

ANNA GIOFFREDA, *Tra i libri di Isacco Argiro* (Transmissions. Studies on conditions, processes and dynamics of textual transmission 4). Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter 2020. X, 303 pp. – ISBN 978-3-311-065109-6 (€ 104.95)

• JOSÉ PABLO MAKSIMCZUK, Universität Hamburg – CMSC
(jose.maksimczuk@uni-hamburg.de)

Tra i libri di Isacco Argiro is an upgraded version of G.'s doctoral dissertation. It offers a comprehensive, analytical description of the script of the fourteenth-century scholar and copyist Isaac Argyros (PLP 1285), an anti-Palamite disciple of Nikephoros Gregoras (PLP 4443), who lived and worked at the monastery of Chora in Constantinople. To date, around thirty manuscripts copied by Argyros are found in libraries in the Czech Republic, France, Germany, and Italy.

The contents of *Tra i libri* is as follows: Premessa (pp. VII–VIII); Introduzione (pp. 1–5); I. Su Isacco Argiro (pp. 6–11); II. La scrittura di Isacco Argiro (pp. 12–43); III. Collaboratori di Isacco Argiro (pp. 44–67); IV. Ancora sui collaboratori di Isacco Argiro: numerose mani simili (pp. 68–78); V. L'erudito e i suoi libri (pp. 79–97); VI. Argiro e la controversia palamitica (pp. 98–118); VII. Una cronologia relativa dei manoscritti di Argiro (pp. 119–127); Epilogo (p. 128); Schede dei manoscritti (pp. 129–264); Tavole (p. 265); Bibliografia (pp. 267–294); Indici dei nomi (pp. 295–297); Indice dei copisti anonimi (p. 299); Indice delle testimonianze manoscritte e a stampa (pp. 301–303).

The Introduction provides a state of the art of the research on Isaac Argyros. Besides the pioneering study in MERCATI 1931, G. comments on other contributions dealing with, on one hand, manuscripts copied by or attributed to Argyros and, on the other hand, works composed by Argyros. With respect to the disputed authorship of the *Adversus Cantacuzenum*, G. considers it to be a genuine work by Argyros.

In I, G. analyses sources for Argyros' biographical information. In doing so, G. revisits evidence already put forward in MERCATI 1931 (a note in Vat. gr. 176, f. 138v and an excursus in Argyros' *Computus paschalis*). According to MERCATI, Argyros was born by the beginning of the fourteenth century and died around 1380; GOUILLARD 1967 set the *terminus ante quem* for his death at 1391. Based on a list of biannual solar and lunar

movements that Argyros started copying in 1368 and that is now in Scorial. Y.III.21, G. cautiously proposes that Argyros could already have been dead in 1381, because the entries in the list after that year were not written by Argyros but rather by Philotheos of Selymbria. As G. herself admits, Philotheos could have continued Argyros' work for reasons other than the latter's decease (e.g. because Philotheos inherited the manuscript, or because Argyros was already too old to write). Ch. I concludes with a table displaying the thirty-three manuscripts identified as having been copied by Argyros. In two different columns, G. calls attention to, on the one hand, the folios attributed to Argyros and, on the other, the literature where the identifications were proposed. Discrepancies with previous scholarship are discussed later in the book.

Ch. II opens with a reflection on the general features of the fourteenth-century scripts. G. also discusses the methodology paleographers developed to approach them, namely, the so-called *Schriftvergleich* and the *paléographie d'expertise*. In II.2 ('La scrittura di Argiro: caratteristiche e modelli'), G. defines Argyros' script as 'di tipo neo-classico' and underscores two modes for its ductus, 'posato' and 'corsivo'. Expressly following PÉREZ MARTÍN 2008, G. proposes two models for Argyros' script: the so-called Anonimo G (clearly influenced by the τῶν Ὀδηγῶν style) and Nikephoros Gregoras. Gregoras' influence is observable in 'i libri d'uso personale', 'copie di studio', 'scolii o commenti'; Anonimo G's, in turn, in 'qualora [Argiro] intenda confezionare in una veste ordinata ed elegante il testo da copiare' (p. 29). G. convincingly establishes a link between Argyros and Anonimo G on the basis of historical, palaeographical, and textual evidence. To the list of manuscripts copied by Anonimo G, drawn up in PÉREZ MARTÍN 2008, G. adds further volumes identified by other scholars (Ang. gr. 74, Barocc. 84, Vat. gr. 16, and Marc. gr. Z 142) and herself (Laur. Plut. 70.5, Marc. gr. Z. 155, Par. gr. 1246, Par. gr. 1672). In II.3 ('La scrittura di Argiro: una descrizione analitica'), G. offers a comprehensive analytical description of Argyros' script, focusing on '[il] tratteggio di ogni singola forma e di tutte le varianti, singole e in legatura' (p. 29). The analysis covers fourteen pages (pp. 30–43) and is accompanied by forty-two tables. For most of the letters, G. offers two tables. The first one displays different forms of a letter in isolation; the second shows forms of the pertinent letter in combination with (an)other sign(s).

Ch. II is the pivotal section of *Tra i libri*. G.'s detailed analysis of Argyros' handwriting will be of paramount relevance for further investigation of Palaeologan scholarly hands. A further merit of this chapter is the adscrip-

tion of folios and lines to other, known scribes. To offer a minor terminological remark, G. employs expressions such as ‘materiale accessorio’ (p. 14 n. 63) or ‘testo accessorio’ (p. 15) to designate ‘commenti’ or ‘scolii’ written by Argyros in the margins of a manuscript. However, as G. correctly observes, Argyros considered those ‘materials’ and ‘texts’ crucial for the correct understanding of the works they comment on (‘la presenza dell’elemento esegetico è indispensabile’, p. 16). I find G.’s observation absolutely pertinent; at the same time, the designation of the exegetic texts as ‘accessory’ is contradictory, as this term can have a negative nuance. I would rather refer to the exegetical paracontent in Argyros’ manuscripts with a more neutral term, such as ‘unit of content 2’ (i.e. distinct from a ‘unit of content 1’, namely, the core content) (cf. ANDRIST – CANART – MANIACI 2013).

Ch. III offers an overview on Argyros’ collaborators. G. distributes them between two large groups (‘macrogruppi’): scribes who cooperated in copying manuscripts of ‘argomento profano’ and scribes who helped with manuscripts of ‘argomento teologico-dottrinario’. Ch. III.2 examines the production of scribes whose handwriting is found in manuscripts with ‘profane’ content: Anonimo β, Anonimo δ, Anonimo A, and Anonimo B. In turn, Ch. III.3-4 addresses eleven scribes who assisted Argyros in copying theological and doctrinal texts. This group is divided into two subgroups: anonymous and identified scribes. The anonymous scribes are further subdivided into: i) those with ‘scritture di tipo geometrico’ (Anonimo τ, Anonimo ξ, Anonimo ζ, and Anonimo χ); and ii) those with ‘scritture di tipo rotondo’ (Anonimo ερ, Anonimo μεν, and Anonimo α). Among Argyros’ identified collaborators, G. mentions John Dukas Malakes and John Kyparissiotēs. Moreover, G. calls attention to new testimonies, namely, Vat. gr. 1102 (f. 10r–15r) and Vat. gr. 1892 (f. 90r–93v + 90ar–v), copied by a scribe who MERCATI called ‘il ammiratore di Demetrio Cidone’, but whom most recent scholarship has identified as Manuel Chrysoloras. The chapter concludes with tables that survey the production of the anonymous and identified collaborators, indicating manuscript signatures, folios, and content copied by each scribe.

Overall, Ch. III is well structured and an excellent complement to Ch. II. The inclusion of tables of specimens for most of the scribes’ scripts is very welcome. However, G. could have facilitated the discussion by linking the discussed palaeographical features to the pertinent lines in the reproductions (as is the case in other chapters of the book). A minor correction: while describing the script of the so-called Anonimo ερ, G. refers to a list

of ‘antipalamiti’ on f. 31v of Vat. gr. 1096 (p. 60). On the same page, in n. 153, the list is said to be contained in Vat. gr. 604, f. 31v. Neither of these references is correct. The list is actually found on f. 29v of Vat. gr. 1096.

Ch. IV.1–3 discusses folios and codicological units that had been earlier ascribed to Argyros, but that G. judges to be the work of Anonimo G (Marc. gr. Z 310, Laur. Plut. 70.5, Par. gr. 1246, Par. gr. 1672), Anonimo A (Neap. III D 37 and Plut. 89 sup. 48), and Anonimo B (Marc. gr. Z 323, Scorial. Y.III.21, Vat. gr. 573, Vat. gr. 1086), respectively. This chapter pragmatically combines the evidence produced in Ch. II and III. In Ch. IV, moreover, G. presents what could be a new biographical fact about Argyros’ last years. Already in Ch. III (p. 49), G. distinguishes two phases in Anonimo A’s script: in Scorial. Y.III.21 and Marc. gr. Z 308, namely, ‘[n]elle realizzazioni presumibilmente più antiche’, his style is close to the so-called *Metochitesstil*; in turn, in Neap. III D 37 and Plut. 89 sup. 48, his script is closer to that of Argyros. G. explains this change as a pupil’s natural imitation of their master’s style (p. 73).

Ch. V.1–2 offers a typology of Argyros’ books, comprising ‘autografi autoriali’, ‘autografi editoriali’, ‘autografi editoriali con apparato esegetico autoriale’, ‘recensioni’ (pp. 79–80). These categories appear to work very well for the manuscripts that belonged to Argyros and which have been passed down to us. Applying them systematically to the manuscript production of other Palaeologan scholars can help us to understand better the way they (re)produced and worked with manuscripts and texts. In particular, the ‘recensioni’ category appears to be a very promising concept. According to G., *recensioni* account for cases when Argyros did not limit his task to copying what he saw in his model, but introduced modifications in the syntax and logic-argumentative structure of a given work with the objective of achieving an improved text vis-à-vis that of the model (p. 90, with references to ACERBI 2016).

Ch. VI focuses on Argyros’ theological manuscripts and his role in the Hesychast Controversy. VI.2 explores Argyros’ strategies for composing his anti-Palamite works. G. starts with a description of the manuscripts containing ‘miscellanee dogmatiche’, i.e. the kind of florilegia that could serve as arsenals of quotations to be cited in independent works. G. proceeds to analyse how Argyros used and quoted from such anthologies and other manuscripts in the *Adversus Cantacuzenum* and the *Opusculum contra Dexium*. Particularly convincing is G.’s conclusion that a line from Lucian’s *Alexander* (which G. quoted from the nineteenth-century edition prepared

by JACOBITZ instead of using a more recent edition, e.g. MACLEOD 1974),¹ quoted in the *Adversus Cantacuzenum*, was probably excerpted from a manuscript that belonged to Argyros, namely, today's Vat. Pal. gr. 174 (p. 104 with tav. 11 on p. 105).

Ch. VII displays 'una cronologia relativa dei manoscritti di Argiro'. G.'s proposal is based on watermarks, filiations between manuscripts, internal references, and cooperation between Argyros and other scribes. All the known manuscripts copied by Argyros would have been produced in the last thirty years of the scholar's life (ca. 1350–1380). G. distinguishes three phases in his activity as a copyist: 1) around 1350, when he mainly copied theological works and collaborated with Nikephoros Gregoras and perhaps Anonimo G; 2) 1350/1360, when Argyros was chiefly focused on copying texts related to the Hesychast Controversy; 3) 1370–1380, a period in which Argyros was interested in scientific texts and collaborated with Anonimo A and Anonimo B.

After the Epilogo, there are descriptions ('schede') of thirty-one manuscripts copied by Argyros. Each *scheda* opens with information on the dating, composition (codicological units and quire structure), and binding of a manuscript. For each codicological unit, G. describes watermarks and quire numbering, copyist(s), type of decoration, interventions of later hands, and contents. The *schede* also notify us of the known stemmatic links of the manuscript, its history, bibliography, and editions of its content. The value of these *schede* is self-evident. A comparison between some of them and older descriptions illustrates just how precious G.'s work is. Compare the five-page *scheda* of Vat. Pal. gr. 174 (pp. 174–178) with the one-page entry in STEVENSON 1885 (pp. 91–92).

Overall, *Tra i libri* is an excellent monograph and useful in many respects. This book will become the reference work for studies on Isaac Argyros. Moreover, it will stimulate further research on other Palaeologan scholars, scribes, and their manuscripts.

* * *

In the last section of my review, I will discuss some peculiarities of Argyros' volume of Aristotle's *Organon*, namely, the codex Neap. III D 37, whose *scheda* is on pp. 190–193 (see also tavv. 1, 4b, and 10).

1. Moreover, the page reference is wrong: G. refers to page 1174, which does not exist in the quoted edition.

Date. According to the scheda, the manuscript dates to the fourteenth century (p. 190). In Ch. V, G. argues that ‘le filigrane lo collocano intorno agli anni ’70 del XIV secolo’ (p. 87). In Ch. VII, Neap. III D 37 is placed in the third phase of Argyros’ activity as a copyist (ca. 1370–1380). The year 1375 can be proposed as the *terminus ante quem*, for this is the latest date, according to the watermarks, for Ambr. Q 87 sup., a copy of Neap. III D 37 (as I recently established through a textual analysis of both manuscripts).²

Contents. The core and paracontents of Neap. III D 37 are listed on p. 191–192. Among other relevant items that can be added are: 1) on f. 94v, an excerpt from Leo Magentenus’ *Commentary on the First Analytics II*, copied by Argyros and corresponding to the scholion 1 in AGIOTIS 2021 (naturally, published after *Tra i libri*);³ 2) on f. 54v and f. 108v–109v, exegetical notes on the *First Analytics* composed by Argyros (as indicated by their attributions, i.e. Ἰσαάκ and Ἰσαάκ μοναχοῦ, respectively). Lastly, an exegetical note on *De interpretatione* copied on f. 37v–38r should probably also be attributed to Argyros (see discussion below).

Subsequent interventions. On p. 191, G. reports some later hands on f. 17r, 32v, 285r, 285v, 286r–v. One can supplement these observations in two ways: 1) by attributing further interventions to the later hands already detected by G.; and 2) by reporting later hands overlooked in the scheda. With respect to the first category, the hand that made notes on f. 17r also annotated f. 38r, 41v (with red ink), and 56r (among many other folios in the manuscript); in turn, the hand that annotated f. 32v could be responsible for a comment on f. 30v. As for the second category, the intervention of an anonymous hand on f. 94v could be of great relevance for understanding the links between Neap. III D 37 and its apographs. The hand added, incorrectly, ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης in dark ink at the beginning of the second line of the scholion 1 in Magentenus’ *Commentary* (probably in order to fill a blank space left after an erasure). The reading ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης is an innovation absent from Neap. III D 37’s earliest apograph Ambr. Q 87 sup. (see f. 155v in the latter manuscript, where the scholion was copied by a hand different from but contemporary to the one that wrote the core text). In turn, ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης is attested in the fifteenth-century apographs of the *Neapolitanus*, Vat. gr. 1498 (f. 174r), Rep. I 68a (f. 15r), and Vat. Reg. gr. 116 (f. 145v). Accordingly, one can cautiously propose that ὁ

2. MAKSIMCZUK 2022a and 2022b.

3. Neap. III D 37 is not reported among the witnesses to the scholion 1 in AGIOTIS 2021. Neither is Vat. gr. 1498 (f. 174r), one of Neap. III D 37’s many descendants.

Ἀριστοτέλης could have been written by the later hand after 1370/1375, i.e. after Ambr. Q 87 sup. had been copied from Neap. III D 37. Among the subsequent interventions in the Napoli manuscript, one may also want to include additions introduced by Argyros himself, after he had completed the manuscript. As pointed out above, f. 108v–109v contain an exegetical note copied and composed by Argyros. It comments on *First Analytics* II 15, 64b 17 (see core text in Neap. III D 37, f. 108v). The formatting of the note is remarkable. Argyros linked it to the portion of the core text it comments on using a symbol. This system of reference is different from the one he employed for the rest of the notes on f. 108r, which are linked to the core text through numbers (πζ´-η´). The note of interest starts in the upper margin of f. 108v and continues in the upper and outer margins of folio 109r. Those portions of f. 109r must already have been covered with scholia (numbers η´-ηγ´) when Argyros copied the two last ‘segments’ of the note. He copied the second segment in the outermost part of the upper margin, above the text of the scholion η´, and awkwardly squeezed the third segment, which features a bizarre change of writing direction, in the outer margin. This peculiar visual organization indicates that Argyros copied the note only after he had completed the ‘original’ corpus of scholia in Neap. III D 37.

Stemmatic relationships. Following DÜRING 1957, G. (p. 192) informs us that Neap. III D 37 is the best witness to the so-called family E of a *Life of Aristotle*. In this regard, G. could have added that DÜRING judged Neap. III D 37 to be the model to Vat. gr. 2189 and Vat. Urb. gr. 57. I can add further information on the filiations of Neap. III D 37 based on my own collation of different portions of the *First Analytics* in Neap. III D 37 and one hundred other *Organon* manuscripts. As the personal copy of a reputable scholar, it is no surprise that Neap. III D 37 was reproduced numerous times. I have identified the following descendants of the *Neapolitanus*: Ambr. Q 87 sup. (ca. 1370/75), Par. gr. 1974 (ca. 1450), and Vat. gr. 1498 (ante 1440). Moreover, one must add Barocc. 87, f. 59–94 (ca. 1450), Vat. gr. 1777 + Par. gr. 1919, f. 124–163 + Rep. I 68a, f. 1–30 (ca. 1442),⁴ and the additions in Vat. Reg. gr. 116 made by Sylvester Syropoulos in the first half of the

4. Par. gr. 1919, f. 124–163 and Rep. I 68a, f. 1–30 were identified as parts of the same broken volume by WIESNER in MORAUX et al. 1976. Recently, I identified another part of that volume, Vat. gr. 1777 *in toto* (an article tackling this issue is in preparation). Earlier, Rep. I 68a, f. 1–30 was dated to ca. 1448. FRIEDERIKE BERGER refined that dating to 1442 (see the entry of Rep. I 68a on www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de).

fifteenth century.⁵ Lastly, there must have been one or more unidentified *codices interpositi* between Neap. III D 37, on one hand, and Vat. gr. 1498 and Vat. Reg. gr. 116, on the other.⁶

I would now like to return to some problematic aspects of Neap. III D 37 mentioned by G. in Ch. V. G. naturally identified Neap. III D 37 as a trivium book (pp. 86–87). In principle, G. appears to place the *Neapolitanus* among the ‘autografi editoriali’ (namely, Argyros’ ‘trascrizioni complete di opere di scrittori dell’antichità’, cf. p. 79). However, she cautiously adds: ‘Difficile stabilire, senza l’aiuto di un’adeguata edizione critica che dia conto del testo recato nel testimone, se Argiro abbia apportato correzioni di natura sintattica o lessicale’ (p. 86). This means that, currently, one cannot be certain whether Neap. III D 37 is an *autografo editoriale* or rather a *recensione*. The results of my collation of parts of the *First Analytics* may shed some light on this issue. In *First Analytics* I 1, 24a 10–2, 25a 13; I 4, 26b 2–5, 27b 8; I 6, 28b 15–7, 29b 28, I found only a few readings in Neap. III D 37 that are not present in other, known manuscripts of the treatise (it goes without saying that Neap. III D 37’s innovations are reproduced in its descendants). I present the variants in question in the following table (a reading before a square bracket represents the text in most manuscripts and the edition of the *First Analytics* [ROSS 1964]; in turn, a reading after a square bracket reproduces the text in Neap. III D 37 and its descendants):

- 27a2. δυνατὸς] δυνατὸν
 a2. ὄρων] ἄκρων
 a6. μηδενὸς... παντός] μηδενὶ... παντί
 a17-18. τὸ ἀναγκαῖον] om.
 a26-27. μὲν πρὸς] πρὸς μὲν
 a37. τινὶ] τὸ M praem.
 a39. παντὸς τοῦ] παντὶ τῷ
 27b.4. τοῦ¹... παντὸς¹] τῷ... παντὶ
 b4. τοῦ²... παντὸς²] τῷ... παντὶ

5. For Syropoulos’ hand in Vat. Reg. gr. 116, cf. ACERBI – BIANCONI 2020.

6. DÜRING argues that Vat. gr. 1498 and Vat. Reg. gr. 116 are independent of Neap. III D 37, a view that I do not share (see MAKSIMCZUK 2022a and 2022b). Since Vat. gr. 2189 and Vat. Urb. gr. 57, which, according to DÜRING are apographs of Neap. III D 37, do not contain the *First Analytics*, I could not compare the text of the *Organon* in those three manuscripts. Judging from some elements in their paracontent, it is likely that Vat. gr. 2189 and Vat. Urb. gr. 57 depend somewhat on Neap. III D 37, as DÜRING concluded. The same can be established for the manuscript Ambr. A 160 sup., which does not transmit the *First Analytics* either.

29a1. τὸ] τὸν
 29b6. ἐπιτελοῦνται] τελειοῦνται

The variants listed above are too few and too trivial to make one think of the text of *First Analytics* I 1–7 in Neap. III D 37 as a recension of the treatise prepared by Argyros. The analysis of other sections of the work creates the same impression. More intriguing is the question of whether the marginal notes that comment on the *First Analytics* text may be seen as Argyros’ recension of John Philoponus and other commentators.

Another interesting point made by G. in Ch. V of *Tra i libri* concerns an exegetical note on Aristotle’s *De interpretatione*, which comments on the four quantifiers (προσδιορισμοί), and which Argyros copied in Neap. III D 37, f. 37v–38r. It is G.’s opinion that ‘[è] frutto di errore l’attribuzione ad Argiro, proposta in alcuni esemplari seriori, di un commentario al *De interpretatione* di Aristotele’ (p. 87). G. refers (n. 248) to Vat. Reg. gr. 116, f. 28v and Ambr. B 103 sup., f. 25v, in which the note of Neap. III D 37, f. 37v–38r is reproduced and attributed to Argyros. Besides the manuscripts that G. mentions in n. 248, I can report further occurrences of the exegetical note (all of them in manuscripts that I identified as apographs of Neap. III D 37): Ambr. Q 87 sup., f. 52r; Par. gr. 1974, f. 92r; Vat. gr. 1498, f. 66r–v; Vat. gr. 1777, f. 79r–v; Vat. gr. 2189, f. 152v–153v; Vat. Urb. gr. 57, f. 117v–118v; and Ambr. A 160 sup., f. 123v–124r. If I have correctly interpreted G.’s reasoning, that Argyros did not claim the authorship of the note in his own *Organon* manuscript, Neap. III D 37, where the attribution is missing, would indicate that the attribution in the other manuscripts (in principle Vat. Reg. gr. 116 and Ambr. B 103 sup.) must be incorrect. I will address this issue from two perspectives, textual criticism and palaeography, and cautiously suggest that it is likely that Neap. III D 37 originally featured an attribution to Argyros for the note of interest. Some descendants of Neap. III D 37 can be sorted into two clearly distinguishable branches: on one hand, Ambr. Q 87 sup. (and its two own apographs Par. gr. 1974 and Barocc. 87, f. 59–94) and, on another, Vat. gr. 1498 and the fifteenth-century parts of Vat. Reg. gr. 116.⁷ Bearing in mind that the two branches

7. Vat. gr. 1777 + Par. gr. 1919, f. 124–163 + Rep. I 68a, f. 1–30 appear to represent a third branch. The pertinent place of Vat. gr. 2189, Vat. Urb. gr. 57, and Ambr. A 160 sup. among the descendants of Neap. III D 37 still needs to be determined (cf. note 6 above). As for Ambr. B 103 sup., which also contains the note on *De interpretatione*, its *First Analytics* text does not relate to Neap. III D 37. The note attributed to Isaac Argyros is a later addition made by a fifteenth-century hand (the scribe who copied the core text in the

descend independently from the *Neapolitanus*, it is crucial for our discussion that manuscripts from both groups feature attributions to Argyros for the note of interest:

Ambr. Q 87 sup., f. 52r (and Par. gr. 1974, f. 92r): Ἰσαάκ

Vat. gr. 1498, f. 66r: Ἰσαάκ μοναχοῦ τοῦ Ἀργυροῦ

Vat. Reg. gr. 116, f. 28v: Ἰσαάκ <μον>αχ<οῦ> τοῦ Ἀργυροῦ

It would be surprising if the scribes of Ambr. Q 87 sup. and that of the lost model to Vat. gr. 1498 and Vat. Reg. gr. 116 conjectured independently an attribution to Argyros for the same exegetical note in manuscripts that contain thousands of similar notes. The most likely explanation for the presence of the attribution in Ambr. Q 87 sup., Vat. gr. 1498, and Vat. Reg. gr. 116 is that it originally accompanied the note in question in their common ancestor, namely, Neap. III D 37.⁸ That the attribution is *no longer* legible in the latter manuscript does not mean that it was never there. Its *current* invisibility may be because its ink faded. But is there some palaeographical evidence to substantiate the hypothesis formulated on the basis of text-critical observations? G. (p. 87, n. 248) argues that the only paratext accompanying the exegetical note in Neap. III D 37 reads σημείωσαι ταῦτα (in reality: ση<μείωσαι> ταῦτα), copied in red ink in the outer margin of f. 37v. However, it is suggestive that next to ση<μείωσαι> one can distinguish some signs (in dark ink) that could be part of a text (an *alpha* and a *kappa* appear to be recognizable).⁹ It is tempting to hypothesize that those signs could be part of a currently illegible attribution reading Ἰσαάκ. A detailed inspection of the outer margin of folio 37v, perhaps using MSI analysis, is needed to elucidate this thorny issue.

manuscript should be dated to the end of the thirteenth century). The model to the note must have been Neap. III D 37 or one of its many descendants.

8. Notice that the exegetical notes in Neap. III D 37, f. 54v and 108v–109r, copied and composed by Argyros, are accompanied by the attributions Ἰσαάκ and Ἰσαάκ μοναχοῦ, respectively.

9. I could not inspect Neap. III D 37 *de visu* and I rely on digital images kindly provided to me by the Biblioteca nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III. G. does not mention the barely visible signs next to ση<μείωσαι>.

Bibliographical references

FABIO ACERBI (2016), *Byzantine Recensions of Greek Mathematical and Astronomical Texts: a Survey*. *Estudios bizantinos* 4, pp. 133–213.

FABIO ACERBI – DANIELE BIANCONI (2020), *L’Organon a fisarmonica di Giovanni Cortasmeno*. *Segno e testo* 18, pp. 223–282 + Tables.

NIKOS AGIOTIS (2021), *Leon Magentenos. Commentary on Aristotle, ‘Prior Analytics’ (Book II). Critical Edition with Introduction and Translation (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca et Byzantina – Series academica 5)*. Berlin.

PATRICK ANDRIST – PAUL CANART – MARILENA MANIACI (2013), *La syntaxe du codex. Essai de codicologie structurale (Bibliologia. Elementa ad librorum studia pertinentia 34)*. Turnhout.

INGEMAR DÜRING (1957), *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition (Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis LXIII/2)*. Göteborg.

JEAN GOUILLARD (1967), *Le Synodikon de l’Orthodoxie : édition et commentaire. Première partie. Travaux et Mémoires* 2, pp. 1–316.

KARL JACOBITZ, *Luciani Samosatensis Opera. Tomus II*. Leipzig 1883.

MATTHEW D. MACLEOD (1974), *Luciani Opera. Tomus II*. Oxford [repr. 1989].

JOSÉ MAKSIMCZUK (2022a), *Layers of Corrections, Scribal Practices, and the Transmission of Prior Analytics I 1–7 in the MSS Neap. III D 37, Ambr. Q 87, and Vat. 244*. *Medioevo Greco* 22 (forthcoming).

JOSÉ MAKSIMCZUK (2022b), *Demetrius Angelus’ Two Volumes of Aristotle’s Organon: A Multi-layered Set*. *JöByz* 72 (forthcoming).

GIUSEPPE MERCATI (1931), *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV (Studi e Testi 56)*. Città del Vaticano.

PAUL MORAUX – DIETER HARLFINGER – DIETHER R. REINSCH – JÜRGEN WIESNER, *Aristoteles Graecus. Die griechischen Handschriften des Aristoteles I. Alexandrien – London (Peripatoi 8)*. Berlin – New York 1976.

INMACULADA PÉREZ MARTÍN (2008), *El ‘estilo Hodegos’ y su proyec-*

ción en las escrituras constantinopolitanas. *Segno e testo* 6, pp. 389–458.

WILLIAM D. ROSS (1964), *Aristotelis Analytica priora et posteriora*. Oxford [repr. 1968].

HENRY M. STEVENSON (1885), *Codices Palatini graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae descripti etc.* Rome.

Keywords

Isaac Argyros; manuscript studies; palaeography