DIMITRIOS DOUKAS AND THE ACCENTUATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT OF THE COMPLUTENSIAN POLYGLOT

by

JOHN A. L. LEE
Sydney

Abstract

This paper begins by pointing out the previously unobserved fact that the accentuation of the Greek New Testament text of the Complutensian Polyglot (1514) follows a monotonic system almost exactly the same as that now in use in Modern Greek. Next is considered the information on the matter in the preface to the volume. The Greek text of the preface is presented with English translation and notes. A number of misconceptions are dealt with. The question of the identity of the inventor of the accentuation is then explored in full. The evidence in favour of Dimitrios Doukas as editor of the text and author of the preface is summarised and augmented. The paper then argues that it was he who conceived and applied the system of accentuation. Possible other sources of the idea are considered and eliminated. Finally the question of who might have been behind the initial intention to print an unaccented text is discussed.

The fifth volume of the great Complutensian Polyglot, dated 1514, contains the Greek text of the New Testament, the first printed (though not the first published) edition. As such it has been of enormous importance, and the subject of scholarly scrutiny, ever since. The authorship, the nature of the text, the manuscripts on which it was based and the typography have all received close attention, and the questions associated with them have been to a great extent unravelled. But the accentuation used in the New Testament text has been observed with some puzzlement, even disapproval, and not pursued further.

Metzger's standard work on the text of the New Testament offers this statement:

> [The Polyglot New Testament] is printed without rough or smooth breathing marks and is accented according to a system never heard of before or since: monosyllables have no accent, while the tone syllable in other words is marked with a simple *apex*, resembling the Greek acute accent mark.[1]

[1] Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and*

The equivalent work of the nineteenth century, that of Scrivener, though fuller, is in similar vein (and also clearly Metzger's main source):[2]

> The Greek type in the other volumes is of the common character, with the usual breathings and accents; in the fifth, or New Testament volume, it is quite different, being modelled after the fashion of manuscripts of about the thirteenth century, very bold and elegant . . . without breathings, and accentuated according to a system defended and explained in a bilingual preface πρὸς τοὺς ἐντευξομένους, but never heard of before or since: monosyllables have no accent, while in other words the *tone* syllable receives the acute, the grave and circumflex being discarded.

In a subsequent note, on the laudatory verses included in volume 5, Scrivener quotes approvingly those of "the native Greek editor, Demetrius Ducas," in which full accentuation and breathings are displayed, and adds this comment: "the fantastic mode of accentuation described above was clearly not *his* work."[3]

Another comment, itself somewhat fantastic, is found in a 1953 paper by Tasker:

> The regular system of breathings and accents, the bane of all printers of Greek, is not used; but acute accents are inserted in an unparalleled manner on the tone syllable in words of more than one syllable, as though Spanish and not Greek was being printed.[4]

Even Geanakoplos, a much more sensitive observer, had only this to say in 1962:

Restoration (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1st ed. 1964; 2nd ed. 1968) 97. An earlier, shorter version of this paper was presented at a Language Colloquium in Memory of G. P. Shipp at Macquarie University, 16 May, 2003, organised by Trevor Evans. I thank Vrasidas Karalis for his reactions and helpful information at an early stage. I am especially grateful to Michael Curran, who read a late draft of the whole article and put my arguments to the test by many acute observations. I am indebted to a number of others for assistance, as mentioned in the appropriate places.

[2] Along with Samuel P. Tregelles, *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament* (London: Bagster, 1854): cf. his statement (p. 10) that the editors say "that they have marked the tone-syllable of each word with a simple *apex*." The "simple *apex*" in turn derives from *simplex tantum apex* in the Polyglot NT preface (Latin version).

[3] F. H. A. Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament: For the Use of Biblical Students* (1st ed., 1861; 4th ed., 2 vols.; ed. E. Miller; London: Bell, 1894) 2:177, 178 n. 1. Scrivener was quite wrong about the authorship of the "fantastic mode of accentuation," as we shall see.

[4] R. V. G. Tasker, "The Complutensian Polyglot," *Church Quarterly Review* (1953) 197-210; quotation p. 204. The fact that this was originally "a lecture given to the Spanish Department of King's College London and others" may go some way to explain Tasker's facile remark.

> Anticipating the reader's questions as to the differences in the Greek type utilized in the printing of the Old and the New Testament volumes, the editor carefully explains why it was chosen to employ Greek characters without accents. (Actually it would be more accurate to say that a peculiar system of accentuation was employed, the acute accent alone being used and only on polysyllabic words, while aspirates were entirely omitted.)[5]

Basil Hall, a year later, uses the same key word "peculiar" to characterise the system:

> The accentuation of the Greek was peculiar: it was justified by the editors on the ground that it formed no part of the genuine text and was absent from older manuscripts; and no "breathings" were provided (yet the editors gave the normal accentuation to their text of the Septuagint).[6]

Most recently (1990) M. A. Screech offers, in passing, this puzzling remark:

> When we turn to the beautiful text of the Complutensian New Testament (with its absence of breathings and its accents designed to show tonic stress not modern Greek usage) we read . . .[7]

In these discussions the accentuation in the New Testament text of the Polyglot has been more or less accurately described; what is lacking is an appreciation of its true nature. It is in fact a monotonic system almost exactly the same as that now in use in Modern Greek, which was officially introduced in 1982.[8]

---

[5] Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance: Greek Scholars in Venice* (Harvard, 1962; repr. Hamden: Archon Books, 1973) 240. Whether *peculiar* is intended to mean "strange, odd" or simply "all its own" is not clear; either way it is inappropriate.

[6] *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. 3, *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, ed. S. L. Greenslade (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1963) 58-59. For Bentley in 1983 "the Greek type is a bit odd" in its omission of "all breathing marks and most accents" (Jerry H. Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983] 92); he further speaks of "the inconvenience caused" by the omission (to whom?). The following report the bare facts: C. R. Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes* (3 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1900-09) 2:925; Eberhard Nestle, *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament* (trans. W. Edie from the 2nd ed.; London: Williams and Norgate, 1901) 2; T. H. Darlow, and H. F. Moule, *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (2 vols.; London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1911) 2:4. There is no remark in K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (trans. Erroll F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 3-4. Tregelles in 1854 had also used the word *peculiar*: "In their preface, the editors refer to the peculiar manner in which they had printed the Greek" (*Printed text*, 10). The views of Proctor and others regarding the type are discussed below.

[7] Anne Reeve and M. A. Screech (eds.), *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament: Acts-Romans-I and II Corinthians* (Leiden: Brill, 1990) XV (introduction by Screech).

[8] For a full statement of the system, see, e.g., *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική· Αναπροσαρμογή της Μικρής Νεοελληνικής Γραμματικής του Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη* (Αθήνα· Οργανισμός

At this point it will be helpful to see a specimen of the Polyglot text. An illustration showing the beginning of the Gospel of John (1:1-14) is given below. This short extract is sufficient to demonstrate the main characteristics of the system and to confirm that it is indeed monotonic, as the term is applied today. That is, a single accent mark, the acute, is used, and it is employed to mark the stress in words of more than one syllable. Further comment on features of the system as seen in the Polyglot may be made.

1. *Features of the Accentuation*

The mark of accentuation is clearly the traditional acute, not something resembling it but in some way different, as implied by Metzger. It is indistinguishable from the acute used, for instance, in the New Testament lexicon at the end of volume 5, with full accentuation.[9]

Monosyllables are generally not accented, but sometimes they are. In the specimen text we have ο λόγος σάρξ εγένετο, with an accent on σάρξ. I have investigated this phenomenon by extensive sampling. My finding is that while the great majority of monosyllables are not accented, a substantial minority are. Those that are accented are mostly nouns and verbs, occasionally other parts of speech. There is no evident system. I interpret this phenomenon as reflecting the actual pronunciation of the phrases concerned, in which the accented word, though monosyllabic, would in fact have a stress on it and not be pronounced like an unemphatic monosyllable (mostly the old proclitics and enclitics such as εις, το, μου). The person responsible for marking the accents intuitively placed a mark on a stressed monosyllable from time to time, contrary to what the system provided, because oral realisation of the text was too strong to ignore; but it was done inconsistently and no regular system for dealing with such cases was developed. This flexibility in accentuation of monosyllables, though unsystematic, parallels to some extent the Modern Greek system, where in specified cases monosyllabic words are written with an accent.[10]

Εκδόσεως Διδακτικών βιβλίων, 1986) 22-26; David Holton, Peter Mackridge and Irene Philippaki-Warburton, *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language* (London/New York: Routledge, 1997) 32-34.

[9] Longer and shorter varieties of the acute accent mark are detectable. In the preface it is nearly always the longer, rarely the shorter; in the NT lexicon it is the other way round; in the NT text I have not detected any of the longer form (in a very small sample).

[10] See Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warburton, *Greek*, 33-34. Modern Greek

The New Testament text (John 1:1-14) in vol. 5 of the Complutensian Polyglot (Alcalá, 1514). From a copy of the facsimile ed. (Madrid, 1983-84) held in the State Library of New South Wales, by permission.

Some examples of accented monosyllables in the Polyglot text:

όπου θέλει πνεί (Jn. 3:8)
μέλλοντες πλείν (Acts 27:2)
οίνω ολίγω χρώ (1 Tim. 5:23)
συ τις εί (Jn. 1:19, 8:25)
είπον ουν αυτώ τις εί (Jn. 1:22)
συ εί ο διδάσκαλος (Jn. 3:10)
ηλίας ει σύ (Jn. 1:21), but ο προφήτης ει συ (Jn. 1:21)

τον βούν αυτού (Lk. 13:15)
ου φιμώσεις βούν αλοώντα (1 Cor. 9:9), but βουν αλοώντα ου φιμώσεις (1 Tim. 5:18)
υμείς εστέ το φώς του κόσμου (Mt. 5:14), but το φως των ανθρώπων (Jn. 1:4, in the specimen passage)
είδε φώς μέγα (Mt. 4:16)
λευκά ως το φώς (Mt. 17:2)
και χείρ κυρίου ην μετ αυτού (Lk. 1:66)
αυτού φλόξ πυρός (Rev. 19:12)

πρίν η συνελθείν (Mt. 1:18)
πού έθηκαν αυτόν (Jn. 20:2), but που έθηκαν/ας αυτόν (20:13, 15)
πού σοφός (1 Cor. 1:20)
εκ της ρούθ (Mt. 1:5)

The handling of enclitics also calls for comment. The practice of the editor(s) is to ignore the special rules of accentuation of enclitics, and treat them as ordinary words. Disyllabic enclitics, then, invariably have an acute on the second syllable, regardless of what precedes, and words before monosyllabic enclitics never receive an additional accent on the final syllable. In the former case the resulting markings, though mostly contrary to the enclitic rules, may well coincide with pronunciation in practice. So εν εισίν (1 Cor. 3:8), σαρκικοί εστέ (3:3), άγιος εστίν (3:17), υμείς εστέ (1:30), οποίον εστί (3:13), των ανθρώπων εστί (1:25), εγώ μεν ειμί (1:12). But the total absence in the latter case is more unexpected. It means that in instances like απέστειλε με (1:17), το κήρυγμα μου (2:4), πνεύματι τε (4:21) the accent marks failed to help the reader place the second stress where it occurred in pronunciation, assuming it did so then as it does today, i.e., απέστειλέ με, etc. (There can be no question that the editor(s) knew the relevant rules: cf., in the preface below, γνωμώνιόν τι (1.35), ἔδοξέ τι (1. 39), and the accentuation throughout the LXX text of the Polyglot.) One must suppose that the editor(s) regarded this as a refinement that was not worth attempting in a reduced system of accent marking.[11]

---

in fact accents πού the interrogative, as in the Polyglot samples below; but not σαρξ or the others.

[11] For modern survival and writing of the accent pattern in απέστειλέ με, etc., see Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warburton, *Greek*, 25-26.

Besides the acute accent, one other diacritic is used, the diaeresis. This is exactly as in the modern system. A few examples: ησαΐας (Jn. 1:23), βηθσαϊδά (1:44), νοΐ (1 Cor. 1:10), γάϊον (1:14). The iota subscript is omitted altogether, as can be readily seen from the opening words of the sample, εν αρχή. This is not a new step, but was already standard practice at the time, even in texts written or printed with full polytonic accentuation.[12]

What we have in the New Testament text of the Polyglot is a fully thought out and effective system of monotonic accentuation, consistently applied apart from occasional variations in the treatment of monosyllables. It is not some unheard of, as if to say outlandish, idea without a place in the history of the language and unworthy of serious notice.

2. *Before and After*

Let us now try to put this remarkable feature of the Polyglot into historical perspective. The official introduction of the monotonic system of accentuation in 1982 was preceded by a long period of experimentation and debate in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Its competitor was the traditional polytonic system inherited from late antiquity, which had been preserved all through into the modern period and was the prevailing system, with some modification, until that time; it can still be seen today in formal writing. Debate over the accentuation (and use of breathings, iota subscript) formed part of the larger language question, that is, what the modern language actually was—or ought to be—and what its orthography ought to be. The first attempt at reform of the traditional method of writing the accents appeared in 1814 with the work of Y. Vilaras, who published texts without any accents and breathings. By 1900 a monotonic system essentially the same as that in use today had been proposed by D. Melandinos, which gathered supporters as the century progressed, culminating in the result we have indicated. Such a system is practical, economical

[12] As, e.g., the preface to the NT and the LXX text in vols. 1-4. The letter υ often appears in the NT text with a small dot between the prongs. This is clearly not a breathing. I take it to be an accidental feature of one of the sorts of upsilon in the Polyglot font. It occurs not only initially but in all positions; it is even found with an accent added above (see, e.g., Παύλος in 1 Cor. 1:13). I notice the same sporadic dot in eta and omega. This then will account for Tregelles' assertion that breathings are omitted "except in the case of Y" (*Printed Text*, 10).

and adequate, removing superfluous distinctions while not abandoning accent marking entirely.[13]

The movement towards a revised system of accent marking begins in modern times no earlier than the nineteenth century. The Polyglot New Testament thus anticipates by 300 years the earliest modern proposal for change, and by over 450 years the establishment of a full monotonic system. This is not to suggest a connexion, but to observe the surprising but apparently unnoticed fact that someone in the early sixteenth century arrived at exactly the same solution as modern thinkers on the subject.

In its own time the accentuation of the Polyglot New Testament was, as far as I can discover, quite without precedent. Other early printed Greek texts show the traditional system, or, less frequently, complete omission of markings.[14] The specimen page of a polyglot projected by Aldus in 1504 uses the traditional system, and is therefore no forerunner of the Polyglot in this respect.[15] Besides this evidence, the fact that the accentuation needed to be explained and defended

---

[13] For a historical summary of the question, on which I rely here, see Γεώργιος Π. Αργυριάδης, *Νεοελληνική Γλώσσα· Ιστορικές και Γλωσσολογικές Διαστάσεις* (Θεσσαλονίκη· Εκδοτικός Οίκος Αδελφών Κυριακίδη, 1990) 154-9. A specimen of Vilaras's orthography may be seen in M. A. Τριανταφυλλίδης, *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική, Πρώτος Τόμος· Ιστορική Εισαγωγή* (Αθήνα· Εκδοτικός Οίκος Δημητρίου Δημητράκου, 1938) 443-4. I am grateful to Elizabeth Kefallinos for drawing my attention to the former work.

[14] Numerous illustrations may be seen in: Robert Proctor, *The Printing of Greek in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1900); Victor Scholderer, *Greek Printing Types, 1465-1927: Facsimiles from an Exhibition of Books Illustrating the Development of Greek Printing Shown in the British Museum 1927* (London: By order of the Trustees, 1927); Stanley Morison, *Politics and Script: Aspects of Authority and Freedom in the Development of Graeco-Latin Script from the Sixth Century B.C. to the Twentieth Century A.D.* (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1972); and Nicolas Barker, *Aldus Manutius and the Development of Greek Script and Type in the Fifteenth Century* (Sandy Hook, Conn.: Chiswick Book Shop Inc., 1985). Barker's collection of 46 illustrations includes script as well as type of the period: none show anything but the polytonic system. See also, e.g., the facsimile edition of Lascaris's grammar (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1966); Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 206; Κ. Σπ. Στάικος και Τ. Ε. Σκλαβενίτης, *Πεντακόσια Χρόνια· Εντύπης Παράδοσης του Νέου Ελληνισμού (1499-1999)* (Αθήνα· Βουλή των Ελλήνων, 2000) 11-17. For texts without any accent or breathing marks, see esp. Proctor, figures 2-4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 20, 26, 28, 31, 35, 38. Some of these are the earliest attempts at printing Greek, with a few words of Greek embedded in Latin text. On fig. 31, which is of special interest, see below. Some may also be seen in Scholderer, facsimiles 2, 3, 6, 19 (= Proctor, fig. 31).

[15] A facsimile can be seen in Antoine Augustin Renouard, *Annales de l'imprimerie des Alde: ou histoire des trois Manuce et de leurs éditions* (3rd ed.; Paris: Renouard, 1834) 390/1 (I am grateful to Erik Hamer for checking this for me). Cf. Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 246 n. 89.

confirms that it was a novelty. In the Complutensian Polyglot itself, the full polytonic system is used in the Greek text of the Septuagint in volumes 1-4, in the New Testament lexicon at the end of volume 5 and in all the other places where Greek is printed, including some where the New Testament font is re-used.[16] As for MSS of the New Testament, the general picture is well-known: older MSS, such as the great uncials, are unaccented (unless markings are added in a later hand, as in Codex Vaticanus), but by the ninth century both uncials and minuscules are regularly adorned with full polytonic accentuation and two breathings. A similar situation applies in the case of MSS of other ancient literary texts.[17]

The Polyglot accentuation, then, was an innovation in its time. We are, however, not without information on the thinking behind it. As mentioned in the quotations above, there is a preface on the subject in the work itself. I propose now to reproduce this preface in full, with a translation, since not all of it has been adequately or correctly appreciated—in fact a number of gross misinterpretations persist—and no

[16] See below for a list of the last-mentioned. Doukas's editions of the *Erotemata, etc.* and of Musaeus, *Hero and Leander* (both Alcalá, 1514), published in the same year but after vol. 5 of the Polyglot, use the Polyglot NT font but with standard accentuation. Illustrations of the *Erotemeta, etc.* may be seen in: Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 241; Émile Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonné des ouvrages publiés en grec par des Grecs au XV^e et XVI^e siècles* (4 vols.; Paris: E. Guilmoto, 1885-1906. Repr. Paris: G.-P. Maisonneuve et Larose, 1962) 1:118; Proctor, *Printing of Greek*, pl. 24; of the Musaeus in: Henry Thomas, *Spanish Sixteenth-Century Printing* (Periods of Typography; London: Ernest Benn Ltd, 1926) pl. 12; Scholderer, *Greek Printing Types*, fig. 24; Morison, *Politics and Script*, pl. 171 (Scholderer, followed by Morison, gives the date of the Musaeus as 1510: this seems to be a mistake).

[17] For illustrations of NT MSS, see, e.g., Bruce M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981). On accentuation, p. 12. A great variety of texts and MSS from III A.D. to XVI A.D. can be seen in Nigel Wilson, *Mediaeval Greek Bookhands: Examples Selected from Greek Manuscripts in Oxford Libraries* (Plates, Text; Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1972, 1973), showing accentuation at various stages of development, from none through incomplete to full polytonic. Instances of partial accentuation do not show anything approaching a monotonic system. Further illustrations in: Guglielmo Cavallo and H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period, A.D. 300-800* (ICS Bulletin Suppl. 47; University of London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987), and E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (2nd ed., rev. P. J. Parsons; ICS Bulletin Suppl. 46; University of London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987). Cf. Turner's summary (11) of accentuation in his sample of MSS (late IV B.C. to VI/VII A.D.): "Accents are rarely written in prose literature, still more rarely in private letters . . . But they are likely to be used fairly frequently in texts of lyric verse, especially in verse in difficult dialects . . ." The earliest occurrence of accents so far known is from II B.C. The establishment of the polytonic system was a lengthy and somewhat complicated process reaching finality in IX/X A.D.; for a summary, see Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* (vol. 1, München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1938) 373-5.

one has yet, to my knowledge, made a translation of it in its entirety. I shall examine its contents closely to see what it reveals about the accentuation, and then go on to consider the question of the identity of its inventor.

3. *The Preface*

The New Testament volume of the Polyglot, that is, volume 5 (1514), opens with a lengthy preface in Greek, entitled Πρὸς τοὺς ἐντευξομένους, filling one folio page and four lines of a second. It is followed at once by a translation into Latin. The heading of the latter makes clear that the Latin is a translation, not the original: *Precedens Greca prefatiuncula in latinum versa. Ad Lectorem.* We are thus spared the need to establish this point. The Latin version (but not the Greek) is printed also in volume 1 (1517), with the heading *Prologus in nouum testamentum: et de causis quare in eo apices graeci sunt praetermissi. Ad lectorem.* This text matches the one in volume 5 very closely, with some minor differences in orthography and very slight differences in substance.[18] Differences between the original Greek and the Latin translation are another matter, to be noticed in passing as we proceed.

Πρὸς τοὺς ἐντευξομένους.

Ἵνα μὴ θαυμάσῃς ὦ σπουδαῖε φιλολόγε μηδὲ σχῇς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀηδῶς εἰ ἐν παρούσῃ τῆς νέας διαθήκης γραικοτυπώσει ἑτεροτρόπως ἢ ἐν τῆς παλαιᾶς τὰ στοιχεῖα μόνα ἄνευ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ τῶν τόνων ἐντετυπωμένα ἐξεδόθη, προύργου νενομίκαμεν τὴν τοῦ πράγματος τούτου αἰτίαν πᾶσιν κατὰ τὰ πρῶτα ἐμπεφανίσθαι. ἔστι δὲ καὶ τοιαύτη.

τοὺς ἀρχαιοτάτους τῶν ἑλλήνων χωρὶς τούτων ἐν τοῖς χαρακτῆρσι κορυφῶν γράφειν εἰθισμένους, σαφέστερόν ἐστιν ἢ πολλῶν δεῖσθαι μαρτυριῶν. καὶ γὰρ δηλοῖ τοῦτο φανερῶς παλαιά τινα κοὐκ ὀλίγα τῶν ἀντιγράφων, οἷον καλλιμάχου ποιήματα καὶ τὰ σιβύλλης ἔπη, καὶ πεπαλαιωμέναι ἐν τῇ πόλει λίθων γλυφαὶ μόνοις ἁπλῶς γράμμασι ἐγκεχαραγμέναι. ὥστε πάντως εἶναι πρόδηλον, ῥαβδίσκων τούτων καὶ κεραιῶν ὑπερθέσεις ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐκείνῃ τῆς γλώττης ἑλληνικῆς γενεσιουργίᾳ μὴ ἐπινενοημένας, μήτε πρὸς ὁλόκληρον τῆς αὐτῆς φωνῆς τελειότητα πανταχόθεν συντετακυίας.

ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν νέαν διαθήκην τοῦ κατὰ ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς δεόντων, ἑλληνικῇ

[18] Differences in substance: heading (above); the word *hac* is omitted from *in hac noui testamenti greca editione* to suit relocation to vol. 1; *rursus* is replaced by *rursum* (once). Differences of orthography: mainly more frequent use of *ae* for *e*; *th* in *authoritas* is changed to *t* (twice). There are differences of punctuation, esp. more frequent use of the colon (:) in vol. 1.

ἀπ' ἀρχῆς διαλέκτῳ ὥσπερ καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐχρηματίσθη, συγγεγράφθαι πάντες ὁμολογοῦσιν, ἔδοξε καὶ ἡμῖν ἀρχαίαν ἐν αὐτῇ τῆς αὐτῆς γλώττης παλαιότητα καὶ μεγαλοπρέπειαν ὁσίως διατηρεῖν, καὶ τὴν βίβλον ἄνευ ὁπωσοῦν ἐλαχίστων προσθηκῶν, ἀρχαίων γραφῶν δίκην ἐκδιδόναι, ὡς μὴ φανῶμεν πρᾶγμα οὕτως δή τοι ἱερὸν καὶ αἰδεσίμης μεγαλοφροσύνης πλῆρες κατ' ἀλλοτρίας αὐτῷ προσεπιβεβλημένας καὶ νέας ἐργασίας ἀνακαινοτομῆσαι. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις εἰ τἀληθὲς λεκτέον ἐστί, ἡ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ τόνων ἔνδεια τοῖς ὁσονδήποτε ἐν τοῖς ἑλληνικοῖς λόγοις γεγυμνασμένοις οὐδὲν πρόσκομμα ἐπιφέροιεν ἄν. λέγω δὲ πρὸς τὴν εἰλικρινῆ τῶν λεγομένων ἔννοιαν ἀναφέρων.

οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ ἵνα μή τις ἀπορήσῃ ἐν ποίᾳ τῶν συλλαβῶν προσήκει τὸν τόνον ἐφαρμόζειν, ἁπλῆ μόνον ἐν ταῖς πολυσυλλάβοις λέξεσι κεραία προσηρτήθη. οὐ μέντοι τόνος αὐτὴ ἑλληνικὸς ὑπολαβέσθω, ἀλλὰ γνωμώνιόν τι καὶ σημεῖον ὑφ' οὗ ἀπευθύνοιτ' ἂν ὁ φιλομαθής, ὥστε μὴ διαμαρτάνειν ποτὲ ἐν τῇ ἐκφορᾷ καὶ εὐρυθμίᾳ τῶν λέξεων. ἐν δὲ τῆς ἀρχαίας διαθήκης ἑλληνικῇ ἐκδόσει ὅτι αὐτὴ μετάφρασις παντῇ που ἀλλ' οὐ πρωτοποίητος σύνταξις οὐκ ἔδοξέ τι ἐκ τῆς κοινῆς ἐν τῷ γράφειν συνηθείας ἢ ἀφαιρεῖν ἢ ἐναλλάξαι.

ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ τοῖς πολυμαθέσι μόνον ἀλλ' ἅπασι καθόλου τοῖς περὶ τὴν ἁγίαν γραφὴν σχολάζουσι συντελεῖν ἡ βίβλος αὕτη πεφιλοτίμηται, ἐφ' ἑκάστῃ τῶν λέξεων γραμματίδια ῥωμαϊκὰ κατὰ στοιχεῖον ἐπετέθη, ἃ ἐπιδεικνύει τὴν ἀμφοτέρων πρὸς τὰς ἑτέρας καταντικρὺ κειμένας ἐπάλληλον σύγκρισιν, ὅπως οὐδὲν ᾖ πρὸς τὸ σφάλλεσθαι ἐνδόσιμον τοῖς μαθητιῶσι καὶ μήπω εἰς ἄκρον τῶν ἑλληνικῶν ἀφιγμένοις. ἔτι δὲ ἐπείπερ ἐγχωροῦσιν ἐνίοτε λέξεις ἑλληνικαὶ πολυσχιδεῖς δοκοῦσαι ἔχειν καὶ ἀμφιβόλους καὶ ἄλλας τινὰς διχογνώμους σημασίας, διὰ σπουδῆς ἡμῖν ἐγένετο σημειοῦν καὶ τοῦτο, ὑποκειμένῃ στιγμῇ ῥωμαϊκῷ γραμματιδίῳ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἑλληνικὴν καθεστηκότι λέξιν.

καὶ ἵνα παύσωμεν προοιμιάζοντες, κακεῖνο τὸν φιλομαθῆ μὴ λανθανέτω, οὐ φαῦλα ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ τυχόντα ἐπὶ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἐντυπώσει ἐσχηκέναι ἀντίγραφα, ἀλλ' ἀρχαιότατα καὶ καθόσον οἷόν τε ἦν ἐπηνορθωμένα, καὶ δὴ καὶ κατὰ τὴν παλαιότητα οὕτως ἀξιόπιστα, ὥστε μὴ πείθεσθαι αὐτοῖς, πρὸς δυσκόλου εἶναι τὸ παράπαν καὶ βεβήλου. ἃ δὴ καὶ αὐτὰ ὁ ἁγιώτατος ἐν χριστῷ πατὴρ καὶ κύριος ἡμῶν ὁ μέγιστος ἀρχιερεὺς λέων δέκατος τῇ ὁρμῇ ταύτῃ συλλαμβάνειν προθυμούμενος, ἐκ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς βιβλιοθήκης ἀγόμενα, ἔπεμψε πρὸς αἰδεσιμώτατον κύριον τῆς ἱσπανίας καρδηνάλιον, οὗ χορηγοῦντος καὶ κελεύσαντος τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ἐτυπώσαμεν.

ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ τῆς παιδείας ἐρῶντες θεῖον τουτὶ καὶ ἱεροπρεπὲς τοὖργον νεωστὶ ἐντετυπωμένον μετὰ πάσης δέχεσθε προθυμίας. κἂν τοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν μιμηταὶ φανῆναι καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις γενέσθαι σπουδάζετε, ἴστε ὅτι οὐδεμία ὑμῖν ἔτι πρόφασις λοιπὴ τὸ μὴ τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ συνομιλεῖν. οὐκέτι ἀντίγραφα διεφθαρμένα, οὐ μεταφράσεις ὕποπται, οὐκ ἀπορίαν τῆς ἀπογράφου φράσεως ἀπορεῖτε. τὸ θέλημα μόνον τὸ ὑμέτερον καὶ προθυμίαν προσδεχόμεθα. ἧς μὴ ὑπολειπούσης, ἀναντιρρήτως ἔσται οὕτως. τῆς γὰρ γλυκύτητος τῶν θείων λόγων γευσάμενοι, τὰς λοιπὰς τῶν ἐπιστημῶν μακρὰν χαίρειν ἐάσετε. εὐτυχεῖτε, καὶ τὸν καινουργισμὸν τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐργολαβίας μὴ ἐκφαυλίσητε.

Notes on the Greek text

The original is in general very accurate in regard to spelling, accentuation, punctuation and word-spacing. Some errors in these are clearly the typesetter's, not the author's. I have attempted to keep changes to a minimum consistent with present-day practice and comprehensibility. The punctuation is that of the original, with a change in two places only, as noted below (lines 24, 45; Legrand made the same changes in his printing of the text in *Bibliographie hellénique*, 1:115-7). There are no capital letters except pi, used once: I have retained this feature. The original is printed in a solid block without paragraphs: I have introduced them.

There appears to be only one place where the spelling is in error: line 35 γνωμώνιον, of which the attested form is γνωμόνιον. This is likely to be a morphological as much as phonological slip: the writer could have been misled by the association with γνώμων as well as the phonetic identity of ο and ω. Cf. εὐγνομόνως in the extract from Doukas's preface to Plutarch, *Moralia* (1509; see below), but εὐγνωμόνως correctly in his preface to the *Erotemata, etc.* (1514; Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, 1:119).

Throughout the text I have made two general changes, not individually noted. Iota subscript, not used at all in the original, is here introduced where required. Second, in initial diphthongs the original regularly has the breathing, or combination of breathing and accent, placed over the first vowel, in accordance with a common (though not universal) practice at that time and still sometimes found long afterwards: I have moved these to the second vowel. Similarly, in the (rare) instances where an accent is placed over the first vowel of an internal diphthong I have moved it to the second. All other changes are noted.

As far as I know, the text has been reproduced only once before, by Legrand in 1885 (*Bibliographie hellénique*, 1:115-7). Legrand's text differs from mine in a few places, the most important as follows: he inserts an article twice (lines 2, 60), alters to τ[οι]ούτων in line 8 and corrects the spelling of ἐπηνορθωμένα in line 55. These I regard as improvements beyond necessity. Legrand also omits the words τοῦ χριστοῦ in line 65, presumably by accident.

In the following, the text I have printed above is given first, the original (or Legrand's emendation) second.

2 Ἵνα] Ινα, first letter drop cap **2** μηδὲ σχῇς] μὴ δὲσχῆς **3** ἐν παρούσῃ] ἐν [τῇ] παρούσῃ Legrand **8** τούτων] τ[οι]ούτων Legrand **13** ἁπλῶς] ἁπλῶς **20** ἀπ' ἀρχῆς] and **26** κατ' ἀλλοτρίας] elision mark and breathing printed together over α **24** ἐκδιδόναι, ὡς] ἐκδιδόναι. ὡς **25** δή τοι] δήτοι **28** λεκτέον ἐστί,] λεκτέον ἐστὶ, **29** οὐδὲν πρόσκομμα] οὐδέν πρόσκομμα **30** ἐπιφέροιεν *sic* **30** ἄν.] ἂν. **32** μή τις] μήτις **33** ἁπλῆ] ἁπλὴ **33** ἐν ταῖς] ἔν ταῖς **35** γνωμώνιόν τι *sic*. γνωμόνιόν τι Legrand **35** καὶ σημεῖον] καί σημεῖον **35** ὑφ' οὗ] ὑφοῦ **36** ἀπευθύνοιτ' ἂν] ἀπευθύνοιτἂν **38** παντῇ που] παντῆπου **38** ἀλλ' οὐ] ἀλλ οὐ **41** ἀλλ' ἅπασι] ἀλλ ἅπασι **43** ἐφ' ἑκάστῃ] ἐφ ἑκάστη **45** σύγκρισιν, ὅπως] σύγκρισιν. ὅπως **47** ἐνίοτε] ἑνίοτε **52** κακεῖνο *sic*. κἀκεῖνο Legrand **54** ἀλλ' ἀρχαιότατα] ἀλλ ἀρχαιότατα **54** καὶ καθόσον] και καθόσον **55** ἐπηνορθωμένα] ἐπηνωρθωμένα Legrand **56-7** τὸ παράπαν] τοπαράπαν **59** ἀποστολικῆς] similarly original. ἀποϛολικῆς Legrand **60** πρὸς αἰδεσιμώτατον] πρὸς [τὸν] αἰδεσιμώτατον Legrand **63** ἐρῶντες] ἐρῶντες **63** καὶ ἱεροπρεπὲς] και ἱεροπρεπὲς **64** τοῦργον *sic*. Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, § 173.a. **65** κἂν τοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου] κἂν τοῦ κυρίου Legrand **67** λοιπὴ τὸ] λοιπή τὸ

Translation

To future readers.

So that you may not be surprised, diligent scholar, or be displeased with us that in the present Greek printing of the New Testament, in

a way different from that of the Old, only the letters, without the breathings and accents, have been set in print and published, we have thought it important that the reason for this be made clear to all at the outset. It is as follows.

That the most ancient of the Greeks were accustomed to write without these points (κορυφαί) on the letters is too clear to need many testimonies. For certain old copies (ἀντίγραφα), not a few in number, clearly show this, such as poems of Kallimakhos and the verses of the Sibyll, and carvings of great age on stone in the city, engraved simply with letters alone. So it is quite evident that, in that first bringing into being of the Greek language, the placing on of these small strokes and marks was not devised, nor contributed to the full completeness of the said language in any way.

Since also all acknowledge that the whole New Testament, apart from the Gospel according to Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews, was written down in the Greek language from the beginning just as it was imparted by the Holy Spirit, we too decided piously to preserve the archaic antiquity and majesty therein of the same language, and to publish the book without the least addition whatever, in the manner of the ancient writings, so that we may not seem to have introduced novelty into something so holy and full of revered lofty thought, by means of alien and new operations imposed on it. Moreover, if the truth be told, the lack of breathings and accents could cause no obstacle to those with any training at all in Greek letters. I mean this with reference to the pure thought of what is said.

Nevertheless, lest anyone be in doubt on which syllable it is proper to apply the accent, a simple mark (κεραία) has been attached only to words of more than one syllable. Let it not be supposed, however, that this is the Greek accent [mark], but a small pointer and sign by which the studious person might be guided, so as never to go astray in the pronunciation (ἐκφορά) and modulation (εὐρυθμία) of the words. But in the Greek edition of the Old Testament, because it is more or less entirely a translation and not an original composition, it was decided not to remove or change anything from what is common practice in writing.

Since this book earnestly aspires to be of service not only to those advanced in learning but to all universally who study the holy scriptures, small roman letters in alphabetical order have been placed on each of the words, which indicate in succession the match between each word and the other lying opposite, so that there may be no cause

for those who are learners and have not yet reached the peak of Greek studies to go wrong. Further, since Greek words are capable at times of seeming to have multiple and ambiguous meanings and others that give rise to difference of opinion, we have been diligent to indicate this also, by a dot underneath the small roman letter standing above the Greek word.

And so that we may make an end of our preface, this also should be brought to the notice of anyone eager for learning, that we did not have inferior or just any copies for our printing, but the most ancient and correct as possible, and in particular so reliable in regard to (κατά) their age that not to trust them is altogether the act of an obstinate and impious (βέβηλος) person. Which very copies our most holy father and lord in Christ, the most high chief priest Leo the tenth, being eager to assist this enterprise, sent, when they were brought out of the apostolic library, to the most reverend lord cardinal of Spain, at whose provision of funds (χορηγοῦντος) and command we have printed the present book.

You who love learning, receive with all zeal this holy and reverent work newly printed. And if you are eager to be seen as imitators of Christ our Lord and God, and in your deeds to be such, know that there is no excuse remaining to you for not engaging with (συνομιλεῖν) holy scripture. No more corrupted copies, no suspect translations, you are not at a loss from the copied manner of expression (τῆς ἀπογράφου φράσεως). We await only your wish and readiness. If this is not lacking, it will undoubtedly be so. For when you have tasted the sweetness of the sacred words, you will put far from your mind the remaining branches of learning. Farewell, and do not disparage the novelty of our undertaking.

Notes on the Greek and the translation

The language is a learned, almost timeless Byzantine Greek, unalloyed by vernacularisms and ultimately based on Classical models, yet idiomatic within its own parameters. The style is dense, verbose and showy. There are no false forms, even in the case of such difficulties as adjectives in -ης, and no mistakes in concord. The syntax is sometimes idiosyncratic, but hard to fault. Confident handling of particles, the relative pronoun, and most noticeably the participle, is on display. Hyperbaton is used, but not to excess. Vocabulary from all eras is deployed as necessary, including neologisms called for by the recent advance in technology, the invention of printing.

Besides LSJ (with *Supplement*) and Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, I have consulted seven lexicons of Ancient, Byzantine and Modern Greek: Contopoulos, BDAG, *DGE*, *Lex. Proia, Mega Lexikon*, Sophocles, and *OGELD*.[19] Even these do not completely cover

[19] N. Contopoulos, *Νέον Λεξικόν Ελληνοαγγλικόν* (3rd ed.; London: Trübner & Co.,

the vocabulary available to the author. TLG CD ROM E (1999) has been checked for the hapax legomena ῥαβδίσκος, ἀνακαινοτομῶ, πρωτοποίητος.

There are some unexpected omissions of the article, notably: **3** ἐν παρούσῃ τῆς νέας διαθήκης γραικοτυπώσει, **4** ἐν τῆς παλαιᾶς [γραικοτυπώσει], **14** ῥαβδίσκων τούτων καὶ κεραιῶν ὑπερθέσεις (for, e.g., τὰς τῶν ῥαβδίσκων . . .), **22** ἀρχαίαν . . . παλαιότητα καὶ μεγαλοπρέπειαν, **37** ἐν δὲ τῆς ἀρχαίας διαθήκης ἑλληνικῇ ἐκδόσει. Rather than signs of inadequate command of the language, these are to be seen as a deliberate mannerism of the style: the writer boldly plays against expectation for effect.

There is a noticeable preponderance of perfect participles. I take this to be a sign of conscious display.

2 σπουδαῖε. Perhaps as I have translated, in the original sense and as the Latin version has it (*studiose*); but it might be no more than an empty cliche, "excellent."

12 πεπαλαιωμέναι. Not just equivalent to "old", but with a certain flavour, like "aged," "of long standing."

14 ῥαβδίσκων. ῥαβδίσκος is not found in LSJ, Lampe, *Mega Lexikon*, Contopoulos, *Lex. Proia*, *OGELD*, Sophocles, *Lexicon*. The neologism (if such it is) provides a neat descriptor of the accent mark (literally "little rod/stick").

14 κεραιῶν. κεραία is old as a term for any mark or serif above or forming part of a letter (see LSJ, s.v. II.3, BDAG, s.v.). Here it evidently refers to the breathing marks, perhaps alluding to the horn shape. But in **34** it refers to the acute accent mark used to indicate the stress.

15, 22 γλῶττα. The Atticistic form signals literary language. There are no other occurrences of σσ/ττ here.

16 πανταχόθεν. It makes the best sense if taken closely with the negative, i.e., "not in every way" = "not in any way," "not at all." I do not know of a parallel with πανταχόθεν, but cf. οὐ πανταχοῦ, οὐ πάντῃ, οὐ πάντως (LSJ, s.vv.). Otherwise it is very tautological if taken with ὁλόκληρον τελειότητα ("the full completeness throughout").

17 συντετακυίας. For συντείνω intr., "contribute," "conduce" (to, πρός), see LSJ, s.v. συντείνω II.2, *Lex. Proia*, s.v. The thought is that the marks were not necessary to make the writing of the language complete. One might translate "nor was important for . . . ," "nor had any bearing on . . ."

24 δίκην + gen., "as, like." An ancient usage (LSJ, s.v. I.2; *DGE*, s.v. A.II) still sufficiently alive in modern times to be recorded in *Lex. Proia.*

27 ἐργασίας. An exactly suitable sense is not evident in the lexicons. A translation such as "operations" or "procedures" fits the context.

27 ἀνακαινοτομῆσαι. Not attested, only καινοτομῶ (with καινοτομία, etc.) from Classical onwards. A model for the compound in ἀνα- can be seen in ἀνακαινοποιῶ (recorded in Lampe, *DGE*). For the meaning here, cf. LSJ and Lampe, s.v. καινοτομῶ. Καινοτομῶ is used in Doukas's preface to Plutarch's *Moralia* (1509; Legrand, *Bibliographie*

1887); *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (BDAG) rev. and ed. by Frederick William Danker, based on Walter Bauer's *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Shriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*, 6th ed., eds. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, with Viktor Reichmann and on previous English editions by W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000); *Diccionario Griego-Español*, eds. Francisco R. Adrados et al. (6 vols.; Madrid: CSIC, 1980-2002 [in progress]) (= *DGE*); *Λεξικόν της Ελληνικής Γλώσσης* (Αθήναι· Έκδοσις Πρωΐας, 1933) (= *Lex. Proia*); *Μέγα Λεξικόν της Ελληνικής Γλώσσης*, ed. Ιωάννης Σ. Ζέρβος (9 vols.; Αθήναι· Δημ. Δημητράκου, 1953); E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)* (New York, 1887); D. N. Stavropoulos, *Oxford Greek-English Learner's Dictionary* (Oxford: OUP, 1988) (= *OGELD*).

hellénique, 1:93) and Mousouros's preface to *Epistolae philosophorum, etc.* (1499; Legrand 1:54).

30 ἐπιφέροιεν. Strict grammar would require ἐπιφέροι, with singular subject ἡ ἔνδεια. But it is plural *ad sensum*, the subject being in effect "the lack of breathings and the lack of accents."

34 αὐτή. I take this to be the post-Classical (and Modern) demonstrative use (subject of ὑπολαβέσθω, complement τόνος ἑλληνικός). For earlier examples of the development, see Geoffrey C. Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (London: Longman, 1997) 74, 93 (papyri), 181-3 (Malalas), 226 (in general); BDAG, s.v. 2.a. (NT).

35 γνωμώνιον. See above on the spelling. LSJ's meaning for γνωμόνιον is "pointer or dial-hand." Cf. γνώμων, "pointer" of a sundial. Here we have a new application, to describe the accent mark. The Latin version renders *notula* ("a little mark").

37 εὐρυθμία, "modulation." I have used a rather general equivalent; I am not sure if the word is meant to have a more precise reference, such as "correct accentuation."

39 πρωτοποίητος. Not attested. There are 37 other compounds in -ποίητος (-τός) in Buck-Petersen, *Reverse Index*, 482. The meaning is evidently "made for the first time," hence "original," "first-hand."

42 συντελεῖν. For the meaning "help," "be of service" (to, dat.), see LSJ, s.v. II.2, *Lex. Proia.*

43 ἐφ' ἑκάστῃ τῶν λέξεων, "on each of the words." **50** ὑπὲρ τὴν ἑλληνικὴν καθεστηκότι λέξιν, "standing above the Greek word." The small roman letters are superscripts standing at the beginning of the word to which they relate.

44-5 ἃ ἐπιδεικνύει . . . σύγκρισιν. The intended meaning is clear, but the expression appears somewhat awkward. σύγκρισις = "comparison," "parallel," according to the lexicons. τὴν ἀμφοτέρων πρὸς τὰς ἑτέρας καταντικρὺ κειμένας ἐπάλληλον σύγκρισιν literally = "the of both [words] in relation to the others lying opposite successive comparison." I have paraphrased slightly, in the interests of natural English.

46 ἐνδόσιμον. A post-Classical meaning, "incentive, cause, occasion," for which see *Mega Lexikon*, s.v. 3, Contopoulos, *Lex. Proia.* The earliest attestation is in Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.7.8 (*Mega Lexikon*).

48-9 πολυσχιδεῖς . . . καὶ ἀμφιβόλους καὶ ἄλλας τινὰς διχογνώμους. All three adjectives qualify σημασίας.

49 διχογνώμους. A rare word (one citation in LSJ, *DGE*), but there is sufficient evidence to determine its meaning: see it and its group in LSJ, *Mega Lexikon, Lex. Proia.*

61 ἱσπανίας (*hispanie* in the Latin version). Likewise (e.g.) in Doukas's prefaces to the *Erotemata, etc.* and Musaeus, *Hero et Leander* (both 1514). The use of the rough breathing implies that its original value was known and it was still potentially realisable as [h] in pronunciation at this time.

61-2 καρδηνάλιον, οὗ χορηγοῦντος καὶ κελεύσαντος τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ἐτυπώσαμεν. The device of the relative clause with participle and hanging finite verb, in the best Classical manner. Cf., e.g., Demosthenes 19.1 . . . τὸν ὅρκον ὃν εἰσελήλυθεν ὑμῶν ἕκαστος ὀμωμοκώς. For a liturgical example, see Αἶνοι at Ὄρθρος, ἦχος πλ. α΄, 1: . . . τὸ μυστήριον, ὃ ἀνυμνοῦσι ἀπόδος ἡμῖν ἀγαλλίασιν καὶ τὸ μέγα ἔλεος. The form with gen. abs., as in the preface, is a clever variation. For a use of χορηγῶ like that here, cf. Doukas's preface to Plutarch, *Moralia* (1509): τοιαύτης μὲν οὖν ἠξιώθητε δωρεᾶς, Ἄλδου χορηγοῦντος, ἡμῶν τε διορθούντων.

65-6 κἂν . . . σπουδάζετε. Is this a slip for subj. σπουδάζητε (after κἄν = καὶ ἐάν)? Probably not. Rather, it reflects the advance of the merging of indic. and subj. endings, and the loss of distinction esp. between εἰ and ἐάν/ἄν, ὅτε and ὅταν, which had begun much earlier. Cf. Basil G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-literary Papyri* (Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences, 1973) 241-8; Horrocks, *Greek* 181, 246-7; BDAG, s.vv. ἐάν, ὅταν for NT examples and references to the standard treatments.

LSJ's example of κἄν with indic. (s.v. κἄν II.1) in Apollonius Dyscolus, *Synt.* 70.22 (II AD) reads: κἂν γὰρ οὕτω φαμέν, . . .

67 συνομιλεῖν. An interesting choice of word. It appears to be a metaphorical use of the standard meaning "converse with."

69 τῆς ἀπογράφου φράσεως, "the copied manner of expression." ἀπόγραφος is often neut. as subst., "copy," but here the adj. "copied" (exx. in Sophocles, *Lexicon*; none in LSJ, *DGE*), hence "at one remove," etc. (A modern meaning "crossed out, cancelled" leads nowhere.) φράσις can also mean "an (individual) expression, idiom, phrase" (cf. LSJ), but this does not fit as well. I take this to be a succinct description of one of the problems of reading a translation, i.e., trying to understand translated idiomatic language without access to the original. The Latin version gives up and paraphrases all of οὐκ ἀπορίαν τῆς ἀπογράφου φράσεως ἀπορεῖτε as: *non inopia textus originalis*, "no lack of the original text."

73 ἐργολαβία. A more general meaning than the older ones in LSJ ("contract for the execution of work;" "profit-making"). See Contopoulos.

The new vocabulary of printing is seen in **5**, **64** ἐντυπῶ, **54** ἐντύπωσις, **62** τυπῶ, all old words now put to work in a new way. Other prefaces of the time use the same terminology. **3** γραικοτύπωσις seems to be a novelty, but γραικότυπος/ον occurs in Mousouros's preface to *Etymologicum Magnum* (1499: Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, 1:61).

4. *Mistaken Views*

It will be as well to begin by clearing away some of the misconceptions that have gathered about this preface. First, it is sometimes said that it was written by the printer, Brocar. There is no reason whatever to suppose this or evidence to support it. On the contrary, its content and the character of the Greek clearly suggest, to put it no stronger, that it was composed by the editor(s) of the volume, as would be one's first expectation in any case. This error originates with Robert Proctor, in 1900, who simply refers to "the preface by the printer, Arnaldo Guillen de Brocar," without explanation or argument.[20] I surmise that Proctor was so focused on the type that he just assumed that anything said about it came from the printer. He was certainly not well acquainted with the content of the preface: he misunderstood even the Latin version at a crucial point, as we are about to see.

A second, more serious mistake is the assertion that the preface states that the font was cut on the model of a single MS sent from the Vatican library. This has spread through a number of writers, not

[20] Proctor, *Printing of Greek*, 144. Repeated in James P. R. Lyell, *Cardinal Ximenes: Statesman, Ecclesiastic, Soldier and Man of Letters, with an Account of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible* (London: Grafton & Co., 1917) 48; Tasker, "Complutensian Polyglot", 201; Basil Hall, "The Trilingual College of San Ildefonso and the Making of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible," in *Studies in Church History*, ed. G. J. Cuming (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969) 5:143; cf. Scholderer, *Greek Printing Types*, 9.

all of whom acknowledge a source, but it can be clearly traced to Proctor. Proctor says that "it can be affirmed with certainty that [the Greek type] is based on the writing of a particular manuscript," and goes on to say "it seems . . . to be beyond dispute that the type was cut on the model of the writing in the 'archetypa tantae uetustatis, ut fidem eis abrogare nefas uideatur,' sent to Cardinal Ximenez by Leo X from the Vatican Library."[21] Even without returning to the original Latin text (let alone the Greek), and relying just on Proctor's elliptical quotation, one can see that something is wrong: *eis* is plural; it follows that *archetypa* probably is also. In fact the context runs as follows (Proctor's quoted words underlined):

> illud lectore[m] no[n] lateat: no[n] queuis exemplaria i[m]pressioni huic archetypa fuisse: s[ed] antiquissima eme[n]datissimaq[ue]: ac tante preterea vetustatis: vt fidem eis abrogare nefas videatur. Que s[an]ctissimus in [Christo] p[ate]r [et] d[omi]n[u]s n[oste]r Leo decimus pontifex maximus huic i[n]stituto fauere cupie[n]s ex ap[osto]lica bibliotheca educta misit ad Reuerendissimu[m] d[omi]n[u]m Cardinale[m] hispanie:
>
> Let the reader be aware, that not just any copies were the originals for this printing, but very ancient and correct ones, and moreover of such antiquity that to refuse to trust them is wrong. These our most holy father and lord in Christ Leo the tenth, supreme pontiff, desiring to favour this plan, sent, after they were brought out of the apostolic library, to the most reverend lord cardinal of Spain.[22]

It is quite clear that the preface here (and in the Greek original, lines 52-61) speaks of manuscripts, plural: *no[n] queuis exemplaria i[m]pressioni huic archetypa fuisse* . . . ("not just any copies were the originals for this printing . . ."). It is clear moreover, as pointed out by Woody in 1971 in a valuable but neglected article, that the remarks are not about the font, but about the *text* and the authorities lying behind it. The "manuscript origin" of the font "belongs to a well-populated world of historical myth," as Woody puts it.[23] In the perpetuation of this

---

[21] Proctor, *Printing of Greek*, 144. Similarly Scholderer, *Greek Printing Types*, 9-10; Cuthbert H. Turner, *The Early Printed Editions of the Greek Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924) 12; Tasker, "Complutensian Polyglot", 204; Hall, "Trilingual College", 143; Morison, *Politics and Script*, 298-9; Barker, *Aldus Manutius*, 6. In Bentley, *Humanists*, 93 there seems to be a remnant of Proctor in: "The preface to the New Testament claimed great antiquity and accuracy for them [the manuscripts used], but troubled to mention only a single one, lent to Ximénez by Pope Leo X from the papal library."

[22] I quote the Latin text in the form found in vol. 5, not that in vol. 1. Square brackets indicate resolution of abbreviations. This passage had been quoted and (correctly) translated in Tregelles, *Printed Text*, 4.

[23] Kennerly M. Woody, "A Note on the Greek Fonts of the Complutensian Polyglot," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 65 (1971) 143-9; quotation p. 143. Geanakoplos already in 1962 ignored the myth and stated the facts correctly (*Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 240-2). Woody (145) makes much out of the preface to the OT as a means

myth, what is most striking is that writers not only take it on trust from a previous source but often repeat Proctor's Latin quotation word for word, oblivious of what it actually says.

Proctor was responsible for another false assertion, which bears on the question of the accentuation. He thought the reason given in the preface for the lack of accents and breathings in the New Testament text was an "ingenious excuse," and the true reason was the "defective state of the type" at this time. This is instantly disproved by the fact that the same font appears with full accentuation elsewhere in the volume, namely: in the preface itself; in the letter of Eusebios to Karpianos; in the miscellaneous introductory matter to the Epistles (12 pages); in the verses of Doukas and Fausto; and in the lexicon at the end of the volume (75 pages). All of this amounts to a substantial body of text.[24] The fact that some accentuation, albeit in the reduced form of the acute alone (and the diaeresis), was in fact employed in the New Testament text further undermines the theory of a defective font: a full set of letters with the acute (and the diaeresis) was available. We may doubt, too, that the editors would have bothered to concoct such an elaborate and plausible justification just to conceal the true reason. A final argument against Proctor's assertion is seen in Nicolaus de Lyra's *Liber differentiarum veteris testamenti*, which was printed before the Polyglot, in about 1512. In it a smaller version of Brocar's Polyglot New Testament font is used for occasional patches of Greek: it has full polytonic accentuation.[25]

---

of elucidating the meaning of the NT preface: the OT preface, in a similar discussion, is clearly talking of the text not the font. This is true and helps to clinch the case, but the NT preface is already clear. Even Woody manages to misquote the Latin, printing *archetype* for *archetypa* (144). The Cardinal's prologue in vol. 1 also clearly speaks of *codices* of both the Greek OT and the NT sent from the Vatican library.

[24] The same point is made by Woody ("Note on the Greek Fonts", 146 and n. 7), but he instances only the poem by Doukas. (The OT volumes, though fully accented, are not relevant here, because a different, Aldine font is used.) On the technical difficulties of printing Greek with accents and breathings, cf. Proctor, *Printing of Greek*, 17-21. I do not pretend to expertise in this area, and am willing to be corrected if I have missed something that supports Proctor's view. Proctor also put a false slant on the preface's statement about the Septuagint. Where the editors are clearly speaking of the accentuation and giving their reason for not departing from the usual practice (lines 37-40), Proctor sees a statement about the choice of font: "According to the printer . . . the Greek of the Old Testament is merely a translation, and therefore not worthy of his fine special type" (144).

[25] I first learnt of this work from F. J. Norton, *Printing in Spain 1501-1520* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1966) 40. I rely on Norton for the attribution to Brocar and the dating ("not later than 1512"): there is no statement of either in the volume. Cf. F. J. Norton, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Printing in Spain and Portugal 1501-1520* (Cambridge:

5. *Information in the Preface*

Let us return now to the monotonic accentuation and what can be learnt about its origin from the preface. The question of the accentuation of the text was clearly of deep concern to the editors. It is the first topic on their minds, and occupies more than half the preface. The tone is defensive, expecting adverse criticism and attempting to forestall it. The question of the text and the manuscripts is deferred till well on in the preface, and on this subject, to the regret of later scholarship, it is tantalisingly brief.

The argument presented is as follows. Ancient Greek writing did not originally use accents and breathing marks. They had not yet been devised, and were in fact unnecessary. Two kinds of evidence are available as proof: old "copies" of some authors, such as Kallimakhos and the Sibylline oracles, and ancient inscriptions still visible in "the city." In both cases texts without any accent or breathing marks are observable. The New Testament was compiled and written in the same ancient period, and may be assumed to have been originally written in the same manner. It is therefore historically accurate to print it without them; and indeed they are not essential. Moreover, it is an act of piety to present the sacred text imparted by the Holy Spirit in its original form without any innovations. It is clear that authenticity is the aim. The New Testament will be presented in its ancient, original form, that is, the Greek text without the accentual markings that historically came later. To the same end, the text is based, as we are told further on in the preface, on the "most ancient and correct" manuscripts.[26]

The two pieces of evidence mentioned by the editors invite further attention at this point. First Kallimakhos and the Sibylline oracles. Woody astutely perceived that the singling out of these authors for mention ought not to be accidental, and he found out the reason for it. In the *Miscellanea* of Angelo Poliziano, published in Florence in 1489, portions of these very authors are printed without accentuation or breathing marks of any kind. As Woody pointed out, Poliziano states

---

Cambridge University Press, 1978) 9: "*c.* 1512?", and 10: "dating based on ornamental material." Norton makes no remark on the accents.

[26] Woody ("Note on the Greek Fonts", 145) makes an interesting observation about the fonts used in printing the *Latin* texts. In the OT volumes the font is the more modern roman, in the NT the archaic gothic. The Latin fonts thus parallel the Greek, i.e., the more modern Aldine cursive in the OT, the traditional "Greco-Latin" in the NT.

or implies that he was following his manuscripts in this respect. Clearly, the Polyglot editors selected Kallimakhos and the Sibylline oracles for mention because they knew this book and it provided visible testimony to ancient practice. By "copies" (ἀντίγραφα) they mean manuscripts (as they do elsewhere), i.e., the manuscripts lying behind Poliziano's text.[27]

There is something more. In the same work, the Kallimakhos verses are introduced by Poliziano in these words: *Sed aures ad Callimachi iam versiculos subscriptos veteri more sine ullis accentiunculis arrigamus* ("Let us now pay attention to the verses of Callimachus written below in the ancient manner without any accent marks"). The words *veteri more*, "in the ancient manner" are significant: Poliziano already uses the same justification for omission as the Polyglot editor(s). They could hardly have been unaware of his remark. It does not follow that they knew of ancient practice only from this source, but Poliziano's work was a precedent for *printing* Greek in this way.[28]

The other evidence mentioned is ancient inscriptions that can be seen in "the city." To anyone reading or writing in Greek, this could mean only one thing: Constantinople. Personal acquaintance with that city, either by the author or by others who had visited it and could report what they had seen, is implied. The Latin version, somewhat surprisingly, translates this as "Rome." Two possible explanations present themselves. Either the translator simply misunderstood ἡ πόλις, or, as seems more likely, it was a deliberate shift by someone who could not allow Rome to appear less well endowed with ancient monuments than the old capital of the Eastern Empire. At any rate the change throws into relief the Greek orientation of the preface, a matter that is important for the question of authorship, as we shall see.

---

[27] Woody, "Note on the Greek Fonts", 146. Illustrations of Poliziano's Kallimakhos text may be seen in Proctor, *Printing of Greek*, fig. 31 and Scholderer, *Greek Printing Types*, facsim. 19. The Greek in the rest of the volume has normal accents and breathings (Woody, 146 n. 8). I have had access to the Poliziano volume only in a later edition (Antverpiae: apud Philippum Nutium, 1567), which seems to be a fairly faithful copy. At any rate, it prints the Kallimakhos and Sibylline oracles without accents or breathings, even though the font used is a later Aldine cursive. Poliziano's reliance on MSS is stated in the case of the Sibylline oracles (576) but only implied in that of Kallimakhos (604-5), it seems to me.

[28] Scholderer (*Greek Printing Types*, 5) quotes the words *veteri more sine ullis accentiunculis* in his discussion of the font, obviously aware of their significance; Woody missed them. Proctor (*Printing of Greek*, 133) again saw only typographical motives: "this rejection of accents [in the Poliziano vol.] must be held to be due to a deliberate decision in favour of greater simplicity. This is certainly attained; for the entire fount consists of twenty-seven Greek sorts."

The argument of the preface now takes a new turn. The text of the New Testament, it has just told us, will be printed without accents or breathings, in fact "without the least addition whatever." Nevertheless, there will be some accentuation after all, a simple mark placed on words of more than one syllable. In practice this means that the inessentials, the three varying accent marks and the breathings, are dispensed with, and a single accent, the acute, is used to indicate where the stress is to be placed in all cases where there might be any doubt. It is a system that supplies the minimum necessary for practical purposes. Though the diaeresis is not mentioned, the author of the system knows that it too is necessary, and uses it where required.

We are told that this system is to provide guidance in the correct "pronunciation and modulation" of the words. The purpose, then, is practical. It is also pedagogical: the learner needs this assistance. We note that reading aloud is taken for granted. The pedagogical concern is visible, and explicitly stated to be the motive, in another feature of the text, the keying of each Greek word to the corresponding Latin word. Elsewhere in the volume, too, the needs of beginners in Greek are served, namely in the *Introductio quam brevissima ad grecas litteras* and the New Testament lexicon that appear at the end of the work. It might be said that volume 5 of the Polyglot is both an authoritative presentation of the Greek and Latin texts and a tool for learning Greek in order to compare them.[29]

There is more than a hint of compromise in the fact that some accentuation is provided after all. It is a step back from the original intention. These, it seems, are the accents you have when you're not having any accents. Why the compromise? Was it simply to answer the stated need? Or was it from fear that the break with tradition was too radical, despite the earlier example of Poliziano's book? We can only speculate: it could have been either or both. But the latter reason is not very satisfying: critics would be just as offended by the novelty of a reduced accentuation as by none at all.

---

[29] The keying of the Greek and Latin texts is at the expense of the general appearance of the page. Cf. Scholderer, *Greek Printing Types*, 9. Besides the small roman letters, the text also indicates, by a small forward slash, every Greek word that has no equivalent in the Latin. Most are occasioned by the Greek definite article. One might have thought they could be dispensed with, but they are inserted with great diligence, further detracting from the general appearance. The OT volumes likewise provide the tools for learning Hebrew and studying the original text. On the dotted letters (ll. 47-51) see below. On the significance of the NT lexicon, cf. John A. L. Lee, *A History of New Testament Lexicography* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003) 47-51.

There is a third possibility. The compromise could be the outcome of conflicting views among the editors. While one side wanted to go all the way and print nothing but the bare letters, the other insisted that there must be some accentuation, and if it was not to be the full polytonic system, at least some minimal indication must be given as a practical guide. We shall return to this later and see if anything can be deduced about the parties involved. But even if we can find out nothing about them, a conflict of opinion would provide an explanation for something rather puzzling otherwise.

The accent system that resulted was clearly not proposed for general use. The editors are careful to warn the reader that it is not the standard system of Greek accentuation ("let it not be supposed . . ."). The standard remains the full polytonic system, as used in the printing of the Septuagint and elsewhere. The novel one has been created only for use here in the special circumstances of the New Testament text. Again we see a concern for the student, in this case not to allow any misconception to arise. We also see a conservative outlook on Greek accentuation.

6. *Doukas the Editor of the Text and Author of the Preface*

I turn now to the question of authorship. Who was the inventor of the monotonic accentuation? It is not possible to say with certainty, but there must be a strong suspicion that it was Dimitrios Doukas the Cretan. Before we approach that conclusion, let us set out what can be said about his editorship of the volume and authorship of the preface.

Bataillon, in 1937, conjectured that Doukas played a leading role in the preparation of the New Testament text of the Polyglot. Then Geanakoplos, in his important work *Byzantium and the Renaissance* (1962), attempted to bring this role into clearer focus. Geanakoplos's cautious conclusion from the evidence he could find was that "it would seem justifiable to affirm that Ducas was not only the author of [the] preface but primarily responsible for editing the Greek text of the New Testament volume." This view was accepted and developed further by Bentley in 1983. The case depends on a series of data, some no more than clues but others good evidence, which it will be useful to summarise.[30]

[30] Marcel Bataillon, *Érasme et l'Espagne* (1st ed., Paris, 1937. Nouvelle édition en trois volumes, eds. Daniel Devoto and Charles Amiel; Genève: Librairie Droz S. A., 1991)

1) Doukas is known to have held the chair of Greek at Alcalá. The date of his arrival cannot be determined, but there is definite evidence of his presence by 1513. He came to Spain at the invitation of Cardinal Ximénes, and was already experienced in editing Greek texts: he had been the principal editor of two major Greek works of the Aldine press in Venice. In Spain, there is evidence of his work as a teacher and publisher of textbooks on the rudiments of Greek for students.

2) In the series of dedicatory verses addressed to the Cardinal in the New Testament volume (five sets in all, two in Greek, three in Latin, with their authors' names attached), Doukas's head the list, followed by those of Nikitas Faustos, Juan de Vergara, Hernán Núñez de Guzmán and Bartolomeo de Castro. The placing of Doukas's name and verses appears significant. None of the others named, or of the other Spanish scholars known to have been involved, Antonio de Nebrija and Diego López de Zúñiga, can be shown to have a better claim as leading editor.

3) A strong link to Doukas is provided by the textual note attached to Mt. 6:13 in the New Testament, concerning the conclusion to the Lord's Prayer. "Its author exhibits a precise knowledge of the Greek Church's liturgy" (Bentley, 79). Doukas, who was both a Greek and subsequently the editor of the *editio princeps* of the Greek liturgies (Rome, 1526), certainly had this knowledge.

21-22, 42; Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 223-55, esp. 239-43; Bentley, *Humanists*, 76-79. Cf. also Ángel Sáenz-Badillos, *La filología bíblica en los primeros helenistas de Alcalá.* (Estella: Editorial Verbo Divino, 1990) 399: he sees Doukas as the only person in the Polyglot team with the capacity to edit the Greek columns in the NT and the OT, and concurs with Geanakoplos that he was the author of the Greek preface. Legrand (*Bibliographie hellénique*, 1:117; similarly p. cv) already asserted that the Greek text of the NT was due "aux soins réunis de Démétrius Ducas et de Nicétas Faustos." See also H. J. de Jonge, *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, IX.2, *Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat novi testamenti aeditione* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1983) 14-17 for an analysis of Zúñiga's share in the Polyglot: there is no sufficient ground to speak of him as "the principal editor," as has often been done (17 with n. 72). Martin Lowry (*The World of Aldus Manutius: Business and Scholarship in Renaissance Venice* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979] 286 with n. 121) dissents from Geanakoplos, finding the attribution of the preface to Doukas "on stylistic grounds" to be "ingenious rather than convincing," and doubting that Doukas could have been the editor of "a text which appeared in January 1514 if he had been in Alcala [*sic*] only since the previous year." Lowry's first argument has no substance; and as far as I can see there is no certainty that Doukas did not arrive in Spain before 1513. His last known location before Spain is Venice with Aldus in March 1509. Aldus shut down his business and left Venice later the same year, when a French invasion threatened (see Lowry, 159-60); Doukas is likely to have been out of work then.

The only other person in the team who might conceivably have been as well informed was Fausto, concerning whom it will be useful to say a little more at this point. Vittore/Vittorio/Vettor Fausto (c. 1480-c. 1540) was certainly an Italian, a Venetian, not a Greek, as has sometimes been said: Νικήτας Φαῦστος is simply the Greek equivalent of his name. Apart from noting that he was elected to the chair of Greek at Venice in 1518, and was the editor of a Greek liturgical book, writers on the Polyglot have offered little information on him. He seemed a shadowy figure who might or might not have played an important role in the Polyglot. But a lot more is known about him, and, most surprisingly, that his "chief claim to fame is his work as a naval architect" (Wilson, 92). This began in Venice in 1525-26 when he proposed the building of a quinquereme, supposedly based on ancient models. The vessel was in fact built, with some success, and Fausto went on to further experiments in ship building and to become "a celebrity in Venice and elsewhere" (95). Wilson seems sceptical that Fausto even took part in the Polyglot project, and says (89) that his collaboration "does not appear to have been the original purpose of his travels [in Spain and elsewhere], and he cannot have stayed very long with Ducas." Fausto's experience of editing up to this point was in Latin texts (Cicero and Terence); later, in Paris, he edited a Latin translation of Aristotle's *Mechanica*. The liturgical book, the *Paraklitiki*, was published in Venice in 1522 by the de Sabio press at the expense of Andreas Kounades. There is a Greek preface by Fausto, from which it appears that he was called in at a late stage as a metrical expert to correct the text from that point of view. He clearly writes as a non-Greek, addressing his preface τοῖς καθ' Ἑλλάδα χριστιανοῖς, and employing "you" throughout. All this seems to justify regarding Fausto as a junior player in the editing of the Polyglot New Testament text and not specially expert in liturgical matters.[31]

4) While the older Spanish sources all play down the role of Doukas, Nebrija once "let slip," as Bentley puts it (78), "the information that

[31] On the subject of this paragraph, see esp. N. G. Wilson, "Vettor Fausto, Professor of Greek and Naval Architect," in *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays*, eds. A. C. Dionisotti, Anthony Grafton and Jill Kraye (London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1988) 89-95, and *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2002 [in progress]) 45:398-401. Cf. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, 1:cv; Bataillon, *Érasme et l'Espagne*, 42; Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 166 n. 179, 240. For details of the *Paraklitiki*, see Legrand, 1:173 and, with much additional material including Fausto's preface, Γεώργιος Γ. Λαδᾶς καὶ Ἀθανάσιος Χατζηδῆμος, *Προσθῆκες, διορθώσεις καὶ συμπληρώσεις στὴν Ἑλληνικὴ Βιβλιογραφία τοῦ Émile Legrand γιὰ τοὺς αἰῶνες XV, XVI καὶ XVII* (Ἀθήνα: [publisher not stated], 1976) 7-11. Fausto's explanation of his part in editing this book begins: ἔπειτα δὲ [ὁ Κουνάδης] πολλῶν ἀντιγράφων συνειλεγμένων τὸ ἐλλεῖπον ἐφ' ἑκάστου ἐξ ἀλλήλων ἀναπληρώσας τὸ σύνολον, ἅτε ποιητικοῦ τινὸς [*sic*] ἀνδρὸς δεόμενον διὰ τὸ ἔμμετρον αὐτοῦ, ἐμοὶ παραδέδωκεν, ἵνα δὴ τὸ φαῦλον ἐκκρίνας τὸ ὀρθὸν δοκιμάσαιμι. Incidentally, the *Paraklitiki* (also called the *Oktoikhos*) is not, as Geanakoplos has it (*Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 240 n. 72), a book of "hymns to the Virgin," but the book containing the hymns of the eight-tone cycle. The *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* ("una raccolta di preghiere alla Vergine") betrays its source. Geanakoplos (240) says Fausto was "probably a pupil of Ducas'." This is a guess, but a plausible one. Bataillon's guess (*Érasme et l'Espagne*, 42) that he was "peut-être le typographe qui a composé le texte hellénique sous la direction de Doucas" seems improbable: surely this was Brocar's task.

Hebrews (i.e., *conversos*) and Greeks were charged with editing, respectively, the Hebrew and Greek scriptures." Doukas was the only native Greek working on the project.

5) Geanakoplos observed (243) that the language of the preface "seems to be that of one intimate with the nuances of Greek style." This is right, but can be put a good deal more strongly. In my opinion the character of the Greek is such that it could not have been written by anyone but an advanced Hellenist. It is a *tour de force* in the Byzantine style. While there were other Hellenists among the Polyglot scholars, they were all non-Greeks, and all Spaniards apart from Fausto. Doukas stands out among them all as the person with the necessary expertise to write it. I offer an additional observation that reinforces this. The Latin translation is inexpertly done, with simplifications, gaps at difficult points and some outright mistakes in translation. This suggests that none of the Polyglot scholars who could write Latin—and that would have been all of them apart from Doukas—had sufficient skill in Greek to translate such a text well. Still less could they have composed it.[32]

6) The reference to ancient inscriptions in "the city," i.e., Constantinople, implies acquaintance with the place, something unlikely to be available to anyone but Doukas. Geanakoplos was inclined to see this as evidence that Doukas himself had visited Constantinople. This of course cannot be ruled out, but it is not certain: word of mouth could have conveyed this information to the Greeks in the West; in fact it may have been common knowledge among them. To me the strength of this point lies more in the Greek perspective evidenced here and highlighted by the change to "Rome" in the Latin version. The writer writes as a Greek. Doukas seems the best, if not the only, candidate.[33]

7) The preface uses the first person plural frequently, but the singular "I" occurs at one point (l. 30 λέγω . . ., "I mean this with reference

[32] Geanakoplos (*Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 242 n. 78) pointed out that the Latin version is "simpler in its wording." But he went on to say, "which may mean it was translated from the Greek," showing he had missed the statement in the heading.

[33] Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 225 with n. 7; 242-3. There seems to be good evidence that a journey to Constantinople was possible after 1453. But the "vividness" of the phrasing in the preface, appealed to by Geanakoplos as a sign that Doukas had seen the inscriptions *in situ*, does not strike me. In fact the Latin version suggests autopsy in a way the Greek does not: *monumenta vetustissima que rome adhuc visuntur*, "monuments of great age which are still on view in Rome." The Greek simply says (l. 12) πεπαλαιωμέναι ἐν τῇ πόλει λίθων γλυφαί, "carvings of great age on stone in the city."

to the pure thought of what is said"). Geanakoplos was rightly cautious about using this, but thought that it "may well indicate that one person was mainly responsible for editing the Greek text." I am not sure that it does that; but it certainly suggests that a single person was responsible for writing the preface. The "we" elsewhere, though it could mean "I," is more probably inclusive, reflecting the collaborative character of the project. The "I" emerges in explanatory λέγω, "I mean," because the singular is usual in this expression unless one really means "we." The Latin translation does not, as Geanakoplos asserted, change "I" to "we" here, but drops the whole sentence! In fact the Latin version eliminates all but two of the thirteen occurrences of "we/us/our." I am not sure what significance is to be seen in this. Perhaps it is simply stylistic. It has a depersonalising effect, at any rate.[34]

7. *Further Indications*

To the above can be added further evidence that I have not seen adduced before. The first is in lines 65-66, where we read κἂν τοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν μιμηταὶ φανῆναι καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις γενέσθαι σπουδάζετε, "and if you are eager to be seen as imitators of Christ our Lord and God, and in your deeds to be such." The phrase τοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν has the sound of Greek liturgical language. Though I have not found this exact phrase, combinations of a similar kind are commonplace throughout liturgical texts:

τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν
Χριστὸς/Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν
Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ

[34] The two that survive are 58 ὁ . . . κύριος ἡμῶν . . . λέων ~ *d[omi]n[u]s n[oste]r Leo;* 62 ἐτυπώσαμεν ~ *imprimi fecimus*. The others are at lines 2, 6, 21, 25, 49, 52, 53 bis, 65, 70, 73. That first person plurals do not necessarily mean a plurality of persons is demonstrated with clarity by another preface of Doukas's, that found in the *Erotemata, etc.* (Alcalá, April 1514). Here we have χαρακτῆρσιν οἷς ἐνετύχοδεν [*sic*] in a series of first person singulars where Doukas is definitely speaking, or rather complaining, of his own labours in preparing the book. The text of this is reproduced in Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, 1:119. Geanakoplos (*Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 235) translated: "using letters [characters in Greek type] which I found here." His translation implies a reading ἐνέτυχον ὧδε. But I suggest the true reading is ἐνετύχομεν, the δ being simply a typesetter's error. Cf. in Doukas's prefaces to *Rhetores* (1508; Legrand, 1:88) and to Plutarch (1509; Legrand, 1:93): τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις οἷς ἐνετύχομεν. Bataillon translated χαρακτῆρσιν οἷς ἐνετύχοδεν as "avec les caractères que j'avais sous la main" (*Érasme et l'Espagne*, 22).

Χριστῷ τῷ Βασιλεῖ καὶ Θεῷ ἡμῶν
τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, Κυρίου δὲ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

The similarity is evident and the point reinforced by the strikingly different formulation in the Latin version: *et si christi Opt[imi] Max[imi] sectatores videri vultis [et] esse*. Just as the textual note on Mt. 6:13 links Doukas to the editing of the New Testament text, this—possibly unconscious—reminiscence of Orthodox liturgical language links Doukas to the writing of the preface.[35]

> The application of the title *Optimus Maximus* to Christ in the Latin text is noteworthy. It was of course originally a title of Jupiter in Roman antiquity. It was then transferred at some point to the Christian God, as seen in the well known D.O.M. (Deo Optimo Maximo) inscribed on churches and elsewhere, and modelled on I.O.M. (Iovi Optimo Maximo). The application to Christ rather than God the Father is unexpected, possibly even of questionable orthodoxy. Who at Alcalá could have written such a thing? And is it an isolated instance? I have no answer to the first, but in answer to the second can point to some parallels, though far from Spain of 1514. *Optimus Maximus Jesus* occurs in a Scottish source of the mid sixteenth century.[36] The application of the title to Christ is also found in Rabelais: in a passage in the *Quart Livre* (1552) in which he interprets the death of Pan in Plutarch as the Crucifixion, he adds ". . . car cestuy tresbon, tresgrand Pan, nostre unicque Servateur, mourut lez Hierusalem, regnant en Rome Tibere Cesar."[37] The whole topic is clearly one worth further study.
>
> In the same sentence there is another difference of interest. In μιμηταὶ . . . γενέσθαι we have a distinct New Testament allusion (cf. 1 Cor. 4:16, 11:1 μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, Eph. 5:1 γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητά, 1 Th. 1:6, 2:14). The Latin translator misses the allusion by translating μιμηταί as *sectatores*, "followers," "adherents," "enthusiastic supporters," whereas the Vulgate renders μιμηταί as *imitatores* in all places; the Complutensian New Testament lexicon likewise gives *imitator* as its only gloss on μιμητής. The reason for the rendering

---

[35] In the NT the only comparable passages are 1 Th. 1:12 κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which however is usually taken as "according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ" (RSV); and Jn. 20:28 ἀπεκρίθη Θωμᾶς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου. There is a parallel use of liturgical language in Doukas's preface to Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι (Rome, 1526; Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, 1:193-4), where the memorable phrase τὸ ἀρχαῖον κάλλος, "[their] ancient beauty," occurs twice. This comes from the Orthodox funeral service: . . . εἰς τὸ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἐπανάγαγε, τὸ ἀρχαῖον κάλλος ἀναμορφώσασθαι (Νεκρώσιμα Εὐλογητάρια 2).

[36] Ferr[erius], *Kinloss* 81, recorded in the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (London: British Academy/OUP, 1975-; in progress) s.v. *optimus*. I thank Jim Adams, David Howlett and Theodor Christchev for their assistance, and especially for making the dictionary entry available to me in advance of publication. I also thank Edwin Judge for valuable help along the way.

[37] *Quart Livre de Pantagruel*, ed. R. Marichal (Geneva: Droz, 1947) 138. Cf. also M. A. Screech, *Rabelais* (London: Duckworth, 1979) 328. I am grateful to Michael Screech for supplying me with this information. He also kindly informs me, in answer to my query, that he has never consciously come across such a use of the title in Erasmus's works and would expect to recall it if he had.

is not quite clear, but it may have arisen, as Joost Smit Sibinga points out to me, from the association of μίμησις with ζῆλος/ζήλωσις, and of μιμητής with ζηλωτής. Cf. Moeris p. 168 (ed. Pierson, 1759) ζήλωσις, Ἀττικῶς. μίμησις, Ἑλληνικῶς, Ammonius 209 (ed. Nickau, 1966) ζῆλος καὶ ζηλοτυπία διαφέρει . . . ζῆλος δὲ μίμησις καλοῦ . . ., cf. 210-211; Hesychius p. 677 (ed. Schmidt, 1867) ζηλωτής· ἐρεθιστής. μιμητής. In the New Testament text, 1 Peter 3:13 ζηλωταί has a v.l. μιμηταί, the majority reading. Finally, the rendering of ζηλωτής as *sectator* occurs in the Vulgate at Titus 2:14. At any rate it seems that the writer of the Greek preface was familiar with the Greek New Testament in a way the Latin translator was not: the latter neither recognises the Greek allusion nor recalls the Vulgate equivalent.

The preface also contains a not so veiled criticism of the Vulgate and its manuscript witnesses. When it says (ll. 67-69) "no more corrupted copies, no suspect translations, you are not at a loss from the copied manner of expression," the target can only be the Vulgate. What this means, put bluntly, is: the Vulgate text is corrupt, its translations faulty and its meaning difficult to grasp. Instead of grappling with these problems, the scholar can now engage directly with τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ, the original Greek New Testament. The sentiments expressed earlier about "piously" preserving the text in its ancient form and avoiding the introduction of "novelty into something so holy" are further evidence of the same high regard for the original. While this may represent the views of some of the Polyglot scholars, they were in general deeply conservative in their approach to the Vulgate; at the extreme end of the spectrum was one like Zúñiga, who later vehemently defended the traditional Latin text against the perceived attacks of Erasmus. The Cardinal himself, though he could assert the need for recourse to the originals when the Latin manuscripts differed or appeared corrupt, revered Jerome's translation and took the conservative side in the dispute between Nebrija and the other editors over the Latin version, restraining Nebrija from presenting a new translation based on the Greek in place of the Vulgate. The conclusion all this tends to is that the views espoused in the preface are those of one who takes for granted the superiority of the original Greek over the Latin translation, that is, someone like Doukas or Nebrija.[38]

[38] Cf. Bentley, *Humanists*, ch. 3, esp. 89-91 (dispute with Nebrija), 97-111 (respect for the Vulgate; evidence of unpublished annotations); also Lu Ann Homza, *Religious Authority in the Spanish Renaissance* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000) 87-88. For a summary of Zúñiga's outlook, see De Jonge, *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi*, 18-20. The Cardinal is said to have exclaimed to Nebrija, "God forbid that I should alter a word of the Blessed Jerome's!" So Felipe Fernández-Armesto, "Cardinal Cisneros as a Patron of Printing," in *God and Man in Medieval Spain: Essays in Honour of J. R. L.*

The fact that there is a Greek preface at all is something to reflect on. Only in this volume of the Polyglot is there a Greek preface; all the other prefaces are in Latin. A connexion is thereby made to all the other publications of Greek texts up to this time, each usually equipped with a learned preface in Greek, written by a Greek scholar involved in the editing of the volume. These range from the 1476 epitome of Laskaris's grammar, with a preface by Dimitrios the Cretan (a different Dimitrios), to the 1513 edition of Plato's works, introduced in Latin by Aldus and in Greek by a 200-line poem (soon to be famous) by Markos Mousouros, the joint editor. And the practice continued long after the time of the Polyglot. The Greek preface in the New Testament volume of the Polyglot signals the presence of a Greek scholar involved in the work, and the quality of his preface is a sign of his competence in Greek.[39]

In other Greek prefaces both before and after the Polyglot the indication of the author's name at the top is standard practice. There is no name at the head of our preface. This absence, however, seems to me readily explicable. The fact that the volume was a team effort would have played some part, but a more compelling reason can be suggested. The great project was the Cardinal's, and all honour for it belonged to him. As Doukas's own verses said, ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἥδε βίβλος,

Highfield, eds. Derek W. Lomax and David Mackenzie (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1989) 157. While the Cardinal's prologue expresses much in common with the views of Nebrija, it also displays what Fernández-Armesto characterises as "pre-humanist techniques," "echoes of cabbalistic lore," and "the world of mystical devotion" (157-8). For the well known passage *Accedit . . . examinetur*, in the Cardinal's prologue, see, e.g., Darlow and Moule, *Historical Catalogue*, 2:4; Homza, *Religious Authority*, 248-9. An English translation of the whole prologue can be found in John C. Olin, *Catholic Reform from Cardinal Ximenes to the Council of Trent, 1495-1563* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1990) 61-64. The Latin version of the NT preface does not tone down the above passage much, *No[n] mendosa exemplaria: non suspecte translationes: non inopia textus originalis*, though *mendosa* is less harsh than διεφθαρμένα, and the last clause is a weak paraphrase (cf. notes above on 1. 69): perhaps the translator missed what was going on. A further point that seems to have drawn no comment before: the preface to vol. 5 has nothing to say about the Latin text printed in the volume. It is only from the title page that one learns that it is the Vulgate (*cum latina beati hieronymi translatione*); there is no other information.

[39] A large body of Greek prefaces from 1476 to 1563 can be seen in Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, vol. 1. Five other Greek prefaces or notes by Doukas, three of them quite lengthy, are found in: 1) *Rhetores Graeci* (vol. 1. Venice, 1508; Legrand, 1:85-88); 2) Plutarch, *Moralia* (Venice, 1509; Legrand, 1:92-93); 3) *Erotemata, etc.* (Alcalá, April 1514; Legrand, 1:119); 4) Musaeus, *Hero et Leander* (Alcalá, [1514]; Legrand, 1:120); 5) Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι (Rome, 1526; Legrand, 1:193-4). There does not appear to be one in Doukas's final publication, *Alexandri Aphrodisiei Commentaria* (Rome, 1527; Legrand, 3:316-7).

"this book is his work." Of course this was exaggerated, but it was the right tone to adopt in dealing with a powerful hierarch and patron. It would have been unseemly for someone else's name to appear at the top of the first page. The collaborators on the volume could put their names to their verses later on in the book, but the opening preface remained tactfully anonymous. In due course the Cardinal's own prologue, addressed to Pope Leo and setting out his titles in their full glory, appeared on the opening page of volume 1.

There is then a strong case for concluding that Doukas was the editor of the New Testament Greek text and the writer of the preface to the volume. This of course is not to rule out or diminish the contribution of others: it is certain that the book as a whole was a collaborative effort, and that is likely to have included some of the labour on the Greek text. The preface also, though written by one person, could have received input from others in one way or another. It certainly had to reflect the general policy decided on by the team under the direction of its head, Cardinal Ximénes de Cisneros.

8. *Doukas the Inventor of the Accentuation*

Was Doukas the inventor of the monotonic accentuation? There is no way to prove decisively that he was; we can only gather the available clues and draw the most probable conclusion. The clues seem to me to be as follows.

Doukas had general responsibility for editing the Greek text, and wrote the preface. He must at least have been closely involved with the decisions about the accentuation of the Greek and the execution of them.

We know that he was a native Greek, a Greek scholar and teacher, and an experienced editor of Greek texts. He was the only person in the team with all those qualifications. Concern over the accentuation of the Greek would seem to belong to such a person, rather than the Latinists and experts in the Vulgate; they are more likely to have felt it was a matter of small consequence.

That Doukas himself did indeed worry about accents is shown by another preface of his, in the edition of Plutarch's *Moralia* (Venice, 1509). At one point the following memorable passage occurs:

> Ὑμέτερον δ' ἂν εἴη τὸν ἡμέτερον κάματον εὐγνομόνως ἀποδέξασθαι, μὴ δ' ἐκφαυλίζειν, εἴ τί που γράμμα διεστραμμένον ἢ ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτον ἡμᾶς παρέδραμεν, οὐκ ὂν ἐμποδὼν οὐδὲ τοῖς μήπω φωνῆς γευσαμένοις ἑλληνικῆς. Πολλοὶ μὲν

> ἀπείρως ἔχοντες τῆς περὶ τὸ διορθοῦν φιλοπονίας ἤ, βέλτιον εἰπεῖν, ταλαιπωρίας, καὶ τοῦ γνῶθι σαυτὸν ἀμνημονοῦντες, ὅλως τε σοφοὶ δοκεῖν ἐφιέμενοι, μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ λαρυγγίζουσιν· «ὀξεῖα ἀντὶ βαρείας ἐτέθη· παῖε, παῖε τὸν κατάρατον, διέφθαρται γὰρ ἡ βίβλος ἣν ἐκεῖνος ἐπετέτραπτο κατασκευάσαι τοῖς φιλολόγοις ὁλοσχερῆ τε καὶ ἀνενδεᾶ.»
>
> Your role would be to receive the product of our toil kindly and not disparage it if some misshapen letter or other such thing has got past us, when it is no hindrance even to those who have not yet tasted the Greek language. Many who have not experienced the labour, better to say pain (ταλαιπωρία), of editing, and forget the maxim "Know yourself," and are anxious to seem very clever, shout out with a great voice: "An acute has been put instead of a grave! Hit him, hit him, the cursed fellow! For the book that he was entrusted with preparing for scholars complete and without deficiency is ruined."[40]

We can see that Doukas had suffered over Greek accents. This outburst is a cry from the heart. He is unlikely to have given the matter anything less than his best attention when it came to the printing of the New Testament text. The extensive treatment of the topic in the preface is another sign of that preoccupation.[41]

That Doukas was responsible for the *execution* of the system in the Polyglot text seems extremely likely, not only from the points made so far, but from the nature of the task. Let us consider what was involved. The manuscripts exhibited the polytonic accentuation. To make the changeover to monotonic would have been too complicated for a typesetter to carry out alone, even with detailed instructions. Someone needed to go through the entire text and mark the new accents and diaereses on the copy that went into the print-room. That person would have been able to follow the polytonic accents of the

---

[40] Greek text from Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, 1:92-93; my translation. Cf. Lowry, *World of Aldus*, 240 for a lively picture of the methods—or lack of them—in Aldus's workshop when this edition was produced. In Doukas's ed. of the *Erotemata*, *etc*. (April 1514), there is another heartfelt preface on the difficulties of the editor's lot, including almost the same phrase as above: ἐν ταῖς ταλαιπωρίαις τῆς διορθώσεως.

[41] Sáenz-Badillos (*La filología bíblica*, 392), after noting what the preface says about omission of accents and breathings and the use of "pequeñas señales" as an aid to pronunciation, attributes the decisive voice in both to Doukas: "Es muy probable, que sea Demetrio Ducas,—el más familiarizado con los antiguos textos, y el que mayor experiencia editorial tiene—quien haya hecho prevalecer su opinión en este punto concreto." Cf. also 399: ". . . puede ser suya la decisión de editarlo sin acentos ni espíritus." Sáenz-Badillos does not discuss the accentuation further. It may be no coincidence that a work published long afterwards by one of Doukas's pupils was on accentuation: Diego Sigeo, *De ratione accentuum* (Lisbon, 1560). Sigeo refers explicitly to his old teacher (. . . *praeceptorem meum in schola Complutensi Demetrium Ducam* . . .). I owe the information here to Legrand (*Bibliographie hellénique*, 1:194 n. 2); cf. Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 233. I have not (yet) been able to see this "livre rarissime," or to check whether it contains any remnant of Doukas's views on accentuation.

manuscripts as a guide to the position of the stress, but expertise in New Testament Greek would be required to ensure that the appropriate changes into the new system were made; some acquaintance with the pronunciation tradition of the Greek New Testament, if not with spoken Greek, would have been an advantage.

There are some indications that the latter was indeed brought to bear. The occasional accentuation of monosyllables, discussed above, indicates more than a mechanical approach to placing the stresses. Though it created inconsistency, this phenomenon arose from familiarity with the actual pronunciation of Greek. The placing of the diaereses was also not a simple matter. The manuscripts often have superfluous diaereses, and the retention of only those that are necessary requires judgement. Again, actual pronunciation is the guide. Someone who knew what he was doing carried out these tasks. Whether it was Doukas himself, or whether he delegated some or all of the work, he at least supervised it.[42]

It is harder to say for certain whether Doukas himself conceived the basic *idea* of the monotonic accentuation, that is, the idea of a system using an acute accent mark to indicate the stress to the extent necessary and no more. It could have come from some other person or source, either in Spain during the work on the Polyglot, or at an earlier time when he was in Venice or even Crete. So far everything points to Doukas in response to a certain need at Alcalá, but we need to consider other possibilities.

9. *Parallels in the Old Testament Text*

First there is something of direct relevance to be seen in the other part of the Polyglot, the Old Testament. The Old Testament volumes (1-4, 1517) are introduced by their own preface, which runs in part:[43]

> Illud est etia[m] co[n]sidera[n]du[m]: q[uod] in hebraicis characterib[us] scie[n]ter omisim[us] apices illos: quib[us] nu[n]c vtu[n]tur Hebraei p[ro] acce[n]tibus.

---

[42] One might speculate that Fausto was Doukas's main assistant (cf. above). An illustration of what might be involved in the diaeresis: in Jn. 1:19 the Polyglot text prints λευίτας, where λευΐτας is found in some MSS, as in a gospel lectionary of XII AD (Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, no. 38). The lack of a second accent in απέστειλε με, etc. (see above) remains puzzling, however. Why did they leave these out, if pronunciation was the guide?

[43] This preface is headed *Prologus. Ad lectorem. De his que ad lectionem veteris testamenti diuersis linguis nunc primum impressi sunt praenotanda* and comes next after the Cardinal's prologue addressed to Pope Leo X. Both are printed in all four OT volumes.

> Na[m] hi cu[m] ad nulla[m] vel significati vel p[ro]nu[n]ciationis differentia[m] pertinea[n]t: sed ad sola[m] ca[n]tus ipsoru[m] modulatione[m]: merito a veteribus Hebraeis reiecti sunt: quos in hoc imitari maluimus. Veru[m] ne locus acce[n]tus cuiusq[ue] dictionis ignoraretur: hoc modo p[ro]uidimus: vt quonia[m] dictiones hebraicae vt plurimu[m] in vltima habe[n]t accentu[m]: o[mn]es huiusmodi dictiones nullo prorsus apice notare[n]tur: reliquae vero no[n] habentes accentu[m] in vltima (quae rarissime occurru[n]t) Super syllaba[m] vbi praedominatur acce[n]tus: apice signare[n]tur: hoc modo אֹרֶץ.
>
> This also is to be observed, that in the Hebrew characters we have knowingly omitted those marks which the Jews now use for accents. For since these do not relate to any difference of meaning or pronunciation, but only to the melody in chanting them, they were with good cause left out by the Jews of old, whom we have chosen to imitate in this matter. Nevertheless, so that the place of the accent of any word may not be unknown, we have made provision in this way, namely, since most Hebrew words have their accent on the final syllable, all the words of this kind are distinguished by no mark at all, but the remainder that do not have the accent on the final syllable (which occur very rarely) are indicated by a mark over the syllable where the accent prevails, thus אֹרֶץ.

We learn that the cantillation marks, which also function as indicators of the accent, will be omitted from the Hebrew text as not being part of the ancient way of writing. An indication of the position of the stress will however be given by a simple system which marks the stress when necessary, namely when there is an exception to the rule that the final syllable receives the stress. The mark (*apex*) illustrated is not unlike a Greek grave accent and is placed above the syllable. Thus the student or anyone else not completely familiar with Hebrew receives the necessary guidance in reading aloud. Inspection readily confirms that this system has been applied, and with great consistency, throughout the Hebrew text. Moreover, although nothing is said about it, the system has already been put into practice in volume 6 containing the Hebrew lexicon, printed in 1515.

The whole procedure here runs parallel to that seen in the editing of the Greek text of the New Testament. In both, an unnecessary part of the accentuation is abandoned for the sake of a return to ancient practice, and instead a simplified accent is introduced as a practical guide to pronunciation.

There is a further notable parallel between the Old Testament Hebrew and the New Testament Greek texts. Not only do they both show the same method of keying each word to the corresponding word in the Vulgate by a small roman letter, but both use the method of marking selected words by a dot under the letter. This phenomenon is easy to miss, and I am not aware that it has been commented on before. It is introduced in the New Testament preface in the sentence ἔτι δὲ ἐπείπερ . . . (see above, lines 47-51) and in the Old by an

explanation beginning *Ex his praeterea litterulis nonnullas reperies: quibus tenue punctu[m] subscribitur hoc modo* ª *Quod quidem punctum designat*: . . . ("Moreover among these small letters you will find some under which is written a slight point, thus ª, which point indicates . . ."). Examples can readily be seen on inspection of the texts. This phenomenon deserves a study of its own, which will not be undertaken here. For the moment we note it only as a further significant parallel between the texts of the two Testaments.[44]

It is evident that the editors of the two parts conferred, and decided on similar procedures in printing the accents and other features of the texts. But can we deduce which came first? The order of printing of the volumes is not much of a guide. Decisions about how the Hebrew text was to be printed would have been made long before 1517, given the huge size of the task. We know the system of accentuation was already in place in 1515 in the Hebrew lexicon, and work on it must have begun well before then. Further, the writer of the New Testament preface already knows by 1514 how the LXX will be printed in the Old Testament volumes, that is, with full accentuation (see lines 2-5 above). So priority is difficult to determine by the dates.[45]

Perhaps it is futile to attempt to determine priority, but the decision about the Hebrew accentuation appears to me, at least, to be based on what was done in the Greek rather than independently evolved for the Hebrew. If authenticity was the aim, we might have expected the editors of the Hebrew to decide to omit all vowel signs and print just the bare letters. This would indeed have been a return to the most ancient practice. Instead they decide to omit the so-called "accents," which they know are primarily musical notation marks. There is no mention of precedents, as there is in the case of the Greek, no allusion to old manuscripts without accents. Further, the accent system introduced is, as far as I am aware, an extreme novelty for Hebrew,

---

[44] Woody ("Note on the Greek Fonts", 145) already noticed the statement about omission of accents, but not the rest. Homza (*Religious Authority*, 86) mistakenly speaks of the Polyglot as printing Hebrew without *vowel* markings.

[45] The OT preface echoes the NT (Latin) preface in the discussion of the Greek MSS employed, even using the same words at some points: see in the NT preface *illud lectore[m] no[n] lateat . . . hispanie* (quoted above) and cf. in the OT preface: *Quod aut[em] ad Graeca[m] scriptura[m] attinet: illud te no[n] latere volumus: no[n] vulgaria seu temere oblata exemplaria fuisse huic nostrae impressioni archetypa: sed vetustissima simul et eme[n]datissima: quae sanctissimus D[omi]n[u]s noster Leo Decimus Po[n]tifex maximus caeptis nostris aspira[n]s ex ipsa apostolica Bibliotheca ad nos misit: ta[n]tae integritatis: ut nisi eis plena fides adhibeatur: nulli reliqui esse videa[n]tur: quibus merito sit adhibe[n]da.* It is natural to suppose that the OT preface of 1517 was written later and drew on the earlier one.

unlike the Greek one, which arises out of the existing system. And the accent symbol chosen is like the Greek one but turns the opposite way. Why so? Because it mirrors the Greek. Moreover, in the Hebrew lexicon we find that an accented Hebrew word and its transliteration into roman letters show accents facing opposite ways, thus: áleph. אֹלֶף and: מָיִם Máim. The suggestion of a mirror image is further supported by the way the small roman letters are placed. In both the Greek and the Hebrew texts they come before the word: in the Greek that means to the left, since one reads from left to right, but in the Hebrew it means the opposite side, that is, to the right, because one reads from right to left.

I conclude from this that the idea of using an acute accent mark to indicate the stress where necessary originated in the editing of the New Testament Greek text and was adapted for use in the Hebrew text. The Hebrew editors' primary reason for giving up the cantillation marks may well have been convenience: it was challenging enough to print the intricate vocalisation in full, without attempting those as well. The justification that they were not ancient could then, with some truth, be brought in.[46]

10. *Latin, Spanish and Italian*

The basic notion of the monotonic accentuation, then, does not seem to have come from the Hebrew of the Polyglot. But there are other possible sources to be considered and eliminated. A system of marking Latin accentuation was long used, and is still found, in Latin service books, as also in various related works. In its basic form it indicates the stress by an acute in words of three or more syllables, this being the minimum necessary. Its purpose was obviously to guide those whose grasp of Latin accentuation needed some assistance when reading aloud. How old is this system? Might it already have been established in Spain and Italy in the time of the Polyglot? I see no evidence that it was.

---

[46] On the accents/cantillation marks, cf. Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testamentes* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1922; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1962) 136-54; Paul Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (trans. and rev. T. Muraoka; 2 vols.; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993) 61-69. There is a cantillation mark ֽא (*'azla*), that is similar to the grave used. But the choice of it from among the thirty or so marks available can only have been motivated by its similarity to the Greek accent.

I have checked a number of mapping points, as follows. There are no marks in 1) the *editio princeps* of the *Missale Romanum* (Milan, 1474), in 2) *Missale ad Usum Sarum* (Basle, c. 1489), and in 3) *Missale Romanum* (Venice, 1549). There is frequent but still incomplete marking of the stress (the circumflex is also used) in 4) *Missale Romanum* (Salamanca, 1587), and very limited marking, sometimes none at all in 5) *Missale Romanum* (Munich, 1613). Finally, full application of acute marks where necessary, and also occasional use of grave and circumflex (for a different purpose), can be seen in 6) *Missale Parisiense* (Paris, 1738), and 7) *Uffizio della B. Vergine Maria* (Rome, 1782).[47]

Latin of the early sixteenth century in general is written without marks, as in the prefaces and Latin texts of the Polyglot. At the same time, however, there begins the occasional use of the grave, not to mark stress but to indicate vowel length, as, e.g., in adverbs (*longè, verò*), a phenomenon still seen long afterwards. But there is no sign of a system of marking the stress.[48]

Nevertheless the occasional use of an acute to indicate stress can be found, when it is needed for a special purpose. Thus Melancthon's Greek grammar (1527), in the discussion of accents, illustrates some points by writing Latin words with an acute; Erasmus does the same in his work on Greek and Latin pronunciation (1528). And Nebrija marks the stress of some Latin words in his Latin-Spanish lexicon (1492).[49] Similarly, as we have just seen, volume 6 of the Polyglot itself uses an acute to mark the stress in transliterations of Hebrew words. The idea as such was certainly about at the time. But there is no sign of the application to Latin of a fully developed system; moreover the inspiration for the sporadic use of the acute mark seems to come from Greek.

The same question needs to be asked regarding Spanish and Italian. Both employ accentual markings today. How far back do these systems

---

[47] A facsimile of 2) can be seen in A. F. Johnson, *The First Century of Printing at Basle* (Periods of Typography; London: Ernest Benn Ltd, 1926) pl. 4, and of 4) in Thomas, *Spanish Sixteenth-Century Printing*, pl. 46. John Sheldon kindly made available his copy of 7). Other copies or facsimiles were seen in the Veech Library, Catholic Institute of Sydney (I thank Charles Hill, Margaret Watt and Michael Cullen), and Fisher Library, University of Sydney. I have been unable to discover a discussion of this phenomenon.

[48] See the plates in Johnson, *First Century of Printing at Basle*; A. F. Johnson, *The Italian Sixteenth Century* (Periods of Typography; London: Ernest Benn Ltd, 1926); Thomas, *Spanish Sixteenth-Century Printing*.

[49] Philip Melancthon [*sic*], *Grammatica graeca* (Hagenau, 1527. Facsimile ed., Menston: Scolar Press, 1969). I have not seen the earlier ed. (1518), entitled *Institutiones graecae grammaticae*. Desiderius Erasmus, *De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione* (Basle: Froben, 1528. Facsimile ed., Menston: Scolar Press, 1971) e.g., 200-1. For Nebrija, see next note.

go? Could Doukas or someone else associated with the Polyglot have seen in the contemporary writing of the vernacular languages a model for Greek? The Spanish system was clearly not in place at this early date. In Nebrija's grammar of Spanish (Castilian) (1492) and his Latin/Spanish lexicons (1492, 1495), accent marks are not used.[50] Spanish documents up to and well after the time of the Polyglot are also seen to be unaccented.[51]

In Italian there is still "chaos" in the writing of accents today (or at least up to 1966), in the words of a leading authority, but the beginnings of accent marking are seen further back than in Spanish. The situation in the early sixteenth century is summed up by Migliorini (trans. Griffith) as follows:

> Accents, too, [like the apostrophe] were modelled on Greek, as can be seen from the preference for an acute accent internally in a word (in the rare cases when an accent was used) and the grave accent on the final syllable. After sporadic appearances in the Quattrocento, they were used by Bembo and Manuzio in the *Asolani* (1505), which sometimes had the grave on the final vowel (*menò, altresì*; but also *amista, castita*, etc.) and very rarely an accent within the word (*restío*).[52]

---

[50] Works seen in these facsimile eds.: Antonio de Nebrija, *Gramatica castellana. Reproduction phototypique de l'édition princeps (1492). Publiée avec une preface par E. Walberg* (Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer, 1909); *Elio Antonio de Nebrija: Diccionario Latino-Español (Salamanca 1492)* (eds. G. Colón and A.-J. Soberanas; Barcelona: Puvill-Editor, 1979); *Vocabulario español-latino (Salamanca ¿1495?): sale nuevamento a luz reproducida en facsímile por acuerdo de la Real Academia Española* (Madrid, 1951). Nebrija does use the acute as a means of indicating the stress in Spanish when discussing points of accentuation, but only then: see *Gramatica castellana*, lib. 2, cap. ii-iiij. In his Latin-Spanish lexicon, some Latin headwords have the stress marked (e.g., *Dídymus*, *Tolétum*), but the Spanish is unaccented.

[51] I have checked the 129 plates in Filemón Arribas Arranz, *Paleografía documental hispánica*, vol. 1 *Láminas*; vol. 2 *Transcripciones* (Vallodolid: Sever-Cuesta, 1965), showing documents ranging from 850 to 1641, including several in the period 1490-1516: there are no marks of accentuation (unlike ç and ñ, which appear sometimes). In Thomas, *Spanish Sixteenth-Century Printing*, I see no marks in the Spanish texts until, and only in, pl. 48, *Vida del P. Ignacio de Loyola* (Madrid, 1594), which has very occasional use of final grave or acute.

[52] The description as "chaos" is in Bruno Migliorini, *The Italian Language* (abridged and recast [and translated] by T. Gwynfor Griffith; London: Faber and Faber, 1966) 474. The quotation is from p. 237 (= Bruno Migliorini, *Storia della lingua italiana* [3rd ed., Firenze: Sansoni, 1961] 383-4). See further Migliorini-Griffith, 181, 231, 278, 322-3, and the plates in Migliorini, esp. the Aldine Petrarch of 1501. A description of the present-day system may be seen in Maurizio Dardano and Pietro Trifone, *La lingua italiana* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1985) 395-6. It is clearly not comparable to the monotonic accentuation of Greek: both acute and grave (also, rarely, circumflex) are used only in certain words and conditions, and not solely to indicate stress. (I am grateful to Gianluca Alimeni for assistance here.)

It is clear that at this time there was no regular system based on the acute alone as far as necessary, as in the Greek monotonic. Moreover, Greek itself was the source of the sporadic and unsystematic accentuation that there was.

None of these, then, provides a model for what was done in the accentuation of the New Testament Greek text of the Polyglot. Nor do we have any indication that any other person had thought of such a system for Greek before. It seems most probable that the idea was conceived by Doukas, who developed it into a workable system and saw to its application in the printing of the text. He had the knowledge and experience—one might add confidence—to invent a new system in response to the need that had arisen, and to come up with one that was simple, practical and elegant.

11. *The Proponent of an Unaccented Text*

Who was responsible for the initial intention to print the Greek text without accents? This is an interesting question that does not have to be answered, but is too tantalising to leave untouched. One could of course argue that it was Doukas himself. Persuaded by the ancient model of the inscriptions in Constantinople and aware of the precedent in Poliziano's *Miscellanea*, he as editor of the Greek text could have initiated the idea and led the rest of the team to agree with him. On the other hand, the final outcome smacks so much of compromise that it is tempting to see behind it a difference of opinion among the editors, as I have argued above. If there was such a conflict, on which side is Doukas likely to have been? In my view Doukas is likely to have been conservative in this matter. As a native Greek educated from an early age in the writing of Greek, and later a teacher of the language, he would have been totally at home with the polytonic system and, in the general nature of teachers, committed to its retention despite the difficulty of learning it. The suggestion to print without accents on the ancient model I think came from someone else, and it was Doukas who clawed back some accentuation to serve as a practical guide. Who was that someone? We need to look for a radical.

Woody came up with a name behind the proposal to omit accents and breathings, though he makes no mention of the other ingredient in the situation, the decision to insert a simplified accentuation:

> The fact that the omission of accents was borrowed from Poliziano may enable us to guess who among the Complutensian editors was responsible for the idea.

> It was probably Elio Antonio de Nebrija, who had studied for ten years in Italy and whom we find, on at least one occasion, placing Poliziano at the head of a list of Italian humanists (even before Pico della Mirandola).[53]

This is an inviting suggestion, but there is a problem about dates. Nebrija did not actually join the Polyglot team until the autumn of 1513, when preparation of the New Testament text must have been well advanced (printing was complete in January 1514). Nevertheless the idea is not to be abandoned entirely. The link to Poliziano is stronger than Woody supposed. Sáenz-Badillos has shown that some of Nebrija's material in his *Tertia Quinquagena* (Alcalá, 1516) depends directly on Poliziano's *Miscellanea*, the very source of the notion of printing Greek without accents, as we saw.[54]

Nebrija (1441 or 1444-1522) was among the most famous and distinguished scholars of his day. He was a renowned linguist, the author of the first grammar of Spanish and a compiler of lexicons. His approach to the New Testament was along humanist lines and his work was of the calibre of Valla's. In Spain "il devance Erasme lui-même" (Bataillon, 27). He held the chair of grammar at Salamanca until mid 1513; it was not until then that Cardinal Cisneros was able to attract him to Alcalá, "at the cost of a handsome salary" (Bentley, 88). We also know that Nebrija held radical views on some other matters bearing on the content of the Polyglot, so much so that he withdrew rather than go on associating himself with it. From a surviving letter we know that he felt thwarted on two counts, both issues in which he was on the side of innovation and the rest of the team were conservative, namely his desire to revise the Vulgate, and his strong objection to the planned inclusion of a ninth-century list of interpretations of proper names by Remigius. Nebrija was radical enough to envisage a New Testament text without accents, and senior enough to be listened to. If he was not in Alcalá at the relevant time, his views could still have had an impact at a distance, especially through those whom he had taught and who were members of the project team, Núñez de Guzmán and López de Zúñiga. In the end there is of course no necessity for Nebrija alone to have been the source: the contents of Poliziano's book could

---

[53] Woody, "Note on the Greek Fonts", 147; cf. 144, 146. Woody voiced his reservations: "[t]here is, however, no proof that the idea was Nebrija's, and the point is not one I will insist upon."

[54] Sáenz-Badillos, *La filología bíblica*, 71-73. Bentley (*Humanists*, 84-85) argues that Nebrija began work on the *Tertia Quinquagena* well before 1505.

have been widely known among Spanish Hellenists, including those at work on the Polyglot.[55]

Whatever the truth may be on the question of who proposed the printing of an unaccented text, the outcome was the invention of the monotonic system, and it occurred in Spain nearly four centuries before the system emerged again in Greece in modern times. Its inventor was almost certainly Dimitrios Doukas of Crete, principal editor of the New Testament volume of the Polyglot.

[55] On Nebrija's NT work, date of arrival, contribution to the Polyglot, and letter to Cardinal Cisneros: Bataillon, *Érasme et l'Espagne*, 26-41; Sáenz-Badillos, *La filología bíblica*, 162-7; Bentley, *Humanists*, 88-91; Homza, *Religious Authority*, 248 n. 34 (letter). Sáenz-Badillos (166-7) finds some reflection of Nebrija's views in the interpretations of proper names provided in vol. 5. If this is right, it is an important clue that Nebrija did have some input even into vol. 5, whether in person or through his writings. On Núñez and Zúñiga as pupils of N.: Sáenz-Badillos, 175, 199. But Zúñiga's teacher of Greek was Barbosa: see De Jonge, *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi*, 14. Barbosa, too, had studied in Italy under Poliziano (De Jonge, ibid., Sáenz-Badillos, 199). Juan de Vergara (born 1492) was still a youngster, though full of promise. According to Sáenz-Badillos (322), he studied Greek under Doukas and Núñez. Homza (4) says an inventory of his books after his death included a work or works of Poliziano (his later brush with the Inquisition is described in entertaining detail in Homza's ch. 1, pp. 1-48). Full polytonic accentuation was used in the LXX, of which Doukas was probably editor also (Bataillon, *Érasme et l'Espagne*, 42; Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance*, 239 n. 70; Sáenz-Badillos, 399). If my reconstruction is correct, Doukas got what he wanted there.