

JOHN WHITTAKER

SINCE THE publication of my "*Parisinus graecus* 1962 and the writings of Albinus"¹ Professor Aubrey Diller has generously brought to my attention two facts of prime importance for the tracing of the movements of this manuscript in the early sixteenth century: 1) *Vaticanus Barberinianus* lat. 3185, in the hand of Fabio Vigili da Spoleto, contains a collection of inventories of libraries including (fol. 260 recto–335 verso) an unpublished inventory of the Greek manuscripts belonging to Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici, the future Pope Leo X.² This inventory was presumably compiled between 1508, when the Medici library was repossessed and transferred to Rome by Cardinal de' Medici, and 1510–1511 when Vigili, travelling in the train of Cardinal Isvalies, in all likelihood compiled the remaining inventories preserved in the *Barberinianus*.³ On fol. 279 recto and verso of his catalogue of the Medici library Vigili lists a manuscript of Maximus Tyrius and Alcinous with a detailed indication of content coinciding in every respect with that of *Parisinus* gr. 1962:

"85. Maximi Tyrij Platonici philosophi Φιλοσοφούμενα:

*sermones vz numero xlj. ut de voluptate quod
etsi bonum est tamen non stabile: sermones tres.
quartus: quis finis philosophiae. v*
41* Deo bona faciente unde sint mala. Sunt autem
xxxv sermones non computatis duplicibus sed
ijs computatis xli. Inscribuntur autem ita:
Maximi Tyrij platonici philosophi τῶν ἐν ῥώμῃ
διαλέξεων τῆς πρώτης ἐπιδημίας vz disputationum
primae peregrinationis apud romam sermones 4.*

Alcinoi didascalicus sive epitome dogmatum Platonis."

2) *British Library*, *Harley* 5760,⁴ containing Maximus Tyrius, carries at the foot of fol. 2 recto the signature (unfortunately somewhat obscured

¹*Phoenix* 28 (1974) 320 ff. and 450 ff. (hereafter *Phoenix* 28 [1974]).

²On the *Barberinianus* cf. M.-H. Laurent, *Fabio Vigili et les bibliothèques de Bologne au début du XVI^e siècle d'après le Ms. Barb. lat. 3185* (*Studi e Testi* 105: Vatican City 1943), and A. Pertusi, "La scoperta di Euripide nel primo umanesimo," *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 3 (1960) 118 ff.

³Cf. Laurent, *op. cit.* X ff.

⁴Cf. *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum* 3 (London 1808) 294, and *Maximi Tyrii philosophoumena* ed. H. Hobein (Leipzig 1910) XLVIII. I am grateful to Mr T. S. Pattie for examining the *Harleianus* on my behalf.

by a MUSEUM BRITANNICUM stamp in heavy red ink) "N° 79 tertiae. N° 24 Α^σ," an unmistakable indication that the manuscript derives from the library of Janus Lascaris and passed thence into that of Cardinal Niccolò Ridolfi.⁵

The *Harleianus* can indeed be none other than the manuscript inventoried by Matthew Devaris in his *Lista de' libri che furon del Sr. Lascheri* as "μαξιμου τυρίου διαλέξεις N°. 24 della p. ^a."⁶ Similarly, the *Harleianus* must be identical with the manuscript of Maximus of Tyre listed as N°. 24 in the inventory of Ridolfi's library in *Vaticanus gr.* 1567.⁷ In his catalogue of the Ridolfi collection in *Vallicellianus* C. 46 Devaris has omitted the number 24 from the philosophical series,⁸ leading one to suspect that the manuscript was already missing when this catalogue was compiled. The further movements of the *Harleianus* may be difficult to trace up to the time of its acquisition, presumably in Italy in the 1720's, by Conyers Middleton (*Protobibliothecarius* from 1721 until his death in 1750 of the University Library at Cambridge) whence it passed into the Harley collection.⁹

It follows from the above that *Parisinus gr.* 1962 cannot be, as I previously suspected,¹⁰ the manuscript of Maximus of Tyre catalogued in the *Lista de' libri che furon del Sr. Lascheri*. On the other hand there is no reason to doubt the identity of the *Parisinus* with the manuscript of Maximus and Alcinous catalogued by Vigili in the library of Cardinal de' Medici. This being the case, there is no longer any ground for presuming that the *Parisinus* passed from the Medici collection into that of Ridolfi with Lascaris as intermediary. Nor is there now any reason to suppose that the *Parisinus* was in the possession of Lascaris when the

⁵Cf. H. Omont, "Notes sur les manuscrits grecs du British Museum," *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* 45 (1884) 329, and C. E. Wright, *Fontes Harleiani: A Study of the Sources of the Harleian Collection of Manuscripts preserved in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London 1972) 286.

⁶Cf. P. de Nolhac, "Inventaire des manuscrits grecs de Jean Lascaris," *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Ecole Française de Rome* 6 (1886) 257, and *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 333 ff.

⁷*Ibid.* 334.

⁸Cf. H. Omont, "Un premier catalogue des manuscrits grecs du Cardinal Ridolfi," *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* 49 (1888) 314.

⁹Cf. C. E. Wright (note 5 above) 239, and his "Italian manuscripts in the Harleian collection," in *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of P. O. Kristeller* ed. C. H. Clough (Manchester 1976) 471. Of little significance is the information in a late sixteenth-century hand on fol. 1 verso of the *Harleianus* that "Questo autore fu di Grecia portato a Lor^o de Medici da Gio. Lascari." That Maximus of Tyre was indeed among the authors brought back from Greece by Lascaris had been a matter of common knowledge since the publication of Cosimo de' Pazzi's Latin version of Maximus; cf. *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 336 f.

¹⁰*Ibid.* 334 f.

Biblioteca Medicea was inventoried in 1495.¹¹ Why the manuscript was omitted from that inventory is a perhaps insoluble mystery, which does not, however, invalidate the likelihood that the *Parisinus* is indeed the parchment manuscript of Maximus of Tyre listed in Lascaris' inventory, in *Vaticanus gr.* 1412, fol. 39 verso, of Lorenzo de' Medici's library.¹² In the philosophical section of Ridolfi's collection the *Parisinus* was catalogued as number 19, as is evident both from the signature on fol. I recto and from the various inventories. Under the "N°. 19" on fol. I recto one can discern without difficulty the partially erased number "24". This I hitherto accepted as proof that the *Parisinus* had been catalogued previously as number 24 in Lascaris' collection.¹³ However, since *Harley* 5760 is necessarily Lascaris' number 24, one must rather suppose that the partially erased "24" in the *Parisinus* was entered in error after the manuscript had come into Ridolfi's collection as a result of a confusion with the manuscript of Maximus Tyrius (i.e., the *Harleianus*) which Ridolfi acquired from Lascaris upon the death of the latter in 1534. The subsequent history of the Ridolfi collection up to the time of its entry into the *Bibliothèque du roi* has been recently elucidated by R. Baladié.¹⁴

Shortly after its arrival in the royal *Bibliothèque Parisinus gr.* 1962 received its present handsome binding in red morocco bearing upon the spine the date 1603.¹⁵ Whether or not the volume had a binding when brought by Lascaris to Florence is not indicated in any of the surviving catalogues. However, as F. Schulte long ago pointed out,¹⁶ we do have positive proof that the *Parisinus* was unbound when *Bodleianus misc. gr.* 239 (= *Auct. T.* 4.1) was copied from it. On the basis of the various scripts which it contains the *Bodleianus* has been unanimously dated to the fourteenth century.¹⁷ Mr. Nigel Wilson has recently re-examined the manuscript and kindly drawn to my notice that he has found in it watermarks similar to design 6506 in V. A. Mošin and S. M. Traljić, *Vodeni znakovi XIII. i XIV. vijeka* (Zagreb 1957) for which the date of 1310 is given. If the *Parisinus* were to have remained unbound between that date or shortly thereafter and 1603, the survival of fol. 146 and other folios which lack conjugates would be almost a miracle. It is likely therefore that the manuscript received some form of binding somewhere in the intervening three centuries.

¹¹As I supposed *ibid.* 343 ff.

¹²Cf. *ibid.* 341 ff.

¹³*Ibid.* 334.

¹⁴In his "Contribution à l'histoire de la Collection Ridolfi: la date de son arrivée en France," *Scriptorium* 29 (1975) 76 ff.

¹⁵Cf. *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 320 f.

¹⁶In his *De Maximi Tyrii codicibus* (Göttingen 1915) 7 ff.

¹⁷Cf. *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 349.

II

The sole evidence of Lascaris' visit to Crete in the spring of 1492 and of the acquisitions he made there on behalf of Lorenzo de' Medici is the contract for the purchase of manuscripts from Niccolò di Giacomo da Siena entered into by Lascaris at Candia on 3rd April of that year in the presence of three witnesses.¹⁸ The original of the contract is no doubt lost, but its text has long been familiar to scholars from the copy preserved at Florence in the *Archivio di Stato* (Arch. Mediceo avanti il Principato, F. 81 a 497 f.) which has been published first by E. Piccolomini and subsequently by E. Legrand.¹⁹ That the Florentine document is no more than a copy is obvious not only from the fact that the signatures of the three witnesses are in the same hand as the text but also from the title which appears in the same hand at the head of the document: *Ex [e] m [plum] sumptum ex libro notarie mei Cyrilli gradonico notarii Venetiarum*.²⁰ It has not been noted by students of Lascaris and the Medici library that the pertinent notarial *liber* survives at Venice in the *Archivio di Stato* as *Notai di Candia busta 119 (Cirillo Gradenigo 1481-1493), quaderno B*. That the contract between Niccolò di Giacomo and Lascaris appears on fol. 84 verso-85 verso of this volume was first drawn to my attention by Professor M. Manoussacas in 1975.²¹ I have since had the opportunity to consult both this and the Florentine document and to compare the two in photographic copies.²² Such comparison shows that both items are in the one hand, i.e., no doubt that of Gradenigo himself, who—true to his profession—has produced in the Florentine document a faithful copy of the text recorded in his own notarial ledger. The Florentine copy is befittingly the more calligraphic of the two and contains fewer abbrevi-

¹⁸Cf. *ibid.* 338.

¹⁹Cf. E. Piccolomini, "Due documenti relativi ad acquisti di codici greci, fatti da Giovanni Lascaris per conto di Lorenzo de' Medici," *RivFC* 2 (1874) 420 ff., and E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des Grecs au XVe et XVIe siècles* 2 (Paris 1885; rp. Brussels 1965) 325 ff.

²⁰K. N. Sathas, *Bibliotheca graeca medii aevi* 6 (Venice/Paris 1877; rp. Hildesheim/New York 1972) 668 ff. has published the text of a deed of gift made at Candia on 7th May 1499 by ὁ Τζανῆς Γραδενίγος καὶ Φραγγισκίνα ἡ αὐτοῦ ἀδελφή, the siblings of the then deceased Cirillo, to their benefactor Τζανῆς Πέτρος who undertook in return to provide them livelihood for their remaining days and to ensure their burial κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τῶν Γραικῶν ἐκκλησίας. Sathas, *ibid.* 677 ff., has published also the will, dated 18th January 1501, of Τζανῆς Γραδενίγος. For references to Cirillo cf. *ibid.* 663.21; 665.16; 668.23; 669.14; 670.20.

²¹Professor Manoussacas had in turn been made aware of the Venetian document by P. Mario Cattapan, to both of whom I here express my gratitude.

²²I am gratefully indebted to Maria Kasanaki for obtaining for me photographic copies from Gradenigo's ledger.

ations, but there is no point at which the texts diverge.²³ Gradenigo has, however, in one instance revised the spelling of a name. For whereas in the Venetian document the names of the Florentine merchants in Peira (= Pera) appear as "Ser Franciscum de Bartolomeo Boratuzi, Alfieri de F[rancisc]o Strinati et Jo de Marco Salviati," the Florentine version gives the family name of the first mentioned in the less vulgar form "Boraduci." Both documents are well preserved and generally legible. The following are a few notes in correction of the published transcriptions.

Legrand in the main simply reproduces the text as edited by Piccolomini but does offer two tacit corrections of his predecessor: i.e., in the title he rightly reads "*Cyrilli Gradonico*" in place of the misreading "*Grilli Gradonico*" reported by Piccolomini, and in the preamble "*satisfaciendis*" where Piccolomini has "*satisfacendis*." On the other hand Legrand has carelessly introduced into the preamble two errors which do not appear in Piccolomini's version: the name of the *notarius imperialis* in Pera is "*S. Dominici de Alssario*" as reported by Piccolomini, and Gradenigo has written not "*exbursavit*" but "*exburssavit*." In particular the correction of Gradenigo's first name suggests that Legrand's text might be based upon a re-examination of the Florentine document. If this is indeed the case, then it is remarkable that Legrand has missed two obvious mistakes made by Piccolomini.

The first of these concerns the very date of the document which both editions reproduce as follows: *Anno domini millesimo quadringentesimo nonagesimo secundo, mensis aprilis die tertia, indictione 4*. But the 3rd April 1492 belongs not to the fourth but to the tenth indiction,²⁴ and both documents in fact read clearly "indictione x." The second error occurs in the list of witnesses at the close of the preamble. Both Piccolomini and Legrand render the name of the third witness as "*D. Petrus Falina*." But the surname is in both manuscripts quite clearly not "*Falina*" but "*Ialina*," a name familiar to us from other contemporary Candian documents.²⁵ In both these instances Legrand has unhesitatingly followed Piccolomini into error.

²³Of the two additions made by Gradenigo in the margin of the Florentine copy (cf. Piccolomini [note 19 above] 421, n. 1 and 422, n. 1; Legrand [note 19 above] 326, n. 1 and 327, n. 1) the first appears also in the margin and the second between lines in the Venetian document. In both documents Gradenigo first wrote "*speravimus*" in the preamble and then corrected this to "*sperabant*," surely in order to indicate that the same correction occurred in the original.

²⁴Cf. F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie* 3 (Leipzig 1914; rp. 1958) 403.

²⁵In the form 'Ταλινᾶς or 'Ταληνᾶς; cf. Sathas (note 20 above) 654.11; 656.12; 658.15; 659.19; 660.5.

Finally, for what it is worth the notation on the exterior of the Florentine document probably reads²⁶ “Conti di messr Lascheri per *resto* di libri comperati per il magnifico Lorenzo de Medici che fu.”²⁷

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND, ST. JOHN’S

²⁶Cf. Piccolomini (note 19 above) 423. I am grateful to Father L. E. Boyle for advice on this point.

²⁷On Lascaris’ activities see also my “Janus Lascaris at the Court of the Emperor Charles V” forthcoming in *Θησαυρίσματα* 14 (1977). For support of my research I am indebted to the Canada Council.