

1-2016

Byzantine Manuscript Colophons and the Prosopography of Scribal Activity

Jeremiah Coogan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/jst>



Part of the [Medieval History Commons](#)

Copyright © 2016 Brill. This is not the final published version. [Please visit](#) for published version. Reprinted with permission.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Jesuit School of Theology by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact rscroggin@scu.edu.

Byzantine Manuscript Colophons and the Prosopography of Scribal Activity*

Jeremiah Coogan

University of Oxford

1. Introduction

Byzantine scribes often appended notes to their completed handiwork, providing miscellaneous information about their lives and craft. These colophons frequently include valuable information such as the copyist's name, the date, and the location. Yet while scholars have analysed the colophons in numerous ways, no one has systematically investigated the invaluable evidence that they provide about the contexts of manuscript transmission.

While palaeography can reveal the approximate dates of Byzantine manuscripts, it tells us far less about the contexts through which they were transmitted. Moreover, since extant manuscripts have most often been preserved in monasteries, scholars frequently assume that literary textual activity thrived primarily, if not exclusively, in monastic contexts.¹ Yet while this may have been true in the Latin West,² the preserved manuscript colophons from Byzantine Greek texts compel us to nuance significantly any such assumption of monastic dominance in the copying of manuscripts. This question is distinct from where texts in the Byzantine period were composed, although the answers may overlap significantly. Further, while the approach of this essay is prosopographical, it focuses on manuscripts themselves. A prosopography of the scribes, discussing their origins, language, training and the like, would require a separate investigation.

For this project, the corpus of evidence is the known Greek colophons up to the year A.D. 1200, a total of some 401 manuscripts. While earlier colophons, such as those in *Codex Sinaiticus* and *Codex Coislinianus*, offer tantalizing clues about the role of Pamphilus, Origen, and the library of Caesarea Maritima in the manuscript transmission of Late Antiquity, the limited evidence from these colophons

* This research was made possible by the generous support of the Mica and Ahmet Ertegun Graduate

¹ See Leila Avrin, *Scribes, Script, and Books: The Book Arts from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Chicago, 1991); Christopher De Hamel, *Medieval Craftsmen: Scribes and Illuminations* (Buffalo, 1992); Niels Gaul, "Scribes, Byzantine," in *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, ed. Roger Bagnall, Kai Brodersen, Craig Champion, Andrew Erskine, and Sabine Huebner (Oxford, 2012); Malcolm B. Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes: A Closer Look at Scribes* (Aldershot, 2008).

² For qualifications of even this claim, see for example Warren C. Brown et al., *Documentary Culture and the Laity in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2013).

remains essentially anecdotal.³ Systematic analysis stands on a firm footing only with the appearance of dated colophons, starting with the *Uspensky Gospels* in A.D. 835. Any exploration of Byzantine colophons must rely on the work of Kirsopp and Silva Lake, who published transcriptions of most known early colophons.⁴ In the last seventy years, nothing has superseded the Lakes' monumental work.⁵ While focused only on dated manuscripts, the catalogue provides the most reliable corpus for our purposes because virtually all manuscripts containing a colophon also include a date.⁶

Once a research corpus has been established, evidentiary challenges continue to plague investigation. If one compares this prosopographical analysis to a survey, one is immediately struck by a key methodological challenge. How does one account for those who, for whatever reason, did not complete the survey? In other words, how representative is the picture that colophons provide? If certain settings were more likely to generate colophons, how would anyone know? As a result, colophons offer only second-order evidence. They reflect where the copying of manuscripts was happening in a way that produced colophons. No obvious tendencies exist in which sorts of manuscripts contain colophons, but only a project much longer than this essay could firmly substantiate that claim. Until then, conclusions based on colophon data must remain somewhat tentative.

Vagaries of preservation might further skew our conclusions. Up until the modern period, most Byzantine manuscripts were preserved in monasteries. Arguably, this might privilege those

³ Among others, see Andrew J. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea* (Leiden, 2003); Marco Frenschkowski, "Studien zur Geschichte der Bibliothek von Cäsarea," in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, ed. Thomas Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (Leiden, 2006), pp. 53-104; Anthony Grafton and Megan Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006). See also Kim Haines-Eitzen, "Imagining the Alexandrian Library and a 'Bookish' Christianity," in *Reading New Testament Papyri in Context*, ed. Claire Clivaz and Joseph Verheyden (Leuven, 2011), pp. 207-218.

⁴ Kirsopp and Silva Lake, *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200*, 10 vols. with index (Boston, 1934-1945). Throughout this essay, colophons are numbered in accordance with the Lakes' catalogue. In a handful of instances, I have regularized spelling of titles for more accurate analysis.

⁵ The Lakes focused on major manuscript collections in Athens, Athos, Berlin, Florence, Grottaferrata, Jerusalem, London, Messina, Milan, Moscow, Naples, Oxford, Paris, Patmos, Rome, St. Petersburg (then Leningrad), the Meteora, Venice, and Vienna. Moreover, their catalogue was compiled more than seventy years ago. As a result, the extensive corpus remains incomplete. More manuscripts exist that could enhance the picture sketched in this article, but it is quite unlikely that they would change the overall argument.

⁶ Further investigations might explore the handful of colophons that originate in this period, but have been copied later, or even translated into Latin, Syriac, or Armenian. When textually reliable, these would offer equally good data.

manuscripts produced in monasteries, or at least the sorts of manuscripts likely to be produced in monasteries. Other skewing effects might also be at work, based on the vicissitudes of geography and history. While this problem cannot be entirely eradicated, manuscripts moved around a good bit over the centuries, a fact which significantly dilutes the effect of serendipitous preservation.⁷ Further, since this essay argues for a less central role for monasteries than has commonly been assumed, the possibility that monasteries are overrepresented in the data does not undermine the conclusions.

A third problem is the reality that some colophons have been forged, as Ernest Colwell compellingly demonstrated with respect to manuscript B 26 from the Athos Laura.⁸ Since the present approach is prosopographical, the forgery of any individual manuscript is largely irrelevant. Verisimilitude is, after all, the only way to pass off a forgery effectively. Not only are forgeries diluted by the relative mass of evidence, they are also unlikely to have slanted the data in any consistent way – beyond the general tendencies to claim greater antiquity or holier origin. Nonetheless, forgery offers a further challenge to studying colophons, especially if a significant number have been forged.

2. Scribes as Monks?

The vast majority of extant literary manuscripts from the Byzantine period are religious ones. As noted already, preservation has preferred some texts to others, but the textual centre of gravity for the ninth to twelfth centuries was certainly religious: biblical texts, commentaries, hagiography, and liturgy. As a result of this textual preponderance, scribal copying also centred on ecclesiastical settings. Yet do the preserved colophons support the assumption that explicitly monastic settings dominated the landscape of manuscript production? The present study attempts to answer this question.

Of the 401 manuscripts in the corpus, approximately one quarter – 118, to be precise – are directly identified by the colophon with a monastery. Yet since many colophons include no geographic indication, the titles by which copyists describe themselves provide a more accurate picture. Other than dating formulae, the scribe's name is the most frequently cited datum in Byzantine colophons,

⁷ For example, nos. 73 and 373, copied by the same scribe, come from manuscript collections in different cities. Other examples could be multiplied.

⁸ Ernest Colwell, "Method in Validating Byzantine Date-Colophons: A Study of Athos, Laura B.26," in *Studies in Methodology in New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden, 1969), pp. 142-147.

providing sufficient evidence for a basic sketch. Further, an acute sensitivity to social standing makes these self-descriptions valuable to the present investigation. Alongside frequent expressions of humility, copyists employed a wide variety of titles to identify themselves: *monachos*, *presbyteros*, *nomikos*, *notarios*, and so forth. Indeed, rather than limiting themselves to a single title, copyists most commonly expressed different aspects of their ecclesiastical or social identities by listing multiple titles. For heuristic purposes, these can be divided into three categories: 1) expressly monastic titles, 2) ecclesiastical titles that do not require monastic status, and 3) professional titles, some of which may also occur within monastic or ecclesiastical settings. The resulting multifaceted descriptions enable us to sketch the multiple settings for textual transmission. This approach not only clarifies the extent to which monks and monasteries were the context for scribal copying, but also illuminates other geographic and social contexts. The study demonstrates that significant secondary *loci* appear in both the episcopal apparatus and secular administrative professions. While intuitively unsurprising, this conclusion nonetheless counters a common assumption of modern scholarship.

2.1. Monastic Titles

I exhort you, whoever reads these things, pray also on behalf of the one who wrote it, the worthless and sinful monk Gerasimos, called preceptor and archimandrite in the New Monastery on the Island of Chios, so that I might find mercy in the Day of Judgment.⁹

The first example derives from an explicitly monastic context. At the end of a codex containing monks' *Lives* (*bioi*), the scribe Gerasimos exhorts readers to pray on his behalf. While describing himself as a 'worthless monk' (*eutelēs monachos*) – a *topos* of monastic colophons – Gerasimos nonetheless goes on to inform us that he is a preceptor (*kathēgoumenos*) and archimandrite (*archimandritēs*) in the New Monastery on the Aegean island of Chios. Fortunately for our curiosity, Gerasimos was not the only monk to combine professions of humility with valuable information about status and location.

⁹ “Παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς ὅσοι ἀναγινώσκετε ταῦτα, εὐχεσθε καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ γράψαντος εὐτελοῦς μοναχοῦ Γερασίμου ἀμαρτωλοῦ, τοῦ χρηματίσαντος καθηγουμένου καὶ ἀρχιμανδρίτου τῆ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ χίῳ νέα μονῆ, ὅπως εὐροίμι ἔλεος ἡμέρα κρίσεως [...]” (no. 13).

The corpus for this project contains 139 manuscripts from self-identified monks (*monachos* or *monazōn*, 137) or abbots (7),¹⁰ a number of whom further identify themselves as presbyters (*presbyteros*, 27), priests (*hiereus*, 15), or readers (*anagnōstēs*, 2). Of those who use explicitly monastic titles, only four describe themselves using terms from the scribal profession: *notarios* (2), *logothetēs* (1), and *bibliographos* (1). To this tally of monastic copyists, we must add the further twenty-one copyists who wrote in monasteries but described themselves by other titles, whether ecclesiastical (*presbyteros*, 8; *hiereus*, 3; *deuteropsaltēs*, 1; *diakonos*, 2; *anagnōstēs*, 2; *klērikos*, 1; *hēgoumenos*, 3) or scribal (*notarios*, 2; *kalligraphos*, 2; *grapheus*, 1). Most likely, these were also monks. Nonetheless, it may be significant that of 160 scribes who identify themselves as monastic, whether by location or title, only nine employ professional scribal titles. By contrast, a significant and entirely unsurprising overlap emerges between the other two categories: almost half of monastic copyists – sixty-eight in total – fulfil ecclesiastical roles that do not require monastic status.¹¹ The absence of significant overlap between scribal titles and indications of monastic context suggests that most manuscripts whose colophons include scribal titles, but not any indication of monastic origin by either title or location, are *prima facie* more likely to originate in a non-monastic context.

2.2. Ecclesiastical Titles

This text was written [...] by the hand of Theophylaktos, presbyter and administrator [...]¹²

The second category of self-descriptions contains ecclesiastical titles that do not imply monastic status, but it becomes immediately apparent that the majority of ecclesiastics also identify themselves as monks. Only fifty-nine copyists, or slightly more than half of the total, use ecclesiastical titles – *presbyteros*, *hiereus*, *anagnōstēs*, *klērikos*,¹³ and so forth – without monastic ones.¹⁴ Furthermore, the

¹⁰ In addition to those with the titles ἀββάς (2), παπάς (1), and πρωτόπαπας (1), this category includes monks with the titles καθηγούμενος (2) and ἡγούμενος (1), although these latter two titles might also refer to a bishop outside the monastic context.

¹¹ Forty-nine explicitly identified monks and an additional nineteen individuals in monasteries are described with various ecclesiastical titles. While self-identified monks are most likely to have worked in a monastery, one might also ask if some with other ecclesiastical titles might have lived outside the monastic context without jeopardising their claim to the title of “monk”.

¹² “Ἐγράφη αὐτὴ ἢ δέλτος [...] διὰ χειρὸς Θεοφυλάκτου πρεσβυτέρου καὶ νομικοῦ [...]” (no. 367).

¹³ Notably, κληρικὸς never occurs with monastic epithets or in monasteries, while it does occasionally overlap with scribal titles.

¹⁴ As noted above, a handful (19) of ecclesiastics without monastic titles also locate themselves in monasteries.

constellation of titles used to describe these fifty-nine non-monastic copyists is significantly different. As in the monastic category, the majority identify as presbyters (27), readers (10), priests (8), deacons (*diakonos*, 6), or clerics (*klērikos*, 6). Now, however, roughly an eighth hold a professional scribal title: *kalligraphos* (4), *notarios* (2), *nomikos* (1), or *chronographos* (1). Our second example, the copyist Theophylaktos, exemplifies this difference. While dispensing with any self-denigrating expressions of humility, he identifies himself as both *presbyteros* and *nomikos*.

A second significant feature also emerges from the titles of these ecclesiastics. Combined with designations for the usual grades in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, other titles suggest an episcopal staff: *synkellos* (1),¹⁵ *koubouklēsios* (1),¹⁶ and *phylax* (1). Perhaps the *chronographos* (annalist, 1) is also best located in such a context. Notably, none of these titles occur in our colophons from expressly monastic contexts. All of these descriptors designate individuals who might have worked in a monastic context, and it is likely that at least some did, but, given monks' tendency to self-identify, nothing justifies the assumption that all or most of these copyists resided in monasteries.

2.3. Professional Titles

[...] the text before you was written by the hand of Nikēphoros, first-rank notary [...]¹⁷

Professional scribal titles provided yet another way for copyists to identify themselves. Not only do they imply textual expertise, they also indicate social position, perhaps even more than assertions of monastic or ecclesiastical status. Already we have seen a handful of these titles used in monastic (8) and ecclesiastical (9) contexts. Yet in the majority of the thirty-six colophons with professional scribal designations, the copyist does not employ monastic or ecclesiastical descriptors. Some of these titles appear exclusively with other professional designations – *grammateus* (1), *grammatikos* (2), *taboullarios* (1) – and never in monasteries.¹⁸ Even those that occasionally overlap with monastic or ecclesiastical titles are far more likely to occur independently or only mixed with other professional

¹⁵ The σύγκελλος designated the personal advisor of a bishop, specializing in questions of administration and ecclesiastical law. The individual was generally an ordained priest.

¹⁶ The κουβουκλήσιος was the court title given to patriarchal chamberlains, the ecclesial equivalent to an imperial κουβικουλάριος. They could be either priests or deacons.

¹⁷ “[...] ἐγράφη ἢ παροῦσα δέλτος διὰ χειρὸς Νικηφόρου πρωτονοταρίου [...]” (no. 28).

¹⁸ The γραμματεὺς designated merely a clerk, scribe, or secretary. While the term γραμματικὸς could share this basic meaning, it could refer to a grammarian or teacher of literature. The ταβουλάριος designates a registry-clerk and virtually requires a chancellery context of some sort.

titles: *grapheus* (1 of 2 overlap), *kalligraphos* (2 of 10), *notarios* (4 of 14), and *nomikos* (1 of 2). Only in the case of *logothetēs* and *bibliographos* do we find an exception. Both occur only once, in each case describing a monk. As we have already seen, there is very little overlap between professional and monastic categories, despite the frequent use of multiple titles. As a result, in the absence of specific indications of a monastic context, scholars should not assume that copyists who used professional scribal titles were also monks.

While they might operate within the contexts of either ecclesiastical or imperial administration – although, of course, the two were never entirely separate – titles such as *notarios* and *nomikos* designated status in Byzantine legal and administrative hierarchies.¹⁹ Further, only in purely professional self-descriptions, and never in monasteries, do copyists mention higher professional grades such as *prōtonotarios* (1) and *prōtokalligraphos* (1), indicating participation in the developed hierarchy of scribal and administrative professions.²⁰ Recognizing that professional scribal titles merge into the Byzantine civil service, a number of other self-descriptions from the manuscript colophons make sense. Titles of the imperial hierarchy such as *prōtopatharios* and *patrikios* – each attested once in the colophons, but not combined with specifically ecclesiastical titles – make the most sense as part of the legal-administrative apparatus.²¹ Not only notaries and lawyers, but also the higher echelons of this system contributed to manuscript production. The titles distinctive to an episcopal staff (*synkellos*, 1; *koubouklēsios*, 1; *phylax*, 1; *chronographos*, 1)²² also contribute to this picture, since ecclesiastical and imperial hierarchies operated with many of the same mechanisms and in many of the same urban settings.

¹⁹ The γραφεὺς denoted the lowest point in the professional hierarchy, a simple copyist or transcriber. While potentially requiring more specialized competence, the καλλιγράφος (occasionally καλληγράφος) likewise carries no particular implications of higher training or a bureaucratic context. The title νοτάριος (from Latin *notarius*), on the other hand, referred to a legal notary or tachygrapher, a description appropriate only to an administrative context of one kind or another. The νομικὸς designated either a lawyer or at least an administrator skilled in legal matters.

²⁰ These are already included in the totals for καλλιγράφος and νοτάριος. Admittedly, with a sample size of one occurrence each, this argument has only suggestive force.

²¹ Indeed, it would not make sense for the senatorial titles πατρικίος (equivalent to the Latin *patricius*) and πρωτοσπαθάριος to occur in either a monastic or ecclesiastical context, while the imperial court is the natural milieu.

²² Although in this last case (ἀναγνώστης χρονογράφος), the title χρονογράφος seems located in an ecclesiastical context, probably that of an episcopal staff, the title itself could just as easily belong in the secular administrative hierarchy.

While the data are predictably untidy, it is not difficult to sketch a picture dominated by *two* main centres of textual activity, although scribal copying was undoubtedly not limited to these two settings. As might be expected based on the predominantly religious nature of transmitted literary texts, both are to some extent ecclesiastical. On the one hand, monasteries remain unchallenged as the most significant location for copying manuscripts. On the other, members of the episcopal apparatus and professionals within the Byzantine legal-administrative hierarchy also copied literary texts. By no means were monastic and administrative contexts impermeable to one another, yet, despite the ubiquitous use of multiple titles by individual copyists, and the common overlap of both monks and scribal professionals with the ecclesiastical sphere, the two groups show surprisingly little overlap.

3. One Scribe, Many Colophons

By using manuscript colophons to sketch the prosopography of scribes, this study has so far treated each manuscript as a distinct datum. Results are weighted by extant productivity, rather than by individual scribes themselves, and thus better approximate centres of scribal activity. Nonetheless, cases where the same scribe copied multiple manuscripts provide a way to assess these tentative conclusions. Does a composite of the colophons from an individual scribe display the same tendencies as my prosopographical survey of individual colophons?

The corpus includes at least eight scribes who each wrote more than one manuscript (three of them named Iōannēs). Of these, three consistently identify themselves the same way: Theodōros (*monachos*, nos. 35 and 343), Ephraim (*monachos*, nos. 44 and 86), and Iōannēs (*monachos kai presbyteros*, nos. 230 and 338). Another Iōannēs, working on Athos, consistently calls himself a monk, though he uses a variety of self-deprecating descriptions (nos. 89, 91, 92, 220, 222).

The final four descriptions offer more insight. A monk named Bartholomaios identified himself as *eutelēs monachos* in A.D. 1104 (no. 303), but the next year, he called himself an *anagnōstēs monachos* in two additional manuscripts (nos. 305 and 306). While this may indicate that he used the title *anagnōstēs* inconsistently, the change more likely suggests his progression to the office of reader. Another scribe (not necessarily a monk) named Leōn, first identifies himself as *presbyteros kai*

hēgoumenos kalligraphos (no. 285), but later only as *elachistos presbyteros hēgoumenos* (no. 103).²³ Bartholomaios' progression is easy to explain, but Leōn's abandonment of the designation *kalligraphos* is stranger. Possibly, he no longer used the title after he did not hold an official post as *kalligraphos*, but this is pure conjecture. In another pair of manuscripts we find a scribe named Kyriakos who identifies himself first only as *presbyteros* (no. 266) and later as *monachos hamartōlos presbyteros* (no. 268).²⁴ Similarly a third Iōannēs identifies himself in one manuscript as *eutelēs monachos kai presbyteros* (no. 230) and in a second, roughly contemporaneous manuscript as simply *presbyteros* (no. 338).

Inconsistencies in the cases of Iōannēs, Kyriakos, and Leōn urge caution. Monks might not have always identified themselves as such and those with a claim to professional scribal titles might not have always used them. On the other hand, there are no surprising groupings. We have already seen that some presbyters resident in monasteries did not identify themselves as monks. Similarly, ecclesiastics using the title of *kalligraphos* are unsurprising, though we might wish for more consistency. With only eight examples, this exercise is largely anecdotal, but it suggests that the overlap between monastic and ecclesiastical categories might be even greater than directly demonstrated by scribes' self-designations, while the imperial chancellery seems to remain a separate context.

4. Texts and Contexts

Both *loci* for Byzantine textual activity are, broadly speaking, ecclesiastical. Nonetheless, might there be a discernible logic to what texts are copied in a given context or by a given scribe? If so, it would facilitate better characterization of the differences between monastic and administrative contexts. Yet it turns out that the specific profile of the copyist has little to do with which text is copied. Without exception, monastic treatises and rules (nos. 2, 13, 269, 288, 304) were written by monks – and are also less likely to be signed than other sorts of documents. Otherwise, however, disparate centres of textual activity do not seem to have led to a segregation of the corpora that were transmitted. Scribes from the Byzantine legal and administrative system with titles such as *notarios* and *nomikos* copied

²³ For the benefit of the doubt, we have counted the title of ἡγούμενος in our tally of monks above.

²⁴ There is some debate about whether this is the same scribe: see Lake, *Index*, pp. 76-77.

legal texts on occasion (nos. 50, 181, 211), but more frequently reproduced biblical commentaries, scripture, hagiography, or liturgical texts. The monk who used the title *logothetēs* copied the Gospels (no. 245). The church reader identified as *chronographos* copied the Septuagint (no. 98). Scribal practice also appears to remain consistent. Colophons take much the same form, regardless of the context in which they were produced. Perhaps the sole exception is monks' prevailing habit of professing humility, sinfulness, and worthlessness, something marginally less common in chancellery contexts, or even in non-monastic ecclesiastical ones.

Further, our corpus suggests that pagan classical texts were not confined to either *locus*, although they may have been more commonly copied outside the monasteries. Of the seven classical texts for which the colophon provides information about scribe and location, only two were definitely copied in a monastic context. Ephraim, a monk whom we have already encountered, copied both the Gospels (no. 86) and Aristotle (no. 44). Theodōros, who identifies himself only as *hyperamartōlos kai* [lacunose] *notarios* copied a manuscript of Isocrates (no. 293) in the *monē tou hagiou methodiou*. Unfortunately a crucial bit of the colophon is missing, but Theodōros was likely also a monk (as indeed suggested by the typical humble profession of sinfulness). Other copyists were ecclesiastics, but seem to have worked for private hire. Stephanos, a *klērikos* in the Peloponnesian city of Patrai, produced a copy of Euclid (no. 51) for the sum of 14 *nomismata*. The *hypodiakonos* Grēgorios produced a copy of Porphyry (no. 333) for a fellow deacon. The price has worn away, but the word *nomismata* remains. Nothing suggests that either was connected to a monastery, and the implication of private contract-hire in the listed prices militates against the possibility. A different Grēgorios copied Plutarch (no. 368). Since he identifies himself as *koubouklēsios* to a bishop, the urban context of an episcopal staff is most likely. Finally, two copyists used only basic scribal titles: Iōannēs the *grammateus* (Alcinus, no. 204) and Iōannēs the *kalligraphos* (Plato, no. 52). This brief survey finds that pagan classical texts were copied in monastic, episcopal, and professional contexts. Given the overall preponderance of monastic manuscripts – more than two-thirds of our entire corpus – it is notable that monasteries produced fewer classical texts than other sources, but the limited data support only tentative conclusions.

5. Conclusion

Based on the colophons of Byzantine manuscripts, this prosopographical analysis concludes that scribal copying centred on two distinct *loci*. While monasteries provided the most common setting for manuscript transmission, the urban settings of episcopal and imperial administration formed a second, significant focal point. While individual scribes occupied one sphere or the other, with remarkably little overlap demonstrable, the monastic and administrative spheres shared a common ecclesiastical context, which may be the reason that the division of scribal contexts did not result in a significant segregation of the textual field itself. With few exceptions, both settings for scribal activity transmitted the same sorts of texts and employed the same conventions, including colophons themselves. While the limitations of evidence and the serendipity of manuscript preservation require methodological caution, these conclusions contradict established wisdom and demand further scholarly attention to the social settings of textual transmission in the Byzantine world.

Appendix 1: Scribal Titles from Byzantine Manuscript Colophons By Frequency

The number after the title refers to the number of colophons in which it occurs.

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| – μοναχός — 83 | – μοναχός γέρων — 2 |
| | – μοναχός ἡγούμενος — 2 |
| – μοναχός πρεσβύτερος — 23 | |
| | – ἀναγνώστης θεολόγος — 1 |
| – πρεσβύτερος — 20 | – ἀναγνώστης χρονογράφος — |
| | 1 |
| – νοτάριος — 9 | – ἀρχιδιάκονος — 1 |
| | – γραφεύς — 1 |
| – ἱερεὺς — 7 | – γραφεὺς ἀναγνώστης — 1 |
| | – ἡγούμενος — 1 |
| – ἱερομονάζων — 5 | – ἱερεὺς σύγκελλος — 1 |
| – ἱερομόναχος — 5 | – κληρικὸς ἀναγνώστης — 1 |
| – καλλιγράφος — 5 | – κουβουκλήσιος — 1 |
| – κληρικὸς — 5 | – μονάζων — 1 |
| – μοναχὸς ἱερεὺς — 5 | – μοναχὸς ἐκκλησίαρχος — 1 |
| | – μοναχὸς καθηγούμενος — 1 |
| – ἀναγνώστης — 4 | – μοναχὸς καθηγούμενος |
| – διάκονος — 4 | ἀρχιμανδρίτης — 1 |
| | – μοναχὸς λογοθέτης — 1 |
| – ἀββᾶς — 2 | – μοναχὸς νοτάριος — 1 |
| – ἀναγνώστης καλλιγράφος — | – μοναχὸς πρεσβύτερος |
| 2 | βιβλιογράφος — 1 |
| – ἀναγνώστης μοναχός — 2 | – νομικός — 1 |
| – γραμματικός — 2 | – νοτάριος καθηγούμενος — 1 |

- νοτάριος καλλιγράφος — 1
- παπάς — 1
- πατρίκιος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος δευτεροψάλτης
— 1
- πρεσβύτερος ήγούμενος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος ήγούμενος
καλλιγράφος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος καλλιγράφος —
1
- πρεσβύτερος μοναχός — 1
- πρεσβύτερος νομικός — 1
- πρεσβύτερος νοτάριος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος ψάλτης — 1
- πρωτοκαλλιγράφος — 1
- πρωτονοτάριος — 1
- πρωτόπαπας — 1
- πρωτοσπαθάριος — 1
- ταβουλάριος — 1
- ύποδιάκονος — 1
- φύλαξ πρεσβύτερος — 1

Appendix 2: Scribal Titles from Byzantine Manuscript Colophons By Category

The number after the title refers to the number of colophons in which it occurs. Titles in this section occur in more than one list and are ordered alphabetically within each category.

1. Monastic Titles (139)

- | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| – ἀββᾶς πρεσβύτερος — 2 | – μοναχὸς κατηγούμενος |
| – ἀναγνώστης μοναχὸς — 2 | ἀρχιμανδρίτης — 1 |
| – ἱερομονάζων — 5 | – μοναχὸς λογοθέτης — 1 |
| – ἱερομόναχος — 5 | – μοναχὸς νοτάριος — 1 |
| – μονάζων — 1 | – μοναχὸς πρεσβύτερος — 23 |
| – μοναχὸς — 83 | – μοναχὸς πρεσβύτερος |
| – μοναχὸς γέρων — 2 | βιβλιογράφος — 1 |
| – μοναχὸς ἐκκλησιάρχος — 1 | – παπᾶς — 1 |
| – μοναχὸς ἡγούμενος — 2 | – πρεσβύτερος μοναχὸς — 1 |
| – μοναχὸς ἱερεὺς — 5 | – πρωτόπαπας — 1 |
| – μοναχὸς κατηγούμενος — 1 | |

Scribes in Monasteries But Not Using Monastic Titles (21)

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| – ἀναγνώστης καλλιγράφος — | – νοτάριος — 2 |
| 1 | – πρεσβύτερος — 5 |
| – διάκονος — 2 | – πρεσβύτερος δευτεροψάλτης |
| – ἡγούμενος — 1 | — 1 |
| – γραφεὺς ἀναγνώστης — 1 | – πρεσβύτερος ἡγούμενος — 1 |
| – ἱερεὺς — 3 | – πρεσβύτερος ἡγούμενος |
| – κληρικὸς — 3 | καλλιγράφος — 1 |

2. Ecclesiastical Titles (108)

- ἀββᾶς πρεσβύτερος — 2
- ἀναγνώστης — 4
- ἀναγνώστης θεολόγος — 1
- ἀναγνώστης καλλιγράφος — 2
- ἀναγνώστης μοναχός — 2
- ἀναγνώστης χρονογράφος — 1
- ἀρχιδιάκονος — 1
- γραφεὺς ἀναγνώστης — 1
- διάκονος — 4
- ἡγούμενος — 1
- ἱερεὺς — 7
- ἱερεὺς σύγκελλος — 1
- ἱερομονάζων — 5
- ἱερομοναχός — 5
- κληρικός — 5
- κληρικὸς ἀναγνώστης — 1
- κουβουκλήσιος — 1
- μοναχὸς ἐκκλησίαρχος — 1
- μοναχὸς ἡγούμενος — 2
- μοναχὸς ἱερεὺς — 5
- μοναχὸς καθηγούμενος — 1
- μοναχὸς καθηγούμενος ἀρχιμανδρίτης — 1
- μοναχὸς πρεσβύτερος — 23
- μοναχὸς πρεσβύτερος βιβλιογράφος — 1
- νοτάριος καθηγούμενος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος — 19
- πρεσβύτερος δευτεροψάλτης — 1
- πρεσβύτερος ἡγούμενος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος ἡγούμενος καλλιγράφος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος καλλιγράφος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος μοναχός — 1
- πρεσβύτερος νομικός — 1
- πρεσβύτερος νοτάριος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος ψάλτης — 1
- ὑποδιάκονος — 1
- φύλαξ πρεσβύτερος — 1

3. Professional Titles (36)

- αναγνώστης καλλιγράφος — 2
- αναγνώστης χρονογράφος — 1
- γραμματικός — 2
- γραφεύς — 1
- γραφεύς αναγνώστης — 1
- καλλιγράφος — 5
- μοναχός λογοθέτης — 1
- μοναχός νοτάριος — 1
- μοναχός πρεσβύτερος βιβλιογράφος — 1
- νομικός — 1
- νοτάριος — 9
- νοτάριος καθηγούμενος — 1
- νοτάριος καλλιγράφος — 1
- πατρίκιος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος ήγούμενος καλλιγράφος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος καλλιγράφος — 1
- πρεσβύτερος νομικός — 1
- πρεσβύτερος νοτάριος — 1
- πρωτοσπαθάριος — 1
- πρωτοκαλλιγράφος — 1
- πρωτονοτάριος — 1
- ταβουλάριος — 1

