

Roger T. Macfarlane, Brigham Young University

A peculiar dossier of parchment manuscript leaves conserved at Brigham Young University preserves portions of three medieval Greek liturgical canons.¹ The dossier once belonged to Sir Thomas Phillips and was bound during the 19th-century into a volume labeled “Fragmenta Graeca Palimpsesta.” All told, including palimpsest over- and undertexts, eight discrete fragmentary texts are represented in the dossier’s various manuscript fragments. Because the undertexts comprise a considerably more complex dossier, they are treated elsewhere and mentioned in this article only in passing. The dossier’s twenty-two leaves present portions of three discrete liturgical *menalugia*, each written in different times and circumstances. The menalugia were written upon codex folios, parchment substrates derived as *matériel* from unrelated manuscript codices. The source-codices had been dismantled, perhaps in circumstances contiguous to the writing of the menalugia. The three resultant codices were themselves later dismantled, and surviving portions were brought together at some time before the mid-19th Century and bound together in a dossier. Uncertainties of provenience notwithstanding, the leaves contribute to the corpus of Byzantine sacred literature. In hopes of reversing the diaspora of the codices from which the leaves are excerpted, the descriptions here pertain to the overtexts’ contents and codicological characteristics.

Menaion A was written in the 9th-century, making it a good deal older than the other menalugia. The leaves of Menaion A contain liturgical contents that are not textually contiguous; but, the two texts may be close enough together that they may once have been in the same codex and perhaps even in the same signature. Menaion B preserves another ecclesiastical text written about the same time as the text of Menaion C. The rubric capitals and hirmoi adorn this less aesthetically pleasant manuscript. A kind of codicological constructive surgery performed upon Menaion C by its creators might warrant closer investigation than other aspects of this fragment. The Scriptorium where Menaion C was made witnessed the synthetic creation of quasi-bifolia from various scraps of parchment leaves, some palimpsests surfaces, but not all. These scraps were once of various sizes, but in Scriptorium C they were cut down in a rather Procrustean procedure.

¹ L. Tom Perry Special Collections in the Harold B. Lee Library of Brigham Young University has assigned the call number “091.G811, volume 1” to the leaves discussed here.

When the cutting and sewing were done, Scriptorium C produced a Frankensteinian synthesized quire as support for the text of Menaion C.

Over-arching questions pertain to the diaspora of these manuscripts. Scrutiny of the dossier's codicological elements allows one to answer some questions pertaining to its constituent manuscripts. Within the dossier's forty-four leaves are represented, all told, fragments of eight discreet texts.¹ Brief descriptions of these elements follow. I would like to locate related manuscripts in other libraries around the world. Of especial interest are the signatures once associated with the portions of the *Loci Communes* of Maximus Confessor that constitute the undertext of Menaion B. Responsible curators, unaware of the remarkable contents in the palimpsest text, may know the related folios only as textually contiguous to Menaion B.² The hope of reuniting these leaves with scattered remnants of the original codex underpins the present publication.

This dossier of remnants from various codices were gathered together in the 19th century into a bound volume. This dossier is now curated among the *Fragmenta Palimpsesta Graeca*, Ms. 091 G811, volume 1, in our Special Collections Library. Parchment bifolia originally constituted the leaves of various codices were dismantled and then repurposed as leaves in liturgical codices. The dossier's careless binding in 1848 imposed a sense of chaos upon the collection. Page numbers were penciled on rectos and versos through the rebound dossier, and these identify the folios in the present article. Only through the careful study of undertexts and overtexts can we now with certainty understand the sequencing of the variegated contents. It helped that in 2012 the librarians of the Lee Library unbound the fragments from their unnaturally imposed sequence and allowed effective regrouping.

¹ Latin letters indicate the liturgical overtexts, Menaion A, B, and C. Greek letters indicate texts inscribed first on the various folios, the undertexts: β Ps.-Maximus Confessor, an utterly unique abbreviated recension of *Loci Communes* 5.2./2 – 25.-./13 [Ihm]; γ an excerpt from a 13th-century ecclesiastical document; δ Symeon Metaphrases, *Martyrium S. Menae et Sociorum* 37 – 39; ζ Basil of Caesarea, *Homilia in sanctam Christi generationem* 4D – 5D [Garnier]; and η John Chrysostom, *De Babyla contra Julianum et gentiles* 12 – 15. Names for non-extant α and ε were withheld from this nomenclature.

² See, beyond the sketch by M.C. Curthoys — “North, Frederick, fifth earl of Guilford (1766 – 1827), *ODNB*, and sources there — also A.P. Vretos, *Notizie Biografiche-Storiche su Federico Conte di Builford, Pari Inghilterra e sulla da lui fondata Università Ionia* (Athens: Reale Stamperia, 1846). Justin Barney annotated the North correspondence archived at the American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Gennadius Library, in Summer 2012.

Meagre evidence illuminates the ownership history. The bound volume contained a Phillips shelfmark. Sir Thomas Phillips seems to have acquired the manuscripts from the estate of Lord Frederick North, the 5th Earl of Guilford. An inveterate philhellene, North likely acquired the manuscripts as part of his institutional library for the Ionian University, or Ionian Academy, which he founded in 1814 and which was not defunct until Greek unification nearly four decades after his death.¹ He likely bought this, as he did so many other books, for use in the Ionian Academy. At his passing, though, Lord North's heirs quickly liquidated whatever manuscripts they could, and Phillips likely acquired these at that time through the well publicized sales from 1829 to 1830. One has the constant, nagging feeling, considering this acquisition history, that many a potential buyer has refused to buy this messy manuscript dossier. Kraus records, however, still elude me, and we do not clearly know about one and one-half centuries of ownership that might be documented.

A — Menaion A, excerpts from two liturgical offices

BYU G811/1- A — membranaceus rescriptus; 145x212; 2 foll.; s. xi

[Specimen: fol. 13, ll. 5 – 12 \(on specimen sampler sheet\)](#)

Two discrete folios from an unknown parchment codex preserve portions of two ecclesiastical services. Folio 1/2 presents the final portions of an unknown canon, odes 6 through 9, while Folio 3/4 presents a variety of options for the fourth ode in the canon for December 30 as composed by Andrew of Crete.

Two leaves are written by the same hand and apparently in the same ink. Although the two leaves are clearly part of the same codex, their text is not contiguous. For, the first leaf contains the end of a paleographically lovely canon, proceeding (f. 1, l. 1) from the middle of the fifth ode through the theotokion of the ninth ode (f. 2, l. 27), and the second leaf begins (f. 3, l. 1) mid-sentence through a text that it not necessarily complete at the end of its verso (f. 4). The leaves are not physically connected to each other. Indeed, because both leaves present their text proceeding from the hair-side to the flesh-side, their relationship to one another is indiscernible. The hand, rubrication, *misse en page*, and so forth, would seem to validate an argument that the two leaves come from the same codex. More is said *ad locum*, below, regarding the contents and interrelationship of these leaves. The miscellany's elements from Menaion A differ from the other elements in that these leaves were not over-written.

Paleographical Observations: A serviceably elegant 9th century miniscule throughout, but with heirmological annotation in like-sized small uncials; miniscule text written with only slight rightward leaning in occasional letters, such as epsilon; beta is of u-shape, pi is as if perlschrift, and serifs on bottom of long descenders tend to hook to the right; nomina sacra and several abbreviations are marked *supra linea*; serifs on bottom of long descenders tend to hook to the right. Line-ends do not correspond, except accidentally sometimes, to the verse rhythmns, and interpuncts distinguish line-ends.

Codicological Observations:

Size: 145 x 212 mm; schriftfeld width scored 92 mm plus 7 mm gutters, 6 mm line heights. Folios 1 and 3 are hair side, 2 and 4 flesh. Although the leaves might once have been two halves of a single bifolium, there is no longer any apparent physical connection between the two leaves. The inner margin of each leaf has been trimmed by a few centimeters, so narrowly that marginalia indicating theotokia appear on the “verso” of each only. These markings are 10 mm left of the text and written in the same ink as the text itself.

30 lines per folio filling a space demarcated by vertical scored gutters left and right.

Ink: A middle brown iron-oxide ink has not been finally evaluated by XRF.

One marginalion, written in a black ink, appears in the right margin of folio 1.

Rubrication: The capital of every troparion — except the initials on the first two troparia on folio 1 — is rubricized, as if in illumination that picks out features of the capital letter in red. The lettershapes for the capitals feature a two-step process where the fields in the capitals are outlined in the first, brown, ink and then filled in later with the highlighting. Apparently a second hand, or at least a secondary process adds a touch of color to the vertical features and some seriphs of each. The canon’s conclusion is indicated by a red band flourished beneath the final line of the text.

Textual Observations: For alignment of this text to Paris ms. 928, see footnote 14 on folio 4.

Further on relationship viz. Crypt., Paris., and Sinaiticus gr. 578, see footnote 7 on folio 3?

Folio 1/2 presents the final portions of an unknown canon, the final troparia of the fifth ode through the ninth. None of the five hymns overlaps with the contents of Follieri. Individual stanzas, i.e. one troparion and two theotokia, are documented in the *Analecta Hymnica Graeca*.

The text of final troparion for Ode 6, τὸν προφήτην διέσωσας = *AHG* Can.Febr.7.7.6.18-21.

The text of the theotokion for Ode 6 = *AHG* Can.Dec. 12.19.6.10.10-14.

Fol. 3/4 presents a portion of a canon for Dec. 30, ode 4, attributed to Andrew of Crete.* This ode's triadikon differs wholly from the texts collated by Kominis. An abbreviated version of the canon, according to Kominis, is transmitted in 23 troparia, while the longer version comes in 65. This present text, though partial, may have had as many as 65. The alternative heirmos reproduces in four of its six extant troparia another fourth ode from a canon for Dec. 25, also attributed to Andrew.

* Cf. Kominis' note ad *AHG* Can. Dec. 30.60.2.1: "heirm. α' EE 105, n. 148, Andreae." For attribution of Can. Dec. 25.50, see Kominis ad loc., p. 632.

the text of Ode 4, *Εἰσακήκοα τὴν ἀκοὴν τῆς σῆς οἰκονομίας* = Sinait. gr. 578 f. 90r = *AHG* Can. Dec. 30.60.2. The Fourth Ode of the Sinaitic canon suggests that two complete troparia precede the text on this folio.

The text of the triadikon for Ode 4 differs from the Sinaitic, i.e. *AHG* Can. Dec. 30.60.2.4: Τρία
ἄναρχα θεολογῶ, / συνάναρχα δὲ τρία, / φῶτα καὶ ζωὰς ἀχωρίστως, /
τὴν ἁγίαν Τριάδα / ἐν θεότητι μιᾷ / καὶ φύσει καὶ οὐσίᾳ.

The theotokion for Ode 4 includes the same theotokion as used in *AHG*, Can. Dec. 30.60.4,
though the accompanying troparia of the ode are separated from the theotokion by
a different intervening triadikos.

The text for secondary hirmos, Ἀκήκοεν ὁ προφήτης = *AHG* Can. Dec. 25.50.4.

The fifth troparion is attested in no mss. reported by Kominis.

The sixth troparion is found in Paris. gr. 928 ad loc, but also in Vallic. gr. E 54 as theotokion.

Disjunctive errors between our ms. and Vallic. gr. E 54 — τε αὐτήν] ἐν αὐτῇ
then τοῦ πρώτου] τὸν πρῶτον and τοῦ γένους] τὸ γένος — align the present
ms. with Paris. gr. 928.

The seventh troparion is read also in Paris. gr. 928 ad loc, with one slight variant in its fifth line:
ὑποδὺς τοῖς ἐμοῖς] ὑποδὺς τὸ ἐμόν.

The final troparion was intended as theotokion, even if it is not apparently labeled as such by
marginalion. The verses follow those of the manuscript tradition for the fourth
ode's third troparium (i.e. *AHG* Can. Dec. 25.50.4.16-22), except for the last two
lines, which are changed for the sake of adaptation to theotokion: δοξάζει, Χριστέ,

A — Apparatus Criticus

Fol. 1 | 1. παρθνου | απουνος 5. ανοις | χς | θς 6. marg. sinistr. θ | ούνιον 8. θν |
παρθνον | marg. ΤΟΤΕ 10. θκον hirmos: ωδ 12. ανινον 13. θυ | ανων 14. σηρ
15. ούνια 17. θς 19. παρθνον 21. πρς 26. χν | θν | ήμ hirmos: ωδ 27. ό | χς 30.
ούνων 31. ms. εύλογ— 32. ό | χς 36. ms. εύλογ— 37. ό 41. ms. εύλογ— 42.
παρθνου | χς 45. ανων 46. ms. εύλογ— hirmos: ωδ 47. προσφέρωμεν ; *AHG*
Can. Jan. 2.4.8.1 etc. 48. παρθνου 50. ms. εύλο πάντα

Fol. 2|: 55. ms. εὐλο πάντα 57. δαδ | σήρ 58. χς | κς 60. ms. εὐλο πάντα 62. χῆ 65.
ms. εὐλο πάντα 70. ms. εὐλο πάντα 72. marg. sinistr. θ | μρα | παρθνον 73. θν
75. ms. εὐλο πάντα 77. πρς 78. μρς 80. σρίαν 81. θν 82. in ligatura ΜΓ 83. θω
85. ms. τῆς | ανοις 88. θν | ἥμ 90. χς 96. ἀνοτέρα 97. παρθνε 100. οὐνια 101.
marg. sinistr. θ | θυ μρα 97. *AHG* προῦκήρυξαν

Fol. 3|: 4. θν 6. παρθνομήτορ 7. *AHG* om. def. art. ὁ | πρς 10. *AHG* ἀναπλάσας 11.
παρθνικῶν 12. αἱ expunxit e texto sinaitico «metri et sensu causa» Kominis 15. ιυ 27.
θυ 28. παρθνομήτορ hirmos: εἶρμο ἄλλο 39. πρι 48. Praeter Paris. gr. 928 et
codicem nostrum, hic versus in omnibus codd. sic legitur: σπαργάνοις εἰλίσσεται. | ms.
ᾠδῶν | Cum Mess. gr. 135 atque Vallic. gr. E 54, sicut noster om. troparion tertium Αἱ
τάξεις τῶν ἁσωμάτων ... σὲ τὸν ἐκ παρθένου Θεόν.

Fol. 4|: 54. σηρ 56. *AHG* post καὶ legitur οἱ μάγοι μετὰ δώρων 57. παρ' θ' ου 60. καὶ
praebent omnes codd. 61. Θεὲ pro Ἰησοῦ in omnibus codd. 65. ις 66. κς 67.
παρ' θ' νου 71. θς 78-79. τὸ μέγα ἐπράχθη μυστήριον, πανάχραντε, τῆς σωτήριας
| σριας 80. θς 84. πνι 97-98. *AHG* δοξάζει Χριστέ σὲ τὸν ἐκ παρθένου Θεόν
hirmos: εἶρμο ἄλλο | ἐπιγνωσθήσει | ἀναδειχθήσει 100. σρια 105. δαδ 106. ις | χς

B — Menaion B, two quaternion signatures from a liturgical codex

BYU G811/1- B — membranaceus rescriptus; var. 139-148 x 204-217; 14 foll.; s. xiv

[Specimen: fol. 15, ll. 8 – 14 \(on specimen sampler sheet\)](#)

Two consecutive quaternions from an unknown codex, here called Menaion B, preserve an internal portion of a 14th-century menaion. The first quaternion is complete, but the second lacks its central bifolium (q 2, 4rv/5rv) where the overtext breaks off. The text resumes and apparently concludes in a synaxarium that ends on the second quaternion's last leaf.

Palaeographical Observations: A servicable, if unelegant, mid-14th-century miniscule throughout is demarcated into individual troparia by off-set magiscule seriphed initials, all in one uniformly

Ms. BYU G811/1 OVERTEXTS, Roger T. Macfarlane Last printed 10/31/14 1:56 PM Page 7

deep-black ink. Ample interlinear spacing allows clear, rounded breathings over initial vowels and accents above or just after their vowels. A practiced monastic hand applies upright set letters with some ligatures — e.g. $\sigma\tau$, $\delta\alpha$, $\delta\iota$, $\upsilon\sigma\iota$; $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ is written with $\epsilon\rho$ in ligature. Marks for diaeresis demarcate iota *passim*. Some abbreviation occurs, in accented nomina sacra with overstroke and in hirmological annotations. Letter shapes are consistent with mid-century: α is written in two strokes, and π in three; medial σ is written throughout the text's body, although the offset initial sigmas are lunate capitals; a particularly distinctive ξ consists of three crabbed half-loops oriented leftward; η and ν have uncial character, while ϕ is a one-stroke cursive; θ is sometimes cursive and sometimes uncial. Comparanda might include MS. Laur. Plut. lxx.6, Harley MS. 5579, and Burney MS. 50 (= E. Maunde Thompson nos. 75 – 77).

A second hand begins a new text on Fol. 10, where the principal overtext had concluded on the leaf's third line. Though basic letter-shapes are largely consistent with the earlier hand, two intratextual capital initials, A and B, are decorated. The capitalized word *EIKΩΣ* written vertically in the left margin begins with a similar capital. Each χ that begins a stichon of the *xaires* has a pair of perlschrift-like loops on top. Ink-blackness is decidedly diminished in comparison to the principal in Menaion B. Presumably this text continues into the subsequent quaternion of Codex B.

One marginalion in the upper margin of Fol. 16 presents a third hand in a stylized cursive. Codicological Observations: The leaves of two consecutive quaternions from a 14th-century menaion. They are the sixth and seventh gatherings removed from a larger codex, called here Codex B, as the serial numeral (stigma) on Fol. 28 (= q 1, 8v) indicates. Codex B is presumably now entirely lost, except for these surviving leaves. At some point, as late as the 18th Century, Codex B was dismantled and these two quaternia preserved separately for the sake of the one text that runs through it, the canon for the feast of Saints Michael and Gabriel Archangeloi, 8 November.

Schriftfeld is scored for the 10th-century undertext, even if the 14th-century scribe seems not to have been limited by the guidelines. Rigature: a sometimes haphazard application of 20A1 and 20B1 Sautel, even if this element is acquired accidentally by the 14th-century Scriptorium B. Rerrangement of bifolia in the two quaternions provides for standard hair-/flesh-side alternation common in 14th-century; however, the 10th-century Codex β was not so arranged. The conserved document size seems to retain the untrimmed dimensions of the 14th-century codex from which it was extracted.

Text is written in 24-26 lines per folio filling a space demarcated by vertical scored gutters left and right, but not filling the shriftfeld scored for the folios' primary use.

Ink: Definitive evaluation by XRF black-brown iron-oxide ink has not been finally evaluated by XRF. A second, less-dark ink appears only on Fol. 10, in a new text that picks up in a new hand. One marginalion, written in a middle-black ink, appears in the upper margin of Fol. 16.

Rubrication: No rubrication is used Menaion B, though the initials troparia are offset left in larger, seriphed capitals.

Fourteen leaves within the dossier come from seven bifolia. Of these, four bifolia comprise the elements of the sixth quaternion gathering of Codex B, two belong to the next gathering, and the two halves of one broken bifolium (Foll. 9/10 and 5/6) once were the quaternion's outer element. The unifying overtext allows this sequential reconstruction of the bifolia. The central bifolium of the second quaternion is missing from the dossier and presumed lost.

Codex B was assembled in the 14th Century from recycled (palimpsest) bifolia. In the scriptorium where Menaion B was composed, the physical remains of an earlier 10th-century codex were dismantled and reused. The codex acquired and repurposed as Codex B once contained a 10th-century unique abridged recension of the great medieval florilegium, Ps.-Maximus Confessor's *Loci Communes*, undertext β of Ms. G811/1.¹ No thematic connection between the 10th-century text and the 14th-century re-use seems apparent. Either because the short-form *Loci Communes* was unpopular or because the text was so readily available, Codex β was deemed disposable, its leaves cleaned and sorted into different sequence, and its text overwritten with the ecclesiastical texts that comprise Menaion B.

Remarkable coincidence preserves in Menaion B bifolia from two consecutive quaternion gatherings of Codex β also. The pair of signatures coincidentally preserves seven of eight bifolia from the two consecutive quaternions of ms. β. That the bifolia were shuffled between dismantling of β and assembly of B is clear from the fact that one bifolium (Fol. 31/32//33/34) presents the *LC* text at 180-degree rotation. Two bifolia migrate from quaternion 2β to quaternion 1B, and two go the other direction. The lost quaternion was the outer bifolium for quaternion 1β and became the innermost bifolium in quaternion 2B. Bifolium 5/6//9/10 was the outer bifolium for quaternion 2B, as it had been for quaternion 2β; however, in its reuse the bifolium was folded inside-out. Perhaps this reverse bending damaged the vellum's integrity and led ultimately to the breakage now manifest. For, this one bifolium is the only of the seven surviving bifolia in β/B no longer intact.

¹ Submitted for publication elsewhere.

overtext

undertext

second ary use	Bre therton	pri mary		pri mary use	Breth erton	secondary
MenBq 1-1rv	Fol .13/14	βq 2-4rv		Los t: q1-1rv	—	Lost: q2-4rv
MenBq 1-2rv	Fol .15/16	βq 1-2rv		βq 1-2rv	Fol.1 5/16	MenBq1-2rv
MenBq 1-3rv	Fol .17/18	βq 2-3rv		βq 1-3rv	Fol.3 5/36	MenBq2-7rv
MenBq 1-4rv	Fol .19/20	βq 2-2rv		βq 1-4rv	Fol.3 4/33	MenBq2-6rv☐
MenBq 1-5rv	Fol .21/22	βq 2-7rv		βq 1-5rv	Fol.3 2/31	MenBq2-3rv☐
MenBq 1-6rv	Fol .23/24	βq 2-6rv		βq 1-6rv	Fol.2 9/30	MenBq2-2rv
MenBq 1-7rv	Fol .25/26	βq 1-7rv		βq 1-7rv	Fol.2 5/26	MenBq1-7rv
MenBq 1-8rv	Fol .27/28	βq 2-5v		Los t: q1-8rv	—	Lost: q2-5rv
MenBq 2-1rv	Fol .5/6	βq 2-8rv		βq 2-1rv	Fol.9 /10	MenBq2-8rv
MenBq 2-2rv	Fol .29/30	βq 1-6rv		βq 2-2rv	Fol.1 9/20	MenBq1-4rv
MenBq 2-3rv	Fol .31/32	βq 1-5rv ☐		βq 2-3rv	Fol.1 7/18	MenBq1-3rv
Lost: q2-4rv	—	Los t: q1-1rv		βq 2-4rv	Fol.1 3/14	MenBq1-1rv
Lost: q2-5rv	—	Los t: q1-8rv		βq 2-5v	Fol.2 7/28	MenBq1-8rv
MenBq 2-6rv	Fol .33/34	βq 1-4rv ↔		βq 2-6rv	Fol.2 3/24	MenBq1-6rv
MenBq 2-7rv	Fol .35/36	βq 1-3rv		βq 2-7rv	Fol.2 1/22	MenBq1-5rv
MenBq 2-8rv	Fol .9/10	βq 2-1rv		βq 2-8rv	Fol.5 /6	MenBq2-1rv

The manifest shuffling of bifolia from the older to the newer codex suggest a workflow in Scriptorium B that must have involved the dismantling of Codex β in relatively close physical proximity to the assembly of Codex B. Perhaps one may imagine the workflow to have allowed the scribe for B to take eight bifolia in quick succession, but not all at once perhaps, from a *promptuarium*, and this relatively soon after their extraction from Codex β. The same scribe will likely have overwritten an eighth bifolium from β in the process of creating the lost bifolium of Menaion B.

The desiderate bifolium, if sought among the world's libraries, will contain four consecutive folios of Menaion B, the innermost bifolium of the second quaternion, 4rv/5rv. The overtext will fill the lacuna in the present canon, from the xaires asketikon interrupted at the end of Fol. 32 to

the xaires continuing onto Fol. 33. The missing bifolium is likely a palimpsest. As with the other bifolia in Menaion B, this parchment will have been used in Codex β, specifically as the outer bifolium (1rv/8rv) of the first quaterion. Before it was extracted from Codex β the missing bifolium will have the section of Menaion B written over the Loci Communes, chapters 4 - 5.1 and 11.29 – 13.1. This undertext will be written along the same axis as the overtext, in twenty-six lines per leaf in an elegant 10-th-century miniscule. The text at the end of the missing folio's verso (i.e. 8v within its quaternion) will have the heading for LC chapter 13, “Περὶ αὐτάρκειας” and then, consistent with the LC scribe's practice, the lemma for the first sententia, “τοῦ εὐαγγελ:~”.¹ The left-side leaf of the bifolium's recto (=1r) may have passages from LC 3 or 4, but its verso's text (=1v) will certainly conclude with the heading for LC c. 5, Περὶ δικαιοσύνης, the citation of Matt. 5:6 and the opening of Paul's epistle to the Romans 6:16. Again, the hope persists that this reasoned speculation will facilitate certain identification of the bifolium once omitted from the dossier.

Textual Observations: At least two ecclesiastical offices seem to be written on these bifolia. The final three odes of a canon fill the first two and one-third folios (Foll. 13-15). The remaining leaves comprise the text of a complex canon. This canon presents a triplicated set of odes which alternates through the canonical sequence from first through ninth ode; a prose synaxarium fills roughly the last three full leaves before concluding at the top of Fol. 9.

The Synaxarium on Foll. 35, 36, 9, and thru line 3 of Fol. 10 offers substantial variants to the text of *Analecta Hymnica Graeca* Canon Nov. III.8.17, which is manifest in two 12th-century mss.²

The complexity of the second canon running all the way from Fol. 15 through Fol. 9 involves the sequentially-interleaved arrangement for each of the office's phases of one two-troparion ode honoring the “Most Holy (*panagia*) Theotokos,” then another two-troparion ode to Michael “the Archistrategos,” and finally by a “hyperalphabetic” three-troparion ode to Michael “the Archangel”. The acrostichs of this third element do not include the theotokia, but help assure the proper sequence of the edited texts offered here.

The hyperalphabetic text is manifest in *AHG* Can. Nov. III.8.19.7 and varies in a few details between the two texts. The theotokia are well attested in traditional liturgical literature of

¹ This lemma introduces extant undertext on Fol. 9 that emerges from the lacuna with Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος: the opening of Matt. 6:25.

² I. Schirò and A. Kominis, edd., *Analecta Hymnica Graeca e codicibus eruta Italiae inferioris: Canones Novembris* (Rome, 1972), locate this synaxarium in Ms. Crypt. Δ.α. xix and Ms. Paris gr. 259 (Colbert 1579).

the Eastern Church.¹ But the two-troparion sequence to the Archistrategos seems not to have been edited elsewhere.

Acrostich arrangement for either of the two canons intermeshed with the hyperalphatic results in non-sense: ΣΥΚΟΛΥΘΕΚΩΜΣΠΟΡΟΣΙΩΣΡΩΣ and ΣΠΑΓΕΗΗΛΕΝΣΑΣΙΤΗΣΑΡΣΟΝΤ (theotokia initials underlined).

The three odes that conclude the first canon on Fol. 13-15 have three troparia each, plus theotokion. No intermeshing of variant odes occurs in this simpler canon. The acrostichs for the final three odes including initials for theotokia identifies the preserved canon as [ΤΟΝ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΥΜΝΩ ΤΩΝ ἈΣΩΜ] Α Τ Ω Ν Ν Ο Ω Ν Ι Ω Σ Η Φ, by Joseph Hymnographus.

6 SEPTEMBRIS CANON
IN MICHAEL ET GABRIEL ARCHANGELOS
Odae 1- 6 desunt.

¹ This canon's odes, ὁ κανὼν τῆς Θεοτόκου, are interleaved with other odes in the Orthros of the feast for Nicolaus the Wonderworker (for 6 December) in *Μηναία τοῦ ὅλου ἐνιαυτοῦ*, vol. 2 [Nov – Dec] (Rome, 1889), 394 – 407.

C— Menaion C, leaves excerpted from a liturgical codex

BYU G811/1- C — membranaceus rescriptus; var. 136-166x209-216; 6 foll.; s. xiv

Specimen: Fol. 39, ll. 1-7 (on specimen sampler)

Six sequential leaves from an unknown 14th-century Menaion preserve the conclusion of one ecclesiastical service and the entirety of one ecclesiastical canon to the Prophets and Martyrs of an unknown date, perhaps 6 September.

The history of Menaion C resembles that of Menaion B. An important difference, though, from Menaion B is that the scriptorium of Menaion C assembled this text's substrate from a variety of sources. All the leaves supporting Menaion C are extracted from different medieval codices. Indeed, seven discreet portions of seven various manuscripts. Not all of these leaves bore text in their original uses. The unpalimpsested leaves are Fol. 39/40 and Fol. 7; but, Fol. 8 is overwritten. In the several other instances, the scribe in Scriptorium C wrote his text upon leaves that were modified from an earlier textual application. The details of such reuse are listed *ad locum*, text by text, below.

Red-rubric capitals and highlights throughout.

codicological: Five miscellaneous folio leaves have been cut to fit and then compiled into the three inner bifolia of one quaternion. These components are reused items with palimpsests included in this collection as undertexts γ , δ , ς , and ζ . The leaf called ϵ bore no undertext, neither recto nor verso. And γ bore text only on one side. For descriptions and contents, see section on "undertexts" elsewhere in this article. Each of the five vellum sheets that comprise this signature's substrate is cut down from a larger leaf.

The original codicological unit for these leaves might have been a quaternion; but, a trinion seems a likelihood, as the outer bifolium of the signature presents hair side out; further, the text on the back leaf fills only a portion the schriftfeld. The text on Fol. 42 fills only 14 lines. Other leaves contain from 22 to 24 lines.

The placement of p.7/8 with hair side out, the signature begins the correct sequence. The leaf is stitched to Fol. 12/11 so that the signature also presents hair side out on its back folio. The middle of the signature, though, has conflicts throughout. The fabrication of the signature from synthetic bifolia creates this confusion. The central bifolium itself, laid flat, presents flesh opposite hair. The outer bifolium, conversely, is synthesized with apparent attention to the sequence.

7h8f-37h38f-39f40h-41f42h-43f44h-12f11h

When the text ends midway through its final leaf, there is some assurance that that spot is the text's end.

Textual: Although the theotokia of this canon are represented by various Follieri texts, the texts within the individual odes' troparia are not otherwise documented. Thus, Ode 1 theotokion is attested at Follieri 2.252, Ode 2 theotokion Follieri 1.586 Bes. s. II 5 (1903) 182, Ode 3 theotokion Follieri 4.78 Bes. s. II 5 (1903) 183 and GIB 73, Ode 4 theotokion Follieri 4.400 MR IV 132, MV VII 892, 105, 1081, Ode 5 theotokion is not paralleled in extant texts, Ode 6 theotokion Follieri 4.400 MR IV 132, MV VII 82, 105, 1081. Ode 7 theotokion Follieri 1.474 HC 51, Ode 8 theotokion Follieri 3.448 Bes. s. II 50, Ode 8 theotokion Follieri 3.448 Bes. s. II 5 (1903) 184, Ode 9 theotokion Follieri 5.45 MR I 382, MV II 51, 105, 1208

1. Fol. 7 πρὸς σὲ τὸν μόνον [NOTE: WHEN AP CRIT IS UPDATED, erase line nos.]
2. εὐεργέτην ἐκδημήσαντας
3. αὐτὸς ἀνάπαυσον
4. σὺν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς σου, φιλάνθρωπε·
5. ἐν τόπῳ ἀναψύξεως*
6. ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἁγίων λαμπρότησι†
7. θελητῆς ἐλέους.‡
8. ὑπάρχεις γὰρ καὶ σώζεις, ὡς Θεὸς,
9. οὕς κατ' εἰκόνα σου ἔπλασας, μόνε πολυέλεε ·—

10. <θεοτ·> ὦφθης ἐνδιαίτημα,
11. θεοπρεπὲς παναγία·
12. καὶ θεὸν ἐχώρησας
13. καὶ θεὸν ἐγένησας ἀπειρόγαμε
14. ἐν δυσὶ φύσεσι
15. καὶ δυσὶν οὐσίαις
16. ἐν μιᾷ δὲ ὑποστάσει§ ἁγνῇ
17. αὐτὸν δυσώπησον
18. τὸν μονογενῆ καὶ πρωτότοκον
19. τὸν σὲ Παρθένον ἄμωμον
20. καὶ μετὰ τὸν τόκον φυλάξαντα
21. ψυχὰς ἀναπαῦσαι
22. τῶν πίστευκοιμηθέντων ἐν φωτί

* ἐν τόπῳ ἀναψύξεως: Apoc. Sedrach 16.11; τόπος ἀναψύξεως: Clement, *Canonens Ceremoniales* 7.100, etc..

† ἁγίων λαμπρότησι: AHG Can. Dec. 3.2.7.18.

‡ Mich. 7.18.

§ Cf. AHG Can. Sept. 11.16.7.37-38.

Appendix: Specimen Sampler

ἡσὶ· ἰαὶ σὺ δὲ γὰρ σὺν αὐτοῖς· τὴν φύσιν ἀνασπλάσσει·
 Εἰ μὲν οὖν σὺ παρρησίαν· αὐτὸν ἀνέχου· πάλιν
 σὺ μὲν οὐκ ἐχθρὸν αὐτῷ ὀρέσῃ· μὴ δὲ σὺ ἀνδρὶ
 μου· καὶ ἀνὴρ μου· τὴν ἀνδραγαθίαν σου·
 Εἰ μὲν γὰρ μάστιγι δυνάμει· ἰσχυρὸς ἐστὶν
 πῶς· πορρωτάτω δὲ γὰρ ἀνέχου· σὺ δὲ τὸν
 ἀπὸ ληΐαν· τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦ πατρὸς· καὶ αἰφύθου
 τοῦ δὲ πᾶσι·

Above, fol. 3, ll. 5 - 12.

γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς· ὅμως τὴν ὑπερβολὴν ἀνέχου·
 ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς· κατὰ βίαν· καὶ ὑπερῷ
 θετόκου· ὅς· ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ νύκτι·
 Οὐ φίλος τῇ ἀβύσσῳ· ἵστε τοῦ χάρι· ἀποδόξασον
 φίλος μοι· σπῆντὴ χαρὶς τὸ βρύει· σε μὲν δὲ
 τὰ περὶ μου· ἀπολογιστὴ τῶν ἀρίστων
 σου τοῦ πᾶσι·

Above, fol. 15, ll. 8 - 14; below, fol. 39, ll. 1 - 7.

σοι· τὴν ἐλπίδα· πάλιν ἀνδραγαθίαν σου·
 πόσοι μὲν τῆς καὶ· τὰ καὶ ὅτι·
 ὅς· ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ νύκτι·
 ἡλὼν ἐρρύπασα· τὴν ἐλπίδα· πο
 ρηαὶς ἐργασίαις καὶ ἐμαυτὸν· ὅλον
 κατὰ χρεῖαν· τὸν προφητῶν σου τ
 ἀχαις· ὅς· μετὰ πόκαθαρσιν·