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Abstract

This present thesis examines the manuscript tradition of the family y of Procopius' Wars Books V-VIII, in the light of a hitherto unknown extant manuscript (Ath), Athos, Lavra codex H-73 (728). It comprises an introduction and four sections (1-4). The introduction gives information on the author and his works concentrating on his major historical work, the Wars.

This is followed by Section 1 containing an analytical codicological and palaeological description of codex Ath. As the codex does not contain a colophon, a possible thirteenth/fourteenth century dating is based on palaeographical and codicological evidence.

Section 2 examines the position of the codex in the stemma codicum, proposed by the latest editor of the text, Jacob Haury (1905-12). A collation of the text with the principal manuscripts (K and L) of the two families, z and y, shows that Ath belongs to the y family. A further collation of Ath with all other extant manuscripts of this family, illustrates the importance of Ath in the tradition of the text.

Section 3 gives a description and updated information of all manuscripts of family y, before the relation is examined and the stemma codicum is reconstructed on the basis of a series of propositions.

The thesis concludes with Section 4, which places the production of Ath and other manuscripts, containing Procopius' works and other early Byzantine historiographical texts, in the general context of the intellectual milieu of the Palaeologan period.
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Introduction

Procopius was born from a wealthy family in the city of Caesarea in Palestine around 500.¹ There he received his early education and proceeded to higher studies in rhetoric and law.² In 527, when Justinian I (527-565AD) ascended the imperial throne, Procopius entered the service of general Belisarius as his legal counsellor and secretary (σύμβουλός, Wars, ed. Haury, Proemium, p. 5, 7-11), and later with the rank of illustrius (ιλλαούστριος).³ In this capacity Procopius accompanied Belisarius in expeditions to Africa and Italy. His major work, the Wars (De Bellis / Περί πολέμων), is a history of Justinian's wars, which covers the period from 530 until 553.⁴ It is important that the greater part of this monumental work remains the only source for these events. Following the classical historiographical tradition modelled on Thucydides, Procopius composed a secular, political history, focused on military events, presented and analysed in the form of cause and effect, with God occasionally replacing Τύχη⁵ as a major factor in the shaping of events. Speeches and vivid battle descriptions are arranged chronologically. As Procopius states in his introduction, the records of events he describes are based largely on his own recollections and for the events he was not present he probably takes information from other sources, mostly oral (Wars, p. 4, 1 – 5, 17). Most probably a substantial section of the Wars was

¹ For a general bibliography on Procopius and his text, see Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia ed. G. Wirth (Leipzig, 1964), p. LXXVII-LXXVII. After 1964 the most important studies are J.W. Barker, Justinian and the Later Roman Empire (Madison, 1966); R. Browning, Justinian and Theodora (London, 1971); A. Cameron, Procopius and the Sixth Century (London, 1985); J.A.S. Evans, Procopius (New York, 1972). For Procopius and his time, the most important are the collective volumes, A. Cameron, Continuity and Change in Sixth-Century Byzantium (London, 1986); P. Allen and E. Jeffreys, The Sixth Century – End or Beginning? (Australia, 1996) and the article, E. Patlagean, “A Byzance: ancienne historiographie et histoire sociale”, Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations 23 (1968), 106-26.

² For Procopius' early education, see J.B. Bury, A History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian (London, 1929), vol. 2, p. 420, n. 1; cf. J. Haury, Zur Beurteilung des Geschichtschreibers Procopius von Caesarea: Programm des K. Wilhelms-Gymnasiums in München für das Schuljahr 1896/7 (Munich, 1896), p. 20. See also Cameron, Procopius, pp. 5-8. An interesting article on Procopius' education and career is J. Howard-Johnston, “The Education and Expertise of Procopius”, Antiquité Tardive 8 (2000), 19-30, which suggests that Procopius may have been “a military architect or engineer by profession” (p. 25).

³ Cf. Souda, s. v. Προκόπιος. Ιλλαούστριος was the highest title of Senators in the later Roman Empire. It provided certain privileges, both fiscal and ceremonial. On the office of illustrius, see N. Oikonomides, Les listes des préséances Byzantines au IXe et Xe siècles (Paris, 1972), pp. 294-295.


written in the 540s, after Procopius resided in Constantinople. According to the author, the final book of his work (VIII) was completed in the eighteenth year of the Gothic war (which started in AD 536), that is AD 554 (Book VIII, p. 678, 4-5), after the completion of Book VII in AD 550 (Book VII, p. 458, 1-2).

The work consists of eight books. Books I-II (De bello Persico) relate Justinian’s war against the Persians. Therefore, the text in high literary style was based on a variety of anonymous sources. Books III-IV (De bello Vandalico) records the war against the Vandals. In this section of his work, Procopius concentrates on describing the organisation and structure of the Byzantine army giving at the same time the names of generals and officers. The praising of Belisarius’ victories in Books I-IV is succeeded by disappointment on account of the defeats of the Byzantine army by the Goths in the war described in Books V-VIII (De bello Gothico). Especially Book VII is pervaded by the author’s criticism of both Justinian and Belisarius. It seems that during the composition of Book VIII in 554, Procopius reached a stage of bitter disappointment as a result of the increasing political and financial problems in the Empire, emanating from the military defeats. This disappointment is clearly reflected in his Secret History (Historia Arcana /'Aνέκδοτα), which gives a bitterly hostile portrait of the Emperor and his wife Theodora. It is possible that the Secret History was composed by Procopius after the completion of Wars, Book VII (AD 550), for he resumes his former negative attitude towards both Justinian and Theodora in the next and final Book VIII.

---

6 On this see Wars, p. 251, 10-11: ἐς Βυζάντιον ἐδέχα καὶ ἐμοὶ ἐπιθημείν τηρικαῦτα ξυνέβη and he was there when the plague came in Spring 542 (Wars II.22.9).
7 For Procopius’ progressive change of attitude towards Belisarius and Justinian in Book VIII, see Cameron, Procopius, pp. 187-206.
9 There had been many scholars who deny Procopius’ authorship of Secret History (J.B. Bury, History of the later Roman Empire, 395-800 (London, 1889), vol. 2, pp. 359-64, argues against the authenticity of the work, but later changed his view in A History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian, 395-565 (London, 1923), pp. 417-30). Today no one would uphold this opinion, especially in the light of J. Haury’s arguments in Procopiana, Programm des Königlichen Realgymnasiums für das Studienjahr 1890-91, that the work should be dated to 550, on the basis of internal evidence and later in "Zu Prokops Geheimgeschichte", BZ 34 (1934), 10-4. The date of this work is also the subject of debate (G. Greatrex, "The date of Procopius’ works", BMGS 18 (1994), 101-14; R. Scott, "Justinian’s coinage and Easter reforms, and the date of the Secret History", BMGS 11 (1987), 215-21; Howard-Johnston, "Education and Expertise of Procopius", p. 21); J.A.S. Evans, ‘The Dates of Procopius’ Works: A Recapitulation of the Evidence” GRBS 37 (1996), 308-10). It is generally agreed that it was published after the death of Justinian.
10 It belongs to the period immediately after the death of Theodora and after Belisarius’ return from the second Italian expedition, when Procopius was most hostile to him.
His third major work, the Buildings (De aedificiis / Περὶ κτισμάτων), written between 553 and 555, is a panegyric for Justinian. In this work Procopius describes public buildings and constructions built by Justinian in various parts of the empire, praising the Emperor’s major building policy.

Procopius remains the most important historical source for the reign of Justinian, a period when the Byzantine Empire reached the peak of its power. The influence of Procopius' work, both in content and style, is evident in contemporary and later historians. For example the leading historians, Agathias (530/32-579/82), Evagrius (536-593/4), Menander Protector (c. 550-), Theophylact Simocattes (c.585-), Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913-959), Joannes Zonaras (11th c.), Georgius Cedrenus (11th/12th c.), Michael Glykas (c. 1100-), Joannes Cinnamus (1143-) and Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos (1256-1335) refer to his work, mainly to the Wars. In addition, most of the above authors and also Theophanes (c. 760-817) and John of Antioch (7th century) used Procopius' works as sources for their histories.


12 For the date of Buildings, see Howard-Johnston, “Education and Expertise of Procopius”, p. 21 with fn. 14.


14 The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius, ed. J. Bidez - L. Parmentier (New York, 1979), IV 12: γέγραπται δὲ Προκοπίῳ τῷ ηὐτορί τα κατὰ Βελισάριον συγγράφουσι... Φιλοσοφώσᾳ ταῖς γαρ κοιμώς τε καὶ λογίως ἐκτίθεται τῷ αὐτῷ Προκοπίῳ δὲ δὲ πέτρικατ ἀπὸ Βελισαρίων σημαντηροῦσι...


17 Excerpta Historica iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta, ed. C. De Boor (Berlin, 1903-10), Book I, Ch.2: οὕτε γὰρ Προκόπως, οὕτε Ἀγαθίας... ἐμμισθευσαν τοῦ τοιούτου ὁδήγητος...

18 Ioannis Zonarai Epitome Historiarum, ed. L. Dindorf (Teubner: Leipzig, 1868-75), XIV.7: τῶν πατρίκιον Βελισάριον... πέμψει... ό καὶ ο Καισαρείων συμπαραμάρτητος Προκόπου, δὲ τα περὶ τῶν ἑκεῖ πολέμων ἱστορίας πλατυκύτερον.


20 Michael Glykas, History, PG 158, col. 505, § 270: Πορφύριος... μῆκος μὲν πῆχες τριάκοντα, εὕρος δὲ πῆχες δέκα τὸν Καισαρείαν Προκόπου.

21 John, Cinnamus, History, PG 133, col. 569, § 217: ῥήξ γὰρ Θεοφίλχος καὶ οὐ βασιλείας διεβιβασε καλοήμενος, καθάτερον Προκόπου Ἰστορεῖ.

22 Nicephorus Callistus, History, PG 145, col. 241, § 746: οὗ ἡ Προκόπειος τῷ Καισαρεῖ κοιμώς μᾶλα καὶ λογίῳ ἐγράφα ἐν ταῖς κατ’ αὐτῶν ἱστορικαῖς συγγραφαῖς. Τέσσαρα δ’ αὐτῷ βιβλία ἀρχαίαττοι φράσεως ἔχουμεν συνετείθη τῷ τὸ μὲν οὖσμας Περσακα... τῷ γὰρ Γοθικά... τὸ δὲ κτίσματα προσεπεσηγείν... τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ἀνιπορηθῆς ὑστερον...

The earliest printed edition of the *Wars* was published by David Hoeschel, *Historiarum Procopii Libri VIII* (Augsburg, 1607). For his edition of Books I-IV, accompanied by his own marginal annotations, he used codd. *Monac. gr. 48 (m)* of the sixteenth century and *Par. gr. 1700 (o)* of the seventeenth century, and for Books V-VIII codd. *Monac. gr. 87 (n)* of the sixteenth century and *Par. gr. 1701 (o)* of the seventeenth century.

Hoeschel’s *editio princeps* was preceded by three Latin translations: by Leonardus Aretinus Brutus, *De bello Italicco adversus Gothos* (Rome, 1441 and printed 1470), who based his free translation of Books V-VIII on unspecified manuscripts and published it as his own composition; by Christophorus Persona, *Procopius de Bello Gothorum* (Rome, 1481-83 and printed in 1506), who translated Books V-VIII from an unspecified Greek codex that he had borrowed from the Vatican Library; by Raphaellus Volaterannus, *Procopius de Bello Persico* (Rome, 1509), who translated Books I-II from unspecified manuscripts or editions; and Hugo Groot (1655) Books III-IV similarly from unspecified manuscripts.


---

26 I use the sigla of the manuscripts adopted by Haury.
Comparetti based his edition on Dindorf's adding the following extant codices: Vat. gr. 1690 (K), 152 (V) and 1301 (f), Vat. Reg. gr. 84 (r), Laur. gr. 69, 8 (L) and 9,32 (l) Ambr. 182 sup. (a) and 52-55 sup. (e), Monac. gr. 87 (n) and 513 (d). Though Comparetti recorded all variants of these codices, he offered no suggestions as to their relations. This deficiency was cured by Jacob Haury in his critical edition of the complete works of Procopius, *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia*, published in the Teubner Series *Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et latinorum*, 4 vols (Leipzig, 1905-13), vol. 1: De bellis libri I-IV, vol. 2: libri V-VIII.

Haury based his edition on the critical text by Comparetti and the study of the manuscript tradition of Books V-VIII and the relationship of the manuscripts by M. Kraseninnikov. Apart from his adoption of a small number of different readings from the Comparetti edition, Haury's main contribution was the construction of a more complete *stemma codicum*, disagreeing with Kraseninnikov that Laur. gr. 69.8 (L) is far inferior to Vat. gr. 1690 (K). In addition, the editor provided an *apparatus fontium* that accompanies the text.

Procopius' Wars, Books V-VIII are represented by three principal manuscripts, K, V and L, dated to the fourteenth century. The rest of the extant manuscripts known to Haury dated between the fourteenth and sixteenth century, were included in the *stemma codicum*, though their variant readings are omitted in the *apparatus criticus*. His reconstruction of the *stemma codicum* is as follows:

---

29 *Comparationes Philologiae* (Petropoli, 1897) and "The critical text of the second tetras of the Wars of Procopius of Caesarea", *Vizantijiski Vremennik* 5 (1898), 439-81.
30 *Prolegomena*, p. LVIII. Cf. p. XXI.
31 Books I-IV have different manuscript tradition, see Haury, *Prolegomena*, pp. XXVIII-XL.
32 Haury states explicitly (*Prolegomena*, p. XXIV) that he does not report all variants from all the manuscripts; he has collated only the manuscripts he lists in capital in his stemma.
According to this stemma x represents the lost codex, from which two traditions, z and y emanate. The z family is represented by K and V, and later copies, the fifteenth-century A, b2, e1 and the seventeenth-century a and o, and the y family by L and the later copies, the fifteenth-century a, b1 and h and the sixteenth-century c, k, n, r, d and γ.

Haury's emendation and selection of readings reflect a text composed in pure Attic, free from syntactical and grammatical errors or sixth-century linguistic and stylistic conventions that developed in the course of time. Haury's emendations strictly follow the syntactical and grammatical rules and style of the classical authors, in the process ignoring the text transmitted in some or even all extant codices.

In the reprint of the Teubner edition of Procopius Opera Omnia by Gerhard Wirth (Teubner: Leipzig, 1962-64), no revision or further contributions to the text were made, and Haury's text remained unaltered with a few exceptions recorded at the end of the volume, together with a number of additions and corrections and suggestions of variant readings to the text by Kallenberg, de Stephani and Wilamowitz. Wirth also examined certain variant readings in relation to excerpts of the text contained in later sources, which may shed light on certain cases where the selection of the variant is doubtful.

Haury's edition of Procopius' Wars as part of the complete works accompanied by translations in various languages has been reprinted several times. An English translation

---

33 Codex a is the same with codex A (Ambr. A182 sup.), which contain different parts of the text of Wars. Haury classifies them in different families. See below, fn. 166.


35 E.g., Haury always changes the negative construction from οὐδὲ - οὐδὲ and μηδὲ - μηδὲ of all manuscripts to οὐδὲ - οὐδὲ and μηδὲ - μηδὲ.

36 In his Praefatio, p. LXXIII-LXXV, he states a very small number of prospectus locorum, which he has changed in the text.


38 For full bibliographical details, see Wirth, Procopius Caesariensis, pp. 679-80.


40 E.g. vol. I, p. 8,19: (ἐνυδαύωσαθαι) adn: διασώσαθαι mihi probabilius propter διεσώσατο Phot 121B (see Wirth, p. 555); p. 233,2; (ἐσκελευκότες) nota: cf. EMagn 385,15 and 717,20 (ἐφ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοίς ἐσκελευκότας), LexAlm 624,18 (ἐσκελευκότες), EGud cod. Barb. 170, Stef 639-640, Stef. Stud 441 (see Wirth p. 564); vol. II, p. 43, 13: (ἐρανον) nota: cf. LexAlm 624,29 (ἐρανος), EGud 204,48, Stef Ed 515,7, StefStud 441 (see Wirth, p. 681).

41 In French: D. Roques, La guerre contre les Vandales, livres III-IV (Paris, 1990); in German: O. Veh, Procopius von Caesarea, vols. 5 (Munich, 1970): vols. 2-4: Gotenkriege, Perserkriege, Vandalenkriege, O
Introduction


The addition of an important codex to the extant manuscripts of Procopius' Wars, Books V-VIII, preserved in the Athonite Monastery of Lavra, under no. H-73, sheds new light on the manuscript tradition of the text and the relation of the manuscripts. An analytical palaeographical and codicological study of this manuscript (Ath) given below will be followed by a palaeographical examination of the text before its position in the stemma codicum is examined.


Although it is stated in the introduction of the edition (p. 13) that "the text followed is that of Haury, issued in the Teubner series, 1905-13", some minor differences in the text can be observed, e.g., V.21.20, 21-22: Haury's text (p. 107): εἰς ἄλληλους τριπήματα φαινεσθαι, Dewing's text (p. 206): εἰς ἄλληλα τριπήματα φαινεσθαι.
1. Description of codex Ath

Athos, Lavra codex H-73 (Eustratiades no. 728)\(^{43}\)

Late 13\(^{th}\)/early 14\(^{th}\) century,\(^{44}\) paper; 211 numbered leaves; 250x140 mm.
Brown leather in wooden cover

**CONTENTS:** The codex contains Procopius' *Wars* Books V-VIII:

1. (ff. 1r – 32v.22) Book V, ed. Haury, pp. 8,4 – 146.
2. (ff. 32v.23 – 105v) Book VI, pp. 150 – 293.
4. (ff. 185r – 21 Or) Book VIII, pp. 487 – 565,10

**COLLATION:** The codex consists of unnumbered gatherings.\(^{45}\) Evidently, the original numbers of the gatherings and the folios have been trimmed after the codex was rebound to fit the new dimensions. This has affected also the marginal scholia (see below, pp. 13-16).

A nineteenth/twentieth-century hand has numbered the extant recto folios in Arabic numerals (the folios following 4 and 69 were corrected from their previous erroneous numbering, 3 and 68 respectively). The lower part (1/3) of f. 11r was left blank by the scribe. Similarly ff. 11v-12r are blank. On f. 11r.20 the text is interrupted; it resumes on a fresh page on f. 12v. On the basis of the text contained in Haury’s edition the missing text (V.15.4,14 Βενεβεντόν καλοῦσιν – 16.10,20 Σαλώνων) between ff. 11r and 12v should cover the blank two and a third pages of the manuscript. Several folios have been affected by worm.\(^{46}\) Some of them have been repaired by paper glued on the margins, especially the lower part of the page\(^{47}\) and the outer margin.\(^{48}\) In some cases the repairing paper covers parts or the whole of marginal notes.\(^{49}\) It seems that these repairs were made both before and after the numbering of the folios, for in some cases numbers are covered by the

---

\(^{43}\) A brief description of the manuscript appears in the catalogue compiled by S. Eustratiades, *Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts of Lavra on Mount Athos* (Athos, 1925), p. 114, no. 728, cod. H-73. Apart from the contents of the manuscript, no other information is given with the exception to the state of the manuscript: δεικνύεται καὶ ἐν τῷ μέρει ἐβαρέμενος.

\(^{44}\) See below, pp. 19-20.

\(^{45}\) A collation of the gatherings remains to be examined.

\(^{46}\) E.g., ff. 2, 3, 6, 13, 15, 17, 25, 32, 62, 76, 133, 140, 164.

\(^{47}\) E.g., ff. 4v, 9v, 29r, 33r, 42r, 69v, 77v, 102v, 170r.

\(^{48}\) E.g., ff. 5r, 15r, 49r, 82r, 113r, 133v, 139r, 209v.

\(^{49}\) E.g., ff. 5r, 14v, 49r, 50r, 80v, 97r, 138r, 139r.
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paper,\(^{50}\) while in other cases numbers are placed either on the glued paper (e.g. f. 5r\(^{51}\)) or are squeezed next to it (e.g. f. 106r\(^{52}\)). In a single case, on f. 84rv, the scribe copied his text avoiding a hole (ca. 1 sq. cm.) on the surface of the paper.\(^{53}\)

From the text contained in the manuscript, it is evident that the first and last part of the codex was removed at some stage. It is possible that this codex formed part of a multi-volume collection of Procopius' *Wars*, though it is difficult to say whether our codex contained originally a larger part of the work extending beyond Books V-VIII. As regards the missing folios in Books V-VIII, however, more certain calculations can be made. For, given the amount of text copied by six successive scribes on each folio, the missing text should have been contained on ca. 62 folios (124 pages):

Thus, three missing folios (ff. <I>1</I>) must have contained the beginning of Book V, 1.1 (p. 4,1) Τα μὲν οὖν ἐν Χιλβίδῃ – 1.25 (p. 8,4) λαβὼν.

Eleven missing folios following f. 6v (ff. <6>5</I>) Book V.5.10 (p. 26,22) ξυμμαχήσεων ὑπέσχοντα – V.11.2 (p. 58,16) καλοῦσιν οἱ.

Three missing folios following f. 10v (ff. <10>4</I>) Book V.12.47 (p. 69,18) ἀπήλαυσεν – V.14.16 (p. 78,15) εἴνοιαν ἔχων.

Two missing folios following f. 16v (ff. <16>16</I>) Book V.18.43 (p. 96,12) διενυκτέρευσαν – V.20.3 (p. 101,21) ενταῦθα φανέρως.

Three missing folios following f. 21v (ff. <21>4</I>) Book V.23.20 (p. 116,8) διαφθειρομένους – V.25.8 (p. 124,7) καθήσαντο καὶ.


**Headings:** The heading introducing Book V must have been contained in the first part of the codex, which is missing. The end of Book V, on f. 32v.22, is indicated by a *vignette*, the only decoration in the whole codex, followed by the text of Book VI. The heading of the new book (VI) is placed on the top margin of the same folio (32v): 'Ἀρχὴ σὺν θεῷ

---

\(^{50}\) E.g., ff. 138r and 139r (see below, Pl. I c).

\(^{51}\) See below, Pl. I a.

\(^{52}\) See below, Pl. I b.

\(^{53}\) 84r, Haury, VI. P. 250,3-4: ⁸ ἐγγράξωσα τὰ πραξόμενα, ἀλλὰ Ὀμοίους ἵππον ἄντρο Ἰουστι [ μιανῷ βασιλεῖ... 84v, Haury, VI. p. 251,2-4: ⁸ ἐς Βυζάντιον ἀφικομένους [ ] γερῶν βασιλεὺς ἵππον τῶν μεγίστων ἡξίωσεν, [ ] Ἀθανάσιον μὲν ὑπαρχον...
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τῆς στ' ἵστοριάς, followed by three monocondyle crosses. The remaining books (VII-VIII) each start on a fresh page. No heading appears for Book VII (f. 106r), though the end of the previous Book VI is indicated by a note (f. 105v), giving, however, the wrong number: τέλος τῆς πέμπτης ἱστοριάς. A note on the top margin of f. 185r introduces Book VIII: ἵστοριῶν ἱλγόγος ἰγαδοος.

SCRIPT: Six successive anonymous hands have contributed to the copying of the manuscript. The text, in minuscule script mixed with certain capital forms, is placed in all cases in a single column:

Hand A, a clear, calligraphic hand, has copied a large section of the text, using a thin ductus: ff. 1r-3v, 4v-21v, 84r-86r, 88r-89v, 91r-92v, 93r-96r, 97r-150r, 115v-121r, 123v-124r, 128v-155v (25-30 lines per page, and 30-45 letters per line). The letters are of medium size and well-formed. Some of the letters are particularly enlarged (λ, τ, ξ, κ, ο, β, γ, ζ) with close round forms, a characteristic of the style referred to as Blob style or Fettaugenstil used at that period. The most characteristic letters of this hand are rho with the curly tale (Ξ), the enlarged beta (Β), the elongated and curly gamma (Γ), ksi (Κ), zeta (Ζ) and phi (Φ), and the open theta (Θ). Ligatures such as omega-nu (Ω) and omicron-nu (Ο), as well as ypsilon accompanied by the mark of diatresis (Ю), though not original, show imagination. Letters joined with epsilon forming a ligature are also very characteristic of this hand: epsilon-iota (Ι), epsilon-ksi (Κ), epsilon-pi (Π) and epsilon-ypsilon (Υ). The scribe made use of a limited number of conventional abbreviations the most frequent being the words (καί) (ΚΑΙ), ὅπερ(αἱ)ον (ΟΠΕΡ), γνωμικόν (ΓΝΩΜΙΚÓN) and the ending --ως (---ΩΣ).

Though, no effort was made by the scribe to divide words, the text is legible. Both rough and smooth breathings, in rounded form, were used consistently (⟨, ⟩). Similarly, all accents (acute, grave, circumflex) were used by the scribe consistently. They appear in medium size and in certain cases they are joined to the letters forming a ligature (⟨).
A diaeresis sign was used over iota and ypsilon anywhere in mid-word. The scribe omitted mute iota.

Hand B, a rather untidy and untrained hand, has copied a single folio (4r),\textsuperscript{50} using medium/large letterforms in a thin d\textit{uctus} (19 lines and 39-46 letters per line). It is clear that this scribe attempted to imitate hand A, unsuccessfullly, forming particularly enlarged letters: gamma (\(\gamma\)), kappa (\(\kappa\)), sigma (\(\varsigma\)), tau (\(\tau\)), phi (\(\phi\)) and chi (\(\chi\)), and ypsilon accompanied with the diaeresis sign (\(\varepsilon\)) as well as breathings (\(\nu\)) and ypsilon-iota (\(\varepsilon\iota\)). The ligatures epsilon-ypsilon (\(\epsilon\varsigma\)), epsilon-iota (\(\epsilon\iota\)), epsilon-kappa (\(\epsilon\kappa\)), epsilon-phi (\(\epsilon\phi\)) and the ending –os (\(\sigma\)) are also very characteristic. In his limited text the scribe uses a single conventional abbreviation, that for (και) (\(\kappa\alpha\)). There is no division of words, though the text is legible. All breathings and accents were used consistently. This scribe used similarly both the mark of diaeresis over iota and ypsilon anywhere in mid-word, and omitted the mute iota.

Hand C, a calligraphic and stylized hand,\textsuperscript{50} again similar to hand A, copied ff. 22r-25v.23 (37 lines per page, and 31-36 letters per line). The letters, designed in thin d\textit{uctus}, are of small/medium size. Almost all letters appear symmetrical, with the single exception of the letter phi, which is slightly enlarged (\(\phi\)). Characteristic letters of this hand are the elongated ksi (\(\xi\)), and the small rho (\(\rho\)). Some characteristic ligatures: epsilon-iota (\(\epsilon\iota\)), epsilon-kappa (\(\epsilon\kappa\)) and sigma-phi (\(\sigma\phi\)). The abbreviated (και) (\(\kappa\alpha\)) is also used. The division of words is clearer than in the previous two hands. A hyphen joins words separated by line ends, following the rules of syllabic division. A diairesis mark over iota and ypsilon anywhere in mid-word, and omission of mute iota was employed.

The major part of the manuscript was copied by hand D, an unattractive and forceful hand, in a thick d\textit{uctus}: ff. 25v.23-83r, 100v-115r, 121v-123r, 125r-128r, 156r-211 (22-30 lines per page, and 35-50 letters per line). The letters are of medium/large size. This hand is characterised by the use of enlarged betas (\(\beta\)) and epsilons (\(\epsilon\)).

\textsuperscript{50} See below, Pl. VI.

\textsuperscript{50} See below, Pl. VII and VIII.
the elongated gammas (Γ), iotas (ι), lambdas (Λ) and nus (Ν). Taus, either standing alone (Τ) or forming ligatures with omicron (Ο) and alpha (Α), appear elongated with their tails sloping to the left. Similarly, nu and iota are sloping to the left. Characteristic ligatures are epsilon-iota (ει), epsilon-nu (εν), epsilon-ksi (εκ) and the ending -ως (ως) as well as the preposition επὶ (ἐπὶ).

The most characteristic abbreviation is the ending -ον (ον) or ων, as well as ωρ(αυ)ον (ωραυν) and γν(ωμικόν) (γνωμικόν). Word division is not consistent. Words separated at line ends are joined by a hyphen placed in the margin of the following line. There is no indication of mute iota. Variation in the formation and size of letters is the main characteristic of hand D. At first sight it appears that the text is written by different hands. A more careful collation of the letter forms, abbreviations and ligatures, however, shows that this effect is produced by the different ductus used successively by the scribe.

Given the length of this section of the text, one assumes that the scribe worked with intervals.62

Hand E took over the copying of the text from scribe A at three small sections: ff. 86v-88r, 90r-90v, 93r (24-26 lines per page, and 28-32 letters per line). This hand is similar to hand D.63 The letters, in thick ductus, are of medium size, sloping slightly to the left. Certain letters are enlarged: beta (Β), gamma (Γ), epsilon (Ε), lambda (Λ), ksi (Κ) and phi (Φ). Characteristic ligatures are epsilon-kappa (εκ) and επὶ (ἐπὶ) or ων (ων). Word division was imposed only in line ends. All breathings, in round form, and accents are used consistently. Diaeresis over iota and ypsilon anywhere in mid-word and omission of mute iota is employed.

A very small section of the text was copied by scribe F (ff. 96v-97r, 15), in thin ductus. In contrast to the previous hands, this is a rather tidy and attractive one.64 The letters are of a medium size (26 lines per page, and 33-39 letters per line). Certain letter forms were designed elongated: lambda (Λ), rho (Ρ) and ksi (Κ), while

61 See below, Pl. IX.
62 For example, on ff. 109v-112r and ff. 156r onwards, a thinner pen nib was used, while on ff. 43r-51r a softer one.
63 See below, Pl. X.
64 See below, Pl. XI.
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beta (Β) and omega (Ω) appear particularly enlarged. This variety adds to the aesthetic appearance of the text. The scribe made extensive use of ligatures, the most characteristic being combination of letters preceded by epsilon: epsilon-iota (ει), epsilon-kappa (κε) and epsilon-rho (ρε). This hand used a limited number of abbreviations, the most idiosyncratic of which is the ending –ευ (ευ).

This hand employed the same conventions regarding the diaeresis sign over iota and ypsilon, but subscribed the mute iota in certain cases. He used consistently all accents and breathings in round form.

A similar punctuation system was followed by all six copyists (A-F), to indicate different degrees of pause: comma (, ), middle point (·) and upper point (‘), which are used interchangeably, and full stop (.) 64 A considerable number of spelling mistakes, syntactical and grammatical errors and alterations of word order are observed in all hands (see below, p. 38-142).

A later hand, G, has added two subscriptions on f. 93r in small letters. 66 The first subscription, on the top margin, is illegible, as it has been trimmed. The second, written vertically, facing the outer margin, most probably refers to an as yet unidentified hagiographical text: καὶ τοῦτο ἀπέκειτο τῇ μοχθηρᾷ …… τὸ βαλ. θανάτου ἀκούσας τῆς ἁγέλας [ψυχῆς] …….. ἦν ἐξεδήλωσεν ἄφ’ ἠμῶν· ὡ ἐνδήμησεν πρὸς κ(ύριο)ν· πάντα τ(ῶν) βίου μελέτας τοῦτο πεποιημένος εὖ…………. μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων, (καὶ) τοῦτο ἀφήμημαι· διὰ τὸ (καὶ) ὦν ἐτι ποιηρ(ῶς) ἔχειν τὸν σώματος (καὶ) λίαν ἐπικινδύνως.

Marginal Notes and Scholia: The text of the Wars, Books V-VIII, is accompanied in its greater part by marginal abbreviated notes to attract the attention of the reader (such as σημείωσαί, γνωμικῶν and ωραῖον) and scholia to the text. These are placed usually on the outer margin. Books V and VI in particular are full of marginal notes and scholia, while in Books VII and VIII apart from a single extensive marginal scholion on f. 141v (VII.17.20, p. 372,22 – VII.17.24, p. 373,11) the remaining sixty folios containing these

66 See below, Pl. XII.
books contain only six brief scholia (ff. 150r, 152r, 171r, 172v, 178r, 206v). In certain cases the whole marginal space is covered by notes and scholia. With the exception of hand D, which separates scholia by a horizontal line (e.g., ff. 36r, 38r, 61v), the rest are placed one after the other with no indication of separation. In a single case (f. 49r) a scholion placed in the top margin by hand D, is not entirely legible, due to the fading ink. It is clear, however, that it refers to the text, for part of it reads: σημείωσαν πάντα ταῦτα... τὰς πόλεις ἔξελέπων (Haury, p. 182,19-21). Most probably, the scholia were added to the margin by each scribe after they completed copying their section of the text from the prototype. This is evident on ff. 45r-50r and 139v-141v, in which the scribes used a different ductus for the scholia from the one used for the main text. The only exception is a note on f. 4r.5-6 where the main text is by hand B, while the scholion was added by hand A: ἀμαλασοῦνθαι ἐπιστολὴ οὖστινιανω. Adequate space was left for the marginal scholia and notes. Usually, their length corresponds to that of the text to which they refer. A number of them are not aligned with the ruling line of the text. In addition, in certain cases, because of the small size of the letter forms, the thin ductus and the untidy handwriting, these scholia are not easily legible. It seems, therefore, most probable that the scholia were copied by the scribes from their exemplar, rather than having been introduced individually by them.

Sometimes marginal scholia are introduced by σημείωσαν, though in certain cases this abbreviated word is omitted. The same word was added in the margin to attract the readers' attention to certain passages in the text, occasionally followed by τοῦτο, ταῦτα or πάντα. Interestingly, on f. 51r a large calligraphic abbreviated σημείωσαν πάντα was written vertically in large capital letters covering half the page. On f. 69v σημείωσαν was crossed out and rewritten below, which may indicate that the scribe re-read the text from his prototype and restored the misplaced abbreviation. Scholia are also introduced by a four-dotted cross (·;·), which does not refer to a particular point of the

---

67 See below, Pl. XIII. E.g., ff. 25r, 27r, 30v, 31v, 141v.
68 See below, Pl. XIV b.
69 See below, Pl. XIV a.
70 See below, Pl. XV.
71 In very few cases σημείωσαν is written in full: e.g., ff. 45r, 46r, 49r.
72 E.g., ff. 24r, 111v, 124r, 139v.
73 E.g., ff. 22v, 27r, 32r, 39v.
74 E.g., 23r, 29v, 74r, 75r.
75 See below, Pl. XVI.
main text. Similarly, all copyists added the abbreviated calligraphic words ωφ(αιον) and γν(ωμικον) to indicate proverbial phrases and noteworthy passages.

Concerning their content, in most cases the marginal scholia summarize the content of each chapter, without adding new information with reference to persons, events or a general theme. They are rather general and lack uniformity in their use. For example, in some cases they identify persons introduced in the text, while in other cases this is completely omitted. Similarly, the outcome of events is sometimes noted in a summarised form, while this is omitted in other cases. On the basis of their content and use, they can be divided into four groups:

a. To introduce new persons in the text, adding information about their identity.
b. Titles at the beginning of speeches or letters, quoted in the text.
c. Summarised descriptions of events.
d. To indicate qualities of generals and leaders, which are demonstrated in the course of events. It is important that this last group of scholia, which reveal a critical approach, are contained only in our manuscript.

---

76 E.g., ff. 25r, 69r, 79r.
77 E.g., ff. 26v, 29r, 39r, 47r, 87r.
78 E.g., ff. 26v, 28v, 38v, 87r.
79 E.g., f. 26v (V.28.7 (p. 153, 15-17): ος γαρ κατα νοιν τα παροντα χωρει, έφ ’ έτερον μεταβάλλεσαι δεξιμοφορον ομα; f. 29r (V.29.12 (p. 141, 9-10): βοσκει γαρ αυτων την παραθηαν το παρα την δξιαν ευτυχια; f. 38v (VI.3.17 (p. 162, 4-5): πανω γαρ εικατως άναρατος ειναι δοκευ μηκυνομενος τοις ουκ εν φερομενοις το βιος; f. 47r (VI.6.29 (p. 178, 17-19): τοις γαρ ευεργειοις ή χαριτω τυφος αρξατες τοις ίσοις άμελεσθα δξουν. To our knowledge, these proverbs are unique, cf. Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum, ed. E.L. Leutsch - F.G. Schneidewin, (Hildesheim, 1958) and Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. For thirteenth-century annotated collections of proverbs, see George of Cyprus, PG 142, cols. 445-70, and Maximos Planudes, ed. by E. Kurtz, Die Sprichwortersammlung des Maximus Planudes (Leipzig, 1886). These lists may have served mainly teaching purposes.
80 E.g., f. 87r (VI.23.30 (p. 256, 4-10): το γαρ υπερβαλλει τα άγαθα παντα προς το χειρον αει τρεπονθαι ειδον. ιμεις ουν μη το φιλονεικω το λοιπον σφαλλεσθη, φευγεν γαρ δε που τον κακουργουτα ουδεμια αισχυνην. αλλ’ ο μεν εσ κακων προωπτων άνεσικέπτων ίων και σωθεις ενθενδει, αν ουν τυχη, άνουν οδισκαιειν.
81 E.g., f. 61v (VI.14.14 (p. 208, 2): Βελισαρίου δυρφόρος έτερος δε Μασσαγέτης γένος.
83 E.g., f. 8v (V.11.29 (p. 63, 3-6): οτι Φραγγοι Γερμανοι το παλαιαν ήσαν; f. 20v (V.23.22 (p. 112, 10-13): αποκυψροσ γοςθων; f. 32v (VI.1.4 (p. 150, 9): και τα περι Κωνσταντινου και των συν αυτω ουνων; f. 34v (VI.1.27 (p. 153, 19): τα περι Χρομομάντιδος και της αυτου τελευτης; f. 29v (V.29.16 (p. 141, 23-24): οτι ουτινης και βελισαριος δπισθεν των στρατευματων υπηρχου έκατερος έγκυευμενος τους αυτου. 
Two scholia with reference to Thucydides’ method and style would suggest familiarity with the text of the Peloponnesian War, reflecting at the same time an interest in Attic phrases, in the general context of mimesis of classical authors by Byzantine writers. A scholion on f. 73r is most revealing with regard to the scribe’s appreciation of the text: ὧραὶα ταῦτα τοῦ προκοπίου, ὅμοιο δὲ καὶ χρήσιμα.  

CORRECTIONS, ADDITIONS AND ERRORS: Interlinear and a few marginal corrections appear throughout the manuscript by the same hands who copied the text. Therefore, as in the case of the marginal scholia, most probably these additional variants may have been contained in the lost prototype. Most of them are superscribed corrections (without deleting the erroneous letters). In a single case a preposition omitted was added above the line. In addition, superscribed variants appear joined by the particle η. In certain cases the particle η precedes corrected words placed in the margin.

Deletion of words is marked either by dots encircling the erroneous word or letter/s, or by simply crossing out. Omitted words were occasionally added in the margin.

---

84 E.g., f. 16r (V. 18.37 (p. 95, 9-11): πρόνοια στρατηγοῦ; f. 35r (VI.2.1 (p. 155, 1): πρόνοια καὶ ἐπίνοια ἄμα Βελισσαρίου σὺν τοῖς καθ’ ἐκαστὸν; f. 36r (VI.2.14 (p. 156, 8): ὁ δὲ Ρωμαῖος ὑπερείχον ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ συμπληκτῇ.
85 See below, Pl. XVII a and b. f. 39v: Θεοκύδιδου τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο τῆς φράσεως for the phrase VI.3.25 (p.163, 12): πόλεμος γὰρ οὐκ ἔξ ἀλογιστὸν σπουδὴς καταρθοῦσαν φιλεῖ, ἀλλὰ εὐθυλία δὲ καὶ προμηθεία τῆς τῶν καιρῶν ἀλλ’ σταθμώμενος βοηθήν and f. 43v: Θεοκύδιδου τὸ ἔθος, for the original text VI.5.8 (p. 171, 17): ταύτης τῆς πόλεως νόκτωρ τὴν οἰκοδομίαν περιέλα, οὐδὲν τῶν πάντων προειρημένων, τὸ πλείστον τοῦ στρατοῦ ἐνταῦθα ἡτοιμαζέων.
86 These phrases do not appear in the text of the Peloponnesian War.
88 See below, Pl. XVII c. Cf. below, pp. 177-8.
89 f. 2r.8: ξυμφέρουν sscr. -ει, f. 3r.21: διατριβεῖ sscr. -οι, f. 15v.23: ἔκπεσον sscr. εμ.; f. 33r.22: πολλαίς, sscr. -α; f. 36v.11: λαβομένος sscr. -ου; f. 47v.1: ἄνευ- crystasamaioussan sscr. -τι; f. 50r.19: μέσου sscr. -η; f. 51r.25: πεισαθαι sscr. -ο; f. 57r.2: ἔριπτου sscr. -ου; f. 84v.4: μέλεια sscr. -η; (see below, Pl. XVIII b); f. 87v.1: ἀνάφαγεται sscr. -η; f. 115r.6: ἀνθρώπου sscr. -ων; f. 140v.18: ποιήσας sscr. -ος; (see below, Pl. XVIII a); f. 141v.25: τεόις sscr. -η; f. 145r.13: ὑπανταίας sscr. -η; f. 482v.10: νόμου sscr. κόσμον, f. 186r.23: ἀπαίρουσα sscr. ἀπαίρεται; f. 208r.19: χόροι sscr. -ω.
90 f. 19r.16: τυχών sscr. -ει (see below, Pl. XVIII c).
91 f. 115r.11: διαβαινοῦσα sscr. -ες ἡ διαβαίνατας; f. 119v.1: ἀντικαθισταμένου sscr. ἡ ἀντιστοιχίας (see below, Pl. XVIII a); f. 124v.26: ὑπανταίας sscr. ἡ σαντες; f. 132v.9: ἔλθων sscr. ἡ ἕκαστον.
92 f. 55r.17: αἰτίος in marg. ἡ αἰτίωστος; f. 140v.18: τρυφεροτέραι in marg. τρυφερωτάτην (see below, Pl. XVIII d).
93 f. 77r.20: εἰς; f. 87r.12: λεπτοῦ (see below, Pl. XIX a); f. 189r.24: χωρίων.
94 f. 15r.24 – 15v.17: αὕτω τε διαφυγὸτες ... τὰ πράγματα διεσώσατο repeated by scribe A, due to homoiooteleuton. Cf. f. 20v.27-28: τὸν ἀπόστολον ... τοῦτον δὲ τὸν is repeated but is not crossed out by.
The text of *Ath* is full of minor errors as well as unique readings, which are analysed and discussed below (see pp. 38-142). It seems that the prototype contained most of these errors, as similar mistakes appear in all six hands (A-F) that copied the manuscript *Ath*. The following list indicates the most important of these errors against Haury’s text.\(^{95}\)

(1) Spelling errors due to confusion of sounds:

(a) Iotacism (affecting ν, λ, υ, ει, οι, and ωι): thus, ἐπεἴθοντο for ἐπύθοντο (f. 10v, p. 68,12); ὤθησιμῷ for ὤθισμῷ (f. 14v, p. 91,16); μυρόν for μηρόν (f. 36v, p. 157,16); προσεδρίαν for προσεδρείαν (f. 54r, p. 193,20 and f. 56r, p. 197,14).

(b) Confusion of η and ωι: thus, κατέρευν for καταίρευν (f. 24r, p. 129,26); ἐφέναιτο for ἐφαϊνετο (f. 29v, p. 142,5).

(c) Confusion of ω and θ: thus, ὦτι for ὦτι (f. 25v, p. 133,24); πότωτε for πώποτε (f. 46r, p. 176,23); κατορρωθηκότες for κατωρρωθηκότες (f. 94r, p. 270,19); λελοφηκέναι for λελωφηκέναι (f. 159v, p. 411,4); ἵσχυρότατα for ἵσχυρότατα (f. 176v, p. 461,4).

(2) Alteration of word order: thus, ἀπολείψεσθαι τῆς ξυμβολῆς for τῆς ξυμβολῆς ἀπολείψεσθαι (f. 38v, p. 161,14); ὅπως φυλασσομένῳ for φυλασσομένῳ ὅπως (f. 69v, p. 223,16); ἑδόκει ταύτα for ταύτα ἑδόκει (f. 86v, p. 255,11).

(3) Additions

(a) of articles to specify the subject (εἷν τοῖς ἀλλοις τισί, (f. 21v, p. 116,5).

(b) of particles and prepositions (εἷνῳ τε καὶ φιλῶν, (f. 123r, p. 334,19); ἐν ὁμολογίᾳ παρέδοσαν, (f. 96r, p. 274,2).

(c) due to lapsus calami (ὁχυρωμάτων ὀπίσω τοῖς πολεμίοις ἀπολείημένων ὀπίσω πολλῶν, (f. 195r, p. 517,23).

(d) due to interpolation (τίτανον κοῦλα ἄσβεστος καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ γύπος, (f. 156v, p. 402,15).

---

the scribe. F. 135v.12: crossed out ζημίας without replacing it with the correct word πόλεως (contained in the remaining manuscripts) (see below, Pl. XIX b); f. 137v.2: deleted ἔκκερτος without giving the corrected word; f. 151v.8: repeated and then crossed out ἐγνώκατε.

\(^{95}\) F. 101v.5: τρός βασιλέως (see below, Pl. XIX c) and f. 174r.23: τὰ παρόντα.

\(^{96}\) Erroneous words and rejected variants are placed first.
(4) Omissions of words and phrases: thus, om. ἐπευόει τάδε (f. 94v, p. 270, 15); om. δόντες (f. 99v, p. 281,4); om. τὰ πρῶτα (f. 106v, p. 299,9); om. προσέσχε (f. 162v, p. 420,18); om. οὗδὲν μέντοι (f. 163v, p. 423,17).

(5) Errors in foreign names: thus, Περσίδιος for Πρεσίδιος (f. 50v, p. 186, 7 and 9); ἀρταβασίος for Ταρβησίος (f. 110v, p. 306,21).

(6) Attractions: thus δέει τῷ Ἕλευρέθῳ for Θεονδερίγυ (f. 9v, p. 66,16).

(7) Errors which may be due to misunderstanding of abbreviations: thus, ἐνθάδε for ἐνθένδε (f. 13v, p. 88,8); ἐδοξάν for ἐδοξεύν (f. 83v, p. 248,19).

(8) Haplographies / dittographies: thus, τήνδε δε for τήνδε (f. 46r, p. 176,12).

(9) Errors due to misunderstanding of meaning: thus, αὐτοῦς for αὐτὸν (f. 20v, p. 110,16); ἱόντος for ἱόντι (f. 24r, p. 129,15).

(10) Change, additions and omissions of prepositions: thus, προσλαμβανόντες for προαλλάμβανοντες (f. 22r, p. 124,17-18); κυνδωνεύειν for διακυνδωνεύειν (f. 26r, p. 134,23); ἐπλησσε for ἐξεπιλησσε (f. 35v, p. 156,8).


(13) Possible misreadings / visual copying errors; ἐντὸς for ἐκτὸς (f. 98r, p. 277,21); τύχην for ψυχήν (f. 167r, p. 433,8); βαρυτάτην for βαθυτάτην (f. 197r, p. 523,19).
DATE AND PROVENANCE: Eustratiades attributed the manuscript to the fourteenth century, without providing evidence for this assumption. In the absence of a colophon and further internal indications, we have to rely on codicological and palaeographical evidence for the dating of the codex. On stylistic grounds of the script, it has been suggested that the manuscript belongs to the late thirteenth century, rather than the fourteenth. A collation of the script with other similar hands points to the same conclusion. This remains to be confirmed by an examination of any watermarks in the codex.

According to the ex libris, added by a thirteenth-fifteenth-century hand on the top margin of f. 1r, the manuscript was owned at some stage by an unidentified hegoumenos Athanasios: βιβλίου τῶν καθηγουμένων δοσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀθανασίου. In the absence of any information on Athanasios or any other detail on its provenance it is impossible to say whether this manuscript was copied on Mount Athos, and in particular in the monastery of Lavra, which was a major centre of copying activity at the time. Similarly, it is difficult to say whether it was copied by monks or laymen scholars. The collection of manuscripts of the Lavra Monastery comprises a number of secular texts, though whether these manuscripts were copied there, it is impossible to say at this stage.

97 See above fn. 43.
98 I would like to thank Mr. Nigel Wilson, who kindly examined specimens of the manuscript and confirmed my original late thirteenth-century dating, on the basis of scribal habits (e.g. beta-gamma script, i.e. Blob style or Fettaugenmode); cf. N. G. Wilson, "The investigation of the scribal habits", in I manuscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito: atti del v colloquio internazionale di paleografia greca (Cremona, 4-10 ottobre 1998), ed. G. Prato (Florence, 2000), p. 686; N. G. Wilson, "Nicean and Palaeologan Hands: Introduction to a Discussion" in La paléographie greque et byzantine, Colloques internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 559 (Paris, 1977), p. 263-267 (cf. A. Turyn’s response in the same volume, p. 266).
99 Cf. specimens in A. Turyn, Codices graeci Vaticani saeculis XIII et XIV (Vatican, 1964): Pl. 30 cod. Borgia gr. 18 (1273 AD); Pl. 33 cod. Vat. gr. 690 (1279 AD); Pl. 62 cod. Vat. gr. 191 (c. 1296 AD); A. Turyn, Dated Greek manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in the libraries of Italy (Urbana, 1972): Pl. 17 Plut. 32, 16 (1280 AD); Pl. 28 Marc. VII, 12, written by hieromonk Sabas (1283 AD); Pl. 65 Ambr. C.126 inf. (c 1294-95 AD); Pl. 73 Marc. 481 written by an amanuensis of Planudes (1299 AD); A. Turyn, Dated Greek manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in the libraries of Great Britain (Washington, 1980): Pl. 12 Bodl. Roe 7 written by the monk Galaktion (1278-79 AD); Pl. 24 Bodl. Roe 13 written on Mount Galesion (1284-85 AD); Pl. 42 Nat. Lib. of Scotland Adv. 18.7.15 written by an amanuensis of Planudes (c. 1290); E. Gamillscheg, Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten, 800-1600 (Vienna, 1981): II Taf. 53 Paris. 2993 written by George of Cyprus (c. 1275/1300 AD); II Taf. 95 Paris. Cosil. 104 (c. 1250-1300 AD); II Taf. 227 Par. 1715 written by Mokios Taranes (1289 AD); III Taf. 123 Var. 1345 (c.1275-1300 AD); III Taf. 253 Vat. Reg. 31 (1281-82 AD).
100 See below, Pl. XX.
101 No information on Athanasios, hegoumenos in any of the Athonite monasteries is mentioned in E. Trapp, Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit (Vienna, 1976-1996).
102 N. Oikonomides, “Mount Athos, Levels of literacy”, DOP 42 (1988), 167-78 refers to the Mount Athos as a center of copying, as well as about the fact that the monks were not as illiterate as usually assumed.
The style of the script itself cannot provide conclusive evidence as to the place of its production. For, due to the mobility of scholars and scribes, similar hands appear in different parts of the Empire in the same period. In addition, there was considerable movement of manuscripts in the Empire. It is difficult, therefore, to identify the place of production of our manuscript with Mount Athos, Constantinople, or Thessaloniki, the main centres of cultural and copying activity at the time, or indeed elsewhere. All palaeographical evidence suggests, however, that codex Ath was produced most probably as a private copy, rather than a textbook for general use.

---

104 Cf. J. Irigoin "Essai de bilan et perspectives d'avenir" in Scritture, libri e testi nelle aree provinciali di Bisanzio, Atti del seminario di Erice (18-25 Settembre 1988), eds. G. Cavallo, G. de Gregorio, M. Maniaci, vol. II, (Spoleti, 1991) 171-179; E. Gamillscheg "Probleme der Lokalisierung von Handschriftengruppen" in I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito: atti del 1° colloquio internazionale di paleografia greca (Cremona, 4-10 ottobre 1998), ed. G. Prato (Florence, 2000), pp. 689-93. I would like to express my thanks to Prof. E. Gamillscheg, who drew my attention to several scholars and scribes who were active in this period in various parts of the Empire: Gamillscheg, Repertorium: II 28 (Anthimos Nomikopoulos), II 99 (George of Cyprus), II 403 (Mokios Taranes), III 512 (Nikolaos Perdikares).

Position of Ath in Stemma

2. A study of the text in codex Ath

**POSITION OF CODEX ATH IN THE STEMMA CODICUM**

A late thirteenth-century dating of Ath places this codex in a prominent position in the manuscript tradition of Procopius' Wars Books V-VIII; for, it is earlier than or contemporary with the principal manuscript L (Laurentianus 69.8), which is dated in the fourteenth century.\(^{106}\) Ath seems to be contemporary with the second earlier manuscript K (Vaticanus gr. 1690), which was dated more recently to the thirteenth century,\(^ {107}\) and with the fourteenth-century codex V (Vaticanus gr. 152).\(^ {108}\) On the basis of Haury's classification of manuscripts in two families, z and y, it is important to establish the position of Ath in the stemma codicum on the basis of a collation of the text in Ath with the principal manuscripts of the two families, K and L respectively.

A collation between the readings, which affect the phonology and morphology of the text, shows a close relationship between Ath and L. They are mainly spelling mistakes in proper names, phonetic / orthographic mistakes and errors possibly due to misreading:

1) V.1.27 (p.8, 16) \(\text{άνδρείας L, Ath Suid. : άνδρείας V}\)
2) V.5.3 (p.25, 18) \(\text{ίνοκέντιος L, Ath : ινοκέντιος V}\)
3) V.18.12 (p. 91, 14) \(\text{εἶναι L, Ath : οἶμαι K}\)
4) V.27.15 (p. 132, 8) \(\text{διαλάσσουν L, Ath : διαλλάσσουν K}\)
5) VI.29.8 (p. 283, 16) \(\text{πολλοὶς L, Ath : πολλοὺς K}\)
6) VI.30.5 (p. 289, 22) \(\text{άτυχου L, Ath, άτύχως K}\)
7) VII.5.1 (p. 318, 5) \(\text{φλωρεντίαν L, Ath : φλορεντίαν K}\)
8) VII.15.9 (p. 361, 20) \(\text{ἐτί L, Ath : ἐτί K}\)
9) VII.25.19 (p. 411, 1) \(\text{δυνήσηθε L, Ath : δυνήσεθαι K}\)
10) VIII.5.8 (p. 504, 14) \(\text{ἐπισπέσθαι L, Ath : ἐπεισπέσθαι K}\)
11) VIII.13.22 (p. 556, 11) \(\text{ἐζησαν L, Ath : ἔζησαν K}\)
12) VIII.13.25 (p. 556, 20) \(\text{μάλα L, Ath : μᾶλλον K}\)

\(^{107}\) Description of the codex in P. Canart, *Codices Vaticani Graeci (codices 1684-1744)*, (Vatican, 1961), pp. 9-10; Haury dated K to the fourteenth century, *Prolegomena* p. XLIII-XLIV.
\(^{108}\) There is a description of the codex in I. Mercati – P. F. De Cavalieri, *Codices Vaticani Graeci* (Rome, 1923), vol. 1, pp. 174-175. This codex contains parts of the text, which are directly derived from K, at a time when that was complete.
The above readings consist of errors, which are due to confusion of sounds \textit{(parechesis)}, and orthographical variations, both of which are very common among Byzantine scribes.\textsuperscript{109} In this sense, such variants are not of great importance, though there are some readings of this kind, such as the ones listed below, which are common in \textbf{K} and \textbf{Ath} against \textbf{L}:

1) V.12.37 (p. 68, 18) \hspace{1em} μέλησιν \textbf{L} : μέλλησιν \textbf{K}, \textbf{Ath}
2) V.26.1 (p. 127, 21) \hspace{1em} ραβένναν \textbf{L} : ραβένναν \textbf{K}, \textbf{Ath}
3) V.26.14 (p. 129, 20) \hspace{1em} ἔκτειναν \textbf{L} : ἔκτεινον \textbf{K}, \textbf{Ath}
4) V.27.2 (p. 130, 13) \hspace{1em} σκλαβηνοῖ \textbf{L} : σκλαβίνοι \textbf{K}, \textbf{Ath}
5) V.28.15 (p. 136, 15) \hspace{1em} αὐρηλίας \textbf{L} : αὐρηλίας \textbf{K}, \textbf{Ath}
6) V.29.31 (p. 143, 23) \hspace{1em} τοῖς \textbf{L} : τῆς \textbf{K}, \textbf{Ath}
7) V.29.42 (p. 145, 17) \hspace{1em} οὐδέτερον \textbf{L} : οὐδέτερον \textbf{K}, \textbf{Ath}
8) V.29.46 (p. 146, 1) \hspace{1em} ξυνειδελλούσιν \textbf{L} : ξυμβάλλονσιν \textbf{K}, \textbf{Ath}
9) VI.20.16 (p. 238, 17) \hspace{1em} ἐπιτολῆς \textbf{L} : ἐπιτολῆς \textbf{K}, \textbf{Ath}
10) VIII.3.19 (p. 499, 21) \hspace{1em} εὐνοὐχων \textbf{K}, \textbf{Ath} : εὐνοὺχον \textbf{L}
11) VIII.14.32 (p. 562, 11) \hspace{1em} ἀπὸ ταὐτομάτου \textbf{K}, \textbf{Ath} : ἀπ’ αὐταυτομάτου \textbf{L}

Variations in vocabulary, on the other hand, offer a more stable basis for the establishment of the relation of the manuscripts. A collation of variant readings, changes, additions, omissions, deletions and transpositions of words introduced in \textbf{Ath} and \textbf{L}, show a close relationship. The following list of \textbf{Ath} and \textbf{L} (against \textbf{K} and \textbf{V}) demonstrates this clearly:

1) V.1.25 (p. 8, 5) \hspace{1em} ἐπὶ θολὴν καλέσας \textbf{L}, \textbf{Ath} : καλέσας ἐπὶ θολὴν \textbf{V}
2) V.1.33 (p. 9, 19) \hspace{1em} πικροτάτους \textbf{L}, \textbf{Ath} : πονηροτάτους \textbf{V}
3) V.1.36 (p. 10, 5) \hspace{1em} τοῦ τέρατος τῷ ὑπερβάλλοντι \textbf{L}, \textbf{Ath} : τοῦ τέρατος \textbf{V}
4) V.2.16 (p. 12, 12) \hspace{1em} om. \textbf{L}, \textbf{Ath} : ὁ πατὴρ \textbf{V}
5) V.2.28 (p. 14, 23) \hspace{1em} ἔστελλε \textbf{L}, \textbf{Ath} : ἔπεμπτε \textbf{V}
6) V.4.5 (p. 20, 18) \hspace{1em} ἐπιστασθαι \textbf{L}, \textbf{Ath} : ἐξεπιστασθαι \textbf{V}

\textsuperscript{109} For these conventions in Medieval Greek, see R. Browning, \textit{Medieval and Modern Greek} (London, 1969), pp. 32-33; G. Horrocks, \textit{Greek, a History of the Language and its Speakers} (London, 1997), pp. 102ff.
In addition to these similarities in vocabulary and word order, it appears that Ath and L share the same syntactical construction (usually incorrect form of the verb) of the text, against K and V. In the following examples L and Ath preserve inferior syntactical tradition to that of K and V:


4) VI.8.8 (p. 187,14): ἀφελῶνται K : ἀφέληται τις L, Ath: ...ίνα ἐπειδὴν τις τοῦς βαρβάρους ἱκέτης ἐς αὐτοὺς ἴκοιτο, οἶδε ἀφέλωνται βία δόσα ἃν τὴν εἰ ἐν χερσίν ἔχων.

Ἀξίμων πόλιν, Γότθων μὲν ἐνταῦθα φρούραν οὕκ ἀξιώρεών τινα ἐμαθεν ἐλα.

7) VII.35.1 (p. 453,6): ἢσχύσας V: ἢσχυσεν L, Ath: Βελισάριος ... οὐδεὶς κόσμῳ
ηῇ ... γῆς μὲν τῆς Ἰταλῶν πενταετές οὐδαμὴ ἀποβᾶς, οὐδὲ πη ἄδω ἴέναι ἐνταῦθα ἢσχύσας ... ἐχόμενος ... ναυτιλόμενος.

8) VII.36.9 (p. 459, 20): ἦκωσι V: ἤκοντα L, Ath: ...ἐπειδὰν δὲ τοῦ περιβόλου ἄγχυστα ἦκωσι...

It appears, therefore, that Ath belongs to the same family with L, family y, rather than to family z (with K and V). Although Ath and L are closely related, L is not an apograph from Ath, as they do not share absolutely similar text. A further collation of Ath with all codices of family y (except d)¹¹⁰ indicates that it contains unique readings (with a single exception),¹¹¹ which confirm emendations introduced by Haury and earlier editors and scholars, and offers new defensible readings. On the other hand, Ath also contains a large number of minor errors and variants, mostly due to parecheses,iotacisms, the euphonic -ν, double or single consonants, additions or omissions of words and phrases. When these errors are common in the manuscripts copied from the fifteenth to the sixteenth century, this is indicated in each case. The errors are grouped under the following categories:

1. Confirmation of editors' emendations
2. New defensible readings
3. Frequent errors and obvious slips of the pen (lapsus calami)
   3.1. Double / Single consonants
   3.2. Parecheses
      3.2.1. ω / ω
      3.2.2. α / α
      3.2.3. General parecheses
   3.3. Iotacisms (ι / η / ε/ οι)
   3.4. Omission / addition of the euphonic -ν
   3.5. σιν / ξιν

¹¹⁰ I have not been able to examine codex Monac. gr. 513 of the end of the sixteenth century, as the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek informed me that as this manuscript is very tightly bound and the writing goes right up to the binding fold, it is not possible to photograph it. See I. Hardt, Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Baiaricae, vol. 5 (Munich, 1812) pp. 261-62; B. Flusin, “La tradition manuscrite du De Aedificiis”, Antiquité Tardive 8 (2000) 10: “copié en partie par C. Labbaeus”.

¹¹¹ See below 1.1.c, p. 25: V. 17.17 (p. 85, 6).
3.6. εἰς / ἐς
3.7. Slips of the pen (*lapsus calami*)
3.8. Inversion of the order of words
3.9. Additions of words and phrases
   3.9.1. Article to specify the subject
   3.9.2. Particles
   3.9.3. Prepositions
   3.9.4. Interpolation / Glosses
3.10. Omissions of words and phrases
   3.10.1. Omissions, which affect the syntax
   3.10.2. Omissions, which do not affect the syntax
3.11. Errors in proper and foreign names
3.12. Attractions
3.13. Errors due to possible misunderstanding of abbreviations and ligatures
3.15. Possible misunderstanding of meaning
3.16. Possible misunderstanding of syntax (incorrect form of the verb)
3.17. Vocabulary
   3.17.1. Possible misreadings or visual errors
   3.17.2. Prepositions
   3.17.3. Particles
   3.17.4. Ordinary / familiar words
   3.17.5. Interpolation / Glosses
3.18. Various other errors
1. CONFIRMATIONS OF EDITORS’ EMENDATIONS / CORRECTIONS

1.1. Spelling and other minor mistakes

1.1.a) V. 4.18 (p. 23,2): καὶ Ἄμαλασσώνθη ἐξηγενόμενον λάθρα ξυμπάσης πέρι (Ath and edd.: περὶ rell.) τῆς Ἰταλίας διοικήσασθαι. Ath confirms an editorial correction. All other manuscripts transmit the wrong accent. In Ath the preposition πέρι because of the anastrophe appears correctly as περὶ. But the fact that the preposition is between the adjective and the noun ξυμπάσης πέρι τῆς Ἰταλίας may have confused the other scribes.

1.1.b) V. 14.16 (p. 78,17-20): ... (Ῥώμη) διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐπιθαλάσσιος εἶναι, καὶ τείχος περιβαλλόμενη τοσοῦτον τι χρῆμα, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐν πεδίῳ κειμένη ἐσ ἄγαν (Ath and edd.: ἐσάγαν rell.) ὑπίπτω τοῖς ἐπιούσιν εὐφοδος, ὡς τὸ εἰκός, ἐστὶν. Ath transmits the correct reading, while all other manuscripts transmit ἐσάγαν, an arguable Byzantine convention of using together a preposition with an adverb.112

1.1.c) V. 17.17 (p. 89,5-7): ΤΗΧΟΟ ΞΕ άυΤΟΙΣ άυΤΟΜΟΛΟΙ ΔΥΟ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΚΟΣΙ (Ath, c, k and edd.: εἴκοσι rell.), βάρβαροι μὲν γένος, στρατιώται δὲ Ῥωμαίοι... Some of the scribes perhaps are confused by the resemblance of the ending of the numeral εἴκοσι to the ending of the dative, or most possibly they just add a final -ν to the word, which is very frequent in manuscripts. It is interesting that manuscripts k and c of the sixteenth century also transmit the word without the final ν, like Ath.

1.1.d) VI. 2.6 (p. 155,10-11): ἡδεῖ (Ath and edd.: ἡδη rell.) γὰρ Εὐθαλίον τε καὶ τοὺς ξίνην αὐτῶ ἢ νῦκτα ἄφιξεσθαι. Ath confirms the editors’ conjecture. The mistake in all other manuscripts is possibly due to iotacism.

1.1.e) VI. 11.8 (p. 197, 15-16): τοιαῦτη μὲν γνώμη Βελισάριος τοῖς ἀμφὶ Μαρτίνον τε καὶ Ἱλδίγερα ταῦτα ἐπήγγελλεν (Ath and edd.: ἐπήγγελλων δ, ἐπήγγελλεν rell.). The scribe of Ath doubles the λ in almost all types of the verb ἄγγέλλω. In this case Ath transmits the verb with double λ, perhaps not because he was

---

112 See parallel cases in 3.3 d, pp. 47-48.
aware of the correct spelling, but because he frequently does so. All manuscripts copied later transmit ἐπὶ ὅγγελεν, except for δ, which transmits the wrong reading ἐπὶ ὅγγελλῳν. The participle of δ is not suitable, because it leaves the sentence without a finite verb.

1.1.f) VI. 22.22 (p. 250, 19-21): ... ἀνόρας παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ ὅραμεν ἑπτάθεσθαι ὑποσχόμενος, οὐπερ ἐς Γόπθος τάς σπουδάς θήσονται, δήν ἐν ἑκατέρως ἐξυνόισειν μέλλῃ (edd., μέλλει sed sscr. μέλλη Αθ, μέλλλα Κ, μέλλει Λ). Λ and Αθ transmit the wrong mood of the verb; Αθ corrects to subjunctive, which is the correct syntax: "in whatever way it would benefit both sides". So, the correction of Αθ by the same hand as the text is in conformity with the editors’ emendation; later manuscripts transmit the ending –ει.

1.1.g) VII. 4.17 (p. 315, 18-20): καὶ μὴν καὶ τῷ (Αθ and edd.: τὸ rell.) ἦν ἡμῶν ἐς αὐτοῖς δέει εὐέλπιδας ἃν ἡμᾶς ἐς τὸν ἁγῶνα γίνεσθαι πρέπει. The article defines the dative δέει. All manuscripts, except for Αθ, make a phonetic mistake.

1.1.h) VII. 5 (p. 321, 22-23): Βριττίους (Αθ and Haury : Βριττίους Dind., βριττίους rell.) μὲν καὶ Λευκανοῦς παρεστησατο... The reading of Αθ confirms Haury's emendation.113 This may not be the accidental duplication of a consonant between vowels. Errors in proper names are very frequent in manuscripts, because the scribes are unfamiliar with their foreign etymology; it would have been impossible for the scribe of Αθ himself to correct the reading; the correct reading possibly existed in the exemplar.

1.1.i) VII. 6.12 (p. 322, 24-323, 1): ἦν γὰρ πολεμίων ἐργῶν οὐδαμῶς ἐμπειρος καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ δεῖλος (Αθ and edd.: δηλὸς rell.) τε καὶ μελητῆς ἐς τὰ μάλιστα. The iotacism is the cause of the error in all other manuscripts; however, it is not possible to say whether the reading in Αθ was an accidental phonetic change or if it existed in his exemplar. Αθ contains several spelling errors due to iotacism.114

113 See W. Pape-G. E. Benseler, Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen (Braunschweig, 1884), s.v. Βριττία.
114 See below, 3.3.
1.1.j) VII. 8.20 (p. 331, 20-22): σκέψασε γὰρ ἦν (Ath and Haury : ἦν rell., ὅσον ἦν Hoesch. and Dind., ὦς ἦν Maltr., sed neque ὅσον neque ὦς licet addere, cf. lib. VII cap. 34,10) ἡμῖν κατ' ἀρχὰς τοῦτο τοῦ πολέμου στρατιωτῶν μὲν πλῆθος δόξη τε καὶ τῇ ἐς τοὺς κυνάντως ἐμπειρία λαμπρόν... The reading of all manuscripts, except for Ath, is the conditional ἦν. This is wrong, because the sentence cannot be conditional; the dative ἡμῖν, which follows immediately, needs the verb ἦν. The scribes were possibly confused by the fact that the verb is placed at the beginning of the sentence, which is normal for a conditional. The reading of Ath confirms the emendation of Haury.

1.1.k) VII. 26.23 (p. 416, 4): Ἐρούλων (Ath and edd.: ἐρούλλων rell.). Although most times Ath transmit this name with double λ between vowels, in this case the word is transmitted correctly, confirming the emendation of the editors. This example suggests that Ath transmits the correct word possibly accidentally.

1.1.l) VII. 35.21 (p. 456, 12-14): καὶ ὁς μελλήσει (Ath and edd.: μελλήσει rell.) οὐδὲμιᾷ ἔστι τοῖς ἐπομένοις καὶ Γησαίδων τισίν ἐθελουσίοις ἐς Σκλαβηνοῦς αὐθις ἀφίκετο. All manuscripts transmit the wrong spelling with a single λ between vowels (noun μέλησις instead of μελλησις), while Ath, possibly accidentally due to its general tendency to duplicate λs between vowels, confirms the editors’ emendation.

1.1.m) VIII. 11.21 (p. 538, 9): ἀποκεκρυμένης (Ath and Braun : ἀποκεκρυμένης rell.). An iotacistic error, which appear in all other manuscripts, perhaps due to confusion with another verb (possibly κρύσειν).

1.1.n) VIII. 9.21 (p. 528, 21-22): ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῶν Τραχέων ὡς ἀγχοτάτω (Ath and edd.: ἀγχωτάτω rell.) ἐγένοντο... This is a phonetic error by all other manuscripts except Ath.

1.1.o) VIII. 10.4 (p. 531, 11-13): καὶ ἀπ' αὕτων Μήδοι οὐ Δαζικὴν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ασιλιάν ἔχουσαν τότε πρὸς αὐτῶν (Ath and edd.: τότε πρὸς αὐτῶν K, πρὸς
αὐτῶν τότε Λ) ὄντο. **Ath** confirms the emendation of the editors, which is certainly the correct reading. **L** just changes the word order and **K** makes a phonetic error.

1.1.p) VIII. 10.14 (p. 533, 9): **ἐκεχειρία** (**Ath** and edd.: **ἐκκεχειρία** **K**, **ἐγκεχειρία** **L**). **Ath** transmits the word correctly against other manuscripts. The same in 11.10 (p. 536, 4).

1.1.q) VIII. 11.30 (p. 540, 6-7): ...κατὰ μέσην τὴν μηχανήν ἀλύσειον **ἀναρτήσαντες** (**Ath** and edd.: **ἀρτήσαντες** **K**, **ἀναρτήσαντες** **L**) χαλαραίς τισιν... **L** has a phonetic error and **K** transmits a wrong reading without the preposition. **Ath** must have copied correctly from the exemplar.

1.2. Omissions and Additions

1.2.a) VII. 16.1 (p. 362, 22-363, 1): ἐτύγχανε γὰρ πολὺν τινα χρόνου διὰ τούτο ἐν Σικελίᾳ <δια>τριβήν (**Ath** and Braun: τριβήν rell.). **Ath** only transmits the correct reading, which confirmed Braun’s emendation. I assume that the scribe of **Ath** did not correct the reading himself, but he found it like this in his exemplar. The correct reading is that of all other manuscripts in 15.9 (p. 361, 19-21): Τότε καὶ Βυζίλιος, ὁ τῆς Ρώμης ἀρχιερεὺς, ἐν Σικελίᾳ διατριβήν (τριβήν **Ath**) ἤχοιν ναῦς ὅτι πλείστας σίτου ἐμπλησάμενος ἐπεμψεν... The phrases τριβήν ἤχειν and διατριβήν ἤχειν have the same meaning: "spend a lot of time". The phrase τριβήν ἤχειν is never used by Procopius.

1.2.b) VII. 24.24 (p. 405, 18-21): φθάσαντες δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων οἱ εὐτολμότατοι τὸ τε σημεῖον ἀρτάζουσι καὶ τοῦ (**Ath** and edd.: om. rell) νεκροῦ χείρα τὴν λαιάν ἀποτεμόντες εῦν αὐτοῖς ἔλαβον. **Ath** is the only manuscript that transmits the article, which is absolutely necessary here, because the dead soldier has to be defined with the use of an article, as he has been mentioned in the previous sentence.

1.3. Syntax and Grammar

1.3.a) V. 3.7 (p. 16,1-4): ἀνθρώπῳ γὰρ οὐδὲ τὰ ἀνθρώπεια ἐς τὸ ἀκριβῆς οἴμαι καταληπτὰ, μὴ τί γε δὴ τὰ εἰς θεοῦ φύσιν ἥκοντα. ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν ταύτα ἀκινδύνως σεσιωπήσω μόνω τῷ (Maltr., **Ath** : τὸ rell.) μὴ ἀπιστεῖσθαι τὰ
Confir mations of editors’ emendations

The reading of Ath confirms the correction made by Maltretus, who made the first complete edition of Procopius in 1661-63. The infinitive preceded by an article was common in later Greek and in Koine, especially in inscriptions. The neuter article in the nominative plus the infinitive is the most common. Not all scribes realised that the syntax here needed the article in the dative. Ath seems to be the only manuscript, which preserved the original reading, or the scribe of Ath may actually have made the correction, perhaps due to a “lucky” attraction from μόνω.

1.3. b) V. 4.2 (p. 20,3-7): διο δη ες τας ευθύνας καλέσασα (Ath and Hoesch. : καλέσας rell.) θευδάτου ἡ γυνὴ διαρρήξην τε πρὸς τῶν διαβαλόντων ἐληλεγμένων ἀποτινυναί πάντα ἡνάγκασεν, ἀπερ οὐ δέον ἀφείλετο, οὕτω τε αὐτῶν ἀπεπέμψατο. Ath confirms the correction made by Hoeschel, in the editio princeps of 1607. The reading of all other manuscripts is definitely wrong, as the participle refers to ἡ γυνὴ. Perhaps the unusual structure/order, participle, object, subject: καλέσασα θευδατον ἡ γυνη, may have led to the scribes’ confusion.

1.3. c) V. 18.31 (p. 94,9-11): Οὐίσανδον Βαυδαλάριου ἐτι ἐμπινου εὐρίσκουσι, καὶ αὐτῶν (Ath and Hoesch. : αὐτῶν rell.) τῶν τις ἐταίρων φωνῆν τινά οἱ ἀφεῖναι ἡξίου. The reading of Ath confirms the conjecture of the editio princeps. The demonstrative pronoun refers to the immediately preceding person who is mentioned, Οὐίσανδον Βαυδαλάριον. The scribes of all other manuscripts may have been confused by the following partitive genitive and thought that the demonstrative pronoun refers to it (attraction). Also confusing for the scribes is the fact that the subject τις is situated between the article and the ἐταίρων. The scribe of Ath may have realised the error and emended it, or possibly he copied his exemplar, which had the correct version.

1.3. d) VII. 13.5 (p. 350, 12-14): ...οὐκέτι δυναμένους τι τῶν ἀναγκαῖων ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν εἰσκομίζονει, καὶ τῶν ἐκ θαλάσσης ἀποκεκλεισμένων φορτίων (L and Haury: ἀποκεκλεισμένων K, ἀποκεκλεισμένως φορτίων Αθ and edd.). This is the text and the apparatus criticus as displayed by Haury. The participle ἀποκεκλεισμένως is parallel with οὐκέτι δυναμένους: "the Romans were no longer able to... having been cut off from the goods from the sea". Both L and Haury must have taken the participle as genitive absolute and the word φορτίων as its object. Ath is
the only manuscript, which confirms editors' emendation, which I believe is the correct reading, as a parallel to δυνάμενοις and having as object the genitive φορτίων.

1.3.e) VII. 36.20 (p. 461, 14-16): Τῇ δὲ ἐπιγενομένῃ ἐβουλεύσαντο μὲν σιτίζεσθαι τῶν ἱππῶν τισιν, δικησεις δὲ αὐτοὺς τῷ τῆς ἐξωθῆς οὐ διεισεβαινών

διεκρούσατο (Ath and Maltr.: διεκρούσαντο rell.) μέχρι ἐς δείλην ὑφίαν, καὶ πείζομένους τῷ λιμῷ ἐς τὰ μᾶλιστα. Ath confirms Maltretus' emendation. The verb should be in singular, because its subject is the singular δικησις. The plural might be due to attraction from the previous verb (ἐβουλεύσαντο).

1.3.f) VIII. 7.4 (p. 516, 14-16): ...ἐυστήσεσθαι τε ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφανοῦς ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐμμελλον καὶ διαχρήσθαι (Ath and Maltr.: διαχρήσθαι rell.) θανάτῳ οἰκτίστῳ... Ath confirms Maltretus' emendation, who goes against the reading of all other manuscripts. The future infinitive is necessary, firstly because it depends on the verb ἐμμελλον, and secondly to co-ordinate with the previous infinitive ἐυστήσεσθαι (future) as they are connected with καὶ.

1.3.g) VIII. 11.13 (p. 536, 19-21): ...ἡς δή ἐκατέρωθεν ἐπὶ πέτρας τινὸς σκληρᾶς τε καὶ ἀμηχάνου τοῦ περιβόλου τὰ θεμέλια ἐτεκτήμαντο (Ath and Christ : ἐτεκτήματο rell.). But at VIII. 14.5 (p. 558, 10-11) Ath gives the wrong spelling: οὶ δὲ τὰ ἐπαγχελλόμενα ἐποίουν, κριοὺς τε αὐτίκα συχνοὺς ἐτεκτήμαντο (ἐτεκτήματο Ath). In both cases the plural is needed since both subjects (Ῥωμαίοι and οἱ δέ) are in plural.

1.3.h) VIII. 12.31 (p. 551, 23-26): ἡνίκα μὲν γὰρ ἐπί τῷ Ῥώμης φυλακπηρόν ἐτέτακτο, ἐλπίδα Ῥωμαίοι πολλὴν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ εἶχον ἀτε ἀνδρειότατο (Ath and Braun : ἀνδρειότατα rell.) διαγεγούσθη τὰ πρῶτερον. Ath agrees with Braun's emendation while all other manuscripts give the adverb. I believe that in this case the adverbial form is the correct one (= he behaved most courageously) rather than the adjective. The reading of Ath is the lectio facilior as an attraction from αὐτῷ. In this case, however, Ath confirms a wrong emendation by Braun.
1.3.i) VIII. 14.35 (p. 563, 1-3): Χοσρόης ...τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκείνη πύργου ἀμυνομένους ἀπε κατὰ κορυφὴν συχνὰ χαλλωμένους τὴν πόλιν αἰρῆσει (Ath and Hoesch.: αἰρῆσειν rell.). Ath confirms the emendation of the editio princeps. The use of the infinitive is not justified, because no verb, which needs an infinitive, precedes. The subject of the verb (Χοσρόης) is mentioned seven lines above.

1.4. Vocabulary

1.4.a) VII. 24.32 (p. 407, 6-7): τὸ τε ἐν Τιβούρει (Ath and edd.: τὴ βου ρ` K, τιβέριδι L) φρούριον ἀνοικοδομήσασθαι σθένει παντὶ ἐγνωσαν. Both the attempt of K to transmit an etymologically "correct" reading and the attempt of L to transmit a frequently used proper name, fail. Ath is the only manuscript to transmit the correct reading and at the same time it confirms the editor's emendation. The correct reading has likely been found in the exemplar.

1.4.b) VIII. 11.14 (p. 537, 1-2): ...διώρυσσον ὀμοίως, οὐκ ἐφείσης (Ath and Suda: ἐφείσης K, ἐνδιδούσης L) τῆς τοῦ χωρίου φύσεως σφίσι περαιτέρω ἠεινα... This is one of the few cases where Ath confirms Suda's reading. This is most probably the correct reading, which is against K and L, though ἀφίημι with the sense of “permit, allow” occurs also in Herodotus.115 Ath tends to change prepositions frequently, but perhaps here the correct reading derives from his exemplar.

115 E.g., Hdt. 3.25; 6.62: ἀφίημι τινὰ ἀποπλέειν.
2. New defensible readings

In the following cases, the readings of Ath may be accepted as the best suitable in each case in accordance with the general usage of Procopius. Ath, as we have seen above, preserves some readings, which confirm emendations of editors, even though they go against all other manuscripts. It is therefore appropriate to examine some other readings of Ath, in an effort to determine whether these may have derived from an exemplar, which reflected the original reading.

2.1. Spelling and other minor mistakes

2.1.a) V. 4.15 (p. 22,10-14): ἄνδρας ἐκ τῆς Ῥωμαίων βουλής Διβέριον τε καὶ Οπιλώνα στείλας σίν ἐτέρους τις, παρατείνοι τάση δυνάμει βασιλέα ἐπίγγελλεν. (K : ἐπίγγελλεν L, a, b, n, δ, ῦ ἐπίγγελλεν Ath, c, k, γ) ἵσχυσαμενος μηδὲν πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἀχαρί τῇ Ἀμαλασοῦθη ἔμβηναι... The reading of L is definitely wrong; the correct form may be that of Ath. All verbs in the surrounding context are in the aorist and the use of the imperfect is not suitable here. There is a possibility that the reading ἐπίγγελλεν in all other manuscripts comes from a previous scribal error of doubling the λ (a common mistake) to ἐπίγγελλεν, which appears in L. It is important that later manuscripts of the y family support Ath's transmission, c, n and δ transmit the same reading with Ath. This means that Ath and these later manuscripts are related.

2.1.b) VI. 6.22 (p. 177, 19-21): ... καὶ ὅσα λησάμενοι τετυχήκατε." καὶ ὅ (K : om. Ath, ὅ L) Βελισάριος Ὁ μὲν ὑπόθεσες ὑμῶν βραχέα... From 6.4 (p. 174) a dialogue between Belisarius and barbarians starts. The first speech begins with "... ἐπεμψαν ... Ῥωμαίον ἄνδρα ... ὅς παρά Βελισάριον ἐλθὼν ἐλεξε τούδε" Then Belisarius answers. Each manuscript has a different variant and the manuscripts do not introduce with any word the six other times they speak (6.30 ff): at p. 178, 9 K has οὐ δὲ βάρβαροι, while L and Ath have nothing; at p. 178, 14 K has καὶ ὁ Βελισάριος, omitted in L (οἱ γότθοι added in margin) and Ath omits it agreeing with L. After that none of the manuscripts name the speaker. I believe that the omission of the article by Ath in this case is correct. This would suggest that once the persons of the dialogue have been introduced for the first time (barbarians, p. 174, 21-23 and Belisarius, p. 177, 20), there is no need to repeat their names. However, all later manuscripts, unlike Ath, place the names of the speakers in the margin.
2.2. Inversion of words

2.2.a) V. 23.1 (p. 112, 23-26): ἐς μέντοι πῦλην τὴν ὑπὲρ ποταμὸν Τίβεριν, ἰ Παγκρατιανῆ καλεῖται, δύναμις τῶν πολεμίων ἐλθοῦσα οὐδὲν ὁ τι καὶ ἄξιον λόγου (λόγου ἄξιον Ἁθ) ἔδρασε, χωρίς ισχυρᾶ. The reading of Ἁθ should be preferred as this is always the way Procopius employs the expression. The only instance he uses ἄξιον λόγου is when he qualifies it with πολλοῖ: πολλοὶ ἄξιον λόγου (Build. III.4.5 (p. 91, 14). In all other cases λόγου ἄξιον appears, e.g., III.3.4 (p. 319, 4-6): Ὅνωριον ζῶντος οὐδὲν οὔτε ἐπείν λόγου ἄξιον οὔτε πραζξαί ἰσχύσασ; VIII.22.20 (p. 603, 1-2): ὃ μέν οὖν Ναρσῆς στράτευμα τε λόγου ἄξιον... κεκομισμένος ἔστελλετο.

2.2.b) VI. 7.12 (p. 181, 20-22): ἐπεὶ δὲ τρόπῳ τῷ αὐτῷ πολλάκις ἀναπλέοςαντε ἀπαντα κατ᾽ ἐξουσίαν ἐσεκομίσαντο τὰ φορτία (ἐν φορτία κατ᾽ ἐξουσίαν ἐσεκομίσαντο Ἁθ), οἱ μέν ναῦται... I believe that the change of the order of the words in Ἁθ is closer to Procopius' usual style (see 7.3, p. 180, 8-9: τὰ τέ φορτία πέμπειν ἐκέλευ. In addition, the adjective ἀπαντά is used with nouns by Procopius: e.g. I.4.20 (p. 18, 7): ἀπαντά τὸν λόγον; IV.4.34 (p. 437, 14-15): ἀπαντά τὸν βασιλικὸν πλούτον. Therefore, ἀπαντά τὰ φορτία would be possible.

2.3. Syntax and Grammar

2.3.a) V. 11.17 (p. 60, 26-61, 2): καὶ μὴν καὶ πρὸς Φράγγων ἐθνῆ ὡς ἡσσώ (Dind : ἡσσών KL, ἡσσώνa Αθ and Scaliger) τοῦδε πόλεμου διαφέρομεν, διὶ δὴ ὡς εὖ διαθεμένους ἐφ᾽ ἐτερον χωρεῖν πολλὴ ἄνοια. In Αθ the uncontracted comparative of the adjective ὁλγος appears. It is certain that the reading ἡσσώ (neuter) that is transmitted by K and L, is wrong. As the adjective qualifies the word πόλεμον it must be an accusative masculine (διαφέρομεν ὡς ἡσσών πόλεμον τοῦδε = we carry a war not inferior to this one). Uncontracted comparatives had begun to fall out of use and thus were a frequent source of scribal confusion as can be seen in the Roman and Byzantine papyri.116 If so, as the noun to which the adjective refers ends in -ον, it was easy for the scribes of K and L, probably unaware of the uncontracted ending, to write ἡσσών.117

117 Cf. below 3.12.b.b, p. 95.
Dindorf emended to ἡσσω which is syntactically and grammatically correct. But Scaliger had corrected the adjective to ἡσσωνα which is the alternative form to the one Dindorf suggested. Procopius generally seems to use both forms of the comparative, either -ω or -ωα. 118 From the palaeographical point of view, Scaliger's correction is more plausible, because it was easier for the scribes to change ἡσσωνα to ἡσσον than ἡσσω to ἡσσον. This is now confirmed by Ath, which presents the correct form of the adjective ἡσσονα.

Confusion over the same comparative appears in V.1.29 (p. 9, 3): ἦν τε ὁ Θευδέριχος λόγῳ μὲν τύραννος, ἔργῳ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἄληθῆς τῶν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ τιμῇ τῷ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡδοκιμηκότων οὐδενὸς ἡσσον (L, Ath : ἡσσων V, Suda), this is a similar confusion as the one above, although it might be a simple confusion of o and w. Codex V and Suda do not understand that an adverb is necessary and not an adjective that characterises Theoderic.119

2.3.b) VII. 14.18 (p. 356, 9-11): καὶ ὑς οὐκ ἀπηίζου τὰ δυντα [λέγειν] καταλέγειν (Haury : λέγειν καταλέγει Κ, καὶ λέγειν. καταλέγειν τε Λ, λέγειν καὶ καταλέγει Χριστ, λέγειν καταλέγει τε Ath) δίν τῷ ἄληθει λόγῳ ἐφεξῆς ἀπαντα... As regards the context, the verb λέγειν is not unsuitable: the author possibly wanted to emphasise that "not only he said (λέγειν) but he stated in detail (καταλέγειν)". I believe that the correct phrase here is λέγειν τε καὶ καταλέγειν, which is not transmitted by any of the manuscripts. The emendation of Christ and Ath comes closest to this reading.

2.3c) VII.16.14 (p. 364, 24-365,2): λέγω δὲ, ὅπως μὴ τῶν Ἐκελωτῶν ἐνεκα... τῶν λόγων ποιήσεις (Hoesch. : ποιήσεις Ath, ποιήσειν KL). I believe that the correct reading is the subjunctive of Ath (=you may speak). It is a secondary sentence, which refers to the future and depends on a verb in the present. The infinitive of Κ and L is not suitable. Hoeschel against all manuscripts prefers the indicative. However, Procopius' usage is in favour of the reading of Ath: VIII.24.17 (p. 619, 16-18): λέγω δὲ, ὅπως βεβαιώτατα μὲν διασώζητε τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν ὑμῖν εὐπραξίαν, συγχωρήσετε δὲ ῥωμαίους ἔχειν τὰ αὐτῶν ἱδια.


2.4. Vocabulary

2.4.a) VI. 15.22 (p. 218, 1-2): ἐπὶ κοινή (K: κοινῷ L, κοινῷς Ath) γὰρ τὰ τε ἄλλα δρῶσι καὶ τὸ ἑπιτήθευμα μετίσαι τούτο. I believe that the correct phrase is ἐπὶ κοινῆς, which is not transmitted by any of the manuscripts. The scribe of Ath transmits the word phonetically correct (iotacism) with two spelling mistakes. In Procopius' works this phrase is used ten times; the phrase ἐπὶ κοινῷ or ἐπὶ κοινῆ are never used. So the reading of Ath is essentially correct and the error most probably caused by internal dictation or originated from a previous manuscript written by dictation.

2.4.b) VI.18.27 (p. 232, 1): ... καὶ Ναρσῆς μὲν τοσαῦτα ἔλεγε (εἶπε Αθ). The correct reading may be that of Ath, without excluding the reading of other manuscripts, as it is not wrong. Procopius always uses the expression ὁ μὲν ... τοσαῦτα εἶπεν, and he never uses the phrase ὁ μὲν ... τοσαῦτα ἔλεγεν. On the other hand, in the Wars he uses thirty-five times the expression ... ἔλεγε τοιάδε / ὦδε / τάδε. Manuscripts e and k of the sixteenth century transmit ἔλεγεν.

2.4.c) VII. 21.20 (p. 393, 12-14): ἡδη μὲν οὖν βασιλεὺς ἥκηκει τὰ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ ἐξυμπεπτωκότα (ἐξυμπεπτωκότα Ἀθ), ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ πρέσβεις ταρ’ αὐτῶν ἠλθον... I believe that the reading of Ath is probably the more suitable of the two. In parallel cases the participle ἐξυμπεπτωκότα is used: III.19.33 (p. 396, 8-9): καὶ ἀπαντά τὰ ἐξυμπεπτωκότα μαθύντες, VII.10.9 (p. 338, 10-11): πάντα ἐς Τουτίλαν τὰ ἐξυμπεπτωκότα σφίσιν ἁνήνεγκαν. In addition some lines below in line 17 the verb ἐξυνέβη is used, which might explain the correction.

2.4.d) VIII. 14.24 (p. 561, 4-6): ...τὰ οἰκία ἐμπρήσῃ λάθρα, ἔνθα (Haury: ἢν δὲ K, οἷς δὴ L, ἐν οἷς Ath) ὁ τε οἶτος καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἑπιτηθείων ἀπέκειτο. I believe that the reading of Ath with the meaning "in which" is correct. The suggestion of Haury is not wrong, but we should prefer a correct reading transmitted by a manuscript.

---

120 E.g., Wars, II 29.6 (p. 290, 12): ἐπὶ κοινῆς βουλευσαμένοις; VII.32.30 (p. 438, 13-14): ἐπὶ κοινῆς βουλευσάμενοι; VIII.20.3 (p. 590, 6-7): ἐπὶ κοινῆς Γερμανοί ἐκαλούθη ἀπαντήσεις.
121 See I.18.23 (p. 94, 16-17): ὁ μὲν Βελισάριος τοσαῦτα εἶπε, II.7.23 (p. 181, 24): ὁ μὲν Χοσρόης τοσαῦτα εἶπεν; III.10.18 (p. 358, 18): ὁ μὲν Ἰωάννης τοσαῦτα εἶπε.
Conclusion

It is clear that the above readings in Ath confirm the editors' emendations and corrections, and in addition offer further defensible readings. The readings in Ath, however, provide minor improvements to the text, mainly correction of spelling mistakes due to confusion of sounds. The fact that the correct readings appear throughout the text, copied by no less than six hands, indicate that they should be attributed most probably to correct copying from the exemplar, or to lucky uses or non-uses of frequent failings by the scribes of Ath (such as, e.g., the interchange of single and double consonants, see below, pp. 38-42).
3. FREQUENT ERRORS AND OBVIOUS SLIPS OF THE PEN (LAPSUS CALAMI)

*Ath* contains numerous errors, which arose mainly out of incomplete knowledge of the scribes concerning spelling, morphology, grammar and syntax of the language of Procopius. Other mistakes were due clearly to the carelessness or lack of attention or mental associations of a non-phonetic nature. However, it is not possible to tell whether some of the mistakes were *Ath*’s errors, or existed already in the exemplar. The following cases have been classified in groups according to the type of error and they have been set out by book according to the order in which they appear.

3.1. Single / Double consonants

A very frequent phonetic phenomenon in *Ath* is the use of double consonants in the place of a simple one and the other way round. This duplication or the simplification of consonants is found mostly in verbs, which in different tenses duplicate the consonant of the ending, e.g. ἄγγέλλω, στέλλω, μέλλω, βάλλω, ῥίπτω etc., but also in proper names. Most of the following errors may have been caused inadvertently.

3.1.a) V. 20.10 (p. 103, 4-6): εἴ δὲ γε θράσει ἔχομενος ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ὁμησι, πάντως σοι καὶ μεταμέλει (μεταμέλλει *Ath*) τῶν εἰκῆ πεπραγμένων. The verb μεταμέλομαι takes the personal dative and the genitive as object. *Ath*, as often, duplicates the λ. Perhaps the scribe of *Ath* is confused by the frequently used verb μέλλω. All later manuscripts examined transmit the word with single λ. The opposite, single λ in the place of double, is found in 22.17 (p. 111, 5-7): Κωνσταντίνος δὲ (καὶ γάρ οἱ ἡγγέλλοντο (ἡγγέλλοντο *Ath*) οἱ πολέμιοι τῆς ἐς τὸν Τίβεριν ἀποπειρώμενοι διαβάσεως) δείσας περὶ τῶ ἐκείνων τειχίσματι... The fact that the verb ἄγγέλλω has some forms (future etc.) with single -λ, may confuse the scribe. Same case in 29.36 (p. 144, 19): διαλάσσου (διαλάσσου *Ath*). All manuscripts copied later transmit double consonant.

122 This happens mostly between vowels, a frequent characteristic in some Modern Greek dialects. For example, in the Cypriot dialect there are double consonants instead of single between vowels, see Μ.Κ. Καλλί, "Η Ελληνική Εκκλησιαστική Γλώσσα στην Κύπρο κατά τη Βυζαντινή και Μεταβυζαντινή Περίοδο", Παρουσία 11/12(1997) 251, 253.
3.1.b) V. 21.7 (p. 105, 16-19): οἴκισκου τε σχήμα τετραγώνου ἐργαζόμενοι προκάλυμμα (προκάλυμμα Αθ) πανταχόθεν ἀντί τοίχων τε καὶ τείχους διφθέρας αὐτῷ περιβάλλουσιν... The ending -μα of nouns is often transmitted wrongly in manuscripts. All later manuscripts have the double μ.

3.1.c) VI. 1.4 (p. 150, 9-10): αὕτης δὲ Κωνσταντῖνος τοῦ Οὐννος (οὐννος Αθ) ἑπαγόμενος ἐν Νέρωνος πεδίῳ ἄμφι δείλην ὄψιν... The use of single consonants in the place of double happens for the same word in 1.8, p. 150, 24. But there are cases in Αθ where the name is transmitted correctly with double -ν (1.6, p. 150, 20, 1.10, p. 151, 10). Another proper name which is transmitted with -ν instead of -νν is the word Ραβέννα (Ραβένα Αθ): 8.2 (p. 186, 8); 10.6 (p. 193, 12-13); 10.7 (p. 193, 19); 11.1 (p. 196, 2); 11.6 (p. 197, 9); 17.22 (p. 227, 16-17); 17.24 (p. 227, 25); 18.19 (p. 230, 16); 18.25 (p. 231, 17); 22.9 (p. 248, 15); 22.22 (p. 250, 19); 23.1 (p. 251, 10); 23.6 (p. 252, 6); 26.13 (p. 267, 13); 28.25 (p. 280, 4-5); 29.5 (p. 283, 3); 29.26 (p. 286, 10) and 29.31 (p. 287, 3). This word too is sometimes transmitted correctly (see 7.37 (p. 185, 18). Also all other manuscripts transmit the above names either with double or with single consonant.

3.1.d) VI. 1.21 (p. 153, 2-3): ... Χωροσόμαντις, ἐν τοῖς Βελσαρίῳ δορυφόρῳ εἴδοκμος, Μασαγέτης (μασαγέτης Αθ) γένος... Αθ transmits the word with single -σ- also in 2.10 (p. 155, 21). Later manuscripts transmit the name correctly.

3.1.e) VI. 3.4 (p. 160, 4-7): τούτω δὴ τῷ ὀχετῷ ἐν χώρῳ διέχοις ἡ Ρώμης σταδίως πεντήκοντα ξυμβάλλετόν (ξυμβαλλετόν Αθ, ξιμβάλλεται Κ) τε ἀλλήλου καὶ τῆς ἑναντίαν ὀδῶν δι’ ὀλέου τρέψεσθον. The single λ is used wrongly here by the scribe of Αθ, perhaps due to the fact that aorist forms of βάλλειν are spelled with single λ. Αθ transmits other words wrongly with single λ. Other cases in this book with single –λ instead of double are: 4.11 (p. 166, 20-22): ... ὅπως ἄν αὐτοῖς τε ἀδεέστερον οἱ ἱπποὶ τρέφοιντο καὶ οἱ Γότθοι μάλλον ἔτι ἀναστέλλοιτο (ἀναστέλλοιτο Αθ) τοῦ κατ’ ἐξουσιαν ...; 6.23 (p. 177,25-178,1): διαλάσσειν (διαλάσσειν Αθ); 8.4 (p. 186, 24): ἡγγέλλετο (ἡγγέλλετο Αθ); 12.29 (p. 203, 24): Γάλλων (Γάλων Αθ); 15.24 (p. 218, 10-11): κάλλιστον (κάλλιστον Αθ); 16.13 (p. 222, 7-9): ἀπαλλασσόμενοι (ἀπαλασσόμενοι Αθ); 21.41 (p. 247, 5): ἄγγέλλων.
Single/Double Consonants

(ἀγγέλων Αθ); 24.8 (p. 258, 16): ἐπὶγγελλὲς (ἐπὶγγελες Αθ); 26.7 (p. 266, 15-16): ἀποβάλλουσιν (ἀποβάλουσιν Αθ); 27.2 (p. 270, 13): βαλλόμενοι (βαλλόμενοι Αθ); 27.8 (p. 271, 5): ἐβαλλον (ἐβαλον Αθ); 27.8 (p. 271, 10-11): βαλλόντων (βαλλόντων Αθ); The opposite, double λ instead of single in Αθ, appears in 10.7 (p. 193, 19-20): μάλα (μάλα Αθ); 14.17 (p. 211, 13-15): Ερουλοι (Ερουλοι Αθ); 14.42 (p. 214, 14-15) and 22.7 (p. 248, 6-8): μετέμελεν (μετέμελλεν Αθ); 20.8 (p. 237, 10-11); 28.30 (p. 281, 6): φυλακτήριον (φυλακτήριον Αθ) and 30.17 (p. 291, 13): περιβαλλόντες (περιβαλλόντες Αθ). Later manuscripts are also confused as to the double / single consonants but not to such an extent as Αθ.

3.1.f) VI. 3.27 (p. 163, 15-16): ύμεῖς μὲν οὖν πεπτευείν οἰόμενοι τὸν ἕνα βούλεσθε ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων ἀναρριπτεῖν (ἀναρριπτεῖν Αθ, ἀναρριπτεῖν Λ) κύβον... Although the verb ᾱρπτω is written with one ρ, the compound and the past tenses are written with double ρ; this is what confuses the scribe of Αθ, but he rarely makes syntactical or grammatical mistakes. In this case Λ transmits a grammatically wrong form, because of a simple change of the accent. The same in 18.27 (p. 232, 2-3): καταρρεῖν (καταρρεῖν Αθ). Double ρ instead of single is transmitted by Αθ in 20.29 (p. 240, 10-11): ... μαθεῖν τε παρ’ αὐτῶν ἀναθορώντα (Κρας : ἀναθορρόντα Αθ, ἀναθορώντα Κ, ἀναθυρώντα Λ) τὸν πάντα λόγον καὶ ἄμφω κτεῖναι, where the editor's emendation is clearly right.

3.1.g) VI. 6.28 (p. 178, 14): Καὶ ἣμεῖς δὲ Γότθους Βρετανίαν (Βρετανίαν Αθ) ὀλην ἐγκυρῳμένον ἔχειν... Single τ instead of double occurs frequently in manuscripts, especially in foreign words with unknown etymology for the scribe. Same case in 12.10 (p. 201): Οὔττιγις (οὔττιγις Λ, Αθ). Almost always the latinized name Vittigis is transmitted wrongly by manuscripts in two forms: οὔττιγις or ιούττιγις. The same in 7.16 (p. 182, 12-13), 12.36 (p. 204, 24), 19.20 (p. 192, 7-8), 28.26 (p. 280, 7-8), 29.22 (p. 285, 19).

3.1.h) VI. 22.9 (p. 248, 18-19): οὐ γὰρ ἀξιόμαχοι (ἀξιόμαχοι Αθ) τοῖς πολεμίοις κατὰ μόνας φῶντο εἶναι. Double μ instead of single between vowels.

123 This error appears very frequently.
3.1.i) VII. 1.22 (p. 301, 10-12): Βελισάριος ... ὥσπερ ἐρρήθη (ἐρήθη Αθ, c, k),
δυνατὸς γενονὼς... Later manuscripts transmit it correctly with double ρ, except
from c and k which agree with Αθ. The same in Αθ appears several times: 2.8 (p. 306,
23); 14.31 (p. 359, 1); 17.15 (p. 372, 2); 18.11 (p. 375, 17); 19.23 (p. 382, 11); 20.3 (p.
384, 18).

3.1.j) VII. 1.35 (p. 303, 24-26): ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ μάχῃ Ἐρουλοὶ (ἐρουλλοὶ Αθ) τε
πολλοὶ πίπτουσι καὶ Οὐίσσανδος ὁ τῶν Ἐρούλων (ἐρούλλων Αθ) ἀρχηγός
θυμίσκει. This proper name is transmitted with double consonant in Book VII, as well:
34.14 (p. 444, 14); 34.44 (p. 452, 12), although many times is transmitted correctly.
Later manuscripts are not consistent, either. The same error also appears in the
following cases in this Book: 1.41 (p. 304, 19-20): διὸ δὴ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα Ἡλίδβαδος
Οὐραίαν ἐς τοὺς βαρβάρους διέβαλεν (διέβαλλεν Αθ)... 4.10 (p. 314, 11-12):
ἄντιπάλου (ἀντιπάλλον Αθ); the opposite phenomenon, which is cause
inadvertently by the scribes of Αθ, appears in the following cases: 18.23 (p. 377,11):
Τουλλιανὸς (Τουλλιανὸς Αθ); 20.4 (p. 384,22): ἐπέβαλλεν (ἐπέβαλεν Αθ); 20.15
(p. 387, 5-6): ἐμβαλλόμενοι (ἐβαλλόμενοι Αθ); 33.6 (p. 443, 2): ἔμμπάλλουσι
(ἔμμπάλλουσι). In the above cases, later manuscripts transmit the correct reading.
However, there are other cases, where this phenomenon appears.

3.1.k) VII. 6.11 (p. 322, 21): ξυνέπλεον τε αὐτοῖς καὶ Οὐννοι (οὖνοι Αθ). The
same in 11.15 (p. 342, 18); 12.10 (p. 348, 4); 14.33 (p. 359, 16); 23.6 (p. 400, 2). Single
instead of double ν appears sometimes in the proper name Ραβέννα (see 11.1 (p. 340,
14) and Ιννοκένττος (15.7 (p. 361, 10-11). The same in other words as
διασκεδάννυσθαι in 30.11 (p. 428, 10).

3.1.l) VII. 12.6 (p. 347, 15-16): πάλιν πρὸς τῶν πολεμίων κατειλημένης
(κατειλημένης Αθ). Frequently single μ instead of double in the particular ending
(μένος instead of -μένος).
3.1.m) VIII. 2.14 (p. 492, 23-24): ...καὶ τείχος μὲν αὐτὴν περιβάλε (περιβάλλε
Ath) μέγα τι χρήμα... The duplication of the single consonant between vowels is
frequent: 2.15 (p. 493, 6): συλλήσας (συλλήσας Ath); 11.27 (p. 539, 14): πολὺς
(πολὺς Ath); 11.45 (p. 543, 3): ἔβαλον (ἔβαλλον Ath). Also the opposite happens:
7.2 (p. 516, 9-10): ἀπηλλάσσοντο (ἀπηλλάσσοντο Ath); 14.11 (p. 559, 4):
βάλλοντες (βάλλοντες Ath).

3.1.n) VIII. 2.31 (p. 495, 19): δέρας (δέρας Ath), 6.27 (p. 515, 2): ἀβυσσός
(ἀβυσσός Ath): Inadvertent errors, double consonants instead of single ones and vice
versa.

3.1.o) VIII. 5.1 (p. 503, 6): Πάλαι μὲν Οὖννων (οὖννων Ath)... Single ν instead of
double between vowels, which appears in the previous books for the same word.

3.2. Parecheses

3.2.1. o / ω

The interchange of o and ω is very frequent in all phonetic conditions in the Byzantine
period.124 The manuscripts copied after the fourteenth century generally confuse o and ω.

3.2.1.a) V. 12.25 (p. 66,20-67,3): ἦν δὲ ὀποτέρων ἀπολελειμένων, οἱ ἐτεροι
στρατεύσαντες τὸ Βουργουζιώνων καταστρέψονται (καταστρέφονται Ath, c,
k) γένος καὶ χώραν ἦν ἔχουσιν παραστήσωσι, ποιήν ὁι νεικηκότες παρὰ
τῶν οὐ ξυστρατευσάντων ρήτων τι χρυσίων κομίζωσι, κοινήν δὲ καὶ οὕτω
χώραν τὴν δορυφόρον ἀμφοτέρων εἶναι. With this phonetic error, the scribe
changes the mood of the verb καταστρέφομαι. The correct mood is definitely the
subjunctive, as it is a conditional sentence beginning with ἦν, which has two verbs
connected with καὶ, which have to be in the same tense and mood. The later
manuscripts, c and k agree with Ath. The opposite error appears in Book VI 22.22 (p.
250, 19-21): ...ἀνδρας παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Ῥαβέννης σταλήσσεθαι ὑποχόμενος,
οἵπερ ἐς Γόθθους τὰς σπονδὰς θῆσονται (θῆσονται Ath), ὅπῃ ἄν ἕκατέρως
ξυνοίσειν μέλη.

is used in POxy 1901.65 of sixth century AD (2nd hand) with almost every ω > o 21 times.
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3.2.1.b) V. 18.11 (p. 91, 8-11): Ἐβελισάριος δὲ αὐτὸς τε ἐπιστροφάδην τοὺς ἄει ὑπαντιάζουσα ἐκτείνε καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ δορυφόρων τε καὶ ὑπασπιστῶν τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν (ἐαυτῶν K, εἰς αὐτῶν Ath) εὐνοίας ὡς μάλιστα δὴ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κινδύνῳ ἀπήλαυσε. The reading of Ath is definitely wrong as the preposition εἰς needs accusative. The mistake must have been made due to parechysis of αὐτῶν and αὐτῶν. K’s version εαυτῶν is unacceptable, because it cannot be plural or reflexive.

3.2.1.e) VI. 1.17 (p. 152, 13-15): ἂν δὲ τὸν πολέμιον πῦρ χάθαι εἶναι, οὐδὲν ἂν αὐτοῦ ποιήσῃ λόγον. The interchange between ο and ω is inadvertent, because the ending of the noun πολέμιον is transmitted correctly. Other inadvertent errors are in the same Book: 6.17 (p. 176, 22-23): καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν διεσωσάμεθα τῶν πόλεων οὐδενὸς ἦσον... (in 6.19 (p. 117.5) the word appears correct); 7.7 (p. 180, 26-27): τοξότας τε καὶ ναύτας ἑσεβίβασαν κατὰ λόγου (λόγων Ath) ἐκάστου; 26.17 (p. 268, 10-12): διὸ δὴ Ἐβελισάριος ἐν σπουδῇ ἐποίειτο ζωντα διὰ τῶν (τῶν Ath) ἐν τοῖς πολεμίοις δοκίμων (δοκίμων Ath) λαβεῖν...; 27.4 (p. 270, 19-20): διὸ δὴ κατωρρωθηκότες (κατωρρωθηκότες Ath) τὴν ἐφοδίων οἱ Γότθοι ἐν ταῖς ἐπάλξεσιν ἡσυχῇ ἔμενον.

3.2.1.f) VI. 6.16 (p. 176, 18-20): Ὅδοικρον δὲ ἀδικίας τῆς ἐς Ἀγαυόστουλον τίσασθαι, καὶ τῆς χώρας αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν Ath) τε καὶ τοὺς Γότθους τὸ λοιπὸν κρατεῖν ὁρθῶς καὶ δικαίως. Ath takes the pronoun as possessive and so he changes the o to ω, not realising that αὐτῶν τε καὶ τοὺς Γότθους go together as objects of κρατεῖν.

---

125 ἐν Maltr.: omiserunt codd.
3.2.1.g) VI. 9.20 (p.... 9-11): ... αὐτεπάγγελτος (αὐτεπαγγέλτως Ath) ἐλθὼν Βελισαρίῳ τε ἀπαντα φράζει καὶ τὸν ἔτερον ἐνδείκνυσιν. The correct form is the adjective, although the adverb is not wrong.\(^{126}\)

3.2.1.h) VII. 7.5 (p. 325, 20-22): διά τε τῶν ῥοτῆνων τὸν κτύπον (τῶν κτύπων Ath) ἐτι ἀλλήλων κατακούειν οὐκ ἦν... The error is phonetic, but would also be a result of attraction, as it is the cases in 12.5 (p. 347, 10-12): ...καὶ κατεπτηχότας τοὺς πολεμίους δεδουλώμενους τε τὸ φρόνημα τῷ (τὸ Ath) πρὸς ἐκείνων πολλάκις ἴσησθαι.

3.2.1.i) VII. 15.3 (p. 360, 23-25): ...ἐκ τοῦ ἀπροσδοκήτου ἐπισκήψαυτες τῷ (τῷ Ath) τῶν πολεμίων στρατοπέδῳ ὀλίγους μὲν τινὰς ἐκείναν... This is also an inadvertent error, as the noun στρατοπέδῳ is transmitted correctly. Phonetic errors also in 15.5 (p. 361, 3-5): ...ισχυριζόμενοι δὲ ὑπό ὦλγῳ ὦστερον ἐτέραν ἐπεκδρομημῖν ἐς τοὺς πολεμίους ποιήσουται (ποιήσωσιν Ath) παρεκάλου καὶ αὐτὸν...; 17.15 (p. 372, 4-5): ...οὶ δὲ φέροντες ἐς τὴν ἀγορὰν τὰ ἐπιπλα πάντα βίον αὐτῶν τὸν (Κ: αὐτοῖς L, αὐτῶν Ath) ἐφήμερον ἀντιλλάσσοντο; VII. 21.22 (p. 393, 19-21): αἴτούμεθα τὰ ἐκ τῆς εἰρήνης καλὰ σὲ τε προσέσθαι αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν Ath) καὶ ἡμῖν ἔμμηχωρεῖν; 25.20 (p. 411, 4): λελοφθηκέναι (λελοφθηκέναι Ath); 27.2 (p. 417, 2-3): Σολόμωνος (σολόμωνος Ath); 34.44 (p. 452, 13): Ἀόρδῳ (αὐρῷ Ath); 35.20 (p. 456, 10-11): ...ἐκέλευσον δὲ αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν Ath) ἐνθένε αἰσθητῶν ὅπη βουλευτο διασώσσοι; 36.18 (p. 461, 4): ἱσχυρότατα (ἱσχυρότατα Ath); 40.17 (p. 479, 8): ἐπιστομένη (ἐπιστομένη Ath).

3.2.1.j) VIII. 8.32 (p. 523, 21-22): οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὃ τι γένονται (γένονται Ath). Interchange of o and ω also in 7.3 (p. 516, 12): ...καὶ διαφθορέα τοῦ Περσῶν γένους αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν Ath) ἀπεκάλουν; 9.11 (p. 527, 3-4): δείκνυται ὡς αἰτήσεται Ἡρώδους Ἑραλδίων δοῦλοι τὸ λοιπὸν ἐσοῦται (ἐσωταῖ Ath); 10.8 (p. 532, 10-11): Ὡπὸ τοῦτον δὲ τὸν χρόνῳ Χοσρῶθ ξυνέβη μηδὲ τὸν γόνον (τῶν γόνων Ath) τῇ ἀπανθρωπίᾳ τῇ αὐτοῦ ἀνέπαφον μεῖναι; 11.45 (p. 543, 1): ἀμφοτέρων (ἀμφοτέρων Ath); 12.12 (p. 549, 1-2): εἰ γὰρ ἀπολείπει ἐβοῦλετο, ὥ ἄνδρες, ὑμᾶς. οὐκ ἄν, οἶμαι, παραδεδώκει (Κ: παραδεδόκει L, παραδεδόκει Ath) τοῖς διασώζειν ἐφεμένοις.

\(^{126}\) This word is used once by Philo Judaeus, De vita Mosis, 2.252,2: αὐτεπάγγελτος ἦν παρέσται, μὴ ὅρωμεν ἐσωτερικόν.
3.2.1.k) VIII. 12.4 (p. 547, 16-18): οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀνδρεῖον (ἀνδρεῖων Αθ) τὸ τοῖς ἀμηχάνοις ἀντιστατέιν, οὔδε ξυνετῶν (ξυνετῶν Αθ) τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι τοῖς κεκρατηκόσιν ὑπείκειν. This may not be a question of phonetics. Perhaps it is an attempt by Αθ to give the meaning of ἀνδρεῖων (ἀνδρῶν) and ξυνετῶν (ἀνδρῶν), namely: "it is not characteristic of strong and wise men to...". However, when Procopius uses the genitive with this meaning he does not omit ἀνδρῶν: e.g. VI.6.6 (p. 175, 1-3): ὡς δὲ ἄξυνετων ἔστιν ἄνδρῶν ἀπέραντά τε ταλαιπωρεῖν βούλεσθαι. VIII.20.47 (p. 597, 20): καίπερ ἂν πρὸς ἄνδρῶν ἐκφερόμενος ἀναρίθμων.

3.2.1) VIII. 14.2 (p. 557, 21): ἄρων (ἄρων ssr. άρων Αθ) γὰρ λοχιμόδεις πρὸ τῶν πολῶν εἰςκ... It is likely that this correction was made by the scribe of Αθ himself after checking the exemplar.

3.2.2. e / αι

3.2.2.a) V. 26.17 (p. 129, 25-27): οὔδε γὰρ καταίρειν (κατέρρειν Αθ, κατέρρειν Λ) ἐνταῦθα Ῥωμαίων νησὶ τὸ λοιπὸν εἶχον, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ Ὄμιλῳ οὕρμίζοντο...; 29.18 (p. 142, 5-6): καὶ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἰκανοῦ ἐφαίνευσι (ἐφέναιτο Αθ) λίαν ὀλίγος οὖσιν ἢ τὸδε αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀγωνίαν ἀποκεκρίθη: phonetic / orthographical errors. These confusions do not exist in manuscripts copied from the fifteenth century onwards.

3.2.3. General pareheses

3.2.3.a) VI. 21.32 (p. 245, 20-21): ἢλθα τοῖς ἀνώθεν διωμισμένοις καιροῖς οὐδὲν ἡσον ἀναπιμπλάσι (ἀναπιμπλάσι Κ, ἀναπιμπλάσι Λ, ἀναπιμπλάσι Αθ) τὴν πεπρωμένην. There are many variants, because of the difficult verb, so the scribes are confused. It is clear that neither the singular of Αθ is correct, nor the subjunctive of Λ; the correct one is the reading of Κ, which is transmitted with the wrong accent. Possibly it is parethesis.

3.2.3.b) VII. 1.42 (p. 304, 22-24): βουλομένοις γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὡς ήκιστα ἤν αὐτῶς (ἄν αὐτῶς Αθ) ἀνιπομικάτως Οὐραίαν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀφανισθήματι. This is possibly an attraction by the previous α [i’kistanou’tos].
3.2.3. c) VII. 5.6 (p. 318, 20-22): ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ Ἀρμαῖων στρατὸς Ἰουστῖνῳ ἤνεμείζεν, ὀλίγους μὲν τινὰς τῶν αὐτῶς ἐπομένων ἐπὶ φυλακῆ ὑπὸ πόλεως αὐτοῦ εἶασεν (ἡσαν Αθ)... An inadvertent error, due to the fact that the scribe fails to understand the meaning of ἐδώ. The correct reading is transmitted by later manuscripts.

3.2.3. d) VII. 6.23 (p. 324, 14-14): ἐκ δὲ τοῦ παραβόλου σωθεὶς τε καὶ ἔναγγελομενον τῷ Δημητρίῳ ἐθάρσουν τε (ἐθάρσουν ἦτο Αθ) μάλιστα καὶ ἐς ταύτην δὴ τὴν πράξιν ἐνήγη. The mistake must originate from the time when the words were not separated from each other (ἐθ’Arsinet[ε] [ἐθ’Arsin’eti]). This is the only time in all of Procopius' works that this type of the verb is used.

3.2.3.e) VII. 17.1 (p. 369, 12-13): τοὺς μέντοι στρατιώτας οὕτω τὰ ἀναγκαῖα ἐπελελοίπει (ἐπιλελοίπει Αθ) ἀλλ’ ἦτο ἀντεἰσχυν. The same error at 17.15 (p. 372, 3-4) and at 30.19 (p. 429, 18-19); the scribe forgets the augment in pluperfect.

3.2.3.f) VII. 20.19 (p. 387, 21 - 388, 2): τοῦ μέντοι δήμου πεντακοσίους ἄνδρας ἀνὰ πᾶσαν (ἄπασαν Αθ) τὴν πόλιν ἀπολελείφθαι εὑνέσεσεν, οὕστε ἐς τὰ ἱερὰ κατέφυγον μόλις. Perhaps the scribe is confused by the preposition ἀνὰ before. The reading of Αθ could be correct; but according to Procopius' usage, he uses πᾶσαν to characterise πόλις thirteen times in Wars, opposed to ἄπασαν which never goes with πόλις. It may be parehesis.

3.3. Iotacisms (ι / η / ει / οι)

3.4.a) V. 4.26 (p. 249-13): Γότθων γὰρ συγγενείς τῶν ὑπ’ ἐκεῖνης ἀνηρμέμενων Θευδάτῳ προσελθόντες οὕτε αὐτῶς οὕτε σφίσι τῶν βίων ἐν τῷ ἀσφαλεὶ ἰσχυρίζοντο εἴναι, ἢν γε μὴ αὐτοῖς Ἀμαλασοῦθα ὀτι τάχιστα ἐκποδῶν γένηται (γένοιτο Αθ). The scribe of Αθ changes the mood of the "if" clause, disagreeing with all other manuscripts which have the subjunctive. According to the meaning, the conditional sentence shows a wish, which may be fulfilled in the future. Although the reading γένοιτο is the lectio difficilior as the optative was not much used in Koine any more, the subjunctive is the correct mood. Regarding the most recent manuscripts examined, none of them agree with Αθ.
3.3.b) V. 12.35 (p. 68,10-13): ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Οὐσίγοτθοι, ἔπει Γερμανοὺς ἀμφὶ πόλιν Καρκασιανὴν στρατοπεδεύειν ἐπίθεθοντο (ἔπειθοντο Αθ) ὑπηντίαζον τε καὶ στρατόπεδον ποιησάμενοι ἥρεμουν. This is a simple phonetic error, which led to the difference in the meaning of the verb, and it seems to make sense in the context: "When the Visigoths were persuaded that / asked to learn whether the Germans were in camp near the city, they went to meet them". Perhaps it is a simple phonetic error. Interestingly, manuscripts k and c of the sixteenth century transmit the same spelling with Αθ.

3.3.c) V. 17.6 (p.87, 13-14): Ὁμής γὰρ Ναρνία πεντήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίως σταδίως διέξει (διέχοι Αθ). The optative of Αθ is not suitable. It is a straightforward case of iotacism. Manuscript r transmits the same reading as Αθ. There is a similar error in 27.5 (p. 130, 24-131, 2): ...οὐδὲ ξίφους ἢ δορατίου τινὸς ἄπτεσθαι, χρῆσθαι δὲ μόνος τοξεύμασιν, ἡνίκα τέ οἴ τιν φαρέτραν οὐδὲν ἐντὸς ἔχουσαν ιδη (Hoesch. : ἰδοιεν Κ, ἰδει Λ, ἰδει Αθ), φεύγειν τε κατὰ κράτος οὐδὲν αἰδεσθέντα καὶ ἐς τὸν ἑρέθλον ἀναχώρειν δρόμῳ. The manuscripts give different moods of the verb *εἰδω. The reading of Κ is rejected, as the subject of the verb is Trajan (the name appears seven lines before). The dative of the personal pronoun οἴ in the sentence confirms that the singular is necessary. Most possibly the errors of Αθ and Λ are phonetic.

On the other hand, the subjunctive, which Hoeschel suggests, may be correct in that case. The syntax of ἡνίκα showing action, which happens repeatedly in the future or at the moment it happens, is with subjunctive. The optative of Αθ may be also correct: there is an indirect speech, every verb depend on the phrase Βελισάριος ... ἐκέλευε... Classical authors frequently use this syntax (ἡνίκα + optative) in indirect speech showing something will happen in the future, but this is not the case here.

Another similar error in this Book is the case in 27.6 (p. 131, 4-6): Τραιανὸς δὲ ξύν τοῖς διακοσίοις ἐκ πύλης Σαλαρίας ἤει (ἡι Αθ) ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν πολεμίων στρατόπεδον. It is again just a phonetic error, interchange of ει and οι due to their phonetic equivalence.

3.3.d) V. 17.9 (p.87, 24-26): ἀνοδοὶ τε δύο ἐνταῦθα δὴ ἄγουσι (Κ : ἄγουσι Λ, διάγουσι Αθ), ἦ μὲν πρὸς ἀνίσχοντα ἥλιον, ἦ δὲ πρὸς δύσοντα. Αθ changes the verb. The verb διάγω has a different meaning ("carry over or across") from the simple
lotacisms

I dyw, and on the other hand the particle δη in the sentence makes sense, because it emphasises that “the river gave the name to the city: ποταμός δε Νάρνος ... ὃς καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τῇ πόλει παρέσχευς), “especially (δη) because two roads lead up to the city”. The verb ἅγω is more suitable for the context, as διάγω is usually used for "carry over". The most important argument is that the verb διάγω is never used by Procopius in any of his works. A similar case appears in VII. 17.16 (p. 372, 5-8): τελευτώντης δὲ, ἐπειδή οἱ τοῦ βασιλέως στρατιῶται οἶτον οὐκ εἶχον, δυσπερ καὶ Ὀρμαίως ἀπόδωται πλὴν γε δη δότι (διότι Αθ) τῷ Βέσσαρο ὀλίγος ἔτι ἑλέλειπτο... which is definitely a phonetic error (they sound the same [di’oti], [di’oti]). We should bear in mind that the above alterations are likely to have been caused also by internal dictation. None of the manuscripts copied later agree with Αθ.

3.3.e) V. 18.13 (p. 91, 15-16): τὰ τε βέλη πάντα ἐδέχοντο καὶ τοὺς ἅνε ἐπίλυτας ὑθησμῶ (ὑθησμῶ Αθ) χρώμενοι ἀπεκρούστο. The interchange of η and ι forms two different words. The correct reading is definitely that of most manuscripts. The wrong spelling of Αθ results from confusion with the word ὑθησίς (ὑθέω) which is used by authors of 4th century AD, such as Gregory Nanzianzinus and Alexandrus Aphrodisius. It is worth noting that the term ὑθησμῶ is never used by Procopius.

3.3.f) VI. 2.23 (p. 157, 15-17): εἰμπροσθεν δὲ ἄλλος μηρόν (μυρόν Αθ) αὐτοῦ τὸν εὐώνυμον νῦξας τὸν ταύτη, μυόνα (L : μύον K, μύοντα Αθ) οὔκ εἶθεὶα τιλι, ἀλλ’ ἐγκαρσία πληγῇ ἔτεμε. Inadverted errors due to confusion of sounds, as it is the case in 6. 1 (p. 174, 9-16): οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι εὐθὺς μὲν ἀπεγίγνωσκόν τε τὸν πόλεμον καὶ ὅπως εἰσέθεν διακριθήσωσιν ἐν βουλῇ εἶχον, πρὸς τὸ τοῦ λοιμοῦ (λοιμοῦ L pr. m., sed o post λ erasum est, λιμοῦ Αθ) καὶ τῶν πολεμίων διεθαρμένοι, ἐσ ὀλίγους τε ἡ δή ἐκ μυριάδων περιεστηκότες πολλῶν, οὐχ ἤκιστα δὲ καὶ τῷ λιμῷ (λιμῷ Αθ) ἐπιέξουσα τῷ μὲν λόγῳ πολιορκοῦντες, ἐργῶ δὲ πολιορκούμενοι πρὸς τῶν ἐναντίων καὶ παυτῶν ἀποκεκλεισμένοι τῶν ἀναγκαίων. The scribe of Αθ changes the meaning of the words, by just excluding the o of the first word and adding it to the second. This is not done accidentally, because both λοιμός (pestilence) and λιμός ("famine") are problems for barbarians. However, all later manuscripts examined transmit the correct spelling, apart from δ which transmits the first term as λιμοῦ; so it agrees with Αθ.

3.3.g) VI. 6.21 (p. 177, 13-14): ὑμεῖς (ἡμεῖς Αθ) δὲ, τούτων τοιούτων δύτων, Ἰταλῆς μὲν οὗ προσεποιεῖσθε... The same in: 21.8 (p. 242, 1-2): ἤν γάρ τινι μελλήσει ἐν γε τῷ παρόντι ἐς ἡμᾶς (ὑμᾶς Αθ) χρήσθη ... This is a common
mistake which occurs frequently in both literary and documentary texts through the Roman and Byzantine periods. The opposite in 28.15 (p. 277, 23-24): ἡμεῖς (ὑμεῖς 
Ath) μὲν οὖν ξυνάρξομεν τε βουλομένοις ὑμῖν Ἰταλίας... Later manuscripts transmit the above cases correctly.

3.3.h) VI. 6.29 (p. 178, 17-19): τοῖς γὰρ εὐεργεσίας ἡ χάριτος τινος ἀρξάντας 
tois toous (τῆς ἱσης 
Ath) ἀμείβεσθαι ἄξιον. The confusion between τοῖς ἱσοῖς and τῆς ἱσης is phonetic and very likely caused by dictation, either at some earlier stage in the transmission process, in which case the reading would have been in Ath’s exemplar, or by the scribe of Ath himself through internal dictation.

3.3.i) VI. 7.18 (p. 182, 15-19): αὐτοὶ δὲ μάλιστα τοῦτος δὴ τοῖς βαρβάροις τῶν ἐπιθείειν τῆς ἀποφάς ἐγένοντο θαλασσοκρατοῦντες Ἱρωμαῖοι, καὶ τι (τοι 
Ath) αὐτοῖς ἐσκομίζεσθαι τῶν ἀναγκαίων οὐ ἀνεχόμεθα. Iotacistic error: τι and τοι pronounced the same [ii]. Probably there has been confusion with the word καίτω. Similar in 15.30 (p. 219, 9-11): ...ός οὖ τὰ ξύμφορα σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ποιοῖς ἐκ Θούλης ἀρχηγὸν ἑπαγόμενοι Ἰουστινιανοῦ βασιλέως οὔτι (Dind. : καὶ οὐ τοι 
Ath, οὐ τοι rell.) ἐθελοῦσιν.

3.3.j) VI. 10.7 (p. 193, 20-21): τὴν ἐν Ἱρωμη διαλύσων προσεδρείαν 
(prosedreian Ath), ἀμφί τῷ χωρίῳ τοῦτο δείσαντες. The interchange between ει and ι in the feminine ending /ia/ is frequent in manuscripts. This indicates the identification of the classical Greek /ei/ diphthong with the simple vowel /i/. The same error in 11.8 (p. 197, 14).

3.3.k) VI. 19.3 (p. 233, 5-6): ... μόνον δὲ δύσοδος (δύσοδος 
Ath) τῷ ἀνάντης ἐς ἄγαν εἰναι, ἀλλὰς τε καὶ τῆς πόλεως ἀγχωτάτῳ ιῶτι. Phonetic error - interchange of υ and ι, perhaps because of confusion of the first compound, δις (double) instead of δυσ- (difficult).

3.3.l) VII. 6.16 (p. 323, 12-13): καὶ ἐτυχὲ γε τῆς (τοῖς 
Ath) τῶν πολεμίων ἐννοίας. An inadvertent error, as is the case in 24.27 (p. 406, 9-10): ...τοῦτο λόγῳ αὐτὸς οὐδεὶς διαφθείρεται διαφθείροιο 
(Ath)....; 19.7 (p. 380, 1-2): ...ἡν τι σφίσιν ἑναντίωμα ὑπαντάσῃ (ὑπαντάσει ssr. -η 
Ath), ἔξουσιαν ὅπῃ διαφυγόντες σωθήσονται; 40.34 (p. 481.25 - 482,1): ὦστερον δὲ Ἰουστινιανός

---

3.3.m) VII. 17.13 (p. 371, 22-23): ...ὅ δὲ δῆ ἄλλος ἄπας ὀμιλος τάς ἀκαλήφας (Maltr. : ἀκαλλίφας Αθ, ἀκαλλίφας rell.) μόνας ἡσθιον... Αθ transmits wrongly this word in other cases, as well: 17.16 (p. 372, 15): ἀκαλήφας, 17.18 (p. 372, 15): ἀκαλλίφας. In these cases all other manuscripts transmit it correct. As this is an unusual word, it is misspelled by scribes and by those of later manuscripts who agree with the spelling of Λ and Κ.

3.3.n) VII. 24.31 (p. 406, 24): ...λύσαντες τὴν προσεδρίαν... (προσεδρίαν Αθ): Interchange of ει and ι in this word. The same cases in this book: 11.27 (p.344, 16-17); 36.26 (p. 462, 14); 37.18 (p. 465, 21-22); 40.39 (p. 482, 15). The above cases are transmitted correctly by manuscripts copied later than the fourteenth century.


3.4. Omission / addition of the euphonic -ν

3.4.a) V. 3.24 (p. 18,19): τῶν ἐνθένδε (ἐνθένδε Αθ) ὑπηθέντων. A very frequent phenomenon in Αθ is the wrong form of ἐνθένδε. Perhaps the scribe does this, because the next word starts with vowel (ὑπηθέντων), as we also find in 29.32 (p. 144, 1-2). The next similar case supports this opinion: In V.3.25 (p.18,22) the correct adverb would be the ἐντεῦθεν; in this position an ἐνθένδε appears. The scribe not only changes the word, but he writes the new one wrongly. In that case again a word, beginning with a vowel follows (ἀπόβασιν). Another possibility is that this mistake is made, because the scribe confuses the two similar adverbs ἐνθένδε and ἐντεῦθεν and he puts an unjustifiable -ν at the end of the first. It is certain that the scribe is not aware

---

129 This characteristic does not exist in later manuscripts in the cases listed below, though it appears in other cases.
that it consists of the adverb ἐνθένε and the particle δε which never changes form. Another possibility which is very likely is the use of a movable -ν irregularly throughout the Roman and Byzantine periods.  

3.4.b) VI. 2.9 (p. 155, 17-19): ἐκ δὲ πυλίδος Πιγκιανῆς ἱππέας ἐξακοσίους ἐπὶ τῶν βαρβάρων τὰ χαρακώματα ἐστέλλεν (ἐστέλλε Αθ). The emphonic -ν, which omitted by Ἀθ, is necessary when the word ends a sentence or when the following word starts with a vowel. Similar cases: 4.29 (p. 169, 16-18): τὸ ὑπὸ μέντοι ἀποσχυρισάμενοι λέγουσιν (λέγουσι Αθ) δι τὸ ἐπειδὰν τῷ Βεβίῳ ταύτην ἐρεύξασθαι τὴν κόμην ἐνμβαίη...  

3.4.c) VI. 5.3 (p. 170, 15-17): κύκλον τέ τινα καὶ χαρακώματος σχῆμα τὰς ἀμάξας ποιησάμενοι ἐνθένε (ἐνθένεν Αθ) τοὺς ἐπίστας ἀμύνασθαι... The adverb ἐνθένε is transmitted very frequently with a final -ν. But this does not happen in all cases (e.g. it appears correctly in 2.4 (p.155, 4). The addition of the final -ν appears in 5.4 (p. 171, 2) and 5.17 (p. 172,22) as well in chapter five. More of the same cases are found throughout Book VI: 9.2 (p. 189, 12); 9.9 (p. 190, 3); 9.16 (p. 191, 18); 13.4 (p. 206, 10); 14.23 (p. 212, 8-9); 21.41 (p. 247, 4); 23.31 (p. 256, 8-9); 24.18 (260, 8); 26.23 (p. 269, 11); 27.4 (p. 270, 21); 28.1 (p. 275, 20-21).  

3.4.d) VII. 5.18 (p. 320, 19-20): ... δεῖδως μὴ οἱ βάρβαροι ἐπ’ αὐτῶν ἰωσι (ἰωσίν Αθ). The same appears either in front of vowel or consonant or punctuation in 6.24 (p. 324, 19): ἔτρεψε (ἔτρεψεν Αθ); 7.1 (p. 325, 3): ναυσί ( ναυσίν Αθ); 18.20 (p. 377, 4) and 21.13 (p. 401, 4): σφίσι (σφίσιν Αθ); 20.17 (p. 387, 17): καταφεύγουσι (καταφεύγουσιν Αθ). Sometimes the opposite happens, the scribe omits the final -ν especially before punctuation: 18.28 (p. 378, 16): ἐλε (ἐλευν Αθ); 20.17 (p. 387, 15): γέγονε (γέγονεν Αθ); 36.18 (p. 461, 3): ἀνδράσι (ἀνδράσιν Αθ).  

3.4.e) VII. 7.16 (p. 327, 19-20): ...ἡν γε τὴν πόλιν ἐνδότες ἡμῖν ἐνθένε (ἐνθένεν Αθ) ἀπαλλάσσομαι... The final -ν added by the scribe of Αθ before a word which start with vowel, is very frequent: 8.7 (p. 329, 12); 10.3 (p. 337, 6); 10.12  

(p. 338, 20); 10.13 (p. 338, 24); 12.20 (p. 349, 18); 18.5 (p. 374, 11); 18.24 (p. 377, 17-18); 19.31 (p. 383, 20-21); 23.12 (p. 401, 3); 27.3 (p. 417, 8); 31.5 (p. 431, 18); 38.23 (p. 470, 26); 40.14 (p. 478, 18). Rarely the word is found with the unjustified final -v before consonant: 13.13 (p. 351, 12-13); 13.19 (p. 352, 11); 18.26 (p. 378, 3); 19.5 (p. 379, 16); 19.7 (p. 379, 27).

3.4.f) VII. 24.4 (p. 402, 12-14): λίθους ἀγχιστα τη ὀντας ξυναγαγὼν ἐπ’ ἀλλήλους οὔδεν κόσμῳ ξυνέβαλεν, οὔδεν (οὔδε Αθ) τὸ παράπαν ἐντὸς ἐχοντας... Here the οὔδε is not correct, because it is not preceded by any other particle οὗ or οὔτε. The scribe omits the final ν, which he frequently does, but here this changes the word.

3.4.g) VIII. 1.1 (p. 487, 5-6): ... τὸ δὲ ἐνθένδε (ἐνθένδεν Αθ) οὐκέτι μοι τρόπῳ τῷ εἰρημένῳ ξυγκείσεται. The addition of the final -v appears in other cases of Book VIII, either before consonant: 2.8 (p. 491, 10), 9.18 (p. 528, 12), or before vowel: 5.30 (p. 508, 17); 6.18 (p. 513, 4); 7.8 (p. 517, 12); 9.28 (p. 530, 9).

We should note here that Αθ’s idiosyncratic use of ejqevnden appears in parts copied by different scribes; this means that the error must have existed in the exemplar.

3.5. σὺν / ξυν

3.5.a) V. 28.26 (p. 138, 20-21): ... ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς πεζοῖς ἐς τὴν παράταξιν ἠγείσθαι ξυγχώρει (συγχώρει Αθ). Usually the Thucydidean preposition ξυν appears as σὺν in Αθ (συμμπτωκέναι, συνέσει, συνεχώρει); but there are a very few cases where ξυν appears.132

3.5.b) VI. 7.27 (p. 184, 9-10): δόται δὲ οἱ τὴν ἐκεχειρίαν αὐτοῖς λελύσθαι ξυμβαιν (συμβαίν Αθ, σημαινή Κ)... Change of the preposition also in 9.18 (p. 192, 2-3); 14.3 (p. 209, 8); 26.23 (p. 269, 7-8); 28.1 (p. 275, 18): ξυν (σὺν Αθ).

131 Later manuscripts transmit either the one or the other variant.
132 Haury states in the introduction of his edition that he does not consider variants of this kind, because they are very frequent, so he does not include them in his Apparatus Criticus.
3.5.c) VII. 6.9 (p. 322, 13-14): Ταύτα βασιλεύς μαθών τε καὶ ἐν ξυμφορᾷ (συμφορᾷ Ath) πεποιημένοις... Also in 6.23 (p. 324, 12-13): ξυγγενόμενος (συγγενόμενος Ath); 8.15 (p. 330, 20): ξυμφοραῖς (συμφοραῖς Ath); 38.4 (p. 468, 2): ξυμμορία (συμμορία Ath); 40.2 (p. 476, 3): ξυνδήσαντές (συνδήσαντες Ath).

We should note that according to TLG there are seventy-seven (77) examples of συν and too many examples of ξυν. Haury appears to have standardised the συν to ξυν in most cases, but allowed συν in cases where the manuscript tradition was unanimous.

3.6. εἰς / ἔς

3.6.a) V. 5.1 (p. 25,4): εἰς (ἔς Ath).

3.6.b) VI. 9.21 (p. 192, 11-12): διὰ δὴ αἰκιζόμενος ἔς (εἰς Ath) φῶς τε ἀπαντα ἴνεγκευν...

3.6.c) VII. 13.2 (p. 349, 20): ...ἔς (εἰς Ath) πολιορκίαν καθίστατο. See also 18.9 (p. 375, 7): ἔς² (εἰς Ath); 19.9 (p. 380, 5): ἔς (εἰς Ath); 20.14 (p. 386, 17): ἔς (εἰς Ath); 32.46 (p. 440, 23): εἰς (ἔς Ath).

3.6.d) VIII. 1.1 (p. 487, 7): γράμμασι γὰρ τοῖς ἔς (εἰς Ath) τὸ πάν δεδηλωμένοις... The interchange between the Thucydidean ἔς and the normal εἰς is frequent also in this book: 5.28 (p. 508, 10); 6.18 (p. 513, 2).

In all cases above the manuscript attestation for the forms εἰς and ἔς is confused. Since ἔς is the archaising form that was dropping out of general use, it would be possible to suggest that this was the form used by Procopius, but was likely to be replaced by the scribes with the word in more general use.
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3.7. Slips of the pen (lapsus calami)

3.7. a) V. 20.4 (p. 103, 21-23): ἡδέως δ᾽ ἂν καὶ Ἄρωμαίως ἔτι ἐροίμεθα τούσδε, τί ποτε ἄρα Γότθοις (Γότθοις τοῖς δὲ Ἀθ.) ἐπικαλεῖν ἐξοντες ἡμᾶς τε αὐτοὺς καὶ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς προδόσαν... The use of τοῖς δὲ is definitely wrong, because there is no μὲν before to co-ordinate with the particle δὲ. What would make sense here is the word τοίσδε, which co-ordinates with Ἄρωμαίως τούσδε immediately before and gives emphasis and a kind of antithesis with the τούσδε. It is possible that the scribe of Ἀθ. found τοίσδε in his exemplar and by mistake divided the words, rather that to have added τοῖς δὲ in the first place, which makes no sense.

3.7. b) VI. 1.12 (p. 151, 18-22): οὔτε δὲ κραυγὴ χρήσαι τολμήσας, ἀτε που ἔγγυς στρατοπεδευμένων τῶν πολεμίων, οὔτε τοῦ βόθρου (θορύβου Ἀθ., c, k) τρόπῳ ὅτι οὐκ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι οἶος τε ἡμᾶς, ἐπεὶ ἀνᾶβασιν οὐδαμὴ εἶχεν, αὐτοῦ διανυκτερεύειν ἡμᾶς ἤγαγας. The reading of Ἀθ. comes from the transposition of a word found two lines above. Possibly the scribe of Ἀθ. wrote θορύβου which is similar palaeographically to βόθρου, because this is much more frequent in Procopius: it is used nineteen times in Wars as βόθρος is used only twice (here and in II 6.12 (p.175, 9). From the manuscripts copied later, only c and k agree with Ἀθ.

3.7. c) VI. 19.1 (p. 232, 22-24): ... καὶ οἱ τῆς στρατιάς ἐξηγομένως (L : om K, καὶ ὃς ἐσ Ὀὐρβίνῳ τὸ στράτευμα ἑπήγε ἔξοδου Ἀθ.) Ναρσῆς τε καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ξύμπαντες εἶποντο. It is possible that the reading of Ἀθ. is a scribal addition or a marginal note, which was inserted into the text. But more likely it is a transposition of the phrase found two lines above: αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπὶ Οὐρβίνῳ τὸ στράτευμα ἑπήγε.

3.7. d) VI. 23.2 (P. 251, 12-14): Κυπριανὸν μὲν οὖν καὶ Ἰουστῖνῳ ἔτι τοῖς ἐπομένοις καὶ Ἰσαύρων τοῖς (στρατεύματι ἄλλῳ Ἀθ.) ἐς Φισσάλλαν ἔπεμψε, καὶ πεντακοσίους πεζοὺς ἐκ καταλόγου... The phrase of Ἀθ. is found four lines below in a similar context: Μαρτῖνῳ δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννην ἔτι τοῖς ἐπομένοις καὶ στρατεύματι ἄλλῳ... So the scribe of Ἀθ. jumped several lines, misled by ἔτι τοῖς ἐπομένοις (homoioiteleuton).
3.7.e) VI. 23.28 (p. 255, 24-25): ...ἐπεὶ ὁ μὲν ἐκ βύρσης τε καὶ ξύλου ὑπεράγαν λεπτοῦ, ὁ δὲ ἐκ παχέος τινὸς χαλκοῦ πρόσει πρόσει added in dotted circle λεπτοῦ Αθή. The addition of λεπτοῦ in Αθή may be due to mechanical repetition from the line above. It is circled with dots in Αθή. None of the manuscripts copied later transmit the adjective.

3.7.f) VI. 30.2 (p. 289, 7-9): ἐπιμελείοσθαι δὲ Ἰταλίας Βέσσαν τε καὶ Ἰωάννην εὖν τοὺς ἄλλους ἐκέλευ, καὶ Κωνσταντιανῷ ἐς Ῥαβένναν ἐκ Δαλματίας ἐπέστελλεν (ἐκέλευεν Αθή) ἰέναι. Procopius often uses κελέω ἰέναι, but here he refers to a letter.’Ἐκέλευεν in Αθή is repeated from the line above. None of the later manuscripts agree with the reading of Αθή.

3.7.g) VII. 1.32 (p. 303, 6-9): ... τὴν ἐς Θευδέριχον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Γότθων ἄρχοντας ἄδικαν ἐπικαλῶ, ἀναγκάζων τε ἀποτυπώναι, εἰ τι ἐκείνους ἔξαπατήσαντες, ὡσπερ αὐτὸς ἐφασκεν, έκήρδαιον (Haury: εἶ έκήρδαιον Κ, ἢ έκήρδαιον Αθή, ἐσύλησαν ἢ έκήρδαιον Λ). There is no justification for the use of Κ and Αθή; perhaps Αθή has a link with Λ. I agree that the correct reading must be what Haury emends. The error must have begun from a previous manuscript, which transmitted εἶ έκήρδαιον as the hypothetical εἶ found several words before, goes to έκήρδαιον. Αθή (with a spelling mistake) and Κ copied the same error. The reading of Λ with ἐσύλησαν may have originated from a marginal note referring to the context.

3.7.h) VII. 17.16 (p. 372, 5-8): τελευτώντες δὲ, ἐπεὶ οὐ τοῦ βασιλέως στρατιῶτας σίτον οὐκ εἶχον, ὄπερ καὶ Ῥωμαίοις ἀπόδονται (Κ pr. m.: ἀπόδονται Κ corr., ἀπόδονται εἶχον Λ, ἀπέδουτο εἶχον Αθή), πλὴν γε δὴ ὅτι τῷ Βέσσα ὄλγος ἐτὶ ἐλέλειπτο... The readings of Λ and Αθή are similar, but they are wrong, because the verb εἶχον appears just before. The subjunctive is necessary for the syntax.

3.7.i) VII. 24.20 (p. 404, 25-26): καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ὑποχωρούντων διώκουντες τῶν Ρωμαίων (βαρβάρων Αθή) τινές... Repetition of the preceding βαρβάρων.
3.7.3) VII. 40.33 (p. 481, 22-24): ...οὗτοι ἀνήκεστα ἐν Ἑβρώτῃ τῇ ὀλῇ ἔργα εἰργάσαντο, οὐκ (ἔργα οὐκ Αὐθ) ἐξ ἐπιθυμήσις ληφώμενοι τὰ ἐκείνη χωρία...
The addition is due to the repetition of the same word appears before.

3.7.9) VIII. 6.20 (p. 513, 21-22): ...διὰ πολλάκις ἐνταῦθα φιλεῖ γίνεσθαι, ἀναστρέφει μὲν τὰ πλοῖα ταῦτα εἰθὺς ἐνθευ (διὰ ἐνθένθευ Αὐθ) ὁμοίηται...
The reading of most manuscripts is correct, because the meaning is "...in the direction from which they have started". Αὐθ takes the phrase from above.

3.7.10) VIII. 7.10 (p. 517, 21-24): ...ἀλλὰ καθιστασθαι οὐ μὴ ποτὲ οἶδος τε εἰς ἐν μέσῳ Ἦματιών, ὀξυρυμάτων (ὀξυρυμάτων ὑπίσω Αὐθ) τοῖς πολέμιοις ἀπολελειμμένων ὑπίσω πολλῶν. The added word is a transposition from the line below.

3.7.11) VIII. 8.35 (p. 524, 14-16): ...ἐνὸς τε θανάτῳ ἀνδρὸς ἢ τε μάχῃ ἐκλίθῃ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἦματιών ἡ νίκη (μάχη Αὐθ) ἡχώρει... The scribe of Αὐθ repeats the word from the preceding line.

3.7.12) VIII. 8.36 (p. 524, 19-21): ...ἐλπίδα ἔχοντες αἱρήσειν αὐτοθεί τὸ τῶν ἐναντίων στρατόπεδον (χαράκωμα Αὐθ). The word "camp" of most manuscripts is necessary; Αὐθ just repeats the word from two lines above.

3.8. Inversion of the order of words
There are not many inversions of the order of the words in Αὐθ. The following transpositions, which do not occur in later manuscripts, do not appear in particular syntactical positions.


3.8.2) VI. 7.35 (p. 185, 11-13): Ὕπο δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον δὲ τε Μεσολόγνων ἱερεὺς Δάτιος καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν ἄνδρες δόκιμοι (δόκιμοι ἄνδρες Αὐθ) ἐς Ρώμην ἀφικόμενοι...
3.8.c) VI. 11.16 (p. 198,26 - 199,1): ... ἐπεὶ τῶν πολεμίων οὐδενὸς ἐπιτυγχάνειν
(ἐπιτυγχάνειν οὐδενὸς Αθ) οἱ θείαν...

3.8.d) VI. 16.22 (p. 223, 14-18): αὐτοκράτωρ δὲ τῷ στόλῳ Ἰλλίγερ ἐφεστήκει, ὄ
δὴ εὐθὺ Ἀρμῖνου Βελυσάριος ἐπέστελλε πλεῖν, φυλασσομένῳ ὅπως (Κ : ὅπως
φυλασσομένῳ Αθ, φυλασσομένως Λ) μή μακράν ἀπολειμμένον τοῦ πεζοῦ
στρατοῦ καταίρειν ἐστὶν ἑκείνη ἀκτὴν ἐγχειρήσασιν.

3.8.e) VI. 20.13 (p. 238, 5-7): ... ὅμως τῇ ταλαιπωρίᾳ παρὰ δόξαν ἀντείχον,
ἥκιστα μὲν τροφῆς κόρον ἑρχόμενοι, ὅσον δὲ μὴ (μή δὲ Αθ) λιμῷ
ἀποθνῄσκειν... The inversion of the words by Αθ is not correct. This phrase is
frequent in Procopius: IV.12.16 (p. 472, 19-20): ὅπως δὲ μή κατὰ κορυφῆν ὑμᾶς οἱ
πολέμιοι βάλλοντι; VI.29.17 (p. 284, 25-26): δεδιότες ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν, ὅπως δὲ μὴ
δούλοι βασιλέως γενόμενοι

3.8.f) VI. 20.32 (p. 240, 19-21): ὅρως μὲντοι αὐτῶν οὐδεὶς ἥπτετο, οἱ πολλοὶ
σιτιζεσθαι πεφύκασι (πεφύκασι σιτίζεσθαι Αθ) νεκροὶς σώμασιν, ἐπεὶ οὐκ
ἐίχον οὐδὲν ὅτι ἐφεύτο. The scribe of Αθ follows the normal structure, verb +
infinite, and this is found usually in the end of the sentence.

3.8.g) VI. 23.23 (p. 255, 10-11): ἥμικα ταῦτα ἐδόκει (ἐδόκει ταῦτα Αθ) τῷ
στρατηγῷ ως ἄριστα ἔχειν.

3.8.h) VI. 28.12 (p. 277, 12-14): ἀλλως τε, ἥν μὲν τὰ (τὰ μὲν Αθ) ὁπλα ξίν ἡμῖν
ἐλησθε, οὐδεμία λελήφεται Ρωμαίοις ἐλπίς... The inversion of the words by Αθ is
wrong. In this case there are two hypotheses (ἡν μὲν τα ὁπλα ... ἡν δὲ γε ξιν
Ῥωμαίοις..., if on the one hand..., if on the other...); what is contrasted here is not the
ὁπλα, so the μὲν is not justified to be after ὁπλα but after ἡν as it is in the second
possibility (ἡν δὲ...).

3.8.i) VII. 1.7 (p. 299, 2-4): οὔτω δὲ πράον τε καὶ εὐπρόσοδον (Κ : καὶ
eu práoν te kai eúprosódon) πράον τε Λ, εὐπρόσοδον πράον τε Αθ) παρεῖχεν ἕαυτόν τοῖς
ἐντυγχάνουσι ὡστε ἀνθρώπῳ πένητι τε λιαν καὶ ἄδοξῳ ἐμπορῆς εἶναι.

3.8.j) VII. 1.31 (p. 302, 23-24): ψαλίδιον γὰρ τοῦτο καλοῦσι τὸ ὅργανον, ὅτως ΤΙΣ
τὰ τοιαῦτα (Κ : ὥ ταυτά τις Λ, ὥ τα ταυτά τις Αθ) ἐργάζεται.
Inversion of the order of words

3.8.k) VII. 11.18 (p. 343, 4-6): ἕνθα Ναζάρης ... στρατιωτῶν τε τῶν ἐν Ἰλλυρίους ἄρξων, ἐργα θαμαστὰ ἐς τοὺς πολεμίους πάντων μάλιστα (πάντων μάλιστα ἐς τοὺς πολεμίους Αθ) ἐπεδείξατο.

3.8.l) VII. 14.18 (p. 356, 11-12): ὡς εἶ ἡ μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀντῆς (Κ : ἄν τις καὶ αὐτὸς Λ, ἀντῆς καὶ αὐτὸς Αθ) τὸ γένος...

3.8.m) VII. 18.13 (p. 375, 21-23): ἐρομένου δὲ αὐτὸν Ἰώνου, τί δὲ οὐκ ἀπολούμενος συνοίσευ ποτὲ (ποτὲ συνοίσευ Αθ) ὅ τι άρως τε καὶ αὐτῷ μέλλει... Change in order of words also in 25.2 (p. 407, 21-22): ἐξελεῖν Περσίαν (Περσίαν ἔξελείν Αθ); 31.21 (p. 430, 11): πράσσειν εἰώθει (εἰώθει πράσσειν Αθ); 32.3 (p. 434, 2-3) and 33.51 (p. 441, 17): εἰργάσατο οὐδὲν (οὐδὲν εἰργάσατο Αθ); 33.6 (p. 443, 1): χρυσοῦ κύριον (κύριον χρυσοῦ Αθ); 34.10 (p. 446, 15): φόρου ἀπαγωγήν (ἀπαγωγὴν φόρου Αθ); 36.8 (p. 459, 17): πλοία μακρὰ (μακρὰ πλοία Αθ).

3.8.n) VII. 29.21 (p. 426, 5-9): ...ἐπεί ὅ ὅμοιος τοὺς ἐν τῷ ἑπὶ ὅ ὅμοιος φρουρᾶς τῶν ἀναγκαίων ὑποστανίζειν ἐποθετο, ἐξαιρήσειν αὐτοὺς οἰόμενος ὅτι τάχιστα, ἢ μή τι ἐσκομιζέσθαι τῶν ἐπιτηδείων (ἢ μέντοι τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἐσκομίζεσθαι Αθ) οἱ οἱ τις ὅσι, ἔστρατοπεδεύσατο τε ὅς ἀγχωτάτω...

3.8.o) VIII. 4.12 (p. 502, 18): ...ἔγνωσαν δὲ ὅς καὶ ὅ ὅμοιος ἱερέα βασιλέως (βασιλέως ἱερέα Αθ) πέμψει... Other cases of inversion in this book: 12.32 (p. 552, 2-3): ...καὶ διεισδομένου ἐκ τοῦ ἑπὶ πλείστου ὅ ὅμοιος τοῦ γένους (τοῦ ὅ ὅμοιος γένους Αθ); 13.28 (p. 557, 1-3): ...καὶ ᾧ ὅσιος οἰόμενοι εἶναι ἢ θάρειν τῶν ἐπιόντων τὴν (τῆν τῶν ἐπιόντων Αθ) δύναμιν ἐς τᾶς σφίς παρασκευασμένας ἀκάτους.
3.9. Additions of words and phrases

The additions and the omissions of words is the one of the most frequent characteristics of Ath. Mostly small words, articles, particles or prepositions are added or omitted, which do not always affect the syntax, or the meaning of a sentence. At times whole phrases are inserted in the text, which are usually intrusions from marginal notes (glosses or explanations related to the context).

In this category, the readings have been separated according to the kind of addition, namely, if it is an article, particle or preposition, or whether the addition is a transposition or an interpolation. The examples in each of the subcategories are set out by book.

3.9.1. Articles

3.9.1.a) V. 22.22 (p. 112, 6-10): ... χρόνον μὲν τινα ὀλίγων ἔκπληξις τοῖς Ὦμουσις ἐγένετο οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐλπίδα καθ᾽ ὃ τι χρῆ ἀμυνομένους σωθῆται, μετὰ δὲ (μετὰ δὲ τοῦ Ἁθ) ξυμφρονήσαντες τῶν ἁγαλμάτων τὰ πλείστα, μεγάλα δύνα, διέφθειρον... The addition of the article is inadvertent; it is not suitable before the participle. Unnecessary additions of articles appear in Book V in the following cases:

22.22 (p. 112, 8-12): ... μετὰ δὲ ξυμφρονήσαντες τῶν ἁγαλμάτων τὰ πλείστα, λίγων μεγάλα δύνα, διέφθειρον, αἱροντες τε (τε τοὺς Ἁθ) λίθους περιπληθεῖσις ἐνθένθε μεροῖν ἀμφοτέραις κατὰ κορυφῇ ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους ἔρρητουν...

23.19 (p. 116, 4-6): ... διελόντες τὸν τοίχον, ἐντὸς Βιβαρίου ἐγένοντο, Κυπριανόν τὸν (ἐν τοῖς Ἁθ) ἄλλοις τισί κατὰ τάχος ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἐσβιβάσας ἔργου ἐκέλευεν ἔχεσθαι.

27.24 (p. 133, 13-15): καὶ τοὺς μὲν πολεμίους δεινόν τε καὶ τύχης ἐναντίωμα παντάπασι ἐδόκει εἶναι, τί (ἐν τοῖς Ἁθ) πολλοὶ τε ὄντες πρὸς ὀλίγων πολεμίων ἐπιόντων αφίσιν ἡσασώνται...

29.11 (p. 140, 25-141, 2): ἐνδηλόν τε ὃς, ἣν μετὰ (μετὰ τὴν Ἁθ) τούτων ὑμεῖς τῶν λογισμῶν τήνδε τὴν ξυμβολὴν διενέγκητε, ράστα μὲν τοὺς ἐναντίους ὑπήκοτε...

3.9.1.b) VI. 13.1 (p. 205, 24-25): Βελισάριος δὲ ἄμφι θερινᾶς τροπᾶς ἐπὶ τὸ Ὀὔρττίγιν καὶ τὸ (τὸ τῶν Ἁθ) Γότθων στρατόπεδου ἵει... It seems that an article to define τὸ Γότθων seems more natural to the scribe. Articles are added in Book VI in:

18.27 (p. 232, 4-5): ... γράμματα βασιλέως ἡ Ἰουστινιανοῦ ἐδείξεν, ἀ πρὸς τοὺς (τοὺς τοῦ Ἁθ) στρατόπεδου ἄρχοντας ἔγραφεν.
20.18 (p. 238, 22-23): διὸ ἐκλιπόντες τὰ οἰκεῖα ταῦτη (οἱ ταῦτη Αθ) ἀνθρωποὶ ἐστὶ Πικνίκων ἢλθον ...

27.16 (p. 272, 12-14): καὶ (καὶ ἣ Αθ) τῶν 'Αρμενίων ἀνδρεῖς ἔπτα ὑπὸ τὸ Ναρσή καὶ 'Αρατίῳ τασσόμενοι ἔργα ἐπεδειξάντο ἀρετῆς ἅξια...

30.18 (p. 291, 16-17): ὀλίγω δὲ ὑστερον Γότθους (τοὺς Γότθους Αθ) ἀπαντὰς ἐξυγκαλέσας ἔλεξεν τοιάδε...

3.9.1.c) VII. 13.6 (p. 350, 16): ...καὶ ταῖς υἱόσις ταῖς (ταῖς τοῦ Αθ) Αἰόλου καλομέμεναίς... Additions of unnecessary articles appear in the following cases:

12.16 (p. 349, 1-2): ...αὐτοῦ τὸ καὶ (καὶ τὸ Αθ) Σπολίτιον Γότθοις ἐνδούναι.

12.20 (p. 349, 16-17): οὐδὲν δὲ ἥσοσιν οἱ Κυπριανοῦ στρατιῶται βασιλεῖ (τῷ βασιλεί Αθ) τὴν πόλιν ἑφύλασσον...

13.20 (p. 352, 17-18): ...Νάρσου ἀδελφὸν ἐῳ (ἐῳ τῷ Αθ) στρατῷ ἐπεμψε βαρβάρων τε καὶ 'Ῥωμαίων στρατιῶτών.

14.14 (p. 355, 20-21): εἶναι γὰρ ἐν τῷ (τῷ τῶν Αθ) Σκλαβηνῶν ἐθνεὶ Χιλβούδιον...

19.27 (p. 383, 1): ὑποτοπήσαντες αὐτῷ (τῶν ἀμφὶ Αθ) τῶν Ἰσαάκην ὁπισθεν εἶναι...

30.6 (p. 427, 11): Μασαγέτην γένος (τὸ γένος Αθ)

36.25 (p. 462, 8): ἐς (ἐς τὸ Αθ) Βυζάντιον, οὕτως ἀνήρ (ὁ ἀνήρ Αθ).

3.9.1.d) VIII. 6.4 (p. 510, 3-4): ...ὁ μὲν Τάναίς ποταμὸς ἐν (ἐν τῷ Αθ) γῇ τῆς Εὐρώπης τικτόμενος... Articles are added in the following cases:

6.10 (p. 511, 15): ...ἀλλὰ περὶ (περὶ τοῦ Αθ) ποταμοῦ τε καὶ τῆς χώρας...

8.35 (p. 524, 11-12): ύψ' ὅτου μὲντοι οὕτως ἀνὴρ (ὁ ἀνήρ Αθ) βληθεὶ... 13.15 (p. 555, 7): ...τοῖς (τοῖς τῆς Αθ) Ἰβηρίας ὁρίους 14.44 (p. 564, 13-14): ...οὕτω τε (τε τῷ Αθ) λιμῷ καὶ ἀσθενείᾳ πιεζομένους πολλῆ διεφθάρθαι.

3.9.2. Particles

3.9.2.a) V. 23.17 (p. 115, 18-20): Οὐίττιγις μὲν οὖν μηχανᾶς τε ἄλλας ἄλλῃ τοῦ τείχους ἤτοιμαζε καὶ ὀρύσσειν τὸ ἔξω τείχισμα (τείχισμα καὶ Αθ) τοὺς Γότθους ἐκέλευε... An inadvertent addition, as in 29.12 (p. 141, 7-9): ...οἳ δὲ θρασύνουνται καθ' ἡμῶν τοῖς ἡμετέροις κακοῖς ἐπαρθέντες, καὶ (καὶ οὐ Αθ) μόνον ἑφόδιον ἐχουσες τὴν ἡμετέραν ὀλγωρίαν.
Additions of particles

3.9.2. b) VI. 15.7 (p. 215, 19-20): μησι δὲ οὐχ ἦσσον ἦ (ἡ καὶ Αθ) ἐξ υστερου ἀμφι τὰς χειμερινὰς ποὺ τροπὰς... The addition of καὶ makes no sense here. After the comparative particle ἦ, the second part of the comparison follows and sometimes is introduced by καὶ. But this is unsuitable here. Another addition of the same particle appears in 26.16 (p. 268, 7-10): Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ οὐδέν τι ἦσσον ἀχθομενοι, δη δὴ ἐν χώρᾳ ἐρήμῳ μακρὰν οὔτω προσεδρέαυν πεποίηται, διηποροῦντο (καὶ διηποροῦντο Αθ) ... The connective particle is not suitable here, because it would connect two different things: the participle ἀχθομενοι and the verb διηποροῦντο.

3.9.2. c) VII. 5.14 (p. 320, 2-4): ἀλλὰ τὰχν (Κ : τὰχν γε Λ, τὰχν δὲ Αθ) τινὶ ἐννεβῇ ἐς το Ῥωμαῖων στρατόπεδον φήμην οὐκ ἄληθη περιφέρεσθαι... I believe that the particle added in Αθ is not correct, because there is no opposition or co-ordination with μὲν. As ἀλλὰ is in the beginning of the sentence, a γε or δὲ is not permissible; there is no such usage in Procopius. Additions of particles appear in the same book also in the following cases:

6.20 (p. 324, 1-4): ... καὶ τῶν κατὰ θάλασσαν ἔργων τε καὶ κινδύνων ἀκριβῶς ἐμπειρός, πλεύσας δὲ ξύν Βελισαρίῳ ἐς τε Λιβύην καὶ Ἰταλίαν ἐγένετο (ἐγένετο δὲ Αθ) ἐς ταύτῃ δὴ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν δόκιμος... The added δὲ in Αθ is not suitable, because it would leave the sentence which begins with πλεύσας δὲ without the main verb. It may have been added due to attraction from the previous one.

9.13 (p. 334, 19-20): ...ὀποίων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐτύχετε ξένων (ξένων τε Αθ) καὶ φίλων ἐπίστασθε δὴ που, εἰ τι τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου μέμνησθε λογισμῶν. I believe that the particle is suitable here; the τε καὶ is very frequently used by Procopius, when two words with the same syntactical level are used.

13.23 (p. 353, 3-5): ...καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πορείᾳ ἐννεβῇ τις τὰχν μεγάλα Ῥωμαίους ἀγαθὰ (καὶ ἀγαθὸς Αθ) ἐκ τοῦ ἀπροσδοκήτου ἐργάσασθαι. The masculine of the adjective does not refer to any existing word in the text.

34.17 (p. 447, 18-19): οὐχ ὃβρισαν ἐς (ἐς οὐχ Αθ) οὐς ἥκιστα ἐχρῆν; I believe that this is just a repetition of the first οὐχ. The second appearance of the negative particle is absolutely unjustified.
3.9.2. d) VIII. 5.10 (p. 505, 1-2): '...Βανδάλων μὲν (μὲν οὖν Αθ) ἦδη ἐνέθεικε ἀναστάντων ἐπὶ τε Λιβύης ἱδρυσαμένων... In Book VIII particles are added also in the following cases:

5.24 (p. 507, 17-19): καὶ τοι... γεγονότα ὑάσι (ὑάσι καὶ Αθ) Σκύθας τε τημικάδε...καλείσθαι...;

6.14 (p. 512, 7-8): καὶ ὀρίσματα αὐτῇ Νεῖλος τε (τε καὶ Αθ) ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ποταμός...

6.20 (p. 513, 9-10): ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Στανείρητος Ἀριστοτέλης, σοφός (καὶ σοφὸς Αθ) ἀνὴρ ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα...

10.8 (p. 532, 15-16): ...καὶ ταῖς γυναιξὶ τοῦ (δὲ τοῦ Αθ) πατρὸς ὀκυνήσει οὐδεμιὰ ἐς εὐνὴν συνιῶν

14.39 (p. 563, 14): ...γυνῆ τίς ἐν πόλει βρέφος ἐκύει τὰ μὲν (μὲν οὖν Αθ) ἀλλὰ ἑπιεἰκῶς ἀνθρωπόμορφον...

3.9.3. Prepositions

3.9.3.a) VI. 20.14 (p. 238, 8-10): ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπαντα σφάς τα ἐπιτήδεια ἐπελελοίπει, δέρρεις τε καὶ διψήφος ὀδατι βρέχοντες πολίν (εἰς in dotted circle πολίν Αθ) τινα χρόνον εἶτα ἦσθιον. There is an addition in the manuscript, which is circled with dots. The addition of the preposition εἰς going with χρόνον is not justified, because according to Procopius' usage the phrase πολίς χρόνος is never accompanied by εἰς. The preposition is not transmitted by later manuscripts.

3.9.3.b) VI. 27.26 (p. 274, 1-2): ...σφάς τε αὐτοὺς καὶ τὸ φρούριον ὑμολογία (ἐν ὑμολογίᾳ Αθ) παρέδοσαν. The phrase παραδίδοναι ὑμολογία means "surrender something in accordance with their will". The preposition ἐν is not justified here. The same phrase is used by Procopius elsewhere (II.17.27 (p. 227, 21); V.5.16 (p. 27, 15); VI.11.19 (p. 199, 9) where it is transmitted correctly by Αθ.

3.9.3.c) VI. 28.23 (p. 279, 16-18): ...Βελισαρίως δὲ οὐδὲν τι ἡσον ἐφύλασσε τοῦ μὴ τοῦς (ἐς τοῦς Αθ) βαρβάρους τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἑσκομίζεσθαι. The addition of the preposition here is unnecessary, because the τοῦς βαρβάρους is the object of ἐφύλασσε ("Belisarius was on his guard lest the barbarians..."). The barbarians are not the destination of the ἑσκομίζεσθαι τὰ ἐπιτήδεια.
Additions of prepositions

3.9.3.d) VII. 11.22 (p. 343, 22): ...μόνος δὲ αὐτὸς τὸν (εἰς τὸν Αθήνα) ἵππον ἔξελάσας κατὰ τάχος ἦει. The εἰς is wrong. In other cases the phrase is transmitted correctly by Αθήνα; e.g. II 4.21 (p. 316, 13-14): τὸν ἵππον ἔξελάσας πρὸ τοῦ ἄλλου στρατοῦ ἐν μεταχειρίᾳ ἔστη; III 31.11 (p. 653, 2-3): τὸν ἵππον ἔξελάσας, ἀγχιστὰ ἔλθε τοῦ Ῥωμαίων στρατοῦ.

3.9.3.e) VII. 11.34 (p. 345, 20-21): ...ἐν τῷ ἄσφαλεῖ γενομένοις ὅσα (ὅσα περὶ Αθήνα) τοῦ περιβόλου κατεπέπτωκε... The scribe is not aware of the syntax of the verb καταπίπτω with genitive, so he adds the preposition περὶ, which goes with genitive.

3.9.3.f) VII. 12.13 (p. 348, 15-16): Ἡρωδιανός μὲν οὖν τοῖς πολέμοις ἐς λόγους ἠλθεν, ἐφ' ὑπάκουστα ἡμέρας ἡσυχῆ μείνωσιν (ἐν ἡσυχῇ μείνουσιν Αθήνα). This is an expression used frequently by Procopius. The preposition is unnecessary. The subjunctive is necessary for the relative secondary clause.

3.9.3.g) VII. 19.3 (p. 379, 8-9): ...πύργων ἔξυλων ἐπὶ αὐταῖς ἐτεκτήνατο, πολλῷ καθυπερτερόν τὸν τοῖς (ἐν τοῖς Αθήνα) πολεμίως ἐν τῇ γεφύρᾳ πεποιημένων. Certainly the preposition ἐν is unsuitable here. The dative of the agent goes with the perfect participle ("the bridge made by enemies") needs no ἐν.

---

133 E.g., I.23.19 (p. 121, 19), II.29, 36 (p. 295, 6), VII.30.14 (p.428, 21).
3.9.4. Interpolation / Glosses

3.9.4.a) VI. 4.3 (p. 164, 27-p. 165, 1): ... ἥξευν τε ξίν αὐτοῖς τὸν σίτον παρακομίζοντι ἐς Ὄστιαν, ὅθε (ὅτι Ath, ὅτι τάχος L) τὸ Ῥωμαῖον ἐπίνειον. **Ath changes the rarely used adverb ὅθε (note that this is the only occurrence in all of Procopius’ works) to the more frequent ὅτι, by just changing the consonant.** Of course, the ὅτι makes no sense in the context. We must notice again the link between Ath and L.

3.9.4.b) VI. 7.8 (p. 181, 1-3): ...διὰ τοῦ Τιβέριδος ἐς Ῥώμην (ἐς Ῥώμην ἤθελον ἀγαγεῖν. καὶ δὴ L, ἐς Ῥώμην καὶ δὴ Ath) πνεῦμα τηρήσαντες φύσιν ἐπίφορον ἐναυτήλλυτο... The reading of Ath is unsuitable, although it emphasises with the addition of δὴ but on the other hand, the participle τηρήσαντες shows time, so it does not allow either the connective καὶ (because of the participle), or the emphatic particle δὴ and especially in this position. The reading of L is interesting. By adding a verb and the phrase καὶ δὴ after a pause, the syntax is correct.

3.9.4.c) VI. 27.31 (p. 274,24-275,4): οὐ τε στρατιώται οὐκ εἰσὶν συγχωρεῖν τοῖς βαρβάροις τὰ χρήματα, τραύματα μὲν πολλὰ (K: οὕτω τραύματα μὲν πολλὰ Ath, οὕτω μὲν πολλὰ τραύματα L) ἐνδεικνύμενοι ... πόνους δὲ πάντας ἀπαθηθοῦντες... The use of οὕτω could be justified, “so many wounds”, as it is the attempt of the soldiers not to concede their properties to the enemy, by displaying the wounds and recounting the struggles.

3.9.4.d) VII. 17.6 (p. 370, 8-9): καὶ χορηγεῖτε τοῖς ὑµετέροις αἷµαλωτοῖς τροφῆν ὅν (οὐκ ἄρκοιςαν οὐδὲ L, οὐκ ἄγουσιν οὐδὲ Ath) κατὰ τὴν χρείαν ἤμῖν ἀποχρώσαν, ἄλλα ὡστε ἀποξῆ ἄρχος ἔχουσαν... First of all the construction οὐ ... ἄλλα is necessary and the οὐδὲ ... ἄλλα of Ath is wrong. The reading of L may be more plausible than the one of K, because it is correct as regards the syntax and the context and it is more emphatic. As for the different verb transmitted by Ath, it may come from a marginal note.

134 In this case the possible intrusion of marginal notes in the text is in the style of additions rather than change of words or phrases, which are listed below in 3.17.5, pp. 137-40.
3.9.4.e) VII. 24.15 (p. 404, 2-3): **ἐπείτα (K : ἐπείτα δὲ ἡμείς κατὰ τὰ άλλα ἅπαν, ἐπεί τε ἡμείς κατὰ τὰ άλλα ἅπαν) οἱ μὲν βάρβαροι ἐν τοῖς στρατοπεδίοις γενόμενοι ἑνυκτέρευσαν... The correct reading is that of K; the readings of L and Ath may be coming from a marginal note (ἐπείτα δὲ ἡμείς κατὰ τὰ άλλα ἅπαν), which intruded into the text in a previous manuscript, common exemplar of L and Ath.  

3.9.4.f) VII. 24.4 (p. 402, 15-17): ...ἐπεὶ οὗτος τίτανος (τίτανος κοινία ἁσβεστος καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ γύψος Ath) εἶχεν οὗτος τι ἀλλο τοιοῦτον, ἀλλ’ ὁπως μόνον τὸ τῆς οἰκοδομίας σώζοιτο πρόσωπον... Certainly the addition of Ath is a marginal note, explaining the meaning of the word τίτανος which intruded into the text either while Ath was being copied or in a previous manuscript. There are two other cases where the word τίτανος appears and Procopius himself explains its meaning: VI.27.21 (p. 273, 8-9): ἡν πάλαι μὲν τίτανος, ταῦτα δὲ ἁσβεστον καλεῖν νεομίκαισιν; Build. II.13.53 (p. 13, 25-26): συνήρμοσε δὲ αὐτοὺς οὗ τίτανος, ἵππερ ἁσβεστον ὑνομάζοσιν, οὐκ ἁσφαλτος... In all other cases there is no explanation when the word appears.

3.9.4.g) VII. 32.47 (p. 441, 3-5): ταύτη τε τὸν διπλούς ὑμὸν ἐπὶ μέγα ἐξῆρον, ἀλλοτρίας αὐτῷ χαριεῖσθαι συμφορᾶς ἐν σπουδῇ ἔχοντες (ἀνθρώπων ἔχοντες ἐν σπουδῇ Ath). The genitive possessive ἀνθρώπων of Ath is correct in meaning ("other men's misfortunes") but it is superfluous as the meaning without the genitive ἀνθρώπων is perfectly clear; besides the order of the words is not correct.

3.9.4.h) VIII. 5.15 (p. 505, 24-25): ...τοὺς μὲν κτείναντας, τοὺς δὲ, ὡσπερ ἔρρηθη, ἐξαναστήσαντες (ἐνθένδεν ἐξαναστήσαντες Ath) τὴν χώραν ἔσχον. The only possibility is that this addition is an interpolation. Perhaps the added word was included in an explanatory marginal note and it intruded into the text by mistake.

---

However, similar phrases appear frequently in Procopius: II.17.17 (p. 226, 16): τότε μὲν οὗν οἱ βάρβαροι ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον ἁγχωρησαν· ἡδη γὰρ καὶ ἡμείς κατὰ τὰ άλλα ἅπαν; VI.12.4 (p. 200, 12-13): τότε μὲν ἡμῖν ἔμενον, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡμείς κατὰ τὰ άλλα ἅπαν; VIII.35.31 (p. 676, 12-14): ἐπειδή δὲ ἡμείς κατὰ τὰ άλλα ἅπαν, αὐτοῦ ἐκάτεροι διαλυθέντες ἐν τῇ τῶν ὅπλων σκέψῃ ἑνυκτέρευσαν.
3.9.4.i) VIII. 8.26 (p. 522, 24-25): ...τῶν Περσῶν ἔνα, φυχῆς τε ἀρετῆ καὶ σώματος ἀλκῆ ἐπιείκῶς μέγαν (μέγαν κεχωμένου Ath), τῷ δόρατι εὐθὺς ἐκτείνεν... As for its meaning and its case, the participle is not wrong. But it cannot go with the following dative: the correct should be κεχωμένου τὸ δόρυ. Perhaps the participle intruded from a marginal note.

3.9.4.j) VIII. 11.20 (p. 538, 6-7): Ῥωμαῖοι μὲν οὖν, ἐπείδη τοῦ περιβόλου τὸ κατασειοθέν (L: τοῦ κατασειοθέντος καὶ θεμένου K, τοῦ κατασειοθέντος καὶ θυμένοντος Ath) αἰθεὶς ἐστηκός εἶδον, διηποροῦντο τε καὶ ἀμηχανία πολλῆ εἰχοντο. The genitive of K and Ath is possibly due to attraction from the previous genitive. However, the second participle, makes no sense. Perhaps it was in a marginal note of a previous manuscript.

3.9.4.k) VIII. 12.8 (p. 548, 7-8): ...καὶ πρὸς τῶν βιῶν ἐνδιαθρυπτομένους τε καὶ βλακεύοντας (μοραίοντας καὶ βλακεύοντας Ath) ἐλεεῖν ἁξιώμεν... Perhaps the first participle was a gloss in a marginal note in a previous manuscript and finally intruded into the text.

3.10. Omissions of words and phrases

This is the commonest feature of Ath; the scribe very frequently omits words, mostly particles and articles and small phrases. As in the case of the additions mentioned above, the omissions, too, in most cases do not affect either the syntax or the meaning, for they are mostly emphatic words. Omissions are especially liable to occur with short words. Regarding the later manuscripts, which have been examined, the omissions listed below do not appear in any of them. There are indeed other omissions to be observed in later manuscripts but none show quite the number found in Ath. Therefore this is a special characteristic of Ath. This group has been divided into two subcategories: the omissions, which affect the syntax, and those which do not, which as mentioned above are much more.

3.10.1. Omissions, which affect the syntax

3.10.1.a) V. 22.14 (p. 110, 14-17): τοῦτον δὴ τὸν τάφον οἱ παλαιοὶ ἀνθρώποι (ἐδόκει γαρ τῇ πόλει ἐπιτείχισμα εἶναι) τείχισμασι (om. Ath, ἐπιτείχισμασι
L) δύο εσ αυτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ περιβόλου διήκουσι περιβάλλουσι καὶ μέρος εἶναι τοῦ τείχους πεποίημαται. **Ath omits a word, which is very important. The scribe may be confused, because he did not realise that the sentence ἔδωκε ... εἶναι is a parenthetic one. He therefore omitted the word τείχισμασι as it already existed before.**

3.10.1.b) V.26.11 (p. 129, 3-6): ἐπειδὰν οὖν οἱ ἐμποροὶ ταῖς ναυσίν ἐς τὸν λιμένα ἀφίκωνται, ἀραντες (ἀραν Αθ) τὰ φορτία ἐνθένδε καὶ ταῦτα ἐνθέμενοι ἐν ταῖς βάρεσι, πλέουσι διὰ τοῦ Τιβέριδος ἐπὶ τὴν Ἡρώην... it is an inadvertent error by the scribe of Ath; he simply does not complete the ending of the participle. The participle ἀραντες is necessary. As the connective particle connects syntactically related words, and as the second part of the sentence has the participle ἐνθέμενοι, the second part should have participle as well. In addition there is a main verb in the sentence (πλέουσι) and another verb is not necessary. The two participles are presuppositions for the verb, that is why they are in past tense and the verb in present: "when they unloaded... and placed..., they sail...". The same omission of the ending in VII. 9.17 (p. 335, 8-11): καίτοι πῶς οὐκ ἂν τῶν ἀτοπωτάτων δόξειεν εἶναι τὸν μὲν θεόν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν αὐτοὺς πιήνυσθαι (πίνυν Αθ), ὑμᾶς δὲ τῇ τούτων ἐμφυλωθέρειν ἀτοπία καὶ τῶν ἐντεθὲν οὐκ ἐθέλειν ἀπηλλάχθαι κακῶν; 19.23 (p. 382, 13): ...ὡς νικώ ἡ τοὺς Βελισάριος, ἀνέλοιτο (ἀνέλοι Αθ) δὲ τὴν ἄλυσιν... There is of course a possibility that the above omissions of endings are due to abbreviations in the exemplar.

3.10.1.c) V.27.26 (p. 133, 22-27): ὠστε ἦν (Κ : εἰ Λ, om. Αθ) κατὰ λόγου τῆς δυνάμεως τὰς εἰμηθολὰς ποιοὶ, οὐδὲν ἂν τῇ σφετέρᾳ ὀλγανωρπία τὸ τῶν πολεμίων λυμήνασθαι πλῆθος. The conditional cannot be omitted; it is absolutely necessary, because the main sentence follows ("if he should fight... the multitudes could inflict..."). Perhaps the scribe is confused by the ὠστε before the conditional conjunction.

3.10.1.d) VI. 16.1 (p. 220, 5-6): Βελισάριος ὅτε Καί Ναρσής (om. Αθ) ἐγὼ ἀμφοτέροις στρατεύμασιν ἄλληλοις ἀνεμίγυντο ἀμφὶ πόλειν Φόρμιον... The second name is necessary not only for the context but also for the syntax, as the word ἄλληλοις and the verb in plural indicate.
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3.10.1.e) VI. 24.13 (p. 259, 8-11): μάλιστα δὲ ἀπάντων ὁ λιμὸς αὐτοῦ ἐξεπετάρασσεν, οὐκ ἔχοντα δὲν ἄν (om. Ath) τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τῷ στρατοπέδῳ πορίζηται. The ἄν is necessary, because the δὲν-clause is hypothetical.

3.10.1.f) VI. 27.3 (p. 270, 14-15): διαφθείραι γούν ἑθέλων τὴν δεξαμενήν ἔπενοεῖ τάδε (om. Ath). ἐξοπλίσας τὸ στράτευμα δλον... If the phrase is omitted, there is no syntactical error, stylistically however the phrase is necessary, because then we have: "wishing to destroy the cistern, he armed his whole army...". But the ἔπενοεῖ τάδε should be included, as Procopius often introduces a plan in this way.

3.10.1.g) VI. 27.14 (p. 272, 7-8): ...καὶ χεῖρα τὴν (om. Ath) δεξιὰν προβαλλόμενος ἔσωσε μὲν τὸν στρατηγὸν ἐκ τοῦ παραδόξου... The article is necessary because it indicates a particular hand, τὴν δεξιὰν. The adjectives for the hands (ἄριστον or δεξιὰν) are always preceded by articles. The same phrase appears correctly in 19.16 (p. 235, 4-5): ...οἱ μὲν οὐν βάρβαροι χεῖρας τὰς δεξιὰς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπάλξεων προτεινόμενοι...

3.10.1.h) VI. 28.23 (p. 279, 12-16): Οὐδέττιγις δὲ ξὺν Γότθων τοῖς ἀρίστοις πολλὰ κοινολογούμενοι τὰς τοῖς μετὰ τιθελέα ξυνθήκας εἴλετο καὶ ἀπράκτους ἀπεπέμψατο τοὺς Γερμανῶν πρέσβεις. καὶ τὸ (K: φράγγους. καὶ τὸ L, om. Ath) λοιπὸν Γότθοι μὲν καὶ Ἑρμαιοί πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐπεκρηκυκέοντο ἀδη... The reading of L is not wrong; the national names Γερμανοὶ and Φράγγοι were used alternatively by Procopius (in 28.9 the speech of the envoys of Germans begins it says οἱ Γερμανῶν πρέσβεις; when it finishes it says Φράγγοι μὲν τοσαύτα εἶπον). Though we should accept the reading of K, which includes the word πρέσβεις. The omission of Ath is not justified. Perhaps it is caused by the fact that the last word finishes in -το and the last word he omits is τὸ and the scribe jumped the phrase (homoioiteleuton).

3.10.1.i) VI. 28.29 (p. 281, 3-6): ...ξὺν ὀλίγοις τισὶ παρ’ αὐτοὺς ἔπεμψεν, ἐφ’ ϑα πιστὰ δώτες (om. Ath) παραστήσονται ὁμολογία τοὺς ταύτη βαρβάρους. The participle is absolutely necessary, because it is the reason why the men were sent
by Belisarius, they had "instructions to give pledges and accept the surrender of the barbarians". Without the participle the object τὰ πιστα does not have a verb.

3.10.1.j) VII. 1.13 (p. 300, 7-9): ἦν δὲ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπαίτην ἀγχύνουσα τὸ διαφερόντως κἂν (K : καὶ ἐν L, ἐν Ath) τοῖς ἀπόροις ἐπιφυγότα σὰ βέλτιστα ἰκανώτατος. The reading of Ath is grammatically possible, but syntactically it is not: the καὶ is necessary to co-ordinate with the previous τὸ. The reading of L is correct, but the two words must be connected; in similar cases it appears correct in L (13.6, (p. 350, 16) and 14.28 (p. 358, 19).

3.10.1.k) VII. 2.15 (p. 308, 5-7): Ἐράριχος δὲ Γότθος ἀπαίτας συγκαλέσας πρέσβεις ἀνέπεισε (KW : βουλὴν προθετο πρέσβεις L, πρέσβεις Ath) πρὸς Ἰουστινιανὸν βασιλέα πέμψαι, δεησόμενος... The reading of Ath is certainly wrong, because it does not have a verb to make the infinitive πέμψαι necessary. The reading of KW seems more plausible here, as the reading of L seems like an explanatory note; the verb προτίθημα was never used by Procopius in all of his works.

Omissions (affect the syntax)


3.10.1.m) VII. 19.23 (p. 382, 13): ἐν τούτῳ τις φήμη ἐπὶ ποινὴ τῷ Ῥωμαίῳ ἐς Πόρτον ἐλθοῦσα περιήγγελλεν (K: ἐλθοῦσα Ath, ἔλθοι L), ὡς νική μὲν Βελσάριος, ἀνέλικτο δὲ τῇ ἄλυσαι... The finite verb is necessary here, because the participle cannot stand by itself, and secondly the next sentence ὦς νικῇ needs a verb to depend on. Ath by mistake omits the verb, and L by confusion from the next optative changes its mood.

3.10.1.n) VII. 28.3 (p. 420, 17-18): ...περαιτέρω δὲ τὰς ναῦς λέναι οὐδαμῇ ἐφιέντος, τῷ Κροτωνιατῶν λιμένι προσέχε (om. Ath). Most probably an inadvertent error. The verb is absolutely necessary, because there is not another verb in the sentence. Inadvertent omission also in 29.5 (p. 423, 16-18): καὶ οἱ μὲν ταύτῃ ὕκημένοι καταχωσθήσασθαι ὑποτοπήσαντες ἐν δέει μεγάλῳ ἐγένουτο, οὐδὲν μέντοι (om. Ath) ἐνθένδε φλαῦρον αὐτοῖς ξυνηνέχθη παθεῖν.

3.10.1.o) VII. 30.9 (p. 428, 3-4): ...στόλων πολὺν ἀγείρας εὐθὺ 'Ρουσκιανῆς κατὰ τάχος ἐπλεί, τοῖς πολιορκουμένοις ἐπαμύνειν (K: ἐμύνειν L, om. Ath) ἐν σπουδῆ ἐχον. An infinitive is absolutely necessary here; so the omission of Ath is not justified. The correct form is the compound, which means "to go in order to offer help to someone" and not "to defend" as the simple verb means.

3.10.1.p) VII. 37.28 (p. 467, 7-8): τότε δὴ Βῆρος ἐν ἀνδρᾶσ, οὗς (L: ἀνδρᾶς V, om. Ath) ἀγείρας μαχιμωτάτους ἀμφ' αὐτῶν ἑπιχε Πέτθοις τοῖς ἐν Πικνῆ ὄους ἐς χειρᾶς ἐλθὼν ... τῶν τε ἑπομένων πολλοὺς ἀποβάλλει... The omission of the phrase omits an important part of the sentence, which is necessary. The reading of V is also wrong, because it would connect ἑπιχε not with ἀγείρας but with ἐς χειρᾶς...
Omissions (affect the syntax)

3.10.1.q) VII. 39.26 (p. 475, 9-11): ἄκηκοέναι γὰρ αὐτοκράτορα τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου τοῦν Γερμανὸν (om. Ath) καταστῆαι τε καὶ ξῦν τῷ στρατῷ οὐκ ἄποθεν εἶναι. The accusative is the object of ἄκηκοέναι and absolutely necessary in the sentence.

3.10.1.r) VIII. 4.11 (p. 502, 10-11): ...εἴτε καὶ ἄλλο τι ἄμφι τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῖς ἡσκῆτο (K : ἡσκεῖτο L, om. Ath), οὐκ ἔχω εἴπειν... The verb is necessary; Ath omits it by carelessness, while L makes a phonetic error.

3.10.1.s) VIII. 6.21 (p. 514, 4-5): οὐ μὴν ἄλλα (L: ἐπεί K, ἄλλα Ath) καὶ τῷ τῆν Ἰταλίαν τε καὶ Σικελίαν διείργοντι πορθμῷ... The phrase of L gives the correct meaning "But this is not the only case..." referring to the previous thoughts.

3.10.1.t) VIII. 11.24 (p. 538, 20-22): τοῖν τε βασιλέων ἐκάτερος (om. Ath) χρυσίον εἰώθει τακτον τοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐνσπώνδοις προεσθαί... The pronoun after the dual is necessary for the meaning: "each one of the two kings used to offer gold".

3.10.2. Omissions, which do not affect the syntax

3.10.2.a) V. 18.35 (p. 95, 4-5): ... δι’ ἄλλης πολης ἐμβεβληκότων, ἢ ὑπὲρ ποταμὸν Τιβερίν ἐστι Παγκρατίων ἀνδρὸς ἀγίου ἐπόνυμος (om. Ath) οὐσα. An inadvertent omission by Ath.

3.10.2.b) V. 22.4 (p. 108, 19-22): πρῶτος ὁ στρατηγὸς τὸ τόξον ἐκτείνας, τῶν τινα τεθωρακισμένων τε καὶ τῆς στρατιᾶς ἡγομένων εἰς τὸν αὐχέα ἐπιτυχών (τυχών sscr. ἐπι Ath) βάλλει. The scribe of Ath wrote by mistake at first the simple τυχών and afterwards he added the preposition above, because he realised his mistake. The simple τυχών would give the wrong meaning “Belisarius hit him on the neck because he accidentally found him”. The meaning of ἐπιτυχών is that what
happened, happened on purpose and successfully, "with lucky aim". The simple verb is not transmitted by any of the later manuscripts.

3.10.2.c) V. 22.11 (p. 110, 1-3): ἐτύγχανον δὲ ἦδη καὶ μηχαναὶ ἄλλαι πύργων τε καὶ κριῶν καὶ (om. Ath) κλίμακες πολλαί ἐνταῦθα οὕσαν. The text refers to the engines of towers and rams and a lot of ladders, which happened to be there. The omission of the second connective καὶ by Ath changes the meaning, attributing ladders to rams. This is impossible for rams have no ladders.

3.10.2.d) V. 21.22 (p. 108, 2-4): αὐταὶ δὲ (L : αὐ τὲ K, αὐταὶ Ath) ἐς τοὺς ἐπιώντας ἐς τοῦ αἴφνιδίου ἐμπίπτοντια τῶν προέχοντια τῶν ἐμβολῶν, ὀσοὺς άν λάβοιεν, εὐπτώς κτείνουσι. Without δὲ the sentence is an asyndeton. The particle is necessary. A similar omission appears in VI. 1.11 (p. 151, 11-15): Περανίου δὲ ἡμέραις οὐ πολλαῖς ὑστερον Ἐρωμάιων τισὶ διὰ πύλης Σαλαρίας ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους ἠγγεσσίσεν ἐφευγον μὲν κατὰ κράτος οἱ Γότθοι, παλινδιώξεως δὲ (om. Ath) περὶ ἡλίου δυσμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἴφνιδίου γεγενημένης... The omission of the particle in Ath is inadvertent. The fact that in the previous sentence there is a co-ordinate μὲν and together they form a contrast, makes the δὲ absolutely necessary.

3.10.2.e) V. 22.21 (p. 111, 21-23): ὡς μήτε τῇ καλουμένῃ βαλλίστρα χρήσθαι τοὺς φύλακας οἴνου τε εἰναι (οὐ γὰρ πέμπονσιν ὅτι μη) (L : om. K, ὅτι Ath) ἐξ ἐναντίας αὶ μηχαναὶ αὐταὶ τὰ βέλη) οὐ μὴν οἷον δὲ τοῖς τοξεύμασι τοῖς ἐπιώντας ἀμ这一年θαί... The omission of the negative particle μὴ by Ath changes the meaning of "for these engines do not send their missiles except (= ὅτι μὴ) straight out". It is possible that the two negatives οὐ γὰρ and ὅτι μὴ and the fact that this sentence is in parenthesis confuses the scribes.

3.10.2.f) V. 26.5 (p. 128, 9-13): ἐστὶ δὲ ἢ ὁ ποταμὸς Τίβερις τὰς ἐκβολὰς ἔχει, ὡς δὴ ἐκ Ἐρώμης φερόμενος, ἑπειδὰν τῆς θαλάσσης ἐγγυτέρω γένηται ὡσον ἀπὸ σταθὼν πεντεκαίδεκα, δίχα (om. Ath) σχιζόμενος τὴν θερᾶν νῆσον καλουμένην ἐνταῦθα ποιεῖ. The omission of δίχα changes the meaning of the sentence; δίχα makes it more specific ("to be divided in two parts").
3.10.2.g) V. 25.15 (p. 126, 1-5): ... καὶ τοὺς φύλακας ἐς φυλακτήριον ἄλλο μακράν
που ἀποθεν τοῦ προτέρου ἀντικαθίστη, τοῖς τε ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ φυλακήν
ἐξουσία (K : ἐξουσίαν Ath, ἀρχοντας L) ἐς νῦκτα ἐκάκοτον ἐτέρους ἐφίστη. The
word ἀρχοντας of L fits the syntax, going with ἐτέρους, but the meaning is not
suitable. The dative participle, which goes with the initial article in the dative, is
absolutely necessary as it is the object of the sentence and without it the sentence makes
no sense. The omission of Ath is most possibly inadvertent.

3.10.2.h) V. 25.18 (p. 126, 16-18): τότε καὶ τοῦ 'Ἰάνου νεὼ τὰς θύρας τῶν (om.
Ath) πνεὺς Πομάϊων βιασάμενοι ἀνακλῖναι λάθρα ἑπειράσαντο. The article is
necessary, because it refers to a specific noun, 'Πομάϊοι (τινὲς τῶν 'Πομάϊων).

3.10.2.i) VI. 2.12 (p. 156, 2-4): καρτερᾶς τε γεγενημένης τής ξυμβολῆς,
ἐκατέρων μὲν πολλοί καὶ (om. Ath) ἀριστοὶ ἐπεσον, ἀμφοτέρους δε ἀπὸ τε τῆς
πόλεως καὶ τῶν χαρακμάτων ἐπίκουροι ἠλθούν. The fallen on the battle were many
on both sides and the best. There are similar constructions elsewhere: VI 12.32 (p.
204.8): ἔσαυν πολλοί τε καὶ ἀριστοὶ; VII 35.9 (p. 454,22): πολλοῖς τε καὶ
λογιμοτάτοις ἐσάγαν οὖσιν.

3.10.2.j) An inadvertent omission of articles in Book VI: 3.20 (p. 162, 13-16):
πάντα γάρ τοῖς ἐνυγχάνουσιν ὁ λιμὸς τα κακὰ φορητα δείκνυσιν, ἐνθα τε 
ἀν 
φαινηται, μετὰ τῆς τῶν (om. Ath) ἄλλων ἑπέρχεται λήθης καὶ θανάτους
ἀπαντας... where τῶν ἄλλων refers to specific sufferings, therefore the article is
necessary. Other omissions of articles: VI 4.15 (p. 167, 13-15): τὸ ἐπιτείχισμα ... ὅν
συχνὰ τε καταθέντες καὶ τῷ ἀπροσδοκήτῳ ἐκπλήσσουτες ἀεὶ τῶν βαρβάρων
toús (om. Ath) τὰ ἐπιπήδεα παραπέμπουται, ἔως Συμβουλὴς...; VI 10.16 (p. 195,
11-12): ἔπειτα δὲ οἱ Γότθοι τραπόμενοι μέγα τε καὶ ὑπερφυὲς σφίσαν αὐτοὺς
to (om. Ath) πάθος ἐποίουν. The omission of the article would be correct, if the
πάθος was not the object of ἐποίουν and if it was not characterised by two adjectives;
here it needs to be specified, as the construction is: τὸ πάθος μέγα τε καὶ ὑπερφυὲς
ἐποίουν. There are similar instances where the article is not omitted: IV 7.6 (p. 449, 7):

136 τῆς om. L
Another omission of article appear in Book VI: 23.31 (p. 256, 13-15): ἥμιν δὲ τοῦ
dιαφυγεῖν τὴν αὐτῶν ἐνέδραν τὸ (om. Ath) τὸν κύνδυνον ὑποστήναι
μεμπτότερον. Here the author in order to give emphasis changes the order of the
comparison and this confuses the scribe. The article is necessary here, because it goes
with the infinitive ὑποστήναι, which is the first part of the comparative and τοῦ
dιαφυγεῖν the second. This is a very unusual structure.

3.10.2.1) VI. 4.13 (p. 166, 25-p. 167, 1): ταύτα μὲν οὖν Βελισάριος
dιαπετραγμένος ἡσύχαζε, μάχης μὲν οὐκ ἄρχων, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ τείχους ἀμύνεσθαι
προθυμούμενος, ἦν τις ἐξώθεν ἐπὶ αὐτὸ (Haury : ἐπὶ αὐτῷ K, ἀπ' αὑτῇ L, om.
Ath) κακουργήσων ίοι; The prepositional phrase is definitely necessary for the
meaning to define the word τείχος. All later manuscripts transmit either the reading of
L or of K.

3.10.2.m) VI. 5.14 (p. 172, 10-12): ἐνταῦθα τῶν τις βαρβάρων πεθωρακισμένος τε
καὶ σώματος ἐς ἄγαν εὖ (om. Ath) ἦκων, ἐπειδὴ εἶδε προϊόντας τοὺς
πολεμίους...The word is necessary here: "A very strong man in so far as his body was
concerned".

3.10.2.n) VI. 9.11 (p. 190, 18-20): διὸ δὴ αὐτὸς τε τὸν ὀχετῶν ἐν μεγάλῃ φυλακῇ
(om. Ath) ἔσχε καὶ οἱ Γότθοι αἰσθάμενοι ταύτης δὴ τῆς πείρας ἀπέσχοντο.
This seems an inadvertent omission.
3.10.2.o) VI. 10.10 (p. 194, 4-8): τολμητής τε γὰρ ἦν καὶ αὐτουργὸς ἐν ταῖς μάλιστα, ἐς τε τοὺς κινδύνους ἄδοκνος, διαίταν τε σκληρὰν καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν τινὰ (om. Ath) ἐς αἱ ἐνθεο-βαρβάρου ὅπου ὢν ὑπερβῶσθεν οὐδενὸς ἤσσον. All characteristics used to describe John are strong and expressive and mostly followed by a strong adjective; therefore the ταλαιπωρία should be characterised as “of a kind”. In addition, perhaps it is used to counterbalance σκληρὰν (διαίταν σκληρὰν – ταλαιπωρίαν τινὰ).

3.10.2.p) VI. 10.19 (p. 195, 22-24): ἀλλὰ Μουνδίλας μὲν τέτρασι βαρβάροις κἀκεῖ ἐκαστὸν (om. Ath) ἐς χεῖρας ἐλθὼν ἐκτεινέ τε ἀπαντασ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐσώθη. The phrase κἀκεῖ ἐκαστὸν must have existed in the original text (“with four barbarians in turn and killed them all”); it is an inadvertent omission by Ath, as it is the case in 13.14 (p. 207,25 - 208,1): ...εἰ μὴ ἄνδρες δύο, ἔργα θαυμάσια ἐνδεικνύμενοι, ἢ δὴ αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἐν (K : om. L, [τοὺς] ἐν Christ, τοὺς Ath) ταῖς ἑπάλξεσι γενομένους ἀρετῆ ὀφαντο...

3.10.2.q) VI. 12.22 (p. 202, 25-26): οἷς δὲ τὸ φιλόφιλον ἐμπέφυκε μᾶλλον, τούτοις δὴ μάλιστα (om. Ath) τὸ εὑτόλμοις εἶναι ξυνοίσει ... The adverb is necessary, as in the previous sentence there is a μᾶλλον to which μάλιστα refers: "For those in whom the love of life has been more deeply implanted, it will be of advantage to those especially to be hold".

3.10.2.r) VI. 29.2 (p. 282, 14-15): ...τῶν δὲ δὴ δὴ (om. Ath) χρημάτων τὸ ἡμῖον βασιλεῖς εἶναι, καὶ αὐτὸν δόσῃ ἐντὸς Πάπῳ πολταμὸς ἐστιν... The particle may be explanatory: “Vittigis gets half of the treasure – the secons half, of course, goes to the Emperor”. The phrase is also used in other cases: I. 24.27 (p. 128, 18); IV. 3.8 (p. 429, 11). Same omission in VII. 6.20 (p. 324, 1-4): ...καὶ τῶν κατὰ θάλασσαν ἔργων τε καὶ κινδύνων ἀκριβῶς ἐμπειρος, πλεύσας δὲ ἔργων Ἑλλαδαὶ ἐς τέ Λιβύην καὶ Ἐθελίαν ἐγένετο ἐς ταύτην δὴ (om. Ath) τὴν ἐμπειρίαν δόκιμος...; 9.8 (p. 334, 1-2): ἢν δὲ τις ἐκ προνοίας ἀδικῆ μόνης, τούτῳ δὴ (om. Ath) μηδὲ ἀντιλέγειν ποτὲ πρὶν τῶν πεπραγμένων λελείψειται.
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Omissions (do not affect the syntax)

3.10.2.s) VI. 29.33 (p. 287, 10-14): τοὺς γὰρ ἐναντίους οἱ Γότθοι πλὴθει καὶ
dυνάμει παρά (om. Ath) πολὺ ὑπεραιροῦτες... δορυάλωτοι τε πρὸς τῶν ἐλασσόνων ἐγίνοντο...
If the pará is omitted, there is no great change in the sentence; it is just used for emphasis. It is very frequently used before πολὺ in Procopius.

3.10.2.t) VII. 1.8 (p. 299, 8-10): τῶν τε γὰρ ἐν ἡμιβολῇ ἡτυχικῶν χρήμασι
μεγάλοις παρεμπνεύτο τὰ πρῶτερα (K : proter/ L, om. Suid. and Ath) πραύματα καὶ τοῖς εὐδοκιμήσασι φελλά τε καὶ στρεπτοὺς ἔχειν...
I believe that the prōterα is not necessary here, because it is quite clear that it refers to the wounds received previously. It is one of the few cases that the reading in the Suda Lexicon and in Ath coincide; this may mean that, at least in this case, they take their information from the same transmission.

3.10.2.u) VII. 1.48 (p. 305, 18-20): ... ἡ κεφαλὴ εἰς τὴν τράπεζα καταρραγείσα
ἐξέπληξε τε καὶ ἐς θάμβος τι (om. Ath) μέγα τοὺς παρώντας ἡμεγεν ἁπαντάς.
An error appears in a similar case in Book V.10.9 (p. 194, 2-4): καὶ μέγα τι (καὶ μέγα τὸ Ath, μέγα τι K, καὶ μέγα L, μέγα τε Kras) κλέος. Inadvertent error.

3.10.2.v) VII. 3.4 (p. 309, 14-15): οὗτος μὲν ὂν (om. Ath) ὁ Ῥωμαίων στρατὸς εἰς
dισχιλίους τε καὶ μυρίους ξυνεῖλεκτο...
The same omission in 10.17 (p. 339, 10-12): Βελισάριος μὲν ὂν (om. Ath) τοὺς ἄνδρας οἱ ἐς ὑπὶ ἔλθοντας ξῦν
φιλοφροσύνῃ πολλή, ὡσπερ εἰώθης, εἶδεν.

3.10.2.w) VII. 3.7 (p. 310, 2-4): καὶ, ἡν γὰρ οἱ τῶν τε φυλάκων ἐκ παιδός
γυνώριμος, πέμψας παρ’ αὐτῶν τῶν οἱ (om. Ath) ἐπιτηδείων τινὰς χρήμασιν
ἀναπείθει τὸν ἄνδρωπον...
The dative of the personal pronoun is necessary here for the meaning, because it shows the familiarity to him of the people he sent.

3.10.2.x) VII. 3.12 (p. 310, 20-22): τότε δὲ ἄνδρας ἐκατὸν ἐκ τοῦ παυτῶς (om.
Ath) στρατοπέδου ἀπολεξάμενος ἀωρὶ τῶν νυκτῶν ἁγχιστα τοῦ περιβόλου
ἐγένετο. The adjective provides emphasis. A similar case in 7.16 (p. 327, 19-21): ...ἡν
3.10.2.y) VII. 3.18 (p. 311, 24-312, 2): καὶ τὸ τε δὴ οἷ (ἡ Κ, om. Αθ) τοῦ Ῥωμαίων στρατοῦ ἀρχοντες τὰ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν Βερώνῃ χρημάτων πρὸς ἄλληλους διοικησάμενοι... The reading of Κ is certainly wrong; perhaps it comes from a dictation error. Αθ is wrong as well, because the article is necessary, as the text refers to the particular ἀρχοντες, those of the Roman army. A similar omission in 6.14 (p. 323, 3-5): καταπλεύσας οὖν ὅ (om. Αθ) Δημήτριος ἐσ Σικελίαν, ἐπὶ Κόνωνα τε και Νεαπολίτας πικρότατα πολιορκεῖσθαι... The article is necessary as it refers to the particular Demetrius who has been introduced just two lines before.

3.10.2.z) VII. 8.3 (p. 328, 23-25): φυλακᾶς ἐν τῇ λιμένι καὶ ταῖς πύλαις καταστησάμενος ἐκέλευε μηδένα τῇ ἐνθένδε (om. Αθ) ἴέναι. This adverb is necessary, because it completes the meaning of ἴέναι: "go away from there (the city)".

3.10.2.a.a) VII. 9.18 (p. 335, 14-16): ...ἀλλʼ ἐπὶ βραχείας τινὸς καὶ ταύτης ἀνωτήτου ύμιν (om. Αθ) ἀποδεικνύμενης ἐλπίδος ἠλπισε μὲν τὰ κρέισσων... The dative of the personal pronoun is necessary; it is the indirect object of the genitive absolute participle.

3.10.2.a.b) VII. 14. 21 (p. 357, 5-6): Ὅσπει δὲ ὁ λόγος περιφερόμενος ἐς ἀπαντας ἦθεν, ἤγειροντο μὲν ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὁ Αὐταί (om. Αθ) σχεδὸν ἀπαντες... Inadvertent error.

3.10.2.a.c) VII. 14.32 (p. 359, 4-6): ἐν ὦ δὲ ταύτα ἐπράσεστο τῆδε, ἐν τούτῳ βασιλεὺς (om. Αθ) ᾿Ιουστινιανὸς πρέσβεις τινὰς παρὰ τούτοις δὴ τοὺς βαρβάρους στείλας... Almost always when there is a reference to Justinian, the name
is accompanied by the word βασιλεὺς either before or after the name, as a title (see some lines below, 14.33 (p. 359, 12).

3.10.2.a.d) VII. 28.18 (p. 422,24 - 423,2): ἐνθεὺς τε ἄραντες καὶ πνεύματος ἐπιτυχόντες ἐκεῖνη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (om. Ath) τῇ Σικελίας Μεσήνη προσέχουν, ἴ τοῦ μὲν Κρότωνος ἐπτακοσίους σταδίους διέχει... This is an omission of a long part of the text by Ath. Similar cases appear below: 29.3 (p. 423, 10-13): οἱ δὲ τῶν Ἰλλυρίων ἄρχοντες στράτευμα πεντακισχιλίων τε καὶ μυρίων ἐχοντες (om. Ath) ἐίποντο, ἀληθὲς μέντοι τῶν πολεμίων οὐδαμῇ ἐτὸλμων ἰέναι and 36.23 (p. 461, 22-24): ἀλλήλους τοῖς ἑξαπτιναίως περιπλακέντες καὶ τῶν προσώπων καταφιλήσαντες (om. Ath) τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ ἡσπάζοντο... It is not accidental that in all cases the phrases omitted are independent, additional or explanatory sentences. However, it is more plausible that the scribe jumped a line due to homoioiteleuton.

3.10.2.a.e) VII. 30.5 (p. 426,23 - 427,1): ἐν τούτῳ δὲ οἱ ἐν τῷ Ὄουσκιανής (Haury cf. 426,5, 429,17 : Ὄουσκιανής K, Ὄουσκιανὴ L, om. Ath) φρουρὶς πολιορκοῦμενοι... The definition of the place is necessary, because above there is another discussion and here a new narrative begins. Haury depends on two other similar cases to emend the text.

3.10.2.a.f) VII. 32.15 (p. 436,6-8): ἀφικόμενός τε παρ’ αὐτῶν Ἀρσάκης ἔφασεν οἱ Λάθρα (om. Ath) ἐν ἑρῴ τιν ἐντυχεῖν βούλεσθαι. The adverb is necessary to the context, "secretly".

3.10.2.a.g) VII. 37.27 (p. 467,5-6): ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ βασιλεῖ μετέμελεν ἀδῆς, ἡσυχὴ καὶ αὐτὸς (om. Ath) ἐμενε. The omission does not affect the syntax, but καὶ αὐτὸς is necessary for emphasis and for the meaning: "...he too remained silent...".

3.10.2.a.h) VIII. 2.8 (p. 491, 18-20): ...ἐίτε Δαζίκης εὐθὺ πλέοντες ἐίτε καὶ (om. Ath) ἐνθεῦνε ἄπαντες, οὐκέτι ἔξης διαπλεῖν δύναναι. The scribe omits inadvertently particles and other small words which are necessary to the sentences: 6.20 (p. 513, 12-13): ὅτεπερ Εὔριππον ὄνομαζον, καὶ λόγον τοῦ (om. Ath) φυσικὸν
3.11. Errors in proper and foreign names

Errors in proper names are very frequent in manuscripts. In Procopius errors of this kind are due to most of the names being foreign and transcribed in Greek. This suggests that perhaps Procopius himself may have been unsure about their spelling. When the proper names are changed due to paretyymology, they are definitely the scribe’s mistake. The fact that in later manuscripts different versions of the proper names appear in particular foreign ones, leads to the assumption that there are scribal errors.

3.11.a) V. 29.11 (p. 141, 1-5): ἢν μετὰ τούτων ὑμεῖς τῶν λογισμῶν τήνδε τὴν ἐξυμβολὴν διενέγκητε, ράστα μὲν τοὺς ἐναντίους νικήσετε, ὀλίγους τε ὅντας καὶ Πραϊκοῦς (K: γραϊκοῦς ἢ ἄσους Αθ, γραϊκοὺς ἢ ἀσους Λ, ἢ Ισαύρως Grotius), κολάσετε δὲ αὐτοὺς αὐτίκα δὴ μάλα τῆς ἀδικίας καὶ ἐβρεῶς ἦς ἐς ἴμας ἤρξαν. There are four different variants for this reading. Manuscripts Αθ and Λ transmit similar additions and therefore the addition most probably existed in a common, previous manuscript. I believe that the aim of Vittigis who speaks here is to give encouragement to his army, and so he exaggerates in some cases: "you will not only conquer your opponents most easily, few as they are and Greeks, but you will also punish them...". Grotius' emendation does not include the name Πραϊκοῦς; if it was included, it would be the most plausible suggestion: "you will conquer your opponents, Greeks or Isaurians". With this suggestion the attempt is not to define whom they will conquer, but to give an indicative object, for exaggeration. I believe that there must be other words after Πραϊκοῦς as in all manuscripts, except from K; this, to some extent, supports Grotius' emendation ['isous] [is'avrous].
Errors in foreign names

3.11.b) VI. 7.23 (p. 183, 14-15): ταυτό δὲ τοῦτο ἀμφὶ τε Ἀλβανῷ καὶ Κεντουκέλλαις (κεντουκέλλαις Κ, κεντουκέλλαις Λ, κεντούλλος Αθ) δῆθεν τῷ λόγῳ ᾑτιώντο... Κ has the correct form, except for the very common -λ- for -λλ-. The name appears correctly in 7.13 (p. 182, 20): Κεντουκέλλας (κεντουκέλλας codd.). Proper names are usually transmitted wrongly in manuscripts, e.g., 22.8 (p. 248, 11-12): Φιλιμιοῦθ (Φιλημιοῦθ Αθ) and Φανιδέου (Φανιδέου Αθ), 27.14 (p. 272, 5): Οὐνίγαστος (οὐνίγαστος Λ, οὐνίγας Αθ).

3.11.c) VI. 7.28 (p. 184, 10-12): πατηλ μὲν τῷ στρατῷ ἄφω τε καὶ ἐξ ἐπιδρομῆς καταθεὶν τῇ Πικηνών (πιγκηνών Αθ, πιγκήν Λ) χώραν... There are various readings for this proper name in almost all cases. This national name is always transmitted by Αθ with γ as πιγκν-; perhaps due to confusion with the name of the gate Πιγκιανῆ. Similar error in 10.1 (p. 192, 20-22): Πικηνών (πικηνῶν Κ, πιγκιανῶν Λ, πιγγιανῶν Αθ).

3.11.d) VI. 8.2 (p. 186, 7 and 9): Πρεσίδιος (Περσίδιος Αθ) ἦν τις (ἀνήρ Ῥωμαῖος... Due to pareymology, the name Πρεσίδιος is transmitted wrongly by Αθ. The tendency of the scribe to find an etymology from Πέρσης is clear. The name is transmitted correctly by Αθ in other cases (see VI. 8.8 (p. 187, 1, 11, 24)).

3.11.e) VI. 11.10 (p. 197, 25-198, 1): Ῥωμαίων δὲ τὸ στρατεύμα, ἐπειδὴ τῇ Πέτρᾳ (προτέρᾳ Αθ) ἐνέτυχον ... Inadvertent error.

3.11.f) VI. 12.32 (p. 204, 9-10): ἐν Τικνῷ (Maltr. : πιγκνῷ Αθ, πικηνῷ Κ, πιγκηνῶν Λ) καταθέμενοι ...The scribes use the national Πιγκηνῶν in the position of a word which sounds similar, because they had not come upon this proper name before. Αθ transmits the correct case (dative). A similar case in 25.8 (p. 262, 15-17): ὡς δὲ ἴκοντο ἐς Τικίνων (Maltr. : πικηνῶν Κ, πιγκηνῶν Λ, πιγγινῶν Αθ) πόλιν, ἵνα δὴ γέφυραν ἐς τὸν ποταμὸν τοῦτον ἐτεκτήματο οἱ πάλαι Ῥωμαῖοι...

137 This name appears two more times inProcopius (VI. 14.18 (p. 208, 21) and VI. 19.20 (p. 235, 20); in both cases Κ transmits it correctly while Λ transmits φανιδέως.
138 Cf. below 3.11.f.
Errors in foreign names

3.11.g) VI. 21.1 (p. 240,26 - 241,2): ... Μαρτινόν τε καὶ Οὐλίαρν (K: οὐλίαρον L, οὐλίαν Ath) ξίνω πολλῷ στρατῷ ἐπὶ αὐτοῦς ἐπεμψεν. The attempt of L and Ath is to give to the name the most frequent Greek endings; Ath may confuse the name with another, the name Οὐλίας which appears once in Procopius. In other cases (p. 242.12, p. 244.5, p. 247.15) the name is spelt correctly.

3.11.h) VI. 21.40 (p. 246, 22-23): Ἐπαρατοῦ (K: οὗ δὴ ἐπαρατοῦ L, οὗ δὴ ἐπάρατον Ath) δὲ εὑρόντες τὸν τῆς αὐλῆς ἔπαρχον, ἐκοψάν τε κατὰ βραχὺ καὶ αὐτοῦ τα κρέα τοῖς κυσίν ἔρριψαν. The scribe of Ath misunderstood the proper name: "where they found the praetorian prefect accursed (guilty), they cut his body...". The correct reading is that of K. Ath shows some connection with L. There is a possibility that the exemplar of Ath had the reading of L, and the scribe changed it to a word which had a meaning, simply by omitting the ρ.

3.11.i) VI. 28.1 (p. 275, 18-20): Μάγνου τε πέμψας ξίνω πλῆθει πολλῷ ύπὲρ Ῥαβένης ἐκέλευε Πάδου (πάγου Ath) τὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὴν δχθην... This must be due to the scribe's lack of attention; it gives an etymology to the unknown word.

3.11.k) VII. 2.7 (p. 306, 20-21): οὕτως ὁ Τούτιλας Γότθων μὲν τηνικαῦτα τῶν ἐν Ταρβηνίῳ (ἀρταβασιῶ Ath) ἀρχῶν ἐτύγχανεν. Inadvertent error. This word does not exist. Perhaps it is a confusion from the proper name Ἄρταβαζης, which is used frequently in these chapters.

3.11.l) VII. 2.10 (307, 10): "Ἡθη δὲ Γότθων τῇ Ἐραπίγου (ἱεραπίγα Ath) ἀρχὴ ἦχθουντο... This is the only case where this proper name is transmitted wrongly by Ath. Perhaps the scribe tried to give an etymology to the name from the word ἱερεῖς.

3.11.m) VII. 3.3 (p. 309, 10-12): ἐπειδὴ τε ἀπαντεῖς εὐνελέγησαν, ἐδοξε σφίσιν ἄμεινον εἶναι πρῶτον ἐπὶ Βερώνη, ἦ ἐν Βενετίαις (βενετίως Ath) ἐστὶ, στρατεύεσθαι... It is frequent in manuscripts to interchange α and ο; instead of the place name Ath forms the national name.
3.11.n) VII. 5.1 (p. 318, 7-8): οἴπερ ἐπείδη ἐστι φωρεντίαν (φυρεντίαν Αθ) ἠλθον... This is just carelessness by Αθ, as all other times the proper name is transmitted correctly.

3.11.o) VII. 6.26 (p. 325, 1-2): ταύτην τε Τουτίλα(Τουτίλαν Κ, τωτίλα Λ, τωτίλαν Αθ) τὴν δίκην Δημήτριος γλώσσης ἀκολάστου εξέτισεν. This proper name is transmitted with -ω by most manuscripts (same mistake in Αθ in 40.22 (p. 380,3) and 40.26 (p. 480,14). As regards its case here, the name is the indirect (the direct is the noun δίκην) object, which must be in dative.

3.11.p) VII. 9.21 (p. 336, 8-10): Τουτίλας δὲ ταύτα ἀκούσας μοῖραν μὲν τινὰ τοῦ στρατοῦ πέμψας ἐστιν Καλαβρίαν (καβαλλαρίαν Αθ) ἀποσπηράσασθαι τοῦ ἐν Δρυνώτι φρούριον ἐπέστελλεν. This change is carelessness, because in all other instances the name is transmitted correctly. The word Καβαλλαρία does not exist as a place name. However, Καβαλλάριος appears in 7.2.17 (p. 298, 13) and hence probably the confusion.

3.11.q) VII. 15.2 (p. 360, 14-15): οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀμφί Βαλεντίνον (βαλεντιανόν Αθ) τε καὶ Φωκᾶν... Inadvertent error. Both names are used in total thirty two times in Wars; this is the only time that the name is transmitted wrong.

3.11.r) VII. 18.19 (p. 376, 20-21): τούτου Κανονισίου πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι σταδίους ἀπέχουσι Κάνναι (κάννους Αθ, κάννωι Λ)... The name of the place is changed to the name of its inhabitants by Αθ.

3.11.s) VII. 18.20 (p. 376, 24): ἕνταθα Τούλλιανός (Βελλιανός Αθ) τις... The name Βελλιανός is never used by Procopius. Perhaps the name Βεναυτίου that follows immediately after confuses the scribe. It may also have been instead by his knowledge of Plutarch where the name Βελλίνος appears. Other errors in proper names: 35.14 (p. 455, 12 and 18): Ρεσισολύφω (ροσισολύφω and ροσισολύφω Αθ); 35.16 (p. 455, 19): Ῥιδίγνησ (λιγίαγος Λ, ἱλίδιαγος Αθ); 35.20 (p. 456, 19): Ἰλιδίγην (ἱλιδίαγον Αθ);
36.6 (p. 459, 2): Λιβέριον (Βέριον Ath); 36.15 (p. 460, 17): Κεντουκέλλας (Κεντουκελίας Ath).

3.11.1) VII. 27.19 (p. 419, 21-23): ταυτά τοι ἐκ παλαιοῦ μὲν ψιλόμασαν ἐπιχώριοι Κυνός (κοινός Ath) Κεφαλήν ἄκραν τῆς μίαν Κερκύρας τῆς νῆσου... This is a phonetic error (confusion of οι and υ).

3.11.u) VIII. 2.2 (p. 490, 6): Βιδύνων (βιδύνων Ath): Some proper names are transmitted wrongly by Ath either regarding phonetics/orthography or due to the scribes’ attempt to give etymology to the names, when they do not know their meaning. It is worthwhile pointing out that this phenomenon is much more frequent in Book VIII:
1.10 (p. 489, 12-13): Φάσιν (φάσιν K, φύσιν Ath); 2.2 (p. 490, 7): Ὀνωριάται (ἐνόρια τε K, ἐνόριοι ἄτε Ath); 2.2 (p. 490, 13): Θερμόδων (θερμόδων Ath); 2.11 (p. 492, 8): Ρυξίαν (ρύξιον Ath); 2.16 (p. 493, 12): Σαγίνας (σανίγας Ath); 3.4 (p. 496, 24): Καυκάσιος (καυκάσιος Ath); 4.1 (p. 500, 12): Βρούχοι (βρόχοι Ath); 8.16 (p. 521, 6), 8.29 (p. 523, 12), 9.13 (p. 525, 13), 11.14 (p. 536, 22) and 11.15 (p. 537, 4): Δαγισθαίος (δαγισταίος Ath); 8.22 (p. 522, 9): Βαλεριανός (βαλλεριανός Ath); 8.27 (p. 523, 6): Ἀρταβάτου (ἄρταβάτη Ath); 8.30 (p. 523, 14): Φιλήγαγος (φιλήγαγος Ath); 9.7 (p. 526, 14): Ἀπιλιός (ἄπιλιος Ath); 9.20 (p. 528, 19) and 9.22 (p. 529, 2): Οὐλίγαγον (οὐλίγαγον Ath); 10.7 (p. 532, 8): Ἀπιλιός (ἄπιλιος Ath); Ὀυαξίνη (οὐαξίνη Ath); 11.4 (p. 535, 3): Ἰσδιγούναν (ἰσδιγούναν Ath); 11.57 (p. 545, 9): Γούζην (γοβύζην Ath); 13.15 (p. 555, 7): Σαρπανίς (σαρπανίς Ath); 14.5 (p. 558, 13), 14.6 (p. 558, 15), 14.12 (p. 559, 7) and 14.42 (p. 564, 2): Δολομίτας (δολιμίτας Ath); 14.48 (p. 565, 3): Κάτας (κοπτάτιν Ath); 14.48 (p. 565, 5): Ἀριανός (ἀριανός Ath); 14.49 (p. 565, 7): Κοίτας (κοιτέων Ath).

3.11.v) VIII. 5.14 (p. 505, 18-19): φοίδερα (L: φίδερα K, φέρερα Ath) γὰρ Λατίνοι τὰς ἐν πολέμῳ καλοῦσι εὐνθήκας... The latin loan-word is transmitted wrongly by K and Ath.
3.12. Attractions

This is a frequent phenomenon in Ath. A word is attracted from its proper case into the case of its antecedent or vice versa. The following examples are unique to Ath and not found in any of the manuscripts copied from the fifteenth century and later, although the phenomenon of attraction is found frequently.

3.12.a) V. 11.26 (p. 62,16-18): οὔτω δὴ τῷ ἄλλῳ στρατῷ ἐς'Ράβευναν ήει, τῶν ἐκ βουλῆς πλείστους ἐν ὀμήρων (ὀμήρῳ Ath) λόγῳ ξίν αὐτῷ ἔχουν. The use of ὀμήρων between the prepositional phrase ἐν λόγῳ confuse the scribe, who makes the word to co-ordinate with the following noun.

3.12.b) V. 11.29 (p. 63,3-6): οἱ δὲ Φράγγοι οὔτοι Γερμανοὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ωνομάζοντο, οὔτων δὲ τρόπον τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ δὴ φικήμενοι (φικήμενον Ath) Γαλλίασ (Γαλλίασ Ath, γαλλίας L) τὲ ἑπεβάτευσαν (ἑπεβάτευσε Ath) καὶ διάφοροι Γότθοις γεγένηται. Ath differs from the other manuscripts in three readings, of which two are definitely wrong and depend on one another. It is inexplicable why the scribe of Ath makes such an error as there is no singular subject for φικήμενον and ἑπεβάτευσε to refer to, unless it is an attraction to the preceding τρόπον. The other reading in which Ath differs is Γαλλίασ; it transmits Γαλλίας that refers to φικήμενον showing the place where they live. L also transmits dative. Ath and L may have been confused by the phrase ἐν Γαλλίας in the preceding sentence: οἱ ἐν Γαλλίας φυλακὴν εἶχον...

3.12.c) V. 12.23 (p. 66,15-17): καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ Φράγγοι τῆς µὲν ἐς αὐτοῦς βίας δέει τῷ Θευδέριχον (Θευδέριχῳ Ath) ἀπέσχοντο, ἐπὶ Βουργουζίωνας δὲ πολέμῳ ἔσχατον. The scribe is possibly confused by the position of τῷ. In a similar case, there is disagreement between the manuscripts: V.11.27 (p. 62,22): ἐς γένος τὸ (τὸ Kras. : τῷ K, τοῦ L) Θευδέριχον. In a case with simpler syntax all manuscripts agree: V.11.28 (p. 63,2): δέει τῶν Φράγγων.

3.12.d) V. 12.27 (p. 67,8-13): μόλις δὲ πέμψας ἐπέστελλε τοῖς τοῦ στρατοῦ ἀρχουσιν σχολαίτερου (σχολαίτεραν Ath) τὴν πορείαν ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ ἤν µὲν Φράγγοις νενικέναι ἀκοῦσαι τὸ λοιπὸν κατὰ τάχος λέναι, ἤν δὲ τὸ ξύμβαμα...
The doubtful word characterises πορείαν. While in Ath the word is an adjective, in all other manuscripts it appears as adverb, σχολαίτερον, also refer to πορείαν. Ath gives the meaning "to make the march more leisurely" and all other manuscripts with σχολαίτερον "to make the march in a more leisurely fashion".

3.12.e) V. 18.9 (p. 91, 1-4): ἄλλα ἔμμβαλλοντες οὐκ εἰκῇ τὸν ὅγον ἐπιπολάζουντα ως πάντας (K: ως πάντα Ath, ἐς πάντα L) λέναι, τῶν ἀλλῶν ἀφέμενοι πάντων, οἱ πλείστοι ἐπὶ Βελισάριον ἔβαλλον. Ath keeps the ως of K, but it takes the form of the adjective from L. The neuter adjective πάντα is wrong, as it cannot refer to anything. The reading of Ath possibly comes from a simple attrasction from ἐπιπολάζουντα.

3.12.f) V. 18.22 (p. 92,26 - 93,2): δοσιν γὰρ ἐν τῇ πρότερον γενομένη (Haury and b: γενόμενοι Ath, a, c, δ, k, n, γενομένοι L.) τροπῇ φεύγουτε ἱκουν, τεθόναι Βελισάριον ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοις ἀριστεύωντα ἱγγελλον. Most manuscripts change the original γενομένη by changing the final vowel plausibly by attraraction. The scribe of Ath, as well, is confused by the subject of the sentence, δοσιν and as the form that other manuscripts transmit does not exist, he thinks that the participle goes with δοσιν. So he forms the phrase δοσιν γενόμενοι ἐν τῇ πρότερον τροπῇ. The conjecture of Haury is correct, because the dative γενομένη goes with τροπῇ (“the rout which had taken place earlier”). Manuscripts belong to later centuries than the fourteenth such as a, c, δ, k and n transmit the same reading with Ath, perhaps by attraction. On the other hand, the participle presented as Haury’s own emendation, is transmitted by the manuscript b of the fifteenth century.

3.12.g) V. 20.11 (p. 103, 8-12): νῦν οὖν μήτε Ὤρμαιός τοῖσδε περαιτέρῳ τῇν ταλαιπωρίαν μηκόνεσθαί ποιεῖν, οὐς δὴ Ἐθενδέριχος ἐν βίῳ τρυφερῷ τε καὶ ἄλλως ἐλευθέρῳ (ἐλευθέρως Ath) ἔξεθεσθε, μήτε τῷ Γότθων τε καὶ Ἰταλωτῶν δεσπότῃ ἐμποδῶν ἵστασο. Ath changes the dative form of the adjective to an adverb. All manuscripts take the adjective together with τρυφερῷ to βίῳ. What confuses the sentence is the ἄλλως and the fact that the two characteristics of βίος follow.
Attractions

3.12.h) V. 21.2 (p. 105, 2-3): ...καὶ τὰ ἐστὶ τῆς περιβόλου ἐπιβουλήν ἐξυπηρέτῳ ὁδε (τῇ ὁδε ΣΛ). πύργοις ξύλινους ἐποιήσατο... The reading of ΣΛ is not correct. The sentence is by way of an introduction before describing what preparations were made for the fortifications and will do on describing the way they were done. It is possible that the mistake arose out of attraction from ἐπιβουλήν, or that ΣΛ replaced ὁδε with τῇ ὁδε which means "there" which fits the context, though the first explanation may be more likely.

3.12.i) V. 21.11 (p. 106, 6-7): η δὲ συχνὰ ἐμβαλλομένη κατασκεύασε τε ὀπη (ἀποι ΣΛ) προσπέπτοι καὶ διελέιν ράστα οἷα τέ ἔστι... Both variants give a plausible meaning but ὀπη, which is found in the majority of the manuscripts, carries the specific meaning of "movement from a place and a stay in another place"; this is preferable to ΣΛ's vaguer ἀποι, which arquable is formed by attraction from ἐποίησα.

3.12.j) V. 21.22 (p. 108, 2-4): αὐταὶ δὲ ἐστὶ τοὺς ἐπινότας ἐστὶ τοῦ αἱμιδίου ἐμπίπτοουσαι (ἐμπίπτοουσι ΣΛ) τοῖς προέχουσι τῶν ἐμβολῶν, ὅσους ἀν λάβοιεν, εὐπετῶς κτείνουσι. Inadvertent attraction from προέχουσι and/or from κτείνουσι.

3.12.k) V. 22.14 (p. 110, 14-17): τοῦτον δὴ τὸν τάφον οἱ παλαιοὶ ἀνθρώποι (ἐδόκει γαρ τῇ πόλει ἐπιτείχισμα εἶναι) τεῖχισμα δύο ἐστὶ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ (ἐπὶ ΣΛ, κ, r, n, b, δ) τοῦ περιβόλου διήκουσι περιβάλλουσι καὶ μέρος εἶναι τοῦ τείχους πεποίηται. Ἐπὶ plus genitive indicates "place" and not "movement from a place" which is the suitable meaning. The correct preposition for the following participle διήκουσι, a motion verb, is ἀπὸ. However, most manuscripts, which belong to more recent centuries, transmit the reading of ΣΛ perhaps due to attraction from ἐπιτείχισμα; these are κ, r, n, b and δ. All the same, I think that the suitable preposition is ἀπὸ.

3.12.l) V. 22.15 (p. 110, 16-17): ἐοικε γοῦν πύργῳ ἧσα ἡμῶν τῆς ἐκείνη (ἐκείνῳ ΣΛ) προβεβλημένῳ. A simple attraction from πύργῳ and the following περιβεβλημένῳ. All later manuscripts transmit the correct reading, except of c and k which transmit ἐκείνη, possibly by attraction from τῆς.
3.12.m) V. 23.20 (p. 116, 4-6): ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ Γότθοι, διελύτες τὸν τοῖχον, ἐντὸς Βιβαρίου ἐγένετο, Κυπριανὸν ἔχων ἄλλους τις κατὰ τάχος ἔτ’ αὐτοὺς ἐσβίβασας ἔργῃν ἐκέλευεν (K: εἶα L, οὔκ εἶα Αθ) ἔχεσθαι. The subject of the verb is Belisarius, whose name occurs ten lines before. It is certain that the reading of Αθ is not correct, as the meaning of the sentence is not negative and Belisarius ordered his men to do something. The reading of Λ is not far from the correct meaning; Belisarius commanded the men to get to work. But as a General, he ordered them to fight, he did not just allow them. The scribes are confused by the fact that some lines above (p. 115, 26) the verb εἶα is used: Belisarius did not "allow the soldiers to defend the wall nor to remain at the battlement". Later he did the opposite. That is why the scribes are confused and they use again the verb εἶα instead of the correct ἐκέλευεν. And the verb εἶα is the reading of most manuscripts from the fifteenth century onwards.

3.12.n) V. 29.37 (p. 144, 20-22): ἄπερ ἐν νῷ λαβόντες οἱ τῶν βαρβάρων ἱππεῖς ἐκ τοῦ δεξιοῦ κέρως ἐπὶ τοῦς (τῷ Αθ) κατ’ αὐτοὺς πολέμιους ἐχώρησαν δρόμῳ. The accusative article goes with πολέμιους. The scribe of Αθ possibly thought that the article goes with δρόμῳ so he changes it to the dative τῷ.

3.12.o) VI. 4.25 (p. 169, 1-3): καὶ ἦν μὲν τινα ὁδὸ τὸ κακὸν τοῦτο βαδίζοντα λάβῃ, τοῦτον (τοῦτῳ Αθ) δὴ τὸν ἀνθρώπου (τῷ αὐθρώπῳ Αθ) οὐδεμιὰ μηχανὴ βιώσεσθαι ἐστίν... It is certain that the reading of Αθ is not an accidental misreading, because the adjective, the article and the noun appear in the dative. But it is not correct; although in syntax ἐστὶ μοι τι the object is in dative as possessive dative, in this case the syntax is different: the accusative is necessary as there is the infinitive that needs accusative as object. However, it might be a simple attraction.

3.12.p) VI. 6.15 (p. 176, 7-8): Γότθοι γὰρ ο*)) Ρωμαίοις ἀφελόμενοι γῆν τὴν (K, Αθ : γῆς τῆς L) Ἰταλίας (’Ιταλίαν Αθ) ἐκτήσαντο... Attraction from the previous γῆν. Later manuscripts have γῆν τὴν Ἰταλίας, except of Κ which transmits γῆς Ἰταλίας.
3.12.q) VI. 6.24 (p. 178, 2-4): ὁ δὲ τὰ (τῆν Ἀθ) περὶ τὸν τύραννον εὖ διαθέμενος ἀγνωστός (ἀγνωστόν Ἀθ) ἐστὶ τάλλα οὖσ ἐν μετρίως ἑχρῆσατο. Ἀθ takes the noun ἀγνωστός with the first part of the sentence and with the participle εὖ διαθέμενος. But this does not fit the meaning of the sentence ("Theoderic disposed of the tyrant well..."). In reality the noun should be in dative as the object of ἑχρῆσατο. In addition, an explanatory sentence follows with γάρ: ἀποδιδόναι γάρ τῷ κυρίῳ τὴν γῆν οὐδαμὴ ἔγνω, which explains the ἀγνωστόν of Theoderic ἐστὶ τὰ ἄλλα.

3.12.r) VI. 6.30 (p. 178, 22-23): Οὐ γάρ ἔσμεν κύριοι τὰ βασιλέως πράγματα διωκήσασθαι, οὐχ ὅπη αὐτῷ (τῷ Ἀθ) βουλομένῳ ἐστίν. Here the demonstrative pronoun is necessary and not the article τῷ. Otherwise the sentence makes no sense.

3.12.s) VI. 9.4 (p. 189, 16-18): ταῦτα (ταύτην Ἀθ) γὰρ τὴν γῆν οὖν ὑπερέχειν τὴν τοῦ ὀχετοῦ οἰκοδομίαν ἄνεξαν... The word is not an adjective here, but an adverb, "there". The scribe of Ἀθ changes it to accusative to co-ordinate with the following accusative τὴν γῆν. The demonstrative pronoun ταύτην is inappropriate, because the τὴν γῆν is not defined as a special area, which the author mentioned before.

3.12.t) VI. 9.5 (p. 189, 20-24): ... ἐνθα δὴ ἀνδός τις ἦν ἐκ παλαίου ἐς αὐτῷ ποιν τὸ Παλάτινον φέρουσα, οἰκοδομία τινὶ (οἰκοδομίαν τινὰ Ἀθ) ἐνταῦθα ἐνέτυχον οὕτε πρόσω ἰέναι... The verb ἐντυγχάνω which takes the dative has the meaning of "come upon". It is clear that by the late thirteenth century the dative has fallen into disuse, even when it is necessary for the syntax of verbs. It is possibly an attraction from the previous participle in accusative.

3.12.u) VI. 9.17 (p. 191, 20-23): δύω οὖν ὁ Ῥωμαίος ἄμφι τὸν Πέτρον τοῦ ἀποστόλου νεὼν ὑφεμένους χρῆσαι ἀναπείθει οἶνον ἄσκον ἔχοντας (ἔχοντα Ἀθ) παρὰ τοὺς ἐκείνην φρονοῦσις λέναι περὶ λύχνων ἄφας... The scribe of Ἀθ considered as subject of the participle the singular ἄσκον, which is next to it, and not the plural δύω ὁ Ῥωμαίος (attraction).
Attractions

3.12.v) VI. 10.9 (p. 194, 2-4): καὶ μέγα τι (καὶ μέγα το Ἀθ, μέγα τι Κ, καὶ μέγα Λ, μέγα τε Κρας) κλέος ἐκ τοῦ ἔργου αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννης ἔσχε, διαβόητος καὶ πρότερον ὄν. A simple attraction from the neuter κλέος.

3.12.w) VI. 10.18 (p. 195, 18-20): οὔτω δὲ τοὺς πλείστους ἀποβαλόντες οἱ λοιποὶ τοῖς πρότεροι (προτεροὶ Ἀθ) διαβάσις ξυνέμιξαν. The scribe of Ἀθ is confused, because the adverb is put between the dative article and the participle (attraction). In other cases the adjective is used: VII.40.31 (p. 481, 13): τοῖς προτεροῖς ἀναμιχθέντες, VIII.29.21 (p. 646, 11): ὄντερ ὁμοίως τοῖς προτεροῖς ἀπαλαγέντων.

3.12.x) VI. 11.3 (p. 196, 14-16): ...Καὶ ἑιν τὸ καὶ Μοντεφέρετρα, ὃν δὴ ἐν ἐκατέρω (ἐκατέρων Ἀθ) φρούραν οὐχ ἤσσον ἦ πεντακοσίων ἀνδρῶν κατεστήσατο. Although there is the preposition ἐν, which takes a dative, the scribe is confused by the meaning of the adjective, which implies plural. A possible attraction from the pronoun ὃν.

3.12.y) VI. 12.17 (p. 202, 10-13): οὔτε γὰρ ἐν τῇ παραλίᾳ πολυρκηθήσεσθαι ὑπωπτεύομεν, οὔτω (οὔτε Ἀθ) δὴ θαλασσοκρατοῦντων Ἦρωμαῖων, οὔτε τοσοῦτον ἡμῶν περιόψεσθαι τὸν βασιλέως στρατὸν ὑπετόπησεν ἃν τίς. The negative particle is used by Ἀθ as the second part of a negative construction οὔτε - οὔτε; the second οὔτε however follows below. It is possible that the scribe, confused by the preceding οὔτε, thought that the construction was the triple negative οὔτε - οὔτε - οὔτε.


3.12.a.a) VI. 18.4 (p. 228, 14-16): διὸ δὴ (δὲ Ἀθ) οὐδὲ Ναροῆν εἰὼν οἱ ἐπιτήδειοι ξὺν Βελισαρίῳ στρατεύεσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἀνέπεθον, ὅσον αἰσχρὸν εἴη... In manuscripts frequently particles are interchanged. Here the emphatic δὴ is correct as the sentence
adds information to the previous one and does not express contrast. Sentences in Procopius often start with the phrase διὸ δὴ, but never with διὸ δὲ (I.7.3 (p. 30,17-18): διὸ δὴ Καβάδης ἐξ αἰτίας οὐδεμίας ἔγνω ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίους στρατεύεσθαι; II.19.5 (p. 232, 8-9): διὸ δὴ τοὺς ἀρχοντας ἀπαντας ἐξυγκαλέσας Βελισαρίους ἐλεξε τουάδε). There is a possibility that the change of δὴ to δὲ has been caused by attraction from the following οὔδὲ.

3.12.a.b) VI. 19.4 (p. 233, 6-7): μίαν δὲ εἰσόδουν ἐν τῷ ὀμαλεὶ (ὁμαλῷ Αθ) ἔχει πρὸς βορρᾶν ἄνεμον. The correct form is ἐν τῷ ὀμαλεὶ, which is used several times in Procopius: II.17.19 (p. 226, 22): μίαν δὲ εἰσόδουν ἐν τῷ ὀμαλεὶ ἔχει, καὶ ταύτην οὐ λίαν εὑρείαν; VI.23.7 (p. 252, 7-8): εἰσόδουν ἐν τῷ ὀμαλεὶ οὐδαμῇ ἔχουσα. It is an attraction from the article τῷ.

3.12.a.c) VI. 24.14 (p. 259, 11-12): οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ῥωμαῖοι ἀτε θαλασσοκρατοῦντες καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἑγκών (ἐγκώνιον Αθ) φρούριον ἔχουσε... The ending -ιο(ν) of proper names in Koine changed to -ιν. Here the scribe did not realise that it is a dative of the name Ἑγκὼν after ἐν; he thought that it was nominative and corrected it to the more archaic form with the ending -ι(ν). There is a possibility that it is an attraction by φρούριον.

3.12.a.d) VI. 25.16 (p. 263, 25-27): ... ἄλλο τι 139 οὔδεν ἐν χώρᾳ (χωρίᾳ Αθ) ἐρήμῳ (ἐρήμῳ Αθ) ἀνθρώπων δόῃ μὴ βῶς τε καὶ τοῦ Πάδου τὸ ὅδωρ προσφέρεσθαι ἔχουν. Both noun and adjective are wrong in Αθ. The adjective has been attracted from the following genitive. As for the noun, Αθ’s reading is wrong, possibly caused by misreading. The phrase ἐν χώρᾳ ἐρήμῳ (but without genitive) is found in three other cases in the sixth book, and they are transmitted correctly by Αθ (14.25 (p. 212, p. 14); 25.23 (p. 265, 6); 26.16 (p. 268, 8).

3.12.a.e) VI. 27.27 (p. 274, 8-10): ...ἄλλα ἐπὶ πλειστον τῇ ταλαιπωρίᾳ κεκακωμένοι οὔδεν ἥσσον ἐς ταύτων τύχης τοῖς (τῆς Αθ) ἐν Φιλούλη ἀφίζουται. Attraction from the previous genitive.

139 The phrase ἄλλο τι is Haury’s emendation. Αθ does not cast any light on this reading, as it transmits the same reading with L: ἄλλο δὲ.
3.12.a.f) VI. 30.21 (p. 292, 2-4): ...άλλ’ ἀνεπόντες τότε πρὸς τὰ τῆς τύχης ἐναντιώματα ξυμφορώτατον (ξυμφορώτατα Ath) ἦμεν αὐτοῖς ἡγησασθε εἶναι... This is the impersonal infinitive ξυμφορώτατον εἶναι. The reading of Ath may have been caused by attraction from the ending of the noun ἐναντιώματα.

3.12.a.g) VII. 4.6 (p. 313, 18-20): ...ἐπεὶ ἀνδρῶν ἁρετή καὶ πλήθει ὑπεραιρόντων καὶ τούτῳ ἐλασσομένῳ τοῖς γε πρὸς αὐτοῖς (αὐτοῖς Ath) διαμαχησομένοις ἐνδήλος γίνεται. This error possibly has been caused by attraction from τοῖς ... διαμαχησομένοις.

3.12.a.h) VII. 4.18 (p. 315, 20-21): οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ ἄλλους τινὰς ἀνθρώπων (ἀνθρώπων sscr. -ων Ath) χωροῦμεν ἢ ὅσοι ἐναγχος ἐν μέσῃ Βερώνη γενόμενοι... Possibly an attraction from the accusative τινὰς. The superscript of Ath is by the hand, which copied the main text.

3.12.a.i) VII. 7.19 (p. 328, 6-8): Τούτιλας δὲ πᾶσαν αὐτοῖς ἐκ βασιλέως ἀνασοβείν ἐλπίδα ἐθέλων τριῶν μηνῶν ἔταξε χρόνον, ἐφ’ ψήφῳ (L : ὃν Κ, ὃν Ath) μετὰ τούτων τὰ ὠμολογημένα ποιήσωμεν. The ψῆφο of Κ refers to μηνῶν, the ὥν of Ath to χρόνον (attractions). The ψῆφο of L is correct; it is the expression "with the stipulation that...". In this case Ath’s reading is closer to K’s.

3.12.a.j) VII. 9.21 (p. 336, 3-5): ἀπαντα γὰρ ἀωρί τῶν νυκτῶν ἐν τοῖς διαφανέσι τῆς πόλεως (τοῖς πόλεις Αθ) χωρίοις παγέντα, ἐπεὶ ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, ἐγνώσθη. The previous article and adjective in the dative may have attracted the noun.

3.12.a.k) VII. 10.10 (p. 338, 14-16): τοῖς τε πολεμίοις τοῖς τῆς ὑπαντιάσαντες (ὑπαντιάσασι sscr. -σαντες Ath) πρὸς τῇ τῆς θαλάσσης ἡμῶν ἐς χεῖρας ἠθην. The dative of Ath may have been caused by attraction from the surrounding datives, though here the dative has a different form. The superscript of Ath is by the original hand and perhaps it was written after the scribe doublechecked the exemplar.
3.12.a.l) VII. 11.36 (p. 346, 1-2): ἐπει ἐξελείν οὐχ (τε Αth) οἷός τε ἦν, ἀπρακτὸς ἐν Αὔξίμω ἐξ το στρατόπεδῳ ἀνεχώρησεν. It is impossible that there are two particles τε the one after the other, and on the other hand οὐχ is required for sense. Ath's reading is due to attraction.

3.12.a.m) VII. 13.3 (p. 350, 6-8): οἷς δὴ ἐπισπόμενοι, ἐς τὴν δίωξιν ἔτι πλείστου ἐκπεπτωκότες ἐνέδρας ὑπὸ (ταῖς Αth) τῶν πολεμίων ἐνέτυχον. Although the reading of Ath is sustainable here, I believe that it may be an attraction from the previous noun in dative.

3.12.a.n) VII. 13.15 (p. 351, 20-21): ...ἐπει χρῆν τότε 'Ῥωμαίως γενέσθαι κακός, ἢ βεβουλεύσθαι μὲν αὐτὸν τὰ βελτίων, ἐμπώδιον δὲ τὸν θεὸν γεγονέναι (γενέσθαι Αth). The infinitive must be in the perfect, because it should co-ordinate with βεβουλεύσθαι as the two infinitives are the second part of the comparison and they are connected with μὲν and δὲ. The scribe of Ath repeats the aorist infinitive, which appears above.

3.12.a.o) VII. 13.17 (p. 352, 2-5): ἀνδρὶ δὲ, οἷμαι, κακοτυχοῦντι εὐβουλία οἰδαμὴ πάρεστι, παραρομένου (παραρομένῳ Αth) αὐτὸν ἐπιστήμην τε καὶ ἄλθῇ δόξαι τοῦ χρῆναι παθεῖν. The participle goes with the following genitive τοῦ χρῆναι. The order of words is strange and confuses the scribe who makes the participle agree with the dative κακοτυχοῦντι.

3.12.a.p) VII. 13.19 (p. 352, 9-10): Βελισάριος δὲ Ἰουσίνων ἐπὶ τῷ (τῆς Αth) Ῥαδέννης φυλακῆ καταστησάμενος... Although the reading of Ath is sustainable, the article to define φυλακῆ is more suitable than the article to define the city (attraction). Similar attraction in 14.20 (p. 356, 24): ... ἦν μέντοι γενηται ἐν γῇ τῷ (τῶν Αth) Ῥωμαίων...

3.12.a.q) VII. 14.33 (p. 359, 11-14): ταύτῃ γὰρ αὐτοῦς καὶ τῷ ἀμφ' αὐτὴν χώρᾳ (Hoesch. in marg.: τῇ - χώρᾳ K, τὴν - χωρία L, τὴν - χώραν Αth) Ἰουστινιανὸς βασιλεὺς ἀτε προσηκούσῃ το ἐξ ἁρχῆς 'Ῥωμαίως ὄμολογει δεδωρήσεθαι...
The variant of **Ath** may have come from attraction from αὐτήν. The reading of **L** is unsuitable as for its meaning. It may have come from misreading.

3.12.a.r) VII. 17.11 (p. 371, 16-17): ...τῆς ἀνάγκης αὐτοῖς ἥσστην τε καὶ τρυφερωτάτην **πολούσης** (πολήσειν ssr. -ούσης **Ath**) τὴν βρώσιν. The original reading of **Ath** is wrong, because the participle is needed to go with the noun ἀνάγκης. Possibly the error was caused by attraction from the endings of the surrounding words. Afterwards the scribe superscribed the correct ending. The superscript is by the original hand. In all later manuscripts examined the participle appears.

3.12.a.s) VII. 17.13 (p. 371, 22-24): ...ὁ δὲ δὴ ἄλλος ἀπας ὀμιλος τὰς ἀκαλήφας μόνας ἠσθιον, **οἶα** (οἶον αἱ **Ath**) πολλαὶ ἀμφὶ τὸν περίβολον κἂν τοῖς ἐρεπίπων πανταχῇ τῆς πόλεως φύονται. I suggest that this is a simple attraction from the ending -ον of the previous verb.

3.12.a.t) VII. 18.1 (p. 373, 17-18): ...Ἰωάννης μὲν ἀπαντάς διαπορθμεναμένους ἦξιοῦ τὸν κόλπον **πεζῆ** (πεζοῦς ssr. -ῆ **Ath**) ἱόντας παντὶ τῷ στρατῷ... The correct form is certainly the reading of most manuscripts. This phrase is used several times by Procopius (e.g. 18.2 (p. 373, 21), 18.4 (p. 374, 8). The original reading of **Ath** may have been caused by attraction from ἱόντας. Later manuscripts transmit the correct reading. A similar error, which may be a phonetic error, appears in 18.15 (p. 376, 6): **πεζοὶ** (πεζῆ **Ath**).

3.12.a.u) VII. 18.24 (p. 377, 18-20): ...ἐπεσθαί σφίσιν αἰσθησιν αὐτοῖς οὐδεμίαν παρεχομένοισ. **αὐτῷ** (αὐτοῖς **Ath**) γὰρ τὰ ἄλλα μελῆσειν. The scribe of **Ath** changes the pronoun due to attraction from the previous participle. In reality the pronoun refers to the name Totila, which appears five lines above.

3.12.a.v) VII. 19.12 (p. 380, 13-15): πέμψας δὲ καὶ παρὰ Βέσσαν τῇ προτεραίᾳ ἐκέλευε τῇ ἐπιγενησιμενῇ ἠμέρᾳ πολλῷ στρατῷ **ἐπεξιόντα** (K : ἐπεξιόντι **Ath**, ἐξιόντι **L**) ἐνταράξει τὰ τῶν πολεμίων στρατόπεδα. The preposition ἐπί is necessary. The correct case is the accusative, because in Procopius the verb κελεύειν
usually goes with accusative rather than with dative. The datives of L and Ath are caused by attraction by πολλῷ στρατῷ. However, the reading of Ath is superior to L in this case.

3.12.a.w) VII. 19.30 (p. 383, 16-17): ...ἐς ἀφασίαν ἐμπέπτωκεν οὐ γεγονός αὐτῷ πρῶτερον τούτῳ (τούτῳ Ath) γε. The definite pronoun here is not the second part of the comparison; it defines the word γεγονός. The scribe of Ath changed the case of the pronoun possibly due to attraction.

3.12.a.x) VII. 20.15 (p. 387, 4-5): ...τά τε σιδηρία ξύμπαντα, οἶς (αῖς Ath) δὴ τὰς κλεῖς ἐδ οἱ φίλακες ἐμπαλλόμενοι ἐκλείον... By attraction the scribe thought that the pronoun goes to the following feminine τὰς κλεῖς.

3.12.a.y) VII. 22.14 (p. 397, 1-3): ...διαφθείραντι δὲ φιλανθρωπίας τε οὔδείς ἔτι λειψάται λόγος καὶ προσέσται τὸ μηδὲν τοῦ ἔργου (λόγου Ath) ἀπόνασθαι. The word ἔργον is necessary for the meaning: "it is certain that no plea for mercy will any longer be left to you, and in addition to this you will have reaped no benefit from the deed". It is a possible attraction by λόγος which appears before in the same sentence.

3.12.a.z) VII. 22.19 (p. 397, 19-21): Ἄρωμαίων μέντοι τοὺς (τῶν Ath) μὲν ἐκ τῆς συγκλήτου βουλής ξὺν αὐτῷ εἶχε... The article refers to the members of the senate and must be in the accusative as the object of εἶχε. The genitive of Ath is due to attraction from Ἄρωμαίων.

3.12.b.a) VII. 24.14 (p. 403, 23-24): γέγονεν οὖν φόνος τῶν βαρβάρων ἄτε ἀφ’ ἱψηλοῦ βαλλομένων πολὺς (πολλῶν Ath).... The change of the ending is due to attraction from the previous word. The adjective is not immediately preceded or followed by the noun it characterises (φόνος), so the scribe fails to copy the correct case and he assimilate it to the word next to it (βαλλομένων). A similar case appears in VII. 37.12 (p. 464, 20-21): ἐν ἐλπίδι τε παρῆμεν μηδεμία (μηδεμίαν Ath) ἐχεῖν, δύναμιν ἐτέραν τινὰ ἐκ βασιλέως σφίσιν ἀφξεσθαι. The dative is necessary
because it characterises the dative ἐλπίδι. Ath assimilates μηδεμίαν with the following δύναμιν.

3.12.b.b) VII. 25.10 (p. 409, 6-7): ἥ δὲ πείρα τισι γινομένη διδάσκαλος κρείσσω (L : κρείσσων K, κρείσσου Ath) τὸν ἐκμαθόντα τῶν οὐ τετυχηκότων τῆς διδασκαλίας τῷ παντὶ πληθοῦν. The correct form of the comparative accusative is κρείσσω or κρείσσονα. There is a possibility that the original was κρείσσονα and Ath omits the final -α with the aim of agreeing with the following accusative. I believe that K's reading is caused by attraction from the following accusative. However the most plausible is the κρείσσω of L. Errors in anomalous comparatives are frequent in manuscripts.

3.12.b.c) VII. 27.1 (p. 416, 25-26): ...γράμμασι τοῖς (τοῦ Ath) Βελισαρίον ἡγμένος... An attraction from the following genitive.

3.12.b.d) VII. 27.6 (p. 417, 19-20): ἥ δυνάμει μεγάλῃ (πολλῇ Ath) χρῆται, ἥ ἀνοία πολλῇ ἔχεται. The power is counted as quantity, but here the scribe is confused by the following πολλῇ. This again shows that the scribe was able to read a long part of the text from his exemplar and while he was transferring it he changed some words. All later manuscripts transmit μεγάλῃ.

3.12.b.e) VII. 32.7 (p. 434, 19-22): ...τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς ἀνηρμημένου ἐπὶ ξυνθηκὼν τε καὶ ξυμβάσεως λόγῳ (λόγου Ath), παντὸς δὲ τοῦ ξυγγενοῦς δεδουλωμένου... Ath is confused by the preceding genitives.

3.12.b.f) VII. 34.6 (p. 445, 13-14): ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι ὄν (δὲ τοῖς πρῶτοις Ath) Λαγγοβάρδαι βασιλεῖ ἐς ὅφιν ἔλθοντες ἔλεξαν τοιάδε. The phrase ἐν τοῖς meaning "while these things were happening" is not frequently used. So the scribe fits the adjective to the article changing it to dative, due to attraction. In addition, the use of δὲ by Ath is not suitable here, as there is no preceding μὲν in the sentence to co-ordinate; the use of ὄν of all other manuscripts is suitable in this kind of narrative.
Attractions

3.12.b.g) VII. 35.4 (p. 453, 20-23): ἦν τις Βελισαρίῳ κλήρος ἐν Βυζαντίῳ τῷ προαστείῳ (τοῦ προαστείου Αθ.), δὴ Παντείχιον μὲν ὀνομάζεται... This is a case of attraction by the preceding ending -τίων. Similar case: 40.6 (p. 476, 22-24): ὃς δὴ ἐς χεῖρας ἐλθὼν τῷ τῶν πολεμίων στρατῷ (τὸν - στρατὸν Αθ.) κατὰ κράτος τε μάχῃ νυκῆςας σχεδὸν τι ἀπαντᾶς ἐκτεινε...

3.12.b.h) VII. 40.9 (p. 477, 15-17): ἐν δὲ εἰρήνῃ καὶ ἀγαθοῖς πράγμασι τά τε νόμιμα καὶ τόν τῆς πολιτείας κόσμου (νόμιμον sscr. κόσμ- Αθ) βεβαιότατα φυλάσσειν ἐξεπιστάμενος... The reading of Αθ is caused by attraction by the word νόμιμα above. Perhaps the scribe himself wrote the correction above when he realised his error. All later manuscripts examined transmit the correct term.

3.12.b.i) VIII. 5.24 (p. 507, 17-20): φασὶ Σκύθας τε τημικάδε... καλείσθαι τοὺς ἐνταῦθα ἀνθρώπους, τεκμηριούμενοι (τεκμηριομένοις Αθ) τοῖς ἀμφὶ τε Ὀρέστη καὶ πόλει Κομάνη... The dative of Αθ is not justified. Perhaps it is an attraction from the following article.

3.12.b.j) VIII. 5.30 (p. 508, 15-17): ...φερόμενος τε ἐπὶ τὰ (τῶν Αθ) Δακῶν καὶ Ἰλιουρίων καὶ τά ἐπὶ ὘ράκης χωρία... The change of the article here affects the meaning, therefore the article τά is necessary. There is an attraction in Αθ from the following genitive.

3.12.b.k) VIII. 6.13 (p. 511, 23-24): καὶ αὐτῶν (αὐτῆς Αθ) Λιβύης μὲν καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Νείλου τὸν Αἰγύπτιον ποταμόν μεταξύ φέρεσθαι... Attraction from the following word.

3.12.b.l) VIII. 12.31 (p. 551, 23-26): ἦνίκα μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ Ὁρμῆς φυλακτηρίῳ ἐτέτακτο, ἐλπίδα Ὁρμαιῶν πολλῆς (πολλὰ Αθ) ἐπὶ αὐτῶ εἰχον ἀτε ἀνδρειοτάτῳ διαγεγονότι τὰ πρότερον (πρότερον Αθ). These are both attractions, the first from the ending -α of ἐλπίδα and the second from the article τά.

3.12.b.m) VIII. 13.27 (p. 556, 23-24): οἱ δὲ ἀποκρινόμενοι ἤνει μὲν αὐτῶν ἐκέλευον ὁπῆ δοῦλοι (δοῦλοι Αθ), ἱσχυρόσαντο μέντοι ὃσ... The plural is
not suitable, because the verb does not go with ἀποκρινόμενοι, but with αὐτόν ("...they ordered him to go wherever he wanted"). Attraction from the following verb.

3.12.b.n) VIII. 14.2 (p. 557, 18-19): ...ἀλλ’ δοσον ἄνοδον ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου τινά ἐς αὐτάς οὐχ ὄμαλή (ὀμαλήν Λ, ὁμαλοῦ Αθ) εἶναι. The genitive of Αθ is wrong, because the adjective goes with the accusative ἄνοδον and not with πεδίου. There is a possibility that the error has been caused by an abbreviated ending.

3.13. Errors due to possible misunderstanding of abbreviations and ligatures

The misunderstanding of abbreviations is a cause of some mistakes in Αθ. However, I suggest that most of the misunderstandings originate from previous copies of the text; for example a frequent misunderstanding is of the τ subscribed and of the final υ, which means that it originated from manuscripts which have the τ written next to the vowel. None of the manuscripts belonging to the fifteenth century onwards transmit the same misunderstandings of abbreviations but they misunderstand some abbreviations in other cases, although in much fewer cases than in Αθ.

3.13.a) V. 17.12 (p. 88, 7-10): Οὔττιγις οὐν οὐκ ἀναμείνας τῶν χρόνων σφίσιν ἑνταῦθα τρίβεσθαι κατὰ τάχος ἐνθέντε (ἐνθάδε Αθ) ἀπαλλαγεῖς τῷ παντὶ στρατῷ ἐπὶ Ρώμην ἦνει, διὰ Σαβίνων τὴν πορείαν ποιούμενος. The reading of Αθ is definitely wrong. The necessary adverb is what all other manuscripts transmit, meaning "from there". In that case what confuses the scribe of Αθ is the verb with which the adverb goes. Usually ἐνθέντε goes with motion verbs; here it is accompanied by ἀπαλλαγεῖς and the scribe changes it, without realising that the use of ἀπαλλάσσομαι here shows movement with the meaning "departure from there". There is a possibility that the error is due to the misunderstanding of the ligature εν (ιυ) and the letter α (α). Note that generally the scribe of Αθ has a difficulty with the adverb ἐνθέντε (see above, pp. 50-2).

3.13.b) V. 22.25 (p. 112, 18-21): παρὴν δὲ ἦδη καὶ Κωνσταντίνος δεδιξάμενος τε τοὺς τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀποπειρασάμενους καὶ ῥᾳδίως ὑσάμενος, ἔπει οὐ παντάπασιν ἀφόλακτον, ὥσπερ φῶςτο, τὸ ἐκείνη (ἐκείνου Αθ) τείχισμα εὑρον. In this case, the scribe may have thought that the adjective refers to the nearest
nouns, ποταμοῦ, which would not make sense. The later manuscripts transmit ἐκεῖνη. This case again may be a misunderstanding of the ligature ou (צטרף) and η (η).

3.13.c) VI. 1.16 (p. 152, 5-7): ...σιωπήν μὲν ὁ Ρωμαίος εἶχεν, ἀτερος δὲ τῇ πατρίῳ (πατρία Ath) γλώσσῃ ἐναγχὸς ἐφασκεν ἐν τῇ γενομένῃ τροπῇ ἐμπεπτωκέναι... The adjective πάτριος is either three gender (πάτριος, -α, -ου) and this is what Ath uses (πατρία γλώσση), or two gender (πάτριος, -ος, -ου) and this is the reading of all other manuscripts. I believe that the correct reading is that of most manuscripts, because contemporary writers used this.¹⁴⁰ This is the only phrase in Procopius where γλώσσα and πάτριος appear together. There is a possibility that the variant of Ath have come from misunderstanding of the ligature ψ (ψ) and α (α).

3.13.d) VI. 1.17 (p. 152, 10-13): ... λαβόμενος δὲ ὁ Ρωμαίος τῶν βρόχων ἱλκετο ἄνω, τοιοῦτον εἴπων, ὅς, ἢ πρὸς αὐτὸς (οὗτος Ath) ἀναβαίνοι πρῶτος, οὕποτε τοῦ ἐταίρου ἀμελήσειν τοὺς Γότθους, ἢν δὲ γαὶ τὸν πολέμιον... Ath changes the demonstrative pronoun to οὗτος. I believe that the correct form is αὐτός as this is frequently used by Procopius in similar cases.¹⁴¹ Possibly the error comes from misunderstanding of the ligature αν (αν) and ου (ου).

3.13.e) VI. 4.15 (p. 167, 12-15): ... ἡδη μᾶλλον ἐλύπουν τοὺς πολεμίους ἀτέ αὐτῶν τὸ ἐπιτείχισμα ο输卵管 ἀποθεῖν δὲν συχνά τε καταθέουσε καὶ τῷ ἀπροσδοκήτῳ (ἀπροσδοκήτων Ath) ἐκπλήσσουσες ἀεὶ τῶν βαρβάρων τοὺς τὰ ἐπιτήδεια παρακατέμεντας... This error comes from the exemplar of Ath; the exemplar or a previous manuscript transmitted the dative with abbreviated ending; therefore the last letter and the iota adscriptum was mistaken for the genitive ending by Ath.

3.13.f) VI. 4.17 (p. 167, 22-24): καὶ λοιμὸς δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐπεισπεσὼν πολλοὺς ἐφθειρε, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ, ὀπερ αὐτοῖς (αὐτῶν Ath, αὐτοῖς Κ)

¹⁴¹ Note the tendency of the scribe of Ath to change the breathing in αὐτός and change the pronoun to demonstrative is very frequent. Parallels for the use of αὐτὸς instead of οὗτος are Ι.1.1 (p.4,7): ὥσπερ τὴν μυθήσαν αὐτός φέρει μέγα τι ἐσεθαι; Π.4.2 (p.162,21-163,1): ὃ μὲν γὰρ ἐν αἰγοκέρω ἢν, αὐτός δὲ ἐν τοξότῃ.
3.13.g) VI. 18.20 (p. 230, 23-24): ὅστε νῦν μάλλον ἡμῖν ἤ πρότερον ἐν κυνόμοις (κυνόμοις Αθ) τὰ πράγματα κεῖται... The plural used by Αθ is not wrong according to the usage of Procopius; he uses the word either in the singular or plural with the meaning "in danger". However, when he speaks about general dangers, he uses the plural (see III.20.8 (p. 397, 20-21): ...καὶ αὐτῷ ἐν κυνόμοις γενησομένῳ ξυλλήψονται ὅτι δύναμις; VII.10.15 (p. 339, 5-7): ὅτι τάχιστα παραγενέσθαι σφίσιν ἐν κυνόμοις τοις χαλεποῖς οὖσιν). Here the danger is specific: a possible attack from Rome.

3.13.h) VI. 22.9 (p. 248, 17-20): ...καὶ αὐτοῖς πολλὰ θουλευσαμένοις... ἐδοξεῦ (ἐδοξαζ Αθ) ἄλλων τινῶν βαρβάρων ἐπικουρίαν ἐπάγεσθαι. The verb should be in singular, because it is impersonal. The scribe may have misread the abbreviated ending of the verb.

3.13.i) VII. 14.21 (p. 357, 7-9): ...μεγάλα σφίσιν οἰδίμενοι ἀγαθῶς ἐσεσθαι, κυρίους (κυρίους Αθ) ἡ δι τοῦ 'Ῥωμαίων στρατηγοῦ Χιλβουδίου γεγενημένους. The participle at the end which goes with κυρίους is in dative.

3.13.n) VII. 19.16 (p. 381, 9-10): ...διὸς δὴ μὴ δοὺς ἐς τὴν γέφυραν λέναι οἱ ἐναντίοι εὔπετός δύναται (δύναται Αθ)... The subjunctive is necessary, because of the διὸς. It may be misreading of the letter α (α) and ω (ω). Generally the scribe of Αθ does not pay attention to the moods of the verbs in secondary sentences.

3.13.q) VII. 31.4 (p. 431, 14016): ...αὐτὸς δὲ, κατὰ Λιβύης ὀλίς στρατηγὸς καταστάσας, ἔχρηζε βασιλέως, ἀναπλάσας τινὰς οὐχ ὑγείες σκῆψες, διὸς αὐτὸς ἐς Βυζάντιον μεταπέμπτωτο (μεταπέμπτωτο Αθ). Neither the plural nor the indicative of the verb transmitted by Αθ are suitable. The error is caused from palaeographical reasons: misunderstanding of the ligature οι (οι) and ον (ον).
3.13.r) VII. 34.1 (p. 444, 19-20): Ὀδηγῶ μὲν οἱ βάρβαροι διεθάσαντο (διεθώσαντο Αθ) τὴν 'Ῥωμαίων ἄρχην. Αθ changes an α to ω due to an erroneous reading.

3.13.s) VII. 37.6 (p. 464, 1-3): Στέφανον τε ἄνδρα Ἱωάννης βασιλέα πρεσβευτὴν ἐπέμψε, τῶν μὲν πόλεμον τόνδε καταλύειν αἰτών (αὐτόν Αθ). The participle is necessary for the infinitive to depend on and to state the purpose of "the emperor sending the envoy". Perhaps a confusion of the ligature αι ( Αη ) and αυ ( Αυ ).

3.13.t) VII. 37.14 (p. 465, 4-5): ...κακῶν ἀπαθέσιν ἐνθένδε ἀπαλλασσόμενοι ἐπὶ Βυζαντίου (Βυζάντιου Αθ) κομίζεσθαι. As there is a motion verb (κομίζεσθαι), perhaps the scribe is confused with ἐς + accusative. More plausibly it is a misunderstanding of the ligature οὐ ( Ου ) and οὖ ( Ου ).

3.13.u) VIII. 12.13 (p. 549, 3-4): θεολογεῖσθαι δὲ ὑμεῖς δηλονότι, ἄντερ (άντερ ζήν Λ, ἄντερ Αθ) ἀξίοις ὑμιν εὐμβαίνει εἶναι. The link of Λ with Αθ is noticeable; but this is not the correct pronoun, because the genitive is necessary. The infinitive of Λ perhaps is an explanatory note, which intruded into the text.

---

142 In Procopius the syntax ἐπὶ plus genitive is used to show the destination (= "to"), e.g., IV.26.5 (p. 536, 21-22): κατὰ τάχος Καρχηδόνα ἀπολογίαν ἐπὶ Βυζαντίου κομίζατο; VII.9.19 (p. 335, 18-20): τῶν τισιν αἰχμαλώτων ὁ Τούτιλας ἐπὶ Ῥώμης ἐκείλενεν ἱώντας τοῖς ἐκ βουλῆς διδόναι.

3.14.a) VI. 6. 16 (p. 176, 10-13): Ζήμων δὲ τὸτε ἡς ἐφασ κρατῶν καὶ τιμωρεῖν μὲν τῷ ξυμβεβασιλευκότι βουλόμενος καὶ τοῦ τυράννου τήνδε (Κ : τήν δὲ Λ, τήνδε δὲ Αθ) τὴν χώραν ἔλευθεροϋν, 'Οδοᾶκρου δὲ καταλύει τὴν δύναμιν οὐχ οἰός τε ὡν... The reading of Αθ with the addition of δὲ is not correct. The scribe thought that a δὲ was necessary to co-ordinate with μὲν in the previous sentence (but this is found in the next one). I suggest that the addition of δὲ in Αθ has nothing to do with the pronoun τήνδε and I do not think that it is simply a dittography. The reading of Λ is also wrong, because as the article and the particle are separated it gives the wrong meaning and syntax.

3.14.b) VI. 9. 17 (p. 191, 23-24): ... καὶ αὐτοῖς τῶν οἶνον τρόπῳ ὁτὶ οἱ ἀνθρωποσύνη (repeats Αθ) ἐνδεικνυμένους χαρίζεσθαι... The repetition of the noun is just carelessness by Αθ (dittography). Repetitions also in 16.18 (p. 223, 4-5): 'Αράτην μὲν ξύν χιλίων ἀνδράσιν αὐτῷ (αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ Αθ) ἐλπιν...; 22.6 (p. 248, 1-5): οὐ δὲ ἑντυχόντες τῷ Οὐραίῳ στρατῷ, ἀνδράποδα τε καὶ ἄλλα ζῷα ὁσα ἐπήγον τοῖς πολεμίως (τοῖς πολεμίως τοῖς πολεμίως Αθ) ἀπέδοντο, καὶ χρήματα πολλά κεκομισμένοι ἀπώμοσαν, μῆποτε Γόθδοις ἀντιτάξεσθαι ἦ εἰς χεῖρας λέναι.

3.14.c) VI. 11. 9 (p. 197, 21-22): ... καὶ τῶν ἐν Φλαμμηνίᾳ ὁδῷ ὄχυρωμάτων (ὁδῷ ὁδῷ Αθ) ἤκιστα ἐθέλοντες ἄγχιστά πη λέναι... The scribe duplicates the word ὁδῷ and omits the ὄχυρωμάτων due to his carelessness, because both words start with the same letter (dittography).

3.14.d) VI. 11.21 (p. 199, 15-17): ἐνθένδε τε ἐς ἴ Αγκώνα ἐλθόντες καὶ πολλοὺς ἀπαγαγόμενοι (ἀπαγαγόμενοι Αθ) τῶν ἠκείνην πεζῶν ἐς ἴ Αρίμμων τριτάϊο ἀφίκοντο ... The necessary tense here for the participle is the aorist, because it should be parallel to ἐλθόντες. Here is a simple haplography.

---

143 None of the following cases of haplographies or dittographies appear in later manuscripts.
3.14.e) VI. 11.22 (p. 199, 18-19): 'Ιωάννης δὲ οὖτε αὐτὸς ἔπεσθαι ήθελε καὶ Δαμιανὸν ξίνῳ τοῖς (τε Αθ) τετρακοσίοις κατείχεν. The four hundred men is the specific number of soldiers Damianus had (see above 7.26 (p. 184). So the article is necessary (dittography) and the τε is unsuitable.

3.14.f) VII. 25.14 (p. 409, 20-22): ...ἐπειδὴ ξυνέβη Βελισάριον κρείσσον λόγου θράσος ἐλόμενον τῶν ἐγκεκειρημένων αὐτῷ ( kald : ἐγκεκειρημένων αὐτῷ Αθ, ἐχθρῶν αὐτοῦ L) παρὰ δόξαν κρατεῖν... Αθ just omits the reduplication (haplography). The reading of L may have come due to the fact that the scribe was not familiar with the meaning of ἐγκεκειρημένων, so he paraphrases it.

3.14.h) VII. 40.27 (p. 480, 19-22): ...'Ιωάνην δὲ τῶν αὐτοῦ κηδεστήν καὶ Ἰουστινιανὸν τῶν αὐτοῦ παίδα παιτὶ τῷ προς Γερμανοῦ συλλεγέντι (repeat Αθ) στρατῷ εἶναι... A simple repetition of the same word.

3.14.i) VIII. 4.2 (p. 500, 14-15): τοῖς δὲ δὴ Ζήχοις κατὰ μὲν παλαιὸν ὁ Ρωμαίων αὐτοκράτωρ (αὐτοκρατοκρατωρ Αθ) βασιλέα καθίστη... This is just a repetition after the syllable -to- (dittography).

3.14.j) VIII. 9.3 (p. 525, 20-22): ἔλεγών τε ὡς Δαγισθαῖος... τὴν ἐπίθεσιν ἐς ἔτερον τινα χρόνον ἀπέθετο, καὶ τοῦ καιροῦ τὴν ἀκμήν ἐν τῷ παραυτίκα μεθῆκευ (μεμάθηκευ Αθ). Αθ may have added the syllable -μα, forming the perfect of a more frequently used verb (μανθάνω), perhaps due to the fact that he was not familiar with μεθῆκευ.
3.15. Possible misunderstanding of meaning

The following errors may have been caused, because the scribe may have misunderstood the meaning of the sentence. Most of the cases listed below are very confusing as regards the word order and in addition they are long or parenthetical sentences, a fact that confuses the scribe.

3.15.a) V. 1.11 (p. 151, 16-18): ... ἐς βαθείαν τινα κατώρχα ἐμπιπτεί, οἴαι (οία Κ) πολλαί (πολλοῖς, scr. -ά Αθ) τοῖς παλαι ἀνθρώποις πρὸς οίτου παρακαταθήκην ἐνταῦθα, οἴμαι, πεποίηται. The adjective πολλαί refers to οίαι. The scribe may have been confused by the fact that the relative pronoun οἴαι refers to the noun κατώρχα in singular; so he does not know at first to what the pronoun and the adjective refer, so he links πολλοῖς to what follows, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (attraction). The fact that there is a superscribed -α above the ending -οίς in Αθ by the original hand, may suggest that the scribe mistook κατώρχα for a neuter plural (the same is implied by the mistake οία in Κ).

3.15.b) V. 2.11 (p. 11, 21-23): ξυλεγέντες τε, δόσι δὴ ἐν αὐτοῖς λόγιμοι ἦσαν καὶ παρὰ τὴν Ἀμαλασοῦθαν ἔλθοντες ἡπιῶντο οὐκ ὀρθῶς σφίσιν οὐδὲ ἦ ξυμφέρει τὸν βασιλέα παιδεύσθαι (οὐδὲς τὸν βασιλέα ξυμφέρει Λ, οὐδὲ οἱ τὸν βασιλέα παιδεύσθαι Suda, οὐδὲ ξυμφέρον (scr. -εί) τὸν βασιλέα παιδεύσθαι Αθ). Λ transmits a definitely wrong reading and the phrase transmitted by Suda cannot stand; the reading of Αθ does not seem correct either, even if the ending of ξυμφέρον appears to have been corrected to -εί by the same scribal hand. It is certain that the reading, which the editor accepts is the correct one. Scribes often cannot recognise the form of the word ἦ and often get it wrong. Most of the later manuscripts transmit the version of Λ.

The mistake of Αθ may go back to a previous scribe. First of all, a scribe omits the ἦ, which frequently causes problems (note οἱ in Suda) and might have dropped out, either because he does not know what it is, or because it does not appear in the manuscript which he was copying from. I believe that the second is more likely. As the first part of the negative sentence begins with the adverb ὀρθῶς, a previous scribe may have thought that the second began in the same way, so he has written οὐκ ὀρθῶς ... οὐδὲ ξυμφερόντως... Later, the scribe of Αθ copied the word without the ending -
τως, and then he realised that the word ξυμφέρον is not suitable there, so he corrects it changing the ending.

3.15.c) V. 2.24 (p. 157, 17-21): Βαλεριανός δὲ καὶ Μαρτίνος τὰ ποιούμενα κατείδον τε καὶ οἱ ἑπιβεβοηθηκότες ὡς τάχιστα ἔτρεψαν τε τοὺς πολεμίους καὶ τοῦ χαλινοῦ τοῦ Βύχα ἵππου ἀμφώ λαβομένων (λαβομένου Λ, λαβομένος sscr. -ου Αθ) ἐς τὴν πόλιν ἀφίκουσα. This mistake has to do again with the lack of the use of a grammatical phenomenon in the time of the scribe; here, the dual of the participle is not recognised by the scribes of Λ and Αθ, or most possibly by the scribe of their exemplar. We observe here again the relation of Λ and Αθ. All manuscripts copied in more recent centuries agree either with Λ or with Κ and none with the original reading of Αθ.

3.15.d) V. 5.3 (p. 25,12-20): ἀρχοντες δὲ ἠσαν λόγιμοι μὲν Κωνσταντῖνος τε καὶ Βέσσας, ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Θράκης χωρίων, Περάννος δὲ ἤξ Ιβηρίας τῆς ἀγχίστα Μῆδων, γενόμενος μὲν τῶν ἐκ βασιλείως Ἰβηρίων, αὐτόμαλος δὲ πρῶτον ἐς Ῥωμαίους κατὰ ἔχοσ τὸ Περσῶν ἡκών, καταλόγων δὲ ἵππων (λαβῶν Αθ) μὲν Βαλεντῖνος τε καὶ Μάγνος καὶ Ἰννοκέντιος, πεζῶν δὲ Ἰρωδιανός τε καὶ Παύλος καὶ Δημήτριος καὶ Οὐρσικένος, ἀρχηγός δὲ Ἰσαύρων ἕννης. The scribe replaces the word ἵππων of all other manuscripts with the word λαβῶν and this replacement cannot be explained; λαβῶν μὲν is essential, because the two parts of the sentence have a corresponding syntax. None of the later manuscripts from the fifteenth century onwards transmit the wrong reading.

3.15.e) V. 15.2 (p. 79,7-9): στρατιῶτας τε οἱ Βελισάριος οὐ πολλοὺς (πολλαῖς Αθ) ἔδωκεν, ὡς αὐτῷ ξυμφιλάξωσα τὰ ἑκείνη χωρία. The scribe may be confused here, because immediately after the word πολλοὺς the verb ἔδωκεν follows, which takes the dative as indirect object and accusative as direct. A similar error in VI. 9.17 (p. 191, 25-27): ... ἐκάστῳ τε ἐς τὴν κύλικα ὑπωντικὸν ἐμβαλεῖν φάρμακον, ὡπερ σφίσιν αὐτός (αὐτοῖς Αθ) ἐδεδώκει. In this case the reading of Αθ is possible.
3.15.f) V. 22.14 (p. 110, 14-17): τούτον δή τόν τάφον οἱ παλαιοί ἄνθρωποι (ἐδόκει γὰρ τῇ πόλει ἐπιτείχισμα εἶναι) τειχίσματι (om. Ath) δύο ἐς αὐτὸν (K: αὐτὴν L, αὐτοῦς Ath) ἀπὸ τοῦ περιβόλου διήκουσι περιβάλλουσι καὶ μέρος εἶναι τοῦ τείχους πεποιηθηκαί. Given that Ath omits τειχίσματι, this is the sentence transmitted by Ath without the parenthesis: τούτον δὴ τὸν τάφον οἱ παλαιοί ἄνθρωποι ἐδόκει γὰρ τῇ πόλει ἐπιτείχισμα εἶναι δύο ἐς αὐτούς... and this may be the reason why he changes the pronoun to plural accusative in order to refer to ἄνθρωποι. The variant of L makes the pronoun refer to πόλιν. The fact that all variants are in accusative shows that syntactically the scribes tried to be correct, but they could not understand to which noun the pronoun refers. Alternatively the error may be due to an abbreviated ending. The correct reading is of course αὐτὸν transmitted by most manuscripts; it refers to τάφον. The later manuscripts transmit the correct case.

3.15.g) V. 26.13 (p. 129, 14-17): ἐτέρωθι δὲ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐκ πόλεως ὦστίας ἐς Ῥώμην ἱόντι (ἵοντος Ath) οὐλόδης τε ἡ ὁδὸς ἐστὶ καὶ ἄλλως ἀπημελημένη καὶ οὐδὲ τῆς τοῦ Τιβέριδος ἠλώνος ἐγγὺς... Ath does not understand the meaning of ἱόντι (“to someone who goes”) and thinks that the participle refers to the genitive ποταμοῦ. The genitive is not transmitted by any of the later manuscripts.

3.15.h) VI. 3.2 (p. 160, 1-2): ἐφύλασσον δὲ δποὺς αὐτοῖς μηδέν (μετὰ Ath) τοῦ λοιποῦ ἕσκομιζοντο. Although the phrase μετὰ plus genitive is common, and this may be the fact that confuses the scribe, it gives the wrong meaning. Without the μηδέν the sentence does not have a subject.

3.15.i) VI. 6.27 (p. 178, 13-14): ἦς δὴ ἐκτὸς λιβύης (λιβύες Ath) ὑμᾶς ἀσφαλῶς κεκτῆσθαι οὐ δυνατῶν. The scribe uses the genitive of the noun (with a phonetic error), because he does not realise that the adverb ἐκτὸς refers to the previous genitive ἦς. This is wrong because the noun is the object of κεκτῆσθαι and so the accusative is necessary.

3.15.j) VI. 15.8 (p. 215,25 - 216,1): ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐς ταύτην Ιέναι τῆν ὑψίων τῶν τε εἰρημένων αὐτόπτῃ (L: αὐτόπτης Ath, αὐτόπτην K) γενέσθαι, καίπερ
3.15.1 VI. 20.27 (p. 240, 2-5): καὶ λέγονται γυναῖκες δύο ἐν ἀγρῷ τινὶ ὑπὲρ Ἀρμίνου πόλεως ἀνδρας ἐπτακαϊδέκα ἐδηδοκέναι, ἀσπερ (ὁπερ Αθ) ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ μόνας περείναι ξυνέπεσε. The scribe changes the pronoun to neuter, because this is the most frequently used pronoun (the female accusative is used in Wars only nineteen times). None of the later manuscripts agree with Αθ.

3.15.11 VI. 22.6 (p. 248, 1-5): οὐ δή ἐντυχόντες τῷ Οὐραῖα (οὐραῖας Αθ) στρατῷ... Misunderstanding of the meaning: the dative is an adjective and not possessive genitive.

3.15.1m VI. 26.7 (p. 266, 12-13): Γότθω γὰρ ἀνδρὶ ἐξω γενέσθαι τοῦ περιβόλου ἀμῆχανα (ἀμῆχανον Αθ) ἐστὶ. The scribe of Αθ changes the ending, because he is confused by the impersonal phrases like καλὸν ἐστὶ etc + infinitive. In Procopius the phrase ἀμῆχανον ἐστὶ never appears while ἀμῆχαα is used thirty-nine times. None of the later manuscripts share this mistake.

3.15.1n VII. 5.13 (p. 319, 23-24): ἡδὴ δὲ καὶ ὁ λοιπὸς (οἱ λοιποὶ Αθ) τῶν Ἱωμαίων στρατὸς ἐς τὸ πεδίον ἀφικόμενοι... The noun στρατὸς does not allow the plural adjective οἱ λοιποὶ. This is the only time the word λοιπὸς is used by Procopius in all of his works. The plural is inspired by ἀφικόμενοι, as the scribe memorized the whole sentence. The plural appears more frequently in the known literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (one hundred and fifteen times and singular only thirteen). Later manuscripts transmit the singular.
3.15.o) VII. 12.3 (p. 347, 3-5): ὄν όδ' ἄν τις μὴ διαρκῶς ἔχων πόλεμον, οἴμαι, διενεχεῖν οὐ (εἰ Αṯ) μὴ ποτὲ ἴκανός εἰη. The negative particle is necessary for the meaning (οὐ μὴ ... = "certainly not", strongly affirmative) and for the syntax. What confuses the scribe is the negative particle μὴ which frequently is preceded by the conditional εἰ.\textsuperscript{144}

3.15.p) VII. 27.15 (p. 418,25 - 419,2): τριακοσίους δὲ τῶν αὐτῶ ἐπομένων Ἰωάννη (Ἰωάννης Αṯ) πέμψας ὁμολόγησε διαχειμάσας ἄμα ἤρι ἄρχομένῳ καὶ αὐτὸς ἥξειν. The name is not the subject of πέμψας, but the object of the participle ἐπομένων. Because of the fact that the subject is found many lines above, the scribe adds a -ς to the dative Ἰωάννη, in order to form a nominative as subject, because he thinks that it goes with the following πέμψας.

3.15.q) VII. 39.2 (p. 471, 11-13): αὐτὸς (αὐτοὶ Αṯ) δὲ τῷ ἄλλῳ στρατῷ ἐς Σικελίαν διαπορθμεῦσαμενὸς τῷ Μεσημβρίῳ προσέβαλε (προσέβαλλον Αṯ) τείχει. Because the previous sentence is plural and refers to the men of the army, Αṯ continues with the plural. But this is wrong, as this sentence refers to Totila mentioned some lines above (καὶ αὐτὸς = and he himself Totila); in addition the plural does not agree with διαπορθμεῦσαμενός.

3.15.r) VIII. 1.2 (p. 488, 2-3): ... ἐν τοῖς μοι τῷ λόγῳ πάντα (πάντως Αṯ) γεγράφεται, ἱστορίαν δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπάναγκες ποικίλην ἔννοιαν ἔγινεν. The reading of all other manuscripts, including those copied later, is correct with πάντα as the subject of γεγράφεται.\textsuperscript{145}

3.15.s) VIII. 7.5 (p. 516, 20-22): πόλει γοῦν Δάρας αὐτίκα ἐγκεκειρημένως ἀπεκρούσθη ἐνθέεις, ὀσπερ (L : ἦπερ Κ, ὅπερ Αṯ) μοι εἰρήναι... "Ωσπερ εἰρηναί is more frequently used in such cases (eighteen times and the phrase of Αṯ only once). All later manuscripts agree either with Κ or Λ.

\textsuperscript{144} E.g., III.16.2 (p. 382, 4-5): εἰ μή πικρόν εἰπεῖν; VIII.11.38 (p. 542, 1-2): εἰ μὴ εὐθύωρον ἀποβληθεῖν.
\textsuperscript{145} Similar in 1.7 (p. 488, 24): γέγραπται πάντα.
3.15.i) VIII. 13.18 (p. 555, 17-19): ἐπει δὲ αὐτοὶ μὲν ἐλύμοις ἀποζήν ὥστερ οἱ Κόλχοι ἐς πλείω χρόνου, οὐκ εἰωθός (εἰωθείσαν Αθ) φύσιν... It is strange that Αθ transmits the feminine accusative of the participle. The correct reading is that of the other manuscripts ("they were not used to it") and those copied later.

3.16. Possible misunderstanding of syntax (incorrect part of the verb)

3.16.a) V. 3.4 (p. 15,15-18): ἐβουλεύετο οὖν Ἰουστινιανῷ βασιλεῖ Τούσκαν ἐνυδοῦναι, ἐφ' ὃ χρήματα τε πολλά καὶ βουλής πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἐξίωμα κομισάμενος ἐν Βυζαντίῳ τὸ λοιπὸν διατρίβοι (διατρίβει Β, διατρίβειν sscr. -οι Αθ). Most manuscripts transmit the correct reading in that sentence. The scribe of Αθ possibly wrote the verb in the infinitive form, διατρίβειν first, which is definitely wrong, but then, he or someone else corrected it to διατρίβοι; perhaps the scribe was confused by the infinitive above, ἐνυδοῦναι. All later manuscripts transmit either the reading of Β or that of Λ.

3.16.b) V. 21.16 (p. 107,3-7): πτεροῖς μέντοι οὐ τοῖς εἰωθόσιν ἐνέχεται, ἀλλὰ ξύλα λεπτὰ ἐς τῶν πτερῶν τὴν χώραν ἐνείροντες (ἐνείραντες Αθ) ὅλων ἀπομιμοῦνται τοῦ βέλους τὸ σχῆμα... The participle has no clear subject; it refers to the manufacturers or anyone who makes the engines. Being a description, it needs the present tense; in addition all other verbs or verbal forms are in the present. So the past participle, which Αθ uses, is not correct. The interchange between o and a is the only difference between the two forms, so it was easy for the scribe to make an error. In addition what helps him to make the mistake, is that a participle does not have an augment in past forms. A similar case appears in 22.1 (p. 108, 6-9): Γότθοι δὲ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτη ἀπὸ τῆς προσεδρείας ἡμέρα, Οὐιττίγιδος σφίσιν ἦγομένου. ἀμφὶ ἤλιου ἀνατολὰς ὡς τειχομαχήσομεν (τειχομαχήσαντες Αθ) ἐπὶ τὸν περίβολον ἐσεαν... Both participles are transmitted in the future tense by later manuscripts.

---

146 This may not be the interchange of different spellings of the sound /i/, which appears occasionally in early Byzantine papyri (e.g. τοῖς οἰκίας for τῆς οἰκίας PMerton 38.17 (c.350 AD).
3.16.c) VI. 1.15 (p. 152, 5-7): ... ἄτερος δὲ τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ ἐναγχος ἐφασκεν ἐν τῇ γενομένῃ τροπῇ ἐμπεπτωκέναι, βρόχον τε αὐτοῖς, ὅτις ἀναβαίνοι (ἀναβαίνειν Ἀθ., ἀναβαίνειν εἰ), ἥξιον καθεῖναι. The two infinitives ἐμπετωκέναι and καθεῖναι, which depend on two verbs, confuse the scribe. The optative is necessary in a purpose clause, therefore the infinitive of Ἀθ. is wrong. All later manuscripts examined agree with Λ and Κ apart from ε, which transmits the subjunctive ἀναβαίνη.

3.16.d) VI. 6.16 (p. 176, 10-13): Ζήνων δὲ τότε τῆς ἐφας κρατῶν καὶ τιμωρεῖν (τιμωρήσαι Ἀθ.) μὲν τῷ ξυμβεβασιλευκότι βουλόμενος καὶ τοῦ τυράννου τήν ἐκχώραν ἐλευθεροῦν, ὁ δ᾽ οὗ οἶχος τοῖς... The infinitive should be in present to co-ordinate with the following infinitive (ἐλευθεροῦν), which depends on the same verb. Later manuscripts disagree with Ἀθ.

3.16.e) VI. 8.12 (p. 188, 3-4): καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ μὲν ἄλλα οἱ ὠμολογεῖ ἄπαντα πείσεσθαι (πείσεσθαι ΣΣ Θ., πείσεσθαι Κ.) βουλομένῳ γὰρ ταῦτα βασιλεῖ εἶναι. Usually the superscribed readings in Ἀθ. are the correct ones; however in this case the future is required. The superscript variant in Ἀθ. may derive from collation with Κ family. The later manuscripts transmit either the one or the other reading.

3.16.f) VI. 6.34 (p. 179, 10-11): ὡς ἔστω γενέσθω (γενέσθω Ἀθ.) ταῦτα, οὐ γάρ ποτε ύμῖν ἔρημα βουλευμένοις ἐμποδών στήσομαι. The aorist is more appropriate here. But this word is used as stereotype. Procopius always uses it in the present and never in aorist. The opposite (present in Ἀθ., aorist in Κ and Λ) appears in 31.2 (p. 431, 4-6); ...ἐξαίσθα τις ἐπίθυμα ἐγένετο (ἐγένετο Ἀθ.) Προείκεταν τὴν βασιλέως ἀδελφιδὴν (ἀδελφιδοῦν Ἀθ.); ἤν εἰχεν ἀγγυνητήν... The aorist is more suitable than the imperfect of Ἀθ. Perhaps it was not an error concerning the tenses, but a simple interchange of ε and ι. As for the second variant, this is the only appearance of the feminine of the noun; all other times the masculine form is used. In the cases above the manuscripts from the fifteenth century onwards disagree with Ἀθ.

3.16.g) VI. 16.8 (p. 221, 12-14): ἐν Ἁρμίνῳ δὲ, ὡς τὸ εἰκὸς, σφαλέντες (σφαλέντας Ἀθ.), εἰ μὴ λίαν πικρὸν εἰπεῖν ἦ, τὴν Ἀρμαίων ἰσχύν
Misunderstanding of syntax

This error is due to lack of attention by the scribe; a possible case of misunderstanding of syntax.

3.16.h) VI. 17.13 (p. 226, 5-7): ὑετὸ δὲ αὐτοὺς, ἐπειδὰν τάχιστα πῦθωνται πανταχόθεν σφίσει πολεμίων ἐπίεναι στρατοῦ, ἀλκής ἄν οὐδεμᾶς μνησθήναι, ἀλλ' αὐτίκα δὴ μάλα ἐς φυγῇν τρέψεσθαι (τρέψασθαι Ath). The aorist of Ath is wrong, because the action refers to Belisarius' expectation for the future.

3.16.i) VI. 18.7 (p. 229, 7-9): οὐκ ἐφ’ ὃ κυνῆυνομα ἰδίῳ τὴν Βελισαρίου δόξαν κρατύνηται (κρατύνει K, κρατεῖνεται Ath), ἀλλ’ ἐφ’ ὃ ἐργα ξυνέσεως τε καὶ ἀνδρείας ἐπιδειξάμενος διαβόητος ἀνθρώπως ἀπασιν, ὡς το εἰκός, εἶν. This is an iotacistic error of Ath (ει for η). In addition, both Ath and K fail to realise that the subjunctive is necessary.

3.16.j) VI. 18.15 (p. 230, 5-7): δέδοικα δὲ μὴ ταῦτα ὑμεῖς τῇ οὐκ ἀληθεί δόξῃ σφαλλόμενοι τά ἀνήκεστα ὑμᾶς τα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ ’Ῥωμαίων πράγματα δράσητε (δράσετε Ath). The correct mood after the verb δέδοικα μὴ is the subjunctive, so the reading of Ath is not correct.

3.16.k) VI. 25.13 (p. 263, 11-14): φεύγοντάς τε αὐτοὺς ἰδόντες ’Ῥωμαίοι Βελισάριον ἐπιβεβοηθηκότα σφίσιν ὑπότο ἐλείν τὸ τῶν πολεμίων στρατόπεδον, ἐνθέατ' τε αὐτοὺς ἐξελάσαι μαχὴ μικήσαντα (μικήσαντας Ath). In this case the scribe did not realise that the participle refers to Βελισάριον mentioned some lines above and not to πολεμίους. Later manuscripts do not confuse the syntax.

3.16.l) VII. 4.19 (p. 316, 1-4): Τοσαῦτα ὁ Τουτίλας παρακελευσάμενος τῶν οἱ ἐπομένων τριακοσίων ἐκέλευεν, ὅσον ἀπὸ σταδίων εἴκοσι τῶν ποταμών διαβαίνοντας (sscr. ἔσ ἡ διαβάντας Ath), κατάπισθεν τοῦ τῶν πολεμίων στρατοπέδου γενέσθαι... Ath transmits two other variant above the word accompanied with ἔσ; other such cases follow throughout the text in parts copied by different hands. The superscriptions may have been copied from a marginal note/variant of the exemplar. The participle should be accusative, because it goes with the accusative τριακοσίος as subject of the infinitive γενέσθαι. I believe that the aorist
of Ath is not correct, because crossing the river is a slow process, so the present is more appropriate.

3.16.m) VII. 8.7 (p. 329, 12-14): ...δεδοτές μὴ τι Τουτίλαν τῶν ωμολογημένων ὀλιγωρεῖν διὰ τὸ κεκρατηκέναι ἔμβαθη (ἔμβαθειν Ath), καὶ κακῶν τι μέγα πρὸς αὐτοῦ λάβωσιν. After δεδοτές μὴ there must be subjunctive or optative. There is a possibility that Ath misspelled the subjunctive ἔμβαθην. But the correct reading is the optative ἔμβαθη, with which later manuscripts agree.

3.16.n) VII. 11.34 (p. 345, 16-20): ...τὰς πύλας...ἐπεμψεν, ὡς δὴ ἐκέλευε τοὺς ἀμφὶ τε Σαβινιανὸν τε καὶ Θουριμοῦθ κατὰ τάχος τοὺς τείχεσιν ἐναρμόσαντας (ἐναρμόσαντες Ath) ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόλου μένειν... The participle refers to τοὺς ἀμφὶ Σαβινιανὸν καὶ Θουριμοῦθ as objects of ἐκέλευε. The wrong reading is not transmitted by any of the later manuscripts.

3.16.o) VII. 16.30 (p. 368, 15-17): ὡστε προσπλακασθέντες ξυνοίσει μᾶλλον διαπετράχθαι τι ὃν ἔνεκα ἤλθον ἤ λόγων ἐπιεικεστέρων ἀκούσαντας (ἀκούσαντας Ath) τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀποτυχόντας ἐπανελθεῖν. The past is necessary for the meaning and in addition the infinitive, διαπετράχθαι, is past as well. The same in 20.4 (p. 384, 24): ...καλῶς τε ἐκ τῶν ἐπάλξεων ἀναρτήσαντες (ἀναρτήσαντες Ath) ἄχρι ἐς τὸ ἔδαφος ἔξικνουμένους...

3.16.p) VII. 18.29 (p. 378, 19-21): ...καὶ τοῖς ἐν Καπῦ φυλάσσοντι τετρακοσίοις οὐσίᾳ ἐς χεῖρας Ἦκων ποιεῖσθαι τὴν δίοδον ἐνεχειρῆσε (ἐνεχειρῆσας Ath). The fact that the participle used is not grammatically correct, shows that the change may be due to the scribe’s lack of attention or due to misreading. All later manuscripts examined transmit the finite verb and not the participle.

3.16.q) VII. 24.29 (p. 406, 14-16): διὸ δὴ καὶ Γότθων εὑμεροῦντα μὲν τοῖς ἐγχειρήμασι Τουτίλαν ἐτεθήπεσαν (ἐτεθήπασιν Ath) ἵσα θεῖφ... The scribe changes the normal ending of the third person plural.
3.16.r) VII. 37.13 (p. 464,21 -465,1): ἀδύνατον γὰρ Ἰουστινιανὸν τὸ λοιπὸν εἶναι πόλεμον πρὸς Γότθους τόνδε διενεχεῖν, εἰ τῷ ίκανῷ τεκμηρίωσαι (𝑉 : τεκμηρίωσασθαι Ὁ : τεκμηρίωσασθαι Λ, τεκμηρίωσαστο Ὁ) τὰ μετὰ χρόνου τοσοῦτον ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης ξυμβάντα. Ὁ does not recognise that an infinitive is necessary. The reading of Λ is wrong, because the verb is active.

3.16.s) VII. 37.19 (p. 465,23 - 466,2): οὐ πρότερον διεβήσαν τὸν τῇδε πορθμὸν, ἐως φρούριον τοῦ ἔν ὅπηγίῳ ἀπεπειράσαντο (Κ : ἀποπειράσασθαι Λ, ἀποπειράσαστο Ὁ). The ἐως goes with indicative; Ὁ and Λ are wrong. This case is similar to the one before in 37.13 (p. 464,21-465,1) where Λ has infinitive, Ὁ optative, both incorrectly. None of the manuscripts copied later than the fourteenth century agree with Ὁ.

3.16.t) VII. 37.26 (p. 467,2-3): εἰς τὸ ἐργον καταστήσασθαι (καταστήσεσθαι Ὁ) ἀντὶ Γερμανοῦ ἔγνω. Here the past of all other manuscripts is necessary.

3.16.u) VII. 40.25 (p. 480,11-13): καὶ οἱ μὲν δρκοὶς αὐτὸν σφίσειν ἀμφὶ ταύτῃ τῇ ὀμολογίᾳ καταληψθέντα (καταλῆψέντες Ὁ) Γότθοις ἀπέδοσαν... The participle refers to αὐτόν and not to οἱ μὲν as Ὁ may have thought.

3.16.v) VIII. 1.11 (p. 489,17-18): τοῖς πράγμασι τὰ πολλὰ τῶν καθεστῶτων τὰ πρότερα νεοχυμόσαι (𝐿 : ἀνεωχυμοῦν Κ, νεοχυμοῦν Ὁ) ἱσχύεσθαι... The reading of Κ is certainly wrong, because such a verb does not exist. The past is the suitable tense, because the infinitive refers to the past: "...many of the conditions which formerly obtained have been replaced by new conditions"; therefore that reading of Ὁ is incorrect, it is not transmitted by any of the later manuscripts; they all agree either with Λ or with Κ.

3.16.w) VIII. 2.8 (p. 491,18-20): εἰτε Λαςκῆς εὐθὺ πλέοντες εἰτε καὶ ἐνθένδε ἀπάραντες (sscr. ἀπαλροῦντες Ὁ), οὐκέτι ἡς διαπλεῖν δύνανται. Ὁ transmits superscribed the present, which is not suitable. The past is necessary. The
superscribed version does not appear in any of the later manuscripts. It may have existed in Ath's exemplar.

3.16. x) VIII. 6.27 (p. 515, 1-4): ...κατὰ ταῦτα Ἰέναι εὐμβαίνει ... τοῖς ἀνω διαρρήδην χωρεῖν, ἐμπαλιν τε τοῦ φαινομένου ἐσαεὶ φέρεσθαι (φέρεται Ath). And the same two lines below: ...ταῦτα δὲ ἀεὶ τῷ ῥεύματι βιαζόμενα τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ Ἱερὸν φέρεσθαι (φέρεται Ath). The infinitives are necessary in both cases. The scribe changes them to indicative, because he does not realise that all verbs depend on the verb εὐμβαίνει, which needs the infinitive. None of the later manuscripts agree with Ath, except of k, which in the first case transmits the same reading.

3.16. y) VIII. 9.3 (p. 525, 20-22): ἔλεγών τε ὡς Δαγισθαῖος ... τὴν ἐπίθεσιν ἐς ἑτερον τινα χρόνον ἀπέθετο (ἀπέθεντο Ath). The scribe changes the number of the verb, perhaps because he does not realise that its subject (Δαγισθαῖος), which is mentioned several lines above, is singular.

3.16. z) VIII. 11.48 (p. 543, 21-22): ...ὡπερ αὐτὸν τε καὶ τὰ 'Ῥωμαίων πράγματα διασώσασθαι ἔσχε (ἔσχεν L, ἔσχηκε Ath). The perfect of Ath is not suitable. Later manuscripts agree either with L or with K.

3.16.a.a) VIII. 11.26 (p. 539, 9-10): οἱ δὴ ἐνταῦθα γενόμενοι εἶν τῷ 'Ῥωμαίων στρατῷ ἐς τὴν τελεσμαχίαν κατέστησαν (L : κατεστήσατο K, κατεστήσαντο Ath). K's reading is clearly wrong. The correct form is that of L. Parallels: I.9.22 (p. 44, 21) and IV.22.18 (p. 524,25-525,1): ἐς τὴν πολιορκίαν κατέστησαν. All later manuscripts agree either with L or with K.
3.17. Vocabulary

This group includes the variants of Ath, which change the "original" word or phrase and use a totally different one. The substitution of one word for another (misreading, usage of ordinary words) can be brought about by mental associations: a word that plays little part in the scribes' life may be mistaken for one that plays a greater part; in other cases, the scribe maybe reminded of a similar word or phrase that he has copied earlier, it may be many pages earlier. A distinctive part of this group is the substitution of prepositions in compounds, a fact that causes change in the meaning of the words. Sometimes a word is substituted for another, which was a synonym (gloss) in the form of a marginal note and inserted into the text.

3.17.1. Possible misreadings or visual errors

3.17.1.a) V. 2.21 (p. 13,12-17): 'Αμαλασσώνθα δὲ οὐτὲ κατωρρώδησε τὴν τῶν Γότθων ἐπιβουλὴν οὐτὲ οία γυνὴ ἐμαλακίσθη, ἀλλ' ἐτι τὸ βασιλικῶν ἁξίωμα ἐνδεικνυμένη, τρεῖς ἀπολέξασα τοὺς ἐν τοῖς βαρβάροις λογιμωτάτους (δοκιμωτάτους Ath) τε καὶ αὐτῆ αἰτιωτάτους τῆς στάσεως, ἐκέλευεν ἐς τὰς τῆς Ἱταλίας ἐσχατιάς ἑναί... The word δόκιμος with the meaning of "trustworthy, approved", does not fit in that context. In addition in V.3.11 (p.16,18) the λογιμωτάτους appears in the same context and meaning ("famous, notable"). This reading in Ath, which may have arisen simply from inattentive copying, could also go further back in the tradition and arise from a visual confusion between Α and Δ. This error does not appear in later manuscripts.

3.17.1.b) V. 11.26 (p. 62,9-12): 'Οὐκτητης, καὶ τῆς Θευδερίχου ἄρχης ὑπομνήσας, ἐνεκελεύετο ἀπαίων ἐς Γότθων τοῦ ἔθνους (γένος Ath) εὐφωικός ἔχειν, ὅρκως αὐτοὺς δεινοτάτους ὑπὲρ τούτων καταλαβὼν... The word γένος is a subdivision of ἔθνος, the first is a smaller group of people. In this case, the ἔθνος refers to Goths. In V.12.25 (p. 66, 22) the Βουργουζιώτων γένος 147 with the meaning

147 Other examples of γένος meaning "nation" are I.8.3 (p. 37, 4-5): Φαρεσμάνης Κόλχος μὲν γένος; I.10.9 (p. 46,22): 'Αμβαζώους. Οἶνος μὲν γένος; IV.23.6 (p. 526,3): Φοίνικης, Ἐμεσημός γένος.
“nation” appears but in V. 11.27 (p. 62, 22) there is γένος τοῦ Θεουδερίχου with the meaning “family”. Procopius seems to use the two words as alternatives, when he speaks about a whole nation, a tribe and when he speaks about a family. I suggest that έθνος transmitted by most manuscripts is the correct reading of the original. The manuscripts written after the fourteenth century transmit έθνος. A similar case appears in VI. 13.14 (p. 208, 1-3): ...ών ὁ μὲν Βελισαρίου δορυφόρος ἤν έκ Θράκης, Ὀλυμπίων δόμοι, ὁ δὲ Βαλεριανού, Γουδουλγουδοῦ, Μασσαγέτης γένος (έθνος Ath). What is correct is the “origin” of the man and not “his habits”. Usually when the author introduces a new person, he refers to his γένος.

3.17.1.e) V. 18.42 (p. 96, 3-6): Βελισάριος δὲ γέλωτα πολὺν πρὸς Ὀφθείου ὁφλευν (ὁφείλειν Ath), ἐπεὶ μόλις τοὺς πολεμίους διαφημῶν θαρσεῖν τε ἡδη καὶ περιφρονεῖν τῶν βαρβάρων ἐκέλευε. The imperfect of the verb ὁφείλειν is used by Ath and the aorist of ὁφλισκάνω by all other manuscripts. Ὅφλισκάνω means "to be

---

148 See above 3.4, pp. 50-2 for the frequent use of ἐνθένδειν.
condemned, to incur (a fine)". This is exactly the meaning here: "Belisarius brought upon himself much ridicule on the part of the Romans". The scribe of Ath was not aware of the aorist form ὑφελεν, so he "corrected" it by interpolating an ε, mistaking it for the more familiar ὑφείλειν. The manuscripts which belong to the fifteenth century and later transmit the correct verb.

3.17.1.f) V. 18.42 (p. 96, 3-6): Βελισάριος δὲ γέλωτα πολύν πρὸς ὅμιλων ὑφελεν, ἔπει μόνης τῶν πολέμιων διαφημῶν βαρσέν τε ἤδη καὶ περιφορεῖν (περιφρονεῖν Ath) τῶν βαρβάρων ἐκέλευε. The correct verb in this context is the περιφορεῖν of all other manuscripts. As we pointed out above, the meaning is not the main concern of the scribe of Ath; but here the syntax is also wrong. Περιφορεῖν takes genitive, but περιφρονεῖν needs accusative. Later manuscripts transmit the correct reading.

3.17.1.g) V. 20.15 (p. 104, 1-2): Ὅ μὲν τῆς ξυμβουλῆς καὶ ὅς οὐκ ἐφ᾽ ὑμῖν (ἐν φυγήν Ath) κείσεται. The mistake in Ath obviously stems from a visual error (misreading), because μι and νι can look similar. Later manuscripts have the correct reading.

3.17.1.h) V. 21.6 (p. 105, 11-13): ... ἕτοιμας καὶ μηχανάς τέσσαρας, αἱ κριοὶ καλοῦνται. ἔστι δὲ ἡ μηχανή τοιαύτη (τοιάδε Ath). κίονες ὦρθοί... The word wrongly used by Ath when is found in this context in a sentence introduces a speech or explains events (e.g. ἄμελετο τοιάδε etc.). So the scribe is confused here as the two words start with the same letters. Here the word τοιαύτη is suitable: "this engine is of the following kind".

3.17.1.i) V. 21.16 (p. 107, 3-7): πτεροῖς μέντοι οὐ τοῖς εἰσώζοιν ἐνέχεται (K: ἀνέχεται Ath, ἀνέρχονται L), ἄλλα ἑξάλα λεπτὰ ἐς τῶν πτερῶν τὴν χώραν ἐνείρουσι διὸν ἀπομιμοῦνται τοῦ βέλους το σχῆμα... Ath and L transmit the same verb, but in different number. They are both wrong, because the sentence means

With this meaning it is also used by classical authors: ὁφλώ γέλωτα, Eur.Hel 67: αἰσχύνην ὁφλῆ, Eur.Andr. 188: ὁφλῳ βλάβην; Plato Symp. 199b,2: γέλωτα ὁρλω.

The τοιάδε used before speeches may declare that what follows is not exactly the real facts; it may mean "roughly these".
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"it does not have feathers of a usual sort attached to it". What confuses the scribes is the more frequent use of ἀνέρχομαι. In addition, as the engine which is described has the feathers, the scribes thought that the meaning was "the engine goes up (flies) not with feathers of a usual sort" and the dative πτεροῖς shows the way; but this is not correct, because the engines, "ballistae", do not move; what is shot are the arrows.

The form of L is wrong, as the subject is the engine, so the plural is wrong there. Perhaps Ath corrects it to singular but he does not realise that it is wrong; what concerns him is the syntax and not the meaning. The change must have been made in steps: a scribe changed the correct ἐνέχεται to ἐνέρχεται, by an addition of ρ and later another scribe changed the ἐνέρχεται to ἀνέρχεται, because ἐνέρχεται does not mean anything in this context. The term is transmitted either like L's or like K's by later manuscripts.

3.17.1. j) V. 28.13 (p. 136, 8-10): ἵππου δὲ ἦ τόξου ἦ ἄλλου ὀσούνον (ὀσούν Ath, οὐσούνον L) διπλοῦ ὑμὼν φειδέσθω μῆδεἰς. The reading of Ath have no sense. This is a possible misreading of ν and υ, which may have been written similarly in his exemplar. Same error in VI.6.17 (p. 176, 23). In some cases the word appears correctly in Ath: VI.10.10 (p.194,8) and VI.17.3 (p.224,16). Later manuscripts agree either with L or with K.

3.16.1.k) V. 28.24 (p. 138, 5-9): ... ἀποτέμνεσθαι ἄξιον τῆς πεζῶν φάλαγγος, μήτε χρηναι τὸ ῥωμαίον πεζίκον ἵππες τεθείσθαι οἶου (οἰου Ath). δὲ οὐ τὴν ἄρχην τοῖς πάλαι ῥωμαίοις ἐς τὸ δὲ μεγέθους κεχωρηκέναι ἀκούομεν. The scribe of Ath takes the second person singular of the verb οἴομαι, as the relative pronoun οἷος in accusative. First of all he must have thought that the infinitive χρηναι needs a verb to depend on; the same happen to the first part of the sentence: there is the verb ἄξιον for the infinitive τεμνεσθαι to depend on. The pronoun is unsuitable there, because a verb is necessary.

3.17.1.l) VI. 5.8 (p. 171, 15-17): ταύτης τῆς πύλης νύκτιν τὴν οἰκοδομίαν (οἰκονομίαν Ath) περιελὼν, οὕδειν τῶν πάντων προειρημένων... The wrong word
in Ath may have been more familiar to the scribe. Manuscripts copied later transmit the correct word.

3.17.1.m) VI. 6.30 (p. 178, 22-23): Οὐ γὰρ ἐσμεν κύριοι τὰ βασιλέως πράγματα διοικήσασθαι, οὐχ ὅπῃ αὐτῶ βουλομένω (βουλευομένω Ath, b, c, k, βουλουλευομένω L) ἐστίν. First of all the reading of L does not exist (dittography). The two variants are two different words: "to debate, discuss" and "to want, wish". In this context either verb is suitable: "we are not empowered to administer the emperor's affairs, not in a way which is in accordance with his discussion/ deliberation (Ath) or with his wish (rell.)." In this case we should accept what most manuscripts transmit though manuscripts b, of the fifteenth century and c, k of the sixteenth century transmit the reading of Ath.

3.17.1.n) VI. 11.11 (p. 198, 6-8): ...ἐν ἀριστερά δὲ οὐ πολλῷ ἀποθεν πέτρα ἀνέχει ἀπότομος τε καὶ ὤψως ἐσ τόσον (τοσοῦτον Ath) διήκουσα, ὡστε τοῖς κάτω οὐδε φανόμενοι ἄνθρωποι... Both pronouns show quantity, have the same meaning and they are used alternatively. Τοσοῦτος has clearer demonstrative meaning, and in this case is not suitable, because with ὤψως we need quantitative rather than demonstrative meaning. So we accept what most manuscripts transmit. In such cases Procopius uses τόσον in quantitative meanings (I.17.8 (p. 83, 10): ἐς τόσον δὲ σκληρὸς τις ὁ χοῦς ἐνταῦθα ἐστιν; VII.17.11 (p. 371, 13-14): ἐς τόσον ἀξιωτέρας μεταλαγχάνειν ἰκανοῖς εἶναι) and τοσοῦτον for quality (e.g. III.3.15 (p. 321, 3-4): ἐς τοσοῦτον δὲ μεγαλοψυχίας τε καὶ τῆς ἀλλῆς ἀρετῆς ἤκετην ὡς τε; VIII.11.48 (p. 543, 19-20): καὶ περ ἐς τοσοῦτον κινδύνου ἢκων).

3.17.1.o) VI. 27.13 (p. 271, 23-272.3): τότε δὴ καὶ βέλος τι ἐπὶ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τῆς γαστέρα ἤει ... ἐίτε τύχῃ τινὶ ἐίτε προνοίᾳ ἐνταῦθα βληθέν (λυθέν Ath). Possibly a visual mistake or due to internal dictation. These two forms are not used by Procopius elsewhere.

The phrase βουλομένω τινὶ ἐστὶ is wrong here, although attested in Thucydides several times. Cf. similar cases in IV 80.2, 26; IV 85.4, 8; VIII 92.6, 6-7).
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3.17.1.p) VI. 28.14 (p. 277, 20-21): ἐστὶ προῦπτον δὲ κακὸν λέναι, παρὰν κυνδύνου ἐκτὸς (ἐντὸς Ath) σωζεσθαι, πολλῆ ἁνοια. These adverbs are being confused in manuscripts at 14.23 (p. 212, 8-10), as well. It is possibly a visual error, because the only different letters are ν and κ.

3.17.1.y) VI. 7.8 (p. 181, 1-3): τῶν τε φορτίων ἐν αὐτοῖς ὀσᾶ (Κ : ὀσᾶ δὴ L, ἐστὶ Ἀθ) φέρειν οὐλοί τε ἱσαν ἐνθέμενοι, διὰ τοῦ Τιβέριδος ἐστὶς Ἐρυμην πνεύμα τηρήσαντες σφίσιν ἐπίφορον ἐναυτίλλοντο... This sentence may have been not clearly written in a previous manuscript. It may be a visual error (misreading of ὀσᾶ/ἐσᾶ and εὐ/δη). None of the later manuscripts agree with Ath.

3.17.1.z) VI. 7.23 (p. 183, 14-16): ταῦτα δὲ τούτο ἄμφω τε Ἀλβανῷ καὶ Κεντοκέλλαις δῆθεν τῷ λόγῳ ᾑτίωντο, ἠπείλουν τε, ἢν µὴ ταυτά σφίσιν ἀποδιδό, οὐκ ἐπιτρέψειν (ἐπιστρέψειν Ath). The correct verb ἐπιτρέψειν means "to yield". The reading of Ath is wrong, because it means something completely different, "to return, to change" and it is used in the known literature of the fourteenth century. Manuscripts copied in later centuries transmit the verbs correctly. Similar errors at VI. 9.14 (p. 191, 5-8): ...ἀπάντησε τε οὐ ἐνυπεταγμένοις ἐστὶ παράταξιν, ἀλλὰ ξὺν πολλῇ ἀκομὴ λοίπα, καὶ τοὺς κατ’ αὐτὸν οὐδὲν πάνω τρεφάμενοι (στρεφάμενος Ath) συχνούς ἐκτείνεαι and at VI. 23.11 (p. 253, 1): ...ρᾶστά τε αὐτοὺς ἁρετῆ ὄσαμενοι ἐπιτρέψατε (ἐπιστρέψαν Ath)... I suggest that all the above errors of Ath may be due to misreading.

3.17.1.a.a) VI. 7.38 (p. 185, 22-24): καὶ αὐτοίς Βελισάριος ὑποσχόμενοι τὴν δέησιν ἐπιτελῇ (ἐπιμελῇ Ath) ποιήσειν κατείχεν αὐτοῦ τὴν τοῦ χειμώνος ὥραν. The meaning here is "to fulfil", so the word ἐπιτελῆς is necessary.

3.17.1.a.b) VI. 13.9 (p. 207, 5-7): ...ἀπαντᾷς δὲ ἀπαγαγῶν δοσον ἀπὸ σταδίων πέντε ὡς ἐστὶ παράταξιν (παράτασιν Ath) διεκόσμησεν, οὐ βαθεῖαν τινα τὴν

---

152 A characteristic passage of fourteenth century from The Vita of Adam and Eve (Apocalypse Mosis) 39.6: πλὴν οὐν λέγω σοι ὅτι τὴν χαρὰν αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέψω εἰς λύπην, τὴν δὲ σοὶ λύπην ἐπιστρέψω εἰς χαρὰν, καὶ ἐπιστρέψας καθίσῶ σε εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν σου ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον τοῦ ἀπατήσαντός σε.
Vocabulary / Misreadings

φάλαγγα ποιησάμενος ... Παράτασις (παρατείνω = to extend the time) makes no sense in the context and is never used by Procopius.

3.17.1.a.c) VI. 21.13 (p. 242, 19-20): μετὰ δὲ Μαρτίνος ἀπολύεσθαι (ἀπολέσθαι Αθ) τὴν αἰτίαν ἐθέλων Βελισαρίῳ ἔγραψε τάδε. Αθ inadvertently omits a v; the same phrase is found again in III.12.17 (p. 368, 3-5): δι' ὧν ἀπολύεσθαι τάς αἰτίας φησὶ χείρῳ εἰκότως εἶναι ποιεῖ τά ἐγκλήματα.

3.17.1.a.d) VI. 29.12 (p. 284, 3-6): τῶν γὰρ ἀτοπωτάτων ἄν εἰ ὑπεραν μὲν ἐως ἐξεστὶν ἐξελέσθαι τὰ κρείσσον, σκοπουμένοι δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς τύχης ἀπόβασιν (ἀπόφασιν Αθ) τὰς αἰτίας ποιεῖσθαι. Exactly the same case appears at 30.22 (p. 292, 10-11): ἀλλὰ τῶν δεδογμένων παρὰ δόξαν εὐλαχίας ἢ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀπόβασις (ἀπόφασις Αθ) ἀπ’ ἑναντίας ἐξώφησε. Internal dictation could be one of the possible causes of this error. The most important argument in favour of ἀπόβασις is that ἀπόφασις is never used by Procopius and it would not make sense here.

3.17.1.a.e) VII. 7.7 (p. 326, 4-5): τὰ μὲν οὖν ἀμφὶ τῷ Ῥωμαίῳ στόλῳ (τὸν - στόλον Λ, τὸν - στρατὸν Αθ) ταύτῃ πη ἐσχε. The noun of Αθ is wrong, because the preceding text refers to the action of the fleet and not the army. As for the case, the correct reading is the dative of most manuscripts, because the dative is used frequently by Procopius as a summary after a narrative. For parallels see I,15.25 (p. 78, 18): τὰ μὲν οὖν ἀμφὶ τῷς Τζάνοις ταύτῃ πη ἐσχεν, II.23.21 (p. 259, 23-24): τὰ μὲν οὖν ἀμφὶ τῷ λοιμῷ ἐν τῇ ἄλη Ῥωμαίων γῆ καὶ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ ταύτῃ πη ἐσχεν. None of the later manuscripts agree with the different noun of Αθ.

3.17.1.a.f) VII. 8.2 (p. 328, 22-23): ... ὡς τὸ εἰκός, ἀποπυγεῖεν, ἐπενοεῖ τάδε (τοιάδε Αθ). According to Procopius' usage the reading of Αθ is possible. We cannot say which was the original reading, because both words are used by Procopius to introduce a plan or a speech (see 3.5.8 (p. 332, 16): "Τύπερον δὲ Τιβερίῳ ἐπενεῖ τοιάδε, 3.7.7 (p. 341, 9-10): καὶ τὰ πρασσόμενα διακόλυβη, μηχανᾶται τοιάδε). The same variation appears at VII.18.9 (p. 375, 4): ἐν τῇ Τιβερίᾳ ἐπενεῖ τάδε (τοιάδε Αθ) and at VII.23.14 (p. 401, 14): ἐπενεῖ τάδε (τοιάδε Αθ). In none of
the above cases do later manuscripts agree with Ath. As the above variations are unique in Ath, the readings of the main tradition should be followed.

3.17.1.a.g) VII. 8.10 (p. 330, 1-2): τὸ δὲ Νεαπόλεως τείχος καθελεῖν ἐς ἔδαφος ἐνεχείρησεν (ἀνεχώρησεν L, ἀνεχώρησαν Ath), ὡς αὐτὴν μὴ καταλαβόντες αὐθεὶς... Ath is not correct, neither in meaning nor in syntax. First of all the verb ἀνακριβῶ does not need an infinitive. L changes the infinitive as well to καθελῶν; so its syntax is correct. But the problem is the meaning, because the wall was not razed to the ground, but he set about (ἐνεχείρησεν) razing it. Later manuscripts agree either with K or with L.

3.17.1.a.h) VII. 8.14 (p. 330, 15-17): ... ξυλεγέντες εἰθές καὶ Τούτιλα ἐς ὅψιν ἔλθόντες ἔδεον ὑ ἀνθρώπῳ τήν αἰτίαν ἀδείναι (ἀναφανήναι Ath) ... The verb used by Ath has no relation to the context. The verb ἀναφαίνομαι is never used in Procopius in any form. The manuscripts copied later than the fourteenth century transmit the reading of most manuscripts.

3.17.1.a.i) VII. 9.7 (p. 333, 25-26): τὸ γὰρ τῆς ἀμαρτάδος ἔσπεσον αἰτίοι τῶν ἐγκλημάτων αὐτῶς παρατείναται (παραρεῖται Ath) τὸ πλείστον. The reading of Ath may be a visual error. Of course, there is a possibility that the scribe failed to understand the meaning. Manuscripts copied later transmit the correct verb.

3.17.1.a.j) VII. 9.13 (p. 334, 17-18): καί τοι ἐξεναγείσθε (Maltr.: ἐξαναγκεῖσθε K, ἐξαναγεῖτε L, ἐξαναγείστε Ath) μὲν ὑμεῖς αὐτοὺς... This is the only appearance of this verb in Procopius. What confuses the scribe is the rare usage of the verb during his period (only nine known appearances in the literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries) on the one hand, and the middle form of the verb, although its meaning is active, "entertain". All later manuscripts are confused and agree either with K or with L.

3.17.1.a.k) VII. 12.3 (p. 347, 2-3): ... ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ ἵππων καὶ ὀπλῶν καὶ χρημάτων χωρίς (K: ἐξ ἄπορία L, χωρία Ath). When the adverb follows the noun scribes are
sometimes confused, because this is not the normal sequence. Ath’s reading makes no sense. The phrase ξυν ἀπορία is odd; perhaps it is a marginal gloss for χωρίς, which intruded into the text. None of the later manuscripts agree with Ath.

3.17.1.a.l) VII. 12.8 (p. 347, 19-21): εὖ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὥ δέσποτα, ἵσθι, ὡς τῶν ὑπὸ σοὶ στρατευομένων (στρατηγῶν μένων Ath) οἱ πλείους πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους...
Neither the context nor the syntax justifies the reading of Ath. There is a possibility that the exemplar of Ath had στρατηγῶν and superscribed the ending -ευμένων as correction; then Ath keeps the στρατηγῶν and he misunderstands the correction, which he transmits as μένων.

3.17.1.a.m) VII. 16.21 (p. 366, 14-15): ... τοῦ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ὅγκον παραιρουμένου (παραιρομένου Ath) τοῖς ἡδικηκόσι τῶν ἔλεον. Careless error.

3.17.1.a.n) VII. 21.3 (p. 390, 10-12): λόγων γάρ τῶν ἐς εὐθαμομένων ἀγώνων κόρον οὐκ εἰκός ἀνθρώπῳ γενέσθαι, κἂν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ (L: τῇ ἀλογίᾳ K, τῇ ἀλογίᾳ Ath) τις ἀποκναίειν δοκῇ. It is important that this is the only appearance of the noun πολυλογία in all of the works of Procopius, that is why the scribes change the word. However, this is the correct word, because it refers to κόρον above. Most of the later manuscripts agree with L and none with Ath.

3.17.1.a.o) VII. 21.21 (p. 393, 16-18): "Ωςα μὲν ἐν Ῥωμαιῶν τῇ πόλει γενέσθαι ξυνέβη ἐπεὶ μεμαθηκέναι σε ἀπαντα οἶμαι, σιωπᾷν ἔγνωκα (K: καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἐγνωκας L, τὸ πᾶν ἐγνωκας Ath). There is a connection between Ath and L again; they transmit a totally different reading from K. This is one of the most important cases, which show the relation between L and Ath. Although syntactically the readings of L and Ath are correct, there is a problem for the meaning, because it repeats the previous sentence. The error may be visual, or it may come from a common exemplar for L and Ath. Manuscripts copied later than the fourteenth century agree either with L or with K.

3.17.1.a.p) VII. 21.19 (p. 393, 7-10): ἐπέστελλε τε αὐτοῖς τὴν εἰρήνην οἱ παντὶ σθένει παρὰ βασιλέως πορίζοσθαι (κομίζοσθαι Ath), ὡς δὴ μὴ αὐτὸς
This may be a visual error, because κομίζεσθαι is more frequently used in Procopius (πορίζεσθαι is used only twenty-five times). In the context, κομίζεσθαι ("to bring") could make sense; but πορίζεσθαι is equally suitable and this is the reading also of all later manuscripts examined.

3.17.1.a.q) VII. 31.15 (p. 433, 7-8): ὁ δὲ μάλιστα ἄνθρωπον ὑψηλὸν (τύχην Αθ) ἀνιῶν πέφυκεν. The context has nothing to do with fortune, but it describes why Artabanes sent away his wife, justifying the fact with the phrase: "...A situation which is bound inevitably to harass a man's soul". In addition the "fortune" cannot be the object of the infinitive ἀνιῶν. Perhaps it is a visual copying error. Anyway none of the manuscripts copied later transmit τύχην.

3.17.1.a.r) VII. 33.12 (p. 444, 6-8): τῶν τε γειναμένων (Maltr. : γειναμένων Β, γεινομένων Λ, γεινωμένων Αθ) ἀφέλκουσές ἐς τὰ οἰκεία ξύν αὐτοῖς ἐκομίζοντο... "...dragging them from their parents...". Αθ and Λ have a link once again; they transmit the same verb γεινάν with a different spelling. Maltretus emends against all manuscripts to the past participle γεινόμαι, which is found in other cases, as well: VIII.3.15 (p. 499, 6-7): ἐκ τῶν γειναμένων ἀφέλκουσες εὐνοοῦχος τε ἀπεργαζόμενοι ἀπεδίδοντο, VIII.24.19 (p. 620, 1-2): εἰ τι τοῖς γειναμένοις ἠμαρτίθησαν ἐξυμβαίνει. None of the later manuscripts agree with Maltretus or with Αθ; they all agree either with Β or with Λ except for Κ, which transmits a different variant, γεινομένων.

3.17.1.a.s) VII. 35.14 (p. 455, 11-12): προνοήσας οὖν Οὐάκης ὅπως εἰς τὸν παῖδα τὸν αὐτοῦ ἡ ἄρχη ἄγουτο (ἀγή γένοιτο Αθ). I suggest that the mistake is visual or it comes from internal dictation. The confusion does not exist in later manuscripts.

3.17.1.a.t) VII. 40.9 (p. 477, 24-25): ...οὐδὲ στασίωτας τοῖς ἐν Βυζαντίῳ τῆς βουλήσεως ἢ τῆς ὁμιλίας μεταλαχῶν (μεταλογῶν Αθ) πῶτοτε... The variant of Αθ does not mean anything. Perhaps it is a visual copying error, which does not exist in any of the later manuscripts.
3.17.1.a.u) VIII. 8.11 (p. 520, 11-13): ...πολλάκις αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐς χείρας (γείρας Ath) ἐλθοῦσι καὶ ὑπερβαλλομένοις τῇ μάχῃ. This is certainly a visual error.

3.17.1.a.v) VIII. 8.31 (p. 523, 19): ἐς φάλαγγα τε ὡς βαθυτάτην (βαρυτάτην Ath) ταξάμενοι... Visual error; a φάλαγγα cannot be characterised as βαθυτάτη.

3.17.1.a.w) VIII. 9.18 (p. 528, 12-14): τῆς τε ἀτραποῦ ταύτης ὑπέρκειται φάραγξ ἐςάγαν σκληρά (σκληρή Ath) ἐκ τοῦ φρουρίου διήκουσα μέχρι ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν. At the time of the scribe, the feminine adjective does not exist in -a. So he is gives it the usual ending of feminine adjectives.

3.17.1.a.x) VIII. 12.34 (p. 552, 11-12): ...εὕρηξα τε καὶ ἀρετῇ τοιᾶδε τῷ στρατηγῷ τῷ (τῷ δέον Ath) ξυνήχθη. Perhaps it is a visual error of Ath.

3.17.1.a.y) VIII. 13.5 (p. 553, 13-15): ὅστε εἰκότως ἁν τις Περσῶν τὴν ἐς τοὺς πολέμους (πολέμίους Ath) ταλαιπωρίαν τε καὶ ἐπιτέχνησιν ἀγαθεῖν... Inadvertent error, which gives a possible sense.

3.17.1.a.z) VIII. 13.19 (p. 555, 24): ...ὡσπερ μοι ταῦτα (ἐνταῦθα Ath) ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν λόγοις πάντα ἔρρηθη... The ἐνταῦθα showing place is not suitable; the sentence needs the definite pronoun as subject. Later manuscripts transmit the correct reading.

3.17.2. Prepositions

3.17.2.a) V.17.1 (p. 86,19-21): ... καὶ τὰ ἐν Τούσκοις ἐκλιπεῖν ὁχυρώματα ἔδωκε οἱ ἀξυμφόρουν εἶναι, ὅπως δὴ μὴ ταῦτα ἐπ' Ῥωμαίοις θότθοι ἐπιτείχισμα (τείχισμα Ath) ἔχομεν. Τείχισμα of Ath would be correct if Procopius meant to refer to a simple wall; however, here he refers to a bulwark. The noun τείχισμα, which means wall or fort generally, either built against an enemy or for general
protection, is used by Thucydides at 4.8.115 as well as Procopius elsewhere. The ἐπετείχοματα has a special meaning; it is a fort or a stronghold on the enemy's frontier.

3.17.2. b) V. 17.2 (p. 86, 21-25): λογισάμενος οὖν Κωνσταντίνῳ τε καὶ Βέσσα ἐπέστειλε (ἀπέστειλε Αθ) φρουράν μὲν τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις τῶν ἐκεῖνη ἀπολλείπειν χώρην, διὰ δὴ φυλάσσειν αὐτὰ ἱκανή εἶν, αὐτοῖς δὲ τῷ ἄλλῳ στρατῷ ἐστὶ Ρώμην κατὰ τάχος ἴναι. In this case the correct verb is ἐπέστειλε which most manuscripts transmit, because its meaning in the context is "sent a message to ..." and it goes with accusative plus infinitive. The scribe of Ath is confused, because the word that follows is the φρουράν, which is often the object of ἀποστέλλω. But here φρουράν is the subject of the infinitive that follows (ἀπολλείπειν). None of the manuscripts copied later agree with him.

3.17.2. c) V. 18.19 (p. 92, 14-16): οὔτω τε διαφυγόντες ἐστὶν Ἡρώμης περίβολον ἥλθον, διώκοντες τε οἱ βάρβαροι ἄχρι ἐστὶ τὸ τεῖχος ἐνέκειμον (ἐκείμον Αθ) ἀμφὶ τῇ πύλῃ Ἡ Σαλαρία ὄνομασται. The different reading of Ath was not the scribe's conjecture or error. The text of 18.19-26 (p. 92, 14-93, 14) is repeated in Ath by mistake, because of homoiooteleuton. The repeated text is later crossed out. Interestingly, the doubtful reading ἐκείμον is also transmitted in the repetition; this proves that the scribe copied twice the word which his exemplar contained. This is very important, because it shows that the same may have happened in other cases; namely the scribe of Ath does not always err or emend, but he copies the wrong reading his prototype. It is rather unlikely that the scribe of Ath made the same change twice in the same word.

The reading of most manuscripts must be the correct one. The compound ἐγκεκείμαι means "to press hard, to push" and is used for troops several times in Thucydides; it has a more emphatic meaning than the simple κεκείμαι, which means simply "lie, stay or be". The compound is more suitable here, because the author wants to show that the barbarians are very near to the Romans' wall and his intention is to show the real danger.


154 See ibid, I. 16. 6 (p. 81, 4): ἐπετείχοματα Πέροιας πεποίησε; VII. 10. 23 (p. 340, 11-12): ἐπιτείχομα τὸ λοιπὸν τοῖς ἑνταῦθα ἐσπλείνυ τουλομένους ἐγίνετο.
for the Romans. The verb of Ath has a totally different meaning but makes sense in the context, it says that the barbarians just went to the wall, without giving the emphatic meaning that the barbarians were staying near the wall and they were waiting for Romans. But the reading of Ath and its exemplar is not the correct reading.

Disagreement between manuscripts for the same verb appears in VII. 3.13 (p. 310, 22-23): καὶ ἐπεῖ οὗ φύλαξ ἦπερ θύβεκεῖτο (L : έκείτο K, έξέκείτο Ath) ἀνεπέτασε σφίσα τὰς πύλας... The meaning of the phrase is "true to his agreement" and is used frequently by Procopius (e.g. II.20.4 (p. 239, 4), VIII.24.10 (p. 618, 11). Certainly the other two variants of the verb are more frequently used, but they are not suitable here, as they change the meaning of the phrase. All later manuscripts agree either with K or with L.

3.17.2. d) V. 18.28 (p. 93, 20-22): Βελισάριος δὲ ἦκιστα ἐκπεσών (ἐκπεσῶν:sscr. εμι- Ath) ἐς τὴν δίωξιν αὐτίκα ἐς τὸ τείχος ἀνέστρεφεν. In this case Ath and all other manuscripts transmit the same reading, but in Ath the letter μ is written above the κ, suggesting a change of the verb to ἐμπεσῶν. The two compounds have no great difference in meaning; ἐμπίπτω in that context would mean "attack" and ἐκπίπτω "attack" again, but here the metaphorical meaning "rushed to change policy and attack" is necessary and therefore ἐκπεσῶν is preferable, as "Belisarius did not rush to change his mind and pursue them, but he returned to the wall." The scribe of Ath may have added the superscript μ, possibly because it existed in his exemplar due to the palaeographical similarity if the letter was κ or μ. None of the later manuscripts transmits ἐμπεσῶν.

3.17.2. e) V. 25.9 (p. 124, 15-18): τολεμίων ἐπεισπεσόντων ὑπεχώρουν δρόμῳ, ἄνδρες φύσει τε ποδάκεις καὶ κούφως ἐσκευασμένοι καὶ τῇ φυγῇ προλαμβάνοντες (προσλαμβανόντες Ath). Προλαμβάνω here means "to take precautions beforehand in order to be safe". Προσλαμβάνω is unsuitable here as it means "take something additional, or arrest someone". None of the later manuscripts transmit the preposition of Ath.

3.17.2.f) V. 28.2 (p. 134, 21-25): Βελισάριος δὲ, πάμπολυ ἐτι εἶναι τὸ διαφέρον ἐν ἀμφοτέροις οἴκμενοι, ὀκνεῖ τε ἄει τῷ παυτί διακλινδυνεύειν (κινδυνεύειν
**Vocabulary / Prepositions**

**Ath**) στρατεύματι καὶ τὰς ἐπεκδρομὰς ἐσπούδαζε τε ἐτὶ μᾶλλον καὶ ἐπενθεὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους. Procopius uses διακινδυνεύειν more frequently than the simple verb (thirteen times and nine times respectively in Wars) Later manuscripts transmit the compound verb.

3.17.2.g) VI. 2.13 (p. 156, 7-8): καὶ ἡ κραυγὴ τῆς πόλιν καὶ τὰ στρατόπεδα περιλαβοῦσα τοὺς μαχομένους ἐκπλησσε Αθ, ἐκπλησσε Κ, ἐπλησσε Λ. **Ath** transmits the simple verb, but here the writer wants to express the terror of the soldiers; this is given by the compound ἐκπλησσω. The fact that **Ath** and **L** had the same exemplar is obvious here. None of the later manuscripts agrees with **Ath**.

3.17.2.h) VI. 3.20 (p. 162, 13-16): πάντα γὰρ τοὺς ἐντυγχάνουσιν ὁ λιμὸς τὰ κακὰ φορητέα δείκνυσιν, ἔνθα τε ἄν φαίνηται, μετὰ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων ἐπέρχεται (ἀπέρχεται **Ath**) ὁ λίθος καὶ θανάτους ἀπαντάς... This is a thoughtless mistake in **Ath**.

3.17.2.i) VI. 6.35 (p. 179, 11-14): τοσαῦτα εἰπόντες διελύθησαν τε ἐκ τῶν λόγων ἐκάτεροι καὶ οἱ πρέσβεις τῶν Γότθων ἔς τὸ σφέτερον στρατόπεδον ἀπεχώρησαν (ἀνεχώρησαν ssr. -π-. **Ath**) **Ath** changes the preposition of the verb, but there is the correct -π- superscribed. Both verbs mean the same, but we accept what most manuscripts transmit, which is also the reading of all later manuscripts examined. The same error appears in 27.20 (p. 273, 2-4): ἀπρακτοὶ γοῦν οἱ Ἰσαυροὶ... ἐκ τῆς δεξαμενῆς ἀπαλλαγέντες ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον ἀπεχώρησαν (ἀνεχώρησαν **Ath**).

3.17.2.j) VI. 9.5 (p. 189, 20-24): ... ἐνθα δὴ ἄναδος τις ἢν ἐκ παλαιοῦ ἐς αὐτὸ ποι τὸ Παλάτιον φέρουσα, οἰκοδομίᾳ τιλ ἐνταῦθα ἐνέτυχον (ἐνέτυχον **Ath**) οὔτε πρόσω λέναι ... The verb ἐντυγχάνω which takes the dative has the meaning of "come upon". It is clear that in the time of the scribe the dative is not used frequently, even when it is necessary for the syntax of verbs, and maybe this is the reason for **Ath** having avoided it.

3.17.2.k) VI. 13.3 (p. 206, 5-6): ... οὔχ ὑποστάντες τῶν κίνδυνον πρέσβεις τι παρὰ (πρὸ **Ath**) Βελισάριου ἐπεμήναν ... The preposition πρὸ is wrong here, firstly
concerning the meaning (πέμπω τινά παρά τινά = send someone to someone) and secondly concerning the syntax the preposition πρό takes a genitive.

3.17.2.1) VI. 14.3 (p. 209, 5-7): οἱ δὲ ξύλα πολλὰ ἐς μέγα τι ὕψος ξυπνήσαντες καθίσταντές τε τὸν ἀνδρωποῦν ἐν τῇ τῶν ξύλων ὑπερβολὴ (περιβολή Αθ) ... The two variants have totally different meaning, although they have the same second element: περιβολή means “cloth” or “the fenced area” and ὑπερβολὴ means “the top point”. Here the first makes no sense; the second is correct as there are some words before indicating height (ἐς μέγα τι ὕψος, ξυπνήσαντες). This different reading of Αθ may be a visual copying error, because the two words look similar having three letters in common (but in different order), but they have no relation in meaning. It is possible that the wrong word existed in his exemplar and it arose from dictation.

3.17.2.m) VI. 16.12 (p. 222, 3-5): ἦν τοῖνυν ἐν τῷ παρόντι εὐημερήσωσι (διημερήσωσι Αθ), τὸ τε φρόνημα οὐκ ἐς μακρὰν ἀπολείψουνται... The verb meaning "doing something for the whole day" is διημερεύω and in this case would be διημερεύσωσι, which in this context is wrong. The word that Αθ uses occurs only once in the first book of the Wars. The manuscripts copied later transmit εὐημερήσωσι.

3.17.2.n) VI. 18.27 (p. 232, 4-6): ...γράμματα βασιλέως Ἰουστινιανοῦ ἐδείξει, ἀ πρὸς τῶν στρατοπέδων ἀρχοντας ἔγραψε (διέγραψε Αθ). ἑδήλου γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ τάδε. The reading of Αθ is wrong; διαγράφω means "to draw or describe". In addition, the letter is introduced by the phrase ἑδήλου δὲ ἡ γραφὴ τάδε and it finishes τὰ μὲν οὖν βασιλέως γράμματα ὁδε πη ἐλε; it never refers to διαγράμματα. Manuscripts of more recent centuries transmit the simple verb.

3.17.2.o) VI. 23.36 (p. 256, 24 -257, 1): ἐν οἷς ἕνα χρυσοφοροῦντα τῶν τίς Μαυρούσιων ἱδὼν λαβομένος τε τῶν ἐν κεφαλή τριχῶν, ὡς ἀποδοῦν, <τῶν> νεκρὸν ἐφείλκε (ἐίλκε, ἐφείλκε in marg. Αθ). It seems that there is no difference between the simple and the compound verb; two lines below almost the same phrase follows with the simple verb: ἀλλ’ οἴδεν τι ἧσον ὁ Μαυρούσιος τῶν τριχῶν ἐχόμενος τὸν νεκρὸν εἴλκεν. Perhaps the scribe was influenced by the following
These verbs are used with the same frequency in Procopius. Therefore, we should accept the reading of most manuscripts and of the manuscripts copied in later centuries. The addition of Ath in margin, in the same hand with the main text, agrees with the reading of all other manuscripts.

3.17.2.p) VI. 28.24 (p. 280, 1): ... Ἰδιγέρα πέμψασ (K: ἐπιπέμψασ L, ἀποπέμψασ Ath) τὸν Πάδον ἑφύλασεν ἑκατέρωθεν... The simple verb is correct, because this is used in similar contexts (e.g. 1.10.16 (p. 22-23): πέμψασ παρὰ Ἦρωμιόν ἡταῖο τὸν αὐτοῦ οἰκοδομήσασθαι). The meaning of the word Ath transmits is not the same with the simple πέμπειν; it means "send back" and it appears twice in Procopius\(^{155}\) accompanied by the word ἀπράκτος. None of the later manuscripts agree with the preposition of Ath.

3.17.2.q) VI. 28.32 (p. 281, 11-13): οἱ πέρ ἐπείδὴ τὰ Σισίγδε πεπραγμένα ἐπύθησατο, ἀμφὶ τοῖς οἰκείοις δεδιότες, ἐνταῦθα πρῶτον ἤξιον ίέναι (συνιέναι Ath). The verb συνιέναι is not wrong, as regards the meaning: "...they became fearful for their families and demanded that they should first go to (ίέναι) or be with (συνιέναι) them". Against συνιέναι is the adverb ἐνταῦθα, which goes with a motion verb. So ίέναι is correct.

3.17.2.r) VI. 30.4 (p. 289, 15-17): ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ πολλὴν τῆς ἐφόδου (ἐφόδου Ath) τὴν παρασκευὴν ἐπύθησαν εἶμαι, ξυμφορήσασσες, εἰ τι αὐτῶν καθάρν ἐνταῦθα ἔτι ἐλέειπτο... Here ἐφόδος "attack" does not make sense. Here the meaning of departure is suitable. It is worthwhile noting that ἐφόδος is used about sixty times in Wars, while ἀφόδος only nine, so Ath uses the more familiar word.

3.17.2.s) VII. 11.27 (p. 344, 16-17): ...ἀυτοὶ μὲν καὶ οἱ χίλιοι παρασκευάζοντο εἰς τὴν ἀφόδου, ὡς νῦκτος τῆς ἀποπορείας (Ἀπο πορίας K, πορείας Ath) ἀρξόμενοι... The meaning that is necessary here is not the simple march as Ath transmits (although it is much more frequently used), but the meaning "departure", which is used only nine times in Procopius. K transmits the c.irrect reading (with a

\(^{155}\) VII.16.28 (p. 368, 10) and VII.34.40 (p. 451, 21-22).
spelling mistakes, but with the wrong word division reading. Manuscripts, which was copied from the fifteenth century onwards, transmit the reading either of L or of K.

3.17.2.t) VII. 16.16 (p. 365, 10-14): ... ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους ὑμᾶς ἐνθένδε εἰσκομιζομένους ἀνὰ πάν ἔτος τὴν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων φοράν (K : εἰσφοράν L, διαφοράν Ath) διαρκῶς ἔχειν. The reading of Ath, meaning "disagreement", is wrong. The reading of L, meaning "donation", may be suitable in this context. All later manuscripts examined agree either with L or with K, except for k which transmits εἰς φοράν which may have come from dictation.

3.17.2.u) VII. 18.1 (p. 373, 20-21): ...ἀλλὰ πλέουσι μὲν αὐτοῖς ἐς τὰ ἀμφὶ (ἐπὶ Ath) Ῥώμην χωρία μᾶλλον ξυνοίσειν. The meaning is "sailing to the areas around Rome" and not "to the areas in Rome"; so the correct preposition is ἀμφὶ, which is less frequent than ἐπὶ, which may be why it is changed by Ath.

3.17.2.v) VII. 18.5 (p. 374, 11-12): πνεῦματος δὲ σκληροῦ σφίσιν ἐπιπεσόντος Δρυνοῦτι προσέσχον (ἐπέσχον Ath). The correct meaning in the context is given by the verb προσέσχω, which means "to put in at, to arrive in the port of a place with a ship"; this verb is used elsewhere in Procopius and, unlike ἐπέσχω, it always goes with dative: IV.14.18 (p. 485, 6): Πελοποννήσῳ προσέσχε; VI.12.29 (p. 203, 23): Γενοῦσα προσέσχον.

3.17.2.w) VII. 18.16 (p. 376, 8-9): οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι ἄνωπλοί (ἀσπλοι Ath) τε καὶ ἀπαράσκευοι παντάπασιν δῦτες... The variants have the same meaning, "unarmed". The word of most manuscripts is used six times by Procopius. The ἄσπλοι of Ath only once (VIII. 28.6 (p. 640, 26 - 641,1: ἄνδρι μὲν ἄσπλῳ). So both variants are correct, but ἄνωπλοι is more frequent in Procopius.156 According to LSJ-Greek ἄσπλος is used in later centuries and is not very formal, s.v. ἄσπλος.

156 However, ἄσπλος is used by Thucydides, Plato and Xenophon with the same meaning, LSJ, s.v. ἄσπλος.
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3.17.2.x) VII. 19.6 (p. 379, 23): ...ἡν τῶν πολεμίων τινες ἐπὶ (ἐς Ath) τῶν Πόρτων ἵψι... Usually motion verbs take the preposition ἐς, but sometimes they take ἐπὶ when used in a threatening sense.

3.17.2.y) VII. 28.17 (p. 422, 17-18): δοσι μέντοι φυγεῖν (διαφυγεῖν Ath) ἵσχυσαν, ὡς πὴ ἑκάστῳ δυνατὰ γέγονε, διεσώθησαν. Both the single and the compound verb are used by Procopius in similar cases with the verb ἵσχυεν with the same frequency (10 times each). See I.15.6 (p. 75, 1-2): ὅ δ' ἐς ἄλλος φυγεῖν τε ἵσχυε; IV.17.24 (p. 504, 9-10): Ο μὲν οὖν Στότζας ἐν τῷ δορύῳ τούτῳ ξίν ὀλίγοις τίσι διαφυγεῖν ἵσχυσε. V.29.43 (p. 145, 17-18): ποδώκης δὲ ὃν φύσει διαφυγεῖν ἵσχυσε... So the reading of Ath is acceptable. However, none of the later manuscripts agree with Ath; they all transmit the simple infinitive.

3.17.2.z) VII. 30.12 (p. 428, 13-14): οὔστος ἐπει οἱ βάρβαροι εἶδον, ἐπὶ (καὶ Ath) τοὺς ἵππους ἀναθορῶντες ἀμφὶ τὴν ἥμιν ἐγένοντο... It is syntactically incorrect to connect the temporal clause ἐπει ... εἶδον and the main clause ἐγένοντο with καὶ. In addition the preposition ἐπὶ is necessary for the noun ἵππους, see II.8.17 (p. 186, 27): εὔθυς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους ἀναθορῶντες. There is a possibility that the error arose from an abbreviation.

3.17.2.a.a) VII. 32.40 (p. 439, 23-24): ...ταῦτα Μάρκελλος πρὸς (παρὰ Ath) Λεοντίου μαθῶν οὔδ' ὡς ἐς βασιλέα τῶν λόγων ἀνενεγκεῖν ἐγών... In this case the preposition used by Ath is wrong. The point is that πρὸς plus genitive is classical where it refers to persons, while παρὰ plus genitive is standard koine. I believe that Procopius' original usage was the classical πρὸς. There is one parallel in V.17.8 (p. 87, 19-20): ἀλλὰ καὶ Ναρνίαν ἔχεσθαι πρὸς τῶν [Ῥώμης] πολεμιῶν μαθῶν οὐδὲν ἐνταῦθα κἰνεῖν ἦθελε. The same preposition is used in 33.14 (p. 444, 16-18): ...τὰς συντάξεις ἀπάσας πρὸς (παρὰ Ath) βασιλέως κεκομισμένοι πῶν ωθεῖ οὐδενὶ ἀπαλλάσσονται, where there is a motion verb κεκομισμένοι, which needs the prepositional phrase with πρὸς. In both cases later manuscripts do not agree with Ath.
3.17.2. a.b) VII. 35.22 (p. 456, 19-21): οὐ μέντοι Γότθοις ξυνέμιζεν, ἀλλ’ Ἰστρον ποταμῶν διαβὰς (ἀναβὰς Ath) αὐθὶς ἐς Σκλαβηνοὺς ἀπεχώρησεν. The preposition ἄνα is wrong for the meaning "cross the river".

3.17.2. a.c) VIII. 2.9 (p. 491, 21-22): ...ἀλλὰ πορρωτάτω μὲν ἀναγόμενοι (ἀγόμενοι Ath) τοῦ ἐκείνης πελάγους... The preposition omitted by Ath is necessary here, because the compound (= "to set out to sea") is required by the context. All of the later manuscripts examined transmit the compound.

3.17.2. a.d) VIII. 4.7 (p. 501, 20-21): ...καὶ ποταμῶν Τάναϊν, ὃς δὴ ἐς τὴν Λίμνην ἐσβάλλει (ἐκβάλλει Ath). The same in 5.30 (p. 508, 17): ...ἐισβάλλει ἐς τὸν Εὔξεινον Πότνον... The meaning of "the river empties into..." should be given by the verb ἐισβάλλειν. The verb ἐκβάλλειν can be used of a river, but with the active meaning that "the river branches off...". All later manuscripts examined transmit the preposition ἐς.

3.17.3. Particles
3.17.3.a) V. 29.32 (p. 143, 32-144, 2): νῦν δὲ (μὲν Ath) καταλαβόντες τὸ τῶν πολεμίων χαράκωμα ἐς ἀρπαγήν τῶν χρημάτων ἐτράποντο, καὶ πολλὰ μὲν ἐνθενδὲ ἀργυρώματα, πολλὰ δὲ ἄλλα χρήματα ἔφερον. The interchange of particles μὲν and δὲ is not frequent in Ath. The correct particle here is δὲ. The same alteration, which may be sustainable due to the following μὲν, in 14.30 (p. 213, 5-6): υἱκήσαντες δὲ (μὲν Ath) τῇ μάχῃ Ἦρωμαῖοι πλείστους μὲν ἐκτειναν...

3.17.3.b) VI. 6.19 (p. 177, 3-6): καὶ μὴν καὶ τὰ Ἦρωμαίων ιερὰ τιμῆς παρ’ ἦμῶν τῆς ἀνωτάτω τετύχκενεν. οὗ (καὶ Ath) γὰρ οὐδὲις εἰς τι τούτων καταφυγὼν πώποτε πρὸς οὐδενὸς ἀνθρώπων βεβλασταὶ... The fact that there are four negative words in the sentence may have confused the scribes. The sentence could start with the phrase καὶ γὰρ, but the information given should be given with a special force; therefore the negatives οὗ and οὐδεις are necessary.
3.17.3.3) VI. 16.9 (p. 221, 14-15): εἰ μὲν οὖν (γὰρ Ath, om L) Ἰωάννης ἐς τὰς σὰς ἑυτολὰς ἐβρισεν, ἀριστε Βελισάριε, πολλὴν γε τὴν δίκην ἐχεῖς παρ᾽ ἐκείνου λαβὼν... Usually small words like οὖν, γὰρ etc. are abbreviated. In this case οὖν is suitable, while γὰρ makes no sense. The same word is changed again in VII. 13.7 (p. 350, 18-19): δᾶσι οὖν (μὲν Ath) νῆς ἐκ Σικελίας ἀναγόμεναι ἐπελεύν ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀρμαῖων λιμένα... and 36.24 (p. 462, 4) οὖν is replaced by δὲ: πέμφας οὖν (δὲ Ath) παρ᾽ αὐτοῦς δυνὶ προύτεινετο αὐτοῖς αἰρέσιν...

3.17.3.4) VII. 19.8 (p. 380, 3-4): ὠρώμα γὰρ ἄλλο ταύτης δὴ (διὰ Ath) τῆς χώρας οὕτως ἐξεκυρν... It is strange that Ath towards the end of the seventh book makes so many errors at easy points of the text. Perhaps the words διὰ and δὴ have been abbreviated in the exemplar and Ath copied the abbreviated symbol wrongly.

3.17.3.e) All the following instances where Ath substitutes a particle for the one transmitted by the majority of manuscripts may be due to carelessness: VII. 13.21 (p. 352, 19-20): καὶ Ναρσῆν δὲ (γε Ath) τὸν εὐνοῦχον παρὰ τῶν Ἔρούκων τοὺς ἀρχοντας ἐπεμψεν...; VII. 20.4 (p. 384, 23-24): καλὼς τε (γάρ Ath) ἐκ τῶν ἐπάλξεων ἀναρτῆσαντες ἄχρι ἐς τὸ ἔδαφος; VII. 20.15 (p. 387, 1): καταλαβαίνοναι μὲν (καὶ Ath) ἐσ πύλας τὰς 'Ασιναρίας...; VII. 32.15 (p. 436, 6): ἀφικόμενος τε (τοῖνυν Ath) παρ᾽ αὐτὸν Ἀρσάκης ἐφασκεν...; VII. 34.20 (p. 448, 11): ἠσως που καὶ ἀναιδείας περιουσία ἐς (καὶ Ath) ξυμμαχίαν παρακαλέσουσιν...; VII. 37.11 (p. 464, 17-18): αὐτὸν τε (μὲν Ath) προῦκαλεῖτο καὶ τοὺς ἀμφ᾽ αὐτὸν στρατιώτας...; VII. 39.1 (p. 471, 3-4): Ὄστερον δὲ (μὲν Ath, μέντοι K) Γότθοι τῷ (τῷ μὲν Ath) Ἐγγύων προσέβαλον ὀχυρώματι...; VII. 39.4 (p. 471, 16): ἀνθίς δὲ (τῇ Ath) ἐν τῇ πόλει γενόμενος...

3.17.4. Ordinary / familiar words
3.17.4.a) V. 11.16 (p. 60, 22-25): καίτοι καὶ ὑμεῖς δῆ που ἑπίστασθαι ὡς τὸ τε Γότθων πλῆθος καὶ ξυμπασαν σχεδὸν τι τὴν τῶν ὀπλῶν σκευὴν (Ἰσχύν Ath, σκευὴν rell., παρασκευὴν b, r, Hoesch.) ἐν τε Γαλλίαις καὶ Βενετίαις καὶ χώραις ταῖς ἐκαστάτω ξυμβαίνει εἶναι. Haury accepts the reading of most manuscripts rejecting the emendations of previous editors. An argument in favour of σκευὴ, is that Thucydides in two cases uses the word σκευὴ in order to describe ὀπλα; In 1.8 he
speaks about the σκευὴν τῶν ὀπλῶν and in 3.94 about σκευὴν ψιλῆν, and in both cases he refers to the equipment of arms. In addition, Procopius uses eight times the word σκευὴ in the Wars and always with reference to the arms.\footnote{E.g. IV.17.21 (p.503, 21-22): μιᾷ τε γὰρ φωνῇ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ τῶν ὀπλῶν σκευῇ οἱ πάντες ἐξῆρωμο...; VIII.32.4 (p. 655, 12-13): ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ τάξῃ καὶ τῇ τῶν ὀπλῶν σκευῇ ἀκρατισμένους ἐκέλευεν.} The reading παρασκευὴ is neither suitable, because it means “preparation”; this word is much more frequently used by Procopius.\footnote{E.g. VII.30.3 (p. 426, 20-21): μεῖζον παρασκευὴ τῶν πόλεμον ἐξαρτάτος; VII.37.8 (p. 464, 9): αὐθίς τὰ ἐστὶ τῶν πόλεμον ἐν παρασκευῇ ἐποιεῖτο.} So, I believe that in Procopius' case the word ἵσχὺς would not be suitable; he may have found it in a marginal note, which was describing the purpose of the preparation. The later manuscripts examined transmit the word σκευὴν, except for b and r which transmit παρασκευὴν, supporting the emendation of Hoeschel.

3.17.4.b) VI. 9.2 (p. 189, 11-12): οἱ δὲ λύχνα (λύχνους Аth) τε καὶ δάδας ἐν χερσὶν ἔχουσι ἀπεπελρώντο τῆς ἐς την πόλιν ἐνθέντε εἰσόδου. The noun has two types in plural: the normal οἱ λύχνοι and the neuter тά λύχνα. Classical authors use both types, but the frequent one is the masculine plural. Procopius' contemporaries use both, but Procopius always uses the neuter form, so we should accept this. Аth goes for the lectio facilior.

3.17.4.c) VI. 12. 6 (p. 200, 22-23): ...αὐτὸς δὲ ξύν τοῖς Ἰσαύροις δικέλλας τε καὶ ἀλλα ἄττα (τὰ Аth) τοιαύτα ὀργανα φέρουσιν... Аth usually transmits this word as τὰ, which is not correct, because ἄττα has the meaning of τίνα (such things). It seems that the scribe fails to understand the meaning. The same error appears in VI. 14.9 (p. 209, 25) and a similar one in VII. 14.24 (p. 357, 25-26): σέβουσι μέντοι καὶ ποταμοὺς τε καὶ νόμφας καὶ ἀλλα ἄττα (K : ἄλλατα L, ἀλλὰ τὰ Аth) δαιμόνια... The scribes of Аth never recognise that this word means "such" and they transmit it as a simple article. Neither does L, who always transmits it as ἄλλατα. A link between L and Аth is again illustrated. К always transmits it correctly.

3.17.4.d) VI. 14.36 (p. 213, 23-25): καὶ μίξεις οὗχ ὅσιάς τελοῦσιν, ἀλλὰς τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν καὶ ὀνών (ζῶν Аth, c, k, n, b, δ), καὶ εἰς πολυράται ἀνθρώπων...
Either variant is possible. The term Ath uses is more frequently used. Manuscripts k, n, b, c and δ share the reading with Ath.

3.17.4.e) VII. 17.11 (p. 371, 16-17): ...τής ἀνάγκης αὐτοῖς ἡδίστην τε καὶ τρυφερωτάτην (τρυφερωτέραν, τρυφερετάτην in margin Ath) ποιούσης τὴν βρῶσιν. The superlative form of the adjective is necessary to co-ordinate with the previous superlative ἡδίστην. It is worthwhile pointing out that this would be the only appearance of the comparative of this adjective in Procopius. Ath transmits the correct form in the margin. The comparative is used by Ath while all other manuscripts transmit the correct superlative also in 34.8 (p. 446, 5-7): οὖσιν ἐὰν τὰ ξυνοίσοντα ὡς ἀσφαλέστατα (ἀσφαλέστερα Ath) ἔξεργάσασθε τῇ Ἡρωμαῖῳ ἀρχῇ.159

3.17.4.f) VII. 25.9 (p. 409, 2-4): ...ἐλογισάμην τῶν ἐργῶν τοὺς ἀμείνους δόξασιν εἶναι μᾶλλον ἐπεσθαῖ ἢ ἐκ τῶν λυμηναμένων (Christ: ἐκ τῶν δυναμένων Κ, τῶν ἐκ δυναμεῶν Ath, τῶν δεδηνημένων L, ἐκ τῶν λυμαινομένων Scal.) τοῖσ πράγμασι διοῦσι βλάβος. The meaning "by the things, which had harmed us" is necessary, and δύναμαι makes no sense. The fact that all manuscripts, except for L, transmit the same verb means that the error may have come from an old manuscript, as difficult texts like this were not understood in antiquity. Scaliger's suggestion is unsuitable, because the past tense of the participle is necessary. Manuscripts copied later than the fourteenth century do not agree either with the emendation of Christ or Scaliger or with the reading of Ath. They all transmit the readings of either Κ or L.

3.17.4.g) VII. 27.4 (p. 417, 10-12): Βῆρος οὗν πρῶτος Δρυσῆτι προσχών καὶ τὰς ναῦς ἐνταύθα ἄφεις (αὐτοῦ Ath) μένειν μὲν αὐτοῦ οὐδαμῇ ἡθελεν... The participle is absolutely necessary here to co-ordinate with the previous one. The scribe is confused by the following αὐτοῦ and by the fact that ἄφεις and αὐτοῦ start with the same sound [αφ]. He uses the more familiar word. Manuscripts copied later transmit the correct reading.

159 This variant of Ath may not have anything to do with the use of comparative in place of superlative, which appears sometimes in Agathias' History; I suggest that it is an inadvertent error by Ath.
3.17.4.h) VII. 32.4 (p. 434, 6-7): δυσφορούμενος δὲ ὀμως τοίς ἐξομπεπτωκώσιν Ἄρσάκης δολώσεις (K: δόλους L, δηλώσεις Ath) ἐπὶ τε Ἰουστινιανῷ καὶ τῇ πολιτείᾳ ἐπινοεῖν ἡξατό. The correct reading of K is not used as frequently as δηλώσεις of Ath. It was easy for the scribe to confuse and change one letter. As for the reading of L, the word δόλος gives the right meaning, but is never used in the plural by Procopius. Later manuscripts agree either with L or with K.

3.17.4.i) VII. 32.8 (p. 434,26 - 435,2): ἑγὼ δὲ σε οἰκτείρω τῆς ἐπὶ ἀμφοῖν ταῖν (L: om. K, τε Ath) γυναικῶν, ὦ βέλτιστε, τύχης, ἢς τε οὐ δέον ἐστέρησαι καὶ ἢ ἐξουσικείν ἡμαγκάσθης. The dual is not in use in Koine; so the unfamiliar word for the scribe is changed to a more familiar. Here the article is necessary, because it emphasises that "he had suffered in the case of both the women". The particle makes no sense.

3.17.4.j) VII. 32.9 (p. 435,6-8): ...όμοι τοῖς τῶν ἱερέων ἐσχατογερουσίων (Hoesch. in marg. : ἐσχατον γέρουσιν K, γέρουσιν ἐσχατον Ath, γέρουσιν ἁσχετον L) ἀνακυκλείν τὰ Χριστιανῶν λόγια σπουδὴν ἔχων. The verb ἐσχατογερεῖν is very rare, so it is not understood by the scribes; it appears in three other cases in Procopius (VII.39.7 (p. 472, 4), VIII.11.48 (p. 543, 19), Sec Hist 9.50 (p. 64, 24). The error must begin from the archetype, as all manuscripts transmit the wrong reading. Ath and L have a link; L changes the second word for a more familiar that has no relation to the context.

3.17.4.k) VII. 34.7 (p. 446, 1-3): ...οἱ λίαν αὐτοῖς εὐπετεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐξαπατᾶσθαι οἴομενοι τῆς τῶν ἡδικημένων ἀπολαύσατον εὐθείας (boθείας Ath) παρ' αὐτοῖς ἥκοιεν. Perhaps this is a visual copying error. The meaning of "help" has nothing to do with the context, but Ath prefers this, because it is more familiar. The word εὐθεία is used only six times in Procopius and in known literature of the thirteenth-fourteenth century twelve times. Later manuscripts agree with L and K.

3.17.4.l) VII. 35.13 (p. 455, 9-10): ...ἡν τίς οἱ ἀνεψιός Ῥεγιστήλφος ὄνομα, δὲν δὴ ὁ νόμος, ἐπειδάν (L: ἐπιβῆναι ἂν V, ἐπιβάς ἂν Ath) Οὐάκης τελευτῆσεν, ἐπὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἐκάλει. The variants of V and Ath make no sense in the context. They
transmit similar wrong readings. Anyway manuscripts copied later agree either with V or with L and none with the reading of Ath.

3.17.5. Interpolation / Glosses

3.17.5.a) V. 1.28 (p. 8,17-21): καὶ ἀδικημα σχεδὸν τι οὐδὲν οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐς τοὺς ἄρχομένους εἰργάζετο (ἐπράττε Ath) οὔτε τῷ ἄλλῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐγκεχειρικότι ἐπέτρεπε, πλὴν γε δὴ ὅτι τῶν χωρίων τὴν μοῖραν ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς Γόθοι ἐνείμαντο... In ancient Greek literature, ἐργάζομαι is used with double accusative with the meaning "I do something bad to someone" by classical authors; this is the meaning of Procopius' sentence. Πράττω is used with exactly the same meaning, but more generally as πράττε τινὰ τι. It is almost certain in this case that ἐπράττε is the wrong reading. This verb may have been a marginal gloss to εἰργάζετο, which intruded in the text at an earlier stage. Only ε of the later manuscripts transmits a different version, but of the same verb; it has the past tense εἰργάζατο.

3.17.5.b) VI. 7.3 (p. 180, 5-9): ...τά τε φορτία (φρούρεια Ath) πέμπειν ἐκέλευε καὶ ξίνῳ προθυμία ἐς Ἄρμῃν λέναι. Both here and in 7.8 (p. 181, 1): φορτίων rell.] φρούριων Ath), the scribe substitutes the wrong noun, a strange error. The word φρούριον, however, is attributed elsewhere in Procopius, but there is not a similar variant. Perhaps there was a marginal note indicating the position where φορτία were moved, and at some point it intruded into the text. None of the later manuscripts agree with Ath.

3.17.5.c) VI. 7.37 (p. 185, 17-19): αὐτὴ δὲ ἡ πόλις φίλισται μὲν ἐν Διογόρους, μέση (μέσου sscr. -η Ath) ποσοῦ μάλιστα Ῥαβέννης τε πόλεως καὶ Ἀλπεων τῶν ἐν Γάλλων ὀρίοις κειμένη. The reading transmitted by Ath is the adverb μέσον, which shows position (place). All other manuscripts, including the ones copied later, have the adjective which refers to πόλις and goes with the last word of the sentence.

---

---

160 In this section the original words or phrases are totally omitted and replaced by marginal or interliner notes which possibly have intruded in the text, cf. fn. 134 above.
162 More rarely it is used in the meaning "I do something good to someone", Her. VIII 79, 3: ἀγαθὰ τὴν πατρίδα ἐργάσεται.
κειμένη in order to show the position. So both readings are correct, but we should accept μέση as it is transmitted by most manuscripts. Perhaps the variant μέσον of Ath was a marginal gloss.

3.17.5.d) VI. 25.11 (p. 262, 26-263-2): κατιδόντες δὲ Γότθοι τὰ πολυμένα ἐς τὲ ἀμαχὼν (ἀμήχανον Ath) τὶ δὲος κατέστησαν καὶ φυγῇ ἐξόμενοι ἑντὸς περιβόλου ἐγένοντο. The adjective ἀμαχὼν going with δέος is found several times in Procopius (VI.1.8 (p. 420, 17), VI.12.4 (p. 471, 4) and also ἀμήχανον (III.12.22 (p. 368, 22), VI.24.12 (p. 259, 8). The meaning is the same, "helpless". In this case we should accept most manuscripts' reading. Perhaps it was a marginal gloss in a previous manuscript. The reading of Ath is unique also regarding the later manuscripts.

3.17.5.e) VII. 4.13 (p. 315, 3-4): ... προϊόντος, ὡς τὸ εἰκός, τοὺ πολέμου πάμπαν κρατήσειν τῶν ἐναυτίων (πολεμίων Ath) ἐλπίδα ἔχω. These two variants are both very frequently used in Procopius. The reading of Ath is not wrong as it has the same meaning as πολεμίων, but it is not transmitted by any other manuscript.

3.17.5.f) VII. 7.6 (p. 325, 25-27): ἐπιβαίνοντες οὖν κατ’ ἐξουσίαν οἱ βάρβαροι τοῖς σκάφεσι τῶν ἐναυτίων, ἐκτεινόν τε καὶ κατέδυνν οὐδενὸς σφίσιν ἀντιστατοῦντος (sscr. ἀντικαθισταμένου Ath). The superscription is a synonym (gloss).

3.17.5.g) VII. 9.16 (p. 335, 5-7): οὐ γάρ ἡμετέρας ἀρετής ἔργου εἶναι φημὶ τὴν τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐπικράτησον, ἀλλὰ τίσιν τινὰ (Compar. : τισι τινὰ K, τὰς ποινὰς L, τοῖς εἰς ποινὰς Ath) ἱσχυρίζομαι τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς ἀδικίας αὐτοὺς μετελθεῖν. The editor suggests that the meaning of "a kind of vengeance" is correct here. The reading of L and Ath with ποινὰς must have come from a gloss (τίσεις = ποινὰς) that at some point replaced the original in the text. The reading of Ath seems to be phonetic (['tisinti'na], [tisispi'nas]) and very likely caused by dictation, either at an earlier stage in the transmission process, or by the scribe of Ath through internal dictation. It is not transmitted by manuscripts copied later.
3.17.5.h) VII. 14.13 (p. 355, 14-16): τῷ κεκτημένῳ ἐς ὅψιν ἤκων (ἐλθὼν ssu. ἢ ἤκων Αθ) τῆς τε φιλανθρωπίας ἐπήνεσε καὶ πολλὰ μὲν οἱ διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἵσχυσατο τάγαθα ἐσεθαί... Both the original reading and the superscript are grammatically correct. But ἤκων is more plausible as it is used by all other manuscripts and because it is used much more frequently in Wars, eighty-five times rather than the ἐλθὼν which is used only thirty-five. Anyway later manuscripts transmit the reading of Λ and Κ.

3.17.5.i) VII. 15.4 (p. 360, 26-27): ...ός δὲ οὐδεὶς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως (γημίας crossed out Αθ) ἐπεξήει, κατὰ τάχος ἐς τὸν λιμένα παντάπασιν ἀπαθεῖς ἀνεχώρησαν. It is strange that the word γημίας is crossed out and the correct word is not given in the text of Αθ. The most plausible explanation for it is that someone else who was reading the text realised that this word was not suitable, crossed it out, but failed to insert the correct word. The scribe himself cannot have made the deletion, because in this case the correct word should have been put. The word γημία (= “loss”) perhaps intruded from a marginal note, explaining ἀπαθεῖς (= <ἀνευ> γημίας = "they quickly retired to the harbour without suffering any loss"). The word γημίας does not appear in any of the later manuscripts.

3.17.5.j) VII. 25.1 (p. 407, 16-18): ...οἷς ἀμφὶ τὸν τῆς πόλεως περίβολον ἐνστρατοπεδευσάμενοι ἐπολιόρκουν ἐς τὸ ἀκριβῆς (ἀκριβῶς Αθ) τῶν ταυτή Ρωμαίους. The phrase and the adverb are used for the same purpose by Procopius; but the phrase is used much more frequently (fifty-two times) than the adverb (eleven times). I believe that the correct form is what most manuscripts transmit, including all manuscripts examined and copied later.

3.17.5.k) VII. 39.22 (p. 474, 16-18): ...ἀγγελον πέμψατες Γερμανῶ σημαίνειν ἐκέλευν ὦς, ἐπειδὺν τάχιστα ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ γενόμενον αὐτῶν (Κ : ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ γενόμενον γερμανῶ Λ, γερμανῶ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ γενόμενον Αθ) ἱδοῖεν, ἐνστρατοπεδευσάμενη τε τῆν αὐτοῦ στρατιάν... The reading of Λ keeps the same order as the correct one, but replaces the pronoun by the noun it refers to, to make the text clearer. Perhaps it was noted in the margin. Αθ transmits the same words with Λ,
but changes the order. This means that they may have had the same exemplar, and Ath corrects the order of words. The readings of Ath and L are not wrong, but I believe that the original text must have had the pronoun.

3.17.5.1) VIII. 6.2 (p. 509, 14-16): ...τεκμηριούμενοι δε ως μεν θάλασσα προϊόσα εκ των ἐσπερίων ἐπὶ τὴν ἐσταυροῦσθαι (K: στέλλεσθαι L, στέλλεται Ath) μοῖραν... There is a link between Ath and L; they use the same verb, which does not fit the meaning (“it is sent”). However Ath uses the correct form, while the infinitive of L is not suitable as a finite verb is required. All later manuscripts agree either with L or with K.

3.17.5.m) VIII. 6.20 (p. 514, 2-4): ταῦτα ὁ Σταγειρίτης ἐννοῶν τε καὶ ἀνακυκλῶν ἐπὶ χρόνου μήκος, δυσθαλαμῶν ἐπὶ ἐμφυνοῦσα ἀφίκετο (K: ἦτι L, ἦν Ath) ἐς τὸ μέτρου τοῦ βίου. The first is a phonetic error in Ath. As for the second variant, I believe that the correct one is K's which the editor accepts, because the meaning is "...and so reached the term of his life". The reading of L may have been a marginal gloss to ἀφίκετο, because the two verbs have the same meaning.
3.18. Various other errors

3.18.a) V. 20.10 (p. 103, 4-6): εἰ δὲ γε ἰράσει (θάρσει Ath) ἐχόμενος ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ὁρμησαι, πάντως σοι καὶ μεταμέλει τῶν εἰκῆ πεπραγμένων. The form of the word that Ath uses is the alternative form of the word θάρσος. The cluster -ρας is used in a few nouns in Roman and Byzantine papyri, mainly in θάρσος and ἀρρην (θάρσος and ἄρρην); the -ρός is used mostly in verbs. Θάρσος and θράσος have almost the opposite meaning: θάρσος is synonymous with ἀνδρεία meaning generally "bravery", while θράσος is the "foolish bravery, foolhardiness". And this is the meaning that the author wants to give here; in the first part of the sentence there is εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀνδρεία... and in the second the opposite is necessary: εἰ δὲ γε θράσει... So the word that is θράσος, "rashness with leads to a foolish action". Some lines before (20.9 (p. 102, 23), the speaker gives the subject of the speech and the answer to which of the nouns is the correct reading: ὁπειξια προς ἂντα ἐξαίσιον τε καὶ ἀκόης κρείσσον (κρείττον Ath)... The scribe makes the opposite mistake. The above terms are transmitted correctly by later manuscripts.

3.18.b) V. 22.5 (p. 108, 23-24): Ὑπομαίων δὲ ὁ λεῖς ἀπας ἀνέκραγον ἐξαισιῶν τε καὶ ἀκοῆς κρείσσον (κρείττον Ath)... The scribe of Ath usually uses double τ instead of double σ in cases like this. Forms in ττ are clearly Attic and predominate in the Roman and Byzantine periods, while σσ is used in Koine. Thucydides used the σσ-types, in contradiction to the tendency in his period; I believe that Procopius both having as model Thucydides and following the language of his time used the -σσ-forms. But the scribe who copies later, possibly having good knowledge of Attic, copies wrongly, thinking that Procopius wrote in genuine Attic. Κρείσσον is also transmitted by all later manuscripts examined. The same happens in VI. 7.1 (p. 179, 18): ἐν ὶ δὲ ταῦτα ἐπράσσετο (ἐπράττετο Ath) τῆδε...
Various other errors

3.18.c) VI. 4.23 (p. 168, 17-19): ἐν δὲ τῷ (τῷ Ath) τοῦ Βεβίου ὑπερβολὴ σπήλαιον κατὰ μέσον μάλιστα βαθὺ φαίνεται... This is an inadvertent error by the scribe of Ath.

3.18.d) VI. 19.9 (p. 234, 6-8): ταύτη ὡς Ναρσής τῷ ὑποθήκῃ (τῆς ὑποθήκης Ath) ἀναπεισθεῖς νῦκτωρ τὴν προσεδρείαν διέλυσε... The genitive is not justified; perhaps it comes from internal dictation. It cannot be explained as misunderstanding of ligature or abbreviations, as both the article and the noun is changed to genitive.

3.18.d) VI. 25.3 (p. 261, 19-22): ...οἱ δὲ καὶ μόνοι δόρατα ἐφερον, οἱ λοιποὶ δὲ πεζοὶ ἀπαντες οὔτε τῶν (τῶν Ath) οὔτε δόρατα ἔχοντες, ἀλλὰ ξίφος τε καὶ ἀσπίδα φέρων ἔκαστος καὶ πέλεκυν ἑνα. The singular used by Ath is not suitable here as δόρατα connected with the same negative is in the plural. In the following sentence, the nouns are in the singular, because the writer refers to each soldier (ἔκαστος). Perhaps this confuses the scribe.

3.18.e) VII. 25.24 (p. 411, 20-21): ὃν δὲ μεταξὺ ἑπιπεσόντων (ἑπιπεσόντος Ath) γενέσθαι τι τῶν δεόντων ἀδύνατον. This is lack of attention by the scribe, because it is easily recognisable that the participle goes with the genitive ὃν.

3.18.f) VIII. 1.7 (p. 488, 19-21): ...καὶ μὴ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀφανῶν σφίσιν ὡσπερ οἱ σκληραμαχοῦντες (σκληραμαχοῦντες Ath) διαλέγεσθαι ἀναγκάζωνται... A simple change of a to o, possibly because the word σκληραμάχεσθαι is unfamiliar to the scribe.

3.18.g) VIII. 14.28 (p. 561, 18-20): αἰρομένη (αἰσχυνομένη Ath) δὲ τὴν φλόγα ἐξαπιναίως Ἐρμαιον ἰδόντες ὀλύγοι μὲν τινὲς ἐβοήθουν... The verb transmitted by Ath is wrong, as it makes no sense to the sentence and in addition, it is not transmitted by any other manuscript.
Conclusion

The above errors of Ath, which appear in all six hands, are of minor importance and therefore no conclusions can be drawn as to the abilities and habits of its scribes. In addition, some of these mistakes seem not to have been made by the scribes of Ath, but to have derived from the exemplar. This is attested by the repetition of the same passage, including the same mistakes in Book V (see above, 3.17.2.c., p. 125-6). However, there are other mistakes for which the scribes of Ath seem to have been responsible. For example, the frequent interchange of single and double consonants, and especially of lambda, the unnecessary addition of articles to specify the subject, the addition or omission of prepositions which affect the vocabulary, the omission of words and phrases affecting the meaning without affecting the syntax, the attempt of the scribes to etymologise proper names, and the frequent change of the endings of verbs and participles, a fact that affects the syntax; all these are some of the most characteristic tendencies of the scribes of Ath, which may not be simple reproductions from the exemplar.

Despite its minor but numerous phonetic, grammatical, syntactical and linguistic errors, codex Ath represents an important link in the manuscript tradition of family y for three reasons: First, it contains common readings with manuscripts copied in a later period (fifteenth and sixteenth centuries), which are not transmitted either by K of the z family, or by L of the y family. The next chapter will deal with the later manuscripts and their relations with Ath, as well as with their position in the stemma codicum in relation with Ath. Secondly, Ath confirms the emendations introduced by editors and scholars in thirty cases and offers new defensible readings in eleven cases. Thirdly and more importantly, being the earliest extant manuscript of family y, Ath is instrumental in reconstructing the tradition of this family.
3. A study of the manuscript tradition of family y
in the light of manuscript Ath

In his edition Haury omitted to collate all manuscripts of family y except the principal manuscript L. This makes a reconstruction of his proposed stemma codicum impossible to verify. In addition, Haury only gave very brief descriptions of these manuscripts, some of which (γ and δ) it seems he did not consult fully if at all. Before proceeding, therefore, to a reconstruction of the possible relations of all manuscripts of family y, including Ath, it would be helpful to provide a more analytical description of all extant manuscripts of this family (with the exception of Monac. gr. 513 (d) of the sixteenth century)\textsuperscript{165} with updated information on the palaeographical aspect including a re-assessment of their dating. This description is based on an examination of the codices through microfilm.

\textbf{a} \hspace{1em} \textit{Ambrosianus A182 sup.}\textsuperscript{166}

End of 14\textsuperscript{th}/beginning 15\textsuperscript{th} c.;\textsuperscript{167} paper; 248 ff.; 312x212mm; 31-32 lines per page.

Contents: Procopius’ \textit{Wars} V-VIII, f. 1-8v, 25-181v, 184-188, and also \textit{Buildings} and \textit{Secret History}, Ch. 1-XXX.

Collation: A much later hand has numbered the recto folios in Arabic numerals. Several folios have been affected by worm at the edges of the pages.

Headings: There is a title at the beginning of the fifth book: προκοπίου καίσαρέως ἱστορία γοθικῶν πολέμων οὐς διὰ τοῦ βελισαρίου ιουστινιανὸς βασιλεὺς συνεστήσατο, ἐν τέσσαρις τόμοις δηηρημενη. ἀρχὴ τοῦ πρῶτου τόμου. The sixth book begins on f. 54r with the title ἀρχὴ τῆς ἔκτης ἱστορίας προκοπίου, while the seventh book begins on f. 89r ἱστοριῶν λόγος εὐθόμος. Similarly the eighth book begins on f. 129v with the heading ἱστοριῶν λόγος ὁγθος προκοπίου.

Script: Three hands contributed to the copying of the codex. A tidy hand A copied the largest part, ff. 1r-177r and 184v-187v. The handwriting is very small and the \textit{ductus} is

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{165} See above, fn. 110.

\textsuperscript{166} Haury used the siglum \textit{A} for part of the text II.642,24-662,18: στρατιάν – ἀυτοῦ (ff. 177v-181r), which he classified under family z, while he used the siglum \textit{a} for the rest of the text in the codex, which he classified in family y. For a description of this manuscript, see A. Martini – D. Bassi, \textit{Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae} (Milano, 1906), vol. I, no. 75, p. 89; B. Flusin, “La tradition manuscrite du \textit{De Aedificiis}”, \textit{Antiquité Tardive} 8 (2000), 10.

\textsuperscript{167} E. Gamillscheg – D. Harlfinger – H. Hunger et al., \textit{Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten}, 800-1600 (Vienna, 1981, 1989, 1997). II Taf. 13 \textit{Laurentianus Plut.} 70.9 written by Andreas Leantinos (c. 1399); II Taf. 120 \textit{Parisimus} 445 by John Doukas (c. 1375-1399); II Taf. 132 \textit{Parisimus Supl.} 192 by Joannis Trimoteos Zoos (c. 1439); Taf. 158 \textit{Vaticanus} 1339 by Ioasaf (c. 1350-1399).
thin. This scribe uses several abbreviations, the most characteristic being the endings –ων (\(\sigma\)), –ου (\(\delta\)), –ευ (\(\epsilon\)), –ας (\(\zeta\)), –ως (\(\zeta\)) and καὶ (\(\zeta\)) and δὲ (\(\zeta\)). He also uses several ligatures: \(\eta\nu\) (\(\omega\)), \(\epsilon\nu\) (\(\epsilon\)), \(\epsilon\nu\) (\(\omega\)), \(\epsilon\pi\) (\(\epsilon\)), and the most characteristic letters are \(\tau\au\) (\(\tau\)), \(\rho\o\) (\(\rho\)), and \(\nu\) (\(\nu\)). A similar hand B copied the ff. 177v-181r in small letters, of which the most characteristic are \(\kappa\si\) (\(\xi\)), \(\upsilon\si\) (\(\upsilon\)), and \(\sigma\i\) (\(\sigma\)), the ligature \(\epsilon\pi\) (\(\epsilon\)), and the abbreviation of the ending –ων (\(\lambda\)). There are bigger calligraphic capital letters in the margins in both hands. A totally different hand C copied f. 188r in thick \(\delta\uct\) and large letters, most characteristic being \(\sigma\i\) (\(\sigma\)), \(\chi\i\) (\(\chi\)) and \(\psi\i\) (\(\psi\)).

Notes and scholia: There are brief scholia by the same hand in margins: f. 2r: παράδοξον; f. 6v: ἄρχῃ πολέμοι; f. 6r: ἀλώσῃ σικελίας ὑπὸ βελισσαρίου; f. 8v: χρησίας; f. 28r: παραίνεσις βελισσαρίου πρὸς νεαπόλιτας; f. 42v: ἀμείβεται βελισσαρίου οὐσίγιν; f. 63r: βλέπετο ὅσον βελισσαρίος πρὸς τὸ δίκαιον; f. 73r: παραίνεσις μουνδίλα πρὸς τὸν στρατὸν; f. 171r: ἀντίρρησις φράγγων. At the end of Book VI, f. 89v there is an extended scholion: ὅταν βελισσαρίου μεγαλοπριχάτον καὶ ἑλευθέροιν γνώμην καὶ πότιν πρὸς ιουστισμανὸν βασιλέα, καὶ ὃτε ἐν πέντε ἔτεσιν ἠμείνεν τὰ κατὰ ἱππας καὶ ιοῦτιγίδος κατορθώματα. In three cases (f. 67r, 72r, 149v) there is an abbreviation for \(\gamma\nu\omega\mu\i\) in and in a single case (f. 184r) there is an abbreviation for \(\omega\rho\ai\) by a different hand.

Errors and corrections: There are marginal corrections in three cases (ff. 56v, 87v, 172r) by the same hand, which copied the main text. Otherwise there is no other correction in the text.

b  Parisinus graecus 1703\(^{169}\)

15\(^{a}\)c.; paper; 165ff; 288x212mm; 31-32 lines per page.

Contents: Procopius' Wars V-VIII. The last part of the text, p. 671,17 (κατὰ τὴν σικελίας) to the end, is missing.

Collation: A later hand has numbered correctly the extant recto folios in Arabic numerals. The codex is in a good condition with no effects by worms. On f. 123v a note shows that the manuscript was owned at some stage by Michael Leontarios, of whom nothing is known: τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ὑπάρχει Μίχαηλ τοῦ λεοντοῦργη.\(^{170}\)

\(^{164}\) See below, Pl. XXI a-c.

\(^{169}\) For a description of this codex, see H. Omont, Inventaire sommaire des manuscripts grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris, 1888), vol. II, p. 127

\(^{170}\) See below, Pl. XXII.
Headings: Book V begins with the title προκόπιον καισαρέως ἱστορία γοτθικῶν
πολέμων οἷς διὰ τοῦ βελισαρίου στρατηγοῦ ιουστινιανὸς βασιλεὺς συνεστήσατο,
ἐν τέσσαρι τόμοις διηρημένη, ἄρχῃ τοῦ πρώτου τόμου. In f. 37 a note introduces the
sixth book: ἄρχῃ τῆς ἐκτης ιστορίας προκόπιου, on f. 75\(^{171}\) Book VII with the
heading ἱστοριῶν λόγος ἐβδόμος and finally in f. 126r Book VIII with προκόπιον
καισαρέως ιστοριῶν γοτθικῶν τέταρτη. All headings are preceded by simple vignettes.
Script: Two hands have contributed to the copying of this manuscript. Scribe A copied ff.
1-88v, while scribe B copied the rest of the codex, ff. 89r-165. Characteristic letters of
hand A are: beta (β), gamma (γ), delta (Δ), nu (ν), lambda (Λ), tau
(τ) while there are also characteristic ligatures: epsilon-iota (ει), epsilon-nu
(εν) and epsilon-omicron-upsilon (ευς). Hand B, a bit untidier in thinner ductus and larger letters, is
similar to A; the letters beta (β), lambda (Λ) and chi (χ) are the most
characteristic of this hand and also the ligature omikron-upsilon (ους). Both hands are
clear and easily legible and they use punctuation and accents consistently and correctly.
Notes and scholia: There are brief scholia in the margins; some of them are by the hand
which copied the main text, e.g., f. 2v: τελευτῆσαι τοι τών βασιλείαν ἀταλάριχον; f. 18v: δημηγορία Θεοδότου πρὸς Χρήστου; f. 65r: βουλὴ
cυγγραφέως πρὸς Βελισαρίου; f. 75r: ὁρανθεὶ Βελισαρίου; f. 101v: γραφὴ
tουτία πρὸς Ἰουστινιανὸν βασιλέα. On f. 74v after the end of Book VI there is a
scholion by hand A: ὁρανθῆ Βελισαρίου μεγαλοφυχαν καὶ ἐλευθερον γνώμην καὶ
πίστην πρὸς Ιουστινιανὸν βασιλέα, καὶ δει ἐν πέντε ἔτεσιν ἃνευς τα κατὰ
ἐντάλεια καὶ ἑντόρθωματα. Most of the scholia in the margins are by a later
untidy hand C, which copies the parts of the text in the margins preceded by δει: f. 5r: δει
οἱ πρεσβεῖς ἃς βυζαντίου ἐπανήνοικησε; f. 5r: δει ἀταλάριχος ἐτελεύτησεν ὃκτω
ἐτη τῇ ἄρχῃ ἐπιβίουσα; f. 56r: δει βελισαρίου καὶ ναρηζ ἀνεμίζωντο ἀμφὶ πόλην
φίρμων or writes a name in margin when first introduced: f. 76v: βιτάλατος; f. 96v:
τωλλιανὸς; f. 117r: σέρμιον. The same hand writes in the top margin of each verso folio
προκόπιον and in the recto γοτθικῶν ιστοριῶν followed by the number of the book, α',
β', γ', δ'. There are also notes in the margins to note the proverbs by the abbreviated
γνωμικῶν (11r, 14r, 14v, 44r, 56v, 65r, 74v. 106v) or to mark noteworthy phrases by the
abbreviated ση(με)ωσαί (4r, 17r, 76r, 80r, 98r) written by both hands.
Errors and corrections: In three cases (52r, 114v, 124v) there are words or phrases crossed
out, which were repeated by mistake due to homoioioteuton. In a single case there is an

\(^{171}\) See below, Pl. XXIII.
interlinear correction by the same hand (129v), while in one case a later hand, perhaps of the sixteenth century, corrects in the margin: γρ(άφε) διοικήσησθαι (72v).

h  Parisinus graecus 1310
15th c.; paper; 466 ff.; 220x140mm.
This is a miscellaneous manuscript with various fragments copied by several hands. It contains excerpts from Gregory of Cyprus, Demetrios Kydones, Gregory of Nazianzus, Empedocles, Xiphilinus, Ptochoprodromus, Hesiod, Michael Psellus and others. Among them on f. 408v there is a fragment of 26 lines from Procopius’ Wars with the title in the same hand “έκ τῆς ιστορίης πραγματέας προκοπίου περί μετάξεως”. Characteristic letters of the hand which copied this part are: theta (Θ), rho (Ρ) and chi (Χ). There are also ligatures, most characteristic with tau, such as τά (τά) and abbreviations, most characteristic being the endings -ον (ον) and -ας (ας). The codex belonged to John IV Lascaris, the son of Theodore II.

c  Ambrosiani A52-55 sup.
16th c.; paper; A52 sup. 183 ff., 215x153mm; A53 sup. 183 ff., 213x153mm; A54 sup. 236 ff., 212x153mm; A55 sup. 213 ff., 213x152mm; 13 lines per page.
Collation: Pages are numbered correctly in Arabic numerals, though in A54 and A55 the numbers have faded away. Parts of A55 ff. 193v and 194r are blank where a part of the text is missing.
Headings: Book V follows after the heading: προκοπίου καλαρέως ιστορία γοθικών πολέμων ὁς διὰ τοῦ βελισαρίου στρατηγοῦ, Ιουστινιανὸς βασιλεὺς συνεστήσατο, ἐν τέταρτο τόμως διηρημένη, ἄρχῃ τοῦ πρώτου τόμου. Book VI follows the heading ἄρχη τοῦ β’ τόμου τῆς στ’ ιστορίας προκοπίου. In f. 183v the sixth book finishes with the note τέλος τοῦ δευτέρου τόμου τῆς ιστορίας προκοπίου.

---

172 For the description and the contents of this manuscript, see H. Omont, Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris, 1886), vol. I, p. 296.
173 See below, Pl. XXIV.
while Book VII begins in f. 184r. Similarly Book VIII begins with the title ἀρχὴ τοῦ δ’ τούτου τῆς ἑτέρας προκοπίου and it finishes with the word τέλος.

**Script**: All four codices were written in the same clear and easily legible handwriting. Haury does not identify the hand, but it has recently been identified as the hand of the very productive scribe Andreas Darmarios (c. 1540-1587). Characteristic letters are gamma (γ), zeta (ζ), tau (τ), ksi (ξ) and psi (ψ). There is a limited use of ligatures, the most characteristic is ἐπὶ (ἐπὶ) and no use of abbreviations. The punctuation and accents are clear and consistent. There are bigger decorated letters in the margins, e.g., Ιρ, Ιχ.

**Notes and Scholia**: There are only three marginal scholia in this codex (f. 18r: γράφει ὁ λοιπυτινανδρος βασιλεις προς ἀμαλασούνθα; f. 18v: ἀντίγραμμα; f. 177v: φθόνος κατὰ βελισαρίου). Otherwise, there are scholia in the text, mostly headings to speeches and letters, e.g., A52: f. 28v: ἐπιστολὴ βασιλέως λοιπυτινανδρος προς φράγγους; f. 35r: ἀντίγραμμα βασιλέως προς αὐτὸν, f. 127r: πρέβος υἱότευχος προς βελισάριον καὶ ῥωμαίοις; f. 174v: γραφὴ λοιπυτινανδρος προς τὸν αὐτὸν στράτον; A53: f. 16r: λόγος ρωμαίων προς βελισαρίου; A54: f. 124r: ἐπιστολὴ βελισαρίου πρὸς τωτίλαν. In A53 f. 183v there is an extended note: ὅρα τὴν βελισαρίου μεγαλουχίαν καὶ ἑλευθερίαν γνώμην καὶ πίστιν πρὸς λοιπυτινανδρον βασιλεά, καὶ ὅτι ἐν πέντε ἔτεσιν ἠνυσεν τὰ κατὰ ἱταλίας καὶ λοιπυτινανδρος κατορθώματα.

**Errors and corrections**: There are some errors, most of which may be due to misreading of the exemplar; in some cases they are underlined and corrected interlinearly (e.g., A52: ff. 17v, 24v, 33r, 34r, 50v, 105v, 124v; A53: 4v, 73v, 110v; A54: 154v, 199v; A55: 9v, 13v, 64v). In three cases the corrections are marginal preceded by an abbreviated γρ(άφε) (A53: f. 17v; A55: 28v, 63r). The scribe of ε frequently omits part of the text, which he replaces by dots: e.g. A54: f. 137v, 200r, 206r; A55: 78r.

---

175 Martini – Bassi, *Catalogus Bibliothecae Ambrosianae*, p. 5: “Manu Andreae Darmarii”. Andreas Daramarios was born in Monembasia. He studied in Sparta under the priest Dorotheos from Nauplion. In 1559 he was employed in Rome, in 1560 in Padua and later in Venice, Trient, Augsburg, Madrid, Escorial, Saragossa, Salamanca, Strassburg. He has been one of the collaborators of Manuel Probatares and he worked in the studio of Nicolaos Choniates. He also worked with Antonios Calosynas, Michael Myriokephalites and with other important scribes of the time. He copied under the instructions of Isaac Casaubon, Antonio de Coverruyas, Andreas Schott and Philip II. Cf. Gamillscheg, *Repertotium*, vol. I, p. 29; A. Bravo García, “Once more on Darmarios’ collaborators” in *The Greek Script in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute of Byzantine Research International Symposium 7, ed. S. Patoura (Athens, 2000), pp. 193-213

176 See below, Pl. XXV a.

177 See below, Pl. XXV b.
k  Basileensis gr. D IV 6178

1574 A.D.; paper; 619 ff.; 223x152mm; 19 lines per page.


Collation: Folia are numbered correctly in Arabic numerals. F. 604v is blank and it only contains three times the word λέιπει.

Headings: Book V begins with the title προκοπίου καίσαρεώς ἱστορίά γοτθικῶν πολέμων οüς διὰ τοῦ βελισαρίου στρατηγοῦ, οὐσισιμαίνος βασιλείς συνεστῆσατο, ἐν τέταρτι τόμοις διηρημένη, ἀρχὴ τοῦ πρώτου τόμου. Book VI begins in f. 143r with ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐκτῆς ἱστορίας προκοπίου ending with τέλος τῆς ἐκτῆς ἱστορίας προκοπίου. The heading ἱστορίων λόγος ἐβδομος προκοπίου introduces Book VII on f. 285r.179 A wrong note introduces Book VIII (προκοπίου καίσαρεώς ἱστορίων λόγος διγόος, περὶ τοῦ περσικοῦ πολέμου). At the end of Book VIII there is the note: τέλος αφοῦ' (1574) μαλακον κφ' ἐτελειώθη.180 Codex Salamantinus 2750 (γ) (see below, pp. 151-2), copied by Antonios Calosynas, is dated in the prefatory letter on 24/5/1574 (see Appendix I, pp. 181-2), seven days before this codex. As the similarity of the handwriting also indicates, there is a possibility that these codices are related.

Script: Haury suggests (p. L) that the codex may have been copied by someone in the circle of Darmarios, without identifying the hand. The hand of Antonios Calosynas (c. 1562-1598) is very similar, (cf. description of codex γ below). The handwriting is large and clear. Characteristic letters are beta (β), theta (θ), ksi (ξ), sigma (ς) and the big nu (π) at the end of lines. The most characteristic ligature is ταυ-ομικρόν (τομ), and also επισλ-υψιλόν (ευπ), επισλ-λαμδα (ελ), επισλ-ομεγα (εω), ρο-ομικρόν (ρομ), ταυ-ρο (τρ) and ταυ-ομεγα (το). While of the abbreviations the most characteristic is the ending −ων (ων). Punctuation and the accents are used correctly. There are decorated letters in the margins, e.g., 26v, 29v, 35v, 56v, 299r.

Errors and Corrections: There are many spelling mistakes and omissions of syllables; a few of them are corrected in the margins (e.g., 2r, 35v, 82r, 176r, 407v). Some letters are missing and in their place there are dots (e.g. 3r, 78r, 312v); in some cases there are whole sentences omitted, similarly replaced by dots (e.g., 78r, 328v). There are errors which are corrected in the margin preceded by the abbreviated γρ(άφε) (e.g., 38r, 39r, 65v, 117v, 146v, 218r, 229r, 330r, 341r, 433v, 466r, 570v) and others which are corrected

178 For a description of this codex, see H. Omont, Catalogue des manuscrits grecs des Bibliothèques de Suisse (Leipzig, 1886), no. 81, p. 33.
179 See below, Pl. XXVI a.
180 See below, Pl. XXVI c.
interlinearly (e.g., 13v, 23v, 110r, 308v, 461r). Some words or whole phrases are repeated due to homoioteleuton, which are underlined by the scribe (e.g. 87v, 162v, 323r, 342r, 382r, 418v, 563r, 578v).

Notes and scholia: There are only three marginal notes in this codex: f. 23r: ἀλώσις σικελίας ὑπὸ βελισαρίου, f. 180r: βλέπε οἶος ὁ βελισάριος πρὸς τὸ δίκαιον, f. 278v: φθόνος κατὰ βελισαρίου. However, there are notes in the text, mostly titles for speeches and letters: e.g., f. 56v: βουλή ιούτιγιδος πρὸς τοὺς αὐτούς, f. 99r: ἀμείβεται βελισάριος οὐτίγιν, f. 267v: πρέσβεις γερμανῶν πρὸς οὐτίγιν, f. 320r: ἐπιστολή τωτῖα πρὸς τῇ βουλῇ βωμαίων; f. 527v: παραίνεσις ὁδονάχου καὶ βάβα πρὸς τὸν στρατὸν. On f. 284v there is a large scholion: ὅρα τὴν βελισαρίου μεγαλοφυχίαν καὶ ἐλευθερίαν γνώμην καὶ πίστιν πρὸς ἱουστινιανὸν βασιλέα, καὶ ὅτι ἐν πέντε ἔτειν ἤμυσεν τὰ κατὰ Ἰταλίας καὶ ἱουστινιαδὸς κατορθώματα.

Monacensis gr. 87

16th c.; paper; 386 ff; 331x227mm; 30 lines per page.

Contents: Procopius' Wars V-VIII with a gap in Book VIII, p. 642,24-662,18 (στρατῷ ... ἀπράκτῳ) as well as some of Synesius' Letters.

Collation: The recto folios are numbered in Arabic numbers in the right hand corner, while all recto and verso folios are numbered again in Arabic numerals. The bottom one third of f. 2r and the whole of f. 2v are blank, but no text is missing. The bottom two thirds of f. 262v and the whole of 263v are blank, where there is a gap in the text. The codex is in a good physical condition, except of f. 70, which is affected by worm.

Headings: Book V begins with the heading προκοπίου καισαρέως ἱστορία γοτθικῶν πολέμων οἷς διὰ τοῦ βελισαρίου στρατηγοῦ, ἱουστινιανὸς βασιλεὺς συνεστήσατο, ἐν τέταρτοι τοῖς διηρημένη, ἀρχῆ τοῦ πρῶτον τόμου. Book VI begins on f. 50r with ἀρχῆ τῆς ἐκτῆς ἱστορίας προκοπίου, while Book VII with ἱστορίων λόγος ἐβδόμος on f. 112r and Book VIII with ἱστοριῶν λόγος δύος προκοπίου on f. 185r. Book VIII finishes on f. 249r, ff. 249v-250v are blank and on f. 251r the other work starts with the heading: συνεσίου κυρηναίοι εἰς αὐτοκράτορα ἄρκαδιον περὶ βασιλείας.

---

181 See below, Pl. XXVI b.
182 This codex is described in I. Hardt, Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Graecorum Bibliothecae Regiae Bavariae, (Munich, 1806-1812), vol. 1, pp. 485-86. It is stated that the codex "optima conservatus und inscriptus est".
183 The Letters of Synesius included in this codex are: Ad imperatorem Arcadium de imperio, Calviti encomium, Aegiptii, Ad Pacontinent de dono astrolabii, Concio, Homiliae duae, Hymni metrici.
Manuscript Tradition - Later manuscripts

**Script:** The codex was written by one hand, in a clear handwriting with characteristic letter the tau (τ) and ligatures epsilon-ksi (εκ), epsilon-rho (ερ), and tau-rho (τρ). This scribe makes no use of abbreviations. There are a few capital letters in the margins. The changes of paragraphs are indicated by change of line.

**Notes and scholia:** There are no notes or scholia, except for one scholion, which is at the end of Book VI on f. 111v in red ink: ὥσ τὴν βελισσαρίου μεγαλοπονίαν καὶ ἐλευθερίαν γνώσιν και πίστιν πρὸς οἰστινιανὸν βασιλέα, καὶ ὅτι ἐν πέντε ἔτεσιν ἤμουσεν τὰ κατὰ ἱταλίας καὶ οἰστίγιδος κατορθώματα.\(^{184}\)

**Errors and corrections:** In this codex there are corrections of the wrong words in the margins (e.g., 7r, 58r, 168v, 173r) and interliner corrections (e.g., 47r, 71r, 90v, 119r). In a single case, f. 95r, a phrase, which is copied twice due to *homoioiteleuton*, is crossed out.

\[\gamma\] Salamantinus 2750\(^{185}\) (formerly Matriensis 38)

1574 A.D.; paper; 605ff; 218x155mm; 20 lines per page.

**Contents:** Procopius' Wars V-VIII. F. 589v-590 are blank, containing only three times the word λεύπει, where a part of the text is missing (Book VIII, p. 642,24 – 662,18). In ff. 1r-2v there is a letter by the copyist of the codex with the heading: Τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ ἄρχιερει, καὶ πρωτοστάτῃ τῇ τοῦ μεγαλοπονίου βασιλέως Φιλίππου, ὅσος θεράπisci (ω) ἀντώνιος λατρὸς φυσικὸς. The letter finishes with the words: ἔρρωσο· εἰς τολέτου, αὐτοῦ δοῦνα μαίου ιεν. (see below, Appendix I, p. 181).

**Collation:** The pages are correctly numbered in Arabic numerals. F. 142v is blank and also half of f. 458v where there is a note by the same hand: οὐ λεύπει ἀμάρτημα γὰρ.

**Headings:** Book V begins with the heading: προκοπίου καυσαρέως ἱστορία γοθικῶν πολέμων οὗς δίὰ τοῦ βελισσαρίου στρατηγοῦ, ἱστοιειανὸς βασιλέως συνεπιστήσατο ἐν τέταρτοι τόμους διερημένην, ἀρχή τοῦ α' τόμου. In f. 143r Book VI begins with ἀρχὴ τῆς ἑκτῆς ἱστορίας προκοπίου, while Book VII in f. 280r with προκατόπτου καυσαρέως λόγος ἐβδομος. In f. 447r the title ἱστορίων λόγος διονος προκατόπτου.

**Script:** The hand of Antonios Calosynas\(^{186}\) is clear and easily legible. The most characteristic letters are beta (β), gamma (γ), zeta (ζ), theta (θ),

\(^{184}\) See below, Pl. XXVII, ff. 111v-112r.

\(^{185}\) The codex is described in T. Santander, *La Biblioteca de Don Diego de Covarrubias y Leyva, Obispo de Ciudad Rodrigo y de Segovia, y Presidente del Consejo de Estado (1512-1577)* (Salamanca, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 180-82.

\(^{186}\) Antonios Calosynas (c. 1562-1598) was born in Crete. In 1563 he was employed in Darmarios' studio in Trient and in 1967-87 in Toledo He was a collaborator of Darmarios and he also worked with the scribes Michael Myriokephalites and Theolepros. He copied under the instructions of Martin Perez de Ayala, Garzia
tau (\(\tau\)) and the large nu (\(\nu\)),\(^\text{187}\) while there are characteristic ligatures, the most characteristic being tau-omikron (\(\tau\)\( \omicron \)), epsilon-lambda (\(\epsilon\)\( \lambda \)), epsilon-ypsilon (\(\epsilon\)\( \upsilon \)), and others such as tau-alpha (\(\tau\)\( \alpha \)). There is a limited number of abbreviations, και (\(\kappa \)\( \alpha \)) and -ων (\(\omega\)).

**Notes and scholia:** There are only six marginal scholia in this codex by the same hand: f. 156r: βελισάριος πρὸς ῥωμαίους; f. 200r: ἔνθα ἔρούλλων; f. 225r: φθόνος κατὰ βελισαρίου; f. 339v: τῷ καυρῷ ἐκεῖνῳ τῆς ῥώμης ἄρχηρετος; f. 427v: τὰς ναῦς καλουμένας τριήρεις ὁνομάζει πλοῖα μακρὰ; f. 473v: ση(μείωσαν) ἄλλο περὶ τοῦτο γεγραφέναι βιβλίον. However, there are many interlinear scholia, mostly to introduce speeches and letters (e.g., f. 244r: βουλή τοῦ συγγραφέως πρὸς τὸν βελισάριον; f. 313v: ἐπιστολή τωτὶ πρὸς τῇ βουλῇ ῥωμαίων; f. 414v: προσθέεις γηπαίδων). At the end of Book VI in f. 279v there is a large scholion: ὅρα τὴν βελισαρίου μεγαλωκυχίαν καὶ ἐλευθερίας γνώμην καὶ πίστιν πρὸς ἰουστινιανὸν βασιλέα, καὶ δὴ ἐν πέντε ἔτεσιν ἤνσε, τα κατὰ Ιταλίας καὶ Ιουστινίδος κατορθώματα. In a single case, f. 593v the note ὦρατον is in the text.\(^\text{188}\)

**Errors and corrections:**\(^\text{189}\) There are several corrections of words in margins, preceded by the abbreviation of γρ(άφε) (e.g., 20r, 35r, 82r, 271v, 346r, 602v). There are several spelling mistakes in the text, some of which were corrected in the margin and others are corrected interlinearly (e.g., 118r, 177r, 287r, 413r, 542r) or are underlined with dots (126r, 132r, 558r). In other cases omitted words are added in margins (e.g., 151r, 156v, 464r). There are also several repetitions of phrases or whole sentences due to *homoioioteleuton*, which the scribe always realised and crossed out (e.g., 26r, 54r, 135v, 143r, 382v, 401r, 415r). In a few cases there are dots in place of letters, possibly because the scribe could not read the letters from his exemplar (e.g., 5r, 69v, 266r). In three cases there are dots in place of whole missing phrases: ff. 321v, 429v, 504v.

---

\(^{187}\) See below, Pl. XXVIII a.

\(^{188}\) See below, Pl. XXVIII b.

\(^{189}\) See below, Pl. XXVIII c.
Scorialensis Y. I. 13

16th c.; paper; 220 ff.; 336x232mm; 30 lines per page.

Contents: Procopius' Wars V-VI up to p. 217,9 (εὐν ταῖς γυναιξὶ τῆν) on ff. 24-107v. It also contains other authors, such as Nonnus of Panopolis, Michael Psellus, Photius and others.

Collation: All recto folia are numbered correctly in Arabic numerals by a much later hand.

Headings: Book V begins on f. 24r of the codex after a vignette without heading. On f. 80v there is the heading βεβαλον β’ν to introduce Book VI.

Script: The codex was copied by one hand, whose handwriting is clear. Characteristic letters are beta (β), ksy (ξ), and rho (ρ). The scribe also uses a limited number of ligatures (epsilon-iota (ει), epsilon-kappa (κα), epsilon-lambda (λ), and epsilon-pi (π)). Punctuation and accents are used correctly. There are simple capital letters in the margins. Changes of paragraphs are indicated by change of line.

Notes and scholia: There are no notes or scholia.

Errors and corrections: There are no corrections in the text.

Vaticanus Reginensis graecus 84

16th c.; paper; 40 ff.; 336x232mm; 33-35 lines per page.

Contents: Procopius' Wars V-VI up to p. 155,20-21 (ἀνδρα Πέρσην).

Collation: The codex is correctly numbered in Arabic numerals from 1-40.

Headings: A note in Latin on f. 1r denotes the possessor of the codex at some point: ex libris Dionysii corsinii. To introduce Book V there is a heading: προκοπίου καίσαρέως ιστορία γοτθικῶν πολέμων οδα διὰ του βελισαρίου στρατηγοῦ, ουσινανός βασιλεὺς συνεστήσατο, ἐν τέταρτο τόμοις δημημένη, ἀρχὴ τοῦ πρώτου τόμου and with capital letters ΠΡΟΚΟΠΙΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΩΤΟΥ ΤΟΜΟΥ. Book VI begins on f. 39v with the heading: ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐκτῆς ιστορίας προκοπίου.193

Script: The codex is copied by one hand, with characteristic letters gamma (γ), theta (θ), and lambda (λ). The scribe uses characteristic ligatures with epsilon, such as epsilon-iota (ει), epsilon-kappa (κα), epsilon-lambda (λ), and epsilon-pi (π). Abbreviations are employed very rarely, only when there is limited space at the end of lines (-ας (α), -ων (ω)). There are some capital letters in the

---

190 For a description of this manuscript, see G. de Andres, Catalogo de los codices griegos de la Real Biblioteca de el Escorial (Madrid, 1965), vol. II, cod. 252, pp. 96-7.
191 See below, Pl. XXIX.
192 This codex is described in C. Pitra, Codices Manuscripti graeci Regiae Suecorum Bibliothecae Vaticanæ (Rome, 1888), p. 65.
193 See below, Pl. XXX b.
margins, but not at the end of sentences. Similarly the change of line to denote a new paragraph is not in the end of sentences.

Notes and scholia: There are a few marginal notes, mostly headings to speeches and letters:
- f. 2v: παράδοξον
- f. 4v: γράφε ιουστινιανὸν βασιλέως πρὸς ἀμαλασσάνθα
- f. 5v: γράφαι οὐκ ἁγαθὴν
- f. 6v: ἄρχῃ πολέμου
- f. 7r: ἀλωσὶ σικελίας ὑπὸ βελισαρίουν
- f. 20r: δημηγορία θευδάτου πρὸς γότθους

Errors and corrections: In a single case (f. 5r) a part repeated due to homoioteleuton is underlined. In other cases repetitions are crossed out (e.g., 15r, 29r).

---

194 See Pl. XXX a.
RELATION OF CODICES

Both L and Ath represent the earliest manuscripts of family y. L represents a good tradition with a few mistakes, mainly errors due to confusion of sounds, changes of prepositions, which indicate misunderstanding by the scribe and other minor errors. A collation of the text in Ath and L shows that L is not a copy from Ath. Though Ath contains important unique readings, nevertheless due to its large number of spelling mistakes, unnecessary additions and omissions of articles and particles (see above, pp. 38-142), it represents an inferior tradition in comparison to that of L.

On the basis of the indirect relation of Ath and L the stemma codicum of family y can be reconstructed in a series of propositions:

**Proposition I: a derives directly from L**

1. a is related closely to L through its marginal notes: e.g., γραφὴ ἱουστινιανοῦ βασιλεὼς πρὸς Ἀμαλασσάνθα; ἀντίγραμμα (L f. 8v; a f. 4r); ἀρχὴ τοῦ πολέμου (L f. 10r; a f. 6v); χρησμὸς (L f. 14v; a f. 8r); παραίνεσις βελισαρίου πρὸς νεαπολίταις (L f. 20r; a f. 28r); δημηγορία θευδάτου πρὸς γότθους (L f. 30r; a f. 34v).

2. a and L contain identical text with very few differences such as: γενομένου L, γενόμενοι a (p. 92, 27); ἀπὸ L ἐπὶ a (p. 110, 16); βουλευμένη a ] βουλευμένη L (p. 178, 23); ὀνομ a (p. 213, 24).

**Proposition II: b is linked to L through an indirect relation**

1. b shares a small number of readings with L; e.g., εἰργάζετο L, b (p. 8, 18); ἐπίγγειλλεν L, b (p. 22, 12); εἰκοσιν L, b (p. 89, 6); βόθρου L, b (p. 151, 20); ἑλεῖς L, b (p. 232, 1); ἄμιχανα L, b (p. 266, 13).

2. Marginalia in b written in the same hand as that of the main text are shared both by a and L: e.g., παράδοξον (L f. 4r; a f. 2r; b f. 2v); γραφὴ ἱουστινιανοῦ βασιλεὼς

---

195 e.g., καρσιανήν ~ καρκασιανήν (p. 68, 11); ἐτόλμου ~ ἐτόλμων (p. 104, 15); ἐγκωνίου ~ ἐγκωνίου (p. 206, 22); προκαλείσθαι ~ προκαλείσθαι (p. 301, 5); ὀθησιοῦ ~ ὀθησιοῦ (p. 319, 17); ξημίας ~ σημίας (p. 438, 22); μέσον ~ μέσον (p. 491, 22). However, L transmits some errors concerning vocabulary and syntax (e.g., see above pp. 23-24), but these are not serious.
196 Codex Parisinus 1310 (b) which contains a single folio from the text (Book VIII 17.1-14 - 8.20 (p. 576-7), is omitted from the discussion of the reconstruction of the stemma, for it could equally derive either from a or from b.
197 See below, Pl. XXXI.
198 See below, Pl. XXXII.
199 The particular readings have been selected to be used in these propositions, because they are common in Ath and in some of the later manuscripts, and therefore they can indicate their relations.
πρὸς ἀμαλασούνθα (L f. 8v; a f. 4v; b f. 4v); ἄρχῃ τοῦ πολέμου (L f. 10r; a f. 6r; b f. 6r); ἑπιστολὴ θευδάτου πρὸς βασιλέα Ιουστινιανὸν (L f. 13v; a f. 7v; b f. 7v).

(3) But b contains also unique marginal notes, possibly added in a later period, which repeat phrases of the text: e.g., ἦν δὲ τις ἐν γότθοις θευδάτος (f. 3v); διὸ οἱ πρέσβεις ἐς βυζάντιον ἐπανήκουτε (f. 5r); διὸ βελισάριος σὺν ναυσίν ἑστελλεν (f. 6v); διὸ βελισάριος τῶν τινὰ ἀνέπεισε χρήμασι σὺν τῷ σίτῳ λάθρα ἐμπρήσαται (f. 71v).

**Proposition III: b is linked indirectly to Ath**

(1) b shares a considerable number of readings with Ath: e.g., ἐπὶ Ath, b (p. 110, 16); διαλάσσειν Ath, b (p. 177, 25); βουλευομένω (p. 178, 23); ζῷων Ath, b (p. 213, 24); εἰλκεν Ath, b (p. 257, 1); ἀποβαλοῦσιν Ath, b (p. 266, 16).

(2) They do not share the same marginal notes.

**Proposition IV: r is directly related to b**

(1) r (which contains Book V and part of book VI) shares identical text with b.

(2) r and b share the same marginalia, with the exception of those added in b by a later hand: e.g., ἑπιστολὴ θευδάτου πρὸς βασιλέα Ιουστινιανὸν (r f. 8r; b f. 7v); παραίνεσις βελισαρίου πρὸς νεαπολίτας (r f. 13r; b f. 12v); βουλὴ Ιουτίγιδος πρὸς τοὺς αὐτού (r f. 16v; b f. 15r).

(3) r and b share change of paragraphs.

**Proposition V: γ, k and c are linked indirectly with L.**

(1) γ, k and c share the same notes with L, a, b and r (γ, k and c contain interlinear notes and L, a, b and r marginal): e.g., βλέπε οἶς ὁ βελισάριος πρὸς τὸ δίκαιαν (a: f. 63r; c: f. 46v; k: f. 180r; γ f. 178r); βουλὴ ναρσοῦ (a: f. 71v; c: f. 91r; k: f. 214r; γ f. 211v); γραφὴ ἱωάνου πρὸς βελισαρίου (a: f. 63r; c: 93r; k: f. 216r; γ f. 213r).

(2) γ, k and c contain several different readings from the L tradition (see below, Proposition VI)

**Proposition VI: k and c are linked closely with Ath**

(1) k and c share a considerable number of readings with Ath, which do not appear in L:

- e.g., p. 66, 27: καταστρέφονται L | καταστρέφονται Ath(f. 9v), c (f. 90r), k (f. 62v)
- p. 68, 12: ἐπίθυσαν L | ἐπείθησαν Ath (f. 10v), c (f. 82r), k (f. 64r)
p. 89, 6: εἰκοσι Αθ (f. 13v), ε (f. 108v), k (f. 84r) | εἰκοσιν Λ
p. 151, 20: βόθρου Λ | θορήθου Αθ (f. 33r), ε (f. 3r), k (f. 144v)
p. 154, 12: ἀμύνεσθαι Λ | ἀμύνεσθαι Αθ (f. 34v), ε (f. 6v), k (f. 147v)
p. 163, 16: ἀναρρίπτειν Λ, ἀναρρίπτειν Αθ (f. 39v), ε (f. 18v), k (f. 157v)
p. 170, 17: ἀμύνεσθαι Λ | ἀμύνεσθαι Αθ (f. 43r), ε (f. 27r), k (f. 164v)
p. 177, 25: διαλάσσειν Λ | διαλάσσειν Αθ (f. 46v), ε (f. 35v), k (f. 172v)
p. 178, 23: βουλευομένωι Αθ (f. 47r), ε (f. 37v), k (f. 173r), βουλευομένωι Λ
p. 213, 24: δύνων Λ | ζώων Αθ (f. 65r), ε (f. 82v), k (f. 208r)
p. 239, 10: ἐγίνοντο Λ | ἐγένοντο Αθ (f. 78r), ε (f. 114v), k (f. 232r)
p. 266, 13: ἀμήχανα Λ | ἀμήχανον Αθ (f. 92v), ε (f. 149v), k (f. 257v)
p. 301, 11: ἐρρήθη Λ | ἐρρήθη Αθ (f. 107v), ε (f. 5v), k (f. 288r)

(2) k and c share a few variants which are different from Ath
e.g., p. 60, 24: ἵσχυν Αθ, σκευὴν ε, k
p. 232, 1: εἶπε Αθ, ἔλεγεν ε, k
p. 257, 1: εἰλκε Αθ | ἀφεῖλκε ε, k
p. 305, 2: μιστήρ γυναικὸς Αθ, μιστήρ γυναικὸς γεγονὸς ε, k

(3) k and c do not contain the same notes as Ath

Proposition VII: γ is linked with Αθ to a lesser degree than k and c

(1) γ and Ath share a considerable number of readings against L
e.g., p. 22, 12: ἔπηγγειλεν Λ, ἔπηγγειλεν Αθ (f. 5v), γ (f. 21r)
p. 92, 27: γενομένοι Λ, γενομένοι Αθ (f. 15r), γ (f. 89v)
p. 163, 16: ἀναρρίπτειν Λ, ἀναρρίπτειν Αθ (f. 39v), γ (f. 156v)
p. 170, 17: ἀμύνεσθαι Λ | ἀμύνεσθαι Αθ (f. 43r), γ (f. 163r)
p. 177, 25: διαλάσσειν Λ | διαλάσσειν Αθ (f. 46v), γ (f. 170r)
p. 213, 24: δύνων Λ | ζώων Αθ (f. 65r), γ (f. 205r)
p. 239, 10: ἐγίνοντο Λ | ἐγένοντο Αθ (f. 78r), γ (f. 228v)
p. 266, 13: ἀμήχανα Λ | ἀμήχανον Αθ (f. 92v), γ (f. 254v)
p. 266, 16: ἀποβαλλοῦσιν Λ, ἀποβαλλοῦσιν Αθ (f. 92v), γ (f. 254v)

(2) γ and Ath contain a small number of different readings
e.g., p. 60, 24: ἵσχυν Αθ, σκευὴν γ
p. 66, 27: καταστρέφονται γ | καταστρέφονται Αθ
p. 68, 12: ἐποθοῦντο γ | ἐπείθοῦντο Αθ
p. 89, 6: εἰκοσι Αθ | εἰκοσιν γ
p. 151, 20: βόθρου γ | θορήθου Αθ
p. 154, 12: ἀμύνεσθαι γ | ἀμύνεσθαι Αθ
p. 178, 23: βουλευομένοι γ | βουλευομένοι Αθ
Proposition VIII: \textit{γ and k share the same exemplar}

(1) \textit{γ} and \textit{k} were copied almost at the same time (they contain colophons with the dates 17 and 23 May 1574 respectively).

(2) \textit{γ} and \textit{k} were probably copied in the same scriptorium given the great similarity of the two hands (see above the descriptions of these codices, pp. 149-50, 151-2)

(3) \textit{γ} and \textit{k} contain the same lacunae:

- p. 342, 21: \textit{σπανίζομενες} ... \textit{αὶς δὴ βασιλεῖς} (\textit{γ} f.321v; \textit{k} f. 328v)
- p. 455, 17: \textit{ἀνέπεισε} ... \textit{τὸν δὲ δισειόλφου} (\textit{γ} f. 420r; \textit{k} f. 433r)
- p. 465, 1: \textit{ῥώμης ἁγιαὶ} ... \textit{εἰ δὲ ὡς} \textit{ἡκιστα} (\textit{γ} f. 429v; \textit{k} f. 442v)
- p. 549, 18: \textit{διεσείσε} τε ... \textit{σπουδῆς ὁ χορφάς} (\textit{γ} f. 504v; \textit{k} f. 518r)

Proposition IX: \textit{c derives from k rather than from γ}

(1) \textit{c} and \textit{k} contain the same lacunae, which do not exist in \textit{γ}

- p. 82, 26: \textit{λεγούριοι} \textit{φικὴ} ... \textit{τὰ μὲν πρὸς βορρᾶν} (\textit{k} f. 78r; \textit{c} A52 f. 101r)
- p. 383, 23: \textit{ἐγνώ} καὶ \textit{τὴς} ... \textit{αὐτῷ} \textit{ξυμβάςης} (\textit{k} f. 367v; \textit{c} A54 f. 109v)
- p. 406, 15: \textit{ἐγχειρήμασι τουτίλα} \textit{ἐτέθη} ... \textit{ισα} \textit{θεῦ} (\textit{k} f. 388r; \textit{c} A54 f. 137v)

Proposition X: \textit{δ} is directly related to \textit{n}

(1) \textit{δ} and \textit{n} share identical text.

(2) The first three folios of both \textit{δ} and \textit{n} contain exactly the same amount of text.

(3) \textit{δ} and \textit{n} share the same distinction of paragraphs e.g., ... \textit{ἐτελεύτησε}; \textit{λόγον αὐτὸν} ...; \textit{ἀπολογῶν}; \textit{§ πεφοβημένοι} τε ... (\textit{n} f.109, \textit{δ} f. 79v)

(4) \textit{δ} and \textit{n} share identical punctuation and accents

(5) \textit{δ} and \textit{n} do not contain any marginalia apart from the extensive scholion at the end of Book VI in \textit{n}

Proposition XI: \textit{n and δ are related closely to a and L, rather than to Ath}

(1) \textit{n} and \textit{δ} share a large number of readings with \textit{a} and \textit{L}:

- e.g., p. 60, 24: \textit{σκευὴ} \textit{L, a, n, δ} | \textit{ἰσχύ} \textit{Ath}
- p. 68, 12: \textit{ἐπιθυμοῦ} \textit{L, a, n, δ} | \textit{ἐπειδοῦ} \textit{Ath}
- p. 89, 6: \textit{εἰκοσι} \textit{Ath} | \textit{εἰκοσι} \textit{L, a, n, δ}
Proposition XII: b, γ and k are transmitted from L and Ath through an intermediary tradition (ω)

(1) b, k and γ share a large number of readings with Ath and L (see below, Appendix II, p. 183).

(2) a, b, r, c, k and γ share the marginal notes of L (see below, Appendix III, p. 184).

(3) ω represents the intermediary tradition between L and Ath, and b, k and γ

(4) all manuscripts of the y family (L, a, b, c, k, n and γ) with the single exception of Ath contain the extensive scholion at the end of Book VI: δρα τὴν βελισαρίου μεγαλοψιχίαν καὶ ἔλευσιρον γνώμην καὶ πίστιν πρὸς Ιουστινιανὸν βασιλεὰ, καὶ δὴ ἐν πέντε ἐτεσίν ἤμυσεν τα κατὰ ἱταλίας καὶ Ιουτίγιδος κατορθώματα.

Thus, on the basis of propositions I-XII the stemma codicum of family y of Procopius' Wars, Books V-VIII, can be reconstructed graphically as follows:

```
        y
       / \  
      L  ω  Ath
     /  \
    a   \
   /    \
   b     \
 /        \
 n         \
|          \
|            \
|              \
|                δ
|                r
|                k
|                γ
|                c
```

13th c.

14th c.

15th c.

16th c.
4. Intellectual activity in the Palaeologan Period
(13th – 14th century)

The production of the earliest extant codices of Procopius’ Wars, Ath, L, K and V, at the end of the thirteenth and in the fourteenth century would indicate a demand for manuscripts and an interest in early Byzantine historiographical texts. This reflects the continuation of classical learning in Byzantium, despite its fragmentation following the Latin occupation in 1204. The productivity and mobility of scribes and scholars of the time is indicative of the cultural and intellectual movement, which certain scholars refer to as “Palaeologan Renaissance”.

This dynamic movement involved all aspects of artistic and scholarly activity and creativity, modelled on the ideals of classical antiquity. In the field of scholarship, the production of manuscripts containing both secular and religious authors of that period, as well as early Byzantine writers, reveals a serious interest in the exploration of the classical past and an awareness of the need to transmit the achievements of the Hellenic and Christian culture to the generations that followed. These manuscripts, as in the past, were copied and studied in Byzantium by both churchmen and laymen scholars, teachers and their students. Their surviving autobiographies, correspondence and works reveal a strong awareness of their role as guardians of Greek paideia, and cast light on their copious efforts to preserve the ancient texts by collecting manuscripts, studying and copying them. Their scholarly interest in secular literature included historiographical works.

---


202 It should be noted that classical historical works are preserved also in earlier extant manuscripts, for example the tenth-century codd. Laur. gr. 70,3 (Herodotus), Laur. 69,2 (Thucydides), the eleventh-century codd. Vat. gr. 2369 (Herodotus), Vat. gr. 126, Brit. Mus. 11727, Monac. 430 (Thucydides); and the twelfth-century cod. Paris. suppl. gr. 255 (Thucydides).
The survival of this tradition was made possible through a series of distinguished scholars and teachers of the early thirteenth century, based mainly in Nicaea. The new development is that higher education which since the twelfth century had been mainly under the aegis of the Patriarch now comes under the protection of the Emperor with the result that secular education was given greater attention. Therefore, teaching, especially higher education, required the re-establishment of schools, like those of Karykes, Hexapterygos, Blemmydes, Babouskomides and the court school of St Tryphon,203 and the re-edition of texts and the compilation of new textbooks.204 Among these scholars and teachers, Nicephorus Blemmydes (1197-1272) played a prominent role in copying, studying and teaching classical Greek philosophical and scientific works, at the same time compiling a number of useful textbooks for his students. His Autobiography is an invaluable source of information on his own studies.205 Following the standard Byzantine curriculum, Blemmydes received his early education, which comprised grammar (in Prousa under Monasteriotes),206 before he pursued his enkyklios paideia in the capital city of the exiled Byzantine court, and then his higher education in the Latin-controlled area of Skamandros under his teacher Prodromos.207 His higher studies, which he completed at Nympaion208 comprised mathematics, geometry, logic and physics.209 In his effort to collect manuscripts, he visited several places in the islands and the Greek mainland: Lesbos,210 Rhodes, Mount of Artamytion,211 Samos,212 and finally Mount Athos, where he spent some time in the large monastic libraries studying “vast quantities of books”.213 He also visited Thessaloniki, where he studied “intensively their similar stock”,214 before pursuing further

203 Generally, see C. Constantinides, Higher Education in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries (1204-c. 1310) (Nicosia, 1982), pp. 5-27.
207 Ibid., I. 4, 1-6.
208 Ibid., I. 9, 6 – 10, 13.
209 Ibid., I. 6, 1 – 9, 5.
210 Ibid., I. 35, 11-12.
211 Ibid., II. 20 -24.
212 Ibid., I. 57, 9-10.
213 Ibid., I. 63, 4-6.
214 Ibid., I. 63, 6-7.
his quest for manuscripts to the region around Larissa and beyond. There must be a link between the efforts of Emperor John Batazes III (1222-1254) to provide schools and libraries with all necessary books, and this great investigatory tour of Blemmydes in 1239; although nothing is stated by Blemmydes in his Autobiography, he is likely to have made the tour to help with this effort.

Blemmydes enjoyed a wide range of interests including astronomy, physics, philosophy, geography and theology. The texts he studied comprised mainly Aristotle and his Neoplatonic commentators, as well as Cleomides and Dionysios Periegetes, whom he used for his textbooks in his school. His contribution to the theological discussions on the Holy Trinity and the Procession of the Holy Spirit, between the Greek Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches at the time, is also very substantial.

Following the recovery of Constantinople and the restoration of the Empire, the Higher Imperial School and the Patriarchal school were re-established as the centres of education, whose aim was to provide the State and the Church with learned and capable officials and churchmen. At the same time monastic and private libraries were re-founded in Constantinople, which became a centre for the study and copying of manuscripts. For this purpose scribes and scholars travelled frequently to the City, in order to purchase or copy works which they could not find in their native lands.

George Akropolites (1217-1282), a high imperial official and major intellectual figure of the times, was appointed head of the re-established School of Philosophy, proving himself a very successful teacher. According to his student George of Cyprus, Akropolites attracted many students, on account of his erudition. Unfortunately, with the exception

215 Ibid., I. 63, 7-10.
216 In this order in his Autobiography, II. 75 -76.
221 George of Cyprus, Autobiography, p. 185, 17-18: συνέφρεον πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐκ ὀλίγοι, ἐρωτή παιδείας ἐλκόμενοι.
of his *Chronicle*, a precise and reliable account of the Empire of Nicaea with echoes of Lucian’s *How to write history*, and some theological works, most of Akropolites’ works do not survive. His legacy is felt through his distinguished student, George of Cyprus, and his son, Constantine Akropolites.

George of Cyprus (1240-1290), later Patriarch Gregory II (1283-89), was born in Cyprus, which at the time was ruled by the Lusignians. His family, which was originally wealthy, had lost its property after the colonisation following the Frankish conquest. George received his early education at the local school, before he moved to Nicosia to pursue higher studies. The difficulty he faced in learning Greek grammar, which was due to the lack of Greek teachers, and the fact that he was unable to master the Latin language, forced him to leave Cyprus. Travelling to Palestine and via Anaea to Ephesos, he tried to visit Blemmydes, who taught in his own monastery on a mountain near the city. Discouraged by Blemmydes’ students, George left for Nicaea. Unable to find teachers who would teach him philosophy, rhetoric and other subjects, apart from grammar and poetry, he moved to the recently restored city of Constantinople, and became a student of Akropolites, who had just been appointed to the chair of philosophy. George was able at last to fulfil his lifelong desire to study philosophy and mathematics. His studies comprised Aristotle’s logic, Euclid’s geometry and Nicomachos’ arithmetic. Rhetoric was one of the fields in which he persevered and finally excelled, earning the admiration of his contemporaries. His familiarity with classical texts is reflected in his numerous references to Homer, Sophocles and Demosthenes, who were the main authors studied by Byzantine students. Like Akropolites, George of Cyprus proved a very successful teacher. His teaching career started in the Monastery of Akataleptos, where he resided as a monk. It remains uncertain whether he later took over the position of his teacher at the School of

---

223 An important recent study on George of Cyprus is I. Perez Martin, *El patriarca Gregorio de Chipre (ca. 1240-1290) y la transmission de los textes clasicos en Bisanzio* (Madrid, 1996).
226 *Γρηγόριος τοῦ Κυπρίου οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατράρχου ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ μνημονία*, ed. S. Eustratiades (Alexandria, 1910) and also in *Εκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος* 1-5 (1908-10), (hereafter George of Cyprus, *Letters*), no. 58 and 80.
227 Ibid., no. 65.
228 Ibid., no. 65.
Philosophy. George taught grammar, poetry, rhetoric, dialectics and geometry and most probably arithmetic, analytics and Aristotelian philosophy. Most of his surviving works were compiled for his students. His collection of proverbs, a collection of seventeen mythological tales and paraphrases of the Fables of Aesop, an encomium of the sea and three declamations in the tradition of Libanius and Aphthonius were all used as textbooks. His correspondence with his students, scribes and other members of the higher intellectual circles, gives valuable information about the codices he copied and owned, including manuscripts with works by Plato, Aelius Aristides, Demosthenes and other orators. Lack of money, the scarcity of manuscripts and his passion for books compelled him to copy texts by his own hand, which sometimes was very painful to him as he suffered with his eyes. His activity as a copyist is reflected in his letters. He often asks his friends to lend him or return books to him, for both copying and studying, as well as restoring them. From his letters, it is clear that he was often unable to purchase writing material, especially paper (χάρτης), which was in short supply and costly.

229 Ibid., nos. 17, 28, 35, 44, 47, 75.
230 PG 142, cols 445-470 (Proverbiiorum collectio).
231 PG 142, cols. 433-444 (Encomium maris).
232 The three exercises were edited in the PG 142, cols. 299-418. Laudatio S. Georgii; Laudatio Michaelis Palaeologi; Laudatio Andronici Palaeologi.
233 George of Cyprus, Letters, no. 14 and 28.
234 Ibid., nos 26, 38, 75.
235 Ibid., no. 97.
236 George of Cyprus, Autobiography, p. 187, 14 – 189, 24. He calls himself a bibliophile (φιλόβιβλος) also in his letter no. 9.
237 George of Cyprus, Letters, no. 58 to Skoutariotes: βιβλίον ελληνικόν παρὰ σους καὶ ἀποδιδώσοι, ἑπειδή ἀποδίδωμι, ἔτερον αὐτ' αὐτοῦ αἰτούμαι λαβεῖν; no. 59 to Neokaisareites: ὑπεσχημένος ἀποστείλαι τὴν βιβλίον ἀπέστειλα οὐδαμῶς; no. 62 to Neokaisareites: καὶ γράφοντες ἀξίωμεν πέμπειν τὸ βιβλίον.
238 George of Cyprus, Letters, no. 187 to Raoulaina: Τὸ δὲ βιβλίον, τὸν Δημοσθένην, ἑπισκόπητεν τῷ γράφειν ἐπιτάττεις, ἀστικὸν περεῖν διόλου καὶ ἀκηλίδωτον ἔσται γε οὕτω καὶ ἑπισκόπημεν ἀλλ' ἑπειδὴ ὁ τοῖς μεταγράφειν ἑσταίη καρός, ἵνα δὲ οὐκ ἐνέστηκεν, ὅτι μηδὲ ἔρι ἔτι, οὐδὲ κρεωφαγοῦν ἄνθρωποι οὐδὲ δέρρεις προβάτων εἰς γραμμάτων ὑποδοχὴν ἐσεῖται δὲ οἷς ταῦτα μετὰ μικρὸν καὶ τότε καὶ γράφειν ἑπιβαλομένη ἄφθονα τὰ τῶν γραμμάτων ἑξούσια ὑποκείμενα, τότε καὶ τῷ γραφεῖ Μελώτα σοι ἐπιτάττεις τὸ βιβλίον συντηρεῖν ἐπιτάδομεν.
activity in the Palaeologan period

His teaching activities ceased once he ascended the Patriarchal throne of Constantinople in March 1283, during a period of ecclesiastical and political upheaval. His students, especially Maximos Planudes and Constantine Akropolites, continued his work, dominating the Byzantine intellectual scene in the decades that followed.

Maximos Planudes (ca. 1255-1305) became one of the greatest intellectual figures of the period.\textsuperscript{240} It has been recognized that his “width of interests is much greater than that of most Byzantine scholars”.\textsuperscript{241} Abandoning the prospects of a successful career in the civil service, Maximos preferred to dedicate his life to scholarship within the confines of a monastic life at the Chora Monastery, relocating to the Akataleptos Monastery sometime before 1301. His teaching interests are reflected in the surviving textbooks he wrote for his students. He composed a dialogue on Grammar (Γραμματικής διάλογος), a textbook on syntax (περὶ τῆς συντάξεως καὶ τῶν τῶν λόγων μερῶν),\textsuperscript{242} another on transitive and intransitive verbs,\textsuperscript{243} and a brief dictionary of Attic expressions (Ἄττικις μικροί),\textsuperscript{244} comprising citations and parallel passages from classical, Hellenistic and early Byzantine authors, including Sophocles, Aeschylus, Theophrastus, Philostratus and John Lydus.

Like his teacher, Planudes was a bibliophile, collector, copyist and restorer of manuscripts. He used to borrow and lend books to friends and other fellow scholars,\textsuperscript{245} and was an expert binder of manuscripts.\textsuperscript{246} One of the beneficiaries of his craft was the protovestiarios George Mouzalon, for whom Planudes bound a number of mathematical treatises in a single volume.\textsuperscript{247} From his correspondence, we also learn about his scribal activity. As in the case of his teacher, writing material must have been in short supply, as is evident in his request for parchment (μεμεβρανη) from Philanthropenos\textsuperscript{248} and Melchisedek Akropolites.\textsuperscript{249} Planudes was also interested in the organisation and enrichment of libraries.

\textsuperscript{240} H. Diller, “Codices Planudei”, \textit{BZ} (1937), 295 characterises Planudes as “the leader of the literary renaissance under the Palaeologi”.
\textsuperscript{242} \textit{Anecdota Graeca II}, ed. L. Bachman (Leipzig, 1828).
\textsuperscript{243} \textit{De emendatio ratione graecae grammaticae}, ed. E. Herman (Leipzig, 1801).
\textsuperscript{244} \textit{Anecdota Graeca I}, ed. J.-F. Boissonade (Paris, 1829).
\textsuperscript{245} \textit{Maximi Planudis Monachi Epistolae}, ed. M. Treu (Breslau, 1890; rpr. Amsterdam, 1960) (hereafter Planudes, \textit{Letters}), no. 28 to Xanthopoulos, no. 106 to Philanthropenos.
\textsuperscript{246} Ibid., no. 67, 41-42: τὸντο γὰρ τῆς ἑκα τέχνης τὸ ἕλκατατον.
\textsuperscript{247} Ibid., no. 67, 106-111: ... εἰς ἕνα τεύχος ἀπαντὰ σωμαθέντα.
\textsuperscript{249} Planudes, \textit{Letters}, no. 100, 3-25.
For example, in his letter to Mouzalon he mentions a list of manuscripts, which the library of the “Imperial Monastery” ought to contain, and asks his addressee for money in order to re-organise the “Imperial Library”. 

Undoubtedly, Planudes played a prominent role in the preservation of classical and Hellenistic Greek and Latin literature. This is attested in the numerous manuscripts transmitting the “Planudean recension”. One of his most important contributions is his *Anthology of Epigrams (Anthologia Planudea)*, consisting of classical and Hellenistic epigrams. Having made his collection he later incorporated other material as a supplement, which is preserved in an autograph codex (*Marc. gr. 481*) completed in 1301, which includes also Nonnos of Panopolis’ *Metaphrasis of the Gospel according to John*. The text of the epigrams bears Planudes’ emendations, which were used as a supplementary source by modern editors, for it not only offers superior readings, but also contains about four hundred epigrams, which are not part of the *Anthologia Palatina*. It should be noted that until the seventeenth century, the Planudean *Anthology* remained the only known collection of epigrams and minor poetry of classical and Byzantine Greek authors, until the discovery of the mid-tenth-century *Anthologia Palatina* (as called after the principal extant manuscript *Palatinus graecus 23*).

Planudes’ hand has been identified also in a number of manuscripts containing works from Apollonius, Hesiod, Oppian, Tryphiodorus and Theocritus, Ptolemy’s *Geography* and Plutarch’s complete moral works. These manuscripts and several others were produced by a circle of scribes and students under the direction of Planudes.

---

250 Ibid., no. 67, 69-70 to Mouzalon.
251 Ibid., no. 67. For the attempt of the Emperor to enrich the Imperial Library after the recapture of Constantinople, see C. Wendel, “Die erste Kaiserliche Bibliothek in Konstantinopel”, *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde* 59 (1942), 193ff; R. Browning, “Recentiores non deteriores”, *BICS* (1960), 12; C. Mango, “The availability of books in the Byzantine Empire, 750-850AD”, in *Byzantine Books and Bookmen*, pp. 33-34.
252 Most information about the Planudean manuscripts is found in H. Diller “Codices Planudei” *BZ* 37 (1937), 295-301, on which E.B. Fryde, *The Early Palaeologan Renaissance* (Leiden, 2000) and Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* are based.
Ten hands, for example, including Maximos', contributed to the production of codex *Ambrosianus C126 inf.* containing Plutarch's *Moralia* and the *Lives* of Galba and Otto. Another subject in which Planudes showed great interest was music and harmonics. All existing works on these subjects were collected by him in a single volume, to be used for teaching purposes at his school.

One of the most important sources of information on Planudes’ readings is his collection of excerpts entitled "Συναγωγή συλλεγέισα ἀπὸ διαφόρων βιβλίων παρὰ τοῦ σοφώτάτου καὶ λογιστάτου καὶ τιμιωτάτου ἐν μοναχοῖς κυροῦ Μαξίμου τοῦ Πλανοῦδη πάνυ ὁφέλιμος" (Vat. Palat. gr. 141). The full text of the excerpts survives in five manuscripts dated from the late thirteenth to the late fifteenth century, and it has been suggested that *Laurentianus 59.30* was Planudes’ master-copy. Most probably used as a school textbook, it contains an inventory of historical, scientific and religious works. Planudes’ serious interest in geography is reflected by his selection of long excerpts of Strabo’s *Geography* and Pausanias’ *Description of Greece*. His excerpts from Pausanias are of great value, for they represent an earlier tradition than the full text in the principal extant codices. A large part of the same collection comprises excerpts from Plato’s dialogues. The collection also includes excerpts from Pseudo-Aristotle’s *De Mundo*, Synesius and Christian authors, especially Gregory of Nazianzus. It is important to note that the content of the excerpts from Gregory of Nazianzus focus on the use of Hellenic *paideia* in the service of Christianity, which is indicative of Planudes’ attitude to the classical past and the teaching of these texts. In general, his selection of excerpts indicate...

---

258 This collection does not survive, but we know of its existence from Planudes, *Letters*, nos. 68, 25-8 and 46-8.
261 Diller, *Studies* comments on the intelligent handling of the work by Planudes explaining that “he omits, compresses, smoothes over and rounds off the text”, perhaps in an attempt to transform it into a manageable textbook. This may prove the purpose of the collection as an educational tool.
262 Diller, *Studies*, p. 344: “the archetype was probably Planudes’ codex”.
263 They are listed in A.M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Medicae Laurentianae* II (Florence, 1770), col. 145. Fryde, *Palaeologan Renaissance*, believes that Planudes possibly began his selection with an autobiographical poem of Gregory in which he spoke about his “love for the glory of literature which had been assembled by the East and the West at Athens, the ornament of Hellas” (ed. Bandini, *Codices Bibliothecae Laurentianae*, cols. 143-145).
that the collection was especially compiled for use in schools, aiming at teaching students their classical heritage, including history, geography, science and religion of ancient Greece.\(^{264}\)

More importantly, a significant section of Planudes’ collection consists of excerpts from historiographical sources, which reflects an interest in Roman and early Byzantine history. These excerpts derive from Byzantine compilations and Byzantine historians. The first forty-four excerpts derive from the seventh-century *Chronicle* by John of Antioch; Planudes cites the part that covers the period between the eighth century B.C. and the last decades before the end of the Roman Republic. Planudes’ interest seems to have lain in examples of ancient Roman virtues and also in comparing Greek and Latin institutions. The major part of Planudes’ historical excerpts comprises the *Epitome* of Dio Cassius’ *Roman History* compiled in 1070 by John Xifilinus. A small part of Planudes’ historical excerpts is of uncertain provenance. Some were probably derived from the verse *Chronicle*, which covers the years from the creation of the world to 1080, composed in 1150 by Constantine Manasses.\(^{265}\) An important part of Planudes’ collection consists of excerpts from John Lydus’ (ca. 490-565)\(^{266}\) *De mensibus*.\(^{267}\) The name of the author appears in the margin of three of Planudes’ own manuscripts, which contain almost the whole text except the beginning and the end. The importance of Planudes’ excerpts rests in the fact that it preserves a section of the work that has not survived elsewhere. The text provides unique information about the pagan Roman calendar and festivities, information which may have been useful also to his students.\(^{268}\) Planudes’ interest in pagan culture is reflected also in his autograph manuscript *Laurentianus* 32,16, containing a selection of thirteen oracles by the Neoplatonist Porphyry, deriving from the early sixth-century


\(^{265}\) See S. Kougeas “Zu den historischen Excerpten des Planudes” *BZ* 18 (1909), 126-46 where the scholar refers to the excerpts from John of Antioch, Xifilinus and Manasses.

\(^{266}\) John Lydus entered the imperial service in Constantinople in 511 and he was a Christian, but like others of his learned contemporaries such as Procopius, he looked back to the glories of the Roman past. Perhaps in 543 he was given a professorship at the University of Constantinople, being permitted to combine this with work in the prefecture until retirement.

\(^{267}\) Ioannis Lydi Liber de Mensibus, ed. R. Wuensch (Teubner: Stuttgart, 1968).

\(^{268}\) See M. Maas, *John Lydus and the Roman Past: Antiquarianism and Politics in the Age of Justinian* (New York, 1992). There is no comment in modern studies about the possible use of this manuscript by Planudes. Both Fryde, *Palaeologan Renaissance*, p. 253 and Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*, p. 234, mention this information without any further explanation, except to say that the Planudean excerpts are an important source for the reconstruction of the text. See Diller, *Studies*, pp. 299-300.
Planudes excerpted from the work the oracles possibly of relevance to Christians.

Apart from his interest in Roman and early Byzantine historiographical works, Planudes was also interested in classical historiography. Two manuscripts of Thucydides' *History*, bearing Planudes' annotations, are preserved: *Monacensis gr. 430* and *Kassel Hist. fol. 3*. As in the case of other manuscripts that he owned, these two codices were most probably used as textbooks for his students.

Another field in which Planudes excelled was his translations of Latin works into Greek. His command of the Latin language is reflected in the translations of the numerous Latin Fathers and secular authors: Augustine, Pseudo-Cyprian, Cato, Ovid, Cicero and Boethius.

Like his teacher, Gregory of Cyprus, Planudes was well aware of the need to produce works for later generations. In his letter to Theodora Raoulaina, the niece of Michael III, herself a scholar and a bibliophile, he states that καὶ δείξομεν καὶ ημᾶς παρέφθαρται χρόνος, ἀλλ' ἐφυσαν κἀν τούτῳ τινές, οἷς τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς καλλίστων κληρονομοῦντες ἔκεινοι δίκαιοι ἄν ἐς τὰ μάλιστα γινώσκειν χάριτας εἶν. 

The same interest and ideals were shared by his friend and fellow student Constantine Akropolites (1250-1324), the elder son of George Akropolites, whom he succeeded to the honorary titles of λογοθέτης τοῦ γενικοῦ and later on of μέγας

---

270 Alan Cameron, *The Greek Anthology*, describes the contents of codex *Laurentianus gr. 32.16*, which was compiled by Planudes between 1280-83 and he refers to the *Theosophia* (p. 211-212).
271 *Monacensis gr. 430* of the eleventh century, *Kassel Hist. f. 3*, annotated by Planudes in 1302.
277 Ibid., no. 68, 75-79.
In his letters Constantine speaks about his own studies, acknowledging the inspiration and the encouragement he received from his father, as well as his generosity. Himself also a bibliophile, it seems likely that he spent a large proportion of his father’s endowment on the acquisition of books which were probably the most expensive element of one’s studies. Though Constantine refers to his teachers, unfortunately he does not give their names. According to George Pachymeres, Maximos Holobolos appears to have been Constantine’s teacher while he received his *enkyklios paideia*. It has been suggested that the anonymous addressee of two of his letters in which Constantine expresses his reverence to his teacher, is no other than Holobolos. His affection for Holobolos is also expressed in his letter 121. Similarly, George Pachymeres, who was possibly the anonymous recipient of another letter of Constantine, acted as his teacher. There is no doubt that Constantine was taught also by George of Cyprus. Their close relationship is evident in their correspondence. Both scholars used to borrow and lend each other manuscripts, and sometimes they complained of the delay in receiving them back, as is the case in one of his letters to Constantine, in which George asks him to return his copy of Aelius Aristides, which his friend had kept for a long time. We know from Constantine’s letters that himself owned a private library, having inherited most of his books from his father. Among his books, a copy of Plato’s *Menon*, works of Democritus and

---

284 For example, George of Cyprus, *Letters*, nos. 2, 38, 39, 183.
286 We learn from the letter no. 80 that a book, probably Plato, was requested by one of his students: Τὴν βιβλίον, ἣν πρὸς τῆς σῆς ἀπηρτήθη σεβασμίτης, ῥαδίως μὲν ἐκτηραζόμην. Πατρόθεν καὶ γὰρ σὺν συνυαίνες ἐτέραις εἰς κλήρου ἀπεινεμήθη μοι ῥαδίως αὐτῆς τοῖς ἑθελοῦσι χραίν.
Heraclitus, Plotinus and George Pisides’ poems. Constantine used to keep his books in a box in a special room in his house, while he had his own study in his house.

His letters contain numerous allusions and references to Greek authors, including Hesiod, Herodotus, Aeschylus, Homer and Aristotle, which reflect his interest and training. Constantine, like most of his fellow-scholars, copied manuscripts for his own use. In his letter to Iosef Rhakendytus, he requested an Epitome of the Aristotelian works to be sent from Thessaloniki, in order for him to be able to make a copy for his own library. In another letter Constantine mentions an incomplete manuscript owned by his unknown addressee, which needed corrections. Elsewhere, he asked his addressee to correct both his own mistakes and those made by the scribe in a personal volume containing his own works.

At an early stage, Constantine became a teacher of rhetoric in which he distinguished himself. He composed a large number or works in both verse and prose, including epigrammata and encomia for Saints. It is this last genre in which he excelled himself earning the title of the “New Metaphrast”. In addition, like George of Cyprus, Constantine composed progymnasmata for the teaching of rhetoric, comprising four fables, a tale, a comparison, five ἐκφρασίς and an ἐκφρασίς. Modelled on Aphthonios, these exercises are adjusted to the Christian context.

---

288 Constantine Akropolites’ Letters no. 95.
289 Ibid., no. 78. He asked for a good text of Pisides to correct his own old copy.
290 Ibid., no. 80.
291 Ibid., no. 59.
292 Ibid., nos. 30 and 178.
293 Ibid., no. 189.
294 Ibid., e.g., nos. 24, 25, 189.
295 Ibid., e.g., nos. 31, 84, 99, 140.
296 Ibid., no. 59: ... διὸς ἐγενόμην τῆς ἀναγνώσεως, οὐκ ὀλίγων ὅπως διέλθων καὶ κόρον τοῦτον λαβὼν, πρὸς ἔτεραν ἐργασίαν ἐτράπην, χάρτην γάρ καὶ μέλαινα μεταχειρισμένος, γράφειν παρωμήθην καὶ ἐγραφών.
297 Ibid., no. 137.
298 Ibid., no. 70: Ἐφην μὲν αὐτός ἐλλατῇ τὴν βιβλοφ οὖν... ἡ στέλλω συν ὁ βιβλίον εἰς ἀναπλήρωσιν ὁ κόσμου θελήσας ἀπαλάξας, αὐτὸς ἀναπλήρωσιν.
299 Ibid., no. 186: τὸ πτεύον αὐτῷ διέλθε. ἀ τῆς τῶν ἐκθέμενος καὶ τῷ μεταγεγραφοίς ἐσφαλματεί τε καὶ δημαρταί γνωῦν αὐτῶν γνώρισά τε καὶ ἡμῖν γνώρισας φροντίδος οὐκ ἀπαλάξεις.
300 E.g., Epigramma contro Satana; Epigramma per l’immagine del Cristo detta Antiphonettes; Antifona per la Vergine. Cf. Romano, Constantine Akropolites’ Letters, pp. 18-19.
A Chronicle from Aeneas to A.D. 1260/1, accompanied by notes concerning fourteenth-century Byzantine emperors added by a later hand (Vindob. Hist. gr. 99, ff. 15-35), has been attributed to Constantine on the basis of the title: τῶν ἀκροπολίτων κυροῦ καὶ μεγάλου λογοθέτου. ἐπιτομὴ ἀρχής τῶν ῥωμαίων ἐπικρατείας κἂν τίνος κατάγονται καὶ πῶς ῥωμαῖοι ἐκλήθησαν. In the absence of the name, however, the attribution of this short work to Constantine remains to be ascertained.\footnote{F. Fotopoulos, ed., "Αὐξήσατο Κωμοτακτίνου τοῦ Ἀκροπολίτου", Νέα Σιών 11 (1911), 862-869.}

After 1261, when the Empire’s role to preserve the Greco-Byzantine heritage and continuity became vital, an increase of the number of teachers and the foundation of more schools took place in Constantinople and in Thessaloniki, which rivalled the Byzantine capital in its intellectual vigour.\footnote{R. Romano, "Etopee inedite di Constantino Acropolita", Talaerikoi: Studia Graeca A. Garzia sexagenario a discipulis oblata (Naples, 1987), pp. 311-338.} Thomas Magistros (ca. 1275-1347),\footnote{F. Fotopoulos, ed., "Ἀνέκδοτα Κωσταντινού τοῦ Ἀκροπόλιτου", Νέα Σιών 12 (1912) 278-281.} a student of Maximus Planudes, is one of the most important figures in the intellectual life of his native city of Thessaloniki at the time. After his studies, Magistros became a monk under the name of Theodoulos and spent his entire life in Thessaloniki, though very little is known about it. He produced a Collection of Attic Names and Verbs, designed to guide the prose writer in the choice of his vocabulary. In composing his work, he used a very wide range of earlier lexica and added numerous citations from leading Greek writers. The index of quotations in his lexicon reveals that Thomas’ tastes favoured Thucydides, as well as authors of the second sophistic age, which is well represented with Aristides, Lucian, Libanius and Synesius. The only patristic writer cited in the lexicon is Gregory of Nazianzus.

Magistros’ works also comprised an edition of Pindar, political treatises, various versions of commentaries on standard texts and especially on Sophocles, Aeschylus, Euripides and Aristophanes. Between 1314 and 1318 he travelled to Constantinople on an embassy to Andronikos II. There he delivered an oration before the Emperor, on behalf of

\footnote{M. Treu, "Ein Kritiker", believes that Akropolites’ high standard in and familiarity with classical Greek was an achievement which was not equalled by any other Byzantine author.}


\footnote{On this, see A. Vakalopoulos, The History of Thessaloniki (Thessaloniki, 1963), p. 51; O. Tafrali, Thessalonique au XVe siècle (Paris, 1913), p. 150.}

\footnote{For Magistros, see Wilson, Scholars of Byzantium, pp. 247-249; Fryde, Early Palaeologan Renaissance, pp. 299-301; Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, eds. A.P. Kazhdan et al., cols 2076-7.}
the general Chadrenos who had defended Thessaloniki against the Catalans, Turks and Serbs. His political treatises, entitled Περὶ Βασιλείας and Περὶ Πολιτείας, modelled on Demosthenes and Aristides, deal with the duties of the Emperor and his subjects respectively. It is clear that the classical tragedians, Thucydides and the authors of the second sophistic period impressed Magistros, though his interest seems to have been mainly philological rather than on the content of the works itself. This reflects the general phenomenon of mimesis, imitating the style of classical authors, which pervades the Byzantine literary world.

Among Planudes’ students the most distinguished was Demetrios Triklinios (ca. 1280-1340). His major contribution to the preservation and study of the Sophoclean, Euripidean and Aeschylean tradition surpassed that of his own teacher and probably of all his contemporary scholars active in Constantinople. Triklinios was born and based in Thessaloniki. The majority of his extant works comprise editions of Greek poetry, plays and rhetorical works, which he fully annotated applying techniques of textual criticism, making use of more than one manuscript for his critical text. Following Planudes’ tradition, Triklinios dedicated the major part of his work primarily to teaching purposes.

It has been pointed out that Triklinios’ handling of the text of the Greek dramatists shows that, unlike his fellow student Magistros, his own editions went beyond the immediate needs of a school reading list. His main aim was to produce complete editions of the extant tragedies. In addition, apart from the standard cannon of comedies of Aristophanes taught in schools, which comprised Clouds, Frogs and Wealth, Triklinios proceeded editing and annotating five more of Aristophanes’ comedies, Acharnians, Wasps, Knights, Birds, Peace. The numerous metrical improvements he introduced produced a text of “fairly good quality.” There is no doubt that Triklinios’ influence in the Byzantine manuscript tradition and commentaries of the Greek plays was substantial.

---

310 Wilson, Scholars of Byzantium, believes that Magistros emerges as “well acquainted with the works of Aristides, but was unable to understand him satisfactorily”.
311 For Triklinios, see Wilson, Scholars of Byzantium, pp. 249-256; Fryde, Early Palaeologan Renaissance, pp. 268-290, Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, eds. A.P. Kazhdan et al., cols 2116-2117.
313 The three surviving ones, Thesmophoriazusae, Ecclesiazusae and Lysistrata, which he did not include, were probably unknown to him.
314 The merits used to be attributed to his student Musurus, but after the discovery of codex Holkham gr. 88, a copy of the Triclinian edition of the eight Aristophanic plays, written about a century after Triklinius’ death, Triklinius deserves the credit for all improvement to the text. See, N.G. Wilson, “The Triklinian edition of Aristophanes”, CQ 12 (1962), 32-47.
Apart from the quality of his editions, his major contribution is his preparation of new recensions of ancient Greek tragedies and comedies, especially those that did not form part of the standard curriculum at the time.\textsuperscript{315}

From his surviving works it seems that Triklinios was interested mainly in Greek poetry. His love and understanding of Greek verse and metre is reflected also in his revision of the Planudean Anthology of Epigrams, for which he possibly had to travel to Constantinople to access the manuscripts he required, and his edition of Hesiod's \textit{Theogony} and \textit{Works and Days}, Theocritus' \textit{Idylls} and Pindar's \textit{Odes}. In this latter edition, Triklinios displayed his profound knowledge of metre, on which he composed an introductory note preceding each of the \textit{Odes}.

Influenced by his teacher, Triklinios developed an additional interest in astronomy and geography. It is interesting that certain codices from Planudes' library came at some stage into the possession of Triklinios. From the notes that appear in some astronomical and geographical manuscripts, it is evident that both teacher and student studied thoroughly and annotated these texts, as in the \textit{Phaenomena} of Aratus, in which they shared a great interest. His legacy was followed by his pupils and later scholars, such as John Catraris (ca.1500-), who is known as a copyist of several classical texts and Marcus Musurus (1470-1517), who was the leading figure in the circle of Aldus Manutius, many of whom not only followed his editorial techniques but also imitated his calligraphic hand.

The production of new historiographical works and the study of the Greek and Roman historiographical tradition of the past by Palaeologan scholars, teachers and students are amply attested. It seems that the study of the classical, Hellenistic and early Byzantine historians and chroniclers emanated both from a genuine interest in history, but also from the need to use these texts for their philological aspect, both as textbooks and private reading. For example, codex \textit{Basileensis} E.II.4,\textsuperscript{316} of the fourteenth century, contains Thucydides' \textit{History}. This codex belonged to Giovanni Tortelli (ca. 1400-1466), who travelled to Constantinople in 1435 to learn Greek under John Eugenikos (1380-1453). He stayed there for two years. On f. 247v a note by the hand of Tortelli states that

\textsuperscript{315} Wilson, \textit{Scholars of Byzantium}, p. 250.
\textsuperscript{316} See a description of this codex in H. Omont, \textit{Catalogue des manuscrits grecs des Bibliothèques de Suisse} (Leipzig, 1886), no. 79, p. 33.
the codex was presented to him by his teacher John Eugenikos on 3 July 1435, two months after he started his lessons.317 The text, which Eugenikos chose for his student, shows his intention of instructing him using a model of Attic language and style and at the same time to introduce him to one of the greatest classical historical works. This manuscript was copied and bound in the Monastery of Prodromos Petra in Constantinople. Similarly, codex *Laurentianus 69.16*, also of the fourteenth century, contains Thucydides' *History*.318 So far, nothing is known about its provenance.

Other classical historians are preserved in a number of fifteenth-century manuscripts: *Vaticanus Chis. R.VI.41*, copied by George Chrysokokkes (ca. 1355 -) in October 1424, contains Xenophon's *Kyrou Paideia*.319 Cod. *Ambrosianus C 82 sup.*, copied possibly by George Baiophorus in 1426, contains Herodotus' *History*, part of a *Lexicon Herodoteum*, together with Theophrastus' *Characters* and letters by Manuel Moschopolous.320 Cod. *Ambrosianus E 11 inf.*, copied in the same period, contains Xenophon's *Kyrou Paideia* and Arrianus' *Anabasis*.321 Both *Ambrosiani* manuscripts were owned by Manuel Sophianus.322 Cod. *Matritensis 4561*, copied by three unidentified scribes in 1427, contains Thucydides' *History* and Xenophon's *Hellenica*.323 Excerpts from Thucydides and Plutarch have been preserved in cod. *Basileensis 297*, datable to the fifteenth century.324

With regard to Procopius, there is strong evidence to suggest that his works were studied in that period for the same purposes, namely for private study and teaching. For the

---

318 See description of this codex in Bandini, *Codices Bibliothecae Laurentianae*, vol. 1, col. 638.
322 Manuel Sophianos lived in Constantinople (Petra) during the fifteenth century and he possessed numerous Greek manuscripts, which were donated to the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana in 1606, see Cataldi – Palau, "Manoscritti di Giovanni di Ragusa", pp. 20-21
324 See description of this manuscript in Omont, *Manuscripts grecs des Bibliothèques de Suisse*, Bern, no. 103, p. 39.
purpose of our study, we have already mentioned above codices which contain the second
tetras of Wars or parts of it: Ambrosianus A182 sup. (a) of the fourteenth/fifteenth century,
Parisini graeci 1703 (b) and 1310 (h) of the fifteenth century, Ambrosiani A52-55 sup. (c),
Basileensis gr. D IV 6 (k), Monacensis gr. 87 (n), Salamantinus 2750 (γ), Scorialensis Y.
I. 13 (θ) and Vaticanus Reginensis graecus 84 (r) of the sixteenth century; some of them
were copied by well-known professional scribes (a, k, γ, c) and some belonged to
prominent scholars of the time (h). Other codices preserving the complete text or parts of
Procopius’ Wars, Buildings and Secret History have survived from that period. Codex
Parisinus gr. 2022 of the fourteenth century,325 bearing an autograph note by Angelos
Vergikios (ca. 1500-1569),326 comprises some unspecified excerpts from speeches by
Procopius (f. 83v), along with Aristotle’s Topica and letters by Libanius, Synesius,
Gregory Nazianzenus, John Glycas and George of Cyprus. Similarly, codex Scorialensis
I.Z.1,327 datable to the fifteenth century and recorded to have been lost in a fire in 1671,
was an epistolarium, comprising some excerpts by Procopius (ff. 49-53), along with letters
by Heraklitos, Iamblichos, Diodorus Siculus, Nicolas Lampenos, Emperor Julian, Nicolas
Secundinos, George of Cyprus, George Gemistos, Bessarian, Manuel Moschopoulos,
Mathaios Kamariotes, Demetrios Kydones, George Scholarios, Mark of Ephesos, Maximos
Planudes and others.328 Laurentianus 9.32, which belongs to the fourteenth century,
comprises fragments from Procopius’ Buildings, as well as excerpts from Wars, Books II-
VIII, together with Arrianus’ De expeditione Alexandri and Historia Indica.329 Excerpts
from Procopius’ Buildings are also preserved in the two fifteenth-century codices
Basileensis 43330 and Laurentianus 70.5. The latter codex contains also a collection of
historiographical texts, including Evagrius’ History, Appian’s Italian History, Paianius,
Mennnon Historicus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ Roman Archaeology.331 The Prooemium

325 Lameere, Tradition, p. 66. See description of this codex in H. Omont, Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits
326 F. 1r: έν τόθε έστι τάυτα / αριστοτέλους τοπικώς βιβλία η’ / συνεσίου ἐπιστολάι / λιβανίου
ἐπιστολάι τίνες.
327 See Lameere, Tradition, p. 53f., n.1, now M.12, see G. de Andres, Catalogo de los codices griegos
desaparecidos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial (Escorial, 1968), no. 605, pp. 279-280.
328 De Andres, Codices griegos desaparecidos de El Escorial, p. 279 notes: “Procopii ex eiusdem histories ut
videtur collectae epistolae Iustiniani imp., Belisarii sex ad diversos, Ioannis ducis Iustiniani, Martini, Vitigis
Regis Gothorum, Tylae Myrrhani inter se permixtae et in f. 51 in fine earum est narratio Procopii de
Belisario”.
330 Omont, Manuscripts grecs des Bibliothèques de Suisse, Geneve, no. 161, p. 55.
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of Procopius’ Wars survives in a later fifteenth/sixteenth-century codex, Ambrosianus P270 sup. (f. 94), which includes also works by Hesiod.332 Important evidence about the critical study of Procopius’ works is provided by Vaticanus gr. 16,333 which contains the Secret History. This codex contains the marginal note ξένος against chapter XVIII, 3-9 of the edited text by a fifteenth-century hand, possibly marking an interpolation.334 In the period that followed, as has already been mentioned,335 Leonardus Aretinus Brutus (1441) and Christophorus Persona (1481) translated Procopius’ Gothic Wars into Latin, though they do not mention their manuscript sources.

Later manuscripts with sections of Procopius’ works include five codices copied by Andreas Darmarios, who also copied codices Ambrosiani A52-55 sup. (c) (see above, pp. 147-8): Ambrosiani C 118 sup. and 121 sup., which contain part of Procopius’ Secret History;336 Scorialenses R.III.13 and R.III.14 with excerpts from Procopius’ Wars, together with fragments from Thucydides, Herodotus of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Sikeliotes, Agathias, Theophylact Simocatta, Menander Protector and Appian;337 and Ambrosianus N 135 sup., copied in August 1574, with fragments of Procopius’ Wars (f. 490r) together with excerpts from Polybius, Zosimus, Diodorus Siculus, Herodotus, Thucydides, Agathias and Theophylact Simocatta.338

It seems that codex Ath was a product of the same milieu of Palaeologan scribes, scholars and teachers, though it is impossible to determine in which specific circle it was produced. The annotation of the text in the manuscript and especially the marginal note on f. 73r: ωφαία μαξτα τοῦ προκοπίουν. ὂμοῦ δὲ καὶ χρήσωμα, which reflects an appreciation of Procopius’ language and style as well as the moral value of his historical narrative (see above, pp. 13-16), point to the same intention, namely to instruct students and/or study the historical text for one’s own pleasure and benefit. The interest in and

332 Martini-Bassi, Catalogus Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, p. 733-736, no. 655.
333 For a description of the manuscript, see I. Mercati – P. F. Cavalieri, Codices Vaticani Graeci (Rome, 1923), vol. I, pp. 14-16.
334 Ed. and trans. H.B. Dewing, Procopius, The Anecdota or Secret History (Loeb: London-Cambridge, MA, 1954), pp. 212, §3 – 214, §9 with no indication of this note, which was brought to my attention by Dr. Ch. Dendrinos.
336 Martini-Bassi, Catalogus Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, p. 223-224, no. 208 and p. 225, no. 211.
338 Martini-Bassi, Catalogus Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, p. 660-661, no. 552.
familiarity of the scribes with classical historiography is reflected by the two marginal notes with reference to Procopius’ similarity with Thucydides’ method and style (ff. 39v: \[\textbf{Θουκυδίδου τὸ εἴδος τούτο τῆς φράσεως, and 43v: Θουκυδίδου τὸ ἔθος}\]. The same values for the production of Procopius’ text, namely pleasure and benefit, and the interest in the classical language and style, are demonstrated in the prefatory letter of Salamantinus 2750 by Antonios Calosynas (see below, Appendix 1, pp. 181-2).

The admiration of Palaeologan scholars for the achievements of the classical past, which they inherited from their immediate predecessors,\(^3\) was combined with a new element, the emergence of an awareness of their Hellenic national identity, which gradually appeared in their own works. This awareness was re-enforced by the bitter experience of the Latin conquest. Rather than looking at their immediate past, the Byzantines preferred to remind themselves of the glorious years of the Empire under distinguished emperors, such as Justinian.

It is essentially to the scholars and scribes of this last phase in Byzantine history that we owe the survival of the treasures of the classical scholarship and literature in the period that followed the fall of the Empire, and indeed to our days.

CONCLUSION

Codex Athos, Lavra H-73 (Ath), datable to the late thirteenth century, is probably the earliest surviving manuscript transmitting Procopius' Wars, Books V-VIII. It is possible that this codex was part of a collection of manuscripts, now lost, containing the complete work. On the basis of textual evidence, it is clear that though, due to numerous minor errors and slips of the pen, it represents an inferior tradition in comparison with Laurentianus 69,8 (L), the second earlier witness of family y, Ath is important for two reasons. First, Ath contains a number of readings that confirm corrections and emendations by modern editors, and offer some new defensible readings, which improve the text in certain unclear passages. Secondly, Ath, unknown to Haury, sheds light on the reconstruction of the stemma codicum of this section of the work in family y, as it is related closely with the later extant codices k, c, γ, b and r dated to the fifteenth and sixteenth century through an intermediary tradition. In the light of these observations the stemma of Books V-VIII has been revised (above, p. 159).

More specifically, though the new evidence confirms Haury's suggestions concerning the close relation between c and k, and r and b, it differs regarding the possible relations between Ath, L, b, γ, δ and n within family y. The proposed relationship of these manuscripts vis-à-vis Haury's stemma is summarised as follows:

1) Ath and L, though sharing the same tradition (y), are linked through intermediary copies.

2) Ath, L, b, k and γ most probably share an intermediary tradition (ω), which contained marginalia of L and readings of both L and Ath.

3) Haury suggested with some reservation that γ is an apograph of L. An examination of γ shows that it derived from an intermediary lost tradition and has a common exemplar with k.

4) Haury's suggestion that b and γ derive directly from L should be abandoned, for b and γ share a number of different readings from L.
5) Contrary to Haury’s suggestion, n derives directly from a, and not from γ.
6) δ, which was not examined by Haury, derives directly from n.
7) γ derived from a common exemplar with k, and not with n, as Haury suggested. For, γ and k seem to have been copied by the same scribe, or at least in the same scriptorium, and share a considerable number of readings.

In conclusion, it appears that Ath is an important manuscript in the transmission of Procopius’ Wars V-VIII. Its production and annotation in the late thirteenth century Byzantium reflects the interest of scholars in early Byzantine historiographical works confirmed by other historical manuscripts dated to the same era.
Τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ ἀρχιερεῷ καὶ πρωτοστάτῃ¹ τε τοῦ μέγα δυναμένου βασιλέως Φιλίππου, ὁ σὸς θεράπων Ἀντώνιος ιατρὸς φυσικός.

Τοὺς παρελθήσας χρόνους, εἰς τὴν τοῦ Τριλήντου οἰκουμενικῆν σύνοδον, μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς καὶ εὐγνωμοσύνης τὰ τῶν ἀγίων παλαιότατα βιβλία ἀνακαίνιζειν σε καὶ ἐπανορθώειν, οὐκ ἔσθ᾽ δοτὶς ἄν εἰὴ ἐξαφνός οἶμαι, πολυμαθέσατε πρωτοστάτα· καὶ τήνδε τὴν πρόνοιαν ποιούμενος πολλά τῶν ἀγίων, καὶ συγγραφεῖς καλλιγραφησάτων, μεγάλοις ἀναλώμασι καὶ δαπάνοις ὑμετέροις ἀνέσωσας. Ὡς ἐμαυτῷ ἐνθυμησάμενος, καὶ κατὰ νύν ἀναπολήσας τὴν προθυμίαν τὴν ὑμετέραν πρὸς τὰ τῶν διδασκάλων συγγράμματα, τὸν τὸν Προκόπιον, διὸ κατὰ τις τόχην εὐρών, σοὶ πορίζειν ἡξίωσα· θαυμάσας δὲ τῆς φράσεως καλλιγραφίας ἀμώσητος καὶ τῆς ἀποκατάστατον διαλέκτου, ἀγεσθαί μου ἐπέρχεται αὕτης ἐρωτομανῆς ἀνακικλῶν τινος ἐνεκεν ὁὐτος ὁ ἱστορικός, οὕτω τοῖς φιλέλλησιν προεξενήθη· καὶ πρὸς πολλῶν ὁν χρημάτων τοῦτον ἀνταλλάξαστο τε τῶν σοφῶν εὖ οἶδα, διὰ τὸ τοῦ Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ νομοθέτου, καὶ τῶν Γότθων ἀξιοπρεπέστατον ὄνομα, ἔξ ὑν οἱ τῶν Ἰσπανῶν ἀρχαίοι βασιλεῖς γενεαλογοῦνται. Οὐ μόνον δὲ ἄλλα καὶ κέρδος τιμαλβικόν τινι γενέσθαι ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις βιβλίοις ἐνιστε· οὐκόν λάμβανε τοῦτο τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα, ἀσπασία μοι κεφαλή, ὃ ὁ πάλαι σοι προφήτης καὶ δεδοκιμασμένος, καὶ ἡμιόλος Ἀντώνιος προεξενίζει καὶ διατελεῖ ἡμᾶς

---

4 εὐγνωμοσύνης, γ || 5 βιβλία, γ || 6 οἶμαι γ | πρωτοστάτα γ | τὴν δὲ τὴν γ || 10 ὑμετέραν, γ | τὸν δὲ γ || 13 ἀπεικόνισεν γ | αὕτης σστ. γ | ἐρωτομανῆς γ || 15 προεξενίθη γ | τίς γ || 14 φιλ᾽ ἐλληστή γ || 16 νομοθέτου, γ || 18 γενεαλογοῦνται γ || 19 οὐκόν γ || 20 ἐπιτήδευμα γ

---

¹ It is possible that the ἀρχιερείς is the Bishop of Toledo, Garcia de Loyasa, who was one of the persons that Calosynas was copying under their instructions, see above fn. 186, p. 151.
στήργων· εἰμιηνεία δὲ θεοῦ καὶ τὸν ἄγιον Κύριλλου εἰς τοὺς δώδεκα
προφήτας μεταγράψομαι σοι βιβλίον πάνυ καλὸν καὶ τίμιον, καὶ οὐδεὶ
άλλω εἴμι σοι ἄξιον, ἀνδρὶ τὴν μὲν ἡλικίαν σεμνῷ, τὸν δὲ βλεύν σώφρονι,

25 ἀρετῆς δὲ ἐν ἔργοις ἐμπειρῷ εἰς δημοφελείαν, βρῶν ψυχικῶν ἁγαθῶν·
ἐν σοὶ γὰρ ἡ εὐφυσία, ἡ φιλανθρωπία, ἡ ἐμπειρία, ἡ ἐγκράτεια, ὡμιλία
eὐάρμοστος, ἀψευδὴς ἡθος, εὐστάθεια, ἐν βουλαῖς τάχος, καλλίστην ἐν
tαῖς πράξεσι προαίρεσιν, ὡστε σοὶ ἀρμόζει τὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου Γαληνοῦ
ῥήτον "οὐ μόνον ψυχρότητος καὶ θερμότητος ἐν τῷ μέσῳ καθέστηκε ὁ

30 οὕτως ἐνσαρκὸς ἀνθρωπός, ἀλλὰ καὶ διαπλάσεως ἁρίστης τετύχηκε".
Ἰσως μὲν ἐπομένης τῆς τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων εὐκρασίας, τάχα δὲ
tυπὸ θειοτέραν ἁρχὴν ἐτέραν ἐχώσης ἀνωθεν.

Ἔρρωσο.
Εἰς Τολέτου α’ ὕπ’ ὕπφ’ Ἐλίον ιζ’.

22 δώδεκας γ || 23 οὐ ὄδειν γ || 24 ἄλλω γ || 25 ἁγαθῶν. γ || 27 καλίστην γ || 28 παρθενεῖν—ῥά
σκερ. γ || ἀσ τε γ || 29-30 ῥήτον οὐ μόνον... τετύχηκε. || 31 ἐπομένης γ | εὐκρασία γ
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Appendix II: Common and different readings\(^{340}\) of Ath and L with later manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ath</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>γ</th>
<th>δ</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιστάς</td>
<td>ἐπιστάς</td>
<td>ἐπιστάς</td>
<td>ἐπιστάς</td>
<td>ἐπιστάς</td>
<td>ἐπιστάς</td>
<td>ἐπιστάς</td>
<td>ἐπιστάς</td>
<td>ἐπιστάς</td>
<td>ἐπιστάς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιστῆς</td>
<td>ἐπιστῆς</td>
<td>ἐπιστῆς</td>
<td>ἐπιστῆς</td>
<td>ἐπιστῆς</td>
<td>ἐπιστῆς</td>
<td>ἐπιστῆς</td>
<td>ἐπιστῆς</td>
<td>ἐπιστῆς</td>
<td>ἐπιστῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάπλασις</td>
<td>ἀνάπλασις</td>
<td>ἀνάπλασις</td>
<td>ἀνάπλασις</td>
<td>ἀνάπλασις</td>
<td>ἀνάπλασις</td>
<td>ἀνάπλασις</td>
<td>ἀνάπλασις</td>
<td>ἀνάπλασις</td>
<td>ἀνάπλασις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐστρίειοιται</td>
<td>- ωται</td>
<td>- ωται</td>
<td>- ωται</td>
<td>- ωται</td>
<td>- ωται</td>
<td>- ωται</td>
<td>- ωται</td>
<td>- ωται</td>
<td>- ωται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπίθυμοντο</td>
<td>ἐπίθυμοντο</td>
<td>ἐπίθυμοντο</td>
<td>ἐπίθυμοντο</td>
<td>ἐπίθυμοντο</td>
<td>ἐπίθυμοντο</td>
<td>ἐπίθυμοντο</td>
<td>ἐπίθυμοντο</td>
<td>ἐπίθυμοντο</td>
<td>ἐπίθυμοντο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμύνωσθαι</td>
<td>ἀμύνωσθαι</td>
<td>ἀμύνωσθαι</td>
<td>ἀμύνωσθαι</td>
<td>ἀμύνωσθαι</td>
<td>ἀμύνωσθαι</td>
<td>ἀμύνωσθαι</td>
<td>ἀμύνωσθαι</td>
<td>ἀμύνωσθαι</td>
<td>ἀμύνωσθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναρριπτείν</td>
<td>ἀναρριπτείν</td>
<td>ἀναρριπτείν</td>
<td>ἀναρριπτείν</td>
<td>ἀναρριπτείν</td>
<td>ἀναρριπτείν</td>
<td>ἀναρριπτείν</td>
<td>ἀναρριπτείν</td>
<td>ἀναρριπτείν</td>
<td>ἀναρριπτείν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐγένοντο</td>
<td>ἐγένοντο</td>
<td>ἐγένοντο</td>
<td>ἐγένοντο</td>
<td>ἐγένοντο</td>
<td>ἐγένοντο</td>
<td>ἐγένοντο</td>
<td>ἐγένοντο</td>
<td>ἐγένοντο</td>
<td>ἐγένοντο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔρρηθη</td>
<td>ἔρρηθη</td>
<td>ἔρρηθη</td>
<td>ἔρρηθη</td>
<td>ἔρρηθη</td>
<td>ἔρρηθη</td>
<td>ἔρρηθη</td>
<td>ἔρρηθη</td>
<td>ἔρρηθη</td>
<td>ἔρρηθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἑσπευσθήνη</td>
<td>ἑσπευσθήνη</td>
<td>ἑσπευσθήνη</td>
<td>ἑσπευσθήνη</td>
<td>ἑσπευσθήνη</td>
<td>ἑσπευσθήνη</td>
<td>ἑσπευσθήνη</td>
<td>ἑσπευσθήνη</td>
<td>ἑσπευσθήνη</td>
<td>ἑσπευσθήνη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υποτήρ γυναικός</td>
<td>υποτήρ γυναικός</td>
<td>μυστήριον γυναικός</td>
<td>μυστήριον γυναικός</td>
<td>μυστήριον γυναικός</td>
<td>μυστήριον γυναικός</td>
<td>μυστήριον γυναικός</td>
<td>μυστήριον γυναικός</td>
<td>μυστήριον γυναικός</td>
<td>μυστήριον γυναικός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γενόμενοι</td>
<td>γενόμενοι</td>
<td>γενόμενοι</td>
<td>γενόμενοι</td>
<td>γενόμενοι</td>
<td>γενόμενοι</td>
<td>γενόμενοι</td>
<td>γενόμενοι</td>
<td>γενόμενοι</td>
<td>γενόμενοι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{340}\) The above readings have been selected, because they are common in Ath and in some of the later manuscripts and therefore they can indicate their relationships.
Appendix III
Marginal notes of manuscripts L, a, b, r and interlinear notes of c, k and γ
(Book V, 1 – VI, 14)\textsuperscript{341}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b\textsuperscript{342}</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>γ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>παράδοξον</td>
<td>(4r)</td>
<td>(2r)</td>
<td>(2v)</td>
<td>(2v)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γραφή Ἰουστινιανοῦ βασιλέως προς Ἀμαλασοῦνθα</td>
<td>(8v)</td>
<td>(4r)</td>
<td>(4v)</td>
<td>(4v)</td>
<td>(18r)</td>
<td>(14r)</td>
<td>(16v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντίγραμμα</td>
<td>(8v)</td>
<td>(4r)</td>
<td>(4v)</td>
<td>(4v)</td>
<td>(18v)</td>
<td>(14v)</td>
<td>(17r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχὴ τοῦ πολέμου</td>
<td>(10r)</td>
<td>(6r)</td>
<td>(6v)</td>
<td>(6v)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>(21r)</td>
<td>(23v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιστολὴ βασιλέως Ἰουστινιανοῦ προς Φράγγους</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>(6r)</td>
<td>(6v)</td>
<td>(7r)</td>
<td>(28v)</td>
<td>(22v)</td>
<td>(25r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἅωση Σικελίας ὑπὸ Βελισαρίου</td>
<td>(11r)</td>
<td>(6v)</td>
<td>(7r)</td>
<td>(7r)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>(23r)</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιστολὴ Θευδάτου πρὸς βασιλέα Ἰουστινιανὸν</td>
<td>(13v)</td>
<td>(7v)</td>
<td>(7v)</td>
<td>(8r)</td>
<td>(34v)</td>
<td>(26v)</td>
<td>(29v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντίγραμμα βασιλέως πρὸς αὐτὸν</td>
<td>(13r)</td>
<td>(7v)</td>
<td>(8r)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>(35v)</td>
<td>(27v)</td>
<td>(30v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρησμὸς</td>
<td>(14v)</td>
<td>(8r)</td>
<td>(8v)</td>
<td>(9r)</td>
<td>(38r)</td>
<td>(29v)</td>
<td>(32v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοῦ Θευδάτου πρὸς τοὺς πρέσβεις</td>
<td>(14r)</td>
<td>(8v)</td>
<td>(8v)</td>
<td>(9r)</td>
<td>(39v)</td>
<td>(29v)</td>
<td>(34r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ πρέσβεις πρὸς Θευδάτον</td>
<td>(14r)</td>
<td>(8v)</td>
<td>(9r)</td>
<td>(9r)</td>
<td>(40r)</td>
<td>(31r)</td>
<td>(34v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γραφὴ βασιλέως πρὸς Γότθων τοὺς πρῶτους</td>
<td>(15v)</td>
<td>(8v)</td>
<td>(9r)</td>
<td>(9v)</td>
<td>(41r)</td>
<td>(32r)</td>
<td>(35v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρέσβεις Νεαπολίτων πρὸς Βελισαρίων</td>
<td>(16r)</td>
<td>(25v)</td>
<td>(10v)</td>
<td>(10v)</td>
<td>(45v)</td>
<td>(36r)</td>
<td>(39v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουλὴ ρητόρων πρὸς Νεαπολίτας</td>
<td>(18v)</td>
<td>(26v)</td>
<td>(10v)</td>
<td>(11v)</td>
<td>(50r)</td>
<td>(39v)</td>
<td>(43r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραίνεσις Βελισαρίου πρὸς Νεαπολίτας</td>
<td>(20r)</td>
<td>(28r)</td>
<td>(12v)</td>
<td>(13r)</td>
<td>(58r)</td>
<td>(45v)</td>
<td>(49r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραίνεσις Βελισαρίου πρὸς τοὺς στρατοὺς</td>
<td>(22r)</td>
<td>(29v)</td>
<td>(14r)</td>
<td>(14v)</td>
<td>(66r)</td>
<td>(51r)</td>
<td>(54v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουλὴ Ἰουστιγίδος πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>(25v)</td>
<td>(31r)</td>
<td>(15r)</td>
<td>(16v)</td>
<td>(72r)</td>
<td>(56v)</td>
<td>(59r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δημηγορία Θευδάτου πρὸς Γότθους</td>
<td>(30r)</td>
<td>(34r)</td>
<td>(18v)</td>
<td>(20r)</td>
<td>(89r)</td>
<td>(69r)</td>
<td>(71v)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{341} The list includes the notes of the manuscripts up to this point, because this point is the end of codex r.

\textsuperscript{342} This list does not include the notes of b, which are possibly written by a later hand and hence show nothing about the relationships of the manuscripts.
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