). Forster (*Characteres Epistolici*, 23) proposed that this manuscript belongs to the family of Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek, Hs. 2773 (see fn. 37), which explains why Hartung's printed edition is relevant as a textual witness.

¹³ Westermann, Antonius. *Procli Platonici de Conscribendis Epistolis Libellus*. A. Edelmann, Bibliopolam Universitatis, 1856. See also Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci*, xii; Foerster, *Characteres Epistolici*, 23, 25.

¹⁴ Chernoglazov, "The Treatise 'Epistolary Styles'," (especially) 89–138.

ing to the position and role of the Byzantine additions relative to the late antique treatise – for example, depending on whether they constitute a distinct set of examples, or whether they supplement or replace the original examples. For the purposes of the present discussion, it is worth noting in advance that his class (I) includes manuscripts in which the Byzantine sample letters form a separate set, usually attached as an appendix to the ps.-Proclus/ps.-Libanius treatise or, in a few cases, transmitted independently, while his class (II) includes manuscripts in which the additional sample letters are integrated with the original examples in their proper place.¹⁵ In this way, Chernoglazov effectively divides Weichert's group (d) in two classes and supplements it with new witnesses.

Finally, arguments have been advanced regarding which version is prior and which title best reflects the content of the treatise and may, therefore, represent the original title. Such arguments mainly rest on comparisons between the contents and structure of the two versions, on correlations between the titles under which the treatise is transmitted and its content, and on consideration of related texts of similar subject matter. Weichert, Foester, and Chernoglazov favor the ps.-Libanean version, Sykoutris favours the ps.-Proclean version,¹⁶ while Westermann and Hercher do not express any opinion on the matter.¹⁷

¹⁵ “Classes (I) and (II)” refer to Chernoglazov's taxonomy in “Die Byzantinische Fassung” and correspond respectively to “versions F and G” in his taxonomy presented in “The Treatise ‘Epistolary Styles’”. The only difference between these two classifications is that version F includes one additional manuscript, i.e., Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, 4806 (15th–16th century), whereas Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 875 (13th century), assigned to class (II), was not subsequently included in version G. Hereafter, when necessary, I will refer to classes (I) and (II).

¹⁶ Sykoutris, “Proklos Περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος”. Chernoglazov (“Die Byzantinische Fassung,” 189, fn. 2) is aware of Sykoutris' objections to the arguments of Weichert and Foerster, but he does not explain why he considers them unconvincing. However, in “The Treatise ‘Epistolary Styles,’” 69–71, Chernoglazov examines Sykoutris' arguments, evaluating them in terms of persuasiveness and importance.

¹⁷ For an informative overview of the literature, including translations and other studies on ps.-Proclus/ps.-Libanius' treatise, see Chernoglazov, “The Treatise ‘Epistolary Styles,’” 5–12.

2. *Paris. gr. 2423, f. 112r–117r: content and structure*

Paris. gr. 2423 is a composite manuscript. Its various codicological units were copied – and probably bound together – in Constantinople in the late 13th century.¹⁸ In general, it is a complex codex that can hardly be regarded as well-preserved or polished. It comprises 158 folios, the last two of which are blank. To my knowledge, eleven textual entities have been identified so far.¹⁹ These belong to the fields of grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, astrology, astronomy, and geography. I speak of textual entities rather than texts, since, for instance, the first 24 folios contain a collection of astrological

¹⁸ For Paris. gr. 2423, see Omont, *Inventaire Sommaire*, 258, Cumont, *Codicum Parisinorum*, 65, Tihon, *Le “Petit Commentaire”*, 144–145, Cacouros, “Deux épisodes,” 609–613, and Burri, *Die Geographie des Ptolemaios*, 411–425. Although she focuses on the part of the codex containing Ptolemy’s *Geography*, Burri provides the most detailed description of the entire manuscript. Regarding the dating of the manuscript, Omont and Cumont offer rather broad chronological framework, namely the 13th century and the 13th–14th century, respectively. On the basis of dates found in marginal scholia to Theon’s *Small Commentary on Ptolemy’s Handy Tables*, written by the same hand as the main text, Tihon (145) dates Paris. gr. 2423 to the end of the 13th century, while Burri (411) suggests round 1300. Burri’s (417, 423) decision to allow for the possibility of the first years of the 14th century appears to stem from her view that the codex was probably produced within the circle of Maximus Planudes, who seems to have lived until 1305. Cacouros (610) provides the earliest specific date range, i.e., 1260–1280, for all the texts included in the codex, although he is aware of Tihon’s observations. Regarding the place where the texts were copied and bound together into a single codex, I follow Burri’s (411) assumption in favor of Constantinople.

¹⁹ More specifically, (1) f. 1r–24v: anonymous astrological collection; (2) f. 25r–34v: Philoponus’ *On the Construction and Use of the Astrolabe*; (3) f. 36r–51v: ps.-Plutarch’s *De Placitis Philosophorum*; (4) f. 51v–59v: Proclus’ *Elements of Theology*; (5) f. 60r–72r: *Division of Epideictic Speeches* of Menander the Rhetor; (6) f. 74r–101v: Proclus’ *Hypotyposis Astronomicarum Positionum*; (7) f. 102r–117r: misleadingly identified as *De Dialectis* of Gregory of Corinth, whereas this treatise extends only up to f. 111v; (8) f. 118r–133v: Ptolemy’s *Geography*; (9) f. 134r–135r: Philoponus’ *On the Construction and Use of the Astrolabe*; (10) f. 135r–150r: Theon’s *Small Commentary on Ptolemy’s Handy Tables*; and (11) f. 150r–156v: anonymous astrological treatise. For more details, see Burri, *Die Geographie des Ptolemaios*, 411–412.

treatises²⁰ and not a single work, whether complete or partial. Two of the textual units derive from the same treatise (i.e., Philoponus' *On the Construction and Use of the Astrolabe*), many units are mutilated at their beginning or end, or survive only as extracts, and all are written in *Fettaugen* style with slight variations.

Folios 112r–117r²¹ which record the ps.-Proclus/ps.-Libanius treatise and the Byzantine supplement are generally in relatively good condition, and the text is legible, with the exception of f. 116, where the ink on a small portion of both sides has faded substantially or completely. Minor signs of damage are also visible on f. 112v and f. 115r. The number of lines per folio varies from 28 to 32, except for f. 117r which contains only 17 lines, the remainder being left blank. There are no discursive marginal or interlinear scholia. The only marginal notes present are Greek numerals used to number the original and additional sample letters, beginning with “α’” and proceeding to “μα’” for the former, and from “α’” to “κβ’” for the latter. These numerals are written by the same hand as the main text.

The title of the text is *Πρόκλου περί ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος*. The late antique treatise (Part A) extends up to f. 115r, l. 29. The Byzantine supplement (Part B) begins immediately thereafter, on f. 115r, l. 30, and is marked by the phrase “Ἑτεραι ἐπιστολαὶ ὅμοιαι”, which functions as a section heading.²²

Part A may be divided into the following sections:

- A.1: f. 112r, l. 2–9: Introduction to the subject of the treatise; definitions.
- A.2: f. 112r, l. 9–16: List of 41 letter types according to their purpose.
- A.3: f. 112r, l. 17 – f. 113r, l. 7: Definitions of the 41 letter

²⁰ For a detailed description of f. 1–24, see Cumont, *Codicum Parisinorum*, 65–69.

²¹ I follow the more recent foliation in the upper right corner of each folio. Just below this, the older sequence is recorded (“117, 119, 120, 122, 118, 133”). On the foliation of Paris. gr. 2423, see Burri, *Die Geographie des Ptolemaios*, 414.

²² From now on, when I say “main/original text/treatise”, I am referring only to the late antique treatise (i.e., Part A), as distinct from the Byzantine appendix (i.e., Part B).

types.

- A.4: f. 113r, l. 7 – f. 113v, l. 4: Remarks on epistolary style in general.
- A.5: f. 113v, l. 4 – f. 115r, l. 28: For each of the 41 letter types, the definition is given *again*, followed by an example.

Thus, while sections A.1–A.4 follow the structure of the ps.-Libanean version,²³ corresponding to Parts I–IV of that version, section A.5 corresponds to the final part, i.e., Part IV, of the ps.-Proclean version. Moreover, each type of letter in A.5 is introduced in the same manner as in Part IV of the ps.-Proclean version.²⁴ This transition from one version to another renders the text rather repetitive. Several explanations could account for the repeated definitions of the types of letters. One possibility is that the repetition was the scribe's own initiative, perhaps intended to enhance readability by restating each definition before the corresponding example. Another is that the scribe of Paris. gr. 2423 consulted and combined two distinct sources, one containing the ps.-Libanean version and the other the ps.-Proclean version. A further hypothesis is that he simply reproduced a manuscript that already presented the material in this hybrid and repetitive form.

Part B contains further examples for the following 22 letter types (the number in square brackets refers, when available, to the classification number of the sample letters in Weichert's edition):

- (i) f. 115r, l. 30: ἐπαινετική [60]
- (ii) f. 115v, l. 5: παραμυθητική [62β: Λίαν ἡμᾶς ... παραλαμβάνοντι. & Ἀσπασώμεθα δὴ ... ἀξιούμενος.]
- (iii) f. 115v, l. 18: παροξυντική [65]
- (iv) f. 115v, l. 23: ὑβριστική [66]
- (v) f. 115v, l. 28: ἐπαινετική [70]
- (vi) f. 116r, l. 1: ἐλεγκτική [73]
- (vii) f. 116r, l. 5: διαβλητική [74]
- (viii) f. 116r, l. 10: ἐπιτιμητική [75]
- (ix) f. 116r, l. 15: παραθαρρυντική [77]. See Weichert 28.5–13.
- (x) f. 116r, l. 21: ἀποφαντική [79]

²³ Section A.1 corresponds to §§1–3 of Foerster, section A.2 to §4, section A.3 to §§5–45, and section A.4 to §§46–51.

²⁴ Section A.5 corresponds to p. 8–13 of Hercher.

- (xi) f. 116r, l. 25: σκωπτική [80]
 (xii) f. 116r, l. 29: μετριαστική [= Ταπεινὸν εἶναι καὶ ἄσημον ... βραχέος ἀξιουῖσθαι λόγου. (Weichert, p. 51) & Τοιοῦτος οὖν καὶ σὺ μὲ κρίνε καὶ παντός ἀχρειότερος καὶ εὐτελέστερος.²⁵]
 (xiii) f. 116v, l. 2: αἰνιγματική [81]
 (xiv) f. 116v, l. 6: λυπητική [83]
 (xv) f. 116v, l. 11: ἐπαγγελτική [88]
 (xvi) f. 116v, l. 13: παραινετική ἢ ἀποτ[ρεπτική] [91]
 (xvii) f. 116v, l. 18: [συμβουλευτική]. The text is severely corrupted; nevertheless, the kind of letter can be inferred from “[συμ]βουλεύοντι” in l. 20. [92]
 (xviii) f. 116v, l. 22: μεμπτική [93]
 (xix) f. 116v, l. 26: φιλική [98]
 (xx) f. 116v, l. 32: ἀπειλητική [100]. The example concludes with the additional phrase “κακῶς ἦν”.
 (xxi) f. 117r, l. 4: ἀπαρνητική [101]
 (xxii) f. 117r, l. 8: παραγγελτική ἢ ἐπιφωνηματική [102]. Weichert (60.21) writes only “παραγγελτική”.
 Unlike section A.5, no definition of the kind of letter is provided before the sample letter in this section.

3. *On the place of Paris. gr. 2423 within the manuscript tradition of ps.-Proclus'/ps.-Libanius' treatise and its Byzantine recension*

Paris. gr. 2423 is among the earliest codices that transmit either the ps.-Proclus/ps.-Libanius treatise alone or the treatise together with Byzantine additions. By focusing on selected passages and on content- or structure-related features pertaining to both Part A and Part B, and by drawing comparisons with other manuscript witnesses, I aim to show that its significance derives not only from its antiquity. The following observations are not intended to resolve all the stemmatic relationships between Paris. gr. 2423 and the other early witnesses of ps.-Proclus/ps.-Libanius treatise and its Byzantine recension. They do, however, demonstrate affinities with specific (sub)branches of the manuscript tradition, or even particular manuscripts; they rule out or propose “model-apograph” relation-

²⁵ The last sentence of the example is not found in Weichert.

ships with certain other manuscripts; and, most importantly, they underscore the necessity of a proper study of Paris. gr. 2423 within the framework of any editorial work on the ps.-Proclus/ps.-Libanius treatise.

Comparison between Parts A.2, A.3, and A.5

Discrepancies are observed between the definitions in Part A.3 and those in Part A.5. First, in Part A.5, the definitions of *παραινετική* (f. 113v, l. 4–7) and *ἐπαινετική* (f. 114v, l. 13–15) are shortened versions of those in Part A.3 (i.e., f. 112r, l. 17–25 and f. 112v, l. 19–23, respectively). The former omits the distinction between *παραίνεσις* and *συμβουλή*, while the latter omits the distinction between *ἔπαινος* and *ἐγκώμιον*. More importantly, the discrepancies include differences in word order (e.g., in the case of *θεραπευτική*), omissions of specific words (e.g., in the case of *πρεσβευτική* and *ἀναθετική*), replacement of one term by another (synonymous) term (e.g., in the case of *ἐπιτιμητική*), rephrasing of parts of the definitions (e.g., in the case of *εὐχαριστική*), and different forms of the same verb or participle (e.g., in the case of *ἀντεπισταλτική* and *σχετλιαστική*). Superior readings are preserved in some cases in Part A.3, and in other cases in Part A.5. Moreover, deviations appear even in the names of the letter types. In part A.5, we read *παραγγελτική* (f. 113v, l. 30), *διαμαρτυρική* as an alternative name for *παραγγελτική* (f. 113v, l. 31), *ὀνειδιστική* (f. 114r, l. 6), and *ἀπολογητική* as an alternative name for *θεραπευτική* (f. 112v, l. 10). In Part A.3, the corresponding readings are *παραγγελματική* (f. 112v, l. 4), *μαρτυρική* (f. 112v, l. 5), *ὀνειδική* (f. 112v, l. 7), and *ἀπαλογηστική* (f. 112v, l. 10). Part A.2 offers *παραγγελτική* (f. 112r, l. 11) and *ὀνειδιστική* (f. 112r, l. 12), while *μαρτυρική*/*διαμαρτυρική* and *ἀπολογητική*/*ἀπαλογηστική* are entirely absent. Additionally, in Parts A.2 and A.3, *παραμυθητική* appears between *παροξυντική* and *ὕβριστική*, whereas, in Part A.5, there is no reference to *παραμυθητική* between *παροξυντική* and *ὕβριστική*; instead, it appears a little further down, on f. 114v, l. 7–10, after *σχετλιαστική* and before *πρεσβευτική*.

Taking all this into account, it seems unlikely that the variant readings of Part A.5 emerged through oversight or as a deliberate correction by the copyist of Paris. gr. 2423 (or the scribe of its model) while consulting the earlier definitions of the treatise. The disrup-

tion of the order of the examples further supports the assumption that Part A.5 was composed independently of part A.3. Moreover, such inconsistencies between Parts A.2/A.3 and A.5, along with several unintelligible or corrupt readings, make it implausible that the scribe of Paris. gr. 2423 undertook any revisory activity beyond simply copying what lay before him. The key question, then, is what exactly that copyist had in front of him. In other words, the major puzzle appears to be whether – and, if so, to what extent – Paris. gr. 2423 preserves readings originating from different branches of the manuscript tradition.

Structure- and content-related distinctive features

(i) An example for *ὀνειδιστική* is absent from Part V of the ps.-Libanean version, whereas it appears in representatives of the two subfamilies of the ps.-Proclean version,²⁶ as well as in three manuscripts that include additional Byzantine letters as an appendix:²⁷ Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 306 (= Vat. gr. 306),²⁸ Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1733 (= Vat. gr. 1733)²⁹ – both of which, though preserving the ps.-Libanean version, are closely related to the ps.-Proclean version by virtue of a significant number of shared readings³⁰ – and Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Gr. Z 521 (= Marc. gr. Z 521).³¹

²⁶ For the two subfamilies of the ps.-Proclean version, see Foerster, *Characteres Epistolici*, 11–17, 21, and here fn. 11 and 37.

²⁷ See also Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, LVII.

²⁸ Weichert dates it to the 13th century, Foerster to the 14th century, and Chernoglazov (“Die Byzantinische Fassung”) to the 13th–14th centuries. By virtue of the additional sample letters it contains, Weichert classifies it under group (d) and Chernoglazov under class (I). Foerster places it under group (iii), since it follows, on the one hand, the structure of the Libanean version and many readings of its most ancient witnesses, while including, on the other hand, some readings attested in the ps.-Proclean branch of the manuscript tradition, especially in Darm. 2773.

²⁹ It is dated to the end of the 15th century. Like Vat. gr. 306, it is classified under Weichert’s group (d), Foerster’s group (iii) and Chernoglazov’s class (I).

³⁰ On the relationship between Vat. gr. 306 and Vat. gr. 1733, see Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, LVII.

³¹ Marc. gr. Z 521 is dated to the 14th century and is classified by Foerster under his group (iii), by Weichert under his group (d), and by Chernoglazov under his class (I). For the shared features of Marc. gr. Z 521, Vat. gr. 306,

Therefore, the presence of such an example in Paris. gr. 2423 (f. 114r, l. 6–9) clearly links it to the Ps.-Proclean branch of the manuscript tradition. The text reads as follows:

[T1] (definition) Ὀνειδιστική ἐστι, δι' ἧς ὀνειδίζομέν τινα ἐφ' οἷς πεπονθώς ἀμνημονεῖ. (example) Πολλὰ καλὰ πέπονθας ὑφ' ἡμῶν | καὶ θαυμάζω καθ' ὑπερβολήν, πῶς οὐδενὸς | τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖς, ἀλλὰ κακῶς ἡμᾶς λέγεις ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀχαρίστου γνώμης. οἱ γὰρ ἀχαρίστοι τῶν καλῶν | ἀμνημονοῦσι καὶ τοὺς εὐεργέτας ὡς ἐχθροὺς κακῶς ἐπὶ τούτοις διατίθενται.

(ii) In Part II of both the ps.-Libanean and ps.-Proclean versions, as well as in Part A.2 of Paris. gr. 2423, παραμυθητική appears between παροξυντική and ὑβριστική. The same holds for παραμυθητική in Part III of the ps.-Libanean version and in Part A.3 of Paris. gr. 2423. Nevertheless, in Part V of the ps.-Libanean version, no example is given for παραμυθητική, either between παροξυντική and ὑβριστική or elsewhere within Part V.³² In contrast, in Part IV of Hercher's ps.-Proclean version, παραμυθητική is indeed placed between παροξυντική and ὑβριστική, and the following example is given: Λίαν ἡμᾶς ἡ ἀποβίωσις ... ἡνίκα συμφέρει παραλαμβάνοντι.³³ This example is also attested in three other manuscripts transmitting the ps.-Proclean version.³⁴ The text in Paris. gr. 2423 aligns with neither of these versions: the definition and example for παραμυθητική are not placed between παροξυντική and ὑβριστική, but rather after σχετλιαστική and before πρεσβευτική, and read as follows:

[T2] (definition) Παραμυθητική ἐστι, δι' ἧς παραμυθοῦμεθα τινὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβᾶσι αὐτῷ λυπηροῖς. | (example) Συμφοραῖς πυθόμενος σε περιπετωκέναι μεγίσταις συνήλγησα μὲν καὶ συναλγῶ σοι σφόδρα διὰ τὸν | τῆς φιλίας ὄρον. παρακαλῶ δὲ μὴ πάνυ τῆς λύπης καταβαπτίζεσθαι τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἄστατον λογιζόμενον | καὶ τὴν παρὰ τοῦ κρείττονος ἀντίληψιν ἐκδεχόμενον.

and Vat. gr. 1733, see Chernoglazov, "The Treatise 'Epistolary Styles'," 47.

³² See Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, 28, and Foerster, *Characteres Epistolici*, 41.

³³ For the full text of this example, see Hercher, p. 10, Foerster, *Characteres Epistolici*, 41, and Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, 28.15–10. In Weichert's list of sample letters, it corresponds to the first part of [62β].

³⁴ I.e., Paris, BnF, grec 2551, Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, phil. gr. 149, and Paris, BnF, grec 2671 (Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, 28).

The definition now given is identical to that provided previously in Part A.3, f. 112v, l. 15–16; it agrees with the definition of the ps.-Libanean version³⁵ but differs from that in Hercher's ps.-Proclean version.³⁶ As for the example, it is recorded, according to Weichert and Foerster, in two later manuscripts of the ps.-Proclean version, namely Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek, Hs. 2773 (= Darm. 2773)³⁷ and Paris, BnF, grec 2671 (= Paris. gr. 2671),³⁸ in Vat. gr. 1733, as well as in Hartung's edition. I have also located this example in Vat. gr. 306 (f. 78r), where it appears in the main text of the late antique treatise just after the example for *σχετλιαστική*.³⁹ Thus, the position of this example within the main treatise in Paris. gr. 2423 strongly suggests that it is related to the Darm. 2773 subfamily of the ps.-Proclean branch and to the kindred Vat. gr. 306 – a (roughly) contemporary, rather mixed manuscript – and Vat. gr. 1733. It is worth noting that the example of Paris. gr. 2423 for *παραμυθητική* is absent in the 11th-century Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, phil. gr. 342 (= Vind. phil. gr. 342),⁴⁰ both in the original text and in the supplementary

³⁵ Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, 17.8–10, Foerster, *Characteres Epistolici*, 31, §25.

³⁶ Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci*, 10: *Παραμυθητική ἐστὶ δι' ἧς ἐπὶ τινὶ συμβά-ντι φίλον παραμυθούμεθα*.

³⁷ According to Weichert and Foerster, it dates to the late 14th century to early 15th century. It belongs to Weichert's group (b) and Foerster's group (ii). Foerster (*Characteres Epistolici* 11, 12, 21) submits that Darm. 2773 and Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 4 sup. (Martini-Bassi 81) (= Ambros. B 4 sup.), dated to the 10th century, descend from a common source and are the oldest representatives of one of the two subfamilies into which the ps.-Proclean branch of the manuscript tradition may be divided. For Ambros. B 4 sup., see also Chernoglazov, "The Treatise 'Epistolary Styles'," 41. Chernoglazov ("Die Byzantinische Fassung") does not mention Darm. 2773, as it does not include late-Byzantine additional sample letters.

³⁸ Paris. gr. 2671 dates to the 15th century, according to Weichert, Foerster, and Chernoglazov. It is a witness of the ps.-Proclean version – thus belonging to Foerster's group (ii) – which also contains additional sample letters, each inserted at its proper place in the text – thus belonging to Weichert's group (d) and Chernoglazov's class (II). See also Chernoglazov, "Die Byzantinische Fassung," 197 and Chernoglazov, "The Treatise 'Epistolary Styles'," 50.

³⁹ Cf. Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, LVII for a different report.

⁴⁰ This manuscript is mentioned only by Chernoglazov ("Die Byzantinische

set of sample letters.⁴¹

(iii) Two further instances establish the affinity between Paris. gr. 2423, Vat. gr. 306, Vat. gr. 1733, and Darm. 2773. In the case of *μικτή*, the example given by Paris. gr. 2423 is supplemented at the end with the sentence (f. 115r, l. 28–29):

[T3] Ἐρρώμενος μοι καὶ πολυχρόνιος διαφυλαχθείης παντὸς ἀπευκταίου ἐκλυτρούμενος καὶ τῶν καταθυμίων ἀπολαύων.

This same sentence occurs in the same position in Darm. 2773, Vat. gr. 306, and Vat. gr. 1733. Similarly, immediately after the list of the 41 letter types (Part A.2), Paris. gr. 2423, along with Darm. 2773, Vat. gr. 306, and Vat. gr. 1733, records the sentence (f. 112r, l. 16–17):

[T4] “Ὁμοῦ πᾶσαι τεσσαράκοντα καὶ μία.”,⁴²

which appears to function as a gloss.

(iv) Despite these meaningful similarities between Paris. gr. 2423, on the one hand, and Vat. gr. 306 and Vat. gr. 1733, on the other, certain structural features set them apart: in Vat. gr. 306 and Vat. gr. 1733, the original examples are introduced with the phrase “Ἀρχὴ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν” and are not preceded by definitions, and the letter type is recorded in the margin next to each example (in Vat. gr. 306) or as an interlinear heading (in Vat. gr. 1733). Two cases of divergence between Paris. gr. 2423, on the one hand, and Vat. gr. 306 and Vat. gr. 1733, on the other, allow us to draw further conclusions about their precise relationship. Between the original sample letters for *σκωπτική* and *αἰνιγματική*, Paris. gr. 2423 contains no example for *μετρίαστική* (f. 115r, l. 13). In this respect, it aligns with Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 915 (= Vat. gr. 915), Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1391 (= Vat. gr. 1391), both belonging to the ps.-Libanean branch,⁴³ Darm.

Fassung,” 192) and belongs to his class (I).

⁴¹ More specifically, in Vind. phil. gr. 342 the order of the original set of examples is as follows: ..., *παροξυντική*, *ὕβριστική*, *ἀπαγγελτική*, *σχετλιαστική*, *πρεσβευτική*, ... – *παραμυθητική* is missing from this set entirely. Moreover, none of the four additional examples of *παραμυθητική* recorded in Vind. phil. gr. 342 corresponds to what we find in Part A.5 of Paris. gr. 2423.

⁴² In Vat. gr. 1733, we actually read “Ὁμοῦ πᾶσαι μᾶ’”.

⁴³ Vat. gr. 915 is dated to the 14th century, while Vat. gr. 1391 is dated to the

2773, and Hartung's edition, but it differs from Vat. gr. 306 and Vat. gr. 1733. These two manuscripts record an example for μετριοστική within the original treatise (f. 78v and f. 207r, respectively), which is almost identical to the example for μετριοστική found in Part B of Paris. gr. 2423 (f. 116r, l. 29 – f. 116v, l. 2):

[T5] Ταπεινὸν εἶναι καὶ ἄσημον ἐξ ἀσήμων ἢ καὶ ἀπαίδευτος καὶ μηδὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν κεκτημένος ὁμολογῶ. οὐ γὰρ ἂν τοῦ ἐλέγχοντος δεηθείης. ἢ ἐγὼ γὰρ τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ εὐτέλειαν γινώσκω. γῆ γάρ εἰμι καὶ σποδὸς καὶ πάν[των] † καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις μηδαμῶς ἢ ὀφείλων τι λογίζεσθαι. μέγα γὰρ μοί ἐστι καὶ τὸ ὅλως παρὰ ἀνθρώποις βραχέος ἀξιουῖσθαι λόγου. τοιοῦτον ἢ οὖν καὶ σύ με κρίνε καὶ παντὸς ἀχρεϊότερον καὶ εὐτελέστερον.⁴⁴

At the same time, in the Byzantine appendices of Vat. gr. 306 and Vat. gr. 1733, no example for μετριοστική is recorded between σκωπτική and αἰνιγματική (f. 83v and f. 231v, respectively). It therefore appears that, in Vat. gr. 306 and the undoubtedly later Vat. gr. 1733, an example was detached from the Byzantine appendix to fill a gap in the main treatise. This, in turn, reinforces the suspicion – already suggested by the differing formats of Paris. gr. 2423 and Vat. gr. 306 – that the former is not related to the latter as a copy to its model. Nor can Vat. gr. 306 be regarded as a copy of Paris. gr. 2423, since the former contains a far more extensive set of additional sample letters than the latter.

(v) Several features of the 14th-century Marc. gr. Z 521 link it to Paris. gr. 2423 and some of its kindred manuscripts mentioned above: (a) the presence of T1 as an example for ὀνειδιστική in the original treatise; (b) the presence of T2 as an example for παραμυθητική in the original treatise; (c) the addition of the supplementary text T3 to μικτή; and (d) the presence of T5 as an example for μετριοστική in the Byzantine appendix. Beyond these features, a model-apograph relationship appears to hold in the case of Paris.

12th century. Both manuscripts belong to Weichert's group (a) and Foerster's group (i). According to Foerster (*Characteres Epistolici*, 3, 4, 21), they are the oldest witnesses of the ps.-Libanean branch of the manuscript tradition and belong to different subfamilies.

⁴⁴ Cf. Weichert (*Demetrii et Libanii*, 51) who, as Chernoglazov ("Die Byzantinische Fassung," 201) also notes, did not edit the concluding sentence.

gr. 2423 and Marc. gr. Z 521. The latter introduces the Byzantine appendix with the same heading as Paris. gr. 2423, namely “Ἑτεροὶ ἐπιστολαὶ ὅμοιοι”. It also contains the same extra sample letters as Paris. gr. 2423 in number, kind, and order, with a single exception: the example for αἰνιγματική is missing (perhaps owing to the scribe’s inadvertent omission). Of all manuscripts of Chernoglazov’s class (I), Marc. gr. Z 521 is the only one whose Byzantine supplement resembles that of Paris. gr. 2423. Finally, Marc. gr. Z 521 seems to be the only manuscript that records the alternative ἐπιφωνηματική for παραγγελτική. It is therefore reasonable to assume that it derives from Paris. gr. 2423.

Distinctive readings

(i) A close examination of the examples in Part A.5 reveals that Paris. gr. 2423 preserves readings attested in either the ps.-Libanean or the ps.-Proclean branch of the manuscript tradition. At the same time, a considerable number of readings indicate that Paris. gr. 2423 shows a special affinity (i) with Vat. gr. 915, Vat. gr. 1391, and Darm. 2773 taken as a group, though belonging to different (sub)families (e.g., the reading “πεφύκασι” in παρακλητική, “ἐπιπτήξαιμι” in παραλογιστική, and “ἡξίουν” in πρεσβευτική); (ii) with Darm. 2773 alone (e.g., “πεῖραν λήψεσθαι” in ἀπειλητική, the omission of “τοῦ κακοδαίμονος” in παροξυντική, “κακῶν” in διαβλητική, and “λεύπημαι” in λυπητική); and (iii) with Vat. gr. 306 and Vat. gr. 1733 (e.g., “μεταδοῦναι δέ μοι ταύτης μὴ κατοκνήσης” in μεταμελητική).

(ii) The presence of the example for ὀνειδιστική (see T1) in Paris. gr. 2423 suffices to associate it with the ps.-Proclean manuscript tradition. Two readings in this passage specify this connection. First, the word “μνήμην” is attested in Darm. 2773, Vat. gr. 306, Vat. gr. 1733, and in Hartung’s edition;⁴⁵ in other manuscripts “μνεῖαν” is written instead.⁴⁶ Second, in Darm. 2773, we find “κακοὺς λέγεις” in the place of “κακῶς ἡμῶς λέγεις,” which is clearly a less satisfactory reading.

(iii) Specific readings of Paris. gr. 2423 in the example for παρα-

⁴⁵ See Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, 25, and Foerster, *Characteres Epistolici*, 38.

⁴⁶ See Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, 25, and Foerster, *Characteres Epistolici*, 38.

μυθητική (see T2) support its close resemblance to Vat. gr. 306 and Vat. gr. 1733, and again show that Paris. gr. 2423 preserves more complete and, in some cases, superior readings compared to the later Darm. 2773 and Hartung's edition. T2 is recorded in Vat. gr. 306 in almost the same form as in Paris. gr. 2423, with two exceptions: Vat. gr. 306 reads “ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων” instead of “ἀνθρώπων”, and, like Darm. 2773, Paris. gr. 2671 and Hartung's edition, it gives “πάνυ σε τῇ λύπῃ” instead of “πάνυ τῆς λύπης”. T2 in Vat. gr. 1733 is the same as in Vat. gr. 603, with the exception that, instead of “παρακαλῶ δὲ”, it reads “παρακαλῶ σὲ” – the repetition of “σὲ” within the same phrase is pleonastic and problematic insofar as “μὲν” appears in the previous sentence. Regarding “ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων” and “ἀνθρώπων”, they work equally well in terms of syntax and meaning. However, “πάνυ σε τῇ λύπῃ” makes better sense syntactically than “πάνυ τῆς λύπης”, unless the latter is the corrupt form of the phrase “πάνυ <ὑπὸ> τῆς λύπης” which would be an equally acceptable articulation in this context. Other than that, the text in Darm. 2773 and Hartung's edition is significantly truncated, and Darm. 2773 contains one clearly problematic reading (i.e., “παραλγῶ” instead of “παρακαλῶ”).⁴⁷ The later Paris. gr. 2671 differs only slightly from both Vat. gr. 306 and Paris. gr. 2423, but at different points. In view of these deviations, and given that Paris. gr. 2671 records, as examples for παραμυθητική, both T2 and “Δίαν ἡμᾶς ἡ ἀποβίωσις ... ἡνίκα συμφέρει παραλαμβάνοντι” (in this order)⁴⁸ after two examples for σχετλιαστική, it appears to be informed, on the one hand, by a source related to Paris. gr. 2423 and Vat. gr. 306 and, on the other hand, by a source from a kindred subbranch of the ps.-Proclean version.

(iv) Many readings and content- and structure-related features have established the affinity of Paris. gr. 2423, Vat. gr. 306 and Vat. gr. 1733. At the same time, Foerster maintained that Vat. gr. 306

⁴⁷ See the critical apparatus in Foerster, *Characteres Epistolici*, 41, and in Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, 28.

⁴⁸ Chernoglazov (“Die Byzantinische Fassung,” 194) appears to have overlooked the presence of T2 before “Δίαν ἡμᾶς ἡ ἀποβίωσις ... ἡνίκα συμφέρει παραλαμβάνοντι” [= 62β, Weichert] in Paris. gr. 2671.

and Vat. gr. 1733 stem from a common source.⁴⁹ If this is taken for granted, then that common source cannot be Paris. gr. 2423, since a direct derivation of Vat. gr. 306 from Paris. gr. 2423 and vice versa has been excluded. But even if one does not rely on Foerster's claim, a comparison of the manuscript variants in the case of T5, i.e., the example for μετριοστική, reveals that Vat. gr. 1733 is better linked to Vat. gr. 306 than to Paris. gr. 2423, and that the latter, though sometimes preserving unsatisfactory readings, remains a witness which should not be overlooked in the reconstruction of the text. More specifically, Vat. gr. 1733 differs from Paris. gr. 2423 in eight cases. In four of these, Vat. gr. 306 agrees with Paris. gr. 2423,⁵⁰ whereas in the remaining cases Vat. gr. 306 agrees with Vat. gr. 1733.⁵¹ Of these eight cases of deviation – with the exception of “τὸ καὶ πάντων μετριώτατον”, for which no safe conclusion can be drawn, since the respective passage in Paris. gr. 2423 is unreadable – only the readings offered by both Vat. gr. 306 and Vat. gr. 1733 are superior to the respective readings of Paris. gr. 2423. In terms of the quality of the readings, Vat. gr. 306 thus appears to offer the best readings, while Vat. gr. 1733 the least appropriate. Nevertheless, just before “καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις...”, only Vat. gr. 306 records “δεῖ γὰρ καὶ μετριώτατον”. The complete absence of this phrase from Paris. gr. 2423, its plausible apograph Marc. gr. Z 521, Vat. gr. 1733, and some other, later, manuscripts⁵² which preserve this example for μετριοστική, raises the reasonable suspicion that this phrase is just an interpolation.

To sum up, the overall hybrid structure, specific structural and content-related features, as well as distinctive readings of Paris. gr. 2423 (i) place it in the ps.-Proclean branch of the manuscript tradition, (ii) linking it especially with Vat. gr. 306, Vat. gr. 1733, Paris. gr. 2671, and Darm. 2773. Nevertheless, (iii) Paris. gr. 2423 cannot

⁴⁹ Foerster, *Characteres Epistolici*, 17–18. Weichert recognized their affinity, but did not specify it.

⁵⁰ Vat. gr. 1733 alone gives “γιγνώσκω” for “γιγνώσκων”, “ὀφείλονται” for “ὀφείλων τι”, “βραχέων” for “βραχέος”, and “μὲ καὶ σὺ κρίναις” for “καὶ σὺ με κρίνε”.

⁵¹ They give “ταπεινὸς” for “ταπεινόν”, “ἄσημος” for “ἄσημον”, “δεηθείην” for “δεηθείης”, and “τὸ καὶ πάντων μετριώτατον” for “καὶ πάν[των] †”.

⁵² See Weichert, *Demetrii et Libanii*, 51.

have been copied from Vat. gr. 306, and (iv) nor can the opposite be the case. (v) Moreover, Vat. gr. 1733 does not appear to have derived directly from Paris. gr. 2423; it is connected more closely to Vat. gr. 306 than to Paris. gr. 2423. (vi) Paris. gr. 2671 seems to have been partially informed by Paris. gr. 2423. (vii) The readings of Paris. gr. 2423 tend to be better and more complete than those of Darm. 2773, but (viii) in some cases, they are inferior to those of Vat. gr. 306. (ix) Generally, although Paris. gr. 2423 does not offer a fully polished and unproblematic text for either Part A or part B, it nevertheless reveals elements interpolated into, or missing from, other manuscripts. (x) In all likelihood, Paris. gr. 2423 served as the model for Marc. gr. Z 521. (xi) It also preserves readings found in two of the oldest manuscripts of the ps.-Libanean version, Vat. gr. 1391 and Vat. gr. 915. (xii) Lastly, a certain discrepancy of Paris. gr. 2423 from the even older Vind. phil. gr. 342, which also belongs to the ps.-Libanean branch of the manuscript tradition, signifies a case of enrichment of the Byzantine collection of sample letters, and further suggests that Paris. gr. 2423 may be the earliest extant witness of such an enrichment.

4. *Paris. gr. 2423 and the reception history of ps.-Proclus'/ps.-Libanius' treatise*

Two further aspects of Paris. gr. 2423, which are not connected with its textual history, underscore its importance for the study of the Byzantine reception of ps.-Proclus/ps.-Libanius.

The main bulk of Paris. gr. 2423 has been reasonably described as astronomical-astrological and philosophical. The codex does not include other texts related to epistolary theory and practice. The only texts that may be considered kindred, in a way, are the *Division of Epideictic Styles* by Menander the Rhetor (f. 60r–72r) and the *On Dialects* by Gregory of Corinth (f. 102r–111v), insofar as they too pertain to language and its uses. Moreover, contrary to what has rightly been observed regarding the manuscript transmission of the Byzantine appendix of sample letters,⁵³ Paris. gr. 2423 presents a

⁵³ Chernoglazov, “Die Byzantinische Fassung,” 199, 200; “The Treatise ‘Epistolary Styles’,” 104.

different case: the Byzantine recension is transmitted without any association with 10th and 11th-century Byzantine letters, or with ancient letters.

Even if thematic affinities between *Πρόκλου περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος* and the rest of the codex are difficult (or not immediately obvious) to establish, it can hardly be a coincidence that Paris. gr. 2423 includes two authentic Proclean treatises bearing titles which explicitly ascribe them to the 5th-century head of the Platonic Academy: (a) on f. 51v–59v, a portion of the *Elements of Theology* (i.e., Propositions 1–78), entitled *Πρόκλου διαδόχου πλατωνικοῦ φιλοσόφου στοιχείωσις θεολογική*; and (b) on f. 74r–101v, the entirety of the *Hypotyposis Astronomicarum Positionum*, entitled *Πρόκλου διαδόχου ὑποτύπωσις τῶν ἀστρονομικῶν ὑποθέσεων*. Even if the copyist of the treatise, or the person who commissioned its copying, or the one who assembled the various works into a single codex, was well aware that the treatise was not written by Proclus the Neoplatonist, it should, in my view, be taken for granted that, at least until a certain point – perhaps not long before the production of Paris. gr. 2423 – this treatise on letter-writing was part of the Proclean corpus.⁵⁴ What is certain is that Paris. gr. 2423 constitutes, so far, our earliest testimony to a scholarly tradition that associated *Περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος* (or under a similar inscription) with Proclus the Neoplatonist.

The co-transmission of one or more authentic Proclean works (or extracts thereof) together with ps.-Proclus on letter-writing is also attested in only three other manuscripts, all linked with Paris. gr. 2423:

- Marc. gr. Z. 521 records an untitled portion of ps.-Proclus and the entirety of the *Elements of Theology*, entitled *Πρόκλου Διαδόχου πλατωνικοῦ φιλοσόφου στοιχείωσις θεολογική*;
- Darm. 2773 transmits ps.-Proclus without any inscription, together with two very short extracts from Proclus' *Commentary on Plato's Alcibides I* and *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, again deprived of any inscription;

⁵⁴ Cf. Chernoglazov's ("The Treatise 'Epistolary Styles'," 68) tentative hypothesis concerning the emergence of Proclus' name as the author of the treatise.

- Vat. gr. 1733 transmits ps.-Proclus, inscribed as *Πρόκλου περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος*, together with the entirety of the *Elements of Physics*, inscribed as *Πρόκλου διαδόχου Λυκίου στοιχείωσις φυσική*. It remains undecided whether the reference to a Proclus without further qualification in the title *Πρόκλου περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος* was deliberately intended to preclude an identification of the author of this treatise with the Neoplatonist philosopher Proclus.

If the co-presence of three works under the name “Proclus” in Paris. gr. 2423 is not a mere coincidence, one further observation may be advanced: although they concern completely different areas of interest – observational-mathematical astronomy, philosophy of the divine, and letter-writing – they all appear to be of a more or less introductory character, serving as manuals. This is particularly suggested in the cases of the *Hypotyposis Astronomicarum Positionum* and the *Elements of Theology*, where the titles themselves indicate such a function (ὑποτύπωσις = outlines; στοιχείωσις = elementary exposition/teaching).⁵⁵ Thus, although *Περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος* in Paris. gr. 2423 is not transmitted among related theoretical texts or actual letters, this shared feature of the three works, together with the fact that Paris. gr. 2423 can be regarded as a miscellany of works on disciplines of trivium and quadrivium, as well as on philosophy, points to the educational use of *Περὶ ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος* already from the end of the 13th century.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ For the character and purpose of the *Hypotyposis Astronomicarum Positionum*, the *Elements of Theology*, and the ps.-Proclus’/ps.-Libanius’ treatise, see Lithari, *Proclus. Hypotyposis*, 1-10, Dodds, *Proclus. The Elements of Theology*, ix–xiii, and Chernoglazov, “Die Byzantinische Fassung,” 199, 200, respectively.

⁵⁶ The use of ps.-Proclus’/ps.-Libanius’ treatise in the school curriculum during the late Byzantium has also been proposed by Chernoglazov (“Ancient Epistolary Theory,” 265–267; “The Treatise ‘Epistolary Styles’,” 78–81), but with reference to 14th–16th-century manuscripts and in connection with school manuals on grammar and rhetoric. Chernoglazov (“The Treatise ‘Epistolary Styles’,” 79) mentions only the much later Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 57.34 (15th c.) as an example of a codex that contains ps.-Proclus’/ps.-Libanius’ treatise (without the Byzantine supplementary letters) alongside works on arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to Dr. Olivier Defaux, who read early versions of this article, for his generous advice, critical insights, and invaluable help in organising the article's material.

argyro_lithari@hotmail.com

ORCID iD: 0009-0003-6490-0534

Works Cited

- Agapitos, P.A. "Poets and Painters: Theodoros Prodromos' Dedicatory Verses of His Novel to an Anonymous Caesar." *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 50 (2000): 173–185.
- "Bibliotheca Palatina," University of Heidelberg, accessed December 6, 2025, <https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/de/bpd/index.html>.
- Burri, R. *Die Geographie des Ptolemaios im Spiegel der Griechischen Handschriften*. De Gruyter, 2013.
- Cacouras, M. "Deux épisodes inconnus dans le réception de Proclus à Byzance aux XIIe – XIVe siècles: La philosophie de Proclus réintroduite à Byzance grâce à l'*Hypotypôsis*. Néophytos Prodeomènos et Kontostéphanos lecteurs de Proclus (avant Argyropoulos) dans le Xénôn du Kralj." In *Proclus et la Théologie Platonicienne. Actes du Colloque International de Louvain (13–16 mai 1998)*, edited by A.-P. Segonds and C. Steel, pp. 589–627. Leuven University Press and Les Belles Lettres, 2000.
- Chernoglazov, D.A. "Die Byzantinische Fassung des Spätantiken Briefstellers: Überlieferung und Textgeschichte." *Philologia Classica* 12 (2017): 188–205.
- Chernoglazov, D.A. "Ancient Epistolary Theory in the Byzantine School: Pseudo-Libanius' Manual and Its Later Versions." *Philologia Classica* 13 (2018): 265–275.
- Chernoglazov, D.A. "The Treatise 'Epistolary Styles' of Pseudo-Libanius and Its Later Versions: Byzantine Letter-Writing Manuals and Their Practical Use. Thesis Submitted in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Sciences in Philology. Translation from Russian." PhD diss., Saint Petersburg State University, 2021.
- Cumont, F. *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum*. Vol. VIII.I: *Codicum Parisinorum*. Lamertin, 1929.
- Dodds, E.R. *Proclus. The Elements of Theology. A Revised Text with Translation, Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Foerster, R. *Libanii Opera*. Vol. IX: *Lib. Qui feruntur Characteres Epistolici. Prolegomena ad Epistulas*. Teubner, 1927.
- Hartung, J. *Methodus Una cum Exemplis Conscribendarum Epistolarum Incerti Autoris Graece et Latine*. Basel, 1548.

- Hercher, R. *Epistolographi Graeci*. Instituti Franciae Typographo, 1873.
- Lithari, A. *Proclus. Hypotyposis Astronomicarum Positionum. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary with a Study of the Diagrams and Illustrations*. De Gruyter, 2025.
- Omont, H. *Inventaire Sommaire des Manuscrits Grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale. 2e Partie*. Alphonse Picard, 1888.
- Stevenson, H. *Codices Manuscripti Palatini Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae*. Typographeum Vaticanum, 1885.
- Sykoutris, J. “Proklos Περὶ ἐπιστολμαίου χαρακτήρος.” *Byzantinisch-Neugriechisch Jahrbücher* 7 (1930): 108–118.
- Tihon, A. *Le “Petit Commentaire” de Théon d’Alexandrie aux Table Faciles de Ptolémée*. Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1978.
- Weichert, V. *Demetrii et Libanii qui feruntur ΤΥΠΟΙ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΙ et ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΙΜΑΙΟΙ ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΕΣ*. Teubner, 1910.
- Westermann, A. *Procli Platonici de Conscribendis Epistolis Libellus*. A. Edelmann, 1856.
- Zagklas, N. *Theodoros Prodromos: Miscellaneous Poems. An Edition and Literary Study*. Oxford University Press, 2023.