

Juan Signes Codoñer/Martin Hinterberger/Inmaculada Pérez Martín (eds.): *The Routledge Handbook of Rewriting in Byzantium*. London/New York: Routledge 2026 (Routledge History Handbooks). XII, 489 pp. £ 245.00/\$ 325.00/€ 295.00. ISBN: 978-1-032-22821-1.

The editors deserve gratitude and congratulations for assembling this wide-ranging collection of studies of the issue of the creation and re-creation of texts in Byzantium: 27 chapters by 22 contributors in addition to the three editors themselves are grouped into six thematic sections, an introductory “Preliminary Issues” (pp. 17–120), then “Rewriting or Inventing the Past?: Historiography and Novel” (pp. 121–185), “The Places of Persuasion: Oratory and Rhetoric” (pp. 187–235), “The Changing Muses: Poetry” (pp. 237–293), “Selling Patterns of Behaviour: Hagiography” (pp. 295–343), “Sharing Technical Competence: Law, Medicine and Science” (pp. 345–428), and “The Quest of Knowledge: Philosophy and Theology” (pp. 429–470).¹ One of the many strengths of the volume is the breadth of coverage that extends far beyond historiography and hagiography, the genres where rewriting has most frequently been studied. As the editors comment in their introduction, the lack of recent research on Byzantine literature as a whole, across a millennium of creativity and in a wide variety of genres, is a problem for this project, but this is a chicken-and-egg issue that can become more daunting as studies of individual authors emerge: a start has to be made somewhere, and the editors have taken the plunge by creating an overview of rewriting that should provide a framework for future specific studies of periods or genres, in the awareness that these studies may result in their framework having to be reshaped.

In a collective volume of this nature coherence and consistency are obvious challenges; the editors, well aware of these issues, sensibly prefaced work on the individual chapters with the composition of the six studies in the preliminary section that were designed to serve as guides and definitions for the subsequent contributions. The editors also remark that the resulting offerings were carefully scrutinised to ensure that they adhered to the methodological guidelines and did not simply present a series of case studies, with discussion and editorial persuasion being able to resolve most discrepancies (p. 4). One key issue for the project is the evolution of the Greek language,

1 For a full list of authors and contents, see the end of this review (pp. 375–377).

both spoken and written, with different levels or registers that evolved over the centuries and also varied from genre to genre (p. 19); education was fundamental for composition in the highest register while lower productions would be attributed to a barbaric or rustic lack of education that failed to exclude unacceptable words or accepted faulty syntax (pp. 32–33). The importance of assessing Byzantine literature on its own terms rather than the standards of the modern world is stressed. For us, originality is prized and imitation attracts the label of plagiarism, but for the Byzantines the twin concepts of *mimesis* and *zēlosis*, imitation and emulation, were esteemed as markers of education and respect for tradition (pp. 40–41); when their products are sensitively probed, it is clear that they did not preclude creativity. Another important difference from our contemporary experience is in the materiality of composition: older readers will still recall the process of writing in pre-computer days, when card indices, inserted slips, and scissors and paste turned the later stages of (re)drafting into a complex process where the possibility of error was ever-present. The Byzantine version of this is admirably brought to light by Filippo Ronconi (chapter 4, pp. 79–90). The other general topics relate to the criteria that governed rewriting, which included both the literary enhancement of texts through the adoption of preferred models as well as simplification for wider audiences, the element of rewriting that was involved in the process of textual transmission, and the creation of collaborative works, of which the *Excerpta* of Constantine Porphyrogennitus are a prime example. The editors' approach to rewriting is broad and inclusive, though the extent to which this is applied in individual chapters varies.

Historiography has been more intensively studied than other genres, with the exception of hagiography, and through the quantity of available research this presents a challenge almost as great as its dearth in other areas. Juan Signes Codoñer responds by proposing a new classification of historical works that takes into account the processes of rewriting source material (pp. 127–131). Inevitably this can be picked apart: Agathias, writing about events two decades earlier than when he was composing in the 570s, did not strictly create a 'history of the present'; neither did Theophylact Simocatta, whose history covered events at least two and in some parts as much as five decades before its composition, and for which one of its written sources, John of Epiphania, is partially extant; conversely Evagrius Scholasticus composed a work that combined a history of the present with one of the past. Signes

Codoñer is rightly concerned to supersede the old dichotomy between chronicles and histories, but what emerges from his discussion is the fluidity of labels and the historiographical approaches they are supposed to define, since different parts of individual works demonstrate different attributes. It would have been interesting to consider how similar material was treated by different authors and texts, for example how parts of Procopius were rewritten by Evagrius, Theophylact, and Theophanes, or how official documents were treated in Malalas, Menander Protector, Theophylact, and the *Chronicon Paschale*. There are some dubious assertions: that with regard to classicist historians “we cannot properly speak of rewriting of sources” (p. 123), since Theophylact rewrote John of Epiphania, Menander reworked diplomatic records, and Agathias most probably gave an elevated patina to reports of military activity in Italy and Lazica; or that the *Chronicon Paschale* is unfinished simply because no facts are recorded for many years in its chronological grid. Signes Codoñer’s discussion of chronicles has been significantly overtaken by the studies in the Brill “Companion to Byzantine Chronicles”, which was obviously not available for consultation.² With regard to the compilation of Constantine Porphyrogennitus’ *Excerpta* the identification of the oldest manuscript of Theophylact Simocatta (Vaticanus Graecus 977) as a text that had been marked up for excerpting casts light on this process and suggests that transitional media such as slips might not have been needed in all cases.³

The other contributions to this section are more specific. Eirene-Sophia Kiapidou briefly presents aspects of her recent study of historiographical proems,⁴ though her assertion that only four of the 44 available prefaces offer evidence of rewriting excludes Agathias and Theophylact, presumably because they were reworking classical texts (Diodorus; Lucian *On Writing History*), and Leo the Deacon who adapted Agathias. The four to be singled out are Procopius, Anna Comnena, and Michael Critobulus, because they

2 R. Tocci: A Companion to Byzantine Chronicles. Leiden 2025 (Brill’s Companions to the Byzantine World 14); reviewed in Plekos 28, 2026, pp. 295–311, URL: <https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2026/r-tocci.pdf>.

3 P. Schreiner: Die Historikerhandschrift Vaticanus Graecus 977: ein Handexemplar zur Vorbereitung des konstantinischen Exzerptenwerkes? In: JÖB 37, 1987, pp. 1–29, pp. 13–23.

4 E.-S. Kiapidou: Byzantine Historiographical Prefaces (4th–15th Centuries). A Study of Praxis and Culture of Writing History in Byzantium. Turnhout 2025 (Byzantios 23); reviewed in Plekos 27, 2025, pp. 579–590, URL: <https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2025/r-kiapidou.pdf>.

rewrote their own introductory material, and Cedrenus who recycled Scylitzes. Martin Hinterberger then examines the rewriting of high-level literary history in the later Byzantine years, namely the metaphrases of the works of Anna Comnena and Nicetas Choniates, the metaphrastic epitome of George Pachymeres, and Theodore Scutariotes' compilation of the works of Choniates and Acropolites. In these cases rewriting and abbreviation are intertwined to different extent – Scutariotes intervenes much more with regard to Acropolites than Choniates, for example adding information based on his own knowledge – but simplification is a common thread through the elimination of higher level allusions to antiquity and the adjustment of the language to approach that of the standard literary Koine. Finally, Carolina Cupane and Martin Hinterberger consider vernacular literature with particular attention to *Digenes Acritas*, but also the *Consolatory Story of Good and Bad Luck*, *Tale of Achilles* and *Tale of Belisarius*. Here the comments in the introductory section about textual transmission are exploited to reveal the difficulty, indeed the impossibility, of producing a single version of texts that were transmitted in differing parallel versions.

Rhetoric pervades many of the genres treated separately in this volume,⁵ but in the part specifically dedicated to oratory Petros Tsagkaropoulos considers homilies, how these oral events progressed from a draft, notes, or a short-hand record of actual delivery through to a finished text. Homilists frequently drew material from the works of celebrated predecessors, hagiographers and historians as well as homilists, so that the genre displays several stages of rewriting in a multi-layered process. Next Aglae Pizzone examines the rhetorical handbook known as the *Corpus Hermogenianum* that remained influential throughout the Byzantine millennium. The handbook offered advice on adapting the language and style of an orator such as Demosthenes, though it was itself also subject to revision, partly for didactic purposes but also in the hands of John Tzetzes, on whose work the chapter focuses, as competitive display that allowed the interpreter to reshape the received advice for his own ends. In the last contribution to this part Michael Grünbart discusses epistolography, where letters that were created as methods of communication morphed into malleable literary texts when

5 This helps to explain the discrepancy between the summary of Nikos Zagklas' chapter in the Introduction, where it is located in the part on Oratory as chapter 2.1 (p. 9), and its actual location in the volume as chapter 3.3 in the part devoted to poetry (see also note 6).

preserved in manuscript collections: they might be quoted, adapted, or copied in ways that complicate the manuscript tradition of several collections.

The next part is devoted to poetry, again with three elements. First Ugo Mondini analyses later writers' (ninth to fifteenth centuries) reuse through paraphrase and quotation of ancient epigrams from the period up to George of Pisidia (*circa* 630) as well as the composition of epigrams in the style of ancient poems where the authors drew on their general knowledge of earlier texts but did not follow a particular model. Mondini compares some specific examples and makes the important point that it is not always right to search for ancient antecedents for Byzantine texts: the lure of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* needs on occasion to be resisted. David Pérez Moro then examines the main metaphrases of Homer's *Iliad* in the eleventh to fifteenth centuries. Most were prose versions that aimed to facilitate the comprehension of this archaic text by pupils who studied Homer as a key element in their educational curriculum but needed help with the language and syntax as well as cultural context of the original. It emerges that an important element in this rewriting was the influence on the new versions of the explanatory material in the Homeric D-scholia. The third element is Nikos Zagklas' study of the didactic composition of short versions (schedography) of fables and stories, some in prose and others in verse. Particular attention is devoted to the fable of the ant and the cicada and accounts of the labours of Heracles. These rewriting exercises were an important part of the standard rhetorical education as a means to develop memory as well as writing skills.⁶ A common feature of these three chapters is the focus on analysis and comparison of individual texts; this is intended to demonstrate the general points that are being made but these might also have been brought out more clearly in the conclusions to each chapter.

Part 4 is another tripartite element, this time on hagiography, a topic that has provided copious material for the study of rewriting, especially in connection with the work of Symeon Metaphrastes in the tenth century. The first chapter, by Daria Resh, examines the centuries before Symeon, highlighting the diversity of literary genres involved through reviewing texts relating to Theodore of Euchaita and his offshoot Theodore the general – "homily,

6 The rhetorical function of these texts, as well as the fact that some of them were prose rather than verse, is probably part of the explanation why this chapter is treated as 2.1 in the section on rhetoric rather than that on poetry (see also note 5).

enkomion, passion, metaphrase, hymns, miracle accounts, metrical life, and more” (p. 299), that may range from high-brow to low. This diversity makes it difficult to define rewriting, but one complicating factor is that the process might involve oral transmission as well as textual, though through whatever reconfiguration the narrative might go the essential story had to remain the same, retellings within the same story-world of a particular saint. Resh then presents the refashioning of the story of Saint Barbara’s bath, where later versions removed the self-baptism that is prominent in the earliest written account and adapted the story, for example as hymns and homilies, for different liturgical purposes and cultural contexts. The proliferation of texts relating to a particular saint did not necessarily result in the disappearance of earlier versions, since these could survive alongside each other, on occasion even within the same manuscript. For Resh diversity is the key feature of hagiographic rewriting.

Christian Høgel then advances study of hagiography to the Macedonian age and the work of Symeon Metaphrastes. The iconoclast controversy prompted widespread rewriting of hagiographical texts by iconodule champions, for example Theodore the Studite, and at centres such as the Studius monastery. In the tenth century the imperial court became the locus for metaphrastic activity with Symeon, a court official, as its best-known representative, though Nicetas the Paphlagonian was an important precursor. Symeon’s *menologion*, or collection of information about saints for their feast days arranged month by month, became the most widely distributed hagiographic text in the following centuries. Other collections, for example in the *Synaxarion* or imperial *menologia*, contained briefer versions of texts than Symeon’s but were part of the same general endeavour. One feature of this process was the stylistic elevation of earlier texts to meet, but perhaps also in some cases to develop, the tastes of their monastic and courtly audiences, with the collective *menologia* requiring a certain homogeneity of style.

This part is concluded by Lev Lukhovitskiy’s survey of the substantial hagiographic production of the Palaeologan period, with particular attention to the compositions of Constantine Acropolites and Nicetas Gregoras. Lukhovitskiy discusses the issue of the preponderance of ‘old’ saints in the production of this period as well as the distinction between rewriting and original composition, making the point that texts about ‘new’ (post-1261) saints might well be based on earlier texts. He also identifies key differences between Palaeologan literary production and that of Symeon’s *menologion*,

namely the transmission of texts in authorial collections, their occasional nature and individual authorship, and, as opposed to the passage by passage approach in Symeon's *menologion*, the diversity of methods of reworking that can completely transform the source text. Lukhovitskiy concludes with speculation that Palaeologan authors found hagiography a means to explore particular historical periods, for example Constantine I or the iconoclast controversy, without the need to construct a high-level historical narrative or a world chronicle. Taken together the three chapters in this section provide an accessible overview of a millennium of hagiographical activity, with useful pointers to future work.

Part 5 is devoted to six distinct categories of technical literature and opens with Marios Tantalos' presentation of the processes of rewriting involved in Byzantine legal texts. Tantalos first describes the main stages of the post-Justinianic evolution of Byzantine secular law, a process in which emperors, as part of their divinely-appointed mission, played the leading role in commissioning change: the *Ecloga* of the Isaurian emperors Leo III and Constantine V in the eighth century, the *Procheiron*, *Eisagoge*, and *Basilika* of Basil I and Leo VI in the late ninth, and then subsequent reworkings of these Macedonian texts from the eleventh to the fourteenth century. This is followed by a comparable brief summary of the evolution of canon law from John Scholasticus in the mid-sixth century to the *Alphabetical Syntagma* of Matthew Blastares in the fourteenth. In both secular and canon law a concern of later jurists was to systematise the arrangement of material by topic; another was to clarify or replace Latin terminology. The second contribution, by Raúl Estangüi Gómez, deals with the formulas used in the preface to imperial and other official documents that relied on formularies maintained in different chancelleries. The adherence of formulas to existing models helped to validate the authenticity of a document; very occasionally a formula was recycled in another document, but these are special cases where the documents were substantively linked, and usual practice was to adapt the relevant formula to the needs of the occasion. In the case of private acts drawn up by a notary, respect for precedent began to fade from the twelfth century and had spread to the patriarchal chancellery by the fourteenth.

Two contributions relating to medical matters follow. First Isabel Grimm-Stadelmann surveys the rewriting of medical texts, identifying four main stages: Late Antiquity when earlier texts were reorganised to meet the evolving needs of medical audiences that included acceptance of elements of mag-

ical practice; the early Byzantine period to the tenth century when texts on discrete medical issues were organised into all-encompassing corpora with terminology up-dated as necessary; an overlapping phase (eighth to tenth centuries) when received texts were rewritten with a distinctly Christian thrust, including invocations to God or Christ, and adapted to the needs of medical training run by religious institutions; finally the later Byzantine centuries when some treatises were versified to help with memorisation and new ingredients, for example sugar, and external influences, for example from Arabic and other eastern texts, needed to be included in advice. Throughout, and especially in the final phase, medical writings functioned as literary as well as professional texts. This is followed by Mónica Durán Mañas' review of pharmacological treatises, with Galen's *On the Composition of Drugs According to Places* serving as a case study. Like the medical works treated in the previous chapter, pharmacological treatises were regularly rewritten to meet changing needs and in the light of experience of remedies to ensure that they met the demands of practitioners, but unlike medical texts literary decoration was stripped away to focus on practical measures and essentials.

In the fifth section of this part Fabio Acerbi presents a typology of what he identifies as nine different approaches to rewriting works on mathematics and astronomy: these range from the creation of text to fill in passages lost in the classical archetype, through different levels of reshaping the tradition that may involve minor clarification through punctuation or more substantial reworking by combining different earlier texts, to expansion through commentaries. Most of the brief discussion concerns the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, when Persian and in due course Jewish astronomical texts were translated and then influenced the subsequent Byzantine tradition. Finally, in another short contribution, Paula Caballero Sánchez surveys how classical geographical texts by Strabo and Ptolemy were adapted between Photius in the ninth century and Gemistius Pletho in the fifteenth. The overarching aim of this process was to ensure that classic texts remained accessible and understandable beyond the academic world and could serve political and administrative needs.

The last part of the Handbook is devoted to Philosophy and Theology. First Michele Trizio examines the ways in which Aristotelian commentaries were rewritten, through clarification of the meaning of terms that had become unfamiliar, paraphrase, epitomes that took apart and recombined Aristotelian text, excerpting, and scholia. As part of these strategies, Trizio

highlights the work of scribes since those who chose to copy Aristotelian texts were naturally men with an interest in their content and presentation. The final chapter by Alessandra Bucossi deals with theological dogma through analysis of the numerous texts that debated the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit, whether this was from God the Father or, as held in the Latin West, the Son was also involved, *Filioque*. Reaction to the Latin position began in the ninth century with Photius and continued through to desperate attempts to overcome the divisions between the Churches in the fifteenth. The founding texts were repeatedly reworked in the light of both new eastern arguments and western responses that had in turn to be refuted. The relevant corpus is so large that it has never been properly studied and Bucossi claims to do no more than present a preliminary overview, enriched with some specific comparisons, that may guide future research.

In spite of the efforts of the editors there are considerable differences in approach between chapters, with a few offerings being essentially a collection of specific textual studies, while others both survey their field and provide pointers to necessary next steps in research, but to an extent this is a consequence of the different quality and intensity of the current research in particular fields. Overall, I found Part 4 on Hagiography the most impressive, but that is a particularly well-tilled field whereas some elements of Part 5 were essentially introductory. The editors acknowledge that there are regrettable gaps, which they attribute to the complexity of the issues or the scarcity of experts (p. 14): hymnography and military treatises struck me as topics that are not exceptionally complex and where suitable scholars could have been found – for example, the latter could have been informatively supplied by Philip Rance, who was not approached for a contribution. There are also gaps in the indices: the *Chronicon Paschale* is not listed though it features more than once in chapter 1.1, while not all mentions of Procopius are picked up, just to note a couple that I happened to check. A minor gripe is the decision to locate bibliographical references within the text rather than in footnotes, which are reserved for other matters; as a result, it can be difficult to follow the main text in some paragraphs, especially where a long string of modern references is located close to detailed information about manuscripts. A more significant regret is that English expression is occasionally wayward or obscure: for example, “the pest of Constantinople” (p. 123) that conjures images of a predator or rodent rather than the bubonic plague; “is not representing” (p. 131, for ‘does not represent’); “whose liter-

ary based” (p. 147, perhaps for ‘whose literary texts’); or the coinage “vehiculating” (p. 437). Numerous others could be cited. Anglophone scholars will be grateful to authors, editors, and publisher for insisting that work is presented in English, but surely it is the duty of the publisher to provide their non-Anglophone authors and editors with professional copy-editing of the highest quality. A UK-based publisher such as Routledge should be capable of better.

However, I conclude on a positive note that the collection amply deserves. The Handbook is a treasury of riches and advances discussion of rewriting beyond the bounds of *mimesis*, which can be complicated by modern attitudes towards plagiarism that are, rightly, hostile in the context of current publication and research. Trizio suggested that the alternative contemporary concept of ‘creative commons’ might be a better approach to Byzantine texts (p. 443), namely one that views inherited text as a shared resource to be adapted and improved. These chapters place the study of Byzantine rewriting on a new footing, advancing matters beyond simple consideration of *mimesis* and underlining the variety of methods used in different fields to rework existing texts in the light of changing interests and needs. Congratulation and thanks all round!

Michael Whitby, University of Birmingham
Emeritus Professor
m.whitby@bham.ac.uk

www.plekos.de

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Michael Whitby: Rezension zu: Juan Signes Codoñer/Martin Hinterberger/Inmaculada Pérez Martín (eds.): The Routledge Handbook of Rewriting in Byzantium. London/New York: Routledge 2026 (Routledge History Handbooks). In: Plekos 28, 2026, S. 365–377 (URL: https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2026/r-rewriting_in_byzantium.pdf).

Lizenz: Creative Commons BY-NC-ND

Contents

List of Contributors	IX
List of Abbreviations	XI
Introduction: Handbook of Rewriting in Byzantium <i>Juan Signes Codoñer, Martin Hinterberger and Inmaculada Pérez Martín</i>	1
Part 0	
Preliminary Issues	17
0.1 Levels of Greek <i>Martin Hinterberger and Juan Signes Codoñer</i>	19
0.2 Vocabulary for Rewriting in Byzantium <i>Juan Signes Codoñer</i>	39
0.3 Tracing the Byzantine Authors' Understanding of Literary Imitation <i>Elisabeth Schiffer</i>	62
0.4 Σχέδη, Dossiers, συλλογαί, Compilations, <i>excerpta</i> <i>Filippo Ronconi</i>	79
0.5 "Seeds for our tongue's and our intellect's training": Rewriting and Textual Transmission <i>Inmaculada Pérez Martín</i>	91
0.6 Collective Rewriting from Late Antiquity to the Palaiologan Period: An Attempt to Trace Collaboration in Literary, Scientific Projects and Manuscript Production <i>András Németh</i>	106
Part 1	
Rewriting or Inventing the Past?: Historiography and Novel	121
1.1 The Unending (Re)writing of History <i>Juan Signes Codoñer</i>	123
1.2 Rewriting in Historiography: The Evidence of the Proems <i>Eirene-Sophia Kiapidou</i>	139
1.3 Late Metaphrases of Byzantine Historiographical Texts <i>Martin Hinterberger</i>	149

1.4	Reworking, Rewriting, and <i>Mouvance</i> in Late-Byzantine Vernacular Literature <i>Carolina Cupane and Martin Hinterberger</i>	164
Part 2		
The Places of Persuasion: Oratory and Rhetoric		187
2.1	Rewriting Homilies and Homilies Rewriting <i>Petros Tsagkaropoulos</i>	189
2.2	The Rhetoric of Rewriting and the Rewriting of Rhetoric in Ioannes Tzetzes <i>Aglæ Pizzone</i>	205
2.3	Rewriting Letters in Byzantium <i>Michael Grünbart</i>	223
Part 3		
The Changing Muses: Poetry		237
3.1	The Reuse of Ancient Epigram in Byzantine Poetry: An Overview <i>Ugo Mondini</i>	239
3.2	Prosifying Classical Verses <i>David Pérez Moro</i>	260
3.3	Memory and Rewriting in Schedography: The Cases of Fables and Narratives <i>Nikos Zagklas</i>	277
Part 4		
Selling Patterns of Behaviour: Hagiography		295
4.1	Same Saints, Different Garments: Hagiographic Rewriting before Symeon Metaphrastes <i>Daria Resh</i>	297
4.2	Hagiography of the Macedonian Period and Symeon Metaphrastes <i>Christian Högel</i>	315
4.3	Hagiography of the Palaiologan Period <i>Lev Lukhovitskiy</i>	328

Part 5**Sharing Technical Competence: Law, Medicine and Science 345**

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 5.1 | Rewriting Byzantine Law
<i>Marios Tantalos</i> | 347 |
| 5.2 | The Process of Rewriting in the Production of Acts in the
Byzantine World
<i>Raúl Estangüi Gómez</i> | 358 |
| 5.3 | Rewriting in Byzantine Medical Literature
<i>Isabel Grimm-Stadelmann</i> | 371 |
| 5.4 | Rewriting of Pharmacological Treatises in Byzantium
<i>Mónica Durán Mañas</i> | 391 |
| 5.5 | Rewriting Mathematical and Astronomical Treatises
<i>Fabio Acerbi</i> | 407 |
| 5.6 | Rewriting Ancient Geography
<i>Paula Caballero Sánchez</i> | 420 |

Part 6**The Quest of Knowledge: Philosophy and Theology 429**

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 6.1 | Rewriting Techniques in Byzantine Philosophical Commentaries
<i>Michele Trizio</i> | 431 |
| 6.2 | The Last Dogmatic Conundrum: Transmitting and Innovating
Patristic Theology on the Holy Spirit
<i>Alessandra Bucossi</i> | 447 |

- | | | |
|--|---|-----|
| | Index of Names and Anonymous Works | 471 |
| | Index of Terms Related to (Re)writing and Literary Genres | 480 |
| | Index of Manuscripts | 487 |