
PANAGIOTIS CH. ATHANASOPOULOS (ed.), *Translation Activity in the Late Byzantine World. Contexts, Authors, and Texts* (Byzantinisches Archiv, Series philosophica 4). Berlin – Boston: Walter de Gruyter 2022. viii+619 pp. 14 ill., 36 tables. – ISBN 978-3-11-067700-3 (€ 129.95)

[table of contents](#)

• PÉTER BARA, HUN-REN Research Centre for the Humanities, Budapest (Bara.Peter.Tamas@abtk.hu)

Any translation presupposes an audience that does not understand the source language yet shows interest in the translated text. Some medievalists have focused on the factors conducive to individual translations and systematic translation movements: DIMITRI GUTAS examined translations from Greek into Arabic during the early medieval period,¹ whereas DANIEL G. KÖNIG established an analytical framework for understanding Latin-Arabic and Arabic-Latin translations between ca. 850 and 1600.² Research on medieval translations from Greek into Latin has also made significant progress, but an overarching narrative explaining their coherence yet remains to be provided.³

Translations can only be understood by studying their broader context. The book under review brings substantial results in this respect, as it examines translations from Latin into Greek, a twin phenomenon of translations from Greek. In the twelfth century, the Eastern Roman Empire saw encroachment upon its territory and even dissolution of its integrity by Latin-using

1. DIMITRI GUTAS, *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture. The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early ‘Abbasid Society (2nd-4th/8th-10th Centuries)*. London – New York 1998.

2. DANIEL G. KÖNIG, *Sociolinguistic Infrastructures. Prerequisites of Translation Movements Involving Latin and Arabic in the Medieval Period*. In: MOHAMED MEOUAK – CRISTINA DE LA PUENTE (eds), *Connected Stories. Contacts, Traditions and Transmissions in Premodern Mediterranean Islam (Studies in the History and Culture of the Middle East 44)*. Berlin – Boston 2022, pp. 11–75. KÖNIG’s work follows in the footsteps of GUTAS, CHARLES BURNETT, and DAG NIKOLAUS HASSE.

3. PÉTER BARA, *Greek Thought, Latin Culture. Triggers and Tendencies Behind Greek-Latin Translations, ca. 1050–1300. Preliminary Observations*. In: PARASKEVI TOMA – PÉTER BARA (eds), *Latin Translations of Greek Texts from the 11th to the 13th Century*. Leiden – Boston, forthcoming.

powers. In the wake of the Fourth Crusade (1204) and of the Greek reconquest of Constantinople (1261), some educated Byzantines became interested in Latin and Arabic literature. But where did this interest come from, what agency stood behind those particular types of literature, and what kind of texts were translated? The volume replies to these three questions by analysing the contexts of textual production, the personalities, aims, skills of several translators, and their translations as such. Arranged chronologically, it can serve as a handbook-like starting point for the interested public. (The current state of research does not allow for writing a proper companion to Greek-Latin translations of the late Middle Ages.)

Even if the book originates from a thematic conference, the original presentations have been extended and some new chapters were added for thematic reasons. This has resulted in over 600 pages, yet I could easily handle the book despite its size, and the binding, format, layout, and typeface (both in the main text and footnotes) helped me understand the content. Standardisation of names and titles of works is a difficult task in the case of translations. Scholars from specific academic traditions sometimes enrich particular subfields overwhelmingly (e.g., see the Italian contribution to medical Greek-Latin translations), and their *usus* becomes the standard terminology. The editor PANAGIOTIS ATHANASOPOULOS was aware of such idiosyncrasies (see p. 610), which in the case of personal names he successfully tackled.

The first paper by COSTAS N. CONSTANTINIDES plays an introductory role. It could be more argumentative but it is well structured. It clearly shows that translations from Greek into Latin depended on changing political circumstances. The translators were Byzantine envoys and/or leading figures in administration; if political tides changed and they fell from power, translating activity would cease for generations. CONSTANTINIDES also calls attention to the previously unnoticed fact that translations from Latin used inferior models, which also influenced the quality of the Greek translations.

CHRISTIAN GASTGEBER's essay studies translations in the imperial and patriarchal chancery. The latter is scarcely documented, so GASTGEBER underlines the need for systematic data collection and analysis that could show whether the patriarchal chancery was subject to developments similar to those at the imperial one. He also stresses that the patriarchal personnel did not seem to include translators, which leads one to assume that documents were translated through *ad hoc* arrangements. Concerning the impe-

rial chancery, the paper complements GASTGEBER's earlier research and shows his long engagement with the source texts. On the basis of those, he offers interpretations and revisions of previous scholarly results (such as those of DÖLGER and TĂUTU). The late Byzantine imperial chancery is better documented than the middle Byzantine one: we know more about its scribes and translators, and many texts survive in the originals. GASTGEBER analyses the chancery's institutional background, changes in language use, types of text and layout, translators' origins, identifiable translators, and translation procedure. He clarifies the relation between Greek and Latin documents with regard to content, production circumstances, and genre. With this, he goes against the trend (p. 20) of using the better surviving versions as the basis of analysis. The noteworthy fact that starting with 1279/1283, the Byzantine emperor's Western correspondence was made in Latin and not Greek, is viewed by GASTGEBER as somewhat enigmatic. He points to the decreasing power Byzantium possessed in the Mediterranean and the changing representation of being not only a Greek but a Roman/*Rhomaïos*. His sensible presentation of the evidence also shows how decisive accidental production circumstances could be: for example, a translator was not available, or the 'real' message would not be recorded in a document but delivered orally by the messenger.

ALBERTO BARDI examines Arabic and Persian terminology in Byzantine mathematical astronomy. His study is very well organised and marks, on the level of primary sources, an advance upon the results of DAVID PINGREE and JOSEPH LEICHTER. BARDI compares 14th-century manuals in chronological order. The main difference he identifies between the use of Arabic and Persian loanwords is whether an author-translator would adopt such loanwords or only use their Greek equivalent. BARDI argues that this shows the prestigious status of Oriental astronomical handbooks in Byzantium. In addition to the translators themselves, very few people might have known Arabic or Persian, so original words might have indicated precision and, as a kind of show-off, the translator's expertise. I was wondering whether using the 'foreign word' added scientific authority to the texts themselves. This happened in the case of Greek words, which were used in the Latin liturgy to convey the mysterious language of the angelic choir around God or the originality of a Byzantine relic. In addition, I do not know whether the translation practice explained by BARDI has something to do with the use of foreign terminology in Byzantine circles dealing with astronomy. BARDI stresses that at present we know little about the community which used these books. In the case of medical trans-

lations from Arabic and Greek in the 11th and 12th centuries, the teaching practice in medical schools influenced the reception of new *termini technici*: new Greek terms came into use very slowly because scholars and pupils used an established Arabic-based vocabulary.

CHRISTOS ANGELOPOULOS scrutinizes Maximos Planudes' Greek translation of the *Disticha Catonis*. His paper is to be praised for its clarity. It critically summarizes previous scholarship and shows the *Disticha*'s success as a schoolbook. ANGELOPOULOS covers the entire history of the text from Planudes to the late 19th century.

On the basis of the manuscript tradition, CAROLE HOFSTETTER analyses the sources of Maximos Planudes' *Great Calculation According to the Indians* and the way Planudes' later readers viewed them. The *Great Calculation* is a complex text: Planudes used an anonymous Byzantine work from 1252, Fibonacci/Leonardo Bonacci's (1170–1240) *Liber abaci*, and the *Algorismus* of al-Khwarizmi (ca. 780–850). These three are themselves interrelated: Fibonacci read Euclid (one of al-Khwarizmi's sources) and al-Khwarizmi in Latin, while the anonymous Byzantine used both Fibonacci and al-Khwarizmi. HOFSTETTER launches her essay with a concise survey of Planudes's sources and examines the way he might have accessed them. Planudes, as his editor ANDRÉ ALLARD has demonstrated, read the *Algorismus* in Latin and the *Liber abaci*, but his principal source was the Byzantine treatise of 1252. The *Great Calculation*'s earliest two surviving witnesses F (Planudes' autograph) and B date from the late 13th century. They are now fragmentary and cannot be compared, as they contain different parts of the work. However, the entire content of F can be reconstructed through its 14th-century apograph L. HOFSTETTER hypothesises that L was copied from F before some of its parts went missing and before B was copied from F. At this point (pp. 109–110) I missed a *stemma codicum*, at least a simplified one. HOFSTETTER convincingly argues that some paragraphs preceding the main text on square roots seem to be part of the work's first, preliminary draft. She shows that those passages correspond to questions that Planudes discussed in letters he exchanged with George Bekkos. HOFSTETTER also demonstrates that the same passages on square roots were moved by Manuel Moschopoulos (in the 14th-century witness V) to the section of the *Great Calculation* on division (which ALLARD considered to be their original place in the work). She then studies how scholiasts saw the *Great Calculation*'s content. Planudes' introduction of the Hindu-Arabic numerals seems to have been a real novelty, as the text's scholiasts would always indicate the corresponding Greek num-

bers in the margins or between the lines. In the manuscript branch deriving from L, one of the readers probably knew different Latin versions of the *Algorismus*. HOFSTETTER demonstrates that the copyist of V consulted the text of the Byzantine anonymous work from 1252 and corrected some passages in the *Great Calculation* according to that source. She indicates that Planudes added to his treatise some marginal notes that scholars had not previously recognised.

THIBAULT MIGUET studies the fate of the Arabic *Zar al-musafir* in the Byzantine tradition. This work, which is referred to as the *Viaticum*, is a 10th-century systematic and practical medical vade-mecum. It enjoyed great success in its original and in Latin, becoming an obligatory course-book in the 13th-century Parisian medical curriculum. MIGUET examines a 14th-century Greek revision of an earlier translation. His paper would have benefited from an introduction with research questions and overview. MIGUET jumps into the topic, which, nonetheless, is organised under subtitles. The Palaiologan revision is examined in the second part of his essay, which is better written than the first five pages. The paper starts by presenting the Arabic, Latin, and Greek texts of the book. The hypothesis (p. 127) that the translator was a 12th-century Italian Greek is plausible, based on the manuscript tradition. He might not have known proper Arabic, but the argument needs further elaboration (p. 130). In general, MIGUET's statements in his text-based study are undermined because he does not explain the relation between manuscripts. He gives a chronological overview (pp. 126–127), which is very helpful, but leaves the reader clueless as to why, e.g., the Florence manuscript is close to the archetype (p. 127) or which codices belong to the principal branch of the tradition (p. 130). The claim that the translation was revised in the 14th century to make it more readable for a Greek-speaking public is well made (pp. 131–134). The witnesses to that revision are clearly presented (pp. 134–136) and its attribution to John Aktouarios is fascinating and well argued.

MARIE CRONIER takes under scrutiny the manuscript Wien, ÖNB, Med. gr. 21. Apart from a catalogue entry by HERBERT HUNGER and OTTO KRESTEN, very little has been published about this codex. It contains Arabic medical texts in Greek translation, which are listed and analysed with respect to translation technique. CRONIER engages with the results presented by HUNGER and KRESTEN and offers an identification of the Arabic source texts. The translation is full of transliterations and Arabic expressions; even if a Greek expression existed, the translator resorted to transliterating. This is particularly true for the names of diseases. The

translator rendered his Arabic sources into everyday Greek. CRONIER assumes that the translator made the Greek text for his own use and that he was not a native speaker of Arabic. In its present form, she identifies the manuscript as a teaching aid with practical content that could have formed part of a larger ensemble. CRONIER situates the book in the context of medical teaching and practice in Damascus (here, I would be interested in a little more detailed explanation of how it could fit into the curriculum, at least with a footnote reference). It was probably produced in there or elsewhere in Syria during or after the lifetime of Ibn Al-Quff, whose works CRONIER identifies as sources of specific parts and who was the head of the Damanscene Nuri Hospital between 1272 and 1283. The translator, CRONIER believes, might have been a local Christian who wrote for a Greek-speaking audience in Syria or a Greek who came to study in Damascus. It is mentioned at the beginning of the essay that the codex later came into the possession of the Hungarian humanist John Sambucus. I would be curious whether Sambucus could deal with a manuscript written for a Greek-speaking audience who also knew some Arabic.

VASOS PASIOURTIDES examines Demetrios Kydones' Greek translation of five excerpts from Julianos Pomerius' *De vita contemplativa*. I could only follow the essay's argument with difficulty. While some paragraphs are clear, others contain long, perplexing sentences and refer to previous content that is hard to identify. It was a major problem for me to identify PASIOURTIDES' main points. He challenges KOLTSIOU-NIKETA's attribution of Kydones' Latin model to Augustine and argues for Julianus Pomerius' authorship. The reader remains clueless, however, as to why exactly the excerpts in the Appendix were re-edited. Furthermore, when, why, and who attributed Kydones' model to specific authors is not clearly articulated from a historical perspective. The presentation of the manuscript tradition of Kydones' version is well structured. PASIOURTIDES then jumps into minor reflections about the text and KOLTSIOU-NIKETA's edition, which make sense but appear somewhat haphazard. Reading the essay from my research perspective of Greek-Latin translations, I took stock of how substantially the Palamite controversy and anti-Latin policies influenced Latin-to-Greek translations, which PASIOURTIDES shows.

CHRISTOPHER WRIGHT examines Demetrios Kydones' translating process in a highly engaging paper. Kydones' translation of Thomas Aquinas' *Summa theologiae (Pars prima)* offers an outstanding opportunity, since a working autograph and two further scribal copies of it survive. WRIGHT illustrates Kydones' working methods but also points to modern scholars'

limitations in describing those. Kydones seemed to have used a Latin model at first, but probably less often during the revisions. He would leave some words (noting them down on the manuscript) or expressions untranslated. The revision was either done by himself or communicated to his scribes (the communication channels remain to be identified).

The revisions concern Thomas' sources and linguistic updates. Although not systematically, Kydones would also revise in the first round for style, while conveying the proper meaning was the primary concern of subsequent changes. Kydones tried to avoid using transliteration or calques, but rendered into Greek the Graecising neologisms of scholastic Latin. In contrast to a Greek-Latin translators' adherence to the literal, word-for-word translation method, WRIGHT shows that Kydones applied a phrase-for-phrase technique and observed the rules of Greek syntax. WRIGHT brings practical examples. I would have been happy to see some images from manuscripts showing different hands, deletions, etc., but the lack of those does not detract from the overall high quality of this fine essay.

ANGELOS ZALOUMIS investigates how Demetrios Kydones rendered Aristotelian passages in his translation of Thomas Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*. His fine paper is easy to follow and clearly structured. ZALOUMIS focuses on one *questio*, namely 'On Prudence' (*Iia Iiae*, qu. 47). The paper starts with a chart that shows in parallel Aristotle's Greek text (in a modern edition), Thomas' Latin text, its sources (Grosseteste's *Ethica Nicomachea*; respective works of Thomas and Albert the Great), the classification of citation (verbatim, adaptation, conflation), and finally Kydones' Greek version. ZALOUMIS shows that Kydones did not correct Aquinas' quotes according to the Aristotelian Greek text but tried to stay very close to the author's Latin vocabulary.

MARCO FANELLI studies anti-Islamic polemic of the Palaiologan period. He examines how John VI Kantakouzenos used the *Contra legem Saracenorum* of the Florentine Dominican Riccoldo da Monte di Croce through Demetrios Kydones' Greek translation. The paper focuses on these three protagonists and shows the way in which their works were connected. The first part surveys the sources and production circumstances of Riccoldo's *Contra legem*: FANELLI not only brings together previous results but engages them in detail. The second section describes how *Contra legem* became a Dominican missionary handbook and was brought to the East: FANELLI hypothesises that a copy originating from the Dominican house in Durrazzo became Demetrios Kydones' Latin model. The paper gives a vivid description of the Constantinopolitan house and the presence of

the Dominicans and tries to locate the *Contra legem* in the friary's library before 1435–1437. The third part assesses John VI Kantakouzenos' anti-Islamic corpus, stressing relations between works, dating, and context: FANELLI argues that Kantakouzenos did not have direct knowledge of the Koran and that passages in Riccoldo's Latin works in Kydones' translation constituted his point of departure. The paper examines a chain of interconnected texts, authors, and contexts. These highly complex topics are presented with outstanding clarity.

MARIA PANAGIA MIOLA studies Prochoros Kydones' translation method of Thomas Aquinas' *IIIa pars* of the *Summa theologiae*. Her essay is well structured and offers a brilliant discussion of the topic. She explains the context, the manuscript tradition, Kydones' selective use of the Latin original, and his additions to the text in four steps. I would have added at least some works in the form of a footnote at the beginning to explain the anti-Palamite context for a larger audience. In its present form, the essay addresses specialists on the topic. More importantly, it describes how a translation from Latin became 'Greek', addressing a Greek audience. The additions on the margins and complete passages that Kydones added himself to the main text, as MIOLA explains, testify to an adaptation of Thomas' views and its reuse in a Byzantine polemical context.

CHRISTIAAN KAPPES studies the way Prochoros Kydones translated the Dominican Hervaeus Natalis' second commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* to confront Barlaam's and Gregory Palamas' arguments against the Latin notion of the filioque. The essay substantially develops our understanding of its topic. At the same time, the paper lacks a proper introduction, and KAPPES' later arguments and train of thought are sometimes difficult to follow simply because of the richness of the evidence he tries to include. It would have been more reader-friendly to single out one aspect as the essay's *Leitmotif*.

MARIE-HÉLÈNE BLANCHET studies two anonymous Greek commentaries of the Apostolic Creed that were produced under the influence of Latin texts and circulated alongside the Kydones brothers' Aquinas translations. The first section is a valuable and concise introduction to the history of the three creeds (Apostolic, Athanasian, Nicene), emphasising that the Orthodox did not accept the Apostolic Creed, although it was translated into Greek no later than the 11th century. The second unit presents details about two Vatican manuscripts containing Aquinas' *De rationibus fidei* alongside the two creed-commentaries. These codices have common

models, and the two creed commentaries are related, containing the same text with modifications. BLANCHET illustrates their broader context as well, claiming that the 14th-century translations of the Apostolic Creed all go back to the Latin *textus receptus* (crystallised by the 8th century in the West). She also shows the dependence of a third manuscript (Vat. lat. 3512) on the aforesaid two. Furthermore, BLANCHET hypothesises that the two differ from a great part of other 14th-century Byzantine codices containing the creed because they present a better text not deriving from the earliest, somewhat faulty translations into Greek. She assumes that a new Greek translation of the Apostolic Creed was produced that accompanied the Greek corpus of Aquinas' writings, more precisely, the translation of his sermons on the Apostolic Creed (entitled *Collationes in Symbolum Apostolorum*). The essay's third part examines the commentaries themselves. The first consists of 14 points, separating statements regarding the divine essence and Christ's humanity. The second text is a double commentary which follows the same division, though in 12 points; a unique feature is that each of the 12 points is attributed to one of the apostles. BLANCHET shows that such divisions were common in the West (e.g. Henric of Ostia ca. 1253) and were used by Bonaventure and, more importantly from the aspect of Thomas' Greek translations, by Thomas himself when he raised questions on the resurrection, sacraments, etc. So, it is reasonable that the two commentaries accompany Thomas' Greek oeuvre; moreover, these are the only commentaries of this sort that have been rendered into Greek. At the same time BLANCHET calls attention to the fact that the text could have been used not only in the context of Thomas' theology; it could have been a sort of small handbook to teach the Latin doctrine, addressing the pro-unionist faithful and priests in Mytelene or Crete, where Greek people lived under Latin rule. A useful critical edition and translation of the two commentaries are included at the end of the paper. In the first text, a certain Henricus occurs that immediately kindled my curiosity. BLANCHET explains that this figure might have been part of the milieu in which the texts were produced or refer to Henric of Ostia, mentioned before.

KONSTANTINOS PALAIOLOGOS' essay focuses on Manuel Kalekas and his circle, who were in the crossfire of the charges that both Latins and Byzantines brought against them despite the fact that they favoured union with the Roman church. PALAIOLOGOS examines the *De fide deque principiis fidei catholicae*. The work is available in early editions, among which that of Dositheos (1698) is remarkable for the editorial interventions PALAIOLOGOS identifies. After that, the essay analyses the content

of the work and supports the view by GOUILLARD and DEMETRACOPOULOS that Kalekas extensively used Aquinas' *Summa contra gentiles* and *Ad cantorem Antiochenum* in Kydones' Greek translation. The paper surveys Chapter 6, which has not yet been the subject of a comparative reading. PALAIOLOGOS concludes that Kalekas largely employed the same arguments and quotations as Thomas did regarding the respective topics, such as baptism, Eucharist, or resurrection. Nonetheless, Kalekas articulates them differently, summarising and selecting sections from Thomas' *Summa*. Furthermore, PALAIOLOGOS singles out that Kalekas identified his sources except for mentioning Thomas and considers this a conscious move. The work was written upon the request of 'a Greek' whom PALAIOLOGOS cannot identify. He suggests that *De fide* was composed in the Dominican house of Pera or in Crete between 1396 and 1400.

JOHN MONFASANI analyses Cardinal Bessarion's translation and use of Plato, Aristotle, and other prose authors in his *In calumniatorem Platonis*. The paper shows that Bessarion wrote the work in Greek (1459) which he later translated into Latin (1466). It seems that Bessarion's translation did not meet humanist standards, so in three years' time (1469) the work reappeared after Bessarion's former secretary Niccolò Perotti revised it from the linguistic point of view, while Giovanni Gatti added an entirely new book. MONFASANI demonstrates that a substantial stylistic revision took place that was not always conducive to an increased level of accuracy. The essay also singles out Bessarion's occasional mistranslations. Furthermore, MONFASANI brings evidence that Bessarion consciously omitted specific passages within his quotes to show Plato's superiority over Aristotle or to make Plato more acceptable to a Christian audience. The paper complements JEAN-LOUIS CHARLET, who claimed that Bessarion's translations of poetic texts have been largely upgraded by Perotti. MONFASANI shows that Bessarion's Latin had a scholastic flavour and that at the same time he used his translations as 'tendentious instruments of war' against his rival George of Trebizond.

Cardinal Bessarion's Greek-Latin bilingual skills have been debated by scholars. CIRO GIACOMELLI studies how he rendered into Greek Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. Two translations from Latin survive under Bessarion's name: that of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and the *Sentences*. GIACOMELLI attributes the former to Plethon, Bessarion's master. After introducing Bessarion's translations from both languages, GIACOMELLI presents the sole manuscript of the of the *Sentences*' Greek version with regard to its content and scribes. The codex consists of parts that have been assem-

bled in different phases and was used by Bessarion (as his numerous notes demonstrate) probably in the 1460s. GIACOMELLI arrives at the plausible conclusion that on codicological grounds, the translation of the *Sentences* cannot be an early work (dating before 1440/1445) as contended by MIONI, who associated it with Bessarion's years in Mistra (1431–1436). The paper convincingly confirms Bessarion's authorship by showing that in its manuscript text was written by Bessarion himself as the first clean copy of a partial translation (with some corrections). GIACOMELLI avers that Peter Lombard's *Sentences* is in accord with Bessarion's interest in Latin patristic and scholastic authors. He emphasises that the Western influence came via collaborators and friends and can be associated with the last twenty years of Bessarion's life. Against this background, the Greek translation of the *Sentences* served as a valuable manual for Bessarion (without the need to consult the original Latin texts, even in translations). Based on the cardinal's intellectual interests, GIACOMELLI dates it to 1458–1468. He identifies Marc. lat. 98 as the model texts, since it was demonstrably in Bessarion's possession. He also claims that the translation is without significant faults. To avoid repetition, Bessarion rendered the same structures differently for the sake of *varietas* and textual flow. At the same time, he was trying to observe the scholastic nature of the Latin source. GIACOMELLI also points to the influence of Plethon and Gennadios Scholarios on Bessarion's Greek. Regarding Biblical citations, GIACOMELLI states that Bessarion did not use the Septuagint but gave a free translation for shorter passages, and the influence of Greek liturgical texts can be detected. He sometimes knew passages by heart that influenced the Greek rendering, even if specific words were absent in the Latin. GIACOMELLI shows that in the case of Augustine's *De Trinitate*, Bessarion used Planudes' Greek translation, at the same time producing one of his own. Revisions regarding word order and particular words are present in the text. Finally, GIACOMELLI assumes that the Kydones brothers' translations of Thomas Aquinas also had an influence on Bessarion's choice of words. Compared to his Latin, Bessarion had a native command of Greek that entailed a higher level of Greek text than his Latin translations. The paper's final section discusses Bessarion's authorship regarding the Greek partial version of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. RIGO rejected Bessarion's authorship, which was surmised based on the association of Bessarion's hand with the copyist of the text. GIACOMELLI follows earlier views in attributing the Greek *Rhetorica*-fragment to Georgios Gemistos Plethon's circle in Mistra. Plethon's identification as the translator of the text, made on stylistic grounds, GIACOMELLI con-

siders hypothetical because at present Plethon's oeuvre cannot be studied in its entirety. I find the paper's results acceptable based on the examples GIACOMELLI cites, which is strengthened by further testimonies in the two appendices.

The final paper by PANAGIOTIS CH. ATHANASOPOULOS and ELEFTHERIOS DESPOTAKIS is a case study on how manuals of Latin-rite confession reached the medieval Latin East. These texts were written in the vernaculars for the use of priests and lay people alike. They travelled eastward through the mediation of pilgrims, the establishment of religious orders in Greece, and late Byzantine scholars who adhered to the Latin rite. The paper studies a single manuscript, Athens, EBE, 2473 – an euchologion that was copied in 1493 by the Cretan scribe, unionist theologian, and later bishop of Methone Joseph-John Plousiadenos. The codex contains three texts: a pattern guide, a questionnaire, and a doctrine. All the texts are based on models written in the Italian vernacular; the sources of the doctrine still need to be identified. The paper presents an *editio princeps* of the first two items. The pattern was a practical handbook consisting of chapters regarding the Ten Commandments, seven sacraments, beatitudes, etc. It was Plousiadenos' translation of the Franciscan Michele Carcano's *Confessionale generale della gran tuba*. Selected Italian and Greek passages are juxtaposed, though without analytical remarks. After presenting these selected passages, the paper reports that Carcano was making a pilgrimage through several Italian cities as a preacher. He stayed in Venice from 1478 to 1485, where his work appeared in 1484. ATHANASOPOULOS and DESPOTAKIS assume that Plousiadenos got acquainted with Carcano's work in Venice, which he visited several times after 1478. Their valuable preliminary remarks on Plousiadenos' translating methods show that Plousiadenos strove to give a precise (sometimes *ad verbum*) translation that nevertheless provided a readership of mediocre knowledge with a text that was easy to understand. In the case of the other two texts in the codex, neither author(s) nor specific sources can be identified. The questionnaire follows the vernacular tradition of confessional handbooks such as Jean Gerson's *Doctrinal aux simples gens* in its expressions (parts of an interrogatory procedure) and content (various topics from the seven deadly sins to prerequisites for salvation). The authors show that the Greek texts go back to different works (Pseudo Bernardino, Della Marca) within the genre of 'general confessions'. The questionnaire was written in a similar Atticist church language as the pattern. The third text under examination is the doctrine, which aims at the same audiences as the other two. It follows the

same structure from the penitent's introductory prayer through seven commandments, sacraments, senses etc. as the other two texts. The paper contains a useful comparative chart of the doctrine's content, which displays a number of representative confessional texts. After structural-thematic comparisons, ATHANASOPOULOS and DESPOTAKIS demonstrate that the Greek text shows similarities with a number of vernacular and some Latin works and suggest (p. 556) that it was probably translated from the Italian. However, they cannot identify its specific source.

Keywords

Late Byzantine period; Late Middle Ages; mediaeval translations; translation techniques