

Patrick Andrist

# Concepts and Vocabulary for the Analysis of Thematic Codices: The Example of Greek *Adversus Iudaeos* Books

**Abstract:** This article describes a new method of scholarly investigation developed for studying the history of complex codices united by a common subject—a type of codices now dubbed ‘thematic books,’ as presented in a 2016 publication. The first part describes the fundamental concepts, based on the codicology of complex manuscripts. It takes into consideration the materiality, the content and the structure of the codices, as they are found today, in order to reconstruct the various configurations in which their constitutive units once circulated, and evaluate the relevance of each configuration as a thematic book. In the second part, the method is applied to the category of byzantine anti-Jewish codices. Questions concerning the analysis of individual Production Units are discussed first, followed by questions linked to the relation between the various Production Units in the same codex.

This article describes a new method of scholarly investigation developed for studying the history of complex codices united by a common subject—a type of codices now dubbed ‘thematic books.’ Discussed in a 2016 publication,<sup>1</sup> this method was developed while applying the principles of codicology of complex manuscripts to the study of byzantine anti-Jewish codices.

Firstly, prolonged work on the manuscript transmission of *Adversus Iudaeos* works revealed codices largely dedicated to this kind of polemics, combined with the fact this type of book had not yet been studied in a book-historical perspective.

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrist 2016. This book is the result of research generously funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation, to whom I extend my kindest thanks. I would also like to thank the editors of the present volume, particularly Alessandro Bausi and Marilena Maniaci, who also closely followed the development of this text, and Michael Friedrich for stimulating exchanges on the concepts presented here. My gratitude also goes to the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures (CSMC) in Hamburg for funding the translation of this text, originally written in French, to Saskia Dirkse and Roderick Saxey for translating it with competence and care and to James Rumball for carefully revising the last version; I alone am responsible for any errors that remain. I would like finally to thank Martin Wallraff and my colleagues in the ParaTexBib project for their moral and intellectual support.

Secondly, academia's fairly recent discovery of the ancient codex's stratigraphy has opened up a growing awareness of the complexities involved<sup>2</sup>—complexities from which new questions have arisen that call for a novel approach for description of the codex and, beyond, for reconstructing its genetic and subsequent history.

A broad look at the bibliography showed that, in spite of important studies on miscellanea or 'multi-text' books,<sup>3</sup> as well as the manuscript transmission of a collection of 'thematic texts,'<sup>4</sup> no methodological study of codices united by a common subject, taking into full account the physical features in a chronological perspective, had ever been undertaken and certainly not regarding Greek manuscripts. As a result, the attempt is made here to develop a method for the study of thematic books, as detailed in the above 2016 volume and what is to be outlined below.

The core idea of this method is to proceed in two steps: the main objective of the first step is to describe the books according to the principles set out in *The Syntax of the Codex*,<sup>5</sup> which highlights the different layers (the 'stratigraphy') of book production via a structured approach. The second step implements the complex elements revealed in these descriptions to discuss and try to reconstruct the history of each codex and from this basis, pinpoint traces of the presence and evolution of various previously circulating *Adversus Iudaeos* codices within a single codex, such as it is found today. This has been done, in an exploratory way, with 33 codices (in their present shape) in the Vatican Library which contain the remains of some 40 Byzantine or Renaissance Greek books on this subject.<sup>6</sup> The ultimate goal is to reconstruct the history of the production and circulation of such books in Byzantium and later.

---

<sup>2</sup> On the history of this growing awareness, see Andrist / Canart / Maniaci 2013, 11–44; a revised and expanded version will appear in English in 2020 from Brepols (henceforth *The Syntax*); cf. chap. 1.

<sup>3</sup> See Friedrich / Schwarke 2016, in particular the editors' theoretical introduction; see also Corbellini / Murano / Signore 2018. For a presentation on the limits of the traditional approach to miscellanea, see Maniaci 2018.

<sup>4</sup> Including a survey of current manuscripts containing thematic texts (see a list in Olivier 1995, 9–21) and some rare studies where the physical aspects of the codices are taken into account, for example Ronconi 2009.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. n. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Described in Andrist 2016, 125–345. Having sought through various European libraries, it was decided, for practical reasons, to focus on the codices preserved at the Vatican Library, as it is the largest known collection of such Judaica. Some of the other manuscripts studied in the course of this inquiry are not included here but are listed and/or discussed in the two final appendices of Andrist 2016, 347–399 and in Andrist 2011.

The results convincingly show that this method allows one to treat difficult and complicated thematic books such as the *Adversus Iudaeos* with far greater precision than before. This opens a quite promising perspective for the study of thematic books in general.

It should, however, be emphasized that this is not a study of the creation of *Adversus Iudaeos* works, but rather a study of pre-seventeenth-century books devoted to the quite specific subject of anti-Jewish polemics; nor is the final goal to describe codices in their present state, but to reconstruct the books dedicated to anti-Jewish polemics as they appeared over time, with the aim of someday being able to trace the history of this ‘book genre’.

## 1 Basic concepts

### 1.1 The question of the texts and their number

The object of our study, the anti-Jewish polemical book<sup>7</sup> written in Greek, constitutes two overlapping things at once: it is both a book-object (the physical manuscript) and a collection of ideas (the content of the book, the anti-Jewish texts). The two are intimately related, and it is necessary to bring forth some general ideas regarding the ‘text’ and the ‘book’.

Firstly, as discussed elsewhere, a fundamental distinction between the concept of *work* (‘text-as-opus’), indicating the intellectual endeavour of one or more authors, and the concept of (literary) *text* (‘texts-as-witness’) understood as a ‘philological unit’ materially recorded in a manuscript must be established;<sup>8</sup> regarding ‘originals’ contents, or contents without a literary tradition,

---

7 In this article the words *codex* and *book* are used equally and merely designate the objects under scrutiny. At a more theoretical level, however, *codices* are only one possible kind of ‘manuscript books’. They are understood as movable objects with an organized and immediately readable content which is meant to be shared and transmitted, and as distinct from non-book manuscripts (personal notebooks, private letters...). Consequently, there are other kinds of manuscript books such as scrolls or palm-leaf manuscripts; and here too, not all scrolls or palm-leaf manuscripts are books. For more details, see Andrist / Canart / Maniaci 2013, 45–48, and for a more nuanced analysis, see *The Syntax* §2.1.1, as well as Andrist / Maniaci in a forthcoming volume dedicated to Paul Canart.

8 On the polysemy of the word *text*, see Andrist 2018, 135–138. Cf. *The Syntax* §2.2.3. One important implication about the dichotomy *text* versus *work* (or however they may be named) concerns the main works from Antiquity and the Middle Ages: what is found in the manuscripts is not equal to what the author(s) wrote but more or less faithfully reflects the book-

such as colophons or, often, book epigrams, the *text* matches the *work*. Generally speaking, a ‘text-as-witness’ is a more-or-less complete reflection of a work, but there are many exceptions. While a given work is often to be found in several manuscripts in roughly identical form, in some cases the differences are so distinct that one is left unsure whether the two instances really count as the same work, or whether one of them should be thought of as an altogether new work whose relationship to the first work has then to be worked out. Accidents in the transmission—for example the loss of folios or quires—sometimes lead to the creation of distinct texts which no longer correspond to a specific work and are no longer the result of conscious choice. The interest here is in the texts as they were copied in the manuscripts.

Nonetheless, both text and content are complex notions that may at times be understood on different levels simultaneously. In this analysis the fact that the codices under consideration are either ‘monotextual’ or ‘multitextual’ is to be decided upon and the numbers of texts present is utilised for a statistical analysis. As a consequence, it is necessary to specify, from the outset, the actual analysis level used in this study, through a few examples:<sup>9</sup>

- Sometimes the texts are gathered into a collection which proceeds to gain wide circulation in that particular configuration.<sup>10</sup> In such an instance a collection or series of texts which generally circulate together (an anthology, or *sylloge*) can be deemed a single text. Although at times, in the descriptions the granular texts making up a collection are listed individually and the complexities are noted in the discussion, a collection is nonetheless usually counted as a single text. One such case is John Chrysostom’s series of homilies *Adversus Iudaeos*; another would be patristic florilegia in general. The Christian Bible also presents an interesting case: the collection of biblical books in a given manuscript is counted as a single text, in spite of variations in the choice and order of the books, as long as they appear in one of the known traditional orders.
- Similarly, how is one to treat the paratexts surrounding larger works, such as hypotheses (arguments) or, to take a specific example, the encomium by Simeon Thebanus often accompanying John Cantacuzenus’s polemical texts? On the one hand, they are texts in their own right, as shown by the fact that the encomium is not by the same author as the main text; on the oth-

---

producers’ knowledge of the text. This is also why marginal textual corrections by the book-producers are to be considered part or the text.

<sup>9</sup> For a more detailed discussion and further examples, see Andrist 2016, 18–22.

<sup>10</sup> On complex questions like this, Maniaci 2004, 82–90.

er, there is no reason for paratexts of this type to exist independently of the text they accompany (their ‘protext’)<sup>11</sup> and they are rarely transmitted detached from it. For the producers of the book, these additional texts were part of the ‘package’, and this is why they are not counted as separate content here.

- Texts also regarded as a single unit are those termed ‘filler content’ (short writings added to blank sections of a manuscript) or ‘private florilegia’.

It is clear therefore, that the notion of text in these cases is applied to sets of contents interconnected in varying ways which, despite obvious intersection, are distinct from ‘texts-as-witness’ (or ‘texts-as-laid-out-content’).

## 1.2 Texts and books related to a specific subject

### 1.2.1 Thematic texts and books

The question is how is it possible to move from the subject of individual texts to that of a book? Here it is necessary to formulate an approach that is not overly subjective, combined with a working vocabulary.

In this research area one often encounters multitextual books constructed around a particular subject, such as medicine, astrology, or religious doctrine. These books are simply termed as a *thematic book*.<sup>12</sup> Here are a few specific points:<sup>13</sup>

- in a given work an author frequently treats several subjects of which one is often given greater prominence than others. Some works may often contain two or three subjects which prevail throughout the work or at different parts within it. Furthermore, works may be quite disparate in the subjects treated; one clear example is the encyclopaedia which by definition does not contain a single overriding theme.<sup>14</sup> A text containing only one major subject is dubbed *monothematic*; should it contain two or three, it is termed *multithematic*; and other cases are titled *athematic*, for they have been considered to contain no dominant subjects. In the terminology implemented here all

---

<sup>11</sup> On protext, see Andrist 2018, 137. On filler-content, see Andrist 2016, 20–21.

<sup>12</sup> Monotextual books containing one mono- or multithematic text are also thematic books and are therefore included in this study.

<sup>13</sup> For an overview of all these concepts, see the summary tables in section 1.4 below.

<sup>14</sup> The words ‘theme’ and ‘subject’ are interchangeable.

- texts containing the same major subject belong to the same *literary category*. Thus, a multithematic text also belongs to multiple literary categories;
- if all the texts contained in a book belong to the same literary category<sup>15</sup> or pertain to a few predominant, identical subjects (whether throughout the book or by section), it is a *thematic* book, which can then be *monothematic* or *multithematic*;
  - the term *book category* is used to designate all books on the same subject, in the understanding, however, that a book can belong to several book categories at once. Thus, a literary category may correspond to each subject, and in turn a book category may correspond to each literary category. Literary and book categories do not therefore constitute predetermined sets, but arise from the observation of texts and books; there are no limits potentially to the number of literary or book categories that can be defined;
  - it is possible that no thematic unity can be discerned in a multitextual book, either because it is an unusual one by today's standards, which the analyst does not recognise, or because none exists; the person responsible for a *multitextual* book may very well have decided to arrange the works according to whim, in the absence of any organizing principle. It is also possible that a book's current state represents a rearrangement, the result of interventions by several people who did not share the same vision for the book; the result is a very disparate object in terms of its content. Again, if no dominant theme emerges, it is not possible to speak of its 'subject' for which reason it is termed *athematic*;
  - the organizing principle of a multitextual book is not always directly connected to the subject(s) of the texts of which it is comprised. The focus of the book may be an author (e.g. Aristotle or Plutarch) or a literary genre (e.g. homilies or literary dialogues). In such cases the relevant organizing principle is termed under the concept of 'book subject'. This may result in a book consisting of monothematic texts all belonging to the same literary category (e.g. a codex containing all of John Chrysostom's homilies *Adversus Iudaeos*) that may yet represent several book categories. In this particular case the categories would be *Adversus Iudaeos* books and Chrysostomic books;
  - this last point is important: for the subject of a book can also be defined by extratextual elements, monotextual books (which are included in this sur-

---

<sup>15</sup> Including multithematic texts, if one of the themes in each of them belongs to the same category / to one of the predominant categories.

- vey) are not necessarily monothematic, even if the text contained in the book is monothematic;
- regarding books in which it is difficult to differentiate between main and secondary subjects, because their texts fit into several literary categories, even many subjects, the question must be asked as to what is actually meant by ‘predominant’ in this case? What ‘quantity’ of texts dealing with the same subject must a book contain for it to be placed into a given book category? If the scope is too wide ranging, the book category may include books with no real connection to the subject whereas too narrow a definition, risks the exclusion of important books. In the absence of any satisfactory theoretical answer, the question is approached in a pragmatic and exploratory way, as illustrated below;<sup>16</sup>
  - it is also necessary to introduce the terms *idiothematic* and *allothematic*: these designate texts or books in which the content falls within or outside the general subject under consideration. In a multithematic text or book, if one of the major subjects as defined above is the subject under consideration, it is deemed idiothematic (in spite of the presence of other, allothematic, subjects). For the sake of euphony and when the context is unambiguous, the term *thematic* is used in lieu of *idiothematic*.

### 1.2.2 An exemplary subject: *Adversus Iudaeos* polemics

Anti-Jewish polemical books are a book category particularly well suited for depicting some of the difficulties in this approach. Indeed, it is not a clearly defined category, widely studied, characterized by specific and recurring patterns of content with the presence and order of certain texts, such as the Books of Hours for instance. On the contrary, the concept of ‘polemics against the Jews’ has not really been the subject of an ‘epistemological’ study: the field has not been clearly defined, nor have objective criteria been delineated for placing a given text or book into the anti-Jewish category.<sup>17</sup>

The first necessary step is to narrow down the subject of the books to be treated in this study. For practical purposes here the texts are considered anti-Jewish upon fulfilling the following criteria:<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. section 1.1.3 below.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Déroche 2011, 535–536.

<sup>18</sup> For this whole section, further explanations and examples can be found in Andrist 2016, 24–30.

- i. Texts, clearly identified with *Adversus Iudaeos* in their title or introduction are, of course, admitted to the corpus without hesitation: e.g. *Dialogus contra Iudaeos* by Andronicus Comnenus,<sup>19</sup> making the intent clear in the title, or the *Dialogus Timothei et Aquilae*,<sup>20</sup> which is a theological dispute between a Christian and a Jew.

This then raises the question of how to deal with texts in which the content is not in keeping with the title? The *Contra Iudaeos* for instance, attributed to Theodoret,<sup>21</sup> is not particularly anti-Jewish, or the *Obiecta Hebraeorum contra Christianos*, a polemical piece in which the Jews are merely a stand-in for the real opponent, the Iconomachs?<sup>22</sup> One may dismiss them for being off-topic, but in observing the transmission of the *Obiecta*, it becomes clear the only two known witnesses of this work are in a collection of anti-Jewish texts transmitted in two manuscripts;<sup>23</sup> clearly those responsible for this collection felt (perhaps solely on the basis of the title) that the work belonged to the category of anti-Jewish polemics.

- ii. There are also texts, many of which are quite well-known that do not appear to be *explicitly* anti-Jewish but are generally recognized as such and thus easily assimilated into the first group. For instance, the famous sermons of John Chrysostom,<sup>24</sup> though addressing Judaizing Christians, contain invectives and anti-Jewish polemics to such a degree that their inclusion in this category is fully justified.
- iii. Also included are anti-Jewish chapters situated within larger works in which anti-Jewish polemics is only one theme among several (and even perhaps a very minor theme at that), when those very chapters gained independent circulation separate from the ‘mother work’ in manuscripts. This is the case, for instance, with *Titulus 8* of Euthymius Zigabenus’s *Panoplia dogmatica*<sup>25</sup> or Chapter 31 of the *Doctrina Patrum*.<sup>26</sup> Methodologically, the distinction is made between work and text, and the texts are what is of real interests here.
- iv. Likewise, extracts of anti-Jewish passages from works containing intermittent or diffuse polemics against the Jews are included. This is in contradistinction to the

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Andrist 2016, 349.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibidem*, 361.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibidem*, 382.

<sup>22</sup> Andrist 1999.

<sup>23</sup> Andrist 2000, here 297–299.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Andrist 2016, 376.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibidem*, 368.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibidem*, 347.



previous category, where the polemical intention is clearly limited to a particular section. As the work of Heinz Schreckenberg (among others) has shown,<sup>27</sup> anti-Jewish polemics are found to varying degrees in a large number of works without always being a central theme. This is evidenced by extracts from the *Chronicle* of George Cedrenus in Barb. gr. 551 (D)<sup>28</sup>, whose thematic focus will be discussed below.<sup>29</sup>

- v. At greater risk are those texts or extracts of texts included that are not in themselves polemical—which are not presented as anti-Jewish and where anti-Jewish polemics play a mere marginal role. Nonetheless, they can be regarded as anti-Jewish for their context in a specific manuscript for having been situated within a series of texts that is explicitly anti-Jewish. This situation is comparable to that of the *Obiecta* mentioned above. To clarify this idea, a closer look at some of the extracts preserved in the second part of Vat. gr. 2658 is useful;<sup>30</sup> it consists in the following group of seven texts, comprising approximately 72 pages of a dogmatic florilegium:

**Tab. 1:** Texts in Vat. gr. 2658 in the section devoted to anti-Jewish polemics

22. (fols 246v–247v)	Leontius Neapolitanus, <i>Contra Iudaeos orationes 1-5</i> (extracts)
23. (fols 247v–252v)	Epiphanius Constantiensis, <i>Testimonia alia de Christo</i>
24. (fols 252v–259v)	Anastasius quidam, <i>Doctrina Patrum</i> , cap. 31, ‘Testimonia e Scriptura adversus Iudaeos’
25. (fols 259v–261v)	Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, <i>Catechesis ad illuminandos xii</i> (extracts)
26. (fols 261v–265v)	<i>Collectiones duae anonymae locorum e Vetere Testamento contra Iudaeos</i>
27. (fols 265v–273v, 237vr!, 274r–278v)	<i>Florilegium chrysostomicum adversus Iudaeorum observationes</i>
28. (fols 278v, 238rv!)	Eusebius Caesariensis, <i>Quaestiones evangelicae, Supplementa quaestionum ad Stephanum 9-10</i> (extract)

<sup>27</sup> See especially Schreckenberg 1999.

<sup>28</sup> The letters in parenthesis after a manuscript shelfmark designates the ‘description unit’, as explained below, to which the discussion refers / in which the relevant information is to be found; in the context of my descriptions, they designate an UniProd or an UniAut (s. below, section 2.1).

<sup>29</sup> Description in Andrist 2016, 130; cf. below section 3.3.1 and 4.4.3.

<sup>30</sup> Description in Andrist 2016, 340–345.

Texts 22 and 24-27 clearly contain anti-Jewish polemics, however, according to the division of the manuscript, no. 22, belongs to the section on icons<sup>31</sup>. And what of nos. 23 and 28? No. 23 is a collection of Old Testament testimonia intended to provide proof of the divinity of Jesus, as is often the case in *Adversus Iudaeos* polemics. This work, however, is not specifically anti-Jewish, nor does it present itself as such, its use here makes it a thematically coherent text by virtue of its context. The same stands for no. 28, which would have no obvious polemical character outside of this context.

Therefore, anti-Jewish polemic as a thematic entity flexes between an 'objective' perception of the texts (e.g. is the text in hand actually *arguing against the Jews*?) and a more subjective interpretation based on context (are the arguments presented in a text produced with no anti-Jewish intent merely used to serve polemical purposes?). Nonetheless, all manner of combinations is possible. There are in fact:

- objectively idiothematic texts used in an idiothematic context;
- objectively allothematic texts used in an idiothematic context (as in the example just observed);
- objectively idiothematic texts used in a context which to all intents and purposes is allothematic; examples of this are the extracts of Leontius or Stephen of Bostra, which are mainly known from florilegia in defence of icons;
- (the endless combination of objectively allothematic texts used in an allothematic context are of no interest here).

There are also intermediate cases (again re the *Obiecta*) where works are objectively allothematic yet their title declares them idiothematic.<sup>32</sup> Here the subjectivity and intentions of the author (or whoever gave the title) must be referred to. It is possible to say the same about certain works that mention the theme in their introduction but actually treat it only very little or not at all.

---

<sup>31</sup> The second UniProd of this codex contains a dogmatic florilegium, which is organised in three sections: a group of eight texts about the Trinity and the Christ; a group of 13 texts about the icons; a group of six texts about the Jews.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. above.

### 1.2.3 Anti-Jewish polemical books

The following definition, based on the criteria above, of an anti-Jewish polemical book may be furnished: a book that contains, either in total or in sufficiently large measure, one or more texts pertaining to the literary category of anti-Jewish polemics.<sup>33</sup>

This begs the question, what is meant by ‘in sufficiently large measure’? What ‘quantity’ of texts related to the relevant subject is required for a book to fit into that category? The answer is a practical one. After some experimentation, all books featuring at least 40% of their content to texts on anti-Jewish polemics are to be considered. This proportion enables a filtering out of all books with only marginal anti-Jewish content and avoids being limited only to books featuring anti-Jewish polemics as the majority of their content; thus books which feature the subject in a significant minority in terms of text size are not eliminated.<sup>34</sup>

As mentioned earlier, a book may have several subjects, depending on the texts it contains and its organizing principle. At this point, it is crucial that at least 40% of the book consist of texts treating this subject. In concrete terms, this proportion of polemical content corresponds to the ratio of the total number of pages containing texts pertaining to the subject to the total number of the manuscript’s written (or partially written) pages. Regarding multithematic texts the idiothematic and allothematic parts of the text are not counted separately; thus avoiding any hasty exclusion of idiothematic books. If anti-Jewish polemics are seen to be one of the main themes of a text, then all the text’s pages are considered here to be thematically relevant.<sup>35</sup>

As far as methodology is concerned it should be noted that this way of measuring does not allow for comparisons between different manuscripts unless the contents are copied by the same hand, in the same writing style, and using the same layout. But it does permit consideration of the ‘total thickness’ of the anti-Jewish polemical books within a manuscript and especially the ‘relative

---

**33** Incidentally, this definition justifies the existence of the book category at the centre of our studies (i.e. anti Jewish polemic) as discussed above (cf. section 1.2.1) and the reconstruction of the history of this book genre. A book category being determined by the category of texts it contains and the text category is anti-Jewish polemic, means therefore that anti-Jewish polemical books are a valid book category and studying the history of this genre of book is quite legitimate.

**34** At the end of the 2016’s study it is discussed whether the corpus which this limit yielded should be further refined; see Andrist 2016, 91–94.

**35** For more specific details on how to proceed, see Andrist 2016, 31, notes 48 and 49.

thickness' of the polemics—that is, the proportion of the book devoted to the subject at hand.

One advantage of this partially quantitative approach is that it frees the analyst from an overly subjective perception. If one looks at volumes in their current state, for instance, perception of what their main subject is may be influenced by the first text they contain or the kind of analysis applied to the volume. Vat. gr. 1204<sup>36</sup> for instance, begins with the *Contra Iudaeos* of Andronicus Comnenus as an independent unit and one might easily jump to the conclusion that anti-Jewish polemics are a central theme in this codex; however this is not so, for only 19% of the written pages treat this theme.<sup>37</sup>

### 1.3 The basic elements for analysis

As mentioned earlier, the object of the study was to examine a group of codices that share a common theme while paying special attention to their complexity and history. The main problem, however—and the problem that led to these investigations taking place at the outset—is the fact that most Greek and Western manuscripts of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance feature elements of complexity in their very materiality and/or in their content. These complexities are the result of elaborate processes of composition and development, during which the manuscripts underwent a greater or lesser degree of modification.<sup>38</sup>

For the research today, the problem lies in discerning the presence and the extent to which one or several 'previous' books are within the bindings the scholar has at hand—all of them may differ in extension and content from the current one—with a view to reconstructing them, if necessary, and to situating each of them in time and space as well as in their production context. Anyone wishing to evaluate the content of a medieval book at a given point in time, or to account for all the books in which the still-preserved folios once circulated (as is the case with this project), cannot do so without a rigorous inquiry into the physical and material dimensions of the volumes under consideration. This method has been developed to achieve precisely that.

---

<sup>36</sup> Description in Andrist 2016, 280–283; see also section 4.2.1 below.

<sup>37</sup> For further examples, see Andrist 2016, 31–32.

<sup>38</sup> For the underlying theory, see Andrist / Canart / Maniaci 2013, specially 59–81, and *The Syntax* §2.2–2.5.

### 1.3.1 Circulation units, production units, autonomous units, and codices

The analysis of each codex is based on the fundamental distinction between:

- A ‘production unit’ (UniProd)<sup>39</sup> meaning all the material support and the content conveyed on it as found in the volume’s present shape, results from a single act of production delimited in space and time. It is possible to define different categories of UniProds according to the increase of content and/or of material support and their material and textual autonomy regarding the other UniProds of the volume.<sup>40</sup>
- A ‘circulation unit’ (UniCirc) corresponds to a phase in the life of a codex lasting as long as all of its composite parts (both the material elements and the contents) remaining unchanged. At the basic level it is a collection of folios which circulate or have circulated together as a unit. Any change in the amount or the materiality of folios, the content, or the way they are held together results in the creation of a new UniCirc, but here distinction is made between different types of UniCircs according to the nature of these transformations.<sup>41</sup>

UniProd, UniCirc and Codex are closely adjacent (and sometimes overlapping) concepts. UniCircs can be equivalent to one UniProd (they will then be a ‘MonoProd’) or to several UniProds together (they will then be a ‘MultiProd’). They may be the result of a simple production act or a transformation of certain parts of one or more UniProds. The same folio with the same content can only belong to one UniProd but it may have belonged to many UniCircs. The making of a UniProd always results in the creation of at least one new UniCirc, but not necessarily in the making of a new codex, as it can be a small addition to an existing book.<sup>42</sup>

For this analysis, the following concepts designating different parts of a codex are also used:<sup>43</sup>

---

**39** The French forms of these abbreviations have been retained (from *unités de circulation* etc.) for consistency between the French and English versions of *The Syntax of the Codex*.

**40** See the detailed explanation in *The Syntax* §2.2.3; an earlier exposition of the theory can be found in Andrist 2015, 511–512.

**41** See the detailed explanation in *The Syntax* §2.2.5.

**42** For further characteristics cf. Andrist / Canart / Maniaci 2013, 79 and *The Syntax* §2.2.7. For a series of models demonstrating how a codex can be transformed see Andrist / Canart / Maniaci 2013, 63–81 and *The Syntax* §2.3–2.4.

**43** See also the summary tables below in section 1.4.

- *Autonomous unit*<sup>44</sup> (UniAut): a UniAut is a UniProd, or a part of a UniProd, which can stand alone potentially in terms of both its content (including the relation to its literary tradition) and its material structure. Each UniAut is therefore unitary both in its production and, potentially, in its circulation, as it does not depend on other folios or other contents. By extension, the materially autonomous UniProds, in which the scribe has obviously not completed his work, are considered to be UniAut.<sup>45</sup> This concept is particularly useful in cases where it is not possible to determine from the outset whether the object is a UniProd or an autonomously produced part of a larger UniProd, or even an indeterminate autonomous UniProd.<sup>46</sup> It also helps prevent the forcing of more or less arbitrary decisions, should any lingering doubts persist after the analysis.
- *MultiProd*: / *MonoProd*: the term *MultiProd*, already introduced above, can now be defined more precisely: this is a UniCirc resulting from the meeting of at least two materially distinct UniProds or UniAut.<sup>47</sup> A MultiProd can also be autonomous if it meets the requirements of completeness of content and material structure. Thus, a *MonoProd* is a UniCirc that presents no materially distinct UniProds or UniAut.
- A *codex* is always a UniCirc but is distinguished by the fact that any modifications that do not substantially alter the structure of the object—i.e. notes added by a reader, purely conservational interventions such as repairing or replacing the binding, or minor accidental losses—do not result in the creation of a new book.<sup>48</sup> This way of proceeding helps avoid taking more objects into account than necessary.

A few straightforward examples:

- if a scribe transcribes a series of homilies on a series of quires, binds them together, and then sells them to a buyer, he has created both a UniProd and a UniCirc, which is also a simple codex;
- if, after some time, this buyer decides to add notes in the margins of his book, he creates a new UniProd (all of his notes) and a new UniCirc (comprising both the original UniCirc and his own addition). But, while there is a

---

<sup>44</sup> For other uses of the expression ‘autonomous units’ see Andrist 2016, 34.

<sup>45</sup> For a discussion of unfinished copies, see below section 3.1.2.

<sup>46</sup> For this concept, cf. *The Syntax* §2.2.1.1.

<sup>47</sup> Or, of course, a UniProd and a UniAut. To avoid confusion, this term replaces the words *assemblage/assemblaggio*, to which different authors apply different meanings in French and in Italian.

<sup>48</sup> On the concept of book, see above n. 7.

new UniCirc in terms of content, it has not changed in terms of its material support or structure: it is still the same codex involving no MultiProd (because no new material support has been introduced)<sup>49</sup>;

- if, on the other hand, he copies out the beginning of another homily on the last folio of the final quire and adds some additional folios in order to finish his work, he has produced a new, non-autonomous UniProd, a new UniCirc, which is also a new codex and a MultiProd. His formerly simple codex has thus been transformed into a new, complex codex;
- if he finally joins the folios of his book to those of another existing UniCirc, he once again creates a new UniCirc, a new MultiProd, and a new complex book; but he has not created a new UniProd (aside from elements related to the new binding).

Thus, in order to discuss manuscript books and study their history, it is necessary to first examine the traces left in current codices, in order to recognize the different books in which the folios in the codex have previously circulated.

### 1.3.2 A working vocabulary

During research it became clear a working vocabulary was required to qualify the basic elements of analysis. Aside from its utility, this vocabulary serves as a defence against certain possible inaccuracies and ambiguities. Here are some general concepts to begin with:<sup>50</sup>

- *Perfection*: (in the etymological sense of the term) as it relates to a UniCirc: this refers to a UniCirc that is complete at the level of the content (including the literary tradition of the works it contains) and is coherent at the level of folio organization, but is not necessarily unitary at the level of production. A ‘perfect’ UniCirc contains a series<sup>51</sup> of complete pieces of content and a finished material structure, to the exclusion of any form of diminution (unless it has been restored) and any unfinished works. By definition a UniAut is potentially a ‘perfect’ UniCirc. The contrary is ‘imperfect’.
- *Independence*: this qualifies sets of folios which circulate ‘on their own’. An independent UniProd therefore denotes a UniProd that is, or was, in circula-

---

<sup>49</sup> For a presentation of different types of UniCirc, and a discussion about the relation between the concepts of UniCirc and Codex, see *The Syntax* §2.2.5 and §2.2.7.

<sup>50</sup> For examples, see Andrist 2016, 37.

<sup>51</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, the term *series* includes also cases limited to one unit.

tion, even for a very brief period. In a MultiProd it means that the independent UniProd once circulated without being accompanied by another UniProd (except perhaps for the elements of the binding or non-material UniProd such as subsequent notes). By definition, any existing UniCirc is independent (and any reconstructed UniCirc has been independent at some point in history).

- *Autonomy*, which underpins the above-mentioned UniAut, qualifies a perfect set of folios. It does not, however, indicate whether the set of folios circulated independently or not. The opposite of autonomous is non-autonomous and this concept can also apply to content and/or materiality.

As will be shown, one of the main challenges in the study of codices is when autonomous units are joined with other autonomous units of similar materiality, for the number of books to be taken into consideration depends on how their original (or former) independence is evaluated. The case studies below help provide a concrete understanding of how to interpret the concepts of independence and autonomy.

Regarding vocabulary, the following pairs have already been encountered: *monotextual* and *multitextual*; *monothematic* and *multithematic*; *idiothematic* and *allothematic*. Let us now add some further useful terms:<sup>52</sup>

- *Monograph*: a monotextual book or UniAut. A volume containing a *sylloge* or a work made up of a collection of extracts or quotations is also a monograph.<sup>53</sup>
- *Homomaterial*: describes books or parts of books bearing enough similarities to each other in terms of their writing support, their hand, and their layout, that one is compelled to consider whether or not they are part of a single production. The limits of this concept are, of course, sometimes rather difficult to define. It is sometimes necessary to speak of codices or portions of codices (thus also of UniCircs, UniProds, etc.) which are either ‘strongly’ or ‘weakly’ homomaterial to each other. Assessment of the degree of homomateriality between two objects should be carried out on the basis of careful analysis, any snap judgments here can be particularly misleading.
- *Heteromaterial*: describes books or parts of books that are noticeably different in terms of their writing support, hand, and/or layout, thus at first glance it appears highly doubtful they come from the same act of production. However, further analysis may uncover complex realities.

---

<sup>52</sup> For an example of their use, see Andrist 2016, 38–39.

<sup>53</sup> On the concept of text in this study, cf. section 1.1 above.



- *Homothematic / heterothematic*: in a similar way, these terms describe books or parts of books that either have or do not have a common subject, without further qualification as to what that subject might be. Accordingly, two idiothematic units are necessarily homothematic, while two allothematic units are not necessarily heterothematic, for they may have some third subject in common. By extension, two or more texts can be homo- or heterothematic.

It is easy to imagine numerous situations in which doubt exists as to a given volume's structural history. Sections 3 and 4 below provide a survey of such challenges.

## 1.4 Summary tables of the terms used

### 1.4.1 Relation between books or physical parts of book, text, themes and material features:

	textual aspects	thematic aspects	material aspects
one codex etc.	monotextual multitextual monograph	monothematic multithematic  athematic idiothematic allothematic	
two or more codices etc.		homothematic heterothematic	homomaterial heteromaterial
one text		monothematic multithematic athematic idiothematic allothematic	
two or more texts		homothematic heterothematic	

### 1.4.2 Relation between a codex and its UniProds / UniAutS and UniModS

	UniProd / UniAut	UniMod (cf. section 4)
book / codex	MonoProd / monounitary: contains only one (materially self-contained) UniProd	MonoMod
	UniProd / multiunitary: contains at least two (materially distinct) UniProds	MultiMod

## 2 The description of codices

### 2.1 The importance of formal description

The writing of a formal description of the codex is both the starting point and end point of the analysis of every codex. Indeed, the method here requires one first carefully and thoroughly examine the entire manuscript. It is this work of observation, imperfect as it always is, that allows a gathering of the information, be they just minor details, that will help determine the different UniProds and UniCircs. This is why a particular type of description has been developed here (set out in detail below) in which the ‘description units’ (i.e. the parts of the manuscript around which the description is organized) operate with a focus not on the codex itself but on the UniAutS or the UniProds, and at times on detached parts of UniProds. This approach makes it possible to foreground the parts that have been produced and circulated together and also helps visualize the manuscript. On this basis, together with more or less explicit chronological and geographical information about these parts, the historical relation between them can often be deduced quite easily. At the end point, the formal description concludes with remarks providing the resulting ‘diagnostic’ of the codex’s genetic and later history.<sup>54</sup> Only when all the codices have been carefully analysed can one hope to understand the history of the production and circulation of thematic books (or any other book category).

<sup>54</sup> For further details see Andrist 2016, 119–123 and the bibliography in note 1.

## 2.2 The structure of the description

According to this method, the units of description generally follow their order of appearance in the codex, so to a certain extent the formal description represents the codex analogically: first the binding, along with the flyleaves at the beginning; then the description of the UniProds or the parts thereof, each fully described separately; supplementary items, such as reader notes or labels, are in a separate subsection within the description of the unit to which they are physically attached. If the folios produced together are scattered throughout a codex (for example, from restoration), they are described together as a single UniProd, usually after the other UniProds. After the description of the flyleaves at the end, conjectures are presented for the manuscript's likely history and the proportion of polemical content in its several units.

Units of description containing idiothematic texts are described in greater detail, than the others, both in terms of content and materiality; the description of these allothematic units is primarily to assist in assessing the independence of the idiothematic units. If the structure is always the same, the implementation of the method varies according to several factors:

- the existence of a catalogue to provide non-essential information; in its absence, more details are usually provided on the manuscript, including for allothematic units;
- the importance of details in determining idiothematic books;
- the complexity of the manuscript. When the structure of a manuscript is particularly difficult to grasp, there is a two-step procedure: first, a brief description of all the series of folios that might from an initial inspection, be reasonably felt correspond to a UniProd; followed by analysis of these basic blocks to determine whether they should be grouped in terms of their production, and how they fit together in terms of their circulation;<sup>55</sup>
- time limitations.

At the level of the unit of description this results in two basic types of description:

- concerning idiothematic or potentially idiothematic units; these sections are more detailed, and each feature has its own paragraph.
- concerning the other units of description; only the features relevant to the study are used—and usually in a summary way. They are separated from each other by a single dash.

---

<sup>55</sup> For example, see the description of Vat. gr. 2220 in Andrist 2016, 301–318.

This distinction, however, is applied in a flexible manner and sometimes ‘hybrid’ descriptions or quite abbreviated ones for units of description that are far removed from the subject of the study.<sup>56</sup>

### 2.3 Inevitable subjectivity

At this point it is important to bring to mind the unavoidable degree of subjectivity involved in this work and, rather than attempt to deny or conceal this, one should strive to be aware of this subjectivity and account for it in the analysis process.

Firstly, as already mentioned, the evaluation is based on the observation and formal description of manuscripts. It is important to remember that any description of a manuscript is a permanent choice between the innumerable things one could describe and what one actually deems relevant to one’s work. It is not merely a question of consciously choosing to privilege certain elements (such as the texts and the types of ruling) while neglecting others (such as the provenance of and the defects in the parchment or the ruling systems). Among the features of the manuscript commonly subject to description some elude an objective ‘measurement’ such as writing or decoration. This also occurs regarding questions on the material features of the codex (such as the description of the types of ruling) which are always the result of interpretation and simplification. Contrary to popular belief—there is no manuscript description or catalogue that is entirely objective.<sup>57</sup>

What consequences do these bear upon the present work? They are potentially important, for in choosing not to describe a particular feature, or to describe it only briefly, there is always the risk of omitting information that could have led to recognizing an additional book or, conversely, could have prevented overestimating the difference between two parts of a manuscript.

Secondly, one cannot proceed from the formal description of a codex to the identification of the several books or remains of books concealed beneath its cover without risk. Indeed, it is often impossible to decide for certain on the basis of the initial information-gathering (to put it more simply, the current state of the codex or of the UniProds being analysed) whether a particular

---

<sup>56</sup> For example where quite allothematic UniProds are described on a single line, see the description of Ott. gr. 384 in Andrist 2016, 165–166.

<sup>57</sup> See Canart 1980 563–616 (reprinted in *idem* 2008, 579–584; see also *idem*, 2007, 1–13.

unit or ‘MultiProd’ corresponds to one (or more) former UniCircons. Some of the different types of problems will be dealt with below.

Thirdly, it has already been seen that it is sometimes difficult to recognize a text’s or book’s subject. Despite the precautions taken, the choice to retain one text and exclude another cannot always be based solely on objective data: the degree of certainty can vary a great deal, depending on the nature and quality of the information available but also on the kind of reasoning applied. Should all manuscripts be excluded when there is an element of doubt? The study shows that one would then have to limit oneself to just a handful of witnesses,<sup>58</sup> whereas a cross-evaluation of information can often provide a nuanced judgment and allow one to assess the potential for independent circulation. This is why it is useful, when creating descriptions, to ‘show one’s work’ when arriving at a particular conclusion, sometimes even factoring one’s doubts into the results by quantifying the degree of one’s certainty or lack thereof.<sup>59</sup>

From a more epistemological perspective, if objectivity is unattainable, does this mean the cataloguer has gone beyond the reach of the scientific method? This question naturally transcends codicology and is relevant to all branches of history. The response to this is a dual approach: firstly, the scholarly quality of the work done is directly related to the quality of the data extracted and the reasoning applied to them. Thus, the data must first be sufficiently reliable and suitable for the research purpose, and any objectifiable information among those deemed useful for the description, perhaps e.g. the dimensions of a page, should be given precisely. But it is also imperative to adhere to sound principles of reason and apply them rigorously. This will not result in ‘objective truths’ but in a reasonable and well-founded representation of the objects studied, enabling others to use them in a critical way and reach their own, well-founded conclusions.

The second part involves balancing out the problems of subjectivity inherent in the description of an isolated codex, no matter how precisely and systematically this is done, by carefully applying a quantitative/statistical evaluation. This second, statistical approach complements the first and is especially valuable if the available data are sufficient for the conclusions to be evaluated against larger chronological evolutions. Indeed, the analysis of isolated data makes more sense if one can determine the rarity or commonness of an object’s characteristics compared to other objects of the same period and/or the same

---

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Andrist 2016, 78.

<sup>59</sup> See, for example, the discussion below on the proportion of polemical material, section 1.2.3, as well as section 3.1.1.

typology at the time of the creation of the UniProds and the books. Conversely, statistical projections are only possible if the isolated data are sufficiently numerous and reliable and amenable to a quantitative study. In any case, the result must be compared with information obtained through traditional analytical methods, especially concerning a manuscript's non-quantifiable characteristics. Unfortunately, this ideal of data contextualisation is seldom possible for manuscript studies due to a lack of relevant quantitative studies.

### **3 The analysis of distinct production units and autonomous units**

The theoretical definitions set forth in section 2 are clear. However, early on in the course of this work a series of theoretical and practical questions arose, some of which are now to be addressed, beginning with those mostly occurring at the level of the UniProd or UniAut, considered separately from other units with which they are, or have been, combined. In section 4 problems relating to MultiProds are discussed.

#### **3.1 Questions concerning the mutilation of idiothematic books**

Two general questions about UniProds or UniAut are considered using some concrete examples.<sup>60</sup>

##### **3.1.1 Simple mutilations**

A number of UniCircs which appear idiothematic today have been mutilated at the end and/or beginning. In rare cases it is possible to see what has been lost owing to the preservation of an old table of content of the book or of the original binding. However, in the vast majority of cases it is impossible to know the original book's actual scope, which may have included several other texts and therefore have been only marginally thematic. The best approach at this juncture is to compare this unit with adjacent units and its content's literary tradition in an attempt to

---

<sup>60</sup> For a third discussion, including dismembered manuscripts, cf. Andrist 2016, 47–49.

roughly evaluate the chances of its being idiothematic. We then place it on a scale of the following values ‘very unlikely,’ ‘unlikely,’ ‘possible,’ ‘likely,’ and ‘very likely’. At times, despite one’s best efforts, the task may be beyond satisfactory analysis. Here are two examples:<sup>61</sup>

- Ott. gr. 384(1-E)<sup>62</sup> is a simple case: Andronicus Comnenus’s *Dialogus* ends abruptly at the end of the last quire and it is no longer possible to know the exact size of the original manuscript, which, had the text been complete, would have contained the last 40 chapters, now missing. However, the composite nature of the current volume and the absence of physical links with adjacent units allow one at least to consider this unit to be the remains of a possibly idiothematic UniAut, which may have circulated independently.
- According to the reconstruction of Vat. gr. 2518<sup>63</sup>, based mainly on several systems of quire signatures, unit k of Vat. gr. 2518 (which is mutilated at the beginning and almost entirely thematic) was also part of two other, older books, called ‘H’ and ‘K,’ and unit l<sup>64</sup> was also a part of these. From existing evidence one may postulate the possible existence of a fourth book (the first being the current Vat. gr. 2518) containing the current unit k without the other units or even a fifth one, containing k+l. One may therefore conclude that these last two hypothetical books may well be the remains of one or two idiothematic books. On the other hand, however, one is not in a position to form a judgment on books H and K, owing to the lack of information on the contents of lost folios.

### 3.1.2 Unfinished copies

To this it can be added that a work whose copy is visibly incomplete (that is to say, ends abruptly at an unusual or unnatural point of the text and is followed in the same quire by an empty space or another text)<sup>65</sup> is not considered a mutilated text but rather an ‘imperfect’ text. Here it is not possible to ‘reconstruct’ a larger UniProd, which would include these folios and the end of the text, for it never

---

<sup>61</sup> Further examples in Andrist 2016, 44–47.

<sup>62</sup> Description in Andrist 2016, 154.

<sup>63</sup> Description in Andrist 2016, 319.

<sup>64</sup> The lower-case letter.

<sup>65</sup> One must of course exclude cases where, in the relevant textual tradition, the text is frequently interrupted at this point—for example, to add a miniature. For the example of Vat. gr. 1152 (A), which might give the impression of being an incomplete copy but is not, see Andrist 2016, 49 n. 88.

existed save as part of the scribe's or sponsor's intended project. On determining the idiothematic nature of a text or a UniCirc, the fact that the ending is abrupt does not alter or undermine the conclusions drawn from analysis of the written text.

- This is clearly the case for Vat. gr. 719 (B)<sup>66</sup>: the copy of *Quaestio* 16 by Michael Glycas ends abruptly at the bottom of the page in the middle of a sentence. The four empty pages that followed were undoubtedly intended to accommodate the end of the text, but for unknown reasons this was never transcribed. Given, moreover, the context of the other texts of the unit, there are no reasons to question the unit's idiothematic character.
- The hybrid character of Vat. gr. 1770 (D) should also be noted:<sup>67</sup> John Cantacuzenus' text ends abruptly in the third discourse at the bottom of the verso of a folio and is followed by two empty folios, which also conclude the volume. The last quire, however, is irregular: the current quire contains six folios but the thread is located between the fourth and the fifth folios; the first four folios are written, while the two last are empty. As a result, one suspects the loss of two folios in the quire's second half (the current sewing is very tight and prevents one from being more precise about the folios' solidarity). In any case, there are two possibilities: if whatever recto that followed the cord was empty, the unit in question should not be considered a mutilated unit but rather an unfinished copy. Aside from which, if the text continued on folios now lost, one would still be dealing with a mutilation but, specifically, a mutilation of an unfinished copy (or a very particular unknown version of the text), as the two folios potentially lost in this place are not nearly sufficient to contain the normal end of the work.

These examples lead to a more general observation: in theory it is possible that any perfect<sup>68</sup> unit (whose end coincides both with the end of the complete text and the end of a volume or quire) may actually have been taken from a larger UniProd. In this sense, in fact, the UniCircs worked with here are almost always hypothetical. But there is a very good chance that whatever followed belonged to another unit, for it would have begun with a new quire. In practice, it is inadvisable to form hypotheses about things which have left no trace, so it is better to ignore these possibilities.

---

<sup>66</sup> Description in Andrist 2016, 234.

<sup>67</sup> Description in Andrist 2016, 297.

<sup>68</sup> In the above defined meaning.



### 3.2 Questions related to the ‘thickness’<sup>69</sup> of doubtful circulation units

A number of uncertain UniCircs have very few folios, leaving one to ponder whether they really could have been independent books. This question concerns the whole of book production and several problems arise during its analysis.

Firstly, many of the current volumes were assembled in libraries for the purpose of consolidating multiple, slim UniAuts. As such, it is often difficult to tell whether such uncertain UniAuts of a ‘slim’ nature ever circulated independently as a monoproduct UniCirc or whether, prior to their integration into their current volumes, they had already circulated together with other UniAuts in one or several MultiProds.

Furthermore, there are no statistical studies on the subject. Marilena Maniaci’s ground-breaking article gives no information on manuscripts of fewer than 40 folios; it also encounters the problem mentioned in the previous paragraph, for it depends directly on volumes in their present state (which are known through catalogues).<sup>70</sup>

There are simple types of bindings well suited to small books, such as ‘limp vellum bindings,’ which require only a little effort to hold a few quires together. Examples include *Bernensis* 639 (4 quires 28 folios + 2 flyleaves) and *Bernensis* 656 (3 quires, 20 folios + 4 flyleaves).<sup>71</sup> One may further wonder whether uncertain UniCircs consisting of a single quire might easily have circulated without binding, especially when the first folio, if left free, could serve as natural protection (see below).

Examination of the five clearly distinct UniProds belonging to the thematic corpus studied here, with a ‘thickness’ of 40 folios or less, tends to indicate the very likely existence of extremely ‘slim’ books. These two examples are pertinent here:<sup>72</sup>

- Ott. gr. 189 (E)<sup>73</sup>: 1 quire, 10 folios; the old numbering (beginning at 1) starts on the second folio; the first folio is empty. This autonomous unit, whose ‘thickness’ is a single quire, is heterothematic and heteromaterial with its

---

<sup>69</sup> In the absence of a proper equivalent this rather less-than-ideal term is used in place of the Italian *consistenza*.

<sup>70</sup> Maniaci 2004, 93–99.

<sup>71</sup> See the catalogue Andrist 2007, 268–271 and pp. 278–281.

<sup>72</sup> Other examples in Andrist 2016, 50–52.

<sup>73</sup> Description in Andrist 2016, 135.

adjacent units. This is an example of a UniProd which very likely circulated on its own.

- Vat. gr. 1770 (D)<sup>74</sup>: 4 quires, 32 folios; the quires are independently numbered; the last quire is apparently incomplete, perhaps mutilated, but the copy of the text is clearly unfinished.<sup>75</sup> The presence of an empty folio at the unit's beginning, the positioning of the quire mark on the unit's second folio (for it to correspond to the beginning of the text), and its being thematically and materially different from the preceding units, all emphasize the autonomy of the unit, which was clearly designed to be able to circulate independently. As this is an unfinished copy, one can only guess that was the case.

### 3.3 Questions related to the idiothematic character of certain texts

#### 3.3.1 Texts not clearly idiothematic

As mentioned above, it is sometimes difficult to assess the idiothematic character of certain texts. The following is one of the two cases encountered:<sup>76</sup>

- In Barb. gr. 551 (D),<sup>77</sup> the question is whether or not the extracts of George Cedrenus, which go beyond the strictly anti-Jewish part of the work, actually constitute an idiothematic text? Or do they simply reflect a more general interest in the Christian history of the period they cover? This section's polemical dimension is reinforced by certain details: the scribe has placed a series of general index notes in the margins and in the upper margin has added three notes of an anti-Jewish character flanked by small decorations. In addition, there are many 'pointing hands' in the lateral margins of fols 55v–58r (containing a polemical section) in an ink corresponding to that of the scribe. It can be deduced from these peculiarities that the idiothematic dimension of this excerpt was most likely the scribe's central concern, though alternative explanations cannot be excluded.

---

<sup>74</sup> Description *ibidem*, 297.

<sup>75</sup> See above, section 3.1.2.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Andrist 2016, 53.

<sup>77</sup> Description *ibidem*, 130.

Such texts which are not clearly idiothematic and cast doubt on the idiothematic character of the UniCirc are luckily rare, as these ambiguous texts themselves are rare and generally brief, and because the focus here is on units where idiothematic texts occupy a significant place. It is significant that the two cases encountered occur in 'slim' units. The threshold of 40% permits the elimination of a small series of idiothematically fuzzy texts found in largely allothematic UniCircs.

### 3.3.2 The subject and the intention of the authors

As explained above, the partially quantitative approach also safeguards against excessive subjectivity in the definition of anti-Jewish polemical books. This does not, however, obscure the question of how a text's subject is connected to the intention of the person who commissioned the book.

- For example, Vat. gr. 1727 (B)<sup>78</sup> and Reg. gr. 43 (A)<sup>79</sup> are monographs containing the *Disputatio Gregentii*, and could well have been copied in honour of the saint for someone with no particular interest in anti-Jewish polemics. In this case the primary intention of the person(s) responsible for the volumes is difficult to determine. If interest was focused on Gregentius, why was this episode chosen? But, why would it not be, as his victorious debate against the Jews was perceived as one of the most important moments of his career? The problem is not so easily solved as interest in either of these themes need not be exclusive of the other, and interest may differ from one reader to the next. Hence the importance of considering this volume as an idiothematic, multithematic book.
- This kind of problem, however, does not arise with all monographs for which the author's idiothematic intention is clear, e.g. Andronicus Comnenus's *Dialogus contra Iudaeos* in Vat. gr. 685 (A).<sup>80</sup>

In multithematic, multitextual units, by contrast, this sort of situation is quite common and difficulties in analysis can decrease if it is possible to be guided by the plurality of themes. Here are two examples:<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Cf. above and the description in Andrist 2016, 288.

<sup>79</sup> Description *ibidem*, 180.

<sup>80</sup> Description *ibidem*, 215. By definition, in a monograph (a book with one text), the themes of the book equals (or at least includes) the themes of the text thus the thematic intention of the authors, independently of any other intention of the book producers (i.e. those who are responsible for the content of a specific codex as well as its physical features).

- In the Ott. gr. 414 (B)<sup>82</sup> the *Dialogus Timothei et Aquilae* and the *Disputatio de Anima* are both literary dialogues composed in a question-and-answer format. The question posed is whether the person who commissioned or compiled this book<sup>83</sup> was interested in anti-Jewish rhetoric, or only in this kind of dialogues? Again, the two are not mutually exclusive, nor are the two possibilities on the same literary level. Furthermore, the two pieces are very different in length and the *Disputatio*, which occupies only about 5% of the volume, can be considered a complement to the first text. In this Uni-Aut, the anti-Jewish polemic clearly occupies a dominant place and seems to match the primary interest of the person who commissioned the volume.
- Thematically, Reg. gr. Pii II 47<sup>84</sup> is divided into two parts: one is grammatical, the other idiothematic. The whole has a polemical proportion of 41% and one cannot discern any textual theme common to both parts. A book subject does exist, however, as Filippo Ronconi explains, ‘the goal of the scribe [...] was to compose a useful handbook for training a good monk’.<sup>85</sup> This manuscript is therefore also an important witness to the pedagogical function of anti-Jewish polemic at this time and therefore the current volume can be deemed entirely idiothematic.

Too few examples exist to establish a general rule and some cases are doubtful, but there are sufficient instances where it can be easily argued that anti-Jewish polemic was intentional on the part of the person responsible for the unit.

## 4 Evaluating MultiProds composed of autonomous units

MultiProds composed of UniAuts pose particular interpretive problems. Indeed, as already mentioned, according to a commonly used but not yet satisfactorily documented manufacturing technique, the byzantine codex producers were able to make their manuscript books from small collections of quires, each con-

---

<sup>81</sup> For additional examples, cf. *ibidem*, 55–56.

<sup>82</sup> Description *ibidem*, 74.

<sup>83</sup> Also called ‘originator’ in the terminology developed at the CSMC.

<sup>84</sup> Description *ibidem*, 192.

<sup>85</sup> Ronconi 2009, 104: ‘le but du copiste [...] était de constituer un manuel fonctionnel pour la formation du bon moine’.

taining a certain amount of texts or coherent parts of texts (meaning that each quire ended with the end of a text or of a book or of a chapter, etc.) which were then combined together. These so-called ‘modular units’ (or UniMod)<sup>86</sup> thus formed the book’s basic ‘building blocks’ and the identification of UniMods offers an important insight into the process of making ancient books. It is often the case that the content of these UniMods (or series of juxtaposed UniMods) is entirely autonomous with regard to its literary or book tradition, potentially allowing them to circulate independently with ease. Such UniMods (or the juxtaposed series) are then also UniAuts.

Faced with a MultiProd, at least two problems arise:

- a. Firstly, how to distinguish, on the one hand, the UniAuts which have never circulated independently having been directly combined with other units in the producer’s workshop, and on the other, those that are quite likely earlier books or remains of books. One must always evaluate the likelihood of independent circulation, and in providing a tentative answer to this question it is essential to analyse the relevant units carefully.
- b. Whatever the answer to the question of circulation, the second problem involves the idiothematic value of the MultiProd, as will be explained. To deal with this question, cases are excluded, from the outset, where the collection’s ‘thematic proportion’ does not reach the threshold of 40%, and MultiProds are classified according to the material and thematic relationships between their constituent units.

#### 4.1 The idiothematic scope of new MultiProds

In cases where a MultiProd consists of one or more formerly independent units and anti-Jewish polemical texts occupy at least 40% of the current written surface, is it possible to automatically infer that the MultiProd constitutes a new idiothematic book?

- On the one hand, it is a fact that, from a statistical point of view, this MultiProd meets the criteria presented above and should therefore be counted as a new idiothematic book.
- On the other, it seems equally important to take the transformational dynamics into consideration: if the unit (or units) with which a thematic unit is combined in the new volume is allothematic and does not influence the perception of the idiothematicity of the thematic unit, one must conclude

---

<sup>86</sup> On the concept of ‘modularity’ and the ‘modular unit’ see Maniaci 2004.

that the new book's 'idiothematic scope' is no different from that of the previous book and, despite a proportion above 40%, he or she should not consider it a new idiothematic book. Otherwise, small thematically irrelevant additions to the book's content will result in a statistically confusing multiplication of pseudo new idiothematic codices, while, in reality, no new idiothematic books were created, as the case of Vat. gr. 1727, presented below, illustrates.

- But if, despite this other unit's allothemacity, one perceives the polemic in the idiothematic unit now to be set in a new perspective, one should conclude that a new idiothematic book has been created, as illustrated by the case of Vat. gr. 719, presented below.

As mentioned above, the challenge, regarding a book with an idiothematic origin that has been enriched over time by small pieces unrelated to the subject, is not to multiply our count of idiothematic books. Here are two examples:<sup>87</sup>

- In Vat. gr. 719<sup>88</sup> the addition of an anti-Saracen text (unit A) to the independent anti-Jewish anthology (unit B + C) adds a new perspective to the anti-Jewish polemic in the latter. One can say that the collection's idiothematic scope is now different from what it was in unit B + C and conclude that a new idiothematic book has been created.
- By contrast, in Vat. gr. 1727<sup>89</sup> the polemical perspective of unit B, containing the *Disputatio Gregentii*, has not, in my opinion, been altered by being placed alongside musical and geometrical treatises in unit A. Therefore, A + B do not constitute a new polemical book, in spite of its polemical proportion of 60% far exceeding the 40% mark.

What remains at this point is to discuss the different types of situations encountered in codices of the corpus under scrutiny and assess the relevant UniAutS according to their thematic and material proximity.

---

<sup>87</sup> For the less clear-cut case of Barocci 33, cf. Andrist 2016, 58.

<sup>88</sup> See below and the description in *ibidem*, 234.

<sup>89</sup> See the description *ibidem*, 288.

## 4.2 Combinations of idiothematic units with allothematic, heteromaterial units

First are the considerations of combinations of idiothematic UniAuts and allothematic, heteromaterial UniAuts.

### 4.2.1 The independence of idiothematic units

When an idiothematic unit has circulated independent of the others, it must be treated as an independent book. However, this independence (and the full content of this previous UniCirc) is not always easy to determine, as mentioned above, and as the manuscripts in the Vaticana's corpus with Andronicus Comnenus's *Dialogus* illustrate (s. below Table 2):

- At first glance Vat. gr. 724 (A)<sup>90</sup> seems to present a simple situation: this unit is distinct from the manuscript's other units by its theme, hand, and layout. But on closer inspection the case is more complicated: the units' heteromaterial nature is very slight, since unit B, which uses two kinds of paper, seems to share one type with unit A and the other type with unit C. Moreover, unit A's scribe, Manuel Provataris, was a colleague at the Vatican Library of Franciscus Syropoulos, the scribe of units B and C. One could argue further that the other units' allothematicity, which at face value seems unrelated to anti-Jewish polemics, is uncertain.<sup>91</sup>
- Reg. gr. Pii II 13, Vat. gr. 1204, and Vat. gr. 1663 show strong similarities to Vat. gr. 724 in terms of the content, the writing support, and/or the scribes, as the table above shows.<sup>92</sup> Of particular note is the presence of Andronicus Comnenus's *Dialogus* at the beginning of each of the four codices and the use of the 'Zonghi 1690' paper<sup>93</sup> in three of them; those three are also written in the hands of scribes orbiting around the Vatican Library.<sup>94</sup>

<sup>90</sup> See the description *ibidem*, 130.

<sup>91</sup> See *ibidem*, 59.

<sup>92</sup> Description of these codices *ibidem*, 188, 245, 280, 284.

<sup>93</sup> Zonghi / Zonghi / Gasparinetti 1953. This paper has a watermark 'man with a halo kneeling before a cross' ('*homme, auréolé, agenouillé devant la croix*'). Since the publication of the celebrated second edition of the watermark albums by Charles-Moïse Briquet in 1923, it is customary to designate the watermarks in French; both designations are given here.

<sup>94</sup> For further examples and a more detailed analysis see *ibidem*, 59–62; on the publication of 'Comnenus+' books, see also 104–107.

Tab. 2: Volumes beginning with Andronicus Comnenus's *Dialogus*

	Reg. gr. Pii II 13	Vat. gr. 724	Vat. gr. 1204	Vat. gr. 1663
Unit A	c.1552–1562 / Rome <i>ut videtur</i> Watermark 'Zonghi 1690'	c.1552–1562 / Rome Watermark 'Zonghi 1690' + crossbow ( <i>arbalète</i> ), cf. B and Pii II 13 (B)	c.1552–1562 / Rome Watermark: 'Zonghi 1690'	c.1559–1569 / Venice Watermark: ladder ( <i>échelle</i> )
	Rhesinos (cf. B) <b>Comnenus,</b> <b><i>Dialogus</i></b>	Provataris <b>Comnenus,</b> <b><i>Dialogus</i></b>	Provataris (cf. C) <b>Comnenus,</b> <b><i>Dialogus</i></b>	Tourianos <b>Comnenus,</b> <b><i>Dialogus</i></b>
Unit B	16 <sup>th</sup> cent. <sup>3/4</sup> / Rome? Watermark crossbow ( <i>arbalète</i> ), related to Vat. gr. 724 (A)	16 <sup>th</sup> cent., ante 1567 / Rome Watermark: cross- bow ( <i>arbalète</i> ) (also like A)	c.1560–1567 / Rome Misc. watermarks different from A	1560–1570 / Venice Watermark: angel ( <i>ange</i> )
	Rhesinos (cf. A)  <i>luridica</i>	Syropoulos (cf. C, D)  <b><i>Exegetica biblica</i></b>	Provataris (and Syropoulos) <b><i>Catena exegeticae</i></b>	Myrocephalitis  <b><i>Exegetica patristica</i></b>
Other Units	—	Units C and D Syropoulos (cf. B) et al. <i>Hom. in Act. Apost.</i> <i>De catenis s. Petri</i>	Unit C Provataris (cf. A)  <i>Historica</i>	—
Overall polem. rate	49%	40%	19%	63%

In summarising the study of these codices, the following points crop up: *between* volumes there is a certain parallelism in the content and *within* volumes there is a certain connection between the scribes; but, by contrast, *within* a volume a certain weakness in the material correspondence between the two or three UniAut's can be noted, especially in regard to paper and/or layout, and *between* volumes, except for the first UniAut, there is only a vague similarity of the content. All in all, the differences in content are too significant to regard these books as a single editorial project repeated three or four times. As a result, each volume cannot be seen as a single UniProd, as a UniProd encompasses all the material support and the content pro-



duced within the same editorial project.<sup>95</sup> As a result, it is preferable to consider each of these UniAuts as a different UniProd.

It should be added furthermore, that no example of a UniCirc (or even of a probable UniCirc) containing the text of Andronicus Comnenus only has been found, and the first units of the four manuscripts can therefore not easily be considered previous UniCircs. On the contrary, they appear to correspond to a type of ‘Comnenus + something’ book (or a ‘Comnenus +’ type), perhaps responding to the idea that this text should not circulate unaccompanied. This would be a particular type of ‘undetermined UniProd’.

What idiothematic value do these MultiProds have? For Vat. gr. 724, at the limit of what is considered a significant proportion, it is unfortunately not possible to determine whether units A + B + C were once a MultiProd circulating independent of D. The situation is even more difficult for Vat. gr. 1204, as the overall proportion is only 19% and no evidence has been found to determine whether A + B circulated independently of C, which is allothematic but also copied by Provataris. It is impossible to decide. For Vat. gr. 1663 and Reg. gr. Pii II 13, however, the overall polemical proportion far exceeds 40%.

As observed more generally, even in cases where heterothematic and heteromaterial units are grouped together, a closer analysis of the volume or a comparative analysis with other volumes can lead one to refrain from identifying separate books.

#### 4.2.2 The idiothematicity of MultiProds

And what of the idiothematicity of UniCircs in which formerly independent idiothematic units are joined with allothematic and heteromaterial UniProds? The issue has already been discussed with regard to the manuscripts presented above. For UniCircs whose resulting polemical proportion is less than 40%, the question does not arise. Vat. gr. 1727, containing the *Disputatio Gregentii*, was already discussed above in section 4.1; here is a similar example:

- In Vat. gr. 688<sup>96</sup> the later addition of two folios (unit A) containing the table of content of Constantine Harmenopoulos’s *Hexabiblos* does not change the polemical scope of unit B and thus does not result in the creation of a new idiothematic book.

<sup>95</sup> See Andrist / Canart / Maniaci 2013, specially 59–81, and *The Syntax* §2.2–2.5.

<sup>96</sup> Description in Andrist 2016, 230.

These two examples do not result in a change in the book count. In practice, such cases are rarely found.

### 4.3 Combinations of idiothematic units with other idiothematic units

There is an equally simple situation with idiothematic autonomous units that are more or less homomaterial (i.e. units which treat similar subjects and are materially similar in their writing support, script, and/or layout) and one sometimes wonders not only whether they ever circulated independently, but whether they might have been produced from the very beginning as a single book and are therefore are parts of a same UniProd.

- Taking the example of the *Venice Adversus Iudaeos* Collection, which has, always in the same order, the following three polemical texts: the *Disputatio Gregentii*, the *Eclogae Veteris Testamenti de sancta Trinitate et de Incarnatione*, and the *Dialogica polymorpha antiiudaica*.<sup>97</sup> It is found in four manuscripts of the sixteenth century, including in the ‘edition’ produced by Manuel Malaxos in Venice in the 1560s and preserved in the Ott. gr. 267 and Vat. gr. 687, as well as in a manuscript list copied by Malaxos in codex Vall. B. 106.<sup>98</sup> In this edition he added the *De gestis* in Perside as a fourth text.<sup>99</sup>
- By contrast, the two idiothematic units of Reg. gr. 43,<sup>100</sup> which also contain the *Venice Adversus Iudaeos Collection*, were copied by two different hands in a slightly different layout and are for the most part heteromaterial: the only real connection is with the paper, because all of the papers feature various watermarks ‘hand’ (*main*); they show some similarities but the initial impression of at least one identical series of watermarks being present in both units could not be confirmed. In addition, the dating of the paper makes it possible to situate the copy of unit B in the first third of the sixteenth century, in other words at least 25 years before Malaxos was active, whereas unit A is datable (less precisely) to the first half of the century. These units therefore do not play a role in the edition mentioned above, even if the core contents are the same. Given these conditions the first two

<sup>97</sup> On these texts, see *ibidem*, 364, 365, 359.

<sup>98</sup> Description of the manuscripts *ibidem*, 150, 224; on the list, *ibidem*, 101–103.

<sup>99</sup> On this ‘edition,’ the *Venice Collection* in general, and other related manuscripts, see Andrist 2016, 63–66, 99–104.

<sup>100</sup> Description *ibidem*, 180.

units of the *Reginensis* are probably two separate books.<sup>101</sup> The current codex, however, contains two other UniProds which are allothematic (C and D) and were copied by two other scribes and are perhaps older than the previous ones. There is no physical evidence to suggest that the two idiothematic units ever circulated together (separate from the two allothematic units of the same current codex) or that either of these is from the same copy project as either of the idiothematic units.

Working then with the hypothesis of an independent circulation of a MultiProd A + B, it is possible to argue that the didactic works contained in unit D give a catechetical colour to unit A + B, although the presence of unit C, which contains an astronomical text, is difficult to explain within this set. Added to the fact that the monk Dorotheus has left his name on units A and D, but not on C (nor on B, but here a circulation that already has A + B grouped together is being considered),<sup>102</sup> it is also possible to ask whether a unit A + B + D (without C) circulated; in which case such a unit would be 88% idiothematic.

Another hypothesis is that the four units circulated independently and were joined at the same time; this combination would change how the polemics were situated in A and B and give birth to a new book which would be 84% idiothematic.

These examples show once again that, even when idiothematic autonomous units are combined, a more careful analysis may produce more nuanced conclusions. However, it has been verified in a more general and unsurprising way that the chances of dealing with separate books are significantly reduced when the homomateriality is strong and the series of texts is part of a documented book tradition.

#### 4.4 Combinations of idiothematic units with allothematic units which are completely or partially homomaterial

The more difficult situation of MultiProds is to be approached in which an idiothematic UniAut is accompanied by one or more allothematic UniAut's that are more or less homomaterial, that is to say they share marked affinities in their script, material support, layout, etc. The evaluation of an independent circulation

---

**101** Certain similarities in layout with Vat. gr. 687 (B), however, mean that one should not too hastily exclude the possibility of a connection to a common ancestor; cf. *ibidem*, 103.

**102** Cf. 'Remarques sur l'histoire du manuscrit' in the description, *ibidem*, 186–187.

of the idiothematic UniAut must now also take into account the material relations between it and the other units.

#### 4.4.1 The manuscripts of John Cantacuzenus

The preserved codices containing both John Cantacuzenus' anti-Saracen texts and his anti-Jewish works can help understand the problem.<sup>103</sup> Here is a single example:

- The case of Vat. gr. 2574 (I)<sup>104</sup> is quite simple: this codex is composed of two heterothematic UniAut's, clearly separated by empty folios at the end of A and the beginning of B on a new quire. Both, however, were copied by Manuel Tzycandylis, partly on the same paper, on 23 lines. Moreover, there do not seem to be any traces of autonomous numbering of the quires in B. Given that there is a strong separation between the two UniAut's and that the two works do also circulate independently, it could be possible the scribe chose to produce these two units as 'indeterminate autonomous UniProds', to allow for different types of circulation and to postpone deciding on their final combination. It is also possible he did so on the instructions of John Cantacuzenus himself, for whom he worked. But, given the material similarities, it is unlikely that these two UniAut's circulated independently and were then joined together by some accident, even though one cannot entirely exclude a scenario in which a person interested in the works of Cantacuzenus acquired the two units at different times and bound them into a single volume. It can therefore be concluded that there is only one probable original UniCirc and one book, with a polemical proportion of 41%.

#### 4.4.2 Non-independent UniProds

It is now possible to analyse instances when a UniAut, does not stand out particularly conspicuously from a volume's other UniProds and is unlikely to be a former UniCirc. As the example here demonstrates:<sup>105</sup>

- In Barb. gr. 360,<sup>106</sup> which is almost entirely given over to the works of Cyril of Alexandria, one suddenly finds *Titulus* 8 of the *Panoplia dogmatica* of Eu-

**103** On these manuscripts and their production 'as a series' in the fourteenth century, Gumbert 2018; see as well Andrist 2016, 67–69, 95–99 and, more generally, Mondrain 2004.

**104** Description in Andrist 2016, 328.

**105** For further examples see *ibidem*, 69–70.

thymius Zigabenus on a particularly slim UniAut E (2 quires, 16 folios). This unit might easily be considered foreign to the whole, had it not been copied by the same hand as the others—on similar paper and with a similar layout. Moreover, in the main work of unit D, devoted to christological questions, the biblical anti-Jewish polemic is an important part of Cyril's argument<sup>107</sup> (but not enough to make the UniProd idiothematic) and this unit concludes with an excerpt from Gregory of Nyssa found in the current volume just before the *Panoply*, which then begins with an extract attributed to this same Gregory. Upon further consideration it surely cannot be a coincidence that unit E is located at this place: the chances that a later owner had the idea and the means of inserting here a copy of the *Panoply* executed by the same hand as the rest of the manuscript and on similar paper are practically zero. Consequently, unit E does not constitute an independent UniCirc and the polemical proportion of the book, consisting of the six homomaterial units, is only about 9%.

#### 4.4.3 Unclassifiable UniProds

Most situations, however, are less clear-cut. Here is an example:<sup>108</sup>

- Barb. gr. 551 (D),<sup>109</sup> which is idiothematic despite the reservations discussed above, was copied by Antonios Episcopopoulos, as was unit C, which precedes it. This latter unit containing, among other things, *Quaestio* 137 of Pseudo-Athanasius and *Quaestiones* 7-8 of Anastasius, is also relevant for the theme under consideration but only in a weak proportion (23%) and must be interpreted in the context of the other polemical texts it contains, especially those against the Latins. Moreover, the differences in paper and layout and the presence of an independent numbering in the quires of D (which in itself is not sufficient to demonstrate an independent circulation for this unit) attest to distinct autonomous productions. Hence the question of an independent circulation arises for each of the two units, whereas a common circulation of C + D, independent of A and of B, is attested by an earlier foliation. As things currently stand, it is difficult to decide but there are no reasons to see units C and D as having been planned and produced together. Perhaps an analysis of the margi-

<sup>106</sup> Description *ibidem*, 125.

<sup>107</sup> Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Contra eos qui Theotocon nolunt confiteri* (ed. E. Schwartz 1929), 19–32; cf. §§15–17, 19–21, (27,) 29, 25–32.

<sup>108</sup> For further examples, see Andrist 2016, 71–73.

<sup>109</sup> Description in Andrist 2016, 130; see also section 1.2.2 above.

nalìa and a better knowledge of the manuscript's history, in particular the Barberini's acquisition of it or of its parts, will offer a more complete picture.

Under the hypothesis of an independent circulation of C and D, only D would constitute an idiothematic book.<sup>110</sup> However, the joining of C and D would place D's anti-Jewish polemic in a new perspective and create a new thematic book (a proportion of 66%). How then is one to consider the current volume, which comes from their combination with A + B and presents a polemical proportion of 52%? Units A and B are exegetical and concern the books of Ecclesiastes and Nahum; if it is confirmed that anti-Jewish polemics play no particular role in them, it would be quite inadvisable to consider their union with C + D (at the same time or one after the other) as creating one or more new thematic books.

#### 4.4.4 Independent UniProds

In this corpus no case was found where, despite a homomateriality between the units, it was possible to show conclusively that the units first circulated independently from one another, though an independent circulation of Ott. gr. 410 (B) is very likely.<sup>111</sup> The scenario of a collector of Cantacuzenus's works was also sketched out above;<sup>112</sup> in cases where owners regularly bought or ordered manuscripts from the same scribes, they necessarily found themselves in possession of separate UniCircs that were in part homomaterial. The example of Ott. gr. 189 and Ott. gr. 384<sup>113</sup> shows how these kinds of units could already have been circulated under the same binding by the sixteenth century, following the principles of a regrouping which are largely elusive.

## 5 Conclusion

At the final point of this overview it becomes evident that all the problems raised in the codicological study of thematic books have by no means been covered. Nonetheless, it is hoped that the potential of this two-step analysis of each codex has been demonstrated: firstly, in scrupulously distinguishing between UniProds (and their subsets) and UniCircs; secondly, in evaluating the resulting UniProds

---

**110** See above, section 3.3.1.

**111** See Andrist 2016, 71–72.

**112** See above, 4.3.1.

**113** Description in Andrist 2016, 135 and 157.

and UniAuts in terms of their content and material reality in order to assess the possibilities of them having been circulated independently or as parts of other, past codices (which may today be preserved as subsets of current codices).

Further results of the study can also be briefly summed up:

By the end of this study it was found that only 29 of the 33 codices in the corpus contained thematic books (these thematic books totalling 42). Among these, 19 are probably or very likely idiothematic, 18 are possible, while five are very unlikely. This also allowed a series of interesting codicological remarks on the distribution of polemical books in the current volumes.<sup>114</sup>

As mentioned above, the ultimate goal was to draw a rough history of this book genre, and this research suggested the usefulness of an exploratory statistical study for that purpose:<sup>115</sup> in summary, the intention has been to give a quantitative account of the chronological evolution of the production of anti-Jewish polemical books written in Greek. This first led to all sorts of questions about how to deal with doubts, especially situations where an imprecisely datable UniProd might be assigned to two subsequent centuries; efforts were also made to quantify and factor the probabilities of book existence into the values ('possible,' 'probable,' etc.) expressed above.<sup>116</sup> On the methodological level the result is convincing, but even by including in this survey the books housed in other libraries than the Vatican Library, the statistical basis is not sufficient to yield reliable results.

Finally, three particularly fertile historical contexts for the production of idiothematic books<sup>117</sup> were analysed and full advantage taken of all the information accumulated during this study to supplement or further nuance the preliminary observations in the article 'Physiognomy of Greek Manuscript Books *Contra Iudaeos* in the Byzantine Era'.<sup>118</sup>

This study has highlighted the kinds of results which this method claims. It is very much hoped that the answers will prompt the analysis of other sets of thematic books and stimulate further reflection.

---

**114** See *ibidem*, 78–80.

**115** Also in the footsteps of Maniaci 2004.

**116** Andrist 2016, 74–91.

**117** *Ibidem*, 94–107.

**118** *Ibidem*, 107–114; cf. Andrist 2011.

## References

- Andrist, Patrick (1999), 'Les *Objections des Hébreux* : un document du premier iconoclasme?' in *Revue des études byzantines*, 57: 99–140.
- Andrist, Patrick (2000), 'Pour un répertoire des manuscrits de polémique antijudaïque,' in *Byzantion*, 70: 270–306.
- Andrist, Patrick (2007), *Les manuscrits grecs conservés à la Bibliothèque de la Bourgeoisie de Berne – Burgerbibliothek Bern. Catalogue et histoire de la collection*. Dietikon, Zurich: Urs Graf.
- Andrist, Patrick (2011), 'The Physiognomy of Greek *Contra Iudaeos* Manuscript Books in the Byzantine Era: A Preliminary Survey' in R. Bonfil / O. Irshai / G. G. Stroumsa et al. (eds), *Jews in Byzantium: Dialectics of Minority and Majority Cultures* (Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 14; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 549–585.
- Andrist, Patrick (2016), *Les codex grecs adversus iudaeos conservés à la Bibliothèque Vaticane (s. xi–xvi). Essai méthodologique pour une étude des livres manuscrits thématiques* (Studi e Testi, 502), Città del Vaticano. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Andrist, Patrick (2018), 'Toward a definition of paratexts and paratextuality: the case of ancient Greek manuscripts' in Liv Ingeborg Lied / Marilena Maniaci (eds), *Bible as Notepad: Tracing Annotations and Annotation Practices* (Manuscripta Biblica, 3); Berlin: De Gruyter, 130–150.
- Andrist, Patrick / Maniaci, Marilena (forthcoming), 'La "Syntaxe du codex" cinq ans après : quelques mises à jour terminologiques à propos du 'codex' et du 'bifolio'.
- Andrist, Patrick / Paul Canart / Marilena Maniaci (2013), *La syntaxe du codex* (Bibliologia, 34): Turnhout: Brepols.
- Andrist, Patrick / Paul Canart / Marilena Maniaci (forthcoming), *The Syntax of the Codex*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Canart, Paul (1980), 'De la catalographie à l'histoire du livre. Vingt ans de recherches sur les manuscrits grecs' in *Byzantion*, 50: 563–616 (reprinted in *idem, Etudes de paléographie et de codicologie* (Studi e Testi, 450 (2008)), [523]–[576]).
- Canart, Paul (2007), 'Consigli fraterni a giovani catalogatori di libri manoscritti' in *Gazette du livre medieval*, 50: 1–13.
- Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Contra eos qui Theotocon nolunt confiteri* ed. E. Schwartz; CPG 5226; Acta conciliorum Oecumenicorum 1.1.7; Berlin, Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1929.
- Déroche, Vincent (2011), 'Forms and Functions of Anti-Jewish Polemics: Polymorphy, Polysémy' in R. Bonfil / O. Irshai / G. G. Stroumsa et al. (eds), *Jews in Byzantium: Dialectics of Minority and Majority Cultures* (Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 14), Leiden, Boston: Brill, 535–548.
- Corbellini, S. / Murano, G. / Signore, G. (eds) (2018), *Collecting, Organizing and Transmitting Knowledge. Miscellanies in Late Medieval Europe* (Bibliologia, 48), Turnhout: Brepols.
- Gumbert, Johan Peter (2018), 'Manuscript Editions: Manuel Tzycandyles, Scribe, and John Cantacuzene, Author' in Lucien Reynhout / Benjamin Victor (eds), *Librorum Studiosus. Miscellanea palaeographica et codicologica Alberto Derolez dicata* (Bibliologia, 46), Turnhout: Brepols, 173–186.
- Friedrich, Michael / Schwarke, Cosima (2016), 'Introduction – Manuscripts as Evolving Entities', in Michael Friedrich / Cosima Schwarke (eds), *One-Volume Libraries: Composite and Multiple-Text Manuscripts* (Studies in Manuscript Cultures, 9), Berlin: De Gruyter, 1–26.
- Maniaci, Marilena (2004), 'Il codice greco 'non unitario'. Tipologia e terminologia' in E. Crisci / O. Pecere (eds), *Il codice miscellaneo. Tipologie e funzioni. Atti del convegno internazionale (Cassino, 14–17 maggio 2003)*, (Segno e testo 2), Cassino, 75–107.



- Maniaci, Marilena (2018), 'Miscellaneous Reflections on the Complexity of Medieval Manuscripts,' in S. Corbellini et al. (eds), *Collecting, Organizing and Transmitting Knowledge. Miscellanies in Late Medieval Europe* (Bibliologia, 48), Turnhout: Brepols, 11–22.
- Mondrain, Brigitte (2004), 'L'ancien empereur Jean VI Cantacuzène et ses copistes' in A. Rigo (ed.), *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino* (Orientalia Venetiana 16), Firenze: Olschki, 249–296.
- Olivier, Jean-Marie (1995), *Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues de manuscrits grecs de Marcel Richard* (Corpus Christianorum), Turnhout: Brepols, 3rd edition.
- Ronconi, Filippo (2009), 'Quelle grammaire à Byzance ? La circulation des textes grammaticaux et son reflet dans les manuscrits' in G. De Gregorio / M. Galante (eds), *La produzione scritta tecnica e scientifica nel Medioevo: libro e documento tra scuole e professioni. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Fisciano-Salerno, 28–30 settembre 2009* (Studi e ricerche, 5), Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 63–110 + tav.
- Schreckenberg, Heinz (1999), *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld* (Europäische Hochschulschriften series 23, vols 172, 335, 497; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (1.–11. Jh.), 1991, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (11.–13. Jh.), 1994 (13.–20. Jh.).
- Zonghi, Augusto / Zonghi, Aurelio / Gasparetti, Andrea Frederico (1953), *Zonghi's Watermarks*, (Monumenta chartae papyraceae historiam illustrantia 3), Hilversum: Paper publications Society.

