4 The language of *iatrosophia*

A case-study of two manuscripts of the Library at Wellcome Collection (MS.4103 and MS.MSL.14)

Tina Lendari and Io Manolessou

The two manuscripts which form the object of this study belong, at least partially, to the category of *iatrosophia*, namely book collections of medical recipes taken from classical and Byzantine medical treatises, updated by new medical knowledge and new medical substances, and enriched with folk medicine.¹ Since most of these works are anonymous and of unknown provenance, linguistic research can contribute to their localisation and dating [Touwaide (2007: 149)], something which would considerably advance their study. This chapter should be seen as a contribution towards the study of iatrosophic texts from the viewpoint of linguistics. It targets two quite different manuscripts of the Library at Wellcome Collection: the first, longer, part examines the unpublished manuscript MS.4103, while the second examines the partially published MS.MSL.14; taken together, they could offer the interested reader a representative picture of the language of iatrosophic texts.

Relatively few vernacular iatrosophic texts have been published so far and the content and typology of such manuscripts has not been systematically investigated. Agamemnon Tselikas estimates the number of post-Byzantine manuscripts to around 150 (2018: 62), but we do not have detailed descriptions or editions for most of these. Moreover, although we now possess a census of medical manuscripts (Touwaide, 2016), it only covers in detail the period up to the Renaissance.² Apart from the interest such texts present for the history of science, folklore etc. [see e.g. Papadopoulos (2009)], they are also of considerable value as linguistic sources, especially in the case of areas and periods for which evidence

1 Definition on the basis of Ieraci Bio (1982); Touwaide (2007: 149); Oberhelman (2015: 133); Tselikas (1995, 2012: 5–8, 2018).

2 Despite its claim that it covers only the period up to the fall of Constantinople, it does list a number of later manuscript (mainly *iatrosophia*) but does not aim at completeness; see Bouras-Vallianatos (2019: 159–160). Another extensive catalogue is provided by Karas (1994).

is either scant or difficult to locate, especially the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Furthermore, they are of special value to lexicography, as they cover semantic fields not commonly to be met with in other textual genres (terms for flora, fauna, materials, popular scientific terms for substances, phenomena, illnesses etc.). Linguistic studies on iatrosophic texts are few and far between, and mostly take the form of short descriptions accompanying an edition.³ The reasons for this neglect are manifold, but are mostly connected with the overall disregard of this category of texts as objects of intensive academic inquiry: disparate and hard-to-locate editions, or editions that do not meet the necessary criteria of textual reliability. Also, such texts are difficult to date and locate geographically, thus lacking important metadata which would assist linguistic analysis. Finally, their very nature hampers their exploitation as linguistic sources, since they are by definition mixed, with a long and complex (even contaminated) tradition. This results in substantial variation of linguistic features, determined by several factors, the most significant of which are:⁴

- *linguistic register*: high archaising versus low vernacular register, and a whole range of intermediate gradations;
- *chronological period*: linguistic features ‘artificially’ surviving from as early as the Hellenistic period versus recent (sometimes as late as eighteenth or nineteenth-century) dialectal evolutions, again with a whole set of intermediate linguistic innovations;
- *geographical provenance*: linguistic features characteristic of different areas or dialects of the Greek-speaking world, with a high number of loanwords (Arabic, Turkish, Italian etc.), not always easily identifiable.

Due to such diachronic, diatopic, and diastratal variation, a unified linguistic treatment is difficult to achieve – not to mention that identifying which of the above factors is responsible for the observed variation is far from simple. For the evaluation of their relative contribution, apart from linguistic data pertaining to the history of Greek, it is necessary to consider extra-linguistic and pragmatic information pertaining to the potential sources of each section of the text, the stages of textual tradition etc.

3 See e.g. the linguistic commentaries in Minas (2012) and Oikonomou (1978). Fuller treatments can be found in Oikonomu-Agorastu (1982) and Alexopoulou (1998).

4 For the linguistic investigation of variation in Medieval and early modern texts, see Manolesou (2008).

1 MS.4103

Manuscript MS.4103 has been collated from the online digital images provided by the Library at Wellcome Collection.⁵ There is no modern continuous numbering of folia, therefore the reference system is rather convoluted: there are different sequences of page numbers, by three hands, all three incomplete. The first (possibly by the scribe) uses Greek numerals in red ink, starting at $\lambda\gamma'$ (suggesting that the first two quires are missing) and running through $\rho\varsigma'$. The page numbering in Arabic numerals (placed in outer right and left margin position), in a hand similar to that of rest of the manuscript, begins at the first page from number 55 – an inconsistency that needs to be accounted for. There is also numbering in a third, later, hand, in different ink, almost always placed at the centre of the upper margin. The third set tries to complete the previous one, but in some cases numbers are repeated, inconsistent, or even erratic.

With the help of the existing description of the manuscript by Petros Bouras-Vallianatos (2015: 324–6), we have attempted a reconstruction of the likeliest sequence of the quires and folia, although the photographs do not always permit a good view of the rudimentary stitching of this codex.⁶ Several of the loose gatherings and singletons can now be safely positioned and one can have a clearer picture of the continuity of the text and the arrangement of the contents.⁷

- $\lambda\gamma'$ - $\mu\eta'$ = 55–70
- $\mu\theta'$ - $\nu\delta'$ = 71–86
- [$\xi\varepsilon'$ - $\xi\varsigma'$ = 87–8] + $\xi\varsigma'$ - $\omicron\eta'$ = 89–100 + [$\omicron\theta'$ - π']. Outer bifolium missing
- [$\pi\alpha'$ - $\pi\beta'$ = 103–4] + 105–16 + [$\rho\varepsilon'$ - $\rho\varsigma'$]. Outer bifolium missing
- 119–34
- 135–50
- 151–64 + [165–6]. Last leaf missing
- [167–82]. Missing quire
- [183–4] + 185–96 + [197–8]. Outer bifolium missing
- [199–208] + 209–12 + [213–14]
- [215–30], [231–46], [247–62]. On the basis of its content, the singleton 4r-v could belong to one of the previous missing quires

5 Available at <https://wellcomelibrary.org/item/b19693515#?c=0&m=0&s=0&cv=10&z=0.1614%2C0.2449%2C0.6649%2C0.4578> (accessed, 1 March 2019).

6 It is hoped that in the near future an autopsy (if the fragile condition of the manuscript permits) will be possible.

7 Angled brackets indicate missing folia or quires. Roman numerals represent the first set of Arabic numbering, italics the numbering by the second hand. In some cases, details that may seem redundant are provided for reasons of clarity, given the absence of modern foliation of the manuscript.

- 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276 + [one leaf missing] + 3r-v⁸ + 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282⁹ (this quire, according to the previous system of numbering should have been assigned page numbers *263–*278)¹⁰
- 279bis, 280bis, 281bis, 282bis, 283–292, 277bis, 278bis
- 293–9, 300–1, 302–9, 310 (should have been assigned numbers 295–310, the ‘correct’ page numbers only reappearing at 300)
- 311–12, 313–19, 320–1, 322–4 + 23r-v¹¹
- [327–8] + 329–42. First leaf missing
- [343–58], [359–74]. Two missing quires
- 385bis, 386bis, 387, 378 (wrong for 388), 379, 380–1, 382, 383–6, + [387–90]
- [391–406]. Missing quire. The text contained in 6r-v possibly belonged here, judging by its content, which is relevant to that of the next quire
- [407–8] + 409–12 + 7r-v + 8r-v + 413–14 + 22r-v¹²
- [first leaf missing] + 15r–20v + 5r-v (reversed)¹³
- 24r-v (reversed) + 9r–14v + 21r-v.¹⁴

As stated above, MS.4103 contains a combination of *iatrosophia* (medical formularies), incantations,¹⁵ prediction/divination methods, brontologia, seismologia, oneirokritika,¹⁶ and other astrological

8 The singleton 3r-v can beyond doubt be placed here, as the last word of 3v: κοπανοισ|| continues at 277.1 μμένα.

9 270 corrected to 282 by the second hand in different ink.

10 Wellcome online images nos 128–9, 132–43, 126–7.

11 F. 23r-v can be safely inserted here, as it continues the text of p. 324.

12 F. 22r continues the text of p. 414.

13 The final word of f. 20v: λμονο|| continues at f. 5r: ζούμ. The illustration in 5v [=Wellcome online image no. 234] (wind chart) is obviously related to the contents of ff. 10v–11r. See especially the rubrics of the illustration in the next page: ‘αντός οφεομοιωτος αστίρ, χει κ(αι) κάποιας ενεργίας οπου τας θέλουμεν γράψοι ενπρουσθεν’ (referring directly to the text that will follow later), and ‘Εδῶ γράφομεν τοιν ἱκωνα του ου(ραν)ού, ταν [sic] άστροιον οπου αστέρας δεν έχοι μόνων ενα οφεομοιωτον ως καθῶς των βλέποτε μέσα στα δῶδεκα ζῶδια κ(αι) με τους οκτώ ανεμους’.

14 The text of f. 24 (=Wellcome online image no. 235) continues at f. 9r, while that of f. 14v at f. 21r.

15 The manuscript contains a rich variety of healing incantations/charms. Most belong to types known from diverse sources, among others collections of *iatrosophia*. For a definition of incantations, as well as sources, history, catalogues of texts, and relevant literature, see Zellmann-Rohrer (2016). For a small sample from MS.4103, see p. 105.

16 This section yielded one of the most unexpected findings: it contains, in fragmentary form, a vernacular paraphrase of the *Oneirocriticon of Achmet* [ed. Drexel (1925)], perhaps the best-known work of dream interpretation from Byzantium. Only one other vernacular reworking of *Achmet* is known so far, contained in the manuscript Metochion Panagiou Taphou 220 [Papadopoulos-Kerameus (1899: 189–90); Drexel (1925: xiii); Mavroudi (2002: 37–8)]. A comparison of the two texts, insofar as the preliminary examination of this fragile, unperformed manuscript (now at the National Library of Greece) has permitted, shows that these two vernacular recastings have many linguistic differences and seem to be independent of one another. We now have evidence of *Achmet’s* reception well into the seventeenth century – possibly to the beginning of the eighteenth (depending on the actual dating of MS.4103). The

texts.¹⁷ It is in fact a very interesting miscellany of texts of different periods, content, style, and register, to a large extent unified linguistically through the compiler's native idiom; the variety of texts suggests that the compiler had access to multiple sources, both manuscript and printed.¹⁸ As for the latter, it is evidenced by the paraphrasing, in several passages, of Agapios Landos' *Geoponikon* [first printed (1643); reprinted (1674), (1686), (1696), (1745), with further reprints in the eighteenth and nineteenth century; ed. Kostoula (1991)].¹⁹

As far as the dating and place of composition of the manuscript is concerned, Bouras-Vallianatos (2015: 324) tentatively places it in the late seventeenth century on the basis of the lunar tables (pp. 142–3), which cover the years 1697–715. According to Tselikas, the handwriting and general linguistic profile of the text are more congruent with a dating in the early eighteenth century,²⁰ and present similarities with a body of iatrosophic literature compiled in Epirus and Central Greece (Sterea Ellas), especially the area of Agrapha, the homeland of a renowned physician and medical author, Nikolaos Hieropais.²¹ Further details for its spatio-temporal location based on linguistic criteria will be discussed below.

1.1 MS.4013 as an object of linguistic study: general characteristics

Turning now to the language of MS.4103, the basic facts have already been laid out: on the surface, it is a text produced approximately in the late

edition of the passages from *Achmet's* paraphrase in MS.4103 is under preparation for publication.

17 Space limitations do not allow us to provide here a full listing of headings/chapters and commentary on the contents, related texts, and editions. The present study is based on a full diplomatic transcription of the text, based on the digitised photographs published online by the Library at Wellcome Collection. The examples and excerpts listed in the linguistic description to follow are orthographically normalised. We were obliged to use a rather unorthodox reference system, because there is no modern continuous numbering/foliation of the manuscript, therefore the conventional system by folio number, recto-verso, could not be applied. The online photographs are presented according to two systems: a) by page numbers of the manuscript (though several folia and gatherings have no reference number), and b) by image number. We have used a combination of both so that textual references are easier to locate. Therefore, when the page reference is unambiguous, we provide a simple page and line reference, e.g. 55.3. In cases where the reader may be confused by repeated or erroneous page numbers, or may find it difficult to identify the page in question (e.g. one of the loose folia), we have devised a combination of page number or folio number, followed by image number (in parenthesis, noted as W), and line number, e.g. 13r(W274).10.

18 Many parallel or related texts were identified in manuscript sources, which we hope to present in a future, full edition.

19 See p. 94 for an illustrative excerpt.

20 Personal communication. We find this opportunity to express our sincere gratitude to Agamemnon Tselikas for his bibliographic assistance and invaluable advice.

21 Tselikas and Ilioudis (1996, 1997). For Nikolaos Hieropais, see also Chatzopoulou (2018).

seventeenth to early eighteenth century, written in some regional form of vernacular Greek, but in point of fact it is a compilation of texts belonging to different genres, periods, and areas, and therefore non-systematic variation is its foremost linguistic characteristic. The variation is apparent in all levels of linguistic analysis, i.e. phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon.

In phonology, the most evident, indeed striking, characteristic is the variable realisation of the so-called 'northern vocalism', an innovative dialectal phenomenon affecting the vowel system, which consists in the realisation of unstressed [o] and [e] as [u] and [i] respectively, e.g. βράσε~βράσι, ἀνακάτωσον~ἀνακάτουσον. This phenomenon will be discussed at greater length as it is crucial for the geographical localisation and dating of the manuscript. Phonological variability is also apparent in the non-regular realisation of many other phonetic changes, some of which are typical of later Greek, such as the dissimilation of stops and fricatives in consonant clusters (e.g. ὀκτώ~ὄχτώ, ἐπτά~ἐφτά) and the deletion of unstressed initial vowels (e.g. ὁμοιάζει~μοιάζον, ἡμέρα~μέρα, ἀμυγδαλόλαδον~μυγδαλόλαδον).

In the domain of morphology, the text of our manuscript presents older inflectional suffixes alongside innovative ones, both in nominal and in verbal inflection, e.g. ἡμέρας~ἡμέρες, δαιμοναρέας~δαιμοναριᾶς, or βράσον~βράσε, ἔχουσιν~ἔχουν.

Syntax is mostly paratactic and repetitive, devoid of complex clauses and constructions, and therefore not allowing much room for variation. However, depending mainly on the style and genre of the source text copied in each section of the manuscript, one may observe variation in domains such as the realisation of the infinitive (retention versus replacement with *và*-clauses, e.g. δῶσι *và* φάγει ~ δὸς γλείφειν), or of the indirect object (retention of the dative versus replacement with the genitive or the accusative case, e.g. εἶπεν αὐτῷ ~ δὸς τοῦ πάσχοντος ~ δῶσι τον *và* φάγει).

In the vocabulary, variation is evident in the use of alternative forms of the same word, or synonyms, belonging to different registers, such as ὄξος~ξίδι, τοὺς ὀδόντας~τὰ δόντια, ρόδα~τραντάφυλλα.

The linguistic evaluation of MS.4103 is inhibited by the erratic spelling: the text does not adhere to a consistent orthographic system and the accentuation is equally inconsistent, frequently absent, or entirely unreliable. The latter feature often hinders the investigation of important stress-related linguistic phenomena such as the presence or absence of synizesis, or the existence of secondary accentuation in certain verb forms. Also, the nature and style of the text (list of instructions in the medical part or list of predictions in the astrological part) entails that certain linguistic constructions are almost entirely absent. For example, as there is virtually no narration, Past tense forms of the verb are rarely to be met with, and the first person (singular and plural) of verbs and pronouns are all but absent. Future constructions occur only in the astrological sections, and there is a lack of complex syntax, questions and reported speech.

1.2 Text samples

Before embarking on a detailed linguistic analysis, it has been deemed useful to provide some samples of the text (in normalised spelling), in order to give a more concrete picture of the language described.²²

- (i) [58.4–17] Ὅταν τρέχει αἷμα ἀπὸ τὴν μύτην τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Ἐπαρε καντήλι μολυβένιον, καὶ μάζωξε τοῦ αἵμα εἰς ἓνα σκουτέλι, ἀπὸ ἐκεῖνου ὁποῦ τρέχει, καὶ γράψε μέσα οὕτως: «Ὅταν ὁ Ζαχαρίας ὁ προφήτης ἐσφάγη ἐν τοῦ ναοῦ, καὶ τοῦ αἵμα ὁποῦ ἔτριχεν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐγενεν ὡς λίθος καὶ οὐκ ἐξαλείφθη, ἕως οὗ νὰ ἔλθει ὁ δίκαιος αὐτοῦ· στῶμεν καλῶς, στῶμεν μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ, ἀμήν». Καὶ εἰς ἐκεῖνου τοῦ ἀγγεῖου ὁποῦ τρέχει τοῦ αἵμα νὰ βάλεις τρία λιθαρόπουλα καὶ τοῦ αἵμα ὁποῦ τρέχει ἀπὸ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

Ἐτιρον εἰς αὐτὸ νὰ γράψεις εἰς τοῦ γλέφαρόν του νὰ σταθεῖ τὸ αἷμα ἀπὸ τὴν μύτην. Ἐπαρε ἓνα φτερόν καὶ <γ>ράσουν τοῦ αὐτοῦ πάλιν: «Ὅταν ὁ Ζαχαρίας ἐσφάγη ἐν τοῦ ναοῦ, καὶ ἰπάγη τὸ αἷμ<α> ὡς λίθους, καὶ οὐκ ἐξελεῖφθη, ἕως οὗ νὰ ἔρθῃ ὁ δίκαιος· στῶμεν καλῶς, στῶμεν μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ, ἀμήν».

Ὅτε βρωμοῦν τὰ ὀρθούνια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Ζουμί ἀπὸ τὰ φύλλα τοῦ κισσοῦ, ἦγον τῆς μπρουσκλιανῆς, καὶ καλαμίνθι καὶ σμύρνα, τοῦ λέγον τούρκικα μουρσαφί, καὶ μέλι καὶ δύοσμον καὶ μυλάνθη, ἦγον μαυρουκούκκι, καὶ κρόκου καὶ ὀλίγον λάδι καὶ γάλα γυναικός.

- (ii) [136.10–21] Μέθοδος τῆς σιλήνης, παρὰ τῆς φλεβοτομίας τῆς σελήνης. Εἰς τὴν -1- εἶναι κακὸν ὅτι τὴν ὁμορφάδα φέρνει εἰς κιτερνάδα τοῦ σώματος. Εἰς τὴν -2- κακὸν ὅτι ἀδυναμίαν ποιεῖ τοῦ σώματος καὶ δρωπικίαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Εἰς τῆς -3- ὅτι ἀρρώστιαν ποιεῖ τοῦ σώματος ὅλον τὸν χρόνον. Εἰς τῆς -4- κακὸν ὅτι ξάφνις ὀλιγουψυχᾷ ἢ ἀπεθνήσκει. Εἰς τῆς -5- κακὸν ὅτι λουλαίνιται, καὶ ἀδυναμίαν ποιεῖ τοῦ σώματος τὸ ἀνθρώπου. Εἰς τῆς -6- εἶναι καλὸν ὅτι πᾶσα ἀσθένεια καθαρίζει τοῦ σώμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἐβγά-
ζει τὸν δρώπικα καὶ ἔρχεται ὥσπερ γάλα ἀπὸ τὸ στομάχι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

- (iii) [17r(W222).1–9] Ἐὰν τύχει ἡμέρα Τετάρτη τὰ Χριστούγεννα, ἐστὶν χειμῶν κερασμένους, ἄρρωστοι πολλοί, ἕαρ ὑγρόν, σίτου λειψίς, χινόπουρον ἀνεμῶδες καὶ αἰφνίδιος θάνατος, μέλιτους λειψίς, νεώτερον θλίψις καὶ κινδὺς κακός. Ἐὰν ἡμέρα -5- τύχον τὰ Χριστούγεννα, εἶναι χειμῶν [λιμῶν ms.] ἀκατάστατος, νερὸ πολλύ, σεισμοὶ πολλοί, θέρους καλόν, ἕαρ ἀνιμῶδης, χινόπουρον κερασμένον, σπόρος καλός, μέλιτους λειψίς, δенаστων ἀπόλειψις καὶ ἀπώλεια. Ἐὰν ἡμέρα Παρασκευὴ τύχον τὰ Χριστούγεννα, ἐστὶν χειμῶν κερασμένος, θέρος ὑγρόν, χινόπουρον ξηρόν, καρπῶν πάντων ἀφορία, κρασί καὶ λάδι πολλύ, νόσοι αἰφνίδιαι καὶ θανάτου ἐπικράτησις, νηπίων ἀπώλεια καὶ νερὰ λείψον.

- (iv) [282.12–283.3] *Περὶ νὰ καπνίσῃς ἄνθρωπον μαλαθραντζιάρην.* Κιννάβαρη δράμια -3- καὶ νὰ βάλεις κάρβουνα περισσά ἀπάνου εἰς κεραμίδα, καὶ ἂς κάτσει ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὰ γόνατα, καὶ σήκωσον τοῦ ποκάμισον εἰς τοῦ κεφάλι του καὶ σκέπασον μὴ τσέργα ἀπὸ τὸ λιμὸ καὶ κάτω τρογύρου δενατά, καὶ ἂς

22 Italics indicate rubrics in red ink.

κρατεῖ ἓνα φλωρί εἰς τὰ δόντια του νὰ μὴν πέσον, καὶ ρίξε τὴν κιννάβαρη ἀπάνου εἰς τὰ κάρβουνα, νὰ σέβει ὁ καπνὸς μέσα ὅλος εἰς τοῦ κορμὶ του, καὶ πρόσεχε νὰ μὴν ξισκεπαστεῖ, καὶ ποιήσον φορὲς -3-, πρῶτα δράμια -3- καὶ δεύτερον δράμια -2- καὶ ἥ τρίτον δράμι -1- καὶ μὲ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑγιαίνει. Καὶ ἂν εἶναι περισσὴ ἡ ἀσθένεια, βάλε καὶ ἓνα δράμι ἄξιφον ὕστρια, καὶ ἄς φυλάγεται ἀπὸν κάθι λογιῆς φαγὶ ἕως ἡμέρας -40-.

- (v) [414(W205).3–9] Ἀρχὴ τοῦ Βροντουλόγιον, συνθεμένον ἀπὸν σοφοὺς διδασκάλους: καὶ ἂν φανεῖ τόξος ἢ σεισμὸς γένει ἀπὸν τὸ τρισμέγιστον Ἑρμῆν καὶ ἀπὸν τὸ Βαρλαάμ, καὶ νὰ ἰδεῖς πόσις ὥρις εἶναι τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τὴν ὥραν ἐκείνην ποῖος πλανήτης τὴν κυριεύει καὶ ἡ σελήνη πόσων ἡμερῶν εἶναι, διατὶ ἡ σελήνη διὰ τὰ δώδεκα ζῶδια, ἀμὴ ὁ ἥλιος τὰ δώδεκα ζῶδια περπατεῖ διὰ -365- ἡμέρις καὶ ὥρις -6-. Καὶ ὥσάν τὰ ἐρευνήσεις, τότε μπορεῖς νὰ εἰπῇς σάν βροντήσῃ καὶ σείσῃ καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἢ τὸ φεγγάρι σκοτεινιάσῃ, ἢ τόξος φανεῖ, τί δηλοῖ.

1.3 Detailed linguistic analysis

1.3.1 Phonology

A VOWELS

As mentioned above, the most prominent feature of MS.4103 is the phenomenon of vowel raising, which is a typical characteristic of the so-called ‘northern’ dialects of Modern Greek, and constitutes the basic isogloss used for the classification of Modern Greek dialects. ‘Northern’ vowel raising consists in the raising of the mid vowels [o] and [e] to the high vowels [u] and [i] respectively when occurring in unstressed position. It has been documented in vernacular texts since at least the twelfth century, and is characteristic of the areas of Central Greece, Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace, and islands of the Northern Aegean.²³

This feature is extensively documented in our text, although not with complete regularity. Examples: εἰς ἀνθρουπον ὁποῦ ἔχει πανάδα εἰς τοῦ πρόσωπον 61.11; τοῦ ἔρχεται νὰ ξιράσει 71.18; κἂν νουσήσει τις ἐν δισώμοις 7v(W215).9. The influence of this phonetic feature is so strong, that it permeates even sections of the text belonging to higher registers, or isolated lexical items belonging to higher registers, e.g. νουσήσοσι καὶ ἄλλοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ οἴκου 7v(W217).9–1; ὅταν ὁ Ζαχαρίας ἐσφάγη ἐν τοῦ ναῷ, καὶ ἰπάγη τὸ αἷμα ὡς λίθους 58.11–12; Λάζαρε, δεῦρου ἔξου 330.19; ὁδεπουσῶς (=οὐδεποσῶς) 140.15; τοῦ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀπωλισθέντους καὶ τοῦ ὄνουμα τοῦ ἀπουλέσαντος 13r(W274).10.

23 For the phenomenon and its value for the classification of Modern Greek dialects, see Newton (1972: 182–214) and Trudgill (2003: 49–54); for its dating, see Holton et al. (2019: vol. I, 29–37).

Figure 4.1 Londiniensis Wellcomensis MS.4103, p. 58.

© The Library at Wellcome Collection, London.

The compiler is aware of this strong tendency for vowel raising, and often feels compelled to ‘correct’ it and reconstitute the word’s original form; this frequently leads to the phenomenon of hypercorrection, i.e. to cases where even original-etymological instances of [u] and [i] are erroneously ‘corrected back’ to [o] and [e] respectively, e.g. ἄς πίνε (=ἄς πίνει, *passim*), ἦγον (=ἦγουν, *passim*), νὰ βράσον (=νὰ βράσουν, *passim*), καινόριαν ρίγανη 106.20, πουλετρίχι (=πολυτρίχι) 111.12, ξίδι δενατὸν 112.11, σὶ λίμνη κοντὰ μὴν κεμᾶτι (=μὴν κοιμᾶται) 121.17–18, περὶ ἀσυλλεψίας (=ἀσυλληψίας) 331.1.²⁴

Northern vocalism as a phenomenon has a double instantiation. It is realised not only as vowel raising, as described above, but also as vowel deletion, and more specifically as deletion of the high vowels [i] and [u] when occurring in an unstressed position. This aspect of the phenomenon is less well represented in our manuscript, although several instances occur, e.g. τοῦ ὀρθοῦνι 55.16 (ρουθοῦνι > ρ’θοῦνι > ὀρθοῦνι), φ’γάδις (=φυγάδις) 7r.15, φ’λοκαλέα 94.8, κρ’φὰ 96.16, ἐκ’λύμπα 6r(W212).10, σ’κάμ’να 384.2, νεροκόν’δον 274(W119).6, τοῦ ἄν’θου τὴν ρίζαν (=ἄνηθου) 332.19, ἄν’θον 127.13, σκρουμπούν’ 382.20, μαν’-τάρι 385bis(W196).9, περ’σσοῦς 106.7, νὰ μὴν τὸ μασήσ’ 193.12, ἔπ’τα 192.14 (=ἔπειτα), τὰτ’λα 91.16 (=τάτουλα). It should be borne in mind, though, that some of the instances may be due to copying errors rather than to true phonetic changes. The scarcity of vowel deletion is not surprising since, as a rule, in written sources raising is much better recorded than deletion [see Holton et al. (2019: 37)]. An additional indication of high vowel deletion is again the reverse, hypercorrect, anaptyxis of a non-etymological high vowel breaking up consonant clusters. This is typical in the northern dialects of Modern Greek and is also recorded in Early Modern Greek texts of northern provenance. In our manuscript it is attested several times, e.g. καριδίαν (=καρδίαν) 162.11, κοριμί 211.11, τσουκονίδα (<τσουκουνίδα <τσουκνίδα) 341.11–12, φιτιάρι 284(W135).18.

As intimated above, northern vocalism firmly places the language of manuscript MS.4103 within the group of the northern dialects of Modern Greek, which includes the varieties spoken in Central Greece (Sterea Ellas), Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace, and islands of the Northern Aegean. Further linguistic investigation combining the evidence of other, morphological and syntactic, features, should narrow down the area in which the manuscript originated.

‘Northern’ vocalism is not very common in the iatrosophic and astrological texts published to date; in general, sizeable texts exhibiting vowel raising are very rare before the end of the seventeenth century [for details see Holton et al. (2019): 31–7]. *Iatrosophia* with northern vocalism are hitherto unknown before the late eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century. Three typical examples are the nineteenth-century *iatrosophia* from Epirus

24 For hypercorrection in vernacular texts, see Jannaccone (1951); in texts of ‘northern’ provenance in particular, betraying the phenomenon of vowel raising, see Katsanis (2012: 43–4, 107–8).

published by Oikonomidis (1953), Krekoukias (1973), and Oikonomou (1978). A linguistic comparison of these texts with MS.4103 on the basis of parallel passages is instructive.²⁵

MS.4103, f. 3r(W206).1–6

Iatrosophion from Epirus, ed.
Oikonomou (1978: 257–8, n. 48)

Περὶ ὅταν ἐβγαίνει τοῦ κάθισμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Βάλε κρόκον τριμμένον καὶ ροδόσταγμον καὶ κρόκον ἀβγοῦ, ἀνακάτουσον ὁμοῦ ὡς ἀλοιφή, καὶ ἄλειφε τοῦ ἔντιρό του, καὶ σπρῶξον καὶ ἄς πηγαίνει μέσα, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐξέβει πλέον. Ἔτιρον. Τὰ μαλλία τοῦ προβάτου, βάλε τα κάψι τα, καὶ τρίψε τα, καὶ ἀνακάτουσέ τα μὴ λάδι, καὶ θέσι τα ἀπάνου, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃ τοῦ παιδίου τοῦ κάθισμα.

Ὅταν ἐβγεῖ τὸ κάθισμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Κρόκον ἀπὸ ἀβγὸν καὶ ροϊδόσταμον ἀνακάτωσον, βάλ' το εἰς τὸ κάθισμα καὶ μαλλὶ ἄπλυτο, κάψι τὸ σκροῦμο, ἄλειφέ το μὲ λάδι, βάλ' το εἰς τὸν πάτο.

MS.4103, 301.16–20

Iatrosophion from Epirus,
ed. Krekoukias (1973: 239, n. 24)

Περὶ νὰ φυτρώσον τρίχis. Καῦσε ἀβδέλλis νὰ γένον νὰ γένον σκόνῃ, τὴν ὁποίαν βράσε μὲ νιρόν, ἕως οὔ νὰ φυράσει τὸ τρίτον, καὶ μὲ τὸ νερόν ἄλειφε τὸν τόπον, νὰ φυτρώσον οἱ τρίχεis. Ἔτιρον, βράσε τὴν φλούδα τῆς πετελέας μὲ νιρόν, καὶ ἀλείφου τὸ κεφάλι, καὶ πάσσισε ἀπήγανον τριμμένον καὶ φυτρώνον.

Διὰ νὰ φετρῶσον τρίχis. Νὰ κάψει ἀβδέλλis εἰς τὴν φουτιάν ὅσο νὰ γένουν σκούνη κὶ ἔπαρι τὴ σκούνη ἱκεῖνη κὶ βράσι τὴν σὶ τρία νιρὰ ἕως νὰ φεράνει καὶ μὴ τὸ τρίτο νιρὸ ἄλειφι τὸν τόπον ἱκεῖνον νὰ φετρῶσον τρίχis. Πρῶτα ἄλειφι τὸν τόπον μὴ μέλι.

MS.4103, 193.19–20–194.1

Iatrosophion from Epirus,
ed. Oikonomidis (1953: 35, n. 36)

Περὶ νὰ χαθοῦν οἱ ψύλλοι. Σκα-ντζοχέρου ἀξοῦγγι ἄλειψον τὴν σκού-παν, καὶ βάλε τὴν εἰς ἓνα μέρους τοῦ σπιτίου σου· καὶ μαζώνουνται ὅλοι ἐκεῖ· ζιμάτισέ τους.

Διὰ νὰ ψοφήσουν οἱ ψύλλοι. Κάμε λάκκον εἰς τὴν μέσην τοῦ σπιτίου σου, κόψι ρόδον δάφνης καὶ βάλε το εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ ἱκεῖ μαζεύονται οἱ ψύλλοι καὶ ζιμάτῃσι αὐτοὺς καὶ τελειώνουν.

²⁵ Note the instances of vowel raising such as κάψε > κάψι, φωτιάν > φουτιάν, νερὰ > νιρὰ, ζεμάτισε > ζιμάτισι, as well as of hypercorrection, such as φυτρώσουν > φετρῶσον.

The other phenomena involving vowel changes attested in our text are not specific to any dialect form, but constitute general characteristics of Medieval and Modern Greek.²⁶ These include the following:

- *Deletion of unstressed initial vowels*: the phenomenon, attested since the Early Medieval period, is frequent, but not regular (see above for examples of its variable instantiation): πρὸς ᾿γείαν 340.5, δὲν ᾿πιτυχαίνει 128.4–5, τῆς μυγδαλέας 293.20, εἶναι ᾿γιέστατον 121.9, τὸν πήγανον 130.22, τὸν δρώπικα 136.20, εἰς ᾿Δροχόον 8r(W216).3, εἰς ᾿Χθίαν 8r(W216).3–4.
- *Appearance of non-etymological vowels word-initially*: the deletion of initial vowels, combined with misanalysis of word boundaries, often leads to changes in a word's initial vowel (e.g. τὰ ἔντερα > τὰ ᾿ντερα > τὰ ᾿ντερα > τὰ ἄντερα). Again, the phenomenon is frequent, without regularity. Examples include: μέσσα καὶ ὄξου 75.5, τὰ ἄντρια 192.18, τῆς ἀλαφρίνας 320.6, ὁμπρὸς 414(W205).10, ἀλαφραίνει 210.3.
- *Prothesis of non-etymological initial vowels (most frequently [a])*: having as its origin the false segmentation at word boundaries, the development of an initial vowel in originally consonant-initial words is a common feature of Medieval and Early Modern texts. In MS.4013 several instances are to be found, e.g. ἀβδέλλις 96.17, ἀμασχάλη 287.3, ἀπαλάμη 196.11, ἀστήθι 105.3, τοῦ ἀχείλι 70.11, ἀγλήγορα 89.17, ὀγλήγορα 337.11. Realisation is again variable, as forms without prothesis also occur, e.g. γλήγορα 337.7; τὸ στήθος 153.6.
- *Change of [i] to [e] in the adjacency of liquid and nasal consonants*: this is a very early change, dated to the Hellenistic period, which is characteristic for the Greek of all areas, but without regularity. The phenomenon is difficult to identify in this text, as instances of [i] > [e] could also be attributed to the hypercorrection of the reverse phenomenon, i.e. the raising of [e] to [i] described earlier. Examples: βοῦτερον 71.10, κύμενον 106.14, σίδερον (passim), τερόγαλον 65.19; μερμηγκιῶν 140.19; μερσίνη (passim).
- *Change of [i] to [u] next to velar and labial consonants*: this phenomenon, again of relatively early appearance, has often been interpreted as retention of the original pronunciation [u] of the vowel <υ>. Examples of variable realisation include: ἀξούγγι 92.6 ~ ξούγγι 91.12; τῆς μερσίνης (...) ἦγον τῆς μουρτέας 99.10 ~ μυρσίνης 14v(W247).3; σουπέας 56.10; κρουστάλλι 81.18; ξούρισον 303.12.
- *Synizesis, i.e. the change of [e] or [i] into a semivowel [j] when followed by another vowel*: this phenomenon, of major importance both for dating as well as for dialectal classification, is rather difficult to detect in

26 A dialectological overview of these features is offered in Newton (1972), while a historical one is provided by Horrocks (2010). For the detailed investigation of their attestations in Medieval and Early Modern Greek see Holton et al. (2019, vol. I).

this manuscript due the erratic accentuation, as mentioned above. However, several instances are clearly marked with an accent, e.g. φωτιὰν 75.3, μία χειρὰ 82.13, ἀχλαδιὰν 290(W141).4, φωλιὰν 141.3. Other indications include the spelling with <ι> of an original [e], e.g. λιόλαδον 286 (W137).19, δαίμοναριᾶς 120.16, and the spelling of the semivowel with a fricative consonant (usually <γ>): ἀνχοιῶνοι (=ἀφιονί) 330.14, γάρη 82.8, γᾶται 60.6, γιαιρεύεται 74.18, του μοικρου κοταγιου (=τοῦ μικροῦ κοταβιοῦ) 195.14. There are also several cases where synizesis does not apply, probably due to the conservative nature of the texts which constitute the sources of the compiler: ἀλιφασκέα 96.13, ἀπινθέας 93.14, δρακοντέας 59.15; ιαιτρεύει 285(W136).9, συκαμινέας 93.19.

- *Apocope of final vowel*: the final vowel [e] is occasionally deleted in the imperative, when the verb is followed by a clitic pronoun: κλειῖς' τον 57.14, κοπάνισ' τα 58.18.
- *Crisis*: as a means of resolving hiatus at word boundaries, the text exhibits, albeit rarely, the innovative phenomenon of crisis [see Andriotis (1956)], i.e. the merger of [u] followed by [e] to [o]. Only a couple of examples have been located: ὁπῶχει ψεῖρις 289.4, ὁπῶχει ὀλόγυρα 55.5.

B CONSONANTS

There are no major regional/dialectal phenomena involving consonants which would assist in the geographical localisation of the text, and most innovations characterise later in Greek in general. The most characteristic are:

- *Deletion of final [n]*: this feature, appearing from the Hellenistic period onward, presents great variation in MS.4013, due to the mixture of higher and lower registers. In general, there is an attempt to retain the final [n], but deletion is common in the accusative singular of feminine nouns, e.g. δὲν φοβᾷσι καμία ἀνάγκη 132.6, ἔπαρε μία λίτρα 192.11, δανατὴ ρακὴ 279bis (W128).11, and in neuter nouns in -ι (<-ιον>), e.g. κρασὶ 97.1, πουτήρι 105.2, ἀλεύρι 106.15, κρομμύδι 108.10, κορμὶ 110.20. The tendency for final [n] deletion is counterbalanced by the occasional addition of a non-etymological final [n]: ἔναν μῆναν 65.6; ρίζαν ἢ ὁποῖαν εἶναι 185.17.
- *Anaptyxis of intervocalic [y/j]*: a glide occasionally develops between vowels within the word, or at word boundaries, for the avoidance of hiatus: ἀλόγην 187.5, τὰ γούλη 81.9, εὐποιγία 152.18, καίγει 69.9, κυλάγει 209.9, λοῦγε 130.14, ὠφελάγει 55.4.
- *Deletion of fricatives before nasals*: this is a late medieval phenomenon, with examples such as θαμάσιον 112.19, θαμαστὰ 210.21, μαλαμένον 313.6, πράματα 63.10, ρεματιζόμενα 96.10.
- *Liquid interchange*: a very common change, datable to the Hellenistic times, the liquid [l] changes to [r] when followed by another consonant, without regularity: ἀρμυρὸν 114.16, ἀρμυρίχι 194.14, νὰ ἔρθει 125.17,

ὀφθαρμικὸν 309.13. Also, dissimilation of two consecutive liquids in the same word may occur: μάλαθρου ρίζαν 278(W123.7), κεφαλαρία (<κεφαλαργία<κεφαλαλγία) 138.1–2, πιροῦλες (<πιλοῦλες) 288.6, γλήγορος 111.1.

- *Manner dissimilation of consonant clusters*: very commonly in all vernacular texts from the Early Medieval period onward, consecutive consonants with the same place of articulation (stop + stop, fricative + fricative) are dissimilated into clusters of stop + fricative. The phenomenon is rarely represented in this manuscript, which displays a strong preference for the older realisations [kt], [xθ], [pt], [fθ] rather than [xt], [ft]. In fact [xt] appears only in two words, ὄχτω (passim) and νόχτα 381.4; in all other cases only forms with [kt] or [xθ] are attested, e.g. ἀλυκτῆσει 317.9, ἐχθρὸν 141.12, κτίσματα 412.21, κτύπημα 319.16, σμιχθοῦν 307.4, στάκτη 56.6 et passim, ἄν τιναχθεῖ 140.13. The cluster [ft] appears more commonly, e.g. φτέρης 23ν(W211).17, τὲς φτέρνις 4τ(W208).15, φτυλέας φύλλα 331.7, φτιρὸν 331.19, νὰ νιφεῖ 61.17–18, προφτάσει 85.4, ἐφτηνὰ 149.9, νὰ σκύφτει 76.20. Conservative realisations are also to be found: νὰ ἀλειφθεῖ 307.2, ὀφθαλμοῦ 161.2, νὰ τριφθοῦν 316.14. Manner dissimilation of stops and fricatives is also betrayed by hypercorrection, e.g. εὔχουλα (=εὔκολα) 335.3, κόφθει 20τ(W228).17, ὄρνιθας φθερὰ 141.12.
- *Palatalisation of sibilants*: one of the few post-medieval dialectal phenomena affecting the consonant system as represented in this text is the fronted (palatalised-palatoalveolar) realisation of the sibilants [s] and [z] before a semivowel, or in loanwords containing the sounds [ʃ] and [dʒ]: κοτσιάνια 83.14–15, ματζιούνι 105.6, νισιατίρι 85.2, νὰ τὰ ξιαφρίσεις 123.11, ξιάφρισον 113.15, τσιαρσί 84.18, φιλτζιάνι 381.19.
- *Deletion of nasals before voiced stops*: for the localisation of the text it would be helpful to know whether the scribe's native dialect exhibits deletion of the nasal before voiced stops, i.e. whether he pronounced the digraphs <μπ>, <ντ>, <γκ> as [mb], [nd], [ng], or as plain [b], [d], [g], since this constitutes a major isogloss dividing northern dialects. However, this is almost impossible to detect in a written text, as both realisations are normally spelt the same (as in Standard Modern Greek). Nevertheless, there are indirect indications that the scribe's dialect might indeed belong to the group where the nasal is retained: (a) the frequent spelling of <γκ>, <γγ> with an explicit nasal, as <νκ>, e.g. σαλινκάρους 64.14, ἐγκράτεια 107.14, συνκομμὸς 111.1, σφονκάρι 319.19; (b) the spelling <νγγ> and <νγκ> instead of <γγ>, <γκ>, e.g. στράνγγισον 93.8, συνγγέρνα 281(W132).10, νεροάνγγαθον 299.10, γονγγυλίου 304.16, σαλινγκάρους 57.2; and (c) the almost total absence of spellings with a plain stop <π, τ, κ> instead of the correct cluster <μπ, ντ, γκ>, i.e. the non-existence of forms like ὀπρός, πάρπας, πέτε (=ὀμπρός, μπάρμπας, πέντε), a practice which is common in texts from areas with regular nasal deletion, such as the Peloponnese and the Cyclades.

1.3.2 Morphology

A NOMINAL MORPHOLOGY

In the domain of the article, it should be noted that the characteristic for several dialects realisation [i] for the nominative singular of the masculine $\acute{o}$ does not occur. The masculine singular accusative $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ is a phonetic variant due to vowel raising ($\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\upsilon\pi\omicron\nu$ 121.13), as well as the neuter nominative/accusative $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ e.g. $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\iota$ 55.15, $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\kappa\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota$ 282.1, $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\sigma\acute{\tau}\omicron\mu\alpha$ 283.20 (et passim). The accusative masculine plural is always $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$, while the feminine varies between $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, and $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, e.g. $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\tau\rho\acute{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\varsigma$ 195.1, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ $\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota\varsigma$ 11r(W240).16, $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\sigma\tau\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ 188.20. The nominative feminine plural also shows variation between $\alpha\acute{\iota}$ and $\omicron\acute{\iota}$, e.g. $\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\acute{\omega}\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ 132.13, $\omicron\acute{\iota}$ $\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\iota\varsigma$ 81.2.

Nominal inflection presents an admixture of inherited, conservative inflectional suffixes alongside new morphological features from various chronological periods. For reasons of space, it is not possible to provide a full inflectional paradigm for all noun subtypes. Instead, an overview of innovative endings and their variants is provided for each of the three genders.

Masculine

- *Nouns in -ος*: the inherited second declension masculine nouns remain stable, without variation. Even the final -v of the accusative singular is never deleted, e.g. $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\nu$ 189.1, $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu$ 187.16, $\chi\epsilon\mu\omega\nu\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ $\sigma\acute{\rho}\omicron\rho\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\acute{o}\kappa\kappa\iota\nu\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\mu\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\nu\acute{o}\sigma\pi\omicron\rho\omicron\nu$ 61.9.
- *Nouns in -ας*: the plural is formed in -ες, rarely -αι, e.g. $\lambda\eta\sigma\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}$ 153.8. The only instances of the innovative suffix -άδες are: $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\omicron\rho\mu\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\varsigma$ 4v(W209).15–6, $\omicron\acute{\iota}$ $\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\varsigma$ 386.7, if one discounts the inherited form $\phi\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, see $\phi\acute{\gamma}\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\varsigma$ 7r(W214).15.
- *Nouns in -εύς*: the innovative nominative $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$, e.g. $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ 22r(W230).13, competes with the conservative suffix -εύς, represented by $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ 148.14 and Ζεύς 8r(W216).11.
- *Consonant-stem nouns*: the transition from the third to the first declension is evidenced through nominative singular forms such as $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ 19v(W227).1, $\iota\chi\theta\acute{\upsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ 7v(W215).13, $\chi\epsilon\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\varsigma$ 135.8. The accusative plural ends both in -ας, e.g. $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ $\beta\rho\alpha\chi\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma$ 137.11–12, $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{o}\delta\alpha\varsigma$ passim, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ 8r(W216).2, and in -ες, e.g. $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ $\mu\eta\eta\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ 414(W205).12, $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ 22r(W231).18. Proparoxytone nouns also have an accusative plural in -ους with accent shift, on the analogy of the second declension nouns in -ος, e.g. $\mu\eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\gamma\gamma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ 156.9, $\kappa\alpha\beta\acute{o}\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ passim.
- *Nouns in -έξ*: the small innovative inflectional class of masculine nouns in -έξ is attested, e.g. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}$ $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\xi\acute{\epsilon}$ 4v(W209).5, $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon$ 381.17.

Feminine

- *Nouns in -ος*: the inherited second declension nouns in -ος are only rarely to be met with in this text. Some have undergone gender change and have become masculine, e.g. ἔτιρος μέθοδος 12v(W243).11, ὁ ἔλαφος 278 (W123).19. Others present deletion of final -s, e.g. ἡ Θεουτόκου 337.21.
- *Nouns in -α and -η*: the plural is formed both in -αι and in -ες, on the analogy of the third declension: ἡμέραι αἱ πληγαὶ 17v(W223).18, αἱ χῶραι 18r(W224).3, πολλαὶ μάχαι 7v(W215).1, βροχαὶ πολλαὶ 9v(W237).4 vs. αἱ ὄρες 132.13, οἱ ρίζις 81.2. Similarly, the accusative plural appears both in -ας and in -ες, e.g. πέτρες καθαρές 59.12–13, πουλλῆς φουρῆς 75.13, εἰς τὲς στράτις καὶ εἰς τὶς ράχις 83.4, τὲς τρύπες 90.7.
 - Of special interest is the innovative plural in -δες, which, starting from inherited third declension consonant-stem nouns in -άς, -άδος and -ις, -ιδος (e.g. ἀγελᾶς -άδος) has spread to vowel-stem nouns as well. The only two nouns with the new ending are: (plural) ταχινάδις 66.18, ταχινάδες 281(W132).3 and ὀκάδις 125.4 (passim).
 - Feminine nouns in -α present a merger of the first and third declension. This is evidenced through the genitive singular -ας competing with the inherited suffix -ος, e.g. ἀγελάδας 91.6, ἐβδομάδας 132.14, τσουκνίδας 84.10, πεκραλίδας 122.4, νυκτιρίδας 158.4, πιτυρίδας 274 (W119).9 vs. ἀκρίδος 152.19, πατρίδος 7r(W214).16, σανίδος 14r (W246).5–6. The accusative plural also varies between older -ας and innovative -ες, e.g. γλιστρίδας 68.6, κιτρνάδας 66.17, πατούνας 140.9, τὰς τρίχας 157.8, ἡμέρες 63.18, πικραλίδες 111.12, ζωχάδις 274 (W119).10, πρεκνάδις 65.17.
- *Nouns in -ις*: present the innovative plural in -ες, e.g., οἱ κίνησις 139.8, καθῶς 111.14, while the older suffixes -εις, genitive -εων, occur only in passages copied from higher-register texts, e.g. ὀχλήσεις 149.8, πόλεων 18r(W224).20.
- *Nouns in -έα*: present variation between conservative forms and innovative forms exhibiting synizesis, e.g. ἀψινθέας 93.14, δρακοντέας 62.5 (et passim), πετέας 62.9, συκαμνέας 93.19, συκέας 90.16 vs. δαιμοναριᾶς 91.10, λυγαριᾶς 93.7, καπνιᾶς 116.16, κίρασιᾶς 105.15, κομαριᾶς 93.13. The nominative and accusative plural are formed both in -ές (<-εες) and in -ιές, e.g. χολιαρές 93.2, ἐλές 299.14 vs. χουλιαριές 212.3.
- *Nouns in -ου*: the innovative inflectional class of feminine nouns in -ου is represented by ἄλωπού, e.g. μιὰ ἄλουπού 280(W129).6, ἄλουπούς χολήν 194.5.

Neuter

- *Nouns in -ο(ν)*: as in the case of masculine nouns, second declension neuters in -ον retain their inherited inflection without variation. In contrast to

masculines, they do present variable deletion of final -v in the nominative and accusative singular. Deletion of -v seems to be more common when the final vowel has undergone the raising [o] > [u]. Examples: τοῦ ἀγγείου 58.7, τοῦ πράσου 55.1, τὸ πρόσουπου 62.8 vs. ἔμπλαστρον 188.10, τοῦ κόκκαλον 191.10, νιρὸν κρύον 57.14, τοῦ πρόσουπον 62.11. Note, however, that the handwriting of the manuscript often makes it very difficult to distinguish υ from v. The only irregular plural form is ὀνείρατα 379(W188).2.

- *Nouns in -ι(ν)*: a new inflectional class of neuters in -ι exists alongside the older forms in -ιον, e.g. ἀσπράδι 59.7, ἀφτί 55.2, βαμπάκι 58.20, γλυστήρι 85.15, ζουμί 59.17, καλακάνθι 212.16, μαλλί 56.17, μασούρι 55.14, vs. γλυστήριον 92.6, δρακόντιον 55.6, καβουροτσέφλιον 61.6, σκολοπένδριον 67.3, ὀψάριον 97.3. The intermediate forms in -ιν are also attested, but more rarely, e.g. βερνίκιν 294(W145).17, γιάριν 56.8, κεφάλιν 304.1, φεγγάριν 139.11, χέριν 122.6. The genitive singular of this class appears both with and without synizesis, e.g. πανίου 56.6, ρεπανίου 65.12, συκωτίου 72.14, φοινικίου 70.19, vs. πεπουνιού 61.14, τοῦ ριγανιού καὶ τοῦ μαρουλιού 86.18, κεφαλιού 133.19–20. Similarly, the nominative and accusative plural is formed in -ία e.g. βυζία 332.5, κοκκία 273(W118).13, σπυρία 189.3, φαγία 65.1 vs. καυχία 279bis(W128).8, μηρία 382.17, πανία 141.8, σπυρία 308.7. In both cases the placement of the accent is frequently dubious or could be considered purely conventional.
- *S-stem nouns*: these exhibit a tendency for transfer to the second declension, with innovative forms -ον alongside older forms in -ος, e.g. ἔχει βάρον τὸ στήθον 340.10, τοῦ μάκρου 292(W143).2, vs. βάρος 110.18, μέλος 195.4, ὄξος 292(W143.10). The older ending may also appear with vowel raising, e.g. θέρους 135.8, μέρους 193.20, στήθους 59.20. The reformed singular in -ι, on the analogy of the plural in -η, is also to be found, e.g. τοῦ ἀστίθι 188.16, τοῦ ἀχείλι 70.11, τοῦ ἄνθι 211.3. The plural appears both as older -η and as innovative -ια, e.g. βρέφη 33.14, χεῖλη 70.4, vs. βρέφια 332.5, χεῖλια 70.1, ἀχείλια 70.6. A number of second declension nouns have partially or fully transferred to this class, e.g. τὰ γούλη 81.9, τὰ κάστρη 152.5, οὔρους 113.4, τὸ οἶρος 160.4.
- *Dental-stem nouns in -μα*: retain their inherited inflection, never exhibiting addition of final -v. The genitive singular is formed both with the older suffix -ος and the innovative suffix -ου, e.g. ὀνόματος 139.19, στόματος 67.11, σώματος 131.20, vs. γευμάτου 189.4, κλημάτου 310.20. Of special interest is the hapax genitive singular χαλκωματίου 281.13 (nominative χάλκωμα), characteristic of some dialects [Northern Aegean, Cappadocia, Peloponnese; see Papadopoulos (1927: 57); Georgacas (1951); Holton et al. (2019: II: 652)].
- *A number of nouns present gender change*: (a) from feminine to masculine: τοὺς ἀμασκάλες 140.8, ὁ ζάχαρης 381.1, τοὺς πλάτες 116.9, τοὺς ψήφους 140.2; (b) from masculine to feminine: τὴν ἀχυρώνα 4r(W208)9, τὲς χαρακτηρίς 334.4, τὲς χαρακτηρὲς 336.9; (c) from neuter to masculine: θέρους καλός, φθινόπουρος ἀχαμνός 136.2.

B ADJECTIVES

Adjective inflection follows that of nouns. Most belong to the class of second declension adjectives in -ος, -η/-α, -ο(ν). Very rarely, in rather higher-register passages one may encounter feminine adjectives in -ος, e.g. ἄρμην θαλάσσιον 272(W117).14, ἄγριον μολόχαν τὴν πλατύφυλλον 23ν (W211).4.

A new inflectional class is constituted by adjectives formed with the suffix -ιάρης, -ιάρικος: μελίσσια βλογιάρικα 63.10, ζῶα ψωριάρικα 277(W126).11, σκρόφας πρωτάρικης 141.15, σκύλος λυσσιάρικος 317.8, ἄνθρωπον μαλαφραντζιάρην 282.11, τοῦ κασιδιάρη 304.3, ζηλιάρης 413(W204).8.

Adjectives in -ύς are few in number, e.g. ξίδι δριμύ 306.3, ἄψν ξίδι 383.3–4, βαρὺ νοῦν 127.15, 16, χειμῶνας βαρὺς 150.12, δαδι παχὺ 82.8, but seem to have attracted a number of adjectives in -ος to their inflectional pattern, e.g. μακρὺ 196.18, τρίχας μακρὰς 206.5, μακρὺ φτίλι 332.8, ὁ σφυγμὸς εἶναι ἄρὺς 379(W188).11. Inflectional forms with stem ending in a vowel appear both with and without synizesis, e.g. γυναῖκα λαπρὰ καὶ παχέα 334.19 vs. τὴν παχιά 193.11, πλατιά 63.13. Deletion of the semivowel resulting from synizesis is also attested (once): δασὰ 292.1.

S-stem adjectives are surprisingly common, albeit appearing mostly in higher-register passages, e.g. ὁ ἀσθενής (passim); ἀνεμῶδης 16ν(W221).4, παχνῶδης 136.2, θυμῶδης 8ν(W217).18, νοσῶδης 12ρ(W242).7, θέρως καματῶδες, ἔαρ ἀνιμῶδης 17ρ(W222).5, χινόπουρον ἀνεμῶδες 17ρ(W222).2, ὁ ἀστέρας ὁ δρακοντοειδής 144.1–2, αἵματοειδής 19ρ(W226).12, σπαθοειδής 10ν (W239).11. Innovative forms include the genitive singular τοῦ ἀσθενῆ 140.8 and the hapax neuter εἶναι ψευδὸς 6ν(W213).22.

An adjectival category of special interest for the localisation of the text is the verbal adjectives which both in Standard Modern Greek and in Classical Greek are formed through the suffix -(σ)τος; in many dialectal varieties their negative form presents the variant -γος, formed analogically on the basis of verbs with velar stem [see Kakridis (1926); Papanastasiou (2008); Tsolakidis and Melissaropoulou (2010)]. This variant appears several times in our manuscript, e.g. ἀνέγγιγον χαρτί 156.20, ἀκοσκίνιγον ἀλεύρι 280 (W125).8, ἀφόρηγον τσουκάλι 296(W147).7; the latter also with deletion of intervocalic [γ], e.g. τσουκάλι ἀφόρηον 275.17–18, πανὶ ἀφόρηου 275 (W120).16. Modern research shows that the innovative forms in -γος appear only in specific dialectal varieties; these include Pontus, the Peloponnese, Sterea Ellas, Epirus, and Macedonia. In Epirus, this characteristic is especially pronounced [Bongas (1964: 17–18); Kosmas (1997: 31)]; in the case of Macedonia, these adjectives appear only with verbs with velar of vowel stem, and not in verbs with the suffix -ίζω [Papanastasiou (2008: 310–11); Tsolaki (2009: 51–2)]. The existence of forms like ἀκοσκίνιγο therefore constitute evidence against a localisation of our text in Macedonia.

Comparison is normally expressed through inherited synthetic comparatives, e.g. κοντότιρον 83.5, μακρότιρα 301.8, πλατύτερον 83.5, στρογγυλότιρο

94.13, occasionally even in forms which normally do not lend themselves to comparison, e.g. σταματικότερον 55.9, στριφτότερον 83.6. Once, pleonastic comparison with both periphrastic and suffixal expression occurs: πλέον καλλιότερον 383.1. Superlatives also display inherited suffixal patterns, e.g. ἀληθέστατον 93.17, ᾗγέστατα 132.1, θαυμασιότατον 122.18.

C PRONOUNS

- *Demonstrative*: the text displays a three-member system [for a categorisation, see Lendari and Manolossou (2013)] with the pronouns αὐτὸς – τοῦτος – ἐκεῖνος, e.g. αὐτὸν τὸν μήναν 132.3, αὐτὰ τὰ ζώδια – ἐτούτου τοῦ ἄστρον 144.3, ἐτούτους τοὺς λόγους 336.8 – ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν 131.6–7, οἱ τόποι ἐκεῖνοι 18v(W225).10, ἐκεῖνες τῆς ἡμέρης 11r(W240).11. The inflection of these pronouns includes several innovative forms betraying cross-paradigmatic analogical influence. Examples: αὐτουινῶν τὸν ζουμὸν 209.4, αὐτουνοῦ ἡ ρίζα 209.10, αὐτουνοῦ τὸ δόντι 330.16–17, τουτονοῦ 23r(W210).6, τῇ νύκτα ταύτῃ 194.2. The qualitative demonstratives are τέτοιος and τοιοῦτος, e.g. τέτοια εὐτυχία 413(W204).19, τοιούτων ἀνδρῶν 6r(W212).11–2, τοιούτους γάμους 7v(W215).1.
- *Relative*: apart from the occasional appearance of residual archaic pronominal forms, occurring in higher-register passages (e.g. τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἣν ἐδέξαντο 60.12–13, οἵτινες οἰκοδόμησαν 324.18), the definite relative system consists mainly of two pronouns, ὁποῦ/πού and ὁ ὁποῖος. Examples: ἄνθρωπον ὁποῦ ἔχει ψεῖρες 288.20, τοῦ χόρτον ὁποῦ λέγον χιλιδόνιον 277bis(W126).4–5, τοῦ κεφάλι ὁποῦ δὲν ἔχει τρίχες 303.3 ~ τὸν πόνον πού πονεῖ 279bis(W128).17, εἰς παιδίον πού κλαίει 157.13, ἐκεῖνα πού βάνον εἰς τὰ χρυσόπετσα 294(W145).17 ~ ὁ ὁποῖος λέγεται 10v(W239).1–2, ἡ ὁποία εἶναι 384.19, σκόνῃ τὴν ὁποίαν βράσε 301.17. The main indefinite relatives are εἷτις and ὅποιος: πᾶν εἷτι θέλει, ποιεῖ 10r(W238).16, εἷτι δουλεία νὰ ἐπεχειριστεῖ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, δὲν προυκόβει 128.6–7, τρῶγε ἀπὸ εἷτι σὶ ἀρέσει 131.6, πότισον εἷτιναν θέλεις 155.8 ~ ὅποια γυναῖκα 339.10, ὅποιον πουνουῖν τὰ δόντια 76.2, ὅποιος κατουρεῖ 109.18. The form ὅ,τις appears once: περὶ ὅ,τις ἴδει 6r(W212).14.
- *Interrogative*: the two pronouns that appear are ποῖος and πόσος, while τίς occurs once in a learned passage: ποῖος πλανήτης τὴν κυριεύει 414(W205).5, εἰς ποῖαν εὐρίσκεται 11v(W241).9, σὲ ποῖον ζώδιον εἶναι 414(W205).9 ~ τίς ἡ κραυγὴ ἐκ τῆς γῆς 336.2 ~ πόσας ἡμέρας εἶχεν ἡ σελήνη 12v(W243).11–12, πόσα στοιχεῖα ἔχει 12r(W243).13.
- *Indefinite*: positive indefinites (= ‘someone’) include the older τις/τινάς, ὁδεῖνα and the innovative κάποιος, κάμποσος, κάθε, καθείς. Neutral indefinites (= ‘anyone’) are represented by τις/τινάς and κανένας, while

negative ones (= ‘no one’) are τις/τινάς, κανένας, and οὐδεὶς.²⁷ Examples: ἐὰν ἰδεῖ τινὰς ὄνειρον 386.6, ἀνθρώπου τινὸς 6r(W212).8 ~ τὸν δοῦλον σου ὀδεῖνα 155.5, κοίμησον τὸν οὐδεῖνα 155.8, τοῦ ὀδεῖνα τὸ νεφρὸν 278(W123).17 ~ ἀπὸ κάποια φαγητὰ 323.9 κάποιας ἐνεργείας W234.1 ~ κάμποσα πίτυρα 381.10, κάμποσον ξίδι 4v(W209).12, κάμποσον κρόκον 32.17 ~ ἀπὸ καθένα 111.13 ~ ἀπὸ κάθε πειρασμὸν 9r(W236).17, κάθε ἄνθρωπος 9r(W236).13, εἰς κάθι πράξιν 10r(W238).18. ὄνειρον ὅτι ἀναστήθηκε νικρὸς κανένας 386.6, γὰ καμίαν δολίαν 6r(W212).8, οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν 6r(W212).19, οὐδὲν ἕτερον 21r(W248).10 ~ νὰ μὴν τὸ ξέρει τινὰς 334.4, μὴν τοῦ ὁμολογήσεις τινὰν 6r(W212).20 ~ διὰ κανέναν τρόπον 131.21, εἰς καμίαν στράταν 9r(W236).16.

D VERBS

The verbal system displays two conjugations: barytone verbs in -ω and oxytone verbs in -ῶ. The -μι conjugation has long disappeared, being retained only in relic forms in higher-register passages, e.g. τίθεται 21r(W248).6, ἴσταται 56.3, ἴστατο 336.13. As discussed above, not all forms of the verb are represented in this text, due to its narrow range of expression. As a result, treatment will be selective, with discussion only of inflectional slots which present variation or special interest.

Barytone verbs

Active voice

- *Present*: the first plural exhibits variation between -ομεν and -οουμεν, e.g. γράφομεν 10r(W238).12, βάνομεν 279(W124).4 ~ παίρνουμεν 11r(W240).15, λέγουμεν 11r(W240).17. Deletion of final -ν is also to be found, e.g. γράφομε 322.11, νὰ κάμουμε 9r(W236).16. The third person plural displays both the older ending -ουσι(ν) and the innovative -ουν, e.g. ἐβγάζουσι 380.6, προκόπτουσι 7v(W215).8, ἐβγαίνουσιν 412.9, ἔχουσιν 7r(W214).20 ~ νὰ ψουφήσουν 195.1, γαίνουσι 4v(W209).1, νὰ βράζον 381.1.
- *Imperfect*: there are no instances in the text.
- *Aorist*: the rare second person singular is formed both with -ας and with -ες, e.g. ἐγέννησες 336.18 ~ ἔλυσας 291.7. The first person plural ends in -με(ν), e.g. ἀναφέραμεν 139.13, δοκιμάσαμεν 64.13, εἴπαμεν 308.12; εἴπαμε 290(W141).7, 308.19.

27 For the classification and evolution of indefinite pronouns see Holton et al. (2019, vol. II: 1023–4).

Passive voice

- *Present*: the second singular is always -σαι, e.g. μὴ γίνεσαι 7r (W214).17, νᾶ φυλάγισαι 380.3, ὥσάν δύνεσαι 131.10. The first person plural is formed with the suffix -μεστε, e.g. ἀνταμυνόμεσθι 11r (W240).16–17, ἀρχόμεστε 130.2, and the third person plural in -ονται, e.g. γίνονται 7v(W215).1, ἔρχονται 386.9.
- *Imperfect*: the third person singular is represented once by ἐλούετον 6r(W212).12, while the third person plural displays variation between conservative -ντο and innovative -νταν: ἐδέξαντο ~ ἐστέκονταν 6r(W212).1.
- *Aorist*: the middle Aorist exists only as an occasional residual form in higher-level passages, e.g. ἐδέξατο 386.21. In the passive, the first singular is always -(θ)ην, e.g. ἐγὼ ἐκοιμήθην 158.15, συνεκόπην 278(W123).16, whereas the third singular shows variation between the older forms in -(θ)η- and, more rarely, the innovative -(θ)ηκ-, e.g. ἀνέστη 163.19, ἰατρεύθη 295(W146).4, ἐχασμήνθη 10v(W239).18, ἐμαζώκτιν ἡ θάλασσα, ἐμαζώκτη ἡ γῆ 279(W123).18. Variation occurs in the third person plural as well: συνεκόπησαν 278(W123).18 ~ ἐγιατρεύτηκαν 286(W137).17.
- *Imperative*: this is the best represented verbal form in the text. In the Present, the second person singular ends in -ε, e.g. παῖρνε 380.1, πρόσεχε 282.17, τρώγε 380.2. In the Aorist, there is constant variation between older -ον and innovative -ε based on the analogy of the Present, e.g. γράψε 58.3 ~ γράφον 59.19, βράσε 63.1 ~ βράσον 63.3, ἔπαρον 59.5 ~ ἔπαρε 59.11, πάσσιον 84.12 ~ πάσσισε 126.20. In the second person plural, one may again observe variation between -ατε and -ετε, e.g. καθοδηγήσετε καὶ διορθώσατε 337.2–3, πληρώσατε 324.20. The passive Present and Aorist second person singular ends in -ου, e.g. ἀλείφου 280(W125).18, προσεύχου 412.11, φυλάγου 20r(W228).13, ~ δέξου 291.7, στάσου 133.17, στοχάσου 11v-12r(W241–2).21–1.

Oxytone verbs

The text displays two tendencies: one for analogical spread of the endings of the barytone conjugation (γεννᾶ > γεννάει) and the other for analogical levelling between the A-stem and the E-stem paradigms (κρατεῖ > κρατᾶ). A number of originally barytone vowel-stem verbs have also joined this conjugation, e.g. μιθάει 97.15, φτεῖ 82.15, δὲν κλεῖ 308.4, δὲν ἀναλεῖ 310.1. The O-stem conjugation has been reformed as a consonant/barytone paradigm (-όω > -ώνω),²⁸ e.g. ἀπουνεκρώνει 316.6, θανατώνει 190.1, θαμπώνει 64.20.

28 For a historical overview of these developments, see Horrocks (2010: 305–6, 313–16).

Active voice

- *Present*: in the third person singular in the A-stem paradigm there is considerable variation between the older ‘contracted’ endings and the innovative ‘uncontracted’ ones, e.g. βασιτᾶ 330.15, κολνᾶ 301.7, νικᾶ 7v(W215).15, σταματᾶ 383.17 ~ βασιτάει 158.8, βρωμάει 67.16, γεννάει 333.9, διγνάει 116.15, κολνάει 83.18, ξερνάει 71.12, περνάει 382.12. Furthermore, there is variation between older E-stem forms and analogical A-stem ones, e.g. ζητεῖ 338.13, ἔμπορεῖ 337.20, καλεῖ 335.12, κακοπαθεῖ 333.10, κρατεῖ 334.9, πουνεῖ 339.10 ~ ζητᾶ 337.14, κατοικᾶς 195.20 ~ ἀρρωστάει 137.15, ἀστοχάει 128.5–6, κινάει 332.15, κοιλοπονάει 337.18, ὠφελάγει 55.4, ὠφελάει 114.16. The second person singular is always contracted in -ᾶς and -εῖς, e.g. τρυπᾶς 295(W146).17, χαλᾶς 280.3, ~ ἔμπορεῖς 140.18, κρατεῖς 69.9, περπατεῖς 4v(W209).7, while the first person plural in -οῦμε, e.g. πουροῦμι 10v(W239).12. In the third person plural, variation exists between the older ending -οῦσι and the innovative -οῦν, e.g. γεννοῦσι 386.11, καρτεροῦσιν 148.12, πιπράσκουσι, ἦγον πουλοῦσι 7r(W214).3–4, ψοφοῦσιν 212.19 ~ νὰ ἀργαστοῦν 113.20, ὁμουλονγοῦν 128.3, νὰ χαθοῦν 194.19.
- *Imperfect*: in the third person singular one may observe the analogical accretion of barytone suffixes, e.g. ἐπαρράκαλειεν 336.
- *Imperative*: the variation between oxytone and barytone suffixes can also be found in the second person singular imperative: ρώτα 160.10, φύσα 61.2 ~ κράτει 68.9 et passim ~ θώρειε 56.1–2.

Passive voice

- *Present*: A-stem verbs form the third person singular in -ᾶται, e.g. γιᾶται (passim), κοιμᾶται 119.17, φοβᾶται 289.19, χασμᾶται 10v(W239).5, χασμουρᾶται 161.1, while the form -ιέται appears only once: γιέται 96.8. The third person plural exhibits the forms -οῦνται and -ῶνται for both A- and E- stems, e.g. γεννοῦνται 135.8, πουλοῦνται 12r(W242).10 ~ φοβῶ(ν)τι 318.11.
- *Imperfect*: there are no instances in the text.
- *Future formation*: the inherited monolectic Future appears in the text in higher-register passages copying astrological and brontological texts, which include predictions for the future: ἀναχωρήσει 412.17, ἐρημωθήσεται 414(W205).17, ἐλαττωθήσεται 17r(W222).20, τὰ δένδρη εὐφορήσουσι 17v(W223).18–19, ἕνας τὸν ἄλλον ἐπιβουλεύσουσι 18r(W224).14, τέξεται 334.10, οἱ ἀδικητάδεις τιμωρηθήσονται 386.7. In lower-register sections, including the iatrosophic parts proper, a variety of future periphrases is used instead. These include:

- (a) impersonal μέλλει + infinitive, e.g. μέλλει γενέσθαι 15r (W218.14), μέλλει ἀπολεσθεῖ 22v(W231).12;
 - (b) μέλλω + subjunctive, e.g. μέλλει νὰ γεννήσει 323.7, μέλλει τὸ φεγγάρι νὰ χαθεῖ 4r(W208).8;
 - (c) impersonal μέλλω + subjunctive, e.g. μέλλει φλεβοτομήσεις 161.6–7;
 - (d) θέλω + infinitive (the most common option), e.g. τὸν θέλει ψοφήσει 196.11, θέλουν χαλαζῶθεῖ 12r(W242).21, θέλουν γένει οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὀργίλοι 9v(W237).9, τὰς θέλουμεν γράψει W234.1, θέλουν ἐρημωθεῖ 17v(W223).16;
 - (e) θέλω + subjunctive, e.g. ὅταν θέλει νὰ κοιμηθεῖ 317.13;
 - (f) impersonal θέλω + subjunctive, e.g. δὲν θέλει εὐρεῖς 282.4;
 - (g) θέ + subjunctive, e.g. θε νὰ τὸ βγάξεις ἀπὸ τὴν φωτίαν 383.5.
- The Present tense may also be used with future reference, e.g. ἄλειφε τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ φυτρῶνον 303.9–10, δὸς πίνε καὶ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τῆς γεννάει 333.8–9.
- *Perfect and Pluperfect*: there are two only instances of Perfect formed with ἔχω + passive participle: ἔχον ἀνοιγμένα 140.21, ἔχουν φυλαγμένον καὶ ξαφρισμένον 100.2.
 - *Infinitive*: the infinitive is retained in future formations, e.g. θέλει ταραῖξει 9r(W236).6, θέλει ἔχει τιμὴν 12r(W242).6 (see earlier for further examples), but may also be found with imperatives, e.g. δὸς τρώγειν 99.9, δὸς γλείφειν 99.14; and with prepositions, e.g. περὶ τεκνοποιεῖν ἢ γυναῖκα 141.15.
 - *Participle*: the text displays a full array of active and passive participles. Active participles are inflected following conservative third declension patterns for the masculine and neuter, e.g. ὁ ἐστὶων τὸ μέλι 163.1–2, εἰς ἄρρωστον ἀγρυπνῶντα 155.10, τοῦ πάσχοντος 64.15, οἱ ἐν τροπικοῖς ἀγοράζοντες 7r(W214).2, οἱ ἀσθενοῦντες 22r(W231).19, ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς 163.20, ὁ ἐπὶ γῆς προτυπωθεὶς 291.4, μέλι τοῦ ἄρκοῦν 385.7, περὶ πράγματος ἀπωλισθέντος 13r(W244).9. Active feminine participles follow the first declension, e.g. ἀπουθνήσκουσα 7r(W214).4, εἰς ρίνα ρέουσα αἷμα 56.15, τὰς ρέουσας τρίχας 13v(W245).10, εἰς ἴμορροῦσα γυναῖκα 341.4, τῆς ἴμορροῦσας 341.7, ἡ δέσποινα ἡ τεκοῦσα 335.13–14. Once, a feminine form appears with a masculine participle, i.e. τρίχας πεσοῦντας 303.4, and there is also a single instance of an uninflected active gerund: ὠφελεῖ τοὺς γόφους πονῶντα 271(W116).16. Present tense passive participles occur rarely, e.g. ἐνσταζόμενος 13r(W245).17–18, τῆς λεγομένης ράμνος 333.4, ἡ καλουμένη χορηγὸς 21r(W248).7, κεφαλῆς ἀδικομένης 335.18. Most passive participles are in the Perfect tense, do not display reduplication, and are as a rule used as adjectives, e.g. ὁ πλευριτιμένος 114.15, κοιλία πρησμένη 195.15, ἀστέρα μελανέ, μελανωμένε 195.17–18, κρυωμένους καὶ πλευριτωμένους 21r(W248).1; πονιμένους ὁδόντας 21r(W248).5, ἀσθენημένη 341.10.

- *Copula*: the copula takes the form ἐστί(ν), εἰσὶν in the higher-register sections of the text, and εἶναι in the lower-register ones. The latter is an indication of the relatively recent dating of the text (forms such as ἐνι, ἔναι are absent).

1.3.3 Syntax

As mentioned above, the syntax of the text is simple and paratactic, consisting mainly of lists of items and short directives. However, it does display a number of subordinate clauses, such as:

- *Conditional*: Ἐὰν γενεῖ παιδί δὲν προκύβει εἰς ἄτυχη ἡμέρα· ἢ ν' ἀγοράσει δὲν πιτυχαίνει· νὰ στρατεύσει, στρέφεται κατασκυμένος· νὰ πανδρευτεῖ, ἀστοχάει· σπíti νὰ θεμελιώσῃ, δὲν στεριώνεται· καὶ ἀπλῶς εἰπέν, εἴτι δουλεία νὰ ἐπεχειριστεῖ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, δὲν προκύβει 128.4–7 ~ ἂν τιναχθεῖ ὁ σκύλος, δὲν πιθαίνει ὁ ἀσθενής, εἰδὲ καὶ ἀργήσῃ νὰ τιναχθεῖ, ἀρρουστᾷ πολλὰ, εἰδὲ δὲν τιναχθεῖ, ὀδεπουσῶς ἀπεθαίνει 140.13–15.
- *Temporal*: νίβε τοῦ πρόσουπον ὅταν ἔχει πανάδα 61.19 ~ ὁπότεν μέλλει νὰ γεννήσῃ, βάλε τα ἀπάνου 323.7 ~ Πόσις ἡμέρις εἶχεν ἡ σελήνη ὅταν ἐκατεκλίθη ὁ ἀσθενής 12r(W243).12 ~ καθὼς τοῦ δώσει μυρωδιά τοῦ δενδρουλίβανον, πάραυτα ψοφάει 320.11.
- *Causal*: νὰ μὴν τοῦ καταπίνε, ὅτι εἶναι καντερόν 86.3–4 ~ ἡ κοπριά τῆς κουρούνας εἶναι καλὴ πολλὰ, διότι ἰατρεύει τὰ βρομισμένα χνῶτα 67.15–16.
- *Final*: βάλε τοῦ μαστίχῃ καὶ τὸ λιβάνι διὰ νὰ μὴν καοῦν 309.20–310.21–1 ~ Ἰδοὺ γράφομεν περὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ πονηρῶν ζωδίων ἵνα γινώσκεις 10r(W238).12.
- *Relative*: τοῦ αἵμα ὁποῦ τρέχει 57.6 ~ ἓνα κακὸν τὸ ὅποῖον εἶναι κρύον καὶ ζεστόν 110.13 (see further examples under relative pronouns).

A syntactic feature that deserves special treatment is the expression of the indirect object, as it is of major importance for geographical localisation. The dative case was in a process of obsolescence since the Hellenistic period, and must have disappeared from spoken language by the end of the tenth century AD, being replaced, depending on the geographical region, by either the genitive or the accusative case.²⁹ The dative case is, nevertheless, ‘artificially’ retained in written language until very late. MS.MSL.4103 does retain a few such instances of the dative case (e.g. εἶπεν αὐτῷ 336.3), although mainly in prepositional phrases, e.g. ἐν τῷ Κριῷ 412.1, ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ 148.17, ἐν τῇ φούσκᾳ 277(W122).17. However, the indirect object is mostly

²⁹ For an overview of this phenomenon, its geographical distribution, and its variable attestation in Medieval and Early Modern texts, see Lendari and Manolessou (2003); for the modern distribution, see Manolessou and Beis (2006).

expressed through the genitive case, in variation with the accusative.³⁰ Examples include: δὸς παρθένον κορίτσι 337.16, δὸς τὸν πάσχοντα νὰ πίνει 111.14, δὸς πίνει ὅποιον τὸν πουνεῖ ὁ λαίμῳς 84.11–12, ἔδουκας αὐτὴν τὸν υἱὸν 324.17 ~ δὸς τοῦ πάσχοντος 64.15, δὸς ὕπνον τοῦ νηπίου 157.5, εἰπέ της 338.10. Sometimes variation occurs even within the same clause, e.g. δὸς αὐτὴν σπέρμα ὥσπερ τῆς ἀγίας Ἄννης 324.19. To a certain extent, this variation may be attributed to the multiple sources the scribe is copying from. But insofar as it also depends on his native idiom, it constitutes an indication of geographical provenance. The accusative case is characteristic of Asia Minor and Northern Greece as far as Thessaly, whereas genitive indirect objects characterise southern Greece including Epirus and Sterea Ellas, as well as the islands (Crete, Cyclades, Heptanese). The combination of northern vocalism with genitive indirect objects in our texts makes areas such as Macedonia, Thessaly, and Thrace less likely places of origin, and points instead to Epirus and Sterea Ellas. This is congruent with morphological indications, such as the adjectives in -γος mentioned above, as well as with lexical idiosyncracies (see p. 84), which can be attributed to the dialect of Epirus.

1.3.4 Vocabulary

The vocabulary of MS.4103 is of mixed provenance, and belongs to different registers. The bulk of the lexical material is common to all varieties of Greek, but one may additionally distinguish loanwords from various languages, and Greek words of a regional/dialectal character.

We should initially make a distinction between loanwords belonging to the specialised botanical/medical vocabulary and loanwords belonging to common everyday speech, as the former may have been copied from the text's model(s) or even from a glossary of iatrosophic terms [see e.g. the glossary of Nikolaos Hieropais, ed. Delatte (1939: 393–417)]. The scarcity of loanwords from Italian and the many loanwords from Turkish clearly indicate that the text originates from an area under Ottoman rule. A rough picture of the loan vocabulary, giving an idea of words of Turkish origin, can be gleaned from the list below:³¹

- *Italian/Romance*: ἀγκουσεύομαι (=suffer), βενέτικος, ζάρω (<usare), φουρτούνα (=heavy sea), πότζα (<bozza=bottle), σαλτάρω (<saldare)

30 In many instances of masculine and neuter indirect objects, it is difficult to discern which case is intended, as the letter forms of <v> and <u> can be frustratingly similar in this manuscript.

31 For the etymological investigation of loanwords the following works were consulted: ILNE and ILNE archive; Andriotis (1974); Andriotis (1990); Bongas (1964/66); Kriaras, *Epit.*; Kriaras, *Lex.*; LKN; Meyer (1894); Minas (2012); Papahagi (1974); Redhouse (1968); Tselikas (2012).

=become healed). Special botanical/medical terms: βεντούζα (=cupping), κάντιο (<Ital. *candi*<Arab. *quandī*=sugar), καρτάνα (=quartan fever), μαλαφράντζα/μαλαθράντζα/μαλιφράντζα (<*male di Francia*=syphilis), μπετόνικα (=betonica), πιρούλα (<*pilula*=pill), (μέλι) ροζάδο (=containing flower petals), ρουσμαρίνι (<*rosmarino*=rosemary), τριμεντίνα (=turpentine), φουντανέλλα (=cautery). Some of these are obviously adopted from Agapios Landos' *Geoponikon*, parts of which are paraphrased in the text.

- *Turkish (and Arabic, Persian introduced through Turkish)*: αφιόνι (<*afyon*=opium), γιαράς (<*yara*=wound), δράμι, ζουλάπι (<*cülâb*=julep),³² κατερποντζίκι (<*katir boncuğu*=cowrie shell), κατράνι (<*katran*=tar), μασούρι, ματζιούνι,³³ μπακίρ, νισεστέ, πάζι (<*pazi*), παζάρι, ρακί, σαλκάνι (<*şalgam*=turnip), σιρούπι,³⁴ στου(μ)πέτσι (<*üstübeç*=white lead), τσιαρσί (<*çarşı*=marketplace), τέντζερες, τσιρίσι (<*çirîş*=asphodel gum), τσεκιρδέκι (<*çekirdek*=fruit seed, weight measure), τσινι (<*çini*=glazed), τσόχα, φλιτζάνι/φιλτζιάνι, χαλβάς, χαραρέτι (<*hararet*=fever), σιχάνι (<*sahan*), χοκάς (<*hokka*=cup, pot), χουζουρεύω.

Special botanical/medical terms: άρσινπé (<*hiyarşembe*=cassia), γιβερτζιλέ (<*güherçile*=potassium nitrate), (γ)κιούλσουι (<*gülsuyu*=rosewater), έγερ ότ (<*eğir oti*=sweet flag grass), έφθιμόν (<*eftimun*=clover dodder<Greek έπίθυμον), έφσεντίν (<*efsentin*=wormwood), ζάμι (<*zamki*=gum), ζουπιλ χοντί (<*sümbül hindi*=Indian hyacinth, *Hyacinthus orientalis*), κακουλε (<*kakule*=cardamom), καρά χιλιλέ (<*karahalilen*=black myrobalan), καραγκιολούκι (<*karagünlük*=*Styrax officinalis*), κασνι (<*kasni*=galbanum), κιαμπάπé (<*kübbabe*=cubeb pepper), καλέμ κικούρτι (<*kalem kükürt*, *kükürt*=sulphur), κερεβίζ τοχρίμ (<*kerefs*=celery, *tohum*=seed), μαχμουτέ (<*mahmude*=scammony), μιάμπαλη (<*meyan balı*=liquorice extract), μουρσάφι (<*mür*=myrrh, *saf*=pure, clear; pure myrrh), μουρτασάνι (<*mürdeseng*=litharge, lead monoxide), μοχούρ μεργιέμ (<*buhur Meryem*=cyclamen), μπεζέρ πέτζι (<*bezr*= seed, *benc*=henbane), μπελεσάν τοχομού (<*belesan tohumu*=balsam seed), νισιατίρι (<*nişadır*=sal ammoniac, ammonia), πές πάς (<*besbase*=mace of nutmegs), πουχούρι (<*buhur*=incense), ραβέντι (<*ravend*=rhubarb), ραζιανά (<*rezene*=fennel), σαρι χιλιλέ/χελιλέν (<*sari helile*=yellow myrobalan), σεργαγάνι (<*şırlağan*=sesame oil), ταρτζίν (<*tarçin*=cinnamon), ταριφίλφιλ (<*darifülful*=long pepper, piper longus), τζιβίτι χιντι (<*cevzi hindi*=coconut), τζιαμσακίζι (<*çam sakızı*=pine resin), τζιντζιφίλι

32 Due to its early attestations (see LBG, s.v. ζουλάπιον), it is possible that this word was introduced directly from Arabic.

33 A direct Persian origin could be claimed for ματζούνι/ματζιούνι, since it is attested in Greek medical treatises well before the Ottoman period [see e.g. Kousis (1939: 211–17)], although its introduction into everyday language must have taken place through Turkish.

34 Alternatively, one could ascribe the introduction of σιρούπι to the mediation of Italian *siropo* rather than Turkish *şurup*.

(<zencefil=ginger), τζιρò òτ (<zire=black cumin – | ot=grass, herb, weed), τορπουòτ/τουρπουòτ (<turp=radish or türbit=turpeth, a laxative), τζιβίζι πεβà (<cevzi bevvà=nutmeg), τιζερτιτζιάφι/ζερτιζάφι (<zerdecav=turmeric, *Curcuma longa*), τιμìρ χιντι (<demir hindi=tamarind), χαβελτζιαν (<havlican, havlincan=galingale), χασχάσι (<haşhaş=poppy).

- *Slavic*: (γ)κουστερίτσα/σκουτέρα (Bulg., Serb. *gušter-ica*=lizard), κουκόσια (<serb. *kokoška*=walnut), λοβοδία (Bulg., Serb. *loboda*=*Chenopodium rubrum*), μπρουσκιανή (Bulg., Serb. *brusljan*=ivy), τσέργα (Bulg. *cerga*, Alb. *tšerge*=blanket); for some words the Slavic origin is contestable (γαρδαβίτσα/μανδραβίτσα, στουμπίζω, τσίπα,³⁵ τσουκάλι).
- *Albanian*: (γ)κορτσία (<*gorrice*), σιγκούνι (<*šigun*=coat), σκρουμπούνι (<σκραῶμπος< *škrump*=charred matter), (μ)πότσικα (<*botške*=squill, *Urginea maritima*), and possibly λουλούδι (of contested etymology, Alb. *lule* or Latin *lillium*).
- *Aromanian*: μαρκάτη (<*merkat*=buttermilk), μπράσκα (<*broască*=toad).

A number of Greek or foreign words found in our text have a distinct dialectal/regional colouring in Modern Greek as they are restricted to specific ‘northern’ dialects. These are the following: βέντζα (=Venetian sumac, Sterea Ellas, Euboea), κατεκνία (=fog, Sterea Ellas, Thessaly, Euboea), κουκόσια (Epirus, Macedonia), λοβοδία (Epirus, Macedonia), μανδραβίτσα (=wart, Epirus, Macedonia), μαρκάτη (Epirus, Macedonia), μούχλη/μούχλι (=mist, Epirus), μπράσκα (part of Sterea Ellas, part of Epirus, Thessaly), (μ)πρέκνα (=freckles, Epirus, Thessaly, Macedonia, Thrace, Sterea Ellas), μπότσικα (Epirus, Sterea Ellas), μπρουσκιανή (Thessaly, Macedonia), τρέβλα (=purslane, Sterea Ellas, Thessaly, Macedonia), τσέργα (Epirus, Thessaly, Macedonia, Sterea Ellas, Thrace), τυροκόμος (=Egyptian vulture, neophron percnopterus; Thessaly, parts of Western Macedonia), χαμόρυγας (=mole, Epirus, Heptanese, Thessaly, Macedonia, in various forms).

A telling indication of the text’s geographical ‘naturalisation’ to a northern idiom, especially the area of Sterea Ellas, is the following passage which constitutes a paraphrase of a chapter from Landos’ *Geoponikon*. The content and structure of the original has been retained but its phonology has been affected by the ‘northern vowel raising’, while typical Cretan vocabulary has been replaced by local dialectal words (ἀβορδακός, ρόσπος → μπράσκα ‘toad’).

35 Again, it is possible to argue for an Arabic origin for this loanword; see Bouras-Vallianatos (2018: 182).

Agaprios Landos, *Geoponikon*,
ed. Kostoula (1991: 239)

MS.4103, pp. 300–1

Εἶναι τινὲς βάθρακοι μεγάλοι, ὡσὰν τὲς Εἶναι βαθράκοι μεγάλοι ὡσὰν σοπιές, σουπίες, καὶ δὲν εἶναι εἰς τὸ νερόν, καὶ δὲν εἶναι εἰς τοῦ νερόν ὡσὰν τοὺς ὡσὰν τοὺς ἄλλους ἀβορδακοὺς, ἀλλὰ ἄλλους βαθράκους, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ χῶμα εἰς τὸ χῶμα κρύπτονται καὶ ὀνομάζονται μπράσκis· κρύπτονται, καὶ ὀνομάζονται μπράσκis· νται φράγκικα ρόσποι. Ἀπὸ τούτους ἀπὸ τούτους ξήρανέ του<ς> εἰς τὸν ξήρανε εἰς τὸν φοῦρνον, κάμε τους φοῦρνον, κάμε τους ὡσὰν ἀλεύρι καὶ σκόνην. Ἐπειτα πρῶτον μὲν ἄλειφε τὴν πρῶτας ἄλειφε τὴν κεφαλὴ τοῦ κασι- κεφαλὴν μὲ ροδολάδιν καὶ τότε βάνε διάρη || μὲ ρουδόλαδον, καὶ τότες βάλε ἀπάνω αὐτὴν τὴν σκόνην, ὕστερα σκέ- τοῦ ἀλεύρι τῆς πράσκας ἀπάνου εἰς τοῦ παζε τὴν κεφαλὴν μὲ φούσκα χοίρου κεφάλι, καὶ ἀπάνου βάλε σφούγγα καὶ ἃς κάμη ἔτσι δύο ἡμέρας. Ἐπειτα χοίρου, καὶ ἃς κάμη ἡμέρας -2- καὶ ἔβγαλε τὴν φούσκα καὶ πλύνε τὴν ὕστρια ἃς πλύνε τοῦ κεφάλι του μὲ τοῦ κεφαλὴν τοῦ κασιδιάρη μὲ τὸ κάτουρόν κάτουρόν του δύοου τρεῖς φορὲς τὴν του δύο τρεῖς φορὲς τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ ἡμέρα, καὶ ἃς τὸ κάμη πέντι ἔξι φορὲς οὕτω κάμη πεντέξι φορὲς νὰ ἀλείφῃσαι καὶ γιαινει, νὰ πλένεται καὶ ν' καὶ νὰ πλύνῃσαι, ὡς ἄνωθεν, ἔως νὰ ἀλείφεται. ὑγιάνης τέλεια.

2 MS.MSL.14

The following analysis of the language of MS.MSL.14 is based both on digital photographs (pp. 18–71, 73–6, 82–189, 191–317 of the codex),³⁶ and on the parts of the codex available in modern editions [*Iatrosophion* by John Archiatros, version ω, manuscript L, pp. 108–271, ed. Zipser (2009) 171–329; also Zipser (2008: 132–3, 2013: 257–8, 261, 264)], collated against the available photographs.³⁷ The codex contains several texts of different provenance, dating, and linguistic register and therefore does not present a homogeneous linguistic profile; nevertheless, they all belong to a higher or middle register, with occasional appearance of vernacular features. The highest concentration of vernacular features is observed in the *Iatrosophion* section, which occupies the larger part of MS.MSL.14. The codex is composite, consisting of two distinct parts (A and B, or L and I), which correspond to two different manuscripts bound together at some early point. Both parts have been localised to fourteenth-century Cyprus on the basis of palaeographic evidence [see Zipser (2009: 15–16); (2013: 251–2)]. The linguistic investigation of the texts

36 Photographs kindly provided by Petros Bouras-Vallianatos.

37 For a description of the manuscript and its contents, see Bouras-Vallianatos (2015: 283–6); see also Nutton and Zipser (2010) and Zipser (2009: 15–17).

contained in the codex has not revealed any features of a specifically Cypriot provenance, (or even/indeed of any other dialectical area), as will be explained below. This investigation is at times inhibited by the editorial practices adopted in the extant editions (mainly of the *Iatrosophion*), which often do not offer an accurate linguistic picture.

The main problem lies in the levelling of the text's linguistic profile through massive but non-systematic editorial intervention, which consists in normalisation towards an undefined form of 'Modern Greek' alongside a self-admitted 'conversion back to the classical form' of words [Zipser (2009: 346)]. This 'standardisation' is not always recoverable from the apparatus criticus (as the changes are not consistently recorded), or the Appendix, which gives a list of the words affected without providing specific textual references that would allow one to gauge the extent of the obscured or erased phenomena.

Another problem is the inconsistent, even incomprehensible, spelling and word division system adopted at times by the editor, especially in the case of lower-register/vernacular elements. Examples include: (a) erroneous spelling or accentuation, e.g. ὑδρώνουσι for ἰδρώνουσι, μαλία for μαλλία (192.2 et passim), νήστικον for νηστικὸν 197.12, κουκουναρία for κουκουνάρια 198.17, νέφρα for νεφρά 181.19, μὴ δειπνας for μὴ δειπνᾷς 198.22; ζώντανα for ζωντανὰ 199.12; πλευρά for πλευρὰ 200.15; (b) word division: either one word written as two, e.g. αὐγοῦ τζικὸν 202.13–14, ὀλίγου τζικὸν 237.9, πλέο τερί τζην 252.8–9, instead of αὐγούτσικον, ὀλιγούτσικον, πλεοτερίτσιν; or two words written as one, e.g. λυθρινάριαστακοί 199.14; or erroneous word division, e.g. οὐ τάδε ποιεῖ instead of οὗτα δὲ ποιεῖ 180.5;³⁸ (c) unnecessary 'remedy' of rather regular phonetic changes, e.g. syncope: κορυφᾶς for κορφᾶς (189.18, 189.20); aphaeresis: δι' ἐκεῖνα for διὰ κεῖνα (264.16); non-etymological vowels at word boundaries: e.g. ἡστίαν (=ἰστίαν) corrected to ἐστίαν (178.8); raising due to velar environment, e.g. κουκκία corrected to κοκκία 213.9, σκουλήκια (σκουλίκια ms) corrected to σκολήκια 309.18.

Morphological interventions include: πότισε corrected to πότισον 284.14–15, χωρέση corrected to χωρήση 186.12, ὠφελεθεῖ (ὠφελεθῇ ms.) corrected to ὠφεληθῇ 191.21, ἄν γένει (ἄν γένη ed.) corrected to ἄν γένοιτο 222.14, δύναται ἀκούση (=ἀκούσει, innovative Aorist infinitive) to δύναται ἀκούσαι 187.3, ἀχέλιν ζῶντα 282.3 corrected to ἐγγελιν ζῶντα (probably due to non-recognition of the innovative neuter singular participle form ζῶντα =τὸζῶν), ἃς γένηται for ἃς ἐγένη 263.5–6.

We can begin by discussing the manuscript's geographical provenance, to the extent that this can be revealed through its language. The first and basic observation is that the text of MS.MSL.14 (or of version ω of the *Iatrosophion* for that matter) cannot be considered 'dialectal' [*pace* Zipser (2009: 14)] under any definition of the term. It belongs to a middle register of

38 For the attested but non-standard neuter plural form οὗτα of the pronoun οὗτος, αὐτή, τοῦτο, see Holton et al. (2019, vol. II: 969).

Medieval Greek retaining several archaic elements, presenting a certain amount of variation, and without any local colouring. Judging from other published texts, it resembles strongly the language of the text of Parisinus gr. 2315, published by Émile Legrand [(1881: 1–17); commonly known as *Iatrosophion of Staphidas*], being perhaps slightly more conservative.

There are no features specific to the Cypriot dialect in the language of MS.MSL14. First, Cypriot phonetic phenomena are absent, especially the characteristic gemination of consonants. A check of typical words presenting the so-called innovative ‘spontaneous gemination’³⁹ such as μύττη, ἀπίδια, αἰσθάννεται, θέττε, has revealed that they are regularly spelt with a single consonant in both parts of the codex. On the contrary, such geminate spellings do occur with relative frequency in another witness of the *Iatrosophion*, namely Monacensis gr. 288.⁴⁰ Examples from Monacensis include: πίννη (=πίνει) ff. 10r, 10v, 48r, 48v, 49r; μύττη(v) ff. 10v, 24v, 37v; 76v; ἄπλωννέ τα ff. 13r, 24r; ἀπλώννη f. 42r; τῆς παλλιουρέας ff. 16v, 73v; μαρούλλια f. 43r; σκύλλοι f. 58v; σκυλλόπουλλα f. 59v. Second, the text of MS.MSL.14 displays a complete absence of recognisably Cypriot inflectional suffixes and local vocabulary, as well as absence of French loanwords. Finally, the systematic expression of the indirect object through the accusative and not the genitive case (e.g. τὰ ἄλλα τὰ σὲ εἶπα 178.7), as is regular of Cypriot since its earliest attestations [see Lendari and Manolessou (2003)], is yet another indication that the text’s provenance is not Cypriot.

The linguistic analysis of the text is further complicated by factors similar to those discussed in the case of MS.4103 above, namely the mixture or registers deriving from the transposition of an older, higher-register text to a lower register (which cannot, however, be equated to everyday language), and the limited grammatical and semantic range of the text, which consists mostly of paratactic lists and short imperative directives. The first of these factors is responsible for the phonetic and morphological variation to be found in MS.MSL.14 and the second for the lack of data concerning many slots of the nominal and verbal paradigms, as well as syntactic features (Past, Perfect and Future forms, first and second persons, complex sentences etc.).

Keeping in mind the above restrictions, we attempt below to provide a linguistic description, first, and in greater detail, of the section containing the *Iatrosophion* (which, as described above, occupies the greater part

39 For the phenomenon see Holton et al. (2019: 135–7).

40 The text of Monacensis gr. 288 was collated from the online digital photographs provided by the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, at <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0004/bsb00049972/images/index.html> (accessed, 1 March 2019). The geminate spellings are not recorded in the edition’s apparatus criticus, only in the Appendix in the list of ‘Words standardized to classical spelling’ [Zipser (2009: 343–5)], but without textual references or specifications as to which witness of the text they are taken from.

Figure 4.3 Londiniensis Wellcomensis MS.MSL.14, pp. 182–3.

Photograph by Petros Bouras-Vallianatos.

of MS.MSL.14 and exhibits the highest frequency of vernacular features), and, second, of the other parts of the codex to which access was available.

2.1 Detailed linguistic analysis of MS.MSL.14: *Iatrosophion* by John Archiatrios

As is the case with many texts of the period, the language of the *Iatrosophion* as transmitted in MS.MSL.14 presents a certain degree of variation. Typical instances include: the omnipresent alternation of the third person plural endings -ουν and -ουσιν, the contrast between conservative Aorist imperative in -ον and the innovative analogical ending -ε (e.g. βράσον vs. βράσε), the presence or absence of reduplication in the passive Perfect participle (e.g. τετριμμένα vs. τριμμένα), and feminine endings -έα vs. -ία (occasionally with hypercorrections, e.g. κορασέαν 266.23, σκουρέαν 275.2).⁴¹

⁴¹ Textual references are to the edited text [Zipser (2009)] by page and line number; the readings were checked against the manuscript.

2.1.1 Phonology

A VOWELS

An indication of the relatively early dating of the text is the absence of synizesis in sequences where the first vowel is stressed, e.g. βυζία, κοιλία, κουκκία, ούγγια. On the other hand, a number of innovative features involving vowels appear in this text:

- *Raising of [o] to [u] next to velar and nasal consonants:* e.g. σκουλήκια 309.18 (σκολήκια ed.), ρουθούνι 189.2, κουκκία 181.7, κουρούνα 232.1.
- *Backing of [i] to [u]:* e.g. ἀξούγγι (passim); φλούδιν 182.3, φούσκα 200.9, and the hypercorrection λυπινάρια 182.16.
- *Change of [i] to [e]:* e.g. σιδέρου 185.3, τῆς ἐτέας 180.16 (ιτέας ed.).
- *Deletion of initial vowel:* e.g. στέον 230.13 (ὄστουν ed.), ψάριν 179.10.
- *Non-etymological vowels in initial position:* ιστίαν 178.9 (ἐστίαν ed.), ἀχέλιν 282.3 (ἐγγελυν ed.).

B CONSONANTS

The most obvious phenomenon affecting consonants is the retention and addition of final [n] in inflectional suffixes, e.g. βραδὺν (βραδὺ ed.) 199.2, κατοῦρημαν (κατοῦρημα ed.) 200.10, στόμαν (στόμα ed.) 278.3, ὀξύγαλαν (ὀξύγαλα ed.) 262.13. A relatively frequent phenomenon is the interchange of the liquid consonants [l] and [r], e.g. ἔμπραστρον 193.8 (ἐμπλαστρον ed.), βαρσαμέλαιον 230.9, τὰ λεγόμενα παρὰ τῶν ιδιωτῶν ἐρμίγῃα παρὰ δὲ τῶν ἱατρῶν ἔλμινθας 290.3–4, εὐφόλβιον (=εὐφόρβιον) 209.9, τὰ λυθρινάρια 199.14. Another vernacular feature is the deletion of intervocalic [ɣ/j] in the inflection of the verb τρώγω, e.g. ἄς τὰ τρώει 298.1. There are no traces of the phenomenon of palatalisation of velar consonants (tsitakismos) which could have constituted an indication of Cypriot provenance. Similarly, the phenomenon of manner dissimilation in consonant clusters is almost totally absent, i.e. the sequences [kt] and [xθ] are not changed to [xt], and the sequences [pt] and [fθ] are not changed to [ft]. An exception is the sequence [sx] which does present dissimilation to [sk], albeit very rarely, e.g. ἄς μοσκέψει (μοσχεύση ed.) 218.12, βλησκοῦνιν 222.8.

2.1.2 Morphology

The general picture presented is conservative, but with a number of innovative variable features.

A NOMINAL

Nominal inflection can be described in terms of the traditional distinction of first, second, and third declension. Among the innovative features one can mention the following:

- The genitive singular of feminines in -α is -ας, e.g. θύννας 322.9, κουρούνας 232.4–5, ρίζας 215.8, σκρόφας 237.18. As far as consonant-stem nouns are concerned (former third declension), one can detect a tendency towards levelling, e.g. ἀσπίδα (nominative) 281.16, ἡ σπλήνα 203.8, τὴν σπλήναν 203.4, κέρατον αἶγας 210.1, τὴν ρίναν 227.14, τὴν χεῖραν 321.11; hypercorrection αἱ τρίχαι 217.7, 218.6, 219.1.
- The very rare occurrence of -ες instead of -ας in the feminine nominative and accusative plural, e.g. ἡμέρες 245.11, τέσσαρες φορὲς 268.16–7 (φοραῖς ed.).
- In the second declension, the appearance of neuters in -iv instead of -ιον, e.g. κρασίν, ἀλεύριν, ὀξίδιν (passim).
- The innovative inflectional class of feminine nouns in -ού, e.g. genitive ἀλωποῦς 243.9.
- Some neuter nouns present the inflectional forms of the third declension s-stems, e.g. τὸ οὔρος 187.18, τὰ οὔλη 189.16.
- In adjectival inflection the greatest interest is presented by the small category of adjectives in -ύς, which exhibits various innovative forms, e.g. δριμέου χυμοῦ 235.3, χυμούς παχέους 265.18, ἡ ὀδύνη τῆς κεφαλῆς ὀξέα γίνεται 252.2, νὰ ἐνι παχέα 267.1, γλυκὺ κρασίν 247.4, γλυκέου γάλακτος 204.9, ὄξους δριμέου 262.13, ἀμύγδαλα γλυκέα 247.17, τὰ δριμέα πάντα 117.13, 178.15.
- In the pronominal domain, a vernacular feature of the text is the presence of weak forms of personal and possessive pronouns (clitics), which follow specific rules of placement,⁴² e.g. ἅπλωνέ τα εἰς τὸ πανὶν καὶ θέτε τα εἰς τὴν σπλήναν 203.3–4, ἃς τὴν τρώγει 283.13–14, ἔδειπέν τον ὁ ἥλιος 228.16, τῶν κοκκίων τους 259.21, αἱ μασχάλοι των 261.10. Another interesting, typically medieval, feature is the definite article as a relative pronoun, e.g. μετὰ τὸ ἔλαιον τὸ ἀπομένει εἰς τὸ λυχνάριον 222.15, ἐκεῖνο τὸ ρέει ἐνι παχὺν (παχὺ ed.) 229.15, ἃς ἀπέχει καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ εἶπα 178.7. Relative clauses are also introduced by the uninflected relative adverb ὁπού, e.g. τοῦ ἀρρώστου ὁπού ἔχει τὰς ἐξωγάδας 207.15–6, γυναῖκα ὁπού δὲν δύναται νὰ γεννήσει 285.7, τὸ πάθος ὁπού (ὅπου ms., που ed.) ἐνι εἰς τὰ βυζία 260.14. Ὅπου can also introduce indefinite headless relative clauses, e.g. ὁπού κατουρεῖ αἷμα, ποιήσον θεραπείαν τοιαύτην 316.4.

Of course, the text presents a wide range of ancient relative pronouns, such as: κρόκον ὃν βάνωσιν 178.1, τὸ πέπερι ὃν τρώγομεν 263.9 (note the analogical final -v in the neuter); ἣν καλοῦσιν οἱ ἱατροὶ ἐκτικόν 253.3–4, τοιαῦτα ἄτινα ὀνομάζουσι θερμὰ 257.2. Note also the presence of the indefinite pronoun εἴτις, e.g. πρὸς εἴτινος ἀνθρώπου ὁ κῶλος ἐβγαίνει 323.6, ξερὰ εἴτι ἐὰν φάγει 193.21, εἴτι (ἦτοι ed.) πρᾶγμα ψυχρὸν 267.11; the unverbated form

42 See Mackridge (1993); Pappas (2004).

τίποτε, e.g. νὰ μὴν ἔχει τίποτε λιπαρότητα 206.2, ἐὰν δὲ ἄλλο τίποτε πέσει 186.10, ἃς προσέχει δὲ μὴ τρώγει τίποτε παστὰ ἢ κρέας ἢ ὀψάρια 265.1; and the residual form ὅπερ, e.g. τοιοῦτον ὅπερ ἔχουσι οἱ ἱατροί, ὅπερ καλεῖται ὠτικὸν 184.21–2.

B VERBAL

A conservative feature of the text consists in the retention of forms of -μι conjugation, e.g. συνίστανται 173.19. In the barytone conjugation (verbs in -ω) the only forms attested are the third person singular and plural, except in conditional clauses, e.g. ἐὰν θέλεις, ἐὰν ἔχεις. As already mentioned, the third person plural varies between -ουν and -ουσιν, e.g. ἃς βράσουν 180.1, ἔχουν 197.11, πιάνουν 229.3, βλέπουσι (βλέπωσι ed.) 215.15, πίπτουσιν 217.17, ρέουσιν 185.16, and the difference between the indicative and the subjunctive is purely orthographic. In the oxytone conjugation (verbs in -ῶ) the ending -οῦσι(ν)/-ῶσι(ν) dominates over -οῦν, e.g. ἀνορεκτοῦσιν 262.15, βρωμοῦσι 261.14, κατασχισθῶσι 270.16, πηδῶσι 225.5.

The expression of the subjunctive through the particles νὰ and ἃς is fully developed and constitutes one of the typical markers of lower linguistic register. In the imperative the second person always ends in -ε in the Present (e.g. ἄλειφε 190.13, δένε 189.2, θέτε 189.4, τρίβε 198.11), while it varies between -ε and -ον in the Aorist, e.g. τάραξέ το καὶ στάξον 186.16, βράσον 187.10, βρέξε 192.20, καῦσε 188.18. Similarly, oxytone imperatives end in -α for a-stem verbs and -ει for e-stem verbs, e.g. ἐμφύσα 189.1, κράτει 191.12, οἰκονόμει 225.9, ποίει 223.11.

In the passive voice, there is no difference between the indicative and the subjunctive, and only the third person singular and plural are attested. The third person plural ends in -ονται: γίνονται 231.4. The passive imperative ends in -ου: κτενίζου 219.6, μυρίζου 228.6.

Past forms are very rare, e.g. εἶπα 178.7, εἶπον 223.3, ἐχώνευσεν 226.4, ἔδειπεν 229.9, ἔπεσαν 235.8; οἱ πάλοι τοῦτο ἐποιοῦσαν (ἐποίουσαν ed.), εἶχασιν 267.2. The Future is expressed through the periphrasis θέλω + infinitive, e.g. εἰς μίαν αὐτὸν δὲ θέλεις νοήσῃν 225.1–2, θέλει γεννήσῃν 285.9. The Perfect and the Pluperfect are not attested. The infinitive is mostly replaced by νὰ clauses, e.g. ἐνδέχεται δὲ τούτοις ἵνα στάξεις εἰς τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν 184.14, ἐὰν θέλεις ἵνα αὐξήσουν αἱ τρίχαι 218.11, ἐὰν θέλεις νὰ ποιήσεις ξανθὰς τρίχας 219.7, but it is preserved in future periphrases.

In the domain of the participle, most of the classical forms are retained, e.g. active participles of the Present and the Aorist, such as ἐκζέσας 177.17, ἐνώσας 181.4, κοπανίσας 185.20; and, of course, the passive Perfect participle, usually without reduplication, e.g. βρεμένον 213.13, γαμημένην 267.3, κοπανισμένα 193.14, φύλλα ξηρὰ τετριμμένα καὶ πέπερι τριμμένον 264.3. The

innovative uninflected active gerund in -όντα(ς), -οντα(ς) is not attested, but there are a few instances of the ending -όντα, -οντα of the uninflected active participle, e.g. ἀχέλιν ζόντα (neuter) 282.3.

The copula appears only in the third singular and plural. The most frequent form is ἐνι, but one may also find ἔναι, ἔναιν, ἐστί, εἰσί, and εἶναι.

2.1.3 Syntax

As discussed above, the syntax of this text is relatively simple and paratactic, presenting mostly short main clauses in the imperative. However, one may also find relative clauses (see relative pronouns above), conditional clauses, and some temporal clauses, e.g. ὅταν κατουρεῖ καὶ στάζει ὀλιγούτισκον 199.7–8, ὅταν πρησθεῖ τὸ ὄλον σῶμα 201.19, ἀφότου διάβουν δέκα ἡμέρες 245.11, ἐὰν δὲ οὐδὲν ὠφελεθεῖ (ὠφεληθῇ ed.) 191.21.

An important syntactic feature of the text is the replacement of the dative case by the accusative in the functions of the indirect object and the ethical/personal dative, which, as already mentioned, speaks against any hypothesis of a Cypriot origin for this text. Examples: καὶ αὐτὸ εἶπα σε πῶς σκευάζεται 265.19, δὸς τα ἄλλην γυναῖκα 288.8, δὸς αὐτὴν καὶ ἃς τὸ φορεῖ 300.12; εἰδὲ φαίνεται τὸν 224.3, ἐὰν συμβεῖ τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἐγγαστρωμένην 288.13.

Two more vernacular features are: the negation οὐδὲν and μηδὲν instead of οὐ and μὴ with which they alternate, e.g. ἐὰν δὲ οὐδὲν ὠφελεθεῖ (ὠφεληθῇ ed.) 191.21, ἵνα μηδὲν ξερᾷ 300.14, and the repetition of the definite article with an adjective preceding the noun, e.g. εἰς τὸν μικρὸν τὸν δάκτυλον 202.21.

2.1.4 Vocabulary

Another indication of the text's relatively early date is the virtual absence of loanwords of Italian and Turkish provenance.⁴³ The totality of the lexical material is inherited Greek with the expected early Latin loans, e.g. ἄσπρος, ἄξούγγι, ἐξάγιον, σακελλίζω, and isolated Slavic loans, e.g. πέστροβα, τσουκάλι (of contested origin).

There are many interesting items in the vocabulary of the text; nevertheless, these are not unique to manuscript MS.MSL.14, but belong to the vocabulary of version ω in general, or even to version κ as well.⁴⁴ Some of

43 The lexical investigation was based on: Andriotis (1990); *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, at <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/> (accessed, 1 March 2019); LBG; Kriaras, *Lex.*; Kriaras, *Epit.*; ILNE – ILNE archive.

44 On versions κ and ω of the *Iatrosophion*, the witnesses, and sigla see Zipser (2009: 6–7, 13–19, 53).

these words are, so far, only attested in this group of texts, as well as closely related manuscripts, especially the so-called *Iatrosophion of Staphidas* (Parisinus gr. 2315),⁴⁵ e.g. ἀκρόαγουρος, ἀκρόξανθος, λούξικας, πέστρουβα/πέστροφα, καυλώνω, ὀρνιθερός. For another set of words and forms, MS.MSL.14 comprises the earliest known source to date, e.g. ἀβγοῦτσικον, γαῖδάρα, γαληνούτσικα, κλουκουνίζω, μαγκούνα, πλεοτερίτσιν, τυρώνω, τσουκαλόπουλο, φαγώνομαι.

2.2 Detailed linguistic analysis of MS.MSL.14: other sections

As mentioned above, the other sections of MS.MSL.14 belong to a middle or higher register and exhibit fewer vernacular elements and less variation than the *Iatrosophion* by John Archiatros. Since the linguistic profile of these texts is not unified, and since they are quite short (something which does not permit a detailed description), the following discussion will consist of a small textual sample for each section, accompanied by a brief linguistic comment concentrating on the vernacular features.⁴⁶

2.2.1 Anonymous collection of remedies [pp. 18–34]

- (i) [pp. 19–20] Περί κυπρίνου στέατος. Κυπρίνου τὸ στέαρ σὺν τῷ ἥπαρ καπνιζόμενα δαίμονας διώκει. Κυπρίνου χολή πᾶσαν ἀμαύρωσιν ἰᾷται ἐγγριομένη. Κυπρίνου στέαρ συνουσίας ἐστὶν ὀρμητικόν· ἐάν τις αὐτὸ τήξει καὶ χρῆσιν τὸν βάλανον, σύλληψιν ἐργάζεται. Κόρακος ὠν μετὰ ἐρυθριδανοῦ τρίψας ἄλειφε τρίχας κεφαλῆς καὶ αὐθωρὸν βάλλῃς ταῦτας μέλαινας ἄκρως ἕως οὗ ζῆς. Κόρακος μεγίστου τὴν κεφαλὴν ὀπτήσας καὶ λειώσας μετὰ οἶνου δὸς πιεῖν τῷ μεθύσῳ (μεθύσων ms.) καὶ μισήσει τὸν οἶνον. Κόρακος ὠν μετὰ σαπωνίου ταραξας πρὸ βαλανείου κατάπλασσε ἀνθρώπου πρόσωπον ἔχον ρυτίδας καὶ οὐχ ἔξει ταῦτας. Κώνωπας ἐκδιώκει καλακάνθιον καὶ μελάνθιον καὶ κύμινον ὑποθυμώμενον.
- (ii) [p. 24] Μαινίδα θαλάσσιος ἰχθύς ἐστι, ἣν οἱ ἀλιεῖς σμαρίδα καλοῦσι· κόψον ταύτης τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ καύσας τρίψον καὶ ἀναλάμβανε μέλιτι καὶ ἐπίχριε καὶ ἐπίπασσε τὴν ἔδραν καὶ θεραπεύσεις πᾶν ἀφεδρῶνος πάθος καὶ διάτρησιν.
 Νήσσης (Μήσσης ms.) ποταμιαίας τὸ αἷμα θερμὸν ἢ ξηρὸν σὺν οἶνῳ ποθὲν σώζει τοὺς πίνοντας παντοίων δηλητηρίων.

45 See Zipser (2009: 22–3).

46 Textual references in sections 2.2.1 to 2.2.7 are to manuscript pages. Spelling is normalised.

As is obvious from the excerpts above, the language of this section (a collection of remedies based on older medical works)⁴⁷ is a form of late Antique Koine, adhering to the grammatical rules of Ancient Greek (allowing, of course for lapses due to copying errors). In general, it presents very few innovative features, and these are mainly in the domain of the vocabulary, e.g. βερικοκοκκέα 21, πανίον 23, σαπώνιον 20, ροῦχον 32, σαγίον 32, σαυρίδιον 23. Note also the nominative singular μαινίδα (24), instead of μαινίς. This form of language is typical of technical treatises, including medical works, and has been studied in the past within the framework of *Fachprosa*.⁴⁸

2.2.2 *Pseudo-Hippocrates*, Sayings about Life and Death [pp. 34–41]

[pp. 36–7] Ὡσαύτως ἐὰν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀδόντων καὶ τοῦ στόματος πάθει εἰ κάμνει καὶ τοῦ τραχήλου αἱ φλέβες ἐκτεταμέναι ὥσι καὶ ὥσανει κωφὸς γένηται καὶ ἐὰν φλυκτίδας πεφυρακτωμένας ἐπὶ τῶν φλεβῶν σχοίη καὶ μία λευκὴ ἐὰν γεννηθῇ καὶ ἐὰν ἐν τῇ ἀρρωστίᾳ ἀτμοῦ ἢ βαλανείου ἐπιθυμήσειεν, εἰς ἣ ἡμέρας ἀποθανεῖται. Αὕτη ἡ νόσος συμβαίνει τῶν τῶν θερμῶν λουετρῶν ἐφιεμένων. Ὡσαύτως οὕτινος ἢ σταφυλῇ ὑπαίτιος ἐστὶν ἐὰν ὑπὸ τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ φλυκτίς· ἐὰν ἀναφανῇ καθάπερ μικρὰ φακὴ εἴτε λουετρῶν ἢ ἀτμῶν ἐπιθυμῆση καὶ τὸ πάθος μετὰ πυρετοῦ καὶ ἀπεψίας γένηται, οἷδημά τι μικρὸν μέλλει εἰς τὸν μέγαν δάκτυλον || τοῦ μικροῦ ποδὸς γένηται, εἰς κ' ἡμέρας ἀποθανεῖται. Ὡσαύτως ἐπὶ τῶν ὀξέων πυρετῶν τοῦ στομάχου. Ἐὰν ἐν τῷ δεξιῷ ποδὶ φλυκτίδα σχοίη ἐν τῷ ἐλματι, οὐχ ὑψηλὴν ἀλλ' ὀμαλὴν, καὶ χυμὸν μελάντερον ἔξει, οὐδεμία δὲ ἔφεσις τοῦ τραφῆναι ἰσχύει, εἰς κβ' ἡμέρας ἀποθανεῖται.

The text is a hitherto unknown version of the Pseudo-Hippocratic ‘Capsula eburnea’ [published by Sudhoff (1915)], and presents minor differences with the published text. The linguistic style is elevated, aspiring to classical standards. Typical of this style is the preponderance of the dative case, as well as the use of the ancient monolectic Future and the optative mood (even with ἐάν). There are barely any concessions to vernacular language, no low-register vocabulary, and only one or two instances that might

47 The diverse sources of this section may be well worth investigating, as a preliminary search showed that there are many parallel passages with the *Kyranides*, and other medical compilations. See e.g. *Kyranides*, 4.37.5–7, ed. Kaimakis (1976): ἔστι δὲ τὸ στέαρ συνουσίας ὀρμητικόν, ἐὰν τις αὐτὸ τήξας χρῆσιν τὴν βάλανον τοῦ μορίου· καὶ εὐχρῶιαν καὶ σύλληψιν ἐργάζεται παραχρῆμα.; see also de Mély (1898: 112): Ἔστιν δὲ τὸ στέαρ συνουσίας ὀρμητικόν· ἐὰν δὲ τις αὐτὸ τήξας χρῆσιν τὴν βάλανον τοῦ μορίου, καὶ εὐχρῶιαν καὶ σύλληψιν ἐργάζεται παραχρῆμα. The assortment of learned sources may account for the generally elevated style of this section.

48 See Rydbeck (1967); van der Eijk (1997) with relevant literature.

betray a command of classical language that is not entirely thorough, e.g. ἐθεάσατο τὸ μνημεῖον αὐτὸ τοῦ Ἱπποκράτους (instead of αὐτοῦ); λαχάνου ὀφθοῦ 39 – instead of ἐφθοῦ or ὀπτοῦ. The morphology of the text is virtually standardised without variation. Of special interest, is the rarely attested use of impersonal μέλλει + bare subjunctive as a Future periphrasis, e.g. μέλλει (...) γένηται 37 [on the construction see Holton et al. (2019: 1776)].

2.2.3 *Anonymous collection of remedies [pp. 41–4]*

[p. 41] Καρύας ρίζας χλωρᾶς τὸ δέρμα καὶ ἀξούγγιον χοίρου καὶ ἄλας κοπανίσας καὶ πέπερι σμίξας καὶ τρίψας, βάλε ἀμφότερα εἰς τσουκάλιον καὶ ὄξος δριμύ καὶ ἔψησον καὶ δὸς ἀλειφθῆναι εἰς τὸ λουετρόν.

This is a very brief section, containing a mixture of medical recipes and healing incantations. It does not present particular interest from a linguistic point of view, as it follows the grammatical rules of Koine Greek. One innovative grammatical feature is the expression of the imperative through the particle ἄς, e.g. ἄς γράφει 42, ἄς φορεῖ 42. There are no instances of linguistic variation, but one may detect a small number of innovative lexical items, e.g. ἀξούγγιον 41, καυκί(ον) 43, τσουκάλιον 41.

2.2.4 *Pseudo-Esdras, On Illuminating Days [pp. 44–6]*

[p. 45] ὁ ἀσθενὼν ἀρξάμενος οὐκ ἀνίσταται, ὁ γάμον ποιῶν οὐ χαίρει, τὸ γεννώμενον οὐ ζεῖ, ὁ εἰς πόλεμον ἐρχόμενος οὐ κατευοδούται, ὁ εἰς κρίσιν ἀπερχόμενος ἀποστρέφεται κατησχυμμένος, ὁ πραγματευόμενος ἀπόλλυσι πάντα καί, ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν, πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς πραττόμενα καὶ ἀρξάμενα εἰς ἐναντιότητα ἀποβαίνουσι.

This very short text consists mainly of a list of auspicious and inauspicious days which, of course, does not lend itself to linguistic analysis, as it only contains one or two paragraphs of running text. It is written in a high-register Koine without variation or vernacular features.

2.2.5 *Anonymous collection of recipes [pp. 47–54]*

[p. 49] Σκευασία ὁ ξηρὸς διοσπολίτης· πεπέρεως λίτραν α', κυμίνου λίτρα α', πηγάνου λίτρα α', νίτρου λίτρα α'. Τὸ κύμινον ὀφείλει ἀποβρέχεσθαι μετὰ δριμυτάτου ὄξους πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῆς σκευασίας αὐτῶν, κατὰ δὲ τὸν τῆς σκευασίας καιρὸν φρύττεσθαι ἐν πεφυρακτωμένοις κεράμοις μέχρις ὅτου γένηται ἐπιτήδειον εἰς τὸ κόπτεσθαι.

The section comprises a series of recipes ('σκευασίαι') presented in the form of lists of ingredients and their required quantities, with an occasional

sentence on the method of preparation. These short sentences are, again, rendered in a high-register style following the rules of classical grammar without variation or vernacular features.

2.2.6 *Anonymous collection of remedies [pp. 84–107]*

[pp. 94–5] Εὐχὴ ὁπότε κρατηθεῖ τὸ ἄλογον διὰ φλεγμὸν οὔρου καὶ οὐκ ἔμπορεῖ νὰ κατουρήσῃ. Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἅγιοι μάρτυρες Φλωρε καὶ Λαῦρε, βοηθήσατε· τὸ ὀρνίθιν νερὸν πίνει καὶ οὐ κατουρεῖ· ὁ ποντικὸς νερὸν οὐ πίνει καὶ κατουρεῖ· καὶ σύ, τὸ τοιοῦτον ζῶον, διατὶ οὐ κατουρεῖς; Ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν πρεσβειῶν τῶν ἁγίων μεγάλων μαρτύρων τοῦ Χριστοῦ Φλώρου καὶ Λαύρου, ἔπε κατούρησε.⁴⁹

The larger part of this section consists of healing instructions and recipes for treating various ailments (some of them repeated), interspersed with charms (see, e.g., the sample above [pp. 47–54]). Its language is not homogeneous; it is mostly middle register, but with vernacular vocabulary items and, occasionally, also grammatical features. Most of the vernacular elements are to be found in the incantations.⁵⁰ Examples include:

- Innovative inflectional forms, e.g. ὕδατος γλυκέου 88, νύκταν 89, βοήθη-
μαν 101, ρέμαν 102, πρήσμαν 104, ἐβγασίματος 106; imperative: βάνε 102,
φλεβοτόμα 103; double augment: ἐπροελάβετε 103; participle: διαβασμέ-
νον εἰς πανὶν 101.
- The regular use of the particles νὰ and ἄς with the subjunctive, e.g. νὰ
ἔνι τὸ μεῖράκιον ἄρρεν 104.
- The use of clitics forms as possessive and personal pronouns, e.g. μηνύει
σας ὁ Χαζάρης 103, τὰ μερμηγκοκουρουνόπουλά σας 103.
- Expression of the indirect object through the accusative case, e.g. δὸς
πιεῖν τὸν τρώμενον 86; δὸς φαγεῖν ὃν ὑπ' ὄψιν ἔχεις 88.
- Innovative lexical items/forms, e.g. ἐβγάσιμον 106, καπούλιν 86, κρομμύ-
διν 94, μουργὶν 86, τσουκάλιν 89, φινοκάλιζω 95.
- Innovative compounds, e.g. βρουλόριζον 105, μερμηγκοκουρουνόπουλα
103, ρεπανόγουλον 107.

49 This passage is very interesting from a pragmatic point of view, as it contains a very early Greek source for the connection of the cult of SS. Florus and Laurus with horses, until now known only from Russian sources, from the fifteenth century onward. See Rizos (2016) with relevant literature.

50 Similar charms are transmitted in other manuscripts, e.g. the charm for repelling ants (in p. 103); see Zellmann-Rohrer (2016: 249–50).

2.2.7 Anonymous medical compilation [Part B of MS.MSL.14, pp. 272–317].

- (i) [pp. 298–9] Περί γυναικὸς ἐὰν μοιχᾶται.⁵¹ Ὀρνιθίου στέον τὸ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ στήθους αὐτοῦ ὃ ἐστὶ || εἰς τὸ δεξιὸν μέρος τὸ διχαλόν, κοιμωμένης τῆς γυναικὸς θὲς ἀπέναντι τῆς καρδίας αὐτῆς καὶ ἄς βλέπει ἢ διχάλης τοῦ ὀστέου πρὸς τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῆς. Πότισον δὲ αὐτὴν καὶ *ὀγκάτει*⁵² λίθον καὶ ὁμολογήσει ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ ὅσα ἐπραξε.
- (ii) [pp. 303–4] Περί ὕδρωπικούς. <K>υθάραν⁵³ ἦτοι τζουκά<ι> καινούριον λαβὼν καὶ εὐρὼν βάτραχον, πουμάτωσον αὐτὸν καὶ ποιήσον μὴ ἀναπνέειν καὶ ἄς ποιήσει ἡμέρας λα΄ καὶ ψηλαφήσας τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ εὗρεις λίθον καὶ [δ]ῆσον μετὰ πανίου καὶ || ἄς ζώσεται καὶ λυτροῦται τὸ πάθος. Εἰδὲ πολλάκις θέλεις δοκιμάσαι, γέμισον μαγαρικὸν ὕδωρ καὶ βάλον τὸν λίθον μέσα καὶ οὐ μὴ μείνῃ ἐν αὐτῷ ὕδωρ.
- Περί τοῦ καλῶς βλέπειν. Αἶμαν ὀρνέου ἐπόπου χρίε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ καλὰ βλέπει.

The second part of MS.MSL.14, due to its brevity, will be examined as a single text, despite the possibility of some thematic distinction of parts, e.g. the first section *On the Pulse* [ed. Zipser (2008, 2013); see also Nutton and Zipser (2010: 262–3)]. The text again belongs to a middle register, preserving many conservative features, such as retention of final -v; the use

51 A diplomatic transcription and English translation of this excerpt is also provided in Zipser (2013: 261). The translation of the rubric ‘Concerning a woman when she does not covet’ indicates that the passage has been misunderstood by the editor; the reading ἐὰν μὴ χαται should be transcribed: ἐὰν μοιχᾶται (=if she is adulterous/unfaithful). Magical rituals for revealing a woman’s infidelity, such as those described in sample (i), have been known since antiquity [see e.g. Dickie (2001: 120–1 and n. 103)] and appear also in several medieval Greek manuscripts (see n. 52 below, especially for rituals involving birds’ wishbones and the magic properties of the magnet/lodestone).

52 The required emendation of the reading *ὀγκάτει* is probably *μαγνήτην* or *μαγνήτιν*, as suggested by a number of parallel texts. Cf. Parisinus gr. 2286, f. 61v: Λίθον μαγνήτιν εἰς ζέοντα οἶνον βάψον, καὶ οὕτω δὸς πιεῖν αὐτῇ νήσται ἀπὸ λουτροῦ, καὶ πάντα σοι λέγοι [ed. Boissonade (1827: 240); see ibid. for test of fidelity involving wishbone]. Also, Parisinus gr. 2316, f. 336r: μαγνήτην λίθον τρίψας δὸς ποιῆν μετὰ οἶνου ἀκράτου· κ(αὶ) μὴ ἀφήσ(ης) αὐτὴν λούσασθαι· κ(αὶ) αἰ ἀφήσις αὐτὴν λούσασθαι τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκύνῃ κ(αὶ) τὴν ἄλλην· ὅταν δὲ ὑπάγεις κοιμηθῇ· δὸς αὐτὴν πάλ(ιν) πιῆν· κ(αὶ) τίποτε μὴ φάγῃ· κ(αὶ) τῇ β΄ συνκάθειδε· καὶ ὁμολογήσει σε τὸν μυχόν· Ὅρνις ἡμέρου τὸ ὅστον τὸ δίκρουν ἐποίησε ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῆς κοιμωμένης· καὶ ἐρώτα αὐτήν· καὶ ὁμολογήσει σοι πάντα ὅσα ἐπραξε(εν); Metrodora, *Περὶ τῶν γυναικείων παθῶν τῆς μήτρας* [ed. Kousis (1945: 55)]: Πρὸς ὁμολογήσαι τοὺς μοιχοὺς αὐτῆς. Μαγνήτην λίθον τρίψας, δὸς πιεῖν μετὰ οἶνου ἀκράτου καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ μὴ λούσεται, καὶ τῇ ἐσπέρᾳ, ὅτε ὑπάγῃ καθεῦδειν δὸς αὐτὰ πιεῖν καὶ μηκέτι ἐτέρῳ γεύσεται· καὶ τῇ νυκτὶ κάθειδε μετ’ αὐτῆς καὶ ὁμολογήσει τοὺς μοιχοὺς αὐτῆς. Ἄλλο. Ὀρνιθίου τοῦ ἡμέρου τὸ δίκρανον ὅστον θὲς ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῆς κοιμωμένης καὶ ὁμολογήσει τίνος φρονεῖ καὶ τίς αὐτὴν ἐσχηκε. Related instructions involving the properties of the magnet in Parisinus gr. 2316, f. 336 (text in Oikonomu-Agorastou (1982: 42.6–11)) and f. 344; cf. also John Tzetzes, *Chiliades*, 5.66.616–25, ed. Leone (1968).

53 Obvious scribal error which should be corrected to κύθραν.

of the infinitive (e.g. ὀφείλει κοπανίσαι 276, οὐ δύναται νοῆσαι 276, θέλεις δοκιμάσαι 303); the ancient participles (e.g. ὁδοπορῶν 314, ἐπιζύων 278, ἐγγυριμένη 283, τοῦ ἀσθενοῦντος 284); third person imperative (e.g. πῖέτω 276, πινέτω 277). At the same time, it presents several low-register elements on all levels of analysis, although it cannot be characterised as vernacular, or dialectal. There are no linguistic indications of Cypriot dialect.

On the level of phonetics/phonology one may mention:

- The common change of [o] > [u], e.g. ζουμὸν 273, πουμάτωσον 303, 315, σουληνάριν 292.
- The deletion of consecutive vowels in the verbal forms πιεῖ > πεῖ 288, φάγει > φάει > φά 289.
- The deletion or change of unstressed initial vowel, e.g. στέον 298, δύοσμον 317; ἐτέας 301, ὀρμίγγια 307, ὀγδιν 312; note also the hypercorrect ὕψηλὸν 313 (instead of ψιλόν).
- Interchange of liquid consonants, e.g. ὀρμίγγια 307, μάλαθρον 291, μαλαθρόριζον 311.
- Change of [sx] to [sk] and [sθ] to [st], e.g. μοσκοκάρυδον 313, κλαστεῖ 285. Note also the hypercorrect καύχαλον (instead of καύκαλον) 302.
- The rare change [tm] to [θn]: ἄθνισον 292.

In nominal morphology one may mention:

- The addition of final -ν, e.g. σῶμαν 275, σπλήναν 288, ρεῦμαν 295.
- The medieval suffix -έα, e.g. χελιδονέας 273, χερέαν 306, together with the hypercorrect forms ἀραῖα (adverb) 275, χοίρεον φούσκαν 278.
- The neuter active participle form πιστακίζοντα 273.
- The mutual influence of neuter paradigms in -ον and -ος, e.g. τοῦ πελάγου 287, τὰ οὔλη 291.
- The clitic forms of the personal pronoun, e.g. βάλε τον 296, βάλε το 297, ἄς τὸ φᾶ 289.
- The form ἐπόπου 304 (genitive) (for ἔποπος).

In verbal morphology:

- The variation in the second person Aorist imperative, e.g. δῆσον 316 ~ δῆσε 294, ἔπαρε 289 ~ ἔπαρον 295.
- The third person of the copula ἐνι interchanging with ἐστὶν (passim).
- The expression of the imperative through the particle ἄς + subjunctive, e.g. ἄς βράσουν 306, ἄς ψηθεῖ δὲ καλὰ καὶ ἄς πίνει 310.
- The double augment ἐδιέβην 290.
- The hapax Future form θέλω + infinitive εἰ θέλει ζῆν ἢ ἀποθανεῖν 384.

Finally, in the domain of vocabulary, one may observe a number of innovative words/forms: ἀβγδ 286, βατσινόριζον 309, κοδιμεντόριζον 311,

Figure 4.4 Londiniensis Wellcomensis MS.MSL.14, pp. 307–8.

Photograph by Petros Bouras-Vallianatos.

κρομμύδι 277, νεράντζι 317, ὀξινόγλυκος 277, πινόμαλλο(ν) 312, ρετσίνη 286, σουληνάριν 292, τσακίζω 289, τσουκάλι 303, φούσκα 272.

To sum up, we hope that the linguistic analysis of these two very different manuscripts, MS.4103 and MS.MSL.14, undertaken here has provided some much-needed reference points and methodological tools for the study of this fascinating branch of knowledge, the history of medicine, and for the edition of similar texts. In particular, we hope that we have shed some light on the largely uncharted territory of late medieval and early modern iatrosophic texts: their provenance, language, and sources, and their place in the bigger picture of non-literary prose. We also hope to have demonstrated that this type of texts are valuable, but so far untapped, sources for the history of the Greek language.

Bibliography

Alexopoulou, M.-P. (ed.) 1998. *Das Iatrosophion des sog. Meletios. Edition mit sprachlichem und sachlichem Kommentar*. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München: Inaugural-Dissertation.

- Andriotis, N. P. 1956. “Η κράση τοῦ συμπλέγματος ου + ε στήν Μεσαιωνική καὶ Νέα Ἑλληνική”, in *Mélanges offerts à Octave et Melpo Merlier pour le 25e anniversaire de leur arrivée en Grèce*, vol. 1. Athens: Institut Français d’Athènes, 1–11.
- Andriotis, N. P. 1974. *Lexikon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Andriotis, N. P. 1990. *Ετυμολογικὸ λεξικὸ τῆς Κοινῆς Νεοελληνικῆς* [3rd edition]. Thessaloniki: Institutouto Neollinikon Spoudon – Idryma M. Triantaphyllidi.
- Boissonade, J.-F. 1827. ‘Traité alimentaire du médecin Hiérophile extrait de deux manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi’, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi* 11(2): 178–273.
- Bongas, E. A. 1964/66. *Τὰ γλωσσικὰ διώματα τῆς Ἡπείρου (Βορείου, Κεντρικῆς καὶ Νοτίου). Α’ Γιαννιώτικο καὶ ἄλλα λεξιλόγια. Β’ Γλωσσάρια Βορ. Ἡπείρου, Θεσπρωτίας, Κόνιτσας, κ.ά.* Ioannina: Ekdoseis Etaireias Ipeirotikon Meleton.
- Bouras-Vallianatos, P. 2015. ‘Greek Manuscripts at the Wellcome Library in London: A Descriptive Catalogue’, *Medical History* 59(2): 275–326.
- Bouras-Vallianatos, P. 2018. ‘Enrichment of the Medical Vocabulary in the Greek-Speaking Medieval Communities of Southern Italy: The Lexica of Plant Names’, in B. Pitarakis and G. Tanman (eds.), *Life Is Short, Art Long: The Art of Healing in Byzantium. New Perspectives*. Istanbul: Istanbul Research Institute, 155–84.
- Bouras-Vallianatos, P. 2019. ‘Review of A. Touwaide: *A Census of Greek Medical Manuscripts. From Byzantium to the Renaissance*. London – New York: Routledge 2016’, *Plekos* 21: 153–76. At www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2019/t-touwaide.pdf (accessed, 31 July 2019) .
- Chatzopoulou, V. 2018. “Ο ἱατρὸς Νικόλαος ὁ Βελισδονίτης: Νέα στοιχεῖα γιὰ τὸ ἔργο του”, in K. Chrysou-Karatza (ed.), *Λαϊκὴ Ἱατρικὴ καὶ Ἱατρικὴ Επιστήμη. Σχέσεις Αμφοδρομίες. Πρακτικὰ Πανελλήνιου Επιστημονικοῦ Συνεδρίου, Αθήνα, 7–11 Μαρτίου 2012*, vol. 2. Athens: Academy of Athens, 17–32.
- de Mély, F. (ed.). 1898. *Les Lapidaires de l’Antiquité et du Moyen Age. Tome II. Premier Fascicule. Les Lapidaires grecs*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Delatte, A. (ed.). 1939. *Anecdota Atheniensia et alia*, vol. 2. Liège and Paris: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres – Droz.
- Dickie, M. W. 2001. *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Drexler, F. (ed.). 1925. *Achmetis Oneirocriticon*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Georgacas, D. 1951. ‘Grammatische und etymologische Miscellen zum Spät- und Neugriechischen’, *Glotta* 31: 199–235.
- Holton, D., Horrocks, G., Janssen, M., Lendari, T., Manolassou, I. and Toufexis, N. 2019. *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horrocks, G. 2010. *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* [2nd edition]. Chichester and Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ieraci Bio, A. M. 1982. ‘Testi medici di uso strumentale’, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 32: 33–43.
- ILNE = *Ιστορικὸν Λεξικὸν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς, τῆς τε κοινῆς ὁμιλουμένης καὶ τῶν ἰδιωμάτων*. 6 vols. 1931–2016. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Jannaccone, S. 1951. ‘Sur l’hypercorrection en grec’, *Neophilologus* 35: 151–61.
- Kaimakis, D. (ed.). 1976. *Die Kyraniden*. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain.
- Kakridis, I. 1926. ‘Περὶ τῶν εἰς “-γος” στερητικῶν ἐπιθέτων τῆς νέας ἑλληνικῆς’, *Ἀθηνᾶ* 38: 194–212.

- Karas, G. 1994. *Οι ἐπιστῆμες στὴν Τουρκοκρατία. Χειρόγραφα καὶ ἔντυπα. Τόμος Γ': Ο ἐπιστῆμες τῆς ζωῆς*. Athens: Estia.
- Katsanis, N. A. (ed.). 2012. *Το γλωσσικό ἰδίωμα τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης στα τέλη τοῦ 17ου αἰώνα, ὡς ἀποτυπώνεται σε 12 ἐπιστολές τοῦ Θεσσαλονικιοῦ ἐμπόρου Δημ. Καστρίσιου*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press.
- Kosmas, N. V. 1997. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῶν Ἰωαννίνων*. Athens and Ioannina: Dodoni.
- Koustoula, D. D. (ed.). 1991. *Αγάπιος Λάνδος. Γεωπονικόν, Βενετία 1643*. Εμπέχεια κειμένου, Εἰσαγωγή, Σχόλια, Γλωσσάριο. Volos: Ekdoseis Tinos.
- Kousis, A. 1939. 'Quelques considerations sur les traductions en grec des oeuvres médicales orientales et principalement sur les deux manuscrits de la traduction d'un traité persan par Constantin Melitiniotis', *Πρακτικά τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν* 14: 205–20.
- Kousis, A. (ed.). 1945. 'Metrodora's Work "On the Feminine Diseases of the Womb" according to the Greek Codex 75,3 of the Laurentian Library', *Πρακτικά τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν* 20: 46–68.
- Krekoukias, D. A. (ed.). 1973. "Ἐνα παλιὸ ζαγορήσιο γιатροσόφι", *Ἑπειρωτικὴ Ἑστία* 22: 237–49.
- Kriaras, Epit. = Kazazis, I. (ed.). 2001–3. *Ἐπιτομή τοῦ Λεξικοῦ τῆς Μεσαιωνικῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Δημώδους Γραμματείας τοῦ Ε. Κριαρά*. 2 vols. Thessaloniki: Kentro Ellinikis Glossas.
- Kriaras, Lex. = Kriaras, E. 1968–2019. *Λεξικό τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς ἐλληνικῆς δημώδους γραμματείας (1100–1669)*. 21 vols. Thessaloniki.
- LBG = Trapp, E. et al. (eds.). 1994–2017. *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität, besonders des 9.–12. Jahrhunderts*. 8 vols. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Legrand, É. (ed.). 1881. *Bibliothèque grecque vulgaire. Tome deuxième*. Paris: Maisonneuve et Cie.
- Lendari, T. and Manolessou, I. 2003. 'Ἡ ἐκφορά τοῦ ἐμμεσου ἀντικειμένου στὴ Μεσαιωνικὴ Ἑλληνικὴ. Ἐκδοτικά καὶ γλωσσολογικὰ προβλήματα', in *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, School of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (17–19 May 2002)*. Thessaloniki, 394–405.
- Lendari, T. and Manolessou, I. 2013. 'Demonstrative Pronouns: Synchronic Variation and Diachronic Evolution', in M. Janse et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory (Ghent 20–22 September 2012)*, Patras: University of Patras, 228–44.
- Leone, P. A. M. (ed.). 1968. *Ioannis Tzetzae, Historiae*. Naples: Libreria Scientifica Editrice.
- LKN = *Λεξικό τῆς Κοινῆς Νεοελληνικῆς*. 1998. Thessaloniki: Institutouto Neoellinikon Spoudon – Idryma Manoli Triantaphyllidi.
- Mackridge, P. 1993. 'An Editorial Problem in Medieval Greek Texts: The Position of the Object Clitic Pronoun in the Escorial *Digenes Akrites*', in N. M. Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della letteratura neogreca. Atti del secondo Congresso Internazionale «Neogreca Medii Aevi» (Venezia, 7–10 novembre 1991)*, vol. 1. Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi bizantini e postbizantini di Venezia, 325–42.
- Manolessou, I. 2008. 'On Historical Linguistics, Linguistic Variation and Medieval Greek', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 32: 63–79.

- Manolessou, I. and Beis, S. 2006. 'Syntactic Isoglosses in Modern Greek Dialects: The Case of the Indirect Object', in A. Ralli et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory, Mytilene, September 2004*. Patras: University of Patras, 220–35.
- Mavroudi, M. 2002. *A Byzantine Book on Dream Interpretation: The Oneirocriticon of Achmet and Its Arabic Sources*. Leiden, Boston and Köln: Brill.
- Meyer, G. 1894. *Neugriechische Studien. I. Versuch einer Bibliographie der neugriechischen Mundartforschung. II. Die slavischen, albanischen und rumänischen Lehnworte im neugriechischen. III. Die lateinischen Lehnworte im neugriechischen. IV. Die romanischen Lehnworte im neugriechischen*. Vienna: F. Tempsky.
- Minas, K. (ed.). 2012. *Ιατροσόφιον του δέκατου όγδοου αιώνα*. Rodos: Ekdoseis Veretta.
- Newton, B. 1972. *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect: A Study of Modern Greek Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nutton, V. and Zipser, B. 2010. 'MSL 14. A Wellcome Manuscript of a Medical Practitioner', in V. Boudon-Millot, A. Garzya, J. Jouanna and A. Roselli (eds.), *Storia della tradizione e edizione dei medici greci: Atti del VI Colloquio Internazionale, Paris 12–14 Aprile 2008*. Naples: D'Auria, 259–70.
- Oberhelman, S. M. 2015. 'Towards a Typology of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Healing Texts', *Athens Journal of Health* 2(2): 133–46.
- Oikonomidis, D. V. (ed.). 1953. 'Εξορκισμοί και ιατροσόφια έξ ήπειρωτικού χειρογράφου', *Επετηρίς Λαογραφικού Αρχείου* 8: 14–60.
- Oikonomou, K. (ed.). 1978. 'Δύο ήπειρώτικα γιατροσόφια', *Δωδώνη* 7: 239–301.
- Oikonomu-Agorastu, I. (ed.). 1982. *Kritische Erstausgabe des Rezeptbuchs des Cod. Par. gr. 2316, f. 348^v-374^v* Universität zu Köln: Inaugural-Dissertation. Thessaloniki: Giahudi – Giapulli.
- Papadopoulos, A. 1927. *Γραμματική τών βορείων ιδιωμάτων της νέας ελληνικής γλώσσας*. Athens: P. D. Sakellarios.
- Papadopoulos, C. 2009. 'Post-Byzantine Medical Manuscripts: New Insights into the Greek Medical Tradition, Its Intellectual and Practical Interconnections, and Our Understanding of Greek Culture', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 27: 107–30.
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A. (ed.). 1899. *Τεροσολυμική Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 4. St. Petersburg.
- Papahagi, T. 1974. *Dicționarul Dialectului Aromân General și Etimologic*. Bucarest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romîne.
- Papanastasiou, G. 2008. 'Στερητικά επίθετα (με το πρόθημα α-) σε -τος, -ος και -γος στις νεοελληνικές διαλέκτους', in M. Theodoropoulou (ed.), *Licht und Wärme. In Memory of A.-F. Christidis*. Thessaloniki: Kentro Ellinikis Glossas, 296–313.
- Pappas, P. 2004. *Variation and Morphosyntactic Change in Greek: From Clitics to Affixes*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Redhouse. 1968 = *New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary. A New Dictionary based Largely on the Turkish – English Lexicon Prepared by Sir James Redhouse and Published in 1890 by the Publication Department of the American Board*. Istanbul: Redhouse Press.
- Rizos, E. 2016. 'Martyrs from the North-Western Balkans in the Byzantine Ecclesiastical Tradition: Patterns and Mechanisms of Cult Transfer', in I. Bugarski et al. (eds.), *GrenzÜbergänge. Spättrömisch, frühchristlich, frühbyzantinisch als Kategorien der historisch-archäologischen Forschung an der mittleren Donau. Akten des 27. Internationalen Symposiums der Grundprobleme der frühgeschichtlichen Entwicklung im mittleren Donaauraum, Ruma, 4.-7.11.2015*. Remshalden: Greiner, 195–213.

- Rydbeck, L. 1967. *Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament: zur Beurteilung der sprachlichen Niveauunterschiede im nachklassischen Griechisch*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Sudhoff, K. 1915. 'Die pseudohippokratische Krankheitsprognostik nach dem Auftreten von Hautausschlägen, „Secreta Hippocratis“ oder „Capsula eburnea“ benannt,' *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 9: 79–116.
- Touwaide, A. 2007. 'Byzantine Hospital Manuals (*Iatrosophia*) as a Source for the Study of Therapeutics', in B. Bowers (ed.), *The Medieval Hospital and Medical Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 147–73.
- Touwaide, A. 2016. *A Census of Greek Medical Manuscripts: From Byzantium to the Renaissance*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Trudgill, P. 2003. 'Modern Greek Dialects: A Preliminary Classification', *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 4: 45–64.
- Tselikas, A. 1995. 'Τὰ ἑλληνικὰ γιатροσόφια: μια περιφρονημένη κατηγορία χειρογράφων', in T. Diamantopoulos (ed.), *Ιατρικὰ βυζαντινὰ χειρόγραφα*. Athens: Domos, 57–69.
- Tselikas, A. (ed.). 2012. *Τὸ γιатροσόφι τοῦ Χιώτη «ταπεινοῦ» Παντολέοντα. Περί ιατρικῆς βιβλίου δεδοκιμασμένον καὶ ὑπὸ πολλῶν διορθωμένον*. Athens: Poreia.
- Tselikas, A. 2018. 'Μεταβυζαντινὰ Ἱατροσοφικὰ Χειρόγραφα καὶ «Λαϊκὴ Ἱατρικὴ»', in K. Chrysou-Karatza (ed.), *Λαϊκὴ Ἱατρικὴ καὶ Ἱατρικὴ Επιστήμη. Σχέσεις Αμφίδρομες. Πρακτικὰ Πανελλήνιου Επιστημονικοῦ Συνεδρίου, Αθήνα, 7–11 Μαρτίου 2012*, vol. 1. Athens: Academy of Athens, 61–8.
- Tselikas, A. and Ilioudis, G. N. (eds.). 1996. *Νικολάου Τερόπαιδος ἐξ Ἀγράφων (;), Πραγματεία περὶ Φυσιολογίας & Παθολογίας*. Larissa: Panepistimio Thessalias.
- Tselikas, A. and Ilioudis, G. N. (eds.). 1997. *Νικολάου Τερόπαιδος ἐξ Ἀγράφων, Ἐκδόσεις μερικαὶ εἰς ἀρχαίον ιατρὸν*. Larissa: Panepistimio Thessalias.
- Tsolaki, M. 2009. *Μορφολογία του ιδιώματος της Σαμοθράκης. Ονοματικό και ρηματικό κλιτικό σύστημα*. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki: PhD thesis.
- Tsolakidis, S. and Melissaropoulou, D. 2010. 'Ἡ διαχρονικὴ ἐξέλιξη τῶν στερητικῶν μεταρρηματικῶν σηματοδότησιν σε -τος στη μεσαιωνικὴ καὶ νέα ἐλληνικὴ', *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the Annual Meetings of the Department of Linguistics, School of Philology, Faculty of Philosophy* 30: 630–42.
- van der Eijk, P. J. 1997. 'Toward a Rhetoric of Ancient Scientific Discourse: Some Formal Characteristics of Greek Medical and Philosophical Texts (Hippocratic Corpus, Aristotle)', in E. J. Bakker (ed.), *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in Its Linguistic Contexts*. Leiden, New York and Köln: Brill, 77–130.
- Zellmann-Rohrer, M. W. 2016. *The Tradition of Greek and Latin Incantations and Related Ritual Texts from Antiquity through the Medieval and Early Modern Periods*. University of California, Berkeley, CA: PhD dissertation.
- Zipser, B. 2008. 'Die uneinheitliche Überlieferung eines Fragmentes über den Puls und ein Iatrosophion', *Galenos* 2: 129–34.
- Zipser, B. (ed.). 2009. *John the Physician's Therapeutics: A Medical Handbook in Vernacular Greek*. Leiden: Brill.
- Zipser, B. 2013. 'Magic, Infidelity, and Secret Annotations in a Cypriot Manuscript of the Early Fourteenth Century (Wellcome MSL 14)', in S. M. Oberhelman (ed.), *Dreams, Healing, and Medicine in Greece: From Antiquity to the Present*. Farnham: Ashgate, 251–66.