
Introduction

Gregory of Nazianzus, the fourth-century Cappadocian church father, was a prolific writer whose eloquence and theology so appealed to the Byzantines that they produced more copies of his sermons than of any other non-scriptural text. The ninth-century copy of his Homilies in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, codex graecus 510 provides the full edition of his forty-four orations,¹ as well as four of Gregory's letters (two each to Kledonios and Nektarios), two poems, and two texts not written by Gregory at all: the anonymous *Significatio in Exechelem*, and the 'Metaphrase of Ecclesiastes' now assigned to Gregory Thaumaturgos. The *vita* of Gregory of Nazianzus, written by Gregory the Presbyter, is partially preserved at the end of the manuscript, where an indeterminate number of leaves have been lost.

Paris.gr.510 is an unabashedly luxurious manuscript. It is large and long, and glitters with colour and gold leaf: most text pages (fig. 47) include at least two gold or painted initials and indicate important text passages with gilded marginal signs; painted headpieces originally introduced each sermon; and the forty-six miniatures – which incorporate over 200 distinct scenes – are full-page, full-colour, and surrounded by gold or decorated frames. The text itself was written in uncial rather than the faster and more economical minuscule.²

The evident expense involved, the coordination of labour implied, and the overall visual effect of the manuscript are, however, rarely noted in modern publications on Paris.gr.510: though the Paris Homilies has been cited more often than any other Byzantine manuscript (and probably more often than any Byzantine monument except Hagia Sophia), among the thousands of pages of discussion only perhaps fifty deal even tangentially with the material attributes of the book.³

¹ The textual tradition represented by Paris.gr.510 is considered later in this chapter.

² The actual cost of the manuscript is unknown; for comments on the expenses incurred in book production, however, see Kravari (1991).

³ Kondakoff II (1891), 57–74, is the most notable exception, but see also Bordier (1885), 62, 89; Frantz (1934); Weitzmann (1935), 4; Nordenfalk (1970), 199; and Brubaker (1991). For the extent of the bibliography on Paris.gr.510, see the yearly listings of manuscript citations in *Scriptorium*, which

Vision and meaning in ninth-century Byzantium

Paris.gr.510 has been accorded its position of prominence for reasons that have little to do with its quality: it remains one of the relatively few Byzantine manuscripts that can be localised and dated with precision, and it contains a vast repertoire of images.

Paris.gr.510 contains such a wealth of extended narrative sequences that one of its major roles has been to function as an iconographical repository for modern scholars to draw upon. The miniatures cannot, however, always be seen (as they sometimes have been) as representative of all-encompassing ninth-century iconographical traditions. Though the core groupings of many individual scenes repeat conventional formulae, the peripheral trappings are often unattested elsewhere; and while this may be an accident of survival, a genuine idiosyncrasy of the manuscript is that the shape of the page as a whole usually affects the presentation of the scenes pictured on it, with compositions adapted to complement other scenes on the page. The miniatures of Paris.gr.510 do not necessarily supply a reliable iconographical stepping stone; instead, they reveal how and why the visual worked in quite specific circumstances. Paris.gr.510 was a private book, and its miniatures sometimes deliver personal messages.

It is perhaps for this reason that the meaning of the illustrations in the Paris Gregory only began to be deciphered in 1962, when Sirarpie Der Nersessian published her pioneering study of the relationship between the texts and images of Paris.gr.510 and demonstrated that the miniatures often acted as commentaries on – rather than direct illustrations of – Gregory's sermons. Standing on the shoulders of such a giant, I have pushed the material a little further; and, as this is a book rather than an article, I have also been able to consider the manuscript from more than one perspective. These perspectives all point back to the personalized messages conveyed by Paris.gr.510. How and why these messages were formed and delivered is the subject of this book.

CODICOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION

In its present state, Paris.gr.510 consists of 464 folios (ca. 410 x ca. 300 mm) plus an introductory gathering (ff. A–C) of five miniatures.⁴ The manuscript is too fragile

almost without fail note at least one new reference to the manuscript over the preceding six months. In Spatharakis (1981), 6–9, the select bibliography on Paris.gr.510 fills two densely packed columns of an oversized page; the only other manuscript even to approach this amount of citation is the *Menologion* of Basil II. Spatharakis included only discussions focused on Paris.gr.510; there are perhaps ten times as many passing references to the manuscript.

⁴ Though the last folio of Paris.gr.510 is numbered (by a modern hand) 465, this same hand omitted 383. Published accounts of the size of the manuscripts vary. Omont (1929), II gives 418 x 305 mm; *Byzance* (1992), 346, gives 435 x 300. I have not been allowed to measure the manuscript; photographs containing scales, however, suggest that page sizes range from 404 to 418 mm high, and from 272 to 305 mm wide.

Introduction

to allow unrestricted access; as noted throughout this book, the Bibliothèque Nationale has never allowed me to handle it. But, because the amount of text written on each page is remarkably consistent, the amount of text missing – as revealed through collation of the Paris text (on microfilm) with editions of the Homilies published in Migne and Sources Chrétiennes – gives a clear and quite precise indication of how many leaves have perished. At least twelve folios, and probably thirteen, have been lost from the body of the manuscript; the end, abruptly cut off in mid-sentence, lacks an indeterminate number of pages. Probably during the fourteenth century, Palaiologan scribes replaced three of the lost pages, and inserted the apparently spurious thirty-fifth sermon. (See the diagram of quires: Appendix C.) With few exceptions, the gatherings are arranged in regular quaternions.

Quire signatures (numbers) appear on the first folio of all but five of the fifty-eight quires; eighteen of these, placed in the upper left margin, are in the ninth-century hand responsible for the marginalia of Paris.gr.510, and this same hand appended two small crosses, aligned with the rulings determining the left and right margins, at the top of f. 61r. At a later date – probably during the Palaiologan period – most of the quire numbers were rewritten. In some cases, the later signatures were placed below the original numbers; in others, the ninth-century numbers were over-written. When the manuscript was trimmed, possibly in conjunction with its rebinding in 1602, all but eighteen of the original signatures were excised; fortunately, most of the later numbers survived. In the quire diagrams that appear in Appendix C, the Greek number below each gathering refers to the quire signature. Those not enclosed by parentheses or brackets indicate a signature in the original ninth-century hand; parentheses denote a Palaiologan signature, brackets a hypothetical one. Quire 20 (K), for example, both retains its original signature and displays a later one, while quire 41 (MA) shows no signature.

The scribe carefully wrote the text on ruled leaves in two equal columns of forty lines each (Leroy's ruling 20C2),⁵ using a regular uncial with a slight but pronounced slant to the right. Letter forms are generally consistent, though the pointed loop of the alphas does not always join the bar in the same place, the cross-bar of mu may be either pointed or curved, and two forms of xi are used interchangeably. Slanting uncial of the type found in Paris.gr.510 recurs throughout the ninth century; it is, however, not common after 870, by which time minuscule – a script introduced around 800 that was faster to write (and therefore cheaper to commission) – had become standard. The relative scarcity of uncial by the 880s may explain why palaeographers have not discovered the hand responsible for the Paris Gregory in any other manuscript: Werner Jaeger's attempt to link the Homilies with a group of texts associated with Vat.gr.2066 has not met wide

⁵ Julien Leroy (1976).

Vision and meaning in ninth-century Byzantium

acceptance,⁶ and recent examinations of ninth-century script simply cite Paris.gr.510 as an example of slanting uncial.⁷ The most similar script that I have found appears in Vat.gr.2625, ff. 216–219, a fragment of a text by Theodore of Stoudion.⁸ The decision to use uncial rather than the more compact and less expensive minuscule presumably signalled two things to a late ninth-century audience: overt luxury and, by the 880s in Constantinople, the past. The old-fashioned script reiterated the authority of the tradition that lay behind Gregory's text.

Four of the marginal signs that had been associated with Gregory's Homilies since the sixth century supplement the text (fig. 47).⁹ The original sigla are nearly all formed of gold leaf (a few were added in a dark ink by a later hand), and convey the same message as the uncial text: the patron of Paris.gr.510 followed tradition and spared no expense in doing so.

In addition to the traditional marginal signs, four homilies carry marginal numbers beside Gregory's references to mythology which correspond with a sixth-century commentary written by Pseudo-Nonnos.¹⁰ The text, which exists in illustrated versions,¹¹ may once have followed the homilies. Sporadic (and unedited) scholia also appear in the margins.

One thousand four hundred and forty-five gold letters and 172 initials with painted decoration are distributed over the 433 ninth-century text folios; twenty sides – six falling at the ends of various homilies, with less than one column of text used – are without initials, while many pages have three or more: f. 123v contains eleven. In the quire diagrams (Appendix C), the arabic numbers along the side of each folio indicate the total number of painted or gilded initials on that page; if there are two numbers, the lower one signals how many of these received additional decoration. On f. 2v, for example, there are no enlarged initials (though there is a colophon, indicated by the letter C), while on f. 5r there are five; of these, one is elaborately decorated and the other four are gold.

Fifty-one headpieces remain; they are signalled by the letter H in the quire diagrams (Appendix C). All were originally numbered, and the (Greek) numbers are enclosed in parentheses immediately below the H marking; brackets indicate that the headpiece number no longer survives. Compare ff. 1r and 33r.

The forty-six miniatures – five prefacing the text (ff. A–C) and forty-one integrated or inserted within it – are indicated by the letter M in the quire diagrams (Appendix C). All will be considered in detail in subsequent chapters.

⁶ Jaeger (1947), esp. 91–95. I have examined most of the manuscripts in Jaeger's group: their scripts are only generally similar to that of Paris.gr.510; the layout and decoration are quite different.

⁷ E.g. Cavallo (1977), esp. 98–99. ⁸ See Julien Leroy (1961).

⁹ See Astruc (1974) and Mossay (1982).

¹⁰ See Brock (1971); Declerck (1976, 1977, 1978/79); Accorinti (1990); Nimmo Smith (1992).

¹¹ Weitzmann (1951b), 87–88.

Introduction

LOCALIZATION AND DATE

The localization and date of Paris.gr.510 depend on the disturbed first gathering of the manuscript (ff. A–C). Folio A, now a single sheet, originally had a blank recto; the manuscript apparently opened with the portrait of Christ on f. Av (fig. 1). Folios B and C form a bifolium which remains intact, but has been reversed.¹² The miniatures of the Empress Eudokia (d. 882; f. Br; fig. 2), a cross (f. Bv; fig. 3), a second cross (f. Cr; fig. 4), and the Emperor Basil I (867–886; f. Cv; fig. 5) are now in incorrect hierarchical order: Basil should come before Eudokia, an arrangement confirmed by the verse framing the empress's portrait which begins 'Basil, emperor of the Romans, precedes you . . .'.¹³ The reversal occurred while the manuscript was in Byzantine hands, at some time after the middle of the tenth century – when the miniaturist of the Leo Bible copied the original disposition of two crosses framing dedicatory portraits¹⁴ – but before the late fourteenth century, when the verse enframing f. Br was copied onto f. Av:¹⁵ had the original order still been retained, the transcription would now appear on f. Cv. Folded correctly, the bifolium's original disposition of a cross (f. Cr), Basil (f. Cv), Eudokia (f. Br), and a final cross (f. Bv) resembles a commemorative diptych with exterior crosses enclosing portraits.¹⁶

Henri Bordier rightly rejected Bernardus de Montfaucon's opinion that the initial gathering constituted a later addition to the manuscript:¹⁷ epigraphy, colour, and decorative details of ff. A–C match their counterparts in the rest of the book. Though all of the frontispiece miniatures are badly damaged, the frame on f. Av duplicates the alternating quadrilobes of headpieces on ff. 316v (fig. 47) and 427r, and the facial modelling of the two boys on f. Br is so similar to that of the frontal angels on f. 67v (fig. 11) that they must have been painted by the same hand.¹⁸ We cannot divorce the frontispiece miniatures from the rest of Paris.gr.510.

The imperial portraits of the frontispiece sequence provide strong evidence that the manuscript was produced in Constantinople,¹⁹ and allow us to date it with some precision. Leo and Alexander are designated *despotes* on f. Br,²⁰ a title that Leo attained in 870, and Alexander sometime before the middle of November 879; Basil's eldest son Constantine (crowned 867/8), who died in September 879, is not

¹² See Der Nersessian (1962), 198; she is wrong, however, in dating the reversal to the 1602 re-binding. ¹³ See chapter 4.

¹⁴ Vat.reg.gr.1, ff. 2r–3v: *Miniature* (1905), pls. 3–6; Dufrenne and Canart (1988), 19–20. This relationship has been noted by many previous scholars: see the discussion of ff. Bv–Cr in chapter 4.

¹⁵ I would like to thank Nancy Ševčenko for her help in transcribing the inscription, and Ihor Ševčenko for his assistance in dating the hand to the second half of the fourteenth century; this dating has been confirmed by Charles Astruc, whom I thank for examining the inscription in December 1986. ¹⁶ So too Kalavrezou-Maxeiner (1978), 24. ¹⁷ Bordier (1885), 62.

¹⁸ The imperial costume worn on f. Br, though not identical, recalls Helena's attire on f. 285r (fig. 29), too. ¹⁹ Cf. Wilson (1967), 57. ²⁰ Kalavrezou-Maxeiner (1978).

Vision and meaning in ninth-century Byzantium

included in the sequence. Eudokia, who died shortly after Leo's marriage to Theophano in the winter of 882, appears; Theophano does not. Folio Br must have been painted after Constantine's death and Alexander's coronation in the final months of 879, and before Leo's marriage in 882 and the subsequent death of Eudokia.²¹ The frontispiece sequence thus indicates that Paris.gr.510 was completed between late 879 and 882.

A slightly earlier dating has been proposed by Ioannes Spatharakis on the basis of the underdrawing now visible beneath the badly flaked f. Bv (fig. 3), which shows a central imperial male figure jointly crowned by an archangel, standing on the (viewer's) right, and a third, barely revealed, figure on the left.²² The underdrawing anticipates the final composition on f. Cv, and most scholars have assumed that it is a preliminary sketch for that page, a portrait of Basil flanked by Gabriel and Elijah.²³ Spatharakis, however, identified the underdrawing on f. Bv as a portrait of Basil's son Constantine, and redated the manuscript's commission to 879, arguing that Constantine's unexpected death led to the covering of his portrait by a cross.²⁴ Spatharakis' thesis was refuted by Ioli Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, who noted that Basil's son Constantine, unlike the man on f. Bv, was never shown bearded; that to place the heir-presumptive after his mother and younger brothers contradicted imperial protocol; and that the reverse of this leaf (f. Br) must anyway post-date September 879 because both the inscription and framing poem identify Alexander as *despotes*, a rank he attained only after Constantine's death.²⁵ Kalavrezou-Maxeiner is surely correct, and other arguments against an identification of the underdrawing with Constantine can be adduced: most basically, there is no reason to connect Constantine with Elijah and Gabriel, while there is ample reason to connect his father with them.²⁶

²¹ See Der Nersessian (1962), 198 and, on the implications of Theophano's absence, Mango and Hawkins (1972), 37. Eudokia appears with Constantine and Basil on what seems to be a commemorative coin struck after her death, and long after Constantine's (Grierson III,2 [1973], 481; for iconoclast parallels, see Grierson III,1 [1973], 8–9), but Constantine's absence here indicates that this is not a memorial sequence.

²² Velmans (1974), fig. 7 (incorrectly labelled f. Av and with Gabriel identified as Michael) and Spatharakis (1974), fig. 5 reproduce details of the most visible underdrawing; a line drawing of additional traces appears in Kalavrezou-Maxeiner (1978), fig. 3. Velmans (1974), 141–145, noted the high quality of the drawing and speculated that a miniaturist otherwise unattested in Paris.gr.510 was responsible. This seems unlikely, as underdrawing visible elsewhere in the manuscript is equally fine; it was apparently simply more difficult to paint than to draw detail. The question of why detail soon to be obscured was drawn at all remains.

²³ See further the discussion of f. Cv in chapter 4. ²⁴ Spatharakis (1974).

²⁵ Kalavrezou-Maxeiner (1978). Spatharakis ([1989], 89–93) later speculated that Alexander might have been crowned before 879, that Constantine was of age by 879 and thus could have been shown bearded, and that Eudokia was placed before Constantine because – as is generally agreed (see e.g. Mango [1973]) – she was not his mother. He also suggests that the manuscript was commissioned by a donor in the circle of the empress. Spatharakis' proposed arrangement remains virtually unthinkable in terms of the Byzantine imperial hierarchy. ²⁶ See chapter 4.

Introduction

Paris.gr.510 was, then, completed in Constantinople between 879 and 882 for the Emperor Basil I and his family. This locates the manuscript in the midst of a crucial half-century in the annals of Byzantium: years of economic recovery, and of religious consolidation following the end of Iconoclasm, the imperial policy that officially banned religious imagery between ca. 730 and 787, and again from 813 (or 815) until 843. The Paris Gregory is, in fact, the only securely dated Byzantine manuscript from the second half of the ninth century, and it is the first surviving illustrated book produced for a Byzantine emperor.

PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF LABOUR

The production of Paris.gr.510 was well organized, and the same process was used consistently throughout the book. When an enlarged initial was to appear, the scribe paused to outline it before continuing with the text: the ink outline of the initial is clearly visible in several letters where the paint has flaked, and this outline must have been completed before the adjacent text was written, for the text flows smoothly around its contours. Further, we can still decipher exactly where the scribe dipped pen in ink, and the pattern formed by the progressive lightening and then abrupt darkness of the ink demonstrates that the scribe wrote the text continuously: there was no need to pause to block in an initial, for its outline was already there.²⁷ The enlarged letters are thus integrated within the text, a process that coincides with a change in the location (and importance) of the initials. In earlier Byzantine manuscripts, enlarged letters appear at the beginning of a naturally occurring line of text: to signal a particular passage, the scribe would enlarge the first letter of the next line of text.²⁸ In Paris.gr.510, with two exceptions among more than 1600 initials, the first letter of the passage to be marked received the enlarged letter; when an initial was required, the scribe began the passage to be marked on a new line.²⁹ The increased status of the enlarged letters is confirmed by their embellishment, in paint or gold leaf, in a separate process after the text had been completed: the paint on the far right edge of a painted initial is occasionally superimposed over the text. The writing and the painting were clearly distinct processes, and the scribes seem not to have anticipated elaborate ornament: even when initial terminal decorations are quite extensive, they never infringe on the text space, for no space was left for them by the scribe. The autonomy of the two processes, and the distinct approaches to the initials taken by the (conservative) scribes and the (sometimes flamboyant) illuminators, suggest that, in an apparent break from earlier Byzantine practice, the scribes were not responsible for the embellish-

²⁷ I thank Michael McCormick for this observation.

²⁸ See Julien Leroy (1978), 52 note 4.

²⁹ See Brubaker (1991), 26–27.

Vision and meaning in ninth-century Byzantium

ment of the enlarged initials. Paris.gr.510 seems to provide our earliest evidence of an autonomous group of illuminators. It is also the first datable and unquestionably Byzantine manuscript with painted initials. A detailed study of these initials has appeared elsewhere,³⁰ and will not be repeated here.

The illuminators also painted the decorative headpieces (fig. 47) that once pre-faced each of Gregory's sermons: initials and headpieces share the motifs of the striped cable, multi-coloured rows of hearts, five-lobed leaf decoration, and an unusual palmette form, as well as more common jewelled panels. However, in only one instance – the miniature and incipit initial to 'On Easter' (ff. 285r–v) – are the non-figural decorations visually coordinated with a miniature. Furthermore, the visual vocabulary used by the miniaturists themselves differs from that used by the illuminators: the blessing hand of the hand-hasta epsilons (fig. 47) is, for example, invariably shown with the palm facing inward; in contrast, the miniaturists consistently elected to reverse the blessing hand, and drew them with the palm exposed to the viewer.³¹ Not only, then, do the illuminators seem to have been distinct from the scribes; they also seem to have been distinct from the miniaturists.

There seem to have been at least three illuminators, most conveniently distinguished by a predilection for a particular type of terminal descender: trilobe (three small circles attached to the base of a letter), grape cluster, or foliate scroll. The trilobe decoration reveals a pattern of allocation in the first quarter of the manuscript, where trilobe initials appear in every third quire:³² at least at the beginning of production, quires were farmed out to the illuminators following a fairly regular system, and the painter of the trilobe initials received every third quire. Collaboration between the illuminators was apparently loose, for initial forms are neither homogeneous nor consistent, and a variety of letter shapes (two forms of mu, for example) appear. There is no evidence that the illuminators formed part of an established scriptorium, nor do any other manuscripts reveal their contributions either solo or collectively.

THE PHYSICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEXT AND MINIATURES

After the five-miniature frontispiece sequence that celebrates Christ's blessing of the Emperor Basil I and his family (ff. A–C), most of the illustrations in Paris.gr.510 are fully integrated into the fabric of the manuscript: the end of the preceding sermon or the beginning of the following one occupies the other side of thirty-two of the forty-one text miniatures. The continuity of the text ensures that these miniatures retain their original locations and preserve the intended disposition of text

³⁰ Brubaker (1991); here too earlier bibliography.

³¹ See ff. 52v, 75r, 87v, 264v, 438v (figs. 10, 14, 16, 28, 44).

³² Two in quires two and five, one in quire eight, three in quire eleven and two in quire fourteen.

Introduction

and image. This arrangement simplifies matters for modern interpreters, but it has not been kind to the miniatures: painting on ruled parchment encourages flaking, and the images are often badly damaged.

Presumably for this reason, full-page miniatures were more normally painted on unruled leaves that were inserted into the text.³³ Apart from Paris.gr.510, the exceptions usually appear in manuscripts where most of the illustrations are not full-page: for example, pictures incorporated within the text dominate the early fifth-century Vatican Virgil, and the occasional full-page miniatures have text on their reverse.³⁴ Another exception is provided by the sixth-century Vienna Dioscorides, a herbal with each full-page plant miniature facing a page of explanatory text; the miniatures thus have the text belonging to the previous image on their reverses. The Vienna Dioscorides, however, was a deluxe presentation copy; herbals did not regularly contain full-page illustrations.³⁵ Like the full-page miniatures in the Vatican Virgil, those in the Dioscorides deviate from a tradition of smaller pictures inserted in the text.

Paris.gr.510 apparently continues this pattern. No other illustrated copies of Gregory's sermons use full-page illustrations: in all other copies, the image always shares a page with text (figs. 48–55, 79, 100). The integral miniatures in the Homilies perpetuate the integrated format normally used for illustrated copies of the text.

It is possible that in Paris.gr.510 the retention of the integrated format represents a bow to tradition, for the miniaturists demonstrably knew about painting on unruled and inserted sheets: the frontispiece sequence is unruled, and eight or nine miniatures in the body of the manuscript were painted on inserted single leaves, unruled, and with blank backs.³⁶ The first ten miniatures, in fact, follow this system: after the five frontispiece miniatures, five inserted leaves with miniatures on one side and a blank reverse appear in the first seven quires of the manuscript. There are no integral miniatures until the eighth gathering, where f. 67

³³ Few full-page miniatures produced in the eastern Mediterranean before (or during) the ninth century survive; those that do, however, usually share their leaf with another miniature (as in the sixth-century Rabbula and Rossano Gospels) or were painted on unruled leaves that remained blank on the reverse: e.g. the ninth-century miniatures of Princeton, Garrett 6 and the frontispiece to the Khludov Psalter. Later Byzantine examples, too, almost always follow this formula, as do pre-tenth-century Latin books: e.g. the sixth- or seventh-century Ashburnham Pentateuch, the seventh- and eighth-century insular gospelbooks, the eighth-century Vespasian Psalter, and the ninth-century Touronian Bibles.

³⁴ On the full-page death of Dido in the Vatican Virgil (*CLA* 1 [1934], no.11; Vat.lat.3225, f. 40r), painted in Rome ca. 400, see Weitzmann (1977), 36. In the ninth-century 'Christian Topography' (Vat.gr.699), eighteen of the sixty-one miniatures are full-page (ff. 15v, 38r, 43v, 45r, 49r, 52r, 59r, 61v, 63v, 66v, 74r, 75r, 76r, 82v, 83v, 89r, 114v, 115v); about half were painted on unruled sheets.

³⁵ Gerstinger (1979); Anderson (1977).

³⁶ See the next note. Quire 47 is problematic; it certainly has one, and possibly two, inserted miniatures.

Vision and meaning in ninth-century Byzantium

contains the end of Gregory's sermon 'On Peace' on its recto and a miniature on its verso.³⁷

The insertion of unruled leaves containing full-page miniatures into regular text gatherings is common in Byzantium,³⁸ but the combination of two systems of illustration found in Paris.gr.510, inserted and integral, is so unusual that the break between the two systems in the eighth gathering must indicate a decision to change the format at this point. It is however hard to imagine reasons for switching from inserted to integral miniatures: inserted leaves allow greater flexibility (scribes and painters can work independently) and provide a smooth surface that takes paint more easily, while the integrated format followed from f. 67 onward required the precise coordination of scribes and miniaturists and imposed an uneven ruled surface on the painters. The shift is unlikely to have resulted from an abrupt decision to trim production costs: in a book the length of Paris.gr.510, the sixteen folios (eight bifolia) saved by integrating the miniatures would have had little financial impact. Were cost-cutting the issue, full-page miniatures are unlikely to have been included at all and each new sermon would not begin on a fresh page, often leaving considerable empty parchment on the final page of the preceding homily. Instead – and especially given the care with which Paris.gr.510 was produced – the change in format seems to document a radical change in plans. This change occurred after the scribes had already begun work on the text and had completed the first six homilies, meticulously outlining the enlarged initials for the illuminators but neglecting to leave blank sides for miniatures. Since the scribes habitually left a blank side for a miniature before each sermon from the eighth quire on,³⁹ it seems reasonable to assume that they were only told to do so after they had completed the first seven quires. Either the designer of the manuscript at first forgot to tell the scribes to make accommodations for pictures, or the design of the manuscript itself was revised *in medias res*. Both possibilities are conceivable. The careful design otherwise evident throughout the manuscript suggests, however, that the shift in format reflects a genuine change in plans rather than the correction of an oversight. If so, the decision to illustrate Gregory's sermons was made only as the scribes began the eighth gathering. While the coherent and self-contained frontispiece sequence might or might not always have been intended, it appears that Paris.gr.510 may not originally have been conceived as an illustrated text. Whatever prompted the change in plans, miniatures were inserted into the first seven quires; thereafter, the

³⁷ All of the inserted leaves – f. 3 in the first quire, ff. 30 and 32 in the fourth, f. 43 between the fifth and sixth, f. 52 between the sixth and seventh, f. 347 in quire 44, f. 367 or (and?) f. 374 in quire 47, and f. 435 in quire 55 – disrupt the regular quaternion system used throughout Paris.gr.510. See Appendix C.

³⁸ See note 33 above.

³⁹ The exceptions are 'On himself' (Homily 26), which was unillustrated (see page 11), and the letter to Evagrius, now prefaced by an inserted miniature (f. 435v) that sustains no relationship to the letter and may well also originally have been unillustrated (see chapter 2). On the problematic quire 47, see Appendix C.