

Introduction

The interest in the activity of Andronikos Kallistos arose at the end of the nineteenth century within the frame of Émile Legrand's pioneering works on Byzantine scholars of the Renaissance.¹ Over decades, researchers have glimpsed the depth of Kallistos' erudite personality towards a comprehension of his role at the critical time of the *translatio studiorum*, i.e. the transfer of ancient Greece cultural heritage to Italy and hence all of Europe. However, it has only been possible to deepen the knowledge on this scholar after identifying a fair number of manuscripts as the work of his hands.²

Dieter Harlfinger's studies on Greek scribes of the Renaissance³ and Ernst Gamillscheg's investigations on the manuscripts preserved at the Biblioteca Estense Universitaria of Modena⁴ first broadened the list of the books attributed to the work of Andronikos. The findings of Elpidio Mioni⁵ with regard to Besarion's collaborators validated these attributions by recognising in further samples Kallistos' hand, even though admitting to the coexistence of two writing-styles. In this respect, Ole Langwitz Smith⁶ had questioned many attribution proposals made by Gamillscheg, assuming that Kallistos was allegedly assisted by an anonymous collaborator (*Anonymus Mutinensis*) whose handwriting resembled that of Kallistos. Not long after Gamillscheg's reply,⁷ Kallistos' and *Anonymus*' identity was to be confirmed by Guido Avezzù:⁸ his intervention therefore put an end to the *querelle* about the existence or non-existence of this *Anonymus*.⁹

Still, the issue of the variability of Kallistos' hand has remained unsolved for the time being. In other words: should the hypothesis of a *synchronic* coexistence of two graphic styles be confirmed or should one instead look at this phenomenon as at a transformation of a handwriting through its various phases? In the

1 Legrand 1885 and Legrand 1892.

2 Diller 1967.

3 Harlfinger 1971, Harlfinger 1977, and Harlfinger 1974. The attribution to Andronikos of a single annotation at fol. 1r of the manuscript Laur. 71.3, proposed in *Aristoteles Graecus* 1976, 226, proved to be wrong.

4 Gamillscheg 1978. All of the identifications presented in the article by Gamillscheg turned out to be correct, with the exception of manuscripts Mutin. α U.9.1 and Mutin. α V.7.14, in which no trace of Andronikos' hand is found.

5 Mioni 1976.

6 Smith 1986.

7 Gamillscheg 1983.

8 Avezzù 1989–1990.

9 For a detailed account of this *querelle*, see Tessier 2015b, 186–188.

first chapter of his monograph about the scribal activity of Markos Musuros, David Speranzi framed the problems modern scholars are faced with when approaching the study of fifteenth-century handwritings.¹⁰ As Speranzi evokes — quoting some remarks by Giuseppe De Gregorio —, cases of synchronic and diachronic variability are particularly thorny, namely those of ‘parallel coexistence, in the writing of a single scribe, of very different models, calligraphic and cursive’.¹¹ The examples adduced by Speranzi are well known to scholars dealing with fifteenth-century copyists’ hands: 1. the calligraphic style of the prolific Cretan scribe Iohannes Rhosos in contraposition to a less accurate writing style, which a famous letter in his hand sent to his friend Iohannes Plusiadenos clearly displays; 2. the so-called *scholarly hand* of Theodoros Gazes, characterized by an extremely cursive (and quite ‘nervous’) *ductus*, which is at first glance incompatible with his usual minuscule as well as with the ‘pseudo-majuscule’ employed in the famous Homer Laur. 32.1;¹² 3. the different expressions of the writing of Konstantinos and Ianos Laskaris, both active over decades in Italy. As Speranzi claimed, the distance between graphic manifestations of a same hand has meant that several scribes of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries have seen some of their products assigned to their ‘palaeographic Doppelgänger’; such attributions have often been shown at a later time as devoid of historical consistency.¹³ This was the case with Markos Musuros, to whom the authorship of some manuscripts attributed to a mysterious Μάρκος Ἰωάννου has been denied for a long time.¹⁴ And this has been, for many years, the case of Andronikos Kallistos too, to whom Ole Langwitz Smith insisted on attributing solely the Vat. gr. 1314 (i.e. the only witness ‘subscribed’ by him, dating 12 March 1449). One of the purposes of this book is therefore to demonstrate the *diachronic* nature of the graphic variability of Andronikos’ hand, thus dispelling any doubt about the coexistence of two styles.

Dieter Harlfinger and Ernst Gamillscheg are credited with most of the attributions that ended up in the entry on Kallistos in the *Repertorium der griechischen*

¹⁰ Speranzi 2013, 11–25.

¹¹ See Speranzi 2013, 13. The quotation is from De Gregorio 1995, 428 (‘parallela coesistenza nella scrittura di un unico copista di modelli di apprendimento assai distanti, calligrafico-posati e corsivi’).

¹² See Speranzi 2012.

¹³ Speranzi 2013, 15: ‘E proprio la distanza tra le diverse attestazioni di una stessa mano [...] ha fatto sì che diversi scribi dei secoli XV e XVI abbiano visto alcuni dei propri prodotti assegnati a loro “doppi paleografici”, rivelatisi poi privi di consistenza storica’.

¹⁴ A decisive contribution towards the identification between the figures of Musuros and Μάρκος Ἰωάννου is Speranzi 2015b.

Kopisten (RGK).¹⁵ In more recent times, other scholars – such as Stefano Martinelli Tempesta, who is drawing up the inventory of the Greek copyists present in manuscripts now kept at the Biblioteca Ambrosiana¹⁶ – have consistently enriched and broadened the perspective by means of several identifications (see below Table 0.1).¹⁷

Table 0.1: Manuscripts copied, restored and/or annotated by Andronikos Kallistos: Current state of research.

	Manuscript / Document	Fols / Intervention	Attribution
1.	Athonita Ἰβήρων 161	restoration	Tselikas 1976 (reprinted in Tselikas 2004, 620)
2.	Berolinensis Hamilton 270	<i>marginalia</i>	Harlfinger (<i>infra</i> , § 3.5.3)
3.	Berolinensis lat. fol. 199	<i>marginalia</i>	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 2.3.1)
4.	Berolinensis lat. fol. 850	<i>marginalia</i>	Rollo 2020a, 129
5.	Bononiensis 2638	initials and titles in red ink	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 2.1.1.2)
6.	Cantabr. Univ. Libr. Nn.III.18		Diller 1967, 408
7.	Cantabr. Emm. Coll. Libr. 30		Diller 1967, 408
8.	Comensis 1.3.19	151r–206r	Stefec 2010, 71
9.	Cremonensis 130	1r–9v, 56r–57v, 62r–64v	Harlfinger 2000, 764
10.	Erlangensis A 4	1r–70v, 72r–99v, 209r–264v	Harlfinger 1971, 413 / corrections in <i>Aristoteles Graecus</i> 1976 (Harlfinger)
11.	Scorialensis Σ.III.1	<i>marginalia</i>	Martínez Manzano 2018, 380

¹⁵ RGK I 18 = II 25 = III 31.

¹⁶ Martinelli Tempesta 2013.

¹⁷ See e.g. Rollo 2006a; Stefec 2014; Orlandi 2014a and 2014b; Martinelli Tempesta 2015a; Speranzi 2016b; Speranzi 2018; Rollo 2020a; Orlandi 2020c. In a recent article by David Speranzi, sections of the manuscripts Marc. gr. Z. 199 and Par. gr. 2086 which were previously attributed to Kallistos have appropriately been ascribed to Iohannes Sophianos; see Speranzi 2016a, 89–91.

	Manuscript / Document	Fols / Intervention	Attribution
12.	Ferrara, Arch. Bentivoglio, Patrim., busta 6, fasc. 35	signature	Gentile 1992, 299
13.	Laurentianus 32.46	<i>marginalia</i>	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 5.3.1)
14.	Laurentianus 58.1	<i>marginalia</i>	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 1.3.4)
15.	Laurentianus 60.16	92r–97v	Harlfinger 1971, 413
16.	Laurentianus 66.31	<i>marginalia</i>	Orlandi 2014a, 165
17.	Laurentianus 72.20	<i>marginalia</i>	<i>Aristoteles Graecus</i> 1976, 254 (Harlfinger)
18.	Laurentianus 74.12	35r–39r, 43r–44v	RGK I 18
19.	Laurentianus 85.21	restoration	Speranzi 2016b, 62
20.	Laurentianus Ashb. 1144		Todd 1994, 70
21.	Laurentianus Ashb. 1599	1r–150r	Todd 1990, IX / Todd 1994, 70
22.	Florent. Riccardianus 46	<i>marginalia</i>	Martinelli Tempesta 2016a, 224
23.	Florent. Magliab. B.2.35	<i>marginalia</i>	Speranzi 2018, 194
24.	Forlì, Bibl. Com., Raccolte Piancastelli, Sez. Autografi secc. XII–XVIII		Perosa 1953, 8; Orlandi 2014a, 167
25.	Hauniensis GkS 1570,4°	<i>marginalia</i>	Schartau 1994, 125
26.	Cracov. Berol. gr. qu. 73	1r–23r	Harlfinger (in Orlandi 2020c)
27.	Lipsiensis gr. 33	restoration	Stefec 2014, 176
28.	Lipsiensis gr. 34	restoration	Stefec 2014, 176
29.	Londinensis Burney 109	<i>marginalia</i>	RGK I 18 / corrections <i>infra</i> , § 5.3.1
30.	Ambrosianus A 185 sup.	228v–243r	Martinelli Tempesta 2013, 108

	Manuscript / Document	Fols / Intervention	Attribution
31.	Ambrosianus D 78 inf.	<i>marginalia</i>	Martinelli Tempesta 2013, 108 / Orlandi 2014b, 187
32.	Ambrosianus E 99 sup.	<i>marginalia</i>	Martinelli Tempesta 2013, 108
33.	Ambrosianus H 52 sup.	1r–133v	Harlfinger 1971, 413
34.	Ambrosianus I 56 sup.	1r–242v	Harlfinger 1971, 413 / Orlandi 2014b, 154
35.	Ambrosianus L 35 sup.	1r–8v	Martinelli Tempesta 2013, 108
36.	Ambrosianus P 84 sup.		Martinelli Tempesta 2013, 108
37.	Mutinensis α P.5.19	2r–43r	Gamillscheg 1978, 232
38.	Mutinensis α P.5.20	corrections	Harlfinger 1971, 413
39.	Mutinensis α P.6.13		Harlfinger 1974, 25
40.	Mutinensis α Q.5.20		Gamillscheg 1978, 232
41.	Mutinensis α Q.5.21		Harlfinger <i>apud</i> Gamillscheg 1978, 232
42.	Mutinensis α T.8.3	<i>marginalia</i>	Harlfinger 1971, 413
43.	Mutinensis α T.8.13		Harlfinger 1974, 25
44.	Mutinensis α T.8.20		Gamillscheg 1978, 232
45.	Mutinensis α T.9.1		Harlfinger 1971, 413
46.	Mutinensis α T.9.2	68r–98r, <i>marginalia</i>	Harlfinger 1974, 25
47.	Mutinensis α T.9.14		Harlfinger 1974, 25
48.	Mutinensis α U.5.1		Gamillscheg 1978, 232
49.	Mutinensis α U.9.3	119v and <i>marginalia</i>	Harlfinger 1971, 413
50.	Mutinensis α U.9.10	restoration	Harlfinger 1974, 25
51.	Mutinensis α U.9.18	initials and titles in red ink	Gamillscheg 1978, 232
52.	Mutinensis α U.9.22		Gamillscheg 1978, 232

	Manuscript / Document	Fols / Intervention	Attribution
53.	Mutinensis α V.7.1	1r–61r	Gamillscheg 1978, 232
54.	Mutinensis α V.7.17	52r–129v	Harlfinger 1974, 25
55.	Mutinensis α W.2.1	1v–2v	Harlfinger 1974, 25
56.	Mutinensis α W.5.5	<i>passim</i>	Gamillscheg 1978, 232; corrections <i>infra</i> , § 6.1
57.	Mosquensis Sinod. gr. 267		Fonkič 1981, 124
58.	Mosquensis Sinod. gr. 370	restoration	Fonkič 1981, 124
59.	Mosquensis RGADA Φ 1607, Matthaei 15	1r–39v lin. 10	Fonkič 1981, 124
60.	Monacensis gr. 332	<i>marginalia</i>	Harlfinger 1971, 413
61.	Neapolitanus II.D.9	<i>marginalia</i>	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 2.3.1)
62.	Oxon. Barocci 63	<i>passim</i>	Diller 1967, 408; corrections <i>infra</i> , § 6.2
63.	Oxon. Barocci 76	initials and titles in red ink	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 2.1.1.2)
64.	Oxon. d'Orville 115		Diller 1967, 408
65.	Oxon. Holkham Hall gr. 71	restoration	Diller 1967, 408
66.	Parisinus gr. 1644	38r–59v	RGK II 25
67.	Parisinus gr. 1811	<i>marginalia</i>	Brockmann 1992, 27
68.	Parisinus gr. 1852	<i>marginalia</i>	Harlfinger 1971, 413
69.	Parisinus gr. 1878	25rv, 27r–162v	RGK II 25
70.	Parisinus gr. 1879		RGK II 25
71.	Parisinus gr. 1890	restoration	RGK II 25
72.	Parisinus gr. 1908	<i>marginalia</i>	Vogel and Gardthausen 1909, 30 / corrections in Diller 1967, 408
73.	Parisinus gr. 2038		Diller 1967, 408
74.	Parisinus gr. 2046	97r–173r, <i>marginalia</i>	RGK II 25

	Manuscript / Document	Fols / Intervention	Attribution
75.	Parisinus gr. 2066		RGK II 25
76.	Parisinus gr. 2069		Harlfinger 1971, 413
77.	Parisinus gr. 2346	1r, 84r lin. 13–166v	RGK II 25
78.	Parisinus gr. 2715		RGK II 25
79.	Parisinus gr. 2772	<i>marginalia</i>	Orlandi 2020c, 480
80.	Parisinus gr. 2998	<i>marginalia</i>	Orlandi 2014b, 165
81.	Parisinus gr. 3011	<i>restoration</i>	RGK II 25
82.	Parisinus lat. 17542	<i>graeca</i>	Gentile <i>apud</i> Speranzi 2016a, 213
83.	Parisinus Suppl. gr. 66	75r–78v, 83r–90r	RGK II 25
84.	Parisinus Suppl. gr. 255	<i>marginalia</i>	Alberti 1967, 14
85.	Parisinus Suppl. gr. 541	11r–136r, 155r–201r, 202r–353r	Harlfinger 1971, 413; additions in RGK II 25
86.	Parisinus Mazarine 4453	<i>marginalia</i>	RGK II 25 / corrections <i>infra</i> , § 6.2
87.	Perusinus H 19	titles in red ink	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 5.2.3.3)
88.	Turinensis Accad. di Scienze, Lettere e Arti, NN.V.7	50rv	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 2.4.1)
89.	Salmanticensis 230	titles in red ink	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 5.3.1)
90.	Vaticanus Barb. gr. 161	<i>restoration</i>	Speranzi 2016b, 64
91.	Vaticanus Barb. gr. 163	<i>marginalia</i>	Speranzi (<i>infra</i> , § 2.2.2)
92.	Vaticanus Borg. gr. 12	<i>marginalia</i>	RGK III 31
93.	Vaticanus Chis. H.V.159	<i>graeca</i>	Rollo 2006a, 378
94.	Vaticanus Ott. gr. 52	<i>marginalia</i>	RGK III 31 / corrections in Rollo 2006a, 376 n. 1
95.	Vaticanus Ott. gr. 181	<i>marginalia</i>	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 2.3.1)
96.	Vaticanus Ott. gr. 355	1r–12r	RGK III 31

	Manuscript / Document	Fols / Intervention	Attribution
97.	Vaticanus Pal. gr. 142	titles in red ink	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 2.2.1)
98.	Vaticanus Ross. 1025	Xv–18v, 21r–33v, 37r–292v	Harlfinger 1971, 413
99.	Vaticanus Urb. gr. 151	<i>marginalia</i>	RGK III 31
100.	Vaticanus gr. 13	<i>marginalia</i>	RGK I 18
101.	Vaticanus gr. 249		Harlfinger 1971, 413
102.	Vaticanus gr. 257		Harlfinger 1971, 413
103.	Vaticanus gr. 593	<i>marginalia</i>	RGK III 31
104.	Vaticanus gr. 1314		Vogel and Gardthausen 1909, 30
105.	Vaticanus gr. 1324	<i>restoration</i>	Stefec 2014, 176
106.	Vaticanus gr. 1950	<i>marginalia</i>	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 5.3.2)
107.	Vaticanus gr. 2189	<i>marginalia</i>	RGK III 31
108.	Vaticanus gr. 2201	<i>marginalia</i>	Harlfinger 1971, 413
109.	Vaticanus gr. 2207	<i>marginalia</i>	Orlandi 2020c, 478
110.	Vaticanus lat. 1532	<i>graeca</i>	Rollo 2006a, 370
111.	Marcianus gr. Z. 10	382r–409r	Diller 1967, 408
112.	Marcianus gr. Z. 186	216r–274v	Diller 1967, 408
113.	Marcianus gr. Z. 190	1r–270v	Diller 1967, 408
114.	Marcianus gr. Z. 192	1r–44v	Diller 1967, 408
115.	Marcianus gr. Z. 198		Diller 1967, 408
116.	Marcianus gr. Z. 223	118r–123r, 171r–228v	Harlfinger <i>apud</i> Liakou-Kropp 2002, 267
117.	Marcianus gr. Z. 226	<i>marginalia</i>	Orlandi (<i>infra</i> , § 2.3.1)
118.	Marcianus gr. Z. 238	62r–124r	Mioni 1976, 298
119.	Marcianus gr. Z. 337	additions	Harlfinger <i>apud</i> Liakou-Kropp 2002, 282

	Manuscript / Document	Fols / Intervention	Attribution
120.	Marcianus gr. Z. 374	1–127v, 128v–166r, 167r–242r	Mioni 1976, 298 / corrections <i>infra</i> , § 2.1.1
121.	Marcianus gr. Z. 518	additions	Harlfinger <i>apud</i> Liakou-Kropp 2002, 311
122.	Marcianus gr. Z. 522	161r–176v, 181r–210v	Mioni 1976, 298
123.	Marcianus gr. Z. 527	1r–9v, 11r–14v, 16rv	Diller 1967, 408
124.	Marcianus gr. Z. 611	46r–243v	Mioni 1985a, 537
125.	Marcianus gr. VII 5	<i>marginalia</i>	Mioni 1985b, <i>addenda</i>
126.	Vind. Hist. gr. 78		Hunger 1961, 85
127.	Vind. Suppl. gr. 23	restoration	Hunger and Hannick 1994, 48
128.	Vind. Theol. gr. 163	<i>marginalia</i>	Hunger, Kresten and Hannick 1984, 253

The research on Andronikos' scholarly activity however remains fragmented into many isolated contributions,¹⁸ mainly concerning some specific chapters of the manuscript tradition of classical Greek and Byzantine authors. Fragmentation is indeed the hindrance to achieving a complete picture of his work as a teacher and philologist.

In this framework, by adopting a systematic and synergistic approach to historical, philological, codicological, and palaeographic data, I intend with this monograph study to accomplish the following:

1. outline an updated biography, which in essence reproduces Giuseppe Cammelli's account,¹⁹ the short contribution by Emilio Bigi notwithstanding²⁰ (Chapter 1);

¹⁸ See e.g. sections of the following works: Alberti 1967; Donadi 1976; Resta 1978; Fera 1997; Serra 1979–1980; Martinelli Tempesta 1995, Martinelli Tempesta 1997 and Martinelli Tempesta 2015a; Tessier 2003; Tessier 2015b; Tarán 2016; Golitsis 2022; Muratore 2022.

¹⁹ Cammelli 1942.

²⁰ Bigi 1961.

2. better define Andronikos' scribal activity by means of a thorough examination (by autopsy) of all surviving manuscript sources which have been transcribed, restored or simply annotated by him (Chapter 2);
3. attempt to reconstruct the development of Kallistos' book collection by tracing its growth and then following its fate after the sale (Chapters 2 and 3);
4. acknowledge Andronikos' scholarly activity both as a teacher for Greek language and literature and as a philologist (Chapters 4 and 5);
5. make an inventory (with codicological, palaeographic, historical, and bibliographical data) of all the manuscripts which bear traces of his writing (Chapter 6);
6. publish Andronikos' works (Appendix).

Formal matters

The identification of copyists' handwriting, whenever it is proposed for the first time in this book, is marked by angle brackets <...> as it is usual in reference works about Greek palaeography; the same brackets are used for the first identification of dates and places. The numbering of tables and figures restarts at every chapter. Quotations in Greek and Latin, when not translated, are paraphrased; when extracted from manuscripts or archival documents, both Greek and Latin quotations follow the spelling used in the source.

Acknowledgements

This volume is a revised version of my PhD thesis (University of Hamburg, 2017). First and foremost, I would like to express special appreciation and thanks to my supervisor, Christian Brockmann, for encouraging my research on the manuscripts of Andronikos Kallistos. Undertaking a PhD experience in Hamburg has been a wonderful challenge, which would not have been possible without his constant and unconditional support. His Greek Palaeography class in 2012 kindled my interest in manuscript studies and I can never be thankful enough to him for the influence this had on my early career.

Very special thanks go to the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD) for giving me the great opportunity to carry out my doctoral research in Germany with generous financial support.

I would like to express here my gratitude also to the institutions which hosted my research at the University of Hamburg and to their members. At the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures (CSMC) I had the opportunity to give presentations at every stage on my project. For comments, enlightening suggestions, and

kind support I am grateful to all of my colleagues. To Michael Friedrich, as director of CSMC, and to Oliver Huck, who coordinated the Graduate School of which I was member, go my special thanks for strongly believing in this work from the very beginning. Moreover, I would like to thank the whole staff of the Institut für Griechische und Lateinische Philologie, in whose library this project was mostly carried out in the years 2014–2017.

I owe a sincere debt of gratitude to distinguished scholars, colleagues, and friends for stimulating discussions and insightful comments: Michele Bandini, Giuseppe De Gregorio, Dieter Harlfinger, Klaus Lennartz, Stefano Martinelli Tempesta, Teresa Martínez Manzano, Paola Megna, David Speranzi, Giuseppe Ucciardello, Stefano Valente.

Heartfelt thanks also to Carole Bould, Caroline Macé, Simone Mucci, Stev Talarman and Paraskevi Toma who helped revise this book. Additionally, I wish to acknowledge the contributions of Dominika Herbst and Florian Ruppenstein (De Gruyter publishing house) regarding the improvement of coherence and content presentation of the book. Any remaining inaccuracies are entirely my responsibility.

Finally, my warm thanks go to Antonio Rollo for allowing me to grow as a researcher. His invaluable comments, suggestions, and hard questions accompanied me at every stage of this work.

