



**HAL**  
open science

# The Letters of Phalaris, between Manuscripts and Editio Princeps

Émeline Marquis

► **To cite this version:**

Émeline Marquis. The Letters of Phalaris, between Manuscripts and Editio Princeps. Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 2023, The Aldine Edition of the Greek Epistolographers, 99 (1), pp.57-70. 10.7227/BJRL.99.1.6 . halshs-04376365

**HAL Id: halshs-04376365**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-04376365v1>**

Submitted on 6 Jan 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - ShareAlike 4.0 International License

**Title**

The Letters of Phalaris, between manuscripts and *editio princeps*

**Name and affiliation**

Émeline Marquis

CNRS, Paris

(Laboratoire Archéologie et Philologie d'Orient et d'Occident, CNRS/PSL University)

**Abstract**

This paper deals with the Letters of Phalaris, a large corpus of 148 letters contained in the second volume of the Aldine edition of the Greek epistolographers. It explores the role of the Aldine edition in the transmission of these letters and mainly focuses on its sources. Building on the works of Tudeer and Sicherl, it determines the text on which the Aldine is based, its position within the manuscript tradition, while stressing the remaining uncertainties: the Aldine is an editorial construction, conflating the text of two different classes of manuscripts with the text of the *editio princeps* from 1498; its main sources are a close parent to the now lost London manuscript Harl. 5610 and a copy from the Heidelberg manuscript Pal. gr. 356 (and not necessarily the antigraphon of the Vatican manuscript Pal. gr. 134 as Sicherl thought); Marcus Musurus might have used another corrective manuscript.

**Key words**

Letters of Phalaris; codicology; manuscript tradition; Aldine; printer's copy; Marcus Musurus

## **The Letters of Phalaris, between manuscripts and *editio princeps***

The corpus of the letters of Phalaris comprises 148 letters attributed to Phalaris, the pseudohistorical tyrant of sixth century Sicily. This pseudepigraphic collection raises many questions;<sup>1</sup> one of them concerns the organisation of the letters in the collection. Indeed, the number of letters and their order vary greatly in the manuscript tradition, and the original arrangement of the letters – if there ever was one – remains a mystery. As a consequence, the choices made in the previous editions and their ordering of the letters deeply influence the way we interpret this collection. Among these editions, the Aldine plays a very special role.

The letters of Phalaris are in the second volume of the Aldine edition of the Greek epistolographers published in April 1499. They are placed between Isocrates' and Brutus' letters, and fill 38 and a half folios. They begin with the title φαλάριδος ἐπιστολαὶ τυράννου ἀκραγαντίνων and end with the mention τέλος τῶν φαλάριδος ἐπιστολῶν.

Unlike other epistolary collections in the Aldine, the text of the Letters of Phalaris is not (or only partly) the *editio princeps*: an edition of 139 letters along with the letters of Brutus and Apollonius had been published only a few months before, on the 18th June 1498, in Venice, by Bartholomaeus Pelusius, Gabriel Bracius de Brisighella (a former employee of Aldus Manutius), Johannes Bissolus and Benedictus Mangius. However, after a conflict with Aldus Manutius and the ensuing lawsuit, the partnership was dissolved and the ten-year privilege they had obtained for the 1498 edition likely lapsed.<sup>2</sup>

In this chapter, I look at the role of the Aldine edition in the transmission of the letters of Phalaris. I mainly turn to the 'roots' of the Aldine: which text is the Aldine based on and what is its position within the manuscript tradition of the Letters of Phalaris? With this particular case within the thirty-five epistolary collections gathered in the Aldine,<sup>3</sup> I want to explore whether the existence of a former and competing edition 'changes the picture'.

### **The letters of Phalaris in the Aldine edition: an editorial construction**

The manuscript tradition of the letters of Phalaris is huge and attests to their popularity. The letters of Phalaris are transmitted in at least 132 manuscripts written between the tenth and the eighteenth century.<sup>4</sup> The number of the letters varies greatly from one manuscript to the other. While some manuscripts transcript only one or two letters, other contain almost the whole corpus (a Vatican manuscript, Reg. gr. 104, from the second half of the fifteenth century, even contains twice 139 letters). Interestingly, no single known manuscript transmits the same number of letters in the same order as the Aldine edition. Therefore, the Aldine introduces a

break in the transmission of the letters of Phalaris. And this also implies that the corpus of letters as well as the text given by the Aldine is an editorial construction (or reconstruction). Where does this ordering of the letters come from? Is it possible to trace which manuscripts were used to produce the Aldine edition of the letters of Phalaris?

Lauri Tudeer, in his seminal study “The Epistles of Phalaris. Preliminary investigation of the manuscripts” published in 1931, first noticed that Marcus Musurus, the editor of the Aldine, had combined several manuscripts in his preparation of the edition.<sup>5</sup> Tudeer observed that the Aldine had the beginning (letters 1–84) as in class A of the manuscripts, the end as in class C (letters 122–148), where letters 77–119 also occur in the same order. I will come back to Tudeer’s different classes of manuscripts in the last part of this paper.

His results were further developed and supplemented by Martin Sicherl in his thorough study *Griechische Erstaussgaben des Aldus Manutius* (1997).<sup>6</sup> Sicherl proposed the following reconstruction: for the first part of the Aldine edition of the Phalaris’ letters, that is for letters 1–77, Marcus Musurus used the antigraphon of the Vatican manuscript Pal. gr. 134 (hereafter Pal. gr. 134) as printer’s copy (*Druckvorlage*) and a close relative of the London manuscript Harley 5610 (hereafter Harl. 5610) as checking copy (*Korrektivexemplar*); for the second part, that is for letters 78–148, Musurus followed the *editio princeps* of 1498 and used the two manuscripts as checking copies.

Pal. gr. 134<sup>7</sup> is a paper manuscript of 307 folios measuring 217 x 155 mm. In addition to Aelian’s *Varia Historia* and several rhetorical texts, the manuscript contains numerous letter collections. It is dated to the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century and is the work of four scribes, who used the same watermarked paper (“balance”, Briquet 2538): 1) fos 7r–58r, Aristoboulos Apostolis;<sup>8</sup> 2) fos 59r–126v and 149r–172r, Phanourios;<sup>9</sup> 3) fos 127r–148v, 173r–180v and 223r–290v, Pseudo-Hieronimus;<sup>10</sup> 4) fos 181r–222r and 293r–305r, a scribe from the circle of Aristoboulos Apostolis?<sup>11</sup> This manuscript was probably copied in Venice.<sup>12</sup> It might have belonged to Giovanni Calturnio, before entering, probably through Henry Scrimgeour (see fol. 1r, ‘*Hen.* 134’), the library of Ulrich Fugger and from there the Palatine library, before finally reaching Rome.<sup>13</sup>

Harl. 5610<sup>14</sup> is all that remains of Scorial. IV.E.18, a manuscript of mainly epistolary content, which disappeared in the fire at El Escorial in 1671. Twenty years before the fire, Matthias Palbitzki, sent on a diplomatic mission by Queen Christina of Sweden, had stolen the last thirty-three folios of the manuscript (folios 185–217), thus saving them from disaster.<sup>15</sup> This paper manuscript, measuring 217 x 150 mm, contained 217 folios.<sup>16</sup> Dating from the end of the thirteenth century,<sup>17</sup> it had an abundance of descendants between the fourteenth and the

sixteenth centuries.<sup>18</sup> 140 letters of Phalaris were included in the missing part, starting from folio 129r. The manuscript is said to have belonged to Pedro de Toledo, Marquess of Villafranca.<sup>19</sup> The Harley fragment was acquired in 1725, it had belonged to the classical scholar J. G. Graevius.<sup>20</sup>

The antigraphon of Pal. gr. 134 is unidentified (Sicherl considers it as lost)<sup>21</sup> and the part of Harl. 5610 that contained the letters of Phalaris is definitely lost. To reconstruct their content, we have to rely on their copies, Pal. gr. 134 itself and the Vatican manuscript Vat. gr. 1309.

Vat. gr. 1309<sup>22</sup> is a small manuscript (175x130 mm) copied on oriental paper. It consists of two volumes: vol. 1, fos 1–168; vol. 2, fos 169–318. A first hand copies Plutarch's *Moralia* from folio 3r to folio 208v (the copy is incomplete) and a second hand several epistolary collections (letters of Phalaris, Anacharsis, Brutus, Chion, Euripides, Hippocrates) from folio 213r to folio 315v. Between the two, a long note in Latin indicates the contents of the volume and its provenance.<sup>23</sup> Long dated to the second half of the fourteenth century,<sup>24</sup> Vat. gr. 1309 is in fact earlier than 1300, as Inmaculada Pérez Martín has shown:<sup>25</sup> scribe 2 (fos 213r–315v) is one of Planudes's pupils who participated in the copy of the Ambrosian manuscript C 126 inf. of Plutarch and the copy predates Plutarch's Planudean *recensio* of 1295. Vat. gr. 1309 was acquired by Cyriac of Ancona at the Iveron monastery on Mount Athos in November 1444.<sup>26</sup> It then passed into the library of his nephew, and later into that of Fulvio Orsini.<sup>27</sup>

Fresh collations of these two manuscripts, Pal. gr. 134 and Vat. gr. 1309, allow us to test further Sicherl's hypothesis and refine his general description of the Aldine's manuscript sources, while highlighting the remaining uncertainties and, therefore, the limits of this reconstruction.

### **Looking for the roots of the Aldine: Pal. gr. 134, Vat. gr. 1309 and the *editio princeps***

If we examine the first part of the Letters of Phalaris in the Aldine edition (letters 1–77), it turns out that, in the vast majority of the cases, the Aldine contains the readings of either Pal. gr. 134 or Vat. gr. 1309.

It is possible to be more specific: The text of the Aldine is closer to the text of Pal. gr. 134. But the manuscript also comprises a lot of spelling errors and other graphical errors along with numerous small omissions which do not appear in the Aldine. While it is possible that Marcus Musurus got rid of these errors with his corrective manuscript, it rather suggests that his model (the antigraphon of Pal. gr. 134 according to Sicherl) was less faulty.

Nonetheless, the names of the letters' recipients were modified according to the checking copy: They are usually identical to those given by Vat. gr. 1309. For example, the Aldine edition and Vat. gr. 1309 have letter 2 Μεγαρεῦσιν ὄνειδιστική, 8 Σαμέα, 18 Ἐρυθία, 32 Κριτοφήμω, 34 Πολυδεύκει, 39 Πολυστράτῳ, 48 Μενεκλεῖ, 51 Ἐτεονίκῳ, 55 Θρασήνορι; in Pal. gr. 134, however, the recipients of these letters are 2 Μεγαρεῦσιν, 8 Ἀμαία, 18 Εὐρυθεία, 32 Κριτοδῆμω, 34 Νικίππῳ, 39 Ἀράτῳ, 48 Μενεμάχῳ, 51 Ἐτερονίκῳ, 55 Τιμοσθένει. In letter 37 and 56 the Aldine edition has Γοργία and Ἀβάριδι respectively, while in Pal. gr. 134 the name of the addressee is not given.

If we now look at the second half of the Letters of Phalaris (letters 78–148), it is clear that the text of the Aldine edition is extremely close to that of the *editio princeps* of 1498. When Marcus Musurus changed his model of copy, he took over the letters in the order in which they appeared in the *editio princeps*. Firstly, he copied letters 78–119. Then, he left out letters 22, 25, 62, 36, 37, 43 and 59 which he already had from his previous model, but added instead letter 120, which in the *editio princeps* had been placed after letter 35. Lastly, he copied letter 121, left out letter 66 and 33 (already present in his previous model) and finished the edition with the group 122–148. In many letters, the text of the *editio princeps* and that of the Aldine are identical. The corrections made after the checking copies are minimal.

A few elements seem to indicate that the *editio princeps* is used as a model starting from letter 78:

(Remark: I give the letter number, followed by the line number according to Hercher's edition; the name of the addressee is counted as line 1, and I start again the numbering for each letter. For reasons which will be clarified below, Pal. gr. 356 is mentioned in the following lemmas, along with Pal. gr. 134.)

**78,13** μαρτυρούντων 356 134 1309 Hercher: προσμαρτυρούντων *ed. princ.* Ald (as noted by Sicheŕl)

**79,9** εἴσονται 356 134 1309 Hercher: ἔσονται *ed. princ.* Ald

**80,4-5** εὐρήσετε *ed. princ.* Ald Hercher: εὐρήσεται 356 134 1309

**80,7** εἰμαρμένης *ed. princ.* Ald Hercher: om. 356 134 1309

**81,3** ὑμῖν ταύτην 356 1309 Hercher: ταύτην ὑμῖν *ed. princ.* Ald ταύτην 134

**81,5** τοῦ γὰρ ἀληθῶς ἔχειν 356 134 1309 Hercher: τοῦ γὰρ μὴ ἀληθῶς ἔχειν Ald τοῦ γὰρ ἀληθῶς οὐκ ἔχειν *ed. princ.*

But the transition from one model to the other is less clear than Sicheŕl presents it, since the *editio princeps* may well have been used as a corrective before letter 78. A few lemmas might suggest it:

4,12 ἄλλ' οὖν *ed. princ.* Ald Hercher: om. 356 134 1309

38,10-11 τὸ μὴ καταθέσθαι 3050 *ed. princ.* Ald Hercher: om. 356 134 1309

77,25 νῆ τὸν Δία 356 134 1309 Hercher: νῆ Δία *ed. princ.* Ald

Lastly, we just assumed that the names of the recipients in the Aldine edition had been copied from the manuscript which served as a checking copy, since they are closer to Vat. gr. 1309 than to Pal. gr. 134; but could Marcus Musurus simply have taken over the names present in the *editio princeps*? The Aldine and the *princeps* editions have different recipients' names in only four cases:

2,1 Μεγαρεῦσιν ὄνειδιστική 1309 Ald: Μεγαρεῦσιν *ed. princ.* Μεγαρεῦσι 134

16,1 Ἀριφοίτη 134 1309 Ald: Ἐριφοίτη *ed. princ.*

21,1 Μεσηνίοις 134 Ald: Μεσσηνίοις 1309 *ed. princ.*

105,1 Νικαινέτω 134 1309 Ald: Μεκαινέτω *ed. princ.*

These lemmas show that the Aldine edition rather tends to follow its manuscript models. But for letter 7, which is absent from Vat. gr. 1309, the Aldine has Εὐήνω as in the *editio princeps*, while Pal. gr. 134 (and Pal. gr. 356) have Ἐρήνω. And the Aldine has taken over the general title of the Letters of Phalaris given in the *editio princeps* 'φαλάριδος ἐπιστολαὶ τυράννου ἀκραγαντίνων', for, in Vat. gr. 1309, the letters have no title, and in Pal. gr. 134 the title is 'ἐπιστολαὶ φαλάριδος τοῦ τυράννου' (as in Pal. gr. 356).

All these elements tend to confirm and refine Sicherl's reconstruction of the manuscript sources of the Aldine.

### **Pal. gr. 134, its model and the printer's copy of the Aldine edition**

However, many uncertainties remain in the search of the sources of the Aldine edition. These uncertainties are due in particular to a well-documented practice in Aldus Manutius' workshop: the printers' copy was generally taken apart to facilitate the printing process, and it was not kept after the work was completed. But exceptions are, fortunately, not lacking, and there are a number of manuscripts, complete or fragmentary, which served as printer's copies in Aldus Manutius' workshop: in the case of the Aldine of the Greek epistolographers, we still have the folios 33r–39v of Paris. suppl. gr. 924 (with letters of Philostratus).

According to Martin Sicherl, the *Druckvorlage* of the Letters of Phalaris was the antigraphon of Pal. gr. 134, now lost. But is this really the case? Was the copy model of Pal. gr. 134 not preserved? At least, that is what Luigi Torraca thought: in his 1959 edition of the letters of Brutus, he referred to Pal. gr. 134 as a copy of the Heidelberg manuscript, Pal. gr. 356<sup>28</sup> –without, however, offering any justification. This hypothesis had also been considered,

then rejected by Sicherl,<sup>29</sup> on the basis of erroneous data from Tudeer: Sicherl mistakenly thought that Pal. gr. 356 contained only 107 letters (without letters 86 and 87) and not 109 like Pal. gr. 134. But Pal. gr. 356 does indeed contain letters 86 and 87, and the reasons advanced by Sicherl being null and void, it is necessary to re-examine the link between the two manuscripts.

Pal. gr. 356<sup>30</sup> is a manuscript of oriental paper, dating from the end of the thirteenth century<sup>31</sup> (except for the indexes on fos 1-3, from the seventeenth century, and fos 195–196 from the sixteenth century, all copied on western paper). It consists of 196 folios and measures 260 x 180 mm. Copied by five contemporary scribes working together,<sup>32</sup> it has a varied content, mainly rhetorical, epistolographic and dogmatic: *progymnasmata*, model speeches, epistolary models, *prooimia* of *chrysoboulla*, etc., make this codex ‘a useful manuscript for acquiring the compositional skills required by the imperial administration’.<sup>33</sup> The manuscript belonged to Aristoboulos Apostolis (Arsenius, bishop of Monemvasia), son of Michael Apostolis, and to his nephew and pupil George, Count of Corinth, as indicated by the two *ex libris* on the verso of the last folio of the manuscript. It was acquired by Ulrich Fugger, whose manuscripts entered the Palatinate Library in Heidelberg after his death.

The Letters of Phalaris are found on folios 11r–25v of the manuscript. Their collation gives the following results: Pal. gr. 134 contains the same copying errors as Pal. gr. 356 and adds others (including a number of small omissions). This data suggests that Pal. gr. 356 is the model for the copy of Pal. gr. 134.

Three cases are particularly interesting. In letter 63, after the verb *διαμαρτάνεις*, Pal. gr. 134 adds *οὐ γὰρ ἀπέχομαι κοινόνητι ποιητὰς· ἀλλὰ τοὺς πολὺ τῆς ἀληθείας διαμαρτάνεις* (folio 193v): he thus repeats twice the same line of Pal. gr. 356. The same type of mistake occurs again in letter 78: after *ἐμπνευσθεῖς δὲ*, Pal. gr. 134 adds *τεθνηκυῖαν δὲ ἐκ διαφθόρας· τὰ μὲν κεφάλαια τῶν ὑποθηκῶν ταῦτα* (folio 200v). In both cases, the scribe of Pal. gr. 134 has copied the same line of his model twice, instead of moving to the line below. In letter 111, Pal. gr. 134 omits *πάντως ἂν αἰτίαν εἶχες εἰληφέναι λάβων δὲ ταῖς ἀληθείαις ἐμοῦ τὸ μὴ δεδώκεναι* (folio 210v): this time he omits an entire line of Pal. gr. 356; the ‘*saut du même au même*’ is favoured by the fact that *δεδώκεναι* occurs at the end of each line in Pal. gr. 356.

In addition, Pal. gr. 134 takes up some blanks left in the text by Pal. gr. 356: this is the case in letter 31, folio 186v, before *ἐπιευκείας* (which is at the end of the line in Pal. gr. 356); and in letter 110, instead of *εἴλου*, Pal. gr. 356 gives *εἴλ* followed by a blank and 134 has *εἴλ* + blank (folio 207v). In some cases, Pal. gr. 134 takes up the alternative readings added *super lineam* in Pal. gr. 356, as in letter 121, where, instead of the usual reading *πρὸς με*, Pal. gr. 356



gives to read the reading γαρ με with a variant οι (for μοι) added above the ε: the same form γαρ με is found in Pal. gr. 134 and the same variant οι *super lineam* (folio 208v). Conversely, the variant περι proposed by the copyist of Pal. gr. 356 in letter 110 for παρὰ γνώμην (he adds a ε above the first α and a ι above the second) has not been understood: the copyist of Pal. gr. 134 leaves a blank and simply writes γνώμην (folio 207v).

Often the scribe of Pal. gr. 134 seems to have had difficulties in reading his model: he is disturbed by abbreviations (he writes περι for the abbreviation of παρὰ in letters 27, 54, 56 and 68, he reads as a καὶ the abbreviation of τῆς in letter 68), he confuses the ν of the accusative and the υ of the genitive in letters 25 and 48. Finally, if Pal. gr. 134 is the apograph of Pal. gr. 356, his mistakes are better understood in letter 55 (πορθῶν 356 but the ρ is tiny: ποθῶν 134), letter 67 (ἐᾶς λόγου which is read ἐᾶσλόγου in 356: ἐᾶ ὁ λόγου 134) and letter 82 (ἄλλ' ὦν 356 but the ν is of small modulus and almost deleted: ἄλλ' ῶ 134).

All these examples prove that Pal. gr. 134 ultimately goes back to Pal. gr. 356. However, it is difficult to prove that Pal. gr. 134 is a *direct* copy of Pal. gr. 356. Imagining an intermediary between the two manuscripts is not impossible,<sup>34</sup> but it is not necessary either. For the sake of economy, it is preferable to think that with the manuscripts Pal. gr. 356 and Pal. gr. 134, we have both the model and its copy. This probability is further enhanced by the fact that Pal. gr. 356 belonged to Aristoboulos Apostolis, who was also the copyist of folios 7r-58r of Pal. gr. 134, and one of Aldus Manutius' early collaborators (with whom he worked, among other things, on the edition of Theodore Prodromos' *Galeomyomachia*, published in 1494).

But then, which manuscript is the source of the Aldine edition? Pal. gr. 356 does not show any corrections, ink stains or compositor's marks as usually found in manuscripts that served as printer's copies.<sup>35</sup> Therefore, the Aldine's printing model was probably a copy of Pal. gr. 356. Was Pal. gr. 134 then the apograph, or simply (as I rather think) the parent of this lost manuscript? The uncertainty remains.

### **The hypothesis of another checking copy (*Korrektivexemplar*)**

The Aldine edition also comprises readings which are likely to be Musurus' corrections, since they are not based on its manuscript models:

- 3, 8** ἅπαντα ἡσεβήκοτα Hercher 1309: πάντα ἡσεβήκοτα *ed. princ.* ἡσεβήκοτα πάντα 356  
134 ἅπαν ἡσεβήκοτα Ald
- 54,8** προυτίμησαν Ald Hercher: προετίμησαν 356 134 1309 *ed. princ.*
- 56,8** προκατέσχησαι 356 134 1309 *ed. princ.*: προκατήχησαι Ald
- 56, 17** φήμην Ald Hercher: τύχην 356 134 1309 *ed. princ.*

- 57,7 φόνος 134 1309 Hercher: φθόνος Ald (letter 57 is not comprised in the *ed. princ.*)  
 67,9 εἰς τοσοῦτον βάθος 134 1309 *ed. princ.* Hercher: ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον βάθος Ald  
 67,13 κακοπαθείαις 356 134 1309 *ed. princ.* Hercher: κακοπαθίας Ald  
 67,17 τῶν ἱερῶν ἀγώνων Ald Hercher: ἱερῶν ἀγώνων 356 134 1309 *ed. princ.*  
 69,5 οὐ μετ' ἔμοῦ 134 1309 *ed. princ.* Hercher: μὴ μετ' ἔμοῦ Ald  
 69,16 ἐν ἀφθονίᾳ πλούτου Ald Hercher: ἐν ἀφθονίᾳ βίου 356 134 1309 *ed. princ.*  
 69,25 ἀνθρώπῳ 356 134 1309 *ed. princ.* Hercher: ἀνθρώπου Ald  
 71,3 περιφανῶς Ald Hercher: φανερῶς 356 134 1309 *ed. princ.*  
 77,6 ὅτε 356 134 1309 *ed. princ.* Hercher: ὅτι Ald  
 77,36-37 φύντες Ald Hercher: ὄντες 356 134 1309 *ed. princ.*

A problem arises in letters 7, 52, 58, 60, 64, 68, 72, 73 and 76, that is in the nine letters which are not included in Vat. gr. 1309. These letters were probably absent in its model.<sup>36</sup> With the exception of letter 7, the other eight letters are also absent from the *editio princeps*. Therefore, did Musurus only rely on the copy of Pal. gr. 356 for these letters or did he use another manuscript as corrective?

There are indeed discrepancies in these letters, between the text of the Aldine and that of Pal. gr. 356 (and Pal. gr. 134). Are they also emendations made by Musurus, or might some of these variants be corrections from another unknown source?

- 52,5 τρις Ald Hercher: om. 356 134  
 60,8 ἀλλ' εἰ μηδὲ (μὴ δὲ Ald) Ald Hercher: ἀλλὰ μὴ δὲ 356 134  
 60,9 φείδη Ald Hercher: φείδου 356 134  
 64,6 ἔχειν τῆς ἀποδοσέως Ald Hercher: ἔχειν τινα τῆς ἀποδοσέως 356 134  
 64,8 κεκομισμένους 356 134 Hercher: κεκομισμένα Ald  
 64,9 ἀγνοηθῆναι 356 134 Hercher: ἀγνοεῖν Ald  
 64,10 τάληθές 356 134 Hercher: μετάληθές Ald  
 64,10 ὑμῶν Hercher: τισὶν ὑμῶν Ald τισὶν 356 134  
 64, 11 πολλῶν Ald Hercher: om. 356 134  
 68,7 ὅτῳ 356 134 Hercher: ὅσῳ Ald  
 68,8 μετὰ ante μεγαλοφροσύνης 356 134 Hercher: om. Ald  
 68,11 με τοιούτοις Ald Hercher, τοιούτοις με 356 134  
 68,12 ὀλίγα Ald Hercher: om. 356 134  
 68,12 διδόντα Ald Hercher: διδόντος 356 134  
 68,18 καὶ δίδομεν 356 134 Hercher: καὶ ὃ δίδομεν Ald  
 72,5 τὸ πρῶτον Ald Hercher: τὸ πρότερον 356 om. 134

72,5 που Ald Hercher: om. 356 134

76,5 ἀξιωθέντα 356 134 Hercher: ἀξιωθέντας Ald

A lemma is particularly problematic if one considers that Musurus had only the copy derived from Pal. gr. 356 at his disposal:

64,10 ἢ τὸν ἕτερον ὑμῶν 356 134 Hercher: ἢ τὸν πλάνον ὑμῶν τοῦτον Ald (this variant is also found in manuscripts such as Paris. gr. 1038 and Vat. Pal. gr. 191).

This example suggests that the Aldine edition had another manuscript source.

Furthermore, the names of several addressees of these letters also imply, as it seems, a complementary source:

64,1 Ἀφιδαμάντι καὶ Θρασυβούλῳ 356 134 Hercher: ἀφιλαντι καὶ θρασιβούλῳ Ald

72,2 Ἀριστοφῶντος Hercher: ἀριφάντου Ald ἀριφράντου 356 134

73,1 εὐάνδρῳ Ald Hercher: εἰνάνδρῳ 356 134

In these last three cases, the readings of the Aldine edition are also given by other manuscripts. Do these readings then come from a single manuscript used as checking copy, or from several manuscripts? Only a collation of all the manuscripts containing the Letters of Phalaris will enable us to answer this question.

### **The Aldine edition and the transmission of the Letters of Phalaris**

While the exact combination of sources on which the Aldine edition is based is still uncertain, the position of the two main sources within the manuscript tradition and hence the position of the Aldine edition in the transmission of the Letters of Phalaris are relatively clear.

Since Tudeer's works on the Letters of Phalaris, based on the ordering of the letters, the names of the addressees and the greeting formulas, the manuscripts of the letters are arranged in five classes of varying importance. While each of the last two classes only comprise three manuscripts, the first three families comprise a high number of manuscripts (Tudeer lists twenty-one manuscripts in class A, eleven in class B and thirty-two in class C). Also, class E only has a selection of letters. This selection roughly coincides with the missing letters of class C, so that class E can be seen as a complement of class C. Many manuscripts of Tudeer's list could not be ascribed to a class. Unfortunately, this is the case for the oldest manuscripts of the letters of Phalaris, the Milan manuscript Ambros. B 4 sup (tenth century) and the Florence manuscript Laur. Plut. 57.51 (tenth/eleventh century), which present a number and order of the letters completely different from those of the main classes.

As we have seen, the Aldine edition combines classes A and C: it has the beginning of class A and the end of class C. The text of the letters is also a mixed text, using the readings of

both classes, since Pal. gr. 356 and Pal. gr. 134 belong to class A and Vat. gr. 1309 to class C. As for the *editio princeps*, it is based on a manuscript belonging to class C. The closest manuscripts to the *editio princeps* are the first part of the Vatican manuscript Reg. gr. 104 (second half of the fifteenth century) and the Oxford manuscript Selden Supra 16 (sixteenth cent.).<sup>37</sup> Thus, the Aldine merged the text of the two most prolific branches of the tradition. For the first time, it gathered together all the letters of Phalaris, offering therefore a more complete version than both class A and class C.<sup>38</sup> In the absence of a new critical edition of the Letters of Phalaris (on which I am currently working), it is still difficult to evaluate the quality of the text offered by the Aldine. But it must be noticed that the manuscripts on which the Aldine is based were well chosen: both Pal. gr. 356 and Vat. gr. 1309 are some of the oldest and leading manuscripts of their class. One may object that Musurus should have used the old Ambros. B 4 sup for the Letters of Phalaris, as he did for Aelian, Philostratus or Theophylact Simocatta,<sup>39</sup> but this manuscript is not always reliable in its readings and it only has a selection of twenty-seven letters.

## Conclusion

After examining the ‘roots’ of the Aldine edition, that is the manuscript and printed sources on which it is based, I would like to turn briefly, as a conclusion, to its influence on the later editors of the Letters of Phalaris. The Aldine introduced a huge change in the transmission of the Letters of Phalaris. It gathered all the letters of the corpus, using a new order of the letters, which combined the order of two different classes of manuscripts (A and C). While it is not found in any manuscript, one has to admit that the order of the Aldine judiciously combined large groups of letters found in the different manuscript classes: class A and, with two minor changes, class B have the group of letters 1–77; class C has the groups 77–108 and 109–119, also partially represented in class D (93–100, 102–108 and 109–119); and C has the letters 122–148, which are partly comprised in class B (letters 124–127) and in class D (letters 121–132). The Aldine’s edition of the Letters of Phalaris was a great editorial success. It completely overshadowed the *editio princeps*, which only influenced the later transmission thanks to its incorporation in the Aldine for the second half of the letters. The Aldine’s organisation of the corpus still prevails nowadays. The letters are numbered according to their order in the Aldine edition. Van Lennep’s attempt (posthumously published in 1777 by Valckenaer and reedited by Schaefer in 1823) to completely modify this organisation of the corpus in order to adopt a thematic and chronological approach – without any manuscript basis – was criticised and did not last long. And Hercher’s edition of the Greek epistolographers (1873) came back to the

ordering of the letters adopted by the Aldine. More than five hundred years later, we still read the Letters of Phalaris as Marcus Musurus arranged them.

---

<sup>1</sup> The bibliography on the literary aspects of the letters of Phalaris is relatively short. See T. Lenschau, 'Phalaris', *RE* XIX.2 (1938), pp. 1649–52; M. Fernández-Galiano, 'Los problemas de autenticidad en la literatura griega', *Revista de la Universidad de Madrid*, 1 (1952), pp. 213–38; O. Bruno, 'L'epistola 92 dello Pseudo-Falaride e i *Nostoi* di Stesicoro', *Helikon*, 7 (1967), pp. 323–56; S. Bianchetti, *Falaride e Pseudofalaride. Storia e leggenda* (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1987); D. A. Russell, 'The Ass in the Lion's Skin: Thoughts on the *Letters of Phalaris*', *Journal of Hellenistic Studies*, 108 (1988), pp. 94–106; O. Murray, 'Falaride tra mito e storia', in L. Breglia Pulci Doria (ed.), *L'incidenza dell'antico. Studi in onore di Ettore Lepore*. II (Naples: Luciano, 1996), pp. 165–180 (especially 175–6) = the article was originally published in L. Braccisi and E. de Miro (eds), *Agrigento e la sicilia Greca: atti della settimana di studio, Agrigento, 2-8 maggio 1988* (Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1992), pp. 47–60; S. Merkle and A. Beschorner, 'Der Tyrann und der Dichter: Handlungssequenzen in den Phalaris-Briefen', in N. Holzberg (ed.), *Der Griechische Briefroman. Gattungstypologie und Textanalyse* (Tübingen: Narr, 1994), pp. 116–68; V. Hinz, *Nunc Phalaris doctum protulit ecce caput. Antike Phalarislegende und Nachleben der Phalarisbriefe* (München/Leipzig: Saur, 2001); J. P. Christy, 'Writing to Power: Tyrant and Sage in Greek Epistolography' (PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2010), ch. 4; M. Ercoles, *Stesicoro: le testimonianze antiche* (Bologna: Pàtron Editore, 2013), pp. 416–60; É. Marquis, 'The Tyrant's Network: Appearances of Characters in the Letters of Phalaris', *CHS Research Bulletin*, 2, no. 2 (2014): <https://research-bulletin.chs.harvard.edu/2014/09/19/the-tyrants-network>. É. Marquis, 'Les *Lettres de Phalaris* ou les bons conseils du tyran', in É. Gavoille and F. Guillaumont (eds), *Conseiller, diriger par lettre* (Tours: Presses universitaires François Rabelais, 2017), pp. 105–19; V. Hinz, 'Vom Topos zum Ethos: Überlegungen zum Umgang mit tradiertem Gedankengut in den Phalarisbriefen', in É. Marquis (ed.), *Epistolary Fiction in Ancient Greek Literature* (to be published); É. Marquis, 'Phalaris ou les paradoxes du tyran', in É. Marquis and P. von Möllendorff (eds), *Brief und Macht: Pseudonyme Briefsammlungen der Antike* (to be published).

<sup>2</sup> See N. Barker, *Aldus Manutius and the Development of Greek Script and Type in the Fifteenth Century* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1992<sup>2</sup>), p. 68; M. Sicherl, *Griechische Erstausgaben des Aldus Manutius. Druckvorlagen, Stellenwert, kultureller Hintergrund* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997), p. 270; V. Hinz, *Nunc Phalaris*, pp. 223–4 and p. 226. Bracius had obtained a ten-year Venitian privilege on 7 March 1498 for the printing of four works in Greek (Pollux, Philostratus and Aesop in addition to the volume of Phalaris, Brutus and Apollonius' letters). But Aldus Manutius had also been granted a privilege to protect his Greek types and he sued Brisighella and his colleagues for imitation. We do not know the result of the trial, but Bissolus and Mangius reappeared in Milan as soon as 1499 for the printing of the Suda Lexicon and Aldus took over the programme of the partnership (Pollux 1502, Philostratus 1504, Aesop 1505) so that one supposes that Aldus won.

<sup>3</sup> Although the table of contents of the Aldine edition mentions thirty-six authors, it actually contains only thirty-five epistolary collections: the letter of Democritus belongs in fact to the letters of Hippocrates.

<sup>4</sup> See D. Muratore, *Le Epistole di Falaride. Catalogo dei manoscritti* (La Spezia: Agorà, 2001).

<sup>5</sup> L. O. T. Tudeer, 'The Epistles of Phalaris. Preliminary investigation of the manuscripts', *Annales scientiarum fennicae*, ser. B, 26 (1931), pp. 1–128 (especially p. 113).

<sup>6</sup> Sicherl, *Griechische Erstausgaben*, pp. 266–71.

<sup>7</sup> A description of the manuscript can be found in H. Stevenson, *Codices manuscripti Palatini Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome: 1885), p. 65; Sicherl, *Griechische Erstausgaben*, pp. 271–75; Muratore, *Le Epistole di Falaride*, pp. 125–26 and on the website of Heidelberg University Library dedicated to the project 'Biblioteca Palatina digital' (accessed August 24, 2021):

[https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/de/bpd/virtuelle\\_bibliothek/codpalgraec/beschreibungen/bav\\_pal\\_gr\\_134.html](https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/de/bpd/virtuelle_bibliothek/codpalgraec/beschreibungen/bav_pal_gr_134.html).

<sup>8</sup> See E. Gamillscheg, D. Harlfinger and H. Herbert (eds), *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800-1600. 3. Teil: Handschriften aus Bibliotheken Roms mit dem Vatikan* (Wien: VÖAW, 1997), Nr. 46; M. Sicherl, *Griechische Erstausgaben*, p. 273; R. Stefec, 'Die Handschriften der Sophistenviten Philostrats', *Römische Historische Mitteilungen*, 56 (2014), pp. 136–206, here p. 177.

<sup>9</sup> See Sicherl, *Griechische Erstausgaben*, p. 274; Stefec 'Die Handschriften der Sophistenviten Philostrats', p. 196.

<sup>10</sup> See D. Harlfinger, *Die Textgeschichte der Pseudo-Aristotelischen Schrift Περὶ ἀτόμων γραμμῶν* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1971), p. 412; Sicherl, *Griechische Erstausgaben*, p. 274; Stefec, 'Die Handschriften der Sophistenviten Philostrats', p. 198.

<sup>11</sup> According to an indication given by Ernst Gamillscheg, see Sicherl, *Griechische Erstausgaben*, p. 274: Gamillscheg found the hand of this copyist in the manuscripts Paris. gr. 572 (with Christophoros Kontoleon), Paris. gr. 835 (with Demetrios Zenos) and Vat. gr. 1678. M. Papanicolaou, who identifies the copyist of the Parisian manuscripts and of Vat. gr. 1678 as the Cretan philologist and humanist Franciscus Portus (1511-1581),

refuses however to attribute to him the copy of folios 181-222 and 293-305 of the Vat. Pal. gr. 134: M. Papanicolaou, 'Identificazione del dotto copista anonimo di un manipolo di manoscritti greci databili al decennio 1526-1535: Francesco Porto', *Rendiconti dell'Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* ser. 9, vol. 21 (2010 [2012]), p. 427-89, and in particular p. 435 note 3.

<sup>12</sup> Sicherl, *Griechische Erstaussgaben*, p. 274-5.

<sup>13</sup> According to a recent hypothesis by C. Giacomelli, 'Per i "graeca" di Giovanni Calurnio. Codici, postillati e alcune nuove attribuzioni', *Archivum mentis. Studi di filologia e letteratura umanistica* 9 (2020), pp. 85-136, who sees in Pal. gr. 134 the codex present in the inventory of manuscripts bequeathed by Calurnio under the title '(42) *Item epistula Phalaridis scriptum calamo cum copertura rubea*' (p. 135).

<sup>14</sup> The manuscript is described in G. de Andres, *Catalogo de los codices griegos desaparecidos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial* (El Escorial, 1968), no. 313, pp. 137-8; A. Diller, *Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1983), ch. 25: The Lost Escorial Codex of the Epistolographers, pp. 263-73; [T. S. Pattie and S. McKendrick], *The British Library. Summary Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts*, vol. 1 (British Library, 1999), p. 129.

<sup>15</sup> See Teresa Martínez Manzano, 'La biblioteca manuscrita griega de Diego Hurtado de Mendoza: problemas y perspectivas', *Segno e Testo* 16 (2018), pp. 315-433, and in particular, p. 356 note 121.

<sup>16</sup> Aubrey Diller (*Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition*, p. 264) noted that folios 212-217, in different format and script, are an abrupt fragment of a manuscript of letters of Julian.

<sup>17</sup> Late thirteenth century according to Diller, *Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition*, p. 264, Muratore, *Le Epistole di Falaride*, p. 164; but fourteenth century for Pattie and McKendrick, *The British Library. Summary Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts*, p. 129, and Martínez Manzano, 'La biblioteca manuscrita griega de Diego Hurtado de Mendoza', p. 356. Insofar as Vat. gr. 1309, recognised since Diller, *Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition*, p. 264, as an apograph of Harl. 5610, was copied at the end of the thirteenth century, in a Planudean context, the dating of Harl. 5610 must be moved up accordingly. That the manuscript originally contained Maximus Planudes's Greek translation of the *Distichs* of Cato might suggest that it comes from the same milieu as Vat. gr. 1309, but Diller, 1983, p. 264, notes that folios 1-128 may have circulated independently, as there is no trace of their content in the descendants of Harl. 5610: 'Fol. 1-128 (α-ιζ) seem to have been still another ms., once separate, as there is no trace of it in the progeny of S'.

<sup>18</sup> See Diller *Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition*, pp. 264-6.

<sup>19</sup> G. de Andres, *Catalogo de los codices griegos desaparecidos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial* (El Escorial, 1968), no. 313, p. 138.

<sup>20</sup> See A. C. Clark, 'The Library of J. G. Graevius', *The Classical Review* 5 (1891), pp. 365-72; C. E. Wright, *Fontes Harleiani* (London 1972), p. 169.

<sup>21</sup> Sicherl, *Griechische Erstaussgaben*, p. 273.

<sup>22</sup> For a description of the manuscript, see for instance, A. Sabatucci 'Alcune note sulle epistole di Chione', *Stud. Ital.* 14 (1906), pp. 373-414, in part. p. 380-4; Sicherl, *Griechische Erstaussgaben*, pp. 266-271; Muratore, *Le Epistole di Falaride*, pp. 143-4; I. Pérez Martín, 'Nouveaux manuscrits planudéens de Plutarque', *MOCXOBIA* 1 (2001), pp. 355-364 (p. 361).

<sup>23</sup> See P. de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini. Contributions à l'histoire des collections d'Italie et à l'étude de la Renaissance* (Paris: F. Vieweg, 1887), p. 144; Sabatucci, 'Alcune note sulle epistole di Chione', pp. 381-3.

<sup>24</sup> Among others by Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini*, p. 144; Sabatucci, 'Alcune note sulle epistole di Chione', p. 381; Muratore, *Le Epistole di Falaride*, p. 143.

<sup>25</sup> Pérez Martín, 'Nouveaux manuscrits planudéens de Plutarque', p. 361.

<sup>26</sup> H. Gräven, 'Cyriacus von Ancona auf dem Athos', *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 16 (1899), pp. 209-15, in part. pp. 211-2; Sabatucci, 'Alcune note sulle epistole di Chione', pp. 383-4; Muratore, *Le Epistole di Falaride*, p. 144; E. Bodnar and C. Mitchell (eds), *Cyriacus of Ancona's Journeys in the Propontis and Northern Aegean, 1444-1445* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1976), pp. 50-1; E. W. Bodnar and C. Foss (eds), *Cyriac of Ancona. Later Travels* (Cambridge (Mass.)/London: Harvard University Press, 2003), pp. 123-125.

<sup>27</sup> See Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini*, p. 144.

<sup>28</sup> L. Torraca (ed.), *Marco Giunio Bruto. Epistole greche* (Naples: Libreria scientifica editrice, 1959), p. XLV.

<sup>29</sup> Sicherl, *Griechische Erstaussgaben*, p. 267.

<sup>30</sup> For a description of the manuscript, see, for instance, H. Stevenson, *Codices manuscripti Palatini Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome, 1885), pp. 203-7; F. Boll, *Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum VII: Codices Germanicos* (Brussels: H. Lamertin, 1908), pp. 79-81, V. Hinz, 'Vom Tyrannen ein Gruss: der erste Phalarisbrief', *Prometheus* 32 (2006), pp. 1-24 (the description itself is in pp. 7-11); S. Papaioannou (ed.), *Michael Psellus. Epistulae* (Berlin/Boston: Teubner, 2019), pp. xcvi-xcviii.

<sup>31</sup> On the dating of the manuscript and its content, see I. Pérez Martín, 'The Transmission of Some Writings by Psellos in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople', in A. Rigo (ed.), *Theologica minora: The Minor Genres of Byzantine Theological Literature* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 159-185 and in part. pp. 170-171.

---

<sup>32</sup> Pérez Martín, ‘The Transmission of Some Writings by Psellos’, p. 170 and note 56, details the distribution of the hands: at least one of the copyists (scribe D) is a professional from the administration of Michael VIII Palaeologus.

<sup>33</sup> Pérez Martín, ‘The Transmission of Some Writings by Psellos’, p. 171. The texts on dogmatic issues would have been useful in the context or aftermath of the Union of Lyon in 1274.

<sup>34</sup> This could explain the curious lessons of letter 82 (blank left by Pal. gr. 134 while the text is given, in tiny script however, in Pal. gr. 356) and letter 88 (Pal. gr. 134 has εὐθὺς even though we read βουλευσόμεθα in Pal. gr. 356).

<sup>35</sup> On these marks, see for example B. Mondrain, ‘Un nouveau manuscrit d’Hérodote: le modèle de l’édition aldine’, *Scriptorium* 49:2 (1995), pp. 263–73 (see in particular pp. 264–265 and the bibliography of Sicherl’s articles devoted to the models used for the first Aldine editions); L. Hellinga, *Texts in Transit* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014), ch. 2, pp. 37–66 (in part. pp. 40–1); S. Martinelli Tempesta, ‘The Wanderings of a Greek Manuscript from Byzantium to Aldus’ Printing House and Beyond: The Story of the Aristotle Ambr. B 7 inf.’, in G. Abbamonte et S. Harrison (eds), *Making and Rethinking the Renaissance. Between Greek and Latin in 15th-16th Century Europe* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2019), pp. 195–211 (and in part. pp. 198–9).

<sup>36</sup> In any case, the catalogues describing the lost part of Harl. 5610 (Scorialensis E. IV. 18, *deperditus* 313) mention that it comprised 140 letters like Vat. gr. 1309 which has 139 letters and one duplicate (letter 88).

<sup>37</sup> The manuscript Selden 16 (*olim* Selden 15) is described as a copy of the Aldine edition by Torraca in his edition of the Letters of Brutus: Torraca, *Marco Giunio Bruto. Epistole greche*, p. XXXIV (no. 16) and XLI; but cf. R. Penella (ed.), *The Letters of Apollonius of Tyana: a critical text with prolegomena, transl. and comm.* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), p. 12: ‘the manuscript, though descended from the same ancestor as Ald., is not a copy of Ald.’

<sup>38</sup> The Aldine also comprises letter 57 (an answer from the Scythian sage Abaris to the tyrant Phalaris); while this letter often circulates among the Letters of Phalaris, it probably did not belong to the primitive collection.

<sup>39</sup> See M. Sicherl, ‘Die Aldina der griechischen Epistolographen (1499)’, in D. Zeidberg (ed.), *Aldus Manutius and Renaissance Culture. Essays in Memory of Franklin D. Murphy* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1998), pp. 81–93 and especially pp. 84–5.