

‘The Man who Found a Treasure’:

The Latin Translation of the Eugenic Recension of Stephanites and Ichnelates

Marc D. Lauxtermann

The text history of *Stephanites and Ichnelates* is rather intricate.¹ The oldest version is a partial translation of the Arabic source text, *Kalīla wa-Dimna*,² produced by Symeon Seth during the early reign of Alexios Komnenos.³ This translation comprises books 1-7 and 9, all in shortened form. Then there are two twelfth-century versions, each adding substantial chunks of material to Symeon Seth’s original translation. The first is anonymous: the additions to Seth include a new translation of the whole of book 9 and translations of books 10 and 11. This version is preserved in a group of manuscripts labelled Bδ.⁴ The second augmented version of *Stephanites and Ichnelates* is the Eugenic recension, named after Eugenios of Palermo, a high-placed official at the Norman court of Sicily, who commissioned the text in 1190-1194. This version comprises the original Sethian books 1-7 and 9, but with substantial additions, plus translations of books 8, 10 and 12-15 and three extensive ‘Prologues’.⁵ The Eugenic recension is preserved in a badly mangled form in a group of manuscripts labelled Bε,⁶ but also in a Latin translation that is clearly superior to all existing Greek manuscripts.⁷

¹ I follow Puntoni (see n. 8 below) in his division of books and paragraphs, but unlike him, I refer to these books and paragraphs with Arabic numerals. *Prol.* stands for *Prologues* (the three books before the actual collection of fables and stories). For the sigla of the manuscripts, I follow Sjöberg (see n. 3 below).

² For the Arabic source text, see François de Blois, *Burzōy’s Voyage to India and the Origin of the Book of Kalīlah wa Dimnah* (London, 1990) and Bettina Krönung, “The Wisdom of the Beasts: The Arabic Book of Kalīla and Dimna and the Byzantine Book of Stephanites and Ichnelates,” in Carolina Cupane and Bettina Krönung (eds), *Fictional Storytelling in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 427-460.

³ *Stephanites und Ichnelates: Überlieferungsgeschichte und Text*, ed. Lars-Olof Sjöberg (Uppsala, 1962).

⁴ There is no proper edition of this version. Category Bδ is represented by three manuscripts: Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vindob. med. gr. 29; Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Ambros. C 46 sup.; and El Escorial, Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Esc. Y-III-26 (fol. 194-248). See Sjöberg, *Stephanites und Ichnelates*, p. 68.

⁵ This translation, too, has not yet been edited. But see Marc D. Lauxtermann, “The Eugenic Recension of *Stephanites and Ichnelates*: Prologue and Paratexts,” *Νέα Πώμη* 15 (2018), 55-106. Despite the promising title, the recent edition and translation by Alison Noble, with Alexander Alexakis and Richard P.H. Greenfield, *Animal Fables of the Courtly Mediterranean: The Eugenic Recension of Stephanites and Ichnelates* (Washington, 2022), does not offer the text of the Eugenic recension, but of a manuscript that combines readings of two different versions, P3 (for which see the next footnote).

⁶ The most important Bε manuscripts are Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Leid. Vulc. 93 (L1) and Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. gr. 172 (B2). Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Suppl. gr. 692 (P3), combines readings of Bε and Bθ. For the Leiden manuscript, see Alison E. Noble, *Cultural Interchange in the Medieval Mediterranean: Prolegomena to a Text of the Eugenic Recension*, 2 vols. (Unpublished PhD thesis, Queen’s University Belfast, 2003).

⁷ Ed. Alfons Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung der griechischen Version des Kalilabuchs,” in idem, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Erzählliteratur des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1928), pp. 59-165. See also idem, “Eine bisher

The two augmented translations of Stephanites and Ichnelates eventually merged into various heavily contaminated branches of the manuscript tradition (labelled Bζ, Bη, Bθ and Bι). Despite all the cross-copying, these branches are important because they quite often preserve genuine ‘Eugenian’ readings lost in the Bε group.⁸

However, apart from there being three translations of *Stephanites and Ichnelates* (Symeon Seth, the Anonymous Translator, and Eugenios of Palermo) and a fair amount of cross-copying in later versions, research into the text history has also been hampered by a blind spot for the actual wording of the Greek. The manuscripts (c. 40 in total) have been divided into redactions (A and B) and sub-redactions (Aα, β, γ and Bδ, ε, ζ, η, θ and ι) on the basis of their contents, not their readings.⁹ Take, for example, ms. J: based on the paragraphs it offers or omits, Sjöberg puts it in group Bε and Papademetriou puts it in group Bζ.¹⁰ But if these scholars had looked at the actual text (rather than mechanically classifying manuscripts), they would have immediately noticed striking similarities with another manuscript, V3. This is a manuscript that contains two Palaeologan collections of fables extracted from *Stephanites and Ichnelates*.¹¹ The second collection of V3 offers fable *Prol.* 3.4b in exactly the same wording as ms. J (fol. 77^v), and this wording differs from both Bε and Bζ.¹² There are many more points where V3 and J offer the same or almost the same text: for example, at 4.102, 7.125 and 9.133, and in all these instances the differences from Bε and Bζ warn against the dangers of a mechanical classification system.¹³ The text history is

unbekannte lateinische Übersetzung der griechischen Version des Kalilabuchs (Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης),” *Jahresbericht der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Cultur* 95 (1917), Abt. IV.c, pp. 1-10.

⁸ It is on the basis of one of these contaminated branches that Puntoni produced the edition of the whole text: *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης: Quattro recensioni della versione greca del Kalila wa-Dimna*, ed. Vittorio Puntoni (Florence, 1889). For the different versions, see Johannes Niehoff-Panagiotidis, *Übersetzung und Rezeption: Die byzantinisch-neugriechischen und spanischen Adaptionen von Kalila wa-Dimna* (Wiesbaden, 2003), pp. 36-45.

⁹ This is true not only for Sjöberg, *Stephanites und Ichnelates*, pp. 21-86, but also for most of the secondary bibliography: see especially Vittorio Puntoni, “Sopra alcune recensioni dello Stephanites kai Ichnelates,” *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, anno cclxxxiii (1886), serie quarta: Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, vol. II, parte I^a, Memorie, pp. 113-182, and John Th. Papademetriou, *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of Stephanites kai Ichnelates* (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Illinois, 1960).

¹⁰ J = Jerusalem, Πατριαρχική Βιβλιοθήκη, Παναγιού Τάφου 208. Sjöberg, *Stephanites und Ichnelates*, pp. 68-69, and Papademetriou, *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition*, pp. 43-44 (Papademetriou’s ‘recension I’ is Sjöberg’s Bζ).

¹¹ V3 = Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 949. For the first collection (attributed to a certain John Eskammatismenos, fol. 106^v-121^r), see the edition by Vittorio Puntoni, “Alcune favole dello Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης secondo una relazione inedita di Prete Giovanni Escammatismeno,” in Enea Piccolomini (ed.), *Studi di filologia greca* (Turin, 1882), pp. 29-58. For the second (anonymous) collection (fol. 122^v-154^r), see Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, app. crit., at *Prol.* 3.4b and 1.18, 1.45, 2.59, 3.81, 4.96, 4.99, 4.102, 4.104, 4.106, 6.121, 6.122, 7.125, 8.131, 9.133, 12.139 and 13.141. The second collection is a sequel to the first: see Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 267, lines 26-29, where we find a cross-reference to fable 7.126 contained in the first collection.

¹² For the texts of Bε and Bζ, see Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, pp. 34-38.

¹³ As Simone van Riet, “Les fables arabes d’Ibn al-Muqaffa en traductions grecques et latines,” in Albert Zimmermann and Ingrid Craemer-Ruegenberg (eds), *Orientalische Kultur und Europäisches Mittelalter*

complicated enough as it is; but it becomes needlessly complicated if one ignores the actual Greek. To quote myself regarding the Eugenic recension, “The point is that scholarship has been so busy reconstructing the contents of the Eugenic recension that it has neglected the study of the text itself. We know its contents, but not its linguistic nature or textual embodiment. The only way out of this conundrum is good old-fashioned philology. This means looking at *all* manuscripts, not just the ones that belong to the Bε branch.”¹⁴

In what follows, I shall look at the Latin translation and what it tells us about the Eugenic recension, but I shall also highlight differences and point out that the Latin translator quite often had recourse to the Arabic source text.

Date and provenance of the Latin translation

The Latin translation of the Eugenic recension of *Stephanites and Ichnelates* is transmitted in two fifteenth-century manuscripts: Budapest, Egyetemi Könyvtár (University Library), cod. Lat. 99, fol. 122^r–172^v, and Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, cod. 13650, fol. 135^r–193^v. But as the editor, Alfons Hilka, already noted, the Latin text is much older: it is not humanist Latin, but medieval Latin.¹⁵ In fact, there can be little doubt that it was produced in the Hohenstaufen Kingdom of Sicily, as evidenced by the translation of στρατηγός, i.e. the governor who presides at the trial of Ichnelates, as ‘stratigotus’ (at p. 113.32).¹⁶ The *stratigotus* was a judicial official in the Kingdom of Sicily, equivalent to a town governor or a bailiff: documentary evidence is abundant for the Hohenstaufens, and the Normans before them, but the title disappears during the subsequent Angevin period.¹⁷ Another piece of evidence is the translation of the term λογοθεσία as ‘officium logotheti’ (at p. 72.6–7). The *logotheta* was the highest official at the court of Frederick II and Manfred, equivalent to the position of chancellor in other European countries: Piero della Vigna (c. 1190–1249) is probably the best-known bearer of this title.¹⁸ Other court titles include *baiulus*, ‘magistrate’ (at p. 112.24, ἐξουσιαστής in the source text), and *senescalus*, ‘seneschal, steward’ (at p.

(Berlin-New York, 1985), pp. 151–160, at p. 160, rightly points out: “Une analyse *qualitative* du recueil de fables (...) devrait être entreprise (...); on ne peut pas se contenter de classer les manuscrits grecs, quantitativement, selon leur contenu.”

¹⁴ Lauxtermann, “The Eugenic Recension,” p. 67.

¹⁵ Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 60. Since Sjöberg, *Stephanites und Ichnelates*, p. 115, denies the existence of redaction B before the year 1400, he incorrectly postulates a fifteenth-century date for the Latin translation: this is a classic example of circular reasoning.

¹⁶ See the convincing analysis by Van Riet, “Les fables arabes d’Ibn al-Muqaffa,” pp. 156–159. For further discussion, see Lauxtermann, “The Eugenic Recension,” p. 63.

¹⁷ See Beatrice Pasciuta, “Stratigotus,” in *Federico II: Enciclopedia Fridericiana*, 2 vols (Rome, 2005), vol. II, pp. 802–803.

¹⁸ See Ernst Kantorowicz, *Frederick the Second, 1194–1250* (London, 1931), pp. 298–307.

149.19–20, for πρωτομάγειρος). Since the Eugenian recension itself dates to 1190–1194, the translation must date from after 1194 and before the last of the Hohenstaufen kings lost his life in 1266.

Another indication that the translation stems from Sicily (or an adjoining region, such as Calabria or Apulia) is the fact that, as I will show below, the translator had recourse to the Arabic source text. Knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Arabic is an extremely rare combination in the Middle Ages, but there is plenty of evidence for it in the trilingual environment of twelfth- and thirteenth-century Southern Italy.¹⁹ Arguably the best-known representative of this trilingualism, and a translator in his own right, is Eugenios of Palermo who wrote in Greek, but also translated from Arabic into Latin. A contemporary source calls him ‘virum tam grece quam arabice linguae peritissimum, latine quoque non ignarum’ (‘a man as fully expert in Greek as in Arabic, with a knowledge also of Latin’).²⁰

A third reason why the translation must have been produced in the trilingual environment of the Kingdom of Sicily, is that the translator borrowed a story from *A Hundred and One Nights*, a collection of short stories and fables that circulated widely in the Maghreb and Al-Andalus, but appears to have been unknown to the rest of the Arab world.²¹ In the light of the close connections between Sicily and the Maghreb (Ifriqiya), it stands to reason that the translator had direct access to this Maghreban source. The story of the apple that is given as a present and is then accidentally passed on to someone else, which causes the husband to suspect his spouse of adultery, is found in many cultures and many languages: in Greek, it is the kernel of the urban legend found in Malalas and other Byzantine sources, according to which Theodosius II gave an apple to empress Eudocia, who then presented it to her confidante Paulinus, who, unaware where the apple came from, in his turn gave it to the emperor.²² In the Latin translation the story goes as follows: a man receives a gift of two apples, eats one of them and gives the other to his brother who, walking home, meets his little nephew to whom he gives the apple; the boy goes to sleep in the same bed as his mother and

¹⁹ For this multilingual (but not multicultural) environment, see Marc D. Lauxtermann, “Tomi, Mljet, Malta: Critical Notes on a Twelfth-Century Southern Italian Poem of Exile,” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 64 (2014), 155–176, at pp. 170–176.

²⁰ See Charles H. Haskins, *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1924), pp. 191–192 and Walter Berschin, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages: From Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa* (Washington, 1988), p. 234.

²¹ *A Hundred and One Nights*, edited and translated by Bruce Fudge (New York, 2016). For a recently discovered manuscript of this collection, see Ulrich Marzolph and Aboubakr Chraïbi, “The Hundred and One Nights: A Recently Discovered Old Manuscript,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 162 (2012), 299–316.

²² See Tommaso Braccini, “An Apple between Folktales, Rumors, and Novellas: Malalas 14.8 and its Oriental Parallels,” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 58 (2018), 299–323, and Margaret Sironval, “Le don du fruit merveilleux dans les *Mille et Une Nuits*,” *Journal of Arabic Literature* 36 (2005), 288–310.

when father joins them later that evening, he sees the apple lying next to his wife and thinking that she slept with his brother, throws her out of the window into the sea; the next morning when the boy asks for his apple, the father understands that he has made a terrible mistake – but too late, she is dead.²³ In *A Hundred and One Nights*, the story is that a merchant when he goes to bed, finds an apple and recognizes it as the apple a friend showed him earlier that day, without knowing that this friend gave it to the merchant’s son who, in his turn, gave it as a present to his mother; the jealous merchant asks his wife to make his bed in the upper storey and when they are there, he throws her out of the window into the Nile; the next day his son tells him about the apple and he realizes his mistake.²⁴ This is more or less the same storyline, and none of the oriental sources (including *A Thousand and One Nights*)²⁵ comes as close as *A Hundred and One Nights* to the retelling by the Latin translator.

Contents of the Latin translation and comparison with Greek versions

The Latin translation of the Eugenic recension comprises the three *Prologues* in their entirety, books 1–7 in their entirety (apart from 1.11–14 which the translator summarizes in a few lines), the whole of book 8, book 9 in the short Sethian version (i.e. without 9.133b), book 10 in the short version typical of Bε manuscripts (i.e. without 10.135 b, d, f, h, k, m, o and q), and books 12–15 in their entirety (but without 15.148–149, which is a later addition to *Stephanites and Ichneutes*).

The Latin translation shows no points of contact with the Anonymous Translator (version Bδ): it does not have book 11, it retains the short Sethian version of book 9, and it offers book 10 in a totally different version. It is not just the content; it is also the wording that is different. Take book 9. Symeon Seth talks about a κίσσα (jay), the Anonymous Translator about a ψιττακός (parrot), and the Latin translator has ‘pica’ (jay or magpie). This bird had a chick and the king had a son, and they grew up together. One day the little boy got angry at the chick and killed it. When the bird saw what had happened, it exclaimed in Symeon Seth’s version: Οὐαὶ τοῖς συναυλιζομένοις τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἀβεβαίοις οὔσι καὶ ἀστηρίκτοις καὶ τὴν γνώμην ἀστάτοις. The Anonymous Translator renders the Arabic source text as follows: Οὐαὶ τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τοῖς μὴ συνθήκας τηροῦσι μήτε φιλίας θεσμούς. The Latin translation reads: ‘*Ve illis qui conversantur in aulis regis, quia eius amicitia nulla et*

²³ Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 143 (§127).

²⁴ Fudge, *A Hundred and One Nights*, pp. 175–177.

²⁵ For the *Story of the Three Apples* in *A Thousand and One Nights*, see Sironval, “Le don du fruit merveilleux,” pp. 291–294, and Braccini, “An Apple between Folktales, Rumors, and Novellas,” pp. 310–311.

instabilis est!’ The Latin here is a free adaptation of the Greek of Symeon Seth. The same is true for most of this chapter: the Latin translation follows Seth, not the alternative text of the Anonymous Translator.²⁶

The Latin translation offers more or less the same as the principal manuscripts of the Bε version,²⁷ with the following exceptions:

- (i) it has *Prol.* 2.7–8 in contrast to Bε
- (ii) it has 3.80–82 in contrast to Bε
- (iii) it offers paragraphs 1.17–24, 2.58–60, and 4.93–107 in the right order
- (iv) it offers a better and more complete text in book 10
- (v) it has the short version of *Prol.* 2.2a.

Points (i) and (ii) are indicative of lacunas in the text tradition of Bε. As for point (iii), some clarification is required: the principal manuscripts of Bε, L1, B2 and P3,²⁸ ultimately derive from a rather peculiar exemplar in which the Eugenic additions to Symeon Seth were copied in the margins, with marks indicating (not always entirely correctly) where they should be inserted in the main text. B2 and P3 (or their exemplars) followed these instructions to the letter;²⁹ the scribes of L1 did the same in the first four books, but then copied the exemplar as they found it, with the additions still in the margins.³⁰ The supposedly contaminated versions (Bζ, η, θ and ι) offer these additions in the right order, indicating that they had access to a more reliable hyparchetype than the Bε version did.³¹ The right order is the order in which we find these paragraphs in the Arabic source text – which must also have been the order of the Eugenic recension.

The problem with the Bε version is not only that it messed up the Eugenic recension, but also that the scribe responsible for the hyparchetype was both extremely sloppy and stubbornly interventionist – a fatal combination of character traits.³² In most books of *Stephanites and Ichnelates*, there are enough manuscripts to show what went wrong with Bε, but for book 10 of the Eugenic recension we rely mainly on the evidence of L1 and B2. It is the Latin translation (see point iv above) that helps us understand what book 10 in the

²⁶ See Van Riet, “Les fables arabes d’Ibn al-Muqaffa,” pp. 152–154.

²⁷ The striking similarities between the Latin translation and version Bε have not gone unnoticed: see Evelyn Jamison, *Admiral Eugenius of Sicily: His Life and Work and the Authorship of the Epistola ad Petrum and the Historia Hugonis Falcandi Siculi* (London, 1957), pp. 14–16, and Van Riet, “Les fables arabes d’Ibn al-Muqaffa,” pp. 154–155.

²⁸ For these manuscripts, see n. 6.

²⁹ P3, however, shows clear signs of cross-copying with Bθ: as from book 4, it offers the paragraphs in the same sequence as Bθ does.

³⁰ For more information and references to the earlier bibliography, see Lauxtermann, “The Eugenic Recension,” pp. 56–59.

³¹ For the contents of these versions, see Sjöberg, *Stephanites und Ichnelates*, pp. 71–76.

³² For horrendous mistakes, see Lauxtermann, “The Eugenic Recension,” pp. 69–74 and 98.

Eugenian recension may have looked like before Bε made a mess of it. Since the Latin translation is a free adaptation of the Greek source text, it cannot be used to reconstruct the exact wording of the Greek; but it can help in signalling lacunas and clarifying obscure passages in the Greek. Take, for example, 10.135l: ὁ δὲ λέων δοκῶν ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ λαληθέντα <lacuna> ἔφη πρὸς αὐτούς (read: αὐτόν)· <lacuna> δέδωκα αὐτὸ τῷ πρωτομαγεῖρῳ ὑποχειρίῳ, where the Latin translation offers: ‘Leo autem illos credens veritatem dicere *fecit vocari pantherem et dixit ei: Quid fecisti de carne? Panther dixit: Dedi eam senescalo tuo*’.³³ The Greek text is nonsensical because King Lion cannot be angry that his meat is missing if he himself gave it to the steward. The truth of the matter is that King Lion is angry with his chief adviser, the jackal (*panther* in the Latin translation), for allegedly stealing his meat whereas, in fact, the latter had given it to the steward. Let this one example stand for innumerable others where the Latin is clearly superior.

The last difference with the Bε version (point v above) is that the Latin translation offers the fable of *The Man who Found a Treasure* (*Prol. 2.2a*) in a short version which, in Greek, is attested only in the oldest manuscript, P1 (13th c.), but which is in fact a feature of all Arabic manuscripts of *Kalīla wa-Dimna* that have been published so far. The long version that we find in all the other Greek manuscripts is a later rhetorical elaboration; it is not original.³⁴

Recourse to the Arabic source text

In the Latin translation the two jackals bear the names ‘Kililes’ and ‘Dimnes’ (*Kalīla* and *Dimna* in Arabic), not the grecized ‘Stephanites’ and ‘Ichnelates’.³⁵ The title has also been adapted: namely, ‘liber Kyliles et Dimnes’, though elsewhere the translator does acknowledge his Greek source: ‘liber iste qui dicitur Kililes et Dimnes, id est Stephanitis et Ignilatis’.³⁶ The translator’s wish to re-Arabize *Stephanites and Ichnelates* is also evident in his translation of the end of *Prologue 2*, where the Greek source text reads: Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἰδόντες τοὺς Πέρσας ἐρμηνεύσαντας τοῦτο ἀπὸ τῆς ἰνδικῆς, ἐλληγιστὶ καὶ ἡμεῖς μεθερμηνεύσαμεν.

³³ Greek: ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 294, lines 9–11. Latin: ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 149, lines 17–20.

³⁴ P1 = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Par. gr. 2231. For further discussion, see Lauxtermann, “The Eugenian Recension,” pp. 63–64.

³⁵ See, for example, Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 88, lines 8–10: “Et inter illas feras erant duo licopantheres, nomen uni Kililes et alii Dimnes, et erant ambo dolosi et fraudulentum.” The Greek reads: Παρήσαν δ’ ἐκεῖσε σὺν τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν θῶες δύο, ὁ μὲν Στεφανίτης, ὁ δὲ Ἰχνηλάτης καλούμενοι, ἀμφοτέρω δὲ ποικίλοι καὶ ἀγγινοῦστατοι (Sjöberg, *Stephanites und Ichnelates*, p. 154, lines 2–4).

³⁶ Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 69, line 6 and p. 86, line 36; cf. p. 74, line 13.

This becomes in Latin: ‘Et nos Persas videntes huius libri interpretaciones a lingua Indorum in linguam Persarum (...), interpretavimus ea a lingua Persarum *in linguam arabicam*’.³⁷

However, vastly more important than this feeble attempt to give the text a more Arabic feel, is the fact that the translator had two manuscripts lying on his desk when he produced his translation: Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης and حكايات كليلة ودمنة. Take, for example, the beginning of the first book. In the Greek version, the emperor has a question and the philosopher answers by telling a story. But in the Arabic source text and in the Latin translation, the emperor has a question to which the philosopher provides an answer, and only then does he tell the story.³⁸

Typical of Symeon Seth’s translation is that he left out most of the Arabic names and almost all the toponyms.³⁹ This was not rectified by the translators working for Eugenios of Palermo. But the Latin translator fills in the gaps: in the first fable of book one, for example, the son of the merchant travels ‘ad civitatem Sane’, with the merchandise loaded onto a cart pulled by two oxen, one of whom is called ‘Simpep’.⁴⁰ The first toponym is a rendering of Arabic ‘Sanūn’, and the second, a free adaptation of the name ‘Shanzaba’.⁴¹ In the fable, this ox gets stuck in the mud and as it is unable to go any further, it is left behind by the merchant’s son. The Arabic source text adds that the merchant’s son ordered a servant to stay with the ox until it was strong enough to walk on its own and that this servant, tired of waiting, rejoined his master and told him that the animal had died.⁴² This part is omitted in Symeon Seth’s translation and not re-inserted in the Eugenician recension,⁴³ but it is there in the Latin translation.⁴⁴ The only solution to this conundrum is that the translator, while translating from the Greek, occasionally checked the Arabic source text to see if anything was missing.

³⁷ Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 64 (the Greek source text) and p. 78, lines 17–20 (the Latin translation).

³⁸ Greek: Sjöberg, *Stephanites und Ichnelates*, p. 151, lines 1–4. Arabic: André Miquel, *Ibn al-Muqaffa’: Le livre de Kalila et Dimna ou Fables de Bidpai* (Paris, 1957), p. 49, lines 1–9. Latin: Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 87, lines 1–6.

³⁹ See Héléne Condylis-Bassoukos, *Stephanites kai Ichnelates, traduction grecque (XI^e siècle) du livre Kalila wa-Dimna d’Ibn al-Muqaffa’ (VIII^e siècle): étude lexicologique et littéraire* (Louvain, 1997), pp. 108–111.

⁴⁰ Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 87, lines 28–29.

⁴¹ See the commentary by Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 157.

⁴² See Miquel, *Ibn al-Muqaffa’*, pp. 50–51, and Wyndham Knatchbull, *Kalila and Dimna or the Fables of Bidpai* (Oxford, 1819), p. 85.

⁴³ This paragraph (1.3b) can be found in two manuscripts belonging to version Bδ (see Sjöberg, *Stephanites und Ichnelates*, pp. 68, 71 n. 2, and 79); but this version is very different from what the Latin translator offers. It is a later addition to the Greek tradition: see V. Puntoni, “Sopra alcune recensioni,” pp. 126–132. See also Condylis-Bassoukos, *Stephanites kai Ichnelates*, pp. 30–31.

⁴⁴ Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 87, lines 32–35.

Arguably the best example of how the translator proceeded is to be found at 6.121. This is the story of the poor man who one night dreamt of great riches: if he were to sell the honey and butter that he had saved, he might buy goats with the money, and these goats would have kids and grow in number, and then he would be able to buy oxen and till the land – he would get immensely rich, buy a nice house and some slaves, find a good woman and have a son with her, whom he would properly educate, and if the boy did not listen, he would beat him, and while thinking of this corporeal punishment, he inadvertently crushed the pot with honey and butter, and it dripped down over his chin. The Greek version of Symeon Seth (and the same is true for the Eugenic recension) does not explain where the poor man gets his honey and butter from; nor it is clear how he can hit a pot while lying in bed. The Latin supplies all the missing bits: ‘(...) quidem pauper qui habebat cottidie de mensa domini imperatoris panem unum et parvum butiri et mellis; panem comedebat, mel et butirum in uno vase reponebat. Vas autem erat suspensum super lectum eius’.⁴⁵ The Arabic source text, likewise, informs us that the man received a daily allowance of honey, butter and flour and that he kept some of the honey and butter in a jar, which he hung above his bed.⁴⁶

But there are also differences with the Arabic source text. In the original, the recipient of the daily allowance is a holy man and the person giving the flour, honey, and butter is a merchant. Since the translator followed Symeon Seth in removing any allusion to asceticism in what was clearly a non-Christian environment, he faced a problem with the identity of the generous donor, it not being clear why a merchant would give a daily allowance to one of the poor. While charity to the poor is usually the domain of the secular clergy and the monastic orders, he chose the emperor as the next best – and the reason is, once again, the non-Christian fictional world of *Stephanites and Ichnelates*. Apart from the few lines that he added on the basis of the Arabic, the Latin translator kept close to the Greek: content-wise and on a lexical level, there can be no doubt that this is a translation of *Stephanites and Ichnelates* and not of *Kalīla wa-Dimna*. But the fact that he occasionally had recourse to the Arabic source text, makes his text one of the more curious outliers in the history of translations from Greek to Latin.

Felicities and infelicities of the translation

⁴⁵ Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 139, lines 21–25.

⁴⁶ See Miquel, *Ibn al-Muqaffa*, p. 198, and Knatchbull, *Kalila and Dimna*, pp. 269–270.

The translator is likely to have been a speaker of Greek (though with a good command of Latin) because when he adds the Aesopic fable about the farmer and the snake at the end of book 9,⁴⁷ it takes the form of Perry no. 51 rather than Perry no. 573. The former is common to the Greek tradition; the latter is typical of the medieval Latin adaptations that go under the name of Romulus.⁴⁸ Since schooling in the Middle Ages begins with the retelling of fables, the choice of Perry no. 51 indicates that this was probably the version the translator learnt at school. And this, in its turn, strongly suggests that he went to a Greek school rather than a Latin one.

As noted by Hilka and Van Riet,⁴⁹ the translator occasionally uses Greek loanwords in his translation. The word λυκοπάνθηροι (jackals) is rendered as ‘licopantheres’.⁵⁰ The word ἱερακάριος appears to have simply been transliterated as ‘hieracarius’, a loanword that was so incomprehensible to readers of Latin that it was then garbled into ‘actorcoreus’ (sic) in the manuscript tradition.⁵¹ The word ἱλαρότης is rendered as ‘hylaritas’ and the rare word τῷ ἱλαροδότῃ (bringer of joy) as ‘hylari datori’ – but ‘hilaritas’ and ‘hilaris’ are already attested in classical Latin.⁵² The phrase ἐκ τῶν μεγιστάνων καὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν is translated as ‘de magnatibus et ideotis’: ‘idiota’ is a classic example of a false friend because in Latin it means ‘uneducated, ignorant, stupid’, not ‘ordinary citizen’ (which is clearly what is meant here).⁵³ The personal name Πάγκαλος is rendered as ‘Pincellus’.⁵⁴

There are other obvious Grecisms as well: the Latin translator, for example, renders ὑπεκρίθη τὸ θανεῖν (‘he pretended to be dead’) as ‘ut ypocrita finxit se mori’ (‘like a hypocrit, he pretended to be dead’).⁵⁵ And he does not seem to realize that the periphrastic

⁴⁷ Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 148, lines 5-14.

⁴⁸ See Ben E. Perry, *Aesopica, I* (Urbana 1952), pp. 341 and 614–616 and Gert-Jan van Dijk, *Aesopica Posteriora: Medieval and Modern Versions of Greek and Latin Fables*, 2 vols (Genoa, 2015), vol. 2, pp. 740–741 (no. 854). For the story plot in other cultures and languages, see Carl Lindahl, “Feindschaft zwischen Tieren und Mensch,” *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, vol. 4 (Berlin, 1984), coll. 982–991.

⁴⁹ Hilka, “Eine bisher unbekannte lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 9; idem, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” pp. 64–65; and Van Riet, “Les fables arabes d’Ibn al-Muqaffa,” pp. 157–158.

⁵⁰ λυκοπάνθηροι: ed. Sjöberg, *Stephanites und Ichnelates*, p. 153.13; ‘licopantheres’: ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 88.2.

⁵¹ ἱερακάριος: ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 154 (§71.1); ‘actorcoreus’: ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 114.13.

⁵² ἱλαρότης: ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 120 (§44.12); ‘hylaritas’: ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 105.10. τῷ ἱλαροδότῃ: ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 112 (§38.6); hylari datori: ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” pp. 102.40–103.1.

⁵³ ἐκ τῶν μεγιστάνων καὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν: ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 5 (Prol. 1, §3.2); ‘de magnatibus et ideotis’: ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 69.29.

⁵⁴ καὶ καλέσω τοῦτον Πάγκαλον: ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 241 (§121.13); ‘et vocabo nomen eius Pincellum’: ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 139.34.

⁵⁵ ὑπεκρίθη τὸ θανεῖν: ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 97 (§32.14); ‘ut ypocrita finxit se mori’: ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 98.23.

use of παῖς in ἰατρῶν παῖδες (i.e. ‘doctors’) does not exist in Latin: ‘filii medicorum’ just means ‘sons of doctors’.⁵⁶

However, the translator does understand the need to bring the text closer to the intended readers by adding lexical glosses that explain Greek words or clarify what the text is saying. Let me give an example of both. A good example of an explanatory gloss is his rendering of διωρίσατο (...) χρήσασθαι ταύτην ἀδιάντω, ‘he prescribed that she be given adiantum (maidenhair)’ or ‘he prescribed that she be anointed with adiantum’ (reading χρίσασθαι), where the Latin translation offers: ‘precepit ungi infirmam quodam unguento quod dicitur adyanto’, ‘he prescribed that the patient be anointed with *an anointment that is called adiantum*’.⁵⁷ An example of a textual clarification is the translator’s rendering of τὸ αἷμα, τὸ φλέγμα, τὸν χυμὸν καὶ τὴν χολήν as “sanguinem, flegmam, coleram et melancoliam”, which helps the reader understand that τὸν χυμὸν here stands for τὸν μελαγχολικὸν χυμόν.⁵⁸ Another form of clarification is the way in which τὸ λοιπὸν σύνθου μοι ταῦτα μεθ’ ὄρκου (‘well, swear you’ll do this’) is rendered: ‘ergo fac mihi iuratoriam caucionem’ (‘make then a pledge under oath for me’) —here the translator offers the precise legal term (iuratoria cautio) for this kind of pledge.⁵⁹

In general, the Latin translator’s aim appears to have been to simplify the text and add information lacking in the Greek. Let us compare, for example, the Greek and the Latin in 3.79:

Ἐγὼ πρῶτον ἐποιησάμην τὴν οἴκησιν παρά τινι μοναχῷ καὶ ἥσθιον λάθρα ἅ ἠτοίμαζεν ἐδέσματα καὶ κορεννύμενος ἐλάμβανον τὰ περιττὰ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς παρετίθουν μουσί· πολλάκις δὲ ὁ μοναχὸς ἄνωθεν ἀναρτήσας τὴν οἰκείαν τροφήν οὐκ ἠδυνήθη τὴν ἐξ ἐμοῦ βλάβην φυγεῖν. Μιᾶ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν ξένος τις κατέλυσε παρ’ αὐτῷ καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀλλήλοις προσομιλεῖν· διὰ μέσου δὲ ὁ μοναχὸς τὰς χεῖρας ἐκρότει ἡμᾶς ἐκφοβίζων· ὁ δὲ ξένος ὀργισθεὶς ἔφη αὐτῷ· μυκτηρίζεις μοι ὀμιλοῦντί σοι;

Ego primum feci habitacionem apud quendam heremitam et absconse comedebam pulmenta que preparaverat, et cum eram satur, dabam aliis muribus que mihi

⁵⁶ ἰατρῶν παῖδες: ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 234 (§116.63); ‘filii medicorum’: ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 137.20.

⁵⁷ Ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 149 (§65.3–4); and ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 112.26–7.

⁵⁸ Ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 44 (*Prol.* 3, §9.22) and ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 85.28–29.

⁵⁹ Ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 293 (§135i.7–8) and ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” pp. 148.38–149.1.

superabant. Et multociens heremita suspendebat *sportam* in altum, *et nihil proficiebat* nec poterat evadere *de manibus meis*. Una autem dierum quidam extraneus venit ad eum et inceperant loqui adinvicem et *inter alia verba que dicebant cepit* heremita plaudere manibus ut nos expavesceret. Extraneus autem indignatus dixit: Subsanas me, quia loquor tecum?⁶⁰

As the Greek source text is rather minimalistic, the translator adds details to clarify the story: the hermit does not ‘hang his own food high up’, but ‘hangs his basket [with the food in it] high up’; but this ‘doesn’t help’ (this bit is missing in Greek), because the mouse keeps coming back —and here the Latin anthropomorphizes the Greek: ‘he could not escape the harm caused by me’ becomes ‘he could not escape from my hands’. In the next sentence, the translator once again attempts to make the narrative easier to understand: ‘meanwhile’ becomes ‘during their conversation’, and rather than saying that the hermit ‘clapped his hands (constantly) scaring us off’, the Latin states that the hermit ‘began to clap his hands (at some point) to scare us off’, which, truth be said, makes infinitely more sense. But there are also translation mistakes: the ξένος is a ‘guest’ in the Greek, but a ‘stranger’ (extraneus) in the Latin; the angered guest/stranger asks in Greek: ‘Are you making fun of me while I’m talking to you?’, but in Latin: ‘Are you making fun of me because I’m talking to you?’, which is quite an odd interpretation of the participle construction ὁμιλοῦντί σοι. The word choice of ‘subsanas’ for μωκτηρίζεις, however, is felicitous indeed: it is the right word for this kind of non-verbal mockery —see, for example, *Jeremiah* 20:7 πᾶσαν ἡμέραν διετέλεσα μωκτηριζόμενος (Septuagint), ‘tota die omnes subsannant me’ (Vulgate).

Writing, rewriting, and writing off

Free translations are known as ‘les belles infidèles’: beautiful, but unfaithful. But can one speak of ‘fidelity’ in the case of a text that freely wanders across cultures and languages and, with protean agility, changes form and substance? Typical of *Kalīla wa-Dimna* and its offshoots in other languages is textual fluidity: the remarkable ease with which it underwent changes, additions, and omissions. There are various strands of textual transmission in Arabic (mostly still unedited); Symeon Seth’s *Stephanites and Ichneulates* is a translation, or rather a free adaptation, of one of these versions —and the Eugenic recension is yet another instantiation of this textual sprawl. None of the Greek manuscripts (apart from apographs)

⁶⁰ Ed. Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*, p. 169.1–9 (§79.1–9) and ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 118.6–14.

offer exactly the same text: some present subtle rewritings, others brutal interventions and adaptations. The Latin translation is no exception. ‘Infidelity’ does not even come close to describing its nature: ‘textual promiscuity’ would be more apt a description. As we have seen, the translator not only renders the Greek, but also adds material from the Arabic; he intervenes in the text to make it more comprehensible to the reader; and he supplements a fable from Aesop and a story from *A Hundred and One Nights*.

In book 5 (*Tale of the Monkey and the Turtle*), the Latin translation differs significantly not only from *Stephanites and Ichneutes*, but also from *Kalīla wa-Dimna*: that is, as far as the latter can be reconstructed at this stage.⁶¹ It is certainly possible that one day we will discover a fuller text of this chapter in Arabic, but at this point the only conclusion can be that the translator came up with a version of his own. Take for example the moment the monkey and the turtle meet: according to Symeon Seth (and the later versions, including the Eugenic recension), while eating figs, one of them accidentally fell from the monkey’s hands into the water and was gratefully consumed there by the sea turtle.⁶² More or less the same can be read in the few Arabic versions at our disposal as well as in medieval translations from the Arabic into other languages.⁶³ But in the Latin translation, the monkey peels the figs and throws the skins onto the ground, and the sea turtle gets out of the water, reposes in the shade of the monkey’s tree (behaviour more commonly associated with tortoises than sea turtles), and eats the fig skins.⁶⁴ This is no longer translating or adapting: this is fundamentally re-writing the source text. This is a form of creative writing on the part of the Latin translator.

The Latin translator –whoever he may have been– not only re-Arabizes the text, but also fails to mention Eugenios of Palermo altogether. He translates the two prefaces by the Persian translator Burzōy (*Prologue 1 and 3*) and the preface by the Arabic translator Ibn al-Muqaffa’ (*Prologue 2*), but he omits the preface by Eugenios of Palermo, in which the latter explains that the Indian fables of *Stephanites and Ichneutes*, if allegorized properly, reveal their inner meaning and, therefore, can be savoured by Christians as well.⁶⁵ As I argued in my edition of this preface, the Eugenic recension caters to the needs and interests of “highly

⁶¹ The problem with the Arabic source text is that only a few versions have been edited and translated so far: see Krönung, “The Wisdom of the Beasts,” pp. 445–448.

⁶² §5.116: ed. Sjöberg, *Stephanites and Ichneutes*, p. 228 and Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης και Ίχνηλάτης*, p. 229.

⁶³ See Miquel, *Ibn al-Muqaffa’*, p. 187, and Knatchbull, *Kalila and Dimna*, p. 258. See also the medieval Spanish translation: Antonio G. Solalinde (ed.), *Calila y Dimna. Fábulas: antigua versión castellana* (Madrid, 1917), p. 85, and the Latin translation of the Hebrew version of *Kalīla wa-Dimna*: Joseph Derenbourg (ed.), *Johannis de Capua Directorium vitae humanae alias parabola antiquorum sapientium* (Paris, 1889), p. 204.

⁶⁴ Ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” p. 135.25–28.

⁶⁵ Ed. Lauxtermann, “The Eugenic Recension,” pp. 101–103.

educated Greeks living in Sicily and Calabria, proud of their culture, but at the point of extinction due to the latinization of the elite”.⁶⁶ The Latin translation is the inevitable result of this process of latinization, and the omission of any reference to Eugenios of Palermo constitutes a form of obliteration, a writing off, a passing over in silence –or to put it in more positive terms, an acceptance of the fact that Greek is on its way out.⁶⁷ Although the Latin translator is most probably a Greek himself, he is working in an environment that, though notionally trilingual, is basically monocultural.

This monocultural environment is the Kingdom of Sicily under Frederick II Hohenstaufen and his son Manfred, open to foreign sources of wisdom and knowledge and curious to investigate new ideas, but also autocratic, medieval in the bad sense of the word, and thoroughly Latin.⁶⁸ Most of the works translated into Latin in this period deal with philosophy (above all, Aristotle and Averroës) or are of a more general scientific nature (natural sciences, astronomy, medicine).⁶⁹ The source language is mostly Arabic, either directly or via the intermediary of Hebrew,⁷⁰ but translations from Greek are also well-represented.⁷¹ There is some interest in fiction as well. The lavishly illustrated manuscript of Heinrich von Veldeke’s *Eneas Romance* (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, germ. fol. 282), dates to the 1220s and is of Southern Italian provenance; Frederick II possessed a copy of the *Palamedes Romance* around 1240; and Manfred most probably commissioned the astonishingly beautiful manuscript of the *Historia de preliis* (the tenth-century translation of the *Alexander Romance*), which is now kept in the public library of Leipzig (Stadtbibliothek, Repositorium, II. 4^o 143).⁷² The *Book of Sydrac* is said to have been brought from Tunis for Frederick II and to have been turned into Latin by a Franciscan friar, called Roger of Palermo; but the text of this compendium in fact dates from the last quarter of the thirteenth century.⁷³ There is every reason to believe that the Hohenstaufen court will have welcomed the translation of *Kalīla and Dimna* (via the Greek intermediary of *Stephanites and*

⁶⁶ Lauxtermann, “The Eugenic Recension,” pp. 82–98; quotation on p. 97.

⁶⁷ For the disappearance of Greek culture in Southern Italy, see Annick Peters-Custot, *Les grecs de l’Italie méridionale post-Byzantine: Une acculturation en douceur* (Rome, 2009).

⁶⁸ See David Abulafia, *Frederick II: A medieval emperor*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1992).

⁶⁹ See Haskins, *Studies in the history of mediaeval science*, pp. 242–326.

⁷⁰ See the various contributions in Andreas Speer and Lydia Wegener (eds), *Wissen über Grenzen: arabisches Wissen und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Berlin, 2006).

⁷¹ See the contributions in Pieter de Leemans (ed.), *Translating at the court: Bartholomew of Messina and cultural life at the court of Manfred, king of Sicily* (Louvain, 2014).

⁷² See Alessandra Perricoli Saggese, “Fra la corte e l’università: manoscritti miniati di età manfrediana,” in De Leemans (ed.), *Translating at the court*, pp. 91–111, at pp. 106 and 109.

⁷³ See Haskins, *Studies in the history of mediaeval science*, p. 254. For a recent edition of this highly interesting work of fiction, see Ernstpeter Ruhe, *Sydrac le Philosophe: Le livre de la fontaine de toutes sciences* (Wiesbaden, 2000).

Ichnelates) because it is a classic in Arabic and offers moral guidance to rulers, such as Frederick II and Manfred. The re-Arabization of the text fits in very well with the huge interest at the Hohenstaufen court in anything presumed to be Arabic wisdom (though not in anything to do with the Muslim population of Sicily, which was wiped out entirely).⁷⁴

On the very last page, where the philosopher and the emperor (the two interlocutors of *Stephanites and Ichnelates*) conclude their polite conversation regarding the ethics of governance, the Latin translator adds a few lines of his own. In these lines the philosopher wishes for the emperor a long life and a prosperous reign with the help of God, and the emperor rewards the philosopher for his wise counsels with the kiss of peace and splendid gifts and then bids him farewell.⁷⁵ One could argue that this expresses an implicit wish on the part of the translator that his text be well received at the Hohenstaufen court; but we will never know because the Latin translation lacks a preface of its own. What we do know is that the translation does not seem to have enjoyed a wide audience because there are only two manuscripts and no early prints. This compares quite badly to the *Directorium vitae humanae*, another Latin translation (this time from Hebrew), produced by John of Capua, a Jew converted to Christianity.⁷⁶ This translation (dedicated to Cardinal Matthew Rubens Ursinus and, therefore, dateable to 1263–1278) was hugely popular: there are many manuscripts, there is an incunable and later prints, and there are quite a number of translations into the vernaculars of Western Europe.

The misfortune of the Latin translation of *Stephanites and Ichnelates* is due to historical circumstances: with the death of Manfred on the battle-field in 1266 and the subsequent Angevin takeover, the centre of power moved north, from Palermo to Naples, from imperial autocracy to papal dominion. It stands to reason that John of Capua must have had close connections with nearby Naples and the mere fact that he was writing for a cardinal suggests a link with the papacy as well. He had everything going for him. But the Latin translator of *Stephanites and Ichnelates*? He is like *The Man who Found a Treasure*. He found it and lost it. His bad luck was that Hohenstaufen culture did not last longer than it did.

⁷⁴ For the persecution of the Muslim community, see David Abulafia, “Ethnic variety and its implications: Frederick II’s relations with Jews and Muslims,” *Studies in the History of Art* 44 (1994), 213–224, at pp. 215–218.

⁷⁵ Ed. Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung,” pp. 154.32–37 and 155.2–4. This addition cannot be found as such in the Arabic versions that have been published so far.

⁷⁶ Ed. Derenbourg, *Directorium vitae humanae*. For other translations by the same author, see Görge K. Hasselhoff, “Johannes von Capua und Armengaud Blaise als Übersetzer medizinischer Werke des Maimonides,” in Speer and Wegener (eds), *Wissen über Grenzen*, pp. 340–356.

Primary Sources

A Hundred and One Nights, ed. and transl. Bruce Fudge (New York, 2016)

Book of Cydrac, ed. Ernstpeter Ruhe, *Sydrac le Philosophe: Le livre de la fontaine de toutes sciences* (Wiesbaden, 2000)

Calila y Dimna, ed. Antonio G. Solalinde, *Calila y Dimna. Fábulas: antigua versión castellana* (Madrid, 1917)

Eugenian Recension (version P3), ed. and transl. Alison Noble, with the help of Alexander Alexakis and Richard P.H. Greenfield, *Animal Fables of the Courtly Mediterranean: The Eugenic Recension of Stephanites and Ichnelates* (Washington, 2022)

Eugenian Recension, Preface, ed. Marc D. Lauxtermann, “The Eugenic Recension of *Stephanites and Ichnelates*: Prologue and Paratexts,” *Néa Póμη* 15 (2018), pp. 100-106

Johannis de Capua, *Directorium*, ed. Joseph Derenbourg, *Johannis de Capua Directorium vitae humanae alias parabola antiquorum sapientium* (Paris, 1889)

Kalila and Dimna, transl. Wyndham Knatchbull, *Kalila and Dimna or the Fables of Bidpai* (Oxford, 1819)

Kalila et Dimna, transl. André Miquel, *Ibn al-Muqaffa’: Le livre de Kalila et Dimna ou Fables de Bidpai* (Paris, 1957)

Latin Translation, ed. Alfons Hilka, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung der griechischen Version des Kalilabuchs”, in idem, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Erzählungsliteratur des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1928), pp. 59-165

Stephanites and Ichnelates (long version), ed. Vittorio Puntoni, *Στεφανίτης και Ἰχνηλάτης: Quattro rensioni della versione greca del Kalila wa-Dimna* (Florence, 1889)

Stephanites and Ichnelates (short version), ed. Lars-Olaf Sjöberg, *Stephanites und Ichnelates: Überlieferungsgeschichte und Text* (Uppsala, 1962), pp. 151-244

Secondary Literature

Abulafia, David, *Frederick II: A medieval emperor*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1992)

Abulafia, David, “Ethnic variety and its implications: Frederick II’s relations with Jews and Muslims,” *Studies in the History of Art* 44 (1994), pp. 213–224

Berschin, Walter, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages: From Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa* (Washington, 1988)

de Blois, François, *Burzōy's Voyage to India and the Origin of the Book of Kalilah wa Dimnah* (London, 1990)

Braccini, Tommaso, "An Apple between Folktales, Rumors, and Novellas: Malalas 14.8 and its Oriental Parallels," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 58 (2018), 299–323

Condylis-Bassoukos, Hélène, *Stephanites kai Ichnelates, traduction grecque (XI^e siècle) du livre Kalila wa-Dimna d'Ibn al-Muqaffa' (VIII^e siècle): étude lexicologique et littéraire* (Louvain, 1997)

van Dijk, Gert-Jan, *Aesopica Posteriora: Medieval and Modern Versions of Greek and Latin Fables*, 2 vols (Genoa, 2015)

Haskins, Charles H., *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1924)

Hasselhoff, Görge K., "Johannes von Capua und Armengaud Blaise als Übersetzer medizinischer Werke des Maimonides," in Andreas Speer and Lydia Wegener (eds), *Wissen über Grenzen: arabisches Wissen und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Berlin, 2006), pp. 340–356

Hilka, Alfons, "Eine bisher unbekannte lateinische Übersetzung der griechischen Version des Kalilabuchs (Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης)," *Jahresbericht der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Cultur* 95 (1917), Abt. IV.c, pp. 1-10.

Jamison, Evelyn, *Admiral Eugenius of Sicily: His Life and Work and the Authorship of the Epistola ad Petrum and the Historia Hugonis Falcandi Siculi* (London, 1957)

Kantorowicz, Ernst, *Frederick the Second, 1194–1250* (London, 1931)

Krönung, Bettina, "The Wisdom of the Beasts: The Arabic Book of Kalīla and Dimna and the Byzantine Book of Stephanites and Ichnelates," in Carolina Cupane and Bettina Krönung (eds), *Fictional Storytelling in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 427-460

Lauxtermann, Marc D., "Tomi, Mljet, Malta: Critical Notes on a Twelfth-Century Southern Italian Poem of Exile," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 64 (2014), 155–176

Lauxtermann, Marc D., "The Eugenic Recension of *Stephanites and Ichnelates*: Prologue and Paratexts," *Nέα Πώμη* 15 (2018), 55-106

de Leemans, Pieter (ed.), *Translating at the court: Bartholomew of Messina and cultural life at the court of Manfred, king of Sicily* (Louvain, 2014)

Lindahl, Carl, "Feindschaft zwischen Tieren und Mensch," *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, vol. 4 (Berlin, 1984), coll. 982–991

Marzolph, Ulrich, and Aboubakr Chraïbi, "The Hundred and One Nights: A Recently Discovered Old Manuscript," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 162 (2012), 299–316

- Niehoff-Panagiotidis, Johannes, *Übersetzung und Rezeption: Die byzantinisch-neugriechischen und spanischen Adaptionen von Kalīla wa-Dimna* (Wiesbaden, 2003)
- Noble, Alison E., *Cultural Interchange in the Medieval Mediterranean: Prolegomena to a Text of the Eugenian Recension*, 2 vols. (Unpublished PhD thesis, Queen's University Belfast, 2003)
- Papademetriou, John Th., *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of Stephanites kai Ichneutes* (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Illinois, 1960)
- Pasciuta, Beatrice, "Stratigotus," in *Federico II: Enciclopedia Fridericiana*, 2 vols (Rome, 2005), vol. II, pp. 802–803
- Perricoli Saggese, Alessandra, "Fra la corte e l'università: manoscritti miniati di età manfrediana," in Pieter de Leemans (ed.), *Translating at the court: Bartholomew of Messina and cultural life at the court of Manfred, king of Sicily* (Louvain, 2014), pp. 91–111
- Perry, Ben E., *Aesopica, I* (Urbana 1952)
- Peters-Custot, Annick, *Les grecs de l'Italie méridionale post-Byzantine: Une acculturation en douceur* (Rome, 2009)
- Puntoni, Vittorio, "Alcune favole dello Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης secondo una relazione inedita di Prete Giovanni Escammatismeno," in Enea Piccolomini (ed.), *Studi di filologia greca* (Turin, 1882), pp. 29-58
- Puntoni, Vittorio, "Sopra alcune recensioni dello Stephanites kai Ichneutes," *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, anno cclxxxiii (1886), serie quarta: Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, vol. II, parte I^a, Memorie, pp. 113-182
- van Riet, Simone, "Les fables arabes d'Ibn al-Muqaffa en traductions grecques et latines," in Albert Zimmermann and Ingrid Craemer-Ruegenberg (eds), *Orientalische Kultur und Europäisches Mittelalter* (Berlin-New York, 1985), pp. 151–160
- Sjöberg, Lars-Olaf, *Stephanites und Ichneutes: Überlieferungsgeschichte und Text* (Uppsala, 1962)
- Sironval, Margaret, "Le don du fruit merveilleux dans les *Mille et Une Nuits*," *Journal of Arabic Literature* 36 (2005), 288–310
- Speer, Andreas, and Lydia Wegener (eds), *Wissen über Grenzen: arabisches Wissen und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Berlin, 2006)