

PLETHO AND HERODOTEAN MALICE.

Peter Allan Hansen.

In 1969 I published the article 'The Manuscript Tradition of Plutarch's *De Malignitate Herodoti*'<sup>1</sup> and stated on p. 13: 'I shall not try here to place in the tradition the excerpts made in Marc. Gr. 517 by Pletho. For our piece they seem inconclusive, ...' Subsequent inspection of the MS showed that something definite can in fact be said about their place in the tradition.

I here reproduce Pletho's excerpts from *De Malignitate*, which may serve as an example of the way in which Pletho excerpted from Plutarch and other authors. The text is followed by a general note about the contents of the excerpts and by the placing of them in the MS tradition. I have normalized accents and punctuation and introduced capital letters in the customary way. Otherwise, the text has been left to stand as found in the MS. There appear to be no itacisms or other errors attributable to Pletho; recourse to a text of Plutarch (Pearson's Loeb text) will show where Pletho's source contained errors which he either did not notice or could not emend.

1. From 858A-B.

(74<sup>r</sup>) ὅτι Ἀθηναίων καὶ Μιτυληναίων περὶ Σιγείου ἀλλήλοις πολεμούντων, καὶ Φρύωνος τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Ἀθηναίων προκαλεσαμένου τὸν βουλόμενον εἰς μονομαχίαν, ἀπήντησε Πιπτακὸς ὁ τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν. καὶ δικτύῳ περιβαλὼν τὸν ἄνδρα μέγαν τε καὶ ῥωμαλέον ὄντα ἀπέκτεινεν. ἐκ δὲ τούτου τῶν Μιτυληναίων δωρεὰς αὐτῷ μεγάλας διδόντων, τὸ δόρυ ἀκοντίσας

---

<sup>1</sup> *Université de Copenhague. Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin* fasc. 2 (Copenhagen 1969).

τοῦτο μόνον τὸ χωρίον ἤξιωσε λαβεῖν ὁπόσον ἡ αἰχμὴ ἐπέσχεν, ὃ καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο ὕστερον Πιπτάκειον.

2. From 859C-D.

ὅτι συχναὶ τυραννίδες ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι κατελύθησαν. οὗτοι γὰρ ἐκ μὲν Κορίνθου καὶ Ἀμπρακίας Κυψελίδας ἐξέβαλον, ἐκ δὲ ...<sup>2</sup> Λύγδαμιν, ἐκ δὲ Ἀθηνῶν τοὺς Πεισιστράτου παῖδας, ἐκ δὲ Σικυῶνος Αἰσχίνην, ἐκ δὲ Θάσου Σύμμαχον, ἐκ δὲ Φωκῆων Αὔλιν, ἐκ δὲ Μιλήτου Ἀριστογέννη. ἔπαυσαν δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐν Θετταλοῖς δυναστείαν, Ἀριστομήδη καὶ Ἄγγελον καταλύσαντες διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Λεωτυχίδου.

3. From 859F-860C.

ὅτι τοὺς ὑπὸ Περιάνδρου παρὰ Ἀλυάτην ἐπ' ἐκτομῇ πεμπομένους Κερκυραίων παῖδας, Κνίδιοι ἐπιπλεύσαντες εἰς Σάμον, καὶ τοὺς μὲν (74<sup>V</sup>) Περιάνδρου φύλακας ἐξελάσαντες τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐν ᾧ οἱ παῖδες καταπεφευγότες ἦσαν, τοὺς δὲ παῖδας αὐτοὶ ἀναλαβόντες εἰς Κέρκυραν ἀποκατέστησαν, οὕτω Ἀντήνωρός τε τοῦ Κρητικοῦ καὶ Διονυσίου τοῦ Χαλκιδέως ἱστορησάντων. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ Κνιδίοις παρὰ Κερκυραίοις τιμαὶ τε καὶ ἀτέλειαι ἐψηφισμένοι.

4. From 861B.

ὅτι Ἐρετριεῖς, καθ' αὐτοὺς πρότερον, στόλῳ βασιλικῷ ἐκ Κύπρου τῇ Ἰωνίᾳ προσπλέοντι ἔξω ἐν τῷ Παμφυλίῳ πελάγει ἀπαντήσαντες κατεναυμάχησαν. εἴτ' ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστρέψαντες καὶ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τὰς ναῦς καταλιπόντες μετ' Ἀθηναίων Σάρδεσιν ἐπέθεντο. καὶ πᾶν τὸ ἄστυ πλὴν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ἐλόντες, τελευτῶντες πλήθους σφίσι συχνοῦ ἐπιχυθέντος εἰς Μίλητον ἐπανεχώρησαν, οὕτω Λυσανίου τοῦ Μαλλώτου ἱστορήσαντος.

5. From 864E-866C.

ὅτι τῶν περὶ Λεωνίδαν ἐξιόντων ἐκ Σπάρτης ἀγῶνα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιτάφιον ἠγωνίσαντο Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ὃν καὶ πατέρες τε αὐτῶν καὶ μητέρες ἐθεῶντο, αὐτὸς δ' ὁ Λεωνίδας πρὸς μὲν τὸν εἰπόντα πάνυ ὀλίγους ἐξάγειν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν μάχην, πολλοὺς μὲν οὖν

<sup>2</sup> There is a lacuna here as the result of an erasure. The word erased was presumably ξενάγου (sic) found in both E and B.

τεθνηξομένους, ἔφη. πρὸς δὲ τὴν γυναῖκα πυνθανομένην ἐξιόντος εἴ τι λέγοι, ἀγαθοῖς, εἶπε, γαμεῖσθαι καὶ ἀγαθὰ τίκτειν. θήβησι δὲ γενόμενος καὶ ἐγκοιμηθεὶς τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ὄναρ εἶδε τοιόνδε. ἔδοξεν ἐν θαλάττῃ πολὺν τε ἐχούση καὶ τραχὺν κλύδωνα τὰς μεγίστας καὶ ἐπιφανεστάτας τῆς Ἑλλάδος πόλεις ἀνωμάλως διαφέρεσθαι τε καὶ σαλεύειν, τὴν δὲ Θηβαίων ὑπερέχειν τε πασῶν καὶ μετέωρον πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀρθεῖσαν εἶτα ἐξαίφνης ἀφανισθῆναι· ἃ τοῖς ὕστερον χρόνῳ πολλῷ περὶ τὴν πόλιν συμπεσοῦσιν ὁμοία ᾤφθη. ἐν δὲ θερμοπύλαις μετὰ τὴν κύκλωσιν δύο τῶν ἀπὸ γένους ὑπεξελέσθαι (75<sup>F</sup>) ὁ Λεωνίδας βουλόμενος τῷ μὲν ἐπιστολὴν ἐδίδου καὶ ἔπεμπεν, ὁ δ' οὐκ ἐδέξατο φήσας· μαχατὰς τοι, οὐκ ἀγγελιαφόρος, εἰπόμαν [sic]. ὁ δ' ἕτερος κελεύοντος εἰπεῖν τι πρὸς τὰ τέλη τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν ἀπεκρίνατο· τὰ πράγματα, καὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα λαβὼν εἰς τάξιν κατέστη. οἱ δ' οὖν περὶ Λεωνίδα οὗτοι Σπαρτιάται ἐπειδὴ τὴν τῶν πολεμίων νύκτωρ ἐπύθοντο περίοδον, ἀναστάντες ἔξω ἐβάδιζον ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν ὀλίγου δεῖν τὴν βασιλέως ὡς ἐκεῖνον αὐτὸν ἀποκτενοῦντες καὶ περὶ ἐκεῖνῳ τεθνηξόμενοι, καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς θεοσιέων τε καὶ Θηβαίων οἱ παρόντες, ὧν ἠγεῖτο Ἀνάξανδρος ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης τε ἱστορήκε καὶ Νίκανδρος ὁ Κολοφώνιος, μέχρι μὲν οὖν τῆς σκηνῆς κτείνοντες ἀεὶ τὸν ἐμποδῶν. τοὺς δὲ τρεπόμενοι προῆλθον. ἐπεὶ δ' οὐκ ἐνετύγχανον βέρξη, ζητοῦντες ἐν μεγάλῳ καὶ ἀχανεῖ στρατεύματι καὶ πλανώμενοι μόγις ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων πανταχόθεν περιχυθέντων διεφθάρησαν. οἱ δ' ἐν τῇ πόλει Θηβαῖοι, ἐπεὶ τῶν παρόδων κρατήσας ὁ βάρβαρος ἐν τοῖς ὄροις ἦν καὶ Δημάρατος ὁ Σπαρτιάτης διὰ ξενίας εὖνους ὧν Ἀτταγίνῳ τῷ τῆς ὀλιγαρχίας προεστῶτι διεπράξατο φίλον τε αὐτὸν καὶ ξένον γενέσθαι βασιλέως, ἐδέξαντό τε τὰς διαλύσεις τὰς πρὸς βασιλέα, καὶ προθύμως ἐμήδισαν οἱ περὶ Ἀτταγῖνον μάλιστα αὐτῶν ὀλιγαρχικοί.

#### 6. From 869B-C.

ὅτι Νάξιοι ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ ἔξ ἔπεμψαν εἰς Σαλαμίνα ναῦς τοῖς Ἑλλησι βοηθοῦς, ὡς Ἑλλάνικος ἱστορήκεν, καὶ Δημόκριτον στρατηγόν, οὗ καὶ τὴν ἀριστείαν Σιμωνίδης ἐπιγράμματι ἐδήλωσε·

Δημόκριτος τρίτος ἤρξε μάχης ὅτε πὰρ Σαλαμίνα  
 Ἕλληνας Μήδοις σύμβαλον ἐν πελάγει·  
 πέντε δὲ νῆας ἔλεν δηίων, ἕκτην δ' ὑπὸ χεῖρα  
 ῥύσατο βαρβαρικὴν Δωρίδ' ἄλισκομένην.

7. From 870E-871B.

(75<sup>V</sup>) ὅτι ἐξιόντων τῶν περὶ Ἀδείμαντον Κορινθίων βοηθῶν εἰς Σαλαμίνα τοῖς Ἕλλησιν εὐξάντο καλήν τινα καὶ δαιμόνιον εὐχὴν τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ αἱ γυναῖκες, ἔρωτα τοῖς ἀνδράσι τῆς πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους μάχης ἐμβαλεῖν τὴν θεόν, ἦν εὐχὴν καὶ Σιμωνίδης ἐδήλωσεν ἐν τῷ εἰς τὸν νεῶν τῆς αὐτῆς θεοῦ ἀνασταθεισῶν χαλκῶν εἰκόνων ἐπιγράμματι·

αἶδ' ὑπὲρ Ἑλλάνων τε καὶ ἰθυμάχων πολιητῶν  
 ἔσταθεν εὐξάμεναι Κύπριδι δαιμόνιαι.  
 οὐ γὰρ τοξοφόροισιν ἐμήδετο δῖ' Ἀφροδίτα  
 Μήδοις Ἑλλάνων ἀκρόπολιν προδόμεν.

ὡς δὲ καὶ παρῆσαν Κορίνθιοι τῇ Σαλαμίνι ναυμαχίᾳ, τάδε τὰ ἐπιγράμματα μαρτυρεῖ. ἐν μὲν Σαλαμίνι παρὰ τὴν πόλιν οὗ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς ἀποθανόντας θάψαι ἐπεγέγραπτο·

ὦ ξένε, εὐδρον ποτ' ἐναίομεν ἄστυ Κορίνθου,  
 νυνὶ δ' ἀνάματος νᾶσος ἔχει Σαλαμῖς.  
 ἐνθάδε Πέρσας καὶ Φοινίσσας νῆας ἐλόντες  
 καὶ Μήδους ἱερὰν Ἑλλάδα ῥυσάμεθα.

τὸ δ' Ἰσθμοῦ κενοτάφιον ἐπιγραφὴν εἶχε τήνδε·

ἀκμᾶς ἔστακυῖαν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν  
 ταῖς αὐτῶν ψυχαῖς κείμεθα ῥυσάμενοι.

Διοδώρου δὲ τῶν τινος Κορινθίων τριηραρχῶν ἐν ἱεροῦ Λητοῦς ἀναθήμασι κειμένοις τότε ἐπεγέγραπτο·

ταῦτ' ἀπὸ δυσμενέων Μήδων αὐται Διοδώρου  
 ὄπλ' ἀνέθεντο Λατοῦ, μνάματα ναυμαχίας.

ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἀδειμάντου τάφῳ τότε ἐπεγέγραπτο·

οὗτος Ἀδειμάντου κείνου τάφος, ὃν διὰ πᾶσα  
 Ἑλλάς ἐλευθερίας ἀμφέθετο στέφανον.

## 8. From 862B and 864D.

ὅτι παρ' Ἀθηναίων δέκα τάλαντα δωρεάν Ἡρόδοτος ἔλαβεν ὁ συγγραφεύς, ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος Δίλλος ἱστορήκεν. ὡς δὲ καὶ παρὰ θηβαίων χρήματα μὲν αἰτήσας οὐκ ἔλαβεν, ἐπιχειρῶν δὲ τοῖς νέοις διαλέγεσθαι (76<sup>r</sup>) καὶ συσκολάζειν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐκωλύθη, Ἀριστοφάνης γέγραπεν ὁ Βοιωτός.

Pletho's purpose in making these excerpts is very clear: he wanted historical facts concerning events and persons of interest to him. He only in part preserved Plutarch's sentences, largely putting the information into his own words, even where considerations of brevity did not necessitate this. When several events are mentioned, they are not given in the order found in Plutarch if that is not chronological, but carefully turned into a chronological sequence. To the historical facts extracted from Plutarch, Pletho added the sources cited by Plutarch as well as quotations (i.e. epigrams) given by Plutarch in corroboration of his statements. The excerpts show us a painstaking historian who is not concerning himself with the literary or psychological aspects of the essay he is searching for historical information. The name of the essay is not given at the beginning of the excerpts, and Pletho's entire setting aside of its nature is underlined in an amusing way by the last excerpt where, after finding no place for the name of Herodotus in the preceding excerpts, Pletho when giving information *about* Herodotus finds it necessary to qualify his name by the addition ὁ συγγραφεύς.

The information, also when given in Pletho's own words, renders faithfully what is found in Plutarch, with two exceptions. One is the perplexing passage describing the Eretrians' meeting and defeating a Cyprian detachment of the king's fleet (861B = excerpt 4). The text would seem to be in further disorder (more deficient) than indicated by the small lacuna in the two MSS.<sup>3</sup> Realizing that the text could not

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Rühl, *RhM* 67 (1912) 163-167.

stand as it was and at the same time not taking into account the possibility of Cyprians on the king's side at the time in question, Pletho made the improbable guess that resulted in the paraphrase in the excerpt.<sup>4</sup> The other exception is the end of excerpt 6 where Pletho rounds off with his own flourish: καὶ προθύμως ἐμήδισαν οἱ περὶ Ἀτταγῖνον μάλιστα αὐτῶν ὀλιγαρχικοί.

Pletho's interest in ancient history is a matter which needs no proving; it will be recalled that his works include a continuation of Xenophon's Hellenica based on Diodorus and Plutarch, and that he also freely included historical and mythological references to antiquity in his non-historical works; see, e.g., his Συμβουλευτικὸς πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην Θεόδωρον περὶ τῆς Πελοποννήσου, *passim*.<sup>5</sup> Pletho seems to have excerpted extensively from ancient authors, to judge from the three MSS of which Aubrey Diller has enumerated the contents.<sup>6</sup> The MS used by Pletho for his excerpts from Plutarch in all probability belonged either to John Palaeologus or to Pletho himself.<sup>7</sup> R. and F. Masai consider that Pletho could not have been the owner: 'Si Pléthon avait été l'heureux propriétaire du fameux manuscrit de Plutarque vu par A. Traversari ... dans les mains de l'empereur, il n'aurait sans doute pas eu l'idée d'en transcrire d'aussi copieux extraits.'<sup>8</sup> When the question is of excerpts, one's mind at once goes to the Elder Pliny's 'electorum ... commentarios centum sexaginta ... opisthographos quidem et

<sup>4</sup> Lionel Pearson is not wrong in saying (p. 49 of the Loeb edition) that 'A different text is implied in Pletho's paraphrase', but we should add explicitly that the text implied is Pletho's emended version of the text known to us.

<sup>5</sup> *Migne*, vol. 160 cols. 841-866 = Σπ.Π. Λάμπρος, *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά* 4 (1930) 113-135.

<sup>6</sup> *Scriptorium* 10 (1956) 27-41.

<sup>7</sup> Diller, *Scriptorium* 8 (1954) 127; cf. my note 10.

<sup>8</sup> *Académie royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la classe des lettres* 5<sup>e</sup> Série 40 (1954) 543 note 1.

minutissimis scriptos' (Plin., *Ep.* 3.5.17), and even if it has since become easier to check a passage in a book, the inclination of scholars to make excerpts for their own use remains essentially the same. It suffices to quote a passage from Arnold Toynbee's *Experiences* (1969) 98: 'From about 1922 onwards I started to take notes in notebooks on points, in books that I was reading, which seemed likely to come in useful for something that I was going to write ... By this year 1969 I have more than thirty of these notebooks, full to the brim. They have, long since, become my most relevant immediate source of the information that I need for writing ...' In neither of these so different cases does the ownership of the book excerpted from seem relevant: Pliny probably possessed all, Toynbee probably possesses a good many, of the books in question.

The main interest of the excerpts to the student of Plutarch would be if they were to prove independent of both E and B. I have already given my view of excerpt 4. The cases of Pletho's giving the truth or what appears to be the truth against the consensus of E and B are the following:

Excerpt 1	προκαλεσαμένου (thus the Basle edition)	: προκαλεσαμένου,
ib.	Πιττάκειον (thus Cobet)	: Πιττάκιον,
excerpt 5	μέν οὖν (thus Reiske)	: μέν,
ib.	Ἄτταγίνωφ (thus Reiske from Hdt.)	: Ἄπαγίνωφ,
excerpt 7	τὴν θεόν (thus Turnebus and Stephanus)	: τὸν θεόν,
ib.	πολιητῶν (thus iidem)	: πολιτῶν,
ib.	δι' Ἀφροδίτα (thus iidem)	: δι' Ἀφροδίταν,
ib.	ἀμφέθετο (thus the Basle edition)	: ἀμφέθεντο.

The fact that these corrections have all been found independently by other scholars, shows their nature more clearly than any evaluation.

νονί in the second line of the Salamis epigram (excerpt 7) might at first sight look like an independent reading. The word ἀνάματος in the same line is a faultless formation from

νόμα (cf. ἀχρήματος, ἀνάματος, etc.), meaning 'carens fontibus' (Wytttenbach, *Index Graecitatis*; the metrical Latin translation has 'pauper aquae'), and it very neatly and appropriately corresponds to the preceding εὐδπον. The reader who has no outside information (Dio Chrysostom 37 or the remains of the monument) will therefore only consider this word corrupt if he finds himself unable to believe in the metrical error it involves when used at the end of the first half of a pentameter. Although even Wytttenbach - who did have outside information - found himself able to tolerate the word (see his note ad loc.), it is unthinkable that Plutarch could have thought this type of error possible in an official epigram like the one in question. Therefore, the corrupt form of the line cannot stem from Plutarch, and as ἀνάματος cannot have been in the text written by Plutarch, there is no reason why the wrong νουί should have been. Accordingly, it is a conjecture *metri gratia*, and the obvious explanation is that it should be fathered on Pletho like the above conjectures.

In the same epigram the form of the next line is very clearly not the original reading; a transposition was made *metri gratia* by someone not familiar with, or not prepared to accept in the present context, the Doric form Πέσσας (Buck, §78). Again, the obvious candidate is Pletho.

As there is thus no doubt that the excerpts belong in the tradition known to us, it only remains to attempt the placing of them in this tradition. Diller in discussing the excerpts suggested that they were made from the MS E.<sup>9</sup> For De Malignitate at least, this is not supported by a collation of the excerpts with the MSS E and B.

Pletho's excerpts agree with B against E in the following instances:

---

<sup>9</sup> *Scriptorium* 8 (1954) 123-127; 10 (1956) 29 f.



Excerpt 2 Ἄμπρακίας : Ἄμβρακίας E,  
 ib. Ἄγγελον : Ἄγελλον E,  
 excerpt 3 Ἄλυάτην : Ἄλυάτην E,  
 excerpt 7 Ἰθυμάχων : εἰθυμάχων E,  
 ib. ἔλευθερίας : ἔλευθερί' E.

While the last three could well be independent corrections, the same hardly holds good for the first two. The form Ἄμβρακία was the one in use from long before Plutarch, and that it was also the form used by Plutarch himself is supported by *Per.* 17.2 and *Pyrrh.* 6.4, 8.11. One can assume that the same spelling was used by Pletho, and it is not easy to suggest any reason why Pletho, if finding Ἄμβρακίας in his source, should have changed this into a form he neither knew from Plutarch nor used himself. That the conjecture Ἄγγελον is wrong, has been certain since Hubert made his correction into Ἀγέλαον. I am inclined to consider it a doubtful coincidence that the wrong conjecture Ἄγγελον should have been hit upon twice over. But even if this point be not granted, it remains that one should have expected Pletho to have known that Ἄγγελος is not a very good guess for the name of an ancient Greek, even if it does occasionally occur in Byzantine times as the sole name of a person; to my knowledge, it is found only once in ancient literature (*Plut.*, *Pyrrh.* 2.1). Further, the conjecture goes somewhat beyond what Pletho allowed himself in his other conjectures, whereas his retaining the form if finding it in his source is consistent with his cautious and meticulous treatment of that source.

On the other hand, there are the following agreements with E against B:

Excerpt 5 εἰπόμεν : εἰπόμεν B,  
 excerpt 7 ἔσταθεν : ἔσταθεν B,  
 ib. ἐπεγέγραπτο : ἐπιγέγραπται B,  
 ib. ναυμαχίας : ναυμαχίης B,  
 ib. Ἑλλάς : ἡ Ἑλλάς B,  
 ib. Σαλαμίνοι : Σαλαμίνοι B.

Of these the last four do not help in the present connexion: ἐπεγέγραπτο would be the tense used by Pletho in his paraphrase whether he found the perfect or the pluperfect in Plutarch; B's ναυμαχίης follows immediately upon a word with a Doric alpha; B's ἡ Ἑλλάς is metrically wrong; and in the last instance B has a simple error in the accentuation of a common word. They are, in other words, all four alterations which could be made without much thought, especially by the man who was capable of the eight conjectures first listed above. It remains to consider εἰπόμαν and ἔσταθεν. These two readings rule out B even more decisively than Ἄμπρακίας and Ἄγγελον ruled out E. In all the other instances considered, the Aldine agrees with B, and this is the normal state of affairs throughout De Malignitate. In the case of ἔσταθεν the Aldine is non-committal with Εσταθεν, but over the other word it shows one of its extremely rare agreements with E. In my previous article (pp. 13-15) I gave in detail the reasons for considering that the Aldine derives from the *Vorlage* of B. The obvious conclusion is that Pletho's excerpts come from the same source. Might perhaps the MS first used by Pletho and later (in 1509) found at Venice, be 'the Emperor's Plutarch' rather than the MS E? <sup>10</sup> My placing of the excerpts in the tradition as taken from B's *Vorlage* is not affected by the acceptance or rejection of this suggestion, as the MS used by Pletho and the MS exhibited by the emperor need not be identical. <sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> I suggest this against Diller's tentative identification (*Scriptorium* 8 p. 127) of 'the codex the Byzantine emperor showed to Traversari in Ferrara in 1438 when he and Pletho were attending the Council' (*Scriptorium* 10 pp. 29 f.) as the MS E.

<sup>11</sup> I am grateful to Mr. Sten Ebbesen of Copenhagen University, who read my draft and made some very useful comments and suggestions.