

Gregory of Cyprus and Aelius Aristides. Some Considerations on their Works and their Transmission

Inmaculada Pérez Martín

International Colloquium "GEORGE OF CYPRUS AND HIS WORLD"

Thursday 18 October 2012, The Hellenic Centre, Great Hall, London

1

First of all, I should like to thank Charalambos Dendrinou for his kind invitation to participate in this conference on Gregory of Cyprus, for which I feel very honoured. My aim is to reflect with you on the transmission of Byzantine texts and, in particular, on the transmission of the writer who has brought us together here today.

My lecture will be divided into three parts. The first will be a brief introduction to the transmission of Byzantine texts. Then I shall talk about the manuscripts of Aelius Aristides copied by Gregory of Cyprus. The second half will focus on the joint transmission of Aelius Aristides and Gregory of Cyprus, that we shall try to classify in various ways: some come to us via the Patriarchate of Constantinople and others through the Monastery of Chora. This will lead to some reflections on the Byzantine canon of rhetoric and on the transmission of Byzantine oratory.

1

The study of the manuscripts preserving Byzantine literature is increasingly rigorous. Philologists proposing to edit or republish Byzantine texts are starting to do more than make a list of the manuscripts preserving that text and give them imprecise dates. They pay attention to codicological details, especially those revealing information about who commissioned the copy, where the manuscript was preserved, or who read it. But what is particularly interesting is the approach to the manuscript as an object endowed with 'organic' qualities: in other words, as if it were a living being, it is considered to be not only the product of the single copy of a text, but, more often, the product of the sum of independent units, or a unit to which are added new texts or simply reading notes or comments. Thus the central

lesson of codicology is learned: that the examination of a manuscript cannot regard it as a homogeneous whole, but has to unravel all the stages of its production.

In the case of complex sets of short pieces attributed to a specific author, such as collections of poetry or correspondence, the material study of the composition of the codex is especially important. Establishing the phases and ways in which it was made can be instructive about the consistency or dating of the corpus of texts that we are trying to organize or edit. An excellent example of this type of approach is that carried out by Stratis Papaioannou on the correspondence of Psellos. It was presented at a conference in Paris some years ago (*La face cachée*), although the proceedings have not yet been circulated as a printed book. Similarly, earlier this year at a conference in Madrid Filippo Ronconi presented research on the codex of the Marciana Library preserving the Bibliotheca of Photios; in it, he showed that the composition of the codex could reveal details about the actual composition of the work; as you know, a very controversial issue.

Needless to say, both of these examples deal with leading Byzantine scholars. They predate the Palaiologan era, in which autograph documents or manuscripts closest to the author are easier to find. Until not long ago the oldest Byzantine scholars whose manuscripts we conserved or whose handwriting we knew were Arethas of Caesarea and Constantinus VII Porphyrogenitus. Now we are approaching the contemporary manuscripts of Photios, and it will not be long before we can talk about the manuscripts of Leo the Mathematician, a legend shrouded in mist for the students of Byzantine scholarship, but the real point of departure of the intellectual life of Constantinople after the Dark Ages.

From the beginning of Byzantine philology attention has been paid to autographs. In the 60s and 70s the focus was on Byzantine authors who worked on language or ancient texts (I am thinking of Alexander Turyn's publications on Planudes and Triklinios); but now we can see a shift of interest from Byzantine philologists to authors who are actual writers, men of letters. We have also observed a shift from the Palaiologan era to earlier times. As to the first Palaiologan century, when Professor Constantinides wrote his *Higher Education*, we knew the handwriting of Planudes, Pachymeres, Triklinios and Gregoras; now we also know that of Gregory of Cyprus and of John Pothos Pediasimos. We are still missing those of Manuel Holobolos and Theodoros Metochites, and we must insist on the need to identify the handwriting of all Byzantine scholars.

The study of the manuscripts conserving autographs, a study impossible in the case of ancient writers, is interesting from several points of view. For example, they are the evidence

best suited for reflecting, as was done in a recent conference in Vienna, on how Greek was spelt and punctuated in the Byzantine period. Moreover, the study of autograph documents breaks down the rather pointless distinction between the writer and the copyist. It is a distinction that makes it difficult to address the many examples of manuscripts copied for personal use, mixing complete works identified by author and title with short anonymous texts, and whose transcribers see no reason to respect the original. The scholar has no tools to deal with hundreds of versions of moral anthologies or collections of sentences or riddles; and yet they are very frequent texts, of complex transmission. So much so that we can affirm that there is a certain amount of 'authorship' in the final version of these personal collections of texts.

2

As to the Byzantine writer who has brought us all here, we have manuscripts copied by him, but no autographs. If I may list some gaps, I will say that, in general, he is an author studied more for his theological aspect (as Prof. Papadakis has done) than for his literary output. We have no critical editions or translations of his rhetorical pieces or of his letters. But we do have the study of Professor Constantinides on his intellectual work, the book of Prof. Kotzabassi on the transmission of his rhetorical and hagiographical works, and that of Lameere on the transmission of the letters; and we know how he wrote, thanks to Prof. Harlfinger.

I must now give a brief introduction to my work on Gregory of Cyprus, which explains why I am here today among such illustrious colleagues. The bulk of the work published in this book is my doctoral thesis, completed in 1992. The object of my research was a manuscript of Aelius Aristides, El Escorial X.I.13, which contained, among other works, *excerpta* of ancient authors.

In my 1996 book I did not pay much attention to the tradition of the text of Aristides. The main reason for this was that, with the exception of a group of orations called the '*Sicilian Orations*', there was no study of transmission in the Palaiologan era. Therefore, it did not make too much sense to study the variations of his manuscripts when they could not be compared with other contemporary codices, but only with a critical apparatus only partially reflecting the readings of the *codices veteres*. This problem is common to other widely read ancient authors in Byzantium, and whose copies from the Palaiologan period have survived in abundance. The publisher Brepols will shortly bring out the description of the manuscripts of

Aristides, produced by a project of the Université de Strasbourg, led by Laurent Pernot and Luana Quattrocchi, in which I am participating. *Catalogus Codicum Aristidis (CCA). La transmission de l'œuvre d'Ælius Aristide à travers les siècles. Papyri, manuscrits et incunables du IV^e au XVI^e siècle.* The team assembled by the teachers of Strasbourg includes French codicologists, and one of them, Jacques-Hubert Sautel, has designed a descriptive index card that ensures careful attention to the codicological aspect of the testimonies. There are nearly 300 manuscripts copied up to the year 1600, and this is the main obstacle to a proper understanding of the transmission of the text of Aristides.

The aim of my work on Escorial X.I.13 was to look into the manuscript tradition of these extracts: again a disappointing task, because in many cases nobody had collated all the complete manuscripts of these authors, and I had to be content with comparing the *variae lectiones* of the Escorial manuscript with those with a very limited critical apparatus. Now I realize that the approach was methodologically flawed. However, and fortunately, we were able to contextualize the copy of the manuscript, which turned out to concern Gregory of Cyprus; moreover, to a considerable degree. An academic year in Paris enabled me to discover in the Bibliothèque nationale other manuscripts with some of the collections of *excerpta* of Escorial X.I.13 and written by the same hands. These were the Par. gr. 2998, Demosthenes, and Par. gr. 2953, again by Aelius Aristides. The main copyist of these manuscripts disclosed his name to us in the very common invocations of the type Χριστέ/Θεοτόκε βοήθει τῷ σῶ δούλῳ Γεωργίῳ. When I finished studying these manuscripts in Paris, the second volume of *Repertorium der Griechischen Kopisten* was published, in which the George of the invocations of Par. 2998 was identified as George/Gregory of Cyprus.

The manuscripts located in the BnF (not to mention the manuscripts of Aristotle) are probably copies from his youth, through which the Cypriot became familiar with ancient oratory. As we all know, the reading of these authors and the accompanying composition exercises were a central component of Byzantine education: the Attic orators and their successors never ceased to be treated as compositional models, and from very early times their *corpora* were preserved in high quality copies that have survived for ten centuries until today. Par. gr. 2998 and 2953 are incomplete copies of the *corpora* of these authors that were rescued in the Macedonian era. In the case of Aristides, for example, Par. 2953 belongs to a family headed by the copy owned by Arethas of Caesarea, two large and exquisite parchment volumes which are now divided between Paris and Florence.

The selection of orations of Demosthenes and Aristides in the Cypriot's codices is due to the limited resources available; in fact, the copying of these manuscripts was a mandatory exercise in the training of the Cypriot, because he could not afford to buy a copy made by a professional scribe. It is possible that he also copied Isocrates or other orators, but these manuscripts have not survived, and we must limit ourselves to noting the interest shown in the two Paris manuscripts. These are actually miscellanea that start with a wide selection of works of Demosthenes and Aristides and continue with other prose works of Lucian, Aeschines, Themistios, Libanios, and Synesios. It is possible that we have not yet found other rhetorical codices copied by him, or that they have been lost, but those we have do not claim to be complete copies of the works of such authors. So it is noteworthy that, as noted by Prof. Constantinides, the correspondence of the Cypriot reflects his 'laborious edition of Aelius Aristides'. The words Gregory used to describe this 'edition' (in the broadest sense of the word) are very solemn: τοῖς δ' οὖν μετέπειτα τῶν φιλολόγων διδασκαλεῖον ἀκριβὲς τῆς τῶν λόγων ἀπεργασίας καὶ ἀγαθὸν παράδειγμα σώζοιτο. There is no doubt that they suggest a similar exercise to that made by Maximos Planudes when he carefully compiled, organized, edited and recopied the *Moralia* treatises. διδασκαλεῖον ἀκριβὲς clearly indicates a work of correction and adjustment of the text; ἀγαθὸν παράδειγμα refers to an *antigraphon* prepared ready to be copied and to publish the corrected text.

Par. 2953 is by no means that actual text of Aristides, but a copy made in his youth, selective and poorly done. There is a luxurious contemporary copy with the corpus of Aristides in two volumes (Par. gr. 2948 + Bodleian Canon. gr. 84) which has given many headaches to philologists, who have been unable to date them. The reason is that it is in an archaic hand usually called 'Palaeologina' because it appears in some luxury codices which belonged to a female member of the Palaiologan imperial family. Theodora Rhaulena is considered by the majority to be the Palaiologan owner of these manuscripts. And this is the moment to remember the close relationship between Theodora and Gregory of Cyprus, who in 1289 moved into the *monydrion* of Aristine that Theodora Palaeologina had fitted out for him as a home, next to the monastery of St. Andrew in Krisei. So it would be logical to think that this luxury parchment copy of Aristides was paid for by Theodora, and represents the Cypriot's edition. In fact, Laurent Pernot's study has determined that this codex and Par. 2953 are copies of the same descendant of the codex of Arethas. However, in this text we should find Gregory's corrections, but what we actually find are corrections by Maximos Planudes, and not the hand of the Cypriot. Therefore, this two-volume copy does not seem to be linked

to Gregory. Moreover, its copyist, even if he shows a fine handwriting, has produced a work full of trivial oversights and errors.

My hypothesis is that this 'fair copy' of Aristides is the Escorial MS X.I.13. It is only a hypothesis: to confirm it requires a comparison of its text with Par. 2953 and other contemporary codices of Aristides, and for this study to show the corrective work of the Patriarch. The Escorial copy has against it the fact that it is limited to the first 15 orations (+ or. 28), and one would think *a priori* that Gregory had established a corpus with the complete works. However, the one who must have done this work was, again, Maximos Planudes. Indeed, Laur. 60.8 has been recognized by Luana Quattrocelli and Nigel Wilson as the 'Planudes edition' of Aristides. Planudes is not the copyist of the text– it was in fact a collaborator of his– but the scholar copied the marginal comments. The manuscript does not present the full corpus of the rhetor of Smyrna (LII-LIII K are missing), but it is a completely new arrangement, which in fact is that currently adopted as the most thematically appropriate. Its text represents a family of a different tradition from that which Gregory of Cyprus may have had at his disposal, which (as stated above) goes back to the copy of Aristides owned by Arethas of Caesarea.

What happened to the corpus of Aristides in those final years of the thirteenth century, when Theodora Rhaulena, Gregory of Cyprus and Maximos Planudes took an interest in him? Did they somehow collaborate in obtaining a better text or a more complete corpus? There is still much work to be done to understand it perfectly, but it is clear that their interest in this author led to a multiplicity of copies, and that not only the Cypriot but also Planudes enjoyed the patronage of the Palaeologina. Suffice it to recall the obituary of the princess that Planudes recorded in 1300 in the ms. of Thucydides Monac. gr. 430. In this manuscript, Gregory replaced some folios by others he had copied himself.

Let us return to Aristides, and try to give ourselves a better idea of what happened at Constantinople in the second half of the thirteenth century. In the 60s, students of Akropolites such as Gregory had access to copies of the manuscript of Arethas, whose text needed to be corrected. In 1282 Theodora Rhaulena had access to the text of Arethas, since she transcribed it in Vat gr. 1899, a copy revised by Gregory of Cyprus. It is possible that, after leaving the Patriarchal throne, towards 1290, Gregory commissioned a fair copy of the works of the rhetor, which was limited or remained limited to orationes 1-15. At the same time or shortly thereafter Planudes would find a hitherto unknown codex of Aristides, a copy of which he commissioned in Laur. 60.8. Perhaps Gregory declined to edit the 'complete Aristides', in

other words, to correct the tradition of the Arethas copy, knowing that Planudes in his turn was working on the text. If so, and regardless of the textual work that he may have done on his copy, what we can say for now is that the MSS Escorial Φ .I.18 and X.I.13 include two treatises that were missing from the Par. gr. 2953, XI and XV. This proves the effort to complete the collection, although they are not the two treatises that he requested from Constantinos Akropolites to complete his fragmentary copy: the speech *In Regem* (XXXV) and the work known as *Egyptian Discourse* (XXXVI). Why simply copy *orationes* 1-15? They have a very classical content, but are not the only ones. Or. 5-15 are *meletai*, but they are not the only ones in the corpus. The only reason would be that they are the first 15 of a corpus that was already established in the Macedonian era, and that had been confirmed by Planudes' discovery.

In spite of not including the entire corpus of Aristides, the *codices Escorialenses* correspond to the idea of a reference copy of great beauty, which does not skimp on material. The *mise en page* is very meticulous, and this presents a challenge in the case of Aristides, since the number of *scholia* varies greatly from one *logos* to another; and great care is needed to enable the reading of the comments in the margin of the text to which they refer.

But above all I would venture to say that is the edition of the Patriarch because he collaborated in its copying. In my 1996 book I have already pointed out the possibility of identifying the hand of cop. X.I.13 B with that of the Patriarch Gregory of Cyprus. At that time I dared not say so unequivocally, but twenty years later I have no hesitation in saying that both hands share many traits and, above all, the same *gestures*, the same *ductus*. The Cypriot's script has undergone an evolution that allows it to move with the spirit of the times, after abandoning the contrast of modules that would be a rarity in the fourteenth century. Many significant features of his writing are still present, and justify this identification.

3

So far we have spoken of the two manuscripts of Aristides in whose preparation Patriarch Gregory was involved. Both belong to the same family of the tradition (δ) studied by Laurent Pernot, starting from the *Sicilian Orations* of Aristides (V-VI K), and which, as we said, goes back to the copy of Arethas. There are many manuscripts belonging to this family, which is a perfect example of what I have called 'firework' transmission, an expression intended to reflect the explosion of copies in the first Palaiologan century. Two reasons underlie this phenomenon: the first is that we still have many more manuscripts from after 1204 than prior

to that fateful date; the second also has to do with 1204, and with the reaction to the destruction of the cultural heritage of the Polis provoked in the elite of Constantinople. Indeed, it started from the restoration of education led by George Akropolites, when those with access to it obtained copies of ancient authors, and members of the nobility pumped resources into the recovery and preservation of Greek learning. We have seen the example of Theodora.

Some of these manuscripts of Aristides are linked to our Cypriot not because his writing is present in them, but because they include his rhetorical works and letters. The last part of my presentation will deal with them and other volumes that include the Cypriot's works together with other authors; and it will place greater emphasis on the theoretical approach rather than on codicological details, which we shall leave for the written version. We shall depict a modest part of the transmission of ancient and Byzantine rhetoric, but we will see the error of those who think of Byzantium as a mere transmitter of ancient texts. Byzantium taught us to read ancient literature by organizing *corpora* or miscellaneous volumes, incorporating into the canon of ancient oratory Byzantine works that were considered valid literary models, and were even passed off as ancient, leading to significant changes to the course of that canon. It was not restricted to selecting authors and texts following criteria that in some cases, such as that of Aelius Aristides, have little to do with our own.

Indeed, Aristides has been a little-known author for modern linguists, often vilified for his style as much as for his personality (hypochondriac, paranoid...). Of his works, only those reflecting the political life of the Roman Empire, or reporting on the sanctuary of Asclepius at Pergamum (*Hieroi logoi*), have received any attention from scholars of ancient oratory. The works of Aristides that are most remote from modern readers (about which there is no literature at all) are precisely what the Byzantines read and imitated with greatest eagerness, the *meletai*. When one of them chose to copy a single work of Aristides in his collection of rhetorical models, the choice was an oration *In Regem* (35 K), which according to Barker may have been composed in the Macedonian era, or a *melete*, *The speech of the Embassy to Achilles* (16 K), when the hero has decided to abandon the battle because of differences with Agamemnon. Finally, let us say that in Byzantium Aristides was copied hundreds of times (as often as Demosthenes, for example), but has only been fully translated into two modern languages, English and Spanish.

As we mentioned earlier, one of the constants of the transmission of Byzantine oratory is its juxtaposition in manuscripts with works of ancient oratory. It is truly remarkable to see

the presence of miscellanea from the first Palaiologan century containing Komnenian oratory, together with that of the Macedonian period and with the works of pagan orators or Church Fathers. Similarly, we find miscellanea in which rhetorical Byzantine works are inserted into the *corpora* of old speeches and letters. You may think that it is quite natural that a volume of oratory should collect similar works, regardless of their era of composition. But we can list many examples of Byzantine rhetorical works that were copied once or twice in contemporary volumes at the time of their composition and were then relegated to oblivion.

In the four cases we see here, what we still possess are copies contemporary with the author. In the first two it remains to be studied whether or not we are dealing with commissioned copies or ones made by the author. Some of you may be thinking that they were not copied more often because they were mediocre works, or because their authors were outside the scholarly circles of Constantinople or Thessaloniki. In the latter two cases, however, the opposite is true: few characters in the court of Michael VIII were more powerful than Akropolites, and yet that did not guarantee the transmission of his rhetorical works. Holobolos was a somewhat unusual character who spent years out of circulation, but was a professor appointed by Michael VIII, and his works could have been incorporated into the rhetorical canon of the Palaiologan era. A good explanation for the fact that this was not the case is that the Byzantines were not interested in courtly works produced in the past. In the case of Gregory of Cyprus, however, the *Encomium in Andronicum II* is the work most often copied, and we typically find it in the manuscripts including a single work of the Patriarch. However, the *Encomium in Michaelem VIII* only survives in two manuscripts, and the reasons may be political. Sofia Kotzabassi explains it another way: in her opinion, since the reign of Andronicus II lasted four decades, the topicality of his encomiums lasted for longer.

Let us now return to the table of the manuscripts of the family δ of Aristides, where the manuscripts copied in the circle of the Cypriot are in red, and those preserving his works, along with those of Aristides, are in blue. I shall not present them in detail, although they are very interesting testimonies, and almost contemporary with the Patriarch. I shall talk a little later about the ms. of Naples. Now let us look at the opposite picture to this, Byzantine manuscripts with rhetorical works of the Patriarch. Here we have distinguished those dedicated solely to the copying of these works; those containing Aristides and Gregory of Cyprus; an example of Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Cyprus; and several examples of miscellanies of ancient and Byzantine authors, where there is a clearly growing dispersion,

culminating in fifteenth-century copies with a panoply of writers of the Palaiologan era mixed with rhetorical works of Antiquity.

Vat. 77 contains Elio Aristides (ff. 1-234) and the letters of George of Cyprus (ff. 235-258v). It is not a combination of two different copies, but the paper and the copyists are the same; some of them copied a volume arranged by John Pediasimos, Vat. gr. 191. The title of the letters is very striking: Ἐπιστολαὶ τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Γρηγορίου τοῦ σοφωτάτου Κυπρίου.

Vat gr. 933 includes a wide selection of Aristides, followed by Plato's *Gorgias*, which should go at the beginning, before or. II and III, in which Aristides discusses this dialogue. Mariella Menchelli attributed this innovation in the transmission of Aristides, i.e. the incorporation of the *Gorgias*, to the Patriarch Gregory. The copy ends, in effect, with the works of Gregory of Cyprus. The *Encomium in Andronicum II* was composed in 1283 or shortly thereafter, and the copy of Vat gr. 933 is certainly very close to the composition of the work. Its scribe is very similar to Planudes. A copy of the *Encomium in Andronicum II* in a manuscript of Aristides is Neap. II.E.20. Its selection of Aristides is shorter than that of Vat. gr. 933, but agrees with a few exceptions and, like Vat. Gr. 933, is part of family δ. Here again the copy of the works of the Patriarch is an addition to the volume of Aristides: the *Encomium* occupies a different quaternio, and has been copied by a different hand. It ends on f. 290, occupying a full quaternio, and on f. 291 there begins a selection of letters from the Cypriot, occupying another quaternio, less one folio. Thus we see that it is a codex consisting of several codicological units, and not a single miscellany. Nor is the content consistent, since it includes epistolary and rhetorical pieces.

Originally, the letters only bore the name of the recipient, but Nicephorus Gregoras added the author's name. As we know, Gregoras was in charge of the library of the monastery of Chora, restored by Theodoros Metochites and at the latter's behest a repository of a splendid collection of books. That Gregoras should add the authorship of these letters in the Naples MS can only indicate that the codex was in Chora. This is not the only example of Aristides belonging to the monastery. In some cases they are apographs of the *Laurentianus* of Planudes, in others they belong to the same family as the *Parisinus* of Gregory of Cyprus. I have recently published a paper on these manuscripts, but it was already known that Metochites was an admirer of Aristides, thanks to his *Comparatio* between this writer and Demosthenes, a very special text in Byzantine literary criticism.

The copyist of the majority of Neap. II.E.20 was also involved in the copying (cop. 6) of what is now Vat. gr. 1085, which includes not only the rhetorical works of Gregoras but also a comprehensive collection of the letters of Patriarch Gregory. But the list of manuscripts with the works of the Patriarch linked to Chora does not end there: Vat. Palat. gr. 374, third part (ff. 138-206) brings together the encomiums of a religious nature with the *Encomium Maris* and the *Encomium in Andronicum II*. This time, the title does not sanctify the Patriarch: Τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου πατριάρχου ΚΠ. τοῦ Κυπρίου...

It is undeniable, therefore, that Gregoras was one of the architects of the transmission of Gregory of Cyprus, with whom he did not coincide in time, but to whom he was united by being a disciple of John Glykys, in turn a disciple of Gregory of Cyprus. Indeed, from his youth, Nicephorus Gregoras had access to the works of the Patriarch, of which he transcribed fragments in his notebook, the famous Heidelberg gr. 129. He also collaborated in the copying of one of the oldest and most complete copies of the correspondence of the Patriarch, Mutin. gr. 82, adding a fragment of Hagios Neilos. I date the copying of the volume to about 1312-15, when Gregoras was a student of Glykys, or later, when the latter was appointed Patriarch (1315-1319), because in ff. 193v-194v of the same manuscript, with the abdication of the Cypriot, we find the writing of a well-known Patriarchal notary George Galesiotes.

Galesiotes not only copied these last pages of the MS of Modena: he was responsible for a codex now in Leiden, University Library, BPG 49, the most complete volume with works by Gregory of Cyprus. He also collaborated on Ivron 184, which preserves (ff. 3-17) 68 letters of Gregorios of Cyprus, some absent in the Modena MS, followed by those of Maximos Planudes. At present, the codex is headed by two folios with a fragment of the Corpus Hermeticum, copied by a scribe of the Patriarchal registry, K6. The identification of copyists establishes the link with the Patriarchate. Incidentally, the editor of the correspondence of Planudes has pointed out that this text is filled with glosses and brief scholia which have no value to the *constitutio textus* but which point to a scholastic use of the letters.

These circumstances suggest an involvement of the Patriarchate in the work of the conservation of the Cypriot's written legacy, and would allow us to speak of an 'institutional path' for this transmission. This involvement did not follow immediately upon the death of the Cypriot. In the circumstances in which Gregory left Hagia Sophia, it is clear that this would hardly be the place which would initiate the organizing of his written legacy into volumes. So it would have to wait for John Glykys to be put at the head of the Patriarchate. However, we cannot say for sure that the Patriarchal library was the repository of these ambitious copies of

the writings of Gregory II. The notary Galesiotes copied manuscripts for people outside the Patriarchate, and acted more as a freelancer than as an officer tied to his desk at the Patriarchate. Therefore, not every manuscript copied by him reflects copying activity for the actual *Megale Ekklesia* itself. This is the same as happens with Michael Klostomalles, another well-known notary, this time Imperial, who frequently copied for Theodoros Metochites. Galesiotes copied luxury manuscripts commissioned by noblemen of Constantinople, while also transcribing and arranging miscellaneous volumes with copies of ancient texts in prose, no doubt intended for the learning of ancient Greek. These manuscripts were not intended for sale: the copies were too irregular and complex for that. Instead, they give the impression of being a product of frenetic activity, only partially coordinated, but involving students whose collaboration is unprofessional and who get poor results. The school context is clear, not only from the coarse appearance of some of the handwriting, but from the actual content of the miscellanies. One explanation for this phenomenon is that the aim was to provide copies to the students themselves, and that the manuscripts are a testimony to the study activities promoted by John Glykys in the Patriarchate.

The Leiden codex copied by Galesiotes became the original used by Bonaventura Vulcanius for the *editio princeps* of the *Encomium Maris*, which was produced by the Plantin Press in 1591. Paradoxically, the text does not accompany other rhetorical works, but the edition and Latin translation of Aristotle's *De mundo*. In 1596, Frédéric Morel printed the same work on its own in Paris, but it took another half century until the printing of the next work of the Patriarch, his collection of Proverbs (Leiden 1653). A critical edition of the writings of Gregory has yet to be produced.