Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: Etude sur l'"Ars Donati" et sa diffusion (IVe-IXe siecle) et edition critique

Review Author[s]:
Robert A. Kaster

Speculum, Vol. 58, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), 478-484.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0038-7134%28198304%2958%3A2%3C478%3ADELTDL%3E2.0.CO%3B2-K

Speculum is currently published by Medieval Academy of America.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/medacad.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org/
Mon Dec 26 08:32:33 2005

graph) manuscript reads "So may I wel / for thow art / wel I woot"; Seymour replaces the virgules with commas, but he puts the second comma *after* "wel," thus changing Hoccleve's sense. On the other hand, "conpleynte" and "feust" in the French endnote silently correct misspellings in the revised Early English Text Society reprint of Hoccleve's minor poems (1970) — errors made in 1892 by F. J. Furnivall, the original editor, and overlooked by me when I was preparing his texts for reprinting. In the *Mother of God,* line 38, "been thyne wone" should read "be thy wone." The period after line 95 should be a comma; otherwise the syntax is obscure. In *La Male Regle* "Despensee" (345) should be "Despenses"; "perpetuetee" (374), "perpetuitee"; and "impotence" (443), "inpotence" — but "auantage" (169), "nyghtirtale" (306), "mirthe" (335), and "Wherfore" (432) are correct where the EETS edition is wrong. In the second *Balade to Sir Henry Somer* "Worshipful" (1) should be "Worsshipful," and "newe" (38), "neewe." The word "monnoie" in the French note before *Three Roundels* should have only one *n*. In line 2014 of the *Regiment* "hye" should be "hys"; and in 1877 "[th'Es]chequere" rather than Seymour's "[th'Ex]chequere" would be an emendation reflecting almost all extant manuscripts — only one, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 496, having an *x* spelling. In the *Balade to Edward, Duke of York* "endur" (68) should be "endure," while "litil" (1) corrects Furnivall's "little." In the *Remonstrance against Oldcastle* "Toform" (135) should be "Toforn," and "not" (447), "nat"; while "deffendyng" (187) corrects Furnivall's "deffending." In the first excerpt from the *Dialogue with a Friend* "before" (568) should be "beforn." Finally, in the *Tale of Jonathas* "meruillous" (111) should be "merueillous"; "wishe" (113), "wisshe"; and "young" (344), "yong." Seymour inadvertently omits "shal" from line 353, which should read "Which Y thee take shal," etc. His worst blunder is in line 293: "Shee kepte" should read "Shee wepte" (Hoccleve's *w*'s look like *k*'s). Unfortunately the last thirty-one stanzas are not printed.

JEROME MITCHELL
University of Georgia

LOUIS HOLTZ, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: Etude sur l' "Ars Donati" et sa diffusion (IVe–IXe siècle) et édition critique.* Paris: CNRS, 1981. Pp. xx, 750; 1 map, 8 black-and-white facsimile plates, many figures, including fold-out stemma. F 600.

WHEN it comes time to write the history of classical scholarship in the twentieth century, an interesting chapter will investigate the sudden neglect which the ancient grammarians suffered in the generations following the First World War. From a central area of study which had supported a prolific secondary literature and absorbed the superb talents of such men as Richard Reitzenstein and Paul Wessner, the grammatical texts became a sidetrack traveled by only a few brave and honorable souls: one will not find a record of their work in the mid-century survey, *Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship;* and even a more specialized inventory, such as that of Jean Collart (*Lustrum* 9 [1964], 213–41), hardly presents a more lively picture. Still, there have of late been stirrings (it is too soon to speak of a renaissance) of renewed interest in the field: one can point to the first volumes of the new *Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker,* the fresh gathering of grammatical papyri by Alfons Wouters (*The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt: Contributions to the*

Study of the 'Ars Grammatica' in Antiquity [Brussels, 1979]), the collection of individual studies from Genoa (*Grammatici latini d'età imperiale* [Genoa, 1976]), and the new edition of Priscian underway at Rome, to mention just a few examples. Professor Holtz's huge book is to be welcomed warmly as the most ambitious addition to this list.

It is Holtz's purpose "à décrire, et si possible à expliquer, la permanence d'un texte, qui . . . reste vivant sans interruption de l'Antiquité à la Renaissance," and, as steps toward that end, to establish the text — the *Ars* (= *Ars Minor* + *Ars Maior* 1–3) — as it was written by Donatus, to analyze its contents and pedagogic value, and to trace its survival from the fourth century through the high Middle Ages (pp. x–xi). The three major parts of the book correspond to the divisions of the task (the following identification of sections differs somewhat from Holtz's own division of the book: see my concluding remarks, below). The first part ("L'enseignement de Donat et la survie de son manuel . . . ," pp. 3–326), after some introductory remarks on the earlier history of ancient grammar and a survey of Donatus's life and work, discusses the constitution of the *Ars* as a teaching instrument, both in its general relation to the traditional form of the *ars grammatica* and in some specific elements of its doctrine, and then follows its diffusion from late antiquity through a "transitional period" (with Visigothic Spain as its center) to Ireland and, finally, the court of Charlemagne. The second part (pp. 329–563) consists of the prolegomena to Holtz's edition: a catalogue raisonné of witnesses to the text, both direct (through s. XI) and indirect; a classification of those witnesses and an "esquisse d'un histoire de la tradition manuscrite"; and a discussion of both general and specific problems in the establishment of the text. The final part (pp. 564–674) offers Holtz's critical edition, followed (pp. 675–750) by a bibliography, a superb set of indices, and other ancillary materials (addenda et corrigenda, a fold-out stemma, a map showing the "principaux axes de diffusion de l'*Ars Donati*," and eight black-and-white plates).

I should emphasize at once that Holtz has put other students of late antique grammar prodigiously in his debt. I can think of no higher compliment than to say that I am reminded of what Otto Ribbeck once did to bring the study of Virgil's text into the modern era; and in a review which cannot compete in length even with the book's table of contents, it is impossible to do more than suggest the richness of the material that Holtz has laid before his audience. As one might expect from his earlier work, especially on Pompeius (*Revue de philologique* 45 [1971], 48–83), Holtz is tenacious in his pursuit of his witnesses (by on-site inspection or by microfilm, Holtz has examined all known manuscripts of the *Ars*, fragments and extracts as well as complete texts, written before A.D. 1100, some fifty-nine in all) and acute in their evaluation and classification: thanks to these qualities he has been able to describe, fully and precisely, a textual tradition consisting of two main branches, one composed of two families, the other of three; and his view of the paradosis, incomparably broader and more refined than Keil's, has allowed him time and again to put his finger on the clearly correct reading where his predecessor had been led into one of the tradition's turbid sidestreams.[1] Holtz also has a sophisticated understanding of

[1] Holtz's text differs from Keil's in over 130 places, very frequently where Holtz has been able to locate a correct reading either unknown to Keil or misjudged by him because of his reliance on three main manuscripts only (especially the Leidensis: see *Grammatici Latini*, 4:xxxix f.): from the *Min.* alone I might signal (with page and line number of Holtz) 586, 1 f. "qualitatem, ut bonus, malus; quantitatem, ut magnus, paruus"; 586, 12 "quot"; 592, 21 "quae similiter ut

the problems that attend the editing of a subliterary text, especially the vulnerability to interpolation (see pp. 553 ff.) and, in the case of Donatus, the mutual "interference" of two distinct but similar parts of the text (*Min.* and *Mai.* 2: see pp. 528 ff.). I am certain that the prolegomena will be consulted, gratefully, for the store of information and exemplary analysis they contain; and the edition proper will be recognized as a critical advance over Keil and will be useful no less for its generous *testimonia* and *apparatus criticus* than for its text.

But in all likelihood it is the first and longest part of the book that will actually be *read;* and it is to that first part that I will devote the balance of my comments. In general, Holtz grows stronger here as he goes along — which is to say, his discussions improve as they become more closely tied to the work he has done for his edition. Thus, the third section (pp. 125–216, "Quelques aspects de la doctrine") and the fourth (pp. 219–326, on the diffusion of the *Ars*) are built, respectively, on the materials collected for the *testimonia* and on Holtz's survey of the indirect witnesses to the text of Donatus; these are the best things in this part of the book. In the third section especially Holtz displays his command of the text and its relation to the grammatical tradition, and has intelligently chosen his targets — the chapters on the pronoun from *Mai.* 2 and on the *vitia* and *virtutes* from *Mai.* 3 — to draw out what is peculiarly Donatian in the treatment of these subjects. The fourth section, although a bit more uneven, contains much that is good: I found chapters 7–10, on the reception of Donatus in Ireland (pp. 264–300), particularly illuminating, and admired Holtz's ability to animate seemingly unpromising (and, in part, unpublished) treatises by identifying the idiosyncratic use that each made of its Donatian source.

The first and second sections, however, on Donatus himself (pp. 15–40) and the "orientation pedagogique" of his manual (pp. 49–121), are less successful; and each is hobbled by an important flaw which reveals itself in other parts of the book as well. In the second section it is Holtz's fundamental thesis that the apportionment of the *Ars* into a brief, introductory "course" on the parts of speech *(Ars Minor)* and a longer, more detailed "course" *(Ars Maior)* was an innovation of Donatus, undertaken to make his instruction more clear and effective. This picture of Donatus as the great codifier and distiller is convincing overall and refreshingly modest: although Holtz clearly has great admiration for those whom he regards as "esprits libres," he honorably resists the temptation to present his author as a neglected genius (his warmest regard is in fact reserved for Priscian and Malsachanus, see pp. 239–44 and 295–300). Yet Holtz here too often falls into likely or certain errors of fact or interpretation to be a thoroughly reliable guide (see n. 2, below); and his presentation is far from economical (I have no doubt that the central arguments made in the seventy-odd pages of this section could have been made in one-half to two-thirds the space). The first section, on Donatus himself, is similarly overblown, and worse: Holtz attempts to supplement the little we know of Donatus's life and make his Donatus tangible by pursuing leads that are either unprofitable (the digression comparing Donatus with Marius Victorinus, pp. 16–17), or necessarily superficial and inconclusive in their treatment (the chapter on Jerome, pp. 37–46), or simply wrongheaded (see below, on Holtz's analysis of Donatus's famous witticism "pereant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt"). It is not simply that Holtz is attempting in these pages to make

passiua in r desinunt"; 594, 7 "tempore praesenti legere, praeterito legisse" (cf. 595, 19 f.); 596, 7 "quidni"; 596, 18 "iunguntur"; 597, 3 "ad foras uel in foras"; 600, 6 "et, igitur"; 601, 7 "seruiunt"; 601, 14 "hoc est de Priamo."

bricks with little clay and no straw (Holtz himself is well aware of this); rather, he does not seem to have given much thought to where the best clay might be found, and into what forms it might most usefully be set.

To put these criticisms differently: Holtz would have been well served by an informed and vigorous editor, who could have kept Holtz's rather self-indulgent exposition under tighter rein and made him think more deeply about the conceptual demands of his task. Holtz's prose, at its best, is not lean, and he has made certain decisions which needlessly inflate his text: it is difficult to see, for example, why in a book intended for a specialized audience quotations from ancient works are regularly translated in the text and repeated, in the original, in the notes. More disquieting, it is not always clear that Holtz realizes what needs to be said and what does not, or on what scale his different subjects need to be treated. I have already referred to whole swatches of the first section which contribute nothing really new or useful; and the list could easily be expanded (e.g., the bare catalogue of the figures of language, pp. 193–98, or the hasty pages on the grammarian Virgilius Maro, pp. 315–18). At such places one has the sense that Holtz had his material collected on his index cards and could not bear to suppress it, even when he was aware (as in the case of Virgilius) that it was not up to snuff. But elsewhere, and most disturbing, it is clear that Holtz neither had the necessary material collected nor appreciated the consequences of its absence. That is the only conclusion that one can draw when, for example, the question of Servius's "ideology" and his relation qua teacher to Donatus and his doctrine (pp. 125–29) are given no more space than a discussion of the authenticity of the lemmata in the *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum* (pp. 307–11). The latter is, in its context, an important question, although one which, again, could have been handled in a fraction of the space devoted to it. The former point, on the other hand, is far more important — indeed, it is the crucial point in Holtz's reconstruction of the diffusion of Donatus's text; yet its treatment neither makes serious use of Servius's writings nor avoids obvious error (e.g., the assumption that Macrobius's portrait of Servius is an authentic likeness), and is simply inadequate.

This inadequacy is rooted in the fundamental flaw of the first part of the book. In his preface (pp. ix–x) Holtz warns the reader that he is not going to trace a history of grammar's place in the culture of late antiquity and the early Middle Ages; and it may indeed be possible, in principle, to prepare a critical edition of the *Ars* within those limits. It is, however, impossible, in practice, to do successfully within those limits what Holtz has attempted in the first part of the book: for not only are some important questions given fleeting treatment, but historical judgments and explanations, instead of being avoided (as the stated limitations would urge), are reached and applied in a basically unhistorical way.

Thus, Holtz correctly realizes that "ce qui compte, pour expliquer la substance et la forme d'un grammaire du IVe siècle comme celle de Donat, est-ce autant l'histoire de l'institution scolaire que l'histoire de la grammaire elle-même" (p. 11); and such an institutional history would certainly have been more productive than, for example, the first section on Donatus that Holtz has given us. But it is precisely such an institutional history that Holtz shows no interest in pursuing. I find, for example, only one sentence in which the "phénomène sociale" and social function of the school are acknowledged (p. 61); beyond that, we are simply told, over and over, that the ancient school was an intellectual "prison," leading at best to a "paralysis" of the "scientific" understanding of its subject and a failure to "evolve", and at worst (and more commonly) to a "deformation" of the conceptual integrity that grammar al-

legedly owed to its origins in philosophy. We see, in other words, a set of convenient and abstract clichés — tendentious, extrinsically derived, anachronistically value-laden — being applied in lieu of the historical imagination and analysis that are needed.

To take a specific and revealing example, the preconceptions from which Holtz proceeds are responsible for what is surely the most misguided thing in the book: the attempt (pp. 41–43) to convince us that Donatus's classroom "boutade" — "pereant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt" — is no "boutade" at all, but a dryly academic reference to Probus's theory on the renewal of vocabulary! I do not believe for a minute that Donatus's words stuck in the mind of Jerome (our source) for a quarter century because they involved the sort of frigid meditation sketched by Holtz, nor do I think that anyone else will believe that (indeed, Holtz himself seems scarcely to believe it: see the lame qualifier on p. 43). But the real point of interest in this episode lies elsewhere: Holtz is forced to take this unhappy line because he believes that Donatus's witticism contradicts the rather more solemn respect for "tradition" expressed in the letter to Munatius, which Holtz has already accepted (pp. 29–32) as *the* distillation of Donatus's attitude toward his cultural tradition; and Holtz reads the letter's sentiments in this way because they conform to his own preconceptions of the hushed and fallen world in which Donatus lived and taught. Of course, the "contradiction" that disturbs Holtz is a contradiction only if one drains all the life out of the idea of "tradition," by forgetting that — in the fourth century no less than at other times — "tradition" was a very fluid thing, about which the same man could speak very differently in different circumstances. Perhaps Holtz would have remembered this if he had made a more serious, more historically-minded attempt to place Donatus in his world. But although "tradition" figures in the title of the book and is invoked as an explanation for any number of phenomena in its pages, I find little evidence that Holtz has given deep thought to what "tradition" meant to Donatus and his contemporaries.[2]

[2] It is appropriate to mention here that (beyond a single reference to the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire,* p. 40, n. 18) North American and British scholarship on the history of education and of late antiquity more generally seems to cease for Holtz in 1961: although some works (e.g., A. D. Booth's important article on the origins of the *schola grammatici, Hermes* 106 [1978], 117–25) appeared too late to be useful to Holtz (from internal evidence the book seems to have been written in 1978–79; see pp. 19, n. 27; 35, n. 45; 315, n. 2), there are other, less understandable gaps. Nor is it only scholarship beyond the Continent that is slighted: one would have thought, for example, that the recent work of E. Siebenborn, *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien: Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik* (Amsterdam, 1976), would be able to add to Holtz's discussion.

I might also mention here a few specific errors of commission or omission that have consequences for Holtz's arguments in the first part of the book. P. 17, n. 10: Holtz rightly rejects the possibility that Donatus became an *orator,* but accepts (p. 18, n. 20) the notion (based essentially on the same evidence) that he gained the clarissimate. P. 32: It is hard to see how Donatus's variorum commentary on Virgil would deserve to be called "une nouvelle synthèse" in any but the most superficial sense of that phrase. P. 54 f.: The crucial question, "Le système [sc. of the *ars*] laisse-t-il place à l'initiative personnelle?" is opened and closed in three-quarters of a page, or less space than would be needed even to establish the terms of the discussion properly. P. 78: Holtz here recognizes that the authenticity of the τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax is at very least questionable, but regularly speaks of it elsewhere as the fountainhead of the "tradition artigraphique." P. 79: It is not clear to me that Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1.4, 6 f. really

Although the comments above have been a mixture of praise and criticism, in the manner of reviews, I should conclude by stressing the praise, for this book will be indispensable to any serious study of grammar and education in late antiquity and the early Middle Ages. Yet in saying that, I find that I must add one more criticism. The Centre National de le Recherche Scientifique has given careful, even lavish, production to what must have been a typographically difficult manuscript;[3] but they have done so at a cost which even in these days of inflation leaves one *bouleversé*. How many individual scholars (beyond a few lucky reviewers) will be able to own this book? Indeed, how many institutions, faced with increasing budgetary limitations, will be forced to say "no"? This situation is all the more lamentable because it was so obviously avoidable. Although Holtz himself divides the book into two largely discrete sections (pp. 3–326, 329–674), he has in fact produced three books (see my divisions above): it would have been simplicity itself — and far more responsible — to publish them as such, with different runs and scales of production for the different volumes (for example, the prolegomena, a typographically difficult section with the most specialized appeal, could easily have been produced separately in a cheaper format). One could then have chosen to buy the text, say, or the text and the initial "Etude" at prices on a more human scale: whatever the combination, the volumes

---

concerns "abridged" *artes*. P. 80 f. (and passim): Holtz stresses the importance of oral instruction (and its limitations) without drawing on either the one Latin piece explicitly designated as a record of viva voce instruction (the *fragmentum Donatiani*, cf. *Grammatici Latini* 6:275, line 11, *ars grammatica accepta ex auditorio Donatiani*) or the very interesting ἀπὸ φωνῆς treatises of Johannes Charax and Georgius Choeroboscus (both admittedly later than Donatus: but note that Holtz elsewhere uses the still later grammarian Joseph Rhacendytes [s. XIV] for the purposes of comparison, pp. 172 ff.). P. 83: The assumption that seems implied here, that only professional grammarians wrote *artes*, is probably false. P. 90, n. 80: It is certainly false that only one manuscript of Jerome's *Chronicle* s. a. 358 has the name "Chrestus," which Usener wanted to emend to "Charisius" (all but three manuscripts read "Chrestus," including the oldest, the *codex Bodleianus* [s. V]); and Usener's conjecture, on which Holtz builds here, is much more likely wrong than right. P. 108: I am not sure that I understand the statement that recitation of declensions and conjugations in the grammarian's school "n'est pas pour contrôler s'ils [viz. the students] possèdent la correction des formes." P. 114 f.: The argument, that later grammarians' citations of republican authors were embedded in the tradition from the time before the "reforms" of Q. Caecilius Epirota, seems to place too much emphasis on the latter's role and is by no means the only argument that could be made from the available evidence. P. 266 f.: Holtz's statement that in Ireland "l'enseignement théorique de la grammaire n'est plus contrabalancé par l'explication des poétes" will probably surprise those who are accustomed to follow the Virgilian commentaries of Donatus and Servius through Ireland. Pp. 315 ff.: The pages on the grammarian Virigilius Maro do not seem to acknowledge that his location is controversial (Ireland or the Continent?).

[3] There are remarkably few printer's errors of any consequence; I note the following, which have eluded the list of corrigenda (p. 749 f.): p. 71, n. 65: in the quotation of Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1.5.1 read "cum omnis oratio . . . quae sunt supra . . . loquendi regulam"; p. 104 (in the quotation from *Mai.* 2 [= p. 632, lines 8–11 Holtz]) read "modum non accipimus"; p. 183, line 2, read "schema" for "metaplasmus"; on p. 203 an entire definition (= p. 667, line 2 f. Holtz) has dropped out after line 2; p. 214, n. 107, read "naris" for "natis"; p. 243, the second note 33 should be renumbered 34 and should be marked in the text at the end of the last sentence on the page; p. 392, line 12 f., the placement of the rubric, "b) *Extraits*," and the designation of the manuscript, "Erfurt . . . , Fol. 10," are reversed.

would almost certainly have reached a wider audience than the *monumentum* we have is likely to do. One presumes that the present format was not forced upon an unwilling author by his publisher: it is dismaying to think that so sensitive a student of the *fata librorum* was so careless of the diffusion of his own work. This criticism doubtless comes too late to affect this book; but one can hope that others will take note.

ROBERT A. KASTER
University of Chicago

HERBERT HUNGER, ed., *Studien zum Patriarchatsregister von Konstantinopel,* 1. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 383.) Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981. Paper. Pp. 178; 5 fold-out tables, 20 black-and-white facsimile plates. DM 56.

HERBERT HUNGER and OTTO KRESTEN, eds. and transs., *Das Register des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel,* 1: *Edition und Übersetzung der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1315–1331.* With a separate volume *Indices* compiled by Carolina Cupane. (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 19/1.) Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981. 1 (cloth): pp. 624, plus 17 black-and-white facsimile plates. *Indices* (paper): pp. 204. DM 140 for both.

UNDER the guidance of Prof. Herbert Hunger, Byzantine studies in Austria have known a remarkable development, and the "school of Vienna" is recognized today as one of the major centers of the discipline. On the occasion of the Sixteenth International Congress of Byzantine Studies, held in Vienna in November 1981, Hunger — in collaboration with a remarkable interdisciplinary team of scholars — has put out this first volume of a new, critical, annotated edition of the patriarchal register, which is preserved in the two manuscripts Vindobonensi graeci 47 and 48. Since the announced complete publication will be in eight volumes, the present review can only be seen as a preliminary welcome to the beginning of a series whose eventual importance for Byzantine studies cannot be overestimated.

As is well known, the various historical catastrophes which befell Constantinople led to the disappearance of the great mass of patriarchal archives. Whereas the diplomatic activity of the patriarchate in the Middle Ages was in many ways equivalent to that of the papacy, the two Vienna volumes, covering the period between 1310 and 1410, constitute together the *only* extant collection of original patriarchal documents. Papal documents from the eleventh to the fifteenth century form more than ten thousand volumes! There is no way of knowing why these two manuscripts — brought from Constantinople to Vienna by Augarius von Busbeck in the middle of the sixteenth century — contain only a selection of documents for the covered period. The difficulty in studying them is compounded by the fact that folios and groups of folios have been misplaced, then bound together in the nineteenth century, so that detailed codicological research in identifying various hands, watermarks, and paper is necessary before the texts can be properly interpreted. The register was first published by Frank Miklosich and Joseph Müller in 1860–66, and this editio princeps has been used by scholars ever since, but the need for a critical edition was obvious. The very thorough study by Jean Darrouzès (*Le régistre synodal du patriarcat byzantin au*