

JOSEPH BRYENNIUS AND THE TEXT OF MARCUS AURELIUS' *MEDITATIONS*

I

A neglected source for the text of Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations* is to be found in the writings of the Byzantine theologian Joseph Bryennius, who seems to have been born about 1350 (details of his early life are obscure) and to have died before the Council of Florence (1438), probably in 1430/1. He was a monk who was also a scholar, a theologian, and an ecclesiastical diplomat. He spent the years 1382–1402 in Crete (then under Venetian rule), and was sent in 1406 on a mission of ecclesiastical diplomacy to Cyprus. Otherwise the greater part of his life was spent in Constantinople; from about 1402 to 1406 he lived at the monastery of Stoudios, from 1416 to 1427 at that of Charsianeites. He was a court preacher, and as a theologian upheld the claims of the Greek Church against the Roman; among his published works are twenty-one *Discourses on the Trinity* maintaining the Greek Orthodox position.

Bryennius was a man of wide learning, and Meyer, in his article 'Des Joseph Bryennios Schriften, Leben und Bildung',¹ drew attention to the fact that quotations from the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius were to be found in his works. He mentioned several such passages, but there are in fact considerably more.

Two volumes of his works were published in Leipzig in 1768, edited by Eugenius Bulgaris (1716–1806), who taught in a school on Mount Athos and became Archbishop of Slavyansk and Kherson; a supplementary third volume was brought out by Thomas Mandakases in 1784. These volumes are rare; there is, however, a set in the British Library. The contents are largely theological, but some are more distinctly moral. They were studied by N. B. Tomadakis, who quotes three passages from the *Meditations* (2.1, 5.19, 8.52), but fails to note their source.² Nor are the *Meditations* included in the list he gives of ancient Greek authors with whom Bryennius shows acquaintance.³

Papadopoulos-Kerameus published Bryennius' will, drawn up in 1421.⁴ This lists nine books among his bequests, but there is no manuscript of the *Meditations*, or indeed any work of moral philosophy, among them; they include some Aristotle, along with grammar, logic, music and Ptolemy's *Geography*.

The following works by Bryennius contain quotations from the *Meditations*. They are listed here in the order in which they are printed in vols I and II of the Leipzig edition.

1. Λόγος πρῶτος περὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος
2. Λόγος δεύτερος περὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος

¹ Ph. Meyer, *Byz. Zeitschr.* 5 (1896), 74–111, esp. 99–100 and 110.

² N. B. Tomadakis, 'Ο Ἰωσήφ Βρυέννιος καὶ ἡ Κρήτη κατὰ τὸ 1400. Μελέτη φιλολογικὴ καὶ ἱστορικὴ' (Athens, 1947), 66–7. The same is true when he quotes the same passages again in his *Σύλλαβος Βυζαντινῶν μελετῶν καὶ κειμένων* (Athens, 1961), 597–9 (part 6 of that volume is devoted to Bryennius). Tomadakis (1947), 48–52 lists 66 mss. of Bryennius, with an appendix of others reported; he also (46–7) lists 16 unpublished works.

³ Tomadakis (n. 2, 1947), 22; longer list at id. (n. 2, 1961), 509–10.

⁴ A. I. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Varia Graeca Sacra* (St Petersburg, 1909), 292–7; reprinted by Tomadakis (n. 2, 1961), 503–4.

3. Λόγος τέταρτος περὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος
4. Λόγος ἕννατος περὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος
5. Λόγος δέκατος περὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος
6. Λόγος πρῶτος εἰς τὴν σωτήριον σταύρωσιν
7. Λόγος δεύτερος εἰς τὴν σωτήριον σταύρωσιν
8. Ὑπόμνημα περὶ τῆς τοῦ βίου ματαιότητος
9. Παραμυθία πρὸς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα
10. Λόγος (ὕπόμνημα) περὶ Νοός (sic)
11. Λόγος περὶ καρτερίας

Quotations are particularly numerous in (3), the *Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*.

Tomadakis (1947), like Meyer before him, attempted a partial chronology of the works, the investigation being continued by Loenertz.⁵

The *Consolation* was delivered on the occasion of the death of Anna, the child-bride of John VIII, in August 1417;⁶ the *Discourses on the Trinity* have been dated to 1420–1 (Tomadakis), the first *Discourse on the Crucifixion* to Easter 1417 (Tomadakis) or 1417–19 (Loenertz), the second to 1417–19 (Loenertz), and the *Discourse on Fortitude* to 1422 (Tomadakis). Bryennius' employment of the *Meditations* thus seems likely to have fallen within the years from 1416 onwards, when he was at Constantinople; clearly he had recourse to the *Meditations* in that period, though not, it would seem, owning a copy himself.

II

Bryennius' quotations from the *Meditations* are taken from all twelve books, with the exception of Book 1, which stands apart from the rest in its personal character, and Book 3, which is one of the shortest; from Book 12 we have, if not actual quotations, at least reminiscences. In no case does Bryennius name his source, and rarely does he indicate that he is quoting. At II.289 (Leipzig edition, 1768), from *On the Vanity of Life*, passages from 6.31 and 8.46.1–2 are attributed to οἱ ἔξω, that is pagans. Another exception is his quotation at II.415 (*Discourse on Fortitude*) from 4.3.5 and 4.4.1, which is presented with the words Διὸ καὶ τις ἔλεγεν. At I.78, in the *Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*, we read καὶ Ἀντωνίνου Καίσαρ Ῥωμαίων τοῖς λοιδοροῦσιν αὐτὸν εὐχαρίστει (sic), χάριν οἶδα τοῖς λοιδοροῦσί με λέγων, ὅτι βελτίονα ποιοῦσιν· ἐγὼ γὰρ σπουδάζων ψευδεῖς αὐτοὺς ἀπελέγχειν, εἴ τι φαῦλον ποιῶ μεταβάλλομαι. This, however, is not a quotation from the *Meditations* as we have them.

The manuscript tradition of the *Meditations* has been carefully studied by a long series of scholars, and especially by J. Dalfen in his Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1979; 2nd edn rev., 1987) (see in particular his stemma at p. xx). The sources are as follows:

A (Vat. Gr. 1950, s. xiv).

T cod. (P cod. Farquharson), the ms. used in Xylander's *editio princeps* (Zürich, 1559) but since lost.

⁵ R. J. Loenertz, 'Pour la chronologie des oeuvres de Joseph Bryennios', *Rev. Ét. Byz.* 7 (1949), 12–32; reprinted in R. J. Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, series altera (Storia e Letteratura 145) (Rome, 1978), 51–75.

⁶ J. W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425)* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1969), 345, 347.

D (Darmstadtinus 2773, s. xiv), containing extracts from Books 1–9. It is closely similar to A.

M (Monac. 323, s. xvi), containing short excerpts from Books 2–4, and also 7. 50.

C excerpts in several manuscripts, from Books 1–4.20.

W excerpts in several manuscripts (4–33 and excerpts from 6, 7, 8, and 11).

X excerpts in several manuscripts (4.49 and excerpts from 5–12).

To these must be added the ‘Folium Treverense’ of 5.6.6–5.12.3, which bears a close similarity to T. This passage is not, however, among those quoted by Bryennius.⁷

The passages quoted by Bryennius do not in every instance fall within those found in D, N, C, W, or X, and there is no sufficient reason to doubt that the text he had before him was complete, Book 1 not being suitable for his purposes. Further, that the randomness sometimes found in the order of his quotations does not necessarily point to a difference between the standard order and that in his manuscript is confirmed by the fact that he quotes some passages more than once in different contexts (see below).

If we enquire into textual affiliations, at 2.1.1 and 2.1.5 Bryennius sides with C against the rest of the tradition; at 4.29.2 he twice sides with T against A; so also at 8.52; at 8.48.3 he sides with two mss. of X excerpts; at 9.42.8 he sides with W and X against the rest of the tradition; similarly at 10.34.6 and 11.9.1; at 11.18.8 he sides with A (παθεῖν) against T (μαθεῖν, which is the usual reading). For what his evidence is worth, he gives no support to Dalfen’s theory of interpolations;⁸ he reads μετὰ λόγου at 8.48.2, which Dalfen excises; similarly ἡ ἄλλως δυσχεραίνοντα at 11.9.1; and at 6.31 he retains πάλιν ἐγγηγορός, which Dalfen follows Lemer cier in excising.⁹

Bryennius thus seems to represent an independent tradition. It may be noted that at 5.19 T differs from A, and Bryennius from both, providing a reading (προῦφεστῶτα) conjectured by Schultz; at 8.56.2 he supports ἐκάστου, conjectured by Coraes; at 11.1.3 he omits καὶ τὸ σχῆμα αὐτοῦ, which Theiler excises, as also some words Nauck excised from 11.1. 1. It is tempting to follow him in the inclusion of ἡ Λιβύη after ἡ Ἀσία at 6. 36, rather than ascribe it to his geographical interests which were certainly strong. (But see Section IV below.)

At the same time it has to be borne in mind that he was liable to be free in his quotations, and if he quotes the same passage more than once he may not reproduce it in exactly the same form. He is also liable from time to time to introduce a Christianization, as when he substitutes πρόνοια at 8.20.1, or θεός at 9.42.5 and 10.20, for φύσις. Interestingly, though puzzlingly, he twice presents his hearers (or readers) with a passage of some length, not in our text, whose style and content are so close to those of Marcus, and which appears in both cases in the context of passages taken from him, that one might well be tempted to ascribe it to him, or at least to the manuscript of him Bryennius was using; on the other hand Bryennius’ close familiarity with the *Meditations* makes it impossible to be confident that it is not his own composition—nor, supposing it to be genuine, could one draw any conclusion about its location in the text of the *Meditations* (see Section V below). (This passage is in addition to that from J.B. I.78 quoted above.)

⁷ L. Bergson, ‘Fragment einer Marc-Aurel-Handschrift’, *Rhein. Mus.* 129 (1986), 157–69.

⁸ On these, however, see F. H. Sandbach’s review, *CR* 31 (1981), 188–9.

⁹ See, in addition to Dalfen’s edition, his ‘Einige Interpolationen im Text von Marc Aurels τὰ εἰς ἑαυτὸν’, *Hermes* 102 (1974), 47–57, and id., ‘Scholien und Interlinearglossen in Marc Aurel-Handschriften’, *SIFC* NS 50 (1978), 5–26.

III

The following are perhaps the most significant of Bryennius' readings (but see the fuller account below):

- 2.1.1 ἐντεύξομαι with C, for συντεύξομαι.
- 2.1.3 βούλομαι for δύναμαι (the ms. reading probably to be preferred).
- 2.1.4 ἀποτρέπεσθαι with C, for ἀποστρέφεσθαι.
- 4.29.2 φυγὰς with T, as against σφαγὰς A.
ὁ ἐνδεὴς ἑτέρου with T, as against ὁ ἐνδεὴς ὁ ἑτέρου A.
- 4.44 ὅσα τοὺς πολλοὺς εὐφραίνει φανέντα ἢ καὶ ἀπόντα λυπεῖ.
- 5.17 For μὴ τοιαῦτά τινα ποιεῖν J.B. reads at I.76 μὴ φαῦλον καὶ τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους ἀπαίδευτα, at II.187 μὴ φαῦλα ποιεῖν, καὶ τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους ἀπαίδευτα.
- 5.19 προῦφεστώτα (conjectured by Schultz).
- 6.31 J.B. reads πάλιν ἐργηγορώς, excised by Lemerrier and Dalfen.
After ἐκεῖνα J.B. adds ἐναγχος.
- 6.36 After ἡ Ἀσία J.B. adds ἡ Λιβύη.
- 8.7.2 J.B. adds κατὰ τι before ἀνεμποδίστου.
- 8.51.2 ἀναβλύουσα T, followed by Farquharson, Theiler, and Dalfen;
ἀναβλύζουσα AD, βλύζουσα J.B.
- 8.54 οὐ γὰρ ἦττον: οὐδὲν γὰρ ἦττον J.B.
- 8.56.2 ἕκαστον: ἐκάστου J.B. (conjectured by Coraes).
- 9. 42.5 After τὴν πραότητα J.B. adds πρὸς δὲ τὸν ἀχάριστον τὴν ἀνεξικακίαν.
- 9.42.12 Before τί γὰρ πλέον . . . J.B. reads ἀλλ' ἀχάριστος; or ἀλλ' ἀχάριστός τις γέγονε περίσῃ; in two passages of quotation (I.76, II.187) (see Section IV below).
- 11.9.1 ἀποστρέψαι ATB (followed by Dalfen); ἀποτρέψαι J.B., with v 8(ms. of W group)X.
σεαυτὸν J.B., with WX (followed by Dalfen): ἑαυτὸν T, ἑαυτὴν A.
J.B. retains ἢ ἄλλως δυσχεραίνοντας excised by Dalfen.
- 11.9.2 ἀσθενές mss., ἀσθενείας J.B., ἀσθενοῦς Richards.
- 11.18.8 μαθεῖν T, παθεῖν J.B. with A.

IV

The following are the relevant passages in J.B., in the order in which they occur in the text of the *Meditations*, with significant variations from Dalfen's text noted:

Med. 2. 1

J.B. I.75 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*), beginning ἐὰν καθ' ἐκάστην πρωΐαν ταῦτα προλέγῃς σεαυτῷ σήμερον . . .

J.B. reads ἐντεύξομαι (with C) for συντεύξομαι, adds φαύλῳ after ἀκοινωνήτω, omits οὐχὶ αἵματος . . . περιβαλεῖ and ὡς οἱ στοίχοι . . . ὀδόντων, reads βούλομαι for δύναμαι after τῷ συγγενεῖ, reads ἐχθραίνειν for ἀπέχθεσθαι, and reads ἀποτρέπεσθαι (with C) for ἀποστρέφεσθαι.

Cf. J.B. II.187 (*Second Discourse on the Crucifixion*) καὶ γὰρ ἀλλήλων ἕνεκα, καὶ πρὸς συνεργίαν ἕκαστος ἐκάστῳ γεγόναμεν, ὡς πόδες, ὡς χεῖρες, ὡς βλέφαρα.

See Section V below on the passage in J.B. I.75, not in our text of *Med.*, which follows the quotation from 2.1.

Med. 4.3.5 ὁ κόσμος ὥσανεὶ πόλις; 4.4.1 ὁ κόσμος ὥσανεὶ πόλις ἐστὶ.

Cf. J.B. II.415 (*Discourse on Fortitude*) Διὸ καὶ τις ἔλεγεν, ὁ κόσμος οὗτος ὥσανεὶ πόλις ἐστίν· ἐγὼ δὲ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης πολίτης.

Med. 4.29.1–3

Cf. J.B. II.344 (mispagination; should be 420) (*Discourse on Fortitude*); for τῷ νοερῷ ὁμματι he reads τῶν νοερῶν ὁμμάτων, for δυσαρρεστὲν he reads δυσαρρεστῆσθαι, before συμβαίνουσι he reads ὁσημέραι.

Med. 4.43–4

J.B. II.344 (mispagination; should be 420) (*Discourse on Fortitude*). At 43 J.B. retains ἐκ, read by the mss. but excised by Dalfen (Nauck proposed ἐστι), adds οὐτοσί after ὁ αἰών, at 44 adds καὶ before πάν, for τοιοῦτο γὰρ . . . νόσος reads τοιοῦτον (so Stich, Leopold, Trannoy, Farquharson) γὰρ καὶ νεότης, καὶ γῆρας, καὶ ἰσχύς, καὶ ἀδυναμία, καὶ ὑγεία (sic), καὶ νόσος, after νόσος for καὶ θάνατος καὶ βλασφημία καὶ ἐπιβουλὴ reads καὶ κάλλος καὶ ἀμορφία καὶ δυσγένεια (presumably these are his own modifications), for μωρούς reads πολλούς, after εὐφραίνει for ἡ reads φανέντα ἡ καὶ ἀπόντα.

Med. 4.49.2 οὔτε . . . οὔτε τὸ ἐπὶ ὄν φοβούμενος

J.B. I.77 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*): for οὔτε . . . οὔτε reads μήθ' . . . μήτε, for φοβούμενος reads δεδοικώς.

Med. 5.17

[1] J.B. I.76 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*) for τοιαῦτά τινα reads φαῦλον, after ποιεῖν adds καὶ τὸ τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους ἀπαίδευτα.

See below on *Med.* 9.42.8.

[2] J.B. II.187 (*Second Discourse on the Crucifixion*, ch. 5, *ad fin.*): for τοιαῦτά τινα reads φαῦλα, after ποιεῖν adds καὶ τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους ἀπαίδευτα.

Med. 5.19 τὰ πράγματα τὰ προσυφεστῶτα

[1] J.B. I.168 (*Ninth Discourse on the Trinity*) has πρὸς αὐτὴν for πρὸς ψυχὴν (but not in [2] below), τὸ before τρέψαι (but not [2]), after δύναται the words ἔστι γὰρ ἐκ πάντων ἐλευθέρᾳ, καὶ πάντων ἀνωτέρᾳ (presumably an addition of J.B.), προῦφεστῶτα (as in [2] below) for προσυφεστῶτα (προεφεστῶτα A).

[2] J.B. II.292 (*Consolation to the Emperor*) has a loose and abbreviated quotation of τὰ πράγματα . . . προσυφεστῶτα, with the manifest slip δύνανται for δύναται and the variant προῦφεστῶτα.

Med. 5.22.1

J.B. II.415 (*Discourse on Fortitude*) adds ταύτῃ after πόλει, and reads οὐδ' ἐμὲ for οὐδέ.

Med. 5.23.2 ἡ τε γὰρ οὐσία . . . μεταβολαῖς

J.B. II.296 (*Consolation to the Emperor*) has τὰ δὲ γινόμενα πάντα ἐν διηνηκεῖ ῥοῇ ἐστι καὶ μεταβολῇ (a loose quotation).

Med. 6.31

J.B. II.289 (*On the Vanity of Life*) introduces this with the words καὶ θαῦμα πῶς καὶ οἱ ἕξω (i.e. pagans) νῦν μὲν φασιν, reads πάλιν ἐγρηγορώς (in the mss., but excised by Dalfen, following Lemer cier), and adds ἐναγχος after ἐκείνα.

Med. 6.36.1 Ἡ Ἀσία . . . εὐτρεπτα

J.B. I.34 (*Second Discourse on the Trinity*) reads ἡ Ἀσία, ἡ Λιβύη, ἡ Εὐρώπη, γωνίαι τοῦ κόσμου· Ὠκεανός, Ἐρυθρά, Κασπία, Πόντος, Αἰγαῖον, καὶ πᾶν πέλαγος, σταγὼν τοῦ κόσμου· Ἄτλας καὶ Καύκασος, Αἴμος καὶ Ἄλπις, Λίβανος, Ὀλυμπος, βωλάρια τοῦ κόσμου· πᾶν τὸ διάστημα τοῦ προσκαίρου αἰῶνος, στιγμὴ τοῦ παντός καὶ ἀπείρου· πάντα μικρὰ καὶ εὐτρεπτα.

In part an expansion, but perhaps the inclusion of ἡ Λιβύη goes back to Antoninus. It is certainly appropriate (Hecataeus, however, had divided the world into Europe and Asia, the latter including Africa [Jacoby, *FGrH* 1]; see also Hdt. 4.41–2). παντός καὶ ἀπείρου not in our mss.

Med. 6.39

J.B. 1.78 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*) reads, after πράγμασι, καὶ οἷς ἀνθρώποις συζῆν σε ἡ πρόνοια ἔταξε, καὶ ἡ φύσις μετὰ τοῦ φέροντος, συναρμόζειν τε σαυτὸν καὶ φιλεῖν τὸ λαχὸν ἀληθινῶς.

Med. 7.1.3

J.B. II.415 (*Discourse on Fortitude*) adds οὐδὲ πρόσφατον, ἀλλὰ after καινόν, and τὰ γινόμενα after ὀλιγοχρόνια.

Med. 7.16.4

J.B. II.289 (*On the Vanity of Life*). No variants.

Med. 8.7.2 ἡ δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσις . . . δικαίας

J.B. I.77 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*) adds κατὰ τι before ἀνεμποδίστου.

Med. 8.20.1 Ἡ φύσις . . . διεξαγωγῆς

J.B. II.344 (mispagination; should be 420) (*Discourse on Fortitude*) reads, for ἡ φύσις, ἡ τὰ πάντα διεξάγουσα πρόνοια, and adds περὶ before ἐκάστου. We have here a Christianizing modification.

Med. 8.46

J.B. II.289 (*On the Vanity of Life*) for οὐδὲ βοῖ . . . ἴδιον reads καθάπερ οὐδ' ἵππῳ ὃ οὐκ ἔστι τῶν ἵππικῶν, for ἂν δυσχεραίνεις reads δυσχεραίνεις, for ἔφερεν ἡ κοινὴ φύσις reads ἡ κοινὴ φύσις φέρει. These differences seem to embody modifications by J.B.

Med. 8.48.1–3

J.B. II.289 (*On the Vanity of Life*) retains μετὰ λόγου in 48.2, excised as a gloss by Dalfen, and reads ἐφ' ᾧ for ἐφ' ὃ in 48.3 (so also two mss. of X excerpts, v₃ and l₃).

Med. 8.51.2 οἶον . . . ἀναβλύουσα

J.B. I.77 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*) reads βλύζουσα for ἀναβλύουσα (ἀναβλύζουσα AD). See Section V below for the passage, not to be found in our text of the *Meditations*, which follows in J.B.

Med. 8.52.1–2

[οὐδὲ τί ἐστι κόσμος] del. Theiler, Dalfen

<οὐδ' ἂν τί ἐστι κόσμος> suppl. Dalfen

[1] J.B. II.183 (*Second Discourse on the Crucifixion*, ch. 5, *ad fin.*) ὁ μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ τι ποτέ ἐστι κόσμος οὐδὲ οἶδεν ὅπου ἐστι, καὶ ὁ ἑαυτὸν ἀγνοῶν οὐκ οἶδεν ὅς τις ἐστι.

[2] J.B. II.322 (*Memorandum on the Intellect*, *ad init.*) ὁ μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ τι ποτέ ἐστὶν ὁ κόσμος οὐτοσί, οὐκ οἶδεν ὅπου ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ μὴ εἰδὼς ὅπου ἐστίν, οὐκ οἶδεν ὅς τις ἐστίν· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ πρὸς ὃ αὐτὸς πέφυκε σύνοιδεν· ὁ δὲ ἐν τι τούτων ἀπολιπών, οὐδὲ θεὸν ζητῆσαι, ἢ εὐρεῖν ὅλως μέμνηται.

[3] J.B. II.344 (mispagination; should be 420) (*Discourse on Fortitude*) ὁ μὲν μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ τι ποτέ ἐστι κόσμος, οὐκ οἶδεν ὅπου ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ μὴ εἰδὼς ὅπου ἐστίν, οὐκ οἶδεν ὅς τις ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ ἐν τι τούτων ἀπολιπών, οὐδὲ πρὸς ὃ τι αὐτὸς πέφυκεν εἴποι.

52.1 ποτε add. J.B.

Med. 8.54

J.B. II.415 (*Discourse on Fortitude*) omits ἤδη, reads οὐδὲν γὰρ ἦττον, reads σπάσαι for γινῶναι.

Med. 8.55 Γενικῶς μὲν . . . τὸν ἕτερον

So J.B. I.75 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*).

Med. 8.56.2

J.B. I.75 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*) reads ἔνεκα for ἔνεκεν, reads ἐκάστου (conjectured by Coraes) for ἕκαστον (ἐκάστων Reiske), reads αὐτεξουσιότητα κέκτηται for κυρίαν ἔχει, reads ἑτέρου for πλησίον, reads ἄλλου for ἐμοῦ, reads τὸν ἕτερον for τὸ ἐμέ. αὐτεξουσιότητα is clearly a modification by J.B.

Cf. II.187 (*Second Discourse on the Crucifixion*) καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἀλλήλων ἔνεκα

See *Med.* 8.59, 11.18.1–2.

Med. 8.59 Οἱ ἄνθρωποι . . . ἔνεκεν

See on 8.56.2 above and 11.18.1–2.

Med. 9.4

Cf. J.B. I.76 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*), adding καὶ after ἀμαρτάνει and, with AD, omitting κακοῖ.

(J.B. continues ἄλλον δ' οὐδείς βλάψαι δύναται, ἂν μὴ αὐτὸς ἐθελήσῃ· καὶ τί λέγω ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπον βλάψαι οὐ δύναται; οὐδ' ὠφελῆσαι δύναται ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπον, ἂν μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς οἰκοθεν ὠφελῆθῃν θελήσῃ).

Med. 9.37.2

J.B. II.289 (*On the Vanity of Life*) omits τί τούτων καινόν, and reads σκέψαι τοῦτο for ἴδε αὐτό.

Med. 9.42.1–3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13

[1] J.B. I.76 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*) has 1–3, at 5 reads Θεός for φύσις, after πραότητα adds πρὸς δὲ τὸν ἀχάριστον τὴν ἀνεξικακίαν, for ἄλλον reads ἄλλο κακόν, after δύναμιν adds ἀγαθὴν, at 8 has τί δὲ . . . πράσσει (reading ἑαυτοῦ for τοῦ ἀπαιδεύτου), followed by *Med.* 5.17, followed by 8 ὅρα . . . ἀμαρτήσεσθαι, reading ὀφείλεις for ὀφείλῃς, adds ἀλλ' ἀχάριστος after ἀμαρτήσεσθαι, followed by 12 τί γὰρ . . . ζητεῖς; followed by *Med.* 11.5 (preceded by ἄλλω μὲν γὰρ ἄλλῃ, followed by 10, for μάλιστα δὲ . . . μέμψῃ reading ἀχαρίστῳ οὖν μὴ μέμψῃ, ἀλλ' followed by 13 ἔχεις γὰρ τὸ σαυτοῦ ποιήσας πρὸς ὃ παρεσκευάζου (loose).

θεός for φύσις at 5 clearly Christianization, 10 and 13 loose.

[2] J.B. II.187 (*Second Discourse on the Crucifixion*) 9.42.8 τί δὲ κακόν . . . πράσσει; (followed by quotation from *Med.* 5.17), 8 ὅρα μὴ . . ., reading ὀφείλεις for ὀφείλῃς, μὴ for οὐ and, after ἀμαρτήσεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀχάριστός τις γέγονε περὶ σέ; followed by 12 τί γὰρ . . . ζητεῖς; adding ἄνθρωπε after ἄνθρωπον, followed by ἔχεις οὖν τὸ σαυτοῦ ποιήσας πρὸς ὃ κατεσκευάσαι (loose reminiscence of 13), followed by καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἀλλήλων ἕνεκα (cf. *Med.* 8.56, 59), followed by quotation from *Med.* 2.1.4 as far as βλέφαρα, followed by ὡς οὖν οὐδ' (9.42.12) ὀφθαλμὸς τοῖς ποσὶν ἀμοιβὴν ἀπαιτεῖ ὅτι βλέπει, οὐδ' οἱ πόδες τούτῳ, ἐπεὶ βαδίζουσι (loose).

[3] J.B. I.80 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*) 9.42.12 (loose) καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' ὀφθαλμὸς τοὺς πόδας ἀμοιβὴν (sic) ἀπαιτεῖ ὅτι βλέπει, οὐδ' οἱ πόδες τοῦτον ὅτι βαδίζουσιν, followed by insertion οὐδεμὴν ὁ λύχνος τιμάς, ὡς οἰκοθεν τὴν οἰκίαν ἅπασαν καταλάμπων, followed by 13 (loose) πρὸς ὃ δὲ πέφυκεν τούτων ἕκαστον ἀρκεῖται δὴ ἐνεργοῦν.

Med. 10. 20

J.B. II.415 (*Discourse on Fortitude*) ἐκείνο ἡμῶν ἐκάστω συμφέρει, ὅπερ ἡμῶν ὁ θεὸς ἐκάστω φέρει· καὶ τότε συμφέρει ὅταν ἐκείνος φέρῃ (loose).

θεός: Christianization of ἡ τῶν ὅλων φύσις.

Med. 10.33.4–5

J.B. I.77 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*), reading at 4 γὰρ for δὲ after νοῦς, at 5 ὡς πῦρ . . . κατὰ πρανούς.

Med. 10. 34.2

J.B. II.296 (*Consolation to the Emperor*), following on *Med.* 5.23 quotes Hom. *Il.* 6.146–9; the quotation is taken directly from Homer, but the context suggests that J.B. had *Med.* 10.34.2 in mind.

Med. 10.34.5–6 ἀλλὰ . . . θρηγήσει

J.B. I. 81 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*) at 5 reads φαντάζῃ for ἐσόμενα φεύγεις καὶ διώκεις, at 6 reads μετ' ὀλίγον for ἥδη, after ἄλλος adds πάλιν (loose).

(οὖν J.B. with WX [om. AT], ἥδη om. WX.)

Med. 11.1.1, 3–4 τὰ ἴδια . . . ἐπιστῇ, 3 ἔτι δὲ . . . ἐμπεριλαμβάνει, 4 καὶ τὸ φιλεῖν . . . προτιμᾶν.

[1] J.B. I.18–19 (*First Discourse on the Trinity*) at 1 reads τὰ ἴδια τῆς λογικῆς ψυχῆς ταῦτα· ἑαυτὴν ὁρᾶν, ἑαυτὴν διαρθροῦν, reads καρποῦσθαι for καρποῦται, omits τοὺς . . . καρποῦνται (excised by Nauck), reads τυγχάνειν for τυγχάνει, at 3 omits ἔτι δέ, at περιέρχεται . . . ἐμπεριλαμβάνει reads περιέρχεσθαι for περιέρχεται, reads ἐκτείνεσθαι for ἐκτείνεται, reads ἐμπεριλαμβάνειν for ἐμπεριλαμβάνει, reads τοὺς πλησίον for τὸν πλησίον, and omits καὶ τὸ σχῆμα αὐτοῦ (excised by Theiler) after κενόν.

[2] J.B. I.167–8 (*Ninth Discourse on the Trinity*) at 1 reads τὰ ἴδια τῆς λογικῆς ψυχῆς, ἑαυτὴν ὁρᾶν, ἑαυτὴν διαρθροῦν, reads καρποῦσθαι for καρποῦται and adds πρῶτην, reads τυγχάνειν for τυγχάνει, at 3 reads τὸ περιέρχεσθαι for περιέρχεται, reads ἐκτείνεσθαι for ἐκτείνεται, reads ἐμπεριλαμβάνειν for ἐμπεριλαμβάνει, reads τὸν πλησίον for τοὺς πλησίον, and omits καὶ τὸ σχῆμα αὐτοῦ after κενόν.

With 4 καὶ τὸ μηδὲν ἑαυτῆς προτιμᾶν, cf. J.B. I.30 (*Second Discourse on the Trinity*) οὕτω τε τὴν ψυχὴν μετὰ θεὸν τῶν ἄλλων προτιμητέον πάντων (Christianization).

[3] J.B. II.68 (*First Discourse on the Crucifixion*) 3 περιέρχεται . . . κόσμον, τὴν ἀπειρίαν . . . ἐκτείνεται, reading ἀπείρου before αἰῶνος.

Med. 11.5 τίς . . . γίνεται

Cf. J.B. I.76 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*) ἄλλω μὲν γὰρ ἄλλη, σοῦ δὲ ἡ τέχνη τὸ ἀγαθὸν πάντως εἶναι, ἢ γίνεσθαι.

Med. 11.9

J.B. I.193 (*Tenth Discourse on the Trinity*) reads ζῶντι for προϊόντι, reads ἀποτρέψαι with WX for ἀποστρέψαι, reads ἀγάπης for εὐμενείας, retains ἢ ἄλλως δυσχεραίνοντας (excised by Dalfen), adds καὶ στοργῆς after πραότητος, reads λιποτάκται with WX for λιποτάκται. ἀγάπης seems a Christianization.

Med. 11.18.6–10 ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς . . . ἐξετάθημεν

[1] J.B. I.194 (*Tenth Discourse on the Trinity*) at 7 after ἀπέχῃ omits ἀλλὰ τὴν γε ἕξιν ἐποιστικὴν ἔχεις, reads κενὴν δόξαν for δοξοκοπίαν, reads εἶτα for πέμπτον ὅτι, adds ὁμολογουμένως after κατείληφας, at 8 reads ἄλλως γίνεται, καὶ ἐτέρως δοκεῖ for καὶ κατ' οἰκονομίαν γίνεται, reads παθεῖν (with A) for μαθεῖν, omits τις after ἵνα, reads ἀποφύνηταί τις καταληπτικῶς for καταληπτικῶς τι ἀποφύνηται, reads ὅταν δὲ καὶ for ἕκτον ὅτι ὅταν, omits καὶ before δυσπαθῆς, reads ἀνθρώπινος for ἀνθρώπιος, reads ἐκλείπομεν for ἐξετάθημεν.

(Some modifications by J.B.; μαθεῖν seems correct at 8.)

[2] J.B. I.81 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*), at 9 reads ἂν δὲ καὶ λίαν ἀγανακτῆς, ἢ

ἀποδυσπετῆς (cf. *Med.* 4.32.5, 5.9.1), reads ἀνθρώπινος for ἀνθρώπειος, reads ἐκλείπομεν for ἐξετάθημεν.

Med. 11.36 Λήσσης προαιρέσεως οὐ γίνεται [τὸ τοῦ Ἐπικτήτου] (τὸ τοῦ Ἐπικτήτου del. Rendall) (*Epict.* III.22.105)

Cf. J.B. I.77 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*) (following on *Med.* 10.33 πρανοῦς) λήσσης προαιρέσεως οὐ γέγονε, οὐ γίνεται, οὐκ ἔσται followed by *Med.* 8.7.2 ἡ γὰρ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσις . . .

In view of the context of this quotation, it seems reasonable to conclude that it is taken not directly from Epictetus but from the *Meditations*.

There are other passages which, though not actual, perhaps not even loose, quotations from the *Meditations*, are reminiscent of their language and thought. (It is, however, not always easy to distinguish loose quotations from reminiscences, especially when they are brief.) The wordings at II.415 (*Discourse on Fortitude*) are particularly free. Among passages not included above which are more naturally classified as reminiscences than as quotations, the following may be noted:

J.B. I.18 (*First Discourse on the Trinity*): χρηὸν οὖν παντὶ τῷ σωθῆναι σπουδάζοντι, πᾶσαν ἡμέραν καὶ ὥραν ἐγκύπτειν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν. Cf. *Med.* 4.3.2.

Ibid. I.19: διὰ γὰρ τὴν τῆς φύσεως ἀσθένειαν, ὡς ὁρᾶς, ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι πολλοσθημόριόν τι τοῦ αἰῶνος βιοῦμεν, τελευτῶμεν δὲ πάντες τὸν ἐξῆς χρόνον. Cf. *Med.* 12.7, 12.32.1.

I.32 (*Second Discourse on the Trinity*): διὰ τοῦτο γέγονε καὶ συνέστη ὁ ἄνθρωπος, πρὸς τὸ θεωρῆσαι τὸν λόγον τῆς τοῦ ὅλου φύσεως, καὶ ἑαυτὸν γινῶναι, καὶ ἐπιγινῶναι θεόν. Cf. *Med.* 8.52.

I.75 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*): ὁ οὖν ἀμαρτάνων ἑαυτῷ ἀμαρτάνει. Cf. *Med.* 4.26.3.

II.415 (*Discourse on Fortitude*): ἄκοντας ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβαίνουσιν ἔπασθαι τῷ θεῷ, καὶ τοῖς ἀπίστοις πρόσεστι. Cf. *Med.* 10.2.2. Cf. also Cleanthes, fr. 527 von Arnim, SVF (from *Epict. Ench.* 53).

Ibid.: ἀλλ' ὅτι μὴ πᾶν τὸ γινόμενον ἀπροσδόκητον. Cf. *Med.* 12.1.5.

Ibid.: ὅθεν οὐδεὶς ὀφείλει ἐγκαλεῖν τῇ προνοίᾳ. Cf. *Med.* 12.24.1.

V

Bryennius' manner of quotation sometimes involves a mosaic of passages, as can be seen from the following cases, some passages being quoted more than once in different contexts. The italics in (1) and (3) bring out the similarity in order of the passages Bryennius quotes.

1. From J.B. I.75–7, *Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*: *Med.* 2.1.1–5, with omission in 3; followed by passage not in our text but reproduced below; followed by words echoing 8.55; 8.56.2; 9.4 followed by words not in mss.; 9.42.1–3; *ibid.* 8; 5.17; 9.42.8; words not in mss.; 9.42.12; *ibid.* 10; followed by words reminiscent of *ibid.* 13; followed by words not in mss.; 8.51; followed by words not in mss.; followed by words reminiscent of 4.49.2; 10.33.4; *ibid.* 5; followed by words

- reminiscent of 11.36, from Epict. III.22.105; 8.7.2. There follows at J.B. I.78 a passage reminiscent of 6.39.
2. From J.B. I.167–8, *Ninth Discourse on the Trinity: Med.* 11.1.1, *ibid.* 1.3, 1.4; 5.19; followed by words not in mss.; 5.19.
 3. From J.B. II.167, *Second Discourse on the Crucifixion: Med.* 9.42.8; 5.17; followed by words not in mss. (but cf. 9.42.8); 9.42.8; followed by words not in mss.; 9.42.12; followed by words similar to *ibid.* 13; followed by words reminiscent of 8.56.2, 8.59; 11.1.4; words similar to 9.42.12. For the passage which precedes this, found also in (1) above, see below.
 4. From J.B. II.289, *On the Vanity of Life: Med.* 6.31; 8.46.1–2; 9.37.2; 7.16.4; 8.48.1–3.
 5. From J.B. II.415, *Discourse on Fortitude: Med.* 10.20; followed by reminiscence of 10.28.2; 8.54; followed by words similar to 12.1.5; 7.1.3; followed by passage similar to 12.24.1. There follows a passage similar to Epict. *Ench.* 8.
 6. From J.B. II.344 (mispagination; should be 420), *Discourse on Fortitude: Med.* 8.52.1–2; 4.29.1–3; 8.20.1; 4.43; 4.44.

The close similarity, both in content and in order, between the series of passages in (1) and that in (3), the former being the fuller, may suggest that he was using and reusing notes he had himself compiled for purposes of self-admonition or moral exhortation (see Section I above for the chronology). Series (2) and (4)–(6) also illustrate his method of composition. Among common themes in each group of quotations, (1) contains a variety of moral exhortations, on the appropriate reaction to the existence of bad men, on man's rational nature, and on individual responsibility; (2) on the place of rational nature in the universe; (3) on the appropriate reaction to bad men, and that we exist for the benefit of each other; (4) on the reaction of a rational being to adversity; (5) on one's place in the universe under providence; (6) on one's recognition of the nature of the universe and of one's place in it, and the transience of events and circumstances in the course of nature.

Another passage, not in our text of the *Meditations* but Stoic in tone, is to be noted. In (1) above, after the quotation from *Med.* 2.1.1–5, there occurs a passage found also almost identically immediately before the beginning of (3); while not in the *Meditations*, at any rate as we have them, it is closely similar both in content and in style. In (1) it runs as follows:

‘Ὅτι καὶ πᾶς κύριος, καὶ ἀδελφός, καὶ πατήρ, καὶ παιδαγωγός, καὶ διδάσκαλος, καὶ ἰατρός, καὶ νομοθέτης, καὶ δικαστής, εἰς τοῦτο κεῖνται, εἰς τὸ μισεῖσθαι παρὰ τῶν, οὓς ἐτάχθησαν ὠφελεῖν καὶ βαρεῖς καὶ φορτικοὶ καὶ ἀναιδεῖς φαίνεσθαι· τὸ δ’ αἴτιον ὅτι οὐ δι’ ὧν τέρπουσιν ὠφελοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ δι’ ὧν λυποῦσι, καὶ αἰεὶ φορτικοὶ καὶ ἦσαν καὶ ἔσονται καὶ εἰσὶ, τοῖς μὲν ἀνοήτοις οἱ συνετοί, τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν οἱ εὐδόκιμοι, τοῖς ῥαθύμοις οἱ σπουδαῖοι, τοῖς ἀπαιδεύτοις οἱ πεπαιδευμένοι, καὶ ὅλως τοῖς στρεβλοῖς οἱ ὀρθοί· πλὴν ἡ τοῦ ἐτέρου κακία οὐ βλέπτει τὸν ἕτερον.

The last sentence is closely similar to *Med.* 8.55, and is immediately followed by words from 8.56. The entire passage recurs at II.187, though ending slightly earlier at οἱ ὀρθοί, and is there followed by words from 9.42.8: τί δὲ κακὸν ἢ ξένον γέγονεν . . . For ἀναιδεῖς in I.75 we here have ἀγδεῖς, which is more appropriate and presumably correct. The sentiments and style are reminiscent of the *Meditations*; it is, however, slightly rhetorical, and it is possible that it is the work of Bryennius himself, used once and then reused; on the other hand he may have been borrowing.

It may be that in ἀλλ' ἀχάριστος; in (1), and ἀλλ' ἀχάριστός τις γέγονε περί σε; in (3), following in each case upon the words of 9.42.8 τοῦτο ἀμαρτήσθαι, we have words which were in Bryennius' text of the *Meditations*, though they are not in ours (which is attested here by ATWX). If so, one is led to ask whether the same may not be true of ἄλλον δ' οὐδεὶς βλάψαι δύναται, ἂν μὴ αὐτὸς ἐβλήσῃ, which follows on the words of 9.4 in (1); but again the words may be Bryennius' own. More puzzling is αὐτὸς πνεύματι ἡγεμονικῶ εἰς τὸ σαυτοῦ καθεστηκώς πάγιος ἔσο καὶ ἄτρεπτος, also in (1), following on 8. 51; the words πνεῦμα ἡγεμονικόν are Stoic, unlikely to have been introduced by Bryennius for fifteenth-century hearers or readers. On the other hand the words ἔστι γὰρ ἐκ πάντων ἐλευθέρα, καὶ πάντων ἀνωτέρα, found in (2), where they are inserted in 5.19, have a Platonic rather than a Stoic ring.

Other philosophical authors

The *Discourse on Fortitude* has three reminiscences of Epictetus, *Encheiridion* (5, 8, and 53) (J.B. II.415, 417); however, the third of these (taken from Cleanthes, fr. 527, von Arnim SVF) may have been mediated through *Med.* 10.28.2. J.B. I.77 (*Fourth Discourse on the Trinity*) quotes Epict. III.22.105, but this again may have been mediated through *Med.* 11.36.

At I.19 (*First Discourse on the Trinity*) Bryennius quotes πειρῶ (πειράσθαι in the original) τὸ ἐν σοὶ θεῖον (τὸν ἐν ὑμῖν θεὸν in the original) ἀνάγειν ἐπὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ παντὶ θεῖον from Porphyry, *Vit. Plot.* 2.

At I.34 (*Second Discourse on the Trinity*) we find διὰ τοῦτο γέγονε καὶ συνέστη ὁ ἄνθρωπος, πρὸς τὸ θεωρῆσαι τὸν λόγον τῆς τοῦ ὄλου φύσεως, which is a modification of Γέγονε δὲ καὶ συνέστα ὁ ἄνθρωπος ποττὸ θεωρῆσαι τὸν λόγον τῆς τῷ ὄλῳ φύσεως, found in Stobaeus 3.1.120, p. 85 Hense, taken from Perictione, *De Sapientia* fr. 1 (H. Thesleff, *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period* [Åbo, 1965], 146). This is followed a few lines later by a longer quotation, ὅς τις ὦν ἀναλῦσαι οἶός τε ἐστὶ . . . τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον περαιομένων from Iamblichus, *Protr.* 4 (ed. E. des Places [Paris, 1989], 54.10–21) ([Archytas], *De Sapientia* fr. 5 Thesleff, 44.31 to 45.4).

As in the case of the *Meditations*, in these passages also Bryennius gives no indication of his source.

VI

It will be appropriate to look finally, if only briefly, at the bearing of Bryennius' interest in the *Meditations* upon his general world-outlook, both in itself and in relation to the particular passages he quotes. Meyer devoted a separate article to his theology.¹⁰ He maintained the Greek tradition over the Trinity against the Western, and also rejected the main stream of Western scholasticism over the possibility of natural theology (τίς γὰρ κοινωνία . . . τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει μετὰ τῶν τῆς Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας δογμάτων;). The divine, he claimed, was above reason, and the seat of religious authority lay in the Councils of the Church. Living in the final decades of the Empire, he saw his age as one of decline;¹¹ a man of austere temperament, he

¹⁰ Ph. Meyer, 'Joseph Bryennios als Theolog. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der griechischen Theologie im 15. Jahrhundert', *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 69 (1896), 282–319.

¹¹ Ihor Ševčenko, 'The decline of Byzantium seen through the eyes of its intellectuals', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 15 (1961), 169–86.

attributed the woes of his time to divine punishment for the moral depravity of society, combined with an addiction to astrology and superstition.¹²

As for the special features of those passages which Bryennius chooses to excerpt, it is natural that he should include nothing from Book 1, which is essentially personal in character. Similarly nothing is quoted which refers to particularities of classical history, and no ancient author quoted by name by Antoninus is so mentioned.¹³ Unlike Antoninus, however, Bryennius names Homer as the source of *Iliad* 6.146–9, which, again unlike Antoninus, he quotes in full (10.34; J.B. II.296 [*Consolation to the Emperor*]). The recurrent themes are on the one hand the moral imperfections of mankind (*Med.* 2.1, 5.16, 9.42, 11.18), the transience of things (4.43–4, 5.23), and the brevity of life (10.34, 11.18); on the other hand the autonomy of the mind (5.19, 8.48), and one's self-knowledge as bound up with one's understanding of the infinity of the universe (8.52). The universe is a city (4.3, 4.4, 5.22) in which rational beings exist for the sake of each other (2.1, 8.59).

Passages quoted more than once, not always in precisely the same words, are 2.1 (twice), 5.17 (twice), 5.19 (twice), 8.52 (three times), 9.42 (three times), and 11.18 (twice). Their themes we may take to have made a specially strong impact on his mind. That of 2.1 is the low moral standard to be expected of mankind, and similarly that of 5.17; that of 5.19 the autonomy of the mind; that of 8.52–4 the paramount importance of understanding one's own nature and that of the universe; that of 9.42 one's self-sufficiency as a moral being among a world of imperfect beings; 11.1 the proper functions of a rational being, recognizing its place in the universe; and 11.18 recognition of one's own moral imperfection and the finitude of human life.

An element of Christianization is found in the substitution of *θεός* for *φύσις* at 9.42.5 (J.B. I.76) and 10.20 (II. 415), and perhaps (though *πρόνοια* is a common Stoic term) in the substitution of *πρόνοια* for *φύσις* at 8.20.1 (II.344 [mispagination; should be 420]); perhaps also the substitution of *ἀγάπη* for *εὐμένεια* at 11.9.1 (I.193). On the other hand, if one raises the question of the appropriateness of the passages quoted from the standpoint of the Christian tradition, one finds that the world appears here in Stoic fashion as a world of endless repetitions (7.1) and cyclical recurrences (11.1), while the treatments of one's self-knowledge, autonomy as a rational being (5.19) and self-sufficiency (7.16, 8.48, and 9.42) are Stoic rather than Christian.¹⁴

Jesus College, Oxford

D. A. REES

¹² L. Oeconomus, 'L'état intellectuel et moral des Byzantins vers le milieu du XIV^e siècle d'après une page de Joseph Bryennios', *Mélanges Charles Diehl* vol. I (Paris, 1930), 225–33. Oeconomus reprints, from vol. III, pp. 119–23 of the Leipzig edition of Bryennius, with a French translation, a discourse from the *κεφάλαια ἐπτάκις ἔπτα* entitled *τίνες αἰτίαι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς λυπηρῶν*; he assigns it too early a date, however.

¹³ See Section IV above on Epictetus at *Med.* 11.36, where the text has been doubted; cf. J.B. I.77.

¹⁴ I mention Bryennius briefly in my earlier paper 'Some features of the textual history of Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations*', in *Philomathes: Studies and Essays . . . in Memory of P. Merlan* (The Hague, 1971), 183–93.